

group was the South African Student Organization, headed by a medical student named Steve Biko. Biko's chapter, "Black Consciousness and the Quest for a True Humanity," was published in a book, *The Challenge of Black Theology in South Africa*, which was immediately banned. In December, 1974, Dr. Manas Buthelezi, Naude's assistant, who had received a Ph.D. from Drew University and was to be the first black Lutheran bishop in South Africa, was issued a banning order. Although it was later lifted for unknown reasons, the writing was on the wall.

By the time of the Soweto protests on June 16, 1976, Horst Kleinschmidt, another of Naude's assistants, had been detained, but he fled to Holland to head the Christian Institute "in exile." The February, 1977, issue of *Pro Veritate* was banned. On March 16 Oshadi Phakathi, Naude's Transvaal assistant, who was the only black in the 1972 photo, was banned for five years. In September, at the time of Biko's arrest and death under questionable circumstances, Phakathi too fled to Holland. When the government's big roundup of black leaders occurred on October 19, it was not surprising therefore that the one white person caught up in the same net was Naude.

The Afrikaner leaders of South Africa are afraid. Naude is the voice of conscience from within Afrikanerdom. Within this clime of fear and hubris he extends the hand of brotherhood, he proposes the positive methods of nonviolence. Thus Naude would release the creative potential of this richly endowed country. Today Naude appears as the victim; but he is also the symbol of Afrikaner victory over its hubris. In this sense Beyers Naude is a harbinger of what all South Africans could become.

G. McLeod Bryan, Professor of Christian Ethics at Wake Forest University, is author of a new book, Naude: Prophet to South Africa. He is chairman for America of the worldwide network of volunteer associates of the friends of the Christian Institute of Southern Africa.

EXCURSUS III

Wendy Moge on

A Practical Guide to Ethics and Public Policy

An invisible participant currently sits at the world's negotiating tables, exerting a powerful influence on haves and have-nots, wheat exporters and hungry nations, bank presidents and corporate executives.

Sometimes disguised as "political will," occasionally used, or misused, by fellow negotiators, this nonpartisan force wields a double-edged sword,

sometimes making, sometimes breaking progress toward a world grain reserve, or an agreement on poor-country debt, or a common fund for stabilization of commodity prices. Ironically the potency of this participant often springs from the unwillingness of other negotiators to grant it "diplomatic recognition." But it does have a name. It's called ethics.

The crises we face demand that we recognize and implement our ethics—our ideals. The alternative is to accept a chaotic, unfair world. But the urgency of such crises as hunger and poverty and nuclear overkill also leads to frustration at philosophizing. How can we sit in conferences and debate what we *should* do? "What *can* we do?" was the impatient question of many who attended recent briefings on "Who Shall Eat?" a series sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) and designed to examine the ethical assumptions underlying U.S. food-policy choices. In response to the frustration behind this search for "cookbook answers to complex questions" (in the words of one conference attendee) I offer a practical person's guide to ethics and public policy.

First, recognize that behind the most devout realist lurks an ethical perspective. We may not overtly proclaim our values, but we all make decisions that are at least partly colored by our beliefs. Even the data on which we base our policy decisions are selected under the influence of a particular ethical perspective. For example, listen carefully for phrases like "the most efficient" (as in "food aid program") or "the most effective" (as in "global trade agreement"). As economist Ronald Müller stated at a recent forum on ethics and multinational cooperation: "Economics is not a value-free science...efficiency itself is a value."

Another example. The lack of political will, which has been thwarting agreements between rich and poor nations, is often rooted in the conflict between moral perspectives expressed by these countries. To paraphrase Lehman Brothers chairman Peter G. Peterson: A reading of the declaration for a new international economic order looks like "they" (the poor) get all the rights, while "we" (the rich) have all the duties. So it's not simply a question of how much money there is to go around: Rights and duties are moral issues.

Second, the ethical dilemmas we face are complex, frustrating, and not easily resolved. What is the good life? What is the relationship between goods and the good life? Such questions deserve more than cookbook answers. Harder still is the problem of reconciling conflicting values. The practical person can recognize that realism often masks an unwillingness to make difficult, conscious choices between precious values. A realist may claim to be acting "in the national interest." But how can national interest be defined without making deliberate choices about which of our societal values we want to preserve?

A third caution for the practical person is to beware of overdosing on idealism. We all tend to set

up an unnecessary tug-of-war between "real" and "ideal." One simple example: The idea of helping farmers gain ownership of the land they till is morally pleasing to those of us who want "self-empowerment" and "self-determination." But this also happens to be an extremely productive method of farming (50 per cent more productive than any landlord system, in fact). It's true that harmony between real and ideal may not always come so easily, but only when we dare to look for it do we have any hope of discovering this synthesis.

Finally, we can adopt a realistic attitude toward how to use our values constructively—not as substitutes for action, nor as unattainable goals that we decide in advance can never be realized.

"Shorn of their aura of mystery and sanctimony, moral principles are simply guidelines to action. They help us decide what to do." So wrote Charles Frankel in his eloquent booklet, *Morality and U.S. Foreign Policy*. It is precisely this definition that motivates the AFSC as it examines moral and practical implications of a new international economic order.

It is precisely this definition that can provide a *practical* basis for ethical analysis.

Quakers (and others) have lamented over a phenomenon called "hiding one's light under a bushel." Without a sensible treatment of our values it is unlikely that the light within each of us will be granted the "diplomatic recognition" it deserves.

Wendy Moge is coordinator of AFSC's new project on "The Limits to Poverty."

EXCURSUS IV

Hazel Henderson on

The Legacy of E.F. Schumacher

To me Fritz Schumacher, in addition to his energetic activism, was a superlative educator who helped us see deeply into the nature of our situation. "The essence of education," he suggested, "is the transmission of values, but values do not help us pick our way through life unless they have become our own—that we think and feel with them, that they are the very instruments through which we look at, interpret, and experience the world. When we think, we do not just think, we think with our ideas."*

Schumacher says: "All philosophers, and others, have always paid a great deal of attention to ideas seen as a result of *thought* and *observation*, but in modern times, all too little attention has been paid to the study of ideas, which form the very instruments by which thought and observation *proceed*.... [I]ndeed, it is often difficult to become aware of our ideas, because they are the *instruments*, not the results, of our thinking—just as you can see what is

outside you, but cannot easily see that with which you see: the eye itself."

Schumacher knew that, as he said, "The way in which we experience and interpret the world obviously depends very much indeed on the kinds of ideas that fill our minds. If they are mainly small, weak, superficial and incoherent, life will appear insipid, uninteresting, petty and chaotic. It is difficult to bear the resulting feeling of emptiness, and the vacuum...may only too easily be filled by some big, fantastic notion—political or otherwise—which suddenly seems to illuminate everything and to give meaning and purpose to our existence. It needs no emphasis that herein lies one of the greatest dangers of our time....If the mind cannot bring to the world a set, or shall we say, a toolbox of powerful ideas, the world must appear to it as a chaos, a mass of unrelated phenomena, of meaningless events. ...Such a person is in a strange land....without maps or signposts or indicators of any kind."

He continues: "Never has science been more triumphant; never has our power over our environment been more complete or our progress faster. It cannot be a lack of know-how that causes the despair of religious thinkers like Kierkegaard and mathematicians like Bertrand Russell and Hoyle. We know *how* to do many things, but do we know what to do? Ortega y Gasset put it succinctly, 'We cannot live on the human level without *ideas*. Upon them depends what we do. Living is nothing more or less than doing one thing instead of another.'" What then, asks Schumacher, is education "but the transmission of ideas which enable us to choose between one thing and another? Science cannot produce ideas by which we could live. Even the greatest ideas of science are nothing more than working hypotheses, useful for purposes of special research, but completely inapplicable to the conduct of our lives or the interpretation of the world....The errors are not in science, but in the philosophy put forward in the name of science. The sciences are being taught without any awareness of the pre-suppositions of science...and of the place occupied by the natural sciences within the whole cosmos of human thought. The result is that the pre-suppositions of science are normally mistaken for its findings. Economics is being taught largely without any awareness of the view of human nature that underlies present-day economic theory...and many economists are themselves unaware of this."

Fritz Schumacher knew that all subjects, no matter how specialized, are connected with a center consisting of metaphysics and ethics—of ideas that, whether we like them or not, transcend the world of facts. He knew, too, that education can only help us if it produces whole people, who are in touch with this metaphysical center and strive for their own definition of what is *good*. This helps us ask the right questions: "Good for whom?" and in turn helps us

*All quotations are from *Small Is Beautiful* (1973) and *A Guide for the Perplexed* (1977).