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HE FIRST VOLUME of *The World History Workbook* examined world history as the history of a single humanity. The exercises and readings in the first book identified universals in human history such as language and its shared genealogy, the common ancestry of all people, myth, literature, religion, archetype, and religious traditions common to societies throughout history. Absolutely essential to understanding world history, universals carry a suggestion of the “innate” or even of “human nature”; they seem inevitable.

This second volume of *The World History Workbook*, titled *The Modern World since 1500*, examines deliberate choices humans have made that distinguished one culture from another, but which eventually bring our collective histories back together into a shared, global experience. The process of globalizing has always been active, but the industrializing world has increased the pace of globalization such that in the course of the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries, time and space between societies has been reduced to a degree not seen for thousands of years—not since our ancestors lived in a geographically small area, cotermiously. In the modern age, therefore, world history has assumed a new value and character.

The methods used in *The Modern World since 1500* are similar to those used in the first volume. The open narrative and broadly framed projects allow instructors freedom to guide their classes and discussions where they feel most comfortable and allow students the intellectual independence to read, discuss, compare, then write about various primary sources representing important historical trends. The instructor can trust the student to think for herself or himself, while the student can develop critical thinking and historical analysis. Together, instructor and student can move through a course about the world, the heritage, and the ancestry they share with the whole of humanity.
LANGUAGE IS universal, and the languages of the world are universally related. Yet languages have very different vocabularies, pronunciations, syntaxes, and so on. In the same way, societies and cultural traditions are also related, universal, and different one from the other. Some differences are obvious: the absence of a word for snow among people who have never seen snow, for example. Other differences are more subtle or complex.

Consider the contrasting concepts of doctor in two societies. For while the concept of doctors as healers is universal, assumptions of what exactly a doctor does and is vary from culture to culture. We in the modern, scientific world implicitly associate certain characteristics with doctor. We expect a doctor to be formally trained and to have a professional understanding of chemistry, biology, and anatomy. We expect a doctor to diagnose using a scientific method. If the doctor went into a trance during our visit, we might find this unusual, even suspicious. But in the culture of the traditional Zulu, people expect certain types of doctors to do just that. The Zulu, like many ancient societies, commonly understand sickness as a spiritual condition with physical symptoms more than as a condition that begins and ends with the physical.

The Zulu are a southeastern African people and culture, emerging from the greater Bantu family of languages. There are today approximately nine million speakers of Zulu, a culture at least as old as Middle English (although as with any language and culture, it is impossible to precisely date its “beginning”). Like all cultures, the Zulu changes and adapts over time, while it also has traditions of longer duration. The English anthropologist Henry Callaway recorded Zulu customs that were already many centuries old at the time of his research in the nineteenth century, and many of the practices Callaway observed can still be seen among the Zulu to this day.
In his accounts of life among the Zulu, Callaway translated several different words as *doctor*. The word *diviner* is among these words. Callaway observed Zulu people visiting diviners for particular illnesses, sometimes for those illnesses they could not otherwise resolve. The appendix provides a description (page 89) of how an individual becomes a diviner in the Zulu tradition. *Becoming a Doctor* describes the specialized process recognized by the Zulu as a doctor’s training.

In contrast, the Oklahoma Allopathic Medical and Surgical Licensure and Supervision Act (page 85) describes the requirements for licensing a doctor in a modern American community. The act is typical of licensing procedures in the United States and in much of the industrialized world as well. It serves as a protection to the public to ensure that only doctors who have received professional, scientific training from recognized institutions and authorities practice medicine. The training and certification required is outlined as a written code, so all parties can be accountable to the process.
PROJECT 1
Contrasting Concepts of Doctor: Modern Scientific and Traditional Zulu

Compare the procedure and process of becoming a doctor in the society of modern Oklahoma (read act on pages 85–86 of the appendix) with the parallel process recognized among the Zulu of the nineteenth century (read Becoming a Doctor on page 89 of the appendix). Answer the following questions about these two texts:

1. What written documentation is identified in the text that the Zulu doctor must produce before he or she is allowed to practice?

2. Name one source of training the Oklahoma applicant should receive to become a doctor.

3. What is the spiritual responsibility or religious training required of the Oklahoma doctor?

4. How is the training of the Oklahoma doctor scientific?

5. Are these contrasting mentalities necessarily in conflict? Might they be compatible?
Unique cultural practices become ingrained in daily life to such an extent that participants often believe them to be part of a natural or divine order. One characteristic that is ingrained in American and European mentalities is the tradition of **humanism**, the set of ideals that conventionally define the **Western tradition**. Humanism is so deeply rooted in our institutions and in the way we think, many people take this grand intellectual tradition for granted. Humanism refers to a trust in human reason, the scientific method, individual liberty, and the essential equality of all people. Most societies with humanist traditions, including the United States, Japan, much of Latin America, Europe, Canada, and so on, accept reason, liberty, and equality as “natural” guiding ideals on which to build society.

The major documents and developments of American political history are humanist, at least in intent. The Declaration of Independence, for example, is humanist in its claims of **freedom**. Not only political, humanism is a guiding principle and a way of understanding the “self” and the universe. There are humanist Christians, atheists, Hindus, socialists, libertarians, Republicans, and most any religious belief or political ideology. Humanism is not a doctrine in a narrow sense, although it would be difficult for a fascist or any person using a pseudoscientific premise to claim humanism. A humanist is someone who acts according to conscience, who uses reason, and who believes in the inherent freedom of the individual.

Many societies in history have held and practiced various concepts of freedom. It is to the Athenians of classical Greece, however, that the European tradition conventionally looks for its historical model of humanism. The ancient Greeks taught that man is a heroic creature who is able to challenge the gods to seize his own fate, and if he does not, he becomes the victim of his fate. Greeks believed that a man holds tremendous power to define his own life if he will have courage and seize opportunity. Humanism presumes an individual is capable and independent, and society should afford him the rights and education to work out his own individuality.

Working from a concept of the noble individual, Greeks established the institution of the individual **citizen** who has the authority to build his own society and govern himself. The Greek citizen owned a natural right and responsibility, not so much to the family or the king or to the gods, but rather to his own conscience. The end result will ideally benefit the common good, for smart, respected citizens will return their accomplishments to the society that enabled them. This departs from previous and later societies that assigned authority not to citizens as such but to people of privilege, kings, or those who rule by “divine right.” Greek humanism strove to eliminate privilege for individual kings and install a more democratic system. Every freeborn male Greek citizen had the right to participate in the political process, to deliberately contribute to the construction of laws, traditions, and the interpretation of universals. Because of the peculiar tradition of the heroic, free individual, it has become conventional, though still controversial, to name Athens the ancestor to modern democracies.
Read the dialogue between Socrates and Meno on page 82 in the appendix. The humanism of Socrates in this passage lies as much in his method as in his argument. Describe in your own words the method Socrates uses in the dialogue. Then answer the question: In what way is the Socratic method humanist?
There were more slaves than freeborn males in most of the city-states of classical Greece, and women did not participate in public institutional life. In fact, only freeborn males held the rights of citizenship. While this plainly was not a democratic society, it was a society that established an ideal of rule by committee rather than by privileged individual. When an individual is granted complete authority, there is always the possibility of decisions based on personal issues, whim, emotion, revenge, or poor judgment. A collective decision, when made without regard to status, is expected to be more balanced, more inclusive, and more reasonable simply by virtue of the greater perspective it includes.
1. Why can inclusion in the public process be used as a measurement of democracy?

2. Is it humanist to include women in the public process (i.e., politics, education, workforce, etc.)?

3. Measure the degree to which the United States is a democratic society. How do you measure this? Is there a difference between the law and the practice of inclusion? (Explain this answer.)

4. How democratic was ancient Athens?
The ancient concept of humanism can be summarized in the phrase “man is the measure of all things.” For the ancient Greeks, a humanist acts on the basis of reason rather than on blind trust in traditions, institutions, leaders, religious teachings, or people with titles. Greeks believed men can govern themselves using reason and therefore possess the potential of sound judgment to construct better lives and better societies. It is not an acceptable position in a humanist society to say, “We must have these laws because this is the will of the gods,” or “because it has always been done this way,” or “because the ruler says this is better.” Rather, each individual must be free from coercive institutions and leaders, to gauge for himself right and wrong, deliberate publicly and freely, and arrive at a measured, majority decision that benefits the community.

Greeks limited public participation to those deemed capable of reason: freeborn men with Greek-speaking backgrounds. No non-Greek, they supposed, was capable of reason, for outside the Greek education and experience all was barbarism. Greeks did not restrict participation on the basis of skin color, but rather on culture and gender. Women did not hold the rights of citizens and never participated in public life, including institutional education. One later observer wrote that Greek philosophers believed, were it not for women, men could commune among the gods.

Humanist freedom was only partially passed along to the Greeks’ western heirs, the Romans. Most notably, Roman society retained for many years the institution of citizenship. The humanist concepts of reason and the scientific method survived principally in Persia and the Islamic east. But for a thousand years after the collapse of the empire of Rome, civilization in the western regions of Europe advanced largely devoid of humanist principles. However, during the fifteenth century in the Italian city-state of Florence, there emerged among artists and scholars a revival of interest in ancient Greek literature and art, and with that a renaissance of the Greek ideal of the heroic man. The Renaissance humanist ideal can be seen in the grand features, posture, and attitude of Michelangelo’s David as well as other great works of art from early modern Italy.

What began as an art movement eventually carried humanism to all spheres of activity in European cultures. Many of the great modern intellectual developments in European civilization have roots in modern humanism, traced back to the Italian Renaissance. The impressive list conventionally includes a series of “revolutions” that span five hundred years and include the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation, the Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment, and the French Revolution. Respectively, these five developments reflect humanism in the spheres of art, theology, science, society, and politics. At the same time, we should be cautious to not imply that humanists of the Renaissance, Reformation, and Scientific Revolution advocated a twenty-first-century style of political freedom or equality. Humanist ideals evolved over time, sometimes slowly and incrementally, and humanist leaders
of Early Modern Europe accepted gender and class divisions that enlightened people might today find alarming.

Far from the secular movement some modern critics describe, the humanism of the Renaissance placed man in relation to God in the universe, not apart from God. As Richard Hooker writes, “The Humanists, rather than focusing on what they considered futile questions of logic, semantics and proposition analysis, focused on the relation of the human to the divine, seeing in human beings the summit and purpose of God’s creation.”

One of the great humanists of the Renaissance was **Giovanni Pico della Mirandola**. Pico articulated in words what Michelangelo articulated in stone: the humanist image of the heroic individual. In his essay “Oration on the Dignity of Man,” Pico uses God’s voice to admonish humanity to seize its own destiny and power to do good, to build rather than destroy.

> Thou, constrained by no limits, in accordance with thine own free will, in whose hand We have placed thee, shalt ordain for thyself the limits of thy nature. . . . We have made thee neither of heaven nor of earth, neither mortal nor immortal, so that with freedom of choice and with honor, as though the maker and molder of thyself, thou mayest fashion thyself in whatever shape thou shalt prefer. Thou shalt have the power to degenerate into the lower forms of life, which are brutish. Thou shalt have the power, out of thy soul’s judgement, to be reborn into the higher forms, which are divine.

The Italian Renaissance was but the first of the modern humanist movements that built the world in which we live today. But it set the tone and the terms for the revolutions to follow and in many ways became the new patriarch of humanism, replacing the dubious models from the ancient world.

If Renaissance leaders applied humanism to art and philosophy, **Martin Luther** and the leaders of the Reformations of the sixteenth century applied humanism to religion and theology. Although there were many Catholic humanist reformers such as Erasmus, and Protestant reformers such as John Calvin, the most influential reformation leader was Martin Luther. The English Reformation also bears mentioning, but while politically influential, it was initially less important as part of the humanist narrative, though the churches that emerged from the English Reformation are squarely in the humanist camp today.

---

The Christian church based in Rome had disputed, debated, and reformed many times during its fourteen-hundred-year history before the Protestant Reformation. Saxon Martin Luther distinguished himself from those previous reforms by establishing an alternative Christian church, which divided western Christendom for the first time into two major camps, Catholic and Protestant. Luther would have preferred to reform his church rather than leave it, but the conflict between reformer and church leaders became so intense and so public that neither side was able to compromise. In short, Luther demanded that the Roman church abandon its long tradition of hierarchical organization and of council and papal authority over doctrine. This would have been a difficult reform for such an entrenched institution in any circumstance but was particularly difficult for the sixteenth-century Roman church, deeply involved as it was in secular political, economic, and diplomatic affairs.

Martin Luther’s challenges to Roman authority began around 1519, and within ten years, the Protestant church already represented a successful, practicing alternative institution in the greater parts of northern and Germanic Europe. In the south and east of Europe, meanwhile, the Protestants lost momentum in the face of Catholic reforms that paralleled Luther’s, particularly in matters of faith and education. Spain, Italy, and southern France, as well as much of the western Slavic regions, therefore remained or returned to Roman Catholicism.

The rapid success of Luther’s movement can be explained in part by the fact that his major teachings—the freedom of a Christian to individually approach God without church intercession and a “literal” (scientific) interpretation of sacred scripture—were both endorsed by an already thriving humanist movement. Luther’s greater success in Germanic Europe can also be explained by a growing resentment in the north toward the dominance of the Latin south and the flow of German wealth south to Rome. Luther’s humanism rested on all of these aspects of his reforms: his attitude toward church hierarchy, church authority, and church traditions; his trust in his own reason and conscience; his individuality; and his scientific method in reading scriptures. Humanism had existed before Luther’s time but the Saxon applied humanism to new problems in new ways.

Luther insisted throughout his public disputes that he trusted his reason because it came as the result of study and hard work. Luther was an untiring researcher and writer, but he understood that not all people have the time and resources to study the scriptures in the original Latin and Greek. Luther therefore translated the Bible into his native Saxon language, for his fellow Saxons to read and discern each for himself. This translation was an eminently humanist work. Luther wrote that in order for people to understand the Christian truth, they need to read for themselves the sacred scriptures and not simply accept blindly what the priest and the church proclaim. Each person must individually encounter God without the church acting as intercessor.
In these things, Luther was a product of his time and intellectually indebted to the humanist teaching that spread from Renaissance Italy.

The success of the teaching that human reason can interpret scripture led to the next episode in the chronology of modern humanism, the Scientific Revolution. This movement is not as simple as the Renaissance or the Reformation to define in national or individual terms. Important contributions to the Scientific Revolution emerged in England, Poland, Italy, Scotland, and Germany. One geographic constant to the Scientific Revolution is that where the movement was welcomed, even encouraged in Protestant states, adherents in the Catholic world were persecuted and censured by a conservative church hierarchy. Great minds of the Scientific Revolution, such as Copernicus, Isaac Newton, Descartes, and Galileo, each contributed to a changing understanding of the physical universe. These scientists introduced laws and theories, rewriting the way we understand the world around us. But probably more important in the long run was the method they used and shared, the scientific method.

The scientific method is a humanist way of inquiring. Rather than believe on faith what one has been told about the way things work, the humanist scientist demands concrete testing and results. Jacob Bronowski writes that the scientific method can be summarized in three steps: build the apparatus, conduct the experiment, and publish the results.³ This method ensures objectivity and accountability; it does not accept anything on blind faith. By apparatus, Bronowski refers to any measuring device that can observe something without prejudice. A ruler is an objective apparatus. Under constant conditions, a ruler measures a distance the same every time; it measures objectively, without judgment or perceptions of “big,” “long,” “short,” and so on. It measures in units that are constant and objective.

Galileo’s scientific method can be seen in his inquiry into the motion and arrangement of the solar system. Galileo built a telescope (the apparatus), with which he observed repeatedly the motions of the planets and the sun (conducted the experiment), until he was confident of the reliability of the observation. Then he published his results: the earth revolves around the sun, and the sun does not revolve around the earth.

Galileo described his findings in 1610 in a book he titled The Starry Messenger. The Catholic Church banned the work, which was subsequently published in Protestant countries. Rome objected to Galileo’s findings because the church found them to be contrary to church teaching. Traditional church doctrine taught that regardless of what Galileo’s observations suggested, the Bible makes it clear the universe revolves around the earth. The church was not interested in a humanist, scientific method in this case; it had its traditions, faith, and scripture and its rulings from councils, theologians,

---

³ Jacob Bronowski, The Ascent of Man (Boston: Little, Brown, 1974), 204.
and religious scholars to interpret the universe. Within the church, the scientific method held little influence.

The indictment of 1633 declared Galileo’s doctrine false because “the sun is immovable in the center of the world, and that the earth moves, and also with a diurnal motion.” The Roman Church based its position in part on scriptures such as the passage from Joshua 10:13 that states, “Move not, O sun, toward Gabaaon, nor thou, O moon, toward the valley of Ajalon,” whereupon “the sun and the moon stood still, till the people revenged themselves of their enemies.” The first chapter of Ecclesiastes also says, “The sun riseth and goeth down and returneth to his place: and there rising again, maketh his round by the south and turneth again to the north.” Other scriptures describe the “foundations of the earth,” and Psalms 104 is explicit that those foundations “should not be removed forever.” According to church interpretation, Galileo’s scientific conclusions contradicted these and other passages.

The chronology of humanism continued with an eighteenth-century, primarily French movement known as the Enlightenment. Prior to the Enlightenment, the study of people had remained outside the realm of science, treated instead as the domain of theologians. But Enlightenment thinkers, known as philosophes, believed the scientific methods refined by Isaac Newton, Galileo, and others could also be applied to the study of human society. Philosophes held members of the Scientific Revolution in high regard; some carried writings of Descartes and Newton with them as if their humanist predecessors were heroes. In all their research, philosophes tried to stay as true and accountable as possible to the scientific method.

Philosophes held widely varying opinions on most social issues, including the role of women, the function of government, and the nature of God. But on one point philosophes agreed: humans are free and individual by nature and, to thrive, require freedom and reason, not bondage and blind obedience. In fact, if the Enlightenment can be summarized in two words, they would be “freedom” and “reason.” Philosophes argued that if individuals were granted equality, freedom, security, and education, people would build better societies, producing more free, reasoning people, who in turn would produce still better societies, and so on. Some philosophes believed that given proper conditions, humans could create a perfect society. This was a major departure from the traditional teaching that humans are fallen, sinful creatures who should not aspire and should obediently accept the station God has appointed, even if it is suffering.

The Enlightenment produced some of the great thinkers of the modern age, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot. Some of the early American revolutionaries were also members of the Enlightenment, or at least the intellectual children of the Enlightenment. Benjamin Franklin is the usual example of an Enlightened founding father, but in fact the American Revolution was itself a political expression of enlightened humanism. The principles described in the
Declaration of Independence reflect the Enlightenment in the concept that people are born neither sinner nor saint, king nor peasant, male nor female. What a citizen becomes and how a citizen contributes to society depends on society’s protection of the individual’s freedom and reason.

The humanist movement moved into the political sphere with the French and American Revolutions. Using Enlightened thought as a foundation, and drawing on the traditions of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Scientific Revolution, modern revolutionary states, including the United States, established an ideal of inclusion that far surpassed the practices of classical city-states. And while those societies have not achieved the levels of equality and freedom proclaimed in their own revolutionary documents, the original humanist goals persist.
The premier political manifesto of the French Revolution was the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen*. Written in 1789, the Declaration still holds the force of law in France today.

Read through the declaration on pages 98–99 of the appendix to answer these questions:

1. In what way is the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen “Enlightened”?

2. Which passage endorses the Enlightened principle of “equality”? How is “equality” consistent with the other modern humanist ideals of freedom, reason, and individuality?

3. It is plain to see that people are not equal in the sense that all people have the same abilities, skills, shapes, sizes, backgrounds, and so on. What, then, do the American humanists mean when they claim that “all men are created equal”?
4. Which passage of the French Declaration suggests women should or should not be included in the public process?

5. Are there passages that could endorse discrimination on the basis of skin color? Which key word that appears in these passages might be perverted or used to defend a discriminatory practice?
THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD HISTORY: HUMANISM

Historians look for institutions, traditions, rituals, laws, vocabulary, and so on, that perpetuate or promote patterns and establish continuum in culture and society. For example, institutions of education, military, law, and advertising have promoted concepts of nationalism and patriotism in the United States of the twentieth century, but how have religious institutions participated in encouraging or discouraging national or patriotic ideals?

Historians also look for exceptions in history, such as objectors, innovators, revolutions, or changes. What might cause a tradition to endure in one society but to disappear in another? These are often difficult questions and can draw in many factors.

The United States presents some interesting problems in world history. The United States entered the world scene as an independent state founded on the humanist principles of the Enlightenment: freedom, individual citizenship, and equality. Yet the nation was built on economic systems of slavery and the oppression of native people. The United States has fought international wars against oppressive regimes and promoted democracy throughout the twentieth century, yet segregated its own population. As a result, the United States stands as a symbol of freedom and progress to some around the world, but to others it appears antihumanist. Such complexity and paradox is the type of problem historians seek to understand.
1. What can you identify (historical or present) in the United States that demonstrates continuity with humanist values? Explain how each item you name endorses humanist thinking.

Institutions:

Values:

Laws:

People (individuals):

2. What elements seem to break with humanist values? Explain how each item you name breaks with humanist thinking.

Laws or policies:

Institutions:

Popular culture:

People (individuals):
The tradition of humanism has dominated political and social understanding in European societies for more than two hundred years, but the record is not absolute. Within and among humanist societies, there are differing interpretations of freedom, the individual, and the use of reason. Censorship is greater in one European society than in another, freedom of speech is stronger in some European societies than in the United States, and one society interprets the role of women differently than another. Furthermore, within single national traditions there have been different interpretations of humanism from one era to the next. Germany in the twenty-first century has one of the world’s most egalitarian societies and has been a major contributor to every phase of humanism since the sixteenth century. Yet in the 1930s in Germany, fascist parties that opposed democracy, freedom, and the use of reason abolished the rule of law and came to power with the support of a large section of the German electorate, though not a majority. Clearly the historical record in Germany has been mixed. The pattern has been equally uneven in other national examples. Yet overall, more than any other single feature, European and American societies share the pursuit of humanist ideals.

In Chinese civilizations, on the other hand, humanist ideals have not prevailed. If there is a dominant set of cultural and political traditions around which to define Chinese civilizations, it would be the teachings of Confucius and the Tao. These two principles have worked to define the foundations of Chinese traditions far longer than the traditions of humanism have defined “the West,” and Confucian influence covers much of the rest of Asia as well. Chinese society has applied the two guiding principles continuously, if somewhat unevenly, for more than twenty-five centuries. As with the West, Confucian and Taoist traditions have been interpreted differently from century to century but overall have survived and are still central to Chinese thinking today.

Confucianism grew out of teachings of Confucius, while the Taoist tradition emerged over time from a collection of writings attributed to the (probably legendary) Lao-tzu. The two schools are complementary but deal with different aspects of life and society. The Tao (or Dao) refers to a path leading to spiritual harmony with all things related as male and female, dark and light, yin and yang. Balancing these elements leads to a mystical sense of internal harmony of the person with the universe. Since the Tao seeks to balance all things, the teaching might include political teaching as well as spiritual, but according to the Tao, true harmony cannot be gained by building a better society. Harmony is attained internally when one understands and accepts the harmony of a universal, divine order. In Tao, human beings do not create or establish paths to harmony; it is instead for people to accept their proper positions in “the natural state” of things. It is for people to listen and understand. The principal text of Tao teaching is the Tao Te Ching.

Confucian teaching has been interpreted and reinterpreted for more than two thousand years but has always been based on the teachings of Confucius,
a Chinese civil servant who lived five hundred years before Christ. The principal texts of the Confucian tradition are the Analects of Confucius, the Doctrine of the Mean, and the Mandate of Heaven. Confucius taught that the ancient ancestors held a more pure understanding of correct behavior that should always correspond to the underlying nature of the universe. But unlike Taoism, Confucianism deals with external behavior more than with personal, internal development.

Confucianism maintains that every person, like every creature in the universe, has a specific nature that brings it into accord with a universal order. If one deviates from one’s nature, he deviates from the inherent truth that defines him, and order begins to collapse. Every person carries therefore a responsibility, not each according to his own choice, but according to his nature. In Confucian tradition, a person does not defy his fate, as with the Greeks. On the contrary, each person embraces his or her fate to make the most of it.

Confucian teaching has direct application in the social and political spheres; it is not overtly religious and addresses the external person more than the internal person. It is less “religious” than the writings of the Tao. Confucianism admonishes rulers to behave well and for superiors to treat subordinates fairly. Confucianism seeks harmony, as does Taoism, only the former seeks external harmony first, while the latter seeks internal harmony. But harmony brings greater harmony in both teachings, and the path to a harmonious society, government, and world begins with individual responsibility or duty to follow the right path.

The contrast between Confucianism and humanism should be apparent. Whereas the former directs an individual to comply with a natural order of things, the latter encourages the individual to define the order and his place within it. There is little encouragement of the “heroic” individual in Confucian teaching, and there is little promotion of a “natural harmony” in humanism, except to say that humans are born free. While there might be a concept of free will in Confucianism, individuals are not free to forge their own paths. The path is laid out; it is up to the individual to accept it or not.
Comparing the documents in the appendix representing Confucianism (pages 107–10) to the humanist ideals and texts, answer the following questions:

1. *The Mandate of Heaven* of Confucianism refers to “heaven” as the source of the mandate. Is there a parallel to “heaven” in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen? (Use quotation marks when quoting from a document.)

2. According to Confucianism, each animal and every person has a correct “nature” to be followed. Is there any suggestion of a human nature in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen? (Quote from the document.)

3. How does a ruler know if he is not correctly following his mandate? (Answer with a single quote from *The Mandate of Heaven*.)

4. If Confucian principles were established as a guide toward harmony, what does *harmony* mean, and how is it achieved? What does benevolence have to do with harmony? (Write on the back of this page if necessary.)
HUMAN BEINGS descend from a single source, a single location, language, and culture. But as groups left the original African homeland and migrated to new locations, cultural patterns revised, interpreting the same human creature and its environment in new ways. As more groups migrated, and groups out-migrated from transient groups, people founded homelands and abandoned homelands and cultures encountered other cultures. People who were separated by generations, centuries, or longer came into contact with reflections of themselves, or the Other. Other is a term that refers to a person or type from outside the community, an “outsider.” Connecting to such groups meant connecting to new ways of doing things, and at the same time to cousins from the motherland. That is the story of world history: people connect and exchange when they encounter long-lost cousins.

Perhaps many conventional accounts of historical connections describe primarily war, suffering, prejudice, and judgment. When one culture encounters another, it seems there is always a story of aggression, territorial disputes, friction over religious interpretations, claims to property, inheritance, rule, or law. Simplistic descriptions of human relations are commonly perpetuated by both victor and vanquished, often to serve political interests. Certainly humanity has an impressive record of fear, exclusion, and prejudice. But such a picture is incomplete, even dishonest, without its counterparts, exchange and inclusion. Human connections rarely, if ever, involve a sudden encounter between one dominant and one subordinate society, concluding with the conquering of the one and the disappearance of the other. Encounters are more complex than that.
Consider a story mentioned earlier in this text. In the fifth century, Germanic \textit{Vandals} migrated from northern Europe to northern Africa. There they conquered local people and established a Germanic rule. Within a century, however, Roman armies defeated the Vandal state, and the culture, language, and rule of Vandals disappeared from Africa. Today there is almost no legacy of Germanic culture in the area. And the native African population, which far outnumbered the population of either outside group, eventually absorbed both Vandal and Roman, adopting no more than incidental characteristics. The once-dominant Vandal disappeared into a society of longer duration.
Most connections between people and cultures are ongoing; interaction is fluid, as dynamic with exchange as with violence and prejudice. People marry, borrow, trade, and exchange with one another. Through such activity, human civilization grows and advances.

The history of relations between Islam and Christianity is replete with familiar accounts of persecution, exclusion, and judgment. Relations between Islamic Iran and European Christianity in the last decade of the twentieth century do not generally betray this image. Yet there is still between European, American, and Iranian societies a great deal of exchange, trade, education, migration, and interaction on many levels. Even where there are negative associations, however, exchange continues. A hostile debate might occur through editorials, or on the Internet, for example, and demonstrate bitterness and prejudice, yet both sides might adopt the same technological medium, sharing forms of communication as they adopt innovations from the Other. But more direct appeals for exchange also come from within both societies.

A professor of history in Iran has recently been a voice for reform in his country. Professor Hashem Aghajari of the University of Tehran, an Iranian war veteran, suggested in a lecture he gave in 2002 that the ruling Islamic hierarchy of Iran look to historical European Protestantism for a model on which to build political and religious reform. Professor Aghajari delivered one lecture in particular (see pages 116–18) in which he encouraged the Iranian leadership to follow the example of Protestant Christians to challenge tradition and create a more humanistic government and society. For these words Aghajari lost his post at the university, was forbidden to teach for ten years, and was sentenced to whipping and to death by a regional Iranian court. The religious fundamentalists in the Iranian ruling order were unwilling to consider any suggestion they can learn from the European movement; their own truth was complete. Humanism was to the religious leadership a religious insult.

But the leaders of Hashem Aghajari’s Iran must deny a great deal to suppose their culture is wholly “original” or neatly segregated from European, Christian, humanist, or other non-Islamic influence. Intellectual traditions cross boundaries even where leaders attempt to stifle exchange. As the great Oklahoma songwriter Woody Guthrie said of another songwriter, “He just stole from me, but I steal from everybody.” To this Woody’s friend added, “Plagiarism is basic to all culture.” The two singers are more intellectually honest than the Iranian religious elite, for no culture is original and every practice, every song, every dance, every technology, every individual of the past 100,000 years has an antecedent. Human culture is a synthesis. Without change and borrowing human civilization would wither and die.
An edited text of Professor Aghajari’s lecture is on pages 116–18 of the appendix. After reading the text of his speech, answer the following questions briefly, using quotations and writing legibly.

1. What does Professor Hashem Aghajari mean by “core” religion?

2. Why does he think Islamic humanism should be the stronger?

3. On what basis does he assume a human rights agenda is necessary to humanism?

4. What belief does Aghajari share with Martin Luther?

5. What is the complaint of the people who shout from the audience at the end of his speech?
When people from one culture connect with people from another, there is potential for both institutional and personal friction. When the British solidified colonial rule in India two hundred years ago, they brought with them attitudes of superiority and arrogance that did not allow them to view the Indian as legitimate a culture as their own. The British, because of a combination of pseudoscientific racial beliefs, economic motivations, and a contempt for any society with a scientific method less modern than their own, did not view Indian people as equal to the British. Institutions that constructed these attitudes spanned the breadth of British society. Educational institutions taught history, geography, and literature from nationalistic and sometimes racist perspectives. Government policies cooperated with corporate and business interests to endorse attitudes that colonies and the native inhabitants were commodities for technological societies to exploit. Churches also endorsed these attitudes by teaching that people who had not entered the modern scientific world were backward, ignorant, and in need of moral conversion to British models, and did not deserve the rewards of their own land and labor.

However an individual is influenced by institutions, one still carries responsibility for one’s own behavior and contributions. One of the finest writers of the British colonial experience in India was Rudyard Kipling. Himself a colonial, Kipling grew up in India in an environment that reflected the British colonial mentality. Kipling’s attitudes toward the people of India are not difficult to locate in his stories, which, while skillfully and sometimes beautifully written, have fallen out of favor in the late twentieth century largely because of their imperial, arrogant, and racist tone. When in the late nineteenth century he saw the United States pursue colonial enterprises in the Pacific, Kipling wrote to the Americans a poem, a warning, as it were, of the reception the Americans could expect to receive from native people in colonial lands. The poem is titled “The White Man’s Burden” and is reprinted in the appendix on pages 96–97. One can hear in the tone of the poem Kipling’s attitude toward the natives and his empathy with the colonials. While Kipling was a product of institutional perceptions, as a journalist and author he also perpetuated those perceptions.

Mahatma Gandhi also lived in nineteenth-century colonial India, but unlike Kipling the colonial, Gandhi was a native of a colonized country. Gandhi did not approve of English rule in India, and he did not bow to British arrogance. He believed the English mentality was materialistic, and English governance was inherently violent. He denied the moral good in the heavier technology of the Europeans and was not convinced that the society that wields greater power wields moral authority. Gandhi led a successful revolt against British rule by encouraging people of India to not comply with British colonial law. Gandhi taught his followers to never resist evil with evil.
(violence); rather, he taught them to resist evil by not complying with evil’s method, to remain peaceful in the face of violence, and to passively resist in the face of force.

Gandhi was a creative thinker, but he had his influences, one of which was the Russian writer Leo Tolstoy. Tolstoy argued that when a person participates in a society that does evil, the person shares in evil. Tolstoy wrote in 1894 in his book *The Kingdom of God Is within You* that civilization means nothing when compared to the “kingdom of God.” Tolstoy believed Jesus commanded his followers to not participate in violence; in other words, to answer evil with good. Gandhi read Tolstoy and did not adopt Tolstoy’s Christianity, but he adopted Tolstoy’s message of noncompliance. He wrote that Tolstoy’s book made “all the books given to me . . . pale into insignificance.” Tolstoy and Gandhi represent individuals who, through the conviction of conscience, rejected the institutional practices of their own societies and considered personal conscience the final moral authority.

As Gandhi drew inspiration from Tolstoy, Tolstoy drew from Jesus. Tolstoy’s entire premise for his work on the kingdom of God was his interpretation of Jesus’s Sermon on the Mount. Historians call such links of ideas *intellectual history*. A fourth great statesman and social activist of the intellectual tradition of peaceful change is *Martin Luther King Jr*. King considered Mahatma Gandhi a model and studied Gandhi’s writings. King was also a Christian minister and thus brings the idea of responding to war and violence with peace and forgiveness to a complete intellectual circle, from Jesus to Tolstoy to Gandhi to King, the disciple of Jesus.
Read the excerpts in the appendix from Gandhi (page 84), Tolstoy (page 104), Jesus (page 87), and go to http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king-acceptance.html to read Martin Luther King Jr.’s Nobel Prize acceptance speech, then answer the following questions.

1. Describe in your own words what the four texts the Sermon on the Mount, The Kingdom of God Is within You, Gandhi’s memoirs, and Martin Luther King Jr.’s Nobel Prize speech share. Support your answer with quotes from each and explain how these quotes represent similar ideas.

2. What are the specific historical complaints of Tolstoy’s critics? How does Tolstoy answer them?
3. On what principles did these four reformers challenge prevailing institutional thinking?
As we have seen from the experiences of Gandhi and Kipling, where cultures meet there is both opportunity and friction. Sometimes individuals transcend cultural differences to try to include constructive rather than destructive elements in their contacts. Others seem to see differences as threats. One can find in history examples of both types of behavior. The Iranian elite’s response to Professor Aghajari’s appeal is institutionalized segregation or exclusion of cultural differences. The same can be said of the violent British response to Mahatma Gandhi and his followers. In both cases, institutional traditions dictate the outright rejection of the Other.

Elements of personal conscience are part of this picture as well, and sometimes individuals find themselves faced with choices between institutional and personal values. One historical example comes from the end of the Second World War, during the collapse of Germany in 1945. As the German military retreated west, the Soviet Red Army advanced into territories that are today the Czech Republic and Poland. These regions were the homes of culturally mixed populations, Czechs, Hungarians, Slovaks, Poles, and others, as well as several million German-speaking people whose ancestors had lived in the region for centuries. As the Red Army advanced toward Berlin, Soviet soldiers raped, plundered, and killed, even publicly tortured German residents, without regard to an individual German’s political past. Atrocities were institutionalized through direct orders from local officers and even on orders from the premier of the Soviet Union Joseph Stalin. Local Czech and Polish authorities also cooperated or initiated such persecutions and violence, sometimes for their own material profit. The episode remains one of the great atrocities of the twentieth century. (See the appendix, pages 119–20, under Documents on the Expulsion of the Germans from Eastern-Central Europe.)

Not all who raped or murdered civilians had been themselves the victims of wartime violence and brutality. Many Soviet soldiers who participated in atrocities had been only recently called up to fight and had not personally experienced battle. On the other hand, not all who might have had “cause” for vengeance behaved violently. Documents collected and published in 1952 under the title Documents of Humanity during the Mass Expulsions (see the appendix, pages 121–22) describe the actions of men and women who, though they had been themselves prisoners of war or were members of a victorious army, and in the face of grave personal danger, made decisions of conscience to resist institutionalized violence. Albert Schweitzer thought so highly of the Documents of Humanity, he referred to them specifically in his 1954 speech accepting the Nobel Prize for Peace. Schweitzer said,

In 1950, there appeared a book entitled Témoignages d’humanité [Documents of Humanity], published by some professors from the University of Göttingen who had been brought together by the
frightful mass expulsion of the eastern Germans in 1945. The refugees
tell in simple words of the help they received in their distress from men
belonging to the enemy nations, men who might well have been
moved to hate them. Rarely have I been so gripped by a book as I was
by this one. It is a wonderful tonic for anyone who has lost faith in
humanity.1

Surely this message from the Second World War still carries meaning today.
A second example of a historical choice of conscience or violence comes
to us from the Silk Road with a somewhat unusual outcome. Around thirteen
centuries ago, the monk Xuanzang (an older spelling is Hsien-tsang) left
China to “find truth” in the west by studying and bringing home Indian Bud-
dhism. His work is a rare example of a person who sets out deliberately and
consciously to learn from a foreign culture, in this case to educate his own
people about the religion and culture of India. The route he took along the
Silk Road was traveled by many different people and cultures, most strange to
him. After sixteen years of research and collecting, Xuanzang returned home
with stories of the strange lands and people he met along the way. One story
he told came from a young soldier, the Turk Khan Yeh-hu.

The son of the Khan Yeh-hu (or She-hu), belonging to the Turks,
[was] rebellious, [and] broke [camp] and marched at the head of the
horde, desiring to obtain the jewels and precious things with which it
[a nearby convent] was enriched. Having encamped his army in the
open ground, not far from the convent, in the night he had a dream.
He saw Vaisravana Deva, [a god] who addressed him thus: “What
power do you possess that you dare to overthrow this convent?” and
then hurling his lance, he transfixed him with it. The Khan, affrighted,
awoke, and his heart penetrated with sorrow, he told his dream to his
followers, and then, to atone somewhat for his fault, he hastened to the
convent to ask permission to confess his crime to the priests; but before
he received an answer he died.2

Xuanzang’s story contained a moral for the Turks as well as the Chinese.
Greed and the abuse of power lead to spiritual ruin. In a Confucian tradition,
this lesson applied not only to commanders such as the son of Khan Yeh-hu,
but also to heads of state, diplomats and civil servants, teachers, mothers, and
individuals in all areas of society.

2. Hsien-tsang and Samuel Beal, Si-Yu-Ki, or, Buddhist Records of the Western World (London: Trubner and Co.,
1884), 45.
1. What is the contrast in behavior described in the set of documents taken from the Documents of Humanity (see pages 121–22) and those taken from Documents on the Expulsion of the Germans from Eastern-Central Europe (see pages 119–20)? (two sentences)

2. Who are the people who performed some of the acts of charity described in the Documents of Humanity, and why might this be unexpected? (two sentences)
3. How was violence against civilians institutionalized in the events described in the two sets of documents? Why did soldiers in particular attack women and girls?
PROJECT 10
In Your Own Words: Xuanzang’s Story

1. What is the moral of the story told by Xuanzang?

2. Apply your moral to your own time, using specific names of people or institutions.

3. The story of the soldier was brought back as a lesson to a society built on Confucian principles. In what way did the son of Khan Yeh-hu violate the principles of Confucianism such as benevolence, respect for hierarchy and authority, and fairness toward subordinates?
Like the Documents of Expulsion and the Documents of Humanity, two accounts of pilgrims climbing Mount Fuji in Japan provide contrasting perceptions of similar historical events. In this case, however, there is not a clear choice between extreme violence and courage. Instead, these selections show a more subtle form of prejudice. Mount Fuji is one of the great sacred sites of Japan as well as a natural wonder. It has been the subject of Japanese painting, poetry, and pilgrimage for over a thousand years. Both accounts come from the nineteenth century, one from a scientist conducting research on the mountain, the other from a missionary working in Japan. The scientist is curious about the pilgrims, but his curiosity about the pilgrims’ religious activities stands in contrast to the missionary’s more opinionated attitude. The documents are *An American Scientist in Early Meiji Japan* (see appendix, pages 100–103) and “Pilgrims on Fu-ji” (see appendix, pages 123–24).
1. Do the missionary and the scientist describe similar physical settings and activities? Might one document be used to confirm the historical accuracy of the other?

2. How might these individual encounters be historically significant as encounters between social systems, mentalities, and civilizations?

3. Describe the encounter between the priest and the scientist. Is their exchange respectful? Why does the scientist suppose “liberal minded” is a positive attribute?
GLOBALIZATION AND THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

When seven centuries ago Marco Polo returned home from a journey into Asia that lasted twenty-six years, he published his description of the world beyond Venice and the Mediterranean. His stories were so fantastic that his readers, many of whom had never ventured outside the village, town, or region of their birth, did not believe him. Some of his accounts were indeed outrageous, like the descriptions of birds so large they carried elephants. To a modern reader, however, much of what Marco Polo described appears normal, sometimes even mundane. But to many Venetian readers of the thirteenth century, images of the grand courts of China, the life of the Mongols, the high mountains of central Asia, and exotic religious and marriage practices of India and southeast Asia were so exotic, they seemed otherworldly. People—even educated, reading people—contemporary to Marco Polo lived in worlds that had very limited access to Other cultures and practices.

The Travels of Marco Polo was one of the most popular books published in medieval Europe. People are often curious about the Other; they learn from other people, compare their own practices and beliefs, empathize, improve, or compete with the Other. Comparison benefits society; it brings self-awareness. Marco Polo concluded his book with the statement, “I believe it was God’s pleasure that we should get back in order that people might learn about the things that the world contains. Thanks be to God! Amen! Amen!”

Marco Polo was one of only a handful of people from any European country to travel to China in the entire century in which he lived. By contrast, in the single year 2000, more than twenty-five million passengers flew in or out of Fiumicino Airport in Rome. Almost thirty-three million passengers passed through Hong Kong International Airport, twenty-one million in or out of Beijing Capital, the city of Marco Polo’s host, Kubulai Khan. For a few hundred dollars, any Italian can fly to Beijing in less time than it took Marco Polo to get fifty miles outside of Venice. The modern era multiplied enormously encounters between societies, and modern technology continues to bring people together in unprecedented numbers. People move and travel more frequently, farther and faster, than ever before. The past two hundred years have accelerated the speeds we travel and communicate so much that in some ways society has changed more in the past two hundred years than in the previous five thousand.

The armies of Napoleon at the start of the nineteenth century traveled and communicated with more or less the speed and efficiency of the armies

---

of ancient Persia and Greece. By century’s close, entire armies transported rapidly across continents by rail while heads of state communicated by telegraph at the speed of electricity. Today armies travel by jet and generals communicate by satellite transmission. As armies travel and communicate at tremendous speeds, so do families, educators, doctors, and immigrants. The world has never been so small, and people have never had the degree of contact and interaction with foreign cultures that they do today. But these modern developments are not universal. The twenty-first-century world has evolved into two enormous camps: those who share modern technological advantages and those who do not. Between those cultures that have the advantages, exchange, connections, and encounters are constantly advancing.

Although great changes in technology and information occurred during the twentieth century, most of the political and industrial basis for the innovations that brought us here have roots in the century of industrialization and nationalism, the nineteenth century. These two forces greatly affected the way people encounter, connect, and exchange with one another. Industrialization refers to a shift away from a dependence on human, animal, and natural (mostly wind and water) power, to a dependence on machine power. Many features accompanied industrialization, such as changes in production from individually produced to mass-produced products, the regimentation of time and labor, and so on. Industrial revolutions refers to specific periods of rapid industrialization.

Nationalism refers to the organization of societies and states into national states commonly based on “ethnic” definitions. National states are a relatively recent phenomenon beginning in Europe during the era of industrialization and the French Revolution of 1789. From a “world perspective,” nationalism might appear to be the dividing of people into “nationalities,” but historically the process was the reverse: national identities absorbed and consolidated local and regional identities. Bavarians became Germans, Lombards became Italians, Cherokee became Americans, and Lapps became Swedes. The formation of national identities expanded rather than shrank most peoples’ perspectives. Before the rise of nations, people generally had identified with villages or parishes, kingdoms, cities, or tribes. Nations did not reinforce as much as assimilate those ancient identities. Nationalist movements conquered and consolidated by centralizing state authority, usually around a single, dominant culture. National and state propaganda claimed where there had once been Sicilians, Venetians, and Lombards there were now Italians; where there had been Bavarians, Prussians, and Cologners there were now “only Germans.”

But not all newly named citizens welcomed the change. The pattern is clear to see in the history of the United States, where thousand-year-old
tribal cultures were destroyed or dismantled in the interest of a national organization that had not existed only decades before. This pattern of “nation building” continued through much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. At the start of the nineteenth century, there were one or two nation-states; by the end of the First World War in the 1920s, much of the world was organized around sovereign nationalized unions. Nationalist struggles remain unresolved today where borders and “national identities” are not always in agreement. National, ethnic, and regional struggles continue in postcolonial Africa, Tibet and China, Canada and Quebec, Palestine and Israel, and other places as well.

As nationalist movements evolved, they grew in popularity and momentum, eventually generating within nineteenth-century empires popular, nationalistic revolts. Patriots of nineteenth-century “nations without states,” including Hungarians, Serbs, Greeks, Irish, Romanians, Poles, Bavarians, and other national groups, worked or fought for independence from Austrian, Russian, British, German, and Ottoman empires. Most nationalist groups hoped to establish new states on ethnic principles, with the rights of sovereignty and self-determination. Most claims were made on the basis of “historic” homelands, whether in Europe or elsewhere. Hebrew nationalists, known as Zionists, sought a national state in Palestine on the claim that Palestine had been historically Jewish.

Industrialism and nationalism brought the nineteenth-century United States and Europe the power and efficiency to conquer and disrupt, if not dominate, the civilizations of the entire world. Motivations for imperialist enterprises came from nationalism and another, somewhat older force, capitalism. Capitalism is a profit-centered economy based on private property, with a tendency toward free markets. Most societies in history have not followed these three principles, and no society has practiced a completely free market. But the humanist concept of freedom, extended to corporations and economically to individuals, emerged in the era of industrialism as the driving force behind much of the colonial and imperialist enterprise. National states set out to claim new markets, capitalize on “untapped” resources (including cheap labor), and convert the people of the world to modern, scientific mentalities. Frequently colonial enterprises gained government backing and sometimes worked in alliance with churches; other times, churches and states came into conflict over the moral consequences of unrestricted competitive economic environments.

Many European Christians opposed capitalism as evil. The cooperation of competitive, profit-driven capitalism with industrial wealth and productivity resulted in deplorable living conditions for many industrial workers and their families. Church groups and socialists in particular protested abuses and encouraged governments to pass labor, market, and health reforms to provide balance for what many saw as an inherently greedy system. Church groups,
through the press, from the pulpit, and by other political action, insisted an 
unrestricted “free market” was part of a greater “modernism” that should be 
held accountable to higher moral authority. Churches established their own 
institutions to counter the ill effects of modern life, to protect the poor, 
women, and children from profit-driven abuses. The Salvation Army, the 
Red Cross, the YMCA and YWCA and other charities, orphanages, and poor-
assistance groups all date to the nineteenth century.

The nineteenth-century world of expanding markets, new contacts 
between people, and the emergence of new nations created tremendous intern-
tional friction. One national state opposed the other’s colonial activities, out 
of fear of being outdone, with prestige and markets at stake. The British resis-
ted French incursions into Asia, Germans opposed the French in Africa, Por-
tuguese competed with the British Empire in Asia, the United States and 
Japan competed in the “game” (somewhat later than the others) in the 
Pacific, Russia and Japan in eastern Asia and Russia, as well as Austria and the 
Ottoman Empire in southeastern Europe. Industrial, scientific, and commer-
cial competition was also fierce in the final two decades of the eighteen hun-
dreds and the first years of the nineteen hundreds. On several occasions 
countries went to war or to the brink of war over colonial disputes.

Diplomatic efforts late in the nineteenth century aimed to limit the 
unchecked growth of adversarial states. International diplomacy, through 
shifting alliances and treaties, struggled tirelessly to maintain an international 
“balance of power” between the “great powers” Great Britain, France, Russia, 
the German Empire, and the Austrian Empire. The list of states competing for 
Great Power status included only industrialized or industrializing countries 
and their subsidiary states. Meanwhile, newer and smaller states struggled to 
get in on the Grand Diplomacy of dividing up the globe. Small states feared 
exclusion from the colonial club would spell imminent absorption. In some 
cases, such fears proved correct.

In part as a result of colonization and the drive to expand markets, the lat-
ter nineteenth century was a period of increased globalization. Globalization 
was not a phenomenon specifically intended to unite the world into a single 
civilization or to bring people closer together; instead globalization advanced 
rapidly because of national and economic competition. Heads of industrial 
states partitioned the globe into spheres of influence: the British in India, the 
French in North Africa, the Japanese in China, the United States in North 
America and the Pacific, and so on. “Spheres” were intended to balance power 
between industrial states and to consolidate power for the same, but one of the 
consequences was an enormous exchange of cultures and people worldwide.

Nineteenth-century nations also competed for supremacy in technology, 
science, and exploration. Nations competed in races to the North and South 
Poles; in laying the first, the fastest, the longest, the most railroads; the first 
telegraph connections (1844); the first flight; the fastest voyage across this sea
or that ocean; the first to seize an “unclaimed” territory; and the first to use a telephone (1878), a plane, and so on. These “races” and more furthered national reputations and influence and at the same time helped to bring distant parts of the world closer together. For this reason, industrialization is sometimes referred to as a development that reduced time and space.

Industrialism also increased the world’s population, as medicine, transportation, and food production improved. At the time of Christ, the population of the world was around two hundred million people. In 1600 it was around five hundred million. By the middle of the nineteenth century this number exceeded one billion, and since that time it has grown sixfold. Industrialization and its attendant developments created a world that can sustain ever-greater populations. Modern science has improved health care and health access for many people; food production and storage also have seen technological advances. Life expectancy is high and infant deaths are low compared with other times and places in history. Indeed, over the past century and a half, industrialism has transformed all aspects of material culture.

But there is another side to this modern story. Medical, industrial, and technological advances are not accessible to all people. Millions in the world starve. Medical technologies are not available equally to citizens of all nations. Life expectancy is not uniform around the world. In many regions of the earth, whole populations suffer life expectancies little or no higher and infant death rates little or no lower than a thousand years ago. And progress has brought dire consequences as well. In the twenty-first century we are accustomed to descriptions of air and water pollution, dying river systems, depletion of animal species, global warming, as well as other social consequences that have accompanied industrialization, such as regimentation and alienation.

Early in the era of industrialization it was already apparent to many observers that there were two sides to advances in science and industry. The railroad, that backbone industry of the Industrial Revolution, was a boost in many positive respects. Benefits of the railroad were immediately apparent, and the industry grew in a few decades from nothing to one of the largest industries in the world. The first rail lines were laid in the 1820s, and within fifty years there were more than 150,000 miles of track in use worldwide. But the suffering brought on by work and slums in centers of the coal, steel, and rail industries has been well documented. Charles Dickens, Friedrich Engels, Emile Zola, and other writers have eloquently painted the picture for us. Industrialization reduced time and space, connected people, and facilitated markets, education, and financial opportunities. But industrialization also brought destruction in at least four areas: the environment, the quality of urban life, the loss of traditional communities, and the destructive capabilities of industrialized militaries. The passage by Friedrich Engels included in the appendix succinctly describes three of these four.
Deplorable working conditions and the destruction of the environment in industrial centers is both an old and a new story. Patterns of abusive labor practices, unsanitary housing, rampant disease, and intense poverty were regular features of industrial life in the nineteenth century. These same conditions continue in today’s industrializing world. In south Asia, treacherous working conditions, particularly for children, are not a recent phenomenon and were not created by industrialization; but increasingly, international, competitive markets have aggravated and multiplied abuses. Children are essentially enslaved by small factory owners who work for large European and American corporations similar to the way children were forced to labor in factories and in mines a century ago in Europe. In 1996 the Human Rights Watch, an agency of the United Nations, reported,

The global leather and footwear industry has changed tremendously in the past decade, moving away from industrialized countries and into developing countries, where labor costs and production costs overall are much lower. As a result of this shift, India’s leather and footwear industry has grown astronomically in the past few years, producing shoes, sporting goods, and leather apparel for both domestic consumption and export. . . . Abuses of child and bonded labor laws are particularly likely to occur in the small house-based “factories” to which shoe-component production is farmed out by contractors. By employing small numbers of people, these subcontractors escape coverage of the Factories Act; by claiming their child workers are members of their family, they escape coverage of the Child Labour Act. . . . Thousands of children are making shoes in the slums of Bombay. . . . They work in tiny manufacturing units that employ three to five children each. These children, mainly boys, are as young as six or seven years old. . . . The boys are trafficked to Bombay from their rural villages. . . . They come to Bombay for ten months at a time, working every day of the month except the days of the full moon and the new moon. Their work days begin at 5:00 or 6:00 a.m. and continue until 10:00 or 11:00 p.m. They sleep at the owner’s house, often a small dwelling above or behind the “factory.” The children receive no wages for these ten months of nearly constant labor. Instead, their parents receive a payment. . . . The children return to their homes during the two-month period of the monsoon. Their contracts are then renewed, the parents paid again, and the children returned to their masters in Bombay. This cycle continues for ten or fifteen years, beginning at the age of seven or so and continuing until marrying age is reached. . . . We saw children tracing heels on wooden two by fours and cutting them out with motorized saws; cutting women’s leather uppers out of leather sheets; stamping brand names on the
insoles of shoes and sandals; making the straps . . . and transporting finished products to wholesalers. Every process involved in the manufacture of this footwear was done by children.⁴

Today, labor reform in Asian countries proceeds slowly and parallels the government- and church-led reforms of nineteenth-century Europe and the United States. In the meantime, urban conditions in the industrializing world reflect the wretched conditions common in Europe a century and a half past.

Thus, we can say that the globalizing, modern society is organized around three primary principles: industrialism, capitalism, and nationalism. These developments continue the humanist evolution that began with the Renaissance five hundred years ago. Interpretations of the three principles vary from place to place and from time to time, but their advance has proven thus far all but irresistible.

Identify from two readings, *Industrial Manchester, 1844* (see appendix, pages 125–27) and the Human Rights Watch report (page 56) on the shoe industry in India, specific examples of three of the four types of destruction perpetrated by industrialization. In a sentence or two, explain how the passage you select relates to its category.

1. Quotes from *Industrial Manchester, 1844* show destruction of
   (a) the quality of urban life:
   
   (b) traditional communities:
   
   (c) the environment:

2. In your own words and using information from the Human Rights Watch, describe in a paragraph why some people resist globalization and call it a negative force.
3. What continuing purpose can a nation-state have in a globalizing world?
1. How did industrialism “reduce time and space”? How is this evident in your own life, in contrast to life in previous centuries? Are these positive developments?

2. Artisans, craftspeople, or other individuals manufactured by hand every man-made thing in Napoleon’s world two hundred years ago. How does this compare with your life? Identify things in your life manufactured from raw materials by hand by craftsmen or artisans and contrast this to the numbers of things in your life manufactured by machine or by people on assembly lines.
Historians refer to the period beginning with the French Revolution in 1789 and concluding with the end of the First World War in 1918 as the Long Nineteenth Century. During this period, the world experienced unprecedented growth in connections and exchanges between people and cultures around the world. The three triumphant forces of the modern age—nationalism, industrialism, and capitalism—defined people by nation, ethnicity, and class. While most European states developed similar industrial and capitalist societies, enormous friction grew between states from competitive national identities and interests. Thus, as the nineteenth century came to an end, the world grew closer together economically and technologically even as it fragmented nationally. Friction in colonial and industrial competition was so intense that by 1910, a major war seemed unavoidable. Patriots of nations were confident of their own nation’s moral mandate to lead the world into a new age, and many believed in a Darwinian “survival of the fittest” of nations. Thus, Germans, English, French, Italians, and others believed war was not only inevitable, it was desirable. War could prove the worth of the fittest and weed out the weak. The intersection of all these factors finally led in 1914 to a nationalist war on a massive scale, the First World War. And that war was followed by a second, deadlier war of nationalism in 1939.

In the summer of 1914, patriots of many nations marched to war singing songs and dreaming of glory. Rare was the observer who did not believe his own nation would quickly seize victory, and win the day through glory and divine right. Before a few months had passed, however, the fantasy of easy victory had turned into a nightmare. The First World War deteriorated into a defensive war of attrition, glory was dashed, and enthusiasm turned to bitterness. On the battlefields of France, Russia, and Germany, warfare bogged down into defensive networks of trenches that stretched for thousands of miles, filled with rotting corpses both human and animal alongside troops armed with superior defensive weapons and inferior offensive weapons. When officers shouted “over the top” for troops to charge across no-man’s land, it was usually a call to a human slaughter, with the attack of infantry or cavalry on horseback no match for machine guns, barbed wire, mustard gas, and heavy cannons firing from the opposite side. Single battles took hundreds of thousands of lives with no change in strategic positions. Alistair Horne reports in *The Price of Glory* that more than 700,000 men lost their lives on a fifteen-mile stretch at the Battle of Verdun alone. Even the United States, which only entered combat in the final eighteen months of the war, suffered around 350,000 casualties. Populations of all belligerent nations became disillusioned, then angry.
As war raged on, citizens, soldiers, and eventually military leaders began to realize the new technological warfare allowed little opportunity for glorious victory. The generation nicknamed *The Lost Generation* because the war deprived them of full, meaningful lives later described the grotesque experiences of the defensive “war to end all wars” in pessimistic poetry, novels, and films. Central to much of the war literature was a picture of lost hope and a wanton destruction of life. Social despair spread across the nations, and a kind of collective depression set in after 1918. Probably the most famous literature of the era is the German novel *All Quiet on the Western Front* by the war veteran Erich Maria Remarque, but many literary works followed similar narratives. The poem “He Went for a Soldier” by Ruth Comfort Mitchell contains many of the most common themes of the literature of the First World War.

**He Went for a Soldier**

He marched away with a blithe young score of him
With the first volunteers,
Clear-eyes and clean and sound to the core of him,
Blushing under the cheers.
They were fine, new flags that swung a-flying there,—
Oh, the pretty girls he glimpsed a-crying there,
Pelting him with pinks and with roses—
Billy, the Soldier boy!

Not very clear in the kind young heart of him
What the fuss was about,
But the flowers and the flags seemed part of him—
The music drowned his doubt.
It’s fine, brave sight they were a-coming there
To the gay, bold tune they kept a-drumming there,
While the boasting fifes shrilled jauntily—
Billy, the Soldier Boy!

Soon he is one with the blinding smoke of it—
and curse and groan:
Then he has done with the knightly joke of it—
It’s rending flesh and bone.
There are pain-crazed animals a-shrieking there;
And a warm blood stench that is a-reeking there;
He fights like a rat in a corner—
Billy, the Soldier Boy!
There he lies now, like a ghoulish score of him,
Left on the field for dead:
The ground all round is smeared with the gore of him—
Even the leaves are red.
The thing that was Billy lies a-dying there;
Writhing and a-twisting and a-crying there;
A sickening sun grins down on him—
Billy, the Soldier Boy!

Still not clear in the poor wrung heart of him
What the fuss was about,
See where he lies—or a ghastly part of him—
While life is oozing out:
There are loathsome things he sees a-crawling there;
There are hoarse voiced crows he hears a-calling there,
Eager for the foul feast spread for them—
Billy, the Soldier Boy!

How much longer, oh Lord, shall we bear it all?
How many more red years?
Story it and glory it and share it all,
In seas of blood and tears?
They are braggart attitudes we’ve worn so long;
They are tinsel platitudes we’ve sworn so long—
We who have turned the Devil’s Grindstone,
Borne with the hell called War!

—Ruth Comfort Mitchell

List agents other than Billy from the poem that encourage Billy’s march to war. Include people, symbols, institutions, and culture. Then answer the following question in your own words: to what degree are these elements responsible for Billy’s march to war? (“None” is not an acceptable answer. Billy did not go to war alone.)
The wars of no century can match the sheer volume of death and destruction of the wars of the twentieth century. The slaughter of troops was unprecedented in both world wars, but the Second World War brought also massive killing of civilian populations. In contrast to Old Regime kingdoms where people were subjects, modern democracies identify people as citizens. Unlike subjects, citizens participate in the decisions of the nation-state and are commonly thought to be accountable for the behavior of their leaders. A historical example of this is the contrast between 1815 and 1918. At the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars in 1815, leaders of the victorious monarchies of Europe exacted punishment on France by convicting and punishing Napoleon personally. He was the emperor, after all, and was held responsible for the decisions of his state. But in 1918, Allied victors meeting at Versailles held the German people responsible for the human and material cost of the First World War. Germany was found collectively responsible for the actions of the state. And in the Allied press, treaties, and popular imagination the concept of “German” defined the enemy. This was also true after the Second World War. This collective, national, ethnic guilt was an invention of the age of nation-states.

The First World War was a disaster for participants, families, and heads of state; nations lost millions of young lives, and governments fell. Four empires collapsed as the former subject people of the Russian, Ottoman, German, and Austro-Hungarian empires revolted and emperors fell from power, were murdered, or fled. In place of those multinational empires, national states were established; Hungary, Yugoslavia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine, Romania, Bulgaria, Poland, and many more nation-states formed to represent ethnic populations. “Successor” states emerged from colonial empires as well. After the unforgivable losses suffered on the battlefields of Europe, citizens of colonial powers refused to support adventurism. Great Britain and France lost colonies around the world, and the United States attempted to retreat into diplomatic isolation.

Despite efforts to isolate, however, advances in communication and transportation spurred globalization. In response to the “world” nature of the war, diplomacy also globalized. After 1918, older states worked with new states to create a balanced, inclusive diplomatic system that recognized smaller as well as larger nations. There emerged a movement to institutionalize a forum for global diplomacy that might prevent another world war. Led by Woodrow Wilson of the United States, the victorious powers assembled a League of Nations to ensure that member states,

In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,
by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations,

by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another,

Agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.6

Founders intended that the League of Nations would prevent war, protect human rights, and promote the right to national self-determination. The success of such goals depended on broad membership, one of the elements the league never achieved. While a majority of European states joined before 1920, Germany did not join until 1926, then quit seven years later; the Soviet Union only entered the league for six years after 1934; Italy and Japan abandoned the league in the 1930s; and the United States never joined, through no fault of the U.S. president, one of the league’s most avid supporters. But the League of Nations left a legacy of cooperation, research, human rights, and a diplomatic forum for a globalizing world.

Nation-states established after the First World War followed the previous model: a centralizing majority defined a “national” concept, usually associated with a language or perception of a culture. But it was not always clear which people might be included as citizens of a new state. There were (and still are) groups in every “national” configuration that did not fit national or ethnic images of the countries in which they lived. There were gypsies in Romania, Jews in Austria, Poles and Bavarians in Germany, Alsatians in France, Macedonians in Yugoslavia, Basques in Spain, and the list could continue into the hundreds of “ethnic” people who did not necessarily identify with the national majority, or who were not welcome in the new national communities. As in the nineteenth century, national groups strove to assimilate or expel those people (the Other) who did not willingly adhere to the majority national identities. Sometimes assimilation was dealt with peacefully, sometimes violently.

In the 1930s, Chancellor of Germany Adolf Hitler, in an effort to homogenize multinational Germany, formed state policies on the basis of racial stereotypes. Laws defining citizenship, property rights, and legal protections were outlined differently for one ethnic group than for another. While precedent for ethnically based state programs had occurred in other countries as part of the nationalizing processes, the Nazis of Germany merged nationalism and racism with industrialism and modern bureaucracy to “resolve” some of the German minority issues. The German media created propaganda that constructed people of one group or another as “uncivilized,” “subhuman,” or

traitors to the nation. These categories were used as excuses to scapegoat, persecute, and eliminate whole populations. Similar state-sponsored behaviors were repeated in many forums—fascist and other—around the world throughout the twentieth century.

The two greatest wars of the twentieth century have been named world wars because, in the industrial and national age, war can rapidly spread to the entire world. The Second World War was fought with Italy, Japan, and an enlarged fascist Germany on one side, and the democracies of the United States, Great Britain, and allies fighting alongside the communist (Stalinist) Soviet Union on the other. The industrialized Second World War attained levels of destruction never before seen. Massive “carpet bomb” and firebomb attacks from the sky, rocket attacks, atomic weapons, blitzkrieg tactics, and concentration camps where many died made killing large numbers of people easier in the Second than in the First World War. And the principle of “nationality” led military and political leaders on all sides to believe that, as citizens of warring states, civilians were responsible for the actions of their countries and were therefore legitimate targets. Hundreds of thousands of women, children, and other civilians of London, Rotterdam, Stalingrad, Hamburg, Dresden, and Hiroshima died for the actions of their countries in ways that in the pre-national age would have seemed irrational. Whereas in the First World War militaries suffered huge losses but civilian populations did not, in the Second World War civilian losses far exceeded military losses. This was due in large part to the changed perceptions of “nations” and citizens.

While countries entered the war on one side or the other as national states, many people fighting in the Second World War thought more of international than national causes and effects. Leaders, troops, and civilians claimed international justifications, and not only the protection of their own countries as just causes for war. Participants claimed human rights and democracy as justifications to go to war against dictators, racism, and oppression. Many who sacrificed in the wars of the twentieth century fought increasingly with a mentality that the world shares a common humanity and a common fate. The latter was frighteningly affirmed in 1945 when the United States detonated atomic bombs over two Japanese cities. It was clear from that day forward that the militaries of the world could destroy everyone on earth. Friend shared fate with foe, civilian with military.

After the conclusion of the Second World War, the League of Nations revived under the new name the United Nations. Note how closely the Preamble to the United Nations resembles the stated aims of the League of Nations.

We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has
brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamen-
tal human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the
equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to
establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations
arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be main-
tained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in
larger freedom, and for these ends to practice tolerance and live
together in peace.7

The United Nations has survived for a half century, during which time the
institution has averted countless disasters and alleviated suffering in many
more. The international institution has provided enormous quantities of
food, medicine, clothing, and shelter to the needy people around the world
in times of disaster, natural and man-made. The United Nations was also a
critical forum for public, international dialogue between Soviet, U.S., and
Allied interests during the Cold War. The United Nations has developed
wider goals, however, while it has also grown more controversial. As the
most prominent international organization, it has almost naturally fallen into
a position of arbiter of globalization even when war and peace were not
immediately at stake.

With every passing year, we see the world shrink not only in time and
space but also in economic, environmental, and technological terms. Global
influences extend into the political sphere such that people living and working
in one part of the world suffer consequences or reap benefits from political
decisions made in other, distant regions. Purchases of consumer goods in the
United States impact the lives of families in India or small businesses in South
Africa or large corporations in Korea. The Internet is creating a single world-
wide marketplace. Greenhouse gases emitted from industrial sites in China
contribute to the warming of the oceans that moderate the climate in Lon-
don. In short, the world’s economy, environment, warfare, and political
spheres have never been as singular as they are today. And tomorrow we will
be more global still.

A Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) report of 2005 (see page 128) on
globalization, named the 2020 Project, opened its executive summary with,
“The very magnitude and speed of change resulting from a globalizing
world—apart from its precise character—will be a defining feature out to
2020.” The CIA project identifies various reasons why globalization will
not reverse despite its detractors. It reports that, while the United States will
continue to play an important role, the geographic center of globalization is
already shifting and by 2020 will reside in Asia.8

(9 March 2006).
In 1889, visitors to the Paris Exposition who climbed the Eiffel Tower witnessed something they had never seen before: the world from the sky. The view from nine hundred feet above the ground was shocking, writes Robert Hughes. People looked the same from the top of the tower, kings and princes blended in with peasants and workers, Parisians were indistinguishable from Englishmen. Society, like the earth, appeared flatter. In the century of modernization, the construction of the Eiffel Tower marks a shift in our perspective; the experience represents what Hughes calls “a pivot in human consciousness.”

The conditions of seeing were also starting to change . . . not so much the view of the tower from the ground, it was seeing the ground from the tower. Nobody except a few men in balloons had ever seen this before. . . . It was the Eiffel Tower that gave a mass audience a chance to see what you and I take for granted every time we fly: the earth on which we live seen flat as patterns from above.9

A century after the Paris Exposition, the world received photographs of Earth viewed from space, one solitary blue orb in the empty expanse of the universe. What was in 1889 a rare perspective has today become commonplace. In 2004 Bill Clinton, speaking at the inauguration of the Bob Dole Institute in Kansas, made the case that if we are careful, globalization can proceed constructively, positively, and peacefully. If we do not take care to proceed with respect, globalization might be our demise. Globalization, after all, seems to be advancing without a pause, pushed on by global corporations, trade, and communications. But Clinton stressed that more powerful societies share the planet with the less powerful, and both carry responsibility to pursue peaceful and generous resolutions to the world’s problems. As Pico wrote, we “have the power to degenerate into the lower forms . . . or to be reborn into the higher forms.” The truth of the twenty-first century is the world will elevate or degenerate together.

---

Read the speech delivered at the Bob Dole Institute by President Bill Clinton (appendix, pages 111–15) and the excerpt from the CIA 2020 Project (appendix, page 128), then answer the following questions in sentences, in your own words, using supporting quotes from the text.

1. To what event does Clinton refer when he says the minds of many initial critics of “the first” United Nations (by which he means the League of Nations) were changed?

2. What does Clinton mean by the phrase “all this new diversity”?

3. What are the terms Clinton and the 2020 Project prefer to “globalization” and why?
4. Why does Clinton say we need to “cooperate institutionally”? To which institutions does he refer?

5. Name two historical models the 2020 Project uses to analyze the present and the future.

6. In what way is globalization a consequence of modern humanist thought? (Write your answer on the back of this page.)
MOST ATTEMPTS to write world history as the history of progress break down under close scrutiny. For example, one might assume that the history of all societies could be unified under the framework of technological progress. While it is true that technology has advanced from the stone tools of Blombos Cave to today’s world, the record of progress is uneven. Ancient Egyptian medicine, for example, was more scientifically advanced than most medicine practiced two thousand years later. Greeks of the classical era also held a higher standard of scientific method than did later societies, as did Mayan, Chinese, and others. And where science succeeds on one front, it fails on the other. What appears to be a technological success today might become an environmental or health disaster tomorrow. Others might say what unifies the history of humanity is the advance of freedom and democracy. But who could maintain that twentieth-century Iroquois live individually more democratic lives than pre-Columbian Iroquois or that Sioux people living on twentieth-century reservations are more free than those of the nineteenth-century plains? Or that Germans of the feudal age were freer than their tribal predecessors? Furthermore, concepts of democracy were more highly developed in classical Greece than in the later Ottoman Empire, yet the Ottomans respected religious diversity more than many of their later successor states. But if “progress” does not describe where we are headed, perhaps there is a different way to approach the question.

Every people and culture on earth arrived where it is today as the result of migrations. People have always been mobile, and this is one activity that has sustained humanity since its beginning. Even during times when people appear to have been sedentary, there were migrations and movements of people. Wars, famines, plagues, pilgrimages, crusades, adventure, study,
construction projects, slavery, and any number of personal, family, or national events cause people to wander. Some migrations are well known—the Jews in the desert, for example; several African diaspora; the migrations of Vikings, Huns, Goths, or Magyars.

One of the great migration systems of all time is not named for a particular people but rather for the network of roads and towns that defined it. For two millennia leading to the modern era, the Silk Road connected eastern Asia to central Asia and western Europe. This network of trade routes carried merchants, pilgrims, philosophers, generals, and travelers of all kinds from one empire and people to another, from the courts of China to the ports of Vietnam, from the temples of India to the markets of Samarkand and the streets of imperial Rome. The Silk Road connected hundreds of societies from three continents and was the conduit for the spread of great religions, economies, technologies, empires, and people. So extensive, enduring, and cosmopolitan was the Silk Road network that every person alive today can confidently claim to have had ancestors who lived, traveled, or visited the route.

Like the Silk Road, human civilization and history are fluid and dynamic. We do not see clearly where the human procession is going because it is not headed in a single direction. We are moving in all directions at once, carrying with us ideas, languages, and stories. The superculture of human civilization behaves like the subculture of the Silk Road: mobile, lively, gregarious, borrowing, laughing, loving, fighting, and stealing. Like connections along the Silk Road, every person we meet has a past related to our own, just as every culture ultimately shares ancestry with every other culture. In many ways we still live on the Silk Road. The study of history empowers the makers of civilization, you and I, to pause along the way, to watch the caravans and processions, merchants, and pilgrims pass by, to witness where they came from and how they interact, and to consider all the places our civilization is going.
Two hundred years ago the author’s Hertzel ancestors were south German people who emigrated from Switzerland. In the eighteenth century, some of that family migrated to the Ukraine to a Lutheran town where the family remained for less than a century. To avoid persecutions by the Russian government, they migrated to the United States, where they met immigrants from Ireland, and individuals from the two families married. One of their children married into a family descended from Norwegians and Austrians, and that family moved from Missouri to Illinois then Minnesota. The author then moved to Seattle to work and study, to Oregon to study, and eventually to Oklahoma to teach. The author is also the descendant of Indo-European and Germanic people, as well as migrations from Africa thousands of years ago.

Almost any person could describe similar events from the past. Some better-known American migrations include Native American “removals,” forced and voluntary migrations across the Atlantic from Africa, nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century migrations from Europe and Asia, and more recent migrations from Mexico into Texas and the southwest, from Southeast Asia to the Midwest, between Pacific Islands, and so on. Furthermore, each one of us has ancestors who migrated out of Africa, across Asia, or who participated in other migrations. And this is not unique to the people of North America; it has been going on as long as humans have been human.

In one paragraph, outline your own migrant heritage. What migrations brought you here?
Appendix of Primary Sources

Readings are prefaced by author introductions, which are set in italics.
SOCRATES

A Socratic Dialogue between Meno and Socrates, Recorded by Plato


Socrates was a philosopher of classical Athens and the teacher of Plato, who recorded Socrates’ teaching. Socrates taught that every individual, if properly instructed, carries a capacity to comprehend truth. One method of arriving at truth is to question a person about their own beliefs and logic. This is called the Socratic method and is a form of cross-questioning. In this dialogue between Meno and Socrates, the Master begins by asking Meno if people behave badly because they desire bad things. When Meno responds in the affirmative, Socrates proceeds to demonstrate that the student likely does not believe his own answer. Socrates does not tell Meno what to believe, neither does he tell Meno right and wrong; rather, he guides Meno to the conclusion that in the end Meno reasons for himself. This is the Socratic method and demonstrates a second Socratic principle as well, that each person has an individual conscience and should not accept any belief simply because tradition dictates.

SOCRATES: And does he who desires the honorable also desire the good?
MENO: Certainly.
SOC. Then are there some who desire the evil and others who desire the good? Do not all men, my dear sir, desire good?
MEN. I think not.
SOC. There are some who desire evil?
MEN. Yes.
SOC. Do you mean that they think the evils which they desire, to be good; or do they know that they are evil and yet desire them?
MEN. Both, I think.
SOC. And do you really imagine, Meno, that a man knows evils to be evils and desires them notwithstanding?
MEN. Certainly I do.
SOC. And desire is of possession?
MEN. Yes, of possession.
SOC. And does he think that the evils will do good to him who possesses them, or does he know that they will do him harm?
MEN. There are some who think that the evils will do them good, and others who know that they will do them harm.
SOC. And, in your opinion, do those who think that they will do them good know that they are evils?
MEN. Certainly not.
SOC. Is it not obvious that those who are ignorant of their nature do not desire them; but they desire what they suppose to be goods although they are really evils; and if they are mistaken and suppose the evils to be goods they really desire goods?
MEN. Yes, in that case.
SOC. Well, and do those who, as you say, desire evils, and think that evils are hurtful to the possessor of them, know that they will be hurt by them?
MEN. They must know it.
SOC. And must they not suppose that those who are hurt are miserable in proportion to the hurt which is inflicted upon them?
MEN. How can it be otherwise?
SOC. But are not the miserable ill-fated?
MEN. Yes, indeed.
SOC. And does any one desire to be miserable and ill-fated?
MEN. I should say not, Socrates.
SOC. But if there is no one who desires to be miserable, there is not one, Meno, who desires evil; for what is misery but the desire and possession of evil?
MEN. That appears to be truth, Socrates, and I admit that nobody desires evil.
2. MAHATMA GANDHI


*Mahatma Gandhi (1869–1948) was an activist who struggled against abuse, prejudice, and colonialism. He worked on behalf of Indians living in South Africa, effecting legal progress toward the protection of human and personal rights. Later, his most famous success came in mass movements he organized against British rule in India. The nonviolent basis for his civil disobedience has made Gandhi a model for human rights activity around the world. Martin Luther King Jr., when he accepted the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1964, said of Gandhi’s movement, “Civilization and violence are antithetical concepts. Negroes of the United States, following the people of India, have demonstrated that nonviolence is not sterile passivity, but a positive moral force which makes for social transformation.”*

[p. 118] I have met practically no one who believes that India can ever become free without resort to violence. I believe repression will be unavailing. At the same time, I feel that the British Rulers will not give liberally, and in time, the British people appear to be obsessed by the demon of commercial selfishness. The fault is not of men, but of the system. . . . The true remedy lies, in my humble opinion, in England’s discarding modern civilization, which is ensouled by this spirit of selfishness and materialism, which is purposeless, vain, and . . . a negation of the spirit of Christianity. But this is a large order. The railway, machineries and the corresponding increase of indulgent habits are the true badges of slavery of the Indian people, as they are of Europeans. I therefore have no quarrel with the rulers. I have every quarrel with their methods. . . . To me, the rise of cities like Calcutta and Bombay is a matter of sorrow rather than congratulations. India has lost in having broken up a part of her village system. Holding these views, I share the national spirit, but I totally dissent from the methods, whether of the extremists or of the moderates, for either party relies on violence ultimately. Violent method must mean acceptance of modern civilization, and therefore of the same ruinous composition we notice here. . . .

[p. 157] But I believe non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment. . . . I want to use India’s and my strength for a better purpose. . . . Strength does not come from physical capacity. It comes from an indomitable will. . . .

[p. 166] . . . Civil Disobedience . . . becomes a sacred duty when the state has become lawless or, which is the same thing, corrupt. And a citizen who barges with such a state shares its corruption or lawlessness. . . . It is not so much British guns that are responsible for our subjection as our voluntary cooperation. . . . Our present Non-cooperation refers not so much to the paralysis of a wicked government as to our being proof against wickedness. It aims therefore not at destruction but at construction.
3. OKLAHOMA ALLOPATHIC MEDICAL AND SURGICAL LICENSURE AND SUPERVISION ACT


480. It is the intent that this act shall apply only to allopathic and surgical practices and to exclude any other healing practices. Allopathy is a method of treatment practiced by recipients of the degree of Doctor of Medicine, but specifically excluding homeopathy. The terms medicine, physician and drug(s) used herein are limited to allopathic practice. . . .

492.1. Application forms—Requirements for practicing medicine—Agent or representative of applicant

A. The Board shall create such application forms as are necessary for the licensure of applicants to practice medicine and surgery in this state. . . .

493.1. Contents of application—Requirements for licensure

A. An applicant to practice medicine and surgery in this state shall provide to the State Board of Medical Licensure and Supervision and attest to the following information and documentation in a manner required by the Board:

1. The applicant’s full name and all aliases or other names ever used, current address, social security number and date and place of birth;
2. A signed and notarized photograph of the applicant, taken within the previous twelve (12) months;
3. Originals of all documents and credentials required by the Board, or notarized photocopies or other verification acceptable to the Board of such documents and credentials;
4. A list of all jurisdictions, United States or foreign, in which the applicant is licensed . . .
5. A list of all jurisdictions, United States or foreign, in which the applicant has been denied licensure or authorization to practice medicine . . .
6. A list of all sanctions, judgments, awards, settlements [etc.] . . .
7. A detailed educational history, including places, institutions, dates, and program descriptions, of all his or her education, including all college, preprofessional, professional and professional graduate education;
8. A detailed chronological life history from age eighteen (18) years to the present . . .
9. Any other information or documentation specifically requested by the Board that is related to the applicant’s ability to practice medicine and surgery.

B. The applicant shall possess a valid degree of Doctor of Medicine from a medical college or school located in the United States, its territories or possessions, or Canada that was approved by the Board or by a private nonprofit accrediting body approved by the Board at the time the degree was conferred. The application shall be considered by the Board based upon the product and process of the medical education and training.
C. The applicant shall have satisfactorily completed twelve (12) months of progressive postgraduate medical training approved by the Board or by a private nonprofit accrediting body approved by the Board in an institution in the United States, its territories or possessions, or in programs in Canada, England, Scotland or Ireland approved by the Board or by a private nonprofit accrediting body approved by the Board.

D. The applicant shall submit a history from the Administration of the Medical School from which the applicant graduated of any suspension, probation, or disciplinary action taken against the applicant while a student at that institution.

E. The applicant shall have passed medical licensing examination(s) satisfactory to the Board.

F. The applicant shall have demonstrated a familiarity with all appropriate statutes and rules and regulations of this state and the federal government relating to the practice of medicine and surgery.

G. The applicant shall be physically, mentally, professionally, and morally capable of practicing medicine and surgery in a manner reasonably acceptable to the Board and in accordance with federal law and shall be required to submit to a physical, mental, or professional competency examination or a drug dependency evaluation if deemed necessary by the Board.

H. The applicant shall not have committed or been found guilty by a competent authority, United States or foreign, of any conduct that would constitute grounds for disciplinary action under this act or rules of the Board. The Board may modify this restriction for cause.

I. Upon request by the Board, the applicant shall make a personal appearance before the Board or a representative thereof for interview, examination, or review of credentials. At the discretion of the Board, the applicant shall be required to present his or her original medical education credentials for inspection during the personal appearance.

J. The applicant shall be held responsible for verifying to the satisfaction of the Board the identity of the applicant and the validity of all credentials required for his or her medical licensure. The Board may review and verify medical credentials and screen applicant records through recognized national physician information services.

K. The applicant shall have paid all fees and completed and attested to the accuracy of all application and information forms required by the Board.

L. Grounds for the denial of a license shall include:

1. Use of false or fraudulent information by an applicant. [etc.]
4. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT


Matthew 5

[21] “You have heard that it was said to the men of old, ‘You shall not kill; and whoever kills shall be liable to judgment.’ [22] But I say to you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to judgment; whoever insults his brother shall be liable to the council, and whoever says, ‘You fool!’ shall be liable to the hell of fire.

[23] So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, [24] leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift.

[25] Make friends quickly with your accuser, while you are going with him to court, lest your accuser hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the guard, and you be put in prison;

[26] truly, I say to you, you will never get out till you have paid the last penny.

[27] You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall not commit adultery.’

[28] But I say to you that every one who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart.

[29] If your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out and throw it away; it is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body be thrown into hell.

[30] And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off and throw it away; it is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body go into hell.

[31] It was also said, ‘Whoever divorces his wife, let him give her a certificate of divorce.’

[32] But I say to you that every one who divorces his wife, except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

[33] Again you have heard that it was said to the men of old, ‘You shall not swear falsely, but shall perform to the Lord what you have sworn.’ [34] But I say to you, Do not swear at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God, [35] or by the earth, for it is his footstool, or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King.

[36] And do not swear by your head, for you cannot make one hair white or black.

[37] Let what you say be simply ‘Yes’ or ‘No’; anything more than this comes from evil.

[38] You have heard that it was said, ‘An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.’

[39] But I say to you, Do not resist one who is evil. But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; [40] and if any one should sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well; [41] and if any one forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles.

[42] Give to him who begs from you, and do not refuse him who would borrow from you. [43] You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.’
But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust.

For if you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even the tax collectors do the same?”
5. LIFE AMONG THE ZULU


The readings describing life among the Zulu are taken from Henry Callaway’s nineteenth-century record of life among the African people. The readings are useful as, among other things, examples of animism. Animism is one of humanity’s oldest beliefs about the spiritual world, death, and God. In these readings, as in other primary readings, you will understand them in their own context only when you read them with an open mind. Try not to look for justifications or affirmations of your own perspectives but try instead to read these texts as they were understood by the cultures they describe. Do you see evidence in these texts that suggests life is present in all things (animism)? How are the living related to the dead, not only in a genealogical sense but in a present, dynamic sense?

*Becoming a Doctor*

**Divining with Sticks and Bones**

The account of diviners when they begin to enter on divination. No one knows that a man will be a diviner. He begins by being affected with sickness; it appears about to cease, but it does not. It is in this respect at the commencement that diviners, and those that have familiar spirits, are alike; they differ in their mode of divination, for the diviner with familiar spirits does not resemble another diviner.

When a diviner divines for people, even he tells back to the people the truth which he first took from them. If as regards that which is done by the diviner we put all together, we shall say, it is the people who divine; for the diviner does not begin with any thing that he has not heard from the people who come to divine.

**The Initiation of a Diviner**

The condition of a man who is about to be an inyanga [note from the translator on the use of the word “Izinyanga”.—It is, perhaps, better to retain the native word than to translate it by a word which does not fairly represent it. Inyanga, generally rendered doctor, means a man skilled in any particular matter = magus. Thus, an inyanga yokubula is a doctor or wise man of smiting, that is, with divining rods—a diviner. Inyanga yemiti, a doctor of medicines. Inyanga yensimbi, a smith, &c.] is this: At first he is apparently robust; but in process of time he begins to be delicate, not having any real disease, but being very delicate. He begins to be particular about food, and abstains from some kinds, and requests his friends not to give him that food, because it makes him ill. He habitually avoids certain kinds of food, choosing what he likes, and he does not eat much of that; and he is continually complaining of pains in different parts of his body. And he tells them that he has dreamt that he was being carried away by a river. He dreams of many things, and his body is muddled and he becomes a house of dreams. And he dreams constantly of many things, and on awaking says to his friends, “My body is muddled to-day; I dreamt many men were killing me; I escaped I know not how. And on
waking one part of my body felt different from other parts; it was no longer alike all over.” At last the man is very ill, and they go to the diviners to enquire. . . . He is possessed by the Itongo. There is nothing else. He is possessed by an Itongo. . . . If you bar the way against the Itongo, you will be killing him. For he will not be an inyanga; neither will he ever be a man again; he will be what he is now. If he is not ill, he will be delicate, and become a fool, and be unable to understand any thing. I tell you you will kill him by using medicines. Just leave him alone, and look to the end to which the disease points. Do you not see that on the day he has not taken medicine, he just takes a mouthful of food? Do not give him any more medicines. He will not die of the sickness, for he will have what is good given to him.

So the man may be ill two years without getting better; perhaps even longer than that. He may leave the house for a few days, and the people begin to think he will get well. But no, he is confined to the house again. This continues until his hair falls off. And his body is dry and scurfy; and he does not like to anoint himself. People wonder at the progress of the disease. But his head begins to give signs of what is about to happen. He shows that he is about to be a diviner by yawning again and again, and by sneezing again and again. And men say, “No! Truly it seems as though this man was about to be possessed by a spirit.” This is also apparent from his being very fond of snuff; not allowing any long time to pass without taking some. And people begin to see that he has had what is good given to him.

After that he is ill; he has slight convulsions, and has water poured on him, and they cease for a time. He habitually sheds tears, at first slight, and at last he weeps aloud, and in the middle of the night, when the people are asleep, he is heard making a noise, and wakes the people by singing; he has composed a song, and men and women awake and go to sing in concert with him.

Therefore whilst he is undergoing this initiation the people of the village are troubled by want of sleep; for a man who is beginning to be an inyanga causes great trouble, for he does not sleep, but works constantly with his brain; his sleep is merely by snatches, and he wakes up singing many songs; and people who are near quit their villages by night when they hear him singing aloud, and go to sing in concert. Perhaps he sings till the morning, no one having slept. The people of the village smite their hands in concert till they are sore. And then he leaps about the house like a frog; and the house becomes too small for him, and he goes out, leaping and singing, and shaking like a reed in the water, and dripping with perspiration.

As to the familiar spirits, it is not one only that speaks; they are very many; and their voices are not alike; one has his voice, and another his; and the voice of the man into whom they enter is different from theirs. He too enquires of them as other people do; and he too seeks divination of them. If they do not speak, he does not know what they will say; he cannot tell those who come for divination what they will be told. No. It is his place to take what those who come to enquire bring, and nothing more. And the man and the familiar spirits ask questions of each other and converse.

The Healing Spirits of the Zulu

I once went to a person with a familiar spirit to enquire respecting a boy of ours who had convulsions. My father and brother and mothers and I wondered what was the
nature of the disease, since it was a new thing. We saw at first sight that it was something about which we must enquire of the diviner. We set out and went to the person with a familiar spirit. We made obeisance, saying, “Eh, friend; we come to you for good news.” We waited. The doctor said, “Good day.” We replied, saying, “Yes.” She poured out some snuff, and took it; she then yawned and stretched, and also shuddered, and said, “They who divine are not yet here.”

We remained a long time, and at length we too took some snuff; when we were no longer thinking of the reason of our coming, we heard that the spirits were come; they saluted us, saying, “Good day.” We looked about the house to see where the voice came from.

The spirits said, “Why are you looking about, for we merely salute you?”

We said, “We look about because we cannot see where you are.”

They said, “Here we are. You cannot see us. You will be helped by what we say only.”

The voice was like that of a very little child; it cannot speak aloud, for it speaks above, among the wattles of the hut.

We replied to the salutation.

The spirits said, “You have come to enquire about something.”

The person whose familiars they were said, “Strike the ground for them; see, they say you came to enquire about something.”

So we struck the ground.

They said, “That about which you have come is a great matter; the omen has appeared in a man.”

We struck the ground, and asked, saying, “How big is the man in whom the omen has appeared?”

They replied, “It is a young person.”

We struck the ground vehemently there, when we perceived that she had hit the mark.

They said, “I say the omen is a disease.”

We smote the ground vehemently.

They said, “It is disease in the body of that young person.” They said, “Let me see what that person is? It is a boy.”

We assented strongly.

They said, “He does not yet herd. He is still small.”

We smote violently on the ground.

They said, “But you wonder at what has occurred to him.” They said, “Strike the ground, that I may see what that is which has occurred to the body of the little boy.”

We struck the ground vehemently, and said, “We will hear from you, for you have seen that it is a little boy.”

They said, “There he is; I see him; it is as though he had convulsions.”

Upon that we smote the ground vehemently.

They said, “What kind of convulsions are they? Enquire of me.” We said, “We have nothing to ask about. For behold you know; you have already first told us. For it is proper that you should tell us to ask, if you were not going the right way; but as we perceive that you are going the right way, what have we to ask of you?”

They replied, “I tell you to ask, for perhaps I am going wrong.”
We said, “No; you are not going wrong; you are going by the way which we ourselves see.”

They said, “The disease began in the child when he began to walk. When he was very young, you did not see the disease—when he was a little infant; at length when he began to laugh, the disease had not yet appeared; at length he began to sit up, it not having yet appeared; at length he began to go on all fours, it not having yet appeared; at length he began to stand before he was affected by it; when he began to lift his foot from the ground to toddler, the disease came upon him. When you saw the disease, you saw it without expecting anything of the kind; he died in his mother’s arms; his mother poured water on him when he was turning up his eyes; she uttered a great cry, you started, and ran into the house; when you entered he had again come to life. The mother said, ‘You heard me cry; my child was dead. Do you not see he is wet? I poured water over him for some time, and therefore he has come to life again.’” The spirits continued, “I have now told you this; deny if what I say is not true.”

We replied, “We can in no way dispute what you say; we have told you already that you were going by the right path.”

The spirits said, “This disease resembles convulsions. You have come to me to know what is this disease which is like convulsions.”

We said, “Just so, you say truly; we wish to hear from you, spirit; you will tell us the disease and its nature, that we may at length understand of what nature it is; for you have already told us the name of the disease; tell us also the medicines with which we shall treat it.”

They replied, “I will tell you the disease. You are greatly alarmed because you say the child has convulsions; and a child with convulsions is not safe; he burns himself in the fire. I shall tell you what caused this disease. Just smite on the ground, boys, that I may understand if the child is the only son of his father.”

We said, “Yes; he is his only son.”

They said, “Smite the ground, that I may understand what relation you are to the child, since you come here to enquire.”

We smote vehemently on the ground.

They said, “The boy is your brother. Smite the ground, that I may see if he is really your brother born of your own father, or not. Not so. He is not really the son of your father. Your fathers are brothers. He is your brother, because your fathers were brothers.”

We smote the ground violently.

They said, “Smite, that I may understand which is the older of the two fathers. I say, boys, your own father is dead. Smite, that I may understand where he died. There he is; I see him; he died, boys, in the open country. He was stabbed with an assagai. By what tribe was he stabbed?”

We smote the ground vehemently.

They said, “He was stabbed by the Amazulu on this side the Utukela; that is where your father died, boys. The father of that child is your uncle, because he was your father’s brother; he was the elder of the two.”

They said, “Let me now tell you the disease which has attacked the boy. His disease is like convulsions; but it is not convulsions. And you are greatly alarmed because you think it is convulsions. But I shall tell you, for you will not again see him have a fit. I
shall tell you what to do when you get home. Did you ever sacrifice for him? You have never sacrificed for him.”

They said, “Let me just see where you live. You live among the Amathlongwa; that is the tribe where you live. Let me just see where you were born. You belong to the Amadunga. Just let me see, since you are here among the Amathlongwa, why you were separated from the Amadunga to come here. You quarrelled with your own people, and so came here to the Amathlongwa. Smite the ground, that I may see if you have built your own village.”

We smote the ground.

They said, “You have not yet built it. You live in the village of another; you have not yet built your own village on the hill. As for the boy, the disease attacked him in the village where you now are. Smite the ground, that I may see what relation the man with whom you live is to you.”

We smote the ground.

They said, “He is your cousin on the mother’s side. I see nothing wrong in the village of your cousin; he is good; I see no practicing of sorcery there; I see that the village is clear; you eat with your eyes shut, for you have nothing to complain of. What I shall tell you is this, it is the ancestral spirits that are doing this. It is not convulsions the child has. For my part I say he is affected by the ancestral spirits.”

We wondered that we should continually hear the spirits which we could not see, speaking in the wattles, and telling us many things without our seeing them.

The spirits said, “I point out your ancestral spirits. When you reach home you shall take a goat. There it is, a he goat; I see it.

We said, “How do you see it?”

They said, “Be silent, I will tell you, and satisfy you as to its colour. It is white. That is it which has just come from the other side of the Ilovo from the Amanzimtoti. It is now a large he goat. You shall sacrifice it, and pour its gall on the boy. You will go and pluck for him Itongo-medicine. I see that Itongo; it says that your village is to be removed from its present place, and built on the hill. Does not the Itongo ask, ‘Why has the village staid so long in the midst of another?’ It injures the lad, saying, ‘Let the village remove from this place.’ The he goat you will sacrifice to your grandmother; it is she who refuses to allow the child to die, for your grandfather had been earnest to kill him, that he might die and be buried in accordance with his wish. I tell you this to satisfy you. I tell you that if the disease returns, you may come back to me and take your money. I tell you that this disease is caused by the ancestral spirit, because it wishes that your village should remove.”

The spirits said, “Now I have divined for you; so give me my money.”

We took out the money.

Then they said to her whose familiars they were, “Take it; there is the money.”

They added, “I just take this money of yours. You will come and take it again if the disease returns. I say, it will never return again.”

The woman with the familiar spirits sat in the midst of the house, at the time of full daylight, when we enquired of her; for the spirits cannot go alone when they are going to divine; their possessor goes with them. For if they wish to go they tell their possessor, saying to her, “Let us go to such a place,” wherever they wish to go. The
possessor of them cannot speak; she usually says little, for she too enquires of the spir-
it's, and says, “So-and-so, when you say so, do you tell the people who come to enquire
of you, the truth?” In reply they say, they do tell the truth, and those who come to
enquire will see it. She says, “Tell them the truth. They will come to me here if they come
to take back their money; and if you tell them falsehoods, I shall give them back their
money again. If you do not tell them the truth, I shall give it back to them.” The spirits
assent, saying, “You may give it back. For our parts we speak truly; we tell no lies.”
So the possessor of the spirits took the money.
The spirits said to us, “Go in peace.” We wondered “When they bid us go in peace,
without our seeing them. They told us to give their services to all our people at home.
We said we would.
They said, “When you get home, do exactly what I have told you. “We replied,
“Yes; we will do all you have told us to do.”
So we went home. On our arrival we found the child better. As we were speaking
with him, our father came into the house, and we said, “O father, we never had such
confidence in a doctor. When we heard we said, ‘The spirit has divined.’ The spirits
divined; they told us all things—our birth, and the order of our birth, and that he with
whom we live is our cousin; they told us every thing. They said the boy has nothing the
matter with him that will kill him. They said we are alarmed, thinking he has convul-
sions; and we assented, saying, ‘Yes, yes; we think he has convulsions.’ The diviner
denied, saying, ‘No; he has not convulsions; he is possessed by a spirit. The spirit says
that your village must be moved.’ The spirits pointed out a white goat, and directed
that it should be sacrificed for the child, and the village be moved; and they ordered us
to pluck for him Itongo-medicine, and sacrifice the goat. They said, if the disease
returned, we were to go and take back our money.”
Our father said, “O, they have divined, both as regards the disease and our relations
with our cousin. We see they have divined. Why did not our ancestral spirits tell me in
a dream that there was something which they wanted, instead of revealing themselves
by coming to kill the child in this way? What prevented them from telling me in a dream
what they complained about, instead of revealing themselves by coming to kill the child
in this way, without saying any thing to me first? These dead men are fools! Why have
they revealed themselves by killing the child in this way, without telling me? Go and
fetch the goat, boys.”
We went to fetch the goat from the house. We killed it, and poured the gall over
the boy. Our cousin went to pluck the Itongo-medicine; he squeezed the juice into a
cup, and gave it to the boy to drink, and left the cup outside the kraal. The goat was
eaten.
We worshipped the ancestral spirits, saying, “We shall see that the child is possessed
by a spirit by his getting well, and not getting ill again; we shall say the spirit has lied if
he is still ill. We shall see by his recovery; and shall then say, the spirits have told the
truth. We do not understand why you have killed such a child as this. What prevents
you from making old people ill? That is a good spirit which appears in dreams, and tells
what it wants.” Such were the words with which we addressed the spirits.
Our father said, “I shall now quit this place with my village in the morning, and put
it in a place by itself. Why, when I thought I was living in peace, am I still obliged to be
a wanderer? There is a site of an old village; I will examine it well. I shall now remove
the village; may the new place be healthy and good, and this boy of mine be no longer
ill. If he is still ill, I shall say he is not possessed with a spirit; and I will quarrel with the
spirits, and say they have not divined properly.” Our father said thus. He said, “I will
look at the new site in the morning; let us go together, my cousin, and look at the new
site, and inspect it well, for I say I am still a wanderer; for the ancestral spirits have killed
me for staying here.”

So he and his cousin went in the morning to inspect the site. They went to a place
on the river Umathlongwa, and thoroughly inspected it and thought it good, and that
it was a proper place for us to build on, for there was water near. They returned home.

In the morning we took our axes, and went to cut wattles and poles for the village.
When we had finished cutting, the people of our village left that of our cousin and went
to it, and then we completed it. The boy was not ill any more. It turned out in accor-
dance with the word of the spirit; he was not ill again. At length he took out the calves
at milking time, and herded the calves; at length he not only herded the calves and goats,
but all the cattle—calves, goats, sheep, and cows. And at length he grew to be a man.
His name is Umpini. He is now a diligent man. Next year he will milk the cows.

The name of the woman with the familiar spirits is Umkaukazi. It was not a man,
but a woman. She saw us for the first time when we saluted her on our arrival; for we
too had been told by others that she was a great diviner. She lived on the Umtwalume
by the sea, at a distance from us. It is a day and a half’s journey from this.
A student in this world history course once explained to me that “The White Man’s Burden” made no sense because the phrase “white man’s burden” meant something different to her from the way Kipling used the phrase. She read the text as if it came from her own time and place, exactly the wrong way to read a historical source. We read historical sources with an open mind to understand the perspective of the source, not to tell the source what it should or should not “really mean.” This is the only way to fairly understand the past and the people of the past. Lessons or applications for the present can come only after the source has been interpreted on its own terms, and in its own context.

This poem provides insights into the mentality of nineteenth-century imperialism. Kipling wrote the poem as a warning to the United States, the new imperial power. Kipling described the reaction he anticipated American colonists would receive from native people based on the experience he saw of the British in India and other colonies. In order to understand how Kipling saw his world, try to read the poem using the following general rule: every second-person reference is directed toward colonizing people and states (Americans). Third-person references refer to native people. Some references might seem counterintuitive, but do not let that deter you. Understand what Kipling said, and you can understand something of the mentality of his time. You might find it odd, for example, that a serf in the poem is a colonial rather than a native. In the way Kipling saw the universe, an enormous burden accompanies the responsibility of colonial powers to spread enlightenment. Thus, though we see today that native people in colonies were enslaved, enserfed, and brutalized, from Kipling’s perspective, it was the colonials who suffered. He appears in this poem to believe colonials suffered for truth.

The White Man’s Burden: The United States and the Philippine Islands

Take up the White Man’s burden—
Send forth the best ye breed—
Go, bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives’ need;
To wait, in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild—
Your new-caught sullen peoples,
Half devil and half child.

Take up the White Man’s burden—
In patience to abide,
To veil the threat of terror
And check the show of pride;
Take up the White Man’s burden—
The savage wars of peace—
Fill full the mouth of Famine,
And bid the sickness cease;
And when your goal is nearest
(The end for others sought)
Watch sloth and heathen folly
Bring all your hope to nought.

Take up the White Man’s burden—
No iron rule of kings,
But toil of serf and sweeper—
The tale of common things.
The ports ye shall not enter,
The roads ye shall not tread,
Go, make them with your living
And mark them with your dead.

Take up the White Man’s burden,
And reap his old reward—
The blame of those ye better
The hate of those ye guard—
The cry of hosts ye humour
(Ah, slowly!) toward the light:—
“Why brought ye us from bondage,
Our loved Egyptian night?”

Take up the White Man’s burden—
Ye dare not stoop to less—
Nor call too loud on Freedom
To cloak your weariness.
By all ye will or whisper,
By all ye leave or do,
The silent sullen peoples
Shall weigh your God and you.

Take up the White Man’s burden!
Have done with childish days—
The lightly-proffered laurel,
The easy ungrudged praise:
Comes now, to search your manhood
Through all the thankless years,
Cold, edged with dear-bought wisdom,
The judgment of your peers.

—Rudyard Kipling
7. DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN AND OF THE CITIZEN
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The following French declaration was one of the great political works of the French Revolution, which threw off the rule of kings (called the Old Regime or the ancien régime) and replaced it with a nation of citizens. The statement is one of the milestones in the history of humanism and stands today as a model for democratic societies.

Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen Approved by the National Assembly of France, August 26, 1789

The representatives of the French people, organized as a National Assembly, believing that the ignorance, neglect, or contempt of the rights of man are the sole cause of public calamities and of the corruption of governments, have determined to set forth in a solemn declaration the natural, unalienable, and sacred rights of man, in order that this declaration, being constantly before all the members of the Social body, shall remind them continually of their rights and duties; in order that the acts of the legislative power, as well as those of the executive power, may be compared at any moment with the objects and purposes of all political institutions and may thus be more respected, and, lastly, in order that the grievances of the citizens, based hereafter upon simple and incontestable principles, shall tend to the maintenance of the constitution and redound to the happiness of all.

Therefore the National Assembly recognizes and proclaims, in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being, the following rights of man and of the citizen:

Articles:

1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good.
2. The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression.
3. The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation. No body nor individual may exercise any authority which does not proceed directly from the nation.
4. Liberty consists in the freedom to do everything which injures no one else; hence the exercise of the natural rights of each man has no limits except those which assure to the other members of the society the enjoyment of the same rights. These limits can only be determined by law.
5. Law can only prohibit such actions as are hurtful to society. Nothing may be prevented which is not forbidden by law, and no one may be forced to do anything not provided for by law.
6. Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally, or through his representative, in its foundation. It must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in the eyes of the law, are equally eligible to all dignities and to all public positions and occupations, according to their abilities, and without distinction except that of their virtues and talents.

7. No person shall be accused, arrested, or imprisoned except in the cases and according to the forms prescribed by law. Any one soliciting, transmitting, executing, or causing to be executed, any arbitrary order, shall be punished. But any citizen summoned or arrested in virtue of the law shall submit without delay, as resistance constitutes an offense.

8. The law shall provide for such punishments only as are strictly and obviously necessary, and no one shall suffer punishment except it be legally inflicted in virtue of a law passed and promulgated before the commission of the offense.

9. As all persons are held innocent until they shall have been declared guilty, if arrest shall be deemed indispensable, all harshness not essential to the securing of the prisoner’s person shall be severely repressed by law.

10. No one shall be disquieted on account of his opinions, including his religious views, provided their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law.

11. The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man. Every citizen may, accordingly, speak, write, and print with freedom, but shall be responsible for such abuses of this freedom as shall be defined by law.

12. The security of the rights of man and of the citizen requires public military forces. These forces are, therefore, established for the good of all and not for the personal advantage of those to whom they shall be intrusted.

13. A common contribution is essential for the maintenance of the public forces and for the cost of administration. This should be equitably distributed among all the citizens in proportion to their means.

14. All the citizens have a right to decide, either personally or by their representatives, as to the necessity of the public contribution; to grant this freely; to know to what uses it is put; and to fix the proportion, the mode of assessment and of collection and the duration of the taxes.

15. Society has the right to require of every public agent an account of his administration.

16. A society in which the observance of the law is not assured, nor the separation of powers defined, has no constitution at all.

17. Since property is an inviolable and sacred right, no one shall be deprived thereof except where public necessity, legally determined, shall clearly demand it, and then only on condition that the owner shall have been previously and equitably indemnified.
I think the distance from Tokyo to Fuji is about eighty miles and we traveled to the foot of the mountain by jinrikisha, arriving late at night, I remember, at the village of Tsubasheri (I am not sure of the spelling) [Subashiri], at which point the climbing is begun. We were to begin the ascent at 8 a.m. And all necessary arrangements for guides, carriers, etc., had been made for us in advance by our young men who had, by direction, preceded us by a day or two. The transportation of the tents and most of the equipage of the camp had been assigned to the students who went ahead, but Chaplin and I had decided to look after two of the most important instruments, those most likely to be injured by careless handling, ourselves.

I took charge of the break circuit chronometer and he of the transit instrument which the chronometer rate was to be ascertained. We had two or three or four “goriki,” or strongmen, whose business it was to climb the mountain and carry freight, and these instruments were handed over to them when the ascent began. The transit, although broken up as much as seemed wise to diminish weight, furnished one package weighing 160 pounds, and I was astonished to see how comfortably one of our goriki hoisted that upon his back and went his way upward, faster than we could go empty handed. Food was carried also, enough for several days, besides extra clothing, blankets, etc.

The ascent of the mountain was interesting and in places rather difficult. It was an all-day job but after passing the level of about six thousand feet near noon we came out above the line of tree growth and the views were very extended and fine. Perhaps one incident is worth recording.

On the night before there had passed through the village in which we were—sleeping there a few hours—a band of pilgrims who were to make the ascent of the mountain. The mountain has always been considered holy among the faithful Buddhists and Shintoists of Japan and pilgrimages to it are looked upon in very much the same light as are pilgrimages to Mecca among the people with whom I am now living temporarily. Every year bands of pilgrims were made up in various parts of the empire, numbering fifty to a hundred men and sometimes women and children and, under the direction of a leader, made the pilgrimage to the summit of Fujiyama and back, practically entirely afoot.

These men were dressed in white flowing garments, with immense hats of straw, like a small umbrella, and usually there was a flute or perhaps two or three in the party. The leader had a small bell with which he made signals governing the party when marching. Their garments, uniformly white, presented a curious appearance when we met them—and still more curious when we left them, owing the practice of stamping each pilgrim with the character or sign or cartouche of the shrine at which he had made his prayers. Every shrine was provided with a stamp, generally of wood, on which the character was cut, the size varying from one to five or six inches square. A pilgrim who had visited a shrine was anxious to have this stamp impressed on his garment (sometimes in black ink and sometimes in red) as a certificate which he might show to his friends at
home of the fact that he had actually worshiped at this shrine. Of course only the most famous on the way had been thus visited but the gowns of the pilgrims had already been used many times and some of them were pretty well covered. There are a number of shrines, or stations, eight in all I think, on the way up before the summit of the mountain is reached, and all of these must be properly endorsed upon the now rapidly disappearing white surface of the gown. The band of pilgrims (of which I am now writing—we saw many others afterward) had left the hotel earlier than we did and had not taken the same path or trail up the mountain that we took later, going somewhat out of the most direct way in order to pass certain shrines which our path left aside.

Before we had breakfast on the morning of our climb, I stepped out of the inn and looked toward the mountain. We had arrived sometime after dark on the night before and had not seen it nearby and hardly during the afternoon, as it was covered with clouds. But this morning was clear and the view of the great volcanic peak was most magnificent as I stood at its base on that morning—a sight I shall never forget, in fact. A few feet away from me I saw Chaplin also gazing at the mountain which rose before us, perfectly clear from clouds. Turning, he saw me and burst out with the exclamation, “My God, I don’t wonder they worship it!”

Sometime near the middle of the afternoon we found ourselves greatly fatigued and, although we were now far above the timber line and really much more than halfway through our journey, the great peak of the mountain still looked to be as far away from us as at the start. We took frequent rests, lying down on the bare rock or powdered lava, and I confess that I began to feel a little discouraged and feared that my strength would not last long enough to get me to the top. Just then we were overtaken by the band of pilgrims I have referred to. We saw with interest the method of their work and almost unknown to ourselves we fell in with it and them and found great assistance and relief. We noted that the pilgrims were strictly under the orders of their leader and that he limited each effort to the taking of one hundred steps, which he counted in a loud voice. At the end of the group of one hundred steps, the pilgrims instantly fell to the ground, where they rested until called to their feet by the bell of the leader. What seemed to keep them in good spirits more than anything else was the repetition, in unison and with great rhythmic effect, of a simple phrase—“Ro-kun-sho-jo”—a short prayer in which they begged to be made clean in all their parts before they reached the summit of their desires. They kept step with this, not much regarding the leader’s counting of the steps. This was a most excellent device which I have imitated many times since.

The thought of each pilgrim was not “Can I ever reach the top of this mountain,” but rather, “I think I can take the next hundred steps,” and he was aided in this by the rhythmic movement of the prayer and also by the fact that he did not even count the hundred steps himself—only kept going, knowing that he would not be obliged to go for long before there would be a lying-down spell. Thus he became for the time a mere machine, with no thought or worry about the magnitude of the task before him. We fell into the ways of this band, soon learned their prayer, repeating it with them and had their moral support during the remainder of our task.

I have already spoken of the pilgrimages made to the summit of Fujiyama, and to the shrines at which they stopped on the way up. The last of these shrines and the most important of all was on the summit, on the rim of the crater, a short distance from the station we had selected for our work. It was built with a good deal of care, out of
selected fragments of lava, was about twenty feet long and perhaps eight feet wide and six to seven feet high. It had been built by pious priests and pilgrims many years ago, hundreds doubtless, and was very solid and strong. At it a priest remained during the pilgrimage season (the month of August) and it contained the sacred insignia of the Buddhist religion: the images of Buddha, the mirror, the “gohei” (strips of paper attached to a stick of wood), the sacred sword, etc., etc. There was a narrow doorway in front of which the pilgrims passed in bands, dropping on their knees in front of it, rubbing their hands together in prayer, and finally tossing in at the door a few coins (copper) as an offering to the god or to the priest.

The pilgrims usually spent only a very short time at the summit. Having spent the night at the eighth station, they returned to it, and even lower, before noon the day of their visit. I had more than once thought, as I wandered about trying to find some solution to our difficulty, of this small temple as a suitable place for conducting our experiments, but I had also thought that the priest in charge would not for a moment consider allowing it to be used for such a purpose. However, after finding that every other place must be abandoned, I at last determined to interview him and ascertain his attitude. As I had expected, he declined to consider such a proposition and seemed somewhat indignant at the idea of desecrating his shrine in that way. In a half hour I resolved to make another trial and this time I began by explaining to him (through one of my young men) the nature of the work in which we were engaged, telling him that if we were successful we would be able to compute the weight of the earth by means of the results of our experiments. I soon saw signs of interest in his face and, when I concluded by saying that we had been sent to do this work by the government at Tokyo, I was delighted to find him in a friendly attitude, and in a few moments he had yielded to us everything we asked, giving up his shrine for our exclusive use during the days necessary for our experiments.

We had began our preparations very promptly and vigorously and in a few hours all was ready. The image of Buddha and other insignia of worship had been removed from their places and packed in the rear end of the hut. The mountings for pendulums had been fixed upon stones projecting from the side of the wall; the chronograph had been mounted, connected with the chronometer, and set going; the astronomical transit had been mounted near the door of the hut, ready for star observations for rating the chronometer as soon as it should be dark enough.

The attitude of the pilgrims toward our work and the improvised observatory was interesting. Generally they continued to make their devotions before the door of the hut as at other shrines, often watching the slowly revolving chronographic cylinder with intense interest, thinking, as we learned, that it was some new-fashioned “praying machine” (praying machines were, and I suppose are still, quite common in Japan) and they threw their copper coins in at the door as had been done before. Each evening one of our young men would make quite a collection of these offerings and carry them to the priest.

On one of the days of our stay, when looking at a band of pilgrims approaching the summit, our attention was especially drawn to one of them, first because he was carrying a book in his hand and second because as he drew nearer we saw that he was a European in countenance, physique, etc. He proved to be a Jesuit priest, his book was the
Bible. He lived with the natives, spoke their language fluently, and dressed, ate, and lived with them and as they did. He had come with them on this pilgrimage to study their habits and especially to make use of such opportunities as might offer themselves to do a little proselytizing. We invited him to lunch with us and found him a most intelligent and agreeable man.

On the fourth day we completed our work and fortunately, for just then there set a dense fog ending in rain which would have interfered most seriously with our operations. As it was, we were compelled to work very hard to get all of our things packed and ready for going down before the dense mist made it almost impossible to see an object ten feet away. Just before leaving the summit of the mountain I went again to the little temple or shrine in which we had carefully reestablished the insignia of Buddhist worship and, after thanking the priest who had permitted us to make use of it, I offered to give him money in compensation. I have forgotten just what I offered him, but it was to him a relatively large sum; to my surprise, however, he positively refused to accept anything, saying that he felt it to be an honor to be able to give some aid in the solution of such an interesting problem. I reported his generosity to the officials of the university, mentioned it in every official report and in public lectures given in many parts of the United States (in many of the largest cities) in which I have related the story of this experimental weighing of the earth.

I have always taken much pleasure in naming this liberal-minded Japanese, named Kinoshita, who allowed me to transform a holy shrine of almost the oldest of religions into a laboratory of modern science and to substitute for his sacred images the most recent devices for the accurate measure of time. I fancy that few priests of more civilized religions would have been equally accommodating.
9. LEO TOLSTOY, THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS WITHIN YOU


Leo Tolstoy is best known for his great novels, but he also wrote essays, some describing his Christian faith. This statement in particular shows Tolstoy's conviction that human civilization is of no lasting value, as the “kingdom of God” is the only goal worthy of attaining. Tolstoy argues here that Jesus commanded his followers to resist evil with good and to respond to violence with nonviolence.

The Kingdom of God Is within You: Christianity Not as a Mystic Religion
but as a New Theory of Life

[p. 48] Did Christ really demand from his disciples that they should carry out what he taught them in the Sermon on the Mount? . . . And can the Christian, or can he not, remaining a Christian, take part in the administration of government, using compulsion against his neighbors? And—the most important question hanging over the heads of all of us in these days of universal military service—can the Christian, or can he not, remaining a Christian, against Christ’s direct prohibition, promise obedience in future actions directly opposed to his teaching? And can he, by taking his share of service in the army prepare himself to murder men and even actually murder them?

[p. 67] The foreign freethinking critics have tried in a delicate manner, without being offensive to me, to give the impression that my conviction that mankind could be guided by such a naive doctrine as that of the Sermon on the Mount proceeds from two causes: that such a conviction is partly due to my want of knowledge, my ignorance of history, my ignorance of all the vain attempts to apply the principles of the Sermon on the Mount to life, which have been made in history and have led to nothing; and partly it is due to my failing to appreciate the full value of the lofty civilization to which mankind has attained at present, with its Krupp cannons, smokeless powder, colonization of Africa, Irish Coercion Bill, parliamentary government, journalism, strikes, and the Eiffel Tower.

[p. 342–343] . . . people . . . who think to make men advance by means of external force . . . say that the Christian life cannot be established without the use of violence, because there are savage races outside the pale of Christian societies in Africa and in Asia (there are some who even represent the Chinese as a danger to civilization), and that in the midst of Christian societies there are savage, corrupt, and, according to the new theory of heredity, congenital criminals. And violence, they say, is necessary to keep savages and criminals from annihilating our civilization.

But these savages within and without Christian society, who are such a terror to us, have never been subjugated by violence, and are not subjugated by it now. Nations have never subjugated other nations by violence alone. If a nation which subjugated another was on a lower level of civilization, it has never happened that it succeeded in introducing its organization of life by violence. On the contrary, it was always forced to adopt the organization of life existing in the conquered nation. If ever any of the nations con-
quered by force have been really subjugated or even nearly so, it has always been by the
action of public opinion, and never by violence, which only tends to drive a people to
further rebellion.

[p. 478–488] But it is not even this question “What will happen?” that agitates
men when they hesitate to fulfill the Master’s will. They are troubled by the question
how to live without those habitual conditions of life which we call civilization, culture,
art, and science. We feel ourselves all the burdensomeness of life as it is; we see also
that his organization of life must inevitably be our ruin, if it continues. At the same
time we want the conditions of our life which arise out of this organization—our civ-
ilization, culture, art, and science—to remain intact.

Nowadays, after so many centuries of fruitless efforts to make our life secure by the
pagan organization of life, it must be evident to everyone that all efforts in that direction
only introduce fresh dangers into personal and social life, and do not render it more
secure in any way.

Whatever names we dignify ourselves with, whatever uniforms we wear, whatever
priests we anoint ourselves before, however many millions we possess, however many
guards are stationed along our road, however many policemen guard our wealth, how-
ever many so-called criminals, revolutionists, and anarchists we punish, whatever exploits
we have performed, whatever states we may have founded, fortresses and towers we may
have erected—from Babel to the Eiffel Tower—there are two inevitable conditions of
life, confronting all of us, which destroy its whole meaning: (1) death, which may at any
moment pounce upon each of us; and (2) the transitoriness of all our works, which so
soon pass away and leave no trace.

Whatever we may do—found companies, build palaces and monuments, write songs
and poems—it is all not for long time. Soon it passes away, leaving no trace. And there-
fore, however we may conceal it from ourselves, we cannot help seeing that the signif-
icance of our life cannot lie in our personal fleshly existence, the prey of incurable
suffering and inevitable death, not in any social institution or organization. Whoever
you may be who are reading these lines, think of your position and of your duties—not
of your position as landowner, merchant, judge, emperor, president, minister, priest,
laid on you by those positions, but of your real positions in eternity as a creature who
at the will of Someone has been called out of unconsciousness after an eternity of non-
existence to which you may return at any moment at his will. Think of your duties—
not your supposed duties as a landowner to your estate, as a merchant to your business,
as emperor, minister, or official to the state, but of your real duties, the duties that fol-
low from your real position as a being called into life and endowed with reason and love.

Are you doing what he demands of you who has sent you into the world, and to
whom you will soon return? Are you doing what he wills? Are you doing his will, when
as landowner or manufacturer you rob the poor of the fruits of their toil, basing you
life on this plunder of the workers, or when, as judge or governor, you ill treat men,
sentence them to execution, or when as soldiers you prepare for war, kill and plunder?

Share all that you have with others, do not heap up riches, do not steal, do not cause
suffering, do not kill, do not unto others what you would not they should do unto you,
all that has been said not eighteen hundred, but five thousand years ago, and there could
be not doubt of the truth of this law if it were not for hypocrisy. Except for hypocrisy
men could not have failed, if not to put the law in practice, at least to recognize it, and admit that it is wrong not to put it in practice.

Your duties as a citizen cannot but be subordinated to the superior obligations of the eternal life of God, and cannot be in opposition to them. As Christ’s disciples and eighteen centuries ago: Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye (Acts iv. 19); and, We ought to obey God rather than men (Acts v. 19).

It is asserted that, in order that the unstable order of things, established in one corner of the world for a few men, may not be destroyed, you ought to commit acts of violence which destroy the eternal and immutable order established by God and by reason. Can that possibly be?

But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you. (Matt vi. 33.) The sole meaning of life is to serve humanity by contributing to the establishment of the kingdom of God, which can only be done by the recognition and profession of the truth by every man.

The kingdom of God cometh not with outward show; neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you. (Luke xvii. 20, 21.)
10. CONFUCIUS


*Included are selections describing two influential Confucian concepts. The Doctrine of the Mean and The Mandate of Heaven describe concepts of state, individual, society, and religion that span over two thousand years and still today represent active mentalities in all aspects of Chinese and east Asian societies.*

The Mandate of Heaven describes a political and social philosophy that served as the Chinese explanation for the success or failure of dynasties down to the end of the empire in 1912. When a dynasty fell, the reason offered by China’s sages was that it had lost the moral right to rule, which is given by Heaven alone. In this context “heaven” did not mean a personal god but a cosmic, all-pervading power.

The Doctrine of the Mean

[1] What Heaven has conferred is called The Nature; an accordance with this nature is called The Path of duty; the regulation of this path is called Instruction.

The path may not be left for an instant. If it could be left, it would not be the path. On this account, the superior man does not wait till he sees things, to be cautious, nor till he hears things, to be apprehensive.

There is nothing more visible than what is secret, and nothing more manifest than what is minute. Therefore the superior man is watchful over himself, when he is alone.

While there are no stirrings of pleasure, anger, sorrow, or joy, the mind may be said to be in the state of Equilibrium. When those feelings have been stirred, and they act in their due degree, there ensues what may be called the state of Harmony. This Equilibrium is the great root from which grow all the human actings in the world, and this Harmony is the universal path which they all should pursue. Let the states of equilibrium and harmony exist in perfection, and a happy order will prevail throughout heaven and earth, and all things will be nourished and flourish.

[4] The Master said, “I know how it is that the path of the Mean is not walked in:—The knowing go beyond it, and the stupid do not come up to it. I know how it is that the path of the Mean is not understood: The men of talents and virtue go beyond it, and the worthless do not come up to it . . . .”


[13] . . . “When one cultivates to the utmost the principles of his nature, and exercises them on the principle of reciprocity, he is not far from the path. What you do not like when done to yourself, do not do to others . . . .

[14] The superior man does what is proper to the station in which he is; he does not desire to go beyond this.

In a position of wealth and honor, he does what is proper to a position of wealth and honor. In a poor and low position, he does what is proper to a poor and low position.
Situated among barbarous tribes, he does what is proper to a situation among barbarous tribes. In a position of sorrow and difficulty, he does what is proper to a position of sorrow and difficulty. The superior man can find himself in no situation in which he is not himself.

In a high situation, he does not treat with contempt his inferiors. In a low situation, he does not court the favor of his superiors. He rectifies himself, and seeks for nothing from others, so that he has no dissatisfactions. He does not murmur against Heaven, nor grumble against men.

Thus it is that the superior man is quiet and calm, waiting for the appointments of Heaven, while the mean man walks in dangerous paths, looking for lucky occurrences.”

The Master said, “In archery we have something like the way of the superior man. When the archer misses the center of the target, he turns round and seeks for the cause of his failure in himself.”

[15] The way of the superior man may be compared to what takes place in traveling, when to go to a distance we must first traverse the space that is near, and in ascending a height, when we must begin from the lower ground.

It is said in the Book of Poetry, “Happy union with wife and children is like the music of lutes and harps. When there is concord among brethren, the harmony is delightful and enduring. Thus may you regulate your family, and enjoy the pleasure of your wife and children.” . . .

[16] . . . “Thus it is that Heaven, in the production of things, is sure to be bountiful to them, according to their qualities. Hence the tree that is flourishing, it nourishes, while that which is ready to fall, it overthrows . . .

[19] . . . “By means of the ceremonies of the ancestral temple, they distinguished the royal kindred according to their order of descent. By ordering the parties present according to their rank, they distinguished the more noble and the less. By the arrangement of the services, they made a distinction of talents and worth. In the ceremony of general pledging, the inferiors presented the cup to their superiors, and thus something was given the lowest to do. At the concluding feast, places were given according to the hair, and thus was made the distinction of years.

“They occupied the places of their forefathers, practiced their ceremonies, and performed their music. They reverenced those whom they honored, and loved those whom they regarded with affection. Thus they served the dead as they would have served them alive; they served the departed as they would have served them had they been continued among them.

“By the ceremonies of the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth they served God, and by the ceremonies of the ancestral temple they sacrificed to their ancestors. He who understands the ceremonies of the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth, and the meaning of the several sacrifices to ancestors, would find the government of a kingdom as easy as to look into his palm!”

[20] The Duke Ai asked about government. The Master said, “ . . . the administration of government lies in getting proper men. Such men are to be got by means of the ruler’s own character. That character is to be cultivated by his treading in the ways of duty. And the treading those ways of duty is to be cultivated by the cherishing of benevolence.

“Benevolence is the characteristic element of humanity, and the great exercise of it is in loving relatives. Righteousness is the accordance of actions with what is right, and
the great exercise of it is in honoring the worthy. The decreasing measures of the love due to relatives, and the steps in the honor due to the worthy, are produced by the principle of propriety. . . .

“Some are born with the knowledge of those duties; some know them by study; and some acquire the knowledge after a painful feeling of their ignorance. But the knowledge being possessed, it comes to the same thing. Some practice them with a natural ease; some from a desire for their advantages; and some by strenuous effort. But the achievement being made, it comes to the same thing.”

. . . “When those in inferior situations do not obtain the confidence of the sovereign, they cannot succeed in governing the people. There is a way to obtain the confidence of the sovereign; if one is not trusted by his friends, he will not get the confidence of his sovereign. There is a way to being trusted by one’s friends; if one is not obedient to his parents, he will not be true to friends. There is a way to being obedient to one’s parents; if one, on turning his thoughts in upon himself, finds a want of sincerity, he will not be obedient to his parents. There is a way to the attainment of sincerity in one’s self; if a man do not understand what is good, he will not attain sincerity in himself.

“Sincerity is the way of Heaven. The attainment of sincerity is the way of men. He who possesses sincerity is he who, without an effort, hits what is right, and apprehends, without the exercise of thought: he is the sage who naturally and easily embodies the right way. He who attains to sincerity is he who chooses what is good, and firmly holds it fast.

“To this attainment there are requisite the extensive study of what is good, accurate inquiry about it, careful reflection on it, the clear discrimination of it, and the earnest practice of it. . . .”

**The Mandate of Heaven**

In the twelfth month of the first year . . . Yi Yin sacrificed to the former king, and presented the heir-king reverently before the shrine of his grandfather. All the princes from the domain of the nobles and the royal domain were present; all the officers also, each continuing to discharge his particular duties, were there to receive the orders of the chief minister. Yi Yin then clearly described the complete virtue of the Meritorious Ancestor for the instruction of the young king.

He said, “Oh! of old the former kings of Xia cultivated earnestly their virtue, and then there were no calamities from Heaven. The spirits of the hills and rivers alike were all in tranquility; and the birds and beasts, the fishes and tortoises, all enjoyed their existence according to their nature. But their descendant did not follow their example, and great Heaven sent down calamities, employing the agency of our ruler—who was in possession of its favoring appointment. The attack on Xia may be traced to the orgies in Ming Tiao. . . . Our king of Shang brilliantly displayed his sagely prowess; for oppression he substituted his generous gentleness; and the millions of the people gave him their hearts. Now your Majesty is entering on the inheritance of his virtue,—all depends on how you commence your reign. To set up love, it is for you to love your relations; to set up respect, it is for you to respect your elders. The commencement is in the family and the state. . . .

“Oh! the former king began with careful attention to the bonds that hold men together. He listened to expostulation, and did not seek to resist it; he conformed to the
wisdom of the ancients; occupying the highest position, he displayed intelligence; occupying an inferior position, he displayed his loyalty; he allowed the good qualities of the men whom he employed and did not seek that they should have every talent.

“He extensively sought out wise men, who should be helpful to you, his descendant and heir. He laid down the punishments for officers, and warned those who were in authority, saying, ‘If you dare to have constant dancing in your palaces, and drunken singing in your chambers,—that is called the fashion of sorcerers; if you dare to see your hearts on wealth and women, and abandon yourselves to wandering about or to the chase,—that is called the fashion of extravagance; if you dare to despise sage words, to resist the loyal and upright, to put far from you the aged and virtuous, and to seek the company of . . . youths,—that is called the fashion of disorder. Now if a high noble or officer be addicted to one of these three fashions with their ten evil ways, his family will surely come to ruin; if the prince of a country be so addicted, his state will surely come to ruin. The minister who does not try to correct such vices in the sovereign shall be punished with branding.’

“Oh! do you, who now succeed to the throne, revere these warnings in your person. Think of them!—sacred counsels of vast importance, admirable words forcibly set forth! The ways of Heaven are not invariable:—on the good-doer it sends down all blessings, and on the evil-doer it sends down all miseries. Do you but be virtuous, be it in small things or in large, and the myriad regions will have cause for rejoicing. If you not be virtuous, be it in large things or in small, it will bring the ruin of your ancestral temple.”
11. BILL CLINTON ON GLOBALIZATION


This text is a selection from a speech presented by Bill Clinton to his friend and colleague Senator Bob Dole. Clinton’s statement provides a president’s perspective on globalization and the global problems facing the world and the United States.

DATE: May 21, 2004
EVENT: First Annual Dole Lecture
FEATURED SPEAKER: President Bill Clinton
LOCATION: Allen Field House, University of Kansas

[Following an introduction by Bob Dole and statements by Bill Clinton] . . .

Now, I say that to try to drive this point home. You may agree or disagree with our policy in Iraq. You may think, for example, we should have put more emphasis in Afghanistan, where the Al Qaida are, because they’re the ones that caused 9/11. But—[Applause] Wait, wait, wait. This is thinking time, not cheering time. You can cheer later if you like it. But think. The point I wish to make is this. You should have disagreements with your leaders and your colleagues, but if it becomes immediately a question of questioning people’s motives, and if immediately you decide that somebody who sees a whole new situation differently than you must be a bad person and somehow twisted inside, we are not going to get very far in forming a more perfect union. Now, why does it happen? Here’s why. Because at the end of the Cold War, the paradigm, the way we looked at the world evaporated and we had to create a new one. It was my great good fortune, but also challenge, to become the first president to serve my entire term in the post–Cold War era, to be the first president of the 21st century, as well as the last president of the 20th century. America is in one of those periods where we are trying to come to grips with fundamental questions. How are we going to relate to globalization, how are we going to relate to the global threat on terror? What is the role of government in our lives now? What are we to make of all this new diversity? Is it going to—the religious and racial and ethnic diversity—is it going to make us more fractured or will it make us more interesting and more unified? These are big, big questions.

When the Cold War was over and the industrial age began to be replaced by an information age, ever more globalized, we changed the way we work, the way we live, the way we relate to each other and certainly the way we relate to the rest of the world in ways that are marvelous and ways that are frightening. I believe we live in an age normally referred to as globalization, sometimes referred to as the global information society. I prefer the term “interdependence.” Because it goes far beyond economics. There’s good and bad in it. I have a cousin that lives in the hills of Northwest Arkansas that plays chess over the Internet with a guy in Australia twice a week. They take turns figuring out who’s got to stay up late. On the other hand, 9/11 was a testimony to the power of interdependence. Don’t you agree? The Al Qaida, what did they do? They used open borders, easy travel, easy access to information and technology to turn an airplane into a weapon of mass destruction, to murder 3,100 people nearly, in Wash-
When I was president, Senator Dole was always pushing me until we got it right—to end the ethnic slaughter in Bosnia. A hundred years ago, we wouldn’t have known how to find Bosnia on a map. But it offended us because we had to watch those people being killed just because they were Muslims being slaughtered, and because we wanted Europe to be united and peaceful and democratic for the first time in history, to make the Cold War all worthwhile. So then we would be united, we’d be working together, we’d be fighting the problems of the rest of the world together. That, too, is interdependence. So if it can be positive or negative, it’s obvious what we ought to be doing. If you agree with me. We need a strategy that builds up the positive and beats down the negative. We need to recognize that interdependence is inherently an unstable condition. And we need to move the world toward a more integrated, global community defined by three things, shared benefits, shared responsibilities, and shared values. That’s what I believe.

Now—[Applause] Here’s the point I want to make. This may seem simple to you, but if everybody thought that way, then in every area, there would be a slightly liberal or a slightly conservative way to do that, and then we would have all these debates, and in all probability, as free discussion usually does, it would lead to the best possible outcome. I’ll just give you an example. In my view, there are five big issues here, for whatever it’s worth. Number one, we have to have a strategy to fight the new security threats of terror and weapons of mass destruction that is both offensive and defensive. What’s the best way to have homeland defense? If you have limited amount of money, if you think about it like this, then you can say, well, I think what we should do is triple or quadruple the number of containers we’re checking at the ports and airports for biological or chemical weapons or somebody else can say, no, I think we should be reinforcing the bridges or putting guards outside the electrical plants that have nuclear power or whatever you think. But the point is, if you’re focused on it that way, you can focus on homeland defense. What’s the best way to pursue an offensive strategy? Is it to go to Iraq and establish a beachhead of freedom in the Middle East or is it to stay in Afghanistan and root out the Al Qaeda, and then turn your attention to the rest of the world? But once you’re focused on it, you can have a civilized debate, and if you both agree on the issue, then just because somebody has got a different idea than you do about how to handle it, you don’t think there’s something wrong with them.

So that’s the first thing. Second thing we have to do is to have a strategy to make a world with more partners and fewer terrorists. Now, why do I say that? Besides the fact that I’m a Democrat. Why would I say that? Why should every American think that? Even people that don’t believe in social programs? Because if you believe the world is interdependent and you cannot kill, occupy, or imprison all your actual or potential adversaries, sooner or later you have to make a deal. That’s what politics is. If there’s a factual matter, that’s what I talked until I was blue in the face in the Middle East about, they walked away from that peace deal in 2000. It was the dumbest thing I’ve ever seen in my life. All we’ve got now is the Middle East is not a bit less interdependent today than it was when we made seven years of progress toward peace. We got 3,000 dead Palestinians, about 9,200 dead—I mean 920 dead Israelis. They’re no less interdepend-
ent. Nothing has changed except more people are dead and now more people are mad and there’s less trust and it’s harder to deal with it, but they are not a bit less interdependent. So you remember that. If you’re in any environment in life that you don’t have total control over, you have to make a deal. That’s what politics is. And that’s why compromise is honorable, not dishonorable.

[Applause]

So, anyway, so how would you go about making a world with more friends than fewer enemies? Well, first of all, you gotta realize that half the people that live on earth aren’t part of this globalized economy that works. On earth, half the people live on less than $2 a day, of the 6 billion people on earth, 1 billion live on less than $1 a day, a billion and a half people never get a clean glass of water, a billion people go to bed hungry every night, 10 million kids die of preventable childhood diseases, and one in four deaths every year on earth now come from AIDS, TB, malaria, and infections related to diarrhea. Most of them are little children who never got a single clean glass of water in their lives. So for a tiny fraction of what we spend on defense and homeland defense, and I do mean tiny, we could double what we spend to help put all the children in the world who aren’t in school in school, to pay our fair share of the fight against the world’s diseases—[Applause]—and to do these other things. And to give you an example, after 9/11, I think we increased—believe this is right. I think we increased defense and homeland defense 60 something billion dollars in one year. We could double our assistance programs in these other areas, double them, for about 10 or 12. In a budget that must now be nearly $2 trillion, I don’t know what it is. I haven’t looked at it. I don’t have to look at it anymore, so I don’t, but I think that’s about what it is. So you got to have a strategy for terror, a strategy for more friends.

The third thing I think is to find more ways to cooperate institutionally. This is a big challenge for America because we’re going through a period in history when we have unrivaled military, economic, and political power. So every time we make a deal with anybody to do anything, we’re giving up some of our freedom of action. Maybe a good deal for them, not a good deal for us because most of the time we can do whatever we please. The problem is, we will not be the only military, economic, and political superpower forever. If present growth rates continue, China, India, and the European Union will equal or surpass the United States sometime in the 21st century, just because of their size. They may not ever have to reach the per capita income we do to have greater output. So I think we should do that, but if you believe that, then it puts a whole different cast on the debates you hear today over putting up missile defense, getting rid of the anti-ballistic missile treaty, should we be part of the comprehensive treaty, should we be part of the criminal court, should we be part of the Kyoto Climate Change Accord, and I say that, I didn’t join—there’s one I didn’t join. I didn’t join the land mine treaty because they wrote it in a way that was absolutely hostile to the United States, and we have the finest record of any country in the world in promoting demining in the last 15 years, and it had enormous bipartisan support. Bob supported it. And so I’m not saying we can join every treaty, but I’m saying we should have a preference for being part of every conceivable network that will bring people together, because I can tell you something. It’s just like any club you belong to, any organization you belong to, it builds the habit of working with other people. And the more you’re in the habit of believing that if you stay on the team, good things
will happen, as compared to if you get off the team, the more likely we are to find peace and resolution to the problems of the 21st century.

So I think that’s very, very important and now I want to make just two more points. So terror, more friends, more cooperation. Fourth thing is, we have to keep making America better. A lot of our influence in the world comes not from the size of our military or our arsenal of weapons, but from the power of our example. One of the schools that was destroyed in New York City on September 11th, 2001, the children had to leave and go meet in a temporary facility. So Hillary and I went to this school to see these kids, elementary school kids. Six hundred kids from over 80 different national, racial, and ethnic groups. One school. If we can prove that freedom brings mutual respect and that people can be proud of their heritage and proud of their religion, and proud of everything that’s special and still bound together in a more perfect union, that will do as much to undermine the long-term appeal of terror as anything else we can do. Just continuing to prove America works.

[Applause]

But anyway, none of this will happen until we move the American people’s way of thinking about other people forward. And let me explain what I mean by that. You guys love your basketball team. I like the Arkansas Razorbacks. We’re all pulling for different people in the NBA playoffs. We have wars you know who you’re for—you got over 600 people from Kansas in Iraq today putting their lives on the line. We think in categories that are oppositional. And we have to organize ourselves in little boxes. I see a man, I see a woman, I see somebody that’s white, I see somebody that’s black, I see somebody that’s brown, all right. I see a Baptist, a Catholic, a Jew, a Muslim, a Buddhist, a Sikh. I mean, if we couldn’t put ourselves in boxes, nobody could function. You think about how many University courses are designed to giving people more boxes to think with. . . . But at some point it has to become irrelevant. The whole story of humanity is a story of forming a more perfect union. Ever since our forebearers stood up on the African savanna, something over 100,000 years ago, they learned to relate to other people, first they were in clans. Then larger tribes, then villages, and they would come into contact with wider and wider circles of people that had different views and felt threatened, and there would be fighting and killing, but sooner or later, before they destroyed the human race, they’d find a way to get along. In the twentieth century, our weapons were so powerful, we nearly got it wrong. But we escaped. We gave in to neither the tyranny of Hitler or the tyranny of communism or the power of our weapons to destroy. We threaded a big needle there. And everybody that made a contribution deserves our gratitude. But the point I want to make is that if you believe to go back to the founders that our job is to form a more perfect union and nobody has got the whole truth, then everybody’s got a contribution to make. And I think America, if we’re ever going to truly defeat terror without changing the character of our own country or compromising the future of our children, has got to not only say, “Okay, I want to shoulder my responsibilities, I want to create my share of opportunities” but we have to find a way to define the future in terms of a humanity that goes beyond our country, that goes beyond any particular race, that goes beyond any particular religion. We should continue to judge people based on what they do. And if they persist in terror, we should punish them. We should go to war, we should use military power, we should do whatever we have to do. I’m not suggesting we act like it doesn’t matter what you
do. It matters a great deal what you do. But we have to be able to say to the world, we want a home for every peaceable person. We like our faith, we like our ethnic group, we like our crowd, we like our basketball team, we like the way it is. But there’s a place for you here, too.

The world has never before, never in all of human history, had to do this. It’s a big psychological jump. It’s easy for somebody like me, who has been to 100 and something countries to stand up and give a speech like this. It’s quite a different thing for a country to live this way. It was not until 1945, after World War II, that we even had a United Nations. The Americans thought it was weird. The Senate defeated it after World War I. “Who wants to be in a United Nations with all those guys? You gotta be kidding.” So then we nearly blow ourselves up and we have a U.N., right? And a universal declaration of human rights. It was a fraud until the end of the Cold War. Not a fraud, we just couldn’t make it available to everybody. We have had 15 short years since 1989 to build a global community in which everybody thinks, like Dole does, that people in Kosovo and people in Kansas are more alike than they are different.

Now, I will leave you with one last statistic to put in your little box. My last year in the White House, Hillary sponsored a lot of these what we call “Millennium Evenings.” We’d bring in people to talk about big questions. One night, Vinton Cerf, who sent the first e-mail to his profoundly deaf wife, now 22 years ago, and Eric Ladner, a biologist and genome expert from Harvard, came to talk about how the digital chip made possible the sequencing of the human genome. Forget about that. You know the most interesting thing that he said? Genetically, all human beings are more than 99.9% identical, and the genetic differences among individuals within a given racial group are larger than the genetic differences of one group as compared to another. Now, next time you start to feel like you really need to demonize somebody, think about that. Biggest laugh I ever got at the State of the Union Address was telling the Republicans and the Democrats whether they liked it or not, they were 99.9% the same.* There had been a lot of blood spread over that one-tenth of one percent, and all you really have to do is figure out how to free yourself to live by the other 99.9%. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

*Researchers now set this number slightly lower, to closer to 99.0%.
12. WE ARE NOT MONKEYS, WE ARE HUMAN BEINGS

Hashem Aghajari, Iran, June 2002

From Hashem Aghajari, iranian.com (October 2004). English translation reprinted courtesy of the publisher.

For this speech Professor of History Hashem Aghajari was arrested and jailed, and sentenced to beating, internal banishment, and death.

. . . The Protestant movement wanted to rescue Christianity from the clergy and the Church hierarchy. . . . We [Muslims] do not need mediators between us and God. We do not need mediators to understand God's holy books. The Prophet [Jesus] spoke to the people directly? We don't need to go to the clergy; each person is his own clergy. . . .

The Role of the Traditional Clerics

At the time of the Constitutional Revolution [1905–1907], the Islamic clergy was opposed to modern sciences such as chemistry and physics. [In their eyes], chemistry meant that there is no God. But in today’s world the clerics take what suits them. If I drive a Peykan [a cheap Iranian-made car] they drive the latest model luxury cars [audience applause]. Is this right?

They have made these concessions because they use [modernity for their own benefit]; they taste it and then decide that it isn't such a bad thing. Seventy or 80 years ago, they opposed these things in the name of Islam; they called it Haraam [forbidden in Islam]. Up until very recently, learning English in Islamic religious institutes of higher learning was forbidden.

. . . In our tradition, Shi'ites wear a ring on the middle finger of the left hand. This is a symbol of being a Muslim. If you ask one of these clerics, they say it is an obligation and a religious principle. Look at the writings of Alameh Majlesi and the book of Halieh Al-Motaqin—the book that guided Muslims 1,400 years ago. Now imagine that today a Muslim wants to dress like they did then, eat like they used to, act like they used to. Is this Islam?

. . . [The way in which] the religious scholars of previous generations understood and interpreted Islam is not Islam. It was their interpretation of Islam; [however] just as they had the right to interpret the Koran [in their way], we have the same right. Their interpretation of Islam is not an article of faith for us. . . . For years, young people were afraid to open a Koran. They said, ‘We must go ask the Mullahs what the Koran says,’ [since] it was used primarily in mosques and cemeteries. The new generation was not allowed to come near the Koran; [young people] were told that [first] they needed [training in] 101 methods of thought and they did not possess them. Consequently, [the young people] feared reading the Koran. Then came Shariati, and he told the young people that these ideas were bankrupt; [he said] you could understand the Koran using your own methods—you could understand as well as the religious leaders who claim to have a ton of knowledge. The religious leaders taught that if you understand the Koran on your own, you have committed a crime. They feared that their racket would cease to exist if young people learned [Koran] on their own . . .
**A Cleric Is Not a Divine Being**

Shariati used to say that the relationship between [the clergy] and the people should be like the relationship between teacher and pupil—not between leader and follower, not between icon and imitator; the people are not monkeys who merely imitate. The pupils understand and react, and they try to expand their own understanding, so that someday they will not need the teacher. The relationship that the fundamentalist religious people [seek] is one of master and follower; the master must always remain master and the follower will always remain follower. This is like shackles around the neck [i.e., eternal slavery]. . . .

**Non-Muslims Too Have Inalienable Rights**

If we, as Muslims of divine and perfect Islam, value mankind, and say that [people] are human beings regardless of religion, even if they are not Muslims, even if they are not Iranians, such as Turks, Kurds and Lurs, whatever they may be—[we should say that] they are human and they have inalienable rights. Dr. Shariati believed that in the Western world, humanism is not strongly rooted because it is not based on religious principles. But in Islam, humanism is God’s creation; it is by God’s grace that we are here. These should not be merely nice words that we utter, like saying people have rights. Such words are vitally important—they are crowns on our heads. [Therefore], when [ordinary people] want to express an opinion, [the clerics cannot say] they haven’t the power to decide and don’t know what’s good for them.

Today’s Islam [should be] ‘core Islam,’ not ‘traditional Islam.’ Islamic Protestantism is logical, practical and humanist. It is thoughtful and progressive. . . . We need a religion that respects the rights of all—a progressive religion, rather than a traditional religion that tramples the people. We cannot say ‘Anyone who is not with me is against me.’ One can be whatever one wants to be. One must be a good person, a pure person. We must not say that if you are not with us we can do whatever we want to you. By behaving as we do, we are trampling our own religious principles. . . .

**A Call for Islamic Humanism and Islamic Protestantism**

Today, more than ever, we need the ‘Islamic humanism’ and ‘Islamic Protestantism’ that Dr. Shariati advocated. Today, we need it more than ever. While [the leaders] of the Islamic Republic apparently do not recognize human rights, this principle has been recognized by our constitution. In many non-Islamic countries, they at least recognize these principles in dealing with their own people. Maybe when it comes to other people, they oppress them—[like] what Bush is doing, and most Western nations, if they had the power.

Human rights have become so vital in some foreign countries that some of our own clergy, whom I see going for two or three weeks of medical treatment, become enchanted with how the authorities of those countries act towards their own people. About 150 years ago, [a Muslim cleric] went to Europe; when he came back, he said, ‘I saw no Muslims in Europe, but I saw Islam’ [i.e., he saw righteousness]. In our time, we see Muslims, but we don’t see Islam. [APPLAUSE]
Without Respect for Human Beings, There Is No Islam

The regime divides people into insiders and outsiders. They [the ruling clergy] can do whatever they want to the outsiders. They can go to their homes, steal their property, slander them, terrorize them, and kill them—like [the intellectual activists] Said Hejjar-ian, and the late [Dariush] Forouhar and his wife [Parvaneh Eskandari]—because they were outsiders. Is this Islamic logic? When there is no respect for human beings? When [Imam] ‘Ali [the Prophet Muhammad’s son in law and successor, according to Shi’ite Islam] sent an emissary to Egypt, he told him, ‘You are a powerful man. Be good and just to the people. There are two groups of these people: Either they are Muslims, and therefore your brothers, or they are your fellow human beings. Behave towards them according to Islam.’ Islam does not say Muslims and non-Muslims . . . [VOICES FROM THE AUDIENCE] Someone shouts: “Because one fatwa is the word of the Koran and the other is not.” Someone else protests, calling “Aghajari namard” (you are not a man, therefore you are a scoundrel), and repeats, “You are a liar,” “namard,” and “You accuse God and the prophets of lying.” [AT THIS POINT, AGHAJARI LEAVES THE MEETING.]
13. DOCUMENTS ON THE EXPULSION OF THE GERMANS FROM EASTERN-CENTRAL EUROPE


These selections are taken from multiple volumes containing hundreds of similar accounts. The testimonies were collected after the end of the Second World War, from survivors of the mass expulsions of millions of German residents of the “Eastern Zones” from 1945 until 1952.

No. 12. Report of the experiences of Dr. August Karl Lassmann, wholesale merchant, of Troppau

[The author describes how, after trying to escape the Red Army, he found himself back in Red Army territory, hiding out in a factory yard.]

... In this way, the first days passed relatively calmly for us, whilst in the houses of the inner town, women and girls were violated and raped every night by Russian soldiers. Especially where the Russians found alcohol, they could not be kept away from the women and it mattered very little of what age they were. A lot of evil and many tragedies have happened in this respect—although our small group was not directly affected...

No. 29. Report of the experiences of Kurt Schmidt, civil engineer of Brunn

... On 5 May 1945... Czech guerillas interned me with my family—my wife and three small children below the age of six. Together with some 300 other Germans, mostly women and children who were evacuees or refugees from Silesia, we were kept prisoners for the subsequent days in a former orphanage in Pribram... It took three days before we got a once-daily ration of soup; no bread was issued during these first days... After 9 May, when the Soviet troops marched in, [this] maltreatment got even worse. After dark the women especially were exposed to the greatest danger. We were not allowed to lock the rooms in the internment camps and the keys had been taken away. Supported by the Czechs, the Russians came and took what they wanted, using the necessary brutal force. In a neighboring camp, located in the former technical school, a woman did not want to submit to the Russians—she was thrown from the third floor into the yard. In the same camp, a woman who had children with her, was raped until she was dead. (I had this information confirmed by several inmates.) Four of the women who had been taken during the night by Russians from the camp, never returned. Those who did return were so broken in spirit that their only wish was to die. All this happened next to us and in countless cases...
[He and those with him were then moved to a different camp.] Hunger and death ruled in the camp. We were even more forcibly reminded of death by the executions which took place in full public view inside the camp. Any SS member who was discovered in the camp, was killed in public. One day, six youths were beaten until they lay motionless, water was poured over them (which the German women had to fetch) and then the beating continued till there was no sign of life left. The terribly mutilated bodies were deliberately exhibited for several days next to the latrine. A 14-year-old boy was shot together with his parents because it was alleged that he had tried to stab a Revolutionary Guard with a pair of scissors. These are only some of the examples of the executions which took place almost daily, mostly by shooting. Apart from the death penalty, there was corporal punishment, mainly carried out in the room of the commandant of the Revolutionary Guard. Women too were beaten with a whip on their naked bodies, for instance the woman leader of a trek who had somewhat delayed a report.
14. DOCUMENTS OF HUMANITY


**Two Young Men in Civilian Clothes**

I was on the railway station at Eberswalde, which is on the Stettin-Berlin line. The station was full of people who camped on the platforms for never ending days. In the night I was frightened out of my sleep by girls screaming and crying wildly. Not a man moved, it would have been no good. During the next day an old man with his young daughter turned up and we sat next to each other, they were on the way home, to Berlin. Then came two young men in civilian clothes. We talked together and it was two young French boys who had come from Gubinnen and Insterburg. They sat the girl between them. They advised me most urgently not to try and get back to East Prussia, as many did do, poor things. On the next day we went different ways, looking for a chance of getting to Berlin. Then I saw them, on a freight train, the girl between the two Frenchmen, the father beside them. They waved and I waved back.

—Signed, Anna Muehlich

**A Colored American**

Around April 1945 we were in a school in Koenigshof, in Czechoslovakia, when the order came to evacuate because the Russians were drawing near. We started at 2 o’clock in the morning, in the dark, each going as best he could. As I could not walk very far, because I am already 70 years old, I had to stay behind. My niece, with her little boy of six and three other women, left me. Then a car full of soldiers came and took us along. We got as far as a crossing where we were to turn off to the Pilsen camp, and the car was stopped by American soldiers, and we had to get out, there was a discussion, and the car turned back. We then learned that the soldiers who had picked us up were Russian officers who were carrying us off [to kill them]. We then had to go farther on foot. It was afternoon and about four o’clock, and all the others had long since gone on. I had taken my shoes off and was walking in my stocking feet, but I could not go on and sat down at the roadside with my bag and thought I must just leave myself in the hands of the Lord. It was not long before a Czech came by on a bicycle and took away my bag and left me with just my purse. After awhile an American negro soldier, with a gun slung over his shoulder, came towards me and I thought my end had come. He came straight up to me and said, “Now Ma, can’t you get along.” “No,” I replied. He took my hand and helped me to get up, put on my shoes, and then gave me his arm to help me along. We went a little way and came to a village where there was an inn. He put me on a bench under the trees, because he wanted to go and have something to eat. He soon came back with a cup of coffee with sugar and cream and a buttered roll and said, “Now get your strength up again and then we’ll go on, I patrol as far as the [border].” He told me that in America he had an old mother whom he perhaps would never
see again, and I told him about my husband who is dead and my only son who became a prisoner in Russia in 1944 and about whom I have, till now, had no news at all.

—Signed, Frau Anna Guenther

With the Red Cross

. . . I was head of the Red Cross centre at the railway station in Komotau, Sudetenland, during the terrible May of 1945, and in the months that followed. . . . Should sober-minded readers not find the experiences described here to be very heroic, I must stress that any assistance given to Germans by a foreigner meant going against either a Russian or a Czech order, and that the punishment for this was severe. . . . One day I received the terrible order that no more soup was to be served to German civilians or sick or wounded German soldiers, only to foreigners and children under six. If I did not comply with this order I could expect to be shot. The result was, of course, that a lot of soup was left over, which I was then ordered to throw away, while the poor creatures were collapsing from hunger. I can still see this misery before me if I close my eyes, and again it was the prisoners [freed prisoners of war, formerly held by the German army], who got me to give them soup and then discreetly hid the cans in the washrooms of the Red Cross, indicating them to the starving refugees with a fleeting glance. A thankful look, a stealthy grasp of the hand was their reward. I shall never forget how my oldest assistant often spoke to the English PWs [prisoners of war], asking them to spend the night in the nurses’ home, so as to protect the German girls who were regarded as fair game by Russians and Czechs. She never met with refusal . . .

These few notes are all the more valuable if one remembers that those who helped us did so out of humanity and without the least thought of personal advantage.

—Signed, Marie Konwalinka

On a Station in Czechoslovakia

At Station X, in Czechoslovakia, our freight train had been standing for three days in the burning sun. We had no food, although we did have water. Anyone who risked going to the village to try and buy food came back beaten up and robbed of everything. The freight cars were guarded by young Czechs who thought it great fun to shoot off their guns in the air, and laughed cynically when the children screamed or the women jumped with fright. . . . My husband and I and our three children sat sadly around a little fire. A handsome man behind us said, “If you will make my soup for me I can lend you a saucepan.” We got talking together and our new friend was a Pole, an interpreter. He had been interned in Germany [he was a POW] but was not filled with hatred against the Germans. I shall never forget what he said to us, the sense of which was, “the victors are not those wild, revengeful, pillaging people who are passing us now, full of the power they are already misusing, the victors are probably you and I, who in such a chaos are good neighbors and try to represent our nations and mankind worthily in the simple things in life.”

—Signed [illegible]
15. PILGRIMS ON FU-JI


Note: Earlier transliterations of the name “Fuji” called for a hyphen, as in the following text.

A motley crowd had assembled at the entrance of the hotel when our travelers left Kako-ne to return to Tokio. Ka-go-men, pilgrims, travelers, drivers with their packhorses—all were congregated there. Those bound for Tokio went down the mountain on its eastern slope, while the pilgrims turned their faces westward toward Fu-ji. Let us follow them.

They went up the one steep street of Ha-ko-ne, out of the gate through which the old daimios passed, and just outside of which some old idols stood, as if keeping guard in the place of sentinels.

Under grand old trees, between mossy banks from which hung tangled masses of vines and ivy, and where ferns grew in rank profusion and fair white lilies bloomed, went the pilgrims stepping from rock to rock and stopping to quench their thirst at some cooling spring. At noon they halted for dinner at Mi-shi-ma, a large town at the foot of the western side of Ha-ko-ne.

Just opposite the hotel was a large temple, and back of the temple a beautiful grove. Pretty winding walks under the shady trees, with thatched cottages and people walking to and fro, made the place very charming. But the most attractive object at Mi-shi-ma was the stream which the pilgrims passed as they went out of town. Down from the mountain it came, pure and fresh, and in such volume that it was sufficient to quench the thirst of all the people of Mi-shi-ma through all time. Truly, Japan is a well-watered country—“a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths, that spring out of valleys and hills, and these bright waters flow over a green, sunny land. It is strange how earth’s most lovely regions are the ones most defiled by sin. Even Sodom and Gomorrah stood in the plain of Jordan which was like the garden of the lord.”

At Yo-shi-wa-ra, a large town near the base of Fu-ji, the pilgrims passed the night. Everywhere they performed their devotions, going for this purpose into all the large temples. And now they came to the mountain.

Fu-ji is an extinct volcano, which stands by itself in the centre of a large plain. It rises (taking the average of several estimates) thirteen thousand feet above the level of the sea, being the highest point of elevation in Japan. Perpetual snow lies upon the summit. Its cone is made of cinders, and is one of the most symmetrical in the world. It is the steepest of all volcanoes, the angle being forty-five degrees. Its ashes cause at a distance the peculiar purple hue which distinguishes the mountain. A hundred years have elapsed since the last eruption.

As the pilgrims started on their journey in the early morning their way lay for a time over a plain whereon beautiful flowers grew. Beginning the ascent, they passed through a grove of cedars, then through a field of flowers, where the vegetation was rank, and then reached hut No. 1. At nearly regular intervals on the mountain are these places of
refuge for the pilgrims. . . . There are eight or nine of these huts and without their shelter travel on the mountain would be almost impossible.

. . . Then began the real ascent of the cinderstone. It all looked black and desolate. Vegetation suddenly ceased, with the exception of a few patches of a sickly green shrub, and the feet of the pilgrims sank deep into the ashes at every step. The way was strewn with castoff sandals . . . they wear out quickly on Fu-ji. . . .

After reaching No. 6, the way up to the crater became yet more steep and difficult, and the scenery of the mountain the very extreme of desolateness. On went the pilgrims, toiling slowly upward, purposing to sleep at the crater. Large stones impeded their progress, and their feet sank deeper and deeper into the cinders. The air became so rarified that it failed to satisfy their lungs, and breathing became difficult. . . . The ashes, flying up at every step, made the throats of the pilgrims very dry, so they constantly wanted to drink.

At last they stood on the summit. A priest sat by the side of a deep well, constructed no one knows how long ago, and a most remarkable feature in such a scene—a well of water at the very crater’s mouth. He pulled the buckets up and down by a rope on a windlass, and as the cold, sparkling water came, he gave it to the weary, thirsty pilgrims. How interesting and deeply suggestive this incident, though happening in a heathen land and in a false pagan worship! There is the counterfeit, and there is the true. Can we doubt where the true well is, and the real water of life?

The pilgrims, refreshed, went on to worship at the crater. Around the deep, yawning pit were the idols of wood and stone, similar to those in their temples and homes. All was quiet. . . .
Manchester lies at the foot of the southern slope of a range of hills, which stretch hither from Oldham, their last peak, Kersall moor, being at once the racecourse and the Mons Sacer of Manchester. Manchester proper lies on the left bank of the Irwell, between that stream and the two smaller ones, the Irk and the Medlock, which here empty into the Irwell. On the left bank of the Irwell, bounded by a sharp curve of the river, lies Salford, and farther westward Pendleton; northward from the Irwell lie Upper and Lower Broughton; northward of the Irk, Cheetham Hill; south of the Medlock lies Hulme; farther east Chorlton on Medlock; still farther, pretty well to the east of Manchester, Ardwick. The whole assemblage of buildings is commonly called Manchester, and contains about four hundred thousand inhabitants, rather more than less. The town itself is peculiarly built, so that a person may live in it for years, and go in and out daily without coming into contact with a working-people’s quarter or even with workers, that is, so long as he confines himself to his business or to pleasure walks. This arises chiefly from the fact, that by unconscious tacit agreement, as well as with outspoken conscious determination, the working-people’s quarters are sharply separated from the sections of the city reserved for the middle-class; . . .

I may mention just here that the mills almost all adjoin the rivers or the different canals that ramify throughout the city, before I proceed at once to describe the labouring quarters. First of all, there is the old town of Manchester, which lies between the northern boundary of the commercial district and the Irk. Here the streets, even the better ones, are narrow and winding, as Todd Street, Long Millgate, Withy Grove, and Shude Hill, the houses dirty, old, and tumble-down, and the construction of the side streets utterly horrible. Going from the Old Church to Long Millgate, the stroller has at once a row of old-fashioned houses at the right, of which not one has kept its original level; these are remnants of the old pre-manufacturing Manchester, whose former inhabitants have removed with their descendants into better built districts, and have left the houses, which were not good enough for them, to a population strongly mixed with Irish blood. Here one is in an almost undisguised working-men’s quarter, for even the shops and beer houses hardly take the trouble to exhibit a trifling degree of cleanliness. But all this is nothing in comparison with the courts and lanes which lie behind, to which access can be gained only through covered passages, in which no two human beings can pass at the same time. Of the irregular cramming together of dwellings in ways which defy all rational plan, of the tangle in which they are crowded literally one upon the other, it is impossible to convey an idea. And it is not the buildings surviving from the old times of Manchester which are to blame for this; the confusion has only recently reached its height when every scrap of space left by the old way of building has been filled up and patched over until not a foot of land is left to be further occupied.
The south bank of the Irk is here very steep and between fifteen and thirty feet high. On this declivitous hillside there are planted three rows of houses, of which the lowest rise directly out of the river, while the front walls of the highest stand on the crest of the hill in Long Millgate. Among them are mills on the river, in short, the method of construction is as crowded and disorderly here as in the lower part of Long Millgate. Right and left a multitude of covered passages lead from the main street into numerous courts, and he who turns in thither gets into a filth and disgusting grime, the equal of which is not to be found—especially in the courts which lead down to the Irk, and which contain unqualifiedly the most horrible dwellings which I have yet beheld. In one of these courts there stands directly at the entrance, at the end of the covered passage, a privy without a door, so dirty that the inhabitants can pass into and out of the court only by passing through foul pools of stagnant urine and excrement. This is the first court on the Irk above Ducie Bridge—in case any one should care to look into it. Below it on the river there are several tanneries which fill the whole neighbourhood with the stench of animal putrefaction. Below Ducie Bridge the only entrance to most of the houses is by means of narrow, dirty stairs and over heaps of refuse and filth. The first court below Ducie Bridge, known as Allen’s Court, was in such a state at the time of the cholera that the sanitary police ordered it evacuated, swept, and disinfected with chloride of lime. Dr. Kay gives a terrible description of the state of this court at that time. Since then, it seems to have been partially torn away and rebuilt; at least looking down from Ducie Bridge, the passer-by sees several ruined walls and heaps of debris with some newer houses. The view from this bridge, mercifully concealed from mortals of small stature by a parapet as high as a man, is characteristic for the whole district. At the bottom flows, or rather stagnates, the Irk, a narrow, coal-black, foul-smelling stream, full of debris and refuse, which it deposits on the shallower right bank.

In dry weather, a long string of the most disgusting, blackish-green, slime pools are left standing on this bank, from the depths of which bubbles of miasmatic gas constantly arise and give forth a stench unendurable even on the bridge forty or fifty feet above the surface of the stream. But besides this, the stream itself is checked every few paces by high weirs, behind which slime and refuse accumulate and rot in thick masses. Above the bridge are tanneries, bone mills, and gasworks, from which all drains and refuse find their way into the Irk, which receives further the contents of all the neighbouring sewers and privies. It may be easily imagined, therefore, what sort of residue the stream deposits. Below the bridge you look upon the piles of debris, the refuse, filth, and offal from the courts on the steep left bank; here each house is packed close behind its neighbour and a piece of each is visible, all black, smoky, crumbling, ancient, with broken panes and window frames. The background is furnished by old barrack-like factory buildings. On the lower right bank stands a long row of houses and mills; the second house being a ruin without a roof, piled with debris; the third stands so low that the lowest floor is uninhabitable, and therefore without windows or doors. Here the background embraces the pauper burial-ground, the station of the Liverpool and Leeds railway, and, in the rear of this, the Workhouse, the “Poor-Law Bastille” of Manchester, which, like a citadel, looks threateningly down from behind its high walls and parapets on the hilltop, upon the working-people’s quarter below. Above Ducie Bridge, the left bank grows more flat and the right bank steeper, but the condition of the dwellings on both banks grows worse rather than better. He who
turns to the left here from the main street, Long Millgate, is lost; he wanders from one court to another, turns countless corners, passes nothing but narrow, filthy nooks and alleys, until after a few minutes he has lost all clue, and knows not whither to turn. Everywhere half or wholly ruined buildings, some of them actually uninhabited, which means a great deal here; rarely a wooden or stone floor to be seen in the houses, almost uniformly broken, ill-fitting windows and doors, and a state of filth! Everywhere heaps of debris, refuse, and offal; standing pools for gutters, and a stench which alone would make it impossible for a human being in any degree civilised to live in such a district. The newly-built extension of the Leeds railway, which crosses the Irk here, has swept away some of these courts and lanes, laying others completely open to view. Immediately under the railway bridge there stands a court, the filth and horrors of which surpass all the others by far, just because it was hitherto so shut off, so secluded that the way to it could not be found without a good deal of trouble. I should never have discovered it myself, without the breaks made by the railway, though I thought I knew this whole region thoroughly. Passing along a rough bank, among stakes and washing-lines, one penetrates into this chaos of small one-storied, one-roomed huts, in most of which there is no artificial floor; kitchen, living and sleeping-room all in one. In such a hole, scarcely five feet long by six broad, I found two beds—and such bedsteads and beds!—which, with a staircase and chimney-place, exactly filled the room. In several others I found absolutely nothing, while the door stood open, and the inhabitants leaned against it. Everywhere before the doors refuse and offal; that any sort of pavement lay underneath could not be seen but only felt, here and there, with the feet. This whole collection of cattle-sheds for human beings was surrounded on two sides by houses and a factory, and on the third by the river, and besides the narrow stair up the bank, a narrow doorway alone led out into another almost equally ill-built, ill-kept labyrinth of dwellings. . . .

. . . Here, as in most of the working-men’s quarters of Manchester, the pork-raisers rent the courts and build pig-pens in them. In almost every court one or even several such pens may be found, into which the inhabitants of the court throw all refuse and offal, whence the swine grow fat; and the atmosphere, confined on all four sides, is utterly corrupted by putrefying animal and vegetable substances. . . .

Such is the Old Town of Manchester, and on re-reading my description, I am forced to admit that instead of being exaggerated, it is far from black enough to convey a true impression of the filth, ruin, and uninhabitableness, the defiance of all considerations of cleanliness, ventilation, and health which characterise the construction of this single district, containing at least twenty to thirty thousand inhabitants. And such a district exists in the heart of the second city of England, the first manufacturing city of the world. If any one wishes to see in how little space a human being can move, how little air—and such air!—he can breathe, how little of civilisation he may share and yet live, it is only necessary to travel hither. True, this is the Old Town, and the people of Manchester emphasise the fact whenever any one mentions to them the frightful condition of this Hell upon Earth; but what does that prove? Everything which here arouses horror and indignation is of recent origin, belongs to the industrial epoch.
17. REPORT OF THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE COUNCIL’S 2020 PROJECT


Executive Summary

At no time since the formation of the Western alliance system in 1949 have the shape and nature of international alignments been in such a state of flux. The end of the Cold War shifted the tectonic plates, but the repercussions from these momentous events are still unfolding. Emerging powers in Asia, retrenchment in Eurasia, a roiling Middle East, and transatlantic divisions are among the issues that have only come to a head in recent years. The very magnitude and speed of change resulting from a globalizing world—apart from its precise character—will be a defining feature of the world out to 2020. Other significant characteristics include: the rise of new powers, new challenges to governance, and a more pervasive sense of insecurity, including terrorism. As we map the future, the prospects for increasing global prosperity and the limited likelihood of great power conflict provide an overall favorable environment for coping with what are otherwise daunting challenges. The role of the United States will be an important variable in how the world is shaped, influencing the path that states and nonstate actors choose to follow.

New Global Players

The likely emergence of China and India, as well as others, as new major global players—similar to the advent of a united Germany in the 19th century and a powerful United States in the early 20th century—will transform the geopolitical landscape, with impacts potentially as dramatic as those in the previous two centuries. In the same way that commentators refer to the 1900s as the “American Century,” the 21st century may be seen as the time when Asia, led by China and India, comes into its own. A combination of sustained high economic growth, expanding military capabilities, and large populations will be at the root of the expected rapid rise in economic and political power for both countries.

Most forecasts indicate that by 2020 China’s gross national product (GNP) will exceed that of individual Western economic powers except for the United States. India’s GNP will have overtaken or be on the threshold of overtaking European economies.

Because of the sheer size of China’s and India’s populations—projected by the US Census Bureau to be 1.4 billion and almost 1.3 billion respectively by 2020—their standard of living need not approach Western levels for these countries to become important economic powers.

Barring an abrupt reversal of the process of globalization or any major upheavals in these countries, the rise of these new powers is a virtual certainty. Yet how China and India exercise their growing power and whether they relate cooperatively or competitively to other powers in the international system are key uncertainties. The economies of other developing countries, such as Brazil, could surpass all but the largest European countries by 2020; Indonesia’s economy could also approach the economies of individual European countries by 2020.
By most measures—market size, single currency, highly skilled work force, stable democratic governments, and unified trade bloc—an enlarged Europe will be able to increase its weight on the international scene. Europe’s strength could be in providing a model of global and regional governance to the rising powers. But aging populations and shrinking work forces in most countries will have an important impact on the continent. Either European countries adapt their work forces, reform their social welfare, education, and tax systems, and accommodate growing immigrant populations (chiefly from Muslim countries), or they face a period of protracted economic stasis.

With these and other new global actors, how we mentally map the world in 2020 will change radically. The “arriviste” powers—China, India, and perhaps others such as Brazil and Indonesia—have the potential to render obsolete the old categories of East and West, North and South, aligned and nonaligned, developed and developing. Traditional geographic groupings will increasingly lose salience in international relations. A state-bound world and a world of mega-cities, linked by flows of telecommunications, trade and finance, will co-exist. Competition for allegiances will be more open, less fixed than in the past.

**Impact of Globalization**

We see globalization—growing interconnectedness reflected in the expanded flows of information, technology, capital, goods, services, and people throughout the world—as an overarching “mega-trend,” a force so ubiquitous that it will substantially shape all the other major trends in the world of 2020. But the future of globalization is not fixed; states and nonstate actors—including both private companies and NGOs—will struggle to shape its contours. Some aspects of globalization—such as the growing global interconnectedness stemming from the information technology (IT) revolution—almost certainly will be irreversible. Yet it is also possible, although unlikely, that the process of globalization could be slowed or even stopped, just as the era of globalization in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was reversed by catastrophic war and global depression.
Glossary

Aghajari, Hashem  Iranian reformer and historian, imprisoned for his humanist ideas.

capitalism  Economic system employing free market, private property, and profit motive.

citizen  A person owing allegiance to and entitled to protection from a government.

collective responsibility  When citizens are responsible and accountable for the actions of a state (government).

Confucius  Chinese philosopher.

Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen  Statement of independence and the establishment of the democratic nation, from the French Revolution, 1789.

Dickens, Charles  English author; novels described conditions of English industrialization.

diviner  In ancient traditions, a doctor who heals by communicating with spirits.

egalitarian  To be equal.

Eiffel Tower  Tower in Paris, symbol of the modern age and the power of industry.

Engels, Friedrich  Advocate of workers’ rights in nineteenth-century England and Germany.

Enlightenment  Era of the advance of social humanist philosophy, particularly in France.

freedom  The first element of humanism and of human rights.
French Revolution  Revolt of French citizens against the Old Regime in 1789. Proposed “liberty, equality, and fraternity” to replace the feudal class system.

Galileo Galilei  Seventeenth-century Italian astronomer, indicted by the Inquisition in 1633.

Gandhi, Mahatma  Reformer of India who opposed English colonization using passive resistance.

globalization  The world grows more and more connected, economically and otherwise, as technology reduces time and space.

heroic man  Classical Greek ideal of the humanist man who pursues and defines his own fate even in defiance of the gods.

humanism  The principle that individuals are born free and equal and the preference for acting (publicly) on reason above belief.

Human Rights Watch  Organization investigating labor abuses, particularly against children.

inclusive  Participating. Can be used as a measurement of democracy.

industrialization  The use of human, animal, and natural power with machine power.

King, Martin Luther, Jr.  American organizer and advocate for passive resistance against human rights abuses in the United States.

The Kingdom of God Is within You  Leo Tolstoy’s book on a Christian’s obligation for noncompliance with violence.

Kipling, Rudyard  English author of the British colonial experience in India.

League of Nations  Organization established after the First World War to provide a world forum for diplomacy and dialogue.

Long Nineteenth Century  The period from the French Revolution to the First World War, marked by the many facets of modernization.

Luther, Martin  Saxon reformer of sixteenth century. Luther translated the Bible into German.

Mount Fuji  Japanese mountain and site of Buddhist pilgrimage.

nationalism  Support for one’s own nation.

nation-state  A people (nation) organized around an independent state.

the Other  An outsider.

papal  Relating to the office of the Pope, Bishop of Rome.

philosophes  Advocates and writers, usually French, of the Enlightenment.
Pico (Giovanni Pico della Mirandola) Fifteenth-century Italian humanist.

Protestant Reformation Early modern challenges to the Roman church and some of its teachings, resulting in the establishment of new church denominations.

Renaissance Fifteenth-century “revival” of Greek humanism, particularly in art.

The Salvation Army Nineteenth-century charity organization established in response to abuses of industrialism and capitalism in England.

scientific method Systematic method of inquiry requiring objective measurements and testing.

Scientific Revolution The revolutions in scientific thought, led by Newton, Galileo, and others, leading to a widespread acceptance in Europe and North America of modern scientific methods and laws.

self-determination The right of a people (nation) to determine its own government, policies, and so on.

shared fate Twentieth-century reality that the one country’s war, economy, and human rights record affects other countries, or all countries around the world.

Silk Road Land and sea trade routes spanning much of Asia and eastern Europe, which for centuries connected societies from Japan to Italy and all points in between. Also refers to the migratory and cosmopolitan culture along the Silk Road.

The Starry Messenger Galileo’s book on the position of the planets in relation to the sun.

United Nations Voluntary organization of world states established after the Second World War to provide a forum for world mediation.

Vandals Germanic tribe of the ancient period.

Western tradition A controversial term referring to a set of literary, scientific, political, artistic, and philosophical principles, influenced by Greco-Roman and Christian traditions, that set “the West” apart from other civilizations. Most countries associated with the Western tradition either are European or have been strongly influenced by West European immigration or settlement, such as the Americas and Australasia.

Xuanzang Chinese pilgrim to India.

Zionists Proponents of a Jewish national state.

Zulu Bantu people and culture of southeastern Africa.