

## ACROSS NATIONAL BARRIERS

[MANAS has often printed accounts of the activities of the Committee for Non-Violent Action—a group of action-oriented pacifists which grew out of the response of peace workers to the challenge of the Cold War. There have been reports of the San Francisco-to-Moscow Peace Walk, of the demonstrations and civil disobedience of the Polaris Action group in New England, and of the San Diego-to-Mare Island Walk last summer. Since some readers may have wondered about the kind of thinking which leads to such action, the editors have felt that a "working paper" prepared by one of the members of this Committee—Ed Lazar, of CNVA-West—would be of general interest. It should be noted that this discussion was not addressed to the general public but to like-minded pacifists for their comment and response. (The paper is dated Nov. 18, and in consequence is not quite up-to-date in its review of the events arising from the Sino-Indian boundary dispute.) Nevertheless, it serves to illuminate for the general reader the values which are at issue for many workers for peace and gives insight into the far-reaching commitment that is involved.—Editors, MANAS.]

*And they became nations as other nations. They raised powerful armies. Their young men went proudly off to battle as the people united against the common enemy. The flag, the motherland, they were united—the world recognized them as nations.*

ON August 15, 1947, India was granted independence and some of the leaders of the revolution became leaders of the Government. The problems facing the Congress party were immense—simply producing food for 400 million people was and is a problem that would challenge any government. Since independence the Government of India has had many other problems, from the bloodbath of partition to the continuing tension with Pakistan. More recently there was the takeover of the Portuguese enclaves. But of greater significance were the internal political and social questions which led to caste and language strife and then to separatist movements. The Dravidian south protesting the

centralization of the northern New Delhi government; the Gujarati-Marathi violence which led to the splitting of Bombay State; the Nagaland separatists under Dr. Phizo; and the Assamese-Bengalese rioting and burning—these are only a few of the better known examples of the tensions and prejudices which exist in India, and which are constantly erupting in violence. Meanwhile innumerable "minor" caste clashes are not even noted in Indian newspapers. Although the Nehru government has often resorted to force in dealing with these problems, it has properly stressed the economic development of the nation and, by comparison with other nations, did not encourage a military defense economy. It has been to Mr. Nehru's credit that, although no pacifist, he tried to de-emphasize the military and remain unaligned in the cold war.

China, in contrast, has always placed high priority on the maintenance of a huge if ungainly military force. The different bases of the revolutions preceding independence naturally contributed to this. Whereas India was influenced by Gandhi and utilized nonviolent techniques to achieve a transfer of power, Mao seized power (officially Oct. 1, 1949) after decades of warfare. Mainland China has continued to maintain huge armies since that time. There were always the threats of Chiang Kai-shek and the hostility of the U.S. to justify militarism to an underfed people. There were also the usual rationalizations for Chinese aggression and expansionism in Southeast Asia and Tibet.

On Sept. 19, 1950, India made the first of its yearly pleas for the admittance of Communist China to the United Nations. India recognized that China needed tempering and believed that increased contact with world opinion would increase traditional Chinese tolerance. Chinese admission to the UN was thwarted (and has been

since mainly because of U.S. pressure). On Oct. 7, 1950, Chinese troops entered Tibet, giving the world a foretaste of new Chinese empire ambitions.

The present border disagreement was first noted on July 17, 1954, when China protested Indian soldiers being in Barahoti, U.P., which the Chinese claimed was their land. This led to several years of note-exchanging, and several minor military actions and border incidents. The territory in question is basically uninhabited, inaccessible land on the Northeast frontier adjoining Bhutan and in Ladakh next to Sinkiang. Before the present crisis India said that China already usurped 12,000 square miles of Indian territory. While last October Chinese troops headed deeper into India, threatening the more populated plains of Assam, they now have been partially withdrawn, except from the Ladakh area.

India bases its border claims on a wealth of material showing that India has been historically administering the land in question (specific statutes dating from 1873, 1880, etc.). The MacMahon line was presented in a map attached to the protocol of the Simla convention of 1914. This line was accepted by the representative of Tibet, which was at that time independent of China. It must be noted, however, that the MacMahon line was never accepted by the Chinese—by neither the Imperialist, the Nationalist, nor the Communist governments. China bases its border claims on old dynastic records and charges that India acted with hostility by giving refuge to Tibetan refugees and providing them with a propaganda base. China also claims that it is in reality Nehru and India who have expansionist aims.

The MacMahon line controversy, however, only represents more complex questions. It is obvious to all that China is playing for bigger stakes than a few thousand square miles of barren land. Since at the present time China is the clear aggressor on the Indian border, the first task must

be to try to understand the reasons for the aggression.

It is often pointed out that no one is quite sure why China would strike at its friendly neighbor, or how far China is prepared to go in this direction. One result of China's present course is that in Mao-Leninist terminology it has seized the leadership of the worldwide Communist revolution. Mao's direct action in India demonstrates his active disbelief in Khrushchev's advocacy of coexistence. China is not interested in "friendly competition" with India—it finds the concept revisionist and soft. China is attempting to qualify as the greatest Asian power by flaunting Chinese military might and by undermining the Indian economy.

In addition China now has at hand another excuse for maintaining its large military machine and calling forth further sacrifices from an undernourished people. It is not acceptable to criticize your government during a war (as Americans who questioned Kennedy's Cuban policies should know), and thus inner dissension will diminish now in China. Furthermore, India's nonalignment is likely to become a part of past history as the political breach with China is widened. The U.S. is deeply involved in what happens on the Indian frontier, since success for the Chinese aggression would immediately strengthen those in other parts of the Communist world who believe in war as a progressive step. The possible repercussions of the China-India conflict may turn out to affect the United States far more than the Cuban situation. The U.S. is already involved to the extent of arms shipments and observers have noted an increase of airborne exercises on Formosa.

Pakistan is also embroiled in the present difficulties. While an ally of the U.S., Pakistan has its own conflict with India over Kashmir. Nehru has refused to allow a plebiscite in Kashmir, knowing that the predominantly Moslem population would most likely vote to be part of Pakistan. Pakistanis have protested recent U.S.

arms shipments to India and fear that the Indian arms buildup will eventually be turned against Pakistan itself, although Nehru has denied this possibility. Pakistan has been conferring with China about border questions and a Pakistani-Chinese understanding would anger India and inevitably create friction with the U.S.

The position of the Soviets has been in flux. Their first response seemed to side with China, but later the Soviet Union said that it is not supporting either side and has called for round-table discussions without any conditions. Interestingly enough, the Russians finally declared that they would fulfill their earlier commitment to ship India MIG 21 supersonic jets, although it is not known whether they will accept future arms orders. Thus it is not clear whether China has succeeded in breaking up the Soviet-Indian cooperation which has been so repugnant to both China and the U.S.

There are undoubtedly many more reasons for the Chinese aggression, but one line of explanation should be of great interest to Americans, since we share responsibility for the factors which are involved. Isolation of and hostility towards an aggressive person or nation breeds hatred and further aggression. China has one of the richest and most civilized histories known to man, yet historically has been looked down upon by the West only because about a century ago several thousand well-armed Western troops were able to frighten the entire Chinese empire into submission. And now that proud China is becoming a powerful nation again, the West still refuses to give the desired recognition. But China, like a neglected child, has found ways to get attention. You don't continue to overlook the child when it stamps on your foot or throws a rock at your head. India, now, and eventually the entire world may reap a bitter harvest for ignoring the Chinese revolution. Chiang-Kai-shek is not an alternative to Mao. The government and ideas of Chiang are not wanted on mainland China. The question before us is whether we can stimulate

and encourage a change in the attitudes of the present Chinese leadership, and whether we can strengthen the role of the moderates in Communist China—the young men who did not fight a battle a day during the years of the revolution, and who may be desirous of the peace necessary to build a new China. Can we *get through* in China to the people who desire peace, justice, and order instead of militarism and regimentation?

There are ways in which India has been adding to the tension, which may have contributed to the present conflict. After India drove out the Portuguese many internal and foreign critics thought that India had boldly asserted itself against weak Portugal while remaining friendly with its more threatening but larger neighbor, China. There has been increasing objection to Nehru's lack of firmness: this criticism has been strongest from the powerful right wing of the Congress party and the Swatantra party. Especially under attack has been Krishna Menon, who was recently relieved of his defense ministership during the uproar over dated military equipment. There is now a major attempt to create war fever in India. Students are demonstrating for war, sari-clad girls are training with rifles, gold bond issues are being supported to pay for arms, and army recruiting is being encouraged. Some observers feel that Nehru is too heavily burdened and is now pushed by events instead of shaping them.

## II

What are the possibilities of nonviolent action in relation to the present China-India conflict? The proposal, here, is that application of nonviolent forces in this crisis should be encouraged within the next few months, and that the World Peace Brigade should give as much attention as possible to the China-India problem. If nonviolence cannot be shown to be an alternative in real situations such as Cuba, Berlin or India, then we must confess to ourselves that nonviolent action is outside the mainstream of

history. There are hundreds of people ready to go to nonviolent seminars, peace meetings, and to write pamphlets, yet it was difficult to find a few volunteers to go on the *Everyman* voyages. What will the response to the Indian question be?

Though seldom practiced, the idea of nonviolence is well known in India. There is an ongoing Gandhian organization known as Sarva Seva Sangh which has centers throughout India. The idea of local peace brigades originated in India with Vinoba Bhave and there are now several thousand shanti-sainiks (peace brigade volunteers). They worked in bandit-infested areas a few years ago. Their most significant work was done when volunteers went with Ashadevi Aryanayakam to Assam during the language disturbances there. A shanti-sena training center directed by Narain Desai was established at Varanasi (U.P.) in 1961.

Most important is the respected, mature leadership of the nonviolent movement in India. No other country has the like of Jayaprakash Narayan, Vinoba Bhave, Shankarrao-Deo, Radhakrishna, Devi Prasad, and Jagarnathan, to name only a few of the better known figures. These men have a wide audience and their words are listened to.

Thus India has many advantages for broad World Peace Brigade action. Ready-made WPB training sites exist at any of several large Gandhian ashrams in North India, or at Viswamedam Bangalore in South India. The concept of the World Peace Brigade itself was first introduced at Gandhigram in December of 1960, by Narayan and Michael Scott, and it would be most appropriate for the World Peace Brigade to embark in direct action in the land where it was conceived.

It is difficult to speak of a specific program or precise alternatives when dealing with a complex problem. The less people know of a problem, the quicker they find easy solutions. Thus the suggestions made here are offered hesitatingly and quietly, in full awareness of the tremendous

difficulty of translating concern into relevant, viable action.

The most obvious first step in resolving this conflict is arbitration. It will certainly be a positive step if the physical conflict can be stopped for arbitration and the UN is allowed to maintain the border or cease-fire line. This step seems unlikely at the present moment because of the statements of the Indian and Chinese governments. Nehru has said: "It is now war between India and China although formally it has not been declared." The Indian Prime Minister has warned the people of the possibility that Delhi will be bombed and has said that India "will never submit to the invasion of its territory." Nehru says he will not negotiate until the Chinese pull back to their original positions and he now speaks of the conflict in terms of years. (He may modify this statement.)

China for its part has gained the immediate positions it desired. These positions protect the Aksai-Chin road and other access routes to Tibet from Sinkiang, thus making Tibet militarily more controllable. (India first protested the building of the Aksai-Chin road across its territory in 1958.) One authority believes that China is now expressing its new nationalism and desires to have hardened borders, preferably with buffer territory. It seems to many that both countries are trying to control Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan. It is not probable that China is thinking in terms of all-out war and the complete invasion of India. Such moves would make China the enemy of the rest of Asia and Africa as well, and would create almost impossible physical and administrative problems for a Chinese nation which is ill-equipped to deal even with its own problems. In any case by advancing on the Northeast Frontier the Chinese have gained the land they want in order to bargain to retain their increased access to Tibet. China has recently called for arbitration but it seems unlikely that China will voluntarily give up all the territory it now possesses in the disputed area. Whether or not arbitration becomes possible, the

causes of aggression will still exist and must be dealt with.

It has been suggested that the techniques of nonviolent resistance be taught to the border peoples. My impression is that this type of instruction is not the most constructive expenditure of energy at the present time. While the effectiveness of nonviolent resistance has been amply demonstrated in situations in which the opponent is already settled in the land or has already completed conquest, there is a great difference, seldom acknowledged, between driving the British out of India, resisting Nazis already in Norway, confronting Southern whites who live in the community, etc., and the completely different project of keeping an invading force out, of not allowing it to settle or conquer in the first place. Nonviolent resistance, as it is usually discussed, presupposes the invader or intruder as already having occupied. Yet this is exactly what India will not let happen without a prolonged violent defense. The basic purpose of any army is to protect the homeland, for a nation not to resist an invasion with arms negates the purpose of having an army and equates with complete unilateral disarmament. Thus whether villagers agree to defend themselves nonviolently or not, the Indian army will feel obliged to defend them with arms. Further, having had a little contact with tribal areas in India, I find it most unlikely that the people in the disputed areas will care whose flag they are under, since flags and faraway governments are almost meaningless to them.

The most helpful thing that Americans in general can do is to try to create the atmosphere in which it is realized that it is to our best interest to support India's continued bid for Chinese UN membership. It is also in our interest to in every way make China feel part of the world community, and realize its basic need for recognition. Trading American grain and other foodstuffs for Chinese goods would aid in decreasing tension, and make it more possible for China to act responsibly. The renewal of large

student and cultural exchanges would help break down the walls of misinformation that have been created. Perhaps the Chinese desire not to coexist will thwart these positive steps, but let us at least take the initiative and see.

Since the present crisis is not conducive to a rational American foreign policy regarding China, it would perhaps be better to again see what, if anything, the nonviolent movement might do. First, support Indian shanti-sena and their program. The continuing efforts of Vinoba Bhave now seem to come the closest to the real nature of the nonviolent revolution. His approach does take time. It does take patience and perseverance. But Vinoba has been reaching the heart of the matter in day-by-day going to the people, with his nonviolent, social reconstruction program, on his *padyetra* (walk) which started over eleven years ago. Our American direct action projects too often go to the institutions instead of people we go to the bases, the courts, the government buildings, the jails, and make long speeches to ourselves.

Our most basic contribution to society comes when we have communicated with people, as on the international San Francisco-Moscow walk in which our presence was as much an act of communication as our words; and in such actions as the *Everyman* voyages, in which we represented a common aspiration which many people shared. It has become increasingly clear to me that the basic challenge for direct-action proponents is involvement in present day international conflict—such as Berlin, Cuba, and China-India. Through such involvement we help break down the dangerous concept of nationalism and help affirm the common humanity of man and our responsibility to the rest of life. The World Peace Brigade and CNVA serve a purpose every time they cross a national border and say: "This problem isn't restricted to governments—individual people have responsibility also."

The direct action project which I am going to suggest amounts to an attempt to establish human

ties with the Chinese and Indian people; to challenge them to live up to the best in their own cultural heritage of past insights, wisdom, and tolerance. This action would first have to be discussed with Vinoba. It would be most encouraging if Vinoba would direct his walk through India, into the Ladakh area, across the Himalayas, and then into and across China. If Vinoba chooses not to do this, I feel that an international team built around a core of Indian shanti-sena and sponsored by the World Peace Brigade should undertake such a walk. This would be a venture at linking the finest aspects of two great cultures. It would be more a walk honoring the greatness of Indian and Chinese culture; emphasizing the values of nonviolence, wisdom, and tolerance which have played such an important role in these two rich cultures. The walk would be saying that the development of these values will be of great benefit to the people of both nations, and that prolonged hostilities will hurt all Asia. The walk might start in a gramdan village west of New Delhi, proceed through the capitol, and go on to the disputed area in Ladakh. On this phase of the trip, the nonviolent approach will be offered as a substitute for the war hysterics which are now being stimulated. A return to a willingness to arbitrate would be urged. Entering China should be significant in itself because this is the kind of contact the Chinese people need—encounter with an international group which has a real concern for the Chinese people, yet challenges Chinese militarism and aggression. (Americans on such a walk would of necessity be challenging our own government's ban on China travel.) The walk would continue across China to a small village east of Peiping. There would be no signs or leaflets on this walk—simply a group of men and women attempting to communicate with their action and lives.

The physical hardships of crossing the Himalayas and going through China would be immense, but not overwhelming. Thousands of Chinese and Indian soldiers have gone on these paths and there are passes which link Chinese and

Indian territory. The largeness of the venture is another aspect of communication, just as people were more receptive to the San Francisco-Moscow walkers when they learned of the thousands of miles already travelled by the group.

It may be that Indians will propose far more relevant programs and I feel that their plans for nonviolent action should have our support. The winter weather now makes actual combat almost impossible in the border territories, and with relaxation of fighting the voice of reason should be introduced on both sides of the border line. Almost any nonviolent action is in reality symbolic, but there are occasions, if the right people are involved, when searching symbolic action is also practical. India cannot afford to end its programs for social progress and enter an arms race. We cannot afford to sit by and watch yet another tragedy unfold.

ED LAZAR

San Francisco, Calif.

## *REVIEW*

### ANOTHER DOUGLAS TRAVELOGUE

No poll has been taken among MANAS readers, but judging from remarks in passing by correspondents we suspect that a number of readers often seek out-of-doors experience in primitive areas. This makes any book or article by Justice William O. Douglas a particular pleasure for the reviewer to share. *My Wilderness, The Pacific West* (Doubleday, 1960) is the predecessor of *East to Katahdin* (reviewed in MANAS for Feb. 28, 1962) and is in every respect a companion though briefer volume. It is inevitable that, along with descriptions of beautiful forest lands and mountains, the author should include asides on the legal steps needed to preserve our remaining wilderness.

Douglas began his leisurely traveling on back trails when he was a boy in the Pacific northwest. He never gave up these explorations, and during his twenty years as justice of the Supreme Court of the United States he has taken whatever time was available for long hikes into the mountains. He has used his summers to visit every major wilderness area in the country, and the two volumes, *East to Katahdin* and *My Wilderness*, take his readers along on such journeys. The justice is unquestionably an unusually vigorous man, both physically and mentally, but these accounts are singularly free from any zestful account of personal exploits. On the other hand, though a Russian news agency once referred to Douglas as a "decrepit" mountaineer—something which amused Douglas, apparently, more than it nettled him—the long treks recounted were certainly rigorous tests of stamina.

One personal conviction emerges strongly, if briefly, in *My Wilderness*—that the availability of wilderness experience is profoundly important to the people of a country presumably dedicated to the preservation of uniqueness in human individuality.

A passage occurring after Douglas describes an ascent of Mount Adams in Washington expresses this concern:

I realized from my day's journey how badly we need high alpine meadows which can only be reached on foot, how badly we need peaks which can only be conquered by daring. The passion to bring "civilization" into our wilderness areas is one sign that we Americans are getting soft and flabby. We want everything made easy. Yet success is worth having only when it comes through great effort and hazardous exertion.

The logistics of abundance call for mass production. This means the ascendancy of the machine. The risks of man's becoming subservient to it are great. The struggle of our time is to maintain an economy of plenty and yet keep man's freedom intact. Roadless areas are one pledge to freedom. With them intact, man need not become an automaton. There he can escape the machine and become once more a vital individual. If these inner sanctuaries are invaded by the machine, there is no escape. For men and civilization will be molded by mass compulsions. If our wilderness areas are preserved, every person will have a better chance to maintain his freedom by allowing his idiosyncracies to flower under the influence of the wonders of the wilderness.

These were my thoughts that night as I sat on my lawn watching the last glow of the sun leave the high snow fields of Mount Adams.

According to Douglas' computations, only two per cent of our total land area remains in a wilderness state, unreachable by easy road travel. This is a total of 55,000,000 acres which, divided up among the population, average out at approximately one third of an acre per person. This, Douglas feels, is an absolute minimum. He believes that suitable acts of Congress should defend the present allotment of wilderness against any further encroachment. If the trend to "multiple use" of hitherto untrammelled wilderness continues—which allows "regulated" timber cutting and the building of macadam roads for recreational purposes—there will soon be no escape from the noise and bustle of civilization. The population of the nation may double by the end of the century, with the bulk of the increase

on the west coast, so that all the country from the Canadian border to Eugene, Ore., may become one continuous urban-suburban area like the coast of California. Douglas writes:

The value of roadless areas is partly in the rewards which are at trail's end. This passion for roads is partial evidence of our great decline as a people. Without effort, struggle, and exertion, even high rewards turn to ashes. There is no possible way to open roadless areas to cars and retain a wilderness. This is one diabolic consequence of the "multiple use" concept as applied. The Forest Service recognizes, of course, that application of the "multiple use" principle means that some areas must be devoted exclusively or predominantly to a single purpose. The difficulty is that, in the Pacific West, "multiple use" in practical operation means that every canyon is usually put to as many uses as possible—lumber operations, roads, campsites, shelters, toilets, fireplaces, parking lots, and so on.

There are of course many who can get close to forests only by automobiles. Not everyone has the legs or the lungs to venture to the interior on his own. Recreational facilities must be provided for them. But once the interior is tapped by roads, the wilderness is gone forever. Lumbering and real wilderness, motoring and real wilderness, hotels and real wilderness are mutually exclusive. The choice must be made. Road building would be as much a desecration as the destruction of the mighty cathedrals created by the sequoias in California. It would be another sign that the dollar leads our civilization, that for man's nobler side we leave but a few crumbs.

It would be misleading to suggest that *My Wilderness, The Pacific West* is chiefly composed of argument for the preservation of areas where a primitive ecology balance can be experienced and studied. This book is essentially a travelogue in the tradition of John Muir, a manifest of what regard a very busy man can have for the æsthetic experience of nature. The following on the High Sierras of California will illustrate the quality and keenness of observation found throughout the book:

For height and for length, there are few wilderness areas that match the High Sierra. They are the rugged backbone of California. Their tree line at 11,000 feet reaches higher than most of our

mountain ranges. Mount Whitney (14,495 feet) is taller than any of our peaks south of Alaska. Wind swept ridges of the Sierra are as high as snow-clad Hood, Adams, and Rainier farther north. This is exhilarating country to travel. The air is thin. The peaks and canyons have colors of brilliant sunsets in them. It seems as if artistic hands mixed the pigments which they reflect.

One who climbs the great Sierra escarpment starts in the desert and ends in the Arctic. There are sagebrush and antelope ground squirrels in the desert valleys; and on the raw ridges is the dwarf willow, hardly four inches high, and the alpine chipmunk. In between are other life zones with trees and flowers, birds and mammals that exceed in variety those of any other wilderness area. The bright sunshine of Summer and the deep snows of Winter perform miracles with plant life, miracles that make species normally dull and monotonous, vivid and exciting.

It seems as if I have known the Sierra all my life. I read John Muir when I was a boy, and through him came on intimate terms with this massive range.

In *America Challenged* (the Walter E. Edge lectures of 1960, printed by Avon), Douglas has nothing to say about his concern that wilderness areas be preserved, but he writes eloquently to show how the collective patterns of economic life, so much on the increase, lead to a routinization which destroys opportunity for individual contemplation, tending, therefore, to wither the individual convictions which our republic was founded to cherish and defend.



## *COMMENTARY*

### THE EXPANDING PEACE MOVEMENT

ONE important and wholly unanticipated effect of the work of the Committee for Non-Violent Action has been to create "room" for a broad enlargement of the peace movement. Until CNVA assumed the role of trail-blazer in the attempt to spread the meanings and the logic of Gandhian and pacifist thinking, the frontiers of this movement were manned mostly by representatives of the traditional pacifist groups—the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the American Friends Service Committee, and the War Resisters League. These groups were once regarded as "extreme" in their thinking—as indeed they were, by comparison with those whose effort for peace was compromised by willingness to support war "if it becomes necessary"—but today, with the various alignments for peace, including the spread of "nuclear pacifists," the Women's Strike for Peace, and the wide spectrum of Turn Toward Peace, the old-line pacifists, while still making up the main body of the peace movement, are by no means seen as the "radicals" in this struggle.

CNVA, in a few short years, has become the vanguard of the movement, attracting nearly all those who are prepared to endure the risks involved in civil disobedience and the dangers (great or small) which attend exposure to the shock and radiation produced by nuclear explosion, in the case of protests which take the demonstrators into the testing areas. So, as a result of the extensive program of CNVA, including actions such as the San Francisco-to-Moscow Peace Walk, which secured wide national publicity, the peace movement as a whole has noticeably gained in dimension, with the further effect that activities which do not involve direct conflict with the law have acquired an almost "middle-of-the-road" respectability. Of course, the extraordinary influence of the British peace movement, spearheaded by the Committee of 100, led by Bertrand Russell, has also made a major contribution to popularizing the idea of working for peace.

What shall we list as the accomplishments of CNVA? If it be admitted that today world peace is an objective second to none, then there can be no doubt that the profound seriousness and manifest commitment which characterize CNVA ventures have

caused unnumbered people to think about the necessity of peace and have made at least some of them move into some form of action for peace.

Peace, whatever else it is, is first of all an attitude of mind. CNVA has drawn dramatic attention to the meaning and implications of this attitude. It has also created, out of sheer imagination, what amounts to a moral equivalent of war, in the sense that CNVA activities hold considerable attraction to the youth of the nation, in the form of radical struggle against the apathy and blind inaction of the status quo. It is providing the substance of a vision with social content to an entire generation of youth, and for generations to come. It is difficult to see how this vision can do anything but grow.

Well, suppose the peace movement succeeds in spreading its hopes and its convictions throughout the United States: what then? What good are pacifist sentiments in America alone?

In reply it can be argued that if a large segment of the American people shows itself determined upon peace, this manifestation cannot be kept a secret from the Russian people, nor even from the Chinese people. It is a fair assumption that the Russians and the Chinese, being human, also want peace. But the Russians and the Chinese, it is claimed, believe what their governments tell them, and do what their governments tell them to do. The answer to this is that peace can come only if *people* determined upon peace make themselves seen and heard by the *same sort of people* in other countries. No matter what governments do, no matter what disarmament experts say, no matter what heads of states maintain, there can be no real peace without such people-to-people communication.

The members of the Committee for Non-Violent Action are doing everything within their power to begin this kind of communication. Ed Lazar's working paper proposing a walk from India into China may well represent the thinking that must precede the real acts of communication that will lead to disarmament and peace.

## CHILDREN

### ... and Ourselves

CARL EWALD FOR YOUR LIBRARY

MANAS can hardly lay claim to having "discovered" Carl Ewald's sensitive and delicately humorous accounts of his relationship with his growing children, but we did reprint, years ago, portions of a translation of this Danish writer's *My Little Boy* from the *Woollcott Reader*, to the great delight of our subscribers. Later, a friend of MANAS, Beth Bolling, undertook to translate the entirety of *My Little Boy* and *My Big Girl*, and these are now published in a single volume by Horizon Press (\$3.50) in extremely attractive form.

While pondering a suitable review treatment, we realized that the publisher's jacket description would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to improve. So, in this case, we have no objection at all to advertising the book for Horizon Press in the publisher's own words:

These two wonderful little novels—one on childhood, the other on young love—by the great Danish writer will be read by parents, and sons and daughters, as long as reading is one of the deepest pleasures in life. The superb translations by Beth Bolling are in every way as masterly as the originals.

They are written with the marvelous simplicity of wisdom by a gentle, profoundly understanding man many years ahead of his time in the joyous art of fatherhood. Both these little classics are stories of love, and of the pleasures and anguish that are the essence of love, by a father steadfastly dedicated to his little son and his grown daughter.

The quality that distinguishes this book from others on the subject is the father's powerful sense of the value of one's own individuality. It gives him a rare objectivity. It enables him to transmit a true sense of values to his children, a calm cutting away of sham, and the ability to live their own lives in independence and truth.

This novel is magical in its re-creation of the days of childhood. We live through the parents' emotions from the day of birth through all the seemingly small things in the life of a child that are as significant as any event in history. We witness the

dawn of the child's character, the overwhelming importance of his first friendship, his discovery of the world of money and the intense meaning of possessions, his first awareness of God, his first girl ("Dad, can you have two sweethearts?"), his first bitter lesson in anti-Semitism when he and his friends beat a little Jewish boy, and, at last, his first day in school ("I have handed him over to society").

Out of the luminous moments of parenthood Carl Ewald has given us an unforgettable tale of which every page is a pleasure to experience.

*My Big Girl* has never been published before. It is a masterpiece of sensitivity, and of devotion to his daughter as young woman in love.

In this book the springtime of life seems literally to pulsate under the words. The girl's first awakenings to desire ("There are other things in the world." "Not for the young."), the blind reaching out of impulse for a mate—a thrust illuminated with love and humor by her father in time to forestall tragic error; the magnificent story of her friend's "illegitimate" baby and the guilt which ends in happiness; the father's searing confession to his daughter of a past love; and finally the coming of passionate true love to "my big girl" blossoming into the womanhood that takes her from her understanding father and mother: "Where do you think she is?"

"She is with her lover."

The growth and adult love that must lead to an independent life form the theme of *My Big Girl*, and make it the perfect companion piece to the story of early childhood that opens this volume. It is bound to be enduringly treasured by its readers.

The whimsy characteristic of Ewald is illustrated in paragraphs from the last chapter of *My Little Boy*:

My little boy is starting to go to school.

He is impossible to keep at home any longer, says his mother. He wants to go very much himself, because he does not know what school is.

But I know. And I know, too, that there is no escape: He must go. And I am sick at heart. All that is good in me rebels against what is to take place.

We take our last morning walk—along the road where something wonderful always has happened to us. It seems to me that the crowns of the trees are wrapped in black that the birds are singing in a minor key and that people are looking at me with concern and worry in their eyes.

My little boy sees nothing. He is merely excited about what is to happen. He talks and asks questions incessantly.

We sit down on the side of our usual ditch.

And suddenly my heart triumphs over my mind. The voice of my conscience penetrates the whole well-trained and integrated ensemble for this concert, and I sing my solo in my little boy's ear:

"I want to tell you that school is a dreadful institution. You have no idea what you will have to put up with there. They are going to tell you that two and two are four. . . ."

"Mother has taught me that already," he says happily.

"Yes—but it's not so, you poor wretch," I shout. "Two and two are never four, or very rarely so. And as if that was all. You'll have to sit and read about ugly old kings who died hundreds of years ago, if they ever existed, which, I, for one, simply don't believe."

My little boy doesn't understand, but he sees that I am desolate, and puts his hand in mine.

Ewald is saying that some of the most important of the early lessons of life are best learned from a parent who is a wise companion. When Ewald first encountered the effects of his son's exposure to "race prejudice," he responded in this fashion:

There is great warfare and a lot of noise among the children in the yard.

I hear them yell Jew. I go to the window and see my little boy bareheaded out in the front line of the battle.

I settle down quietly to my work again, certain he will appear shortly and tell me all about it.

Soon after he is there.

He stands next to me, as is his habit, and says nothing. I steal a glance at him—he is highly excited, feels very proud and happy, like one who has fearlessly done his duty.

"Such fun you had down there."

"Well," he says modestly, "—it was only a Jewish boy we were beating up."

I jump up so my chair turns over.

"A Jewish boy—you were beating him up—what had he done?"

"Nothing."

His voice is not very confident, for I look so queer.

But this is only the beginning. For now I grab my hat and run out the door as fast as I can and yell:

"Come on—come on—we must find him and ask his forgiveness."

My little boy hurries after me. He does not understand a word but he is terribly in earnest. We look in the yard, we shout and yell. We rush into the street and around the corner. Breathlessly we ask three people if they have seen a poor, mistreated Jewish boy.

All in vain. The Jewish boy and all the persecutors have vanished.

We sit up in my study again—the laboratory where our soul is crystallized out of the big events in our little life. My brow is knit and I drum with my fingers on the table. The boy has both hands in his pockets and doesn't take his eyes from my face.

"Well—," I say, "there is nothing more we can do. I hope you will meet that boy some day, so you can shake hands with him and ask him to forgive you. You must tell him that you did it because you were stupid, that if anyone tries to harm him again, you will help him and beat them as long as you can stir a limb."

I can see from my little boy's face that he is ready to do my will. For he is still a mercenary who does not ask under which flag he serves so long as there is battle and booty. It is up to me to call forth in him the staunch soldier who defends his native land. Thus I continue:

The day belongs to the Jews.

And when evening comes and Mother goes to the piano to sing the song that Dad loves best of all it appears that the words were written by one Jew and the melody composed by another.

My little boy is hot and flustered when he goes to sleep that night. Restlessly he tosses in his bed and talks in his sleep.

"He is a bit feverish," his mother says.

"No wonder. Today I vaccinated him against the meanest of all common blights."

## *FRONTIERS*

### Twentieth-Century Mysticism

IN MANAS for Sept. 26, of last year, "Children and Ourselves" reviewed a Ballantine paperback, *Student*, which told the story of the protests of University of California students against the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in San Francisco in 1960. The author was David Horowitz, a teaching assistant at U of C, who, it turns out, is a graduate student in Chinese classics. We learned this from his identification as a contributor to the first issue of a radical quarterly, *Root and Branch* (Winter, 1962), which grew out of the new life on the U of C campus.

A paragraph from the opening editorial will show the temper, if not the direction, of this magazine:

We accept the socialist premise that the good life cannot be achieved without the radical reorganization of society. But the good life does not automatically follow upon social ownership of the means of production. What guarantees can be built into a planned society so that it will be responsive to the people's needs and desires? What measures can be taken to mitigate the alienation of workers in a mechanized age? How can we assure the fullest democratic participation in decision-making, both in government and in industry? What will be the opportunities for the non-conformist, the eccentric, the odd-ball? Where will artists and writers fit into the new society?

We are afraid of becoming so over-politicalized, so concerned with only the traditional problems of leftists, that our analysis lacks depth and our criticism humanity. We want to retain a sense of humor in a world too ludicrous to be laughed at. Artists and poets have something important to tell us about our lives, their perceptions often go deeper than the understandings of political men. And so we devote a substantial portion of our journal to them—that together we may achieve a more penetrating understanding of the world and a more human vision of the future.

The article by Mr. Horowitz in *Root and Branch* is in some sense a confirmation of the

above statement of policy. His title is "The Question about Meaning," and the content of the discussion has the subtlety of a Taoist reverie. Perhaps the most interesting thing about his contribution is that it could not possibly have appeared in a radical magazine twenty years ago, and probably could not even have been written, then, by the same man who would take a leading part in activist demonstrations. It seems correct to say that this kind of thinking itself marks a revolution in the cultural lines of the twentieth century. Mr. Horowitz begins:

The question about the meaning of life, which men have in their hearts so centrally in our era, is but another sign of the homelessness that man, himself, experiences in his social and cosmic dwelling place. At stake in the question is a footing in the world, the bare courage to endure. That is because for this generation, the courage to be comes as a grace, no less than life itself. And the question about meaning, by which the questioner has also in mind, "What am I to do, being here?" comes not as a seeking to know, but as the last sign of man's estrangement from himself, the despair of his will to become. . . .

Men seek answers; they reach out, wanting something to hold. That, in itself, is no illusion. Illusion is involved in seeking with the hands; for the reason that the question about meaning comes to them is not that their hands are empty, but that their feet grip without a ground to take hold on.

We have come to regard things in this age so that only the tangible has substance, only the substantial is real, and when we seek answers, as in all other quests, we are seeking for such real things. Our asking about the meaning of life, then, expects an answer of the form: "The meaning of life is . . ."

But that cannot be, because life, in its fullness, is not accessible to such formulations. (And it is here, that the question about questions finds its root.) For within our experience only the oblique language of art, working through the vague concreteness of the image, can approach the complex and the multiple, the real range of life. While all schematic efforts of the mind, which set out to pocket reality, fall short at the doorstep of its incalculable finite space.

When we approach, therefore, with our question and await a content, we must withdraw more emptily than we first came, for not even our question, now, which wants a key and not a way, has meaning.

This deep awareness of the betrayal in false certainties—where did it come from? It is not an implication or logical development of any of the familiar lines of twentieth-century philosophizing, but rather a break with the past. It is a disjuncture in thought something like the disjuncture in history produced by the advent of nuclear weapons.

The longing for meaning, for explanation, is a new form of the search for "security," yet the quality of this longing is such that it finds no help from past accounts of meaning. It is as though, here, Mr. Horowitz is saying that any account of the meaning of human life will have to be given in terms of man's own essence, not in terms of any mortal form or finite goal. And we do not *know* man's essence, so that the question remains tantalizing and unanswered.

Man's hunger for roots often makes him settle upon some fixed habitation:

. . . he may, if he chooses, stop. Become bound to this place and, build here a house. What he builds, controls him, demands his attention, his presence, his care. Still, because the house looks alone, barren without it, he may be moved to plant there, a garden. Again care. As for the house, he may decorate it, set things in it, make it beautiful. Each step lays burdens anew upon him; but each extends him as well.

In this simple image Mr. Horowitz tries to capture—with some success, it seems to us—the paradox of human bondage and human achievement. He isn't trying to "tell" us anything, but to illustrate the fundamental confrontation of human existence, of human consciousness. But he is saying one thing quite plainly: Not far off may be the time when the slogan, "Bigger and Better Houses!" will fall on totally deaf ears.