ONE KIND OF COMMITMENT

[Young men who decide to be conscientious objectors to war are required by the Selective Service Act to fill out a form which asks several questions of the applicant. The answers are intended to provide his draft board with information sufficient for deciding whether or not he can qualify under the law. The applicant is asked to show that he seeks this classification "by reason of religious training and belief," and to support his claim with evidence. One question (the first) is: "Do you believe in a Supreme Being?" Until a recent Supreme Court decision (*U.S. vs Seeger,* 1964), this question presented difficulties to many applicants, since the meaning of the God-idea is about the most uncertain conception in modern theological thought, as well as in the thought of serious young people, who can hardly feel qualified to give a simple "yes-or-no" answer. While the Supreme Court has made clear the right of any individual to his own interpretation of "Supreme Being," to confront eighteen-year-olds with this question still seems a pretty desperate way of checking on the "sincerity" of conscientious objectors. And it is still a "religious test."

So, with the idea that many readers may be wondering how eighteen-year-olds conscientiously opposed to war are answering these questions, we print an article made up of the replies by Jesse Tepper, a student at St. John's College in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The text begins with his answer to Question 2 which is: "Describe the nature of your belief which is the basis of your claim in Series I above, and state whether or not your belief in a Supreme Being involves duties which to you are superior to those arising from any human relation."]

When I did poorly I learned about myself, and
When I was in love I learned about others.

I have experienced many things but I think not hate
(I hope I never learn hate).

To respect thyself thou shalt love all thy brothers
And realize Oneness—I have learned this
I know not when or where or how, only that I know.

— By a young man with eyes

I AM a man committed to action, and for any man committed to action, responsibility is a very important concept. Whenever I have acted, I have tried to foresee the consequences of my choice, and to act with these in mind. I suppose that by responsibility, I mean keeping my actions in harmony with my ethics, with my moral beliefs, and keeping my character in tune with all my obligations to myself and my fellow man. Almost since I could think I have tried to love everyone.

George Washington said, "Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire—conscience." And very similar to these are the words of another American philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson: "Whoso would be a man, must be a non-conformist. He who would gather immortal palms must not be hindered by the name of goodness, but must explore if it be goodness. Nothing is at last sacred, save the integrity of your own mind. Absolve you to yourself, and you shall have the suffrage of the world." Both men are saying that man possesses something in which we can have faith. For some mysterious reason, there is something different about man, something which fires wisdom, inspiration, and guidance. There is something in man which lights the path to truth, to goodness; and to beauty. Washington called it conscience, Emerson the integrity of the mind. Most of us would call it religion, or at least a religious concept. Gandhi translated a poem which begins:

This and this alone
Is true religion—
To Love thy brethren;

This is sin above all other sin,
To harm thy brethren.

These lines are so true, so very, very true. True religion is loving all people, and loving is believing. Loving is believing in good things and in an ultimate good, believing in beautiful things

and in ultimate beauty, believing in little truths and in truth. Love is a faith in mankind, a faith so strong that even in the face of the most frightening obstacle, challenged by the strongest tyrant, teased by the most tempting seductress, man will somehow, by some wondrous means, transcend reality. Love is the faith in mankind that dreams of an unthinkable strength in man, in all men. And love is the power that makes this strength come true. To love thy brethren is true religion, for religion is love.

And by the greatest sin, harming thy brethren, what do we mean? It means of course not loving your fellow man, but how does one not love? One does not love by not believing. I guess the greatest sin, really, is not to believe in the beautiful, the good, the true, and the noble. For if there is no beauty, no good, no truth, no nobility, man becomes meaningless. The things important to me are the ultimate. If man cannot be beautiful, good, true, noble, and loving, why live? Man's meaning is in becoming beautiful, good, true, noble, and loving. If there are not these ultimates, life is essentially meaningless. I want life to be beautiful. I want to be good. I want to be noble. I want to love. To love and be loved is meaningful, and yet love surpasses meaning, even surpasses reason or reality. Love is all. I think that if my life is good and beautiful and noble and loving that inevitably all people's lives must be. Only by improving my spirit, only by increasing my capacity to love and be noble and be good and be beautiful can life itself be noble and good and beautiful and loving. All that life means to me is striving for perfection, changing things, improving things. I do not ever wish to see anyone injured in any way. When no one is injured in any way, when all people love and are loved, then the world will be beautiful. Until then, I wish to begin by trying to make the world as nearly beautiful as it can be.

Earlier, when I spoke of acting and being responsible, what I was trying to communicate was that to be really religious is to be infinitely responsible to your fellow man. Practicing a faith or going to church, not practicing a faith or not going to church, does not determine whether people are religious. Being religious, being religiously responsible, is determined by outlook, by relations and beliefs. Simply going to a church once a week or even seven times a week does not make a man religious any more than having a child makes a man a father. The proof of being a father is the child. Superficially, an adult male parent could perform all the functions which he was required to, and appear to all observers a model father, yet still be a complete failure. A good father worries not about what people think of him as a father, but what his child thinks of him. If the consensus of all the adults around him is that he is a grand person and a fine parent, and the child says no, the father is a failure. The proof of the father is not the consensus of the multitudes, but his child. And a good father need not prove he is a good father. This truth proves itself. Certainly a religious person need not prove he is religious. A religious person acts as he must to be in harmony with God, or the Supreme, or Nature, or the devil, or whatever his deity may be. And to the truly religious person, the only judge to be considered is his god.

A person need not have gone to church ever to be religious. I think I have been inside a church about five times in my life, and yet I consider myself religious. A person need not believe in an anthropomorphic god to believe in God. A person need not believe in God to believe in goodness. If a person believes in goodness, in truth and beauty, and in love, he need never have gone to church, never prayed, never repented, nor offered sacrifices, and yet have been as holy as Christ, and Buddha, and Socrates.

An example of a non-worshipping, non-church-going religious person that strikes the mind is Henry Thoreau. Thoreau, who lived near Walden Pond for two years and who wrote *Walden* and the essay "Civil Disobedience," seems to me a very religious person. I do not agree with

much of his faith, just as I do not believe in many other creeds, yet I do recognize the sincerity of his beliefs. It is not really mine to judge whether they are right or wrong. If Thoreau disagrees with me, or if anyone disagrees with me, and yet is still sincere in his beliefs, then our disagreement matters not. Perhaps, in the end, all our disagreements will be settled.

Thoreau saw life as more than existing, more than merely functioning. "I am convinced, by both faith and experience," he said, "that to maintain oneself on this earth is not a hardship but a pastime, if we will live simply and wisely." He saw each individual as more than an object to be shifted at will. He saw man as a powerful individual, capable of saving and helping himself. "Nothing can be effected but by one man. He who wants help wants everything. True, this is the condition of our weakness, but it can never be the means of our recovery. We must first succeed alone, that we may enjoy our success together."

I think that Thoreau's belief in nature, man, and their potential perfection fits the test of a supreme being:

> . . . the test of belief in a relation to a "Supreme Being" is whether a given belief that is sincere and meaningful occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption; where such beliefs have parallel places in the lives of their respective holders we cannot say that one is in relation to a Supreme Being and one is not. (*Supreme Court, U.S. vs Seeger*, No. 50, October Term, 1964.)

My Supreme Being is different from that of Thoreau. Mine is closer to the one of which Tolstoi speaks:

> I believe in God, who is for me spirit, love, the principle of all things.

> I believe that God is in me, as I am in him.

> I believe that the true welfare of man consists in fulfilling the will of God.

> I believe that from the fulfillment of the will of God there can follow nothing but that which is good for me and for all men. I believe that the will of God

is that every man should love his fellow men, and should act toward others as he desires that they should act toward him.

> I believe that the reason of life is for each of us simply to grow in love.

> I believe that this growth in love will contribute more than any other force to establish the Kingdom of God on earth.

I agree very much with Tolstoi, although I have not been influenced by him (the above is the only thing of his I've ever read). I think all men are brothers. Simply by virtue of being born into the human race all men are alike, all are brothers. All have certain rights, certain virtues, and certain desires which are for all time. The most important desire of men, although probably the hardest to realize, is the desire for Oneness, for only by Oneness can real love exist, a love of giving and a love of receiving. Only through Oneness can a love of beauty and warmth and a love which hurts no one add to the joy and beauty in the world. The sin of any man who cannot let himself love or be loved is horrendous. For, in the final analysis, to destroy one person is as infinite an evil as to destroy five people, or twenty, or a thousand. Killing is the greatest evil possible, and therefore demonstrates the greatest lack of love possible.

> There exists a solidarity among men as human beings that makes each co-responsible for every wrong and every injustice in the world. . . . somewhere among men the unconditioned prevails— the capacity to live only together or not at all—But that this does not extend to the solidarity of all men, nor to that of fellow-citizens, or even of smaller groups, but remains confined to the closest human ties—therein lies this guilt of us all—metaphysical guilt is the lack of absolute with the human being as such. (Karl Jaspers)

A man who does not kill or cause slaughter, a man who is tolerant with the intolerant, mild with the violent, free from greed; a man from whom anger and hatred, pride and hypocrisy have disappeared; a man who speaks softly and gently, criticizes no one but exhorts all, he is a beautiful man. He is a good man, he is a just man, he is a

man who loves. Of course I believe in a Supreme Being. I believe in love.

Question 3: Explain how, and from whom or from what source you received the training and acquired the belief which is the basis of your claim made in Series I above.

Nineteen sixty-two was my first year of high school and the beginning of my intellectual belief in non-violence. The sources from which I received my beliefs are varied but I think that the most powerful impulse which drove me to non-violence was seeing violence. Violence needn't be physical, it may also be psychological or emotional.

I first became consciously aware of violence and my reaction to it by attending Quaker youth camps. I attended only a few but they had a very profound effect upon me. The Quaker camps were all based on a philosophy of being tolerant and understanding of all people and opinions with which you come into contact. Many of the campers disagreed, but we were all considerate of each other. There was no attempt at, not even any thought of, labelling people and classifying them. Classifying people is a tendency which I think we all have. But calling people Communists or patriots or politicians or beatniks, etc., is a useless and meaningless pastime which disappeared at these camps.

I remember talking to some kids from military schools who had come to the camp, and, since the atmosphere was relaxed and tolerant, we were able to do more than just talk; we communicated. We had only a few days to talk so none of us changed very much, yet I think we all felt that if we had more time, we could have worked out our differences. The understanding was one of the most beautiful experiences of my life. There was just no comparison between the cooperation which existed there and the competition which usually exists in the world. Philosophically it seems to me that cooperation is always preferable to competition. When cooperation comes about, people are relaxed and in a sense freed from building fences for defenses, freed from having to be right, and so they are able to learn, to agree, to be right, and to be wrong. On the other hand. when we compete we must always be right. No one is always right, yet whenever we compete we feel compelled to be always right.

Violence is the most insane form of competition for it is the logical extension of illogic. It is what we resort to after we have failed to convince our adversary that we are right and he is wrong. Again, the violence need not be physical, it can be shouting or snubbing or simply being cold to a person. I've never been a good boxer so I don't think I've ever hurt anyone physically, but I have hurt people by being violent to them in a psychological or emotional or spiritual sense. It is as great a sin to harm someone in these ways as it is to harm them physically. I am trying to be, but am not yet, a truly non-violent person. A superficially non-violent person refrains from using physical violence whereas someone who is truly non-violent tries not only to refrain from doing any violence to another but also tries to be compassionate and tolerant to others. The truly non-violent person is understanding of the *people* doing the *action* which is to him most odious. The action which I find most odious is killing people.

Taking a particular example of people committing this action, I cannot believe that any soldier wants to hurt anyone. For all soldiers are human beings. I do not believe that in a situation where people are relaxed, where people are not forced to compete, that any man would want to kill. The only way I can understand the fact that the soldiers kill, is that by being in a tense situation they are goaded into a position where they must be angry, intimidated, or the like. And the only answer I see to such a tense, unrelaxed situation is to fight it with tolerance and compassion and a situation where people can relax and be honest and wrong; a situation where people can listen and learn. When I am prideful,

or angry, or afraid, I hope that people will try to be relaxed and patient with me. When a plant is hungry, water it. When a man is hurt, befriend him. I was beat up once about three years ago by a group of kids. I wasn't mauled over or destroyed; nevertheless, I was beat up. To my astonishment and pleasure, I felt neither pity nor anger (opposite extremes of the same evil) towards the kids, but compassion. I was upset, certainly, but I was also peaceful.

Gandhi believed in meeting tense situations with peace and tranquility and a relaxed state of mind and was successful against an armed and therefore unrelaxed adversary. Christ, for the most part, believed in the same. I believe the Buddha was serene. Martin Luther King has tried to meet tense situations with a peaceful attitude. Meeting a slap on the cheek by turning the other cheek and refusing to do evil but permitting it to be done to you to show how wrong it is, are examples which have influenced my life. As I said earlier, just seeing violence led me to non-violence. Seeing people physically harmed and seeing people emotionally or psychologically hurt steered me towards understanding and compassion and a peaceful outlook. I have seen people hurt and I have hurt people. I never want to hurt anyone again and I wish that I had never hurt anyone.

The only alternative to violence, and again, I mean psychological and emotional violence as well as physical, is non-violence. Lao-Tse, Dostoevski, seeing people cry, Herman Hesse, Socrates, shooting guns, Christ, Gandhi, and hitting people have all been spiritual leaders and inspiration for me, for non-violence. And, as I said in the beginning, the reason I am non-violent is that I love people and have seen the effects of violence.

Question 4: Give the name and present address of the individual upon whom you rely most for religious guidance.

To give the names and addresses of the individuals upon whom I rely most for religious

guidance is very difficult. I believe that all people have the potential to give religious guidance. By this I mean that to me religious guidance is seeing people be truly religious (*i.e.,* loving their brethren). And since I feel that all people have this potential, all people are potential religious guides. In this sense, my schoolmates, my draft board, everyone in the entire world is a religious guide.

But I guess by religious guides you want me to be more specific. Again, I run into the same problem. For those religious guides who are most important to me are those already named Lao-Tse, Dostoevski, Herman Hesse, Socrates, Christ, Gandhi, Buddha.

Again, I imagine this is probably not what you want. In the final analysis, the answer I think you want, and that I want to give, is that the person upon whom I rely most for religious guidance is myself.

Question 5: Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe in the use of force?

There are only three situations in which I could imagine myself using violent force. If the woman I was planning on marrying, or the woman I was married to, was ever attacked and the only alternative I had to saving her life was physical violence, I would use physical violence. And if I was put in a similar position, I might use violence. In a case concerning myself I would be less likely to use violence, I think; but the chances would still be about 50-50. However, in none of these three instances would I condone my use of violence. I can understand in any of these instances using violence, but I would never condone it. I hope that some day I can be like Gandhi and never even *consider* using violence. Right now, I am young and still not fully mature.

The extreme instances which I mentioned are all cases where no other alternative, that is a relaxed, compassionate situation, would exist. However, if there was one small chance that

things could be worked out non-violently, I would take that chance.

Question 6: Describe the actions and behavior in your life which in your opinion most conspicuously demonstrate the consistency and depth of your religious convictions.

Question 7: Have you ever given public expression, written or oral, to the views herein expressed as the basis for your claim made in Series I above? If so, specify when and where.

I think the following words, which I wrote last year, are helpful in understanding the consistency and depth of my religious convictions and the reason for making the claim in Series I.

"Silence, then, appears to be the great sin. Assume that men realize their solidarity with each other (as all animals do) at least on some level. An outrage is committed. Man remains silent. Is he anything more than nothing? And isn't it true that the only thing which silence lends is guilt, a guilt which only hastens the destruction of man?

"The world of speech is the world of humanity, of solidarity and empathy, of existence and being while the world of quiet is the world of things, of isolation and hostility of non-existence and death."

And from an essay on Dostoevski: "Being is commitment, solidarity, freedom, and most importantly, love."

During my senior year of high school I procured various speakers for student rallies. As strongly as I believe in nonviolence, I also believe in presenting differing viewpoints and understanding opposing arguments. On March 5, I had a Col. H. D. Blazzard, a Viet Nam veteran, speak to the student body about the American position in Viet Nam. The following week, March 12, I had Ira Sandperl, a noted pacifist, speak and present a non-violent alternative to the war.

I am convinced that my philosophy is right. Yet I am also convinced that I should not impose it on others, only allow others to hear it and judge

it for themselves. If I am in a position where I feel I should comment on something about which I have ideas, or if someone asks me to so comment, I will. But I also demand that people think and evaluate for themselves. I want people to consciously choose my alternatives, and the only way to accomplish this is to permit them to make decisions for themselves, permit them to dissent, permit them to choose.

In January of 1965 I felt that I must comment on something I held dear. It was this commitment to acting as I must, that led me to say in my speech for president of Lick-Wilmerding High School:

> If Lick does not begin to become definitely committed to the issues of our day, if we do not begin to grapple with the problems of the next twenty years, problems like automation, weaponry, civil rights, what will we accomplish? If I, you, everyone, remain complacent, we will have succeeded in producing, as Ralph J. Gleason says, "A generation for whom the bomb dropped before they were born, and a generation where cleanliness is next to Godliness, and you don't make waves, just ride on them."

It is responsibility in actions as well as thoughts which prove to me depth of conviction. I have tried to act in accordance with my beliefs. It was this obligation to what I felt was right that led me to say, in May of 1965, in reference to accepting a badly needed National Defense Loan:

> There is one problem, however. I have been looking over the National Defense Student Loan forms, and while I realize the sum of $350.00 is impressive and extremely necessary, I regret to say that I could in no way accept this loan. I recoil at the thought of a "defense" loan for various reasons, among these reasons—that I am extremely committed to non-violence and love. Since I am committed to loving people, I cannot justify philosophically an organized "defense" form such as an army, navy, etc.

To me the religious person is one who is responsible. The things to which one is responsible may vary. One of the things to which I am responsible is peace. I do not mean peace on a world-wide level only, but on all levels. Peace

means not only making allowances for, but actively striving for relaxed, quiet, understanding situations. I do not believe any man will be violent unless he is in a tense situation. Only by forgetting violence can we ever achieve relaxed situations. It is imperative that men be able to be honest with one another, and yet frightened by force and power of so many varieties, it is difficult for man to be honest. Being peaceful implies being honest.

JESSE TEPPER

St. John's College
Santa Fe, New Mexico

REVIEW
ECONOMICS FOR THE MILLIONS

E. F. SCHUMACHER, a German-born economist who came to England as a Rhodes scholar and settled there in 1937, contributed to the (London) *Observer* for Aug. 29, 1965, an article on foreign aid which combines serious criticism of the prevailing method of helping the under-developed (or "developing") countries with what seems a much-needed proposal of change for the better. (Dr. Schumacher was for years closely associated with two of the most influential economists of the century, Keynes and Beveridge; he has served as adviser to the Burmese Government and in 1962 counseled the Indian Government on development policy. He is presently Economic Adviser of Britain's National Coal Board.)

The central point of his criticism is that countries with advanced economies such as the United States too often give economic aid to less developed countries in a form which creates new problems more rapidly than it solves old ones. The wrong kind of economic stimulus, he says, leads to accelerated development in urban areas, and while the cities grow and the Gross National Product (the familiar measure of economic progress) increases, this advance brings a disaster that is revealed in the general increase of unemployment. ("The Third Five-Year Plan in India," Dr. Schumacher says, "showed higher unemployment at the end of the period than at the beginning." There were similar results from help given to Turkey, and, he says, in "most of the larger developing countries.") Conventional economic analysis has concluded from this experience that mass unemployment in such regions is inevitable and perhaps even "necessary for sound growth." Dr. Schumacher rejects this view, but before making his proposal presents the following description of what has been happening:

> Unemployment and under-employment in developing countries are most acute in the areas outside a few metropolitan cities, so there is mass migration into these cities in a desperate search for a livelihood: and the cities themselves, in spite of "rapid economic growth," become infested with ever-growing multitudes of destitute people. Any visitor who has ventured outside the opulent districts of these cities has seen their shanty towns and misery belts, which are often growing ten times as fast as the cities themselves.

> Current forecasts of the growth of metropolitan areas in India, and many other developing countries, conjure up a picture of towns with twenty, forty, and even sixty million people—a prospect of "immiseration" for a rootless and jobless mass of humanity that beggars the imagination.

> No amount of brave statistics of national income growth can hide the fact that all too many developing countries are suffering from the twin disease of growing unemployment and mushrooming metropolitan slums, which is placing their social and political fabric under an intolerable strain.

> The suspicion has been voiced (and cannot be dismissed out of hand) that foreign aid, *as currently practiced,* may actually be intensifying this twin disease instead of mitigating it; that the heedless rush into modernization extinguishes old jobs faster than it can create new ones; and that all the apparent increases in the national income are eaten up, or even more than eaten up, by the crushing economic burdens produced by excessive urban growth. It is rather obvious that a man's cost of subsistence—something very different from his standard of life—rises significantly the moment he moves from a small town or rural area into "megapolis."

Dr. Schumacher advocates what he calls an "intermediate technology"—technology not as advanced as the methods used in highly industrialized countries, but which will serve the developing country's actual needs in terms of its existing capacity for growth. As he points out:

> Western technology has been devised primarily for the purpose of saving labor; it could hardly be appropriate for districts or regions troubled with a large labor surplus. Technology in Western countries has grown up over several generations along with a vast array of supporting services, like modern transport, accountancy, marketing, and so forth: it could hardly be appropriate for districts or regions lacking these paraphernalia. This technology, therefore, "fits" only into those sectors which are already fairly modernized, and that means—some special cases apart—the metropolitan areas, comprising, say, 15 to 20 per cent of the whole population.

What, then, is to become of the other 80 to 85 per cent? Simply to assume that the "modern" sectors or localities will grow until they account for the whole is utterly unrealistic because the 80 per cent cannot simply "hold their breath" and wait: they will migrate in their millions and thereby create chaos even in the "modern" sectors.

The task is to establish a tolerable basis of existence for the 80 per cent by means of an "intermediate technology" which would be vastly superior to their traditional technology (in its present state of decay) while at the same time being vastly cheaper and simpler than the highly sophisticated and enormously capital-intensive technology of the West.

Dr. Schumacher is not in the least impressed by abstract arguments against this program. Only design studies and experiments will tell the story. "Let us see," he says, "what can be done by relatively simple means, with mainly local materials, local labor, and low-cost capital equipment—equipment which would be simple enough also to be made locally." Actually, examples of such "intermediate technology" exist all over the world and these may be studied:

A new approach is needed, a systematic effort to collect them and develop them into actual blueprints for industrial action. . . . What stands in the way? Perhaps a kind of technological snobbishness which regards with disdain anything less than ultra-modern? Perhaps a certain callousness in the attitudes of privileged minorities towards the immense suffering of their homeless, jobless, miserable fellow-men? Or is it lack of imagination on the part of the planners in resplendent offices who find ratios and coefficients more significant than people?

Whatever it is, millions of people in the wealthier countries are today moved by a genuine desire to help those who live in misery, and this elemental force should be capable of overcoming all petty preoccupations. "Intermediate technology" can help the helpless to help themselves.

An economic study which sets its general problem differently, yet drives toward the same broad end, is Wilfred Wellock's *Beyond These Barren Years,* a pamphlet published by Sarva Seva Sangh Prakashan, Rajghat, Varanasi, India (1965, forty cents), and distributed in England by Housman's (5 Caledonian Road, King's Cross,

London N. I). Mr. Wellock seeks means of restoring qualities of life that have been lost in the modern technological society. He contrasts the temper of workmen on assembly lines with the spirit generated through the socio-economic functions of the guilds of craftsmen before the industrial revolution, and he sees the emergencies described by the authors of the Triple Revolution Manifesto as marking "a major turning-point in the history of Western civilization." A central criticism is put in these words:

It is beyond understanding that with all our boasted freedoms so many millions of people have been, and still are being, deprived of basic human rights even in the countries that are supposed to be enjoying all the freedoms and splendors of a scientific, democratic civilization—which splendors are soon to be eclipsed by the cybernation revolution. The fact is being overlooked that if the capitalist spirit and outlook continue to prevail, a world-wide ideological revolution is inevitable. Computers can multiply the output of goods and services, and increase both profits and wages and thus material consumption, but they cannot determine social justice nor teach the art of living and thus prevent a world-wide ideological war on the issue of plutocratic or democratic control of a nation's wealth. On its present materialistic foundation social antipathies will multiply while what we need is knowledge of how to extend our spiritual horizons, multiply our vital experiences, inspire us to cultivate local, national and international cooperation and the satisfactions of creative functioning. This generation has lost all understanding of the immense possibilities of creative living in a creative society, the countless avenues to more fruitful living.

The latter part of this pamphlet considers the importance of active "participation" as a means altering human attitudes and engendering a spirit of cooperation. With the idea of an annual income for all beginning to be seriously considered, the time has come, Mr. Wellock believes, to promote various schemes for the common ownership of industry. He gives examples of enterprises with this policy already in operation and suggests that interested readers write Demintry, 12 Downside Crescent, London N.W. 3, for details. In his conclusion, Mr. Wellock writes:

Common-ownership transforms power relationships into human relationships and material

values into spiritual values. It is thus the most revolutionary and rewarding operation open to businessmen today. It, therefore, merits careful meditation for its repercussions would be many and far-reaching. As to the workers, most of them would experience the exhilaration and added power of responsibility. A new outlook would emerge which would raise the level of culture and cut out a vast amount of wasteful expenditure, a change which in its totality would reduce the pressure on the national economy. More discretion in spending would quickly reveal the possibility of choosing between, say, a seven-hour day and a four-hour working day with a daily three-hour interlude for creative activities.

A book published in the United States which Mr. Wellock recommends highly is *The True Society* by Frank Tannenbaum. Here the idea is for the achievement of common ownership through the purchase of shares in various businesses by trade unions. Already, Mr. Wellock notes, American labor unions have bought stock in sixty-eight companies.

While far more is involved in the transformation of society than the common ownership of industrial companies, a gradual change of this sort might help to release dammed-up capacities and longings for a more constructive life. No doubt many catalysts are needed to set going regenerating processes of the sort Mr. Wellock envisions, but any one step with a basically ethical inspiration cannot help but lead to others.

A volume from a very different wing of opinion, Richard C. Cornuelle's *Reclaiming the American Dream* (Random House, 1965), has a place here because of the evidence it provides of a growing sense of social responsibility in the business community of the United States. The author is a foundation executive who rejects strongly the tendency of this country to become the passive material of a vast and all-powerful welfare state, and he presents substantial evidence that social and moral failure will attend final reliance on government for the solution of all economic problems. Unwilling to divide American society into two vast sectors—government and industrial enterprise—he draws attention to the historic role of a third, which he calls the Independent Sector, that is neither commercial nor political, but exists to give scope to private

concern for the public good. It includes a large variety of institutions and its services to the country, as recounted by Mr. Cornuelle, are impressive beyond ordinary guess. He thinks these institutions can do a lot more, and that they must.

Despite its conservative vocabulary, and regardless of its author's fond regard for the message of Bernard Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* ("Private vices make public benefits") this book is a forceful appeal for a new arousal of altruism and the assumption of private responsibility for the state of the nation. Mr. Cornuelle puts a persuasive case, the more so because what he recommends, to the extent that it is adopted, could do only good. The book has the flavor of a writer who is doing his level best not to distort or exaggerate his argument, and in view of its comparative novelty, he deserves particular attention. There is much to be said for his central contention, which he takes from Tocqueville's *Democracy in America:*

> Tocqueville put his warning into political prophecy: "It is vain to summon a people, which has been rendered so dependent on a central power, to choose from time to time the representatives of that power; this rare and brief exercise of their free choice, however important it may be, will not prevent them from gradually losing the faculties of thinking, feeling and acting for themselves, and thus gradually falling below the level of humanity." This is the final danger of an ever expanding welfare state.

It will not do to ignore the dawning expressions of social and moral responsibility which are reported in this volume. While its themes are very different from, say, A. H. Maslow's *Eupsychian Management,* the qualities of mind exhibited show genuine hospitality to the motives and objectives of the Humanist outlook, and those who work for individual human renewal, as distinguished from politicized economic panaceas, can hardly afford to neglect this seriousness of purpose, ardent effort, and practical example.

COMMENTARY
THEY WALKED TO MOSCOW

JERRY LEHMAN, a Quaker who had his twenty-fourth birthday during the first week of the Peace Walk from San Francisco to Moscow, is the author of *We Walked to Moscow,* a book which tells the story of the 312-day trek by a dozen or so Americans which began in December, 1960, and ended, 5700 miles later, in Moscow in October, 1961. We learn from a publisher's note than an earlier book about the Walk, *You Come with Naked Hands,* by Brad Lyttle, is the official chronicle of the undertaking, but that there is hardly any duplication of that account in the present volume. The publisher is Greenleaf Books, managed by Arthur Harvey, of Raymond, New Hampshire. The price is a dollar a copy, with various reductions on quantity purchases.

The book is a day-to-day narrative of being on a peace walk which crossed all of one continent and much of another—a colorful and now and then chatty report of the experience as seen through the eyes of a young American. There are brief sections by four other walkers, a reprint of A. J. Muste's evaluation of the Walk in *Liberation,* several pages of photographs of the Walkers in places along the way, and some maps with mileage statistics. Format is 8½" X 11", print by a clear mimeo process, with Acco binding. The 87 pages are full, so that the book is the equivalent of one with twice as many pages of ordinary size.

While the various encounters of the walkers with people in the United States are interesting, the experiences abroad are often fascinating to read about. The report is consistently candid and gives clear insight into the attitudes and temper of the peoples of Europe, which change somewhat from country to country. France was the only country which refused to admit the walkers. The heavy hand of bureaucratic order strained both the good humor and the principles of the team almost to the breaking point on several occasions, with the goal of actually reaching Moscow sometimes jeopardized for the walkers by their natural unwillingness to make only "token" or practically meaningless demonstrations. They often became aware that they were not really "getting through" to officials who thought they could control everything that the walkers said and did.

But they did get through, a lot of the time, and there were moments, even in Moscow, when they knew they had made it absolutely clear that they were protesting *all* acts of war, and *all* preparations for war.

It is difficult to imagine anyone interested in practical peace-making not enjoying this book and valuing it as material to lend to friends.

FRONTIERS
The Threat—and Promise—of Change

WE live in a house whose doors are continually being battered down by the forces of change, and hardly a day goes by when we are not told by some stern champion—usually an expert in some important field—of the great demands and obligations which the unavoidable changes he foresees are about to impose upon us. We can hardly reproach this man, or others like him, for telling us so many upsetting things. Telling us what their education and experience enable them to see is the job of such people—what we hired them to do—and even if all their voices, taken together, make a continually threatening din, there is no sense in telling them to keep still.

There is also, however, this to be said: While the various prophets of change are trying to get us ready for the particular conditions which they are certain will come about, they are not giving any attention to the capacity of human beings to receive or accept what they say. The fact that, after a certain amount of exposure to the threat of change, most people try to isolate themselves from warnings which only overwhelm, is not the concern of the experts. The experts weren't told to become psychologists, but to explore concrete aspects of the "real" world, and to make conscientious reports to the rest of us, who have then to make decisions about the common good.

So, more important than accurate description of impending changes and their "necessities," and more valuable than a carefully compiled catalog of all the various changes said to be on the way, would be some means of realizing that our only hope lies in developing a temper of mind which is capable of accepting change. This means thinking about ourselves and the world in a way which enables us to believe that the coming changes will not necessarily destroy what is precious to us as human beings. We may need to sort the changes out, but we can't do it in fear.

A text that should help in this discussion is a paragraph from an article by George A. Kelly, appearing in the Fall 1965 *Journal of Humanistic Psychology:*

> The human enterprise is, at best, a touch-and-go proposition. Any assumptions we make about what is good, or what is evil, or what will open the door to the future, are best regarded as temporary only, and any conclusions we draw from our experiences are best seen as approximations of what we may eventually understand. The human quest is not about to be concluded, nor is truth already packaged for distribution and consumption. Instead, it seems likely that whatever may now appear to be the most obvious fact will look quite different when regarded from the vantage point of tomorrow's fresh theoretical positions. Yet it is a misfortune that man should be so set on being right at the very outset that he dares not risk stupidities in an effort to devise something better than what he has.

Now, *why should we* "be so set on being right at the very outset"? It seems obvious that a large part of the explanation for our feeling this way lies in the assumption that we and our experts and authorities have *been* right up to now. Our historical religion is one which persuades its followers that they are secure in the one, true faith. Our science, while proposing very different definitions of reality, has through its popularizers practiced the same general psychology by proclaiming that its discoveries have created a great store of unmistakable, undeniable "objective truth." Add to this aspect of our heritage the fact that religion and science, in their epochs of domination, both gained positions of pre-eminence only after a long competitive struggle with powerful rivals—that Western religious history is the story of militant conquest, bloody suppression, and methodical indoctrination; and that science, in turn, had to compete for centuries with the antagonistic authority of religion—and we see why our cultural habits of mind make almost no distinction between being right and being *righteous.* It is an identification which involves the moral emotions in resistance to change.

But is this really the way to look at our present problems? Is it possible that Western civilization, which has racked up the most impressive record of "progress" in all history, must now be admitted to be ill-equipped for further change? It may be so, if the *kind* of progress we need to make—indeed, the only kind of progress that remains *open* to us to make—requires us to become uncertain of both our rightness and our righteousness.

Putting the situation in this way makes it sound as though we are in the midst of a deep identity crisis. Are we people who can't tolerate not being "right" at the very beginning and all the way? How much of a revolution will it take to exchange both our scientific and our moral certainties for honest doubts? Our loud assertion for intelligent humility?

One thing seems clear: If we could endure more uncertainty we would be relieved at once of a heavy burden of anxiety (the feeling of having to be "right"), and at the same time be less tempted to hide behind screens of false confidence. The responsibility of acting as we think we "ought" is far less threatening when we don't feel obliged to "know" so much. Then you can do what you are sure is right and *stop*. And when you don't claim any infallibility, the people who have been toughening themselves up in order to disagree with you are enormously relieved. An "uncertain" stance of this sort brings more human dignity into all relationships. There is a sense in which the stature of a human being grows with his admission of uncertainty, as was the case with Socrates.

Discussing the debilitating effect of reliance on the scientific claim to "objective" truth, Michael Polanyi puts these humanizing gains in broader terms:

> Objectivism seeks to relieve us from all responsibility for the holding of our beliefs. That is why it can be logically expanded to systems of thought in which the responsibility of the human person is eliminated from the life and society of man.

> In recoiling from objectivism, we would acquire a nihilistic freedom of action but for the fact that our protest is made in the name of higher allegiances. We cast off the limitations of objectivism in order to fulfill our calling, which bids us to make up our minds about the whole range of matters with which man is properly concerned.

Here is release, in principle, from the pressures of ideological authority, and the return to reliance on the human qualities of human beings. It is a release because it takes away the compulsion to behave in ways which we are *supposed* to believe are "right," but don't really understand. It also opens us up more widely to the meaning of firsthand knowing.

A manifest advantage of this point of view is that it doesn't require people who accept the need for change to cry out for *total* change, far beyond anyone's capacity to see and to test the results of what is done. Since the most important immediate effect of this attitude—probably the most important effect of all—is an open-minded, undogmatic, friendly approach to problems, the provocations to hostility in human relations are greatly reduced. Mutual respect is the universal solvent in all difficult problem-solving, and people who are shy about claiming certainties tend to be good listeners to the viewpoints of others.

These are ideas about man, science, and society which are very much in the air, today. They relate to the basic conception we have of ourselves, and bear less and less upon what we think we *must* get other people to do. These ideas are coming out in the works of the new thinkers about science, in the writings of the humanistic psychologists, and they are finding another sort of expression among workers for peace. A closing sentence from Erik Erikson's distinguished book, *Young Man Luther,* strikes a keynote:

> But will revolutions against exploiters settle the issue of exploitation, or must man also learn to raise truly less exploitable men—men who are first of all masters of the human life cycle and of the cycle of generations in man's own lifespan?