VOLUME III, NO. 39
SEPTEMBER 27, 1950

# TIME-TRACK OF THE FUTURE

IT will be a sad day for the prestige of "philosophy" and "pure" scientific research when hidden powers of the mind, long denied in academic circles, gain public acceptance through being championed by statesmen and military leaders who, unacquainted with the academic rule that the "known laws of nature" do not permit psychic phenomena to occur, find that phases of extrasensory perception can be made to serve the interests of the national State. During the war, the fact that Hitler retained one or two "court astrologers" to guide his determinations of policy was often a subject for jocular comment. It was even funnier to learn that the allied governments opposing Hitler felt that it might be a good idea to have their own astrological consultants—not to predict the future, of course, but to predict what Hitler might *think* was going to be the future. After all, our astrologers could look at the same stars, and perhaps figure out what Hitler's astrologers were telling him.

The employment of psychic specialists by governments, however, may not continue to be a laughing matter. According to a recent report, a mind reader named Fogel has offered a manual on mind reading to the United States Government, suggesting that it might be useful for ranking officers of the armed services to learn to read minds. Contrary to expectation, the Government did not laugh. Instead, the report relates, the Government will give some consideration to Fogel's psychic communications system.

Fogel, it seems, has a reputation for results, and in important circles. He was once called in on a case by Britain's Criminal Investigation Department, and came through with the right answer. He also predicts things like train wrecks and the outcome of prize fights. Fogel says that anyone can develop the powers of telepathy and precognition if he goes about training in the right way—that all men have these powers already, though they often lie dormant, or are unrecognized when functioning. This, by the way, seems to be the universal testimony of investigators who have given extra-sensory perception, in any of its phases, serious attention. Dr. J. B. Rhine, Director of ESP experiments at Duke University, and author of *The Reach of the Mind,* reports that no other conclusion fits the facts:

> Telepathy was the first psychic capacity to be scientifically studied. It was reasoned that if thought can be transferred directly from one mind to another without the use of the senses, man must possess mental powers transcending brain mechanics. Proof of telepathy, then, would be a successful refutation of materialism and its physical theory of the mind.

And now, ESP, unable to win recognition in the more reactionary halls of learning, may make the grade with the Army. Rhine and others tell us that the existence of powers beyond the physical realm re-opens the fundamental question of the "Soul," and of its possible survival after death, but it is the telepathist offering to help us win battles who really gets over. Why is this?

The fact that potential destructiveness, such as that of the atom, nearly always gets our closest attention, is well known and deplorable, but we need to know the reason for this psychic concentration upon avoiding calamities. Are, perhaps, morbidity and fearfulness simply immature phases of the cycle of human evolution in which we presently find ourselves? If this were so, we might be able to change the cycle, by determining to do so. Allowing the possibility, it is reasonable to guess that no way to change the cycle will ever be found except one that grows out of delving ever more deeply into the mystery of man's "latent powers." On this view, incidentally, Dr. Rhine and others like him may be more

valuable to the cause of World Peace than the UN.

The potential of the atom is another matter entirely. While it is true that atomic energy may be used for the bettering of the conditions of mankind—for more heat, more light, more health, and more leisure investigation of the atom will never bring us closer to the secret of how we may change the temper of our age, while investigation of man's internal powers may. All the investigations of latent mental, psychic, or "spiritual" capacities might be considered potentially valuable for this reason, while the meaning of such terms as "soul force," as applied to Gandhi's influence, becomes crucial.

Most well-known historical instances of precognition and accurate prophecy indicate that the emphasis on apprehensions of future destruction has been going on for some time. This, apparently, is psychic power being used in a manner opposite to the Gandhian sense—and unconsciously rather than consciously. Famous men have recounted dreams of imminent destruction (Lincoln's dream of assassination and Mark Twain's dream of the death of his brother are striking examples, furnished by R. L. Megroz's *The Dream World );* spectacular holocausts, such as the explosion of the "Macon," earthquakes and tidal waves in South America, have been reported "seen" beforehand by a number of people. Dunne's one-time best seller, *An Experiment with Time*, lists tragedies in great number, accurately predicted in dreams by various experimenters, but names few cases wherein the event foreseen was a desirable or happy one.

Dire predictions have also been made by people who had no dreams and saw no visions, but who simply felt "rationally" convinced that a certain historical development was inevitable. A virtually unknown instance of this kind of prediction occurs in an old volume published during the Presidency of Franklin Pierce, entitled *The New Rome, or The United States of the World* (Putnam, 1853). Its authors, two unmistakable Teutons named T. Poesche and C. Goepp, writing a century ago, bring us face to face with what we today call the problem of Communism. But were they predicting "future events," or predicting *attitudes and beliefs* that were to prevail in years to come? Is seeing a Russia "ever intent on destruction" a vision of Truth, or a vision of what Americans are *now saying?* In any case, for 1853, the following is a remarkable prevision of something:

> Napoleon's vision failed when he said that in fifty years Europe must be either republican or Cossack: he should have said that it would be first Cossack, and then Yankee. Russia must either deal or brink destruction: she is ever intent upon the former. European aristocracy cannot withstand her, for it is already absorbed, one half in monarchical, the other in democratic interests. European democracy cannot withstand her, for it is disorganized unsteady, theoretical, and unstatesmanlike. It contemplates ideals without bridging the gulf between them and reality.
>
> The reign of Russian absolutism is an inevitable phase of European development.
>
> The lines are drawn. The choirs are marshalled on each wing of the world's stage, Russia leading the one, the United States the other. Yet the world is too small for both, and the contest must end in the downfall of the one and the victory of the other.

Three fundamental questions seem to us to be raised by even the most cursory inspection of the evidence favoring prophecy—and this evidence, it should be added, is both considerable in extent and impressive in quality. First, is it possible that we "predestine" situations of violence and international discord because we think about them in a manner similar to that by which we give ourselves psychosomatic illnesses? Did Goepp and Poesche see what they saw only because the trend of thought, a century ago, was so confined to imperialism and warfare that the present *was* made inevitable? Second, does such a prediction, so far fulfilled, call upon us to accept the inevitability of a war to the finish with Russia? Most people expect this anyway, and we usually get what we expect, *especially when we expect*

*something destrucctive.* Third, if there is a way out of the grip of predestination—itself perhaps but a projection of thought-energies fascinatedly focussed on death and destruction—how do we go about finding it?

The first step, we think, is to convince ourselves that the things which can be *dependably* predicted do not really belong to the future at all. They are simply a part of the present which exists on a slightly different time-scale. As Plato has it, only some of our choices are really free—others are determined by our past actions. Yet for us, as for Plato, there must be a Future to believe in, and, when the time comes, to live in—a future circumscribed by nothing save the dynamics of our present thinking.

Herbert Spencer once described "the whole of life" as the "continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations" and "of external relations to internal relations." When we devote ourselves solely to adjusting ourselves to "external relations," we must run a very predictable course indeed. As Edwin Arnold put it in *The Light of Asia:* "So grow the strifes and lusts which make earth's wars, so wax the angers, envies, passions, hates, so years chase bloodstained years with wild red feet."

If there are "latent powers of extra-sensory perception," as Fogel and Rhine tell us, is it too much to hope that they may, when developed, afford, not vision of "future" events scheduled to happen, but vision of how men may adequately learn from their present Nemesis-Destiny, and subsequently to make a future which is truly New? In any case, having quoted with respect the dire prophecies of Messrs. Poesche and Goepp, we can at least follow our own advice and rummage for a passage of different tone from the same source:

> In the fusion of nationalities, we find the integration of humanity. The time is past for comparing man to the vermin on the leaf, of which each species can only infest its particular plant. History now advances with great strides, to hasten on the day when all the nations of the earth shall be one people, united in a single state. No longer a circumscribed portion of lands, the new *'orbis terrarum'* shall encircle the globe; and as ancient Rome assembled all the gods of her empire in a single Pantheon, so shall the ideas of all nations be marshalled into unity.

Man's hopes, as well as his fears, must be potentially "predetermining" factors. They will have equal power, however, only when we give them equal power.

# *Letter from* **ENGLAND**

LONDON.—Apart altogether from the political, juridical, or military issues which are currently subjects of endless debate on the fighting in Korea, Premier Attlee has broadcast some observations that open out a wider vista of thought than is usually associated with political leaders. Speaking over the radio, he said:

> Our fight is not only against physical but against spiritual forces. In Britain and the Commonwealth and in the democracies there are diverse creeds, but their adherents all believe in the supremacy of a moral law. Let us, then, arm ourselves against evil with an equal enthusiasm to preserve and protect the higher creeds in which we believe.

One is tempted to be ironical in face of this enthusiasm! But we may content ourselves with saying that to speak of spiritual forces, moral law, arms, and creeds, in the same short breath, is indicative of the confusion of thought so prevalent in the modern mind. It is not clear, for instance, how the "spiritual forces" against which we are to fight can possibly be equated with the "evil" in opposition to which we are asked to arm ourselves, unless it be assumed that "spiritual" evil can be overcome by scientific explosives. Philosophically—and without regard to the obvious perplexities of thought—we are here in the realm of that pluralism that befogs our efforts to solve the problem of evil on the basis of the supposition that there are several independent categories which cannot be reduced to any single principle.

What is the "single principle" in this Korean business? Surely, if we are to have any regard at all to the "supremacy of a moral law," it is the welfare of the Korean people themselves, as distinct from the interests or prestige of nations entertaining ideological differences. And yet we find this fact more often forgotten than not in all discussions of policy. As contrast to strategical views of the country, listen to Mr. Scott Morton, Lecturer in Far Eastern Affairs, Glasgow University. Broadcasting a brief description of Korea, he remarked that the people are quiet and naturally peaceful folk:

> Their character seems to fit the name by which their country has always been known in the orient—*Chosen*, Land of Morning Calm. The dignity of the old men is emphasized by voluminous white clothes, tall black openwork hats, and the long-stemmed pipes which they always carry. Peasants for the most part, they grow rice, wheat, beans and cotton, in fields that nestle in the numerous valleys. The old men dream of the glories of the past whose records go back to 1000 B.C., and some of them can remember a time when Korea was still an independent country.

Peace and dream alike are shattered by ruthless aggression and the implements of modern warfare. Only one or two war reporters here have touched on this aspect of affairs. The London *Times* correspondent, for example, cabled on July 23: "It is impossible to confine this war to two professional armies: millions of simple people who ask only to be left alone have become involved. Every mile of road behind the front gives evidence of this human tragedy." All this, in a land which, because of her geographical position, has so often been exposed to pressure and invasion. Dr. Hermann Lautensach, famous German geographer, makes this clear in his recently published monumental work *Korea* (Stuttgart, K. F. Kohler Verlag). Chinese forces under the Sui and T'ang dynasties, half-nomad K'itans and ruthless Mongols, have poured into Korea from the vast lands to the west of the Yalu river. The hand of Japan has weighed even more heavily. In the fourth century A.D., the Japanese Empress Jingo conquered one of the states into which Korea was then divided; the sixteenth century saw the terrible invasion of the great Hideyoshi; while so far in our own century Korea has spent 35 years wholly under Japanese rule.

It is against this general background of history alone that we shall understand the effort made by Premier Nehru to mediate in the dispute. Although he failed, he was really only implementing the views expressed to U. N.

General Assembly two years ago by India's Foreign Secretary, Mr. K. P. S. Menon:

> Deep down in the heart of every Korean, whether in the north or in the south, is this longing for unity. I feel that if only the Koreans are left to themselves—not merely in name but in reality—they will work out their own salvation and establish their own democratic Government.
>
> . . . What has obstructed progress is the 38th parallel. If a Government in South Korea cannot be national in a geographical or political sense, it cannot also be national in a military sense, that is in the sense that it can normally defend itself against aggression without foreign assistance.

That longing for unity still prevails, and will have to be taken into consideration by the United Nations, whatever may be the outcome of the present fighting. In Korean eyes, the real struggle is not to restore the frontier at the 38th parallel, but to achieve unity under one Government or the other. "It is probable," wrote a special correspondent in the London *Times* (July 6, 1950), "that to many Koreans unity under either is preferable to strife between the two." This is the tragedy and the threat of world war implicit in the situation as it exists today. As the *Times* writer points out: "The United States and her allies can hardly be expected to offer the conquest of North Korea as an alternative (to the restoration of the 38th parallel), for such a policy would almost certainly be taken by Moscow as grounds for war."

In brief, the lesson of Korea reinforces the appalling dilemma which has faced the "leading" nations of the world for the last fifty years, and which has its roots in the dreams and realities of conquest that so afflicted the nineteenth century. Perhaps no one has defined the problem so well as M. Francois Mauriac. In a recent *Figaro* article he addressed a warning especially to America, but what he said has a wider application. "A people cannot be both the happiest and the most powerful in the world," he wrote. And, he added, between "strength for the State or happiness for the individual—Soviet Russia, for her part, has made the choice." The world may be entering on an era of horror and distress now unimaginable, or its peoples may yet decide, before it is too late, to follow other values. In coming to a decision, is it too much to hope that even an unprincipled world may take to heart two comments made by that most unmystical of modern philosophers, Mr. Bertrand Russell? In his *Power* (1939) he wrote:

> . . . all war, but especially modern war, promotes dictatorship by causing the timid to seek a leader and by converting the bolder spirits from a society into a pack . . . .
>
> If I had to select four men who have had more power than any others, I should mention Buddha and Christ, Pythagoras and Galileo.

ENGLISH CORRESPONDENT

# *REVIEW*
## ADVENTURE AND SCHOOLTEACHING

THOSE who have agreed with us in the conjecture that the dearth of human-interest stories about schoolteaching leaves a serious gap in American literature will find *The Thread that Runs so True* by Jesse Stuart a warming and welcome publication (Scribner's, 1950). Best known for his popular wartime saga, *Taps for Private Tussie,* Stuart here gives the detailed story of his experiences as a Kentucky Mountain grade schoolteacher, as a high school Principal, and as a county superintendent. Such a description fails, however, to give any real idea of the nature of the book, for Stuart in no way resembles what we have unfortunately come to think of as the "schoolteacher type." Born in an uneducated family, his father a railroad section-hand, Stuart found himself with an amazing opportunity to teach a country school when he was seventeen years of age, just following his own graduation from the twelfth grade. Some of his pupils were older than their teacher—a thing not uncommon in this Kentucky region—and among the oldest a few were still in the first grade.

Most of *The Thread that Runs so True* sounds like a Prank Merriwell novel. Jesse's first success in establishing himself as a teacher resulted from his victorious fight to a finish with his most bellicose, larger and older pupil. Later, while opposing the trustee system of Kentucky—an arrangement responsible for each struggling, underpaid teacher having approximately nine bosses, many of them practically illiterate—Stuart was threatened with physical violence of all sorts, and was blackjacked, and shot at as if he had been a foreign spy, or, at the very least, spearheading a local movement to overthrow government. But Stuart was one of those rare young men in whom an inspiration becomes a consecration. Neither the local terrorists nor a host of environmental "inconveniences" kept him from being a force for the enlightenment of his pupils. He once undertook a 35-mile walk at night in 12-below-zero weather to carry back books for his pupils to read at a time when he felt sure that they were psychologically ready to devour what he planned to bring. He carried a suitcase in his hand as he struggled through the wind and snow, and carried these simple but compelling ideas in his mind:

> The teacher held the destiny of a great country in his hand as no member of any other profession could hold it. All other professions stemmed from the products of his profession.
>
> Within this great profession, I thought, lay the solution of most of the cities', counties', states', and the nation's troubles. It was within the teacher's province to solve most of these things. He could put inspiration in the hearts and brains of his pupils to do greater things upon this earth. The schoolroom was the gateway to all the problems of humanity. It was the gateway to the correcting of evils. It was the gateway to inspire the nation's succeeding generations to greater and more beautiful living with each other; to happiness, to health, to brotherhood, to everything!
>
> I thought these things. . . . And I believed deep in my heart that I was a member of the greatest profession of mankind, even if I couldn't make as much salary shaping the destinies of fourteen future citizens of America as I could if I were a blacksmith with little education at the Auckland Steel Mills.

One of the instructive features of this incredible story is the way in which the typical evils of political control of education are outlined in a recital of innumerable travesties of educational freedom, occurring even in the simplest rural setting. Sometimes we understand the forest better for carefully examining a single small tree, and each of Stuart's schools serves as a valuable easy-to-grasp case study. (Kentucky has for years rated second from the bottom among the states in terms of literacy and adequacy of pay for schoolteachers. The only favorable thing Kentucky schoolteachers are able to say about education in their state is, as Stuart tells us, "Thank God for Arkansas!") But none of Kentucky's educational problems are or were unique. They are but startling enlargements of familiar surroundings.

Stuart's writing may be "naïve," but it has the strength and vigor which refined sophistication often lacks. And if readers criticize this book for what may appear to be ingenuous egotism, let them first ponder carefully on what Stuart accomplished—and see whether he had a right to feel proud of his determination and creativity. He worked with endless enthusiasm, no matter what the obstacles placed in his way, and if we may excuse pride at all, let it be in the case of a man who has done what Stuart did.

Stuart's "obstacles" included the failure of a bank controlling all of his County School System's funds when he was a 20-year-old supervisor; attacks on his founding and editing of a newspaper to challenge the trustee system; lawsuits designed to end his progressive influence and his labors to promote, in the face of disapproval and even hatred, a concept of Basic Education possessing some of the dynamic of Gandhi's work in India. Stuart was hardly the Gandhi type, especially at that time, running to 225 pounds of athletic energy and belligerence, but he caught the spirit of the greatest educators of all time by *fully incarnating himself as a teacher in each situation he faced.*

Because he wanted to increase the amount of applied intelligence in each region, he became an Adult Educationist, both during school hours, by virtue of special invitation to parents to attend school, and, in his spare time, when he demonstrated the value of arithmetic and applied sciences to those who could calculate only by guess or with the fingers of their hands. When he administered the destiny of a comparatively well-to-to school, incidentally, he did not let himself forget the educative values of those other schools where the pupils had to take responsibility for much of the upkeep. The following passage gives some idea of Stuart's work in an unusually well-equipped high school where he once served as principal:

> We put the responsibility of schoolwork upon our Maxwell High School pupils. We gave them the responsibility of providing entertainment at the chapel periods. We let the pupils do most of the work. Our work was to guide and to teach them. We let them do the rest.
>
> For instance, we let our pupils direct one-act plays. They chose their own cast. They selected their own pupil or pupils to direct the plays. If they didn't have a one-act play, we let them dramatize a short story. They arranged their own musical programs, Seniors competing against Juniors, Sophomores against Freshmen.
>
> We let pupils who needed to earn their noon meal help run the high-school cafeteria. One or more pupils did the buying of supplies. One of the commercial pupils kept the financial books. One operated the cash register. Home-economics pupils helped the home-economics teacher prepare the food.
>
> We let the young men in our agriculture classes dig wild trees from the woods and bring them to our school ground and plant them. They, with the aid of their teacher, arranged the trees that are standing there today. They looked after mowing the grass on our spacious acres. They raised a garden and truck patches. Our home-economy pupils canned vegetables that we later used in our cafeteria. These were lessons of practical experience for our pupils. We gave them plenty to do. In every subject we taught, we gave our pupils all the responsibility we could for practical application. Instead of our constantly reminding our pupils to do more work, they were constantly seeking direction from us.

We should not neglect to mention that this book concludes with Stuart's resignation from educational work.

He resigned because he could not, even as educational supervisor of Greenwood County, earn enough money to be married, and at the age of thirty-two he felt that something like a twelve-year engagement was long enough to wait. Stuart's resignation is very interesting, however, in relation to his book. Here is a clue to his indefatigable spirit: he wrote a book to *inspire* schoolteachers when one might expect him to be somewhat embittered against his profession. The same attitude made it possible for him to omit hatred and animosity in all of his disputes and to look *only* toward constructive accomplishment. In this sense he was Gandhian, and in no other

sense, perhaps, is it important for anyone to emulate Gandhi.

In conclusion, we would like to return to the "amazing-story" (or Frank-Merriwell) tone of this book. We think that the exciting content, at times approaching melodrama, is one of the best things about *The Thread that Runs so True:* it suggests a most important truth— that education is, or can be, in all its ramifications, an Adventure. Adventure was what Stuart found in school-teaching; it was what he encouraged his students to find in it, and it is what the reader finds. We learn of rural instructors who are still taking classes in order to receive *their own* high school diplomas when fifty or seventy years old. One woman taught school on a mountain top, and since she weighed 250 pounds and no road was available, her pupils had to push her up the precipitous path to school, and, at the end of the day, lower or guide her safely home. This lady had become a remarkable instructor, incidentally; and her students appreciated her efforts through fifty years to finish high school and college, after beginning to teach at the conclusion of her fifth-grade education.

Such fantastic stories abound in this book, and we are glad that they do. The backward schools of Kentucky help to give us a clear focus for seeing the persistency of inspiration which any teacher must have to succeed. Of course, in Kentucky, only those who had this inspiration survived. We might reflect that it is only those who have such inspiration who should survive in any school system.

So *The Thread that Runs so True* is a great many things at once. It is an indictment of political meddling with the self-determination of educational policies by teachers; it is a reproach to teachers who profess to love their profession, yet who have not expended one thousandth part of the energy put forth by the men and women of this book; it is an inspiration to all those who feel themselves falling into the persuasion that they "cannot teach the way they really wish to." And last but not least, because this whole story is an Adventure, full of narrow escapes and thrills, it suggests in the simplest of language, to any teen-agers who may read it, that within this profession may exist every sort of challenge to man's creative and adventuresome proclivities.

# *COMMENTARY*
## THE ADMIRABLE BISHOP

ONE of the things to be learned from a cycle of witch-hunting is that courage and honesty are at much lower ebb than we thought. It is always dismaying to realize how few there are who will stand upon their principles, regardless of popular disapproval. The only value at all in a witch-hunt seems to lie in the disclosure that those few do exist—people who refuse to submerge their convictions because of the hysterical suspicions of the multitude. Of the witch-hunts all through history, we remember not the witches that were caught, but the persons who spoke for sanity, for justice and impartiality, no matter what it cost them.

In the present, therefore, we take pleasure in noting the recent address of Gerald Kennedy, Methodist Bishop of Portland, Oregon, in which he advised his audience to stop "spending nine tenths of the time adopting resolutions declaring that we aren't Communists," and to turn to a program of constructive action. The occasion for this counsel, it seems, was an article by Stanley High in the *Reader's Digest*, suggesting that the Methodist Federation for Social Action has a somewhat pinkish hue. Bishop Kennedy declared that the Federation must neither "retreat, apologize, nor play safe." He added:

> A vast number of people are of the opinion that the church is successful if it has no criticism; has enough money to pay its bills and a calm, sweet, meaningless message for people who would not be bad anyway, and represents to the established interests of the community something that will never have to be questioned.

For the past sixty years, he pointed out, the epithet "communist" has been directed at everyone intelligent enough to know that there ought to be some changes in our economic system. "Christianity," he said, "will never adjust itself entirely to the status quo."

Not Bishop Kennedy's brand of Christianity, at any rate. We have no special information concerning the Methodist Federation for Social Action, nor are we interested in either confirming or denying what Mr. High may have said about this organization. But what Bishop Kennedy says about popular attitudes toward the churches is so true that he, in disagreeing, constitutes himself one of the most promising heretics of the year. It remains to be seen how well Methodist Christianity will adjust itself to its Oregon Bishop.

# CHILDREN
## . . . and Ourselves

> With reference to the view you attribute to Homer Lane (MANAS, August 2, 1950)—his counselling against warning of the dangers of sex involvement—we wonder how ideal proportion and worthy conduct may be achieved and assured in adolescents who early awaken to the mystery of sex and suddenly find themselves unconsciously caught in its whirl. Often they do not have time to take stock and actually forget the plans, ideals and aspirations that immediately preceded such awakening; they proceed to make permanent decisions for close involvements on the basis of their present romantic interests before their creative energies have had a chance to mature and express themselves. What advice may be given to such young people, who, more often than not, resent any adult interference ?

THE last sentence of the question contains an understandable but possibly significant confusion. A great many parents, we suspect, have not troubled themselves to set up a series of careful distinctions between Expressing Opinions to their children, Giving Advice to their children, and Using Coercive Means to prevent their children from doing something. Actually, we cannot "advise" anyone who will resent our interference, for advice has to be solicited, and if solicited, cannot be regarded as interference.

As we have many times remarked, a parent's capacity to help an adolescent with problems of conflicting or confused emotions is dependent upon creating an atmosphere of ease, and we give the tone of "ease" to our conversations only when we offer our ideas solely on the basis of their own impersonal, inherent worth. When we try to back our ideas by any form of coercion—including that of "moral suasion"—we are no longer discussing, but dictating. While there may be times when we must assume something of a dictatorial role and use coercive power, it is of great importance that we first admit to ourselves, and possibly even tell our child frankly, that this is what we are doing. At least, if we *are* using coercion, we must not call it "advice" or "discussion."

We become increasingly convinced that the greatest danger in the matter of inadequately conceived adolescent love affairs is not the lack of warnings from parents, but the inability of parents to communicate sympathetically with the children on a subject that is apparently much more frightening to adults than to the young, since they may have learned "concern" from experience. We hold, moreover, that the child who has been encouraged to develop respect for a parent's judgment will bring up most emotional situations for a talking over. Children are perfectly well aware that they are confused by many things during adolescence. We doubt the necessity of cataloging the things they must view with "alarm" because they *will* view them with a measure of *concern* in any case, and this is sufficient. But it is only natural, or "human," to hide any feeling of confusion or doubt from a parent if the child feels that the parent is even less likely to find a satisfactory course of action than he will himself. This is often the way an adolescent feels about emotional entanglements, probably because here parents seem so often to be preponderantly negativistic when talking about such matters.

If we swing back and examine the parent's side of the matter, we can at least see why so many "warnings" are sincerely given. Most adults know that if they had postponed becoming deeply entangled in emotional situations for a few years, they would have been able to handle the complexity of such matters much more adequately. What is commonly not recognized, though, is that few are really willing to postpone *anything* they desire to do unless a contrasting positive desire of even greater strength takes root in their mind. "Warning" somebody of the dangers of a certain journey does not necessarily diminish his desire for the journey—and may increase it. Also, though he may be prevented by fear, his mind and feelings are not really changed, the desire will not diminish, but only generate heat for internal combustion.

Our correspondent's phrasing in one portion of the question implies that the greatest need of the adolescent is the Need for Time before emotional involvement. True, a young person needs to find and know himself before he can be safe with his own emotions. But how is the parent to go about influencing an adolescent towards that desirable postponement—as well as with many another problem?

One fairly common procedure, which may be used with a measure of success, is that of challenging the adolescent to try the strength of his or her attachment or love by the test of time. This is rational enough, and some youths will accept such a challenge even though they may desire to marry immediately. (At this point, we are limiting ourselves to discussion of *serious* romantic attachments.) But the effectiveness of such an approach is almost entirely dependent upon the adolescent's communicating certain doubts and puzzlements of his or her own, so that the decision to postpone or avoid too deeply entangling emotional alliances will be, in *part,* the young person's own decision. As we have said, we are unfortunately very seldom privileged to know about such doubts and puzzlements when our child has them. For the child, fearing that there may sometime be a clash between the parent's tendency to be negative on all such subjects and his own desire to act positively, will keep close counsel and say nothing, pretending to a greater surety and confidence than he actually feels. A child gathering his forces for achieving liberation from domineering or benevolent dictating at home *will not wish to admit* being immature enough to feel confused about anything of a personal nature.

To guard against this sort of deception, based on an understandable personal pride, perhaps the very best thing is for parents to admit at the outset their own *partial* confusion on matters involving sex—to state, perhaps, that they would not know exactly what advice to give if they were asked, and that it is their private opinion that no parent can be *completely* sure of anything in regard to what is best for their particular child, though they have been observant of how such things work out, in many cases. Such a statement, to an adolescent, is not only disarming but possesses the additional virtue of being true; in any case, once the child is disarmed, we can help him. He will much more readily ask advice from someone who claims he never wants to take the real responsibility of advising anyone else than from someone who "knows it all." The child instinctively realizes that no adult actually does know it all, that no advice will be perfect, and that it is very difficult to deal with someone who is giving you what they think to be *perfect* advice. But he knows he needs counsel.

# *FRONTIERS*

## Men of Little Faith

EVER since the Supreme Court outlawed "released time" programs for religious education, in its decision in McCollum versus the Board of Education of Champaign, Ill. (October term, 1947), the advocates of "released time" have kept up a running fire of aggrieved criticism of the Court's action. It will be recalled that the Court held, in an eight-to-one decision, that the Champaign released-time program of religious instruction in the public schools was in violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Justice Hugo L. Black, who delivered the opinion of the Court, said that under the Champaign plan the Illinois compulsory education system

> assists and is integrated with the program of religious instruction carried on by separate religious sects.... This is beyond all question a utilization of the tax-established and tax-supported public school system to aid religious groups to spread their faith. And it falls squarely under the ban of the First Amendment (made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth) . . . .

Various arguments have been made to oppose this decision, the most popular one, perhaps, being based on the idea that, now, of all times, in this moral crisis of Western civilization, our children need the guidance of religious truth. To render our schools "Godless," we are told, is to invite a terrible punishment for our unbelief. Much sanctimonious scorn has been directed at Mrs. Vashti McCollum—the Champaign, Ill., mother who instituted the tax-payer's suit eliciting the decision—for daring to challenge the use of the public schools for "religious" purposes.

The most elaborate and sophisticated critique of the McCollum decision that we have seen, however, appeared in the Summer, 1950 issue of *Measure,* a learned quarterly published in Chicago under the guidance of Robert M. Hutchins, who is chairman of the editorial board. In an article, "Church and State in America," Anthony Bouscaren, professor of political science at the University of San Francisco, constructs an argument against the decision which reaches a climax of special pleading in the following statement:

> Contrary to previous cases under the freedom of religion clause, cases which dealt with the rights of individuals and minorities against the state, this was a matter of one child [Mrs. McCollum's son, Terry] and his parent as against all the other children of the community. It was decided in favor of the one child, but one wonders what becomes of the freedom of religion of the other children involved.

Given Mr. Bouscaren's assumptions, it would be difficult to avoid the view he reaches, but it is precisely his assumptions which need to be questioned. There is first the assumption that *religion,* meaning the quest for spiritual truth—which is, incidentally, what the First Amendment intended to protect for all citizens of the United States—is the same thing as denominational Christianity. It is quite possible for a man to be deeply religious yet deeply suspicious of the dogmas of organized religion. Mr. Bouscaren takes no account of this possibility. Second, he assumes that sectarian religious schools "are performing a public service, notably the public service of training young men and women for citizenship." He does not trouble to point out that if it were absolutely certain that religious institutions perform "a public service," there would have been no occasion for adopting the First Amendment to the Constitution. The First Amendment was passed to prevent any sectarian church from securing any sort of political power or preferment, by means of which it might prejudice or abridge the religious freedom of others. The State, in one of its aspects, is a major engine of coercion, and the religious sect that can borrow the power of the State, if not by gaining the position of the "established religion," then by the more roundabout means of "cooperation" between Church and State, is in a strong competitive position with regard to other religious groups. It might even be able to persuade legislators that sectarian instruction in *its* creed is the best possible and even the necessary way to train "young men and women for citizenship."

Maybe sectarian education is good training for citizenship, and maybe it is not. Individually, we may form opinions on this subject; individually, we *ought* to form opinions on this subject; but publicly and politically, *we can make no laws on this subject*, nor rest any laws upon our private decisions about it, one way or the other.

There seems to be a vast confusion abroad concerning the scope and authority of political or governmental institutions. Institutions armed with the power of the State have a proper jurisdiction over the morality of *behavior,* as established by law. Institutions concerned with the shaping of attitudes, convictions or beliefs become tyrannical in the moment that they reach out for the kind of power which the State exercises to maintain order and to regulate overt behavior. But Mr. Bouscaren reminds us of none of these realities, nor does he recall any of the experiences of history which instruct us about them. Instead, he quotes the Founding Fathers to show that they had a genuine concern for *religion.* But the religion of the Founding Fathers was far from being the same as the denominational Christianity that is represented in the various released-time programs affected by the McCollum decision. Further, if it is desired to apply *in principle* the views of the Founding Fathers to the present scene, it will be necessary to consider the fact that very little was known, at the end of the eighteenth century, of religions other than Christianity, so that in those days it was natural for plaudits to the religious spirit to seem restricted to the Christian faith. Today, however, true catholicity in the appreciation of religion would find expression in much broader terms. And if Mr. Bouscaren can call George Washington to witness, as saying,". . . let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion," it is also possible to recall another of Washington's declarations, to the effect that "the Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion."

Mr. Bouscaren refers regretfully to "seven thousand" released-time programs affected by the McCollum decision, "embracing a total of ten million public school children in forty-six states." But he says nothing of the school boards which tried the released-time idea and rejected it as ineffectual or even harmful. And he ignores the plain fact that sectarian operations within the school system quickly generate a sense of "difference" among the pupils—an effect entirely contrary to the traditional spirit of fellowship and equality in American education.

Finally, what sort of "religion" is it that needs the public schools to assist in its propagation? And what sort of "believers" are wanted, if the family life is not sufficient to quicken the proper religious conviction? The advocates of released-time programs are indeed men of little faith—little faith in the persuasive power of their religious teachings, little faith in the capacity of parents to teach their children wisely in respect to religious truth, and little faith in the principle that the best religion is the religion that a man discovers for himself, without indoctrination in his intellectually defenseless early years.