

one's own person, the second to respecting the person of the other. Lorenz points out, by the way, that the only animals capable of love are those that are "aggressive." One can, it seems, only love another "as one loves oneself."

This life-serving balance—this equilibrium between self-assertion and respect for others—has evolved among animals on the physiological plane. In human beings it can be gained only on the plane of consciousness. And the plea this essay makes is precisely that we make the disciplined effort to gain it—all those of us who hope really to change men's lives, who, in Fanon's words, "want humanity to advance a step further," want to "set afoot a new man." My plea is that the key to a revolution that would "go forward all the time . . . in the company of Man, in the company of all men," lies in discovering within ourselves this poise. But it calls equally for the strengthening of two impulses—calls both for assertion (for speaking, for acting out "aggressively" the truth, as we see it, of what our rights are) and for restraint toward others (for the acting out of love for them, which is to say of respect for their human rights). May those who say that they believe in nonviolence learn to challenge more boldly those institutions of violence that constrict and cripple our humanity. And may those who have questioned nonviolence come to see that one's rights to life and happiness can only be claimed as inalienable if one grants, in action, that they belong to all men.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Although those in the Movement who issued critical statements against use of the slogan "Black Power" seemed almost always to imply that "power" was an improper word, I couldn't help noticing that just that word had a way of slipping into their own publicity releases—an SCLC release, for example, repudiating the slogan but speaking the next moment of the "political power" they sought through pushing voter registration.
- ² Sometimes, if one disciplines oneself to act upon this assumption, the feeling itself of love for one's enemy enters one, taking one by surprise—a kind of grace. Some readers may ask: why should one want to feel love for one's enemy? But I note that Fanon in *Black Skin, White Masks* writes, "I the man of color, want only this: That it be possible for me to discover and to love man, wherever he may be."
- ³ It is possible, but not always simple. When we stage an act of massive obstruction in a city, for example, there is always the risk that we will prevent some emergency call from being answered—prevent a doctor's car from getting through, perhaps. One has obviously to anticipate such situations and be ready to improvise answers to the human problems raised.
- ⁴ I am uneasy, however, at the way Carl Davidson of SDS words his defense of obstruction. He writes in *New Left Notes* of November 13, 1967: "The institutions our resistance has desanctified and delegitimized, as a result of our action against their oppression of others, have lost all authority and hence all respect. As such they have only raw coercive power. Since they are without legitimacy in our eyes, they are without rights. Insofar as individuals, such as recruiters, continue to remain in association with those institutions, they run the risk of being given the same treatment. . . . We can assert the Nuremberg decisions and other past criteria of war crimes as the criteria by which we, in conscience, decide whether or not an institution and individuals associated with that institution have lost their legitimacy and their rights." Can one give individuals the same treatment that one gives institutions—and deny them all respect? If he means that we need not grant individuals the right to oppress others, I am in agreement. But if he means that when we can identify an individual as an oppressor, then we need not treat him as though he had any human rights—he alarms me. This formulation would seem to me to lead into grim territory.
- ⁵ See *Mau Mau from Within* by Barnett and Njama.
- ⁶ There is a cliché often applied to the enemy: "All he can understand is force." But men "understand" brute force in the most narrow sense only: They understand that they are being hurt, or may be hurt by it—and so that they had better either surrender or manage to hurt the other side even more. Brute force cannot make the other understand that in a new world he could find a new life for himself.