

"AMERICA UNDER PRESSURE"

AT the suggestion of a subscriber, we have read Adlai Stevenson's article, "America Under Pressure," in the August *Harper's*. As usual, we think well of what Mr. Stevenson says. Of all the men who have held high political office in the United States, and have contended for the highest office—that of the presidency—Mr. Stevenson stands out as an unusually perceptive and articulate thinker. His *Harper's* article is consistent with past performance—freely written from a wide background. While he discusses politics, this is not "political" writing but an expression of intelligence and far-seeing citizenship. The article is also pleasantly and usefully short.

Mr. Stevenson starts out by speaking of the resourcefulness and adaptability that the society of the United States has shown in the past. Something great and new got going on the North American continent with the birth of this civilization. Unbound by tradition, free from feudal customs and conceptions, the Americans were able to grow and to build without inhibition. "We were born in the morning of popular government and national liberation and some of that fresh light still falls on our faces."

But this article was not written by Mr. Stevenson to celebrate America's greatness. His present concern is with "the three great distempers of the public mind—reaction, complacency, and mediocrity." These forces, he fears, may drain away the characteristic virtues of American society, leaving only a sluggish hulk. We are not going to summarize his illustrations and discussion of reaction, complacency, and mediocrity in American life, since their effect upon our lives is all too plain, and *Harper's* magazine is easy enough to get. Further, the thing to do with this material, it seems to us, is to make it a point of departure for another kind of investigation. After

all, while what Mr. Stevenson says is good, it is not new. Dozens of social critics have said the same thing.

The important question is rather why such articles hardly touch or disturb the vast apathy and complacency of which Mr. Stevenson complains. No doubt such a question can be answered in hundreds of ways, which in one sense means not at all, yet the vague or difficult questions are precisely the ones that need attention. Most of the familiar answers to the question of why people are apathetic or indifferent are tautological. That is, they say that people are apathetic at one level because they are apathetic at another level, and then conditions *a*, *b*, and *c* are suggested as the cause of this primary apathy. The explanation may be "correct," so far as it goes, but it doesn't really go anywhere.

It may be more to the point to say that the civilization of the United States has become a mass society, that a mass society does not innovate, it only reacts, and that a prosperous or "affluent" mass society reacts only to stimuli from without, never from inspiration from within. This statement seems true enough, but it has only analytical value.

Well, you could go on and say that two things have to happen to change this situation. Leaders must recognize the stultifying traits of the mass society and begin to evolve forms of pioneering behavior which will break the mold of mass attitudes and reactions. That is one thing that must happen. The other is that we need some kind of collaboration from history—some upsetting event, a catastrophe perhaps—to awaken people to an awareness of what has happened to them, and so give them reasons for supporting the leaders who are taking off in new directions of behavior.

You could say all this and document your contentions from history and social psychology making an impressive thesis out of the contention, but you *still* wouldn't get beyond careful analysis.

It is time to stop circling and light. The proposition, then, is this: If human behavior is to be affected on a large scale, the means of moving men and women to change must include a general idea of the meaning of human life which is rich and inspiring enough to reach into their hearts and help them to *want* to change their lives. You could say, if you wanted to be brief, that the idea has to relate to the profound, inward longings of human beings and that it has to be in some sense *true*. No doubt a lot of other things are needed, such as appropriate attending circumstances, at least a few great or distinguished men to dare to lead and to set an example, but without the general idea of meaning, nothing important can happen. That is the proposition.

Now an idea or theory of meaning will make no impact unless it fills some kind of void. This need of men to fill the voids in their lives is almost certainly the explanation of why some great religious movements take hold while others die aborning. The trouble with Mr. Stevenson's article is that, while he talks about values and matters that men hold dear, what he says does not really break the surface of traditional ideas of value to get into the human heart, where the *sense* of values generates new longings and conceptions of good and evil. This is of course the trouble with politics, especially politics in the twentieth century.

In the eighteenth century, politics spoke to the human heart. The eighteenth century might be called the epoch of valid political religion. And you could call the twentieth century the epoch of invalid political religion. Today, to get at what is the matter—or to suggest what may be good—you must leave the field of politics altogether and explore the void in the lives of the people of the twentieth century. This void exists above or beyond or behind the political field. The

emptiness is in the sense of meaning. Political meanings don't touch our immediate hungers and our immediate pains. Political meanings still touch the hungers of men who think abstractly about the general good and who are aware, as Mr. Stevenson says, that "Three-quarters of mankind still live in a poverty so grinding, in such pitiful conditions of health and livelihood, that the framework of their brief lives is not very distant from Hobbes' definition: 'nasty, brutish, and short'."

But not very many people in America are able to feel these hungers which persist around the world. Perhaps they ought to; no doubt they ought to; but what the American "masses" *ought* to do is not at issue in this discussion. Here, for the moment, we are trying to take account of the facts. For a large number of human beings to become sensitively aware of the sufferings of other large numbers of people, some extraordinary change has to take place, with causes behind it more potent than exhortation from intellectuals and moralists.

Well, who has some idea of the emptiness in the lives of the American masses? How are these people hurting? For an answer to this question you have to go to the psychotherapists. The psychotherapists are having daily direct encounters with the hurts of people. The rest of us have only indirect encounters; that is, we experience the behavior of people who suffer from a sense of void in their lives, but we are seldom equipped to understand the phenomena of this behavior. Often we are victims ourselves. More generally we experience large-scale, impersonal results of the void, in the façades of our culture, in the patterns of our institutions, in the glittering shrines we have built to absolute triviality, in all the varnished ugliness and stupidity which made Allen Ginsberg write a poem like *Howl*, Paul Goodman write a book like *Growing Up Absurd*, and Kenneth Patchen utter declarations which have caused him to be a symbol of the "other America" for sensitive youth around the world.

We experience it lightly and abstractly in the mounting statistics of delinquency, alcoholism, addiction, and mental illness, but the psychotherapists, alas, must find themselves at home in this widening territory of rejection, obsession, terror, and flight.

Alas for the therapists and alas for ourselves. We cannot understand the therapists without joining their number, and not enough people are able to do that. They have their specialists' vocabulary and we have our common speech. Their language lives only by reason of their experience and we don't yet know how to translate it into the tongue of our own experience. To take the words without the experience is to create another jargon for the coteries to amuse themselves with.

It is obvious that the psychotherapists—some of them, at least—are trying to learn the speech of the common man and to render their experience of the hurts of twentieth-century people comprehensible to a larger audience than their own fraternity. This is a difficult project for therapists, since it means turning into philosophers and religious teachers—a transformation not natural to them. In our culture, the position of the official philosophers and religious teachers is hardly natural from any point of view. The role of the psychotherapist has a built-in antagonism to the artificialities of conventional philosophy and religion, so that to perform the functions of these offices without adopting their paraphernalia and charismatic atmosphere produces something of a strain, even in psychotherapists, who are, after all, human too. And of course, they are not sure. Who is? One of the chief virtues of the modern therapist consists in admitting to himself and others that he is not sure. We are almost dead of sureties.

The progress in our inquiry stops here. The progress, that is, without speculative resources. But since we have or ought to go on, we shall draw upon speculative resources.

Who, in recent years, has been able to move the world, or a large part of it, to a noticeable extent? Only one man, Gandhi.

What do we mean by moving the world? A lot of people have "moved" the world, lately, by war and threats of war. This isn't the sort of moving we mean. We mean moving the world by appealing to the humanity and vision of human beings, not by frightening them half to death or "selling" them something they don't need or which perverts their natural taste.

Gandhi stirred millions to some kind of action, some kind of regenerated stance, in India. He also sent clouds of spores around the world which are now producing small plant communities elsewhere—in England, in the United States, in Italy, Africa—who knows, now, enough to total Gandhi's score?

There are those who minimize Gandhi's influence, who make all sorts of excuses for British vulnerability to Gandhi's non-violent drive for independence, and who suggest that the hard core of the world's indifference to decency is still untouched. Well, you can listen to these people if you will, but to accept what they say you have to ignore the immeasurable leavening influence of Gandhi's life, both in India and abroad, to make light of the fact that Gandhi is a lodestar of many of the forward-looking movements of the age, and the further fact that the genius of non-violence is also the genius of any conceivable harmonious, peaceful society.

What gave Gandhi the power to move people, to touch their hearts? After you have listed all the uniquenesses of Gandhi as a man, and after you have taken into account the historical situation of the Indian people and the moment in their history which made them ripe for change, you must confront and consider Gandhi's ideas about the meaning of human life. Gandhi accepted, believed, practiced, preached the ancestral religious philosophy of the Indian people. He was a man of universal religion in that he found and declared the truth he saw in all the

great religions of the world. He gave fresh currency to the archetypal metaphysic of Hinduism and renewed the psychological and ethical verities of Buddhism. He saw the role of Jesus Christ as one in a great series of religious teachers. Man, in Gandhi's view, is a being of immeasurable potentiality with a high spiritual heritage and destiny. He asked for heroism of human beings, and he often got it. He repeated ancient doctrines of the essential nobility of man and did the best he could to embody that nobility himself. He took the transcendental metaphysics of Oriental philosophy out of the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads* and gave them functional meaning in modern life. He adopted the principles of practical brotherhood expounded in the *Dhammapada* and put them to work. He stripped these ideas of their luxuriant growth of custom and ritual and showed their undying meaning, independent of the outworn cultural matrix of Indian tradition. He made it possible for the simplest of men to think of themselves in heroic terms.

You can make something of a legitimate case against certain of the things Gandhi said or did, but this sort of criticism is not pertinent here. What needs to be recognized is the positive dynamic behind his influence, which is metaphysical and mystical. He took up the line of teaching of ancient Indian philosophers and gave it new life, declaring his unequivocal belief in immortality (rebirth of the soul), moral justice (Karma), and the immanence of Deity in every living thing (Pantheism). The values implicit and explicit in this ancestral Indian religious philosophy became implicit and explicit in Gandhi's life. If you soak in Gandhi's writings, this is what you find.

It is true, of course, that these views (or truths, if you prefer) lay sleeping in the Indian people. The cultural continuity of Indian life had not been interrupted by the industrial and political revolutions. These interruptions are taking place only now, with results extremely discouraging to

Gandhi's followers and disciples. But the ordeal of these revolutions is not to be avoided—Indians can no more escape the trials and tests to which the West has been subjected than they can assert that they are a special breed of men. You could say, however, that they do have the opportunity—the advantage, if they will take it—of undergoing these tests armed by Gandhi's prophetic insight and fatherly instruction.

The obvious difficulty, here, is in making judgments about "success" and "failure." Such judgments usually participate in all the follies of uninstructed opinion. What do we know of the rate of human development, of the capacities of human beings, taken by the million, to live up to the vision of their leaders? Neither pessimism nor optimism makes any sense without norms to judge by, and we have no norms. All that we have to judge by is our private intuitions about what people *ought* to do, or ought to be able to do.

Maybe the human race is doing the best it can possibly do, given the circumstances in which it is working and the problems set by the course of evolution. It seems doubtful, but perhaps this is so. At any rate, we have no larger framework of hypothesis, no transcendental historical record, not even a doctrine of progress to which we are willing to listen, on the basis of which to form rational judgments. All that we have, or seem willing to use, is our own personal sense of obligation, or guilt, or potentiality, which we usually project on a racial or national or planetary basis, for purposes of pretentious moralizing about "people" or "the world."

Then, if there is anything to be learned from the psychological experience of human beings—lessons of the sort we of the West have been able to participate in ever since William James wrote his essay on "The Energies of Men"—we now know that what people are capable of is largely determined by what they *believe* themselves to be capable of. This means that what men can do is in some measure a self-created capacity. It is for this reason that religious philosophy is more important

than objective historical science. The one expands, the other confines—that is, it confines if it is taken to be the whole truth about human beings.

But how are you going to apply to Western civilization the principles of Gandhian regeneration and reform? How are you going to move a generation of disenthralled, unhappy, sickly and dissatisfied Western peoples to take their own lives in their hands, as Gandhi proposed? Our proposition is that there is nothing else to do and that we had better come into focus on this question.

The West has no ancestral religion to be compared with Eastern religious philosophy. It has inherited, instead, the tired guerilla war between science and religion, some ennobling political principles that we haven't been able to keep current with the technological revolution, and a lot of pseudo-religious doctrines concerning the good life a man is supposed to enjoy by being able to possess an endless number of "things." But there is one priceless gift that Western man has in increasing abundance, but doesn't quite know what to do with: his self-consciousness, a kind of isolating perception of himself and his situation, which becomes at once his strength and his weakness. This self-consciousness makes the genius of the age essentially non-traditional: the more self-conscious you are, the less you are able to use the crutches and institutional assists which less aware cultures supply and rely upon; but then, when you are self-conscious, your weaknesses show more, to yourself and others.

Self-consciousness creates the necessity of direct encounter with experience. You can't redefine your problems in terms of any inherited tradition. We may have captured part of the secret of freedom, but it strips us naked to hold on to it.

And that, we propose, is about where we are. These are the real terms, we think, of the confrontation of experience during the second half of the twentieth century. We need to embody the

innumerable aspects of this problem in concrete situations and get familiar with new accounts of ourselves and the meaning of our lives in this way.

REVIEW

THE MANY FACES OF ASIA

AN optimist, in current definition, is a man who spends all his spare time studying Russian, while a pessimist is one who spends all his spare time studying Chinese. This quip accurately represents the nth degree of fairly prevalent states of mind, oddly balanced by the more regrettable opinion that we democratic Americans should blast all the Communist countries as soon as possible. Actually, widespread study of the Russian and Chinese languages is an excellent idea and need not be equated with foreign conquest of America. We need to know the languages, the histories, and perspectives of the countries we worry about.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has lately been making notable contributions to world understanding. Its monthly publication, *International Conciliation*, is a gold mine of informative, non-partisan and constructively-intended material. The May issue, for example, contains a 60-page treatise by Prof. Arthur Steiner, titled "Communist China in the World Community," and we recommend this piece of writing as a psychological "eye-opener" similar to André Lobanov-Rostovsky's "Rhythm and Meaning in Russian History" (reviewed in *MANAS* for Dec. 21, 1960). The editor of *International Conciliation* remarks that Dr. Steiner focuses "attention on the world as Communist China sees it," adding that his article "presents an unaccustomed, but perhaps for that reason all the more useful, perspective on mainland China's impact on international relations." Dr. Steiner begins by reminding his readers of some always-surprising statistics: the Chinese People's Republic has a currently estimated population of 660,000,000—50 per cent larger than that of India—which is increasing at an annual rate of about 2.3 per cent. At the same time, Communist China is able to maintain diplomatic relations "with fewer than half the members of the world community and takes no part in the organized life of that community." Further, "At a time when the United Nations is rushing to give full membership status to minuscule new states barely emerged from tribalism, it is

unable to accommodate the country which has a longer record of historical continuity than any other United Nations member."

How has this come about? Dr. Steiner points out that the reactionary—or, at the very least, short-sighted—policies of the United States in foreign relations are very largely responsible, due to a rather ridiculous support of Chiang Kai-shek's deposed Nationalist government. The consequences are considerable. Dr. Steiner writes:

An accident of history allowed a remnant of the defeated Nationalist government to escape to nearby Taiwan (Formosa), where it speaks as the Republic of China, offering a Chinese alternative to Marxism-Leninism. The CPR has found its determination to revolutionize the world community challenged by a Nationalist government of China that is dependent on foreign support, and has reacted all the more vigorously against the "imperialism" that has prevented the unification of all China under a single leadership. Nonconformity derived from ideological principle has been supplemented by that based on national political interest.

No one can say whether the CPR would have followed a more moderate course in international affairs after 1950 had it been saved the aggravation of Taiwan. Is it not quite possible that with an integrated territory and an assured security the Chinese Communist leaders would have concentrated more of their energies on the gigantic tasks of internal revolutionary transformation, and have been less disposed to adventuristic policies in foreign affairs? As it happened, however, they exploited the menace of external attack, branded their domestic enemies as both "counter-revolutionary" and traitor, and judged that there could be no complete victory on the domestic front without complete victory on the foreign front. The resulting extremist position in world affairs has left little room for compromise or concession. . . .

Dr. Steiner has spent considerable time in China, working under a Fulbright Research Scholarship in 1948-49—the scholarship grant being partially the result of two previous visits to China before World War II. He has also served as specialist in South Asia for the Department of State, and is the author of some forty monographs and articles on aspects of Chinese Communism. Of

particular interest is his discussion of the curious parallels between Nationalist and Red China:

The national interest of the CPR includes strategic and territorial objectives not dissimilar in kind from those pursued by other countries. But Chinese national interest has still other dimensions. It would seek to reinforce elements that already contribute to China's magnetism and prestige in the eyes of smaller Asian neighbors. . . . At a time when Chinese economic development calls for the maximal use of its present labor force, national interest would seek to win support from co-nationals resident in other countries, and attract to the mainland the families and financial resources of the Overseas Chinese. As a relatively underdeveloped country, needing at least some technical assistance and financial aid from external sources, China would tend to develop friendly relations with other countries able to supply its needs (a circumstance that may explain the recent diminution of the ideological struggle with other members of the Communist bloc).

Moreover, China has deep historical roots, a superlative record of cultural achievement, and in past centuries Chinese political and cultural imperialism scattered the seeds of Chinese influence over a wide Asian area. A Chinese government concerned with national interest would seek to nurture the soil in which Chinese influence might grow outside China itself and to employ that influence in the attainment of other national objectives.

In many of these matters, Peking can see eye to eye with Chinese compatriots on Taiwan: both seek to protect overseas Chinese communities (whether in Indonesia, which recognizes the CPR, or in the Philippines, which recognizes Taiwan); both seek to treasure, develop, and enhance the cultural influences of the Chinese nation; both are concerned with maintaining the territorial integrity of China and protecting the national heritage against external encroachment. If one could imagine the restoration of the Nationalist government to power on the mainland, one would also need to contemplate the probability that the restored regime would build its foreign policy on the elements of strength presently being accumulated under Communist rule. The basic continuum of Chinese national interest is a major fact of contemporary political life in Asia and the Far East and any Chinese government would act upon it—the Nationalists as well as the CPR.

So here we have some provocatively-interpreted history regarding the relationship between Communist China and the rest of the world. To know and sympathize with certain aspects of this history is important, but it is equally important to endeavor to look impartially at the uncontrollable and undesirable elements in the unfolding of the "karma" of Asia. That some Asians themselves are capable of a detached point of view is often demonstrated. A recent and rather surprising illustration of this comes in a reported interview of the Dalai Lama of Tibet, a man who "lost" his religious kingdom by Communist intervention. The Dalai Lama is neither vindictive nor moralistic, but, rather, sympathetic to "the whole world's woes." The interview was conducted by Raghavan Iyer, an Indian scholar, and first appeared in the *Asian Review* for April, 1961. When Mr. Iyer pressed the Dalai Lama for his reactions to the worst aspects of Communist leadership, he received this reply:

He spoke with quiet compassion about these ignorant though cunning evil-doers. It would be most wrong for us, he implied, to condemn them or to dismiss them out of the horizon of our sympathy, as they did more harm to themselves than to other human beings, although they could not see it. Sometimes people were able to see the truth but through selfishness they could not apply it. There were also people who were utterly misguided in their view of what was in their own interest. If only they could know, if only they were not so short-sighted through their own desperation and through their own false concepts, they would see more clearly what was in their interest and that this could not be so very different for different peoples. In all conflicts the combatants ought to realize that their ultimate interests were the same, but this was exactly what was so difficult. Therefore, it was always the people who could stand outside a violent conflict in any part of the world to-day, who, by their awareness of this ultimate identity of interests between both sides in terms of their common survival and in relation to the whole of humanity, could be an active force for good.

Here is the wonderful solvent of Buddhist philosophy at work in the theatre of international conflict and tragedy.

COMMENTARY
A NON-POLITICAL COMMENT

FROM the contributor of the letter which opened the lead article in the July 5 issue (inquiring into Gandhian economics), we have received an able defense of the free market economy and an expression of concern lest "few people realize that when MANAS says 'socialism,' what is meant is socialism of the highest type—ethical socialism. It might be taken as the support of a distinguished paper for the monstrosities of statism."

Only a very careless reading of MANAS would permit the supposition that MANAS supports "the monstrosities of statism." Statism, in its aggravated contemporary forms, is the strangulation of human freedom. But why does Statism exist? One reason, surely, is the ruthlessness so evident in the historical development of Capitalist society. The socialists would have had no case if the free enterprisers of the nineteenth century had exercised only a little of the responsibility their growing wealth gave them.

MANAS often refers to great socialists with respect, not so much in approbation of their theories as to honor their motives and their deep sympathy for the underprivileged and exploited of the world—the great majority. Those who ignore the moral grounds of the revolutionary movement of the nineteenth century neglect one of the most important expressions of human solidarity and the struggle for justice within the modern historical period.

The free market enthusiasts are often strangely oblivious of the historical origins of the great social movements which they oppose. Their arguments smack as much of the textbook and abstract theory as the socialist visions of economic utopias. The free market economy, we submit, is as much a thing of the past as the democracy of the Greek city state or the New England town meeting. So long as you have nations armed and arming for total war, you will have increasingly

concentrated, centralized power with almost absolute authority vested in the State. Eventually, in such circumstances, it will matter little whether such a state is capitalist or socialist, so far as the individual is concerned.

MANAS regards these developments as effects rather than causes. Our argument for the American system (whatever it is) rests on the proposition that MANAS has been able to survive under this system. There are several socialist systems in the world where MANAS could not even have been started, much less maintained. We have no doubt, however, that out of the present ideological and political confusion will eventually develop some sort of pluralistic society in which the practical mechanisms will suit both the physical needs and the moral development of the people. Rigid orthodoxy and doctrinaire attitudes in politics and economics can only retard this development.

CHILDREN

. . . and Ourselves

TEACHING AS A CONFUSING PROFESSION

THE lead article in the August SSRS *News Letter* (published by the Society of Social Responsibility in Science) is titled, "The Image of a Professor," excerpted from a longer essay by Samuel Hynes, assistant professor of English at Swarthmore College. While the discussion has a "literary" quality, it also contains ideas which the members of the SSRS consider to be usefully challenging. In his conclusion, Prof. Hynes wonders why novels in which professors and teachers play a part are almost entirely devoid of a classical sense of drama. "Perhaps," he says, "as a society we no longer believe that the questions of the nature and end of knowledge are important. Or perhaps we don't think they have answers. Perhaps we no longer believe that man's desire for knowledge has a moral dimension. Perhaps we have lived too long with the authority of science, and have lost the courage to make moral judgments of the scientist's truths."

Various influences incline the contemporary instructor to think of himself as more of a businessman than a teacher. In the first place, the idea of making contributions which involve radical innovations is discouraged by loyalty oaths and by the need to "sell" one's self to a department head in a large university or to the school board of a high school district. No board of trustees or other body possessing administrative influence can possibly get down to an evaluation of the actual teaching worth of a given individual, even if the members possess considerable insight. The universities are too big and sprawling, and the small colleges are in the throes of rapid expansionist moves.

Prof. Hynes has apparently been particularly interested in novels about professors and, excepting the writings of C. P. Snow, has concluded significantly that every "professor character" is depicted as thinking about his field,

his work and his students only *after* the problem of his orderly advance in rank and salary has been maneuvered to the best of his ability at any given time. So, "In recent fiction we don't have an image of the professor which distinguishes him, either in his values or in his problems, from most other middle-aged men. Perhaps this is so because the American professor does not see himself as an image of the intellectual life, distinguishable from the image of the Good Citizen, the Family Man, the Liberal, the Professional Man, and all other stock figures that populate our society."

Professor Hynes continues:

This state of affairs can be partly explained, I think, in terms of a change in society's attitude toward the Intellectual. Twenty-five years ago, the commonest image of the professor was William Randolph Hearst's—a man in a black beard and a slouch hat, carrying a bomb. Today, laymen consult professors, pay for lectures, listen to them. Corporations even send their executives to the professors to be humanized. The experience is an overpoweringly seductive one, and as all academic fiction demonstrates, professors are easily seduced. The poor fellow is inclined to think, "What can I do to make them like me *more*? How can I be a regular fellow, like the other executives?" Hence, perhaps, the blurry image, half professor and half salesman. Hence the gradual submersion of a distinct and lonely species into the mass of undifferentiated professional men.

This process seems to me peculiarly ironic, in that the Real World doesn't come to the academic world for mirror images of itself, but for firm, unpopular, intellectual attitudes. It comes looking for the image of the professor that the past provided—the committed scholar, isolated by his knowledge. . . .

"The Teacher's Millstone," by Judith Stiehm (July *Progressive*) provides a good companion for the Hynes article, at the level of high school teaching. Here, as in the university, *desiring* to think of one's self as just another "professional" has certain consequences. Miss Stiehm, a former teacher in a suburban school near Philadelphia and an employee of the Institute of International

Education, indicates that the "professional" dream is a delusive one:

Teachers of classical Greek and Roman times were frequently slaves. During the Middle Ages pedagogues graduated to the rank of lower clerics. In modern times the teacher has finally achieved middle-class social rank with a lower middle-class wage. The two principal aspirations of today's teacher seem to be recognition of teaching as a "profession," and improved salary schedules. Ironically, the aspiration toward the first commendable goal seems to inhibit attainment of the latter. While status as a professional is clearly a desirable symbol, it has become, clearly, a new instrument of control which is used to check salary increases by denying to teachers their only instruments of power: teacher organization and the strike.

But the high school teacher does not even have the opportunity to be deviant or radical, whereas the university professor is still granted such opportunity in theory and, in rare instances, may avail himself of it—to the credit of his academic community as well as to himself. Miss Stiehm continues:

There is no concept of academic freedom accorded the teacher such as is fairly well established for the college instructor. It is true that there are daily reprisals against college professors who have too audibly supported miscegenation, socialism, free love, Krebiozen, or integration. Still, the right to intellectual error is generally accorded an instructor, and reprisals do not often result in blacklisting of the "troublemaker." Sometimes a transgressor stays on in his own institution even though he does not receive promotion or merit increases; in the most extreme cases, he resorts to institution hopping. The point is, institution hopping is possible. Some college is always ready to welcome to its faculty a martyr in the cause of academic freedom (if only to atone for the professor fired last year for refusing to take a loyalty oath).

Occasionally a teacher will lay claim to the rights of academic freedom. One who does and retains his job is a person whose own values coincide with those of the community, and whose outspoken opinions are directed against, for example, "free thinkers" like James Conant, who is interested in changing the school system. Most teachers, however, do not claim the prerogatives of intellectual freedom.

It is significant that there is no record of a teacher being the complainant in a court case regarding such problems as Bible reading and prayer in a public school's daily schedule. Such objections have always been made by parents or lay people in the community.

The high school teacher has no difficulty in joining an organization which calls itself "professional"—in fact, it is practically impossible to avoid membership in the National Education Association and its affiliates. But such membership may make individual initiative even rarer and more difficult. In many schools a contract to teach is contingent on joining local, state and national associations, so that any introduction of constructively controversial issues by a particular teacher, if disapproved of by reactionary administrators and hand-in-glove members of the association, would lead automatically to termination of tenure. The point is that when people begin to think of themselves primarily as *members* of a profession, they are apt to be thinking in terms of success. And the catch-all formula for success is, "Let's keep things running smoothly!"

Returning to Prof. Hynes, it may be noted that the situation he describes prevails all the way down the line to the first grade teacher in a rural area:

There is a curious, and rather repulsive Togetherness about recent college novels; the characters join committees, they have meetings, they discuss. They rarely seem to step aside to think, and when they do they think about each other. No doubt this quality in the novels reflects a primary characteristic of our society—the social definition of personality. But it seems to me regrettable that it should have affected our image of the intellectual; for surely the intellectual remains one only so long as he thinks alone.

FRONTIERS

In the Pima County Jail

[Jerry Wheeler was one of the four men who, on Aug. 9, 1960, trespassed at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif., to protest against the nuclear researches for war conducted there. He later joined the San Francisco-to-Moscow Peace Walk, of which he remained a member until January, 1961. The Walkers having then reached Arizona, he left the Walk to trespass at the Davis-Monthan Air Force Base near Tucson. For this act of civil disobedience Wheeler was sentenced to six months, which he served in the La Tuna federal prison at La Tuna, Texas. After his release Wheeler returned to Arizona to form with some others the Tucson Peace Project, defined as "a plan of continued effort at one location." On July 25 the members of this project walked from Tucson city hall to the Davis-Monthan base and the next morning three men, Jerry Wheeler, Allen Schaaf, and Byron Wahl, entered the grounds by the main gate, and were arrested. Upon arraignment they pleaded not guilty and were set free on bail until trial some time this month. The reflections printed below are by Jerry Wheeler, written in the Pima County Jail. They should be of interest to all those who wonder about the motives and meaning behind acts of civil disobedience and what is in the minds of the individuals who take this means to protest the military preparations of the United States.]

I

WE shall succeed as our project, by its deeds, elicits the loyalty of men. Publicity, finances and numbers are byproducts of this success and not its cause.

We will strike a responding chord in our fellow man which must be digested before we have his overt fellowship. He will know our cause is right before he knows why it is right. Before he can overtly join in our efforts he must have the rudiments of a rationale for his actions, *i.e.*, we will have his heart before we have his brain. His heart will bring him to us and his brain will set him to action.

Through faith there is allegiance and from thought there are deeds; thus one of our literal aims is to awaken thought in men. We are convinced that allegiance is not enough.

Allegiance makes our vision possible while thought-filled actions bring it to external reality in the "here-and-now." Even small amounts of rational reflection serve to solidify men's intuitive allegiance to the truth of non-violence. This is so because violence became patently absurd with the advent of thermonuclear weapons. Up until this time, while men admittedly accepted the immorality of violence, they successfully defended its use on grounds of emergent necessity, necessity arising from the moment, *i.e.*, emergency use. However, our thermonuclear evil returns so quickly to sit upon the shoulders of its "user" that the emergent necessity argument no longer sustains itself.

II

One of our largest problems is not the need to learn how to love but the need for an ability to love *equally in all directions*. The ability to maintain a non-discriminative love for one's total environment is a prerequisite to the successful practice of love in any particular sector, as, for instance, the human sector. The inanimate and animal part of our surroundings must be loved along with the humans who pass through our sphere. We must impersonally love the totality of our environment whether it be in jail or at home. A preference for one to the other must fade before this impersonal love becomes possible.

Once you achieve, even momentarily, this new approach to your environment, you will realize that personal hate reflecting from your surroundings cannot affect you as you are grounded in an impersonal love for ALL. Such hate points at your personality in particular while your concerns point past this to the general situation, desiring a cure of the disharmony within the environment. By doing this you accept obligation to your environment rather than to yourself.

From this organic membership in the environment we recognize our brother's hate as our responsibility rather than his. We correct it in the same manner as we correct a personal injury.

Our actions become those of personal self-interest rather than "do-gooding" or "missionary work."

Here are a few practical hints that may help toward an "environmental love" rather than a personal one. (1) Choose your *favorite* food and give it to the person you like *least*. (2) Do the work your comrades do not wish to do. (3) Cultivate the habit of verbal non-defense. Accusations, even untruthful ones, are best answered by silence. (4) Treat discriminatory treatment toward yourself as if it were generous and well-meaning.

III

I mentioned earlier one way of approaching "environmental love" by practicing non-defense in the face of untruthful remarks. Defending yourself is a recognition that the accusation exists in reference to your existence, regardless of its truth or untruth. This procedure never proves your accuser wrong yet it gives power to his remarks by simply recognizing their existence.

Try silence. You will find people leaping eloquently to your defense. You will find your actions contradicting the false statement, and non-verbal acts are potent disproof of verbal accusations! You will find that your accuser suddenly changes his attitude and asks you about the relevance of his accusations. When this happens, your accuser makes the crucial step of willingly opening his life to correction. This change from accusation to a request for information must occur before any remarks you make will be correctionally relevant to your accuser's existence.

I also mentioned (in Part II) the method of treating discriminatory treatment as generosity. Recognizing that we must put our brothers first and ourselves last, that we must happily feed upon the ambrosial remains of existence, we naturally recognize any situation in which we find ourselves as a reward. Any requirement made of us, either in good' humor or bad humor, we leap to furnish,

thankful of an opportunity to enrich the Totality in which we exist.

When you follow this procedure, your mistreater is immediately made to recognize the nature of his actions. If you verbally complain or recognize the mistreatment, you immediately allow your mistreater to justify his actions to himself, while your friendly acceptance of his acts as just and fair reflects to his existence, contrasting his deeds and their motivations to your response.

IV

I mentioned the value of treating any situation in which we find ourselves as a reward. This attitude becomes poison if we approach it with the taint of hypocrisy, just as fasting is useless or valuable according to whether the idea of material starvation or spiritual feasting becomes dominant in your mental picture of the fast. Even though we admit hypocrisy to be an elusive and difficult self-made enemy, we should not allow this as an excuse for no effort. The very fact that you recognize and admit the danger of hypocrisy in a sincere effort to perfect your existence is the death-knell of this particular disease. Is not the apathy in which men wallow in relation to their beliefs the deepest hypocrisy imaginable?

For instance, if you find yourself in prison, consider the value and honor in the experience that has come your way. You have been given the opportunity to join your brothers who are punished by society and can now study *first hand* the relevance of social punishment. You can study *first hand* the effect of our penology system upon its administrators. You are exposed to a simplified existence giving plenty of time for introspection and evaluation regarding your "outside" existence. The one crucial factor in transmuting *all* the consequences of your acts into a reward is that you do them from your best understanding of a Truthful Life.

In Part III, I also mentioned the transmuting contrast created when an "environment-centered"

act is juxtaposed to an egocentric act. As your efforts to practice a life devoted to the environment rather than yourself gain momentum, you will become fascinated with the *potency* of your non-violent acts in contrast to the general impotence of your words. This is true even though your acts are *far more imperfect* in their existential explication of what you do than your words. When the transmuting power of your acts begins to percolate, people will begin to approach you for verbal discussion of the internal mechanics of your existence. Your fellow humans, in short, wish to know what makes you tick. At this point words can become useful as an explication tool brought into play by the magnetism of an "environment-centered" act.

V

In Part IV, I mentioned that consequences are transmuted into a reward by doing acts from your best understanding of Truth.

The thoughts with which you formulate your acts are key to their reflecting effect upon your existence. The acts which you perform are only symbols or effects of your thoughts and therefore only you can correctly interpret the symbols you create. As this holds true for your brother as well, the necessity to *judge not* becomes patently obvious.

The mental reception of consequences flowing from one's acts is quite different in the case of a Civil Disobedient and a "robber." In the former you embrace environmental existence, while in the latter a non-social egocentric existence is embraced. The former proceeds to his deeds with a thought pattern that embraces the consequences reflecting from his acts; the latter proceeds on a thought pattern attuned to avoiding the price that reflects from his deeds. Through these dynamic thought-patterns or approaches to the Environment, the same experience (incarceration) has radically different effects on two individuals. To the "robber," incarceration is an unfortunate surprise in which his self-determination, *i.e.*, his freedom, is lost. To the

Civil Disobedient, incarceration is a recognition of self-determination as it is accepted as the price of an act committed in the framework of expected consequences.

Guarding his freedom by the intensely selfish act of depriving his brother to enrich himself, the "robber" loses that freedom he so desperately seeks to preserve. The Civil Disobedient, by voluntarily sacrificing his self-determination in an "Environment-Act," gains greater self-determination than he had when the voluntary sacrifice was originally made.

JERRY WHEELER

Pima County Jail, Arizona