

FULL TURN TOWARD PEACE

[This article is an interview with Robert Pickus, reprinted from the December, 1961, issue of the national magazine, *Mademoiselle*, by permission of the publishers. Robert Pickus is a founder of the Turn Toward Peace movement, and was one of the writers of the pamphlet, *Speak Truth To Power*, which attracted much attention when it appeared in 1955. Publication in *Mademoiselle* of his perceptive yet popular presentation of the pacifist outlook is evidence of the widening range of interest in practical alternatives to war.—Editors.]

What does the word pacifism mean to you?

It can mean a complete refusal to lend yourself to any use of force. That's the traditional view. Tolstoi's, where the big word is reconciliation, the great emphasis is on goodness and harmony. But if you condemn violence and refuse to use it, you must answer the question: what are you going to do about the other guy's violence? Tolstoi, and most pacifists, can't answer that. But another concept of pacifism does—Gandhi's. He saw conflict not only as real, but necessary—the worst situation is where there's injustice and nobody's doing anything about it. He was willing to challenge it. But most people still think of it the other way. I sat down at a discussion group awhile ago with my big "Pacifist" label on, and the first question the chairman asked was, "Mr. Pickus, what is your view of human nature?" You could just see him thinking: You idiot, you think men are good. There's some justification for this attitude toward pacifists. Some do rest their case on man's goodness. But the point is not that man is good, it's that he's *capable of* goodness. He's also capable of monstrous evil. The question is: what brings out the good and what strengthens it? You can start with a very pessimistic view of human nature and nevertheless come to the conclusion that a commitment to nonviolence can work.

But are men good enough to get rid of violence, to get rid of war?

Those are two different questions. We've got rid of slavery, but we still have exploitation, and in one form or another we're likely to have it always. But the move from a world that accepts slavery to a world that rejects it and is working on problems of exploitation is an important move. Isn't it possible that we could get rid of war, while people went on being nasty to their wives, occasionally kicking stray dogs? Wouldn't that still be an important advance? I'm not talking about saintliness or the best of all possible worlds when I talk of getting rid of war. I'm talking about the minimal understandings necessary if the human story is to go on. We've got to recognize that organization for war is no longer right and no longer rational, that we must turn our energies to developing alternate methods for the defense of our values. The startling thing is that in almost every other area of life we've already rejected violence. In penology we don't think punishment is the real answer any more. We don't throw the mentally ill into chains. The kind of pacifism I mean is already working in most other areas of life. It's only here in the question of war that there's been a failure of thought. Beat a child? No. But jump into a plane and destroy a city of a million human beings . . . yes sir!

Aren't there any causes worth the sacrifice of human life through warfare?

It isn't the sacrifice of human life that's at stake—most pacifists are willing to put their own lives quite literally on the line in order to further their beliefs—it's your phrase "through warfare." The point is, can causes we care for be furthered by war? To me it's clear that they can't. You only collaborate in spreading the very attitudes and actions you wanted to stop. It isn't even a moral

question of whether war is right or wrong, but does it work? And I say no.

Assuming war can't serve our values, still they are under attack . . .

That's the problem we must think about. It's tragic that so few intelligent people have been willing to start at that point—ruling out organized violence as a solution and then saying, "All right, what do we do instead?" All our intellectual efforts have been set in the context of one basic assumption: that organization for war is still right and rational for people holding democratic values—by which I don't mean voting, but a view of what a human being is and why there's dignity and value simply in the fact of being human. If this is the ground you stand on, then you have to rule out mass-organized violence and start searching for an alternative. The trouble with many pacifists is that they haven't faced the consequences of renouncing the violent solution.

Do you think war has ever achieved what people wanted it to?

I can't make an absolute statement about violence in the preatomic past, but I will now. Herman Kahn's book, *On Thermonuclear War*, has done the peace movement a great service by carrying the premises involved in the use of violence to their logical conclusion. He's demonstrated that a commitment to violence today is not limited, not discriminate, not proportionate; that if you go along that road you must be willing to accept the final results. I think many people assume that somehow it'll never happen—even though so much of the whole life of our society is organized around war, still they say, "But it's unthinkable. The whole point in preparing for war is to prevent war." But Kahn says, in effect, "Nonsense, you can't prepare for war intelligently unless you face the fact that it may come. And if it comes, this is what it will cost, and we must do something about the cost."

Since nuclear war may be likely, the way we're going, shouldn't civil defense be strengthened?

Sure, it's one of the great instruments the peace movement ought to use. But it must be *honest*. *Life's* statement that ninety-seven out of one hundred can be saved by civil defense makes a set of special assumptions—for instance, that the attack is on missile bases, not on cities, and that it comes in one wave. Offering that kind of comfort is a *dishonest* use of civil defense. If you really consider how to defend civilians in nuclear war, you come to the obvious conclusion: You can't. So you're driven back to my question: Is there no alternative to preparing for nuclear war? Isn't working for peace the only real civil defense for civilians?

Do civil defense people willingly debate those who challenge their facts?

Yes, I think many of them are genuinely concerned and see a problem they'd like to do something about. Their one argument is that around the periphery—and no one knows where that's going to be—it obviously would make a difference if there were some kind of preparation. That makes some sense. What doesn't make sense is the original assumption. If you're figuring out how to clear up after the war, then you're assuming there's going to be one. If you don't want to assume a war, then you've got to think about policies, and attitudes to support them, that give us the best possible chance of avoiding it.

Then you think the deterrence theory doesn't provide the best chance of avoiding war.'

That's the real argument. Does it provide the best chance of avoiding war? Does it offer the best way to defend democratic values? My answer to both questions is no. Kahn argues for civil defense as part of the deterrence theory—you need it to make your threat credible. It would be important in the midst of negotiations to demonstrate that you can evacuate certain cities and have a remnant of survivors. He's quite right,

but in an insane framework. It's getting out of that framework that's important.

How can we?

This is either a time when man's history ends (or at least is so severely ruptured that you need a new language to talk about man from here on in), or else a time when we get rid of war. If we ever do reach the year 2000, it will be because we've renounced war as a solution. But if you ask then what role American intellectuals played in the middle of the twentieth century in getting rid of war . . . right now, in 1961, anyway, I believe you'd have to say they've been one of the major obstacles to peace.

What do you mean?

Almost all the real intellectual energy has gone into rationalizing organization for war, figuring out how you can hang on to it somehow. Thought that challenges this is left mainly to ministers and a few odd nineteen-year-old pacifists. It seems absurd that able people are not, simply out of intellectual responsibility if nothing else, posing the other premise: that organization for war is no longer right and rational. And therefore, since we *do* have values to defend, what can we do, without relying on our ability to injure other men?

If you were President, what would be your first step toward removing the immediate threat of war?

The things I'd want a President to do can only be done given certain preconditions. Establishing these is the really central job. But assuming the President had the power to do it, I'd have him make clear to the world that our goal is total and general disarmament. Not the management of arms, not arms control, but literally an end to the war system. I think the President's disarmament proposal before the UN didn't mean much more to the world than Khrushchev's did. No doubt his was just Russian propaganda, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't have responded then with enormous earnestness: "That's exactly what we

want ourselves, and here's how we hope to get there. Won't you join us?" It's tragic that we weren't capable of that response, instead of the suspicious sneer, even though it was justified.

Why should we pretend to believe Khrushchev?

Because somebody's got to take the lead. If our response were both adequate and realistic—adequate meaning we'd say, "Yes, of course you're right," and realistic meaning, "But you don't trust us and we don't trust you, and both of us for good reasons"—it would be a real step away from war. Either we make these fine statements about no more war and then go on organizing for war, failing in our attempts at negotiation, and moving closer and closer to war; or else somebody's got to start moving in the other direction without waiting for prior agreement from the other side. I would have the President announce that we intend to undertake certain acts that will, in fact, constitute a series of coercive events which, by changing the whole environment, would force certain responses from the Russians.

What do you have in mind?

Well, we have prepared a ten-page document outlining them, but I'll try to give you an idea. It starts with acts in the disarmament area. There are things we could do that don't require the Russians' agreement, that move us in the right direction, and do not so seriously weaken our posture—for those who think in those terms—that they're out of the question. The President would announce that this country is placing all U.S. missile tests under international surveillance. Then we would make the DEW line two-way, so that we'd both have a warning against surprise attack. Those are examples of technological initiatives. Then there are moral initiatives, and here I think what would make the biggest impact would be to close Fort Detrick and turn its facilities over to the UN for world health work. I presume you know what's done there.

No, what?

It's not just research. We're literally stockpiling bacteriological warfare material there. Death through disease. It's a factory and that's what it makes. Another thing, simply administrative, would be to establish within the Executive office an economics-disarmament unit. Everyone seems to believe the Communist charge that without war contracts you'd have a depression. I know no serious economist who thinks so. It's a political problem, a problem of planning the transition to production for peaceful purposes.

Why a political problem?

Any kind of government intervention in the economy is called socialism. And socialism is a Bad Thing. That frame of thought has to be changed. It's absurd that government intervention should be accepted in the war context, as it has been for the past twenty years, but in no other. The only question is, can better controls be established outside the war context?

What do you mean by better controls?

Controls that meet legitimate worries about centralized power. If there's anything that distinguishes us from the Soviet society, it's that there's a place a guy can go and operate from if he wants to challenge the main drift. People's fears of centralized economic power are legitimate, but given some serious thought, I don't think it's impossible to achieve responsible planning and at the same time keep power dispersed.

How about actual disarmament?

We'd announce we were cutting our military budget by 5 per cent and that we intended to do this every year for the next fifteen, upping the percentage as it became possible—we'd hope the Communist world would follow suit, but we're intending to do it anyway. That's the most radical of the initiatives—the worst thing you can do in an arms race is to plan on coming in second. It's a very fundamental decision, but that's the decision

we call for—that the most important thing is *not* staying ahead in the arms race. The most important thing is reversing and ending it.

Wouldn't this expose Kennedy to a charge of weakness?

Yes. Certain preconditions must exist before any President, except one with great stature, could do these things. The first precondition is that the country have a sense of the fact that the choice is not between maintaining the threat of war on the one hand or surrender on the other.

Better red than dead?

As if there were no other choice! One way to break this idea—and it's got to be broken—is to lay out alternatives as concretely as possible. That's what I'm trying to do. And these alternatives must be set in a framework that is not naïvely optimistic about Communism, but starts with the worst possible assumptions. Today—these alternatives are brushed off as surrender.

Do you see any signs of a breakthrough?

More people today than three years ago are willing to consider alternatives, yes. Many leading intellectuals have joined us—sometimes for the wrong reasons, I think, reasons of survival or moralism. These are important, but you simply cannot persuade a skeptical, hostile audience to listen if all you've got to offer is moral censure and a kind of waving the hands—"We're all going to be blown up!" Everybody knows this already. So you have to do something more solid: fresh thought based on premises that are adequate to the problem, not on premises that were adequate to the world before the atom bomb. And in a context that rejects the military deterrence but is unwilling to accept surrender and refuses to be optimistic about the Communists.

That kind of thought is just becoming visible in this country. More and more able men are helping.

Wouldn't any step toward disarmament, reduction of stockpiles, and so on, simply seem too risky to most Americans?

Sure, and it *is* risky. Any time we take our eye off the big thing we're committed to, it's extremely dangerous. But the fact that it's dangerous doesn't rule it out as perhaps the wisest choice from both a practical and a moral point of view. There is no safe or easy way out, and maybe it's a good thing the waters are so muddy we can no longer make our case in simple moral terms. But in another sense, no matter how creative or sound your proposals are, without a recovery of a sense of moral initiative, the dynamic to realize them just won't be there.

Then has religion played a big part in the peace movement?

It's both one of the major obstacles and the backbone of the present peace movement. There is, of course, the fact of hypocrisy and organization masquerading as religion. But it's still true that you have a ground to stand on when you address a church group. And for all my criticism of traditional pacifism, the Fellowship of Reconciliation has played an enormously valuable role in this country. But it's new people, engaged not so much in the external discipline of a church as in an inner search (most of them would describe themselves as "nonreligious"), who are, I think, the hope. They suddenly discover that you've got a few years on earth and that as you look in yourself for what really matters to you as a human being, it's clear that you simply cannot accept what nuclear war demands and be true to yourself. Some kind of "no" needs to be said. Combine this kind of rooted belief with informal thought about alternatives and there is real hope.

But do you really think these coercive acts you'd have us take would tend to curb the spread of world Communism?

Deterrents have failed to stop it, haven't they? Somehow you've got to get this fact across to people, that in spite of all this talk about power

and strength, over half a trillion dollars in arms have only produced a steep rise in Communism in the past thirteen years. If we stay "realistic" and "powerful" and spend another half a trillion—even without war it's all over. We'll be alone in a Communist world. So what do we do? The answer we've given so far is: work harder on armaments. But I say there's another answer: American initiatives not dependent on Soviet agreement, but likely to elicit a favorable Communist response. I've outlined the disarmament policies, but they are useless unless set in a context of positive alternative policies.

What alternative policies?

First, growth toward world law. This country would announce that it's willing to internationalize the Panama Canal Zone. Then we'd repeal the Connolly Amendment to our accession to the World Court, which states that we'll accept the authority of the court, all right, but we'll be the ones who decide over which cases it can have jurisdiction—which makes a mockery of it. Then we'd announce that we recognize that universal membership in the UN is essential if we're ever to move toward a disarmed world under law. We'd appoint a special envoy to open negotiations with the mainland Chinese and the Formosan Chinese. We'd announce a yearly allocation of American funds to support the development of a UN police force.

To have world law assumes a sort of utopian one-world community, doesn't it?

This is the central problem, of course. You do have real conflict, and to resolve it you must achieve a sense of community adequate to sustain world law. The essence of the conflict is the denial of community. Each side can do what it wants to the other, because in a sense they're outside the human race. Well, to overcome this feeling we'd take various steps, such as inviting Soviet and Chinese writers to publish their views in our newspapers and magazines. We'd invite Soviet journalists, teachers, and jurists to lecture in this country at our expense. We'd invite them

to join in a joint Peace Corps program. We'd underwrite a string of UN radio stations across the country. Things like that.

How much more would you have us do for underdeveloped countries than we are doing already?

There's much more to do and a whole new attitude to be developed. If we simply put unused American industrial capacity to work, we could double the investment funds now available for use in these countries. You see, it's terribly important for us to intervene at this point and support economic and political policies that challenge colonialism and feudalism. There are risks here, of course, but fewer, it seems to me, than in being the prop of any militarist regime anywhere, simply because it's anti-Communist. This intervention thing is important to get clear, because there's been so much nonsense about nonintervention. We *should* intervene. The question is to what end and with what methods?

Do you have any answers to immediate political problems?

Yes, we want initiatives to reduce political tensions, and in our document we name some of the issues and what could be done—with regard to Berlin and Germany, nuclear tests, China, the UN. But the hardest thing to summarize briefly is this business of the nonmilitary defense of values. I think it's extremely important that the experience that's come out of the South, of socially organized nonviolence as a way to force change, be recognized for the tremendously important development that it is. It's incredible what Gandhi did with regard to untouchability in India. And in the South now, if you talk to white people and ask the essential question—What is your view of the Negro?—you find a change sometimes. They have seen the Negro capable of dignity, of accepting suffering, of refusing to cooperate with a moral disease any longer. How can you refer to that kind of human being as somehow inferior to yourself? I think the message has gotten across to many of them. The whole idea of the nonviolent

defense of values is something people are beginning to be willing to think about.

How long would it take to re-educate people to the idea of ending organization for war?

It's a forty-year job, not less. A fundamental change in attitude toward war, and the establishment of institutions to express that change—it would take a couple of generations. And that any day may be the last day is a very important fact to keep in mind, but you can't organize around it. You're by no means optimistic about man if you've lived at all, and the world we're working for isn't going to be without exploitation and violence, but it won't be mastered by them—or destroyed by them. It will be a world moving in another direction. This is a kind of pacifism very different from the popular image. It is active, it claims to have alternate answers, it accepts the hard realities of man's life in politics. It's not convinced that it has all the right answers, but that it does have the direction. At present it's a very dim path in the bushes, but it's the only one I know that leads out instead of deeper in.

How many pacifists of that sort would you say there are in this country?

That can articulate it? That understand it? Maybe fifty.

So, then, what's the point? There are fifty of you and a hundred and eighty million others. How can you get anywhere?

The answer to that has to come out of what you are as a human being and what you must therefore do. If that answer isn't there, you give up. It's a personal, religious stand of conscience, and all this intellectual stuff means not a damn thing unless that root is there. Because the winds that blow are so strong that a man cannot be sustained without it.

There must be more than fifty people with this personal, religious feeling, aren't there?

Lots, lots. An enormous number of people know in the root of their being that this thing is

wrong. They need two things: a sense that there is a frame of ideas adequate to meet the tight assumptions most people are operating on today, and then a feeling that there's some hope, some point to this. When Turn Toward Peace develops across this country, important as the unions and churches will be, the heart of it will be people who have made a commitment, and who have a view of their lives that enables them to find time. Others are too busy.

Would you call it fundamentally a religious commitment?

I call it religious and I call myself religious, but it isn't adherence to ritual or organization, important as they are. It's some kind of resting place outside the situation that gives you strength to stand against it. It's more than a philosophic or moral commitment—yes.

How did you yourself get to be a pacifist?

Well, if I thought of my life as a road, I could point to all the things that led me this way—things like Rouault's "Old King," and what it's like to really love a woman and sleep with her. The myth of the Lamed-Vov. Schwarz-Bart wrote a novel about it, *The Last of the Just*. You wonder how God could allow the world to go on—I mean, why allow this cruelty and misery and ugliness even one more day? The question is answered in the Jewish tradition with this story of thirty-six men who, by the quality of their lives, provide justification. It's told in different ways. Schwarz-Bart says their function is suffering, and they suffer so much for the world that enough is absorbed, so that at least the souls of newborn children aren't choked in their cradles, and they can live. But the way I've always heard it, and believe it, is that each day one of these men, who are sometimes not even known to themselves, commits an act of such purity and goodness and rightness that for the sake of this act alone God lets the world go on for one more day. This conception of what it means to act in the world and the responsibility you bear would be another step on my road. My experience in OSS during

the war would be a step. And a really good education, so that I feel a carrier of the whole tradition of man in a sense. Having my parents die when I was young. And men I've known, the whole flavor of their lives. My time in India, traveling without a companion or a capacity or money, so that I got my nose rubbed into what it means to live in Asia. I don't know. . . maybe the most important thing of all is the rich, complex sense of moral responsibility, of tragedy and humor and the many-leveledness of things that come out of Jewish tradition. But I feel an enormous debt to the Quakers for moving me out of the rejection of religious values that comes when a person growing up in the Jewish community sees its hypocrisy. The Quakers gave me a sense of what it meant to operate again on the basis of religious values. And yet it was the Jewish community, from which I felt estranged, that had given me this sense of values in the first place. Well, there are so many more things . . . thirty-seven years of living. But three years after the war was when it really hit me. I saw what was coming. I was a strong anti-Communist, but I knew that I couldn't lend myself to war any more. That was it.—EVE AUCHINCLOSS, MARGARET B. PARKINSON, AND VIRGINIA VOSS.

REVIEW

WORLD OPINION ON REINCARNATION

THERE has been during the last twenty years a notable increase of interest in the age-old belief that each man lives on earth, not once, but many times. One might think that this is to be accounted for as another quirk of religious faddism, but it seems clear that the philosophy of reincarnation has been gaining respect chiefly among the literate classes and is beginning to capture the imagination of an occasional philosopher and psychologist. It could also be maintained that the possibility of atomic destruction has driven hitherto hard-headed thinkers to wishful thinking about a possible life after death. But this argument seems without much substance, since if one is going to go in for wishful thinking, he would more naturally anticipate life in a peaceful heaven or on some more peaceful planet. It is possible, however, that the ominous advent of thermonuclear explosives represents a radical turning-point in Western thought and culture in general, away from well-marked trails of dogma in orthodox religion or science.

All of which is meant to be a brief introduction to a new collection of profound thoughts on the philosophy of rebirth—*Reincarnation: An East-West Anthology*, edited by Joseph Head and S. L. Cranston (Julian Press, New York, 1961, \$6.50). This volume demonstrates that, unless deliberately "purged" by one or another form of priestcraft, the conception of rebirth as a means of continuing the human struggle for wisdom has been a part of every great religious tradition. The book also gives selections from some four hundred Western thinkers. We learn, for example, that the hospitable mind of William James finally inclined in this direction as a logical possibility; we learn of Albert Schweitzer's respect for reincarnation; we find Walt Whitman, Thoreau and Emerson all virtually committed to this persuasion. The view of the compilers is expressed in the Preface:

Although a surprising number of distinguished thinkers of every period of history have either championed or on occasion favorably considered the idea of repeated existences upon earth, as this Anthology attests, such testimony hardly establishes reincarnation as a fact. It does suggest, however, that an idea that has occupied so many exceptional minds cannot be lightly dismissed, but is worthy of questioning, study, and investigation. . . . The real case for or against reincarnation, however, will probably rest not so much on evidence of a phenomenal character but on its capacity to provide a rational explanation of life and its mysteries, based on the ascertainable laws of nature.

Many of the individuals quoted in these pages seemed to have been able to conceive of meaning and purpose only in a universe of unbroken continuity, where birth is not a beginning nor is death an end. Not as "authorities" are their views presented, rather as coadventurers on the sea of discovery. The question of "authority"—whether religious or scientific—has been a benumbing weight upon the inquiring mind for many centuries, but now there appears to be a growing awareness that each individual must become his own authority, and that whatever of fundamental truth there is to be known must be discovered anew each for himself. The open-minded inquirer examines on its merits alone every idea that may point the way to self-knowledge.

W. Macneile Dixon, in his Gifford Lectures at the University of Glasgow (1935-37), provided an excellent synthesis of the various perspectives found in the anthology (in which he is represented). Dixon writes:

What kind of immortality is at all conceivable? Of all doctrines of a future life palingenesis or rebirth, which carries with it the idea of pre-existence, is by far the most ancient and most widely held, "the only system to which," as said Hume, "philosophy can hearken." "The soul is eternal and migratory, say the Egyptians," reports Laertius. In its existence birth and death are events. And though this doctrine has for European thought a strangeness, it is in fact the most natural and easily imagined, since what has been can be again. This belief, taught by Pythagoras, to which Plato and Plotinus were attached, has been held by Christian fathers as well as by many philosophers since the dawn of civilisation. It "has made the tour of the world," and seems, indeed, to be in accordance with nature's own favourite way of thought, of which she so insistently

reminds us, in her rhythms and recurrences, her cycles and revolving seasons. "It presents itself," wrote Schopenhauer, "as the natural conviction of man whenever he reflects at all in an unprejudiced manner."

Further indication of the increased interest in the conception of continuing human life beyond the interruption of death is afforded by a discussion of *Reincarnation: An East-West Anthology* in the December, 1961, *Library Journal*. The reviewer, Mary Barrett, recommends it highly, showing that she spent considerable time with the volume:

"Science teaches there is no death but only transformation." (Giuseppe Mazzini.) This noble anthology proves that belief in reincarnation or some transformation after death is or has been, held in all parts of the world, and from the most primitive times. The subtitle reads: "Including Quotations from the World's Religions and from over 400 Western Thinkers." The quotations, many of considerable length, begin in the East with excellently chosen passages from the Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh, Egyptian, Judaic and other scriptures or from pertinent commentaries. Then follow Christian, Mohammedan and other texts, including the early Christian, the Druses, Roman Catholic, Masonic and twentieth-century clerics of various faiths. In Part II, "Western Thinkers on Reincarnation," the editors have collected a remarkable anthology from poets and other noted writers of Europe and America, grouped by country. Part III comprises quotations from scientists and psychologists on the subject. Besides a long list of "Acknowledgements" (which constitutes a useful bibliography), the book contains an index and appendix (including "The Anathemas against Origen"). Another special item is a reprint from "Yale Review," Spring, 1945, of Professor J. Paul Williams' article "Belief in a Future Life." It would seem that every human concept of immortality and/or reincarnation is represented. An essential item for all large religious collections and useful in a library of any size. It should be invaluable to clergymen and to professional writers and speakers.

The most thorough-going scholar in the field of reincarnation is Prof. C. J. Ducasse, a past president of the American Philosophical Association and author of *The Belief in a Life*

After Death. Dr. Ducasse has the following to say about *Reincarnation: An East-West Anthology*:

The book is an excellent piece of work, informative, judicious, and likely to be of great interest to any person who has given thought to the possibility of a life after death, but who is not content either with the sonorous phrases on the subject heard at funeral services, or with the accounts—nebulous when not unbelievably naive—offered by orthodox tradition concerning the nature of a future life.

In short, this volume is a guide to what may well be the best of human thought concerning the full possibilities of human destiny.

COMMENTARY
TURN TOWARD PEACE

ROBERT PICKUS is a new kind of pacifist—the kind who impresses you more with his powerful common sense than with his absolute pacifist stance. He expresses, you might say, the new social and moral intelligence that is slowly getting born in the modern world.

Pickus has his roots in deep moral commitment, as the account of how he became a pacifist makes plain, but he is also aware of the growing persuasiveness of the commonsense basis for rejection of war, and is able to express it with remarkably flexible intelligence. It is the business of a pacifist to be disarming, and Pickus obviously has an extraordinary talent for disarming obsolete arguments against decisive action for peace. He shows how it is in the common interest of everyone to work for peace. He exposes and matures the implicit logic of peace action in dozens of situations, enabling common sense to overcome old habits of thinking.

The world *has* changed. The people in it have not changed, perhaps; and the influence of custom and national tradition is still the same; but the probable outcome of going on the way we have gone in the past is now *much plainer* than it used to be. A man who has a sneaking suspicion that it is immoral to go to war will usually go, anyway, because he thinks he must. But when he begins to see that it is also *stupid* to go to war, the going gets rough.

The stupidity of war is not merely a matter of working against one's own self-interest of survival, although that may be a factor. There is also the fact that the kind of war the next war will be is practically certain to destroy the conditions for survival of any kind of human ideals or human decency.

Finally, there are the practical alternatives to war-causing behavior that can be offered and are being offered. When enough people get interested in these alternatives and how they may be made to

work, governments will get interested in them. Governments can hardly end war. Governments are too much the creatures of their structures, making function follow form, instead of the reverse. *People* can end war by originating and campaigning for functions which make for peace.

It is suggested that readers interested in this kind of thinking and action write to the Turn Toward Peace movement at its California (1730 Grove St., Berkeley 9) or its New York (P.O. Box 401, New York 3, N.Y.) headquarters, asking to be placed on the mailing list.

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves MORE ON TELEPATHY

SINCE last week's report on "Extra-sensory Perception in Early Childhood," we have discovered considerable local interest in this field, and come across several relevant articles which have appeared in the *Journal of Parapsychology*. Here in the Los Angeles area a group of school psychologists, psychiatrists and research consultants, working with the Consciousness Research Foundation, has completed a preliminary report on "children's guessing abilities." There is apparently no doubt left in the minds of the five researchers involved that ESP ability is natural and in some degree normal in every child. Further, that, particularly during childhood, inability to use telepathic capacity is to be correlated with a general inward fear and withdrawal. Here are some conclusions:

It would appear that children who are not withdrawn can, in general, guess better than chance alone would account for, whereas withdrawn or neurologically handicapped children guess only at the chance level. This is by groups of children, and the reader should realize that individuals within these groups can vary a great deal and that not all children in each group guessed uniformly well or poorly. Conclusions are based on group tendencies, not on individuals

Since all except the withdrawn and neurologically handicapped children in the above categories could guess above the chance level, on the average, and since the aggressive children tended to guess better than any of the other groups, it is interesting to speculate as to how guessing is arrived at by the child. From previous studies it is assumed that this is an unconscious process and that clues are obtained through processes that do not involve the known senses (which were eliminated in the test).

The investigation of telepathic contact between teachers and pupils received a major impulsion from the work of Dr. J. G. van Busschbach, who secured leave from his position as Inspector of Schools in the Amsterdam District

of the Netherlands to pursue his studies, first in Holland and then in America. Although the first American experiments, undertaken at Durham, N.C., did not yield such impressive results as those obtained in Amsterdam, the work here has continued since 1956 and now, by way of a report published in September, 1961, a sifting of evidence seems to support the earlier work. Dr. van Busschbach summarizes his conclusions (*Journal of Parapsychology*, September, 1961):

Education consists of transferring objects of consciousness from educator to pupil. Extensive studies exist about the way in which this occurs, the factors at work in it, and the conditions which influence the transfer. Up through the eighteenth century, the principles of pedagogy were speculative and its practice was largely intuitive. Rationalism brought changes. The development of psychology provided a better basis of information, and the nineteenth century brought education as a practice under the influence of associationism and intellectualism. The educator-pupil relationship was analyzed in a more concrete way. Intuition, considered an unreliable and unmeasurable factor, was neglected and could not hold a place in the new, rational system of education. Thus the possibility that intuition had any role in the transfer of educational ideas and influences was denied.

Nevertheless, persistent and widespread experiences from everyday life suggested the occurrence of ESP, and parapsychology has today accumulated conclusive evidence in support of this factor. The pedagogical field has become an important area for parapsychological research—one which has proved to be a source of new data and hypotheses for future experimentation and conclusions. Pedagogy certainly needs the help of parapsychology to grow to full maturity. On the other hand, it is important for parapsychology to operate in combination with other branches of science in order to come out of its more or less isolated position. These studies of ESP in the schoolroom situation thus continue to serve a valuable purpose that should be mutually beneficial to parapsychology and educational psychology.

In this connection it may be good to point out again that the basic purpose of all my school ESP tests is to make a study of the relationship between the educator and the pupil as a part of the relationships between people in a general sense.

Accent has been placed upon the occurrence of ESP as one factor that might influence the normal teacher-pupil relationship.

Now, if it is entirely natural for significant nonverbal communication to take place between teachers and pupils as well as between child and mother, and if such telepathy is an aid to the learning process, it becomes a matter of some importance to know whether particular teachers are able to achieve this "natural" rapport with the pupils. We hardly expect the day to come when checking a teacher's credentials will involve measuring his telepathic capacities, yet this is an interesting point to raise! One thing is certain: the teacher who is affronted at the very idea of telepathy and who takes no stock in the existence of non-verbal, psychic communication will inhibit its normal functioning in the child. A friend of ours tells of a family in which one little girl was particularly gifted by what the family called "distant sight." She could perceive clairvoyantly and describe accurately situations occurring a considerable distance away, entirely beyond the range of either eye or binoculars—and whether or no a hill or a structure intervened. The child retained this capacity until she was eight years old, perhaps because other children as well as her parents did not jeer or doubt, but accepted the ability and upon occasion found that they could make good use of it. The mother was convinced that constant probing and challenging would have frightened the power away.

We recently noted a paragraph from "The Aural-oral Approach in Language Teaching" by A. T. MacAllister, Jr., director of a language laboratory at Princeton University (see *Bulletin* of the Council for Basic Education, November, 1961). Although Dr. MacAllister is not discussing the subject of telepathy, he supplies an interesting link between rigidities of language and cultural rigidities:

With the rise of nationalism in whatever guise, and the growth of high-quality literature in the several vernaculars, came the impulse to dignify the national tongues by giving them formal textbook

presentation. Not only was Latin *grammatica* the best available model; national pride prompted the new grammarians to strive to invest their simpler subjects with all the complexities of the model. Under these forced and unnatural auspices was born the grammar-translation method. And thus began, for eventual millions, the years of unrewarded effort and frustration which came to be synonymous with modern language study. For inevitably, methods borrowed from the study of a silent or "dead" language, when applied to living languages yielded silent or "dead" language results.

Well, telepathy seems to be a language of its own—perhaps, as Edward Bellamy suspected, a means of communication which is as much a part of the future as it may have been of the ancient past.

FRONTIERS

The Root of Freedom

FREEDOM, today, is defined negatively. A person, object, or act is free if it is: *not* subject to external authority, *not* determined by anything beyond its own nature, *not* held in forcible restraint, *not* united with anything else, *not* obstructed in any way. Like other abstract terms, "freedom" is a figurative application of a word originally denoting a concrete situation. Unlike many abstract terms, however, it originated, not in a physical relationship, but in a social one, that of master-slave. Freedom is defined negatively because it is defined in opposition to slavery. Because of this original opposition, slavery is assumed to be the only alternative to freedom; or, to put it the other way around, freedom is presumed to be synonymous with mastery or the desire for mastery. The inimical character of this concrete social relationship is hidden as an assumption in our negative definition of freedom; when projected into other situations, it leads to a contradiction of scientific theory, and, in practice, to negation of freedom itself.

In practice, we project the social relationship of master-slave into individual relationships and assume that men are naturally inimical toward each other. This assumption is unwarranted. In primitive societies, such as the Eskimo, in small communities, in family life, and in the loving, trusting nature of babies and very young children, we see that domination of others is not the sole motivating force of each individual. Yet by assuming that every individual is a potential master, we negate freedom, for fear of others causes our actions to be determined, not by our own desires, but by what we presume to be theirs. Since we imagine their intentions are evil, we must either seek isolation, prepare for self-defense, or we must all agree to restrain our own (evil) natures in order that all may enjoy a limited amount of freedom. External force is thus replaced by internal force or self-restraint.

In theory, our negative definition of freedom leads to the conclusion that a person or entity must have a "nature" or "essence" quite apart from conditions. This contradicts the scientific assumption that an entity is not an essence opposed to conditions, but is defined and determined by the conditions under which it exists. Science is based on the premise that by changing conditions we change the character or behavior of an entity. If we are interested in a certain characteristic or way of behaving, we bring it about by substituting favorable for unfavorable conditions relative to this purpose.

Applied to human beings, this scientific assumption of causality (whether it be described in terms of determinism, probability, or functions) means that freedom for us to manifest our potentialities is not attained by the absence of obstructions (which are, from the scientific point of view, merely exceptionally poor conditions), but by the presence of favorable conditions. Absence of coercion, absence of external authority, is necessary for each person to express his will, but it is not sufficient. Just as scurvy was not conquered until someone thought of its being due, not to the presence of a disease but to the lack of a proper diet, so, in reverse, freedom to develop our potentialities is not possible until we realize that freedom to do so is not attained by the *absence* of restraint alone, but by the *presence* of something more.

This something, this missing ingredient, is trust—the opposite of fear. Only if we do not feel ourselves exposed to the enemy on all sides, only if we trust others as one member of a family trusts another, only if we trust our own "natures"—that is, the nature of Nature herself—only thus are we able, not only to grow and expand our potentialities, but to exfoliate those innermost parts of ourselves too sensitive to trust to any but the most sympathetic atmosphere. This trusting, permissive, unpossessive and uncritical atmosphere is the positive ingredient we have left out of our definition of freedom. This ingredient

was recognized in the original definition of freedom, which was, it is true, also defined in opposition to slavery, but from the master's point of view, not from the slave's. The word "free" is derived from "frijon," meaning "beloved," and its meaning is due to its application to members of the (master's) family as opposed to slaves. Now that we, the freed slaves, the "people," are our own masters, it may profit us to reflect on the fact that the root of freedom, both figuratively and literally, is not fear, but love.

ELEANOR WOODS

To the foregoing, it might be added that trust, while it creates or changes conditions, is not itself so much a "condition" as an attitude of mind. It seems fairly obvious that in order to trust somebody, you have to believe in the "somebody's" capacity to rise above unfavorable conditionings, just as you are trying to do yourself. You have to believe, that is, in the human capacity to *change* the chain of causation which leads to suspicion and fear—to be the creator of conditions instead of their creature.

Plato called the soul a "self-moving unit"—an essence, that is, which has the capacity to choose, to respond to circumstances by inward inclination rather than from outward stimuli. Love is an inward inclination, trust one of its forms.

If you don't like the Platonic vocabulary, there are others, such as the one Dr. Rogers uses in *On Becoming a Person* (see last week's Review), or the one A. H. Maslow is developing in his studies of self-actualizing persons. The basic consideration is that love and trust, if they are to be sustained, need the support of an idea of the nature of man which supplies a continuous inspiration.—Editors.