VOLUME XV, NO. 11
MARCH 14, 1962

WORKING FOR PEACE

[This article was first published by *Mademoiselle* for December, 1961 (International Copyright by Street & Smith Publications), as a companion piece to the interview with Robert Pickus in the same issue (reprinted in MANAS for Feb. 7). Bearing the full title, "Working for Peace: What Can I Do?", this useful summary of areas of work for peace as defined by existing peace organizations was prepared by the College and Career Department of *Mademoiselle* and is reprinted here by permission. Both articles have been reproduced in a handy booklet now available at 25 cents a copy from the Alumnae Advisory Center, 541 Madison Ave., New York 22, N.Y.]

WHAT burns into my soul most deeply," Norman Cousins wrote in a letter to Dr. Albert Schweitzer recently, "is that the war, if it comes, will not be just a war between nations. It will be a war by man against nature itself.

"Inevitably, each of us asks: What can I, the individual, do? The average person feels cut off, remote, helpless. He ties his hopes to what others of higher station may do. But the men at the heads of governments are the prisoners of absolute national sovereignty. They are almost like fixed attachments to the giant weapons rather than independent masters enjoying free will."

"What can *I* do?" Is it a question, or an utterance of despair? The desire to live in peace is fundamental, but it must find coherent voices and functions. Alone, we feel helpless; but when we find others with whom we can think and speak and work, something *can* be done. "What can I *do?"* When it becomes a question, it has answers. First, the issues of peace must be studied. A mindless, emotional approach ("Are you for peace or aren't you? Then get out in the streets.") is ultimately harmful to the peace effort.

Next, a ground to stand on must be discovered: a group of people, believing and caring as you do. Below, we describe the principal non-Government peace groups, most of them national. These are chiefly organizations whose eventual goal is disarmament. Many of them are now cooperating in one joint, nationwide effort, called Turn Toward Peace. Their approaches vary widely, but they have a common aim. If one of these groups interests you, we suggest you get in touch with it directly.

THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

The American Friends Service Committee, an organization run by members of the Society of Friends, but not limited to Quakers, is justly called the backbone of the peace movement in this country. It was formed in 1917 and since then has trained many of the outstanding U.S. peace leaders. A.F.S.C. sponsors some "public witness" projects (that is, vigils or peace walks in which individuals participate as a matter of personal conscience).

However, most of its program consists of continuing work in peace education and of numerous service projects, carried out mainly by non-Quakers. Because of the obvious social value of this work, and the general respect the Quakers command, the A.F.S.C. has solid public backing. As one staff member explains: "People find it hard to dislike us, even though we're raising hell on peace." The twelve A.F.S.C. offices employ three hundred staff members and hundreds of volunteers. Volunteers in peace education may help run a film or literature program, staff a speakers' bureau, plan a discussion institute (on a subject like, "Should Red China be admitted to the UN?"), or a seminar on the UN for high-school students. Many young adults work part time on weekend projects (at mental hospitals, for example) or full time at work camps in trouble spots (e.g., Harlem) in this country and abroad—projects which, because they are aimed at finding nonviolent solutions to problems, the Friends believe contribute substantially to the cause of world peace. For information, write A.F.S.C. national headquarters, 160 North Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia 2, Pennsylvania. Another Quaker group pushing for

d1sarmament is the Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street N.E., Washington 2, D.C. It publishes an excellent *Washington Newsletter.*

ACTS FOR PEACE

Acts for Peace is a collection of "peace centers" (three of them are actual houses) in Northern California. They are devoted to continuous work for peace, as opposed to spurts of activity during crises. Through the centers—some of them active, some just getting started—several thousand Californians whose convictions cover a wide ideological range (from the liberal's concern for finding the next step to the radical's demand for immediate action to abolish war) are working in projects appropriate to their interests. Projects include both full-scale programs aimed at labor and church groups and simpler efforts: placing literature in a dentist's office or running a P.T.A. discussion about what to say when a child asks, "What is war?" Centers encourage an interested applicant to make a "work commitment," indicating what he can do and how much time he can spend at it. The commitment replaces actual membership. "Too many people," says Robert Pickus, the driving force behind Acts for Peace, "are organizational consumers, absorbing literature and returning dues." A commitment, for one example, might involve preparing a display of publications giving information on crisis issues, and then promoting the display with libraries, civic groups. The main Acts for Peace office (1730 Grove Street, Berkeley 9, California) trains "peace internee"—people interested in peace work as a career—who, after a year of study, go out to staff centers. Acts for Peace originated as an experiment which, if successful, would spread to other parts of the country. In October, a new center opened in Greenwich Village.

STUDENT PEACE UNION

The Student Peace Union was created two years ago at the University of Chicago to provide a peace organization strictly for students. Previously, students (always a major force in peace work) were active solely through student chapters of adult groups—the Collegiate Council for the UN, or Student SANE, for example. They often felt hampered by differences in outlook and the inevitable organizational ties. Not surprisingly, the S.P.U. spread quickly in the Middle West and East, now has about forty active chapters. In them, both pacifist and nonpacifist students meet to share a commonly felt concern: that new alternatives to war must be found, and that, today, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States is presenting them. To encourage fresh thought on peace, S.P.U. groups sponsor speakers and undertake studies on aspects of disarmament. They also circulate petitions and engage in peace walks, and pacifist members participate in demonstrations during civil defense drills. A list of S.P.U. chapters may be obtained from the national office, 6029 University Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois, which also issues a monthly *Bulletin.*

COMMITTEE FOR NONVIOLENT ACTION

Of all the peace groups, the pacifist C.N.V.A. holds perhaps the greatest appeal for the militant young person inclined to dramatic peace work. C.N.V.A.'s action projects—such as the recent San Francisco-to-Moscow peace walk and the durable current protest at New London, Connecticut, against the Polaris submarine as a symbol of the arms race—demand a total commitment reflected in the fixed expressions of the young pacifists who demonstrate in them. C.N.V.A. was formed a few years ago to run nonviolent peace projects that might involve arrest and physical duress. Large organizations, even those run by pacifists, shy away from such action because they honestly doubt its value or feel it enables potential members to write off as "crackpot" a group they might otherwise join. C.N.V.A., however, believes that "people will find it harder to ignore our ideas when they see we are willing to go to jail for them." It reports its mailing list has doubled in the past year.

Couples experienced in peace work head both of C.N.V.A's offfices, the one in New London and one in New York City (158 Grand Street, New York 13), from which the peace walk was directed. C.N.V.A. has no members as such, but volunteers are welcome at both centers; they may do office

work, pass out leaflets to crowds at demonstrations, conduct meetings, vigils, or, with proper training engage in the action projects.

National Committee For A Sane Nuclear Policy

Among the newest of the peace groups, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy grew overnight into one of the best known, when thousands responded in 1957 to its newspaper ads protesting the danger of fall-out and calling for an end to nuclear tests. This year, SANE renewed the protest when tests were resumed after a two-year moratorium. The slogan at one autumn rally read, "No tests, East or West." Many saw in it a declaration of SANE's intention to keep Soviet apologists out of its ranks. Earlier, SANE had become involved in serious internal conflict following an attack by Senator Thomas Dodd of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, who declared SANE had allowed Communists to infiltrate. The crisis was resolved, but only after some charter revisions excluding Communists and the resignation of some leading non-Communist supporters. Recently, SANE has adopted policies regarded by most observers as evidence of an increasingly sophisticated outlook. Committees of experts, made up of scientists and SANE supporters like Erich Fromm, David Riesman, Norman Cousins, prepare papers analyzing the ramifications of disarmament. SANE's position is not pacifist, but is sometimes described as "nuclear pacifist." SANE hopes to mobilize wide public support for its policies and operates most characteristically through mass rallies focused on a crisis (e.g., Berlin), or through full-page newspaper ads explaining a stand. Members may support SANE through more than one hundred local groups by raising funds, organizing rallies, lobbying for legislation like the bill creating the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as by carrying out education programs. A list of groups can be obtained from SANE National Headquarters, 17 East 45 Street, New York 17.

Fellowship Of Reconciliation

The Fellowship of Reconciliation is a nondenominational religious organization with many ministers and Quakers in its following. Its members (now twelve thousand) are required to sign a pacifist pledge indicating they will neither take part in war nor "sanction military preparations." Perhaps 10 per cent of them publicly demonstrate these convictions by holding vigils—at a missile-launching base, for example. The recent FOR-supported vigil outside the Government's biological warfare research center at Fort Detrick, Maryland, was held ten hours a day for over a year. Since the advent of nuclear weapons, the forty-six-year-old FOR has accepted nonpacifist support and has recruited volunteers to work on peace education, letter-writing campaigns, and other projects. As Reverend Glenn Smiley, FOR secretary for field work, explains: "There was a time when we laid more stress on pacifism, on the idea that comes a war, I will not go. Now, no one goes to war. It comes to you. We are not trying to develop conscientious objectors so much as we are trying to curb war preparation and discourage the arms build-up."

FOR has its headquarters in an old mansion filled with staff and volunteer workers, in Nyack, New York. A volunteer might find work here, or in a local group (write POR, Box 271, Nyack, New York, for a list). The national office publishes a bimonthly magazine and other literature and, as an established organization, helps spawn other social-action groups—like CORE, one of its lustiest offspring.

United World Federalists

U.W.F. tries, in its own words, to be "hardheaded" about peace. It believes that nations are bound to maintain defense systems so long as the possibility of war exists. It is not pacifist, but it feels that under its plan for world government arms can be sharply reduced. U.W.F. has fifteen thousand members who promote this model plan through newspapers, congressmen, civic groups, and who know by heart its main provisions: A strengthened world assembly along the lines of the UN, world taxes, and a permanent, individually recruited world army to "see that peace is enforced." U.W.F. is a hardy organization, but the position it held a few years ago as the major secular peace group has been

usurped by SANE. For information about local chapters, write U.W.F., 800 Thirteenth Street N.W., Washington 5, D.C.

WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE

The War Resisters League is a radical pacifist organization run in this country by a handful of men from a single office in New York. It has considerable influence in the peace movement for the effectively run protests it aids or initiates. Currently, it is working through an *ad hoc* committee composed of officers of several peace groups on a protest against civil defense. In this effort, hundreds of persons up and down the East Coast (mainly in New York) demonstrated in the past year during drills, in defiance of the take-shelter order. They sought to challenge the assumption underlying civil defense: that humanity can, with *any* system of defenses, survive a nuclear war. To assume this, says the League, is absurd and foolhardy. In another vein, the organization has made a case of the particular vulnerability of big cities and other likely target areas. "Maybe in Nebraska a fall-out shelter would be of some good—but in New York?" a spokesman questions incredulously. Civil defense authorities do not claim that shelters protect anyone directly under a blast, but the League feels the current civil defense program misleads people into feeling safe when they are not.

The League prepares participants in the civil defense protest to face possible arrest for civil disobedience (one hundred sixty persons were arrested this past year). The threat has not deterred increasing numbers of students and young professionals from turning out, however. "Under the surface, much of Madison Avenue is as radical on the peace issue as are lifelong pacifists," says Dave McReynolds, the League's field secretary. One of the older peace organizations, the League neither holds meetings nor forms local groups, but volunteers might find office work at its headquarters, 5 Beekman Street, New York 38.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

Jane Addams founded the W.I.L.P.F. during World War I, in the hope, one imagines, that it would not have to live to a grandmotherly old age. Today it is still working—through a lobbying office in Washington, several local groups, and the vigorous efforts of its top officers in Philadelphia and New York—for a solidly liberal program stressing immediate steps toward disarmament. (It also lobbies for economic aid to underdeveloped countries, supports the UN, works for civil liberties.) Branches in college towns (Ithaca, Detroit, and Berkeley are three) might appeal to newcomers to the peace movement. For information, write national headquarters, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

Ideally, if the UN were a strong, perfectly functioning, and thoroughly accepted body, the giant A.A.U.N. would be no more necessary than, say, an American Association for the U.S. Senate. Since the UN today has precarious authority there is need for a national group that will continuously inform the public about UN functions. The A.A.U.N. bends all the resources of a large, established organization to this task. Its members—liberally estimated at fifty thousand in two hundred fifty chapters around the country—work to disseminate information in their communities. They train and book speakers; hold group discussions on topics such as how much financial support the U.S. should give the UN; form school committees that suggest ways for teachers to interest children in the UN ("We try to get them to do plays in costume, things children understand"); and promote UN Week each year with everything from window displays to, on one occasion, a commission for a Peace Cantata.

The A.A.U.N. staff in New York keeps an eye open for any crisis at the UN that calls for additional public support; in September, 1960, for example, when the Soviet Union tried to force Hammarskjold to resign, the A.A.U.N. called a conference of leaders in various fields who voted to issue a resolution supporting the late Secretary-General. For

information about where to find a chapter, write A.A.U.N., 345 East 46 Street, New York 17.

WORKING FOR PEACE: RESEARCH

Just as the term "peace movement" is registering itself in political circles, the concept of "peace research" is making its impact on the scientific world. The concept is imprecise (in some areas, its concerns seem to overlap with those of international relations), but its essential aim is to concentrate study in all related fields on the problems inherent in ruling out war as a means of final arbitration. The questions of disarmament and inspection will take highly technical answers; research in the physical sciences is just as necessary to the elimination of weapons as it is to their production. But, interestingly, it is the humanistic sciences that are more and more being looked to as the source of fundamental solutions to war. There is growing conviction that the conduct of world powers can't be studied without reference to the conduct of man himself. Why do men fight, and under what conditions will they not fight? How do wars start, and what makes small wars turn into big ones? What impact do differing national value systems and differing national behavior patterns have on the probability of violent conflict? What are the international effects of unilateral action? What is the role of public opinion in the making of foreign policy—does it constitute a force, or is it no factor at all? And what are the implications of really achieving permanent peace? The absence of war from the world would certainly entail major readjustments. There is already widespread anxiety that disarmament would lead to economic depression. Most economists don't think it's necessarily so, but studies must be made of the problem, especially as it relates to the American economy. And would the absence of war cause internal dissensions—since outside opposition has always been considered a necessary source of internal unity? Research could determine whether national morale, kept high by the threat of war, could be maintained by other sources of cohesion.

The concept of a world without war raises questions about even the arts: would peace bring on boredom and dullness—or would the absence of anxiety mean a new surge of creativity?

The answers to these questions, and hundreds of others like them, are being worked on by scholars in almost every field: sociology, anthropology, philosophy, economics, political science, psychology, history, mathematics, military strategy.

It's only been with the growing threat of nuclear annihilation that so many academic disciplines have been involved in world affairs. In this country, there's long been scholarly concern—chiefly among political scientists, economists, historians—for international relations as a topic of study, and there's been a heavy outlay of grant money to support it. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Twentieth Century Fund—all have been long-time contributors.

But the study of peace per se has only recently been deemed an area worth concerted inquiry. For one thing, there existed before no comprehensive framework for research—what was known, what wasn't known, what should be found out. And with no clear-cut reference for assessing the worth of proposed study, it was hard for interested scholars to get financing.

In a climate of increasing anxiety about the world situation, however, opinion is changing—and peace research has been given both scope and shape by the Institute for International Order, a New York foundation, which has sponsored a broad analysis of research needs and published the findings in five volumes. Four hundred and ninety-five separate projects are outlined in these publications, which include summaries of existing research.

Other programs are developing, new research centers are being set up, and foundation money has started flowing—if not exactly pouring—in their direction. One impetus for this activity comes from the new U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Agency is undertaking some of its own research, but it will also be farming out work and funds and facilities to private and public centers for specialized study.

Many new peace centers now exist at universities, traditional fosterers of research (Interest in international relations has for years been reflected by Princeton's Center of International Studies, Harvard's Center for International Affairs, M.I.T.'s Center for International Studies, and Columbia's Institute of War and Peace Studies.)

At the university centers, graduate students in a wide variety of fields either work as part-time research assistants or channel their own thesis interests toward peace questions that need answers.

One of the first new, specifically peace-oriented groups is the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan. It's an association of scholars who develop projects and then find outside money for the projects' support. It maintains no permanent research staff, but employs qualified people, usually found among the graduate students, for assistance on specific jobs.

At Stanford University in California, there's a program called Studies in International Conflict and Integration, which got started in 1960 with a five-year Ford Foundation grant. The research staff of thirty-five consists mostly of degree candidates who work part time. To qualify, they must be able to do social-science research of a sophisticated nature, be able to read at least one foreign language. A knowledge of mathematics and statistics helps.

St. Louis' Washington University began a program in 1959, known as the Committee on Research in International Conflict and Peace, whose aim is instruction as well as inquiry. It plans to establish a course for college seniors. Colorado State University has a Research Foundation, and at Duke University there's a World Rule of Law Center. (Some of these university centers publish journals; among the best are Duke's *Current Thought on Peace and War* and Michigan's *Journal of Conflict Resolution.)*

For the college senior who's thinking of going on to graduate work—or the recent graduate who contemplates a return to the academic life—there's almost bound to be some avenue open to her own research for peace. Perhaps the best and easiest way to find that avenue is to get in touch with the Peace Research Institute, a clearinghouse of information and direction for scholars.

Started just last spring, P.R.I. is a private nonprofit corporation which, in the promotion and sponsorship of peace research, keeps tabs on who's doing what, and where, and for whom. Acting as a kind of switching station, it connects scholars to universities or other centers, grant-seekers to donors. And, since many academic specialists are not attached to specific centers, but are at work under individual grants, it is also in a position to know who might be looking for private assistance. The Peace Research Institute is at 1329 Eighteenth Street N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

REVIEW
"LONELINESS AS PROFOUND EXPERIENCE"

MANY readers found *The Self: Explorations in Personal Growth,* a book edited by Clarke E. Moustakas, a useful introduction to the idea of a more philosophical approach to psychology. Published in 1956 by Harper Brothers, *The Self* assembled papers by such psychologists and sociologists as Gordon Allport, Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, A. H. Maslow and Carl Rogers—all of whom are frequently referred to in these pages. Prof. Moustakas supplied in his introduction and conclusion to this volume a thread of synthesis, showing the common ground uniting the various contributors. A new Moustakas volume, titled *Loneliness* (Prentice-Hall, 1961), is in many respects a companion volume. Dr. Moustakas begins his preface to *Loneliness* with this paragraph:

> The basic message in this book is that loneliness is a condition of human life, an experience of being human which enables the individual to sustain, extend, and deepen his humanity. Man is ultimately and forever lonely whether his loneliness is the exquisite pain of the individual living in isolation or illness, the sense of absence caused by a loved one's death, or the piercing joy experienced in triumphant creation. I believe it is necessary for every person to recognize his loneliness to become intensely aware that, ultimately, in every fibre of his being, man is alone—terribly, utterly alone. Efforts to overcome or escape the existential experience of loneliness can result only in self-alienation. When man is removed from a fundamental truth of life, when he successfully evades and denies the terrible loneliness of individual existence, he shuts himself off from one significant avenue of his own self-growth.

Prof. Moustakas is clearly building an experiential link between some of the nearly-lost contemplative arts of the world of ancient philosophy and many still-to-be-explored vistas which are the growing concern of today's psychologists. The beginning, for Moustakas, was his own experience with loneliness, during which he began to feel that even among young children the "lonely" times are so often the most instructive times:

> I had many opportunities to observe children experiencing isolation and loneliness. It was at this time that I felt a strong urge to look into the heart of the lonely experience. Starting with these experiences before and during the hospitalization I began to discover the meaning of loneliness. I began to see that loneliness is neither good or bad, but a point of intense and timeless awareness of the Self, a beginning which initiates totally new sensitivities and awarenesses, and which results in bringing a person deeply in touch with his own existence and in touch with others in a fundamental sense. I began to see that in the deepest experiences the human being can know—the birth of a baby, the prolonged illness or death of a loved relative, the loss of a job, the creation of a poem, a painting a symphony, the grief of a fire, a flood, an accident—each in its own way touches upon the roots of loneliness. In each of these experiences, in the end, we must go alone.
>
> In such experiences, inevitably one is cut off from human companionship. But experiencing a solitary state gives the individual the opportunity to draw upon untouched capacities and resources and to realize himself in an entirely unique manner. It can be a new experience. It may be an experience of exquisite pain, deep fear and terror, an utterly terrible experience, yet it brings into awareness new dimensions of self, new beauty, new power for human compassion, and a reverence for the precious nature of each breathing moment.

Much of this book is concerned with loneliness as a "peak experience" in the lives of various individuals. One can hardly fail to be impressed by the idea emerging from these recitals—the conviction that both our educational and our societal processes are woefully lacking in respect for meditative contemplation. This gives a distinct metaphysical aspect to the message which Prof. Moustakas endeavors to convey, although the metaphysics arises from introspective experience rather than from reasoning about theologically established "truths." Two paragraphs from the concluding chapter, on "The Value of Loneliness," seem particularly striking:

> Loneliness has a quality of immediacy and depth, it is a significant experience—one of the few in modern life—in which man communes with

himself. And in such communion man comes to grips with his own being. He discovers life, who he is, what he really wants, the meaning of his existence the true nature of his relations with others. He sees and realizes for the first time truths which have been obscured for a long time. His distortions suddenly become naked and transparent. He perceives himself and others with a clearer more valid vision and understanding. In absolutely solitary moments man experiences truth, beauty, nature, reverence humanity. Loneliness enables one to return to a life with others with renewed hope and vitality, with a fuller dedication, with a deeper desire to come to a healthy resolution of problems and issues involving others, with possibility and hope for a rich, true life with others.

The "never be lonely" theme is a reflection of man's estrangement from himself in the world today. The moments between death and creation, the periods between the end and the beginning, the interval between completion and starting of a significant project are often times of deep loneliness. But in these intervals the individual can come to self-truths, to new strengths, and to new directions. Let there be loneliness, for where there is loneliness, there also is love, and where there is suffering, there also is joy.

The basic philosophical assumption underlying Moustakas' thought is clearly non-mechanistic. On the issue of whether or not everything that a man is or may become is due to conditioning, Moustakas decides in the negative—for the "loneliness" of which he writes could be of value only if there were within each man a non-conditionable aspect of his being. Here we can relate directly to the insights of Viktor Frankl, who revives the old Platonic distinction between the "psychic" and the noëtic elements in man. Viewed from a standpoint of the psyche as "persona," every human being is essentially conditionable, but from the standpoint of an indwelling spiritual essence he is a non-theological "soul," a "self-moving" intelligence with the capacity to make conditions rather than only a plastic image shaped by the conditioning process.

Herbert Spencer once described man's twofold experience as bringing about both "the continuous adjustment of internal to external relations" and "the continuous adjustment of external to internal relations." Maslow's "self-actualizing person" and, in a different context, Riesman's "autonomous man," is the individual who has begun to act "from within, without"—the man who has taken the conditioning of his psyche into his own hands. All of which, of course, brings us full circle through the age of scientific psychology to some of the fundamental profundities of ancient philosophy and religion.

COMMENTARY
STUDENTS IN WASHINGTON

IN January MANAS received a copy of a Student Union call to "Student Action—for a Turn Toward Peace," announcing that several student organizations were planning "a major demonstration and confrontation of the government" in the nation's capital on February 16 and 17. The project was under the auspices of the Turn Toward Peace Youth Committee, with a number of participating groups, including the Student Peace Union, SANE's National Student Committee, the FOR youth section, Students for a Democratic Society, and a committee representing several youth groups in the Boston area. The demonstration was to urge five peace-making initiatives on the Government of the United States: (1) An announcement that the U.S. will not resume atmospheric nuclear testing; (2) a refusal to supply nuclear weapons to powers not now armed with them, and a move toward UN inspection of existing nuclear reactors to assure that they are used only for peaceful purposes; (3) withdrawal of U.S. missile bases which are useless except as "first strike" installations aimed at the Soviet Union (as in Turkey and Italy); (4) an effort toward disengagement in Central Europe, as contributing to resolution of the Berlin crisis and as a basis for further disarmament negotiations; (5) an all-out effort to reduce poverty, hunger and disease throughout the world, channeled through the UN, followed by an invitation to the Soviet Union to make similar contribution through the UN, in behalf of world peace.

The projected student action in Washington was described:

> Starting at 10 a.m. Friday, Feb. 16, students will picket the White House and other government buildings, handing out a condensation of the primary policy statement, while delegations of students well-versed in the adopted position of the project, will visit individually the Senators and Representatives in Congress.
>
> Students will sleep in Washington that evening and the next day, Feb. 17, picketing will continue, combined with administration officials, civic leaders in Washington and special delegations going to every foreign embassy in Washington. Late in the morning the thousand or more students, both those who arrived on Friday and those arriving on Saturday morning, will march through the city to the White House for a demonstration. In the late afternoon there will be a major rally with key speakers. . . .

Well, we didn't see much in the local press (except for Drew Pearson's column) about what happened in Washington on Feb. 16 and 17. But a couple of days later we received a letter from a New England reader who said:

> Eight thousand students came out, in case you didn't know. It certainly wasn't published back here. The largest number given by a newspaper was 4,000. But the Student Peace Union has slips from every student that showed up. Participation in the Action was 3,000 over the rosiest expectations. Some of the students said that they would have another action and next time they would get 20,000. I understand that there were two planes from California and two students flew over from Oxford.

There is more, including some colorful incidents, but this report is all that our space allows to add a dimension of current goings-on to the *Mademoiselle* survey of fields of peace action and research.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

STILL DISCOVERING THE CHILD

A NUMBER of points developed in our recent review of Nevitt Sanford's *The American College* can also be nicely—or ironically—made in regard to elementary and secondary school education. In this "age of psychology" it is becoming quite clear that preoccupation with the content of subject-matter and techniques of teaching have long diverted attention from just what it is in the human being that is teachable—which is another way of saying that we can't define the potentiality of children because we don't know the potentiality of Homo sapiens.

Children are commonly dissatisfied with school in direct proportion to their native intelligence, but when children become teachers they usually turn conservative and seek refuge from philosophical questions by promoting one or another system. But the expressions of psychologists who participate in "workshops" indicate that some teachers work their way back to philosophy by way of psychological observation. In a testimonial volume compiled by appreciative students to honor Gardner Murphy, a summation of attempts to formulate new teaching insights speaks of "the necessity for and value of perceiving the teacher-child relationship as a unity which depends for its outcome to a great extent upon the mutuality of interplay between the feelings underlying expressed behavior. It was observed that dissatisfaction on the parts of the teachers lay largely in the area of practical application and meaningfulness of discussions to the classroom situation."

A discussion under the title of "The Problem of Individuality in Development" in the Kaplan-Wapner volume, *Perspectives in Psychological Theory*, contains this admission in regard to limitations of constructive conditioning by the educational environment:

> We recognize, indeed, that differences in early life experiences cannot account fully for the broad psychological differences we have observed among children. There can be little doubt that constitutional differences may also be extremely important. We have recently begun studies that may clarify the connection between characteristics observed in infancy and the kinds of pervasive differences we have found in later development.

Coming down to the practical problems of meeting "individuality" in the child during transmission of the three it's, we note some sensible and percipient remarks which came to light during an Associated Press interview with a teacher of remedial English in a Rockford, Ill. high school. She worked out a technique for English instruction which began with the request that each child start to compose his or her own autobiography; this teacher feels that autobiography is a letter to oneself, and that unless a child can write to himself he can never write much of anything else. Mrs. Nellie Thomas' methods have gradually spread to twenty of Rockford's forty-nine schools, and to other Midwestern cities. In the interview, she explains her approach:

> I knew the old practice of the teacher taking papers home to correct at night—while the youngsters watch TV—had to go. No teacher has the time to do a good job of correcting 100 to 150 papers, so she cuts down on the writing assignments.
>
> But the children learn to write by writing, and once they learn to write they like to write. I wanted a system where the students would have writing assignments every day. . . .
>
> I don't caution them about spelling, grammar, punctuation, neatness or organization. I want a true picture of the youngster's ability, and these papers are not corrected. They are posted on the wall, and they stay there to give the students something to build on.
>
> For the first two weeks the students have to write so slowly it is almost a drawing lesson. At the end of that time they will begin to speed up, but their letter forms will remain the same. And whenever they get careless or sloppy, I simply refuse to accept their work. They soon get the idea. . . .

This seems to us a sensible complement to a proposal made by Carroll Newsom, former president of New York University, who suggested that the first two years of university work should begin with attention to the field closest to the student's direct personal interest, spreading out to a broader orientation by way of the "humanities" in the junior and senior years. The complementation lies in the fact that both Mrs. Thomas and Dr. Newsom believe that a pupil has first to go to school to himself, in terms of what he *wants* to learn. The child, on beginning to write, should write about himself, gradually developing special interests, and finally, before he leaves the school atmosphere at the end of his senior college year, return to himself in the broadest context which the humanities can provide.

In the home, the equivalent of the teacher's encouragement to the child to write about himself is simply letting the child talk, although this may not be so "simple," in view of the routines and time schedules of the average family. Further, there is a marked difference between perfunctory replies to a child's expressions on this or that—no matter how friendly the tone of the parent's voice—and showing a genuine interest in what the child wishes to say about himself. The "art of conversation" between parents and children is just as difficult as the art of communication between adults—which means that we seldom realize the necessity for finding time during the day to use for this purpose. After all, parent and child are alone together only occasionally.

Do we know how to ask our children the questions that allow them to really become *themselves* in the answering? One criterion would seem to be a genuine curiosity on our own part about what the child has been thinking, for this parallels the spontaneous curiosity of the child himself. This is the child's "level," yet this should by no means be taken to mean an intellectual descent on the adult's part. It is rather that children, when they are not pressed by either time or criticisms, are not so concerned with defending established opinions as so many adults are. It is by a *true* curiosity as to the thoughts of the child—not heavily prompted by the feeling that we "ought" to know what the child is thinking—that we place ourselves in natural rapport with the young.

The parent has of course an ideal function to perform in assisting the child, but this is not apt to be fulfilled unless the parent is motivated by something other than mere theory, or the determination to be a "dutiful" father or mother. If communication is natural and if propitious times are chosen, conversation can assist each childhood experience in becoming a *whole.* A quarrel or a minor accident briefly mentioned by a youngster can be the key to thoughts which the child has had about the incident. And here we might note that "suffering" is often a better teacher than pleasure.

The child may be capable of more retrospective evaluations than his parents, and there are many ways of encouraging this capacity, such as by asking questions about a period spent in nursery school, or about the feelings or imaginings of the child in connection with his first bicycle, etc. As with the rest of us, the individuality of the child has to be achieved through the interplay between thought and expression. And we never know just how much "individuality" is there at any given time unless we are imbued with an abiding interest in its progressive manifestations.

FRONTIERS

The Pied Piper Principle

THESE are days when the go-for-broke figures of the past take on a particular glamor and appeal. The peace-walkers who tramped from San Francisco to Moscow were animated by clearer intentions than the adolescents of the Children's Crusade, yet their underlying motives were not so dissimilar. Arthur Rimbaud and Jack London were civilizations apart, yet they were one in their disdain for conventional values and the vigor with which they pursued an independent course. There are times when a total disrespect for prudence becomes an immeasurably useful contribution to society, and even if many of those who abandon conformity let go, also, of normal self-restraint, their behavior may be more a symptom of health than of wild abnormality.

A man with an infected organism who cannot raise a fever is in a very bad way. It is better to manifest hysteria than to fall into a catatonic stupor. This is not to come out foursquare for fevers and house-breaking frenzy, but to acknowledge that the desperate attempts of members of a mass society to break out of the confinements that have grown up around them will seldom display the even temper and balance of a Henry David Thoreau.

What would a young man do today, if he wanted to become a Johnny Appleseed? You might find him on a picketline in Washington, New London, or Los Angeles, trying to plant the seeds of peace instead of apples. Or he might go to India to join Vinoba in his wanderings from village to village, seeking a touch with operations that relate to fundamental human values. There is this to be noted: The old-style rebellion or disaffiliation on æsthetic grounds no longer attracts very many of the young, who are now more concerned with socio-moral issues than with "self-expression." What is plain is that they are seeking a ground of moral reality, for which the familiar forms of security hardly count at all. In the case of the civil disobedients—a growing number of young men, as well as a few young women—the idea of going to prison is nearly as commonplace as the need of the ordinary young person to go out and get a job. The youth in this category do not seem to worry at all about their future, although we suppose that, being human, they do worry now and then. In any event, the importance of the things they feel called upon to do far outweighs any personal considerations. They do get along, and you never hear them complain.

There is an important principle involved in behavior of this sort. We have dubbed it the Pied Piper Principle, mainly because the children who followed the Pied Piper simply got up and walked away from what the adult members of the community thought was the proper and settled order of things, and while the grown-ups couldn't understand why the children left, it made them think. The man, or youth, or young woman who walks away from the conventional community gives evidence of an ultimate quality of human beings—the ability to respond in an absolute way to the call of freedom. Freedom always has an asking price, but it is always possible to pay it and go.

Often the youthful rebel does not realize how high the price can get, but if he understands this part of the bargain, the price may seem to get lower and lower for him as he goes along. It is a question of choosing to be on the side of life, and of having some confidence that there is a kind of moral balance in any transaction which increases the goodness of life's natural flow.

"Freedom" is of course a perilous ideal to argue for in the abstract. It is easy to show that the naïve desire for freedom is usually little more than longing for a comfortably fixed irresponsibility. The idea of freedom, we suppose, comes first from the subjective experience of being able to let the mind wander from alternative to alternative, to imagine oneself doing anything and everything, without an encounter with

obstacles. To convert this idea into practical reality in life on earth is hardly possible, so that freedom then becomes an object reached by finding the appropriate ways and means. This is no doubt what led John Dewey and others before him to say that freedom is knowledge of necessity. To be free, you have to know the conditions of choice, and also be able to anticipate its consequences.

True freedom is not, therefore, a matter of circumstances, but of power, of knowledge, and attitude of mind. Politics has a relation to human freedom because it gives formal shape to the power and knowledge and will of a community of human beings. When politics loses these animating principles, it becomes a shell that opposes the very qualities which originally gave it authority. The problem of politics is the problem of creating self-regenerating institutions which continually adapt themselves to the mandate of its animating principles. When these principles become weak or ineffectual, the problem becomes great. It is a problem by no means fully solved, mainly because people imagine that a political system can be improved without improving the power, knowledge, and attitudes of the people.

The radical role of the Pied Piper comes into play when the power of the people grows diffuse from being devoted to trivial ends, when their knowledge is indifferent to consequences and their attitudes are absorbed in private self-interest. Then the institutions change into mindless mechanisms which have lost their relation to actual human need, with the result that the old forms of freedom which the culture has provided become useless to persons who have real power, knowledge, and originality of mind. All that is left for them to do is to get up and walk away.

This is not to suggest that the transformations of a human society, either up or down, for better or for worse, are ever "absolute" in character. It seems probable that the American society, whatever its defects, has more pliability and susceptibility to change than many of the societies of the past. It is far from necessary to invoke the Pied Piper in all institutional relationships. A Mountain Man could always retire to the mountains, and a modern man can always find ways of retiring into the interstices of the complex society of the present, if he is willing and inventive enough to do so. But there come times when an honest person will find nothing else to do but walk away. And every honest man who will some day be confronted by this choice has a great debt to all the Pied Pipers of history—those who by personal example have shown that it is always possible to be free.