VOLUME XLI, NO. 45
NOVEMBER 9, 1988

OUR NEXT STAGE OF EVOLUTION?

READING, recently, in Joseph Campbell's books, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* and *Masks of God,* we were driven to return to an old favorite, Bullfinch's *Age of Fable,* which still seems the best source of the great myths of the Western world. Yet the full meaning of myths is not disclosed in the accounts of encyclopedias and anthologies, but grows out of the use we make of them for ourselves. Prometheus, one could say, is the essence of the creative spirit in human beings. To become active, he cannot depend upon memory, although he needs memory as a field of action. The business—the duty of Prometheus—is sacrifice, as becomes evident when he risks the displeasure of Zeus, the divine autocrat, to bring the creative fire of mind to mankind.

A contemporary understanding of the resources of myth is provided in an interview by Bill Moyers with Joseph Campbell published in the July-August *New Age Journal.* Myths, Campbell said, are no less than "clues to the spiritual potentialities of the human life."

> They teach you that you can turn inward, and you begin to get the message of the symbols. Read other people's myths, not those of your own religion, because you tend to interpret your own religion in terms of facts—but if you read the other ones, you begin to get the message. Myth helps you to put your mind in touch with this experience of being alive. It tells you what the experience is.

Musing on the meaning of myths brings an awareness of the transcendental significance of the root experiences of life.

> Marriage, for example. What is marriage? The myth tells you what it is. It's the reunion of the separated duad. Originally you were one. You are now two in the world, but the recognition of the spiritual identity is what marriage is. It's different from a love affair. It has nothing to do with that. It's another mythological plane of experience. When people get married because they think it's a longtime love affair, they'll be divorced very soon, because all love affairs end in disappointment.
>
> But marriage is recognition of a spiritual identity. If we live a proper life, if our minds are on the right qualities in regarding the person of the opposite sex, we will find our proper male or female counterpart. But if we are distracted by certain sensuous interests, we'll marry the wrong person. By marrying the right person, we reconstruct the image of the incarnate God, and that's what marriage is.

The dialogue of question and answer continues.

> *The right person? How does one choose the right person?*
>
> Your heart tells you. It ought to.
>
> *Your inner being.*
>
> That's the mystery.
>
> *You recognize your other self.*
>
> Well, I don't know, but there's a flash that comes, and something in you knows that this is the one.
>
> *If marriage is this reunion of the self with the self, with the male or female grounding of ourselves, why is it that marriage is so precarious in our modern society?*
>
> Because it's not regarded as a marriage. I would say that if the marriage isn't a first priority in your life, you're not married The marriage means the two that are one, the two become one flesh. If the marriage lasts long enough, and if you are acquiescing constantly to it instead of to individual personal whim, you come to realize that that is true—the two are really one. . . .
>
> There are two completely different stages of marriage. First is the youthful marriage following the wonderful impulse that nature has given us in the interplay of the sexes biologically in order to produce children.
>
> But there comes a time when the child graduates from the family and the couple is left. I've been amazed at the number of my friends who in their forties or fifties go apart. They have had a perfectly decent life together with the child, but they interpreted their union in terms of their relationship

through the child. They did not interpret it in terms of their own personal relationship to each other.

It seems that men like Joseph Campbell—who died in the fall of 1987—are figures with a restorative function for the human race. We live in an age in which the structures of meaning known to antiquity, preserved in area literature, myth, and legend, are no longer transmitted from one generation to another. These themes have to be restored if people are to make sense of their lives Campbell speaks of this:

> One of our problems is that we are not well acquainted with the literature of the spirit. We're interested in the news of the day and the problems of the hour. It used to be that the university campus was a kind of hermetically sealed-off area where the news of the day did not impinge upon your attention to the inner life and to the magnificent human heritage we have in our great tradition Plato, Confucius, the Buddha, Goethe, and others who speak of the eternal values that have to do with the centering of our lives. When you get to be older, and the concerns of the day have all been attended to, and you turn to the inner life—well, if you don't know where it is or what it is, you'll be sorry.

What kind of a world do we live in? An answer to this question is provided by Ross Mooney in the Summer 1967 issue of the *Journal of Creative Behavior.* Early in his paper on Contemporary Culture he says:

> One of the salient realities of these times is that a modern civilized, and highly educated sister nation murdered 5,000,000 of its citizens. Germany had already initiated war. War sanctifies killing one's neighbors *outside* the borders of the state. Extremists took one more step and killed 5,000,000 neighbors *inside* the state. The killings were carried out systematically; there had been plenty of time to think; the victims had not attacked the state; many were women, children, aged and infirm. What happened to make these killings possible?
>
> Those who performed the murders explained later that they could do what they had done because they were "carrying out the orders of the state." Somewhere along the line "the state" had become the primary source for order, and had supplanted "the civilized way of life" as the controlling frame of reference. In the "civilized way," order in life is given by what is required for order in the individual human being, as a maturing and respected member of the human species; the state is instrumental to this end. The killers, inadequate to order life in themselves as persons had taken the state as primary source for order and had taken themselves as creatures subordinate to its ends. Having sacrificed themselves, they could see other human beings as also sacrificial to the state. In this frame of mind, they could perform the murders.
>
> War gives practice in using frames of mind which take the state as primary, and the individual as sacrificial to its ends. That's the way we prepare ourselves to die in war and to send our loved ones to their death. So the concept is not new. Appearing in prior wars, we had long since rationalized it, along with war, as something "primitive" and "natural," even if uncivilized. But the murder of 5,000,000 *inside* the state! This was something else, not fitting to the rest! What people, even if primitive, "naturally" kills members of its own assembly! This was "unnatural," disordered, diseased.
>
> With war begun, neighboring nations were drawn into the all-out effort. These nations, like Germany, were made up of well educated people. Eventually fifty-four nations and hundreds of millions of people were involved. Not military men alone, but civilians were included in the struggle and the dying. Tens of millions of people were killed. Those who did not die had practice in operating the system in support of those who did, equating order in life with order in the state and offering their personal lives as sacrifice to the system.
>
> Experienced thus, people around the globe had in their minds the means to project upon the ambiguities of the post-war world what they already experienced as "true," *i.e.*, that social systems dominate and men are sacrificial to them. Their views were soon confirmed, there came the Korean War and other "local wars," the generalized "cold war" between two colossal factions, and giant new preparations for total-kill and over-kill by nuclear, chemical, and biological means. The world is now covered by systems guaranteed, upon provocation, to kill everyone, not once but many times, in many different ways, the killers being killed themselves in final offering. Local wars continue risking escalations.

Myths instruct in the obligations of life. They provide principles of order. Every human being has in him the potentialities of a life ordered by mythic meanings. He has in him a latent

Prometheus, a more or less tyrannical Zeus; in every man there is an arrogantly clever deviser who brings upon himself the fate of Sisyphus, fated forever to push a large stone up a steep hill, where, for a moment, he loses control and the stone rolls again to the bottom, to which he must return and begin again. Yet for every legend of pain and defeat there is a heroic tale of achievement that may become a model in childhood and an ideal for adults.

What happens, Bill Moyer asked Campbell, when a society no longer embraces a powerful mythology? He replied:

> What we've got on our hands. . . . read the *New York Times.* The news of the day, including destructive and violent acts by young people who don't know how to behave in a civilized society.
>
> Moyer then asked:
>
> *Where do the kids growing up in the* city*—on 125th and Broadway* [*in New York City's Harlem section*] *for example—where do these kids get their myths today?*
>
> They make them up themselves. This is why we have graffiti all over the city. These city kids have their own gangs and their own initiations and their own morality, and they're doing the best they can. But they're dangerous because their own laws are not those of the city. They have not been initiated into our society. . . .
>
> Every mythology has grown up in a certain society in a bounded field. Then they come into collision and relationship, and they amalgamate, and you get a more complex mythology.
>
> But today there are no boundaries. The only mythology that is valid today is the mythology of the planet—and we don't have such a mythology. The closest thing I know of to a planetary mythology is Buddhism, which sees all beings as Buddha beings. The only problem is to come to the recognition of that. There is nothing to do. The task is only to know what is, and then to act in relation to the brotherhood of all these beings.
>
> *Brotherhood?*
>
> Yes. Now, brotherhood in most of the myths I know is confined to a bounded community. In bounded communities, aggression is projected outward.
>
> For example, the Ten Commandments say, "Thou shalt not kill." Then the next chapter says, "Go into Canaan and kill everybody in it." That is a bounded field. The myths of participation and love pertain only to the in-group, and the out-group is totally other. . . .

Speaking as a restorer of the meaning of myths to our time, Joseph Campbell says:

> We have today to learn to get back into accord with the wisdom of nature and realize again our brotherhood with the animals and with the water and the sea. To say that the divinity informs the world and all things is condemned as pantheism. But *pantheism* is a misleading word. It suggests that a personal god is supposed to inhabit the world, but that is not the idea *at* all. The idea is trans-theological. It is of an undeniable, inconceivable mystery, thought of as a power, that is the source and end and supporting ground of all life and being.

Scientists, Bill Moyer suggests, are beginning to talk quite openly about the Gaia principle.

Campbell responds:

> There you are, the whole planet as an organism. . . . You can't predict what a myth is going to be any more than you can predict what you're going to dream tonight. Myths and dreams come from the same place. They come from realizations of some kind that have then to find expression in symbolic form. And the only myth that is going to be worth thinking about in the immediate future is one that is talking about the planet. Not the city, not these people, but the planet and everybody on it. . . . And what it will have to deal with will be exactly what all the myths have dealt with—the maturation of the individual, from dependency through adulthood, through maturity, and then to the exit; and then how to relate to this society and how to relate this society to the world of nature and the cosmos. That's what the myths have all talked about, and what this one's got to talk about. But the society that it's got to talk about is the society of the planet. And until that gets going, you don't have anything.

Of profound interest is what Campbell has to say about consciousness. Moyer asked him what he meant by it, and he replied:

> It is part of the Cartesian mode to think of consciousness as being something peculiar to the head, that the head is the organ originating consciousness. It isn't. The head is an organ that

inflects consciousness in a certain direction, or to a certain set of purposes. But there is a consciousness here in the body. The whole living world is informed by consciousness. . . .

How do we transform our consciousness?

That's a matter of what you are disposed to think about. And that's what meditation is for. All of life is a meditation, most of it unintentional. A lot of people spend most of life in meditating on where their money is coming from and where it's going to go. If you have a family to bring up, you're concerned for the family. These are all very important concerns, but they have to do with physical conditions, mostly. But how are you going to communicate spiritual consciousness to the children if you don't have it yourself? How do you get that? What the myths are for is to bring us to a level of consciousness that is spiritual.

Another approach to mythic awareness is found in a book by an English psychiatrist, Alan McGlashan, *The Savage and Beautiful Country*, published years ago, which has just been issued in a new and revised edition by Daimon Verlag. The author reveals his temper in the first chapter, where he says:

Not so long ago the doctors were loftily amused to hear of an old countrywoman who used to treat dropsy with decoctions of foxglove from her garden—and who was finally proved to have been, in fact, dispensing a hitherto unknown drug called digitalis. And it is only yesterday that the mold in damp cheeses, kept in many a farmhouse scullery in our greatgrandfathers' time to make a rude plaster for infected wounds, was shown to be the source of penicillin. In the country they know things that are only half-discovered—and half-remembered. The precarious balance is unconsciously preserved, and with it the secret of the crude sanity of country life.

It is really amazing how blandly the scientific mind ignores these constant exposures of its own limitations. Like Theseus in the Forest of Arden, it "never can believe these antique fables, nor these fairy toys." Random proof, however startling, of the practical wisdom hidden in simple hearts seems only to serve as the origin of fresh distortions. With indecent haste the humble ladder is kicked away, and the thought to which it leads is separated, fatally, from the feeling that was its partner, and from the human contest in which they quietly met and married.

For the essence of this earthly wisdom lies precisely in its slow, centuried synthesis of thinking with feeling, of remembering with forgetting. It cannot be invented or new minted from any single mind, but forms itself mysteriously, with the imperceptible accretions of a stalactite, in the tenebrous caverns of the collective mind. And we do wrong if we dismiss this process as merely passive. Such silent, patient waiting for truth, as Simone Weil has said, is an activity more intense than any searching. . . .

Now the mature wisdom of a psychiatrist speaks:

It would be well if man could recapture this richer, older mode of response to the enigma of existence, wholly lost to us these last three hundred years, which recognized that the final secrets of life may often be reached less by what we learn than by what we half-remember. What is needed is an extension of contemporary consciousness to include what can be defined as the translucent quality in all things, the quality by which an object or an event is seen not only as a thing-in-itself, but also as a membrane through which can dimly be discerned the foetal stirring of a different order of experience.

It is indeed a "savage and beautiful country" of which writers like Joseph Campbell and Alan McGlashan invite us to become citizens, by awakening the imagination. As the latter puts it:

This once caught, even for a moment, transforms the sensible universe, investing all objects with a sharp intensity of being. The seeming-solid world grows permeable, beginning to transmit, not merely to reflect, the light. The quality of translucence is the key; a golden key that is the careless plaything of all children, and the conscious instrument of a few geniuses.

It is the deeper, more conscious life that may represent our next stage of evolution.

REVIEW
A GREAT INDUSTRIAL MISTAKE

THE Worldwatch Paper No. 84, "Rethinking the Role of the Automobile," by Michael Renner, is a dreadfully discouraging document. Toward the end of this pamphlet the author says:

> The auto culture is so deeply ingrained in western society that alternatives to it seem virtually unthinkable. But excessive reliance on cars can actually stifle rather than advance societies. The very success of mass motorization has created conditions that cannot be ameliorated simply by making cars more efficient and less polluting.
>
> The automobile exacts an enormous toll in human life. Despite safety improvements, more than 200,000 people died in traffic accidents around the world in 1985, with millions more suffering injuries of varying severity. In several developing countries, where fatalities per mile are often 20 times higher than in industrial ones, traffic accidents are now a leading cause of death.
>
> Large stretches of land have been given over to the automobile and its infrastructure. Parking a car at home, the office, and the shopping mall requires on average 4,000 square feet of asphalt. Over 60,000 square miles of land in the United States have been paved over: That works out to 10 per cent of all arable land. Worldwide, at least a third of an average city's land is devoted to roads, parking lots, and other elements of a car infrastructure. In American cities, close to half of all the urban space goes to accommodate the automobile; in Los Angeles, the figure reaches two-thirds.
>
> Cars confer on their owners virtually limitless freedom as long as their numbers remain limited. But instead of facilitating individual mobility, the proliferation of automobiles has bred a crisis of its own—congestion. This is as much the case in industrial nations, where cars are incredibly numerous, as in developing countries, where fewer vehicles crowd still fewer roads and compete for space with buses, rickshaws, bicycles, animal-drawn carts, and pedestrians. Those cities most reliant on automobiles face virtual paralysis, an "urban thrombosis," as Kirkpatrick Sale has put it "that slowly deprives the city of its lifeblood."

All this may be said without reference to fuel and pollution problems. After World War II, the automobile industry in the United States experienced a dramatic and sustained expansion, supported by extensive highway construction projects and fueled by cheap and abundant oil. Car production grew from less than ten million vehicles per year in the fifties to close to 30 million in 1973. Then, with the first oil crisis in 1974, production dropped by about five million vehicles, almost a fifth. There was another slump in 1980-82, yet global production reached a peak of 39.9 million vehicles in 1987. So the world's car fleet has grown from about 50 million vehicles in the post-war years to 386 million in 1986.

> Third World car ownership is concentrated mainly in the newly industrializing countries of Latin America and Southeast Asia, and in the major oil-exporting countries whose appetites for cars were whetted by soaring oil revenues in the seventies and low gasoline retail prices. Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico together account for almost half the cars in the developing world. During the first half of the seventies, their car markets grew at a phenomenal 16 per cent per year, and Brazil became the world's ninth largest producer.
>
> Yet the emergence of the debt crisis in 1982, coming on the heels of surging oil prices in the seventies, shattered the auto industry's expectations that the bulk of future growth would occur in Latin America. The debt crunch compelled these nations to marshal! their financial resources for debt servicing, precipitating major recessions. In 1986, debt-service payments absorbed one-quarter of Brazil's export earnings, and almost half of Mexico's and Argentina's. Soaring interest rates and falling real wages eroded purchasing power and considerably shrank the number of potential car buyers.

Both Brazil and Mexico began to manufacture and export cars as a means of escaping the morass of debt. The governments helped in various ways and in 1985 cars were Mexico's second largest revenue earner after oil. South Korea joined in building up a car industry, challenging Japan's dominance in the small-car market.

> Domestic car sales in South Korea tripled between 1980 and 1985, but there is still only one car for every 77 people. In the wake of widespread strikes and political unrest in the summer of 1987, the Korean car industry may gradually have to adjust its competitive strategy: Higher labor costs may curb its export drive but could assure the growth of a middle class at home who can afford to own a car.
>
> The overwhelming majority of the Third World's population can never aspire to such a goal.

> The promotion of car ownership thus entails sharp inequities; The resources of poor and wealthy alike are drained, though only a few enjoy the benefits. It is questionable whether "democratization" of car ownership—if it could be achieved—can be considered desirable. Mass motorization in the western industrial countries leading to depleted oil reserves, impaired human health, and a degraded environment, . . . If a repetition of these mistakes on a global basis is to be avoided, industrial and developing nations need to curb their reliance on automobiles and join together in a search for more sustainable alternatives.

Sooner or later the world will run out of oil, no one knows when. Various substitutes are being tried, most notably ethanol in Brazil. In 1986 sugarcane-derived ethanol provided about half the country's automotive fuel. Today, almost a third of Brazilian cars run on pure ethanol. However—

> A major drawback of all alcohol fuels is that some 30-40 per cent of the original energy content of their potential feedstocks (biomass, coal, and natural gas) is lost in the conversion process. Numerous studies suggest that the total amount of energy inputs to obtain ethanol—including energy required to fuel farmers' vehicles, to produce fertilizer and pesticides, and to ferment and purify the alcohol—may be close to or even surpass the eventual energy output.
>
> Using natural gas directly as an automotive fuel, either in compressed (CNG) or in liquefied form (LPG) appears more practical than tapping it as a foodstock for alcohol fuels because less of the original energy is lost in the conversion process. . . .
>
> In the more distant future, hydrogen—the most common element in the universe—may become a widely used fuel, either in liquid or compressed gaseous form. . . . Electric vehicles promise higher energy efficiency and quieter operation than conventional internal combustion engines. Barring major breakthroughs in battery technology and cost, however, electric vehicles will likely be confined to market niches where performance and range criteria are less important than in the overall passenger car market. Moreover, such vehicles can only be a viable alternative if the fuels used in electricity generation are renewable. Fuel cells could some day hold the key to making electric vehicles more acceptable. A fuel cell converts the chemical energy in hydrogen, methanol, and natural gas directly into electrical energy without mechanical losses. . . .
>
> The potential of alternative fuels to substitute for gasoline varies considerably from country to country and fuel to fuel. In the short run, no single alternative is likely to become a panacea with global applicability. Those that emerge are likely to supplement gasoline, rather than replace it. In the longer run, hydrogen could become a universally used fuel. But an enormous research boost is needed now to make its generation less costly and to achieve breakthroughs in hydrogen-vehicle technology.

Car manufacturers in the United States respond only to conditions of urgent need. As Michael Renner says:

> After the first oil crisis, car companies around the world made dramatic strides to boost fuel efficiency. Until the early eighties, efficiency improved year after year. This was particularly true in the United States, where the industry was subject to the triple pressure of rising fuel costs, intense Japanese competition, and mandatory U.S. government standards (effective in 1978). New passenger cars in the United States today are almost twice as efficient as the gas-guzzling behemoths of the early seventies; as a result, the average fleet fuel economy rose from 13 miles per gallon (MPG) in 1973 to 18 MPG in 1986. . . .
>
> Despite these gains, American-made cars continue to trail those produced elsewhere. New U.S. cars travel an average of 27 miles per gallon; their European and Japanese competitors achieve roughly 30 MPG. The U.S. average fleet efficiency of 18 MPG also compares poorly with the mid-twenties range of other industrial countries. Due to lower efficiency and more driving, the average North American car still burns up more than twice as much gasoline each year as its counterpart in Japan or Western Europe. . . .
>
> The most efficient cars currently available are about twice as efficient as the average new oar on the road. At the top of the list is a Japanese model, the Suzuki Sprint, which gets 57 MPG. More advanced prototypes, such as the Peugeot ECO 2000, Volkswagen E80, and Toyota AXV, achieve anywhere from 70 to 100 MPG; Sweden's Volvo claims its LCP 2000, which contains more lightweight materials than any other car, will achieve a fuel efficiency in excess of 100 MPG without sacrificing performance, size, safety, or emissions criteria. Renault's VESTA scored a stunning 124 MPG in prototype testing.

These are exciting figures, but are no solution to the fundamental problems created by the automobile.

COMMENTARY
WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM

ONE thing that we learn from the contents of this issue is that the "little" countries have much to teach us. Consider for example what Rodrigo Carazo, former president of Costa Rica, has to say. "We believe that if you really want peace, you have to prepare for peace." This simple verity is obvious enough, but it is never asserted by spokesmen of the major powers. No one habitually given to telling the truth in this unambiguous way ever reaches a position where his voice may be heard in one of the powerful countries. But in smaller countries, without hope of international dominance, such men are occasionally recognized and elevated to authority. Costa Rica has managed to do without capital punishment for a century, and without an army for nearly forty years. Smallness may not be a certain path to excellence, but giantism seems an absolute barrier to any such attainment. There is a great lesson in this. If we want to be a force for peace, we need to be small.

But how can the United States, long regarded as the most powerful nation in the world, become small?

The answer is simple enough. If people refuse to respond to the war-making intentions of the Nation-State, that power will simply disappear. Already the beginning of a change in loyalties is evident. The voices of the decentralists are now more and more heard. The appeal of the all-powerful state has a formal reality, but with less and less emotional substance behind it. Young men volunteer for the armed services, but in most cases only because they need jobs, not because they want to be soldiers or sailors. Happily, Costa Rica has no problems of this sort. And for as yet a small minority, yet a growing one, a supervening loyalty to the earth and its regions, which are authentic hosts to our lives, is being born.

What shall we say about the Worldwatch Papers, one of which is on the automobile, discussed in this week's Review? We could say that these Papers are one way in which thc aware members of the nation form a community which assumes responsibility for the welfare of the whole and undertakes responsibility for publishing the results of research. They inform the public, for example, that—

> Cars confer on their owners virtually limitless freedom as long as their numbers remain limited. But instead of facilitating individual mobility, the proliferation of automobiles has bred a crisis of its own—congestion. This is as much the case in industrial nations, where cars are incredibly numerous, as in developing countries, where fewer vehicles crowd still fewer roads and compete for space with buses, rickshaws, bicycles, animal-drawn carts, and pedestrians. Those cities most reliant on automobiles face virtual paralysis, in an "urban thrombosis," as Kirkpatrick Sale put it, "that slowly deprives the city of its lifeblood."

Here, again, is a great lesson. We who live in the large cities of the United States and require an automobile simply to carry on the duties of our lives are virtually helpless in the face of the growing congestion on the road. Yet some tasks, we find, can be done quite well at home, making trips less necessary. But the elimination of congestion will be a long-term process resulting from farreaching revision of our lives. Simplification here will be largely the result of decentralization and the rebirth of community life, after the example of the bioregionalists. We need to adopt, however slowly, another way of thinking about our way of life on earth.

Meanwhile, we may be especially grateful to the people at the Worldwatch Institute, who are enabling us to understand how we got into all this mess, and how, over the years, we may be able to get out of it. This may be instructive in the kinds of leadership we need, and in the necessity of listening to the counsels of those who undertake to help us along. It is time to stop wasting our leisure on the publications issued for popular

entertainment and to read the Worldwatch Papers and the Magazine.

There is plenty of intelligence in the world, as this week's Review makes plain. It is equally plain that the country as a whole has not been using this intelligence, but living according to our casual desires without counting how much their satisfaction will cost. The lesson from this is that we must begin to live abstemiously simply as a matter of principle, to form the habits which pleasure-seeking and personal enjoyment have thrust aside.

A fresh reading of both Emerson and Thoreau would be of help in making a new beginning. Fortunately, they are both in print and easily available.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

A PEACE-MAKING NATION

THE University for Peace in Costa Rica was chartered in 1980 by the United Nations, as proposed by Dr. Rodrigo Carazo, President of Costa Rica from 1978 to 1982, to the UN General Assembly. He maintained that "if you want peace, prepare for peace." He is now President of the Council of the University for Peace. Last December (1987) a writer and producer for the Cousteau Society, Mose Richards, interviewed Dr. Carazo for the Cousteau paper, the *Calypso Log*. Asked to define peace, Carazo replied:

> The basic concept of the balance of terror is that if you want peace, you have to prepare for war. At the University for Peace, we have a totally different approach. We believe that if you really want peace, you have to prepare for peace.
>
> The culture of today's world has been based on competition—people fighting each other in order to conquer pieces of land, or to increase the power of different regions or countries or groups or individuals I think that when people fight and kill each other, they are not aware that they are fighting for somebody else's interests. The only way to be free is by protecting your own life and the lives of your fellow humans. So we have to change, no matter how long it takes. We have to transform this culture of violence into a culture of peace, a culture of human beings concerned about the survival of humanity.

Asked why Costa Rica has become a symbol of peace to the world, Rodrigo Carazo said:

> When I was in office, I thought about this very same question. I feel that Costa Rican culture today is the result of centuries of educational development that contributes to peace. When we abolished the death penalty in 1882, we were working for a nonviolent world. The same was true when Costa Rica abolished the army. We thought this had to be done, not as an example, but as a way of showing that if people are educated, they can live without an army, without weapons; and that by respecting human life, they can contribute to happiness, to a positive future. That's why we presented a proposal to the General Assembly of the United Nations to create a University for Peace in Costa Rica.

If you look at a map of Central America, you find that Costa Rica is a small country between Nicaragua and Panama. Its total area is about 23,000 square miles. It is mostly a tableland of from between 3,000 to ,6000 feet above the sea. It was discovered and probably named by Christopher Columbus on his fourth and last voyage to America. The name of the country, Costa Rica, means "Rich Shore," perhaps because of the gold which Columbus found there. The independence of the country dates from 1821. A boundary dispute with Panama was settled in 1941. According to the *Britannica:*

> The functioning of the government in Costa Rica follows closely the constitutional provisions set down, and the popular suffrage, which in some countries on the Caribbean region is more an ideal than a reality, functions smoothly and effectively in Costa Rica. There is a high standard of public trust; the courts are independent of the executive; the highest offices are, in practice, confined closely to a group of the capable aristocracy and there is a very high feeling of public duty in the men holding such offices.
>
> The concentration of population in the highlands favors a centralized and efficient school system, with the result that Costa Rica ranks among the leading nations of the world in public education. Illiteracy is the lowest in Hispanic America (less than 23%).

Carazo's interviewer asked if he thought that education can play a role in reversing the tide of violence, gaining this reply:

> Absolutely. Education is the only tool; and now with the sophistication of the mass media and communication technology at the service of humanity, we can educate people in a few years—if we really want to prepare for peace. . . .
>
> I would say that people have been trained, not educated. Universities today train people; they do not educate people. They do not give an individual the possibility of behaving as a full human being. They train you in how to do things as an expert, not as a human being. So we have to include education within today's procedures in order to develop integrated human beings.

Asked about the objectives of the University for Peace, he said:

> Our university is not going to transform the world. The world should be transformed and has to be transformed through the efforts of millions of people. The only thing we have to tell them is that they must consider their task as a combination of two efforts—education and training—in order for them to work on their own in their respective communities. We have to teach everyone to behave as part of this global family and to help create the kind of future that we want. The world has become a very small village, in which we relate to everybody and we work together with everybody. For example, we have to take care of the environment because the problems affecting a single country affect the whole planet.

The interviewer remarked that Costa Rica had managed quite well without an army for thirty-nine years, but what about other countries? Dr. Carazo answered:

> We need other countries to prove what we have been doing. There are many ways to reach the same goals. . . . I am not going to tell any country to do the same things that Costa Rica has been doing for centuries. I think that we have to tell them that intelligence and positive, creative initiative are better ways of solving conflict than confrontation.

What then about escalating population?

> If you pay attention to the population problem, you will learn that it is worse in those countries where educational systems are not as good as everyone would like them to be. The problem is that population grows as a result of a system that offers poor or no education: they have no information about the effects of population growth. We think that all educational processes should contribute to solving the basic problems of humanity—the environment and population. The arms race is another problem, which is the result of the culture of violence in which we live. We also have other problems that are closely related to peace and war, respect for human rights is one of them, as is knowing the proper role of international organizations, governmental organizations and private foundations. All kinds of goodwill groups could contribute to the betterment of society. These are the resources that we have to use as teachers of peace. The population problems that are affecting large areas of the world are the result of a lack of education and health services. It is not a matter of telling people not to have more children, but of educating them so that they can make their own decisions in a responsible way.

What can be done to preserve the environment in over-populated countries?

> When we think of the environment, we have to think about the social and economic development of the world. If a country destroys its environment in order to pay off foreign debt, who is killing whom? The environment in a given area is a part of the environment of the planet. If a money-lending institution tries to recover a debt by making a loan to that country to destroy its environment in order to repay its debt, then two countries are committing suicide.

Recently an agreement was signed by Costa Rica and Nicaragua to create a Peace Park uniting these two countries. Asked about this plan, which came from the University for Peace, Rodrigo Carazo said:

> It is very simple. Borders divide countries and nature unites them. If you have a national park uniting two countries, then you are telling the present and future generations not only that they have to protect that part of the environment within the national park, but also that when you damage the environment in a given country, you are also affecting the environment of the entire planet. So there are no borders in a national park.

The interviewer asked about the creation of Cocos Island in the Pacific as a national park. Dr. Carazo said:

> I thought that this island should be a good example of how a poor country could preserve a piece of land, not only for the present generation, but the future. . . . If it belongs politically to Costa Rica, we think that it also belongs to the human race. And we wanted to give it to the human race.

What did he mean by saying that peace is a matter of disarming minds?

> A peaceful human being is one who has matured on the concepts of reason, intelligence and a peaceful mind. So the first thing is not to abolish arms, but to abolish the possibility for human beings to be violent.

FRONTIERS

Making "Haters of War`'

A PAPER by Barry Childers and Elizabeth Ferris, "The Individual and the Change Process," first published in *Peace and Change* in 1984, discusses the difficulties in arousing the peoples of the world, particularly the American people, to take action against the threat of war, pollution, and world hunger. They begin by saying:

> One of the most puzzling and surely one of the most important phenomena of our time is the relative passivity and inaction of most of the people of the world in the face of a variety of impending disasters. Over half the people in the world are malnourished and the prospects of devastating famines are increasing. The planet is being polluted with various wastes and chemicals at an alarming rate. And the likelihood of a worldwide holocaust is growing as arms proliferation continues unabated.
>
> That people have many ways of avoiding dealing with serious problems around them is, of course, nothing new. But what is new and what makes this pervasive apathy hard to understand is that for the first time in history the problems clearly threaten *everyone*, and quite likely the very existence of life itself on earth. In the past, the simplest and perhaps the most common avoidance technique has been to convince oneself that "it won't happen to *me."* With regard to the threats of nuclear war, hunger, and pollution, however, given the evidence widely available, this is no longer an easily maintainable position.

One question is forced to the front by these circumstances: How do people learn? They learn, it must be admitted, mostly from pain. There are other ways of learning, but they require an exceptional exercise of the imagination, and we can hardly count on this development to take place rapidly however urgent the need for learning to take place. The one thing that has happened as a result of the dark clouds hanging over the future is an increase in the suicide rate, especially among the young.

The writers of the paper have this to say:

> There is a way out, fortunately. We can, while recognizing our dilemma and being respectful of our limitations, develop the security necessary to enable us to move in the direction of more openness to the things that threaten us, in order to understand them better and respond constructively. That there are solutions to the problems is obvious. There is enough food available to feed everyone. We can stop polluting the planet. Arms can be reduced and nonmilitary solutions to international conflicts developed. What is necessary is that millions of people become concerned enough to focus a goodly portion of their time and energy on social and political action.

But what these writers do not say is that the abolition of war and the other evils named can only be accomplished by gaining the *maturity* which will make people simply incapable of the evils which bring about war and other disasters. In last week's MANAS we quoted at length from Emerson and Thoreau—enough to show that such human beings could not possibly bring about the conditions that we now fear so much. The mystery, then, which lies before us is how to develop such human beings. Emerson set the problem well in an essay called "War," taken from a lecture he delivered in Boston in 1838:

> We surround ourselves always, according to our freedom and ability, with true images of ourselves in things, whether it be ships or books or cannon or churches. The standing army, the arsenal, the camp and the gibbet do not appertain to man. They only serve as an index to show where man is now; what a bad, ungoverned temper he has; what an ugly neighbor he is; how his affections halt; how low his hope lies. He who loves the bristle of bayonets only sees in their glitter what beforehand he feels in his heart. It is avarice and hatred; it is that quivering lip, that cold, hating eye, which built magazines and powder houses.
>
> It follows of course that the least change in the man will change his circumstances; the least enlargement of his ideas, the least mitigation of his feelings in respect to other men; if, for example, he could be inspired with a tender kindness to the souls of men, and should come to feel that every man was another self with whom he might come to join, as left hand works with right. Every degree of the ascendancy of this feeling would cause the most striking changes of external things: the tents would be struck; the men-of-war would rot ashore; the arms rust, the cannon would become streetposts; the pikes,

a fisher's harpoon; the marching regiment would be a caravan of emigrants, peaceful pioneers at fountains of the Wabash and the Missouri. And so it must and will be: bayonet and sword must first retreat a little from their ostentatious prominence; then quite hide themselves, as the sheriff's halter does now, inviting the attention only of relations and friends; and then, lastly, will be transferred to the museums of the curious, as poisoning and torturing tools are at this day. . . .

This is not to be carried by public opinion, but by private opinion, by private conviction, by private, dear, and earnest love. For the only hope of this cause is in the increased insight, and it is to be accomplished by the spontaneous teaching of the cultivated soul, in its secret experience and meditation, that it is now time that it should pass out of the state of the beast into the state of man. . . .

The cause of peace is not the cause of cowardice. If peace is sought to be defended or preserved for the safety of the luxurious and the timid, it is a sham, and the peace will be base. War is better, and the peace will be broken. If peace is to be maintained, it must be by brave men, who have come up to the same height as the hero, namely, the will to carry their life in their hand, and stake it at any instant for their principle. . . .

And Thoreau wrote:

Law never made men a whit more just; and, by means of their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily made the agents of injustice. A common and natural result of an undue respect for law is that you may see a file of soldiers, colonel, captain, corporal, privates, powder-monkeys, and all, marching in admirable order over hill and dale to the wars, against their wills, aye, against their common sense and consciences, which makes it very steep marching indeed, and produces a palpitation of the heart. They have no doubt that it is a damnable business in which they are concerned; they are all peacably inclined. Now what are they? Men at all? or small movable forts and magazines, at the service of some unscrupulous man in power. . . .

While walking in Canada, Thoreau came to the Plains of Abraham where a regiment of Highlanders was being reviewed. He remarked that they had a graceful gait, "like a herd of their own red deer," adding however,

But they made a sad impression on the whole, for it was obvious that all true manhood was in the process of being drilled out of them. I have no doubt that soldiers well drilled are, as a class, peculiarly destitute of originality and independence. The officers appeared like men dressed above their condition. It is impossible to give the soldier a good education, without making him a deserter. His natural foe is the government that drills him.

People who absorb such ideas have a good chance to become haters of war.