

GREAT QUESTIONS: III

IF the declarations of leading anthropologists are any indication, the old controversy about evolution—thought to have been settled finally in favor of the scientific contentions of Charles Darwin, Gregor Mendel, and one or two other creators of the scientific world-view—is about to be reopened on another front. Not since the Scopes trial back in 1925 has there been any real excitement or argument about the evolution issue. Most of the Christian groups years ago decided to make some sort of peace with the Evolutionary Theory, or at least to soft-pedal the differences between Genesis and Geology, while scientists, on the other hand, have been content to admit that, even if evolution is an established fact, the *processes* of evolution are still exceedingly obscure.

The interesting thing about the revival of controversy over evolution—over *human* evolution, to be precise, for philosophical or theological questions really turn on the origin of man—is that the initiative is coming from the scientists themselves. Most recent contribution is that of Dr. Charles W. Goff, orthopedic surgeon and anthropologist of Yale University, who spoke in Los Angeles last April at the Cedars of Lebanon Hospital. Man, asserted Dr. Goff, did not descend from the apes, but has a line of development independent of the anthropoid species. Anthropological research pursued since Darwin's time, he said, "indicates man was on the earth 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 years ago, before the apes ever differentiated. Thus man would have had to arise from a pre-ape form."

(The great apes, we note in passing, are relatively recent arrivals, from an evolutionary point of view, going back at most to mid-Miocene times, or some three to five million years ago.)

Dr. Goff offered a simple illustration to persuade his hearers of the essential difference between apes and humans:

A baby crawls on all fours. But notice he crawls with the palms of his hands flat. No living or extinct ape does that at any time. Apes always touch the ground with their knuckles, not their palms.

Readers who suppose that Dr. Goff is dealing somewhat cavalierly with the science of anatomy should turn to *Hallmarks of Mankind* (1949) by Frederic Wood Jones, professor of human and comparative anatomy in the Royal College of Surgeons in England, where will be found a large and impressive array of evidence, drawn from the human frame, on precisely this point. Dr. Jones shows that the great apes display numerous bone structures which represent a departure or "advance" from the human type, leading to the unavoidable conclusion that the line of human evolution was established *before* the apes made their appearance on the scene. Dr. Jones has little respect for learned books which picture primitive man as a bent-over bruiser with a club in one hand and a rock in the other:

There is no halfway stage in posture. It would be better to discard all the drawings that depict the early progenitors of Man as slouching brutes carrying themselves in postures incompatible with the dictates of gravity, and to relegate to oblivion all the speculations and theories concerning the gradual rise of Man from a quadrupedal pronograde to a bipedal orthograde posture.

The true ancestors of man, if they are ever discovered, Dr. Jones thinks, "will be utterly unlike the slouching, hairy ape men of which some have dreamed and of which they have made casts and pictures during their waking hours; and they will be found in geological strata antedating the heyday of the great apes."

Dr. Franz Weidenreich, famous for his research on the Peking Man and the Java Ape Man, or *Pithecanthropus erectus*, took a somewhat similar position on the question of posture in his *Apes, Giants and Man* (1946). He rebuked Thomas Huxley for representing man and ape, side by side, in one of his much-copied illustrations, with the ape unnaturally erect and man unnaturally stooped. These pious distortions in the interest of evolutionary "truth" are found neither impressive nor persuasive by modern anthropologists, who are more interested in the facts of man's evolution than in winning polemical engagements with an embattled clergy.

Such facts, perhaps, are now able to come out with less circumspection and regard for hurting the "case" for evolution, simply because the clergy no longer contests the scientific version of the origin of man, and scientists with a bone to pick with their Darwinist colleagues feel free to express themselves without fear of a rearguard attack from the warriors of religious orthodoxy. In any event, the facts are coming out, and the question of human evolution is once again open for speculation.

How wide open is the question is easily seen. In the first place, if man is not simply a progressed ape, then what did he progress from? Perhaps he has a line of evolution entirely his own. In this case, the eager materialism which insists that man is "just another animal" no longer has the same "undeniable support" from the geological record. Just possibly, the psychological evidence of man's extraordinary difference from the animals will now be regarded impartially; he may even be considered as more of a psychological being than anything else, despite the manifest physical basis of his life on earth and his unmistakably animal body.

There is good scientific precedent for recognizing the psychological or psychic factor in life as playing an important part in evolution. Even in the physical sciences, the importance of the psychic factor has been recognized. As the

biochemist, Albert P. Mathews, remarked years ago:

We must leave out, because of our ignorance, the psychic side of chemical reactions. Our equations, therefore, will be as incomplete as if energy were omitted. The transformation of matter and energy alone can be considered in this chapter, which becomes hence like Hamlet with Hamlet left out. Let us not blind ourselves to this fact. (In *General Cytology*, edited by E. V. Cowdry, Chicago University Press.)

Two years ago, Prof. A. G. Hardy, a British zoologist, became more specific in assigning a role in evolution to the psychic factor. Speaking before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Prof. Hardy urged that some sort of organic "telepathy" may induce changes in species, according to the needs of the species. Another sober scientist, also a Briton, Dr. Julian Huxley—grandson of the famous T. H. Huxley—has argued for the possibility that "man's so-called supernormal or extrasensory faculties are in the same case [today] as were his mathematical faculties during the Ice Age."

It is not of course possible to present from recognized scientific sources anything like a unified theory of psychic evolution of human beings. The quoted statements are but speculations. What we are suggesting is that they now have hope of being regarded as *likely* speculations.

But before a genuinely philosophical theory of human evolution becomes available, something will have to be done about the proposals of the Emergent Evolutionists. As a group, the Emergent Evolutionists have long enjoyed the enviable status of men who, somehow or other, have managed to keep science and religion in touch with one another. Actually, the emergent evolutionists read off the same spells to a gullible public as did the medieval theologians who maintained that God created the world entirely out of nothing. The emergent evolutionists have asserted, with astonishing success among large numbers of educated people, that in the course of

a long evolution, mind and intelligence gradually "emerged" from the blind and untaught forces of the material universe. By some sort of cosmic conversion process, the fortuitous concourse of atoms preached by Lucretius eventually ceased to be a random bouncing around of primeval elements and took on the rational order which we find everywhere in nature and in ourselves. We may say, perhaps, that the emergent evolutionists wanted something *good* to be going on, but they didn't want Jehovah to be responsible. On the other hand, they felt obliged to pay a decent tribute to the scientific explanation of things. So, to make everybody happy, they started out with the materialist's blind and irrational "complement of forces," and mixed them thoroughly with their own Moral Optimism, ending with Modern Man and all his Works as the peak and pinnacle of the world's evolution.

But mind, it seems to us, is the foundation principle of all Nature. It has to be there at the beginning. Evolution must be like any other sort of making or fabricating. Intelligence beats and molds some recalcitrant materials into shape. Instead of God's intelligence, which always gets us into difficulties we cannot get out of without getting rid of God, it is Nature's intelligence which does the molding, the shaping, the forming and the maturing. Nature is not a being, but myriads upon myriads of *beings*, all intelligent, all bent upon a great pilgrimage of self-expression and growth. Some of these beings are involved in states of matter, some in states of consciousness—and man, as even the medieval scholastics imagined, represents the union of mind and matter, the composite microcosm of the universe, half animal, half god.

By what logic should we evade the honorable hypothesis that all the world is alive and conscious, and everything in it intelligent, on an infinite scale of both organic and moral or spiritual evolution?

The logic of the founders of modern science was not alien to this view. Only the enmity of the

doctors of divinity, the administrators of the Holy Office and the interpreters of "God's Will" insisted that matter is dead and impotent, that all power, all will, all intelligence, belong to a single omnipotent God. Shall we then, having done away with this blasphemous conception of Deity, adopt the very delusion which it produced? Nature became a thing dead, matter a thing evil, mind an energy prone to sinfulness only because all the virtue, all the goodness and all creativity and power had been given to God. If we dispense with this "God," we must restore to Nature her natural greatness and infinite potentiality. Then we need no longer be materialists, no longer founder on the fallacies of emergent evolution; we can admit the inherent mind and genius of the world as found throughout all natural beings—there are no others—and see in evolution a vast sweep of life and consciousness toward ever receding goals of both inner and outer development.

But what shall we say of this vision, when the world grovels in a fit of anarchic self-destruction? Have we considered that the tragedy of *human* evolution reveals itself in man's capacity to be self-deceived? That his true evolution lies in recognizing his own spiritual nature, his immeasurable responsibility for the rest of life, and that his full happiness and joy in being can come to him by no other means than that of trying and forever trying to become more like a god?

They tell us, our statesmen, that we have nothing to fear but fear. This means, very simply, that our real life is a life of the mind. That our existence grows and flowers by the thoughts we think and the hopes we hold and make come true. Do they really believe it? To really believe it may be the next crucial evolutionary step for the entire human race.

Letter from **NORWAY**

OSLO.—Just now, in Norway, nothing is thought too good for "*Amerikanerne*," despite our unwitting "boners" and despite the fools a few conspicuous tourist groups make of themselves. No one is so popular, not even the beloved Danes. "Marshall Hjelpl" rescued the nation's solvency for the nonce, and is the backlog of "defense," the costs of which are already crippling the hopes of achieving a normally balanced national budget and free foreign trade. Roosevelt, Bunche and Eisenhower are almost national heroes.

One hears in Norway that Norwegians are very like Americans, and it is true that some Norwegians are like some Americans. They are all taught more or less English (albeit the King's English, not American). Some who have spent some time in the USA and can relax their inhibitions become Americanly extroverted. A few become all too Americanized: one cringes in recognizing imitations of some of America's least admirable culture-traits.

But Norwegians are not blind to American shortcomings. It does one's heart good to hear two of the outstanding Americophiles, Haakon Lie and Sigmund Skard, lecture to a group of likable, but often somewhat provincial and reactionary American visitors. They paid tribute to the great achievements, influence and responsibilities of USA but did not hesitate to point out our economic shortsightednesses and pecuniary scale of values, as well as our too conspicuous banalities and boastfulness.

Lie (no relative of Tryggve) is secretary of *Arbeider Partiet* (the Workers' Party) which has controlled the government since before the last war. Like certain other Norwegian labor leaders, his initiation into the labor movement was through the original idealistic-romantic and 100% American leadership of the pre-communist IWW, to which he occasionally makes reference with a nostalgic gleam. But now he talks not in Marxist

or syndicalist terms of class struggle, but in terms of labor's democratic responsibility for and to the national community, and even to its political opponents—rather than to any one class. He called the CIO shortsighted and narrow in boosting the price-level with further wage demands. (To be sure, Norwegian conservatives have plenty of stories of padded government payrolls and party favoritism in administration.)

Professor Sigmund Skard, the cordial friend of hundreds of Americans, heads the American Institute at University of Oslo. His wife, a professor of psychology and mother of five children, is daughter of the great historian, great scholar and pre-war foreign minister Halfdan Koht, whose book on *The American Spirit in Europe* is a revelation. As refugees through Siberia, the Skards spent the war years in America. In a public address he good-naturedly "told us off" and made us like it: he had great applause.

Some things about America Norwegians do not understand, and some of them will tell you so. For examples, our wastefulness, our race relations, our witch-hunting laws and persecutions all in the name of "liberty," and our advocacy of an international economy in Europe while maintaining nationalistic barriers for our own "benefit."

Of their own nationalistic economies, Norwegians will say, "Well, we are at least consistent." Enterprisers and importers and real estate owners complain about the restrictions, but (like the labor government) they consider them as temporary after-effects of war, not as "communistic" or "destructive of our liberties."

Norway's comparatively moderate bill to limit traditional freedoms in case of national emergency met with such widespread and courageous protests that it had to be revised.

There is a little anti-Semitism in Norway; a little traditional antipathy toward Swedes, revived by the events of the war; a stronger feeling against

Germans and Quislings. But Norway invited and cared for a group of Jewish refugees equivalent to those deported and destroyed by the Nazis; has given eight months' camp-rehabilitation to two hundred Jewish orphans and two hundred Bavarian and Austrian displaced children; and has shown great official restraint and fairness toward Quislings, even those flagrantly guilty, despite persistent social ostracism against those still at large.

One finds no such hysteria over communists here as there is in USA; this presumably because they are used to having them around as a legislative, administrative and political minority. Also, American jitters are understandable in view of direct Russian threats, the targets to be defended, and the shocking revelations of espionage. Recent cases of espionage in the Norwegian army may now arouse public tension on the subject.

In general, the Norwegians are keeping their equanimity. They are definitely with USA, and their young men are rugged, not soft-looking. In defending Norway, the USA would be defending many of its own finest traditions of law, liberty, courage and culture.

NORWAY CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW

"ONE WOMAN'S FIGHT"

IT is a pleasure to recommend this book by Vashti McCollum (Doubleday, 1951) to every MANAS reader. "The McCollum Case," of course, is but one of a series of engagements in the long, intricate, and important warfare of approximately two centuries over the definition of "separation of Church and State" in American government. Mrs. McCollum became the spearhead for a counterattack against religious encroachment in the public schools when she sought to secure a legal ruling which would eliminate sectarian religious teaching on "released time" during school hours. After losing both local and Illinois Supreme Court decisions, this energetic housewife nevertheless struggled on to a United States Supreme Court victory.

Mrs. McCollum's personal story may be considered of genuine documentary value; the Church-State issue, it seems to us, is much more vital than it ever appears when being formally debated in court—around it revolve many of our personal concepts of value, our philosophies of morality and our philosophies of government. Above all, our beliefs in respect to "religious education" reflect what we really think about irrational authority in human life—whether we regard it as integral to social order or a confession of democratic failure. The McCollum story focusses these issues at a level where their importance is demonstrated without any necessity for argument. This, we think, is why everyone should read *One Woman's Fight*, which brings home the real psychological problems underlying the Church-State controversy so vividly that we are enabled to feel ourselves participants in every step taken by Mrs. McCollum. And we may reflect that anyone can as easily be slanderously attacked without cause, if he should interfere with the designs of religious politics.

It is quite possible that sociologists, two hundred years from now, will consider *One Woman's Fight* class A source material for evaluation of the 1950 American personality. The summation is not altogether discouraging or damning, but it does demonstrate how many people have religious psychoses, and how bad they can get. Mrs. McCollum brought suit against the School Board of Champaign, Illinois, for allowing what she contended to be

unconstitutional use of school buildings. This was the legal issue, and it is clear that Mrs. McCollum had no desire to attack any religion as a personal faith. Immediately, however, she became the target of vituperative and even obscene slander, hurled by fanatics who were happy to find an "atheist" to hate. One "fan mail" letter began, ". . . may your rotten soul roast into hell. . . ." A rabid minister probably stirred some moron in his congregation to write that one. But people who ought to have known better did the same sort of thing, in different verbal form. At a preliminary hearing, for instance, Mrs. McCollum was actually questioned concerning the legitimacy of her child! This was but a forerunner of what was to come. She was repeatedly threatened and once physically attacked. On Halloween night she was greeted by—

. . . a shower of everything the victory gardens had to offer that year. Rotten tomatoes smashed against the walls, splattered in my hair and over my clothes. Huge cabbage plants, roots, mud, and all, came careening through the open door into the living room.

Weakened by fever and exhausted by the activities of the evening, this was the last straw for me. I called the police and they arrived shortly. All they did was pick up a cabbage or two as they walked out and suggested that perhaps they'd better drive around the block a couple of times. Naturally it was too dark for them to see or identify anyone. All the time the hoodlums were concealed in the shrubbery in front, so when I went out to shake the throw-rug free of debris, I was greeted by, "So you don't like it? You had to call the police, you atheist," and much more. There were teenagers' voices among them, but they were liberally fortified by adults.

Fortunately, Mrs. McCollum found principled and courageous defenders, also, which may help to convince readers that something besides insanity and fanaticism can exist in a small town:

One minister (Unitarian) saw to it that his congregation heard of the goings on of this fine group, the products of that highly moral religious education, who had apparently profited so richly from those precepts, "Love thy neighbor as thyself" and "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

His heading of it was especially appropriate.

He called it simply, "Christian' Halloween."

Some churches split down the middle on the McCollum case, and good men tumbled out. The valiant Unitarian minister threw himself wholeheartedly into the fight, and even managed to secure support from other denominations whose representatives finally became convinced that the issue was a legal and constitutional one and not an attack on Religion at all. The Chicago Civil Liberties Union and the Chicago Action Council mobilized, and, before the case was concluded, had found subscribers for the sum of more than twenty thousand dollars to help support the case.

A university student who dropped in on a preliminary Champaign debate was another spontaneous and perceptive defender. The "important people" on that occasion, as on most others, seemed determined to becloud the issues. One Reverend of Champaign, nearly apoplectic because a *university professor's wife* had suggested that a sectarian religious program might not be good for her children, stooped to bring the charge that the suit was offering "some people a good chance to gain publicity." At this accusation, the young man stood up:

"I'm merely an interested bystander," he said, "but this is an important case. I figured it might assume national importance, and I wanted to hear it discussed. I have not been prejudiced one way or another. But as a result of the last gentleman's remarks, I'd like to make one observation. From the beginning, something has been quite apparent to me. One side seems to have all the support, all the money, all the respectability. The other side seems to have nothing but sincerity.

"Now what I can't figure out is why the side with all the advantages should stoop to name calling. I think the gentleman who just spoke owes the young lady an apology." The Reverend Cartlidge stood up then, flushed, and said, "I'm sorry." As I was leaving the hall he apologized personally.

As the book progresses one gains an insight into another abyss—that of the paralyzing social fears apt to be present in a bible-pounding town. Many who actually *wanted* to agree with Mrs. McCollum as to the damaging effects of emphasizing sectarian differences within school buildings became afraid to speak up—or even to speak *to* Mrs. McCollum.

But while *One Woman's Fight* should make us all worry about the number of warped and misinformed

minds in our land of unparalleled literacy, we are also helped to see how many of the genuinely liberal Christian churches fight the good fight against all odds whenever they grasp a principle clearly. Some newspapers reflected a fine editorial integrity, also. And the Supreme Court gave some cause for people being proud they are Americans, after all.

The battle joined by this case is by no means over. Every sort of public pressure by the strongest church bodies will be brought to bear to secure reversal of the Supreme Court decision. The Big Churches, it is clear for all to see—especially the Roman Catholic—are militantly against that conception of secular democracy upon which our Constitution was founded. Headlines from the Catholic press on the final outcome not only demonstrate this, but also that rabble-rousing methods will probably be used in attempts to undo the work Mrs. McCollum began, and the Supreme Court, presumably, but only presumably, finished.

A significant collation of inflammatory headlines, furnished by Mrs. McCollum, needs no elaboration as a warning on what level "anti-McCollumites" will continue to fan emotions:

"God Is Out! Atheism Wins in Court Fight," declared one paper. "U.S. Court Decision on Schools Called First Class Mystery," "Keep Out, God," "McCollum Decision Makes First Amendment a 'Historical Relic,'" "K. of C. Call McCollum Verdict 'Catastrophe,'" "Supreme Court Ban on Religious Study Spreads Confusion Across Nation"; and, "Madness in the Supreme Court," said the *Catholic Chronicle* of Toledo, Ohio, which went on:

"A degenerate disease has been eating away at the highest tribunal's legal philosophy ever since Oliver Wendell Holmes brought the infection to the bench. This madness has been advancing upon the court for many years . . . The infection of Holmesian atheism has eaten into the marrow of their intellects . . . The most charitable thing we can say is that they have gone out of their legal minds."

What we wonder is, how could the writer of the above ever *tell* when anyone went out of the realm of reason?

COMMENTARY
UNTIL SEPTEMBER 5

FOR those readers—few, we hope—who have missed previous editorials on the subject, this will constitute final notification that with this issue MANAS is suspending publication for two months, the next issue to appear being that of Sept. 5. It is hoped that the future will be a little more prosperous, both in growth of circulation, and therefore in income, and in articles contributed by other than staff writers. If such developments come about, there will be no further need for another suspension during the summer months of other years.

"FRIENDSHIP GRAIN"

This seems a good place to report some news contained in the June *Progressive*, to the effect that several American citizens, dissatisfied with the laggard action of Congress in sending grain to famine-stricken India, have started a private movement of their own. Students on the campus of Bucknell University have organized a "Wheat-for-India" group and within a week collected enough money to buy five tons of wheat.

Meanwhile, in Minnesota, Senator Hubert Humphrey announced a nation-wide campaign for "Friendship Grain" to be sent to the people of India. Supporting this drive, the Senator said:

The American Congress is guilty of tragic delay in providing food for the starving millions of the Republic of India. While we debate on the floor of the Senate on how to stop Communism by arms and military power, Communism is conquering the minds of millions of people who are the victims of economic injustice and mass starvation. The one weapon we have in abundance in this war for the minds of men is food.

Confirming the Senator's judgment was the news that Soviet Russia has shipped 50,000 tons of grain to India, without waiting for final arrangements as to terms. The Russian ambassador told Indian officials: "Let's forget

terms and get wheat started in order to feed the hungry."

Such statements win cheers on the Indian publicity front, despite the fact that America is already shipping more grain than this to India through normal channels of trade. Nevertheless, the Congressional debates and delays make the headlines, not simple facts of trade, and the hedging of food shipments to India with political demands makes it seem as though, for the United States, not food, but famine, is a weapon.

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

VERY seldom can one find in the watered-down discussions of the ladies' magazines and the Sunday supplements either instructive or ingenious material in relation to education. *This Week*, for May 13, however, contains an article, "No More Homework?" capable of being jockeyed into quite an exception. It is by Amy Selwyn, who presents an educational issue bristling with controversial implications.

Most parents have never thought to question the validity of the "homework" approach to elementary and secondary school learning, so habituated has the public become to it through years of its wholesale adoption and unthinking acceptance. For this very reason, however, some parents are going to be surprised and jolted when it becomes known that officials of the National Education Association in Washington have been pressing for elimination of homework. Miss Selwyn writes:

In the last few months I have been talking to school officials throughout the country. They brought up three specific charges against homework. For one thing, they said, homework does not improve children's minds or increase their scholastic achievements. For another, homework is not good character training; it is more apt to build up resentment toward all education. They also scotched the traditional idea that homework helps to tie a solid, healthy knot between home and school. On the contrary, many testified that homework can bring on major difficulties both at home and at school.

The real importance of this controversy, of course, is in the stimulus to revaluation of the whole learning process. Miss Selwyn quotes statistical surveys which demonstrate that the child learns more in half an hour at school than in two hours at night. Further, that when two test groups, one of which discontinued homework, were given comparative IQ exams, the "no-homework" group fared either as well or better than the other.

Why should this be? Obviously, school-learning is least rapidly accomplished when it passes a reasonable time-limit for a "challenge" and becomes a chore. But, in addition to this psychological verity, may we not assume that the human mind is rather a vastly sensitive potential for *inspiration*, than an adding machine?

Unfortunately, the industrialization and materialization of culture has influenced most teachers and school boards toward the Quantitative View of mind-development, even though a great deal of scattered evidence has always been present to the contrary, as, for instance, with the university students who scored far higher grades on comprehensive examinations after spending one-fifth of the daily study time used by other students with comparatively equal IQ's. The mind, when "it" *wants to*, can grasp and retain a great deal in very little time.

"No More Homework" provides us with fitting opportunity to present a quotation we have been saving from Herbert Read's *Education Through Art*. We submit that this single paragraph offers a thorough explanation of the statistical results tabulated by Miss Selwyn:

The word 'discipline' had originally the same meaning as education; it was the instruction imparted to his disciples by a master of any subject. When education ceased to be personal and became general or systematic, the subjects taught (literature, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music, etc.) were known as the liberal disciplines or arts. We have already seen how these disciplines gradually degenerated into artificial studies far removed from the organic realities of human life: and at the same time that education lost its biological function—the inculcation of a natural and harmonic control of body and soul—it assumed as a compensation for its failure, the right of arbitrary compulsion. Society was no longer, either ideally or practically, based on natural law: its codes, stabilized from habits and conventions, became an end in themselves, and the business of education was to subdue the untamed spirits, the 'unruliness' of young children, and to train them to conformity. Education became, in Tolstoy's deeply perceptive phrase, the 'tendency to a moral despotism raised to a principle', the expression of the 'tendency of one man to make another just like

himself.' So far has the concept of discipline degenerated that its present meaning could not be stated more concisely than in the words of the Concise Oxford Dictionary: 'order maintained among schoolboys, soldiers, prisoners, etc.' The discipline which was the receptive relationship of pupil to master has become identifiable with the barking of a sergeant-major on the barrack-square.

Miss Selwyn's discovery that most of the demands for increased homework came from parents who thought that "more work" would keep their children out of trouble unhappily dovetails with Read's concluding sentences. The point is not that children will learn too much by reading at home, nor that they should spend their time at home "recreationally" watching television sets, but only that the formal study required in school continually minimizes the most important aspect of learning, which is that of spontaneous curiosity. A child can "learn" beneficially during every waking hour, each activity of the day constituting a part of a gradual awakening to maturity. In fact, most children do learn in just this fashion; the least progress takes place while they are attempting to memorize details to pass examinations.

The parent who is still sufficiently alive to feel that he is himself learning daily—rather hourly—will not even have to plan particular forms of instruction for his youngsters. Children usually need no more than an *atmosphere* of mental vigor in order to wish to grasp the principles involved in the things they see around them. Unless a child wants to know what makes the electric lights go on, where the water comes from in the bathtub, or why people shoot guns at each other in a war, the parents are probably not supplying the most vital kind of "atmosphere." Moreover, parents who love to read, and know what in reading is worth loving, can help children to see how they may learn in the evening without pain.

We may hope that the movement summarized by Miss Selwyn is representative of a gradual revolution of something more important than a theory of education—that it is a trend toward a

more philosophical conception of the nature of the child. The "wooden disciplines" should be correlated with all the authoritarianisms we know and rightly dislike—first with that of medievalism and, later, with all the other "fascisms" brought from psychological depths to the forefront by the general increase of social mechanization in world culture.

FRONTIERS The Real Issue

How far, in these days, can a newspaper editorial go in explaining the social and psychological transformations which are now in process throughout the world? Manchester Boddy, publisher of the Los Angeles *Daily News*, writing on his editorial page on May 30, made of Decoration or Memorial Day an occasion to discuss responsibility for the progressive militarization of the United States. Mr. Boddy went so far as to eliminate the Personal Devil hypothesis from the explanation. Setting the stage, he quoted Congressman Thomas H. Werdel (Rep., Calif.) on the subject of American militarism. In a speech before the House on April 3, the Congressman had said:

I am reluctant to admit that I now believe that we have come to the awful day in America where we have a supreme general staff, modelled after Hitler and the Prussians, seeking military control over industry, labor, all military establishments, the economy and the press. I am convinced that this is their plan against the expressed will of the Congress.

..

No one can deny that America is at a crossroads in its history. It is beyond belief that at a time of world crisis we should have in our military establishment persons whose hunger for control, and whose greed for power should lead them to seize this moment of national peril to foist upon us that which they could not get at any other time.

The Congressman claims, Mr. Boddy goes on to explain, that this growth of military influence in government has been engineered by "little blocs of men."

Mr. Boddy does not agree. Not personalities, but a major world trend, he holds, is back of the change in the American scene. The men in the Pentagon, along with Congressman Werdel "and the humblest citizens in the land are all caught in the same broad, swift current that is sweeping our country into a military-like form of government in which regimentation will, for the time being at least, supplement what little is left of democratic

freedom." Mr. Boddy refers to previous editorials:

... we repeatedly called attention to the fact that the United States was being forced by Fact the Dictator from its traditional system into a new system that would have practically all the characteristics of complete military control.

As we put it: "Weeping and wailing for our departing freedom will not bring back that which has already gone, nor will it postpone the loss of much that remains. It is for us to understand why we are losing our old freedoms and how we are getting a new form of government; what it will be, and how, under it, we will carry on. . . ."

"We have moved a long way. The development will continue because the vast majority of American citizens know it is the only road that is open. They realize that the atomic bomb and other agencies of destruction—products all of a free people enjoying the blessings of uncontrolled democracy—are the 'seeds' that have destroyed freedom itself.

"It is idle and stupid to complain that little blocs of men—civilian or military (rather than Fact the Dictator)—are 'conspiring' to establish a military government."

Being a gloomy rather than an optimistic prophet, Mr. Boddy turns out to be more right than wrong. And he has at least refused to indulge in a familiar brand of "liberal" witch-hunting—that of blaming a handful of military men for the curtailments of democratic freedom under the conditions of war, or of imminent war.

But Mr. Boddy does not say anything about why the dictating "Fact" is what it is, nor what we may hope to do about it in order to place other facts in the seat of authority. Perhaps, as a student of history, Mr. Boddy will accept the explanation which a historian of militarism has offered for this broad trend. During the nineteenth century, says Alfred Vagts, author of *A History of Militarism*, "militarism and Liberalism grew up side by side, as bourgeois enriched himself and officer entrenched himself." The liberals were busy with their social reforms, tending "to ignore the military problem and left the conduct of military affairs in other hands."

The fact of the matter was, as Vagts points out, that democracy evolved no philosophy or agencies of control over the military, at least in Europe. Not until the military grew to the proportion of a Frankenstein was there much real awareness of the part it might play in determining the course of history, and today, as Mr. Boddy suggests, the technological expansion of military methods has become an irreducible Brute Fact. The resulting psychological dilemma has been well put by Lorenz von Stein:

It is true that victory brings to the sum total of the State, to the people, the highest profits, whereas at the same time it remains forever unable to restore to the individual what it has taken from him. . . . It is therefore natural that the individual hates war when at the same time he willingly surrenders his all to it. Forever an educated people will consider war as a misfortune, forever war will be combated in the name of humanity, and still after a victory a nation will seldom doubt that it is worth as much as it cost.

This nineteenth-century analysis may need some qualification, today, especially in Europe, but it is still useful in explaining the contradictory attitudes of peoples who at the same time insist upon both "victory" and "peace." The real issue, which no newspaper editorial that we know of has ever touched upon, was well stated by Clyde Mitchell, land administrator in the U. S. Army Military Government in Korea, from 1946 to 1948, in the June *Progressive*:

In the fifties, Americans are being induced to think that the world's ills are all caused by Communism and that Communism must therefore be crushed. In the '40s it was Fascism. What will it be in the '60s and '70s? Can't we get at the bottom of our troubles? Can't we see that both the Communist and Fascist attempts at world conquest were and are feeding on some deep-rooted human needs, and that the destruction of the one or the other of the major world powers will not solve the problems which created them?

Has it Occurred to Us?

THE well-known attraction of opposites is made much of in our casual thought and conversation—too much so, often, for us to recognize the even more remarkable attraction of the homogeneous. Has it occurred to us that some of our deepest psychological insights are born, not of the clash of contrasts, but in the interchange of profound sympathies?

There is a certain sense in which we can perceive nothing but *ourselves* in others, no other traits than those familiar to us at first-hand, no deeper aspirations than those which (though it be only occasionally) dip into our waking mind. This is not always a happy realization, but neither does it need to be a discouraging one. Among our friends are some we admire and respect, finding their characters nobler than our own; some who startle us, now and then, with a revelation of capacities we had never before perceived in them; some who dismay us—and quite shake our faith—by falling into distressing habits, or succumbing to an inconsequential distress as if it were a mammoth disaster. We look on, marvelling at how human nature daily declares its independence of easy hypothesis and naïve rules.

The dismaying weakness of an associate—what shall we gain from such an observation? Is our dismay fastened upon the person or the weakness? Is it greater or less than the dismay we would feel upon observing a similar weakness in ourselves? Who can say that the emotional strength of our attitude is not a hint for us to follow up, since a definite feeling (whether for or against) a specific person, action or place indicates a thread of contact. Contact means a two-way flow, a binding force, a channel of influence. In practice, it may be impossible to separate the feeling we get "from" a given individual and the feeling we have *for* that one.

Still, there are those to whom our mind looks up, and those others who allow us glimpses of undreamed-of aims. What does this mean about

ourselves, if not that our perceptions are far in advance of our everyday ideas? How could we recognize the high purpose of another, if we could not detach our minds from ordinary goals and envision extraordinary ones? What we can imagine and feel respect toward, shows the presence in us of ideals as great as those we are aware of in others. Our admiration mirrors our greater selves, even as our prejudices reflect the lesser. It may even be that respect for the rare virtues of a comrade acts as a tonic on our own: inspiration and emulation follow close upon each other. It is certain—human nature seems ever more positive about "negatives" than about affirmations—that although criticism of someone else may freeze his life-blood, so to speak, its effect is no less icy in our own veins.

All this does not, however, erect an ego-centered universe. We cannot, if we would, congratulate ourselves on wonderful powers of appreciation, or be contented with moving loftily in the company of our peers. Also in *our* universe are the human weaknesses we despise in others—and how could emotional rejection of one form of conduct arise, unless some correspondingly despicable trait of our own was just as emotionally embraced?

The power is given us—poet Burns to the contrary—to see ourselves as others see us, if only we look in the right place. We can see ourselves in *our perceptions of others*: there is no clearer mirror. When we charitably, and with gentle honesty, look at others, our own insights will be more profound. But mildly or harshly; bitterly or tenderly; hastily or with care: it is ourselves we treat to character analysis. We do not necessarily fasten upon our brother a fictitious personality. Rather, it is the presence of identical qualities that draws us out of the complex of self. We begin with a sense of being "understood"; we have only to persist to develop understanding. We are, literally, *understood*—certain of our cherished habits are most wonderfully corroborated in another person. Without stopping

to assess the habits, we accept the discovery of them in someone else as a brilliant confirmation of our judgment and taste. Qualities of strength become doubly strong; and so with weakening proclivities. Comes a time when each secretly studies the other, observing the connection between one habit and the next, between this habit and that "mysterious"—yet perfectly habitual—occurrence.

Has it occurred to us that the metaphorical remark by Jesus anent the relative positions of the beam and the mote is more truth than imagery? It takes only the veriest speck arriving on our eyeball to make us think a beam has landed; one lash is a whole broom; one tear a rainy universe. Doubtless the exaggeration is necessary—nothing less than a "beam" would attract our attention to our practically-perfect combination of virtues and graces, and it may be that the sharpening of sight required to discover a "mote" in a distant eye could be accomplished in no other way. It will also be agreed that *removing* a mote from a neighbor's eye takes a delicacy of touch and a steadiness of hand such as cannot be achieved by the hasty, wasteful efforts of the careless critic. In fine, our sympathies for others reveal us to ourselves. Others' sympathies may touch off the spark in us that warms our whole being.