

## THE YEAR 2000: DREAM OR NIGHTMARE

What will the world be like in the year 2000? This question is the leitmotiv of all that follows. What I am trying to do is the opposite of history and something short of prophecy. There is a deep conviction among modern Christians, and I count myself one of them, that we can affect the course of our times, that theological and philosophical principles can become operative in a wide variety of social, economic, political, educational, scientific, and technical activities, and that as a result, the world will become better, more human, even somewhat divine, and in the incarnational sense of the English word, godly.

Because of this conviction, the modern Christian parts company with those who would relegate theology to the library and religion to the sacristy. The modern Christian refuses to divide the sacred and the secular into watertight compartments well insulated, one against the other. I speak here mainly in the operational sense, not in the order of concepts. I am not confusing the sacred and the secular as ideas, realities, even realms. But granting this conceptual separation, the modern Christian refuses to confine part of his activity to time and part to eternity. He realizes that we must travel to eternity through time, and that the light of his or her faith must somehow illumine and suffuse all temporal activities. The modern Christian's prayer and action must blend and be mutually supportive. His or her yearnings for eternity are not unrelated to yearnings for time. The modern Christian will not settle for pie in the sky.

When a modern Christian speculates about the possible and probable state of the world in the year 2000, he or she is really dreaming hopefully about a better condition for humanity in the days ahead. The dream draws upon many realities and trends already at work in the world today. The dream focuses upon what could happen, happily, if ---

I should at this juncture declare myself a Christian optimist, actually optimistic because of my Christian belief, my firm faith that the Holy Spirit is at work in the world, that the great powers and forces of the religious and secular orders can find new and fruitful directions if we nudge them at the right time towards better goals.

Why should now be the right time? Well, the next millennium is almost upon us, and that has only happened once before in the Christian era. The last time was a period of great foreboding. There were dire predictions of worldwide catastrophe, even of the end of the world. As we approached the second great milestone, we actually have the capability of creating the doomsday that they predicted. By our own awesome weapons we can reduce this world and everyone in it to cinders. In fact, we have enough nuclear weapons stored up to do it several times over -- and we are ever adding to the store and further embellishing armament's house of horrors.

It is against this background of lurking fear that I would like to speak of hope. Rather than the scenario of global catastrophe in the days ahead, I would like to project a new world that is both possible and even probable if we will ourselves dare to think new thoughts, to

engage in programs worthy of our hopes, and to share our vision with all who will work with us to achieve it.

The total projection that follows is an essay in Christian humanism, a quite totally different vision of what man and his world can be as we enter the new millennium. It is not a silly chiliastic dream; it is based on real forces now in movement, new techniques already viable, even though largely unused or used badly. And I trust you will forgive me if I speak personally of realities with which I have been engaged here and there about the world during the past three decades.

Is the year 2000 too far ahead to be concerned about it? Well, you and I may not live to usher in the second millennium, but a child born this year will only be twenty-seven years old when the millennium arrives.

# I

The first opportunity I would like to discuss is ecumenism, both in its Christian and in its larger world-religion dimension. I discuss it first because it is the only professedly theological reality among the many other realities that give promise for a better world in the millennium ahead.

My most serious introduction into ecumenism came in April of 1964, the third year of Vatican Council II, when Pope Paul VI asked me to visit him in Rome to discuss a special project he had in mind. During our discussion, he explained that one of the greatest personal experiences he derived from the Council was the opportunity of meeting

personally the many theologians who were observers on behalf of the Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox churches. He had found them wonderful men, dedicated to theology, deep in their faith, holy in their lives, and, like himself, yearning for the unity of all Christians in our times. He mentioned that as a young priest, he had thought of a possible gathering place for all Christian theologians, a place where they could live and pray and theologize together -- to create in microcosm the unity towards which all dream in the words of Our Lord, "That they might be one, as You Father in me, and I in Thee". He had, in those earlier days, thought of Assisi, a locale that still speaks to the heart of all Christians because of the simple Christian faith of Saint Francis, Il Poverello, beloved of birds and beasts, and most humans, too. You may remember the apocalyptic book of Alfred Noyes, "The Last Adam", which is based on the destruction of practically all of mankind. The remnant that survived gathered in the crypt of Assisi to begin the remaking of the world. But, in reality, it was not to be Assisi.

The Holy Father had also been deeply impressed by two remarkable experiences in the recent months preceding our conversation. The January previous, he had met and embraced in Jerusalem, Athenagoras, the Patriarch of Constantinople, now Istanbul. After more than a thousand years of painful separation, beginning at the time of the first millennium, when the Eastern and Western, the Latin and Greek branches of Christianity were separated by schism, the heads of these two ancient churches now for the first time encountered each other in the only place on earth where this was possible, where it all began, in Jerusalem, the holy city, the city of peace.

The second experience was a meeting of all the non-Catholic observers with the Holy Father. The speaker for the observers was Dr. Kristen Skydsgaard of Copenhagen. He reflected a thought inspired jointly by another observer, Dr. Oscar Cullmann of Basle, that the Holy Father should capture the magic of the hour by creating a place where the Christian theological fraternity that was born during the Council might be continued, an institute where the mystery of salvation, which we all share and cherish, might be studied together in an atmosphere of brotherhood and prayer.

The spark flashed between these two experiences. The Holy Father asked whether, as President of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, I might not be able to establish such an institute, not in Rome, Geneva, Istanbul, Canterbury, or Moscow, but in Jerusalem.

The day following, one of those lovely April days in Paris, the Council members of the Federation who had assembled from Manila, Kinshasa, Lima, Quebec, Lille, and Notre Dame, agreed to try. A Provisional Commission was established. Within a year and a half, an international group of university theologians from all the Christian churches was convened at the Rockefeller Foundation's Villa Serbelloni at Bellagio, Lake Como. After three days of discussion, they agreed to form an Academic Council which would plan and, hopefully, realize the project which from this day forward would be under their direction. It was the Thanksgiving weekend, November of 1965. Subsequently, the International Federation of Catholic Universities bowed out, delegating to the University of Notre Dame the multitudinous financial, architectural, and administrative responsibilities of the project, now under the policy

direction of the Academic Council of ecumenical theologians. The Council continued to meet during the six planning years in Paris, Rome, Westminster, Venice, Istanbul, Thessaloniki, Notre Dame, and, of course, many times in Jerusalem.

Everything conspired against the project: The six-day war and the ensuing turmoil, financial problems with widespread incredulity at the thought of building a two million dollar institute in Jerusalem, of all places, especially at this time, the impossibility of it all. But somehow, land was obtained, a generous donor, named I. A. O'Shaughnessy, shared the vision and donated the cost of the building; it did get built and is reputed to be the most beautiful Christian building in Jerusalem, seeming to grow out of its olive and pine tree clad hilltop of Tantur, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem; and it has been operating these past two years with all those who first dreamed the dream occasionally in attendance, including Skydsgaard and Cullmann. I should acknowledge the continuing moral support of the key religious leaders: Pope Paul VI, the late Patriarch Athenagoras, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey, Dr. Visser 't Hooft of the World Council, his successor, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, and many others. Although this endeavor is not of the churches, it profited by their spiritual and moral support, in fact, would have been impossible without it. Nonetheless, the Jerusalem Institute is an international, ecumenical, universitarian endeavor governed by an Academic Council reflecting all of these features and, itself, self-perpetuating in membership.

I have diverged to tell you this story because it illustrates several realities we all need to recognize in our day. First of all,

the impossible is possible with faith and hope and, especially, love. Secondly, Protestants, Orthodox, and Catholics can move strategically together towards unity if they pray and live together as they theologize. Lastly, as one who probably worried the most as all of this moved along, I was immensely edified by the fact that these were my brothers who shared the dream, who worked side by side to make it come true, who never lost faith or hope, and were prodigal in their love.

All of this has happened against the background of one thousand years of misunderstandings between Orthodox and Latin Christians, four and a half centuries of bitter and unchristian strife between Catholics and Protestants. We do share our faith in Christ, our Saviour, and it brought us through every crisis and every difficulty. At least, in one place which has been called the umbilical of the world, a place sacred to Moslems, Jews, and Christians, we are living, praying, and working together.

This whole experience, stretching over eight years in time, and a quarter of a million miles in space traveled, has left me with the profound conviction that the third of humanity who call themselves Christian need no longer be separated by past errors for which we are all guilty; that we are determined to be one again as the good Lord desires, and that all the ancient divisions may now be laid to rest as we renew our deepest brotherhood. As the Holy Father remarked in that first conversation about the project: Many of the religious diversities that have developed during so many centuries of disunion may be looked upon as rich developments of the Holy Spirit within the

total Christian community which still represents about a third of mankind on earth. Unity does not mean uniformity. Nothing good that has developed to enrich faith and prayer and community life need be lost as long as we now grow together in the unity of our faith, hope, and love.

Will the next millennium see Christian unity emerge from centuries of division and strife? I believe that it will, and further perceive that the faithful are far ahead of all the clerical bureaucracies in learning to live together in Christian love and understanding. This new Christian peace that is dawning under the powerful inspiration of the Holy Spirit has enormous potential for the unity of mankind in our day, for there are fewer glues more pervasive than glue born of religious faith. It once held the Western World together against almost impossible strains. It may in the new millennium begin to bring together a wider religious global world, especially if we view the broader ecumenism that is now burgeoning between the Christian and non-Christian religions.

Too long have we taken for granted that "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet". Young people especially today are much more interested in what unites human kind than in what has so long separated the people of the world. The non-Christian religions have more than a billion members. One thinks first of religions of the Book, those closest to Christianity, Muslimism and Judaism, all sons of Abraham, and then of the Hindus, Buddhists, Confucianists, Shintos, animists, and many others, mostly Eastern and African. For centuries, all of these religions and their followers were for most



Christians simply "others", or worse, heathens or pagans. We never stopped to consider the strong bridges of essentially religious beliefs that linked us together and could contribute mightily to the essential unity of mankind and to peace between us in our separated worlds.

Take, for example, the four following beliefs, shared essentially by all the great religions (with the possible exception of a personal creator god on the part of the Buddhists):

1. Belief in God, conceived and named variously, but nonetheless a persuasive key reality transcending all other reality and somehow explaining all other reality. A God who somehow made us, somehow ineffably speaks to us and hears our prayers, a God found in so many ways that not to believe in Him has always been a minority position among humans.

2. Belief in a moral order of good and evil, somehow created by God and somehow supervised by Him. A godlike man is a good man, and an evil man is ungodly. Whatever the divergences in moral belief across religions and cultures, the great broad lines of what the mediaevals used to call the natural law or the law of peoples, lex gentium, is generally, in its broadest lines of doing good and avoiding evil, taken to be binding on every man, woman, and child of whatever time, place, or condition. We are understood to know the broad lines of good and evil by an inner voice called conscience, often conceived to be the voice of God speaking within us and to us.

3. The primacy of the spiritual over the material. This belief, like the former one, is what has so closely linked religion and culture.

Man is superior because he evaluates in a spiritual sense, creates in his life and works an inner beauty that transcends money, power, prestige. The great spiritual values of love, justice, honesty, compassion, courage, fidelity, and so many others are what enrich a person's character and life and works. The spiritual, rather than the material, is the factor most important in fulfilling a person and making him or her happy. The material is important, not bad as the Manichaeans said, but religiously material reality must ever cede primacy to the spiritual.

4. Immortality, in whatever form, is among the deepest yearning of all religious beliefs. Ultimate death or the demise of immortality would be ultimate negation of everything precious to men and women: consciousness, selfhood, loving relationships with others, family and friends, justice and mercy at work at last, reward of the good and punishment of the evil, an end to pain and the misery of separation, and, ultimately, that great burning hope of eternal union with God. Life is fundamentally tenacious and religion makes eternal life a most tenacious hope. I have placed this belief last because, while it is in many ways the most universal bridge of all between all religions, it has taken so many forms that it is the most difficult to enunciate or define. But it is there and it perdures. Even in our Christian religion, it is left the most vague of all revelations. The good Lord merely said, as if to tease us: "Eye has not seen, and ear has not heard, and it has not entered into the mind of man to imagine what God has prepared for those who love Him". And our creed merely concludes: I believe ..... in eternal life. Amen."

Man, so often divided in so many ways over so many millennia, ought at least to use now at last the strong bonds that will ultimately unite him to others on this planet. One way to begin might be to take these four beliefs I suggest, and others that suggest themselves, and see what enlightenment we might receive in discussing them with theologians of the other great world religions. Already this is beginning to happen at our Christian Ecumenical Institute at Tantur. Salvation, of course, is central to all religions, however variously viewed. But the important point is that mankind believing has been separated by its religious beliefs when the very opposite should be true in the next millennium. I believe that the new and growing interest in world religions, evidenced by the fact that even my Church now has a Secretariat for Christian Unity, a Secretariat for Non-Christian Religions, and a Secretariat for Non-Believers, would indicate that the new millennium will see a new union of mankind in a growing active ecumenism, in both the Christian and world-religion dimensions.

To illustrate what we have been missing, let me read you three passages from the Hindu poet, Rabindranath Tagore:

"Leave this chanting and singing and telling of beads! Whom dost thou worship in this lonely dark corner of a temple with doors all shut? Open thine eyes and see thy God is not before thee!

"He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the pathmaker is breaking stones. He is

with them in sun and in shower, and his garment is covered with dust. Put off thy holy mantle and even like him come down on the dusty soil!

"Deliverance? Where is this deliverance to be found? Our master himself has joyfully taken upon him the bonds of creation; he is bound with us all forever.

"Come out of thy meditations and leave aside thy flowers and incense! What harm is there if thy clothes become tattered and stained? Meet him and stand by him in toil and in sweat of thy brow." (A Tagore Reader, MacMillian, New York, 1961, p. 295)

\* \* \* \* \*

"This is my prayer to thee, my lord -- strike, strike at the root of penury in my heart.

Give me the strength lightly to bear my joys and sorrows.

Give me the strength to make my love fruitful in service.

Give me the strength never to disown the poor or bend my knees before insolent might.

Give me the strength to raise my mind high above daily trifles.

And give me the strength to surrender my strength to thy will with love." (Ibid. p. 300)

\* \* \* \* \*

"I was not aware of the moment when I first crossed the threshold of this life.

What was the power that made me open out into  
this vast mystery like a bud in the forest at midnight?

When in the morning I looked upon the light I  
felt in a moment that I was no stranger in this world,  
that the inscrutable without name and form had taken me  
in its arms in the form of my own mother.

Even so, in death the same unknown will appear as  
ever known to me. And because I love this life, I know  
I shall love death as well.

The child cries out when from the right breast  
the mother takes it away, in the very next moment to  
find in the left one its consolation." (Ibid. p. 307)

What Christian, what Westerner could not recite these lines  
in prayer and come closer to God. Yet most Christians would never  
suspect that an Eastern Hindu could write of God so beautifully, so  
incarnationally, as this. I am happy that I had Amiya Chakravarty,  
the translator of these gems from the original Bengali, autograph  
a copy of his "Tagore Reader" for Pope Paul VI who, in turn, sent  
the author an autographed photo of himself, with a personally  
inscribed Papal Blessing. So moves the world, faster than we think.

It might also be worthy of note that one of the best known  
Christian monks, Thomas Merton, Brother Louis of the silent Trappists,  
died in Bangkok while discussing monasticism with his Buddhist  
counterparts. He said, "We have to begin to understand Eastern  
religions so that we, in turn, might rediscover our Christianity".

And that other great visionary of the unity of mankind, Teilhard de Chardin, died on Easter Sunday, the day of the Resurrection, as he had hoped he might because that day signalizes the ultimate convergence of man and God. Many paths lead toward the ultimate, the Omega of human progress meeting the Parousia of Christian hope, nature and grace meeting and embracing eternally. These are two small coincidences perhaps, but in a personal way they indicate to me a force at work that should see great fruition in the next millennium. Maranatha. Come Lord Jesus.

## II

The second great trend that can and should profoundly affect the condition of human kind and the state of the world in the next millennium is a growing consciousness of human dignity, human rights, and human development. This is at base a concept with profound philosophical and theological underpinnings, but the realization and acceptance of its importance, especially for women, children, and minorities, racial or socio-economic, has been a long time coming. In many ways, a consciousness of human dignity and a respect for human rights has been the keystone of man's march towards civilization and culture. As in all other human developments, there have been peaks and valleys. In this one, more valleys than peaks until very recently.

I think it a fair statement that in man's long history -- who knows how long -- men and women have been mainly slave and seldom free. In those long millennia of unwritten history that we have tried to

reconstruct archeologically and anthropologically, feeling in the deep darkness for a few definable objects, a few landmarks in a vast unknown desert, we discern one great abiding fact -- that early man had a short painful life and an early death, that most of his life was spent in the all-consuming effort to stay alive. There was little nicety, little culture, little humanity, little beauty in all of this. As Professor Gliddings of Brown University found in his digs at the Onion Portage of the Kobuk River above the Arctic Circle in Northern Alaska, each of thirty layers of human existence, stretching back some eight thousand years, told the same story. There were some remains of a primitive shelter against the cold, some fish and caribou bones, and some camp fire remnants, some human bones sprinkled with red ochre in the hope of a better world beyond. Food, shelter, and hope beyond. Perhaps a less grim story in pleasanter climes, but generally the same emphasis: to maintain life, not really to live in any deep human sense during those long dark millennia of pre-history. Man was then a slave to cold and heat, to hunger and illness, to fear and superstition and ignorance. But he did keep yearning and moving upward. When the ideograph, the symbol and the alphabet ushered in recorded human history, man's existence begins to emerge as a bit more human with the advent of the trappings of culture and urbanization here and there around the world, but slavery remains very much a reality for the majority of human kind. The earlier forms of slavery give way to political and economic slavery, more sophisticated, but slavery all the same, the basic denial of human dignity, rights, and equality.

With the beginning of the Christian era, the first millennium, one of St. Paul's letters is written to a slave owner, Philemon, asking him not to free, but to deal kindly with Onesimus, his runaway slave who had been good to Paul and who Paul was returning to him. Despite the new human vista of Christianity, official slavery co-existed with it four hundred years after the death of Christ. When it reoccurred a millennium later, it was Christians who were the best customers of the Arab traders. One should visit the Island of Gorée, in the harbor of Dakar, to sense the horror of what it must have meant to cram 450 slaves into a small prison to await the next slave ship. It adds to the horror to recall that some twenty million slaves died on their trip across the Atlantic. In the rest of the non-Western world, human dignity and human rights continued to live their fragile existence in travesty rather than reality because of a variety of human and natural forces.

Western civilization gradually reached for peaks like the Magna Carta. Centuries later, there were great statements like the liberté, egalité, fraternité of the French Revolution, or those great documents that ushered in the birth of our country almost two hundred years ago. But mind you, even then, the majority of those first Americans could not exercise the most fundamental political right of voting, because they were slaves, women, not property owners, or too young. We have since redressed these injustices, but at the initial and ineffective price of a civil war in the case of slaves, and in the last decade's revolution in the case of the young. Even now, women are awaiting the ratification of an amendment to assure their constitutional rights.



The most amazing aspect of the growing consciousness of human dignity is how recent is the total development. After millennia of slow upward strivings, it was not until twenty-five years ago that the nations of the world finally proclaimed the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- written largely by Rene Cassin of France and Eleanor Roosevelt of the United States.

I had the enlightening experience of attending, as Head of the Vatican Delegation, the Twentieth Anniversary of the Universal Declaration held in Teheran, Iran. Two sad realities impressed me at that meeting. First, practically none of the large nations had yet ratified the two Protocols, one on civil and political rights, the other on economic, social, educational, and cultural rights that flowed from the Universal Declaration, and none of the smaller nations was really observing these rights either. Secondly, the first week of the Conference was mainly given over to fighting between Arabs and Israeli, Indians and Pakistani, Northern and Southern Africans, and others more numerous to mention. My own contribution, I fear, was to scold them for acting like this. And I quote from what I said on that occasion:

"The understandable frustration is most evident in the way that so many delegates find it easier to accuse others of their shortcomings than to look deeply into one's own conscience, individual and national. What would be the effect of this conference, if instead of pointing our fingers or aiming our invective at one another, we

would look honestly and sincerely at ourselves, to measure, each his own country, against the great ideals enunciated in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

"Our Delegation is especially intrigued by the imaginative Costa Rican suggestion of a High Commissioner for Human Rights who might become a worldwide ombudsman, especially if this post could be filled by someone recognized everywhere for personal integrity and high moral leadership. He or she could be helped by a committee universally chosen for high competence, with adequate national and regional support, governmental and non-governmental, with ultimate juridical support from national, regional, and international courts. The Commissioner could indeed become the personal and living focus for the problem that so concerns us here in this conference. The problem of human rights is so universal that it transcends all other problems that face humanity and the United Nations. It is obvious to our Delegation, as to all of you, that this conference will not reach a successful conclusion if we do not agree on some realistic mechanisms to translate words into deeds, ideals into reality, hopes into achievement. The strong agreement of this conference on the necessity of a High Commissioner for Human Rights would seem to be a minimum first step in this direction.

"One cannot speak of hopes without underlining the fact that the younger generation, half of the world's population today, is conscious of all that we have said

and the little that we have done about their deep concern for the world that we have created, with all its inequities, with its racism, with its perduring prejudices, with its continuing and flagrant discrimination. I speak as one who has spent all of his adult life in the university, with young people. Our younger generation will not wait forever for peaceful solutions to this burning problem of human equality. They have only one life to live here on earth and it is now before them, filled with a whole series of tantalizing frustrations. They know that the human situation need not be what it is, as we permit it to be. If we do not act now, and act together, and act effectively -- this conference will be in fact a sad celebration of a very happy and promising moment of twenty years ago. The younger generation are being constantly and strongly tempted to violence, violence that solves nothing and deepens human misery, even the misery of the young. But if we do not act effectively, what other alternative do we leave them?

"Love or hatred, peace or violence, order or disorder: these are the real choices that face humanity, young and old, and this conference today. Strange as it may seem to us, our continuing apathy in the face of worldwide and inhuman injustice, makes the young of this world even doubt the meaning of the words we use in expressing humanity's ideal, makes them even more doubt our sincerity and our courage."

Despite all of these negative factors, this Universal Declaration of Human Rights does exist, for twenty-five years this month, and it does represent the most complete statement of its kind in the history of mankind. Our present problem is to make it less an ideal and more a reality, to persuade all the nations of the world to ratify the two Protocols, to see in their provisions a great step forward for all human kind, in realizing the inherent God-given dignity of every man, woman, and child, in achieving freedom to be truly human, in creating a new equality of opportunity to make the world more humane and more just.

One would hope that for many reasons, but mainly because of our great traditions and growing consciousness of human dignity and equality, our country might take a leading role in this endeavor as we approach the new millennium. Nothing else, not power, not might, not wealth, not prestige, would speak more realistically to the rest of mankind everywhere. In so many ways, the United States is the microcosm of the total problem everywhere. We have every race in our population. Color is more often a cause of prejudice than race, and again we have more colored citizens than any majority white nation on earth -- more blacks than the total white population of Canada, more browns than all whites in Australia. While we are largely a Christian nation, we have more Jews, by three times, than Israel, and we have every variety of Christian under the sun. We are an amalgam of every European nationality, culture, and language, and in exchange students alone

have more Asians than any other country, plus thousands of Africans and Latin Americans. It is almost as if the good Lord set us up as a laboratory experiment to pioneer the observance of human rights and dignity and equality in a most pluralistic world.

Despite our obvious failings, and they are many, I believe that in the decade of the sixties, we made more progress in solving what Gunnar Myrdal called "The American Dilemma" than had been made in our whole history before. Moreover, no other ancient or modern nation made similar advances in so short a period of time. I think that today we need the encouragement of this fact to keep trying and not to lose hope, despite temporary setbacks.

When the United States Commission on Civil Rights was established by the Congress in 1957 to ascertain the facts regarding the condition of civil rights in America and to advise the President and the Congress regarding corrective action, we found the situation bad indeed. The law creating the Commission was the first attempt to legislate federally something for civil rights in over eighty years. In addition, we of the Commission were generally considered a fairly impotent body, six members representing both political parties, three Northerners and three Southerners, five whites and one black, armed only with the power to subpoena persons and documents, and to publicize our findings and our corrective advice to the President and the Congress. It seems almost miraculous that over the next fifteen years about 75% of our suggestions were enacted into federal law, even though they were often dismissed as ridiculous by one President and endorsed by the next one.

At the Commission's beginning a decade and a half ago, several million black Americans in the Southern states could not even register to vote, black children by law had to attend inferior black primary and secondary schools, black students were not welcome at Southern state universities, and their presence was miniscule at white private and public colleges and universities, both North and South. As a result, there were very few black professionals -- for example, four black lawyers out of over two thousand lawyers in Mississippi, where no white lawyers would touch civil rights cases. Even one of the four black lawyers wouldn't either. Black Americans throughout the South faced dozens of daily indignities. They could not eat a meal in most restaurants, rent a room in most hotels, drink at most fountains and bars, sit where they pleased in buses, trains, theaters, even churches, could not even be buried in cemeteries with whites. They could pay taxes, die for their country in a war, and do most of the menial work, North and South. What was a de jure indignity in the South was often enough a de facto indignity in the North, because of federally financed and sustained housing patterns.

We should remember all of this tragic human situation, even though much of it has now passed into history, a dismal history for blacks. We should remember Rosa Parks who refused, at long last, to move to the back of the bus when her feet were tired after a long day's work -- thus starting the Montgomery bus boycott and a whole sequence of sit-ins, eat-ins, drink-ins, pray-ins, sleep-ins, and, in fact, the whole revolution of the sixties for the achievement of human dignity

and human rights. We should remember Martin Luther King and Medgar Evers and all who suffered and died to make the country awake to its plight. We should remember President Lyndon Johnson who stood before a joint session of Congress and declared from his heart, "We shall overcome", and we did with the passage of the great omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Act of 1965, and the Housing Act of 1968.

Some have said that the law does not really change anything, but this time it did. Public accommodations were opened to blacks overnight. With only 3% desegregation of Southern school districts in the decade following the Supreme Court's Brown decision of 1954, over 70% of the districts were desegregated in the five years following the enactment of Title VI of the 1964 Act. There were only about six elected black officials in the South when the blacks largely could not vote. More than a thousand were elected in 1972. Blacks are seen more frequently now in business and the professions, in all the great universities of the land, slowly but surely on their faculties, on corporate boards, as mayors of great cities like Cleveland, Newark, Detroit, and Los Angeles. And as the world did not end with this sudden change -- in fact, was often enriched and improved -- the law did prove educative.

I have spoken mainly of the rights of blacks and the sudden breakthrough they made in the sixties. To be honest, I should add that about twelve million Spanish-speaking Americans, and about a million Indians still await their equal breakthrough. Orientals

still have special problems, too. Women are better than half our population and I need not remind you of the new stirrings of women's liberation here in America and all around the world. And because I have been on the side of all who could not speak effectively for themselves, I must also speak for those who have no voice at all, the unborn children who are so cavalierly deprived of the most basic right of all, the right to life, without which all other human rights are meaningless. Each of us once was what these unborn children, of whatever age of development, now are. No one of us would have liked to have been deprived of the days and years of human life we have enjoyed. Millions of unborn children are now, within the law, the law of man, not of God, being so denied. And I must speak for them and their most basic right to live. And I do. I would hope that more of them might survive to enjoy the new millennium and to contribute to a new dignity for all mankind, once their own has been recognized and they have been allowed to live and love as all of us have. Later, I will speak of the children of the underdeveloped world, half of whom die before the age of six.

To return to my original thought, will America give leadership to all the world in the area of human dignity, rights, and equality of opportunity because of the special tradition of our country and our special situation as a nation of many religions, races, nationalities, cultures, and colors -- or will we default, just as the world at long last is beginning to awake to the burning need for the recognition of human dignity and rights everywhere? We did give great and unique leadership to all the world in the sixties. What has begun to go wrong in the seventies?



First, Americans are impatient. We like quick victories, facile solutions, and are quickly bored by lingering problems. That is why our typical art form, the Western movie, always ends quickly by killing off all the opposition -- the bad guys. There is no more lingering problem among all mankind than prejudice. While laws can correct inequitable situations and educate while doing this, prejudice must be faced and conquered every hour of every day by every individual within his inner self. No law, not even God's, can effect understanding, tolerance, magnanimity within us. This is a challenge that each of us face, each day. No quick victory here.

Secondly, the problem of civil rights in the sixties was easier when it primarily affected the South. Everyone is good at practicing virtue at a distance. When the problem began to move north, with a total approach to open housing, desegregation of schools by busing, greater equality of opportunity in employment in the great Northern cities and their suburbs, then the great Northern liberals began to act as defensively as the Southern conservatives had. Not my neighborhood, not my child's school, not my university, not my club, not my job. As the old farmer said, "It depends on whose kid has the measles".

Thirdly, the fast pace of progress in the sixties was slowed in the seventies because politicians, like sharks smelling blood, began to see political profit in catering to the inherent prejudices and fears of Americans who perhaps felt that there had been too much progress too quickly or, more honestly, that they were personally threatened by the onward march of progress. New banners of ethnicity were waved, Northern as well as Southern political strategy emerged, idealism was replaced by crass political pragmatism, leaders followed instead of leading, the slow-down and the slip-back began, lead by the highest powers in the land.

The same burning question remains: Are we going to stand still on basic human rights, slip back, or move forward? We have come down from a high peak in our history and are presently in a valley. The rest of the world is hardly heroic in this matter either, given the slaughter of the Hutus in Ruanda, the plight of the Bihari in Bangladesh, the fratricidal hatreds of the sons of Abraham, Arabs and Israeli in the Middle East, and the continuing vendetta between North and South Vietnamese, and Koreans to name a few. Yet with all the prejudice and hatred, I believe that our age, more than any previous one, knows that this is wrong, further, that it is suicidal on so small a planet as ours. We do still have our Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is light years beyond the statement of the Magna Carta and the French and American revolutionary documents. All agreed to write these words of the Universal Declaration at the birth of the United Nations, to proclaim these ideals for every man, woman, and child on earth. I believe we must keep our eyes on that peak. And I deeply believe that given the proper kind of courageous and inspirational leadership from our next President, from all of the leaders of church and state on all levels, America will continue the onward march into the next millennium. We have our upcoming 200th birthday as an added incentive to celebrate what has happened thus far to make the promises of our Constitution and Bill of Rights come true. More than the military shield of America, the world today and in the millennium to come will need the shield of our conscience towards the variegated assemblage of our citizens who make this country unique in all the world, e pluribus unum. Might all the world be thus in the next millennium.

### III

I remarked as I began that the modern Christian believes that he can make his theological and philosophical principles operative in the affairs and problems of his times. So can she. The rest of these lectures will be an exercise of that belief.

However one may project his or her hopes for the next millennium, central to every consideration will be the human person. It is the person who shares the hope and sees it realized or denied in his or her life. It is the person who has faith and who loves his or her brothers and sisters in truth and justice. It is the person who enjoys or is denied his or her rights. It is the person who is at the heart of all earthly history, who is hungry and thirsty, who seeks shelter and warmth, who is born, suffers, enjoys, works, gives life and love, or persecutes, hates or is violent, who makes war or peace, who builds or destroys, who dies.

It is surprising how little one finds today, even in philosophy, on the human person. The best description of human personality that I have found comes from a former Terry Lecturer, Jacques Maritain, in his Principes d'une politique humaniste, (pp. 13-42):

"What do we mean precisely when we speak of the human person: When we say that a man is a person, we do not mean merely that he is an individual, in the sense that an atom, a blade of grass, a fly or an elephant is an individual. Man is an individual who holds himself in hand by intelligence and will. He

does not exist only in a physical manner. He has a spiritual super-existence through knowledge and love; he is, in a way, a universe in himself, a microcosm, in which the great universe in its entirety can be encompassed through knowledge; and through love, he can give himself completely to beings who are to him, as it were, other selves, a relation for which no equivalent can be found in the physical world. The human person possesses these characteristics because in the last analysis man, this flesh and these perishable bones which are animated and activated by a divine fire, exists 'from the womb to the grave' by virtue of the very existence of his soul, which dominates time and death. Spirit is the root of personality. The notion of personality thus involves that of totality and independence; no matter how poor and crushed he may be, a person, as such, is a whole and subsists in an independent manner. To say that man is a person is to say that in the depths of his being he is more a whole than a part, and more independent than servile. It is to say that he is a minute fragment of matter that is at the same time a universe, a beggar who communicates with absolute being, mortal flesh whose value is eternal, a bit of straw into which heaven enters. It is this metaphysical mystery that religious thought points to when it says that the person is the image of God. The value of the person, his dignity and his rights

belong to the order of things naturally sacred which bear the imprint of the Father of being, and which have in Him the end of their movement."

I promised that my projections for the next millennium would be hopeful and optimistic, so you may expect a bright rather than a dismal preview, even though I concede that the worst could happen. Since the person is so central to all that follows, it seemed appropriate to say a few words first about population. Obviously, everything said of persons will be somewhat conditioned by the number of people involved.

I do not believe that anyone or any group -- not even the Club of Rome with their computers -- has any absolute wisdom about the precise number of people who would make an ideal population for space-ship earth. Certain truths about the numbers are absolute, however. I do not believe that a planet with finite, life-sustaining resources, some of which are being completely depleted -- oil, for example -- can endure a constant geometric growth in population without courting global disaster.

For example, the net population growth in the decade of the sixties, 700 millions, equaled the total net growth of the Nineteenth Century. If the present rate of growth were to be continued until 2073, a century hence, we would be adding a billion persons a year, the present world's population every three and a half years. Obviously, that is not going to happen.

The sad fact is that we are doing a fairly inadequate job of feeding, housing, educating, health-caring for the present population

of approximately three and a half billion people on earth. We must either slow down our present net world population growth of 1,300,000 persons a week or vastly improve our care for those earth dwellers presently aboard. Personally, I believe we must do something about both factors, first, so as to achieve progress on our present problems and, secondly, not to further complicate the present problems while we are trying to solve them.

Numbers are very much a part of the problem of development at present because the greatest population growth is taking place where the greatest underdevelopment and socio-economic problems exist. India, China, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Indonesia presently account for half of the increase in the world's population each year. Mexico contributes more to the total than the United States, Brazil more than the Soviet Union, the Philippines more than Japan, demonstrating clearly that smaller, less developed countries add more to net population growth than larger developed countries.

I believe that just about everyone today concedes that rational and moral population control is a desideratum of the highest order of priority, although there is obviously a great deal of disagreement as to the proper ways and means of control. Ideas range all the way from strict government control by sterilization, abortion, and penalizing parents, to personal parental control by whatever their consciences dictate. Then there is the actual poverty of possible means of parental control. My own judgment is that because of inadequate research in the past, probably due to taboos and other cultural and

religious factors, we know less about the biochemistry of human reproduction today than we do about the breeding of most farm animals.

As a member of the Rockefeller Foundation Board, I have constantly argued for a great increase of funding to the best centers of medical and biological research so that we might develop a whole new array of means, many of which I believe would meet any moral or cultural requirement imaginable. Moreover, I have argued against the "Fuller-brush" approach to population control whereby objectionable means of every inadequate variety of population control are pushed upon large populations without the slightest regard for their cultural, religious, or psychological frame of mind. I would call this the huckster approach, missionary in its fervor and insensitive in its methods. Naturally, most of these large target populations are poor, or colored, or foreign; often the results are predictably short-lived and we are accused again of Yankee imperialism.

One current myth is that the Catholic Church is the great obstructor of progress in this field. The simple fact is that developed or developing countries control their populations, and the less developed countries do not, irrespective of whether they are Catholic or not. Italy has the same low rate of population growth as Sweden (doubling every eighty-eight years), and Spain the same low rate as Russia. Three predominantly Catholic countries, Paraguay, Ecuador, and Panama, have the same high rate of growth (doubling every twenty-one years) as three Moslem countries, Morocco, Syria, and Pakistan. I am not arguing the moral implications of these situations, although I would welcome some new inspirational, spiritual, and moral approaches to human

sexuality which has also been largely taken over by the hucksters. Here, I am just citing the facts of the matter. If you would like to study further the constant and factual correlation between human development and population control, I would refer you to our Overseas Development Council's booklet: "A New Development Strategy: Greater equity, faster growth, and smaller families." (1972)

The conclusion is fairly obvious. If population control is a wise policy today, the surest road to its realization is greater concern for human development, especially where it is most needed in the Southern Hemisphere of our planet earth. Most of what I will have to say in hopes of a better millennium to come will be in that interest.

But again, the present facts about population are ineluctable, whatever progress is made during the next decades in the way of new, improved, humane, and moral controls. The next millennium will begin with between six and seven billion people inhabiting this planet. The question remains: how will they be housed and fed, supplied with the necessary energy and natural resources for industrial processes, educated and politically organized for better human development and peace, assuming that to be our goal in the next millennium? This question is all the more poignant when one considers the present dismal state of each of these aspects of man's development. If we do so poorly, so inequitably, so unjustly with three and a half billion people, what will we do with six or seven billion having the same or even heightened needs due to the revolution of rising expectations. No easy question here. I shall spend the rest of my time addressing myself to this basic question, giving more attention



to these aspects of the question in which I have had actual experience and, hopefully, can contribute some new ideas and realizable goals.

#### IV

There have been times when I have speculated that the easiest way to solve the housing problems of mankind would be to move the whole population of the earth to the tropical zones where cold weather is not a problem. Then I visited the sprawling slums of Lagos, Nigeria, during a tropical rainfall and it was clear that there are real shelter problems in the tropics, too.

The more one thinks about it, the basic problem of housing is one of distributive justice. Everywhere in the world a few people live in palaces, always have, and most people live in poor housing and many people live in shacks and shanties and cardboard or wattle and mud huts. Even in the United States, the richest country in the world, a land of many palaces, we recently set up a goal of 29,000,000 new houses to be built in a decade, with 6,000,000 to replace present dwellings that have been condemned as unfit for human habitation. I have seen in most of our great cities slum housing far worse than normal shelter for farm animals. In other parts of the world, the quality of housing goes lower and lower until one sees the nadir in the less developed parts of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Here and there one sees bright new housing schemes that seem to be working, as in Singapore. But for most of humanity, housing is costly, money is scarce, so housing is a disaster, unimaginably horrible to those Americans who have seen the worst in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Beside the element of injustice and maldistribution of what is essential to a human condition in which human dignity is at least a possibility, much of the present world housing disaster for the poor is a direct result of a relatively new phenomenon sweeping the whole world, urbanization. All the world has witnessed the flight to the cities, the attraction of bright lights and, hopefully, employment, the urban concentration of workers in service and industrial enterprises, the deterioration of farming as a way of life, massive refugee movements, rising expectations of easy sudden wealth following decolonization throughout Asia and Africa. Much has been written about urbanization. More than a third of mankind lives in cities and the prediction for the year 2000 is 60%. In the poor countries, the present urban population of 600 million is expected to grow to three billion by the next millennium. The population of cities of Latin America is doubling every fourteen years, with Rio, Sao Paulo, and Mexico City surpassing seven million in population. I have seen the results in the swollen slums around Rio, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Lima, Caracas, Mexico City -- where large proportions of whole national populations flock to the capital cities to seek a better life and, instead, find new misery. I have seen urbanization run wild in Africa and Asia. Calcutta and Bombay, Kinshasa and Lagos, Hong Kong and Saigon, Tokyo and Manila are truly disaster areas for human beings seeking new dignity and a better life.

Even our own country, atypical because of its wealth, is a typical example of the movement of urbanization. For years, a million families a year have been leaving the farms and flocking to the cities, with the result that today 75% of our population is living on 3% of

our land mass. There is little rhyme or reason to this maldistribution of our living space, but one might hope that there is a better possible plan as we face the next millennium. Again, we might give a good example. New cities are being pioneered in Britain, and great cities, such as Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide, were well planned from the beginning in Australia, a land as large as ours with the population of New York City. Here in America we are experimenting with new cities like Columbia in Maryland and Reston in Virginia, where all socio-economic classes and races are integrated into a situation that is both functional and beautiful. At least, one may say that open housing must be the pattern for the future if we are to solve the race problem and achieve integrated education and living.

For the larger answer, the key elements for the next millennium must be dispersal and rapid public transit. Cities are important to civilization as centers for education, culture, commerce, and government. The problem is that we have greatly overcrowded our cities as living rather than working and leisure spaces, allowed slums to fester and spread their malignity, especially to the poor who must dwell in them. Few whites realize that blacks, one tenth of the population, suffer more murders annually than whites, and this mainly in slums.

Now those who can, flee the city, and it further deteriorates with a shrunken tax base and growing social problems. To compound the problem, industry is now also moving to the suburbs and the poor, especially minorities needing the jobs, are not allowed to move because of restrictive and very high cost housing in the suburbs, so

they are disproportionately out of work and the problems of poverty and consequent crime are compounded.

Somehow, we need a completely new scheme. My only suggestion would be the removal of slums and the dispersion of most of its housing to open areas beyond the city. The city -- all cities -- need a complete overhaul of facilities, both educational and cultural, including parks, museums, libraries. Around each great city, to a distance of a hundred miles or so, rapid transit facilities can move people from where they can live graciously to where they work, in a matter of a half hour or so -- if only we abandon the one car, one person concept that so clogs our highways and pollutes our air and wastes our energy.

If the Japanese can move trains at 120 miles an hour, and I have enjoyed lunch at that speed without spilling the coffee, so can we and other countries. How to finance all of this? Ten cents additional gasoline tax would net ten billion additional dollars a year here in America, twenty cents, twenty billion, and we would have to raise gasoline tax by forty cents to equal the cost of gasoline in Europe. If we did that, we would have forty billion dollars annually to spend on renewing our cities and our rapid public transit facilities.

In any event, we cannot, as we face the new millennium, continue to allow cities to grow like Topsy and see all civility die out in the process. The world's housing problem is far worse than ours and will probably need far more governmental intervention and planning, as has worked so well in Singapore. Our problem is more manageable, even

though the present administration has just removed federal subsidies to housing. I predict that we will begin to manage this problem better as the new millennium approaches, simply because it cannot continue as it is -- a truly national disgrace.

V

I shall next speak about food, not because I believe that man lives by bread alone, but because in the matter of human development, even on the highest level, I have always been impressed by that wonderful earthly wisdom of St. Teresa of Avila. She said, "If a hungry man asks you to teach him how to pray, you had better feed him first". With all due respect to the ancient Christian tradition of giving bread to the hungry, I have been likewise impressed by Ghandi's wisdom when he said, "Give me a fish and I will eat today. Teach me how to fish and I will eat every day".

Food has been a perennial problem for mankind, so much so that prehistoric man was subdivided into hunters and gatherers, depending on how he provided for sustenance. We link the Eskimo with the seal and the salmon, the Sioux with the buffalo, the Inca with potatoes, the Mexican with corn and beans, the Orientals with rice, the tropical Africans with cassava or manioc. I should perhaps add in jest, although it is a bit of black humor, Americans with hamburgers. Even though we raise the most beef in the world, we import one-third of all the beef produced by the rest of the world, which is really saying something in a largely hungry world. On the other hand, we have been generous with food grains from our surplus -- now largely depleted because of Russian

and Chinese demands and drought disasters around the world, especially in India and Africa. One should here caution against the myth that America can feed the world. We have a working buffer of 50,000,000 acres of agricultural land, not the best, sometimes all in use when needed, other times in reserve when stocks are high. That is the only buffer there is and we are using most of this acreage at the moment. World demand for food has increased by 50%, while current reserve food stocks worldwide are the lowest they have been in twenty years. Add a few more natural disasters, and we may find it difficult to provide help.

This past Summer, I visited the drought and famine areas of three Sahelian countries: Senegal, Mauritania, and Mali. On the edge of the desert, after four years of practically no rainfall, I looked into the faces of hungry men, women, and children, all of whose animals had died, depriving them of milk and meat and a whole nomadic way of life. Here one learns that beyond the dismal statistics, there is a human condition that calls for a solution. We were flying into Timbuktu and Gao fifteen tons of food grains per airplane each day, with three airplanes available for two flights daily. This is the eye-dropper approach to the plight of hundreds of thousands of people, minimally effective, but crying for a better long range solution. There are few sights more heartrending than human beings without food or drink. One realizes, in seeing them, what a premium the good Lord placed on feeding the hungry and giving drink to the thirsty. We must respond in a more long range manner than these risky C-130 daily flights responding to cyclical crises.

The largest question regarding food is how can we feed a world with hundreds of millions presently undernourished, and adding over five million additional people to be fed each month? I believe there are two basic answers -- apart from what we have already said about population control. The first answer is the green revolution, better genetic stocks of seed for higher productivity and better nutritional quality of all human food stuffs and, of course, better animal and fish production for protein. The second answer is more land for agriculture. One thing is certain. Granting a population of six to seven billion people in the year 2000, food production will have to double in the next three decades the total annual production achieved since the beginning of formal agriculture 10,000 years ago, and this would only sustain the present nutritional levels which are insufficient for two-thirds of the world's population.

My knowledge of the green revolution comes primarily from observing the great agricultural programs of the Rockefeller, Ford, and Kellogg Foundations, as well as the governmental aid programs that have now joined them in their worldwide efforts.

Perhaps the best example of what private initiative and a few well-spent dollars can produce is the rice program.

A little over a decade ago, the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations decided to have a real go at rice research. Rice has been the staple food throughout the Orient for thousands of years, but no total research had ever been done on it. The Foundations decided to make this an international project, governed by a Board made up of plant and rice scientists from all over the Orient. The International Rice

Research Institute was located at Los Baños, outside of Manila, adjacent to the Agricultural College of the University of the Philippines. I have been there three times, and never cease to wonder at what has been accomplished in so short a time span, and at such relatively low cost (the price of a few supersonic military aircraft).

Every known species of rice, over 10,000, was gathered, classified, and stored. Some 250 of the best species were identified according to a check list of about thirty qualities, ranging from reaction to fertilizers during growth to taste and nutritional value. A total approach was used to genetically cross the better species to get one of the best. New fertilizers were devised which could be minimally used to reduce cost to the poor farmer. The stem borer, larvae deposited by moths, used to be attacked by spraying insecticides, but the first rainfall washed it off the plants. IRRI devised a new systemic insecticide which was put into the irrigation water, picked up by the root system, and deposited throughout the plant so that the moths were killed before the larvae could be laid to eat out the lymphatic system. The meter high stems of the better rice varieties, like peta from Taiwan, used to lodge, to bend over so that rats would eat large quantities before it could be harvested. It also received less sunlight while lodging. Genetically, the stem was shortened to about half a meter, and a simple electrified short chicken wire fence was devised to eliminate the rats. Dr. Robert Chandler, the founder and first Director of IRRI, told me that the



first harvest of their first improved variety, IRRI-8, using the same land and the same farmers, delivered a crop \$1,300,000,000 more valuable than the year previous. The next year's crop made an advance of over three billion dollars. Under the best conditions, this represented an increase of several times the usual return of kilograms per hectare. There have been at least four additional improved varieties since then. Between 1966 and 1970, new varieties of rice and wheat planted, mainly in Asia, grew from 41,000 to almost 44 million acres, with spectacular results. The new millennium must see much more of this kind of imaginative, highly scientific approach to agriculture.

Following the success of IRRI, and an earlier success pioneered during the forties with hybrid corn in Mexico, under the leadership of Dr. George Harrar, subsequently President of the Rockefeller Foundation, there has been established a whole network of research stations in tropical agriculture at El Baton in Mexico; Centro Internacional de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT), Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT) at Palmyra, in the Cauca Valley of Colombia; International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA) at Ibadan in Nigeria; International Crop Research Institute for Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) in Hyderabad, India; a potato center in Peru.

All of these centers interact and most of them have satellite or field stations in different climatic situations. When visiting the field station at Toluca, outside of Mexico City, two Summers ago, the plant breeder explained that each promising strain of seed goes through at least seven plantings, first to establish resistance to

disease and then greater productivity. Samples are sent to eighty different counties for experimental planting under different conditions of climate and crop disease. There is a constant effort at improvement so that the world does not get locked into a monoculture.

The Spanish language has a word "agropecuaria" which includes both vegetable and animal cultures. Some of these international research centers do both. There is also a concern in these centers, not for just bigger and more disease-resisting crops, but better food products from the standpoint of protein and amino acids, vitamins. For example, in 1963, Edwin Mertz and his Purdue associates discovered a high-lysine gene lost when hybrid corn was developed. It was called Opaque-2. When the gene was reintroduced, the corn had several times more vegetable protein than before. I saw a litter of pigs in Colombia, half of whom had been fed regular corn and half Opaque-2 corn. The latter half of the litter was, after three months of feeding, twice the size of the former. It is now hoped that a similar gene may be identified for the other food grains. Last October, Purdue scientists, after screening 9,000 varieties of sorghum, found two Ethiopian strains with a high lysine gene that will almost triple the protein quality of normal sorghum strains.

The world is in large part protein starved. Vegetable protein is a perfect substitute for animal protein. There are also new approaches to animal protein, such as planting Talapia, a milk fish, in the irrigated rice fields where it could be harvested with the rice. Hundreds of millions of tons of additional protein sources

could be obtained this way, especially in the lands where it is most needed.

Recent research has shown that early nutritional deficiency in the child results in poor brain development and damage to the central nervous system. By age one and a half, a child has all the brain cells he will ever have. Some poor Indian children have only about 500 calories a day during the first five years of their life. Wherever this is happening, we are diminishing human mental capacity irreparably. One would hope that better nutrition and adequate food for every human would be a minimal, but absolutely essential goal for this whole planet during the next millennium. It is possible to conquer hunger, but agriculture must begin to have a higher priority and greater support than foolish armaments. When children are diminished in their essential human capacity and the genetic development of mankind is weakened, what is there left to defend?

I would insist on the necessity of massive action, fully supported by the governments involved, even though pioneered by private initiative, as most of the above projects were. The study to emphasize the need for tropical agriculture research was done by the National Academy of Sciences with government support. 450 scientific man years were spent in the effort. Their report was superb scientifically, but absurd politically, and thus abandoned by the government. A handful of us, under the leadership of Harrison Brown, International Vice President of the Academy, and George Harrar of the Rockefeller Foundation, put the project back on the track, initiated it with Foundation money, and now several governments are supporting it, including our own government and Canada.

*George Harrar*

The fallout of these programs is impressive when massive effort is involved. Several of us were involved in West Pakistan's food plight some years ago, under the leadership of President Kennedy's Science Advisor, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, now President of M.I.T. We were all so busy we could only meet and work at the White House on Sundays. May the Lord forgive me. 42,000 tons of seed from the new short stemmed durum wheat developed at the Center in Mexico were shipped to West Pakistan. Four years later, Pakistan's problem was where to store the surplus wheat the new seed had produced.

I have gone into this detail to give a taste, really only a suggestion, of what is possible if our leaders, especially in the less developed countries, begin to understand that agriculture is initially more important than steel mills, national jet air lines, and military establishments. Hungry and undernourished people simply lack the energy to build a nation, even to live a human life or plan a better one.

But the problem is far from being solved on a technical level, whatever the progress made in rice, wheat, corn, millet, sorghum, potatoes, yucca, cassava, and the genetic improvement of animal herds. This is an economic, as well as an agricultural problem, involving land tenure and the scientific study of the best land usage, credit, marketing, housing, and a wide variety of allied concerns. I would hope that larger less developed countries might do in macrocosm what the small island of Formosa has done in microcosm through their Joint Council on Rural Reconstruction under the direction of Dr. Shih. This is a spectacular project, involving all of the above agricultural,

economic, and technical aspects in small farmer community centers, with education and health care included as well. India has attempted something of the same with great, though less success because of size and recent droughts. Latin America, Africa, and many parts of Asia could well emulate the J.C.R.R. of Taiwan in the next millennium, although they should begin tomorrow.

Even if we could perfect agriculture to the nth degree, the new millennium would still face, with growing population, even though slower growing, the prospect of running out of arable land for food crops and grazing land for herds. There are a few great tracts left, like the llanos beyond the Cordillera in Colombia and Venezuela. The Amazon Basin is enormous, but the soil is thin and leaches quickly when the tropical forest is removed. Argentina is a magnificent land, though underpopulated, and without any real growth in agricultural productivity during the last fifty years.

On the other hand, countries like Bangladesh have an impossible density of population. In any event, the new millennium will certainly see the opening up of what few untouched or underpopulated areas there are on this planet, but, even so, there will be the next great challenge of raising food in the great oceans that cover the largest part of the earth's surface and of recovering for agriculture the one-third of our total land mass which is classified as desert, lost to agriculture entirely, although it often has good soil and great sunlight year round, lacking only water.

During one of the General Conferences of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, I heard Dr. Alvin Weinberg, Director

of the U. S. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, outline a plan that, if successful, could recover for agriculture and agro-industry all of these arid lands. This could be one of the great projects of the new millennium, a great enhancement of spaceship earth's resources that will undoubtedly be needed if we are to feed and employ twice as many people as are now aboard.

The plan involves the use of fast-breeder nuclear reactors for electrical energy production and the desalination of water. Weinberg bases the economy of the project on massive size and the fact that the fast-breeder produces more fuel than it consumes. He was speaking of 400 megawatts of electricity and 250 million gallons of water a day. Using the cheap electricity to power about ten chemical industries around the power plant, including the production of fertilizer, the energy could also be used to pump water to the growing fields. The new drip-method, underground irrigation system pioneered in Israel uses only 60% as much water as open-ditch irrigation, and would avoid the plague of schistosomiasis that is afflicting the great irrigation project associated with the Aswan Dam in Egypt and the Volta in Ghana. Two of these reactors would open up 1,500 square miles of desert land to agriculture. Fortunately, many of our great deserts are adjacent to salt water in abundance, the Sahara in North Africa, the Atacama in Chile and Peru, and the great Northern Australian to mention a few.

I would not like to underestimate the difficulty involved in putting great fast-breeder reactors on line and reducing the cost of desalinating water, but under the impulse of the energy and food

crises, I am convinced that it will be done by the next millennium. Meanwhile, we are beginning to learn more about arid lands' agriculture through on-going projects at Puerto Penasco, Sonora, Mexico, and an internationally manned project at Sadiyat in the sheikdom of Abu Dhabi on the Arabian Peninsula. Both projects were initiated by the University of Arizona. The latter project, involving a hundred acres enclosed by fiber glass and polyesterine plastic, is already producing a ton of produce a day, cucumbers, egg plant, tomatoes, turnips. Cost is still a factor in these projects, since they are using oil diesels for desalination. Weinberg's scheme would ultimately be more viable, but would profit by the arid land agricultural techniques now being pioneered in the smaller projects.

There is another political aspect to all of this which is not unsubstantial in looking ahead. Formerly, power plants had to be placed near the sources of fossil fuels or water power. Nuclear plants carry their own fuel and, in the case of fast-breeders, produce additional fuel. Should nuclear fusion of hydrogen, the thermo-nuclear reaction ever become harnessed, electrical power would be essentially so cheap as to be practically free. But I would predict that this is still a long way off because of the 100,000,000° F temperatures involved.

Returning to nuclear fission reactors, they can be placed anywhere, even where politically expedient and helpful. I should add that they should probably always be placed under ground for safety in the case of a runaway reaction.

When I first heard Weinberg's scheme, I thought of a use that would certainly be politically expedient and a great help towards peace in the Middle East for the next millennium. Apart from territorial considerations, and senseless hates, the great bone of contention today between the Arabs and the Israeli is the homeless presence of the million Palestinian refugees. Even were the Arabs and Israeli to begin to talk, as seemed possible during the past two years, the Palestinians can be counted upon to cause a crisis, a Munich or a Khartum, to draw attention to their still unsettled plight. Until this human condition is settled, the problem solved to everyone's satisfaction, it will continue to exasperate any possible political solution.

Supposing there were created in an Arab country, Egypt or Jordan, and in Israel, one each of these large agro-industrial installations, both feeding into a common electrical and water grid to open up hundreds of thousands of acres now useless land in the Sinai for year-round agricultural use. Suppose that all Palestinians were given first choice of this land, with proper credit arrangements, twice as much land as any family lost, special provision for children born in exile since the first Arab-Israeli war, and land far more productive than that of the West Jordan. One could not force Palestinians to take this newly available land, but at least it would be available where none is now. Suppose also that the excess populations of Israel and Egypt were also invited to settle there and live and work together. The Israeli have already shown how the Negev can be turned into a verdant garden with the provision of water. They



also have a high level of competence and experience in dealing with nuclear reactors.

The whole project could be placed under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency and could be financed internationally. If successful, it would not only be a large step towards peace, but it would be an enormous pilot project for the next millennium's need for additional agricultural land. By way of postscript, similar large scale projects would be a natural and normal investment outlet for the huge sums now being generated from the sale of Middle Eastern oil. It would seem both plausible and profitable to reinvest some of these monies in the area that generated them and which is still in dire need of development for the human advancement of Middle Eastern people in modern agriculture, education, housing, and health care. This area was the early cradle of civilization and, in the Middle Ages, Arabs and Jews, particularly Avicenna and Averroes, kept alive the ancient wisdom of the Greek philosophers, promoting mathematics, architecture, astronomy, and medicine -- bringing all of this to an intellectually decadent Europe.

The Middle East might yet become in the new millennium a new cradle of revived culture if the constant threat of war and the flood of verbal hatreds might be replaced by a common endeavor of all Semitic peoples aimed at peace and justice for all. Food may seem to be a banal approach to such a lofty dream, but mankind has often learned to cooperate when survival is at stake, and there will be fewer worldwide endeavors more related to survival aboard this spacecraft earth in the new millennium than the adequate production of food for all its passengers.

VI

We now move to a somewhat loftier plane. If men and women can achieve the basic necessities of life, food and shelter, it still remains to make life human, beautiful, intellectually and morally satisfying. The preparation for this falls under the broad rubric of education, beginning with the rudimentary verbal skills of literacy and quantitative reasoning, and passing on to the arts and sciences, natural, physical, and social, technology, law, medicine and theology, the joys of literature, music, dance, and drama, all that we subsume under the word culture or more broadly in its organized form, civilization.

One might say that we already have most of this well in hand, but I hasten to remind you that there are over 300,000,000 million children today who have never been in a school and probably never will be. Despite all the efforts of UNESCO, the many governmental aid programs, the overseas projects of the great foundations, there are more illiterates in the world today than there were a decade or two ago, probably a third of humanity. Unless we can devise some ingenious new plan, there will probably be an ever increasing number of illiterates when the new millennium arrives.

We have spoken of the problem of feeding and housing the new arrivals on planet earth. If we are presently slipping backward, what of the future with increasing numbers of children arriving each day? They all arrive needing everything. While we began thinking of the physical necessities, life would be grim indeed if only physical

survival were the goal. As Faulkner said when receiving the Nobel Prize for literature in Stockholm, man will not simply endure, he will prevail. A brave announcement, but not one of automatic fulfillment.

Today less than half of the children in Latin America ever enter a schoolroom. The figure is worse in Sub-Saharan Africa and vast regions of Asia. Is there any hope of doing better as the number of children involved doubles between now and the year 2000? One should add that the educational gap of this generation is the technological gap of the next, followed by the inevitable economic gap between rich and poor, educated and uneducated, developed and underdeveloped. As children grow up, the educational problem of this generation becomes the unemployment problem of the next generation.

I have spoken of children, but there are also hundreds of millions of adults who share the same hunger for knowledge that matches their physical hunger for food. I remember once flying from Tangier to Casablanca alongside a Tuareg who watched me read my breviary. Finally, he reached into his pack and brought out a copy of the Koran which he pretended to read, turning the pages of Arabic script slowly and solemnly. When I finished, I asked him in French if he knew what he was reading. "Not really", he said, "but I know that it must be beautiful". When the stewardess handed out the entrance visas, I had to fill his out for him. "When were you born", I asked. "I don't really know", he said, "You just fill in something for me".

I had never before realized what a deprivation illiteracy must be. Teilhard de Chardin speaks of the noosphere, that vast envelope matching the biosphere that encircles our globe. The noosphere represents the total production of man's intelligence and creativity, the total human culture of the world. To be completely cut off from this most precious patrimony of mankind must be the most terrible blindness of all, and it afflicts unnecessarily about a third of all our fellow passengers on spaceship earth. The saddest part is that it is likely to afflict even more in the millennium to come. But there is a way out of this dilemma, a way not possible twenty-five years ago, but very possible today.

First, may I say that I do not believe it is possible to solve the global educational problem by conventional means, the building of classrooms, even in remote areas, and the preparation of a vast army of teachers. Very affluent countries may well continue to pursue education this way, but even we in America have, almost without realizing it, created a vast system of non-conventional, continuing education that today is serving to educate more people than the conventional system, ranging from kindergarten to the university. We have certainly come to the time when we need to think some new and creative global thoughts about the total enterprise of education, especially as it affects the lesser developed countries which will become even lesser developed without some new system of education. What are the new means at hand?

A whole series of unrelated instrumentalities which were developed after World War II have given us a communication capacity

hitherto impossible in the whole long history of mankind. These new inventions are, in general, television, synchronous satellites, computers with vast memory banks of magnetic tape and the capacity for instant retrieval amid billions of items, systems for miniturizing stored materials, for example, the whole Bible on a postage-stamp size card, instant Xerographic copying, the SNAP system for a miniturized atomic power unit in a satellite, and with this additional power, the capability of millions of channels aboard a satellite for receiving and transmitting, ultimately transmitting directly from satellite to the television set without the intervention (and interference and control) of a central ground receiving station. There are other marvels to come, but these, with the exception of eliminating the ground station, are already in being now, although as stated above, none of them existed twenty-five years ago.

It is not difficult to see what a concatenation of all of these would mean in developing a whole new approach, albeit supplementary, to the education of the world.

First of all, thanks to the space program, we are now perfectly capable of launching and maintaining in space three synchronous satellites. These would be located above the Equator at three equidistant positions from each other,  $6\frac{1}{2}$  earth's radii out from the earth (about 25,000 miles) traveling just under escape velocity so that they remain in exactly the same spot, all turning in perfect harmony with the earth's rotation. From these three satellites it would be possible to transmit millions of television programs to any spot on earth, television being line-of-sight transmission.

Secondly, there is the possibility of an educational data bank, or to simplify matters, three of them, one below each satellite. These data banks, to oversimplify, would contain the noosphere, the total record of man's knowledge, science, literature, and culture, like some universal encyclopedia. It would be contained as well in several world languages, although in some areas of knowledge, such as science, English would emerge, as is now happening, as the one world language for science.

Thirdly, where appropriate, courses would be organized and recorded for the data bank ranging from literacy in a world language to astro-physics, each taught by the very best teacher in the world in that field, with all of the best visual aids. No more would any great teacher, anywhere in the world, be lost to mankind or learning. If this had been possible in an earlier age, we could now hear Einstein explaining relativity theory, Oppenheimer in physics, Lavoisier in chemistry, Keppler, Descartes, Newton in mathematics, Shakespeare in drama, Galileo in early astronomy, Copernicus on his new theory of the solar system, and so on throughout the arts and sciences. We could sit at the feet of all the great philosophers, theologians, novelists, poets, artists, and architects.

Nothing of human culture, no great teacher, need ever again be lost to anyone on earth who has access to a television set and a directory telling him the proper number to dial to inform the satellite to signal the computer to retrieve and transmit within seconds, back through the satellite, the proper program in the proper

language to the person requesting it. Never again need it matter where the person desiring an education happens to be, whether in a remote Andean village, an oasis in the Sahara, a craggy outpost in the Hindu Kush range of Afghanistan, a remote Pacific island, or an Arctic igloo, and it would not matter what kind of an education he or she would like to have. Whatever is a valid subject for education would be included in the ever-growing educational data bank and would be instantly available.

Think of what this would mean, first in the case of literacy. The remotest village would have its miniaturized atomic-powered television set with an apprentice teacher to operate it -- no greatly complicated task -- and to help the learners get started with elementary literacy and mathematics. Then there would be all of the other lessons needed most in lesser developed countries around the world -- special courses for adults -- in health, agriculture, sanitation, crop planning by region, marketing, child care, home economics, nutrition. One could easily visualize a kind of international Peace Corps of youngsters to help organize the total endeavor and train the local para-professionals to carry it on when they left. These local guardians of the television could be further trained by television where needed as an additional aid in learning. Moreover, the sets could also be equipped to reproduce materials from the tube, diagrams, charts, even whole books of every description.

One of the worst features of rural life is boredom and isolation. Most of the population of lesser developed countries lives reluctantly

in unhappy boredom and isolation. This is what fuels urbanization with all its evils. The presence of music and drama and opera, sports and news, learning and enjoyment, could bring the best features of the cities into remote areas and give them new life. There are great educational and human values to be learned from primitive peoples in rural areas, as our American Peace Corps volunteers have often told me, peace such as they never knew in the hurly-burly of modern living, family values, hospitality, simple joys. Much of this is lost through urbanization. Remove boredom and isolation and lack of educational opportunity from the rural areas, and the trend to move might be reversed, with a much better distribution of the earth's population on the earth's available space.

I have always been impressed by the fact that high intelligence, character, and genius exist all over the world, almost at random, and that much of this scarce human resource is lost to humanity for lack of educational opportunity. Here are three personal modern examples.

A poor youngster was born in a small village in the mountain area of West Pakistan. Someone noticed his innate mathematical ability and sent him to a distant elementary school where he indeed showed great promise and was sent again to a more distant high school. The series was completed when he was sent to Cambridge University in England to study under one of the greatest physicists of our times in the Cavendish Laboratory. Today this man, still young, would ordinarily be herding sheep across the border from Kashmir. Instead he is directing an International Center for Theoretical Physics which enrolls promising scientists from the less developed countries.



The second boy was indeed herding sheep in a rugged area of Yugoslavia when someone perceptive saw him whittling figures from stray pieces of wood. He apprenticed the boy to the local stone cutter where he was again noticed by someone who sent him to study with Rodin in Paris. At nineteen, he had his own showing of sculpture there and became world famous, beautifying the world until his recent death.

The third young man was brought to my attention by a Colombian priest, Monsignor Joachim Salcedo, who was operating a literacy program, called Radio Sutatenza, for the mountain-dwelling isolated campesinos North and West of Bogota. He claimed to have taught two million illiterates to read and write by radio and published a paper for them, El Campesino, to continue their education. One day while I was visiting his project, he told me of this promising young man who had learned to read and write in one of the mountain-top radio schools. Subsequently, after some striking vicissitudes, unfortunately too lengthy to recount, this same young man came to the University of Notre Dame where he studied Electrical Engineering. Later, he received a graduate degree in Business from an Ivy League university. He is now performing extremely well in aiding the economic growth of his own country.

All three of these might have been underperforming far below their talents if they had not been noticed -- a chance affair -- and educated. The world would have been poorer by far. My question is: How many thousands of such talented people are being lost to man's development today simply because they lack this educational opportunity? No one notices them and does something to send them on their way upward.

Worldwide educational television, a kind of total university of the world, would begin to fill this important gap in liberating intelligent and talented men and women to learn, to develop their talents, and to serve others. My three friends were fortunate. Many others are not.

One immediate objection to any scheme, however good, is cost. Let me remind you that in our country, "Sesame Street" reached half of the children between three and five years of age and rendered them semi-literate when they arrived in kindergarten two years later. The cost was less than a penny per day per child reached. Well, the total scheme here presented for the world would cost far less than the total annual world budget for armaments, \$200 billion. I need not add that most armament expenditures are dead capital, whereas there are few investments more productive than education. What are the alternatives to this scheme -- growing world illiteracy, wasted scarce talents, hopelessness in further development, frustration, violence, war. What are the cost of these? More dead capital.

The cost of this project would also be far less than the cost of building classrooms and providing teachers for a billion people -- if even it could be done and the fact is, with Herculean efforts, we have fallen far short of the goal. Wherever the television set would be, there would be a classroom, in a town hall, under a tree, even in a church or temple -- for truth and learning are indeed godly. And wherever there is a classroom where people really learn, there is new hope, fulfillment.

If education on all levels is at the heart of human development, can we afford to do as badly as we are doing today to provide it for all who hunger to learn, to progress, to grow, to develop themselves?

There is another feature to the plan which is part of the genius of television. The schools of the world are as good as their teachers. As one who has visited schools and colleges and universities all over the world for many years -- as a kind of busman's holiday during our vacation time and in connection with Peace Corps and University projects under many auspices -- I can assure you that the further one goes from the centers of development, the poorer are the schools and the more depressing the quality of teaching. At a certain point it becomes the blind leading the blind, going nowhere. Now the genius of television is that the greatest teachers in the world are teaching everyone who can see or hear them. With worldwide educational television, that means practically everyone, even the local apprentice teachers, are being taught every time they supervise a class taught by a great teacher.

When serving on the National Science Board, I had to learn much of modern science from fellow Board members. I cannot remember a clearer lesson in my life than learning about the trans-uranium elements from Glenn Seaborg -- because he discovered and predicted most of them. Why shouldn't every science student learn that lesson from him? It is perfectly possible, not only here, but all over the world.

Another objection comes from the developed countries who fear this would interfere with their existing systems of schools, colleges,

and universities. I do not think so. The educational establishment, with few exceptions, is presently too entrenched and too conservative to make adequate use of the new technology already existing. That is why continuing education has grown up largely outside the present formal systems of education and has pioneered far more with technological aids, largely unused by conventional education. We published a few studies on the matter from the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education. Sir Eric Ashby of Oxford had the wisest thing to say and I refer you to his essay, as well as our general study, on the new technology and education. There is still much to be said for person-to-person education, but in the present world scene, there just are not enough logs and Mark Hopkinses, given the dire need in the less developed and largely illiterate parts of the world. UNESCO is already proposing a satellite plan for education in India which is 70% illiterate, and which presently spends \$5.00 per student annually, 1/200 of the United States expenditure. Brazil and Indonesia are also interested. I would suggest, as one of our priority endeavors while we approach the new millennium, that we test the technique with one satellite and one data bank in the Western Hemisphere. I believe that with proper leadership and resources, it will work, especially because we are dealing with a limited number of languages, Spanish and Portuguese in Central and South America, with English and French in the North.

I should add here that I visualize this continental and world endeavor as a two-way street, not as another exercise in American

cultural imperialism, or French either for that matter. All parts of the world have much to learn from each other. The richness and variety of human culture should not be homogenized. All should have a say in what goes into the data bank and in what form. If it is successful, one would hope that the university of the world will eventually become a reality, and illiteracy a bad dream of times past, as the new millennium begins.

There is yet another hurdle facing the full realization of the potential inherent in a university of the world. Even if one could finance the project, there is the political obstacle that has always been the enemy of universities anywhere, under whatever auspices. When universities first began, in the Middle Ages, they were Catholic. The first and the greatest, founded in Paris in 1205, soon had to seek a Papal charter to remove its faculty and students from the control of the local civil and church authorities. Forever since, universities have had one long struggle to maintain their academic freedom and autonomy.

The second last General Conference of the International Association of Universities, a UNESCO dependency, had for its general theme "The Freedom and Autonomy of the University". Despite all of the rhetoric one heard on the subject in 1965 at the Tokyo meeting, it soon became obvious that whatever the auspices or geo-political location of the university, they all were still struggling to maintain their freedom and autonomy against both external and internal pressures.

The World University cannot hope to escape this eternal tension between those who believe in intellectual freedom and those who do not.

I am reminded of a petty but powerful ruler whose subjects were grievously afflicted with trachoma and blindness. A friend of mine who had a large commercial interest in that country was struck with compassion at the sight of so many blind people, especially when the disease could be so easily arrested by applying sulfa salve to the eyes. He obtained a million dollars and persuaded a drug company to prepare the drug in handy small capsules. When he told the ruler of his plan, this bully said, "Nothing doing. Leave my people alone. They're much easier to rule when they are half or fully blind".

This may well represent in parable form the reaction of the politically powerful of the world nations when they are confronted with the possibility of their people's free and open access to all knowledge and science, not to mention political theory or religious concepts other than their own, cultural differences, hopes, new aspirations, and quickly rising expectations -- even for justice and equity and real human freedom in today's world. The same answer may be forthcoming, "Nothing doing. Leave my people alone. They are easier to rule (read abuse) when they are half or fully blind".

I believe that the true development of peoples means the liberation of mankind to be truly human. It may be the acid test of development or the lack of it in the next millennium to see whether or not political authority will allow people to be truly free, to have access to all that is known about politics, religion, culture, as well as a wide variety of other human realities that really liberate a man or woman. We faced somewhat the same dilemma in a smaller context when printing began and

literacy spread throughout Europe. It is difficult to calculate the effect on rising expectations of the now almost omnipresent transistor radio. But we do know that there were as massive attempts to jam programs as to transmit them.

The Lord once said that the children of darkness are wiser in their generation than the children of light. I caught a glimpse of this in a few sketchy news reports from Paris regarding a UNESCO Board meeting which dealt with television communication. A rather harsh resolution was debated -- and I believe passed -- to the effect that all satellite transmitted programs had to pass through a ground station and would be under the complete control of government authorities as to whether or not they would be allowed to enter a particular country. I can let you guess who was promoting this restriction. My greater concern was that the delegates from more open countries -- including our own-- were not fighting for freedom. I said to myself, "There goes another great idea", another victory for the children of darkness, with the children of light asleep at the switch, as the Lord foretold.

It was not lost on the opposition that the new communications technology was enormously powerful, especially in the realm of ideas. Our landing on the moon was generally televised worldwide, watched almost everywhere television was available (and there are still some large countries holding the line against it). I remember standing in front of the first space photos of the moon walk shown in the window of the U. S. Information Service in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. I was surrounded by a ragged group of little wide-eyed boys who did not know

a word of English, but who were pointing to the pictures and yelling, as if in a cheer: "Armstrong, Neil Armstrong". I could not help but think that Venetian youngsters in a different age must have pointed to a man and said: Polo, Marco Polo", meaning that the world was not just Venice or even Europe. This time it was an instantaneous lifting of the human spirit everywhere, and live television did it, even to little illiterate boys in far off Addis Ababa.

I cannot, perhaps need not, say more, except that the new millennium will see far greater and more widespread development of mankind and womankind and childkind in the truest sense of liberation of the human spirit through learning, if this new approach to worldwide education is indeed, as I believe it to be, an idea whose time has come. No politician or group of politicians, however powerful, should be allowed to obstruct this liberation.

## VII

This brings us to a consideration of the political alignment of the world in the next millennium. I am on thinner ice here, since in the nature of my personal knowledge and experience, I am here indulging more in speculation than in prediction based on fairly firm evidence. Someone once remarked to Winston Churchill that Clement Attlee was a modest man. Churchill replied, "He has a lot to be modest about". In this context, so do I. However, a few words are necessary on this subject, since whatever happens regarding the political organization of the world will largely affect all else that I have predicted. At least I can speak in hope.



Recently I read Philip Hughes' "History of the Catholic Church". While this is not general history, it was helpful by way of perspective to view one institution that has co-existed with the first two millennia and is about to move into the third, enormously changed in the past decade because of Vatican Council II. I might add, changed for the better on most counts, as I view it, even though it has happened so quickly that it has shaken a lot of people who need firm structures to lean on.

Reading rapidly through two thousand years of change brings to mind the impression that, in some spiritual, many material, and most scientific technological ways, the world itself has changed more in the post-war era than in all of the past two millennia. That is a very large statement which I do not have time to document fully, even if I could, but I will mention a few examples. We have printed almost twice as many books since 1945 than in all the centuries since printing was invented by Gutenberg, Irving Stone notwithstanding. I wish I could say we have doubled our wisdom, but even so, knowledge has increased spectacularly, particularly in the sciences, more than doubling in volume since the war. Man took all of his history to achieve a speed beyond running fast or racing a horse, when he achieved fifty miles an hour at the turn of the century with the steam engine. In the next fifty years, he multiplied that ultimate speed ten times, fulfilling Admiral Byrd's prediction after flying the Atlantic at 90 m.p.h. in 1928 that man would probably reach 500 m.p.h. in the future. It was a very near future! In the latter period since the war, we have

learned to move fifty times faster than 500 m.p.h. The astronauts are going about 25,000 miles an hour when they re-enter the earth's atmosphere from the moon.

We have used in this post-war period more energy than all mankind used from his advent on earth on through our first two millennia until World War II. We have taken a quantum step in energy production with the advent of the nuclear age and will take another when we learn to harness the thermonuclear reaction, the source of all the energy we receive from the sun.

We tripled our higher educational endeavor during the past 25 years, going from the three million students of 1950 -- a high point since the beginning of American higher education with Harvard's founding in 1636 -- to a new high of over 9,000,000 students, including a tripling of faculties and facilities. In a word, we did more by twice in twenty years than had been done in the preceding three centuries.

One could go on and on, as Toeffler does in "Future Shock", but this should suffice as a background for the political change that occurred at the same time, and with comparable rapidity, undoing the political underpinnings of centuries.

Since the age of exploration in the late 15th and 16th centuries, the world had been politically accustomed to the regime of European empires with their vast colonial holdings in Asia, Africa, and earlier in Latin America. Then suddenly, following that worldwide cataclysmic happening of World War II, the old world came apart at the seams. There was the unusual historical event of the United States, the most militarily

powerful and worldwide conquering state in history, not wanting or taking an additional foot of territory after the victory. Then there were the Four Freedoms, freedom from want and fear, freedom of speech and religion -- an interesting constellation of hopes, not unrelated to all we have been predicting for the new millennium. People, especially colonial peoples, were listening to that war-time proclamation of Four Freedoms. They wanted them all, especially their own freedom.

It took some time after the war for the movements of political liberation to jell. Even Winston Churchill said he did not become Prime Minister to dismember the British Empire. Not that it has happened, we tend to forget how recent it all did happen.

I can remember attending the Charter Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency at the United Nations in 1956. All nations were invited and most came, even Vatican which I represented with Marston Morse of the Advanced Institute at Princeton. The point is, though, that there were only 47 nations in attendance. At a similar conference today there would be about 140 nations at least, and that was only 17 years ago.

Similarly, I recall traveling throughout all of Sub-Sahara Africa in 1958. At that time, only Ghana of the long time colonies had become an independent nation. Today practically all are independent, with the exception of Portuguese Angola and Mozambique and a few tiny Spanish enclaves.

It seemed almost inevitable that all of these peoples, including the vast Indian subcontinent, should be liberated. It seems less a

matter of rejoicing that nationalism, in all of its worst aspects, was reborn and reinvigorated in almost every new nation. This may be partially due to a reborn pride in one's people and culture. That is certainly good. But it can be overdone too, especially in an ever more interdependent world.

As a result of all this, we have begun to see in the political order the impossibility of trying to govern a small planet like this, or maintain its peace, when votes are equally distributed to the very powerful and the very weak, the very large and the very small. Whatever one says of realpolitik, there is something very unreal about the geopolitical operation of the United Nations today. Even the Security Council arrangement cannot heal this flaw, flawed itself as it is, by the veto power of the great members. So we have ineffective posturing, rhetoric in five languages and millions of words, all faithfully recorded. We have voting by alignment rather than by what is right and just. A small evil is loudly condemned here, and a massive evil is conveniently overlooked there. Anyway, it doesn't work and must be overhauled before we can move politically with any confidence into the next millennium.

In the last analysis, it has been the great powers that have called the real tune during the past two decades and a half. Unfortunately, the tune was "cold war" with not unrelated heatings in the Far East, in Korea, and Vietnam.

Fortunately, all that has suddenly come to an end, with the United States now on good terms with China and Russia, even though the latter two are still mighty fidgety about each other. Europe is

more united and more prosperous than ever and Japan really booming with the third highest GNP in the world.

Now, against all of that background, I will dare make my predictions, or rather speculations, about the evolving shape and structure of this new world, approaching the new millennium.

First, I would postulate that there will be a new North-South orientation resulting largely in a tri-regional world. In the past, going back to the earliest days of the Orient and New World trade, the important orientation was mainly East-West. North-South represented trade of an extractive and exploitive nature, picking up raw materials for low prices and dumping cheap manufactured goods for higher prices. The North became wealthy and the countries of the Southern hemispheres, Australia and New Zealand excepted (they were our kind of people) mainly remained poor. Even today, the important political powers, the big five of the United States, Great Britain, France, USSR, and China, with Japan now added, are on an East-West axis.

With the decolonization of the world and the ridiculously large number of sovereign powers emerging, arranged at best by historical accident and at worst by wars, we have quickly learned that there must be a better political structure for our small planet. I suggest that a tri-regional arrangement, on a North-South orientation, is likely to develop in something like the following sequence. Japan and China are emerging as the great powers in the Orient, especially as the United States withdraws. Russia will be squeezed out or neutralized, driving it, willy-nilly, with its satellites into a much closer cooperation

with a uniting Europe, Russia in the process conveniently finding itself more European than Oriental anyway. The total economy of the Orient will loom large, especially if you consider the potential mineral wealth of Indonesia, Malasia, and Western Australia. Japan, as mentioned above, is already ranked third economically in the world without this total North-South alliance.

The total emerging European Economic Community, plus Russia and the satellite countries, will vie with the Orient for economic first place. Since the present E.E.C. without all its potential partners will attain 80% of the level of the United States Gross National Product by 1980, once the fullness of the potential community is totally organized and looking Southward to the Middle East and Africa, it does not take much imagination to see the United States in third place worldwide. If this begins to happen, and it well might, our natural region, largely neglected by us this far, is the Western Hemisphere, Canada and Latin America. We are already about as close to Canada economically as can be, sometimes perhaps too close for their liking. To the South there have been regional stirrings in Central America and in the Andean region. Brazil is by all odds the new leader of the third world as was evident during the United Nations Trade and Development Conference in Santiago, Chile, last year and at the Stockholm World Environmental Conference a few months later. The United States would have an enormous fence-mending task to do before anything like an Economic Union of the Western Hemisphere could be evolved. If my speculations are anywhere near the mark, we had best begin the mending.

Others may have a better scenario for what is evolving in the political structure of the world as the millennium approaches. Certainly, three strong and equally powerful North-South regions would seem to be geographically rational and would make the political structure of this small planet more reasonable, more amenable to peace, even more just. The North-South alignment could be greatly conducive to development, with a better distribution of the finite resources of the earth. Each center of economic strength in the North would be related to a large Southern area of present economic weakness, but great potential development. Such a North-South orientation would not prevent normal East-West trade continuation, but arrangements for tariff or free trade would be negotiated between strong communities, not the strong preying on the weak, and, moreover, the best trade and credit benefits could be within the three regional communities themselves for their internal health and growth.

As Lester Brown has observed in "World Without Borders", a book which has provided me with many statistics:

"In effect, our world today is in reality two worlds, one rich, one poor; one literate, one largely illiterate; one industrial and urban, one agrarian and rural; one overfed and overweight, one hungry and malnourished; one affluent and consumption-oriented, one poverty-stricken and survival-oriented. North of this line, life expectancy at birth closely approaches the biblical threescore and ten; South of it, many do not survive infancy. In the North,

economic opportunities are plentiful and social mobility is high. In the South, economic opportunities are scarce and societies are rigidly stratified. (p. 41) One might add, the gap is continually widening, and will continue to do so unless something like I suggest begins to happen.

Brown adds later on in his book, quoting Robert McNamara of the World Bank, "The outlook for the seventies is that the fault line along which shocks to world stability travel will shift from an East-West axis to a North-South axis, and the shocks themselves will be significantly less military and substantially more political, social, and economic in character". (p. 157)

I have consciously drifted from politics to economics and now back to my original political speculations again. Somehow, men and nations will act more quickly and more decisively under economic, rather than under political necessity. That economic necessity, whether viewed as a crisis of global development, peace, monetary systems, trade, or energy crisis, is already upon us. The emerging crises are shaping history in a wide variety of new forms. I believe that political community, or regional groupings, will follow the economic realities.

If this should happen, we will be hopefully seeing a vastly different economic and political world in the new millennium. Many of the other hopes I have already enunciated would be greatly facilitated by such a new tri-regional world community. In proposing all of this, I continue to see economics and politics as subordinate to the common good of the human community. Creative economics and



creative politics are an important part of man's creative force in human history as we try to create a new vision of earth and new man, liberated from the alienations, exploitations, indignities, hatreds, and violence of the past.

One should also add that already the cold war terminology of three worlds, one democratic, one socialistic, and one non-aligned and poor, is out-of-date. There are not three worlds today, but really only two -- the developed and the underdeveloped, the rich and the poor, the North and the South. A tri-regional alignment of these two worlds may be the best promise of the new millennium.

#### VIII

Throughout all that has been said thus far, there is involved a common thread of human development. The concept of development was pioneered by Shumpeter who used the German term "Entwicklung", perhaps more in the sense of "evolving". Those who first developed the concept, and many yet today, as in the well-known works of Samuelson and Walter Rostow, speak of development mainly in the economic sense. With so much underdevelopment in the world today -- witness the 1.9 billion people who make less than \$100.00 a year -- no wonder that economics has been called the gloomy science.

Over time, and as scholars became more involved in the actual work of development, going beyond models to the realities, as I once saw Walt Rostow wrestling with realities in Latin America together with the seven "Wise Men" of the Organization of American States, it became more and more evident that one must think of development as a

total process, "integral development" as Paul VI used the term in his best encyclical, "Populorum Progressio".

It is in this sense that I have attempted to use the concept of human development as we look ahead to the year 2000. Man's religious and moral consciousness is deeply involved, his physical and intellectual well being, too, as touched by his sustenance and educational opportunities and his total numbers to be served, all this is important too, as is where and how he lives and works.

The geo-political, social, and economic realities will also bear on the kind of world and the kind of human person who is evolving or developing. I have tried, with the briefest kind of analysis and synthesis, to indicate some current thrusts of history in the making, as well as some lines of force that will help or deter the kind of world that would seem most desirable, certainly more desirable than the largely imbalanced actual world of today, where so few have much and so many have little in the way of all those means that bear most importantly on man's development.

Again, as Lester Brown says so well: "An affluent global minority is overfed and overweight, but more than half of humanity is hungry and malnourished; some can afford heart transplants, but half of humanity receives no health care at all; a handful of Americans have journeyed to the moon, but much of mankind cannot afford a visit to the nearest city; several thousand dollars are spent on a college education for (each of ) millions of young Americans, while much of

mankind lacks the limited resources required to become literate. In a shrinking world, these growing disparities place great stress on the international political fabric". (ibid. p. 9)

Having underlined all of this, and having left you with a whole spate of hopeful predictions, I should add that the people of that Third World, which has languished between the capitalistic and socialistic world, are increasingly having thoughts of their own regarding their own development. Some of them, especially in Latin America, increasingly do not even like the sound of the word "development" (or desarrollo for them) because it has had so many overtones of dependency upon those who are already developed. Perhaps this is inevitable, as development does require capital, credit, technical assistance, experts, and a host of other means.

However, the Latin American argues, much of the development thus far has been largely a one-way street, where they have had to accept our model of development so that while they go ever more deeply into debt, their iniquitous feudal social structures remain largely untouched, the rich getting richer and the poor poorer. What the new breed want in Latin America is a change of concept, substituting the word liberation for development. They want this negatively to eliminate the connotation of dependency, and positively to be freed to work out their own plans for liberating those large masses of the dispossessed from their grinding poverty, misery, alienation, exploitation, and indignity.

I am using the words they use, and it would be honest to add that many of the younger revolutionary elements are more attracted by socialism

than they are by capitalism, which they regard as their ancient despoiler. That is why people like Che Guevara, Camilo Torres, Allende, and even Castro, are more idealized than Nixon, Heath, Pampidou, or even Willie Brandt. I am not arguing their case, which often appears to people from developed countries to be naive, subversive, ungrateful, or just plain foolish.

My own reaction, after listening to them, is that they are mighty frustrated. Capitalism has dealt more brutally with them than it has with our own poor and racial minorities. Certainly, they should be allowed to determine their own destiny, even make their own mistakes, especially in choosing their own model of development, even if it should come out looking more like socialism than capitalism. I believe that we can work with them on their terms and not only always and everywhere completely on our terms, according to our plans for them.

After all, the Chinese people developed in rather extraordinary ways, all by themselves, mainly without foreign aid. We may not like the Russians being Communists either, but in point of fact, they were an oppressed society, 97% illiterate before the revolution, whereas they are highly developed educationally today. Perhaps none of us would like to pay the price of freedom that both the Chinese and the Russians paid, but we can still believe strongly in our own model for development while co-existing with and even helping others having a different model. This should no longer be an impossible stance when the Republicans can get the American taxpayers to subsidize wheat for Russia at a cost of \$300 million, while getting higher food prices here in the process.

The honest reason that we will give more leeway to Russia and China is, I believe, because we respect their power, while we tend to patronize Latin Americans as powerless, undisciplined, poor. If what I have previously said about our own future being closely interwoven with the total future of this Western Hemisphere makes any sense, then we had better find another Henry Kissinger who is as interested in our underdeveloped neighbors, as the real Henry Kissinger is effectively interested in our powerful erstwhile enemies. The Third World will not go away. It actually has much that we need and want. But especially that massive Latin American segment of the Third World that will number over 600 million people by the end of the century, and to whom we have on occasion been both good and bad neighbors, deserves something uniformly better in the next millennium: first, greater understanding from us in the sense that they call sentimiento and, then, a two-way traffic that makes for a better hemisphere, and also a better world, whether we call it development, liberation, or both.

It is a welcome development that the new U. S. foreign aid bill is entitled, "Mutual Development and Cooperation", as is the agency to carry out the bill's provisions, one of which had hoped to establish a billion dollar credit annually for that poorest 1.9 billion of the world's people. Unfortunately, it was scuttled by the small-minded in the Congress. We should also be reminded occasionally that we have about as much trade with the developing nations as we do with the whole European Economic Community and Japan combined. If the new provision of the new aid bill had been enacted, we would probably

be doing more trade with the least developed -- as this poorest group has been largely untouched by former programs. But this important point was lost on those with tunnel vision.

I can certainly think of better motives for helping our needy neighbors than those just mentioned. I hope that these better, more altruistic motives will be more apparent in the concluding section that follows.

## IX

I should like to conclude, as I began, with a word of theology. I have been accused, often enough in my life, of attending to all too many secular concerns that seem to bear no real relationship to that which should concern me most as a priest: God, Faith, Church, Salvation, in a word, the Kingdom of God. The more crude objectors say, "Go back to your Bible", although I suspect I spend more time with it than any dozen of them. Others say, "You should pray more", and indeed I should, although I say with thanksgiving, not pride, that during my thirty years of priesthood I have offered Mass every day, save one, that Mass is allowed to be offered (no Mass on Good Friday). This is the greatest prayer of all and it has carried me through many a difficult day, all the way from the South Pole to the Faculty House at the University of Moscow. Besides, the Mass puts me in vital touch each day with God, and allows me to participate in His great act of redemption for everyone in the world. Whatever else I do, I am most a priest offering Mass. But the critics are still right. While I never miss my daily breviary,

I should pray more. The more perceptive of the critics say that while human progress, justice, peace, and all the rest are important, it is hardly a priority of Christians, not to mention priests, to spend most of their lives in such pursuits. As they put it: "How would you answer the saints when they ask you, 'Quid hoc ad aeternitatem' - what have all of these economics, political, cultural, educational, and other concerns to do with eternity?" A nice question. It deserves an answer, especially since I started out in the University twenty-eight years ago as a professional theologian.

Before attempting, with the help of some modern theologians, to build a theological bridge between human progress and the Kingdom of God, may I at least indicate briefly the basic question of transcendence that must never be forgotten in discussions of this kind. The German theologian, Joseph Ratzinger, has said that the two most important issues in theology today are politics (neo-Marxism, violence, the true meaning of liberation) and spirituality (the content of our hope, in what way God is the basis of our life). The latter issue of spirituality is the transcendent one, although both issues are closely related. As Ratzinger puts it briefly, "For me, priority must be given to the urgent question of how to discover God in our life ..... I'm talking about what may awkwardly be described as coming into contact with God, finding Him as the basis of our being and all of our acts -- discovering that real sense of interiority which gives us both an independence from the things of this world and a new relationship to them.

"In prayer and meditation we can find the tranquility and the transforming power of the presence of God. Union with God is,

ultimately, the only basis on which our community with others can rest. Our interior liberty enables us to live in community, and to see and serve the needs of all, especially the poor. The type of committed detachment which is the by-product of this interior liberty destroys the roots of all forms of exploitation, including the lust for power inherent in political activity; and it opens the eyes to the injustices that are concealed in every system". (Cited in article, "Lost in the Shouting: The Meaning of Vatican II", U. S. CATHOLIC, p. 34) This primacy of the spiritual and of spirituality in one's personal life will save theologians from becoming either academic pedants speaking only to each other on esoteric subjects, or from being aliens in the land of faith which they should primarily, but not exclusively, inhabit. Transcendence does not mean unconcern, but ultimately greater concern, freely given, without compromise. Living theology makes all of this possible, in fact, necessary for the theologian.

Theology strives to be the orderly spiritual expression of Christian wisdom as it was so well during the early ages of the Greek and Latin Fathers of the Church. It became in the Middle Ages, under the genius of theologians like Abelard and Albert and Aquinas, a strict intellectual discipline wherein faith and reason met, discussed, and illuminated each other -- as was so well said: *Fides querens intellectum et intellectus quarens fidem* -- Faith seeking understanding and understanding seeking faith.

As human sciences developed in recent centuries, there was and is mutual advantage in theology, the science of faith, meeting and discussing



with the secular sciences, all of the insights they both bring to man's total understanding of himself, his world, and his God. All human knowledge can benefit from theological reflection, and vice versa. But all too little of this intellectual linkage takes place in a world of isolated specialization.

Today, as never before, theology must be increasingly involved in a critical reflection on the problems of the world and modern man's place in the world as he works out his salvation and seeks the Kingdom of God. As Yves Congar said: "If the Church wishes to deal with the real questions of the modern world and to attempt to respond to them ... it must open, as it were, a new chapter of theologico -- pastoral epistemology. Instead of using only revelation and tradition as starting points, as classical theology has generally done, it must start with facts and questions derived from the world and from history". (Situations et taches, p. 72)

This new theological attitude has led to the introduction of the word "Orthopraxis" -- relating to critical theological reflection, and especially, action regarding a Christian's life and commitment in a very complex world, according to the light of the Gospel message. Orthopraxis is used in contrast to Orthodoxy which reflects a concern for doctrine, generally in the abstract order of ideas. The Dutch theologian, Edward Schillebeeckx, puts it bluntly, although a bit too antagonistically and absolutely for me: "It is evident that thought is necessary for action. But the Church has for centuries devoted her attention to formulating truths and, meanwhile, did almost nothing to better the world. In

other words, the Church focused on orthodoxy and left orthopraxis in the hands of non-members and non-believers". And later, "The hermeneutics of the Kingdom of God consists especially in making the world a better place. Only in this way will I be able to discover what the Kingdom of God means". (La Teologia, in Los Catolicos holandeses, p. 29, Bilbao, Desclee de Brouwer, 1970). All such statements are more nuanced in context, but the import for our purpose is clear enough from these words of Schillebeeckx.

Granted that modern theology can and should be deeply involved in the complex problems of modern man and his world -- for these also need the illumination of the faith and the inspiration of Christian wisdom as never before -- that still leaves unsolved the involvement of the Christian. How does all of this so-called secular activity relate to the mission of the Church, the life of the Christian, salvation, and the Kingdom of God?

First, one must say that there is an integral and organic unity to the life of a Christian. In the broadest sense, as regards both the whole of creation and himself, the committed Christian is, like Christ the Saviour, engaged in the creation of a new world and a new man. As Vatican II put it: "We are witnesses of the birth of a new humanism, one in which man is defined first by his responsibility towards his brothers and towards history". (Guadium et spes, p. 55). One could add, and towards history in the making, the new creation, for this same Constitution begins by saying that the Church today must share "the joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties, of men of this age". (p. 1) The presumption spelled out later on in the Constitution

on the "Church in the Modern World" is that we are going to do something about these hopes and anxieties, are going to be engaged in some new creative and salvific action as Christians.

Creation and salvation are deeply allied in the Old Testament and the New. A modern theologian, the Peruvian, Gustavo Gutierrez, uses this linkage to establish a connection between Christian social praxis, working for the new creation, and salvation. "...When we assert that man fulfills himself by continuing the work of creation by the means of his labor, we are saying that he places himself, by this very fact, within an all-embracing salvific process. To work, to transform this world, is to become a man and to build the human community, it is to save. Likewise, to struggle against misery and exploitation and to build a just society is already to be a part of the saving action, which is moving towards its complete fulfillment. All this means that building the temporal city is not simply a stage of 'humanization' or 'pre-evangelization' as was held in theology up until a few years ago. Rather it is to become part of a saving process which embraces the whole of man and all human history. Any theological reflection on human work and social praxis ought to be rooted in this fundamental affirmation". (Theology of Liberation, p. 160) "...The conclusion to be drawn ... is clear: salvation embraces all men and the whole man; the liberating action of Christ -- the Word made man in this history and not in a history marginal to the real life of man -- is at the heart of the historical current of humanity; the struggle for a just society is in its own right very much a part of salvation history". (Ibid, p. 168)

One can say all of this without identifying all temporal progress with the building of the Kingdom of God which is, by nature, eternal. However, while one makes a distinction between temporal progress and the growth of the Kingdom, they are and can be closely related in the minds and motives of Christians working for peace and justice, indeed must be part of the total endeavor of the one life we live.

There is a profound unity in the divine plan for man, creation, salvation, and the Kingdom of God. Redemption does embrace the totality of creation, and those working for a new man and a new earth are very much creating, and redeeming the times as well. There is one history of mankind. It is not static, but dynamic, and in all that we have been saying, proposing, dreaming, hoping, I trust we may be presumed to be working in the broadest possible historical context, which is also escatological, looking ahead to that ultimate Kingdom of justice, peace, and love that validates, as nothing else can for the Christian, his or her efforts to seek eternity through time, to love God by loving men, to serve and to create, to build a community of men which may also, by God's grace, be also a Kingdom of God. Anything less is unworthy of a Christian.

Believing all of this profoundly, and relying on the words that the good Lord proposes to use in judging us all, "What you did for one of these, my least brethren, you did it for Me", I find no dissonance in a Christian's involvement in the world. In fact, I would be deeply concerned about a Christian, a Christian community, or a church which did not concern itself seriously in all of these temporal matters we have been discussing.

Isaiah put it well long ago: "Your countless sacrifices, what are they to me, says the Lord. I am sated with the whole offerings of rams .... the offer of your gifts is useless, the reek of sacrifices is abhorrent to me .... though you offer countless prayers, I will not listen. There is blood on your hands .... cease to do evil and learn to do right, pursue justice and champion the oppressed; give the orphan his rights, plead the widow's cause". (Isaiah 1: 10-17)

And the good Lord left no doubt that He identified the love of neighbor with the love of God Himself. When we feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, clothe the naked, or visit the imprisoned, we do it to Him. And likewise, when we refuse, we refuse Him. We then do not love either God or neighbor.

I would like to conclude this apologia pro vita mea, and that of so many of my collaborators, by quoting a beautiful passage written for those who spend their lives among the poor and suffering in the missions of Latin America:

"All the dynamism of the cosmos, and of human history, the movement towards the creation of a more just and fraternal world, the overcoming of social inequities among men, the efforts, so urgently needed on our continent, to liberate man from all that depersonalizes him -- physical and moral misery, ignorance and hunger, as well as the awareness of human dignity, all these originate, are transformed, and reach their perfection in the saving work of Christ. In

Him and through Him, salvation is present at the heart of man's history". (La pastoral en las Misiones de America Latina, p. 16)

May we all be a part of this evolving history, this creative and salvific act, as well.

X

Postscript

Since I have been speaking in global terms and, through you, to a global audience, it now seems proper, since these lectures have been given at a distinguished American university, that I conclude with a message directed primarily to Americans, especially young Americans, since it is these students who will usher in the new millennium, and it is our country that bears the largest responsibility for world leadership today.

It is a strange paradox that the most striking photograph brought back from the moon by the astronauts was not a close-up picture of the moon itself, but a far away picture of the earth. There it shines as no earth dweller had ever seen it before: blue, flecked with white cloud patterns, a beautiful small globe set against the blackness of space's void through which it is whirling at incredible speed.

Archibald McLeish caught the poetry of the vision. It is up to all of us to make the new vision come true. The sad reality is that the earth is much more beautiful from afar than it is up close. Not that physical beauty does not exist on earth. I have been awed

by the majesty of the soaring snowy, wind-swept heights of the Himalayas seen against the jade green uplands of Nepal. The pastel colored sweep of the Britannica Range in Antarctica seen from McMurdo base camp almost two hundred miles away is enough to thrill the soul of any observer. A sunset following a storm at sea, a sunrise on the hushed African game-filled caldera of Ngorongoro Crater, the cordillera blanca of Peru and Chile viewed from a high flying jet on a bright Winter afternoon, these are unforgettably beautiful earthly visions.

Note, however, that in most of them, man, apart from the viewer, is almost completely absent, and where man is present in large numbers on earth, one can almost always expect a diminution of beauty, both physical beauty diminished through pollution and spiritual beauty marred by violence and injustice.

It is a singular blessing for our age that we have been able to see the earth from the moon, to see it as it really is, in Barbara Ward's words: Spaceship Earth, a beautiful, small space vehicle, providing a viable ecosystem for human beings with quite limited resources. As Heilbroner has said so well: "Life on this planet is a fragile affair, the kind of miraculous microbial activity that flourished on the thin film of air and water and decomposed rock which separates the uninhabitable core of the earth from the void of space".

We, the passengers of spaceship earth, have the capability of creating by our intelligence and freedom, a whole series of man-made systems that will enhance the inherent beauty of our planet, and make it even more humanly viable and physically beautiful, or we can turn

spaceship earth into an ugly wasteland where human beings barely survive and hardly live in any human sense.

If you have any doubt that we are doing the latter rather than the former, walk through the streets of Calcutta, visit the favellas, barriadas, villas miserias, and callampas surrounding the Latin American capital cities, step aboard the floating junks adjacent to Hong Kong's harbor, or look at the native locations north of Johannesburg in South Africa, or inspect some of our own inner city slums or Chicano colonias in the Southwest, or miners' rotting villages in Appalachia, or almost any American Indian reservation in the West. It isn't just what you see that will sicken you. It is that it is all so unnecessary, that it is man-made, and man-kept, and that it is in startling contrast to the way other humans are living in luxury only a few miles away from each of these human sewers and garbage heaps.

An easy answer would be to say that there is just not enough of the world's resources to house and feed everyone -- but then remember that last year, and for most of the years that we can remember, the governments of this planet have spent more than \$200 billion dollars on armaments, and that is more than the total annual income of the poorest half of the earth's population. We do it because the Russians do it, and they do it because we do it, and so the foolishness goes on, and on, and on, all around the world. Meanwhile, the poor go to bed hungry, if they have a bed.

To put the case for the poor most simply, imagine our spaceship earth with only five people aboard instead of more than three and a



half billion. Imagine that one of those five crew members represents those of us earth passengers who live in the Western world of North America and Europe, one fifth of humanity on earth, mainly white and Christian. The person representing us has the use and control of 80% of the total life sustaining resources available aboard our spacecraft. The other four crewmen, representing the other four-fifths of humanity -- better than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  billion people -- have to get along on the 20% of the resources that are left, leaving them each about 5% to our man's 80%. To make it worse, our man is in the process of increasing his use of these limited resources to 90%.

Now if this sounds piggish to you, it is! If you put resources just in terms of energy, which is popular today, we in the United States, with 6% of the world's population, used last year about 40% of the total world's available energy. While we complained about a trade deficit a year ago, we made two billion dollars excess from the less developed countries, depending on our less favored brethren in Latin America to provide us with one billion of these dollars in surplus trade balances, while we provided them with the least aid ever, since aid began.

How much human peace can you visualize or expect aboard our spacecraft when its limited resources are so unjustly shared, especially when the situation is worsening each year? Peace is not gained by armaments, but by justice. If four-fifths of the world's people live in misery while the other fifth in the United States and Europe enjoy ever greater luxury, then we can expect no peace aboard spaceship earth, only frustration, despair, and, ultimately, violence.

The tragedy is that this is the world that man has made and is making. The general human condition is very bad indeed aboard our spacecraft.

Is there any hope for man? Is our spacecraft really hurtling towards massive human disaster, cataclysmic human upheaval and ultimately the reduction of this beautiful globe to a burned-out cinder in space? One can be optimistic, I believe, only if this generation -- and I address the young particularly -- can shuck off the madness of the nightmare that man for centuries, and increasingly of late, has been creating aboard our planet. A new global vision is needed if man is to create on earth the beauty that this planet manifests and seems to promise from afar. The vision must be one of social justice, of the interdependence of all mankind on this small spacecraft. Unless the equality, and the oneness, and the common dignity of mankind pervade the vision -- the only future of this planet is violence and destruction on an ever increasing scale, a crescendo of man's inhumanity to man that can only result globally in the extermination of mankind by man.

As one of our graduates in the Peace Corps in Malawi, Africa, put it: "While our leaders have their power battles and ego trips, countless millions of unknowns are in need of a bit more food, a year or two more of education, another pot or pan, a sensible way of controlling family size, a book or a bicycle. These people aren't asking for much; they would only like to be a bit more free to be a bit more human".

I believe that none but the young -- or the young in heart -- can dream this vision or pursue this ideal. Why? Because it means

leaving behind the conventional wisdom that pervades the old and aging bones of the Western World. The vision of one peaceful community of mankind on earth, dedicated to justice, equity and human dignity for all is contrary to most of the modern American myths -- unlimited growth for us at the expense of almost everyone else; the absoluteness of our Declaration of Independence; patriotism isolated from every other moral value, my country right or wrong; security only by force of arms, however unjustly used, as President Nixon said recently, "Bombs saved lives"; material wealth as the greatest goal of all, since it guarantees pleasure, power, and status -- everything but compassionate, unselfish rectitude.

Who but the young or young in heart can say, I will march to another drumbeat; I will seek another vision for my country and my world. Not a vision of might makes right, but noblesse oblige. Not a vision of power, but of honor. Not just honor proclaimed as we hear it proclaimed so loosely today, but honor lived. As Robert Frost said:

"Two roads diverged in a wood, and I --

I took the one less travelled by,

And that has made all the difference".

What is mainly needed today to make the difference is a vision of justice to which we commit ourselves anew at home, to demonstrate that if justice is possible here in America, between different races, different religions, different socio-economic classes, it might just be possible all around the world. America's leadership must be demonstrated at home while it is proclaimed abroad, and lastly, our leadership must be

inspired by the same kind of vision that first inspired the birth of this country, a vision of human equality and dignity needed today to create the rebirth of one whole world, a new planet where human beings aspire to be humane, where beautiful human beings begin to replace the past creations of human ugliness with new creations born of compassion, concern, and competence, too.

Is all this an empty dream, a naive vision? Not if young people, those who will usher in the new millennium, take it seriously, joining intelligence to their idealism, competence to their vision, and the courage to dare to be different in how they view the world they are going to make, or better, remake. I am often asked, "How can we possibly turn the world over to them?" My answer is both simple and obvious. "What other choice do you have? Tomorrow is theirs, not ours".

We might all begin by a declaration of the interdependence of mankind today. The evidence is totally on the side of such a declaration -- even as regards this country which was founded almost two centuries ago by a Declaration of Independence. There is no serious problem facing our country, and indeed the world today, that is not global in its sweep, as well as in its solution. You can make a whole list: pollution, the dollar, population, trade, peace, human rights, human development, security, health, education, communication, drugs, crime, energy, space, raw materials, food, freedom, and so forth. Try solving any one of these problems in any adequate way without involving the whole world. Try even thinking about the philosophical implications of a true solution without reference to the inherent unity, equality, fraternity, and dignity of mankind and what that dignity

demands and requires of human persons everywhere, but more especially those who live where the power, the wealth, and the leverage lie.

I was brought up in an America visualized as completely separated from the rest of the world, proud of its independence and oceanic-insured isolation. Now we learn that the energy that makes all of America run, or be lighted, heated, mechanized, and mobile, will depend mainly on sources outside of the United States in another dozen years, and that the fourteen basic metal resources we need for our manufacturing and industrial process will come mainly from other less developed countries by the turn of the century. The present energy crisis is just a preview of things to come. The almighty dollar my contemporaries idolized has been devalued twice in less than two years.

Containing Communism has been for almost three decades the one all-embracing reason for our doing almost anything abroad -- from the Marshall Plan to save post-war Europe, to destroying Vietnam in order to save it. What validity does containing Communism have now when our greatest diplomatic concerns today are better relations with the two worldwide root sources of Communism, Russia and China? If we can recognize self-interested and new interdependence in this new relationship with China and Russia, as indeed we must, then we can recognize it anywhere and everywhere. As our students love to sing during liturgical celebrations at Notre Dame, "There's a new world coming, every day, every day". Indeed there is!

It would appear quite obvious at this point that the winds of unity are blowing, that many are working to bridge the many chasms that have separated mankind aboard spacecraft earth. Diplomacy is happily bridging the chasm of ideology. All mankind need no longer visualize society exactly as we do. Ecumenism is bringing the Christian and non-Christian religions together in understanding at last, thank God. Cultural exchange is finding new and mutual values in the East and the West, while mercantalism in the modern dress of the multi-national corporation is pioneering some unusual ways of economic development between the Northern and Southern parts of our spacecraft. The energy crisis is pushing for a solution to the Middle Eastern dilemma. Racial prejudice stands convicted worldwide of idiocy when Africans in Uganda expel Asians who were born there and have adopted that country long ago, or when the citizens of Bangladesh cannot forgive their fellow Bihari. Male chauvinism is on the way out in the Western World, belatedly since in the East and Middle East, India and Israel already have female Prime Ministers. The unity of mankind must be the wave of the future if we are not to divide ourselves unnecessarily according to race, religion, color, sex, and age, and thereby make human life impossibly complicated aboard our shrinking spacecraft.

This leaves the one great remaining divider of human kind, perhaps the worst of all, national sovereignty. Suppose that an intelligent and cultured visitor from another solar system were to be informed, on seeing our planet earth as the astronauts saw it from the moon, that in addition to all the inequities, injustices, and

alienations already mentioned, mankind on earth insisted on governing our spaceship by dividing it into 140 different nationalities, some very large, some impossibly small, and quite a few in between. Our interplanetary visitor would also learn that there was no reasonable rationale for these national divisions, that they often represented people of the same language, religion, race, and culture, and were, in fact, often separated only by historical accidents. Now that the political separation is a fact, they are ready to fight to the death to maintain their national identities and territorial prerogatives.

Since this is a factual description of how things mainly are on spaceship earth, how difficult it will be to achieve human unity, decency, and oneness of purpose aboard our spaceship. We must find some new way of transcending this inane block of nationality that pits human against human because by an accident of birth they happen to be American or Canadian, East or West German, Venezuelan or Colombian, Kenyan or Ugandan, North or South Vietnamese.

I would like to propose a solution that would bypass, rather than cut the Gordian knot of nationality. It is likewise a solution which is bound to be misunderstood unless someone stands in spirit on the moon and views the world from there, with all its promise of beauty, unity, and a common home for mankind united. As McLeish said: "To see the earth as it truly is, small and blue and beautiful in that eternal silence where it floats, is to see ourselves as riders on the earth together, brothers on that bright loveliness in the eternal cold -- brothers who know now they are truly brothers".

What I would suggest is that everyone in the world would be allowed to hold dual citizenship -- to be a citizen of the nation in which he or she happens to be born and, in addition, to be able to qualify for world citizenship.

The application to be a citizen of the world, of spaceship earth, would involve certain commitments:

1. One would have to certify his or her belief in the unity of mankind, in the equal dignity of every human being, whatever his or her nationality, race, religion, sex, or color.

2. One would have to certify his or her willingness to work for world peace through the promotion and practice of justice at home and abroad.

3. One would have to do something to prove the sincerity of these beliefs, something to promote justice for all, something to promote the peace and well-being of his or her fellow humans at home and abroad.

The growing number of human beings on spaceship earth who would freely opt for world, in addition to national citizenship, might begin to prove that men and women are ready to regard each other truly as brothers and sisters, to seek justice for all, to live in peace, to commit one's idealism to practice, to transcend nationalistic chauvinism, and to seek to realize a new vision of a spaceship earth with liberty and justice for all -- the only true road to world peace.

One would hope that whatever international agency would certify this additional world citizenship might also grant to its world citizens



some benefits befitting their commitment, such as free passage without visas anywhere in the world, a small concession, but one symbolic of what one free world might be for all its citizens as more of them apply for world passports.

One would like to hope that our country, with its rich trans-national, multi-racial, and poly-religious population base, might be the first to propose and allow this new idea of dual citizenship for all who would desire to give leadership and meaning to this new concept of a more beautiful, more human spaceship earth.

I would like to say for myself, and I would hope for many of you, that I would welcome this kind of opportunity to declare myself interested in the welfare of mankind everywhere in the world, concerned for the justice due all who suffer injustice anywhere in the world. I would like to believe that being a citizen of the world would enlarge me as a person, would declare my fraternity with every other man, woman, and child in the world. I would take world citizenship to be a firm commitment to work for a new vision of spaceship earth and all its passengers, to be a harbinger of hope for all who are close to despair because of their dismal human condition, finally, to be a beacon of light for humanity beleaguered by darkness in so many parts of our world today.

Again, one of Notre Dame's Peace Corps volunteers, now studying at Harvard, puts it well: "One comes away from an experience like the Peace Corps with a sense of real international brotherhood. The fact that a fellow who had never been out of the Midwest and could speak

only English could then live in two countries on the South and Eastern fringes of Asia, form deep and lasting friendships with the native people, learn a language and a culture in both Ceylon and Korea and function well in them -- it makes one feel a sense of oneness with people all over the world".

I do not see the possibility of world citizenship as a panacea or an immediate answer to all the world's ills and evils. Rather, it would be for each of us a chance to declare our interdependence with one another, our common humanity, our shared hopes for our spaceship earth, our brotherhood as members of the crew, our common vision of the task facing humanity -- to achieve human dignity and the good life together.

Once more, Barbara Ward has elucidated the new vision best:

"One of the fundamental moral insights of the Western culture which has now swept over the whole globe is that, against all historical evidence, mankind is not a group of warring tribes, but a single, equal and fraternal community. Hitherto, distances have held men apart. Scarcity has driven them to competition and enmity. It has required great vision, great holiness, great wisdom to keep alive and vivid the sense of the unity of man. It is precisely the saints, the poets, the philosophers, and the great men of science who have borne witness to the underlying unity which daily life has denied. But now the distances are abolished. It is

at least possible that our new technological resources, properly deployed, will conquer ancient shortage. Can we not at such a time realize the moral unity of our human experience and make it the basis of a patriotism for the world itself?" (Barbara Ward, Spaceship Earth, Columbia University Press, New York, 1966, p. 148)

It will be easy to scoff at this vision of our humanity, our oneness, our common task as fellow passengers on a small planet. The great and powerful of this earth, and indeed of our country and Europe, can easily sniff cynically and return to their game of power politics, national jealousies, mountains of armaments, millions of graves of men mourned by widows and orphans, ravaged oceans, and unverdant plains and hungry homeless people who despair of the good life. Somehow I believe that there is enough good will in our country and in the world to expect millions of people to declare all of this powerful posturing of corrupt politicians to be arrant nonsense on a common spaceship, to say that we do want all men and women to be brothers and sisters, that we do believe in justice and peace, and that we think homes, and swaying fields of grain, and schools and medicine are better than billions spent for guns, tanks, submarines, ABM's and MIRV's. The trouble is that the millions of little people, the ones who really man spaceship earth, the ones who really work, and suffer, and die while the politicians posture and play, these little ones have never been given a chance to declare themselves. And this is wrong, globally wrong.

It is, I believe, a most important, urgent, and timely part of the new world a-borning that everyone in the world should be able to declare his or her broader citizenship in adopting a wider vision for spaceship earth, a vision that transcends nationality and anything else that separates man from man. Having traveled across the face of our beautiful planet, having traversed all its oceans and its continents, having shared deep human hopes with my human brothers and sisters of every nationality, religion, color, and race, having broken bread and found loving friendship and brotherhood everywhere on earth, I am prepared this day to declare myself a citizen of the world, and to invite all of you, and everyone everywhere to embrace this broader vision of our interdependent world, our common humanity, our noblest hopes and our common quest for justice in our times and, ultimately, for peace on earth.