VOLUME IX, NO. 48
NOVEMBER 28, 1956

NEW TYPE CRUSADE

IN the past, crusades have almost always been pretty dangerous affairs. A crusade, by definition, is "a remedial enterprise undertaken with zeal and enthusiasm," and most of the remedial enterprises of history have been directed *against* some people, nation, or group. But now we have the makings of a crusade that is not against anyone—the crusade pushed into the political foreground by Adlai Stevenson in demanding an end to atomic and H-bomb tests by mutual international agreement, during the recent presidential campaign.

The democratic candidate was not, of course, the first to advocate the cessation of such tests. Numerous scientists have been warning against them for years, and small radical and humanitarian groups have been making strenuous efforts to publicize the warnings of the scientists. But Mr. Stevenson's choice of the tests as an "issue" in his campaign was a great public service, if only because it showed that the question could be publicly discussed, encouraging others to form opinions on the subject. (Whether a Democratic *President* would have taken the same stand as Mr. Stevenson is a matter which ought to be considered by those who claim a significant difference between the two major parties, as a result of this phase of the recent campaign. We tend to the view that the heavy "responsibilities" of an incumbent administration would be likely to place the emphasis on "national defense," as the Republicans have done. And "neither party," as the radical pacifist magazine, *Liberation*, pointed out in a pre-election issue, came out in its platform "in favor of the proposal of the Japanese Parliament that the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union put an end to nuclear weapon tests." Nor did either party advocate "that the United States unilaterally put an end to its morally revolting and politically perilous policy of staging the big nuclear tests on foreign soil or in foreign waters where Asians and not Americans will be exposed to danger from fallout!")

But if the issue of the tests entered the zone of intense public interest and intention by a political accident, it is surely there to stay, and the concern to .stop the tests can do nothing but grow. This is a"new-type" crusade.

It represents a "man-against-himself" sort of problem, in which the difficulty lies in grasping the fact that any and all experiments with and promotion of atomic weapons may indeed be steps against ourselves.

On the one hand, centuries-old emotions naturally oppose the view that the perfecting of atomic and nuclear weapons can be seriously against ourselves. The nationalist longing to be *strongest* among the nations has the sanction of all the traditions of military self-defense. There will be inevitable and deeply anxious resistance to giving up this longing. What can fill the emotional vacuum that will be left by relinquishing atomic weapons? Just the thought of being without absolute military superiority strikes terror into the heart of this aspect of our national being. We can hardly look for *rational* response from the reservoir of nationalist emotion to the appeal to abolish atomic experiment and testing.

Then, on the other hand, there is the growing suspicion on the part of many that atomic and nuclear weapons represent the wicked diabolism of the twentieth century. There will be a natural tendency, here, to support any sort of criticism of these weapons—whether concerning their use in war, or steps of preparation for war—with the full fervor of moral emotion. Accordingly, the advocates of testing will claim to be the hard-headed, sober "realists" who refuse to be carried away by visionary dreams and groundless fears.

And the opponents of the tests will declare that they are the *true* realists, who understand the implications of the atomic revolution.

The crusade against the tests—against the bombs—is nevertheless on the way, and this, in psychological terms, may mean a kind of mass awakening to the sort of world the men of the twentieth century have created for themselves, whether they like it or not.

What sort of world is this? It is a world in which we are bound to be held responsible for what we do. This prospect alone could easily produce the reaction of unreasoning fury. Suppose, for example, a community to exist (which we doubt is possible) where all the people accept without doubt or question the idea that they are irreclaimably sinners and that their hope of heavenly bliss depends absolutely upon the Vicarious Atonement of a Saviour who appeared on earth long years in the past. If you were to approach such people with the news that they could no longer depend upon the Saviour in whom they had believed—that they would *themselves* have to be answerable for their sins and offenses against one another—what would be their reaction?

For years, the great nations have conducted themselves as though their might was its own justification—as though they would never be called to account for their policies in relation to other peoples, whether in war or peace. The only acceptable criticism of power was *more* power, with weakness the only thing that need be feared.

But now weakness, or what has been defined as weakness, is said to be a practical necessity for all. What could be more frightening than this?

It is as though the heavens had opened and an unearthly voice had warned the Roman centurions who presided over the crucifixion that they must now lay aside their weapons and learn to be like Jesus, meek and mild. The slow assimilation of this warning is likely to be the major psychological experience of the next fifty years. The repetition of the warning could easily mark the slow growth of the crusade against atomic weapons.

The Great Debate is now beginning. Today, at its outset, there is temptation to regard it as a "political" debate. Some may say that it is basically a "scientific" issue, since the question of how dangerous the tests are can be settled, presumably, only by scientific experts. The moral values involved are obvious, but we suspect that the most fruitful analysis of the controversy will come from the psychologists. For the psychologists may be able to point out that the position taken by most people on the issue of the tests does not stem from either moral or scientific or political considerations, but from the sort of "security" which is most prized by them. The progressive study of the debate will, therefore, constitute a kind of self-revelation.

At present, the debate comes to a focus on the question of the degree of danger from fall-out from A-bomb and H-bomb explosions. Fall-out is minute debris of the explosion, made up of radioactive atoms of the bomb itself and other materials affected. Fall-out becomes a mist of radioactive atoms which may poison with radiation sickness or affect heredity. The Atomic Energy Commission insists that the fall-out from bombings and tests to date constitute no menace to health. However, some of the fall-out may linger high in the earth's atmosphere for as long as ten years, and then filter down to earth. The big question, today, is when the danger-point from fall-out will be reached.

While one group of scientists claims that fall-out will not be a threat for thirty years, if the tests continue at the present rate, twenty-four scientists of Washington University declared recently in a public statement:

> The tests have already burdened the upper atmosphere with radioactive materials which continue to fall on the earth, contaminate our food and become incorporated into human organs.
>
> There are at present insufficient data to permit an absolute conclusion on the danger in continued

accumulation of such radioactivity to ourselves and to future generations. The outlook is, however, alarming. The situation calls for intensive scientific study and public discussion. (New York *Herald Tribune,* Oct. 19.)

Nobel Prize winner Linus Pauling, professor of chemistry at the California Institute of Technology, maintained on Oct. 19 that the testing of atomic bombs in any country increases susceptibility to mental illness and almost every other disease. (Los Angeles *Mirror-News.)* He asserted that continuation of the tests means increased genetic damage in the present and the future. According to the *Mirror-News* report:

> Every eight-and-a-half years, the scientist said, the human body undergoes metabolic changes after maturity which make it twice as susceptible to disease. "Radiation may increase this susceptibility to four times," Dr. Pauling said.
>
> Research by Dr. Harvey Itano at Caltech on sickle cell anemia, a hereditary decease, shows that radiation increases the occurrence of the "bad" genes involved, he said. "Cretinism is an example of a mental disease caused by an abnormal molecule which can increase through radiation," he added.
>
> Similarly, psychoses caused by bodily imbalances are increased by radiation, Dr. Pauling declared.

Dr. Pauling explained that his opinions are based on the National Academy of Scientists report to President Eisenhower (published June 13), and on his knowledge of chemical genetics.

Experts from sixteen countries gathered recently in New York under the auspices of the United Nations to study the effects of fall-out. Special attention is being given to strontium 90, "a deadly isotope produced by hydrogen bomb tests." Reporting the plans of this committee, the New York *Times* for Oct. 19 said:

> According to United Nations officials, milk is of special importance in the study because of its wide use by children and the fact that strontium 90 is chemically similar to the calcium contained in milk.
>
> Strontium 90 is found in the milk of cows that have grazed on pasturage in areas contaminated from hydrogen-bomb fallout. The strontium 90 becomes concentrated in bone tissue, which has an affinity for calcium, and is suspected of causing bone tumors, leukemia and other dangerous or fatal diseases. . . .
>
> The strontium 90, instead of falling to the ground within a short time and within a short distance of a hydrogen explosion, is carried into the stratosphere, where it spreads over the whole earth and is deposited gradually over a period of years.

While the National Academy of Sciences report cited by Linus Pauling says that strontium 90 is "not a current threat," it adds that "if there were any substantial increase in the rate of contamination of the atmosphere, it could become one."

However, the Oct. 22 issue of *Chemical and Engineering News* makes this statement: "Human tolerance to strontium go may have to be revised sharply downward, new research reveals." Three days later, a committee of the Federation of American Scientists declared: "It seems likely that the radiation hazard is more serious than is suggested by recent official statements." This committee added that "the concentration with which we should be concerned is '10 to 100 times less' than that indicated by the National Academy of Sciences report." A British Medical Research Council has pointed out that "growing bone takes up more of the bone-seeking isotopes such as strontium 90 and concentrates them," so that "rapidly growing tissues, such as those of children, are often particularly radiosensitive."

In a long letter to the New York *Times* of Oct. 31, Dr. William G. Cahan, a surgeon at the New York Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases, called into question statements suggesting that the amount of radioactive materials so far released into the atmosphere are "insignificant." He writes:

> . . . surely, the use of the word "insignificant" presupposes knowledge of what is significant, and that, explicitly, is the knowledge we do not now possess.
>
> For instance, is there a scientist who knows the exact amount of strontium 90 required to produce a bone cancer in any given human being?

Dr. Cahan recalls the many victims of unexpected incidence of cancer due to exposure to X-rays, adding:

> There have been increasing numbers of leukemias developing in the Japanese who had been exposed to the atomic blast in Hiroshima. These have taken five to ten years to manifest themselves. In all probability cancers attributable to this radiation will develop as time goes on.
>
> Although the gross contamination to which we have been exposed does not, presumably, approach those examples given, there is, in our state of ignorance, a further ominous unknown.
>
> Particles of radioactivity which are judged "insignificant" or "permissible" when measured in isolation may be significantly augmented by natural processes and thus reach man in highly concentrated form. Evidence of this is provided by the case of the wild muskrat which was captured and found to be cancer-ridden. The animal had eaten the water-plants growing beside the river which flows past Plant X-10 at Oak Ridge, Tenn. "Insignificant" amounts of radioactive material were released into the river by waste from Oak Ridge. But the plants at the water's edge absorbed these particles and, through evaporation, concentrated them.
>
> The radioactivity of the water-plants the muskrat ate was fourteen times higher than the radioactivity of the water; and the radioactivity found in the bone cancer in the muskrat's right hind leg was more than 150 times higher. These facts are, I believe, pertinent to any discussion of significant and "insignificant" amounts.

Dr. Cahan also points out that an "insignificant" amount of radiation may combine in the human body with some other, unknown, cancer-producing agent and tip the scales sufficiently to bring on disease. He says that years will be needed to decide such questions, and points to the folly of continuing "large-scale radioactive enterprises" during our present state of ignorance.

This is the sort of material now being assembled by specialists who fear the consequences of continued pollution of the atmosphere by atomic and nuclear experiments and tests. As the years go by, the warnings will become more substantially supported by facts. Unless the feelings aroused by these warnings subside into a *1984* type of apathy, the crusade against nuclear weapons may even become a "mass movement" of popular revolt.

REVIEW
HELEN KELLER

MANY passages in Van Wyck Brooks' *Helen Keller—Sketch for a Portrait* are likely to be remembered by readers. Published this year by Dutton, this small, easy-to-read volume has the easy communication one might expect from a neighbor or close friend of Miss Keller—a quality which helps to dispel the atmosphere of sensationalism to be expected of the highly publicized legend Miss Keller's life has become.

Helen Keller's fame, of course, is not undeserved. Her friendship with such men as Mark Twain and Alexander Graham Bell was not based on either their sympathy or their curiosity. Both these men found joy in Miss Keller's presence—and personal inspiration as well. In a closing passage, Mr. Brooks quotes a paragraph from Miss Keller to show how this woman, blind, deaf, and hardly able to speak, refused to associate herself with those who think it is "noble and comely to be unhappy." "Delight is essential to growth and self-improvement," wrote Miss Keller, and she added:

> Do not the pleasures of taste enable the body to assimilate food? What mind that thinks at all does not choose the ideas that please it and let all others go unheeded? . . . He who does not see that joy is an important force in the world misses the essence of life. Joy is a spiritual element that gives vicissitudes unity and significance. Belief in the triumph of good vitalizes a race; enlightened optimism fosters in man a constructive purpose and frees him from fears that fetter his thought.

Since the world knows mostly of Helen Keller's triumphs, her mastery of several languages, her familiarity with mathematics and the sciences, her literary abilities and her gracious sense of fitness, it is worth while to also learn that twenty-five years of struggle to develop intelligible speech tones were unsuccessful. Although able to communicate, she knew that her voice was neither pleasant nor satisfactory; yet she said of her heart-breaking struggle for a "normal" voice that it "strengthened every fibre of my being and deepened my understanding of all human strivings and disappointed ambitions." More of this attitude is provided by one of Mr. Brooks' chapters on Helen Keller's early life:

> Her disabilities drove her down to deeper levels of the will than the normal discover in themselves, and she was already reversing, moreover, some of the unhappier traits that had always been imputed to the blind. For where they were apt to have lowered vitality, hers was always higher, and she was adventurous where they were apt to be timid. But the most unusual fact about her was that, before she had entered her teens, she had discovered in herself the philosophic mind. At twelve she wrote to Michael Anagnos, "Yesterday I found Athens on the map, and I thought about you;" and one day she turned to Anne suddenly and said, "Such a strange thing has happened. I have been in Athens! I have been far away all this time, and I haven't left the room." It came over her instantly what this meant, that her mind had a reality independent of all conditions of place or body,—how else could she have been so vividly in a place that she had never seen, so far away? It was evident, then, that space meant nothing to spirit. Later Helen Keller wrote, "The fact that my little soul could reach out over continents and seas to Greece, despite a blind, deaf and stumbling body, sent another exulting emotion rushing over me. I had broken through my limitations and found in touch an eye. . . Deafness and blindness, then, were of no real account. They were to be relegated to the outer circle of my life."

No matter how often one reads of the facts of Helen's childhood, they always seem both incredible and an affirmation of the phenomenal resources of the human will. Until she was seven, Helen dwelt in a world of tactile sensations alone, without any knowledge of the cause of those sensations—a world without hope, anticipation, wonder, faith or joy. Then, with the first efforts of her inspired teacher, Anne Sullivan, Helen suddenly broke through to an understanding that *there were things to be learned.* Of this awakening, Helen was later to write: "there was a strange stir within me,—a misty consciousness, a sense of something remembered. It was as if I had come back to life after being dead . . . I understood that it was possible for me to

communicate with other people by these signs. Thoughts that ran forward and backward came to me quickly,—thoughts that seemed to start in my brain and spread all over me. I think it was in the nature of a revelation. . . . I felt joyous, strong, equal to my limitations. Delicious sensations rippled through me, and sweet strange things that were locked up in my heart began to sing." It is perhaps the realization that all of us are blind and deaf in many ways, that makes us respond to the "strange stir, a misty consciousness" which began Helen Keller's new life.

We might consider that Helen Keller may teach us more about the "arts" than the painter with an exquisite color sense, the singer with an incomparable voice, or the writer who shapes the cadence of his sentences with a delicate ear. For Miss Keller had only the *inner* senses to bring her appreciation of beauty and harmony, yet these were more than sufficient. Sensation without the senses—what does this imply? To us it suggests that every human being, whatever his initial endowments, is sensitive at heart and at soul. The source of all loveliness is not in the lovely things of the world, but in one's capacity to open the mind's eye to the symbols of awareness the physical world represents to man. Thinking these thoughts, one joins with the philosopher Plato, who anticipated what was expressed by Helen Keller concerning her first awakening. "A sense of something learned," to Plato, meant simply that the eye of the "soul" is far more penetrating than the eye of the body, and that given sufficient inspiration, we all might gain new vision, and cease seeing "as through a glass darkly." In what J. B. Rhine calls our "physicalist age," we tend mistakenly to think that our failure to grasp reality results from some technical ineptness. But the opacity of material forms is, in both Eastern and Platonic philosophy, an illusion. This Helen Keller discovered—a discovery that the "soul" may have both breadth and specific perception, regardless of the bleakness or absence of external stimuli. From a physiologist point of view, one can only conclude that Helen Keller's life must be a mindless turmoil; from the standpoint of Platonic philosophy there is nothing miraculous about her discovery of value, in herself, and in the world around her.

It must be more than coincidence that the most grievously afflicted enlighten us more than the fortunately endowed, because they demonstrate how petty are our troubles, how inadequate our appreciation and use of the faculties we possess. In summation of a life which can never be summed up entirely, Mr. Brooks adds this note of appreciation:

> What a response is Helen Keller to the smart blasphemers who sneer at "our neighbours' earthly welfare," as if this were merely materialistic, as if body and soul were not interrelated and misery were not an impediment to the growth of the spirit. Our fatalistic epoch, which has lost faith in the goodness of men, still recognizes the saints of the religion of art,—who are often in other respects mundane or vicious—while it ignores the real saints who exist among us and remind us that human nature is not a snake-pit. But the fame of Albert Schweitzer shows what a hunger for goodness exists in the world, a hunger that many novels are now disclosing, with a belief that "goodness is the only value that seems. . . to have any claim to be an end in itself." It is Somerset Maugham who says this in *The Summing-Up,* and he adds what everybody feels in Helen Keller's presence: "When now and then I have come across real goodness I have found reverence rise naturally in my heart."

COMMENTARY
BEARING THE UNBEARABLE

HELEN KELLER, Van Wyck Brooks relates, learned the lesson of living with failure from her inability, over twenty-five years, to develop a pleasant speaking voice. This, she said, "deepened my understanding of all human strivings and disappointed ambitions."

Is there any more important lesson in life than this? Every one of us has had a session or two with "intolerable" or "unbearable" situations. These are the situations which threaten to make us slaves of desperation—which seem to justify the use of any wild or insane action to gain escape. Psychologically, this condition is akin to the feeling that we *must* possess a particular thing, or be loved by a particular person.

Maturity comes when we recognize that no man needs anything outside himself to make him complete—when we understand that the "failure" is not in our inability to get what we want, but in all compulsive *wanting.*

Nothing can be plainer than the fact that the circumstances of a man's life do not have final control over the quality of his life or his maturity. Whatever it is that we *want,* there are always millions who get along very well without it. Whatever we fear, there are always millions who live out their lives in close familiarity with the threat we find intolerable. Sometimes, just recognizing this is enough to precipitate the real crisis of our lives, for then we must choose whether to wallow in the fierce egotism of our wants and fears, or to begin to grow into mature human beings.

Circumstances do not *cause* us to choose one way or the other, but they sometimes make decision unavoidable. This is the sort of decision being served up to us by the controversy over the testing and use of atomic and thermonuclear weapons. If it accomplishes nothing else, the debate of this issue will inevitably reveal the measure of our maturity as a people.

As a matter of fact, the entire field of political activity needs close examination in terms of the criteria of psychological maturity. Too often, in order to win elections, political campaigners deliberately exploit the immaturities of the voters, laying the foundation for what may be termed a *cultural psychotic break.* If the psychotherapists would give their attention to what used to be called "the great game of politics," they would probably gain little in popularity, but there would be compensation in the new light on the problems of the social order which might result.

This is a heavy responsibility for the psychologists—fully as heavy as that which weighs on the shoulders of the atomic scientists.

CHILDREN
and Ourselves

CORRESPONDENCE AND NOTES

Editors: In reading Bruno Bettelheim's *Truants from Life*—of which you often speak—I fell to pondering what seems to me a fairly basic question. Bettelheim describes how the sense of conscience in an emotionally disturbed child may begin to appear in a desire to please the therapist-counsellors in order that some manner of approval-reward may be achieved. But is this really "conscience," as most people think of it? If so, are we justified in assuming that normal children, also, seek rapport with parents in hope of "approval-rewards"—and the more tangible assets which tend to follow when apparent rapport has been achieved?

WE agree that this is "a fairly basic question." In fact, it is quite a bit like asking, "What is the human soul?"—involving, as it does, whether or not man is "naturally" selfish at birth, whether conscience is a sort of expedient overlay, and whether the ultimate development of what we call the higher motivations must always begin in self-interest.

The word "rapport" at the end of this question can take us back to the earliest days of a child's life. Not all parents may feel spontaneous "rapport" with an infant, but some may feel something which they can describe in no other terms. Unless we deny the existence of this feeling—or insist that it is merely a romantic cloak for fatherly or motherly pride—we have some grounds for holding that rapport may *either* come "naturally," at birth, or later be created, by degrees.

As we read them, many psychologists have impaled themselves on a contradiction by simultaneously maintaining that each parent *must* offer love to his child, and that the higher emotions are derived from simple selfishness. If "love" is a refinement of or compromise with selfishness, we can hardly expect a parent to manifest love just because he *is* a parent. Logic would require that "love" arise only when the object of love increases one's self-esteem. But we would agree with Karen Horney that there is a love which asks no reward, which has no expectations save that of a continuing desire for the *other's* welfare.

If mutually appreciated love can be described as rapport, and if this rapport does not have clear rational explanation, it is surely not beyond reason to imagine that a child may sense that a state of rapport does exist with the adults to whom he is closest—that this is the highest *natural* state. As the plant turns toward the sun, as its roots seek moisture, the instinctive intelligence of the child will gravitate toward inward sharing.

It is the height of obtuseness to imagine that any child is primarily concerned with tangible rewards. When presented, these are merely substitutes for his sense of growing towards greater meaningfulness in the life of others.

Even when the adolescent perversely tries to stay in the realm of irresponsible childhood, this may be because he has not been offered means of participating in the lives of the adults who form his environment. Always, we think, there is an inner urge to become an adult in terms of responsibility, in terms of faith in one's capacity to "give" more to parents, teachers and friends. When insensitive parents or teachers fail to provide opportunity for such organic growth, the children may turn "neurotic"—that is, fasten on possessions and aggressive accomplishments as personal totems of their individuality, evidence that they *can* assert themselves.

The psychological immaturity of our age is betrayed by the fact that so many children and adolescents discover the beauties of "rapport" outside the home apart from the tensions of inadequate adjustment. Whoever meets the psychologically neglected child on his own terms, who appreciates him for potentials *he* sees in himself, instead of criticizing him for inept performance, becomes a "psychological parent." And true friendships, whether between children or between adults and the young, are their own

reward. In their absence, the growing psyche of the child can do nothing better than seek to win tangible signs of approval. And thus the matter of "social conscience" is approached. Individual conscience, we take it, is direct intuitional perception. Intuition senses the meaning of rapport, and conscience, the voice of intuition, protests its rupture. "Social conscience," on the other hand, may merely reflect the compulsions and compromises of convention. All the same, the attempt of the child to gain "approval-rewards" is shadowy evidence of creative and constructive intelligence.

Books such as Karen Horney's *Neurotic Personality of our Time* and *Self Analysis* suggestively develop the hypothesis that, as man moves towards maturity, he literally develops two distinct "selves." The "social self" may be equated with most of the elements described by Freud as "the super ego"—the imposition of the mores of one's society, and a "survival reaction" to pressures exerted and rewards promised. The "real" self has a different scale of values, stemming from some inchoate but ineradicable conviction that no one can live happily in society or anywhere else unless he discovers his own personal convictions and is true to them. Rapport, then, can vary with the self. There is, for instance, the rapport which one feels by blending successfully with his environment. The child whose reactions and responses are in conformity with those of the children and adults who surround him will feel one kind of "belonging." But another variety of rapport has to do with those deep affinities—sometimes arising at birth—between those whose sharing of certain sensitivities of perception tends to make them independent of group thought. There is, in other words, a sharing of originality—a much rarer thing—as well as a sharing of conformity.

The "rewards" flowing from achievement of these two types of rapport are just as different as their causes. While the emotionally disturbed child may need to feel accepted by his elders, before the courage to be truly individual can assert itself, the second type of "reward" is much more important—for it has little to do with attempting to please parents, teachers or counsellors, and everything to do with his spontaneous desire to share his consciousness with one to whom he is drawn by either birth or circumstances. This is spontaneous selectivity, and on this basis alone can one move towards the deep friendships that bring the widest reaches to human experience.

"Conscience," for one who is moving beyond social conscience, becomes an inability to wish other than the greatest happiness for those we have accepted as "a portion of ourselves." It can be our further assumption that the universal ethics of a sage who regards all human beings with equanimity can well derive from an origin in depth of individual friendships—never from the "social" conscience itself.

We stand, then, with the most radical educators who are much less concerned with the emotional adjustment to environment of the normal child than with the deepening of his individuality, since the deepening of the individuality, alone, leads to the attainment of the highest rapport. For the maturing child, the attainment of one true companion is of far greater importance than the acceptance or even the adulation of large numbers. It is unfortunate that it seldom seems possible for young people to develop perfectly in both directions at the same time, but it is also true that the very struggle to break away from the group "norm" eventually provides a better basis for *understanding* that norm than would passive acceptance.

So, while we have no criticism to make of Dr. Bettelheim's recognition that the emotionally disturbed child needs to be encouraged to seek "acceptance," we feel that both "rapport" and "conscience" can ultimately be defined in terms of greater significance.

FRONTIERS

Between Two Worlds

BETWEEN July 15 and July 30, representatives of the Bureau of Indian Affairs met with groups of Hopi Indians on the Hopi Reservation in Arizona. These hearings grew out of a visit last year to Washington by leaders of the traditional Hopis. On May 18, 1955, Dan Katchongva and David Monongye, traditional Hopis, and several others talked to Glenn L. Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, presenting the viewpoint of the those Hopis who believe that following the traditional Hopi way of life is an all-important religious duty. At that time Dan Katchongva laid on the desk of the Commissioner some of the temporary grazing permits which the Indian Bureau had issued to Hopi stockmen. The permits, the traditional Hopis felt, were symbolic of an authority over them which they were determined not to recognize. Commissioner Emmons then asked the Hopi leaders to retain the permits until he sent to Hopiland a "team" composed of the Assistant Commissioner and two Program Officers of the Bureau, to hold hearings in the Hopi villages.

These hearings were held last July. Scores of Hopis had opportunity to speak, every point of view being represented at the various Hopi villages. While the hearings, judging from the four hundred pages of stenographic report of the proceedings, were conducted with patience and dignity, there is evidence throughout of the clash of cultures and of the great difficulty of a meeting of minds between the traditional Hopi point of view and the representatives of the United States Government.

Not all Hopis belong to the "traditional" group. The tribe is divided on the issue of whether it is desirable for the Hopis to adopt the white man's point of view and willingly accept his influence over their lives. Opposition to the ways of white culture is embodied in the stand of the traditional Hopis, who reject entirely the sovereignty of the United States, deny the right of the Government to allot land to the Hopis, to build roads through the Hopi country, to educate Hopi children in American schools, to expose Hopi children to the influence of Christian missionaries, and to draft Hopi young men into the Army in time of war. The traditional Hopis refuse to recognize the authority of the Tribal Council, established under the Indian Reorganization Act as a form of democratic self-government for the Indians. They feel that all these institutions of American influence lead the Hopi youth away from the sacred tribal traditions and cause them to abandon the high responsibilities which the Hopi religion presents.

The non-traditional Hopis are those who endeavor to practice cooperation with the Indian Bureau, and who are often, it seems, converts to Christianity. It is clear from the testimony in these hearings that Christian missionaries have persuaded the Hopi Christians that the Hopi Great Spirit, Masawau, is the same as the Christian Devil. One non-traditional Hopi said during a hearing:

We have learned from the Bible this Masawau is Lucifer, Satan, or the Devil, who is a deceiver of the world. . . . Masawau, Devil, has misled our people, created doubt in their minds against their own government and against themselves... It is appropriate, here, to present the estimate of the Hopi religion offered by Laura Thompson and Alice Joseph, as a contrasting evaluation to the judgment of this Christianized Indian. In *The Hopi Way* (University of Chicago, 1947), these authors suggest the deep discipline and commitment which the Hopi attitude toward life involves:

> In the Hopi system of mutual dependency, which gives basic form to the universe, each individual, human or non-human, has its proper place in relation to all other phenomena, with a definite role in the cosmic scheme. But, whereas the non-human orders fulfill their obligations more or less automatically under the law, man has definite responsibilities which have to be learned and carried out according to a

> fixed set of rules. These rules form an ethical code known as the Hopi Way. . . . a large part of the training of the child is devoted to learning this code.
>
> . . . The individual's success in life and also the welfare of the tribe depend on wholeheartedly, and with an effort of the will, cultivating the Hopi Way. . . .
>
> It is interesting to note. . . that the Hopi use the same word *(na'wakna)* for "to will" and "to pray." The Hopi believe not only that man can control nature to a limited extent by observing these rules, but that if he does not do so, the universe may cease to function.

With this in mind, it is easy to understand the profound concern of the traditional Hopis for the preservation of their way of life, and their open indifference to the "advantages" of white Western culture. The Hopi people, according to the authors of *The Hopi Way*, "stand out among the 360,000 Indians of the United States proper as the tribe which has been least affected in its basic culture by modern civilization." And the Hopi, it may be added, are outstanding among all peoples, Indian or white, as having high intelligence, sensitive moral perception, and a strong sense of immanent justice. Students of culture have for years been attracted to the Hopis as representing a society which contains many of the ingredients of the good life which seem lost to the more "advanced" cultures of Western civilization.

Early in the hearings of last July, Dan Katchongva, a venerable leader of the traditional Hopis, now in his eighties, spoke of the division among the Hopis. The following is taken from statements by him, made at different times, providing a composite impression of the traditional Hopi view. Dan does not speak English, so that the words are those of an interpreter.

* * *

Many of the [Hopi] people followed a new life of the white man and tried to influence our people who are following their own way of life, and it seems it is a great struggle, now, between those people who want to follow their own way of life and those people who have broken away from the life pattern and accepted these many policies of the white man. Things have become so confused we can never get together in that way. Many would like for the Hopis to be all under one leader or one great cultural authority, but our life is set up in such a way that each village has its own village leaders, and each one takes care of its own life; yet it is all based on the ancient teachings of the Hopi people that were handed down to us, so that no matter what happens once we recognize that since we are Hopis, since we are the first people in this land, and since we have opposed these things, and since we have obtained these life instructions from one who came to this land—once we recognize this fact, I am sure all of us will appreciate that we are Hopis, that we have a great and good life, but not by turning away from these teachings that were handed down by our forefathers.

Now all these conditions and all this confusion among the people have been created when some of our people have turned away from this life pattern and have worked along with the group who have turned away. They have burned up their altars and have buried all their religious beliefs and traditions of the Hopi, saying that that was the end and that nothing will come out of it any more. . . . The great leaders in former times had a great faith in the things that were taught to them, and they held fast to it, but once one lets go it and goes to the other side, to the people who are following a new life plan, if he is a great leader he will be recognized as the highest leader by the people who have turned away from their life pattern. The white man will look to him as the great leader because we have forced him away from his life pattern. The white man will always make him the biggest chief of all. Perhaps if I turn away from this life pattern and accept the new life pattern I might become a great leader also. But we in this village are still remaining fast with this life pattern because we have been taught that we must never let go of it, no matter how hard it might be.

Now to the future. My teachings have been handed to me from my forefathers because I belong to that group who belong to the great leaders, leaders who have been the ones who carried this stone tablet, and we are told that somewhere one of these great leaders will fail in his duties and turn aside. Then it will be up to me, I was told, because I come from the clan who are the keepers of the stone tablets. I will have to take on the great duties that belong to the other leaders ahead of me, but since they have fallen down everything will be left to me to carry on, even though I am not a great leader as those ahead of me. . . .

All these great leaders in these various clans have a great duty to perform in this life, and when we left, all people rose up and said that the people who went to Washington are not the great leaders. That is true, but these are the men who are carrying on this life for us and are the proper ones to do it at this time.

* * *

It is evident from the words of Dan Katchongva that he is addressing his fellow Hopis as much or more than the representatives of the Indian Bureau. Indeed, Dan is absorbed in the mission of the Hopi people; nothing else has any reality for him. The evils suffered by the tribe, while difficult to bear, are a small matter compared to the importance of the fidelity of the Hopis themselves to their way of life. This is clear from what he says about the land.

* * *

We have spoken of land and how to settle the land problem. I say no one can settle this land problem. It is going to be the one who will come who will settle this land problem. This has been warned to us, so we are still holding on to all of our life and all of our land that was designated under our stone tablet. That is what these stone tablets are for. We know that one brother of ours will have the same kind of stone tablets, and we will then fully recognize each other as brothers. Only then will this land problem be settled. We cannot settle it now. We will only make the mistake of cutting it up in the white man's way. We have been told by the white man that all livestock belongs to him. The white man has been the last to come upon our land, yet he seems to know everything about Hopi people or Indian people. That is what he claims. If he did know, these problems would not have come up in this way. You have claimed everything: our land, our forests, our wild game, and you want to make us pay for those things. This is not the way a person should do. Now we have to be paying for those things that were ours in former times. If you know us, you would have followed up our ruins where we have lived, and you would have come to us and known us, but instead you have come claiming everything for yourselves. . . . You have never explained your policies or programs to us in a way that the people can understand. Without consulting us, without our consent, you push many of your programs upon us. It is the way of a man who works in secret places. Now, if you had done it in the right way you would have consulted with us and explained things so that we could make our decisions. Then if we wish to do away with our own way of life, we might have accepted your programs. . . .

Concerning the permits that were laid on this table, these stockmen have all decided they do not want to go under these permits. If you do not accept them, they will lie there. No one will take them. If there is someone who has changed his mind, he is free to take and use them. Otherwise they will be left there and perhaps will be thrown away somehow.

* * *

The grazing permits are a sore point with the Hopis. In the 1940's, many of the sheep herds from which the Hopis earned their living were forcibly reduced by the Indian Bureau as a means of range conservation. The Indians did not believe this was necessary; at any rate, some Hopis resisted the curtailment of their flocks and

some were punished by jail sentences. Now the traditional Hopi deny the right of the government to give them "permission" to graze their flocks; just as they refuse to apply to the Land Claims Office for what they hold to be justice in respect to the extent of the Hopi country; and just as they are embittered by the Government's program of building roads in certain sacred areas of the reservation. The Hopis who share the convictions of traditional leaders such as Dan Katchongva are literally untouched by the Government's plans and policies—even the most benevolent or well-considered. These Hopi think in terms of their ancestral duty and role in the universe: To set an example as the Peaceful People, to live according to the Hopi Way of Life, and to transmit these conceptions to the coming generation. What disturbs the performance of these appointed tasks is an interference with destiny. The traditional Hopis regard as "good" only those things which permit them to pursue their destiny on their own terms, without meddling interference.

There is no problem of communication with the traditional Hopis. There is no communication with these Hopis, for the reason that the whites have nothing to say that the Hopis care to hear. We can force our presence upon them, but we cannot gain their interest or real attention. All that we can do is leave them alone. And we do not, alas, know how to do that. It seems a monumental conceit of the dominant white culture that it is unable to appreciate the simple right and moral necessity of these people to be left alone.