

The United States of America
vs.
Daniel A. Seeger:

**A Lay-person's Reflection on Religion and Public Life Thirty
Years Later**

By Daniel A. Seeger

Offered at the School of Law,
Indiana University at Indianapolis

October 12, 1995

Good morning Friends. It is a great pleasure for me to visit with you here at Indiana University Law School. I am very grateful to Professor Mary Mitchell for inviting me, and for giving me the chance, in preparing for this visit, to reflect about the intersection of our religious life with our civil society. The case of *The United States of America vs. Daniel A. Seeger* in some respects illuminated the issues involved in this intersection, and in some respects, perhaps, it obscured them. Actually, I have spent most of my life's energies on one side of this equation, the religious side, and not in studying or meditating about the law. Therefore, what I hope to do this morning is share some thinking about the role of religion in our lives as citizens in a pluralistic and democratic society, speaking as a non-lawyer, in the hope of stimulating questions which most of you in this room will be far more qualified than I to answer. The time for an open and general discussion following my presentation will be an opportunity for those of you who are gathered here to address some of these very fascinating questions.

I know that members of Professor Mitchell's class have read the *Seeger* case, but there are probably a good number of people here who have not. I will, therefore, take just a few minutes to review the salient points.

It began when I was an undergraduate student with a major in Physics at one of the branches of the City University of New York. My practice of Roman Catholicism, the religion in which I was raised, had lapsed. I nevertheless retained a lively interest in spiritual matters and in questions about the meaning of human life and about the ways of living a moral life. I took as many philosophy courses as the rigors of the Physics curriculum would permit. But the real excitement for me

occurred in a required series of courses entitled "The Basis of Contemporary Civilization." It was a four semester sequence during which we read portions of the works of a wide array of thinkers, from Heraclitus in ancient Greece through Karl Marx. Admittedly, even though the course was two years long, we only read snippets from all these people. Nevertheless, the panorama which was opened up was very exhilarating. I suppose everyone has the experience of attending a course, finding many things in it to be stimulating and useful, and yet, for some unaccountable reason, to have one thing really stand out in one's awareness and stick with one in a special way. For me, after the final exams were taken, and so much was forgotten, I found the thought of Mahatma Gandhi, Leo Tolstoy and Henry David Thoreau sticking with me and inspiring much extracurricular, post-final exam research, reading and study.

The upshot of this was a kind of religious conversion which took place somewhat gradually, yet firmly and ineluctably. Now I admit there was a peculiarity to all this. It was probably not the intent of the designers of this course to foster a religious conversion. This was, after all, a public institution supported by taxpayers' money. The second peculiar thing is that I do not know of very many religious conversions which occurred in such a bookish fashion. Usually the spark of spirituality moves from person to person, with pages of text being a kind of supporting element. Nevertheless, I felt myself to be transformed in a deep way, and to have grasped something profoundly relevant to the human condition in this century of total wars, in response to the pacifist and non-violent thought and practice of these writers, without ever personally knowing any real living and breathing pacifist.

At any rate, at one point, when I got one of my routine notifications from the draft board informing me of my draft status, I realized that although I was entitled to a student deferment, in the long run I was going to be unable to join the armed services. And so, I dutifully sat down and wrote a polite, and perhaps somewhat

sophomoric, letter to the Draft Board informing them of this. My naivete will surprise you. I never used the word conscientious objector because I had never heard of it. This was back in 1957, well before the Vietnam War, when the possibility of opposing the draft became common social currency. In the 1950's, when what we know as the Cold War was relatively new and very intense, most social activism was concerned with the phenomenon of Joe McCarthyism and the impact on civil liberties of a search for subversive people imagined to be in our midst. Opposition to serving in the military was an irrelevant side issue for most people, including my friends and associates on campus.

My draft board responded to my initial letter by sending me a form for conscientious objectors. The fact that the form was printed rather than mimeographed was my first clue that I might belong to a class of people large enough to merit specially designed treatment by the government. But the second surprise was that, under the great seal of a United States Government agency, there appeared as the first question: "Do you believe in a Supreme Being?" After the question there were two small and neat check boxes -- one labelled "yes" and the other labelled "no." Now I had heard a lot about freedom of religion in America, and about the separation of church and state, and was quite startled to find this question presented to me by the government. I also did not relate the question to my conscientious concern. Neither Gandhi nor Thoreau talk a lot about God, and I had not read enough of Tolstoy clearly to apprehend the depth of the Christianity he embraced near the end of his life. In the end, deciding that I had nothing to hide, I answered the question forthrightly, rather than challenging the legitimacy of the government's asking it. So, rather than checking either "yes" or "no," I carefully drew a third neat little checkbox, printed "please see attached pages," and sent along seven single-spaced pages of philosophical reflections with an agnostic cast, although I claimed to be religious and to adhere to a moral code.

In effect, I placed myself outside the provisions of the law, as far as being a

conscientious objector to military service was concerned. For the Congress, in passing the Universal Military Training and Service Act in 1948, the first peace-time draft our country had ever known, clearly stated that in order to be exempt from military service as a conscientious objector one had to profess "belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation."

My local draft board, quite properly I suppose, found me ineligible for exemption from military service. A long appeal process within the Selective Service System followed leading up to the President of the United States, who at that time was President Kennedy. When I was found ineligible at the Presidential level, I was drafted, I refused induction, and by so doing became liable to prosecution, which then led to another long appeal process within the judicial system, ending in the Supreme Court of the United States, which in a surprising unanimous decision, determined the issues in my favor. While there is much that might be of human interest in the long adventure of these appeals, it would be too much of a digression to narrate all that here. I should only mention that having gotten myself into trouble in a rather solitary and single-handed fashion, I got out of trouble with a lot of help from many, many good people, including deeply religious and church-going people who saw an important issue of principle at stake, and who organized a defense committee. These people included the attorney who argued the case through the courts, Mr. Kenneth Greenawalt.

Essentially, the argument made in my case was that the government, in granting exemptions from military service, could not prefer people holding some religious beliefs over people holding different religious beliefs, and could not prefer people with religious beliefs as a class over people without religious beliefs, for this would be a violation of the freedom of religion provision of the First Amendment. In a somewhat unexpected development, at the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Irving R. Kaufman, speaking for a unanimous three-judge panel, concluded that the Supreme Being clause of the Selective Service Act was clearly unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court, however, in issuing its unanimous decision, supported, as I recall, by five separate concurring opinions by different justices, did not declare the phraseology of the Selective Service Act unconstitutional, but said rather that for many people questions of conscience occupy the same place in their lives that belief in a deity occupies for more orthodox believers, and so a person such as myself qualifies for exemption under the terms of the law. While this was a less stirring opinion than Judge Kaufman's, it did cause the removal from Form 150 of the Supreme Being question. The opinion was rendered in March of 1965, a little over thirty years ago. You will remember that that was just as America was becoming enmeshed in the Vietnam War, and many, many people with unorthodox religious views who might not have qualified for exemption under the conditions prevailing before the Seeger case were able to be recognized as conscientious objectors.

But I should also mention that because I was what is termed an absolute pacifist -- that is, I was opposed to all war in any form -- the case did not particularly help the many people who did believe in the need for a military defence in general but who found the Vietnam War in particular abhorrent or illegal or both. In other words, the case did not allow citizens the right to pick and choose the wars they would participate in, and, as we know, many people of draft age left the United States during the Vietnam War period on this account.

Well, this is a very brief summary of a process that took eight years to unfold. There is a lot more that might be said, but this did take place over thirty years ago, and I did want to take some time to reflect, even if only to ask questions, about today's issues of religion and civic life. If anyone here is interested in more details about what transpired thirty years ago, perhaps we can get to that in the open discussion later. But in saying that the case is thirty years old I do not mean to imply that the issues involved are no longer relevant. For the case addresses the most fascinating and compelling aspects of our adventure together on this earth as human beings -- our search for and response to spiritual truth, our identification of

life's meaning, the beliefs and spiritual experiences which define our nature as persons, and our endeavor to construct a free an open society where people arriving at different answers to these fundamental questions can nevertheless live together, live not only with cold tolerance, but in an atmosphere of active sympathy and rapport, so that our common life is something more than a mere truce of warring ideologies.

Throughout the thirty years which have elapsed the case keeps cropping up. Of course, during the Vietnam War, it was cited in many other cases bearing on the issues of conscientious objection to military service. But even after the War was over, it kept cropping up, sometimes in surprising ways. I remember once reading in the *New York Times* about a group of parents in Tennessee who were using the Supreme Court's broad definition of religious belief given in the Seeger case to argue that their local public schools were, in effect, teaching a secular religion, violating their parental rights as Christians, a use of the case I would not have anticipated. And just a month ago it came to my attention that Professor Howard Lesnick of Pennsylvania State University published a significant reflection on the case in the *Penn Law Journal*.

I have not made a career of following the literature about the case in general. Partly this is because I am not a lawyer, and much of the discussion is over my head. Partly it is because, by the time the case was finished, I needed to turn to something else simply to avoid the pitfalls of a one-track mind. But partly it was, I think, a sense that it would be wrong to be trapped in, or over-identified with, a spiritual perspective that I expressed at age twenty, or earlier. After all, the idea that the spiritual life resembles a pilgrimage, or journey, is a very widely understood one. The Exodus story in the Hebrew scriptures is a kind of primal narrative symbolizing, I believe, a forty year journey through a wilderness to the promised land, to the place of God's presence. Saint Augustine speaks of his life as a long and slow journey from darkness to light. The Buddha also undertook a strenuous spiritual search, a search

which was an itinerant search through a wilderness. His original bondage was not to Egyptians and to the hard labor they imposed, but he was walled in a pleasure palace erected by his royal parents. But the point of all these stories, it seems to me, is that it would be wrong to get stuck in one's journey at one place, particularly a place defined when one is twenty years old. So I have found it a somewhat odd thing to have something I have written in the spiritual field so long ago keep cropping up as if cast in stone -- in a law journal last month, or a book last year.

It is not that I wince in pain and want to repudiate what I wrote. While there is nothing wrong with repudiating something one writes at an earlier stage of life -- Tolstoy, after all, repudiated *all* his novels, and Thomas Merton is said to have come to regret his own best seller, *The Seven Storey Mountain* -- my reaction to seeing this earlier effort of mine to articulate the spiritual truth I saw is that it is quite defensible, but somewhat flat and incomplete. And while I think I have a deeper appreciation now for the difficulty the Congress faced in trying to formulate in a fair way a definition of who it is that should be exempt from so grave, and often so costly, a duty of citizenship as service in the armed forces, I remain even more deeply troubled than I was thirty-eight years ago by the preference the Selective Service Act's formulation gives to a certain sort of religious belief -- one that regards humankind's spiritual destiny to consist of a response to the dictates of an external commander-deity who compels us to bow before him. (I use the masculine pronoun deliberately, because such an external commander-God seems always to be male). How many people's actual religious experience is like that? And here is where one of my first questions arises about the intersection of religion and the law. Let me see if I can explain.

All of us carry within us a great question. In fact, our very life itself is a quest, a search. We are all seekers. At some times we are more aware of this than at other times. Sometimes the question within us is sharply etched, sometimes it is vague, subconscious or unformulated. But when Jesus said that we cannot live by

bread alone, he was speaking of this great question within us, and of our need for a corresponding great answer.

This great answer which we seek is indeed given to us. We not only seek, we also find. Sometimes what we are meant to find is given to a person in a blinding flash, suddenly, in an instant. To other people it comes slowly and gradually over time. But, however it arrives, there comes upon us an experience of knowledge, of insight, of wisdom, and a leading to transform the way we live out our life in the world. Thus, the answer we seek comes both as new knowledge, as new awareness, but also as a transformed way of being, of acting.

It is important to understand that what we seek and what it is given to us to find makes us new persons. In religious life we try to describe this transforming experience in different ways: we are born again, we repent, we are justified or sanctified, we become enlightened or achieve nirvana. In the original Greek version of the New Testament the word that frequently appears in this connection is *metanoia*. The prefix "meta" means beyond, and appears in such English words as metaphysics or metamorphosis. The root "noia" or nuos refers to the self. In metanoia we are taken beyond our old self, we are transformed. At its root, then, this seeking after the bread of life has something to do with our identity, with our nature, with who we are. It has to do with the worshipping principle within us. For what it is we worship comes to determine who we are. I believe that everyone worships something. Even professed atheists worship something in the sense that, if we examine their inner lives carefully, we will find that there is at the center of every life some animating value or principle which gives form and shape to that life, which colors the experience it has of existence, and which forms its nature. We encounter many of these gods in modern times -- they are idols, really -- money, power, prestige, some aspect of the passions or emotions, some popular hero or celebrity, some political ideology. Whatever god it is one worships gives form and shape to one's life, for better or worse. For those of us who place Jesus and what he

stood for at the center of our beings and who seek to exist in accordance with the way the truth and the life which he embodied acknowledge his divinity for us. This is what determines our own nature as individuals and as a community of faith.

I would like to reflect a bit about the Gospels to make a general point about religious experience in general. I could make this same point using the prophets of Isreal, the Upanishads, or the Tao Te Ching, but I will use the Gospels because they are the scriptural texts most commonly known in our own culture.

The Gospels reveal something important about the life and ministry of Jesus. We are told he was a being who was both fully God and fully human, a victor who rode on a donkey at his hour of triumph, a king whose kingdom is yet to come but which is also here within us and among us, a teacher who told us to love our enemies, who told us that we gain our life by losing it. In short, in Jesus we are faced with a series of paradoxes and contradictions.

Indeed, we can observe that all sanctity is born of conflict -- of contradictions resolved, finally into union. For the landscape of humankind's spiritual world, the world in which we realize our most noble accomplishments and in which we suffer our most crushing defeats, is a landscape of intellectually unresolvable dichotomies. Freedom versus order; tradition versus innovation; the simultaneous fallenness and exaltedness of human nature; justice versus mercy. (Saint Thomas Aquinas observed that justice without mercy is cruelty, while mercy without justice is the mother of dissolution). We are told to be wise as serpents and innocent as doves, simultaneously. In his many wonderful paintings entitled *The Peaceable Kingdom* the Quaker artist Edward Hicks charmingly symbolized for us an ideal of sanctity which involves the reconciliation of such opposites. The logical mind is offended by these dichotomies and seeks to come down on one side or the other of them; the same dichotomies provoke and stimulate the higher human faculties, the faculties without which human beings are nothing but very clever animals. People of great sanctity

somehow transcend these dichotomies without abandoning the truth on each side of them.

Humankind's particular vocation, then, is a precarious balancing act. It is a vocation that can be carried out successfully only with wisdom and love. It is a vocation which cannot be guided by simple, dogmatic assertions, which by their nature tend simply to prefer one side or the other of these dichotomies. Legalism, lawyerliness and literalism are the enemies of all true spirituality. Poetry and parable are its friends. When spiritual discourse is reduced to lawyer-like debates, everyone loses.

It is interesting that Jesus never claimed to be a philosopher or an analyst. Indeed, very few of his sermons, at least as they are passed down to us in the gospels, could even be said to follow an outline. It is hard to imagine these sermons being spoken without long intervals of silence interspersed, the silence of wisdom listening. Often Jesus spoke in somewhat obscure anecdotes and parables. On several occasions he simply said, "I am the Truth." One of these occasions occurred during an interview with Pontius Pilate. Pilate's response to this strange assertion was to ask the question, "And what is Truth?" In asking the question this way, Pilate was perhaps revealing his background in Hellenistic culture with its penchant for philosophizing. And as if to indicate that there was little possibility for rapprochement between one who claimed to "be" the Truth, and another ready to dispute about it, Pilate, without waiting for any response from Jesus, turned away and, ultimately, washed his hands of the entire matter which ensued.

Thus, even though Jesus brought many people into a new connection with the divine origin of all things, many others were unable to hear or to respond to his message. Moreover, the Gospel testimony makes it quite clear that even his most convinced and loyal followers had difficulty actually understanding him. We are told that Jesus himself was impatient with them and frequently driven to despair owing

to their failure to grasp his message. Despite his instructions, his close followers could not always remember this teachings accurately or coherently. This is perhaps partly due to the fact that they were simple, unschooled people. But even more important, the teaching Jesus had to give was itself intrinsically difficult both to understand and to convey. We must dismiss any idea that Jesus was a simple figure. His actions and motives were complex, and he taught something which was elusive and hard to grasp. Jesus had new insights to deliver, or at least, startlingly refreshing interpretations of old insights. But he apparently sought to present this as a fulfillment of the old order. He sought to include outcast elements in his mission, but seemed also eager to carry the orthodox along with him.

Given all these difficulties, what we have in the gospels regarding the teachings of Jesus is more a series of glimpses than a clear code of doctrine. There is certainly no simple set of handy rules that can be unreflectively applied in daily life. Jesus started a spiritual movement based on dialogue, exploration and experiment, a movement which invites comment, interpretation, and elaboration in a spiritual quest. The radical elements in his teachings are balanced by conservative qualifications. There seems to be a constant mixture of legalism and antinomianism; there is an emphasis which repeatedly switches from rigor and militancy to acquiescence and the acceptance of suffering. Some of this variety reflects, perhaps, the genuine bewilderment of the disciples and the confusion of the evangelical editors to whom their memories descended, but some of it undoubtedly truly reflects Jesus' awareness of the insoluble dichotomies of which we spoke earlier.

According to the Gospel stories, Jesus never once described a saved person as one who believed in certain defined doctrines. In fact, in the ninth chapter of the Gospel of John, Jesus, when speaking to the Pharisees, seems to imply that those who claim Truth as a possession are apt to become like blind people. At another time he is reported to have said that his followers would be known by one thing only, by the way they loved one another. He also said that he himself had come so that "all

may be one." Thus, the godliness which Jesus embodied was concerned not so much with right belief or right doctrine, but with right practice or right living. It was a godliness which was humane and compassionate. Indeed, in an odd and mysterious paradox, the godliness of Jesus was realized by his living in a fully human way, by his being the ultimate human, the perfect human being. To reduce the way of life Jesus taught us to a list of rigid rules and regulations is to turn the wisdom tradition he left us into an ideology.

It seems to me that the language of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, well intentioned though it may have been, comes down squarely on the side of religion as an ideology rather than religion as a wisdom tradition. And indeed, I wonder if it is possible for law to deal with the kind of religion of which I am speaking, the kind of religion which understands that the great Creative Principle which is around us and within us and seeking to make Itself known to us is nevertheless beyond the power of our words to define, beyond the capacity of our mental concepts to apprehend. True religion understands that, while it is good that we seek to use the powers of thought and speech to communicate our spiritual experiences, we need constantly to be alert to the dangers of being misled by conventional notions and mental cliches, constantly aware of the risks of seeking to domesticate the ineffable with the limitations of our words and concepts, constantly aware that with a lack of respect for mystery we deprave ourselves. Indeed, would not many sincerely religious people recoil from a checkbox "yes," checkbox "no" presentation of a question about a Supreme Being?

In saying that legalism, lawyerliness and and literalism are the enemies of true spirituality, as I did a few minutes ago, I am not joining the ranks of those who love to debunk the profession of law. I have every reason to be grateful to the profession itself and to the legal system of the United States. But I see law, perhaps incorrectly, as a meticulous effort to be careful and logical, to be precise, and this serves very well in many spheres, but when it comes to the grand and ultimate

questions we seem to find it increasingly difficult to cope within the bounds of lawyerly disciplines. I am only a layperson and not a lawyer, but as a layperson most of whose day-to-day information is gotten via the *New York Times*, I find myself with the impression that the body of law dealing with church/state issues is in considerable disarray.

I would like to outline for you, even if only sketchily, a second dilemma which I see us facing in our national life having to do with the intersection of religion and public life. The dilemma I have in mind is the breakdown of discourse about social and political ethics in our society. It seems to me that the most striking feature of contemporary public utterance about moral and spiritual questions impacting upon our common life is that so much time and energy is used up expressing disagreement. The most striking feature of the debates in which these disagreements are expressed is their seemingly interminable character.¹ Our democratic society is built upon the expectation that reasonable and fair-minded people, after a period of respectful discussion, will come to a meeting of minds, and having achieved such a meeting of minds, will work together so as to upbuild the social order in a way that gives expression to the democratically arrived at agreement.

Yet in our experience, whether we are talking about the Vietnam War, abortion, euthanasia, a system of health care, the relationship between men and women, homosexuality, capital punishment, immigration policy, or prayer in public schools, we see, in contrast to this optimistic expectation upon which our democratic society is built, a pattern of vituperation and contention which seems to have no end in sight. Moreover, many of these issues are such that we can scarcely expect a simple majority vote or a decision of the United States Supreme Court to put the matter to rest.

¹Paraphrased from page 6 of *After Virtue* by Alasdair MacIntyre (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981). For a fuller discussion of this modern dilemma see Chapters Two and Three in this same book.

The problem, it seems to me, is that moral and spiritual claims, unlike factual claims, cannot be proven by testable hypotheses. Our rationalistic culture leads us to expect that truth is the product of logical reasoning. When we are dealing with intermediate truths or detailed truths, which rest on more fundamental premises, logical reasoning can indeed be of service, even in the moral and spiritual fields. But the model breaks down when we try to establish the fundamental premises themselves. Logic and rationalism is a way of getting to conclusions from premises; by its very nature logical argument cannot justify the premises upon which it rests. There is no way to justify through logic the ultimate starting point for moral and spiritual reasoning. The rational and enlightened founders of our Republic recognized this when they declared: "We hold these truths to be self-evident . . ." and then proceeded simply to announce the starting point of their thinking.

The reason why we are surrounded by an ethical chaos which has come to be called a "culture war" is that there are so many people who begin their moral reasoning from rival but incommensurable first premises, and we possess no rational way of weighing the claims of one against another.

Consider abortion. Everyone agrees that the government should not intrude into the intimate and personal aspects of our human existence; everyone agrees that life is sacred and that murder is wrong; everyone agrees that each individual deserves the protection of the community. Indeed these are hallmarks of our civilization. But everyone cannot agree when a human life begins, they cannot agree whether a human fetus is to be included within these definitions and protections or not. Is there any amount rational democratic discourse which is going to generate agreement about whether or not a human life begins at conception, or whether a fetus remains not a person in the full sense until some later time when it finally becomes a pre-born infant?

So the second dilemma upon which I want to focus is the one which arises from

the failure of reason to solve spiritual and moral questions, and the need to sort out incommensurable first principles. Where does the truth come from? How do we as a society determine the correct unpremiered first premises? Is it possible for a social order to survive if there are no commonly agreed to and accepted first premises?

My own response to these dilemmas takes its point of departure from one aspect of the *Seeger* case. I mentioned that at the Supreme Court level there were several concurring opinions. One of these was written by Justice William O. Douglas. Some of you are probably much more aware than I am of the significance of Justice Douglas's work. As a lay person I recall him as a somewhat eccentric Justice who married often and who had an interest in such things as ecology and Asian spirituality long before these came into fashion in society at large. I recall that in his concurring opinion Justice Douglas likened my views to the tenets of Buddhism. I have already told you I was naive. The concept of Buddhism was about as foreign to me as was that of conscientious objection. Obviously this is something I ought to look into, I thought. Justice Douglas' comment started out what has proven to be for me a life-long interest in Asian spiritual cultures. I cannot claim to be an expert in any of this.

But out of this study I have come to believe that unity among us mortals is indeed possible, if difficult and still remote. It is not that I have come to any conclusion that all religion is fundamentally alike; this would be far from correct. But let us imagine, just for a minute, that personages such as Francis of Assisi, Mahatma Gandhi, and Lucretia Mott could meet each other. Would they not recognize a deep kinship? Certainly, they would be clearminded about their diverse devotional practices and doctrinal concepts. Yet we would hardly expect a spirit of alienation, of disownment, to arise among them.

So the unity that seems possible is not one based on philosophy, or doctrine, or manner of worship; rather the essential point of convergence is in the quality of

the human person, the quality of spirit, which the sincere and selfless devotion to any well tested spiritual path can produce. For although we can not adequately articulate spiritual truth, we can embody it. Those who, in increasing numbers, know this, never engage in debates about religious doctrines. They know that Truth is to be lived, not merely to be pronounced by the mouth, and they know that by their living it, that which is unutterable will be rendered visible.

We are told that in the beginning there was but one Word, a Word which is the Mother of all things, a Word of grace and Truth. The Word abides within each and every one of us and within every human being ever called to life. People everywhere are engaged in a common journey, a pilgrimage, a search to discover within themselves the Word and its revelation of the universal and eternal things upon which all right living and true peace is based. There are many paths possible on this journey of search, and one of them always opens up to those who selflessly seek after it. For it is one of the characteristics of spiritual truth that those who thirst after it eventually come to partake of it and to express it, as if the price at which truth is bought is the sincere and pure longing for It itself. This is why we have been promised that those who seek will surely find. I am an optimist. I have confidence that, having found in our American way of life and government something that is very good, there is something more of inexhaustible measure which we, as Americans and as citizens of a new world-wide human community, have yet to achieve. I know that we will, in time, succeed in acheiving it!

Daniel A. Seeger
Indianapolis, Indiana
October 12, 1995

d:\wpdata\dan\sp\indlawsc.sp