

## IDENTITY AND ROLE

THE "quest for identity," so often spoken of these days, is much more than an individual search. National and cultural personalities are also undergoing rapid change, with consequent confusion at many levels of human life. Take for example the situation in Africa. Seldom has historical change imposed upon many millions of people so great a demand for adaptation to radically new conditions, and for the discovery of a new sense of meaning. The people of Africa are being torn from the context of their habitual way of life, detribalized, rendered indifferent to ancestral institutions which no longer serve their needs, and presented with dramatically new objectives. A special (Feb. 8) issue of the *New Leader* sets the stage for a discussion of this great transition in some brief but revealing paragraphs. The writer, John Marcum, says:

Africa has joined the global revolution of rising expectations. It has joined Asians, Arabs and Latin Americans in demanding a radical improvement in living standards. Its societies stir with a growing awareness of physical force and human potential. They are demanding change and are shattering social patterns.

Indeed, Africa is changing with intense, often traumatic speed. A whole new continent is entering the mainstream of man's quest for human dignity through the intelligent use of modern science, technology, social organization and humanism. . . .

A human being undergoing personal change through intense educational experience will apply much of his new knowledge and insight to gain a better understanding of himself. Similarly, Africa must seek not only material betterment and human dignity for its people, but knowledge of itself, of its past, of its identity. As the young Voltaique historian Joseph Ki-Zerbo, wrote in *Libérons l'Afrique*, a people that has "no conscious memory of its collective personality ends up by alienating itself in a mechanical imitation of others." Africa needs historians to interview its elders, to excavate and interpret its past. It needs historians "not to become

intoxicated with obsolete ideas, nor to systematically judge others, but to make known to its sons and daughters, as well as to the entire world, the various stages and records, fortunes and misfortunes of a particular human experience. This experience should thus enrich all humanity."

This statement is remarkable in two ways. It is remarkable, first, for the temper of both John Marcum and the African historian whom he quotes. The cultural aspirations to which both give voice are so noticeably different from the cries of nationalist pride common only fifty years ago. These men express a genuine understanding of the meaning of civilization. The values they speak of are essentially psychological and ethical. There is no trace of the expansive emotions which characterized the protagonists of the "age of Empire," no egotism of the sort evident in the dream of Manifest Destiny, nor any presumption of the kind widely blazoned in the more recent claim that the twentieth century is to be the "American Century." It is fair to say that the peoples struggling for cultural freedom in the present are giving expression to a new concept of the qualities of civilization—a concept embodying maturity and universal ideas of human excellence.

The other way in which the statement is remarkable is in John Marcum's failure to notice the need for philosophic search for the actual foundations of "human dignity." He refers to "science, technology, social organization and humanism," but these—unless the meaning of humanism be expanded far beyond its ordinary implications—are hardly capable of going into the depths of the human situation and uncovering principles which are capable of ordering so far-reaching a revolution.

Perhaps the discovery of these principles will be in part a function of the revolution itself. One must hope so, since what Marcum says are to be

the means of the realization of human dignity by Africans are already in the possession of European and American culture, and they are manifestly not enough!

Americans *have* science, technology, social organization, and humanism of a sort, but no one will claim that they are using these instruments intelligently. The quest for identity is in as crucial a phase in the United States as it is in Africa, even though the forms of the search and the type of the emergency are very different. The *last* thing that anyone should hope for is that the Africans should catch up with *us*! While the Africans may be unclear on what to try to become, we are equally or more unclear on what we have become, and what we should do next. As a *Nation* writer said recently:

Nothing is harder than to have a clear, steady and sound idea of what society is and what it should be. . . . The word "democratic" has ceased to have any more independent meaning than the word "united" in United States. We have no good analogy by which to comprehend our society. . . .

A less self-conscious form of this confusion is portrayed with bitter clarity in a recent novel by Warren Miller (Crest), *The Way We Live Now*. The author illustrates what happens to skillful and sophisticated but essentially aimless people in the scientifically founded technological society of the United States. The leading character of this book reflects on the preoccupations of modern "adults," while his own personal life is falling apart:

Grown men with matured and searching minds, with a sense of what is important and what is not, could not devote themselves with all their energies to the amassing of monies for someone else. Stewards, they call themselves in the annual report, the stockholders' stewards. There was no real excitement in corporate life. Lionel could understand business being exciting, but it would have to be a small business, small enough so a man could see an immediate response when he tugged a string. There was still something piratical, free-booting, in the idea of a small business making money for yourself. But not here. One man made no difference. . . . Even these men, executives, having the power to make small decisions, and even to guess wrong at times,

were already coming close to the level of the men who worked on a factory's production line turning one screw as a metal plate paused briefly before them. The end product was never seen. No pride in labor was possible. Still, he supposed, all this had its benefits, too: refrigerators, pressure cookers. And yet, he was not satisfied with this answer. He knew that most of what are called the Good Things are not the necessities they are thought to be. The point is, buddies, the point is—something's been lost and the tray of ice cubes, which still, after all, sticks, hasn't made up for it.

Paul Goodman's recent series in *Commentary* on American youth (February, "Youth in Organized Society," March, "The Calling of American Youth," April, "In Search of Community," chapters of a book, *Growing Up Absurd*, to be issued by Random House later this year) is concerned with a similar lack of belief or faith on the part of the young. They see that many of the things they are expected to do aren't really worth doing. "Delinquency" is only one of the side-effects of this disillusionment.

One interesting thing about the present environment of the quest for identity is that it is no longer "natural" or even a "normal" environment. The traditional philosophies of achievement and success, current in the West, no longer apply. The big issues of today are racial equality, security, and survival. These do not represent the task of surmounting natural obstacles and through ambition and "hard work" coming out "on top." Today, the obstacles are man-made—the pass laws in South Africa, the theory and practice of segregation in the American South; the inability of members of the middle class to live within their means, and finally, the obsessing threat of total war, with the incalculable toll it takes of both human emotion and material resources. These are now very largely preoccupying elements of the human environment and have a dominating effect upon the spirit of enterprise of human beings.

In the American South, a sense of role has been made available to the young by the Supreme Court decision ordering desegregation of the

schools and by the victory of the Negroes in the Montgomery bus boycott. Today, in Greensville, North Carolina, an eighteen-year-old Negro youth, Ezell Blair, Jr., is the leader of the sitdown or "sit-in" lunch-counter demonstrations to gain unsegregated service for Negroes in the South. The story is told in dramatic terms in a dispatch to the *New York Times* (March 26):

The patient endurance of Mohandas K. Gandhi in his long struggle for Indian self-rule has been fashioned to domestic uses by Ezell Blair, Jr., an 18-year-old college freshman. The current wave of sitdown demonstrations at chain store lunch counters began Feb. 1 when he and three schoolmates sought service at a Woolworth Company counter here. Behind the act lay nights of discussion of Gandhi's protest—passive resistance—in young Blair's room at the North Carolina Agricultural and Technological College. The boy likes to call the protest against segregation "passive insistence."

He is prepared to follow Gandhi's methods even to the point of going to prison. In fact, he almost seems to expect it.

"I've never forgotten a television show I saw last year called 'The Pictorial Story of India,' " he said. "Gandhi was shown time and time again leaving jail, only to be arrested again."

Ezell Blair's account of his approach to the issue of segregation at lunch counters reflects the rising spirit of an educated generation of Negro youth:

Ezell said he avoided talking to "older Negroes" about the sitdown protest.

"You see, what we call the old Negro has always had to comply with everything in the South because of his economic status," he said.

"As new Negroes, we can speak up loudly now and without fear of economic reprisals. As college students, we have no jobs from which to be fired by people who don't like to see us assert ourselves."

"You can't push a thing like this overnight," he said. "Some Negroes say we're moving, but not fast enough. I say that if it takes two or maybe three months to gain equal service with white people in a chain store that has 100 years of history behind it, we've done something pretty big."

"My mother has always told me that I'm equal to other people. My father told me that before I ever said anything in an argument to try to reason what the other person is thinking, and then perhaps I'll see his side and can make my point better. That's what I'm trying to do now."

People keep asking him how it feels to have started something that has caught on and spread through much of the country.

"It seems almost as if it's a dream, though deep back in my mind I thought it would grow," he said. "But I haven't changed in any way."

An article by an American pacifist, David McReynolds, in the *British Peace News* for March 25 makes an interesting comparison with the foregoing. McReynolds is discussing the possibilities of the role of Britain on the present international scene. The British, he suggests, have an opportunity to become leaders in the practice of nonviolence, in a way that may be impossible for the people of the United States. His development of this contention is a new twist in the doctrine of historical determinism, and one that may have a good deal of truth in it. McReynolds writes:

It is always the race or the nation which does not have the power of violence that is able to begin exploration of the power of nonviolence. Thus with Gandhi in his struggle against Britain. Thus also with the Negroes in the Southern part of the United States, who have chosen to pit prayer and the singing of hymns against the clubs and guns of the Southern police.

But no special credit should go to the Indian people or to the Negroes. The average Negro in the South is no more "saintly" than the average white American. But, because he lacks the power of violence he is able to develop new techniques of struggle.

My first point therefore is that British pacifists must *not* look to either the Soviet or the American Governments for any real lead in ending the Cold War. Precisely because these two nations are so "powerful" they are in reality powerless to act in new ways. The leadership must come from outside each power bloc.

This is why Britain is so very important to the peace movement today. The British military

establishment has no real military or political function. It is partly an expensive gesture toward past greatness and also an earnest attempt by Britain to bear her "fair share of the defense of the free world." But the fact is that whether Britain is armed or disarmed, Russia will not start a war, because it is America which Russia fears and not Britain. . . .

In Britain the pacifist position is also a sound political position and provides the basis for a *mass* movement. For, deprived of real military power, the British are able to see that the only real defense is peace. But a mass movement is never a strictly pacifist movement. Observe India, where the moral authority of Gandhi was combined with a real political genius and he got a whole nation to adopt a political programme to accomplish certain immediate objectives, even though his own "pacifist army" or Satyagraha units were always very small. . . .

Every mass demonstration that occurs, every storming of a missile base, every invasion of a nuclear weapons factory, is far, far more than a quibble between the pacifist movement and the British Government. It is part of a struggle to build a real mass movement, embracing virtually all the British people. It is a part of the long march of Britain toward a new destiny. . . .

Philosophers and mystics see the quest for identity as a "pure" investigation, a metaphysical and introspective search for the ultimate meaning of individuality. One may have no doubt of the importance of this search, not only for its own sake, but also for the balance its partial fruits may give to man's mundane labors in the temporal world, yet still see in the transitions, passages and plateaus of history another aspect of quest. It seems quite clear that, from epoch to epoch, men acquire new cultural ideals and discover new instruments by which to realize them. Surely, the present is such a time.

And there is poetic justice in the fact that the dispossessed and apparently weak, or men of declining power, may be, in the present age of transition, those to whom the world of the future will owe the fact that they have a peaceful world, or have been allowed to exist at all. David McReynolds may be right in saying that the Southern Negro is no more "saintly" than the Southern white, but in taking the initiative in this

cycle of extreme transition, the American Negro may *become*, along with others in other groups, an example of the kind of man all men must learn to become. And if the British, by following the example of their former colonial possession, India, are able to crown a past having its full share of high moments, with the revolutionary role anticipated by David McReynolds, the balance of racial equality may be restored in an unexpected and entirely different sense.

## *REVIEW*

### SCIENTISTS AND SCIENCE-USERS

AN acute reader much interested in the goal of enduring world peace has pointed out that the April issue of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* has three discussions in it which come out for unilateral disarmament. There is Charles E. Osgood's paper, "A Case for Graduated Unilateral Disengagement," Ritchie Calder's "The Non-Nuclear Club," which reports approvingly on the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in Britain, and, in the letter columns, W. H. Ferry's letter concerning alternatives to the arms race (this letter was printed in full in MANAS for March 30).

Since scientists are no doubt among the most intelligent members of the modern social community, and since they have at least as much moral sensibility as the rest of us, it is perhaps natural that the ambivalence and moral contradictions of our society should often be most clearly illustrated in the deliberations of scientists. This, at any rate, seems to be the case in the contents of a periodical like the *Bulletin*, in which one finds the lion of "balance of terror" theories, if not lying down with the lamb of disarmament proposals, at least present in the same menagerie of ideas.

An article in the *Listener* for Feb. 11 makes a distinction among scientists which helps to throw light on this situation. The writer, Stephen Toulmin, teaches philosophy at Leeds University, and has also been Acting John Dewey Professor of Philosophy at Columbia. In this article he contrasts the role in society of those whom he calls the "science-users" with that of the "original thinkers." The science-users, he points out, come into positions of power and influence whenever their society is highly institutionalized. Prof. Toulmin writes:

Any new institution tends to develop a certain conservatism, a certain orthodoxy, to acquire a vested interest in an established body of ideas. (The medical profession is an obvious example.) In this respect, the interests of the class of science-users are in direct

opposition to those of the original thinkers on whom the future of science will depend. The scientific profession is faced with the need to do what no other profession has succeeded in doing: it must always reserve the highest honors for men who overthrow ideas on which many of its members depend for their livelihood.

Another more serious side of this problem is the risk that scientists—confident in their new status as professionals—may become, not just intellectually conservative but unadventurous. Arnold Toynbee has pointed out how obsession with an established technique can hamper the development of a better one, and this can easily happen in the intellectual field just as in any other. Any professional group may naturally be tempted to concentrate on the things it is good at—on the techniques it has already mastered. Yet science is unlike other activities in this: it must concentrate its efforts on the things we do not understand, on the problems we have so far no technique for dealing with. Here again the interests of the science-users, for whom existing ideas are valuable as practical instruments, are different from those of original scientists, whose ambitions are, at the theoretical level, revolutionary.

Prof. Toulmin supports this generalization with an account of what happened to Greek science after Aristotle had established a synthesis of the orthodoxy he had created. Aristotle's weakness in mathematics was a serious confinement of scientific progress. Archimedes and Hipparchus made the first steps toward a science of mechanics, but they had no followers to carry forward the beginnings they made. Instead—

. . . there was an easier way out. Comfortably ensconced under government patronage in the museum of Alexandria—that great precursor of the Institute for Advanced Studies—scientists were tempted to concentrate instead on doing things they were good at. Intellectual dissatisfaction had largely evaporated. Hero of Alexandria was busy designing obol-in-the-slot machines for dispensing holy water, and hydraulic singing birds for use as ostentatious table decoration. Ptolemy was finding better and better ways of preparing nautical almanacs. On its own ground, Alexandrian science was without doubt a great advance on anything the Athenians could show. Yet, comparing the modest craftsmanlike Alexandrian science with the more dashing and

speculative theories of classical Athens, I myself cannot help regretting the results of professionalization. Hero and Ptolemy had lost something essential, were no longer concerned in the same passionate way with natural philosophy. In so limiting their ambitions and expectations, the Hellenistic scientists turned their backs on the crucial issues; and the intellectual vacuum they left was quickly filled by gnostics, astrologers and fanatics.

The way was open for the burning of the libraries, and for what Gibbon called "the triumph of barbarism and religion." The chief glories of Greek science were soon denounced as pagan superstitions, and when Philoponus and Simplicius revived the old debates, they found the Academy closed and the scholars dispersed. The scientists of Athens were forced to wander—like Kepler and Einstein in later centuries—across the face of the earth.

Prof. Toulmin completes the parallel between ancient and modern scientists by drawing attention to the pertinent issues for scientists of today:

The fundamental responsibilities of science go far beyond the boundaries of any professional duty. In the last resort, science is one of the great critical activities, with a responsibility only to itself; like art, religion, ethics and politics, it can never be entirely professionalized. Since Hiroshima, some scientists have come to feel that their ultimate responsibility was to serve human welfare more faithfully, and they have thought that this required that they should pay more attention to applied research. I am not so sure about this. I feel all the more that their proper service is to further science itself. For it remains the permanent mission of the scientist to apply his intellect critically to the problem of understanding Nature. And suppose scientists, as a profession, ever do lower their sights—ever do reconcile themselves as a body to the demands of the military or the role of computing-machine minders; if that ever happens, they will leave a vacuum which will be quickly filled in the same way that it was before. And then it will be only a matter of time before the libraries burn again.

Occasional reading of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* is of value for keeping track of what scientists think about this difficult decision.

**COMMENTARY**  
**"NO ANNIHILATION WITHOUT  
 REPRESENTATION"**

IN a paper entitled, "Suggestions for Winning the Real War with Communism" (printed in *Conflict Resolution* for December, 1959), Charles E. Osgood points out the essential inconsistency of a so-called "preventive war" with the traditional ideals and conceptions of American democracy. He says:

. . . it is obvious that a preventive war of this sort must begin (and probably end) with a *surprise attack*. This means that the preparations must be secret, and, to be secret, they must be known to only a small minority of the population. The decision for preventive war in the nuclear age cannot, therefore, be arrived at through ordinary democratic processes. The government, or clique within a government, that decides on this course must assume that the people it represents are morally, emotionally, and attitudinally prepared for such an act—or it must be completely insensitive to the reactions of the populace. This strategy is, therefore, more feasible for a totalitarian government than a democratic government. . . . Not only would the launching of a surprise attack of necessity constitute a lapse of our beliefs and values, but it would put us in the position of being the major threat in the eyes of the world. Hence we ourselves would be under continuous threat of surprise attack and would be forced to exhaust ourselves in policing the globe—or forced to secure our "way of life" by systematically exterminating competition. One cannot imagine our system of government surviving under such conditions.

Mr. Osgood is director of the Institute of Communications Research at the University of Illinois. The paper quoted above was originally prepared for a seminar at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences, at Palo Alto—a seminar in which Dr. Jerome Frank, recently quoted in these pages, also participated. (Mr. Osgood was also quoted in the MANAS lead of two weeks ago [May 18], but by some mischance the final paragraph taken from his *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* discussion was attributed to another writer, elsewhere quoted in the same article.)

It is to the credit of the social and psychological sciences that some of their leading figures are now taking the initiative in public discussion of the real issues of nuclear war. This is entirely proper. The prospect of another war is no longer a "pacifist" issue. It is an issue for all civilized human beings. That such men tend to discuss the problem in the light of pacifist conceptions is of course to be expected, and a credit to the realism of pacifist thinking, but the issue of war should never more be presented as an argument between pacifists and non-pacifists. This would hide the central fact that it is now an argument between the sane and the insane.

Men like Erich Fromm, David Riesman, Lewis Mumford, Linus Pauling, and Karl Menninger cannot be ignored as though they were pacifist sectaries. And if a slogan like "No Annihilation without Representation" can be discovered in the pages of the *United States Naval Proceedings* (April), the time has come for all men to forget silly distinctions between "pacifists" and "non-pacifists" and to look at the facts without blinders.

No less a person than the President of the United States, in an address before the Parliament of India last Dec. 10, said:

Governments are burdened with sterile expenditures, preoccupied with attainment of a defensive military posture that grows less meaningful against today's weapon carriers. . . . Controlled universal disarmament is the imperative of our time. The demand for it by the hundreds of millions whose chief concern is the long future of themselves and their children will, I hope, become so universal and insistent that no man, no government can withstand it.

Last week we recalled that in 1959 some three thousand demonstrators against British manufacture of nuclear weapons marched the fifty-three miles from the Aldermaston weapons center to London for a mass protest meeting in Trafalgar Square. This year, according to *Peace News*:

Ten thousand on the first day of the march, 15,000 on the second, 20,000 on the third, and over 40,000 on the last! Judged by numbers alone the Aldermaston March of 1960 was a tremendous success. Nobody in their wildest dreams could have anticipated so many people taking part.

The New York *Times* reported that nine thousand began the March on April 15, led by Canon Lewis J. Collins of St. Paul's Cathedral and Jacquetta Hawkes, wife of J. B. Priestley. On April 19, however, the *Times* gave the finish of the March front-page treatment, with a picture showing the enormous crowd, and a headline reading, "75,000 in London Protest H-Bomb." All traffic was blocked by the cheering people and a union leader described the demonstration as "the greatest popular rally London has known since the Chartist processions of 1848." It is only fair to add that the West Coast newspapers, which last year almost totally ignored the Aldermaston March, this year gave it thorough coverage.

Similar protests, although not in the same massive proportion, are being made in the United States. But each protest, each voice that is raised, each alternative proposed—such as, for example, "Instead" (see *Frontiers*)—increases the general perception that there is or ought to be an alternative to nuclear war. When this perception is strong enough, the alternative will be found.

## CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

### PHILOSOPHY FOR THE YOUNG

TWO weeks ago we reviewed Dorothy Spoerl's *Tensions Our Children Live With*, which, among other things, affirms the capacity of the young to benefit from serious discussions of social issues. Previously (MANAS, April 13) we quoted Clifton Fadiman on the value of philosophical discussion to children. The following communication is further evidence of the potentialities of children as thinkers, from a MANAS subscriber who is a teacher:

Editors, MANAS: Having taught 4th-5th Grade from November, 1956, to June 1959, and having dealt for three years before that with innumerable groups of children of the same age, teaching Sex and Reproduction for a voluntary agency, I feel qualified to say that Mr. Fadiman and Mr. Warren (founder of Verde Valley School, in Arizona) couldn't be more right.

Elementary school children *are* natural philosophers and scientists of incomparable acuity, and, as far as I could make out, not only appreciate a cultural-anthropological presentation of subject-matter, but, given any kind of a chance, will demand it, and it's my private opinion that a clutch of them, riding high with any question of significance, constitute a match for any sage or philosopher in this country or any other.

To give anyone who thinks this is not so some proof to chew on, I will quote here some of the hair-raising questions I ran into with my various broods, wishing I could report even more of them and include the discussions which accompanied them, because such questions always arose in such a logical way, and always sparked such fascinating spirals of thought both for me and for the children. At any rate, the following are some of the ones I remember best:

"What is the *real* difference between human beings and animals?"

"Who first thought of God?"

"Why do you die when your heart stops?"

"What color was Jesus?"

"Why are most babies so cute, and how come they grow up so ugly?"

"How does the food you eat turn into you?"

"How can something that is *one* thing turn into *two* things?" (In reference to cell division.)

"Who had the first baby?"

"How much rain is there in a cloud?"

"If no one has ever seen an atom, how did they know they were there?"

"Why did the Indians start smoking?"

"Why do teachers say that addition and multiplication are the same thing, when the numbers in multiplication are all the same, and the numbers in addition are all different?" (The child is 100 per cent right: counting and figuring recurrence are separate in cultural development until number systems appear, and this question and the discussion which followed clarified number operations on the basis of human need and use of them, for both myself and the whole class.)

"Why are scientists so funny-looking?"

"Can you imagine things no one has ever known?"

"What is a person, *really*?"

And last, but not least, my favorite teacher-scorcher—a three-way exchange clarifying the pioneer movement. Me: "As the colonists needed more space, they pushed the Indians back, and cleared and settled more and more land." Student A: "How do you mean they 'pushed the Indians back,' Mrs. R.?" Student B: "She means they killed 'em, you dope!"

Well, anyway, after six years with fourth- and fifth-graders I considered myself a wiser woman, even though I was crawling home from school on my hands and knees every day. And I would warn any lighthearted Ph.D. or solemn professor of this or that to be oscillating at his highest frequency if he intends to broach a philosophical subject or to allow philosophical discussion of any subject with a group of this age. Because the children are so good at it, and get so little chance at it, that anyone who encourages nine- and ten-year-olds in philosophical discussion gets swarmed over like a gumdrop in an ant hill.

Meanwhile, if they were allowed this privilege from the first and supplied with teachers who had sufficient command of the subject-matter and philosophical understanding to lead them on without egg-walking, God knows how fast their cultural development and the cultural development of the society they inhabit might progress! As for myself, I would be all for it, although I suspect that it would necessitate decapitation of all teacher-educators who seem to be sure that if you don't TELL CHILDREN RIGHT FROM WRONG, they will never be able to figure it out for themselves, and that if you let them THINK, most of all about human development and customs, they may all turn into A1 Capones.

Furthermore, you would have to reform our system of teaching radically to promote such a thing, because, as things stand, the school day is so jammed up with dizzy little rules of one kind and another, and the curriculum and textbooks are so jammed up with organized fatuity and ignorance, that a teacher can only choose between a sort of puppet automation for herself and her class and suicide by exhaustion. . . .

P.S. Am enclosing a photograph of my last brood, whose interests ranged (over my limp body) from Van Gogh, Tutankhamen and burial customs, to the design and operation of the electronic microscope. They also wrote to Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip, asking them to come to Alpaugh on their last visit to the U.S.A. and Canada, and promised them a potluck dinner and a rattlesnake hunt, so Prince Charles could have a rattlesnake. See what I mean?

We live in a neighborhood largely inhabited by conscientious parents imbued with the determination to condition their children to accept traditional Christian definitions of Right and Wrong—and although we have done no peeping through other peoples' windows and one cannot say for sure, we have a strong impression that nearly all these parents, when duty calls, sit down patiently beside erring children in the interests of moral instruction. But it also seems to us, as to the majority of concerned but less self-assured parents, that it is impossible to begin ethical teaching without first fulfilling a natural desire to discover what the *child* thinks, and why. What conception of value is implicit in the action or statement we deplore? How did he arrive at it? To what extent can we understand and sympathize with the end result, no matter how inadequate or

faulty it might be adjudged from the standpoint of adulthood?

Perhaps one of the great lessons to be learned from the history of man is the fact that ethics must be *discovered*. Awareness of this, as we recall, is what made Carl Ewald's "My Little Boy" stories so memorable—and, in the mood of whimsey, why A. A. Milne's *Winnie the Pooh* deserves immortality. Both Ewald and Milne encourage one to examine, gently and tolerantly, the minor foibles of self-seeking, so that, instead of moving "from sin to punishment," the mind of the child moves forward in the capacity to smile at its own pettiness.

## *FRONTIERS* "INSTEAD"

IN MANAS for March 30, you say that the prevention of war involves two questions: "There is the practical question of what to do . . . and the moral question of how people in general are to become ready to *take* the practical steps."

You also publish a proposal by W. H. Ferry for unilateral disarmament as an alternative to our present "defense" policy. Mr. Ferry's sound and vigorous arguments of course offer a more rational means to prevent war than the present activity of all nations as they rush toward it.

The British people might accept unilateral disarmament, not because they are nobler, but because their geographical and economic situation is different from ours. The vicious and panicky opposition to Mr. Ferry's proposal is an almost irrelevant indication of why the proposal is not practical.

The fact is that the people of the USA, or USSR, or of the People's Republic of China would be no more ready to consider unilateral disarmament in the next ten years than would the USA to consider a woman for president in that time.

However, there is a plan which can prevent any war between nations for at least thirty years. It is a practical plan because it accepts us human beings as we are, rather scared, rather stupid, rather selfish, and always strongly preferring to be told what to do by their leaders in order to get what they want.

All of us want the same things. The peoples of Nato and Warsaw, of Bandung and Seato, O.A.S. and Bagdad, the Arab League and Israel, India and Switzerland, The People's Republic of China and Taiwan, the USA and the USSR, the peoples of Africa, even South Africa, all agree:

1. We don't and they don't want to be pushed around by anyone.

2. We will all give our lives and a lot of money to be in a position to tell other people where to get off.

3. We are all afraid of being worse off than we are now.

4. We all want to be better off than we are now.

5. We believe our leaders when they tell us that the arms race, diplomacy, our economic and political systems, and our educational practices can procure what we want.

Alex Comfort writes in the *Listener* for March 24, 1960:

Cardboard missiles would serve the same purposes more cheaply and without running our present risks. Instead we have the astounding sight of the whole vast technical and intellectual effort of man being diverted down the drain of a few individuals' imagination . . . pyramid-building, but in a form which endangers the actual survival of the species . . .

It is demonstrably false that we are all responsible for the decisions (leading to nuclear catastrophe). Not only were we not consulted—elaborate measures are taken to see that we do not anticipate or alter the choices made (by our leaders).

Our best hope of survival . . . is in the combativeness of the ordinary man in defense of the things he is always being encouraged to think unworthy—his skin, his food, his sexual relationships, his pleasures (his right to survival for him and his race).

We need to exchange the courage which is willing to annihilate the entire race on principle for a little intelligent cowardice in office, and above all for an intelligent love of pleasure.

As the public cynically recognizes, official scientists always support official utterances on scientific grounds . . . not that they have been bribed or threatened, but that governments are experts in selecting experts who will participate in their own fantasy. We are now getting cases in the West where a pathological scientific tail is wagging a reluctant political dog.

[Yet] our generation has an excellent chance of seeing this problem resolved . . . even the lack of principle and policy in party leaders is perhaps an

exploitable thing—it makes it possible for us to reverse their attitudes 180 degrees by pressure applied to their chance of office. . . . As we see in modern English parties virtually the only object of policy is to stay in office. . . . Men who like living from choice under the shadow of annihilation (should not be our masters. It is up to our recalcitrance, then, in the 1960's to control, or instruct, or better eject them in favor of realities.

There may still be time, by using modern communications media, to convince all peoples that present policies prevent their getting the things they want and also lead directly to absurdly unnecessary but irreversible disaster.

A crash publicity program must not only expose fallacies, bad leadership and unknown dangers; it must also offer a positive, concrete, easily understood and easily acted upon plan—acceptable to all people. It must be so unnovel and so customary as not to repel support.

War can be prevented for 10 to 30 years by a new project named

## INSTEAD

---

### SUMMARY OF INSTEAD

INSTEAD separates the personnel of all armed forces from their weapons and employs them in countries other than their own for the benefit of the people of those countries.

INSTEAD spends what each country spent annually for war matériel for the development of nuclear and solar energy for peaceful uses, and for the production of useful goods.

INSTEAD will be accepted when all people know the specific goods and services INSTEAD provides for them, and the horrors of the war which INSTEAD prevents.

1. INSTEAD must be proposed by one or more neutral governments or citizens of neutral states. Publicity is a necessary preliminary to acceptance of INSTEAD. Present communications media make world-wide publicity possible and purchasable, in spite of opposition by any

government. Publicity must be controlled by neutrals but it can be financed by citizens of any state, or by governments of states whose citizens have convinced them of the value of INSTEAD.

2. INSTEAD produces world disarmament but not demobilization.

3. INSTEAD prevents depressions.

4. INSTEAD costs annually exactly what all armed nations paid for "defense" in 1956 (\$110 billion).

5. INSTEAD employs the same number of civilians at the same annual wage as were employed in 1956 in defense establishments in support of armed forces at home and abroad.

6. INSTEAD replaces the armed forces of each nation at their 1956 strength (19 million) with INSTEAD Forces. These forces contain units from many different nations. They are assembled for distribution to their tasks at INSTEAD Assignment Centers. They are employed only for INSTEAD Tasks. The kind and amount of work has been agreed upon by each host and contributing country before the arrival of INSTEAD Troops.<sup>1</sup>

7. INSTEAD disarms all troops and sends them all on foreign service. (Armies, navies, and air forces.)

No patriotic people, convinced of the rightness of its political, social, economic or religious systems could fear that acting as host to aliens whose beliefs may differ, could alter their own convictions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Beside the maintenance of all INSTEAD forces, the INSTEAD tasks will include road and airstrip making, flood control, irrigation and sanitation projects, water supply development, school building, etc. Development of nuclear and solar energy will take precedence. Prosperous countries will use INSTEAD workers for jobs which would be done if there were labor available to do them without pay; jobs not profitable for private enterprise or jobs which would increase taxes if done by the government.

Disarmament for INSTEAD is voluntary and self-enforcing—requiring no treaties nor mutual trust nor inspection. No nation would be so foolhardy as to have arms available for possible seizure by INSTEAD forces. So before receiving INSTEAD forces, each country will insist on converting, destroying or storing in INSTEAD Safety Centers all its war matériel.

Countries possessing hydrogen bombs and their means of delivery could conceal them and use them. But any attack would inevitably kill their own troops, and such an attack would not be popular either with their troops or their families.

INSTEAD converts *bad* words into *good* words: "enemy" into "host," "occupying forces" into "helpful, invited, paying guests," and "hostages" into "protectors of the home land," since their stationing on foreign soil unarmed prevents the war that threatens us now with unimaginable disaster.

8. INSTEAD converts all defense contracts to INSTEAD Contracts for the production of INSTEAD Goods directly or indirectly serving consumer needs.<sup>2</sup>

9. INSTEAD employs the same number of persons as were employed on war contracts in 1956. INSTEAD guarantees the same annual wage, the same profits, and the same return to stock and bond owners as in 1956.<sup>3</sup>

10. INSTEAD produces goods in each country but these are *not* used by the country producing them. INSTEAD goods are given to foreign countries according to quotas previously

determined by what each country wants and what it will give.<sup>4</sup>

11. INSTEAD contributes Goods and Services to *all* countries, but some nations do not receive the full equivalent of their contributions. This is in order that goods-hungry peoples receive amounts disproportionate to their previous small expenditures for defense. Indirectly this benefits both have and have-not countries.

INSTEAD Goods and Services develop new sources of power, expand agriculture, increase means of distribution, etc. INSTEAD thus creates new jobs and so raises living standards and so increases purchasing power on the world market.

12. INSTEAD ends the need for any foreign aid programs by individual nations. (USSR is currently spending one billion annually and USA 0.8 billion.)

13. INSTEAD has an identical purpose with the United Nations—"to maintain international peace and security." INSTEAD benefits from U.N. reports, *e.g.*, on shortages and surpluses and from its thousands of expert personnel. U.N. benefits from INSTEAD which makes more national funds available for U.N.

14. INSTEAD requires no world law. INSTEAD changes only the use of the war apparatus of each country.

15. INSTEAD requires no new organization. The various national military structures are coordinated in INSTEAD as they were in World War II. Since there is no enemy INSTEAD is simpler to conduct than global war.

16. INSTEAD is controlled by INSTEAD Governors who are civilians elected or appointed (two each) by each country. These Governors elect from among themselves a coordinating

<sup>2</sup> War goods serve no consumer needs, and if used destroy the consumer.

<sup>3</sup> If objection is made that this constitutes a planned economy, it affects only a small portion of the economy. *E.g.*, the USA spent 36.5 billion dollars for war preparations in 1956, but its total national product was \$410 billion.

<sup>4</sup> Goods to produce and use nuclear energy and to harness and use solar energy for productive purposes; goods capable of producing other goods, *e.g.* machine tools, farm equipment, etc.; and consumer goods will probably be required in that order.

committee which appoints commissions such as for Development of Nuclear and Solar Energy, and Information. These commissions employ only INSTEAD Forces.

INSTEAD IS BETTER THAN  
INCINERATION!

The conceptual basis for this proposal might be summed up as follows:

No nation wants war. All nations would like to concentrate their minds and energy on positive and effective planning for lasting peace. The chief deterrent to such planning is *fear*. Because of fear of the military prowess of other nations, the arms race continues and planning for lasting peace is made extremely difficult—if not impossible.

Therefore, what is needed *now* is a proposal that can overcome the fears of competing nations for a long enough time so that energetic and thoughtful planning for lasting peace really can be done.

Proposals made by competing nations are (almost by definition) viewed with skepticism by the vast uncommitted areas of Asia and Africa. However, positive involvement of these uncommitted peoples is vital to any plan for peace. Therefore, any proposal by a competing nation must be so real that there can be no cause for skepticism by the uncommitted. In fact, probably a plan for peace will have its best chance of success if the uncommitted nations spontaneously take up the initiative for promoting its accomplishment.

Therefore, a vital component of any plan must be a *real* method for helping uncommitted peoples in their fight against poverty.

All the major nations spend prodigious amounts of wealth, energy and intellect against war apparatus each year. In its simplest terms, INSTEAD is a plan for shifting the enormous power of the world's war apparatus to production of useful consumer goods and services for a long period of time so that a world-wide plan for

lasting peace can be developed—unencumbered by fear.

An idea for putting the power of the world to wage war to work at the job of waging peace *instead*.

MRS. DONALD BUDD ARMSTRONG  
Scarborough-on-Hudson, New York