VOLUME XV, NO. 9
FEBRUARY 28, 1962

THE PROBLEM OF FRAMING ISSUES

TOO often the argument about unilateral disarmament, or about peace action, nonviolent demonstrations, civil disobedience, tax refusing, and similar acts of war resistance obscures the fundamental question of what is happening to the world. But if this tendency is a misfortune, it is natural enough, and has a simple explanation. The problem of what is happening to the world—of where Western civilization went off the track of progress, and who or what is responsible for its mistakes—is so difficult to analyze, and the complex causes so difficult to trace, that most people prefer to select a field of argument or discussion where the issues are more definable and fixed.

Take for example the region of moral behavior, which is usually divided into two great areas of private and public morality. It is common to say that a man's personal behavior is a private affair—a matter between himself and his conscience or religion—*unless* his actions move into a range that is clearly adverse to the welfare of others. Then, we say, he must answer to the social community for what he does. While the extremes of private and public action are easily identified by common-sense definition—a man may throw rocks at his own windows, if he feels like it, but he must not throw the broken glass on a public highway—the dividing line is always a more or less arbitrary decision. For example, the government of the city of Geneva, under Calvin in the sixteenth century, was empowered to send inspectors into the homes of the residents. The care with which housewives dusted their cupboards was considered to be within the jurisdiction of the public community. The inspectors also had authority to count the petticoats worn by the women of Geneva, to see if the going definition of modesty was being observed. A person's views on the Holy Trinity were likewise subject to critical inspection. Michael Servetus had the misfortune to hold unorthodox opinions on this question and was burned alive as punishment for his dissent from doctrines held to be essential to Geneva's spiritual good.

Today we have a very different view of the relation between private and public morality. The practice of nudism is permitted under special circumstances and no one cares what another may think about the Trinity, if at all. The heat of anxiety about opinion has left the religious area—and now turns up in politics, where outspoken criticism of the Radical Right may cause your home to be bombed by people who believe that open discussion in the manner prescribed by the democratic tradition is a threat to the national security. (Early this month, while two Southern California ministers were answering questions in a public meeting, after talks on the dangers to American society of "radical right" activities, home-made bombs damaged their homes in the San Fernando Valley. Their wives and children were not harmed, but in one case fragments of the bomb struck the crib of a four-months-old baby, who might have been injured or even killed if the crib had been turned another way.)

The clearest recent discussion of the dividing line between private and public morality has been in thoughtful evaluations of the prosecution of Adolf Eichmann by the Government of Israel. The chief point of the critics has been that the trial has had the effect of grossly over-simplifying the issues of the Nazi crimes against the Jews. As Rosal Rogat put it (see last week's MANAS): "Reducing the unique historical events at issue in the trial to legally manageable proportions risks leaving out too much that is vital. . . . Legal processes are not necessarily appropriate for the solution of all problems." And as Hans Zeisel

observed: "The trial of Adolf Eichmann is likely to make all the wrong points because neither the procedure nor the substance of our criminal law fits such a case. . . . Eichmann's trial will keep us from seeing our share in this catastrophe because, by comparison, our share must seem infinitesimal."

The point is that what Rogat and Zeisel say remains true, no matter how right are those who insist that Eichmann is guilty and should be prosecuted, despite any shortcomings of the judicial process. The point is that in some other sort of social community, Eichmann's weaknesses and submission to the compulsion to do hideous evil (his own compulsion, or that of the Nazi State), might have found no scope for expression, while his small bureaucratic talents might have been turned to some small public good.

Which, then, is the most important matter to give our attention: the punishment of Eichmann, or the design of a social community where Eichmann's crimes could not take place?

The obvious reply is to say that we do what we can; the punishment of Eichmann is within our competence, while the reconstruction of the social community will be the work of centuries—in effect, beyond us, today.

What we must beware of in making this reply, or allowing it to be made, is the tendency to accept without any serious questioning the legalization or politicalization of problems which are neither legal nor political in their origin, but only in their effect.

It is a prime function of the legal and political means of the social community to "reduce to legally manageable proportions" the evil that men do to one another. What we are confronted with, in the middle years of the twentieth century, is the break-down of the legal and political means for this purpose. This is to say that while thoughtful men have always known that politics and the law involve inevitable inequities and compromises, and manifest crudities in the formulation of the public welfare, these limitations have now grown beyond any tolerable limit. That is the meaning of the mushroom cloud which hung over Hiroshima.

In relation to evil, it has been the historic function of politics and the law to distinguish between the guilty and the innocent, to restrain or punish the guilty and to protect and benefit the innocent. But now, in simple terms, the problem is this: Physical science and modern technology have armed politics and the law with tools of restraint and punishment which are so "effective" that they can hardly be used selectively—against, that is, the guilty, but not against the innocent. In other words, if these tools are to be used rationally or justly we must broaden our definition of guilt to the point where many, many millions, possibly billions, come under its scope. Our weapons of universal punishment require this universal guilt.

This is the hard, the inescapable absolutism of the political means in thermonuclear war.

It creates the necessity of making one of two choices. Either we accept the new definition of guilt as including possibly half or more than half of the inhabited world, or we abandon the weapons we have developed for reducing the unique historical events of our time to *politically* manageable proportions.

The psychological pain of facing this necessity is so great that very few persons, so far, are inclined to attempt it. As Charles Bolton pointed out recently in a *Nation* article (Jan. 27): "A disarmed world is as inconceivable to most people today as was a world without a hereditary ruling class to our medieval ancestors." In Mr. Bolton's view, the major task of the peace movement is to present the idea of a disarmed world in terms that show not only its possibility, but its desirability.

It is at this point that Gandhi's contribution should enter the picture. Without the effect of Gandhi's thinking, or thinking of the sort he did, hope for a disarmed world would indeed be

inconceivable. Gandhi did not deny the presence of evil in the world, nor of men who commit evil acts. You might even say that Gandhi found more evil to contest than many of his time were willing to recognize. Gandhi's thinking was revolutionary in respect to the nature of man. He held it to be a distinct possibility that, given an environment from which threat, anger, and hate had been removed, many men who were doing evil might turn to good. Love, sacrifice, and nonviolence were the tools he proposed to use, and used, toward this end. The measure of his accomplishments and of the accomplishments of persons using similar means can hardly be taken, as yet, but it is fair to say that Gandhi's ideas have spread around the world with a rapidity equal to the spread of great religious and moral reforms of the past.

In simple terms, Gandhi proposed and put into practice the use of moral suasion to take the place of violence or physical coercion in the restraint of evil behavior. Ironically, this method has in common with the method of nuclear war a failure to distinguish between the guilty and the innocent, but in the Gandhian approach the sharing of guilt is undertaken voluntarily by those who seek to restrain evil with nonviolence. There is a sense in which you could say that the Gandhian or nonviolent solution for evil behavior is as absolute in its way as the destructiveness of modern, nuclear war, but pursues its way to this conclusion in an opposite direction. The Gandhian extends his sense of personal moral responsibility to include the problems of the social community, while the political-military solution of modern war makes its judgment wholly in terms of the behavior of states and exacts its penalty for guilt with total destruction.

The foregoing analysis hardly pretends to solve any problems, nor could it possibly have assembled all the considerations that ought to be weighed in shaping a decision about either national or personal policy. All that was attempted was to give brief outline to the psychological environment in which decision will be made. Nor does this suggest that very many people will soon make clear-cut decision. The natural tendency in a difficult situation is to drift, evading choice, and evading even the clarification of issues, lest clarification press home the necessity for fully responsible choice.

Actual historical change, or transition, on any large scale takes place, we very much suspect, by means of countless minute subjective inclinations, by the strengthening of resolve in some, its weakening in others, and by the slow opening to perception of new avenues of action. No man can chart all these subtle possibilities. Preparation for historical change is like a general education—it seeks familiarity with basic principles, basic issues, basic contrasts in direction. It hopes to awaken and foster basic intelligence, on the ground that only this kind of preparation will give people the extreme adaptability they will need in order to meet the challenge of both rapid and complex change.

What must be acknowledged freely, frequently, and generously, is that an unknown variety of views, conceived in courage and with good will, will play a part in whatever solution *is* found for the present crisis. Meanwhile, a consensus among men of good will is hardly possible until there is more common agreement on the question of the essential elements of the world situation and on what can be expected of human beings in large numbers as agreement grows on the answer to this question.

For example, we have a letter from a reader whose approach varies greatly from views often suggested in these pages, yet obviously sharing in the same ideals:

> I don't believe that unilateral disarmament is the answer.
>
> I do not believe that Americans have too much government.
>
> I do not believe that men must not fight, no matter what the circumstances.
>
> I do not believe that surrender of our ideals is better than extinction.
>
> I am therefore not with you any more.

I do believe that war must be eliminated.

I do believe that we must strive for national disarmament and for world government.

While Americans may have more government than would be ideal, I know that Russia today and Germany and Japan before her, definitely have and had too much government.

The criterion for this is really very simple. Americans and many others of similar tradition might feel extremely critical of their government and call for drastic changes, but they do not fear it. There seems to be an impossible ignorance among many people of what a truly totalitarian government means. Even after Hitler and the Eichmann review, they haven't learned. Even after the exodus from East Berlin, or after Hungary, or after renewed nuclear testing. Of course, Americans are concerned over the growing authority of their government. But please, if you don't see it, there are plenty who still see that it is a very long way from there to where the individual citizen has truly to live in fear of his own government.

I do believe that we are still the blessed possessors of incalculable values of freedom and human dignity, for whose protection men are and should be willing to fight. Of course, we all know, and no one has to tell us, that there are a great many who only count those values that come from belonging to a rich nation; that is, the material values it brings them and which they are unwilling to share. But no one needs to tell us either that that is all. The valid reason that Americans hesitate to surrender their last shreds of national sovereignty is that they know that very few have ever had as long a history as a nation under a government where men could enjoy a never-before known freedom and dignity—a freedom, that is, allowing close practical approach to human ideals and the meaning of human life. If we could only find a sure way to give this to all mankind, we would surely do so.

And I do believe we are making progress toward this goal. The progress is painfully slow, especially when the fate of humanity hangs in such precarious balance. Where lies the true meaning of, "Give me liberty or give me death"? It may be illustrated by stating its opposite: "Let them putrefy rather than be free!" We have a tough choice before us, especially as the meaning of the two sentences is almost the same, the difference lying more in emphasis.

A tough or a delicate choice. The enemies of freedom are tough and freedom of choice is a delicate thing. But human life without freedom is not human life. To hold these values and at the same time prevent physical destruction, that is our problem.

Are you to pronounce judgment, here and now, as to which is better—to deliver generations to come into unlimited power of authority or to have a handful of survivors of humanity who may perhaps be able to rebuild a human society after the worst disaster mankind ever suffered? A peace marcher or any defender of unilateral disarmament is passing precisely such judgment. Are you and they so sure that surrender will not bring on the same fate of physical destruction within perhaps a few years, if the world is left to totalitarian rule?

Personally, I believe that man will eventually survive either disaster, if it must come to that. But our task lies in steering free of either. It is a very stormy sea in which we must find our course. But I do not believe that Americans, and many others with them, have lost their bearings as completely as you so often complain. I believe that, by and large, we have not lost all these values, but are trying everything possible with our great ideals and our feeble practice to find this course.

We agree with this correspondent that Americans need not personally fear even their local governments (unless they happen to be Negro Americans and live in the deep South), but if one takes a larger view than the personal outlook—the view, for example, adopted by C. Wright Mills in *The Power Elite*, or the view of Fred J. Cook in his full-length *Nation* (Oct. 28, 1961) article "Juggernaut—The Warfare State"—then some fear, or at least some questioning apprehension, is clearly in order. It was not an unstable radical of little faith, but former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said in his Farewell Address: "We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence . . . by the military-industrial complex."

There are bound to be disagreements as to which constitutes the greater risk to present and future generations—the unilateral path to disarmament or continuing reliance on the theory of deterrence. What the unilateralist or peace-walker wants is not blind agreement—which would be ridiculous to expect—but an honest

weighing of the evidence and open-minded evaluation of alternatives to war. A good example of this kind of thinking occurs in Mr. Bolton's *Nation* article (quoted earlier), in which he says:

> The most fundamental risk in disarmament involves an intellectual judgment: that Communist leaders are not men of undiluted and *unchangeable* evil. I cannot agree with those who say we must take the pessimistic view of Communism. It is a thin line between successfully answering this challenge and being declared "soft" on communism. The problem is not to defend communism at all; it is to make clear that the Communist world is changing, that the direction of this change depends very much on our responses to it, and that communism would change even more under disarmament. While it would be naive to expect Communists promptly to give up their belief in the ultimate triumph of their system, history makes clear the falsity of the premises of ideological invariance and the unchangeability of national orientations. The form taken by applied Communist ideology has been shaped in large measure by the paranoid logic of an arms race with modern weapons, by the grinding context of forced-march industrial development, and by the world-wide anti-colonialist revolution. Under disarmament, it is highly plausible to believe that the loss of effectiveness of fulminations against the West, combined with an increase in the consumers' share of an already impressive rate of economic growth, would accelerate change in Communist societies and hasten their evolution away from the police state and their efforts to export revolution.

We suggest a rereading of the Pickus interview (from the December *Mademoiselle)* reprinted in MANAS for Feb. 7 as a clarifying statement which represents the views of many of those who are working for disarmament and peace.

Letter from **INDIA**

MADRAS.—I wonder whether you can give me a fresh lead on colonialism? Even the West has now come to regard it as an evil, possibly because the all-too-obvious immorality of one country's rule over another can no longer be ignored. But should a principle claim enormous importance and dictate military action, while the realities that do not support that principle are wholly ignored? These reflections were provoked by the report given to me by an Indian journalist who had been to Goa, and which I briefly recapitulate below:

Indian newspapers published only what would please the Indian Government, which wanted to make it appear that the Indian troops went in the role of liberators and were given a magnificent welcome. But there was nothing of the sort. At best, Goans were indifferent to the entry of Indian troops and there was no "welcome" extended to them anywhere. Stories of Portuguese blowing up bridges and destroying buildings were mostly untrue. The blowing up and the destruction were carried out by the Indian troops, who gave out the story that the Portuguese had adopted a scorched earth policy. There was no jubilation in Goa over the entry of Indian troops and it would be true to say that the majority of Goans wanted Portuguese rule to continue, since prices were low and supplies of goods plentiful, while in India controls and scarcity had made life far too difficult, of which Goans themselves knew. India must be glad that the foreign journalists who had been in Goa before, during, and after the military operations let off India comparatively lightly, in the reports they cabled to the newspapers, which, it is said—even the most rabid among them—"did not want to annoy Nehru."

The report on Goa is of some interest, but basic questions on colonialism keep intruding. The magnanimity with which the British retreated from Asia gave authenticity to the anti-colonial sentiment, but it would be well to remind ourselves that we have no obligation to grant nobility to the anti-colonialist simply because he represented and agitated for victims of European imperialism; the backing and the power he has acquired are more likely to make him intolerant than considerate towards criticism or different points of view. I am inclined to think that what has happened in Goa illustrates this sufficiently. The journalist I mentioned above was definite in saying that there was no resistance movement in Goa against the Portuguese. The border violations by the Portuguese were negligible, as also the alleged importation of NATO weapons into Goa. The reports fed to the Indian public prior to the Goa operations were all the work of Indian protagonists and publicists.

While this report—I had no reason to think that the journalist was exaggerating—disturbed me, as it should everyone who associates high standards of conduct with India and Mr. Nehru, it also showed how the ways of politics and power hold India prisoner as much as they do any other country, making it impossible for India to live up to the level of behavior set by Gandhi. As the Prime Minister of a big country, Mr. Nehru could not possibly ignore the material considerations that promote Indian interests, and his prolonged attention to such considerations makes saintliness of conduct very difficult, if not foolish for him. He could perhaps never know when he would be more selfish than was necessary, Goa being a case in point. The fourteen years during which Mr. Nehru has been India's Prime Minister—if he is the introspective person that one believes him to be—must have been instructive to him on the very narrow region of choice open to the head of a Government, who is ever in a battle of wits with other governments and forced to be as self-seeking as they in an unregenerate world. What worse dilemma could confront a Gandhian?

Having mentioned Gandhi, it may be pertinent for me to wonder briefly about his awareness of the problems that an independent India might face and which might well baffle a man of his

persuasion. I suspect that he must have had this awareness. There were enough indications even during his time that he never claimed any universality or absoluteness for whatever he said or did. He would readily discard views if they were found wrong or inadequate in practice. He was often regarded by Western observers—and I think with some accuracy—not as an impractical saint, but as a shrewd strategist who well knew what he was doing. It might, therefore, be reasonable to suppose that he might have brought some understanding and sympathy, if not approval, to the expediency and materialism that Indian leaders have had to employ while dealing with her many problems.

This enables me to take up my theme again. If Indians are obliged to resort to expediency and self-interest while building up their country and making it strong, then friends of India who have had hopes of a lead from India towards making things more agreeable in the world, may well abandon them. It is obvious that India and the other undeveloped countries that have emerged from colonial subjection have now taken the same road on which Europe and America have gone far, intent upon making themselves prosperous and powerful. You have written often on how wealth and power have forced freedom and sanity to retreat from the world, and I think you have also expressed the hope that India would acquit herself better than the other nations. I am afraid that India is inevitably taking a course that will oblige her to stew in the same juice as the West.

I am not, of course, an apologist for Portugal. But that she had not so much wisdom as Britain did not make the self-interest of the Indian action in Goa less evident. Meanwhile, the Indian newspapers attacked Portugal with the same fury as that shown by their Government, without one of them troubling to seek out and publish facts. Of course, they knew that the Government would not have brooked any criticism of action held to be taken in the national interest. This is the era of expediency and the Indian newspapers know it very well.

INDIAN CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW
WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS' "WILDERNESS"

SUPREME COURT Justice William O. Douglas is apparently one of the most versatile men of the twentieth century. He is a man of contemplation who is also a man of action, and his conceptions of "principle" connect a matured personal taste with the obligations of a high-minded jurist. His latest book is the leisurely record of personal treks on foot through the most interesting primitive areas remaining in the United States; it also conveys his belief that a civilization which exploits and destroys its natural resources is still in the brat-hood stage.

The full title of the book is My *Wilderness: East to Katahdin* (Doubleday, 1961), and it joins an earlier volume by Mr. Douglas, *The Pacific West.* The explorations recorded represent pieced-together vacation times. Starting in Arizona, the traveler finally reaches Katahdin in the state of Maine. Stops along the way are the Maroon Bells wilderness of Colorado, the Wind River Mountains in Wyoming, the Virgin River in Utah, Quetico-Superior in Minnesota and Canada, the Florida Everglades, the Great Smokies of Tennessee and North Carolina, the C & O Canal along the Potomac, the White Mountains of New Hampshire, the Allagash, and then Katahdin.

Conservationists who appreciate the delicate perceptions of an Aldo Leopold, a Joseph Wood Krutch or a John Muir will discover in Mr. Douglas the same semi-mystical insight—and also will understand the psychological significance of his warning against encroachments on the remaining areas of virgin nature. The passages coming after the account of the Douglas hike through the Maroon Bells area of Colorado establish a Thoreau-like link between recognition of the balance of primitive nature and the lack of balance in our cultural existence:

> We have reached the point where only a few precious islands of wilderness are left. If we behave in the future as we have in the past, they will be depleted or nibbled at until they too are gone. The demands for more sheep and cattle, for more mass recreation (now treated as an industry) will cause even high basins to be badly hurt. More and more roads, more and more hostels, more and more resorts will be built deeper and deeper in the sacred precincts of the mountains. Under those influences we will end up like Europe, with hardly any real wilderness left.
>
> We need a restatement of national purpose. We need to bring to our educational programs a new ethic. Man is capable of care as much as he is of destruction. Preservation of beauty, tenderness in relation to other life, communication with nature—these too can be awakened and given a powerful thrust. If we make conservation a national cause we can raise generations who will learn that the earth itself is sacred. Once a person breaks through to the level where love of beauty is the ideal, he will worship the rocks and plains that are America. Then he will look on a tuft of grass with awe. For it has the secret of chlorophyll that man hardly comprehends. The miracles of Spring, the songs of birds, even the discovery of a lone harebell in the litter of a forest floor will fill him with reverence. Poets and philosophers have seen this transformation. A line in a Jewish prayer book states the idea concisely: that which "nourishes the roots of the grassblade" also "attains fulfillment in the soul of man."
>
> Once that ethic is taught, beginning in our kindergartens, no more American wilderness bowls will be broken and turned to dust.

Government agencies sometimes strive intelligently and laudably for the preservation of wilderness. Ten or so years ago the Quetico-Superior wilderness of the Great Lakes region was threatened by a deluge of sportsmen brought in by charter flights. On December 17, 1949, President Truman—instructed in the meaning of the problem by conservationists throughout the country—signed an executive order which banned all flights below the 4000-foot level, thus eliminating a prime cause of the denudation of the forests. Although some fairly powerful interests opposed the move and took the matter to court, the executive order was sustained. Over 1,000,000 acres of comparatively virgin land regained the quiet of past centuries, and the wild life was able to move toward its natural and self-replenishing balance. But government organizations do not always proceed with this

foresight, as Douglas points out, since Congress usually designates forests for what is called "multiple" use. And "multiple" use, says Mr. Douglas, "is semantics for making cattlemen, sheepmen, lumbermen, miners the main beneficiaries." His indignation breaks forth as he continues: "After they gutted and ruined the forests, then the rest of us could use them—to find campsites among stumps, to look for fish in waters heavy with silt from erosion, to search for game on ridges pounded to dust by sheep. On Piñon Ridge, I realized that the pretense of 'multiple' use as applied in this area in Wyoming was an awful wrong." Basic issues of conservation are pointed up by this paragraph:

> One of our deepest conflicts is between the preservation of wild life and the profits of a few men. The coyote, with his wise, doglike face and his haunting call, is gone. Fox, marten and bear have been sacrificed. Mountain sheep are doomed. Is there no place left for any life except man and his greed? Must we see our wild animals only in zoos? Is there no place left for mountain sheep and coyotes? The thought of their eradication was as dismal as the prospect that all trails would be paved, that man will go only where a machine will take him.

There is a deep philosophical and ethical—or, if we will, religious—aspect of this question. It is not simply that *we* may lose the beauty of unspoiled nature, that our lives will be aesthetically impoverished. Mr. Douglas feels that there are dimensions of man's relation with nature which we have hardly begun to understand:

> The relation of all life in the circle of existence has been of consuming interest to philosophers as well as anthropologists. When I first visited India, I heard of Hindu epics that extol the beneficial effect of music on plant life. The ancient god Krishna was said to have made a garden blossom by playing a flute. I dismissed the idea as fanciful. But T.C.N. Singh, a botanist on the faculty of Annamalai University, in Madras State, India, has shown that music does affect plant growth. Different plants respond to different music. The flute and violin produce the most effective tunes. Seeds, serenaded with their music, sprout faster. Over-all crop yields may possibly be affected. We are perhaps closer constitutionally to the life around us than we have imagined. The life of which we are a part may be unitary in a sense that only poets have divined. If we took that view *only speculatively*, it would have a profound effect on our attitude toward conservation. We would have a new reverence for life. Our drive would be to preserve it; to stand against all forces of destruction. I thought of this as I left the high country of Wyoming.

No religion, it seems to us, can be regarded as superior to the "religion of nature." This idea is suggestively developed on the last page of *My Wilderness:*

> We must provide enough wilderness areas so that, no matter how dense our population, man—though apartment born—may attend the great school of the outdoors, and come to know the joy of walking the woods, alone and unafraid. Once he experiences that joy, he will be restless to return over and over again to discover the never-ending glories of God's wilderness and perhaps solve some of its mysteries. Before long he will cease to enter our wild precincts as a predator. He will come with reverence. He will learn to see bog kalmia, fiddlehead ferns, and woodcock chicks in the leaf litter at his feet as links in a chain of which he too is a part. Then he will walk the woods quietly and humbly. He will come to know that man needs a Bill of Rights for his wilderness—a Bill of Rights that includes the privilege of drinking from a pure, cold-water spring. If that is to happen, the places where the gold thread, monkey flower, spring beauty, or starflower flourish in sphagnum moss must be made as sacred as any of our other shrines.

COMMENTARY
GANDHI'S LOOK AHEAD

THE question of whether or not Gandhi was "aware" of the problems that an independent India might face (see Letter from India) need not remain unanswered. Gandhi answered it many times himself. In 1942, he said:

> My resistance to war does not carry me to the point of thwarting those who wish to take part in it. I reason with, I put before them the better way and leave them to make the choice.

Yet Gandhi never ceased to speak of his dream:

> I fear that the chances of non-violence accepted as a principle of State policy are very slight, so far as I can see at present. . . . But. . . I believe that a State can be administered on a non-violent basis, if the vast majority of the people are nonviolent. I am conducting my experiment in that faith. (1940). . . . If I am in the minority of one, I must try to make converts. Whether one or many, I must declare my faith that it is better for India to discard violence altogether, even for defending her borders. For India to enter into the race for armaments is to court suicide. . . . I must live up to the creed I have professed for the last half century, and hope to the last breath that India will make non-violence her creed, preserve man's dignity, and prevent him from reverting to the type from which he is supposed to have raised himself. (1939.)

Asked in 1925 if free India would have room for soldiers, he said that he did not regard himself as equal to preaching universal non-violence, but would preach it only for "the purpose of winning our [India's] freedom and therefore perhaps for the regulation of international relations by non-violent means." It was Gandhi's sense of his own limitations which held him back. "But," he said, "my incapacity must not be mistaken for that of the doctrine of non-violence." He had absolute faith in the power of nonviolence and many times said that India was potentially nonviolent in the natural inclination of her inarticulate masses. In 1940 he answered another question about the future:

> . . . the spirit of India, as I conceive it, is and will be a mixture. What policy the National Government will adopt I cannot say. I may not even survive it, much as I would love to. I would advise the adoption of non-violence to the utmost extent possible, and that will be India's great contribution to the peace of the world and the establishment of a new world order. I expect with the existence of so many martial races in India, all of whom will have a voice in the government of the day, the national policy will incline toward militarism of a modified character. I shall certainly hope that all the effort for the last twenty-two years will not have gone in vain and a strong party representing true non-violence will exist in the country.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
NOTES AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE NEW REPUBLIC for Jan. 1 contains a one-page editorial on recent developments in an old controversy between teachers and school administrators. On the one hand the teachers, both individually and as represented by their unions and federations, argue strongly that policy in *all* educational institutions should be largely directed by the teachers themselves. As the *NR* reports, the Union Federation of Teachers has won a New York City election which will enable the 43,000 teachers of New York City to be represented by the Federation in dealings with school boards. This means that the teachers will have "a much broader role in educational policy-making than teachers have ever had in the past, and could also pave the way to similar developments in other cities where American Federation of Teachers locals hold sway."

The *New Republic* has been championing teacher influence or teacher control of local policies, but, as intelligent correspondence directed to the *NR* editors has indicated, the problem is not simply one of seeing that teachers prevail over administrators. Frederick L. Redefer, professor of education at New York University, speaks to this point when he says that more teacher participation in administrative control would not necessarily improve matters, since "teachers like administrators reflect the dominant values of our society." He adds: "As classroom teachers they now have more freedom and power than they exercise. Most administrators are former teachers who as administrators repeat all the cliches included in your article. In positions of power, they proceed to act like administrators." Dr. Redefer is provocative in the suggestion of a common denominator of failings uniting teachers and administrators, although administrators or school board members may not be very well educated persons. An administrator may have risen politically by the popularity of an athletic coach or a physical education superintendent. Dr. Redefer continues:

> A major source of difficulty is the whole structuring of our schools that has not changed since the days of untrained teachers who had to be directed. The structuring supported by tradition, rules, regulations and salary differentials remains the same so that those who become a part of it behave accordingly. The former president of the Teachers Union becomes a model superintendent just as the former union leader in the boss's clothes often out-bosses the boss. The structuring of our colleges is not much better with their hierarchies of vice presidents, assistant deans and assistants to the dean. The changes you desire will not occur until there is a revamping of the structural organization of schools and colleges that support the behavior you bemoan.

* * *

Our brief reports on "Midtown School" in Los Angeles have elicited considerable interest, with plain indication that professional educators in this area are well aware of the value of the no-grade, no-examination approach which seems so successful at Midtown. In other words, in the sprawling community of southern California, with its numerous new campuses at the junior college and university level and the endless additions to elementary and high school facilities, interested teachers and administrators can undertake something of a study of the non-graded school at first hand. One correspondent, a qualified teacher, explains her approval of non-grading Midtown:

> The differences in ability in the average fourth-grade class range over four years, increasing as the age of the children increases. Another interesting fact is that the range of achievement is pretty much the same no matter how much you try to narrow down the IQ ratings to a homogeneous group. Many times a group of children of whom a great deal could reasonably be expected because of their high ability, just don't produce. The reason for this is that, although they are given enrichment programs, cultural opportunities, etc., their experience is all on a very superficial level—not really creative—and they have no time for contemplation. Now originality or creative ability cannot be measured in the same way as intellectual abilities. Children who are very

> creative in the sense of evolving original solutions to problems frequently do not do well in standard intelligence tests.

Another subscriber—one who has visited Midtown on two occasions—feels that this school is a natural step toward the same sort of "basic education" as that envisioned and pioneered in India by Gandhi. We have spoken of the Gandhian program on many previous occasions and now, in the Midtown setting, there is further opportunity for considering its psychological ingredients. The present correspondent finds no fault with Midtown, save that the excellent physical facilities are simply "provided" for the children. Might they not take some part in the construction or the gathering of the facilities, at least in the play area? She writes:

> Could it not be said that it is somehow basic to the continuing growth of the individual that no matter what his current pursuits he should not lose contact with the preparatory physical work upon which his educational activity depends? If this generalization is true, then it is certainly a necessary element in the education of children, and later, the value of whatever a man engages in is enhanced if he can return periodically to these basic activities for a while. But in our society this is usually not at all practical, so is there some substitute, or larger sense in which it could be accomplished?

It seems to us that in typical urban and suburban localities various compromises become necessary. Gandhi's school of "basic education" at Sevagram was situated ideally from the standpoint of the concerns expressed by the above correspondent: in the first place, there were no funds available for buying elaborate equipment and, in the second place, it was necessary for students and teachers alike to bend their backs to the problem of building-construction in order to house the increasing numbers of pupils who arrived from outlying districts. Gandhi's teachers taught arithmetic and art in connection with the practical needs of erecting unpretentious additions and making them pleasing to the eye. From the Gandhian standpoint, nearly everything comes to American children too easily, and because there is no *apparent* need for youngsters to engage in physical labor, vital elements of the natural maturing process are denied, or at the very least delayed until after school years have passed. It is possible, however, for experimental schools which share Midtown's general aims to initiate practical projects on behalf of the school, in which students can participate.

Also, above the level of the physical projects which create or improve facilities to be used by the school, there is always a way in which older students can be encouraged to help with the instruction of the younger ones.

FRONTIERS

Link after Link

IN your article, "The Dynamics of Freedom" (MANAS, Jan. 10), you speak of the personal action of individuals and what impact it can have. I would like to add that I have found this very true, and back it up with a couple of examples.

In October I heard that the women of Hanover, New Hampshire, would be going out on the first women's strike on November 1. Living in Woodstock, about twenty miles away, I had to find a ride over if I were to join them. I do not drive so this meant involving another person. (I had tried unsuccessfully to arouse a few people to go out in Woodstock.) After calling around I found a ride. In the process eleven other women became interested and we went in three cars to the demonstration. The result of this was that many questions came to our minds—what could we do in our community?

A few nights later a friend came over lugging a huge poster. He asked what we thought of it. We were overwhelmed—it covered the whole women's strike from coast to coast, including the newspaper shots of our own few. He said he thought he'd like to put it in some store window, and we asked if he had a store in mind. He answered that he thought the barber shop in the center of town had a good window and he'd approach the barber. The next time in town we found the poster in the barber's window where every one could see it. Since that time this same man has built a very comprehensive window display which is lighted at night. He changes the newspaper clippings every few days.

Others of us have formed a peace group, each one doing the things he can do best. Two of the men arrange for speakers in a forum. One of the ministers calls on the school boards to see what can be done about a better understanding between them and our group. Two of us went to Washington, D.C., for the Women's Strike on Jan. 15. I had heard about the Washington trip from a New York City woman at Christmas time. As this demonstration seemed like a good thing to be represented at, I got up and announced I was going and asked if anyone else would go. One woman could. Her husband was a photographer and I asked if he could go also. So with our own photographer we made the trip. His pictures were sent out immediately and three state papers and one New Hampshire one used them to illustrate a story on the march. Since our local weather was so icy on Jan. 15, no women in Vermont or New Hampshire were able to go out to demonstrate, and if these photos hadn't been made available there would have been no coverage on the strike in these New England states.

All the things we have been working on for three months are beginning to take hold. Last month we sponsored a public forum, with two Dartmouth professors speaking on thermonuclear war and its implications. All these activities have been done with an outlay of $3.00 each from twenty-five people (all voluntary donations). This covered the rent of the town hall and a half-page ad with an open letter to President Kennedy. The other things have been done at the expense of the persons doing them. There has not even been a discussion about that aspect.

Yesterday the minister of our group was approached by the head of the Rotary Club. He wondered if we would come and speak about what our forum would offer. This is a real breakthrough. Communication between all representative members in the community is beginning to come about. This may be an ideal community for this to happen in, but nevertheless, and ideal as it may be, peace is a lot of work.

After our trip to Washington we were asked a number of times to speak about the trip. People were interested and wanted to know about it. The students at our school wanted to learn what it would be well for them to know when some of them went on the student march on Washington in February. This whole thing has been a long chain which has grown by adding link after link.

A student at the Woodstock public high school has come to three of our peace council meetings. He wrote a letter for the high school paper, telling about the forum. It was not accepted—they felt it was too controversial. He then sent it to the newspaper which covers Woodstock and the Hanover (N.H.) area. This paper published the letter in toto as the editorial for that day, and even printed the "Postscript" that told why it was not accepted by the school paper.

Many of us on the peace council are becoming more and more aware of the need to try to understand others with different views and mix in more so that people will see we have neither six toes nor purple eyes and are pretty much alike and not to be feared because we have different ideas.

I cannot personally write very well but I have tried in letters to editors to tell my impressions of the women's strike, in case others do not get around to it. It is so important that people are given hope. There was a train load of it on the Washington trip and 2,000 of us felt we must make ourselves heard, even though with a small voice. Many women have come up to me since my return, saying that they believed in what I did but did not have the nerve to go out yet. I came back in one piece and none the worse for the hours in the rain. This has made a small impression.

One of the most interesting things I heard was from the women who visited the Russian embassy. First of all, only fifteen women were supposed to be allowed in—but sixty got in! Four Russian lady tourists came to the embassy at about the same time and interpreters were quickly gotten. Our women and the Russian women spoke for a great length of time. The women of Roslyn, Long Island, had brought a letter with them to present to the Soviet embassy. When it was opened by the attaché he showed tremendous pleasure to find it written in Russian. He commented that the Russian was excellent, also, which returned the pleasure to our women. He said that English was their second language, but that few Americans know Russian. I tell you this as a small incident that made relations run much more smoothly and agreeably for both parties involved.

My personal impression of the trip is this: I believe that had we tested in October, right after the Russians did, many of the women and people in general would have said, "If the Russians do it, so can we." This sort of feeling was totally absent from anyone's mind on January I5. Most of the women felt that we must work even harder to keep our country from testing, and if it was started again, to wear ourselves out trying to do something about it.

I have tried in the last few months to read all I can on all the interrelated subjects of our present dilemma and I hope that your magazine continues to speak of the many books and findings you have come across. When students ask me what they should do most before going to Washington, D.C., I say *read*—read and read so that you can ask and deal with the many questions that come up at such a time, and not be brushed off with, "Sonny, you don't know what you are talking about."

From your magazine I have become interested in and then have bought *Summerhill, The Informed Heart,* and other books. Have you read *The Shark and the Sardines* by Juan José Arecalo? This book concerns our relations with Latin America. It has been reviewed very badly by the popular press.

I close this letter with hope in my heart that we shall all rise up and wake up, even though it is a very painful process.

VIRGINIA NAEVE

West Woodstock, Vermont