

examination, I have no doubt that this college is entirely true to its religious heritage.

But one must look beyond these identifiable parts of conviction to the larger conservative Quaker heritage. And here one encounters difficult questions as well. The Society of Friends was founded in a profound spirit of anti-intellectualism, and yet here we have today a Quaker institution that is renowned for its intellectualism. In 1640, Quakers were banned from English universities, and the illiterate founder of the Society reacted by expressing his contempt for what went on within those universities.

Even William Penn himself, exposed to the university education of seventeenth-century England, observed bitterly, "We are at pains to make scholars, but not men." . . .

The educational system [Frank Aydelotte] brought to Swarthmore in 1921 was a full-blooded descendant of the educational system against which Friends had rebelled three centuries earlier . . . I dare say that he would . . . [have said] that this was simply a sign that the Society of Friends had matured a lot in three hundred years.

Obviously, something *had* changed. Either Quaker

beliefs had been modified, or their translation into educational policy had been garbled, or Swarthmore was no longer consciously dedicated to the beliefs of the Society. Or, more likely, history will reveal some combination of all these. . . .

Swarthmore's historical experience suggests, at least, that the relationship between organized religion and higher education is a complex one, and that the translation of religious conviction into educational practice is both difficult and challenging. . . .

If I have seemed to suggest that Swarthmore may have become oriented more to the world of learning than to the life of the Society of Friends, I am not saying . . . that Swarthmore has "sold its Quaker heritage for a mess of worldly pottage." The founders of this college consciously avoided Societal control of the college at the time of its founding, in order to allow for the possibility that time and change would warrant a greater degree of independence from formal religious patterns. They dared to believe that the pursuit of truth, though it might lead to the college's independence from the Society, could not be inconsistent with their most profound religious convictions.

## The Civil Rights Revolution

By JOHN DE J. PEMBERTON, JR.

**T**WENTY YEARS ago our nation was only just emerging from a long dark age of relatively unquestioned Jim Crowism. The migration of Negroes to the North and West permitted some of them to enlarge their opportunities but also tended to be accompanied by a transplanting of Jim Crow practices to all areas of the nation. World War II, contributing its desperate need for manpower, sowed the seeds of a genuine reversal.

What has happened during these last twenty years has been a process of deliberately bringing the issues of racial discrimination to the consciousness and to the conscience of the nation. Ingrained attitudes of prejudice did not vanish with the temporarily improved economic conditions of Negroes. The Supreme Court's 1954 decision that segregated education violates our constitutional principle of equality proved to be a turning point in the effort to reach the national conscience. With its undergirding of the righteousness of equality's cause, new hope and new energy became assets of the movement.

At the same time the gap thereafter exposed between the Supreme Court's constitutional mandate and the dis-

crimination actually administered by government at lower levels brought forward a barrier of official obstruction to the Negro's emergence. In these ten years we have learned that our vaunted system of constitutional guarantees tends to function only skin deep. Massive resistance, in the form of ingenious legal schemes to protect segregated institutions, official encouragement of private harassment, and even the use of law-enforcement machinery itself to keep the Negro in his place, emerged as a pattern. Thus, the movement found that a larger forum than the judiciary had to be addressed in order to seek redress of its grievances.

Up till now some response has been achieved in both the legislative and the executive branches of the government. In 1957, for the first time since 1875, a civil rights bill passed the Congress; then a second made it in 1960. But the extent of relief afforded by these measures was minimal, and the first major contemporary legislative effort to touch the whole pattern of discrimination is that now pending in the U. S. Senate. Executive action likewise reached some aspects of official discrimination, from the integration of the armed forces to the more recent executive orders affecting discrimination in federally assisted housing and apprenticeship-training programs. But the executive branch has never exercised the full panoply

John De J. Pemberton, Jr., a member of the Durham (N. C.) Meeting, is national executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union. This is a condensation of a talk he gave in March at the New York celebration of the Friends Committee on National Legislation's twentieth anniversary.

of its powers to eliminate unconstitutional discriminatory practices. In both the legislative and the executive branches there has been felt so far too little sense of urgency for the civil rights issues to be met with a full spectrum of remedies.

Meanwhile a new urgency has overtaken the Negro's cause. Despite advances in the legal recognition of rights to equality, actual retrogression has occurred when the consequences of discrimination are measured. Unemployment has hit the Negro with at least double the effect it has had on the total population. The gap between average Negro and average white incomes has grown during the past ten years. Concentration of Negro populations in the restricted ghettos of northern cities has increased, and with it larger numbers of Negroes are attending schools which are segregated in fact.

So the civil rights movement has had to address itself to a still larger forum. Beginning with the Montgomery bus boycott in 1956, continuing through the lunch-counter sit-ins, the freedom rides, and the more recent mass demonstrations, it will culminate, I believe, in yet larger movements of protest addressed to the broad arena of public opinion. It demands that the grievances of discrimination be seen and understood by all of the people, and it presses home the urgency of the need for remedies. There is a disturbing quality about these concerted efforts; they are less comfortably accommodated than the orderly litigation that dominated the civil rights movement's earlier years. But we must remember that their function is to disturb, to make a whole nation uncomfortable, for the civil rights movement has rightly assumed that total redress will not be attained until the whole nation becomes acutely conscious of the patterns of prejudice that pervade its life and of the justice of our Negroes' claims for redress.

The primary civil rights organizations—such as NAACP and CORE—have had predominant roles in shaping these events. But in one sense the issues have an even larger significance for those of us—such as FCNL and ACLU—whose legislative concerns cover a much broader range. That larger significance lies in the ways in which civil rights issues are being met.

#### *Speaking Out for Change*

It is important to stress the way in which the civil rights movement has sought to reach the whole nation with a total consciousness of its grievances. Our reaction to its boycotts and freedom rides, its sit-ins and its mass demonstrations, suggests that we have forgotten the importance history has assigned to such means of speaking out for changes which an under-represented part of the community desires. We tend to forget the turbulence a generation ago through which the labor movement

gained a secure position in our social and economic order. We tend to forget that some three generations of public protests enabled the woman's suffrage movement to achieve the Nineteenth Amendment. We may have forgotten the prohibition movement, the populist movement, the abolition movement, and the movement for independence itself. It took the civil rights demonstrations to remind us that one of the constitutional guarantees written into the 1789 Bill of Rights assures "the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

The civil rights movement, in bringing to the national consciousness a recognition of the important issues relating to the achievement of equality, has begun to do something for our perspective on the role of the citizen in self-government. In traditional political terms it has moved the issues of civil rights up from the position of petty political annoyances grudgingly included on the agenda of national issues toward their rightful place of top priority on that agenda.

#### *Touching the Citizen's Conscience*

In other terms, it has brought these issues into the national consciousness in a unique way—in a way that reaches the conscience as well as the consciousness of citizens. For the civil rights issues involve people as citizens, on each side of every equation—citizens being denied opportunities others take for granted, and citizens enjoying the unearned advantages of patterns of discrimination, whether they consciously discriminate or not. Civil rights issues speak to the very purpose of our national being in terms of the document which declared that purpose when it said that it is "to secure these rights [that] governments are instituted among men." Because of this they are among the great issues of our times.

There is an urgency about the resolution of these issues above and beyond even the intrinsic merit of equality. Civil rights issues are not the only great issues facing our generation. Beyond them lie others, at least equally challenging and infinitely more novel and complex. Our domestic revolution in the relations between Negro and white citizens is, in a sense, but part of a world-wide revolution which is similarly kindled by the idea of equality. Masses of mostly nonwhite people whose ancestors accepted poverty as their inevitable lot have been stirred, largely by Western ideas and innovations. They seek to participate in the affluence which only the West has enjoyed from the application of science and capital to the problems of production.

So far we have witnessed only some of the first and easiest steps in that revolutionary movement—the attainment of a kind of equality in nationhood through independence from colonial empires. But independence, far



from facilitating that development of productive capacity essential to release from poverty, tends at least initially to handicap economic development and to deter some infusions of capital. Another Western gift—the introduction of public health and sanitation measures which have radically altered death rates and augmented population growth—promises further to retard the “take-off” of these underdeveloped economies. And Peking and Moscow are adding to the urgency inherent in this world-wide revolution with the offer of a pat solution in communist ideology to the problems of development.

Each of the world-wide developments—the revolutionary impulses toward political and economic equality, the explosion of populations, the attractive appeal of revolutionary communism—portends catastrophic potential for us. We are very much involved, as exporters of the idea of equality, as possessors of the pinnacle in national affluence and power, as objects of the envy and hatred that affluence engenders, and as objects of the expressly hostile aims of revolutionary communism.

It is here that the experience and wisdom to be gained from resolution of immediately pressing civil rights problems hold forth their highest promise. Civil rights issues cannot be resolved by officials alone; only a total commitment of the conscience of an entire people to fulfillment now of the promises of 1776 will do it. Only with such commitment can official action be wholly effective, and only with the concurrence of unofficial action can the deprivations of prejudice be significantly eradicated.

### His Hand Is Stretched Out Still

By MABEL S. KANTOR

—Isaiah 5:25

In one shaft of light is all the light there is.

One drop of dew reflects the entire spectrum.  
A child's whistle hints of the range of sound.  
Wings at my window demonstrate motion and travel.  
In one small seed lies the gift of life.

If I be confined in a cell or bedfast by a wall,  
If my limbs fail me, or my eye be dimmed,  
If love and joy be stripped away,  
Lord, by thy gift of remembering,  
May a breath of air or the salty tear,  
The touch of cloth or the taste of bread,  
Or yet the sigh of pain, or a faint  
Sense of the turning earth  
Bless my soul as thy gift,  
As surely as a sky full of sunset glow,  
As truly as song of bird at dawn;  
For thy hand is stretched out still.

### The Little Ones Shall Lead Them

By STANLEY C. MARSHALL

**S**UPPOSE two of the small powers, located anywhere in the world, but neighbors to each other, were to say, “We are not going to attack each other. Our combined strengths are insufficient to fight off an outside invader. Yet we are maintaining armies. Why?”

“Suppose we turn to the United Nations and ask them to guarantee our safety. We shall take the monies which we are presently expending for the support of our useless armies, and turn them over to the United Nations, who, in turn, would guarantee our security. Perhaps they would even use our forces in United Nations uniforms at a much lower cost than we could afford, since we will be combining administrative procedures under the U.N. Now, what have we gained?”

“Initially, we have gained, however slightly, on the cost of supporting a military force. Second, we have provided a guarantee of our own safety from outside attack, which was never possible before, for it will take a rash country, indeed, to defy the combined strengths of the United Nations. Third, we have provided our own people with a sense of significance and safety, for we have proclaimed our own willingness to be stable and peaceful members of the world's family of nations, as we no longer have the power—even if we so desire—to attack anyone else. Thus, we receive special recognition in the world.”

Now, suppose it would be possible to find two countries like this in Africa, two in South America, two in Asia, or two in the small group of Pacific Ocean nations. Here and there, we would see the formation of little islands of sanity, and with it we would begin to see the real functioning of a safety program for some of the U.N. members. The more nations that became involved, the more military budgets could be dropped within those nations, for the economies of joint military supervision should begin to take over somewhere down the line.

Next, suppose two of the nations who have been in on these first stages turn to a neighbor with common borders and invite it to join in their little enclave. Chances are that once this is under way it might be successfully extended, and so the little islands would grow, and the power of the United Nations with a real police force would grow with it. Chances are that a nation which did not join with its neighbors would, after a period of time, be branded as a potential aggressor, and the force of world conscience, for whatever it is worth, would act to drive it into the camp.

Stanley C. Marshall, a public relations executive, is a member of Pittsburgh (Pa.) Meeting and serves on the Advancement Committee of Friends General Conference.