VOLUME 1, NO. 19
MAY 12, 1948

MEN WITHOUT LAND

WHY are 1,100 agricultural workers of the Di Giorgio Farms near Arvin, at the southern end of California's rich San Joaquin Valley, on strike? Mr. Joseph Di Giorgio, head of the huge Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation, who built up its vast holdings in California and elsewhere to a property said to be worth 80 millions, has a reputation for fair dealings with labor unions other than the recently organized Farm Labor Union, to which the strikers belong. He pays his pickers and shed workers as much or more than other employers of agricultural labor in the Valley. He gave $150,000 for the construction of a public school for the children within the region of the Di Giorgio ranch—and it is a "region," encompassing eighteen square miles, or about 10,000 acres. The nearby community of Arvin thought so well of Mr. Di Giorgio that they placed a bust of him in the patio of the Arvin Community Center, to honor him as a public-spirited citizen. Mr. Di Giorgio has the admiration of many friends. Starting in 1919, when he first bought land in California, he turned a semi-desert into a fertile plain.

To understand what is at stake in the eight-months-old strike at Di Giorgio's, some knowledge of farm-labor history in California is essential. For more than sixty years—since 1886—the California farm-labor problem has been basically the same, although it has spread over the State and increased in intensity and complexity with the expansion of California agriculture. It is the problem of plentiful, cheap labor for the grower, of economic survival and elemental decency in living conditions for the worker.

Until recently, the large growers have always been able to provide themselves with an abundance of cheap labor. It was abundant because men were recruited in large numbers. It was cheap because these men had no alternative—they either worked for the farmers or starved.

Large-scale farming began in California after the gold-rush days of '49. Many who failed to gain sudden riches from gold turned to raising wheat, for which there was great demand. Enormous tracts of arable land were acquired by relatively few men through the usually fraudulent titles of Mexican land grants. From the beginning, therefore, "bigness" characterized California farming. After a cycle of profit-taking from wheat, fruit became the major crop. This became possible through the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869, enabling perishable products to reach the eastern market in good condition. The transition was hurried by a decline in the price of wheat, starting in 1870, and by the development of intensive irrigation following a serious drought in the '60's. "Fruit," as Joe Di Giorgio has said, "is nothing but water, and labor, and more labor and freight." Pumps provided the water, and, successively, the Chinese, Japanese, Hindus, Filipinos, Mexicans, and finally, native Americans, provided the labor.

California agriculture, today, has to its credit what might be termed a historic achievement in the mass production of fruits and vegetables. More than a third of the nation's large farms are in California. For many years, the value of California's farm products has ranged around the half-billion mark. As a single instance of California's volume, the lettuce-growing region of Salinas supplies some 90 per cent of the total lettuce consumed in the United States. California produces lettuce, asparagus, artichokes, cantaloupes, cherries, peaches, plums, grapes, raisins, berries and citrus fruits in enormous quantities.

When wheat farming gave way to fruit and vegetables, the need for a large supply of temporary labor, especially at harvest time, became acute. At first, almost providentially, the Chinese were available at just the right time. Driven from the mines by discriminatory laws and by terrorism practiced against them by white miners, the Chinese went to work on the California farms. When the railroad was finished, thousands more Chinese needed employment. The fruit growers and shippers found the Chinese a docile and efficient labor force which served the interests of the large landowner by harvesting and picking his crop and then disappearing until the next season. The small growers, however, were angered by the competitive advantage which "coolie labor" gave to the big operators. Orchardists unable to exploit cheap Chinese labor united with white labor interests to renew the anti-Chinese campaign. Finally, when legislation against the Chinese proved ineffectual, gangs of resentful whites drove them bodily from the fields. Many were deported to China under the Oriental Exclusion Act of 1882 and the Geary Act of 1892, while others took refuge in the cities. After the Chinese were driven away, and by the time Japanese were "enticed" to come to harvest the crops, "over half a million acres of farm land had been put out of cultivation in California."

During the 90's, Japanese farm laborers began to appear around Fresno. From about 2,000 in 1890, their number grew to 24,000 in 1900, and 72,000 in 1910. They worked almost exclusively on specialized farms. They had no families, moved quietly from harvest to harvest, and never obtruded their presence on the white community. No one seemed to know where or how they lived, or where they went when their work was done. They were hired through their own employment clubs, and, at first, worked for less than white and even Chinese labor. Again, the big farms had "solved" their labor problem.

The Japanese, however, behaved most ungratefully. First, after obtaining a virtual monopoly over California farm labor, they demanded higher wages, and got them. Second, they began to acquire land of their own—waste land, to be sure, which no one else thought worth cultivating—and were amazingly successful in farming on their own account. By 1918, they were growing some 25,000 acres of rice in California. Other arid stretches were turned into fruitful berry country by the Japanese. These innovations were due entirely to the skill and imagination of Japanese farmers.

Accordingly, instead of an "ideal labor force," the Japanese now were known as undesirable "Asiatics" who must be prevented from getting a "firm foothold and permanent position in the community." The campaign against the Japanese resulted in the Alien Land Act of 1913 and restriction on Japanese immigration in 1924. They were forced to sell their land-holdings under the Alien Land Act, and except for the few who were able to evade the provisions of this law, the Japanese lost the benefit of their contribution to California agriculture. During World War II, of course, they suffered further losses.

Another racial group, less numerous than the Japanese, but reaching a total of 10,000 before the first world war, were the Hindu agricultural workers who filtered in from Canada. Their history was much the same as that of the Japanese. They were excellent workers, but soon became farmers on their own account. They suffered the same legal persecutions as the Japanese and by 1930, their number had dwindled to 1,873 in California.

Next came the Mexicans, who were "imported" to harvest the crops of California's fertile valleys. It is estimated that from 1924 to 1930, an average of 58,000 Mexicans were brought across the border each year. Of the total of 200,000 agricultural workers employed during the harvest season, 150,000 were Mexican. Unlike the Filipinos, who were also "imported"—principally because the growers feared a restriction of Mexican immigration—the

Mexicans, not being American nationals, could be *deported* at the end of the season, as most of them had entered the United States illegally.

While lobbyists for the agricultural industry were fighting threatened restrictions on the importation of Mexican labor, the welfare agencies of California cities shouldered the heavy relief burden created by the winter unemployment of Mexicans who did not return to their country, or were themselves American citizens. The Mexicans worked for as little as 15 and 14 cents an hour during the depression; they had no desire to become land-owners, and they gave no "trouble." They were brought from Mexico to work in the harvest, then turned loose to be supported on the city relief rolls, but after a deportation law passed in 1929, the cities began to repatriate much of their Mexican population, thousands of whom were shipped back to Mexico. As entry into the United States became more difficult, the available Mexican labor decreased. Finally, the Mexicans began to unionize as a national group, and while their first strike was broken by arrests, threats of mass deportation, and special work-crews recruited from Texas and Oklahoma, the era of "good feeling" toward Mexican labor was at an end.

The Great Migration of farm workers from the dust-bowl of Oklahoma, Arkansas and Texas began in 1933. They came to California and they came to stay. Hundreds of thousands arrived within four or five years. They were drawn into the vast circulating current of migratory farm workers within California, moving from crop to crop during the harvest season, traveling in antiquated "jalopies" and the nondescript transportation described by John Steinbeck in *Grapes of Wrath.* And they met, on the whole, the hunger, unemployment and degradation which Mr. Steinbeck allotted to the Joads in his story.

The period of the migration from the dust-bowl was also the period of attempted unionization of the farm workers, mostly by Communist organizers. After years of failure, an American Federation of Labor official in California had said, "Only fanatics are willing to live in shacks or tents and get their heads broken in the interests of migratory labor." The Communists welcomed the opportunity. The epoch of "The Great Strikes" is fully described by Carey McWilliams in *Factories in the Field* (on which the present summary draws heavily for its facts). The reaction to this effort to organize the migratory workers came in the form of a counter-organization of the grower-shippers, the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., which has some 40,000 members. It has a long record of avowed opposition to the unionization and farm labor.

The present strike at Di Giorgio's dramatizes the basic problem of California farm labor and at the same time illustrates the difference between the problem as it existed twenty years ago, and today. In contrast to some of the big California farms, Di Giorgio is in some respects an ideal employer. It cannot be said of Di Giorrgio's that the quarters for farm laborers are "devoid of the accommodations given horses," which was the phrase used to describe the conditions under which workers had lived in previous years. Nor can the Di Giorgio strikers be called "migratory" at all. Most of them have year-round employment in the Di Giorgio Farms, and Mr. Di Giorgio has allowed himself to be quoted as saying he believes in an "annual wage" for agriculture—a revolutionary conception, so far as the Associated Farmers are concerned.

Further, the Di Giorgio strike presents no "race problem" unless it be in connection with the several hundred Mexicans recruited from distant depressed areas to break the strike. The Di Giorgio strikers are mostly native Americans—men and women from Oklahoma and Arkansas and Texas—dust-bowl refugees who have been working at Di Giorgio for years. The strike is not "Communist-inspired," as Di Giorgio spokesmen have claimed. The Farm Labor Union, formerly the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, is chartered

by the American Federation of Labor. Its constitution bars any Communist from membership and the union broke away from the CIO on the issue of Communist penetration—the first CIO union to take this step.

The strike at Di Giorgio is primarily and emphatically a strike for union recognition. The long-term union objective, quite obviously, is the stabilization of farm labor in California, and the ultimate release of half a million human beings from a rootless, wandering existence at the mercy of the requirements of the most highly organized and powerful farming interests in the world. Farms like Di Giorgio's are not farms in the familiar sense at all, but vast industrial empires operated like any other big business, except that there is virtually no check on the abuses of their labor policy.

It would be difficult to find a more helpless, defenseless and resourceless body of laborers in the whole of the United States, than the agricultural workers of California. The struggle of these people for the right of collective bargaining in no way resembles the power-hungry activities of some long-established unions of skilled workers. These people are farmers, and they are farmers without land. Even if some day they obtain guarantees of an annual wage, gain seniority rights, protection from arbitrary discharge, and special compensation for exceptionally long hours of work which the harvest sometimes requires—even if, after years of struggle, they become able to own or rent decent homes and send their children to school regularly, and establish residence in one community long enough to vote like other American citizens—they will still have little enough to show for their arduous toiling on the sun-baked plains of California.

But these objectives are precisely the objectives which the powerful land-owning interests of California agriculture oppose. The advantage of the industrialized farm lies in large measure in its ability to obtain a lot of cheap labor for a brief period of time. Not all the big farms can use year-round labor to the extent that Di Giorgio can. Di Giorgio, if he recognizes the Farm Labor Union, will do himself little harm—he could easily pay the wage demands of the strikers, and considerably more. But he is bound by his alliance with the other big farmers to maintain the anti-union position. He does not "recognize" the strike at all, and has repeatedly refused to confer with union representatives.

If the workers of these great "factories in the field" should root themselves in California, a generation hence might find a new force in public opinion developing in the agricultural counties. More than half of all those gainfully employed in agriculture in California are paid laborers without land. As voters, they might be formidable. They might help to put through the 160-acre limitation proposal of the Reclamation Bureau's scheme for water-control in the Central Valley, under which tremendous holdings such as the farms of the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation would be divided up into smaller units of ownership. The "Okies" and the "Arkies" and the "Texicans" might, like the Japanese before them, acquire farms of their own, and as Oklahoma, Arkansas and Texas are not countries in Asia, their right to own property in California could not be contested in the courts. Further, they might even undertake ventures in cooperative farming, and continue the large-scale efficiencies of industrialized agriculture without its present exploitation of workers who have no choice except to submit to the feudal system which now prevails.

Despite the virulent greed which animated the early settling of California and has characterized much of the economic history of the State ever since, certain instances of genuine cooperative enterprise in that history may be prophetic of a future social order. The Kaweah Cooperative Colony, established near Visalia in the 1800’s showed what could be accomplished by 500 intelligent and determined people, stirred by the ideals of Lawrence Gronlund and Edward

Bellamy. Jealous private industry and a stupid and inequitable act of Congress in 1890 put an end to this genuine "free enterprise" in co-operation, but not before the Colony had revealed its extraordinary possibilities, both socially and economically. Another and more humble venture was the Salvation Army's settlement at Fort Romie in Salinas Valley in 1898, where some indigent San Francisco families were helped to become home-owners on tracts of ten and twenty acres. On this land they raised beets for the near-by sugar-beet factory of Claus Spreckles. In 1905, the colony was pronounced a success by Rider Haggard, who noted in particular the spirit of cooperation among the settlers. By 1912, all the land was paid for, and the Salvation Army realized a profit of $12,000.

Such experiments are today almost forgotten, but they are nevertheless evidence that men, and families, working together, can solve their economic problems and build for themselves the foundations of full and happy lives. The desire to work together is primary, but access to the land is necessary, too. Lacking land, the Di Giorgio strikers can at least work together, for one another. That, more than anything else, is the explanation of their strike.

Letter from **GERMANY**

BERLIN.—Since the "capture of Prague," our capital is more than ever the focus of world politics. There are several points of view which invite a look at this city of ruins and 3.25 millions of mostly destitute people. Take for instance the look of a military strategist who would say that no bridge-head can last forever: it will either be destroyed or must be enlarged and extended into the enemy territory. Because the power behind the present "bridge-head Berlin" is the superior power with regard to the array of forces in our present world, the strengthening of the bridge-head seems certain. But—on the other hand—that does not exclude the transitory crushing of this point of vantage. (The fate of Danzig in the so-called Polish Corridor, which was occupied by the Germans in 1939 and held for the duration of the second world war, could be used as an example of the situation of our city.)

With regard to the future, one can safely say that Berlin has become more and more a thorn in the Russian flesh. The Russian organism tries desperately to fester this thorn out of its flesh, but it is already too deep. The strength of the organism cannot get it out.

In strong contrast to the lively activity in the political, diplomatic, and military field of the four occupation powers stands the rather passive attitude of the population of Berlin. It is, after all, *their* fate that is to be decided in the near future. But they cannot participate in the great struggle now raging behind closed doors.

Why are they so passive?

Two reasons can be given: (1) The passivity of the Berliners is not a mental one. They study eagerly the latest news in the different papers. (There are now fifteen dailies in Berlin.) But what *can* they do? Nothing. Even when the Berliners join one of the four allowed political parties, they are still impotent, without power to say or to decide anything that matters in this important battle. In this regard the fate of the Berliners is not different from that of most other common people on the globe. Decisions are made without these people and usually without their consent. (Lack of freedom in Berlin is only the lack of freedom in the world, but in its most striking, clearly visible form.)

(2) The second reason for the inactivity of the Berliners is that freedom in Germany today is only a minor problem compared to the most urgent questions of food and clothing and heat. No matter whether West or East: the hunger in both zones of Germany is the same.

The point in history when the Berliners will become subjects again—instead of mere objects of today's power—politics remains hidden in the future. This point presumes the decline and the ruin of power-politics—which will certainly come, because the great questions of our present world cannot be solved by power-politics any more. They will be solved only by the human cooperation of free and equal beings, a co-operation which will grow with irresistible force from the spreading and irrevocable social crisis of our society.

REVIEW
THE SLENDER THREADS

THE choice of Louis Lochner's annotated "representative sections" from the private diary of Joseph Goebbels as "Book-of-the-Month" for May merits careful attention. The volume will be useful if readers begin with the premise that Humanity is One, and that Joseph Goebbels represents a side of ourselves, but not if it is relished as confirming smug assumptions about the superiority of American politics and morals.

It is obvious that both Mr. Lochner and the BoM are presenting this book for public consumption on the theory that it will be pleasing to the American people to learn that the No. 2 Nazi was just as evil a man as our war propaganda claimed him to be, and that the Nazi Party in its entirety was a sub-human species. We have no doubt that Mr. Lochner's choice of "representative sections" was inspired by this motivation, for the whole arrangement seems to be calculated to prove that an unbridgeable gap in morality existed between the Axis leaders and the leaders of the United Nations. The same tendency to select the worst possible commentaries on the Nazi state of mind is further accentuated by the BoM *Bulletin*, which introduces the Goebbels Diaries to prospective readers. Under the sub-title, "Goebbels on Hitler," for instance, the *Bulletin* contents itself with emphasizing the popular version of Hitler as an ever inconsistent, neurotic mystic, a fanatical hater on the borderline of insanity. No mention is made of sentences like the following, which was chronicled by Goebbels after an informal talk with his Fuehrer: "We all long for the day when we can take part in reconstruction and not experience only the seamy side of this tremendous revolution." Nor is any mention made in the *Bulletin* of Hitler's interest in the children of the Goebbels family, nor the joy he apparently experienced when enabled to spend some time with them. The BoM *Bulletin* also reproduces a section dealing with the position of the Nazis in regard to organized religion, but excludes a passage from Goebbels which shows that he was impressed by Hitler's refusal to take drastic action which would interfere with the religious life of simple German people. Hitler "declared that if his mother still lived she would undoubtedly go to church today, and he could not and would not hinder her."

Since we are assured by BoM that Goebbels wrote the Diaries "for his own eyes," and not for History, we might ask why such passages are ignored in descriptions of this volume. Are not the threads of common humanity, however slender, in the life of a man like Goebbels, of the greatest importance? Debs' statement, "If there is a criminal class, I am of it," can hardly be overlooked, because it reminds us that real social and political reconstruction begin with the understanding that all human strengths and weaknesses are shared.

Much has been made of the Nazis' "irreligion." It is true that although most German conscientious objectors to war were placed in concentration camps, some were summarily executed. True, that the Churches of Germany fared poorly under the Nazis. Yet the following evaluation of religion by Goebbels is typical enough in America, nor is it without justification:

> The opinionated "sky pilots" of course know exactly how the world is constituted. Whereas the most learned and wisest scientists struggle for a whole lifetime to study but one of the mysterious laws of nature, a little country priest from Bavaria is in a position to decide this matter on the basis of his religious knowledge. One can regard such a disgusting performance only with disdain. A church that does not keep step with modern scientific knowledge is doomed. It may take quite a while, but it is bound finally to happen. Anybody who is firmly rooted in daily life, and who can only faintly imagine the mystic secrets of nature, will naturally be extremely modest about the universe.

It appears that we often castigate the Nazis, not for their views, but because they were more ruthless and extreme than ourselves in putting them into application. It is of record that Selective Service in America also felt it a positive

duty to make things difficult for those with religious consciences.

We have the feeling that this book has been annotated and commented upon chiefly for people who are uninterested in studying the significance of the extreme attitudes of mind held by the Nazis, but who will enjoy proving their own moral superiority by condemning the Nazi vices. There is not the slightest doubt that Joseph Goebbels was a paranoiac. But it is also true that when we support our own delusions of moral grandeur we tend in a paranoid direction ourselves. We feel that the whole context of the Lochner-BoM presentation makes it difficult for a reader to learn what would be actually most useful to him—that we are ourselves living among many of the same psychological complexes as those revealed by Goebbels. If we can legitimately regard any human being as detestable, it is certain that Goebbels rates highly under that classification, but even in this case of the most unlikeable Nazi it would be educative to discover that the gulf between himself and ourselves is not wondrously great.

Mr. Lochner asserts that Goebbels' children were conceived for propaganda purposes and to ingratiate himself further with a leader who believed in large families. But we find consistent mention of Goebbels' desire to devote himself to the upbringing of his progeny after the war and the fact that he misses a natural companionship with them which is denied by exigencies of the time. Even Goebbels was "human":

> In the evening I am able to devote a little time to the children, with whom I'm having much fun. It is such a pity that one can be so little with one's children. . . Once the war is over I shall be able to devote myself much more than hitherto to their upbringing. I could not think and wish for any more beautiful task for the coming peace.

If we can endure a little more flagellation, we may be sufficiently open-minded to note that both Goebbels and Hitler felt justified in assigning to the Germans a cultural and moral superiority over the average American. The impression Goebbels gained from interviews with American prisoners, however unjustifiable, evidences a sincerity of belief in this regard:

> A report on interrogations of American prisoners is really gruesome. These American boys are human material that can in no way stand comparison with our people. One has the impression of dealing with a herd of savages. The Americans are coming to Europe with a spiritual emptiness that really makes you shake your head. They are uneducated and don't know anything. For instance, they ask whether Bavaria belongs to Germany and similar things. One can imagine what would happen to Europe if this dilettantism could spread unchallenged.
>
> There is constant talk among Soviet prisoners about a joint war of Germany and the Soviet Union against England and the United States. Interestingly enough the English and American prisoners talk about a joint war of Germany and the Anglo-Americans against the Soviet Union.

The Goebbels Diaries are actually compelling evidence the Nazis thought they were fighting a war for the improvement of the human race. Their delusions of superiority and their contempt for classes and masses of people alien to their own peculiar ideals were typical of the attitudes which flourish whenever a country is on the brink of war. American attitudes towards the Japanese on the West coast were often nearly identical. Interestingly enough, also, Goebbels, like most of us, made a distinction between his wartime activities, his intrigues and deceitful propaganda, and the kind of life he would imagine himself living under less tumultuous circumstances.

We realize, of course, that in seeking out and quoting from Herr Goebbels' diaries passages which reflect attitudes, both good and bad, most easily recognized in ourselves, we are exposed to the possibility of indignant reproach by readers who quite naturally see between the lines of anything the Nazi propaganda chief might write the spectre of Maidanek and all the horrors to which little attention has been paid in this review. The question that to us seems important, however, is not how evil human beings can be in their actions, but rather, what sort of men, in other respects, are they to whom such evil came to

appear as a kind of "good." In *The Goebbels Diaries,* one finds the rationalizations and racism carried to an insane extreme, so that the question is in order: Are there *any* human qualities which remain somewhat "normal" despite this progression in the dark logic of fanatical nationalist "security"? What is left to build upon in men who take this course? Not to minimize the evil, but because of its magnitude, we seek evidences of its opposite.

We make the recommendation that this book be read as a study in the hallucinations which come to all men, and that we seek to find in it practical warnings in regard to many of our own attitudes. The conditions in Germany after World War I most certainly encouraged the development of extreme psychological difficulties. The emergence of paranoid states of mind in the Nazis and the popular acceptance of the Nazis as leaders came as a matter of course. World responsibility for the German condition is apparent to every serious student of history.

COMMENTARY
COMMENT AND REPLY

WE have a letter on the review of *The Dark Side of the Moon* (MANAS, April 21), offering two suggestions: (1) Inhumanity like that suffered by the Poles and others in Soviet concentration camps has in the United States been inflicted on our own minorities—negroes, sharecroppers, and miners in the Harlan coal district, Kentucky. (2) Polish charges against the Russians are probably exaggerated.

The first suggestion we accept, with this qualification: Brutalities in the United States differ in one important respect from the systematic attack on moral individuality which characterizes totalitarian lands—the former are not justified by an "official" political philosophy.

Scores of aroused individuals and groups in the United States are fighting injustice and political and economic inequalities in the name of humanitarian principles and basic constitutional law. No minority is fighting the lagier system in Soviet Russia.

There would, however, be a parallel instance in the punishment in this country of negroes for resisting the draft for a war against Soviet Russia. A negro spokesman recently pointed out that many negroes will refuse to serve in another Jim Crow army, and that a war with Russia, where racial discrimination is absolutely condemned, would not be supported by negroes in the United States. Imprisonment of negroes for resisting the draft would be an official act of the national authority, and the fight of a racial minority for equality before the law would become "treason" in the eyes of the State.

We selected *The Dark Side of the Moon* for review for the reason that it does not contain any evidence of distortion or exaggeration. Our Review department has no interest in typical "anti" books. This documentary account of the fate of a million Polish people is simply another chapter in the story told by such impartial writers as Vladimir Tchernavin *(I Speak for the Silent Prisoners of the Soviets).*

But the *meaning* of the immeasurable human disaster of totalitarianism is much more obscure than "facts" such as are reported in these books. Guglielmo Ferrero, we think, touched the basic cause of terrorism in government in *The Principles of Power,* where he develops and illustrates from history the simple thesis that a government without legitimate authority derived from the governed is a government haunted by fear of rebellion, and uses increasingly the weapon of terror to maintain itself in power. John Fischer, writing in *Harper's* (August, 1946) on "The Scared Men in the Kremlin," supports this contention with regard to Russia. And it is certain that the crimes of the Nazis increased in direct proportion to their fear of downfall and defeat.

Fear, it seems, is at the root of the massive cruelties and deliberate injustices of our time. But the serious books of today are mostly devoted to the conditions which appear to make a life without fear *impossible.* What is needed is books about living a fearless life *in spite of* those conditions.

It does no good, of course, to say with the insistence of a New-Thought ritual, "We must be fearless! We must be fearless!" The problem is to discover and to adopt as unbending convictions those ideas about life, death, and human freedom which destroy any and every *occasion* for fear. That is why, in MANAS, we speak so often of great exemplars of fearlessness in history—of such men as Buddha, Socrates, Jesus, Thoreau, Tolstoy and Gandhi. They, like Chevalier Bayard, lived without fear, and without reproach. Nothing less than this ideal can serve the cause of human progress—even human survival—in the years that lie ahead.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

EVERY important social institution has a direct effect upon the education of our children. A more powerful Army means a heightened military consciousness, and a heightened military consciousness means that fourth-graders from Florida to Oregon will play "dive-bomber" more frequently during recess. The legend of a fabulously "efficient" FBI filters into the minds of the young, not only from Government-sponsored programs, but also through a wide variety of commercial radio serials. In other words, when a "tone" is set by a major institution, it is soon translated into the various suitable or unsuitable impulses which move the minds and emotions of children.

It is a mistake, also, to think that the modern university influences only its undergraduates. "College men" write our motion pictures, our popular novels and short stories and our radio scripts. Further, both our State institutions of higher learning and our smaller colleges are a sort of melting pot for the cultural biasses of the time. During the formative mental period of their lives, young men and women absorb the optimisms and pessimisms circulating in the atmosphere of the "higher learning." The young teachers who receive Masters' degrees, and then proceed to grammar or high school instructorships, carry with them—unless they are untypically independents—a general outlook or philosophy which is their real collegiate heritage. And this is what their pupils will learn more than anything else.

There are several ways of analyzing or describing the modern university point-of-view. We can decide that there is either too much "idealism" or too little, too many courses on literature and the humanities, or too few, but what we all need to admit is that every college is engaged in the manufacture of propaganda as to how life should be lived. It is, of course, hard for the average university graduate to view his or her Alma Mater as the dispenser of propaganda. Most of the propaganda is unconscious rather than deliberate; yet, from the point of view of this column, the most insidious feature of "university propaganda" is the fact that we are convinced that departmentalized learning prevents indoctrination. We have an aversion to the idea of an integrated point of view—one in which religion, philosophy and the specific arts are connected—an aversion which stems back to our disapproval of medieval religious institutions of learning. But we have not yet learned that our separation of religion and philosophy from the life-sciences and from literature and history makes us especially susceptible to another sort of bias. The modern college distrusts attempts at synthesis, and therefore we derogate philosophy. Today we believe in Economic Man, the man who is subservient to Events, and, considering recent evidence, we are apparently rendered just as helpless by implied dogma about Economic Man as we once were by explicit theological articles of faith. Man is no more "economic" than he is the creature of "God." His security is to be found in self-knowledge—never in external protection.

Obviously, in a competitive system, not everyone—not even those who go to college—can get to the Top. The ones left over are doomed to a relative sort of failure and its accompanying frustration. Some may attempt to live by the standards they would follow if they were millionaires, and others like to pretend they are Eminent, or spend considerable time trying to prove to themselves and others that they, too, would have been "successes" except for "bad luck." This is our great American educational problem, for Success is a poor ideal for youth. We ought to see this clearly enough, for as a culture we have apparently never liked the idea of some other country's National Success, although those bad nations, Germany and Russia, were but applying our own philosophy on a different scale. The ambitious spirits in those lands thought they couldn't get to any sort of imposing Top without an improved "national supremacy."

The eminence we seek to achieve is the eminence of a specialist in some particular field. Somewhere along the way we have lost touch with the "science of life" as envisioned by some of the early Greeks. The Greeks knew that nothing was important of itself. No particularized science, whether it be of healing or of politics, was regarded as fully mature unless part of a larger and more complete outlook.

The advantage of the Greek way of looking at life was that it encouraged the development of the Whole Man. In our own time, it remained for a Hindu to demonstrate that such an approach could be practical. Gandhi's religion and his economics, his politics and his literature, his philosophy and his education were inseparable, so that the man who knew something of Gandhi knew a little more of all of these. But our universities correlate such matters in a marvellously wooden fashion: We have, for instance, a biologist's view on military conscription, a military officer's position on the science of government, and a psychiatrist's conclusions in regard to religion—never a Man's view on Human Problems. As a culture, we have somehow sundered and disported the various areas of human inquiry. And this habit of separatism is most firmly entrenched in what we call our institutions of higher learning. Parents who are unable to break away from this particular preconception will inevitably leave a dubious cultural heritage to their children, who will come to rely upon specialists in every field except the one chosen for their own particular advancement—and in so doing will destroy their own roots of self-reliance.

President Truman's speech on "The State of the World" caused a certain proportion of ex-servicemen on the campuses of every state to discard the campus library for the campus bar. "If we are soon to be back in uniform," they reasoned, "why try to learn anything? We may be dead before we have a chance to become successful specialists." And the college man who never had a chance to find out that real education begins with a philosophical point of view has children who are apt to fare no better than he himself. Here we have again the heritage of Unnecessary Pessimism.

FRONTIERS

Educational Controversy

FOR those who want to know what, precisely, is the issue between Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago and the opposing champions of "scientific" education, the April Human Affairs pamphlet, *Two Educators: Hutchins and Conant,* by Oliver Martin, is a concise and pointed summation of the two points of view.

As Mr. Martin tells it, Dr. Conant (President of Harvard University) wants more science in education, while Hutchins wants more reflective evaluation. This Department is on the Hutchins side of the controversy and welcomes Mr. Martin's outspoken criticism of what he exposes as basic dogmas of the Conant school. Conant's position seems to be that philosophical principles, as such, have no independent validity. But, as Martin points out—

> Even the denial of philosophy implies a philosophy. In denying philosophy as a discipline all one can ever mean is that there can be no rational criticism of *his* philosophy. On Conant's plan, under the guise of understanding science the students would be handed a naturalistic philosophy; under the guise of studying "human relations" and learning "manipulative skills" they would be handed a nihilistic philosophy of business. In one place Conant does give philosophy a way out. After informing us that philosophy must be concerned "with matters of human adjustment to a rapidly changing physical environment," and that "the more a thinker is concerned with philosophical inquiries, the less he can afford to juggle abstract notions," we are told that philosophy might be saved by joining forces with the more social sciences. This is an excellent idea if properly interpreted. But taken in context all it can mean is that if philosophy can be used to defend and make strong business and the profit motive, then well and good. If not, then the philosopher is merely juggling "abstract notions."
>
> To avoid misunderstanding we may point out that it is not business-baiting to deny that our "profit system" can be taken as an absolute. It may be the best economic system. But that is not the question at issue. The real question is concerned with the method by which an evaluation is to be made.

This is another way of saying that after all the facts of science are assembled, and assured mastery over all technical processes has been gained, there still remain the questions: What do the facts mean? How shall we use the techniques?

It is still important to know, or try to know, whether the root of man is a soul or a body, whether or not human experience can be explained in terms of moral law, and to decide what the end of a lifetime of striving ought to be. "The unexamined life," said Socrates, "is not worth living." Determining whether or not Socrates was right is something more than the juggling of "abstract notions." Such questions, it is true, have been made to seem of small importance by the "practical" leaders of modern society, but both Socrates and Dr. Hutchins would explain that that is exactly what is the matter with our society. Even the psychiatric counselors, with all their materialistic assumptions, lend back-handed confirmation to this diagnosis, for what is psychiatric guidance except a method of helping people to examine their own lives and to "straighten them out" ?

Socrates, as an educator, spread the gospel of undiscouraged search for the Good. Has the acquisitive man who labors only for "profits" discovered the Good? Has the fearful, timid and conforming individual found the Good? Have our anxious politicians, prophesying and preparing for war, found the Good? Have the scientists—the physicists making atom bombs, the chemists inventing biological weapons, the engineers designing bigger and better machinery for the next war—found the Good?

Dr. Hutchins wants every man to ask himself these questions. Dr. Conant, in effect, says they are irrelevant. They are not irrelevant, but they are revolutionary, and there is no education possible without them.

FOR CHILDREN

The distinguishing characteristic of a good professional journal is the absence of "professionalism." Far too many professional magazines seem principally concerned with status for professional workers, with rates of remuneration and with organizational activities. For example, it is possible to go through a periodical on "social service" without finding a single breath of authentic devotion to service—and one learns about the people social workers are supposed to serve through the depersonalized term of "client," as though clients were some sort of commodity in which social workers deal.

It is refreshing, therefore, to discover in a copy of the *NEA Journal* (Journal of the National Education Association) not one but several articles by teachers who obviously like to teach children and who know how. Among these, in the April issue, is a discussion of "Wild Foods"—how and where wild foods growing in the country may be sought and found. At least fifteen or twenty edible plants are easily located almost anywhere in the United States. The writer, E. Lawrence Palmer, points out that "dandelion greens and mustard greens that cost nothing have twice the Vitamin A food value of rather expensive beets and turnips; ten times that of more expensive carrots; 25 times that of the still more expensive tomato juice; and 50 times that of the often prohibitively priced asparagus." Cattail shoots may be prepared in the same way as asparagus, and later on in the year their staminate tops provide a good flour. The red berries of the staghorn sumach make a delightful tea, and other drinks are provided by sassafras, spearmint, peppermint, wintergreen and black birch.

Mr. Palmer has many more suggestions through which children may be introduced to the hospitality of Nature, and the meeting be made an adventure for all.