VOLUME II, NO. 11
MARCH 16, 1949

THE CURRENT OF HISTORY

FOR almost a generation, a handful of travelers and journalists have been trying to persuade the West that a new Asia is in process of birth. The serious reading public in the United States has a literary acquaintance with the fact, and the financial interests and political officials of certain European countries—France, England, and Holland, in particular—have been made to realize that the epoch of colonial empire has reached its gloaming. But the average European or American, without personal experience in the East, knows little more than the blurred impressions resulting from a combination of Kipling and Dr. Fu Manchu with contemporary headlines and newsreel sequences.

A number of inherited mental and emotional attitudes conspire against Western understanding of the Orient. Besides a romantic literature which accepts the premises of imperialism, the West is saturated with a semiconscious cultural arrogance which has its roots in sectarian dogma. For more than a thousand years of Occidental history, the pagan, heathen, or "heretic" has been fair game for the believers in Western religion. To defeat the armies, unseat the kings and occupy the lands of unbelievers were acts of both piety and valor in the tradition of the West, and even if the sanction of religion is no longer invoked to justify imperialism, the prevailing moral indifference toward the mistreatment of non-Christian peoples reflects the old religious prejudice brought forward in secular form.

Differences in color and custom add their weight to the basic religious egotism. Americans are peculiarly susceptible to the delusion that whiteness of skin is a mark of racial superiority, because of the background of slavery in the history of the United States. For some forty years before the Civil War, southern apologists for "the institution" spent their lives in working out justifications of slavery on Biblical and "scientific" grounds, their pamphleteering activities growing in exact proportion to the moralistic zeal of northern abolitionists. Even though the South lost the war between the states, the ideological war for white supremacy continues to be a factor of major political significance in the domestic affairs of the United States. A military victory is not the same as moral persuasion, although Western peoples habitually ignore the distinction between the two. Why should believers in a God who would destroy the first-born of every family of an "enemy" nation care about such subtleties? The atom bomb was much less selective.

One could say that, in Christian terms, the struggle of the West to find itself should be regarded as a continuing conflict between the moral psychology and ethics of the Old and New Testaments, with the Old Testament represented in the policies of the dominant Western Powers, and the New Testament spirit embodied in the lives of such men as Damien, Tolstoy, and, among the living, Albert Schweitzer. Notably, all three of these men—Damien, a Catholic priest; Tolstoy, a nobleman and intellectual; and Schweitzer, a scholar, physician and Protestant thinker—withdrew from the conventional patterns of modern life, in overt or implicit protest against the prevailing injustices of Western civilization. Damien and Schweitzer went among the much-wronged "primitive" peoples of the world, and Tolstoy, although he remained in Russia, devoted his energies to revolutionary criticism. They were concerned with the vast neglected portion of mankind—the millions who live out their lives in relative poverty and want, while the well-fed minority among Western peoples remain unaware, in any realizing sense, of their existence.

Today, as the world grows rapidly into a mechanical unity of transportation and

communications, the abysses of psychological, cultural and religious differences have yet to be bridged. The average westerner's contact with the peoples of other civilizations is almost always in some form of repercussion from acts of self-interest. This has been true for centuries. Hardly ever has there been a genuinely human reason for learning to understand other peoples. Consider the successive stereotypes of popular opinion held, for example, by Americans concerning the races with which they have had relations. All are results of the circumstances of war, imperialism or dollar diplomacy. First there were the American Indians, against whom the colonists and later the United States waged a war of virtual extermination. (Readers who regard this as an extreme judgment should turn to Helen Hunt Jackson's *A Century of Dishonor*, Dr. S. F. Cook's *The Conflict Between the California Indian and White Civilization*, and John Collier's *The Indians of the Americas*.) While American shipping had long been carrying Chinese merchandise to American ports, the first treaty between China and the United States was drawn up after the Opium War, which broke out in 1839 when Britain attacked China because of official Chinese interference with the British opium traffic. In this treaty, Americans gained extraterritorial privileges similar to those granted to the British. While the United States did not participate in this shameful and brazen war of imperialism, Americans profited by the British victory and soon became the principal smugglers of opium into China, in violation of specific treaty obligations. The official American view of the Chinese is reflected in the correspondence of the United States Commissioner in China, Caleb Cushing, who wrote home to President Tyler that the "heathen" Chinese Government was outside the "law of nations" and therefore undeserving of faithful observance of treaties. A few years later came the war with Mexico, the annexation of California and its admission as a state in 1850. Then, at the turn of the century, the war with Spain led to the annexation of the Philippines—to "Christianize" the heathen Filipinos, as President McKinley explained, after an anguished night of prayer. Hawaii, too, finally became an imperial possession of the United States during this interval of expansion.

The wars of the present century are familiar enough to need no particular description, although it may be recalled that during World War II, when the foreign policy of the United States needed all the support it could get in the East, the application of the Oriental Exclusion Act to the Chinese was revoked, and that on this occasion an indignant Senator protested against allowing a heathen people equal rights of citizenship along with other people in the Christian United States. The psychology of the "chosen people" dies hard.

Wars and trade have been the principal instruments of the instruction of Western peoples concerning the inhabitants of other lands. The humanitarian conceptions of political democracy were able to give life to political institutions providing for freedom and a measure of equality at home, but the extension of these ideas to foreign "heathens" was too much to expect. After all, a robust self-interest supported the institutions of democracy in the United States, but in foreign relations there was no great tradition of internationalism to nourish and spread the altruism expressed by the few who could recognize the Dignity of Man anywhere on earth, regardless of color or creed. The peoples of other countries, most of all the peoples of Asia, are unknown to the people of the United States, and what is unknown is always disregarded, except for the expedients of national policy.

This is one reason why popular knowledge of the depth and dimensions of the culture of other countries is today almost a political necessity. "Isolationism" is much more destructive as a provincial attitude of mind than it is as a national policy. In fact, political isolationism is almost practical wisdom in comparison to the merely political interventionism which is animated by

slogans and operates mechanically, unguided by genuine social insight.

As the processes of government become increasingly remote from the individual citizen, the "isolationist" state of mind tends to become characteristic of the domestic scene as well. Actual participation in government becomes the function of organized pressure groups representing special interests, and the acts of legislatures, instead of being understood by the electorate, must be "interpreted" by commentators and columnists. The bigness of industry and the complexity of economic organization, with increasing centralization of political power as an accompaniment and a result, contribute to the practical disfranchisement of the individual, who gradually loses his sense of "belonging" to the political life of the nation. This means, in the course of time, the replacement of the working ideas of self-government by the emotional substitutes of propaganda. The men charged with the responsibility of maintaining a coherent social organization for the nation feel the necessity of shaping public opinion by means of symbolism. If a law is regarded as desirable, it is described in terms of the symbolic values to which the people are expected to respond, instead of in terms of the actual mechanisms the law proposes. Politicians speak only of ends, leaving the means vague and undefined. The opposition adopts the same technique, so that eventually what was once the democratic process becomes nothing more than a display, before the public, of a succession of facades constructed by new Machiavellian techniques, without any relation to a comprehensible program of action. This situation was analyzed some years ago by Harold D. Lasswell in the American Journal of Sociology (January, 1941). He is discussing the diversity of special environments created in an industrial society by modern technology, and the resulting segregation of individuals into numerous isolated interest-groups. He writes:

> Thousands of technical operations have sprung into existence where a few hundred were found before. To complicate the material environment in this way is to multiply the foci of attention of those who live in our society. Diversified foci of attention breed differences in outlook, preference and loyalty. The labyrinth of specialized "material" environments generates profound ideological divergencies that cannot be abolished, though they can be mitigated, by the methods now available to the leaders in our society. As long as modern technology prevails, society is honeycombed with cells of separate experience, of individuality, of partial freedom. Concerted action under such conditions depends upon skilfully guiding the minds of men; hence the enormous importance of symbolic manipulation in modern society.

What Dr. Lasswell does not say, although it is certainly implied, is that a society which obtains its social unity or "morale" from "symbolic manipulation" is a totalitarian society which can hardly be governed except by a single-party rule. These are tendencies, of course, and not finalities, which we are considering, but the isolationist character of our present society is easily illustrated. In California, for example, during the great depression, the agricultural valleys were the scenes of extreme human suffering and degradation for hundreds of thousands of people. These people, the agricultural workers and their families, were subjected to treatment that finds its closest parallel in the lives of the serfs during the Middle Ages, except that the serfs, at least, belonged to the land, while the migrant workers belonged to nothing and nobody. Californians should read over again Carey McWilliams' book, *Factories in the Field*, about once every five years, in order to realize what may go on within a hundred miles or so of where they live, entirely without their knowledge. They might, having done this, be better able to understand the similar provincialism of the German who claimed that he knew nothing of the conditions in the concentration camps of the Nazis. The cases are the same in kind, if not in degree, and they illustrate the impossibility of full individual social responsibility in any society where the press is controlled by either the profit motive or by the national State; or, to consider the problem in more

impersonal terms, in a society where the dominant cultural influences are in the direction of self-interest, for both rich and poor, powerful and weak.

In the larger sphere of international relationships, the habits of moral isolationism may prove more costly even than the inequities which characterize the domestic life of the United States. Formerly, a careless national egotism in relationships with other countries has meant only an indifference to the exploitation and suffering of the colonial peoples of the world. Today, it is beginning to mean a serious ignorance of the fact that moral and political initiative is passing from the Western to the Eastern hemisphere—that the eighteenth-century spirit of revolution has been reborn in Asia, that the "silent immovable East" is now rampant with an awakening sense of power. Robert Payne, in his *Revolt of Asia*, sketches briefly the extent of this awakening in Indonesia:

> The prodigious momentum of the revolutionary movements in the Far East have blinded us to their true worth. It took the American colonies fourteen years (1775-89) to establish representative government; it was forty years later before political democracy for the white male population was finally realized. Even so, the patterns of American government have become confused, and the legislature is not yet entirely divorced from the executive. In Indonesia the government was formed and functioning within three months of Japan's defeat in all the territories of the Islands, and within less than eighteen months a communist uprising was quashed. Dutch and British armies were fought to a standstill, and peace was signed with Holland. The judiciary is independent of the executive, and a vast program of education is under way. No other Asiatic state has achieved such a triumph.

Indonesia is not a country of "childlike" primitives, such as, for example, that portrayed in *Anna and the King of Siam*, but an island empire of 70 million people, rich with natural resources, eager for education and industrialization, and—what is most important of all—led by patriots who write and think like a Thomas Paine of the twentieth century. The fact that for a year and a half, Dutch, British and American guns were leveled at this surge toward freedom—that a few months ago, Dutch troops parachuted down on the islands to occupy Indonesia all over again—only illustrates the abysmal blindness of the West to the new current in history. This tide will never be held back by mere military action. The leaders of the Eastern revolt are mature in Western political theory and at the same time imbued with a sense of the moral power of the traditional organic culture. Since the days of Sun Yatsen in China, these two great traditions have been growing together toward a new synthesis in the Orient. Today, the progeny of this marriage between East and West is beginning to appear. "Of all men from the West who are revered in Asia today," says Robert Payne, "the name of Washington is uppermost." Great ideas are again on the march, and the balance of moral power is moving westward again. All other powers will follow.

Letter from ENGLAND

AFTER the fall of Singapore in 1942, a young girl named Joan Price left her work in a mill for a job in a munitions factory in an English midland town. She was twenty-one years of age, and a volunteer. The workers in the factory were warned of the dangerous nature of their task. They were given protective clothing, and a special cream to put on their hands. Nurses examined them every fortnight. In May, 1945, as the war was ending, Joan was stricken with an illness which lasted until her death on Dec. 2, 1948. Her father said: "Her courage during her long illness put us to shame for grumbling at ordinary ailments." A Government pathologist assured a coroner's jury that it was the first case of its kind in his experience.

The story is but a drop in the ocean of tragedy arising out of World War II. Compared with the holocaust of Hiroshima, its significance may be thought of as infinitesimal. Yet the story has its own importance. For Joan Price was one of a team of 40 whose job it was "to fill tracer bullets with potassium dinitrophenate, which can kill in two ways—through disease of the bone marrow and hardening of the liver."

Presumably, as long as there are tracer bullets, there will have to be this deadly poison to fill them. Equally, all "civilized" nations today, propelled by the natural tendency of Power to extend its control, are busily engaged in perfecting their means of defence against aggression. To that end, research goes on in the fields of atomic and bacteriological warfare, and we are all being asked to exchange liberty for an illusory security. In the sphere of war, we have travelled far from the Code of Manu: "The king shall not slay his enemies in battle with deceitful or barbed or poisoned weapons, nor with any having a blade made hot by fire, or tipped with burning materials" (vii, 90). And, in the political realm, we need no argument to persuade us that, parallel with the increasing power of the State, the human race has developed its capacity for deadly mischief. If natural or artificial selection be the one key to the problems of evolution, we are left to imagine how this ability to destroy will favour some human qualities, and alter the average biological character of the nations. For we are asked by the modern anthropologist to give up the idea that the nation consists of a number of individuals, and "look on it as an interwoven network of strains of various innate hereditary qualities, strains differing in character and quality." (*A Short History of Science*, by Sir William Dampier, F.R.S.)

Before World War I, William James suggested that every up-to-date dictionary should say that peace and war mean the same thing—"now *in posse*, now *in actu*." Battles, he remarked, "are only a sort of public verification of mastery gained during the peace interval." (*Memories and Studies*, 1911.) It is certain that Science has been the handmaiden of History in the working out of this pattern of life and death. Some of those engaged in the profession of war have been the first to point the moral. Major-General J. F. C. Fuller, for instance, in his *Armaments and History* (1946) showed that "the hidden impulse in the technological epoch of war is the elimination of the human element both physically and morally, intellect alone remaining." He brings in still another phase of scientific thought (one not unknown to Joan Price) as seriously contributing to the emotion of conflict, of which war is but an expression: ". . . gold standards, loans, debts, foreign markets, tariffs, embargoes, full employment, and all the other black magic of the Age of Snatch and Grab." No nation or individual is guiltless of transgressing spiritual laws. And, if any of us are inclined to self-righteousness, we may remind ourselves of the famous words of John Donne: "Every man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind. And, therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

But what about Joan Price, and the thousands of victims like her? The comment of Manu again seems appropriate, and if we prefer the authority of history to that of the old Indian lawgiver, he will, in this case, we think, be wholly supported by the passage of events: "Justice, being destroyed, will destroy; being preserved, will preserve."

ENGLISH CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW
LINDBERGH ON LIFE

THERE was a time when the young airman-scientist, Charles Lindbergh, had so captured the fancy of the American people that he was often named as having Presidential caliber. The man who had first flown the Atlantic became a scientific colleague of Alexis Carrel, a valued member of the famous scientist's staff, as well as the pioneer of World Airways. Here was someone who apparently embodied three qualities of supreme American repute—the youthful spirit of adventure, a high degree of foresight in enterprise, and enough technical training to make him a practical scientist.

Then came the time when Americans were urged to hate Lindbergh and to call him "fascist." From some of his statements, people began to gain the impression that Lindbergh did not think the Nazis much worse than the British. With the approach of war, he joined the group known as America First, and was used as a major figurehead by that organization. Lindbergh was also unfortunately given to predictions concerning the outcome of any war with Germany.

We should perhaps remember, however, that Lindbergh, alone of the America Firsters, gave and emphasized the argument that *we could help the whole world best* by improving the quality of the democracy of our own country—that war would not help the world. Lindbergh, in other words, used a moral argument, rather than one of pure expediency, and we may see here some kind of link between one aspect of his America First career and his present book, *Of Flight and Life* (Scribners, 1948). This small volume is straightforward and worth-while. It says many important things well and compactly. But before dealing with the general views expressed in this book, it seems only fair, both to the reader and to Lindbergh, to include a short statement of his own concerning his America First period:

> I saw our Western peoples turning their resources into bombing planes for war. I believed that a conflict between English and German groups of nations would leave Europe prostrate, destroy her cities, kill her finest men, and dangerously increase the Soviet Government's strength. For five years, at home and abroad, I spoke, wrote and argued against a fratricidal war. . . . With Hitler and Stalin wishing to exterminate each other, and with Nazi forces already pointed eastward, it seemed to me the greatest folly to draw German guns to western Europe against a France and England unprepared. After fighting began, I pleaded that a negotiated peace between Allied and Axis powers would leave free peoples stronger than a victory based on unconditional surrender.

These *were* Lindbergh's views during the war. However inadequate, they may sound less peculiar than they once did. They were honest views, openly expressed.

In *Of Flight and Life,* Lindbergh contends that we must escape the amoralism of materialistic science, must avert a tendency to follow that blind worship of mechanics which made Nazism possible in Germany.

> Means and ends [he writes] are inseparable. In a timeless sense, they form a single path, a "way of life" along which we must travel. What is the way? That we must find in each day and hour. Eastern mystics say, "Thou canst not travel on the Path before thou hast become that Path itself." The New Testament tells us, "Seek, and ye shall find." We must search for it as we have searched for the discoveries of science. We must consider the problems that face us until the desire for their solution takes on the strength of a prayer. We must discuss them with each other, read and write about them. . . . We must learn from the sermons of Christ, the wisdom of Laotzu, the teachings of Buddha. In these, in the Bible of the Hebrews, in the philosophy of Greece, in the Indian Vedas, in the writings of saints and mystics, we have a record of the great religious and moral truths discovered by man throughout the ages at his moments of highest inspiration.
>
> Our mission is to understand these truths, to separate them from the dogma which surrounds them, and to apply them to our way of modern life. We must draw strength from the forgotten virtues of simplicity, humility, contemplation, prayer. It requires a dedication beyond science, beyond self, but the rewards are great and it is our only hope.
>
> We still have the possibility, here in America, of building a civilization based on Man. . . .

Lindbergh has not "renounced" modern science and "come to God" in any usual popular sense; nor can his book be regarded as an apology for views which brought him such resounding unpopularity a few years ago. There is again much of the "unpopular" in his present conception of America's destiny. He says, for example:

> . . . rule by vote has its limitations. . . . We cannot escape the fact that our civilization was built, and still depends, upon the quality rather than the equality of men.... For Americans, the doctrine of universal equality is a doctrine of death. If we ever become an equal people among the other peoples of the world, our civilization will fall—and our equality with it. Our security, our freedom, our democratic system itself depends on maintaining an extraordinary quality in our people. . . . Our survival, the future of our civilization, possibly the existence of mankind, depend on American leadership—upon the wisdom of our policies and action. . . . Our leadership, to be successful, must contain elements of force; it must contain elements of equality; but it must also contain elements which reach far beyond the materialism of force and equality. We must strive to achieve a civilization so satisfactory to men that its force can remain unused in the background, while the question of leadership becomes akin to the relationship of head and hand. . . . The improvement of our way of life is more important than the spreading of it.

It seems that a restless energy impels Charles Lindbergh to pile up unpalatable ideas at a pace which confuses, exposing him to charges of contradiction and overstatement. But his first appeal should not be forgotten by his critics: "We must discuss [these problems] with each other, read and write about them." Lindbergh has done his share of "reading and writing," and he seems to ask for discussion rather than for agreement. This is hardly a "fascist" tendency.

The confusion we see in Lindbergh is the confusion we see in ourselves and in the majority of mankind—the confusion resulting from a well-meaning but too impatient attempt to reconcile incompatibilities. Two passages from *Of Flight and Life* will illustrate the difficulty. The first identifies the grip of a mechanistic civilization upon individual man, tending to weaken and finally to destroy his moral initiative:

> Day after day, scientific man must serve the mechanistic Utopia he his built. If he failed to do so, his entire system would collapse. He does not have the lash at his back, as the common slave of old. He is driven by the more subtle whip of a system whose arms he needs for safety and whose dollars he must have for food, shelter, and the momentary dignity of life—a system which hypnotizes him into believing that he is free while he follows an iron-bound routine—a system which, in its diabolical knowledge, now holds the means of breeding even his mind and body for its service. . . . scientific man loses contact with both the qualities of life and the truths essential to his survival. . . .

Yet later we find him saying:

> For the present, we must continue to serve our machines and our production lines, to sacrifice sunlit hours to factory and office. To survive today, we must have high industrial efficiency; we must build great military strength. Whatever the cost may be, it is necessary for us to prevent an aggressive power from starting atomic war. All this we must do that we may continue to live in freedom, that we may have the time and liberty to seek for higher values. We must survive in order to progress.

We should ourselves put the matter differently. May it not be that we must progress in order to survive? What, here, has happened to the Lindbergh who elsewhere wrote: "We have seen that military strength is like a flame which consumes the very stuff from which it springs. Great military peoples have conquered their known world time and time again through the centuries, only to die out in the inevitable ashes of their fire."

So, finally, it seems that Lindbergh is very much like the rest of us—wanting peace, but not too clear about the things that make for peace. Yet his desire to stimulate reconsideration of the philosophical premises of our time is proved by the boldness of his book. This quality may yet prove our surest salvation.

COMMENTARY
PRIVATE SOCIAL INITIATIVE

SMALL INDUSTRY is a four-page leaflet devoted to the problems of small manufacturers, published by Walter Gormly of Mt. Vernon, Iowa. As it touches upon several ideas of frequent recurrence in MANAS, we are glad to call the attention of our readers to what seems a wholly constructive effort in practical economics. Mr. Gormly explains his point of view in the first number (February, 1949):

> As a mechanical engineer, I am providing an engineering service for small manufacturers and machine shops. . . . I went into this work because I am disturbed by the concentration of industry in large corporations and large cities, and I wanted to do something about it. . . . Instead of hollering for the government to do something about big industry, while working for General Motors, I am taking the direct method of helping manufacturers, even though it means I won't "get ahead in the world" in the usual monetary sense.

Small Industry contains three articles: (1) An explanation of the type of engineering service offered, with illustrations of work already done; (2) an analysis of the causes of the boom-bust cycle and a simply written review of the effects of technological advance in industry; (3) a discussion of the sort of products which small manufacturers can make as easily as large companies, together with a list of such products as suggestions to his readers.

We shall never tire of repeating that a free society means a society in which individuals can and do take the initiative in starting projects for the general good. This may be Mr. Gormly's way of making a living, but it is also an expression of social intelligence. Individual initiative has always characterized the American scene, but not enough of it has been for the general good. As a consequence, businessmen have slowly but steadily been destroying their right to private initiative, and establishing oppressive conditions which, if allowed much further development, will make an end to the time-honored forms of political and economic freedom in the United States. It is futile to rant against the government for interference with private enterprise. The government is the creation of the sort of enterprise we have and the sort of people we are. The only sort of enterprise that can remain free is the enterprise that contributes to the freedom of everybody. Walter Gormly, so far as we can tell, is one of the few who has recognized this truth and is doing something about it.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

MANAS readers are by now familiar with the interest of the editors in the "home-production" experiments of Ralph Borsodi, whose achievements provide refreshing contrast to the centralized production techniques usual in our society. Considerable attention has been paid to the Borsodi program of personal economic independence. Mr. Borsodi's educational inventiveness also deserves attention. The following extract from *Flight from the City* describes the experiment of Mr. and Mrs. Borsodi in "domestic education"—need for which became evident from the low educational standard of the school in their rural community. As readers will observe, the result of their efforts was far more than a "substitute" for public school training.

* * *

Our plan [writes Mr. Borsodi] was to use the regular textbooks, to follow the state procedure in teaching as laid down in the syllabus of each subject, and to have one of the public-school teachers who lived in the neighborhood come in once each month to put the boys through an examination which would insure their finishing up each year precisely as well as did the boys attending public school. This plan, we believed, would prepare them for high-school even though they had none of the "benefits" of class work for a few years.

Thus began our experiment in domestic education. And again, individual production proved its superiority to mass production. Mrs. Borsodi found it possible to give the boys, in two hours' desk work, all the training which they were supposed to get, according to the state, in a whole school day plus the work which they were supposed to do at home. One of her first discoveries was that the training of the boys on such sheer fundamentals as addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division had been so poor that mathematical progress and understanding were almost impossible. She made the boys retrace their steps. Some conscientious drilling on the A, B, Cs, and they were then able to gallop through the more difficult parts of arithmetic. Working closely with them, she knew whether or not they really understood. She did not have to rely upon an examination to find out—an examination which revealed little to the teachers because of its mechanical limitations. Two hours of such study, I agreed with Mrs. Borsodi, were sufficient for the sort of thing upon which the public schools concentrated; the rest of the day would prove of more educational value to the boys if devoted to reading and play. The play, in such a home, was just as educational as the reading. Productive and creative activities in the garden, the kitchen, the workshops, the loom-room furnished the boys opportunities to "play" in ways since adopted as regular procedure by the progressive schools. In our home however, such play was directly related to useful functions; they were not merely interesting exercise.

Best of all, the new scheme furnished plenty of time for reading. The reading seemed to us all important. One of the terrible things which the average school does to its pupils is to kill their love for books. All books, to the child who has had to "read" in class, tend to become textbooks. The poetry, plays, novels, essays which are part of their courses in English are read, not to furnish rich experiences and to expand the imagination, but as subjects for recitation and grammatical analysis. This is a process which dissects what should be a living thing, and the corpse of a poem which the child is made to study is no more what the artists who created it intended it to be than the corpse which medical students dissect is a living, breathing human being. The reading of *Ivanhoe* was a part of the prescribed course of English in the public school during the years they attended the district school. They were required to read in class a paragraph at a time daily. The idea horrified me. So I suggested that they read the whole story through at home without regard to

their class work. The result more than pleased me. The boys discovered that *Ivanhoe* was a fascinating story; one of them read it through several times before tiring of it. Instead of hating the story, they learned to love it.

As a result of our insistence upon the fact that reading was fun, rather than work, books came to play naturally the part in their lives which they should play in every educated person's existence. Their imaginations were broadened; the provincialism of city and country so prevalent today became impossible to them; even the textbooks acquired, by sympathetic magic, an entirely different significance from that which they develop in schools. Instead of consisting of lessons to be memorized in preparation for "exams," they were found to be keys to the accumulated knowledge of mankind. We found, however, that the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* was better for this purpose than all their textbooks put together.

Most parents will probably shrink from considering such an undertaking because of the amount of time they believe they would have to devote to it. But such a supposition is a mistaken one. It really does not take much time. We have acquired our notions about the number of hours children should study daily from the amount of time which they usually spend in school. There is a dreary waste of time inescapable in the process of mass education. Most of the time of the children in public schools is devoted to waiting, not studying. Studying of a sort is prescribed as a means of filling in the time devoted to waiting. The children wait in classes, and they wait between classes. Occasionally there is an educational contact between teacher and pupil. In between these contacts, the children are kept out of mischief by an amazingly ingenious series of time-filling exercises. What I consider an educational contact is usually a fortunate accident in our conventional schools. Education is the exception, not the rule, because only when a child feels a need for information and explanation, and feels it emotionally and intellectually and not mechanically, is that educational contact established. Mostly when these needs develop in the lives of school children, the routine of the schoolroom prevents the teacher from responding to it, and the hunger is dissipated and replaced by boredom.

Our experience showed that in such a home as we were establishing these opportunities abounded. Education was really reciprocal; in the very effort to educate the boys, we educated ourselves. Indeed, it is a notion of mine that no real educational influence is exerted upon the pupil unless there is also an incidental educational effect upon the teacher. The average public school is operated upon the theory that this personal relationship is unwise; that the relationship should be impersonal, objective, and mechanical, the example of Socrates and the peripatetic school to the contrary notwithstanding.

With our method, we not only managed to avoid the handicap of a poor school, but the whole Borsodi family seemed to be going to school. But it proved to be a school so different from that to which most of us have become accustomed that I have had to invent a special name for it—the school of living.

FRONTIER
A World of Mind?

THE difficulties of remaining an ordinary, "common sense" materialist and at the same time accepting telepathy as a fact are fairly well known. Here is a force or communicating energy which operates at the level of human consciousness, yet seems absolutely free from the influence of known physical laws. Thought, in the case of telepathy, is transmitted from one mind to another without dependence upon any discoverable physical medium, and the distance between the two individuals seems to have no effect on the communication.

This is the general situation which explains the skeptical reaction of scientists—some scientists, that is, and a diminishing number at that—to the claim that telepathy, or Extra Sensory Perception, as it has been renamed by the researchers at Duke University, is a natural fact. ESP amounts to an unavoidable challenge to what has been called "the general scientific world picture," in which, by common assumption, mental events are all supposed to be caused by physical events. If thoughts can pass between people without the use of ordinary sensory channels, then it is conceivable that thoughts may exist independently of any physical body at all-an idea which raises a host of undesirable implications for the materialistic thinker.

Thus there is an obvious explanation for the disinclination of the scientist to welcome telepathy into his family of "natural" facts. He sees that telepathy could easily come to be regarded, not as a mere adjunct to the known facts of the external world, but as the sort of fact which may require a revaluation of all or nearly all the other facts with which the scientist works. As Joseph Jastrow said a number of years ago, stating the case for skepticism:

> The day is past when a power, agency, "faculty"—or whatever it is supposed to be in the psychic realm—so subversive as ESP can be posited, and its issues and implications developed, without giving an intelligible if speculative account of its operation.

Dr. Jastrow wanted a theory of how telepathy works before he would even consider acknowledging it as a fact. This is a novel viewpoint in a representative of *empirical* science—the science which is supposed to get the facts first, and make the theories afterward.

Dr. Rhine of Duke University, however, who has borne most of the blows of aggressive criticism from skeptics like Dr. Jastrow, is far too sagacious an investigator to allow the argument about ESP to reach the theoretical level of "how it works." Instead, he keeps on piling up the results of experiments, getting the approval of mathematicians for his statistical methods, and pointing out the possibility that, some day, "the general scientific world picture" will have to be revised.

Meanwhile, what has religion to say on the subject of telepathy? Astonishingly little. One would suppose that the churches or some of their more eminent spokesmen would manifest an intense interest in psychological wonders of this sort (like that, perhaps, shown in the report of a Church of England committee on Spiritualism, a year or so ago), but we know of no major denomination which has attempted a systematic explanation of telepathy, or even called the attention of its followers to the possibilities that may be involved. One explanation of this "religious" apathy would be that modern religions are "faiths," rather than attempts at "knowing," so that religious sects are commonly afflicted with intellectual lethargy, making little or no effort to assimilate the progressive experience of the human race.

A further consideration is suggested by Prof. H. H. Price, of Oxford University, in the *Hibbert journal for* January. Unlike most of those who discuss ESP and allied subjects, Prof. Price is principally interested in how processes like telepathy may work. He writes:

> It is to be noticed, however, that although telepathy does not fit in with the Materialistic conception of human personality at all, it does not altogether fit in with the traditional religious conception either, at any rate, if we confine our attention to the religious tradition of Western Europe. For the traditional religious conception of human

> nature is not only dualistic, regarding mind and body as two different and separable entities. It is also, if I may say so, an "isolationist" conception with regard to the individual mind. It holds that each individual mind is a separate and complete substance, whose only direct causal relations with the rest of the universe (apart from God) are relations with its own brain. The individual mind, it is supposed, can affect and be affected by other finite minds only in a very indirect and circuitous manner, by a long, intervening chain of physical causes. The existence of telepathy shows that this "isolationism" is false, even with regard to embodied minds; and *a fortiori* false with regard to disembodied ones, if there are any. It is not true that the only part of the universe with which a given mind has direct causal relations is its own body. It also has them with other minds.

Prof. Price's purpose in this analysis is to show the implications of telepathy for the idea of "mind." Instead of being a separate intelligence, wholly contained within the brain, Mind, in the light of ESP phenomena, seems more like a universal principle of intelligence or sentience: a vast thought-continuum, one might say, with individual "outlets" into the world of the senses through human beings—and perhaps through other sorts of beings as well. The old idea of "many distinct and separate minds," as Prof. Price says, does not make sense:

> . . . we are trying to map out the psychological world into so many distinct and separate individual minds, and assuming that every mental event must be attributed to one or the other of them. But this way of mapping out the psychological world does not fit the facts. Is the "control" of a medium an individual mind or not? If a haunting apparition displays a certain degree of intelligence and purpose, but not very much, are we to say that it is a manifestation of an individual mind or not? If we are to talk intelligibly about such queer entities, . . . I believe that we must change the unit, as it were. We must take as our fundamental unit something far less complicated than a complete mind, something like an individual idea, and build up the various grades of psychical entity from them: from not-very-purposive ghosts and Freudian complexes at the one end, to the complete and healthily integrated human mind at the other, with mediumistic "controls" somewhere in the middle. All these different sorts of mental entity, we must say, and any others there may be, are idea-systems of different degrees of complexity and different degrees of autonomy and internal coherence.

Years ago, in *The Nature of the Physical World*, Arthur Eddington said that he regarded the foundation of the universe as being "mind-stuff"—not exactly "mind," nor actually "stuff," but *mind-stuff*. Here, perhaps, is the sort of primary material of mind which Prof. Price is feeling for-an intellectual substance which is the basis of consciousness, with laws of its own (just as physical matter has laws of its own), but which, involved with the matter of our sense perceptions, is difficult to distinguish as an independent reality.

Before leaving this subject, note should be taken of the serious criticism of the ethics of orthodox theology implied by Prof. Price's remarks about the "isolationist" idea of the mind or soul. A man who thinks the soul has inner, psychical contact only with "God" will be a man naturally inclined to hope for personal salvation as a result of that contact. This, in fact, is the tendency of Christian orthodoxy. Righteousness means a proper relation to God, and then, if spiritually convenient, good works on behalf of mankind may be undertaken. The private contact—or contract—with God comes first.

Psychic research, as Dr. Price interprets it, suggests another, more pantheistic view, in which every human being is linked, through mind, with every other; one mind may be, actually, an organic part of the mental being of the whole. This is an entirely different conception of individuality from the conventional religious idea, and one which presents immediate responsibilities to the rest of humanity, because of the subtle linkages uniting the consciousness of all.