

WORLD CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND PEACE

PROCEEDINGS

The World Conference on Religion and Peace was held in Kyoto, Japan, October 16 - 21, 1970, to discuss the urgent present obstacles to peace in the light of common religious principles. (For its "Findings" see Vol. IX, No.4.)

Part One consists of addresses delivered at the inaugural plenary session, October 16. Part Two contains three fundamental papers read at the Conference.

PART ONE: ADDRESSES

Opening Address

*By Lord Abbot Kōshō Ōtani**

On this occasion of the convening of the World Conference on Religion and Peace under the sponsorship of the Japan Religions League for six days, beginning today and ending on the 21st, here in this Kyoto International Conference Hall of the ancient capital of Japan, it is with pleasure that I want to express, first of all, my deepest respect and heartfelt appreciation to you who have come with burning hopes from distant lands overseas as representatives of your respective religious organiza-

* Delivered on October 16, 1970, at the Inaugural Plenary Session of the World Conference on Religion and Peace in Kyoto, Japan. Lord Abbot Kōshō Ōtani is head of the Honganji Sect of Jōdo Shin Buddhism and Honorary President of the World Conference on Religion and Peace.

tions for the founding of world peace and happiness of mankind. There are two points that I want you to be aware of in the holding of this conference in Japan. First of all Japan is the only country that has been victimized by an atom bomb, and the second is that, since 1947, ours is a nation that has absolutely discarded all aggressive war potentials through the promulgation of a "Peace Constitution." On account of these two points, I think Japan is an appropriate country in which to convene this very meaningful meeting.

Moreover, as a resident of the City of Kyoto, I am delighted that this city has been selected as the conference site.

Arnold Toynbee in his message to the conference has said that the City of Kyoto is a happy choice for the meeting-place of a world conference on religion and peace. When he said this about Kyoto, which was officially Japan's capital city for more than 1,000 years, and is one of the most beautiful cities in the world, I heartily agreed with him.

The World Conference on Religion and Peace has been convened with the hope that you who are attending do so with a mutual understanding of the nature of each other's religion, that you seek the guiding principles for world peace and a harmonious development of mankind, that you as religious leaders will clarify your roles and that you will meet on the question of how religious leaders of the world may cooperate and put into practice their ideals.

There is but one fate awaiting mankind today. Atomic weapons threaten not only the destruction of material civilization and spiritual culture that is our heritage but, also, the very existence of man. Today we must by all means transcend every

difficulty to outlaw wars and labour earnestly and hard towards the building of a peaceful world. The advance of science and its skills which is symbolic of this space-age is truly amazing but the very remarkableness of this scientific civilization has given birth to a frightening armament race and awesome wars with sophisticated weapons which are as yet to end. Moreover, scientific skill even has become the root of human alienation. Scientific civilization may even be called the civilization of lost humanity and is the cause of deep concern for those who see its danger to mankind and the crisis in spiritual culture.

Even if science comes to know of the largest and the smallest in the world and man gains the knowledge of all he can know, yet will it be impossible for him to answer from its facet the questions of "how shall man live" and "how shall man realize peace and happiness"? Science may contribute to peace but at the same time it has lent its powers to destruction in the process of its advance. That which shall make the scientific civilization to contribute toward man's peace is the heart of man. The priority should lie in the building of peace in the heart of each individual man. Concerning this conference Arnold Toynbee says, "Human beings cannot claim themselves to be peaceful unless each of them is at peace with each other. The source of peace—and of war—is the interior life of each individual human spirit. The destiny of mankind depends on the struggle within each of us, to overcome his own selfcenteredness; and in each of us, as we know from experience, this struggle is life-long." And so it is. The most important thing is for each man to labour earnestly throughout his lifetime for mutual peace and happiness by reflecting on his own inner self and overcoming the anger, hate

and jealousy towards his fellow men all of which arise from within this inner self. Understanding towards others and the generosity to forgive them are surely the spiritual bases which lead to a peaceful world. This is difficult to practice and perhaps is a round-about-way towards peace but, no matter how difficult or circuitous a path, it is my conviction that these ingredients of a spiritual foundation are the only ones upon which true peace, a peace all men will accept, shall be forthcoming.

Based on and supported by our faiths, we must strive step by step to reach our goal of peace, with clear thinking and ceaseless efforts. No matter how much technology and science may advance, they in themselves cannot decide upon peace. Man himself must seek his *raison d'être*: man himself must discover the road in the world. In this sense the realisation of peace is dependent wholly upon the decision and endeavor of man himself.

This conference has chosen from many problems confronting peace the following three as the most important for study and discussion: namely, disarmament, development, and human rights.

I hope sincerely that this meeting will give us a worthy result through your diligence in a frank discussion that shall be positive and constructive. There may be differences of opinions, but let us not just be abstract and subjective — it is much more important to be concrete in finding a solution to peace. May we transcend individual feelings and faiths and advance our deliberations by centering our thoughts on the one subject of world peace.

It may be said that the true meaning and fruit of this con-

ference rests in what the religious leaders of the world will do for the realisation of peace after this conference is over.

Therefore, I hope that as the result of this conference the religions of the world shall find a common bond which shall lead to a strong unity of purpose in contributing towards world peace.

In closing, may I, once again, pay my deepest respects and sincere gratitude to the delegates from overseas and those of the various religious faiths of Japan who have assembled here today.

Inaugural Greetings

*By Rev. Nikkyō Niwano**

It is my heartfelt pleasure to have this privileged opportunity of addressing the distinguished religionists who are gathered here from all over the world. On behalf of the Japan Religions League, the host organization to this World Conference on Religion and Peace, let me first of all express our deep gratitude to you all, whose participation has made this gathering a most significant occasion. I would also like to take this opportunity so express our thankfulness to Rev. Kōshō Ōtani, President of the Japan Buddhist Federation, for graciously accepting the call to the Honorary Presidency of the Conference, thereby giving added dignity to this historical gathering.

The Preparatory Committee and the Executive Committee

* Delivered on October 16, 1970, at the Inaugural Plenary Session of the World Conference on Religion and Peace in Kyoto, Japan. Rev. Niwano is President of Risshō Kōsei-kai.

have been very instrumental in making the idea of this Conference into a reality. We are deeply indebted to those members of the committees for their united and untiring effort. They are Archbishop Fernandes, Dr. Greeley, Shri Diwakar, Rabbi Eisendrath, Prof. Husain, Bishop Lord, Msgr. Murray, Prof. Saiyidain, Cardinal Wright, Rev. Inada, Rev. Miyake, and Rev. Nakayama.

I have long cherished a hope that someday I shall meet and discuss with those in the religious fields who are working hard for peace of mind, peace among men and peace of the world. This dream has now been realized here and today in the form of this Conference. And let me express my conviction that this gathering cannot but be a great success. Some of you may criticize me for this unqualified optimism, but allow me briefly to dwell upon my personal experiences that have led me to this conviction and optimism.

At one time, various religions, precisely because of their own conviction, were unable to cooperate and were even antagonistic to each other. But the times have changed. Improvement in the means of transportation has made the earth much smaller, and progress in science and technology has made it possible for man to see his planet from outerspace. In this day and age, the need for unity in the family of man is being brought home with an increased sense of urgency. It is my firm belief that religion alone can provide the motive power to create a peaceful world, not through armed might but through respect of humanity.

Indeed, the time has arrived when religions, instead of antagonizing each other because of what we once thought was

religious conviction, should cooperate with each other in order to contribute to the cause of mankind and world peace, because, in the final analysis, all sectors of religion are and can be bound together by the common aspiration for human happiness and salvation. This must be our responsibility; responsibility of us religionists who are called upon to realize on earth the will of God and the spirit of the Buddha. It is for this reason that in this Conference, we must address ourselves sincerely to the question, "What can and should we religionists do?"

The genesis of the World Conference on Religion and Peace partially dates back to the Japanese-American Inter-Religious Consultation on Peace, held in Kyoto two years ago, in January, 1968. Participating in this Conference and talking intimately with religionists from abroad with whom I had had no personal acquaintance, I was pleasantly surprised to discover so many of my colleagues shared the same enthusiasm, the same conviction and the same understanding.

I have since witnessed with my own eyes and mind how this understanding has developed into mutual trust and confidence, which, in turn, have produced deep friendship, and how this has heightened into religious cooperation overcoming sectarian differences, and ultimately into making this Conference a reality. This is something that cannot be achieved through self-interest or calculation. Nor would sectarian-mindedness, such as being a Buddhist or a Christian, be equal to this task. This Conference has been made possible precisely because all the religionists, who are dedicated single-mindedly to the cause of human happiness, have focused all their attention to the problem of where they can cooperate and what they can achieve through

such cooperation. Out of such heart-warming experiences during the past two years of preparation for the Conference, and out of precious and enthusiastic discussions with the dedicated religionists I have come to know, a deep conviction has begun to grow in my heart that this Conference must be a great success in its contribution to world peace.

Some people had suggested that the Conference should have met during EXPO '70, for it would attract a greater number of participants who might avail themselves of this opportunity to visit the Exposition. However, let us recall the fact that the slogan of the EXPO, "Progress and Harmony of Mankind," represents man's aspiration rather than a reality, and that to achieve "progress and harmony" still remains an unfinished job. And would it not be true that we religionists are called upon to lay the groundwork for this important task? We chose to hold this Conference not during, but immediately after EXPO '70 because we are guided by our religious mission of making progress a genuine and orderly one and of dissolving conflicts into harmony. I hope you will kindly understand how we felt in organizing the Conference.

It is true that many people today are negating or neglecting religion. But, no matter whether they believe in God or not, they are, deep in their hearts, ridden by serious doubts and are asking themselves, "Is this the right way for us to live?" They are in search for a way for man to live based on a universal truth that transcends both time and space. Obviously many people, being beset with blind recklessness of scientific and technological advances and the resultant disharmonies that surround our daily lives, have gradually begun to reconsider their past path.

In the closing ceremony of EXPO '70 one of the overseas delegates said pointedly: "If I were forced to choose between progress and harmony, I would rather choose harmony without progress than progress without harmony." He meant to say that the world today is full of disharmonies. While we talk selfcomplacently of the analogy of men being brothers on a same boat, we have a tragic gap between those living in abundance and those starving. Science and spirit, nature and man are in discord with each other.

Of all the discords and disharmonies, those among various religions in the past should not escape our attention. We should sincerely reflect upon this fact, for, in the final analysis, they represent the lack of harmony between us and God, us and the Buddha. We must first of all repent of this grave sin.

Only when we start our discussion and cooperation with this repentance and reflection, can the World Conference on Religion and Peace offer good tidings for the future of mankind.

On this final note of hope, let me close my greetings.

Opening Address

*By Dr. Dana McLean Greeley**

Mr. Honorary President, Mr. President, my fellow Chairman, Mr. Niwano, distinguished co-chairmen, members of the Secretariat, and dear friends, all: I am compelled to feel that this is an historic occasion and week, this gathering of religious

Delivered on October 16, 1970, at the Inaugural Plenary Session of the World Conference on Religion and Peace in Kyoto, Japan. Dr. Greeley is a chairman of the World Conference as President of the International Association for Religious Freedom (IARF), with headquarters at The Hague.

leaders from all faiths and all parts of the world; and I thank God from the fulness of my heart for it. Religions have waged war and they have waged peace; but they have misunderstood and persecuted each other too much, and they have not waged peace enough, or effectively together. Some of us in America dreamed some years ago of a World Conference of religious leaders for peace. We are abundantly grateful to the Japanese and to the Indians and to other individuals for the preliminary meetings and the careful and persistent planning that have made this day possible. We believe that our country is not peace-minded enough—that is an understatement—and we believe that most of your countries are not peace-minded enough. But even if our countries were peace-minded, we would come together, and we do come together, not to represent those countries, but with a larger loyalty. As has been said many times, the world is our country, and all mankind our fellow-men. Love is our ideal, and there is no hate and no fear and no division in love.

Many people recognize today that peace is a survival-necessity. The scientists and the humanitarians alike acknowledge that we cannot have both war and life upon this planet. And we had better acknowledge it too. Let me add, however, that the time has certainly come for countless people when peace is a moral necessity, when ethically there is no alternative for it, and when we cannot be human or the children of God and reject peace or kill our fellow-men. If cannibalism was outgrown morally, so must fratricide be outgrown morally. The time is here to say emphatically that it is wrong; and that they who promote it are not only diplomatic failures, but ethically speak-

ing they are still in an age of cannibalism or savagery. War is barbaric as well as futile; and it is a violation both of the law of God and of the evolution of man.

Dante in Italy, Erasmus in Holland, Tolstoy in Russia, Gandhi in India, Woodrow Wilson a Christian, and U Thant a Buddhist, have dreamed of peace and of world organization and have labored for them. How can we with our callings dream or labor any less, whatever our competence may be! Forty-five years ago the United States and France signed the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact outlawing war altogether and forever. Twenty-five years ago at San Francisco we agreed to end war for the settlement of international disputes, and to rely only upon international arbitration. Still we give hardly more than lip service to the covenants that we signed: and I am not indubitably convinced that all of the countries inside of the United Nations are more peace-loving than all of the countries on the outside. Can you and I comprehend the Commandment of the Lord and help to melt down the golden calves of national idolatry, and worship together at a true altar or at a shrine of universal peace? The very decade and hour in history has arrived when in harmony with our religion and the principles of social justice we should practice as well as proclaim the brotherhood of man.

Allow me to say that we don't want just a generation of peace under American power or any other unilateral malevolent or benevolent force; but we want a millenium of peace under the sunlight of understanding and goodwill, where the whole family of man will make decisions for the whole family of man and mutual trust in spiritual terms will keep abreast of our mu-

tual inter-dependence in, for example, economic terms.

What might be some of our objectives as we assemble in this ancient center of culture and as explorers together, like Columbus—this week was his week—for a new world or as members one of another? I think of three objectives in particular. The first is to become acquainted with each other and to discover and strengthen what we have in common or the unity that exists among us. We are brothers, brothers in the spirit; and if we can join hands and hearts around the globe, we might hold the globe together against some fatal explosion. If we really know each other, we shall really love each other. We are supposed to be leaders of the people; and our friendships here should be an example. After a smaller Japanese-American gathering here once a Japanese Buddhist said to us: “If we had known you like this 30 years ago we could not have bombed Pearl Harbor as we did; but if you had known us as you now do you could not have dropped that horrendous destruction on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I covet your friendship and I am eager to give you mine, and if we are worthy of our vocation, such friendship should serve as moral cement for our society, to change the metaphor from holding hands.”

Surely a second objective is to clarify and lengthen our personal and collective vision and to pursue that vision relentlessly. G. K. Chesterton in England once said that if we only had more visionaires among our statesmen, we might get something really practical done. If that be the case, how much we need visionaires in religion to get something really practical done. It is not practical to have just old ideas, or to do things only in the old ways. Without vision the people perish. “I saw

a new heaven and a new earth," said John on the island of Patmos, "for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." Our old world is passing away before our eyes, and unless we can achieve a vision of that which must take its place, and share that vision, the portals to the future might not open for us at all. And we and our faiths would perish, visionless, with the decadence of a divided and transient civilization. I want to see with my eyes and my mind and my heart a better world than we have known before since the dawn of time, and I want to identify it, and I want to believe in it, with you.

And thirdly, I think we can devise some steps, calculated and specific steps, that we ourselves can take toward that better world, and start walking. A traveller once inquired of a native in Greece how far it was to Mount Olympus, the home of the gods, and how to get there. The native thought for a while and then replied, "It is a long way to Mt. Olympus and you can get there only by doing all of your walking in that direction." What steps can we take and how persistently can we walk to our Mt. Olympus? We may decide to form a permanent council for lasting fellowship among us and to foster faithfully our wisdom and our devotion for peace—a witness and an agency of our common dedication. We might come forward with a plan for the cessation of the war in Southeast Asia, providing protection for the Thieu-Ky government in exile, and for an interim trustee or coalition government, but with no defense for either regime against the will of the people. We might urge the United Nations to suggest—I have a friend who has recommended it—that Jerusalem, the home of three of the world's living religions, be an "open city" and a cradle and a haven for those

religions and all others, in tolerant co-existence and creative companionship. And we could support a more inclusive and dynamic United Nations itself for tolerant co-existence and creative cooperation the world around. We could resolve to extend the spirit of Vatican Council II among all our religions and in every community where we exist and at every level. We need the ideal and practical plans together. We need the mandate of the prophet and the knowledge of the political scientist. We need both motivation and application for our principles. Dr. Albert Schweitzer once said to some of us who were visiting him in Lambarene in Africa—it still rings freshly in my ears—“Arouse the people out of their moral lethargy before it is too late.” We must arouse ourselves, and the people too, and take forward steps, and keep on walking.

Many of you remember the story of the Christ of the Andes in South America. In the year 1900 Chile and Argentina were about to go to war with each other over a territorial dispute. But on Easter Sunday that year an Argentine Catholic bishop said that they must not go to war and that they should settle their dispute amicably. Presently a Chilean bishop responded with a similar pronouncement. The temper of the people began to change and the rulers listened to the bishops. The controversy was appealed to the King of England for arbitration. A decision was rendered in 1902, and there was no war. The countries signed their first all-inclusive treaty; and with gratitude and enthusiasm the people erected 13,000 feet up on the mountains, where fortresses might have stood instead, the monumental statue, the Christ of the Andes. And they engraved there also the following words: “Sooner shall these mountains

crumble into dust than Argentines and Chileans break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the foot of Christ the Redeemer.” Is it not the duty of bishops and ministers and priests and rabbis to speak out today in similar manner for the cause of peace? We are morally committed by our religion. May Everest and Fujiyama and the Andes and the Rockies and the Urals and the Alps be flattened, and may the sun refuse to rise in the heavens before we abandon our quest and our witness for peace and for world community. You will permit me to say, or encourage me to do so, that it doesn’t have to be in the name of Christ. It can be in the name of Moses or of the Buddha or of Mohammed or of Confucius or of God or of justice or of humanity. But it has to be. And surely for all of us it is in the name of the highest and the holiest that we know. And the Buddha and Christ and mankind will not have less than full and universal peace. May we be the makers and the messengers of peace.

Amen.

Religion and Peace

*By Archbishop Angelo Fernandes**

I would like to begin by thanking one and all who have made this Conference possible. In the same breath I extend a very

Archbishop Angelo Fernandes is Archbishop of Delhi and Secretary-General of the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of India. He was a leader of the International Inter-Religious Symposium on Peace in New Delhi in 1968. He was elected President of the Interim Advisory Committee initially planning the World Conference and was named President of its Preparatory Committee. He was the only nominee for President of the World Conference when it convened and he was elected President during the Inaugural Plenary Session on October 16th at the International Conference Hall in Kyoto.

warm welcome to all the participants, delegates and observers who have gathered here from the four corners of the globe to discuss how religion can help mankind to attain peace on earth.

Almost simultaneously, the United Nations Organization is meeting in New York to celebrate its Silver Jubilee, and I think it is in the fitness of things that we place on record our keen sense of appreciation of the splendid achievements of the world body and its many agencies.

The last quarter of a century has witnessed international cooperation on a scale unprecedented in the history of mankind. One need only recall the efforts made in the fields of education and literacy; communications and culture; food and agriculture; health and population; socio-economic development, commerce and industry; international law, politics, and even in the delicate sphere of peace-keeping. The record is an impressive one and men of religion cannot but see in it a sigh of further hope for the world of tomorrow.

But this must not blind us to the fact that the promises contained in the charter have not been fulfilled. The frightening challenges are still very much with us in the form of mass poverty, hunger, disease, unemployment, illiteracy, and a host of associated byproducts. At the same time, world efforts to curb greed and selfishness, the aroused awareness and concern for the needy have been tragically inadequate and, if anything, the introduction of the idea of Might into the world of party politics has brought about the use of brute force and rancour in civil and political life.

The inequalities and injustices between men and nations have increased; gross violations of human rights and fresh manifesta-

tions of discrimination, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid continue to rear their ugly heads. By and large, there is a widespread sense of frustration and revolt and an alarming increase in the use of violence and its concomitants. Many are constrained to conclude that life in this fashion is meaningless, and they do not hesitate to act accordingly.

Ever since Hiroshima, mankind has lived under the shadow of the atom bomb and of other weapons of mass destruction. True peace seems further away than ever!

EXPO '70 with its central theme "Progress and Harmony for Mankind" was a splendid ideal indeed but it seemed to equate progress with the scale of industrialization and to promise a golden age based on technology and human wisdom. And, as for harmony, nearly half the budget of the developed and developing countries is meanwhile being spent on armaments of one kind or another for waging war! Technology is good but it is powerless to make men righteous. Man's spiritual and moral maturity must grow proportionately to his technical skill and power. What EXPO '70 did serve to highlight are the tremendous possibilities open to the men of today's world for the betterment of human life. A paramount factor are the steadily increasing resources of the wealthier economics. This great asset is at the root of mankind's new freedom to choose between a great variety of alternatives—of greater or lesser importance—to make its own future—for good or evil. And thereby hangs a tale! For the snag is a human one and not technical! If these resources, know-how, personnel are matched by a deepened sense of basic values, a morality common to all men, in order to control and use beneficently the marvels of technology, there

is hope for the future. It can be done if science and religion get together and work together in a harmonious relationship. As Lenin Peace Prize winner J. D. Bernal says: "All scarcity, all need felt in the world is henceforth due to human interference, human stupidity and human greed. The means are there, the knowledge is there; what is needed is the will to apply them."

Religion and Life

The idea of religion working for world progress and peace seems on the face of it futile, for religion, at least in its traditional sense, is losing its grip on the men of the age, more especially the younger generation. What is worse is that the minds of millions today are being manipulated by state systems of education and social communication, dominated by the thinking of an industrial-military complex or caught in the vortex of poverty and want. And yet the disastrous division between Religion and Life can only worsen the present unhappy situation and lead to a still more crippling frustration. The alternative is to bring about the triumph of a spiritual regeneration.

Religion and Life are both elemental forces. They lay claim to the entire man and to all men and human institutions and this sets up a tension between them. The element they possess in common is that they both belong to human nature; true religion is also life and true life is also religion. When religion is cultivated in its finest sense as a relationship of man to a transcendental God and the submission of the entire man to him and when life is understood in all its vitality as the highest possible cultivation of human values and when both govern man and all human relations, the tension reaches its climax, with a con-

sequent release of energy and the maximum amount of work and progress. This enjoins a two-fold task on all men of good will, not to allow the forces of tension which are related to each other to separate entirely and, secondly, to strive to create equilibrium out of tension—a tragic harmony produced through apparently discordant notes. The struggle is a source of joy and strength and the path to peace for man and mankind.

The unity of religion and life is not something which can be easily achieved; it must evolve in a dynamic, organic way. We must seek to create the conditions favourable to this process of evolution in all spheres of human activity, so that religion may contribute to the perfection of human nature and a noble humanity to the perfection of religion.

The proud achievements of our age, unless properly related to religion, lack their deepest meaning. Yoked together, they will be a beacon of light and an anchor of hope for the baffled men and women of our generation.

In practice, this may mean the recognition of human conflicts beneath the apparent calm on the surface of many societies; mutual acceptance of others as human beings even when there is disagreement over the ways of justice and peace, and the realization that the establishment of peace through justice and love will always, humanly speaking, remain an unfinished symphony. We can only strive towards creating the human relationships which will in turn generate forms of mutual responsibility by which and through which men may live in creative tension and help each other to deal constructively with the world's conflicts. This is the violence of the peacemaker—at once creative and constructive.

And it is feasible. For much as religion may appear to be on the wane, it still commands the nominal allegiance of the great majority of mankind; it continues to be, in more refined form, the most hotly debated subject even in death-of-God societies; it occupies many columns in today's newspapers; it is implicit in the agonising search for identity which is basic to students' unrest movements the world over and is finding its way back into the very challenge of world development by the current emphasis on non-economic factors and on integral humanism as the goal of the entire process. It is likewise at the core of that helplessness of pleading mankind in the face of a nuclear holocaust.

And so this Conference on Religion and Peace is very timely indeed. It may have its limitations but it nevertheless imposes a serious responsibility on each and all of us to make the most of this golden opportunity for the forthright application of religious thinking to the burning issues of today as a humble service to mankind.

The Challenge to Religionists

The first response of religionists to the quest for peace must be one of repentance before God. Both in the past and even today, if not religion as such, our religious institutions, have been party to those attitudes and have been caught in those structures which inflict suffering and deny man his true dignity. Too often has there been connivance or listlessness in the face of discrimination and racism, colonialism and exploitation, reflecting the inhumanity of the unconcerned rather than the compassion of religion. Repeatedly we speak of freedom and tolerance, of

love and justice, of peace and reconciliation, but our actions and our inertia belie our words.

The efforts at healing or mutual acceptance, which in all humility we ourselves will doubtless make at this meeting, might well illustrate the first steps in the kind of programme that should obtain in the process of peace-keeping.

By the same token, we must not be content with a hackneyed concept of tolerance. It would smack of the negative. It is respect and reverence for each other and for each other's religions in the fullness of courtesy that should provide a strong foundation for that fellowship and partnership, which I hope will be one of the most marked features of this gathering. It is not the name but the spirit of religion that we must bring to bear on our dealings, one with another, of our deliberations and conclusions, our hopes and our plans for the future.

In this connection, I would like to issue a call for the spirit of fearlessness. Some nations in the past may have used religion as a tool for their unpeaceful purposes. Today the danger perhaps is in another direction. Religionists may be inhibited in their thinking and the free expression of their views by the stance for the countries they hail from. There should be no such seduction by narrowly nationalistic ties and sentiments: As servants of a higher Authority, we must exhibit a universalism which is fully in keeping with the value systems of the major world religions. Only through such an attitude could we one day hope to exercise that other fear which is part and parcel of the equilibrium of terror and which must be shed if true peace is really to be achieved. Only so are we likely to provide a fitting answer to the call for full human development of each

and all men everywhere and to the heartrending cry for liberation from oppression that rises from the hearts of millions of our fellowmen, and to that hope of all for living and struggling together in brotherhood and love.

This implies an act of faith in man. It calls for and expects a change of heart in human persons. Perhaps that is a tall order but to hope for a better society without it is sheer folly. In Toynbee's words: "The source of peace and of war is the interior life of each individual human spirit." And this is religion's role par excellence to be stressed in season and out of season, through worship and ritual, through teaching and life in all its aspects.

The application of this spirit to the social and international field is a natural corollary unless we reduce the concept of religion to a purely individualistic affair which has no bearing on society. Religion which only ends up with "mine" and "thine" and reduces mankind to a multitude of individuals, as numerous as the sands of the seashore, all of whom show violently discordant inclinations, is not worthy of the name. True religion must bind man to man, as brother to brother, in the creation of our harmonious whole.

Echoing his moving appeal to the conscience of mankind in his historic address to the United Nations, Pope Paul VI asks these pointed questions: What should be done to fight against the conditions of life in the world which are incompatible with the dignity of the human person? What must be done to bridge the gap between nations which are prosperous and those which are in want? What must be done so that justice rooted in solidarity should reign?

These are the main thrusts of our Conference, the topics we are to discuss in the Workshops. I will not presume to anticipate but I would like all the same to share with you some general hints or guidelines. I venture to think they may be helpful. The first is to make man the focal point of our thinking; the second, to lift our vision to the entire human family; and the third, to see the quest for peace as wholeness of life as an enterprise of justice and love.

Focus on Man

Belonging to the very nature of peace is the correct attitude to man, his nature and dignity and the expression of consideration for others as human persons. The approach to security must recognise and rest upon the concern for man—any man, including our potential enemy—just because he is a man. As has been well said: “Individual human beings are and should be the foundation, the end and the subjects of all the institutions in which social life is carried on.” Institutions can never be given absolute priority over the worth of individual human beings. That is a religious standpoint we should warmly endorse.

So too there is a fundamental relationship between peace and human rights which is grounded in justice. Any structures which deprive persons of their human rights and dignity prevent justice from being realized and force men to resort to violence or war. Religion cannot be blind to such situations.

Then again, in discussing development we may not forget that “man is the source, the centre and the purpose of all economic and social life.”

The principal purpose of productivity is not mere multiplication of products but the service of man and indeed of the whole man, his material needs and the demands of his intellectual, moral, spiritual and religious life. And because men now have the power to remove the causes of evil, whose symptoms alone they could treat before, our responsibility is not merely as persons for other people but also for the political and economic structures that bring about or perpetuate poverty, injustice and violence. Religion must address itself to the twin engines of economics and power which largely control the world situation.

**The Whole Human Race: The Entire Human
Family: The Common Good of all Peoples**

If there is hope for man and mankind in our time, it is because the human family can no longer avoid recognizing itself. This is the basic message of Pope John's great call in "Pacem in Terris" as it is implicit in the mute appeal of Hiroshima: "May all peoples of the earth become as brothers." In the concrete, this common good requires bread and dignity for all; social, racial and international justice and the dismantling of international violence.

Enlightened self-interest is too meagre a motive to provide the policy that will solve our problems. And yet the opposing ideological concepts of the modern world all identify national self-interest with some essential human good; even old-fashioned patriotism—national self-love pure and simple—sees its very particularism as loyalty to a universal value. We must try to unify nation-building and the building of world community.

Nationalism can be based on peaceableness and enlightened social action instead of on power seeking or empty symbols. Be that as it may, the unity of mankind is prior to the moral ideologies that divide it and demands a basic responsibility of all men and all nations for all of mankind. In the realm of peace-making, this means co-existence; for the unity of mankind challenges us to a common achievement of a common good. In this respect the isolation of the People's Republic of China and other such sovereign republics from the broader community of nations is greatly to be deplored. The establishment of a world community of peoples is urgently demanded by the requirements of the universal common good.

Peace as Wholeness of Life (Shalom)

Next I would like to commend the radical meaning of peace which is the biblical concept of justice. It is summed up in wholeness of life as conveyed by the term "Shalom." It expresses the wholeness of full human life in a community of mutual sharing and affirmation. It includes prosperity, happiness, respect among friends and all that belongs to personal fulfilment. For a community, it means the efflorescence of its common life in all respects. It suggests an almost paradisiacal reign of security and abundance; it is something that lasts, something common to all men. Moreover, because the concrete demands of the common good of man are constantly changing, peace becomes a never-ending corporate quest on the part of all men of good will for a more human order. It is in this sense that development, the struggle of the needier nations for a better life, is the new name for peace and is an enterprise of justice, the establishment,

namely, of the disadvantaged in the full rights and possibilities of their humanity.

Doubtless, peace begins in our own hearts but it is not an evasion of forgetting of one's fellowmen. On the contrary, private life, public life, political life and international relations are all meant to be changed by the dynamics of peace into a life in harmony for the whole of mankind.

Specific Issues

The role of religion in its moral witness within the political order does not demand that we usurp the role of the diplomat or politician, the general or the merchant, or sit in judgement on heads of states. Our task as spokesmen for religion is to create a moral climate that gives hope of a better chance to the efforts and blueprints for peace that otherwise tend to remain merely mechanical or operate in a vacuum. It is a complementary role but one that is badly needed in the interests of those personal and community values that society at all levels exists to serve and prosper. Because of the growing permissiveness in society with its heavy emphasis on purely subjective morality, this task of all religions has assumed poignant urgency. By this token, it is for us to give to the organization of world peace a dynamic, organic moral principle of life and growth.

At this stage, I would like to indicate a few specific issues which we might care to support.

Through a Conference such as this it might be worthwhile to urge all responsible governments and competent authorities, at all levels, to ensure liberty of thought, conscience and religion and also the right to public manifestation of religion without

discrimination and with a mutual respect for the convictions and beliefs of every individual—with due regard for the common good. All Religionists should demonstrate, in a positive way, their concern that all men everywhere be free to exercise without discrimination of any kind all the rights which are indispensable for a complete fulfilment of the human person.

A first move in the direction of future non-violent defensive strategies is the establishment of *the right of conscientious objection*. This is a religious issue. Inherent in the dignity of human beings is the exercise of conscientious judgement. Accordingly, each person should be assured the right on grounds of conscience or profound conviction to refuse military service or any other direct or indirect preparation of wars or armed conflicts.

By the same token, this should be extended to include a particular war or a conflict in which weapons of mass destruction are likely to be used or military orders issued involving the commission of criminal offences or war crimes or crimes against humanity. It will be for the Conference, if it thinks fit, to indicate the practical steps required to ensure this recognition under national and international law.

In line with this is the wider issue of *human rights*. They have been set down in writing; it is now necessary to do everything possible to make them operative.

Would it be in order for our Conference to endorse the proposal currently before the United Nations for the establishment of an office of a High Commissioner for Human Rights within the structure of the U.N.? Perhaps we could also go on record as urging all governments to ratify all the international conventions relating to human rights as a matter of top priority.

Such steps may not appear to concern religion directly but we cannot ignore the common man's conscience and his hopes and aspirations also in this area of life.

Integral Humanism

The world is trapped in the economic systems of nations and their cleverly made out budgets. Efforts in the field of world cooperation over the last two decades have been assessed largely by figures and statistics and growth in terms of G.N.P. From a human and religious standpoint it is as well that we remember and perhaps remind the world that economy in this limited sense is not life's highest value. And maybe what is being witnessed today in high consumption societies bears this out where the trend is to make it a goal and ambition in life to be in a position to spend without let or hindrance! Before crass hedonism make further inroads, religion should come out forcefully on *the quality of human life* which we should all be endeavouring to promote. So too the motives of self-interest, which to a large extent underlie these business deals, are no substitute for that nobility of which men and nations are capable.

On the other hand, economic development is a necessary condition of much of what we mean by humanisation and one reason why development is called the new name for peace is that growing sufficiency tends to reduce the tensions that breed strife. We live in a world where many men have high hopes for human well-being, justice and peace. These hopes are justified and their fulfilment could and should be speeded up by the force of true religion. Discovering and harnessing *the motivation in all religious traditions* to aid this process might be our specific con-

tribution. This could well be a desirable follow-up. Not only might it make the notion more acceptable in traditional societies, it might also help to emphasize that, to be authentic, development must be integral and promote the good of every man and of the whole man—man on his way to God. This needs to be insisted upon as part of the effort for peace.

And by the same token, there can be not true progress towards the complete development of man without the simultaneous development of all humanity in the spirit of universal solidarity.

Religion's Prophetic Role

In the effort to assist humanity out of its present impasse, religion has a prophetic role to play, which it should not shirk. It must address itself to the grass roots conscience, to *the creation of public opinion, enlightened by morality* to which sooner or later all must render an account. The demand for an accounting will be either violent, i.e., a form of war, or it will be religious, that is to say an effort under God so to work together as to develop what makes for peace, so to discharge our duties as to make safe our rights, so to live our beliefs as to make them not only credible in the abstract but effective on the practical level of everyday life. All this in effect means the non-violent building of a peaceful world order.

As Churchill put it twenty years ago: "The empires of the future will not be of rubber or cotton or oil, those which have caused the wars of the past and the present, but the empires of the mind and the spirit, the empires of those ideas and ideals of which religion in every race and culture and in every period of history has been the teacher, the custodian and defender."

We must feel in our bones that "the arms race is an utterly treacherous trap for humanity" and that we must work might and main for complete disarmament, for the time when all war can be completely outlawed by international consent. Nuclear war has rightly been characterized as the end of reason. It involves the use of force out of all proportion to any possible good which may be brought about. There is no such thing as winning a thermo-nuclear war. As Walter Stein points out: "The possibility of launching a nuclear attack on an enemy implies such a colossal failure to recognise the value of human life as to reduce the whole operation to something sub-human." And yet the gravest threat to mankind is not the existence and manufacture of these diabolic weapons spreading dark clouds of fear over mankind, but the temptation to resignation or apathy toward the possibility of their use. What more hideous inversion of values than this which proposes to wipe out God's proudest creation—MAN—and carefully preserve the passing creations of human technology! How can the spirit of religion be silent in the face of such barbarism!

And so I make a *plea for non-violence* not only as a citizen of the country that gave Gandhi to the world, not only as a follower of the Prince of Peace, but as a man, any man; a voice of the nameless millions of every creed and condition of men who are weary of violence and persuaded that the time for peace is right now and the place to begin right here.

And lest we shirk the real issue, let us recognize that millions around the world are becoming convinced every day that war begins not when it is declared but when its machinery is in the process of being built and that ultimately there may be no such

thing as preventing the war by piling up armaments which will end up by making war inevitable. The risks of disarmament, as Kennedy pointed out, are much less than those of the arms race.

The voice of religion, when it speaks fully and authentically, denies that fear is the best to which man can rise and that it prevents war or produces true peace. Only love can do that and love knows no constraint and never carries a weapon! It may plead; it may reason; it may persuade; it may suffer. But it never threatens. This is indeed a hard saying but it is the very essence of religion and we have no option but to point the way beyond the regimen of fear in which our lot is cast, to that higher ideal of brotherhood and love towards which all mankind, including hard-boiled politicians and military strategists, should also be striving in all their plans and policies. We cannot acquiesce in a situation in which mankind must be condemned for all time not even to look beyond the system of deterrent fear to the possibility of working together in understanding and brotherhood for the creation of a better world. War can have no future if human society is to survive. It is a choice between the one or the other.

Paths to Peace

The chances of nuclear peace and later on a peace on earth progressively worked out through world institutions and international efforts giving priority to "the common good of all peoples" will be neither easy nor a painless operation. But it will be even further away till religion takes a stand on nuclear violence, in all objectivity, care, information and intelligence,

but above all in faith in God and faith in human nature.

And, as for the question: "Will non-violence work as a substitute for war?" the answer in Roszak's words is not an assertion or a statement of probability but a commitment: "We must make it work!" even as, generally speaking, it has been accepted as a substitute in life for other forms of social violence.

However arduous the steps towards total disarmament they must be taken. And to relativise and limit the influence of the great powers and preclude narrow nationalism it might be helpful to suggest the formation of *Regional Councils* for human rights, development and security—e.g. for the countries of Asia. The power of decision would thus be shared and spread to more groups around the world. But religion has more to offer.

The new world of freedom, security and peace for all can be achieved only by those who are moved by great *spiritual ideals*. It is the only way to live a coherent and meaningful life in the midst of today's great upheavals. And true universality of spirit consists not in knowing much but in loving widely.

Divine imperatives must not be confounded with human tactics. The means we use cannot be those of power and overwhelming pressure but; in the words of Pope Paul, the infectious witness of love which reveals to ourselves and to our fellowmen the sin which separates us, and through prayer and penance opens men's hearts to justice, solidarity and brotherhood.

When Gandhi was asked one evening during his period of prayer: "What would be your first act if at this moment you would have power to shape the destinies of mankind?" he replied after a suspense of silence: "I would pray for the courage instantly to renounce that power." This attitude will receive

its best support from religion lived and experienced in the depths of the human heart in openness to God and in growing union with Him.

Much as we are to strive collectively to bring to bear the force of religion on the burning issues of the day, we may not forget that another major contribution to the cause of peace is *at the level of the individual person*. If men everywhere experiencing God in the intimacy of the heart in true *bhakti* were to live in harmony with themselves and those around them, bridges of understanding and brotherhood would be built at the grass roots level. And there lies man's greatest hope for a better world.

This is the interior disposition which ought to be the basis of all transformation of society and every religion would concur in giving priority to this conversion of men to mutual respect and honour as a basis for peace in our own hearts and in society.

As Gandhi wrote forty years ago in *Young India*: "The man of prayer will be at peace with himself and with the whole world; the man who goes about the affairs of the world without a prayerful heart will be miserable and will make the world also miserable."

To go a step further. The interests of world loyalty require that we learn to appreciate other traditions of life. That is one of the strengths of this Conference—that it is a meeting point of diverse religions and cultures. The question is—could it likewise become a point of departure for a new spirit and a new way of life for humanity? Could there be a *follow-up* that would in time get all the great world religious traditions to speak with

one voice for man and the conscience of mankind on the burning issues that face the world in its onward march? Could a summit meeting of the world's topmost religious leaders point one day to the formation of a world body—a sort of parliament of world religions, with the independence and impartiality of a judiciary—unhesitatingly and fearlessly proclaiming and upholding what is in the interests of the common good of all peoples? The answer depends on you and what you make of the Conference.

To conclude: In a world tortured either by its own abundance or by the lack of it, we shall not find in indifference or self-indulgence the moral energy to change ourselves and the social order in which we live. The energy must be sought from above, in what real religion has always proclaimed, the strength of the divine and the search and conquest of inner space in the heart of man and a return to the great realities of prayer, sacrifice and grace.

The agonies of the contemporary world are crying out for such a vision and for that fulness of the energy of the Spirit to fill the hearts of young and old, for the renewal of the face of the earth.

On Making This The Best We Know

*By Dr. Homer A. Jack**

It is my pleasant duty to explain some of the practical philosophy which lies behind the program of this Conference. Thus

* Delivered on October 16, 1970, at a plenary session of the World Conference on Religion and Peace in Kyoto, Japan. Dr. Jack is Secretary-General of the World Conference, and an American clergyman and disarmament expert. Dr. Jack was an observer at the Asian-African Conference in Bandung (1955), and the Confer-

if you know the reason for a particular part of the program, perhaps you can make best use of the opportunity. On the other hand, even at this late date, there is always the possibility of making changes. No program in this age of universal confrontation is sacrosanct—beyond human change—even at a world gathering on religion and peace!

Inter-religious dialogue for peace is a relatively new development. That is why we welcome one informal pre-Conference event: The Consultation on Inter-Religious Dialogue which was held here in Kyoto on October 13th and 14th. Some of the conclusions of this Consultation are being placed before you. There is an art and science of inter-religious dialogue and such dialogue for the purpose of world peace must be increasingly viewed in a professional manner. We have had, of course, some experience, especially through the organic predecessors to this World Conference, such as the National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace held in Washington in 1966, the International Inter-Religious Symposium on Peace in New Delhi in 1968, and the Japanese-American Inter-Religious Consultation on Peace held here in Kyoto also in 1968.

From the experience especially in New Delhi, some of us have concluded that religionists soon reach a point of limited returns by constantly unveiling the “peace passages” in their scriptures. Indeed, we can begin here in Kyoto with the firm assumption that there are worthy passages demanding world peace in the

ences of heads of state of non-aligned nations in Belgrade (1961) and Cairo (1964). Dr. Jack was appointed Secretary-General of the World Conference on Religion and Peace by its Preparatory Committee in February, 1969, and has been working full-time in this capacity since 1970.

scriptures of all world religions. But is it worth the time and money involved to convene a World Conference merely to reiterate this well-understood fact?

Rather than ask the simple question of what—what scriptures?—we should ask the more sophisticated question of why—why have organized religions ignored their own scriptures? Why have organized religions been unable to give effective leadership for world peace and indeed why have they usually been unable to affect the policies of governments and their leaders?

The Program

You are aware of the official purposes of this World Conference. They were stated in the original brochure, as carefully formulated at the Interim Advisory Committee meeting in Istanbul in 1969. For your current reference, they are printed in the booklet of biographies. The Preparatory Committee, and your Secretariat, have taken very seriously these purposes in arranging this six-day program.

Every international conference, especially every religious conference, must have its quota of addresses. We have tried to keep the quota at this particular conference as low as possible. We do want, of course, to hear from a few distinguished speakers. We already know that the quality is uniformly high. But we did not want too many formal addresses. Please forgive us if we have had to be rude and discourage those of you who wrote us in advance asking to make “only a half-hour speech” to the inaugural plenary of this World Conference: The Preparatory Committee has, wisely I think, ruled out a Conference primarily of speeches.

In addition to three addresses tomorrow, each on one workshop theme, toward the end of our Conference we will hear from Archbishop Helder Camara and the Ven. Thich Nhat Hanh. We have especially asked the latter to be a friendly critic; to live among us, to participate, to observe, and then—in the current American idiom—“to tell it like it is.” There may be also a group evaluation of the Conference; we are asking an international group of sociologists who are also participants to make a professional, objective evaluation.

Perhaps now you better understand why your Preparatory Committee has decided to make ours primarily a working conference, a meeting where the participants can talk to—not through—each other.

We have left most time for the three workshops. Each of you will be together for almost ten hours in the workshop of your choice. We have selected three workshop topics, not at random, but with reference to that one international organization which, however weak, however imperfect, still embodies the best hope for peace on earth today: the United Nations. The subjects of disarmament, development, and human rights are repeatedly U.N. agenda areas. We, as religionists often accused of being irrelevant, must be relevant. We have chosen these three highly relevant subject areas. Indeed, as you know, we have in two cases chosen official U.N. documents for our Pre-Conference Study Packet.

We know that you will take these workshops seriously. We have selected able chairmen and rapporteurs and this leadership will be augmented by drafting committees selected when you gather in your workshop. Each workshop will

draft a report, hopefully under 1,500 words. There will be a “first reading” of each report in a plenary session on October 20th. This will be the best time to comment on all three drafts, especially on the two of which you were not a party. Then after the first reading and debate, each drafting committee will weigh the comments and present the final report to another plenary on October 21st for additional comment, debate, and—hopefully—adoption.

In addition to the workshops, we have a programmatic sequence on “The Techniques of Peace Action.” Not only must we religionists become more sophisticated about substantive matters—which we are attempting to do in this Conference through the addresses and workshops—but we must be more familiar with techniques. There is often a collective religious will for education and action, but no obvious way seems apparent. Indeed, religionists in certain parts of the world are more experienced than others in using some of these modern techniques. One of the opportunities of this Conference is for new techniques to be unveiled to more religionists. Thus we especially have created the participant category of Fraternal Delegates. Category A being persons primarily from religious and secular peace organizations and Category B being persons primarily from religious or inter-religious organizations. These dozen delegates will be with us during the entire Conference and we hope that you will seek them out and pick their brains for their obvious expertise.

Tomorrow afternoon there will be a panel of distinguished persons on “The Techniques of Peace Action.” This will, we hope, set the stage for further study of this topic. Then on October

20th we will have five simultaneous workshops on five techniques: education, communications, legislation, direct action, and inter-religious cooperation—for peace. We have chosen participants with experience as chairmen, rapporteurs, cooperation—for peace. This, however, is a subject where there can be few conclusions. Thus there will be no reports for the plenary to adopt. The rapporteurs have been asked to provide the Secretariat with a summary and this will appear in the final proceedings of the Conference.

We are providing, in the program, one opportunity for participants to meet together as religionists and one as nationals from various nation-states. Since this is a conference of religionists, we feel that, at least once, members of each major faith should have an opportunity of meeting together. This will happen this afternoon. This Conference will bring co-religionists together from all continents, many who have never known each other personally. If these groups, or their sub-groups (such as Protestant Christians or Mahayana Buddhists) desire to meet more than the one scheduled time on the program, that is their privilege, provided it is not at a time interfering with other scheduled programs. Please do not schedule any meetings for any purpose directly conflicting with any meeting on the official program. The evenings of October 17th, 19th and 20th are purposely free for suddenly convened, informal meetings.

Likewise, we are providing one opportunity for nationals of each country represented here to meet, irrespective of their religion. Again, this is a conference primarily of religionists and only secondarily of nationals of nation-states. No country

is on your name-badge. We are citizens, here anyway, of the world, the religious world. But there is a point to participants irrespective of religion to meet—for example, as Indians or Germans—to get to know each other and, hopefully, to make plans on how to begin to implement the findings of our Conference back home. In several countries, there already exist the equivalent of national inter-religious committees on peace. Whether their further formation will be specifically recommended by this Conference, we do hope that you will meet once together here—on the evening of October 18th. Further meetings, here in Japan or back in your own country, will be in your hands.

Informal Programs

I have tried to give the highlights of the formal parts of our program. But there are informal aspects which may be as important as the formal.

Some of us have insisted that, at this religious conference, there be prayer services of the major religions represented. We are not trying to find a common religion. This is an objective, discussed in some circles, which should be firmly denied, even rejected. But we want to witness at least once what each of the major religions say to us about world peace in a necessarily abbreviated liturgical, worship dimension. We hope this will be a fitting start to each plenary session and on certain other occasions. Also the Secretariat will be glad to try to arrange special meeting places for members of any faith for your own private worship services.

The tours are also an integral part of our program. There will be the all-Conference, all-day tour of Kyoto and Nara on

October 19th. For most of the overseas participants, this is your first time in Kyoto and in Japan. Our Japanese hosts want you to see something of the culture and religion of this country. The tour has been especially arranged for religionists and you will visit four different centers of high religious interest. (While we strongly recommend that all participants go on the tour, certain members of committees and drafting committees and the Secretariat have duties which unfortunately keep them in this building that day.) Also there are certain post-Conference events and tours. We hope you will take advantage of these opportunities, even at this late date. We cannot departmentalize, or even anticipate, the utility of each aspect of the total Conference experience. The tours may be just as important as the workshops, but we hope you will faithfully participate in both.

This Conference, as all international gatherings, will be remembered, not only by the speeches, the reports, the high mound of papers, the debates, and the final statistics, but essentially by the people gathered here. Personal friendships will be an important, perhaps *the* important, dimension of this event. Make the most of the opportunity. Do not create ghettos, according to religion or nationality. Mix freely—even if there are some language barriers. Fellowship and friendship are dimensions of all religion.

Publications and Press

We hope, as after the Washington, New Delhi, and Kyoto conferences, to publish the proceedings of this event, at least in the two official languages, Japanese and English. We see

World Conference on Religion and Peace

little use for an expensive, long, unedited verbatim record—but we are making tapes in two languages of all sessions, just in case. We will publish the official documents and also include something of the spirit and color of the Conference. No contracts have yet been signed for publication, but any follow-up work will surely include publication.

As you know, publication in any country takes many months, even in this electronic age. Thus we are suggesting a quicker way for you yourselves here to collect the proceedings of this Conference. You can then have them for use immediately upon arrival home. In your Conference Kit is a short memorandum explaining this plan for “instant proceedings.” This is merely suggestive. But the makings of the proceedings are available, again in two languages. If, for some reason, you cannot stay here in Kyoto until the morning of October 22nd—when the last and fullest issue to “The World Conference Daily” will be published—arrangements can be made to receive it by airmail. Publications have been issued before the Conference, and now during it, solely for the purpose of facilitating our proceedings. Additional copies of the Pre-Conference Study Packet are available at cost. We apologize if some participants did not receive this Packet before leaving for Japan. The Conference Kit which you received upon registering here will, we hope, be helpful. It contains the booklet of Biographies which, we know, will be carefully used throughout the Conference—and for many years to come. The Glossary booklet is an important element for the Japanese participants, but also useful to remind the English-speaking participants of the specialized vocabulary necessary for this specialized task. The final Program booklet

speaks for itself.

“The World Conference Daily” will be published six times, the first time today and daily, except on Monday when the program will consist chiefly only of the tour. “The Daily” is for your use. If you have any general announcements, please send them to the Secretariat, if possible by noon before the day of desired publication—since it will also be published in two languages.

There will be Conference literature tables, primarily here in this building. We have encouraged participants and organizations to bring or make available literature, especially printed in the two official languages, on objects related to the purpose of this Conference. We cannot take responsibility for the contents of this literature; we are merely making tables available on the theory that a wide variety of information and attitudes can only help, certainly not hinder, human decisions. Only the most objectionable literature will be questioned, but no literature being made available will be considered official Conference literature unless clearly marked. Likewise, there will be a table where low-cost literature can be purchased.

To help circulate ideas of participants, and frankly to lessen the urge for long speeches, we offered through the Pre-Conference Study Packet to reproduce in one language, but not in translation, essays of participants up to 1,000 words. A few of these essays were contributed and they are being distributed. We thank those participants who used this medium so as not otherwise seriously to impose upon the precious time of participants.

The press corps—both Japanese and overseas—is an important part of any national or international conference. We hope that

all participants will cooperate fully with the press. We have a special program for the press, including daily press conferences. Each participant can also be helpful in spreading news, both to the religious and secular press, about the Conference once you return home.

Conference Business

Now let me indicate at this time whom we represent. The Conference has been called together by a group of individuals—rather audacious, daring individuals. No organization was behind them. No organization is sponsoring this Conference (although, it is true, that the Japan Religions League is our host). No organization can take the blame or, in the end, the credit, if any. We have had much sincere, helpful cooperation from a great many of the official bodies of many of the world religions. We are grateful, but we stand on our own. Thus when you as participants act, you act in your own name, as individuals convened in this World Conference on Religion and Peace—and not in behalf of any institution or organization.

Although we are very much an *ad hoc* body, somebody had to take the initiative. The religionists who met in the New Delhi Symposium and then the Kyoto Consultation possessed both the imagination and determination to begin. Thus an Interim Advisory Committee met in Istanbul in February, 1969. This appointed a larger, more representative Preparatory Committee. The latter met only once, here in Kyoto last December. Its smaller Executive Committee met in Boston in July, 1969, and here in Kyoto yesterday.

The Executive Committee dissolved itself yesterday and it is

the recommendation likewise of the Preparatory Committee that it dissolve as of this afternoon (even though the vast majority of its 32 members are present) and that the Conference itself—you the participants—elect a new Conference Steering Committee. The Conference Nominating Committee, from whom you first heard this morning, will in a few moments make nominations for members of this Conference Steering Committee. This body will “steer” the Conference from here to its adjournment on October 21st. By agreement, the nominations will not mean automatic election, and additional nominations can be made by delegates from the floor.

To keep the Conference structure from being cumbersome, it is proposed that there be only three additional Conference committees. First is a Conference Credentials Committee. The membership of this Committee has been appointed by the outgoing Executive Committee. Its only role is to make two reports on attendance here at the Conference; any political problems involving the seating of delegates not heretofore solved will be in the hands of the Steering Committee.

There will also be a Conference Message Committee. This will work on a Message to be adopted before we adjourn on October 21st. The Committee will be considerably aided by the preliminary work of the Interim Message Committee under the chairmanship of Prof. K. G. Saiyidain.

There will also be a Conference Follow-Up Committee. This will try to discover if or how our experience together this week should be followed up and whether or not a World Council on Religion and Peace—of whatever name—should be organized. Again, an Interim Follow-Up Committee under the chairman-

ship of Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath has done some very important preliminary thinking and their results will be turned over to this new Committee. There has been, however, no firm decision as to whether or not this Conference becomes, in a sense, permanent.

In a few moments you will be creating, democratically, the structure of this Conference. You will have an opportunity to present your individual ideas about the Conference Message to an open hearing of the Message Committee on the evening of October 17th. You will have an equal opportunity to present your ideas about the future of our work to an open hearing of the Follow-Up Committee on the evening of October 19th. You will hear, and act upon, the final reports of both of these committees on the final day of our Conference.

Voting at this Conference will be the prerogative only of delegates. Those of you who are delegates know who you are; indeed, you received a voting card in your envelope at the time of registration. You may use this voting card often or seldom or never. It is the hope that this body can work chiefly by acclamation—unanimity. Yet we should not be afraid of division in love. There may arise genuine differences of opinion: good men and women arrive at different value judgments. The Rules of Procedure, at least as recommended to you by the Preparatory Committee, do provide for the mechanism of voting. Again these Rules are suggestive and you the participants in a few moments can adopt them, reject them, or modify them.

It is also suggested that only delegates, including fraternal delegates, can speak in the plenary, in workshops, and in the panel discussions. Other participants can speak only on the

initiative and invitation of the chairman of each session.

We further tentatively suggest that all meetings, even workshops, be quite open—even to the press. We have nothing to hide. If some group subsequently feels strongly that certain matters are confidential, that certain sessions should be closed, they have the right to put this decision to a vote of the group involved. Otherwise our conclusions will be openly arrived at. It is, however, suggested that the meetings of the four Conference Committees are closed, just to expedite a relatively tight schedule, since many committees will have to meet using the more timeconsuming consecutive interpretation.

Other than these necessary distinctions, we have tried to treat all participants as members of the one World Conference family. Many of us in the past have attended world conferences where each category of participant had a different colored badge and thus there were more colors on lapels than in the rainbow! There are, as it is, too many categories of participants even in this Conference. But at least, as much as possible, we are attempting to treat all participants on the same level—speakers, delegates, fraternal delegates, observers, guests, secretariat, press, spouses, private interpreters/aides, and volunteers. We are all one World Conference family—for six days anyway.

As Secretary-General, I have tried to estimate the costs to the Conference for each hour we are together here in this International Conference Hall. I have reckoned the cost by totaling the Conference budget without including your own travel expenses (except those few of you partially subsidized) and without counting the loss your organization or institution is receiving from your being absent. (We hope there will, in the end, be a

distinct institutional gain, not a loss, to your being here!) In any case, we estimate that it costs the World Conference budget 3.6 million yen or \$10,000 an hour for each hour we are together here in this building. Thus we must use our time wisely. Indeed, this speech of mine is costing approximately \$5,000!

If I sound like a stern task-master, I am not implying that as religionists you should not play hard as well as work hard. I even suggest that you sneak away, at least once, to visit a temple or even Gion which, I understand, some Japanese religionists have visited for centuries! So find spaces between your work; the Conference schedule is tight, but it is up to each individual to find leisure moments, without hurting the Conference as a whole.

I must sound one note of caution. I do this on my own initiative, but perhaps I do speak in the spirit of the Preparatory Committee. This Conference cannot solve all world problems all at once. This Conference is a "first"—a trial, a model. To change the figure, this Conference can be likened to a baby. And the baby could perish—no matter how heralded the birth—if it were given too much responsibility too fast. I say this by way of urging that not every world problem can be discussed here, especially not all regional problems—some caused at least in part in the name of religion—which have produced so much regional tragedy and bloodshed. What I am saying is that I hope that the war in the Middle East or tension between India and Pakistan will not break out in this Conference Hall. No participant will be—can be—muzzled. But any insistence on injecting all regional problems, albeit religious ones, into this first meeting of world religionists might make world headlines,

or receive commendation back in some circles at home, but also might well foreclose any possibilities of our further work together. Ours is a tender child, easily killed by too much love—or controversy—as well as by too little love or controversy. There can be no firm rules, only common sense, only restraint.

I have spent just one year working full-time as your Secretary-General preparing for this World Conference and part-time for several years planning this event and its predecessors. I have easily received more than I have given. For the many short-comings of this Conference, blame me; for your many good experiences and amenities, commend the Rev. Shūten Ōishi and the hard-working Japanese Secretariat. They have been diligent and, toward me a foreigner in their midst, long-suffering. The post of Secretary-General of this Assembly of Religions may have parallels with that of U Thant at the United Nations, but my position is less glamorous I can assure you and much more mixture of a hotel clerk, dean of men (alas, still too few women are among our participants), travel agent, and parsimonious pay-master than that of a religious diplomat.

Some religionists said that it couldn't be done, that such a conference as ours could never be held. They insisted that there are still too many historical, cultural, and doctrinal differences among world religionists which prevent their working for peace as a team. Perhaps the prophets of doom will be found to be correct; yet we have no other alternative but to try—and to try to show them to be false prophets.

I hope that we can be optimists without having too many illusions, certainly no illusion that religionists alone in the mo-

dern world of the secular city—and secular government—can make world peace. The time is probably past when any one sector of any society alone can make peace. But the point is that we religionists must do our own vocational share for peace, carry our institutional weight—as the scientists, the artists, and other professionals are doing in many societies today. Ironically, religionists who should do most for peace often lag behind other vocations, other institutions in society.

In the first half of the last decade, it was my good fortune to work with several world religious leaders in behalf of atomic peace. I spent some time in the African jungle with Albert Schweitzer, before and after he received the Nobel Peace Prize and became a man consumed with an effort to stop nuclear armament. I met much more briefly Martin Buber in Israel and was amazed at his concern for an atomic-free zone in the Middle East in the very last days of his long, productive life. And for more than a decade I knew Martin Luther King, Jr.—not as intimately as several delegates here—but well enough to see his horizons broaden, from the time when we were together in Africa as Ghana became independent in 1957, to his outspoken attacks—as a religionist—on America's Vietnam War. All three of these spiritual giants were busy, but never too busy to lend their names and often their whole energies to often unpopular movements for peace.

In a real sense this Conference is a tribute to the vision and the example of these three religionists, and also to Pope John XXIII, as well as to the four persons cited in the front of the booklet of Biographies who also fell before this Conference could be consummated. In the memory of these eight co-religionists

World Conference on Religion and Peace

of us all we are determined to make this Conference the best we know and, in their spirit, to refuse to allow the complexities of international life to dull our ethical sensitivities.
