VOLUME IX, NO. 50
DECEMBER 12, 1956

PROBLEMS OF HUMAN ASSOCIATION

MEN associate together for various reasons—to feel together, to think together, and to act together. "Feeling together" is what happens when men join with one another for the sake of companionship. Or "feeling together" may result from some form of religious association. "Thinking together" is an activity of learned or scientific societies, or of groups which come together for the purpose of analysis of a common problem, or in order to plan for some common objective. "Acting together" usually has a practical end, and is typified by the various forms of organization which have specific tasks to perform. A government is an association of men, more or less representative of other men, which establishes order and seeks to serve the general welfare.

It is impossible, of course, to separate feeling and thinking and acting in any final way, but it is quite reasonable to isolate broad areas of human behavior according to the activity which obviously prevails in each one, and to examine them in terms of those activities.

Thinking, for example, is in some respects radically different from acting. When a group of men gather to consider a problem in physics or technology, they do not come together only to think alike. They also come together to cross-fertilize one another's minds and to provoke each other to original discoveries. A dull agreement, at the outset of the examination of any question or problem, would stultify research.

It is stipulated by the members of a group of this sort that the truth is not known, that it is to be sought, and that any direction of investigation which shows promise should be followed until all its potentialities are revealed. Only in a very qualified sense does such a group pursue "group-thinking." The members invite each other to think independently concerning a question which has been given a tentative formulation. They may not even agree that the question is properly stated, so that here, too, the "group" aspect of their approach to the problem is insignificant.

The important thing to recognize is that such men do not unite in order to "influence" one another to some specified conclusion or course of action. They associate to enrich their individuality rather than to diminish it. And it is the duty of each member of the group to dissent from any common conclusion so long as he has reason to question its validity.

How different the typical religious association; where the unity ostensibly derives from the willingness of the members to think the same thing! Of course, the contemporary religious denomination is far from being an association of people with the same authentic convictions. Today, with the exception of the Catholic Church and perhaps the Quakers and the Unitarians, denominational association is for the most part an accident of sentiment, neighborhood, economic bracket, and the wish for social companionship. The creeds accepted by the members are not of great importance to the members, whatever the views held by their ministers.

In principle, however, the sole justification for a religious denomination is a distinctive belief which is held by the members to be the highest religious truth, and which avoids the errors of other denominations. The creed, therefore, is not evidence of a quest for truth, but the sign of its discovery in the past. Acceptance, not search, is the attitude of creedal religion. The invitation of the creeds, therefore, is an invitation to uniform belief, and this belief is traditionally held to be the means of salvation.

The difference between a religious association and a political association lies in their differing objectives. A religious association is presumed to bring spiritual benefits, while a political association seeks some practical good. All sorts of side-motives qualify these intentions, but the broad differentiation stands wherever the associations are undertaken with sincerity. The religious association may lead to action, but the action is personal and individual; or, if some practical good work is undertaken, that work is an end in itself, and not the means to some other end, such as power. The actions which flow from political associations, however, are usually intended to have broad political consequences. A political association may be formed to get a nation into war—as, for example, "to save the allies," or "to stop Hitler." Or it may be formed to conduct a revolution that promises "to expropriate the expropriators" and "to abolish the means of economic exploitation."

The principal distinction of a learned or scientific society as an association is that it is not identified by the common opinions of the members, but by the *field* which the society determines to investigate. While learned men may in the course of time acquire some common opinions as a result of their studies—and even common prejudices, since they are human—these common views are a consequence of the association and not its cause. Nor is the association dependent upon such uniformity of ideas, when it happens to occur.

A religious association, on the other hand, obtains its integrity from common belief. Take away the particular beliefs which give the association its name, and the association loses its identity. What would be "Christian" about a denomination the members of which decided that the existence of God is a questionable matter, the divinity of Christ subject to debate, and the Vicarious Atonement possibly a debilitating deception?

A political association may conceivably have its origin in a group which sets out to study a particular human problem—say, the problem of class distinctions, or of racial discrimination. The association becomes political when it decides to expand its activities and to seek the power to erase the evil which has previously been only a subject of study. When a clear principle is involved, the act of political association may be seen as unequivocally good. In the case of human slavery, which was a major issue of the Civil War, or in the case of the Supreme Court decision ordering desegregation of the races in the public schools, the relation of a political opinion to a basic principle is clearly evident. One might argue, also, that, once the facts disclosed by scientists are made common knowledge, the demand that atom and thermonuclear bomb experiment be stopped is a political proposal which can be made without creating any confusion. The issue is unmistakable.

The curious thing about modern politics, however, is that the existing political organizations seem to consistently ignore the issues which voters might have some chance to decide upon by using their own reason and intelligence. Instead, the appeal of the major parties is through slogans which declare for desirable goals, without introducing any principles which the voters can examine in terms of their basic validity. Mechanisms for achieving those goals may be mentioned, but their presence is little more than symbolic. At a national election, *Men* go before the voters, and *Magic Words* representing *What We Want* are repeated. Between the Men and the Ends to be achieved there is only a great blur. We can vote for men whom we tend to trust, or whom we find reason to respect, but principles and policies are usually far beyond our grasp. They are beyond our grasp for two reasons: first, modern government is a vastly complex affair; and, second, the candidate who invites the voters to take seriously the difficulties of government will undoubtedly suffer in popularity for his pains.

But even in the best imaginable political circumstances—with, that is, ideal politicians—one basic problem remains. Political action is group action, and in our society major political actions are necessarily *mass* actions. Now policies and actions capable of winning *mass* approval must always be uncomplicated and easy to understand. Yet the problems of the modern world are subtle and difficult to understand. The politician has no time to become an educator. He needs a decision *now.* He naturally succumbs to the temptation to simplify. He goes before the public as a contestant, not as a teacher. He seeks agreement, not understanding. Any educational influence he exercises is merely incidental to his campaign to win.

There are times when the public man, in the name of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, completely betrays the entire project of democratic education. There are times—like the present—when the will to be a true teacher is seen "objectively" as a willful desire to subvert the national security. What candidate for office, then, will dare to "weigh" issues of right and justice in a matter of national decision when our very lives, liberties, and "standard of living" are at stake?

It follows that political leadership, in these times, subjects the leader who understands educational responsibility to unbearable compromises; and that political followership, in a like manner, makes the follower pathetically unable to think for himself in any effective measure. The alternatives are too meagre, the decisions afforded him too unrelated to any significant choice.

Shall we then retire from active citizenship? Shall we join the anarchists? Or shall we form or unite with some political fraction which undertakes an educational program in some entirely different scheme of political organization?

These are all possibilities, but the best suggestion we think we can propose is the design of a theory of politics in which, whenever there is a conflict between political and educational ends, the political purpose gives way to the educational purpose. No politics which displaces or interrupts educational processes can be honored by the members of a free society. This was the verdict of Socrates, who preferred death to a subordination of the educational process to politics. And this was the reason why, as he explains in the *Apology*, he abstained from political action throughout his long career.

Years ago the *Saturday Evening Post* printed a story about a Central European peasant who came to the United States in full manhood and went to work in a blast furnace in Pennsylvania. As old age approached, when he had retired from work, he fell under the influence of a local politician who used him to sway the immigrant vote. For a while he gloried in his role as "leader," but eventually he realized that he was only the ward-healer's pawn—that this was not supporting American democracy, but perverting it. So he stopped voting entirely as a gesture of respect for the adopted country he loved so well. This was better, he felt, than pretending to be able to cast an intelligent vote. So far as we can see, his decision was an act of political integrity.

The contrast between the labyrinth of modern politics and the public affairs of the city states of ancient Greece is a striking one. In *Hellas Revisited*, W. Macneile Dixon describes the life of the Greek citizen:

> Some of the smallest islands in the Ægean contained two or more cities, jealous of their independence. With what result? That in every town, in every village, we may say, the stage was set, as in a mighty kingdom, for high events, for drama, in which every citizen bore a part, and no trifling, irresponsible or merely spectacular part. The tiny community to which he belonged dealt daily, as a senate might deal, with great matters—made its own laws, supplied its own necessities, debated policies, provided for its protection against aggressive neighbors, dispatched and received embassies, made war or peace. These were not subjects for idle talk in times when one's country extended as far as a spear could reach, and possessions could only be securely held by men whose hands were firm upon their weapons. Imagine a state of things in which every

> villager is a statesman, a magistrate a soldier, involved in all public affairs, and with a share in all responsible decisions. . . . There is no government to blame if calamity follows upon errors of judgment; he is the government. If his city declares war—and quarrels leading to war, quarrels over boundaries or the theft of cattle, are endless—it is he who fights for home, family and property with spear and shield in his own hands. Circumstances like these, and they were universal in ancient Greece, make for activity of mind and call forth whatever powers it may possess. They make, too, for communal cooperation. In such circumstances, and under such pressure, thought will burn, if ever, with a clear, intense flame.

In these terms, political association has profound meaning; but even the democracy of Athens, the best of the city states, decayed so grievously that Socrates, the wisest of the Athenians, avoided a political career. The fundamental problem, then, is that of scaling our political communities to workable dimensions. Our political institutions have grown beyond all sensible limit—due chiefly, we think, to the fact that we have trusted too much to political action to obtain for us the Good Life. And of all our political faiths, the faith in war is the greatest offender. We can have no real self-government so long as war remains an instrument of national policies, for war is the absolute which contains and dictates the limit of every other human enterprise, however excellent. This is not freedom, but slavery—slavery to the politics we have created and relied upon to make us free.

REVIEW
ANOTHER "GANDHIAN" WESTERN

Two weeks ago, an article in these pages suggested the possibility of an eventual transformation of the Western psyche in the direction of non-violence, intimating that any such change would have to be a gradual cultural influence. Whether or not this hopeful prediction of "a new-type crusade" is vindicated by history, the idea is an interesting one, and not without support from current fiction. Already, here, we have noted the appearance of "pacifist" heroes in Western novels—a curious contribution to the special world of stylized gun-bravery and violence. *Rebel Gun,* by Arthur Steuer (a paperback), carries this theme to a balanced emotional conclusion. So, if your adolescent son has reached the stage of reading the "Westerns," be sure he tries this one for psychological contrast—nor will it hurt similarly addicted parents.

"Drum" Carpenter enters the story as a seventeen-year-old Missouri boy whose father has fought in the Civil War and whose state and county are now invaded by poverty and carpetbaggers. Drum's resentment of the injustice of reconstruction leads him to train himself as a top gunman, against the day when he will have to fight ruthless Yankee raiders to save his family's farm. In this crisis, his father's attitude is a crushing disappointment to the boy—a boy who followed him to battle several years before, playing the drum for the volunteer corps Captain Carpenter led. Here the carefully developed theme of Mr. Steuer's book begins:

> His father had been a man of strength, a man of pride, a man of spirit and dedication, admired and followed by all who knew him. He had ridden to the war on the back of the stallion Alexander the Great with a company of seventy-two volunteers trooped out behind him, their allegiance sworn to Luke Carpenter as much, if not more, than to Jefferson Davis and the Confederacy. Drum, bursting then with pride instead of humiliation, had rattled his sticks on the drum he carried all through the first six months of the war up and down country roads, the tall man on the big brown stallion and his twelve-year-old son on the little gray mule, rapping the drum behind him.
>
> But after one long, bloody day of battle something had crumbled inside Luke. Somewhere in the shelling he had dismounted and left his troops, bowed his head and led the big horse back away from the bursting shot.
>
> It was as if all the world was blind and only Luke Carpenter could see. Headlong humanity rushed to the precipice of damnation leaving only Luke Carpenter to observe helplessly, ignored, and to mourn. No one could understand. Those who could and did were dead. It was useless to explain. Beside him had ridden the flagbearer, a youth of twenty named Carl Hodges into whose hand he had personally thrust the quill and held and guided it over the page, for Carl could not write his own name and was embarrassed to sign with an X. One minute he was there, Carl Hodges, and the next he was any man. His own mother wouldn't have recognized him. His face disappeared in a powder blast. He sat his horse like that, without a feature to his name, only a scream that came out of nowhere, so loud it seemed to flap the flag; and then he fell and took the flag down with him.
>
> It was then Luke had dismounted. Not from cowardliness, though not even his own son could believe him, but more out of simple disgust. He had walked through the meanest barrage on the field, slowly, without fear, leading the horse. He had stopped by a shell where fresh water rose out of the rim of the earth, a hidden spring uncovered by a falling ball.
>
> He had led the battle horse, Alexander, stripped of his saddle, in and out amongst the fighting, and flung two and three bodies sideways over his great back. Captain Luke Carpenter, unhorsed and unsworded had resigned his manhood to the cause of mercy. He gathered the torn remnants of common soldiers about him and washed their wounds and brought them water to drink from the spring. He had never remounted the horse. He served out the war as a nurse and a minister, easing the dying into death and their souls into heaven.
>
> He had accepted the castration of his rank and stood silently as they led the horse away to be ridden by an officer who sat high in the saddle with sword outstretched at the gallop of charge. He had written home only once, from the hospital in Richmond. . . .

The eviction and the gun battle come as Drum expected, and his father, still protesting violence, is shot down by a stray bullet intended for his angrily resisting son. His father lies dead, and Drum goes on trial for his life for killing the marshal—a sequence of events impossible for the seventeen-year-old boy to

understand. Drum's mother tries to explain to him the convictions of her dead husband, while showing understanding for the boy's violent mood:

> "I know, son, I know. It's not your fault you became a man so soon."
>
> "Somebody had to say something, do something! Pa signed the paper. He just looked sad and accepted it!"
>
> "Your father was a different cut. I won't say he was better than other men and I know a lot of people think he was worse, or maybe not worse so much as less. It was hard for a boy to grow up with a father who was one way and then suddenly see him change like he did. But I know that he was a complete man, even without that itch, without that pride that makes other men fight. Someday you will see your father for what he was. You will understand the courage it took for him to become what he became. You will believe, as I do, that—whether he was right or wrong—he was the bravest man you have ever known."
>
> Martha Carpenter raised her head and looked up to her son. Her eyes were dry and her shoulders were set square and straight.
>
> "You believe me, don't you, Ma?" Drum said. "He drew on me, the marshal. He moved to his gun first."
>
> "Yes, yes, boy." She stood. "You had to fight. Someone challenged you and you fought. I'm not saying you were wrong. I only wish you'd realize, just admit, that there is another way, and not resent your father for following that way. I don't know which of you is right, or if either of you is wrong. I just wish you'd respect him for his belief and the courage it took to live by it."
>
> "I do, Ma," Drum said.
>
> "No, no, you don't. And I don't expect you to. Not now. But someday you will. Someday you may even make the decisions he made. God willing you survive."

Escaping from jail, Drum joins the James and Younger gang, but, somewhere along the trail of useless violence, after narrowly escaping death, he begins to wonder:

> He sat, not speaking, asking himself the questions already answered by facts he had seen.
>
> "A war won't solve it, then," he said finally.
>
> "A war caused it," she said. "War kills everything. It killed my father long before he died out there. He came back with a hate that only dying could end."
>
> "I don't know," Drum said. "I thought it was the Yankees' fault."
>
> "It's the fault of hate and anger," she said. "Everyone tries to kill what they think they hate. They end up killing themselves. They end up killing what really matters. They end up killing what they love," she said.

Drum is tortured by the conflict between his thirst for violence and an inner feeling that he should put his gun away. When he tries the latter course in what first appears to be an old, old sequence in which the "changed" gun hand buckles on his six-shooter one last time to dispose of the villains—the lives of several men hang in the balance. A girl reasons with him:

> "Drum, it takes so much more strength to be a man without a gun."
>
> And now he remembered his father. His mother had said that some day he would understand the courage it took for his father to be what he was. She said he was the bravest man she had ever known. When he understood, she said, then he would love him again. Yes, she was right, he was the bravest man. *I*, he told himself, *am not that brave.*

But Drummond was just "that brave." Instead of killing, he finds a better way, and finds his own full manhood. He also discovers the meaning of his father's hard-won conviction and heretofore meaningless martyrdom. So this is, truly, a full-scale "pacifist Western"—a good story, with nothing overdrawn or underdrawn, and with both violence and non-violence receiving their due. Will there be more such stories from authors who are no longer content to turn out conventional "yarns," and will motion pictures like *Friendly Persuasion* show that the bravery of a Gandhi or a Gandhian can, at times, be even more impressive than the valor of the man who brings violent "triumph" to a worthy cause?

COMMENTARY
MISLEADING APPEARANCES

WE have two comments on our frontiers article for Oct. 24, which examined the contentions of Dr. D. M. Morandini concerning mysticism, as presented in an article in the *World Humanist Digest.* One comment is from Dr. Morandini. He says:

> . . . you state, "The mystic, in other words, is little more than an emotional fool—benevolently inclined, perhaps, but still a fool." This is not my statement. . . . I am extremely sorry that such an interpretation of my words was possible. I meant, however, that *scientific* truths do not satisfy the mystic ultimately, as a rule. But no one could be called, in my belief, a fool for that, especially since all science is based essentially on fundamental mysteries, as is clearly stated in an earlier (not quoted) paragraph of my article. I think, therefore, that this portion of my writing—the part which deals with mysticism—was thoroughly misunderstood.

It is good to have this disclaimer from Dr. Morandini. We were led to mistake his opinion by his description of the mystic as a person who "contemplates deeply in an armchair, or still worse, 'just feels intuitively'." He said further that the mystic recognizes his "truths" without hesitation "and without any desire for consistency." So far as the mystic is concerned, according to Dr. Morandini, his truths "simply *are* true, regardless how contradictory these truths may be to each other or to experience." This seemed to us a pretty foolish way to search for "truth," so we concluded that Dr. Morandini regards mystics as fools.

The other comment concerns possible limitations of the scientific method, as presently conceived and applied. This correspondent illustrates how confusion may arise:

> Take a sealed glass vessel containing air whose humidity is such that nothing is visible in the vessel at room temperature. Then force a stream of cold air across the vessel. Quickly it is filled with visible particles. Remove the chilling agent and the interior of the vessel soon appears empty. To an observer, ignorant of what is taking place, there appears to be creation and destruction of matter. The enclosed system has suffered neither addition nor subtraction, but remains the same.
>
> It sometimes seems that we attempt to solve a problem by a wrong approach and with equipment and methods that do not apply to that problem. Failing, we conclude that the problem is unsolvable. It is possible that we have been made a little heady by our advances in physics and mechanics. There are few things so blinding as cocksureness. This condition and the wonder that is said to have characterized the ancient Greeks are mutually exclusive. And wonder would seem to be essential to breaching boundaries. So long as there is the probability, or even the possibility of unknown factors, experience and logic would seem to caution restraint in assertion.

This suggestion surely applies to us all, whether scientists, mystics, or ordinary folk.

CHILDREN
and Ourselves

CORRESPONDENCE AND NOTES

WE have on hand another letter referring to our Oct. 3 discussion of "home education" as opposed to standardized instruction. Apparently a number of MANAS readers, whether or not currently wishing to avoid "mass instruction," are considerably interested in this issue, regarding the right to educate one's own children as crucial, if one is to stand, everywhere and all the time, for freedom of individual conscience. Our Oct. 3 "Notes" took account of various obstacles to home education. The present letter suggests some qualifications:

> There are undoubtedly many areas where home teaching would be permitted under some circumstances; one need not assume that the letter of the law will be everywhere upheld. Even in a totalitarian society such an assumption would be mistaken; in this country, it is nonsense. In such matters (as in everything else) the permission depends on a variety of local factors, personalities, and pressures; past experiences of the authorities, how the parents go about seeking permission, their reasons and attitudes, and the like. Legally, it is probably true that there is no place where this may be done; actually it can probably happen anywhere. Speaking politically, there is probably nothing more valuable you can do for your readers than to avoid, and help them to avoid, such monolithic thinking as you have been guilty of here.
>
> The problem of isolation which you raise is of course a very difficult one; I suppose parents who feel as we do, and as your earlier correspondents apparently do, would consider "sociality" a real sacrifice, but a worth-while sacrifice for other goals. (There is too much gregariousness forced on children in our culture anyhow). That the child will grow up into a world of enforced regulations is undoubtedly true; however the proposition that one learns to oppose standardization effectively by having a large dose of experience of it when young, strikes me as dubious to say the least.

An *AP* dispatch from Centertown, Mo. (Oct. 12), supports both our correspondent and our Oct. 3 Notes:

> An attractive former teacher, faced by the threat of prosecution, stood firm Thursday in her refusal to let her 7-year-old daughter attend public schools which she says turn children into trained seals.
>
> "I am going to stand by my guns," Mrs. Mary Schoenheit said in response to an ultimatum from the acting superintendent of the Moniteau County public schools to have the girl in classes by Friday or face legal action.
>
> The dark-hared mother, in her 40's, maintained she is complying with state law by tutoring her daughter Mary at home in a study course that she says is equal to what she would get in public schools.
>
> Acting County School Supt. Raymond McDaniels does not agree. Although she once taught in Illinois, McDaniels said Mrs. Schoenheit does not have a Missouri teacher's certificate and "does not qualify as an instructor capable of giving the child equal education at home."
>
> "Mary does very well under my program," Mrs. Schoenheit said, "and she is not going to public school. Our public schools are antiquated institutions consuming our children's lives and our money, and giving us in return trained seals who balance balls on their noses and bark at the right signal."

Mrs. Schoenheit had previously explored the possibility of home instruction *in* Southern California, and moved to Missouri in the belief that the interpretation of the law of compulsory education in that state was more flexible, terming the California state compulsory school attendance law "dictatorial." She is apparently willing to go to any lengths—including moving half-way across the United States—to carry out her program. She doesn't believe that all children, regardless of individual capabilities, should be "forced" to submit to one standard of education. Mrs. Schoenheit's position as a former school teacher makes this an excellent case for arousing public interest, since it is difficult to imagine that an instructor who once handled whole classrooms of children is unable to teach one seven-year-old girl.

The best way to maintain perspective on this question, it seems to us, is to realize that many who appreciate children's need of careful individual attention, close companionship and understanding affection in the teaching of the

young "are presently teaching in public schools." No "system" can ruin every teacher or keep good teachers from developing. On the other hand, it often seems as if the best accomplishments of public school instruction come when there is a lack of "system"—when the need is great and the equipment and money scarce. As Jesse Stuart wrote in *The Thread That Runs So True:*

> A great idea occurred to me. It wasn't about poetry. It was about schools. I thought if every teacher in every school in America—rural, village, city, township, church, public, or private—could inspire his pupils with all the power he had, if he could teach them as they had never been taught before to live, to work, to play, and to share, that would be a great way to make a generation of the greatest citizenry America had ever had. All of this to begin with the little unit. Each teacher had to do his share. Each teacher was responsible for the destiny of America, because the pupils came under his influence. The teacher held the destiny of a great country in his hand as no member of any other profession could hold it. All other professions stemmed from the products of his profession.
>
> The schoolroom was the gateway to all the problems of humanity. It was the gateway to the correcting of evils. It was the gateway to inspire the nation's succeeding generations to greater and more beautiful living with each other; to happiness, to health, to brotherhood, to everything!
>
> I thought these things as I walked in the somber autumn beside this river and watched the leaves fall from the tall bankside trees to the blue swirling water. And I believed deep in my heart that I was a member of the greatest profession of mankind, even if I couldn't make as much salary shaping the destinies of fourteen future citizens of America as I could if I were a blacksmith with little education at the Auckland Steel Mills.

Stuart, as his words indicate, loved to teach and loved his schools, although he discovered that his desire to give students individual attention tended to be frustrated in a *large* school. The originality which brought him amazing success in the backwoods towns of Kentucky was largely cribbed and confined in a huge city school system. But Mr. Stuart's remarks on the "poetry" of teaching are a reminder that, within school systems as well as outside of them, there are bound to be those who have a natural calling for the instruction of the young—and one such teacher in the life of the child is a precious advantage. While the parent who instructs at home may succeed at integral living, blending teaching with family life and necessary work, not all professionals are time-servers.

FRONTIERS

For Freedom in Tanganyika

[MANAS for Sept. 19 printed an editorial appreciative of the work of the Capricorn Africa Society, a movement begun with British inspiration which seeks to set a pattern for national government in Africa with "no discrimination on racial grounds." We now have a long letter from an African farmer in Tanganyika which, so far as we can see, shows how far behind articulate African opinion are even the apparently "liberal" proposals of the Capricorn Society. We are printing this letter almost entire. While MANAS does not normally open its pages to polemical correspondence, the need for Africans to be heard seems far more important than such considerations. Moreover, Mr. Japhet argues his case with such manifest clarity and apparent good sense that we are glad to give space to what he says. We are incidentally pleased by his confirmation of our own questioning of Capricorn's single-minded devotion to "free enterprise," in contrast to the traditional African conceptions of land use.—EDITORS.]

INTRODUCTION

OF late considerable laudatory attention has been given the Capricorn Africa Society in overseas press, books and comment. The gist of it all is that here is a brilliant, Christian, brotherly plan that means the salvation of Africa from either apartheid folly or black fanaticism, from foreign exploitation and stagnant poverty.

Directly, or by implication, any who would doubt its virtues or oppose its program are relegated to the ranks of irresponsible nationalists or racial bigots. It is sobering to see the parade of big names marshalled in advocacy of Capricorn, including an eminent humanitarian like Alan Paton, a churchman like Dr. J. H. Oldham, an author like Laurens van der Post, none of whom live in East Africa.

Many of us who have founded the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) are committed Christians who are tired of waiting for others to bring our people the practice of democracy and brotherhood which they preach. At first we viewed Capricorn with an interest which has turned to doubt and now dismay and resolute opposition. We must tell the other side of the story which the eminent admirers of Capricorn, off in other lands, either do not understand or do not tell.

I am a Tanganyikan African farmer who helped organize TANU. I studied at Marangu Teachers' Training School, have served as a government medical assistant, and am an active layman in the Lutheran Church of North Tanganyika. In 1952 I testified before the United Nations Trusteeship Committee at New York and studied for a time at San Jose State College in San Jose, California.

N. KIRILO JAPHET

I

The CAPRICORN CONTRACT adopted at Salima, Nyassaland in June, 1956, can, with its five implementing Provisions and Appendix, be obtained from the London Office of the Capricorn Society [42 Cheval Place, London S.W. 7]. This is the proposal for which the Tanganyika National Society (the local organization of Capricorn) is attempting to enlist "an irresistible weight of multi-racial opinion" in the UN Trust territory, and which, in the form of "Capricorn Citizenship Bills," it says it will introduce for acceptance in the Legislative Council.

The basic definition of civilized standards to which we of TANU subscribe has been set forth by the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as follows: Article I, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights..." and Article 21 declares that "(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives. . . (3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodical and genuine elections which shall be held by universal and equal suffrage . . ." On the other hand, in working out its purpose of "working for the creation of a common citizenship

. . . in which the members of all races would take a *full* part" the Capricorn CONTRACT declares, "The vote is *not* a natural right but a responsibility to be exercised for the common good . . . If the vote is not a right open to everyone but a responsibility of those who have shown themselves fit for it, there must be degrees of fitness among those who have earned the privilege." With this introduction to its unique scheme of "the multiple vote," the Capricorn CONTRACT sets forth a multitude of restrictions which it calls "broadening the franchise."

This ". . . principle that it is possible to qualify for more than one vote" is in direct contradiction to the Declaration of Human Rights. In Britain, if a General, a wealthy land owner, a university Don, or an archbishop should try to cast one vote more in a general election than the lowliest charwoman or West Indian laborer, he would get into serious trouble. Why cannot Capricorn people follow that same civilized standard here? India, a leading Commonwealth nation, entrusts the control of stable government to universal and equal suffrage even though the majority of its people are yet illiterate. Why not in Africa, too?

Two centuries of political progress have writ large the principle that it is the primary duty of government to consult all the people as to how it rules them. Government is a natural and inalienable right, as the British settlers in America showed long ago, and belongs to all the people whom it rules, not to a minority, however elite or wealthy or educated.

Under the CONTRACT'S franchise PROVISION, most adult Europeans would qualify in many ways for many votes. Only one or two per cent of African men or women now living in Tanganyika could reasonably hope to get any vote in their lifetime! Almost every European would be given not only one but up to six votes—only two years after arriving from overseas. A few thousand European residents would thus have no difficulty in perpetuating their domination in the Legislative Council over 8,000,000 Tanganyikans. Under the present Parity Principle, introduced by his Excellency, Governor Sir Edward Twining, we have already progressed far beyond these Capricorn "improvements." Could HM Government in London condone this Capricorn scheme for reversion to unfair representation which it has not allowed in any other colonial area? Could the Trusteeship Council and the Fourth Committee of the UN General Assembly permit such unusual manipulation of affairs under their Trusteeship?

A closer look at the Appendix to the CONTRACT (which is included in it by the signatories) finds suggested as voting qualifications honorary offices, titles and military ranks of British custom which few if any Africans hold or hope to attain. The income and production qualifications fit only a very few Africans because they pertain to businesses with a large cash volume or to estates so large they can only be farmed with expensive and complicated machinery. The restrictions based on cash income or wealth in immovable property are set so high that in our African societies, based on production for use rather than for profit, only a few hundred Africans could hope to meet them at this time. Similarly for education. All European children are provided adequate subsidies for education up to the university level, but the school opportunities are still woefully inadequate for Africans who receive less than 1 per cent as much money expended per child. This might be expected, but it does make Capricorn's qualifications for its "common electoral roll" into an empty and useless promise to 98 per cent of present-day Tanganyikans.

Heretofore, we of TANU welcomed Capricorn's "primary concern with human values" and its stated plan "to help establish a common citizenship and an electoral system in the devising of which each race will feel *equal* in responsibility." However, a plan which would divide a few of us with some education from our fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, for

whom there has been no place in school, does not arouse our patriotic fervor. True leadership, it is our TANU conviction, dare not allow itself to be divorced from the common people.

II

TANU's current proposals are very conservative, simply being that the 1-1/4 per cent of the immigrant communities should share "equally"—that is, 50 per cent—in legislative representation with the African 98-3/4 per cent. The latter should be permitted to learn voting by doing so under qualifications broad enough to give real citizenship training *now*. Capricorn would bar nearly everyone from this privilege and this training for another generation or two. It is easy to understand Capricorn's lack of appeal to any large number of the African people when it asks us to entrust our property, justice and security to an elite which discriminates so overwhelmingly in favor of European immigrants.

The Preface of the *Capricorn Handbook* concludes: "When all human beings in Africa can aspire to the full status of citizenship then we believe we will have achieved a living partnership between the races, and only then will Capricorn Africa fulfill its destiny." It is our experience that the existence and rapid growth of TANU is a living demonstration that large numbers of our people do aspire right now to responsibility for the state which governs them, whether self-appointed guardians will admit their readiness or not. Those who now come asking African support, saying "all men are created equal, but some are more equal than others" are living in the wrong century or the wrong country. The contradiction between their idealistic Capricorn professions and their naive or cynical legislative proposals is bound to be self-defeating.

In Tanganyika there is no entrenched and legally-hallowed colour bar. Capricorn may well appeal elsewhere for a "great act of faith" in overcoming the colour bar; but we are doing all right here without them coming to save us.

III

The land we depend upon for security as well as a daily living is a much more serious matter. Here, again, Capricorn CONTRACT PROVISIONS show an appalling lack of understanding of human and civilized values. PROVISION II says, "All existing and individual rights in land shall be recognized and confirmed by law." To overseas observers who don't know Africa this sounds reasonable enough, doubtless. However, the key words are "individual" and "existing." The rights of all European individuals would be protected. All existing European landholders have title on freehold or long term leasehold *as* individuals. No Africans under the existing laws are permitted to hold land *as* individuals! What follows then takes on a very different meaning.

Under the CONTRACT all land would be made available gradually for purchase by all persons without regard to their race. But we ask immediately, who would be able to afford to "purchase"—for money—any sizeable amount of land, except, of course, the immigrant from overseas with accumulated wealth or credit backing? Certainly not for a long time many Africans; for few have cash to spend for land. Our customs of land use and transfer are based not on buying and selling and speculation manipulated by those with the most money. Our customs are based upon the actual primary needs and usage of each head of a family with his wife, children and other dependents.

Examine this "Land Reform Provision," as Capricorn calls it, closely. Let overseas people read the small print behind the lofty phrases of the Preamble. It confesses in print that ". . . legislation to implement this principle may in certain instances involve the abrogation of treaties and of solemn pledges to various communities. . . ." After having removed the protection of Her Majesty's Government by obtaining "Dominion Status" (another one of Capricorn's proposals), and then being unwilling (according to their

franchise provisions) to permit the majority to have any real proportion of representation at all, the Capricorn CONTRACT goes on to suggest that "the state" (*their* state) set aside the solemn promises and treaties of HM Government. That they dare make such a proposal publicly is an amazing confession, one which Parliament ought to find highly interesting!

Of course, Capricorn suggests that the state set up "Land Boards" to ease the problems arising from the abrogated treaties, but we have had enough of other people giving away our land. God gave this land to us through our ancestors. No state has any right to take it from us without our free and equal consent. We in Tanganyika know the CONTRACT is trying to win the favor of white settlers who covet the remaining good lands of our neighbors in Nyassaland and Northern Rhodesia, but how can Capricorn expect to appeal to any but the most naïve Africans with its "Land Reform Provisions"?

The CONTRACT would actually prevent the possibility of Africans buying lands held by other racial groups by its provision that the state ". . . may also take steps to ensure that transfers of particular lands are made only to experienced farmers." We have a pretty good idea of where the "particular lands" would turn out to lie and just whom they mean by "experienced farmers."

Again and again, the Capricorn CONTRACT demonstrates the classic observation by the philosopher, Reinhold Neibuhr, that "the intelligence of privileged groups is usually applied to inventing specious proofs for the theory that universal values spring from, and that general interests are served by, the special privileges which they hold."

IV

Our criticism of Capricorn springs inevitably from our own position. TANU is a popular political movement. Its constitution, in full, and its books as well, are open to the public. It is democratically controlled by the activities of the local branches and the individual members. Its goal is to represent and to be responsible to the needs and hopes of the 98 per cent of the population who find no other party willing to consult their opinions or genuinely promote their interests. In the two years of our organized existence, more than 220,000 people have enrolled in our membership and paid their fees, despite our proscription by government for all African civil servants, such as teachers. The Capricorn people are not proscribed for their "non-political" activities.

We agree heartily with Capricorn that we are "determined not to risk lowering civilized standards." However, it is transparently obvious that the CONTRACT lavishes most of its attention on ensuring such standards as are native to the European community. In spite of a few of our Europeanized Africans, many Africans are not convinced of the self-advertised "superiority" of Western standards. Their sheer materialism, in spite of their claims to the Christian philosophy, and their anarchic individualism often seem to produce the most frustrated masses of individuals and the most savagely destructive nation-states. The culmination of centuries of "progress" in these civilized countries seems to be their proud ability to annihilate God's entire world according to their uncontrollable self-interests and paranoiac fears. If "Western civilization" does not succeed in giving us more godly character, orderly and lawful human relations, and joyful living than most of the European nations have, there is no good reason for us to rush to desert our African traditions.

All we peoples of Africa ask are the same Universal Human Rights other men recognize and cherish. No one can presume to "give" them to us when *they* decide we "have earned the right." These rights are not made or conferred by men. God has already given them to us as He has to all His children. We do not think we are insisting on any more than we are entitled to receive. The signs of the times proclaim to all who can see and

understand the African people will not follow leaders who claim for them less than full human rights.

We do admire the Capricorn people for one thing—their frankness. They say they consider the Central Africa Federation to have failed in its glowing promises of "interracial partnership" because it has tended to subordinate human values to political and economic interests. They admit they were deluded into issuing the Capricorn Declarations of 1959 which identified the Capricorn movement actively in putting over the Federation scheme. Now they say they have changed their minds and are absolutely sure once more as to the purity of their aims, and humbly ask forgiveness in their *Handbook* of the many Africans who "suspected that the Society's policy of human relations was only a clever cover-plan." If their newest proposals were any different, it wouldn't look so bad. However, they are even more unacceptable than ever to most of our African people.

In the Capricorn CONTRACT we see the same "non-political" idealistic drapery trying to conceal specific political legislation which has no chance of popular acceptance because it is incompatible with universal standards of civilized nationhood and human dignity.

N. KIRIEO JAPHET

Usa River, Tanganyika