VOLUME XXXII, NO. 51
DECEMBER 19, 1979

GOING TO WORK OR HOME?

THE central idea of modern civilization—the idea of progress—is rapidly losing its authority. We are not "progressing" very much these days. The planet, ecologists tell us, can't stand the way we are using it and the raw materials we depend upon for further development are already in short supply. Sociologists and cultural historians point to the increasing unworkability of the social forms we have developed—so big, so pretentious, and so complicated that their anti-human effects become worse and worse. Critics write large books about these multiplying flaws.

Yet progress is surely a part of our lives. Humans pursue meaning, and when they get it, progress has occurred. We have been aware of this for a long time. Back in the twelfth century, the jurist, Azo, proposed that "custom turning into nature, knowledge itself may become a permanent characteristic of human nature." What could you call that but progress? And Vico, early in the eighteenth century, declared that the social world is the work of men, a conception encouraging others to say, later on, that by revolution men can change their social arrangements for the good of all. Interpreting this great trend in *The Meaning of History* (Braziller, 1964), Erich Kahler wrote:

> Gradually—and this was an advance most effective in the American and French revolutions—the theory of Progress was extended from the restricted field of human capacities, which thrived on the accumulation of knowledge, to the broadly social and moral condition of man. This meant an *activation* of the concept. Progress of knowledge and technical praxis was no longer merely propounded, it was to be systematically used for the material well-being and the moral advancement of humanity. . . .
>
> So through Descartes' "universal reason," deified in the French Revolution, and in its application to social and political institutions, *man* was seen to be *perfectible,* a belief which reaches from the Abbe de Saint-Pierre and Fontenelle in the seventeenth century to Hegel and Karl Marx in the nineteenth. In fact, with Fontenelle and Montesquieu the doctrine of Progress was almost complete. Man, according to Fontenelle, will never age, nor intellectually degenerate, but, on the contrary, ever improve through further knowledge. Progress is certain and definite, it has its necessary order and sequence, it is autonomous and impersonal, that is, independent of the persons who serve it: if Descartes had not existed, Progress would have used another man. Similarly, Montesquieu excludes Fortune as well as Providence as agents in history. "It is not Fortune," he writes, "that governs the world. . . . There exist general causes, moral or physical, which are at work in every monarchy, raise it, sustain it, or bring it down. Everything is subordinate to these causes. . . . In short, the main current of events sweeps along all single events."
>
> At this point where not only man's ability to experience to gain knowledge and to invent, but his whole social and moral being is considered perfectible, perfectible by the very means of his faculties, a new state of consciousness is achieved. It is at this point that the secularization of the religious concept of salvation is completed. Salvation becomes *the self-salvation of man.*

In this last sentence Prof. Kahler distills the essence of the great change. For *self-salvation,* in Western thought, could mean only *evolution.* How shall we save ourselves by evolving? By knowing the laws of nature, which govern every natural process. Salvation, therefore, becomes what the laws of nature, as we understand them, provide for. From the human point of view, this isn't much.

In *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (Yale University Press, 1932), Carl Becker tells what happened to Salvation, which had become Evolution and Progress, during the eighteenth-century Enlightenment:

> Natural philosophy was transformed into natural science. Natural science became science, and scientists rejected, as a personal affront, the title of

> philosopher, which formerly they had been proud to bear. The vision of man and his world as a neat and efficient machine, designed by an intelligent Author of the Universe, gradually faded away. . . . "Science," said Lloyd Morgan, "deals exclusively with changes of configuration, and traces the accelerations which are observed to occur, leaving to metaphysics to deal with the underlying agency, if it exist."
>
> It is well known that the result of pursuing this restricted aim (the scientific method reduced to its lowest terms) has been astounding. It is needless to say that we live in a machine age, that the art of inventing is the greatest of our inventions, or that within a brief space of fifty years the outward conditions of life have been transformed. . . . Science has taught us the futility of troubling to understand the "underlying agency" of the things we use. We have found that we can drive an automobile without knowing how the carburetor works, and listen to a radio without mastering the secret of radiation. We really haven't time to stand amazed, either at the starry firmament above or the Freudian complexes within us. The multiplicity of things to manipulate and make use of so fully engages our attention that we have neither the leisure nor the inclination to seek a rational explanation of the force that makes them function so efficiently.

We should remember that Becker wrote in 1932. He gives a clear idea of what most people understood by progress—then, and until quite recently—and his summary of that state of mind seems just and accurate:

> We necessarily look at our world from the point of view of science. Viewed historically, it appears to be something in the making, something which can at best be only tentatively understood since it is not yet finished. Viewed scientifically, it appears as something to be accepted, something to be manipulated and mastered, something to adjust ourselves to with the least possible stress. So long as we can make efficient use of things, we feel no irresistible need to understand them. No doubt it is for this reason chiefly that the modern mind can be so wonderfully at ease in a mysterious universe.

The contrast here with the present hardly needs emphasis. Our "ease" is completely gone, replaced by continuous anxiety, and our "progress"—more and more things to manipulate and master—has been running in reverse for quite a while: the "things" are now manipulating us, or *riding us*, as Emerson put it. We no longer dream about the great things to happen in the future. We're *afraid* of the future, and wish it would hold off or just go away, and, whether we realize it or not, this means that Time, which is a necessity of evolution and progress, is no longer worshipped as the deity that will bring us all those good things. Half a century ago, we could hardly wait for tomorrow—we were futurists to a man. Tomorrow was the promised land and speed the magic vehicle that would take us there. No more. We have indeed run out of gas.

Well, if time will now bring us nothing but trouble, have we ever understood well what time means? We know a little about time. It ushers in both birth and death, and presides over growth. Without time, no evolution. It is impossible to imagine human life without past, present, and future. But simply in saying this, we imply a position outside time. To speak of these relativities requires an independent stance, above or outside their schedule, to make them intellectually objective. Even if only in our imagination, that position must exist.

While time has its gifts, its oppressions eventually overtake us. This has always been true, and there have come periods when unbearable oppressions seemed to make it desirable to "get out of time," somehow or other. So much depends on how we feel. In the morning of our lives, we tend to embrace time and evolution as the best friends in the world. But at night, when the fatiguing work is not finished, and the daily harvest slim and diminishing, the thought of another day of scrabbling around brings quickened appreciation of the oriental religions with their promise of "escape."

In *The Savage and Beautiful Country* (Houghton Mifflin, 1967), Alan McGlashan wonders if some of the ancients had worked out a balance between the peace of timelessness and the ardors of evolution and growth in time. The celebration of death as both submission to and transcendence of time—its arrest through ritual—

was one thing they did. Then Dr. McGlashan says:

> All these maneuvers, however, are protests on a childish level. Archaic man did something else to arrest the flow of Time, of infinitely greater significance. By an approach which his descendants only sporadically revived and have now for centuries largely discarded and forgotten, he made a sustained, magnificent, and in some ways successful attempt to give certain parts at least of his life the quality of timelessness. His method was to sacralize the essential human activities.
>
> According to man's earliest beliefs, in the beginning, in *illo tempore,* man lived in a timeless world on terms of near equality with the gods, with whom he freely conversed, he could fly or climb to heaven at will; and be possessed also the power of communication with many of the lower forms of life, with birds and beasts and even insects. To paraphrase these naive beliefs in contemporary terms, primitive man held that human consciousness instead of being confined to its present narrow range had once extended "upwards" into the spiritual sphere and "downwards" to the animal level. He believed—in company with certain modern philosophers, notably Bergson—that this pristine range of consciousness had been lost, and that man's first aim must be to recover it, if only momentarily. To bring this about he tried in all his essential activities—eating, drinking, hunting, sleeping and waking, copulating, dying—to imitate the actions and attitudes, as known to him through oral tradition, of the superior beings from whom he believed himself to have descended. By so doing he tried to lift these particular actions out of the temporal and accidental into the timeless atmosphere in which these beings had lived. That is, he raised as much as he could of his daily life to the level of a sacrament.

What those ancients realized in this direction, we hardly know. In our enthusiasm for the world presented to us by Galileo, Newton, and a galaxy of succeeding scientists, inventors, and engineers, we ignored and ridiculed their attempt. The timeless aspect of human life—the possibility that somewhere in us is a reality that can stand outside time, knowing at once both timelessness and evolutionary process—was put aside as metaphysical nonsense.

> Gradually the sacredness of the metallurgist's activities and the spiritual quality of the operator became less important. Finally they became irrelevant. . . . The suggestion that a test should be made of a man's spiritual fitness to be a nuclear physicist would sound extremely peculiar to a modern ear. . . . Men of insight have often declared that man's chief aim is "to escape from the vanity of Time." Swelling with pride the twentieth-century Humanist now claims to have discovered the trick of it, the talisman that saints and artists and philosophers have patiently searched for through the centuries.

But the claim is vain and false. The wild chase of the future—Enjoy now the pleasures and thrills of tomorrow, the ads say—has made us slaves to the complex mechanisms of pursuit:

> In the world of today man lives by stopwatch. His prosperity, even his life, depends on split-second timing and ever more precise chronometers. In large organizations he clocks in and out like an automaton—which in any case is rapidly replacing him—and in factories his movements are watched by experts to see if a few seconds can be lopped off his rate of work. . . . On the roads his clock-chasing speeds involve daily human sacrifice on a scale that leaves the holocausts of the Aztecs and the Inquisition far behind. In Western societies it is regarded as a serious moral defect not to be anxious about time. . . .
>
> This is the paradox of the contemporary world, to be at once the masters and the slaves of time.

Who escapes? Children, mystics, and sometimes artists, is Dr. McGlashan's answer. But children grow up, artists are rare, and are we really ready to exchange the promise of evolution for the mystic's way of opting out—supposing for a moment we have the determination required? The author muses:

> The spiritual certainties of former days, untroubled then by a gross factual ignorance of which we have now become uncomfortably aware, have lost, for us, their numinous power. Contemporary man urgently requires an adequate intellectual framework for his inner life.
>
> But if the mystic's rejection of time is only an aspect of truth, so also is the evolutionist's wholehearted acceptance of it. . . . The evolutionary theory is only one aspect of a polarity whose opposing aspect has a precisely equal validity. But there are fashions in thought, and this other aspect is for the time being extremely unfashionable; with the result that the contemporary technologist is at least as

> childishly ignorant of the meaningful world of the primitive, saint and mystic, as ever they have been of his.

The balance between the two can be found, Dr. McGlashan aflirms. But leave the "authorities" on both sides to go their own way, he advises:

> To reach this is Everyman's personal task. Not by saint, scientist or philosopher, those three curious mutations from the mainstream of human life, but by Everyman himself must be accomplished the daring leap, the *salto mortale,* to a new level of awareness. And for this great adventure he must use the homely tools that are available to him, not the recondite instruments of intellectual and spiritual experts.
>
> It is within his powers. The task is simple enough, though not easy. Pompous, pseudo-scientific terms such as "expanded consciousness" and "a new level of awareness" could intimidate him, but need not. They are nothing more than attempts to express a way of living which has not yet risen to general recognition—though now it is very near: the habit of paying as much attention to the fringes of an experience as to the experience itself; of keeping all parts of the mind so attuned that every impact which life makes upon it evokes not a note but a chord; of understanding, in T. S. Eliot's phrase, "what it is to be awake, to be living on several planes at once"; in a word, the habit of seeing everything, and especially Time itself, translucently. In all such apprehensions Everyman starts nearer to the truth than any specialist.

What is Dr. McGlashan saying? That human life is always a going out and a coming back—endlessly, arrival and departure? There must be a meaning to the going out and a meaning to coming back. Our evolution, which is not only that of form, not only that of body, includes both journeyings. They are complementary and interdependent. But we cannot really know this, or accomplish our peculiarly *human* growth, without realizing, as we go out, that the flowering of the expedition always awaits the return trip. We cannot know this without becoming aware that we originated in some primeval heart of being, and that it is *there* that the principle of balance lies—a balance that becomes ours by having an inner stance there, wherever we go or are.

What then is "evolved" by us, if at root and core we are the changeless center—the resolving capacity which enables us to think in terms of both absolute and relative realities, to negotiate distances while retaining our motionless place, and to live in conscious intersection of time and eternity? Surely, we evolve what we call the mind, or some ever-growing portion of it. For with mind we become able to consider these things.

Not all ancient versions of the mystic path are blemished by "factual ignorance." The sacred verse of the Hindus, called the Gayatri, used in the initiation of the Brahman, reveals nothing of such limitations. As provided in one translation:

> That which giveth sustenance to the Universe and to ourselves,
>
> From which all cloth proceed, unto which all must return,
>
> THAT THOU ART.
>
> In the golden vase of shine earthly body
>
> May the pure light of the spiritual Sun shine forth,
>
> That thou may'st know the Truth, and do thy whole duty,'
>
> On thy journey back to the Sacred Seat.

Throughout the lore of mankind, both East and West, there is this theme of quest, heroic achievement, and coming home. Whether it is the search for the Nibelungen treasure or the Golden Fleece, life is conceived as an Odyssey, a Pilgrimage, a Quest for the Holy Grail. Certain of the poets turn toward this idea by what seems a natural tropism of mind and heart. Writing of the letters of John Keats, Lionel Trilling (in *The Opposing Self*) describes the poet's sorrow at the miseries of the world, afflicting both simple tribes and civilized nations. Trilling says:

> He [Keats] canvasses the possibilities of amelioration of the human fate and concludes that our life even at its conceivable best can be nothing but

> tragic, the very elements and laws of nature being hostile to man. Then, having stated as extremely as this the case of human misery, he breaks out with sudden contempt for those who call the world a vale of tears. "What a little circumscribed straightened notion!" he says. "Call the world if you please 'The Vale of Soulmaking!' . . . I say *'Soul making'—Soul* as distinguished from an Intelligence—There may be intelligences or sparks of divinity in millions—but they are not Souls till they acquire identities, till each one is personally itself."

Keats wrote this to his brother in America more than a hundred and fifty years ago. But the idea emerges in another form in one of the last books of Ernest Becker, *The Denial of Death.* Becker finds the essential quality of human beings to be the striving to be a hero, an aspiration disguised and disfigured in modern civilization, but a natural longing for those whose spontaneous qualities have not been suppressed. "The urge to heroism is natural," he says toward the end of the book, "and to admit it is honest." He adds: "For everyone to admit it would probably release such pent-up force as to be devastating to societies as they are now."

But that, surely, would be a benign sort of devastation to endure, compared to the fate so many seem to be preparing for themselves.

REVIEW
THE PEN AGAINST DISASTER

WE have for review two books written by people filled with a sense of outrage, yet determined to write coolly and informatively in behalf of what they think is right and what ought to be done. One *is No Nukes—Everyone's Guide to Nuclear Power,* by a number of contributors and a larger number of informants and collaborators, but mainly by Anna Gyorgy. The publisher is the South End Press (Box 68, Astor Station, Boston, Mass. 02123) and the price for this bulky paperback of nearly 500 pages is $8.00. The other book, which we look forward to going through again, is the paperback (Ballantine) edition of *Food First,* by Joseph Collins and Frances Moore Lappé—revised and updated ($2.75).

No Nukes is of interest and value for several reasons. One is the enormous amount of information put between two covers on a subject that is far from easy to understand. Wondering ignorance was the condition of the principal author at the beginning. Anna Gyorgy lived near the site of the construction of a giant reactor and decided it was her business to find out what this might mean for her family and her neighbors. She says:

> Nuclear power is a huge and complex subject, but one which affects us all. For our own protection, we have to understand its basic principles. In order to help along a reasoned public debate and decision on this most crucial issue, we've tried to summarize key information in a way everyone can understand.

A quotation early in the book is from Richard Nixon. Speaking in 1971 at Hanford, Washington, the location of various nuclear facilities, the former President said:

> Don't ask me what a breeder reactor is: ask Dr. Schlesinger. But tell him not to tell you, because unless you are one of those Ph.D.'s, you wouldn't understand it either, but I do know that here we have the potentiality of a whole new breakthrough of power for peace. . . .

Anna Gyorgy recognizes that most of us are in about the same state of ignorance Mr. Nixon confessed to, but she has a list of other authorities whom she recommends—scientists who declare that the "breakthrough" is to inevitable and hardly measurable disaster. To help the reader to grasp something of what these scientists mean, she and her co-workers have collected in this book warning after warning, with copious explanation by qualified scientists of why they regard relying on nuclear energy as a horrible mistake.

The most interesting thing about this book is its evidence of what ordinary, non-expert people can accomplish when stirred by outrage and human concern to assemble needed facts in a form that ordinary people can understand. Telling about the work, Anna Gyorgy says:

> This has been a low-budget, mostly volunteer effort. Since the atomic-industrial establishment has tremendous resources at its disposal, we haven't felt it necessary to present its "side" of the debate. That's readily available, and we tell you where to find it. Pro-nuclear propaganda has flowed from government, industry, and utilities for decades now. Most of us learned what little we know about nuclear power through the eyes of the industry, in their well-funded hype designed to sell rather than inform. We want to help set the record straight.
>
> Until now, information critical of nuclear energy has been scattered—in books, articles, newsletters. In this volume we've distilled information from hundreds of sources to offer a coherent background for making the energy choices we all have to make.
>
> Frankly, it's hard to stop writing! Every day there are new reports and information, studies, accidents, actions to add to the story. There can be no "last word" on nuclear energy. All we can do here is share with you the results of five years of research and participation so that you can have an outline and some basic facts at your fingertips.
>
> In the course of writing this book we have seen the tide of public opinion turning sharply against atomic energy. As the stockpiles of atomic wastes mushroom, as the price of both plant construction and electric bills soar, as the health and environmental dangers become more obvious—so grows the anti-nuclear movement. Of late, because of new information about safe, viable renewable resources, it has also become a pro-solar movement.
>
> This broad movement includes people from all walks of life all over the planet.

No Nukes is a sort of world almanac of anti-nuclear arguments, facts, campaigners, and groups. This book probably contains more than you want to

know, but if it has what you *need* to know, the excess information can be put up with in good humor. One thing seems certain: Compiling it has been a public-spirited labor of love. The nuclear advocates are animated by no such emotion.

The message that comes through on almost every page of *Food First* is that the problem of growing enough food for all the people in the world is not a matter of production or more efficient farming methods, but of *access to the land.* The outrage in this book is toward the claims made in behalf of agribusiness and the mass-production techniques of factories in the field. These people, the authors say, are not "saving the world" from starvation, but destroying the capacity of region after region to feed its own people. The fundamental contention of the authors is given in a section which answers the question: What Is Food Security?

> Most measures of food security fixate on global statistics of agricultural production. But food security simply cannot exist in a market system where there is no democratic control over resource use. Commercial growers will not grow food for hungry people when they can make more money growing luxury crops for the minority who can always pay more. Moreover, we have seen that much of the increased production has been at the price of increased vulnerability, *and unnecessarily so.* Increased production approached as a mere technical problem has completely reshaped agriculture itself, reducing a very complex, self-contained system into a highly simplified and dependent one. The Green Revolution approach converts a recycling, self-contained system into a linear production formula: pick the "best" seeds, plant uniformly over the largest area possible, and dose with chemical fertilizer. The reduction of agriculture to this simple formula leaves crops open to attack and soils highly vulnerable to deterioration. . . .
>
> We are all exposed repeatedly to catchy corporate ads that attempt to scare us into believing that the corporate-marketed inputs are the only safeguards against hunger. Yet the increasing capital costs of this way of producing food exclude ever larger numbers of rural people abroad as well as in the United States from a livelihood and push the price of food beyond the means of those who most need it. . . . We have learned that real food security simply cannot be measured in production figures. Production figures may well go up while the majority are getting less of the food they need. Food security must be measured by how close a country is to achieving sound nutrition for all. It must also be measured in how reliable, how resilient, and how self-contained the agricultural system is. On each of these counts the Green Revolution approach means less food security for us all.

Food First is organized around fifty questions—questions to which wrong answers have been circulated for years. The documentation of the right answers given by the authors is impressive—the back of the book devotes more than a hundred pages to appendices, notes, and index. "In this edition," the authors say, "the positive guidelines for food self-reliance called 'Food First Fundamentals' are more fully developed." In other words, it gives the background motivation for another kind of life in relation to what we eat.

Of most interest to the general reader may be the answer given to Question 21—"Isn't the Backwardness of Small Farmers to Blame?"

> *Question:* You seem to think the small farmer is the savior of the hungry world. But isn't one basic reason for low production levels in the poor countries that so much land is in farms too small to be efficient? Aren't most small farmers just too backward and tradition-bound to respond to development programs?

In their reply, Lappé and Collins remark that the question has great importance since about 80 per cent of *all* farms are of less than twelve acres. But do small farms produce less? After looking at studies from around the world, they say:

> "Contrary to our previous assumptions, the small farmer in most cases produces more per unit of land than the large farmer." This is true in India, in Thailand, in Taiwan, and according to a World Bank report small farm production in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Guatemala is three to fourteen times more productive per acre than the large farms. Why?
>
> Studies show that small landholders plant more carefully than a machine could, mix and rotate complementary crops, choose a combination of cultivation and livestock that is labor-intensive and, above all, work their perceptibly limited resources (especially themselves) to the fullest.

This book should be a basic text in every human geography course in the land.

COMMENTARY
WHO IS TO BLAME?

SINCE John Pilger wrote about his experiences while making a film in Cambodia (see "Children"), the plight of the Cambodian refugees has been much in the news, with reports of food and medical aid being sent from various sources. There is also bitter controversy about who or which country is most responsible for the unspeakable conditions in that ancient land. Meanwhile the agony continues. Last month (Nov. 19) a *Christian Science Monitor* writer described the enormous refugee camp being constructed (by the UN High Commission for Refugees and others) in Thailand, near the border of Cambodia. Hundreds of thousands of Cambodians are massed in this area and Thailand wants to move them inland, away from the border, to avoid attack by the Vietnamese. The camp, located at Khao I Dang, will accommodate 200,000 persons and might become "the largest refugee housing camp in the world," if more than half of the 430,000 refugees in that general region decide to come there. The able refugees will have to build their own huts, but the ill and weak will be given shelter. The site is without water, which will have to be trucked in.

That is the plan. But some of the Cambodians are armed anti-communist guerrillas, others sick and hungry. "Just how all this will work," the reporter says, "is a big unknown."

> No one knows how many will come. And will the gunwielding anti-communist, anti-Vietnamese Khmer Serei guerrillas permit the civilians to come? Moreover, will the Thai Army permit Khmer Serei guerrillas to keep their weapons and stay on the border, thus providing a continuing provocation for Vietnamese attack? . . .
>
> Khao I Dang, so close to the border [seven miles], is, theoretically, only temporary until six permanent camps . . . come "on stream." Slated to hold more than 300,000 persons, the six permanent camps have been delayed by administrative and political hurdles.
>
> It is still unclear whether Thailand will accept these people as genuine refugees deserting of protection—or whether it reserves the option of deporting them back to Cambodia when conditions seem ripe.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the former neutralist ruler of Cambodia who took refuge in China, now speaks of leading a volunteer force to rid his country of the Vietnamese, although he does not expect military victory. "But what is the choice, monsieur?" he said to another *CSM* correspondent. "What is the choice? How can we, a small people, a weak people, a dying people, win?"

Who should accept responsibility for this ongoing crime against "a small people"? Instead of compiling volumes of analysis to reply to this question, it would be better simply to say that war and all war-makers are responsible. This is the verdict inevitably rendered after every war of modern history. War-makers do not know how to make peace, and "military necessity" and the "national interest" will not allow them to try.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
THEORY AND PRACTICE

IN the *Progressive* for October, Irwin Stark—writer, teacher of English, and an active member of the ACLU Academic Freedom Committee—provides a useful survey of what is being attempted by the Pentagon to make sure that in future years the Army and Navy have enough men (and women) to fight our future wars. There is already an ongoing effort to use education as the means of conditioning the young psychologically for joining the military services. Stark describes these plans in detail, giving their provocation in his first paragraph:

> The Pentagon has a problem. Within the next five years it must recruit more than one out of three male eighteen-year-olds to meet its goal of an active-duty military force of 2.1 million men and women. And it must accomplish this task precisely when the number of seventeen-to-twenty-two-year-olds promises to be the smallest in our history in proportion to the total population.

Recruitment on this scale, Stark says, is "bound to have an enormous impact on education—all the more so because high school and college enrollments are in sharp decline." The educational community has become anxiously aware of this impact:

> The Academic Freedom Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has been so disturbed by these efforts that it has transmitted a new and radical set of policy proposals on secondary education and the military to its national board. And the American Council on Education has taken the unprecedented step of establishing a commission "to guide relationships between the military services and higher education."

What has aroused so much concern? Irwin Stark describes the present practices and future plans. One deceptive promise offered by the military has been that the various branches of the service will provide the basis of career education—often a real problem for the young. But most of military training is irrelevant for civilian careers, as Stark shows. He then says:

> A recruiting scheme far more pernicious because it is potentially more corrupting has been the funding of school personnel by the Department of Defense. In November 1976, for example, the Pentagon donated more than $376,000 to the Council of Chief State School Officers for its "Education/Military Liaison Project." The professed aim of this project was "to assist high school students toward making appropriate and proper decisions by providing the students with up-to-date information on career and educational opportunities existing in the military service." Actually, the Council was a conduit for channeling recruitment information from the military to the school population. In short, public school officials and educational policy-makers throughout the country became an arm of the military. The project was terminated in January 1978, though on whose initiative is still unclear.

This at least gives the flavor of Pentagon intent. Stark continues:

> A more direct approach to the student is the Delayed Entry Program (DEP), a recruiting mechanism which encourages students to enlist as early as the junior year in high school. While completing their high school education, they are officially members of the Reserves on inactive duty. Having signed the enlistment agreement and taken the oath of enlistment, they are legally obligated to report for active duty after graduation. The attraction of this program is not only the money the student receives for his own participation, but also the bounty he gets for persuading three other students to enlist—he is entitled to higher rank and additional pay on entering active service. In effect, he too becomes a military recruiter.

Such appeals to the young illustrate the sort of activity that was predicted in 1977 by Thomas W. Carr, then Director of Defense Education. Mr. Carr's astonishing candor, Stark suggests, may explain his removal from office. Some of the things he said in a speech (before the National Council on Continuing Education) are condensed in the *Progressive* article:

> A recent study shows that the chance to learn a valuable skill is the single most important attractor to the Armed Forces of sixteen-to-eighteen-year-old men not in the military.
>
> By 1984, the military will have become a major instrument for youth socialization, assuming a large portion of the burden of the role once dominated by the family, the church, the school, and the civilian work setting. The Department of Defense will also be assigned a major role in helping induct youth into the American work force.

> By 1984 the military and education will have entered into a massive new partnership symbolized by modern learning centers on military bases around the world.

Commenting, Stark says:

> Carr candidly admitted that "the strains between higher education and the military are real and they run deep. Education implies creativity, improvement of the human condition, and preservation of cherished societal values. The military stresses *obedience*, established procedures, and hierarchy—and has little interest in a more abstract search for purer knowledge."

After this speech the Department of Defense received inquiries about what it really meant. "Speculation about the future," was the reply, and Carr was transferred to another job. Of his shrewd anticipations, Stark says: "Could any blueprint for an Orwellian 1984 be more at odds with the traditions of American education and with democratic values as we have known them?" The *Progressive* contributor puts the basic dilemma in a few words:

> While most Americans probably regard the military as a necessary evil in a less than perfect world, they recognize that if the nation requires an army of 2.1 million, the Pentagon can meet this requirement only if it is allowed to tap the country's most abundant reservoir of recruits—the public secondary schools. The question is how far the military should be allowed to go.

The best answer to this question is doubtless the one offered by Thoreau in *A Yankee in Canada:*

> It is impossible to give the soldier a good education, without making him a deserter. His natural foe is the government that drills him. What would any philanthropist, who felt an interest in these men's welfare, naturally do, but first of all teach them so to respect themselves, that they could not be hired for this work, whatever might be the consequences to this government or that. . . .

What have the young subjected to "military preparedness" to look forward to? A writer in the *Los Angeles Times* for Oct. 7 gives a general idea of military "achievement." Just back from a visit to Cambodia, he says:

> The process begun by the Nixon-Kissinger Administration is nearing completion. Their bombing of Cambodia in the early '70s, the greatest aerial bombardment ever, tore apart the fabric of a once peaceful and neutral Cambodia and provided Pol Pot and his Khmer Rouge fanatics with an external catalyst for their "revolution." Out of the inferno of bombs, war and invasion, they declared 1975 to be "Year Zero," the beginning of an Orwellian age in which there would be no families, no sentiment, no expression of love or grief, no medicines, no hospitals, no schools, no books, no learning, no music, no holidays, no post, no money: only work and death. . . .
>
> More than two million people, or about a third of the population, died brutal deaths during the four years of Khmer Rouge terror. . . . Virtually the entire middle class appears to have been exterminated; out of the 550 Cambodian doctors before April, 1975, 46 remain. At the last census there were 11,000 university students; 450 have been found alive.
>
> The survivors, most of whom are children, now face the real prospect of extinction. "We have six months to save almost three million people from starvation and related diseases," said UNICEF's Beaumont. . . .
>
> Only six planes with food and medicine have reached Cambodia from the West in the 10 months since the Vietnamese routed the Khmer Rouge and earned the gratitude of the majority of the Khmer people and the condemnation of the United States, which, having sent its greatest bombers over Cambodia, has not funded one of these relief flights.

The *Times* writer, John Pilger, had gone to Cambodia to make a television film of conditions there, and he and his associates could not escape the "screams of fleshless, dying children."

> In the "hospital" of a Phnom Penh orphanage, laid out like a World War I field station in the gothic shell of an abandoned chapel, there were children who had been found wandering in the forest, living off tree bark, grass and poisonous plants. Their appearance almost denied their humanity: rows of staring, manic eyes set in skin like the frayed cloth of a tailor's dummy; once our filming had to stop while the cameraman walked away to cry.
>
> In the "people's hospital" where every piece of modern equipment had been mutilated by the Khmer Rouge and the dispensary was bare, the cries of children reached such a crescendo that they could be heard in the street outside. When we returned the next morning, another six had wasted to death: their names chalked on a blackboard beside a poster reminding us that 1979 was the International Year of the Child.

Behind these horrors, along with other causes, was a nation's "military training."

FRONTIERS

The "No" and "Yes" of Peacemakers

THE twentieth century has the distinction of being the time when war became both *inevitable* and *intolerable.* That is, for most people, the idea of putting an end to war seems the extreme of forlorn hope, while, on the other hand, the technology of nuclear science has made the threat of war an evil beyond imagining. Today many groups work for world peace, and the rhetoric which denounces war as total folly is heard daily, yet the average person has little expectation that war can be avoided. For this reason a basic pessimism has settled over the world—an outlook that may be sound enough in respect to the goal of a completely peaceful planet. Too often overlooked, however, is that working for peace is not an all-or-nothing activity. The problem may be defined in absolutes, but the solution, in human experience, comes about only through small steps of change.

Commonly ignored is the fact that a personal absolute—refusal by young men (and now, young women) to serve in a military force—has a *relative* effect for good on society. Take for example the article on Conscientious Objection in the first edition of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* published in 1930. After a historical survey of the subject, the writer, Clarence Marsh Case, concluded:

> The conscientious objector has always stood as a most difficult challenger of the political state's claim to absolute authority over its citizens. Conscientious objection is itself simply a special case under nonconformity, and heresy is another aspect of the same thing. The list of conscientious objectors therefore includes most of the intellectual and moral innovators in human history.

A conscientious objector who refuses to undergo military training is one who takes to heart Albert Einstein's statement: "You cannot simultaneously prevent and prepare for war." And taking his personal responsibility seriously, he adopts the principle of the War Resisters League: "Wars will cease when men refuse to fight them."

In the East the rejection of war and violence goes back at least as far as the Buddha, whose advocacy of harmlessness once "made all Asia mild," and in the West it begins with the example of Christ and his early followers. Today, in Europe and America, the most influential pacifist groups are the War Resisters International and the Christian International Fellowship of Reconciliation. How do the people in these groups think about what they are attempting?

Two articles in *Fellowship* for September provide some answers to this question. In one of them, James H. Forest, coordinator of the International Fellowship, with headquarters in Holland, was moved to describe the efforts of FOR members after a visitor had declared that their peace work was a "complete failure." Forest felt obliged to agree, saying—

> . . . not a day has passed [in his two and a half years as coordinator] without a certain immersion in bad news, including kinds that receive little public notice: certain arrests, certain deaths, certain persons who have disappeared. Our work frequently renews a pained awareness of what is both too normal and too secret to merit press interest: the assembly each day of new weapons of mass destruction. One is reminded that our lives are threatened less by local gangsters than world leaders, few of whom have the will and initiative to risk careers in order to challenge a world defense system that threatens human annihilation.

Well, do pacifists do any good at all? Jim Forest muses:

> Given the weaponry at hand these last few decades, it is a wonder that any of us are alive to wonder. Pacifists, it is fair to say, have had a hand in this. Had they been still rarer, had there been no Fellowships of Reconciliation, might not the disaster we seek to prevent have already happened?
>
> Perhaps not. One dare not boast too much about what never occurred. Yet there is no doubt that pacifists have played a part in saving, if not billions, then millions of lives.
>
> An example: A member of the White House cabinet in the early 1950s, during the Korean War,

> credits an FOR project with convincing President Eisenhower to reject a Pentagon proposal to attack China with nuclear weapons. Tens of thousands of Americans put a little rice in small FOR-distributed cotton sacks and sent them to Eisenhower, appealing that surplus American grain be sent to China to relieve a famine. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him," said the text printed on the bags. Surplus grain was never sent, but—unknown to the Fellowship until twenty years later—Eisenhower was moved to prohibit a nuclear attack which would have killed many and which might have sparked a world war. . . . The undertakings of pacifists often seem tragically unsuccessful. Yet they may restrain governments more than we realize, saving many lives.

The sacks of rice sent to President Eisenhower were an organizational feat, impressive in its simple moral appeal. The other article in *Fellowship* is Will Warren's story of what one Quaker was able to accomplish, doing what he thought he must do, in Northern Ireland. Men who had become "terrorists" through desperation learned to trust him—he took their children out for days in the country, and did other friendly things like that, but nothing to help their violent enterprises. When there were confrontations with the British Army, he would simply stand in the middle, between the two armed forces. This convinced practically everyone of his sincerity! When some children set out to destroy an Army post, Warren walked into the riot area, hoping to slow things down. He did this every day for three months. Finally, wherever he went, violence lessened or stopped.

Explaining, he said:

> Primarily, I wanted to demonstrate that there is something more powerful than what comes out of the barrel of a gun. Also, I wished to show that I was neither pro-Army nor pro-rioter, but pro-people.
>
> One evening, I was asked to go along to the Apprentice Boys' Hall where there was a phone call from Belfast for me. It was the Ulster Defense Association leadership calling to say that two of their members had been murdered, it was thought by Derry Provos. The UDA proposed to murder six Derry Catholics that night unless I could assure them within an hour that no Derry person was involved. An hour wasn't enough time, I protested, I must have at least two. They agreed. I hurried around to Bogside where I was lucky to find the man I wanted; he assured me that no one in Derry knew anything of the murders. I rushed back home and telephoned Belfast just in time to prevent a party of men from setting out for Derry. It is interesting that each side accepted the word of the other, something I found to be true on numerous occasions. All that was necessary was to have a trusted intermediary.

When the intermediary was trusted, both sides believed what he said. "I'm certain," Warren says, "that it was only because I treated them as friends that I had any influence at all." *Nations*, alas, never draw the obvious conclusion from such personal realities. No "nation," therefore, will ever do much of anything to put an end to war. Only people accept the currency of trust.