

# WHAT SHALL IT PROFIT A MAN...?

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. CHARLES MALIK

The following is an address given at the Second International Industrial Conference in San Francisco, California in September, 1965.

It was twenty-one years ago that the Charter of the United Nations was drafted and the whole notion of development began to take shape. Asia and Africa were then almost entirely under colonial rule, and many of the leaders of the world spoke and acted as if that rule was eternal. But those of us who came from countries which had since the First World War attained independence from foreign domination rejected that assumption. We argued that we wanted nothing of the language of the Covenant of the League of Nations in the new Charter—no such language as “colonies and territories... inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world”; no such language as “the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization”; no such language as “the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations.”

The truth was that a new age had already been ushered in, of whose import most of us who gathered to draft the UN’s Charter did not have the slightest inkling. The characteristics of this age were immediately revealed by three points:

1. Those who insisted that the terms “colonies” and “tutelage,” the language of the League’s Covenant, had to be eliminated got their way; the Charter of the UN contained no such words. Instead, a central section of the Charter consisted of a declaration regarding non-self-governing territories made by members of the United Nations which had or which would assume responsibilities for the administration of such territories. The mere use of the phrase “non-self-governing territories” instead of the term “colonies” was itself most significant. This meant that these territories were to be thought of, not as colonies, but as countries not yet self-governing; in this declaration the administering members (and this covered all colonial powers) pledged themselves, among other things, “to ensure... the political, economic, social, and educational advancement” of these peoples (and this covered all dependent peoples), “to develop self- government,” and “to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions.” This was all the more remarkable if we recall that the whole colonial system, apart from what the victors had acquired from the vanquished, was absolutely outside the scope of the League of Nations, and thus the language of the UN Charter would have been wholly foreign to the spirit of the Covenant.

2. Another difference between the UN and the League is the former's emphasis on the notion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and of the dignity and worth of the human person. This notion became a central feature of the Charter, but was completely absent from the climate of thought surrounding the League.

3. Finally, self-determination, which was not so much as mentioned in the Covenant of the League, although President Wilson was the principal architect of the whole system, was adopted as one of the primary purposes of the United Nations.

Such, then, were the principal characteristics of the new age. Those of us who were immersed in the daily routine of drafting, debating, and lobbying little appreciated the spirit that we had actually set in motion, or at least codified. Such appreciation comes only with the perspective of time. It is only now, with the benefit of twenty years of history behind us, that we see that what was enacted was nothing short of the formal recognition by the international community of the greatest revolution of our time: that man was entitled by nature to certain inalienable rights and freedoms; that these rights included equality, justice, and free self-development; that it was only a matter of time before all peoples, all nations, and all cultures would actually exercise these rights; and that therefore the fate of the colonial system was absolutely sealed.

The Charter did not create this revolution. It was only the occasion on which it was reflected and noted; and because the noting took place in the most solemn way imaginable, namely, in a charter for the new world body itself, the United Nations became the most potent vehicle for the channeling and focusing of this greatest revolution of our time: the setting of all humanity on the irreversible path of self-development. What were the causes and conditions, even prior to the formation of the United Nations, which doomed the colonial system, awakened Asia and Africa to their natural rights, opened the future before them, and made the whole notion of development the most creative principle of this age?

## EIGHT REASONS

They were clearly eight. (1) The internal maturation of these peoples, brought about by the stimulation and challenge of western civilization even more than by their own natural growth. (2) The two world wars, which shook the whole world to its foundations and which considerably weakened Europe, relative both to its two daughters, America and Russia, and to its two dependencies, Asia and Africa. (3) The American Revolution, with its emphasis on man and freedom, and its distinct anticolonial spirit, expressing itself both through Wilson's principle of self-determination and through America's consistent support of India's struggle for independence. (4) The Russian Revolution, with its policy, partly arising from ideological conviction, partly from defensive-offensive motives, of bringing about the liquidation of all European, non-Russian colonialism. (5) The fact that

[Representing his country's interests while Lebanese Ambassador to the U.S., and subsequently serving the world community as President of the UN General Assembly (1958-1959), Charles H. Malik is uniquely able to appraise development from both a national and a global point of view. Currently Dr. Malik holds the position of Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the American University of Beirut.]

both America and Russia, holding these views, and at times vying with each other on them, were among the principal victors in the Second World War and the principal participants in the San Francisco Conference. (6) The Nazi atrocities against human rights and fundamental freedoms, which produced such a world-wide revulsion and horror that the conscience of man simply swore to high heaven that such barbarism would never happen again. (7) The scientific, technological, and industrial revolutions, which bore upon the life and thought of these peoples from every side. (8) The fact that the western peoples, by reason both of their religion and their fundamental philosophy, had a guilty conscience about their relations to these dependent peoples, and as soon as you develop such a guilty conscience about any issue, you are already done for. The greatest revolution of our age, then, is nothing accidental; it is the integral expression of a total concrete world situation.

What has happened is common knowledge to all. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was proclaimed in 1948. Asia and Africa are now almost completely free. Between them, if they combine their votes, they can dominate the United Nations. Scores of billions of dollars from all over the industrialized world have been poured into schemes of development for them, both bilaterally, multilaterally, and through the United Nations. The competition for their mind, for the orientation of their policy, and for the system of their government, has been most intense, both as between America and Europe, the west and the Soviet Union, and now between between China and the rest of the world.

Development indeed existed before; what is new is self-development. It is not development in them, but development of them, if not altogether by them, that is decisive today. It is they-and not somebody else-who are ultimately responsible for their decisions, their priorities, and their plans. This does not mean that they are impervious to advice and callous to suggestion; it does mean that after every advice is proffered and every suggestion made, they and they alone are responsible for the final decision. This is the awesome meaning of self-development. Nothing is more exhilarating than to see the whole of humanity, in all its natural divisions and tribes, marching forward side by side, each in accordance with its proper gifts and endowments, but all in freedom, in equality, and in mutual respect. Nothing is more exhilarating than this sight, provided the dangers, the pitfalls, and the falsities that may then arise are understood and overcome.

## THE LIMITS OF AMBITION

Development is not a simple matter. Nor is it enough for a nation to catch the fever of development to succeed in developing itself. You see other nations prosperous and industrialized, and you say: I am going to be prosperous and industrialized myself. You see them with Cadillacs and atomic bombs, and not only do you want to have these things, but you want to manufacture them yourself.

To envy and to wish to follow suit are not enough. There are conditions for self-development; there are also obstacles and limitations; and above all there is a price that you must morally determine to pay. While it may not be kind and politic to remind people just awakened to their lot and on fire to do something about it that there are strict limitations to their hopes and intentions, in the interest of truth and world peace, and in the long run out of sincere compassion for them, it is most important to expose the false hopes that they usually entertain about the possibilities of their development. I say, in the interest of world peace, because one of the principal causes both of international conflict and internal strife is unfounded expectations. These are based ultimately either on deception or on a belief in magic. If only these hopes had been moderated in accordance with reality, they would have made people much more sober and amenable to peaceful and humble association with others.

Climate, geographical location, smallness of territory and poverty of natural resources set natural physical limits to all development. It is not an accident that civilization never arose in the desert or in the arctic regions or in the jungles of Africa. The amount of physical and mental activity of which even the best human being is capable in the torrid and tropical regions of the earth is a fraction of what the same person can put forth in the more temperate zones. The booming air-conditioning industry all over the world bears testimony to this fact. It is quite possible to work out scientific coefficients of human productivity based on climate, humidity, altitude, and a series of other physical factors affecting the human body. Such coefficients would show that a country of 100 million people living under bodily debilitating conditions is hardly the match, in sheer productivity-even if all other things were equal, which of course they never are-of another country with 20 million people living under less inclement and harsh conditions. And it is not only a matter of quantity of production; what is drastically curtailed is also the quality of thought and creativity itself. You become mechanical and lazy, sleepy and dull; the joy and freedom of the spirit depart from you; you are depressed and miserable, unable to think and sing, unable to laugh and dance. All this is a matter of direct experience and observation. There is cruelty and injustice in all this, but it is nevertheless an ineluctable fact. It cannot be blamed on anybody, certainly not on "imperialism" or "colonialism" or "capitalism," or this or that "class" or this or that "race"; it

can be blamed only on the elements. This does not mean that the harsh conditions cannot be overcome; but, in the first place, there are always limits to how much they can be overcome, and, secondly, they can only be overcome by infusions, both intellectual and economic, and sometimes even racial and political, from those regions where nature is more beneficent, more compassionate and kind. There is thus a final natural determinism that cannot be blinked or fought against.

## CONSTRAINTS OF AN OSSIFIED CULTURE

Development does not only depend on the clemency of nature. It is a function of the social and cultural conditions as well, which in turn may have ossified as a result of natural determinism. Where the family enslaves instead of liberates, development is correspondingly impeded. Where the children are not cared for and loved, the next generation is not going to be free and vigorous to create. Where there are rigid caste structures, mobility, both vertical and horizontal, is restricted, and development is correspondingly hampered. Feudal society, which is the norm in many countries, does not provide favorable conditions for the requisite kind of development. Where there is no middle class, which is again the norm in many developing countries, enterprise, daring, initiative, independence, experimentation, adventure, risk taking—all those things that are necessary requisites for development—suffer considerably. Certain views of God, man, mind, society, government, and destiny are inimical to development; but in most developing countries it is precisely such views that prevail. Where labor, especially manual labor, is looked upon as something degrading, development is correspondingly impeded. In development, then, you are dealing with a total cultural situation and not only with narrow economic values. The family, the woman, the child, the class, lords and serfs, the free professions, the prevailing religion, the attitude toward work—all these things have their decisive say in the matter.

The question then becomes: is the developing country morally prepared to pay the social and cultural price for the coveted development? Is it prepared to transform the family, free women, revolutionize its concept of the child, do away with class distinctions, liberate serfs, promote a free middle class, reform its religion, dignify labor as the noblest thing in the world? Confronted with such a price, especially if the full implications are clear, it may balk and say: to hell with all development! It will then begin talking about the values of its culture, about its not wanting to barter away its soul and its distinctive national imprint. But what if imprint, culture, and soul are incompatible with development? Having caught the fever of development, you cannot eat your cake and nostalgically have it. You want to develop yourself? All right then, you must to a large extent give up your values, your soul,

and your national imprint. Indeed, the sheer material pressure for economic development is breaking up societies at all their cultural levels. That is why they can only look forward now to generations of revolutions and upheavals until a new equilibrium is attained.

Nor can self-sustaining growth, as it is called, take place without the cultivation of science and theory for their own sake. It is relatively easy to borrow a principle discovered and formulated elsewhere and then go about applying it. This is not development; this is imitative, parasitical existence. The point is to discover the principle yourself, or to engage in the most exciting of all pursuits, to wit, the discovery of general principles for which others will in turn be indebted to you. For if you remain imitative and parasitical, then no sooner have you copied and applied the principle that others have discovered than they have moved on to other creative principles, leaving you miles behind. To keep on trailing imitatively behind is exactly the hallmark of underdevelopedness.

## THE NEED TO WESTERNIZE

It was the Greek habit of seeking for universal principles that enabled western man to explore and exploit his world. And while it is not fashionable today-in fact people are ashamed-to say that so-and-so is westernized, the blunt fact is that the under-developed peoples must be westernized, at least to the extent of nurturing science and theory, before the process of self-sustaining growth can take root. It is sometimes said that Asia is the land of contemplation and the west the realm of sordidness and action; this is not true. God knows, there is plenty of sordidness and corruption everywhere, but if Asia is the land of something, it is the land of imagination and not of contemplation. Free imagination is guided by nothing, whereas contemplation is the most responsible action possible, because it is wholly controlled by the truth. Contemplative existence, which has since the Greeks been perfected in the west more creatively than anywhere else, is the rapt beholding of existent being. This is the source of all strength and all fruitful action.

The terms “western” and “westernized” do not at all refer to geography or ethnic origins; they are terms of culture and outlook and attitude. The joy of vision for its own sake, the thrill of developing a connected argument based on observation and grounded in first principles, the pleasure of subsuming a particular under a universal, which in turn articulates with other universals into a system, the ability to detach oneself and view an object exactly as it is in itself- these spiritual qualities do not exist in abundant supply in the underdeveloped countries. But without them science and technology cannot arise and these countries can never industrialize. Western man was not born a theoretician and a scientist; he attained scientific and theoretical stature because he submitted himself to Greek and Christian

apprenticeship. The Greeks molded his soul to faith in reason and Christianity to the belief that there is a guarantor of the order of the universe. Without faith in order and in the ability of the human mind to grasp that order, science is impossible. And this faith you acquire by entering into a whole tradition, a whole culture. Nature will rebel if all you do is use it. Nature wants first to be loved before it will yield itself to your embrace. And love means theory, detachment, contemplation, the tender vision which sees everything and conserves everything.

## TOO MUCH POLITICS, TOO LITTLE SCIENCE

It follows that to be able to develop themselves the underdeveloped countries must promote scientific research in all fields. Neither their history nor their social conditions nor their religion should be considered out of bounds so far as research is concerned. Their contribution to scientific journals today is negligible. Their thinkers and scientists are not at the very forefront of creation and discovery. Political and social issues occupy them far more than the idea of truth. It is a fact that they cannot yet boast of their Socrateses, their Averroëses, their Galileos, their Brunos, their Einsteins-men who saw and dared to affirm, and who suffered at the hands of their country- men, not because they were seeking riches or glory or power for themselves, nor because they were leading revolutions, but because they fell in love with the truth, and the world would rather live in darkness than permit the light of the truth to dissipate its illusions and disturb its complacency.

Students from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East today go to Russia, Europe, and America to study, not only about nature and about western civilization, but about themselves and their own history and civilization. When will Asia, Africa and the Middle East develop universities to which students from the west will repair, not only to study about nature and the cultures and civilizations of these lands, but about themselves and their own western civilization itself? It may take them fifty or a hundred or a thousand years, but not until Africa, Asia, and the Middle East develop something of the concentration of theory and learning that exists in the German or French or English universities, or clusters about the Charles River in Boston or the Bay Area in San Francisco, or the Hudson River at New York, can they truly speak of their ability to develop themselves.

You want to be independent? You want to be free? You want to develop your own resources and turn them to the enrichment of your life? All that is excellent and you have every right to it. But I beg you to consider first the state of the mind in your own domain. Consider your universities, your institutes, your laboratories, your scientists, your thinkers. First, do these agents of the spirit exist? Secondly, are they free? And thirdly, are they



producing anything, not in the realm of data and statistics, not in the realm of raw materials, but in the realm of creative thought—anything respected and recognized and used by the greatest thinkers of the world? These are the questions. The best index of a country's ability to develop itself is how much of its total budget, both public and private, it is devoting, not to the army, not to the production of raw materials or consumer goods, not even to the building of industry and the opening of schools, but to pure theoretical research.

The price here is humble entry into the cumulative tradition of thought. When a scientist or thinker in Russia or Europe or America refers to Pythagoras or Aristotle or Roger Bacon or Descartes or Newton or Einstein, he refers to them as his fathers or his uncles or his cousins; at any rate they are his spiritual ancestors, and it never occurs to him that they exist anywhere save in himself and his own tradition. This is the infinite richness which lives in him and his culture, on which he rests and feeds, and from which he springs. Not so with the scientists or thinkers of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. All this richness appears to come to them from the outside. Their problem is to assimilate it and make it their own. Not until their thinkers view Aristotle or Descartes or Newton as their uncle or their cousin, not until they place themselves integrally in this line of tradition, can they truly create in the commanding realm of thought and theory. For there is no community of the spirit comparable in depth and power and effectiveness to the community of the continuous line from Pythagoras to Einstein. If their hopes of self-development are going to be more than pleasant dreams, the underdeveloped countries must enter this community.

## THOUGHT IS NOT USED; IT USES

Community, continuity, and cumulativeness are part of the essence of thought. We have behind us a cumulative tradition of 4,000 years. Because it is behind us, this tradition is really before us to contemplate and to absorb. Just as nature rebels if all you do is use it, so thought refuses to be played with, in a mercenary fashion, from the outside. It insists on using you, namely, on permeating your soul, before you can really use it. For the greatest given nature is human nature, and the greatest thing about this nature is all the experience and wisdom it has gathered and cherished and passed on. The underdeveloped countries cannot start from scratch; they cannot begin the history of the spirit anew, nor need they do so. But they must make themselves part of the intellectual tradition if they hope to reach a point of theoretical creativity. And you simply deceive them if you do not tell them, even at cost of frightening them, that the price of reaching such a point is the total and radical transformation of their soul.

Another condition of self-development is to master, at least among the intellectual elite, a European language. The mind of the underdeveloped countries, for as far ahead as we can peer into the future, is absolutely fated to be bilingual. This fact is of the utmost spiritual-cultural significance. There are six languages that offer themselves as second tongues to the mother tongues of all the countries of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East: English, French, German, Russian, Italian, and Spanish. Without the mastery of one of these languages it is impossible for these countries to develop themselves. The ultimate reason these six tongues play this controlling function is because they spring from the same cultural trunk-the Graeco-Latin-European humane tradition-because they carry a fullness of thought and spirit which no other tongue carries, and because they have been for centuries interacting with each other. Let those who speak these tongues therefore realize the infinite responsibilities which devolve upon them!

To recapitulate: (1) development must reckon with natural physical limitations; (2) development is a function of social-cultural conditions; (3) development, to be self-development, depends on the cultivation of science and theory for their own sake, and this cultivation is impossible without a costly entry into the community of the cumulative intellectual tradition. On top of all this, (4) development is also a function of the economic and political system.

Western professors are now vying with one another in proving, by the most ingenious arguments, that the best economic system for the developing countries is some form of socialism, and the best political system some form of dictatorship. I can draw up a bibliography of 100 books, each replete with the most impressive statistics, case studies, and economic and social analyses, and all coming uniformly to this same conclusion. Freedom and democracy are not good for the self-development of these countries: there must be dictatorship. Capitalism and free enterprise are not good for their self-development: there must be state ownership of the means of production. So far as the way out of underdevelopedness is concerned, the professors appear to have been won to the Marxist thesis.

Capitalism today is a term of reproach. In the eyes of the leaders of many of these countries, it is synonymous with exploitation and evil. It used to be socialism and communism, but now it is capitalism. And democracy and freedom have become so ambiguous that the slave today is free and the police state a form of democracy. It is an interesting task to find out who contributed more to this state of affairs, the communists or the professors.

## COGENT BUT DOGMATIC

What is missing in all these 100 books is a single controlled experiment in which you take two countries with closely analogous conditions and let one develop democratically through free and fair economic competition and the other through dictatorship and communism, and then compare the results after about a generation, when the initial frictions and difficulties have been overcome and people have had time to reflect on the fruits of freedom and un-freedom, both as a method of getting them out of their underdeveloped state and as a way of life. In the absence of such a controlled experiment, much of current analysis, despite its apparent cogency, remains dogmatic. Until they have performed this experiment, the professors really do not know from sheer observation and statistics that one system is better than the other.

They always give you the examples of Russia and other communizing countries. Marshaling impressive statistics on productivity and on the rise of the standard of living, they appear to prove, doubtless to their own satisfaction, that communism and dictatorship were the best things for these countries. But it is impossible to prove this until the controlled experiment to which I referred has been performed. From sheer observation, we have no idea where Russia would be today if she had developed along lines of freedom, democracy, and capitalist competition. All that these men prove is that here a certain system was imposed and here are the results. But from this they can draw no comparative conclusions with other systems whatever.

Then these writers insist that China and India are running a race on whose outcome depends, as it were, the fate of the universe. This appears to be their controlled experiment. But, in the first place, conditions are so different in these two countries that the experiment is not a controlled one at all, and from its outcome no comparative results whatever can be drawn. If China “succeeds” and India “fails,” nothing then necessarily follows about the relative values of freedom and communism. And, in the second place, those who want India to “win” don’t mind if she exercises as much state economic control and as much central political authority as possible, provided she emerges the victor. The question, then, ceases to be the comparative merits of the two systems: it is merged into the power politics of the cold war between China and the rest of the world.

In these matters controlled experiments cannot be performed. In these matters history itself is the arena of decision. It is true the communist-socialist-authoritarian ideology has spread and is spreading. But far from being due to its inherent worth, this “success” may have come about from quite other causes, such as force and intrigue, the studied dissemination of atheistic materialism, or the snoring sleep of others.

## A CONSPICUOUS ABSENCE OF PROOF

Scanning the free arena of history, I find no evidence that the communist and communizing countries are faring better than the capitalist and capitalizing ones. The latter appear to be stronger, happier, more prosperous, more energetic, and the subjects of the envy of the former. They are tackling their many economic and social problems with increasing wisdom and success, and without sacrificing their essential freedom. There is far greater nostalgia for freedom in the realm of communism and dictatorship than there is yearning for communism and dictatorship in the realm of freedom. The Berlin wall is dramatic proof of that, and there are many other walls of a different nature that can also be adduced as proofs. Moreover, there has been some experimentation with freedom and individual incentive in the communist economies. I find the problems of these economies at least as formidable as those of free ones. And in the world of the emerging countries themselves, everyone that has not sacrificed its freedom upon the altar of socialism and dictatorship is happier, healthier, and more prosperous than those who have. It is a myth, therefore, a dogmatic and doctrinaire myth, to hold that the best the underdeveloped countries can look forward to is some socializing, communizing, and dictatorializing regime. At least it is an unproven proposition.

## IS DEVELOPMENT THE PREEMINENT GOOD?

But what if it were founded on solid evidence? What if socialism, communism, and dictatorship were indeed prerequisites to development? One has then to ask whether economic development is worth the purchase price, if that price is not merely the destruction of ossified social and cultural conditions, but also the weakening of cherished free values. Is development the highest value, and are all other values subsidiary, left to scramble for position as best they can underneath the preeminent good? To be human, to experience that inner joy which only the free know, to trust your reason, to be unafraid, to seek the truth wherever you may find it, to discuss even the absurd, to be interested in the affairs of your government in such a way as to effect a difference in its tone and its direction, to worship God as your conscience dictates—are all these values of freedom unimportant unless they serve the nation or help to increase its gross national product?

There are many who believe that development is the invariable and that all other things fluctuate; and if any value cannot find a place for itself in the development-oriented society, then so much the worse for it. These pontiffs of development reveal that in their scale of values, freedom does not come first. If this is not the case, then let them dare say so—and act on what they say. Let them behave, theoretically and practically, so as to convince us that they regard nondevelopmental values as more important, and that, in the event of an

irreconcilable conflict, they would cast aside development to preserve freedom. Let them reaffirm what they know or should know: that all the full stomachs, all the high standards of living, all the development in the world, cannot by themselves make one man honest, or magnanimous, or grand, or sincere, or pure, or forgiving, or humble, or loving, or happy, or self-sacrificing.

It is worthwhile pointing out that those who reject freedom for development really run the risk of losing both. Development depends, both positively and negatively, on its ends and purposes. Positively, because the end always determines the means to be taken to achieve it. And negatively, because if the spirit you are developing is warlike and aggressive, the rest of the world is not going to sit idly by. If the kind of person your civilization is producing is obnoxious, incongruous, arrogant, contradicting, nihilistic, and full of hatred, the rest of the world is going to do something about it. It all depends on the kind of spirit your development generates. Surely everybody has every right to develop himself, but always within the strict limits of consideration for others. China cannot go on developing itself in a manner repugnant to others, including Russia; sooner or later this disapproval is going to make itself felt. And there are many little Chinas whose development is under the daily scrutiny of the rest of the world. When the time of reckoning comes, many a development can only end in setting back its people hundreds of years.

## THE PRICE IS SPIRITUAL POVERTY

It is thus the tragedy of the underdeveloped world that many of its leaders promise their peoples material abundance, and either cannot deliver or can only do so at the price of a spiritual poverty which threatens the stability of the material gains themselves. In many of these countries freedom, in every sense of the term, especially in the personal, spiritual sense, is being overcome by unfreedom. The mind is becoming absolutely terrorized against standing up for man and truth, while the intellectual classes—the teachers, students, thinkers, and poets—grow estranged from the concepts of a free society.

Much of the fault belongs to the west. The west which has aroused and awakened the desires of these peoples and fed them false and extravagant hopes, and then, when hopes and desires were unfulfilled, said: “Well, the only thing is to keep the lid down, and prevent the caldron from boiling over, by strong and dictatorial government.” The west which has spoken about man and freedom in muffled voices, and which has conceded to the foes of freedom by arguing, in effect, that the only difference between them and it is that whereas they want progress by revolution and force, the west wants it by evolution and peace. This is pernicious nonsense, for the real difference is not in the method of reaching the end, but in the character of the end itself—the kind of man and spirit and civilization that will then emerge.

The tragedy of the industrialized world is that its thinkers no longer believe and project its ultimate values-I mean, believe in the human person, in the ultimacy of man and his freedom, in the creative originality of the mind and spirit, in objective truth, in the ability of the mind to grasp it, in the potency of love, and in the reality of God. They try to explain these values away; in fact, they are ashamed of them, or they preach their relativity, either to special cultures or to special epochs. They come to the under-developed peoples concealing from them their ultimate values. And why? Because they no longer know them! They thus deceive the underdeveloped by revealing to them only the superficial, the external, the merest crumbs of existence. Nothing is more tragic than the sight of a man having everything, and yet, in approaching the desperately needy, not giving of what he has, either because he does not really know what he has or because he no longer believes in it.

It is a question of faith in the values of freedom. This is a most serious matter. If the leaders of the developed world are ashamed of their system and its values, if they believe that these values are good for their own people but not for all men, if their thinkers keep on dinning into the ears of the world the unproved proposition that their system is not good enough for the underdeveloped countries, if capitalism continues to be a term of reproach, if free enterprise is treated with contempt by the people of Asia and Africa, if capitalism and free enterprise are not going to be rehabilitated morally, if the idea of "development at any price" is accepted without question-if this state of affairs continues to reign, I believe that the west is already licked, and awaits only the final coup de grâce. I am not thinking of the crude, only cutthroat, individualistic capitalism of the 19<sup>th</sup> century; I am thinking of the mature and socially responsible system of today. I am thinking of the ultimate values of freedom which lie behind this system, values which have been preserved through and despite the maturation of this system, values which have made possible, not only the system itself, but the dearest possessions of western civilization.

This is not a question of professors or of propaganda. It is a question of the highest statesmanship, one that has been thoroughly aroused to the terrible crisis of the age. The recent drift must be brought to an end. Shame, apology, hesitation, uncertainty, the sense of inferiority and guilt, all this must be ruthlessly brushed aside. Man, his freedom and spirit, must be reinstated in their place. The greatest values of the western heritage must be rediscovered and re, and all the alien values must never be allowed to obscure or overwhelm them. There is no meaning to this moment of history save to rise resolutely to this challenge.

## THREE STAGES OF ASSOCIATION

It is only by striving to meet this challenge that the western nations can fashion meaningful relations with the underdeveloped world. The association of developed and less developed historically has covered three stages. The first stage is colonial domination, but since the spirit cannot stand domination indefinitely, a rebellion ensues. This leads to the second stage, to which I apply the term “monadic independence.” Here the detached colony wishes to be left all alone. But it soon discovers that it needs the developed world, and so it seeks to enter into new creative relations with it, this time on the basis of equality and mutual respect. The first state-association between unequals-is false, because the stronger tends to dominate and exploit the weaker. The second stage-dissociation into monadic equals-is abstract, because the weaker desperately needs the stronger.

The third stage-reassociation between equals-is stable, provided the limits of equality are carefully discriminated. Such then is the law of development in the relations of the more- to the less-developed countries of the world.

The first two stages are mostly behind us: colonialism has gone, but so has monadic independence. Our era is the third stage in which new associations are developed between equals. But equality here cannot possibly be absolute: it can only be sovereign and moral equality. It is mutual respect between the otherwise unequal. For generations and perhaps centuries to come, new creative associations are going to be sought between the countries of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, on the one hand, and the more developed countries, on the other.

## THEY ONLY ASK TO BELONG

The most important principle of the new association is to make the underdeveloped countries feel in truth that they belong. It is not a matter of giving, nor a matter of taking, nor even a matter of giving and taking; it is a matter of belonging. The developing countries must feel that they belong to humanity, that they have a part, indeed an honorable and important part, to play in the drama of being. As soon as man suspects that something of transcendent importance is going on somewhere, which he cannot appreciate or understand or take part in or enact himself, from which he is debarred in principle, the spirit is soured at the core. Man must feel that he belongs. This is a task that will tax the powers of the highest statesmanship, the highest thought, and the deepest spirit. But it is a task that must and can be accomplished.

The evil of the colonial system is not so much its exploitation as its moral treatment of peoples as inferior, as not belonging. The oppressed soon internalize this feeling so that they believe their masters and begin to look upon themselves as not belonging. This is all so false, so untrue. Man essentially belongs. The underdeveloped peoples would put up with suffering, any inequality, any task assigned to them, if only they believed that they belonged. Part of the genius of communism is precisely its ability to include them, to banish their feeling of estrangement.

In the spirit of including him, of giving him the sense of belonging, of taking him into communion, you can turn to underdeveloped man and address him as follows, and, with a twinkle in his eye, he will understand you perfectly, without the slightest resentment:

“You have every right to be independent and every right to develop yourself in freedom. But you must acknowledge that you are not really independent of others and you cannot develop yourself alone. The more fortunate people—more fortunate physically, naturally, scientifically, culturally, spiritually—are themselves the bearers of history, destiny, and creativity. You are a very nice fellow and all that, but ultimate responsibility before time and eternity resides more in the developed nations than in you. You resent the phrase ‘the sacred trust of civilization’ being applied to you, and of course in the developed nations used this phrase with a sense of pride and superiority, they would be wrong, and some day they would suffer retribution for it. But it is a fact that you do constitute a ‘sacred trust’ for these people. Nothing is more obvious than that you cannot be independent of Europe, Russia, and America, nor can you develop yourself without them. This raises tremendous issues of responsibility both for you and for them. For them, because they must pray that they be worthy of the wonderful blessings of which they are the custodians. And for you, because there are limits to how much you can envy them, or hate them, or wish them ill, or play them off against each other.”

The heart of man craves rest and peace even more than motion and development—the rest and peace of fellowship. In fact, all development is in order to land him ultimately in that. Imagine then perfect love, perfect trust, perfect power, perfect fellowship, perfect understanding, perfect warmth of intimacy and belonging, and you have already entered into life eternal. I assure you man does not want more than that. Give him that, and he does not mind death itself. Only the lonely fear death, but not the beloved. When you insist on development and progress, it is presumably because you cannot assure him of love and fellowship and forgiveness. Man says: if only I am understood, if only I am trusted, if only I have a friend, if only I am given a chance, if only I have a lover, if only I can love myself! I assure you this is all that the underdeveloped countries are saying in the end. Provide them then with conditions of love and trust, and together with them you can develop their immense resources for all the time to come, and together with them you can go home and sleep in peace.