

THE QUALITY OF GREATNESS

ONE wonderful thing about a Great Book is that it always contains an element of the unexpected. Like others who read *Progress and Poverty* "many years ago," we have thought of it as an enlightened treatise dealing broadly with economic forces, offering the proposition that freedom depends upon equality, and that equality, in economic terms, depends upon free access to the land. Now comes a new, condensed edition of Henry George's classic—published in England for the Henry George Foundation of Great Britain by the Hogarth Press (available at \$1.25 in the U.S. at the Henry George School of Social Science, in various cities)—which makes us thrill anew to this nineteenth-century genius. The book is pervaded by universal sympathies for it represents a non-partisan cause; indigenous American radicalism such as Edward Bellamy's and George's has no use for the class struggle, and George, like Bellamy, refused to divide human society into partisan groups.

For vision of a theme in American life that is all but forgotten, these days, we recommend an excursion into the works of Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman, Bellamy, and George. If there is to be a "Next America," such as Lyman Bryson hopes for and predicts, it will need, we think, the inspiration of these Americans of the past.

Henry George, some may remember, ran twice for Mayor of New York on a labor ticket. The second campaign was too much for his ravaged health, and he died four days before the election (in 1887). The evening before his death, he addressed a meeting at which the chairman introduced him as "the great friend of labor." George rose and spoke. He started feebly, but his voice grew until it filled the hall. He exclaimed:

"I have never claimed to be a special friend of labor. Let us have done with this call for special privileges for labor. Labor does not want special privileges. I have never advocated nor asked for special rights or special sympathy for working men. What I stand for is the equal rights of all men."

When working men and all other men recognize that any leader who stands for anything else is not worthy of being followed—that objectives which are partisan always backfire we may begin to get leaders like Henry George, once again; and if we do, we may hope and pray that they will not die four days before election.

But this is not the unexpected element of which we spoke. Turning to the last chapter of the condensed *Progress and Poverty*, George says that his researches into economic processes led him to a new conviction of the immortality of the human soul! He was no tired and disillusioned thinker who turned to economics because he could believe in no religion and wanted to do something "practical"! He was a man moved to study economic processes by his love of his fellow men, and by his hatred of suffering and injustice. But he pursued these studies as a philosopher. Concerning the question of immortality, he wrote:

The yearning for a further life is natural and deep. It grows with intellectual growth, and perhaps none really feel it more than those who have begun to see how great is the universe and how infinite are the vistas that every advance in knowledge opens before us—vistas that would require nothing short of eternity to explore. But in the mental atmosphere of our times, to the great majority of men on whom mere creeds have lost their hold, it seems impossible to look on this yearning save as a vain and childish hope that arises from man's egotism, having not the slightest ground or warrant, but on the contrary seems inconsistent with positive knowledge.

When we come to trace and to analyze the ideas that thus destroy the hope of a future life, we shall I think find that they have their source, not in any revelations of physical science, but in certain teachings of political and social science that have deeply permeated thought in all directions. They have their root in the doctrines that there is a tendency to the production of more human beings than can be provided for, that vice and misery are the result of natural laws and the means by which advance goes on, and that human progress is by a

slow race development. These doctrines, which have been generally accepted as approved truth, do what (except as scientific interpretations have been colored by them) the extensions of physical science do not do—they reduce the individual to insignificance; they destroy the idea that there can be in the ordering of the universe any regard for his existence, or any recognition of what we call moral qualities.

It is difficult to reconcile the idea of human immortality with the idea that nature wastes men by constantly bringing them into being where there is no room for them. It is impossible to reconcile the idea of an intelligent and beneficent Creator with the belief that the wretchedness and degradation that are the lot of such a large proportion of human kind result from His enactments. And the idea that man mentally and physically is the result of slow modifications perpetuated by heredity irresistibly suggests the idea that it is the race life and not the individual life that is the object of human existence. . . .

George contends against the Malthusian doctrines. He holds that "the waste of human powers and the prodigality of human suffering do not spring from natural laws, but from the ignorance and selfishness of men in refusing to conform to natural laws." He ends with an heroic note which may surprise even some of his admirers who have not lately looked through *Progress and Poverty*:

What then is the meaning of life—of life absolutely and inevitably bounded by death? To me it seems only intelligible as the avenue and vestibule to another life. Out of the chain of thought we have been following there seems to rise vaguely a glimpse, a shadowy gleam, of ultimate relations, the endeavor to express which inevitably falls into type and allegory.

Look around today.

Lo! here, now, in our civilized society, the old allegories have yet a meaning, the old myths are still true. Into the Valley of the Shadow of Death yet often leads the path of duty, through the streets of Vanity Fair walk Christian and Faithful, and on Greatheart's armor ring the clanging blows. Ormuzd still fights with Ahriman—the Prince of Light with the Powers of Darkness. He who will hear, to him the clarions of the battle call.

How they call, and call, and call till the heart swells that hears them! Strong soul and high

endeavor, the world needs them now. Beauty still lies imprisoned, and iron wheels go over the good and true and beautiful that might spring from human lives.

And they who fight with Ormuzd, though they may not know each other—somewhere, sometime, will the muster roll be called.

And now, with this blazoning of faith, do we think less of George, or more? Curiously, it is the enthusiasm of great men which their followers often wish to forget. They want the hard facts, the close-woven arguments, the devastating logic, but not the glow of the dream. Newton's profound, Neoplatonic mysticism, Kepler's heavenly intelligences—in these the modern astronomer is hardly interested. Yet the structured transcendentalism of great thinkers may be as important a part of their contribution as anything else perhaps more important; for what good, Newton might ask, is a Universe without a soul?

Let us note that Henry George's wonderings about immortality led him to write prophetically of the materialistic ideologies of the twentieth century. To him, Malthusianism was not merely an economic doctrine to be refuted: it was an attack on the dignity of man. He saw that the claim that Nature or "natural law" dictates the multiplication of the human species far beyond the earth's capacity to support these multitudes implies that man—individual man—is of no more account than a white rat. And if men are but a social horde, then why not *control* their life and behavior—"the idea that it is the race life and not the individual life that is the object of human existence." So goes the Nazi ideology, and so, with a few changes, goes the Communist credo of State power in behalf of "the masses."

What we are contending for, here, is not the dogma of immortality, nor the certainty of immaterial forces and intelligence in nature, but the *possibility* of these things. For unless a man like George had held in his mind a sense of such possibilities, it might not have occurred to him to consider the implications of their denial. It is the *certainties*, whether of affirmation or denial, which we must learn to beware. The certainty that man is no more than a physical being, shaped by the forces of heredity and

environment, will bring, in time, logical justification for the ruthless terrorism and "liquidations" which are supposed to purify the blood stream of the race or complete arrangements for the perfect social environment. It is the men who "know" with finality what man is, what are his qualities, and what must be done to improve his lot, who are never restrained by doubts. The head of the secret police and the Grand Inquisitor of Dostoevsky both obtain sanction for their crimes from the notion that they possess absolute knowledge. The one maintains that man is a social animal, the other that he is a spiritual "creature," and both insist that their certainty gives them absolute authority over the destiny of other men.

So, oddly enough, the important thing is not a choice between the competing claims of these two, but a rejection of their common presumption.

Socrates—or Plato—is a model of excellence in this respect. His disciples longed for finalities, yet Socrates plagued them with uncertainties. They wanted blueprints of a life beyond the grave, but Socrates gave them "myths." Not this, he told them, after speaking of his own views, but something "like this," may be what the future holds. Socrates suffered death at the hands of the Athenians because he insisted upon his faith in man's capacity to learn the Good, whereas the Athenians were looking for endorsements of a particular doctrine of the Good—the doctrine currently popular among the Hellenes.

Nothing angers the mob so effectively as a threat to take away its common certainties, to question its popular authorities. This was the crime of Socrates, the crime of Jesus, and is the offense of every man who publicly resists the orthodox finalities of his time. The determined inquirer who cares more for the truth than for conformity disturbs all those who obtain their feeling of security from being a part of the herd. It is really the fear of the members of the herd which defines the opinions of dissenters as crimes against the public good; and it is the habit of believing in doctrines as finalities which makes the herd assume that the dissenter who questions is actually declaring for a competing finality, when all he actually demands is impartiality and caution in reaching the conclusions upon which men act. Thus

the man who questions "capitalist" assumptions is soon branded a "communist," and the critic of Stalinism is singled out as a monster who has "betrayed the working classes."

This may seem a long way to have come from Henry George's objection to the social philosophies based upon utilitarian assumptions, and far from the raptures with which he ends his great work. But George's transcendentalism and the deep philosophical faith which made his raptures possible are, we think, of immeasurable importance not, perhaps, to George's actual economic theories, although of this we are not certain, but to the quality of his historical influence. The enrichment of human life is the gift of wide-hearted men who are unable to contemplate a mean and impotent status for the individual human being. This is a "law" of human progress, for both society and the single man. And as George shows in his last chapter, the view men entertain of the universe exercises control over what they think of individual men.

The influence of Henry George on social thinking may live on after other nineteenth-century social philosophers are forgotten, even if his economic theories, as some maintain, are "dated." As to this, we cannot say. But the principles he expounded are not dated, nor his conviction that it lies within the capacity of men to remake their society according to canons of equality and justice.

THE ARTS OF PEACE

THE "experimental" hydrogen bomb explosions in the area of the Marshall Islands have brought reactions abroad which indicate that in Europe and Asia, at least, world opinion is seriously aroused, although a few warning voices have been heard in America, also. A leaflet issued by *Contemporary Issues* (a magazine of political commentary) makes this summary:

The denunciations of the experiments have already reached the level of open demonstrations in many parts of the world. In Japan, a stormy sentiment for immediate cessation of the tests has unified both press and public; in India, Nehru has personally demanded an end to the explosions; in Britain, if not all of Europe, the newspapers and population are virtually of one opinion that the experiments be stopped at once. The French Foreign Minister has been compelled by popular feeling to describe the experimenters as "sorcerer's apprentices, who often unloose forces over which they have no control."

One distinguished American, Lewis Mumford, pointed out in a letter to the *New York Times* that

—retaliation is not protection, that total extermination of both sides is not victory; that a constant state of morbid fear, suspicion and hatred is not security; that, in short, what seems like unlimited power has become impotence.

This comment seems profoundly true, and in a different class from naïve optimisms which once maintained that the very horror of war would eventually lead to peace. It is only a matter of time until the spread of absolute power transforms it into absolute impotence, for, as former AEC chairman Gordon Dean remarked, "It does no good to reach the point where we would be able to wipe out an enemy twenty times over if he reaches the point where he can wipe us out just once."

An American professor, H. David Kirk, puts a pertinent question, also in the *New York Times*:

At Nuremburg we judged war criminals on the basis of personal responsibility for acts of brutality

committed while under higher orders. . . . What about our own political leaders who in the face of international questioning and protests pay no heed but insist that the experimentation must go on? . . .

Questions of this sort may not be the best way to work for peace, but they may be one sort of beginning that can be made at this time.

REVIEW

NOTED IN PASSING

AN intriguing supplement to Kurt Vonnegut's *Player Piano* is supplied by Clifford D. Simak's "volume of the far future," entitled *City*. Winner of the last International Fantasy Award, Mr. Simak's tale brings a theme of some subtlety to the science-fiction reading public. As in Vonnegut's story, we encounter a technological paradise of the future, in which wars and violence have been systematically eliminated; but man finally also eliminates himself through boredom, lack of direction and a surfeit of apparently innocent sensuous pleasures. Civilization becomes, with each millennium, more impressive from a physical point of view, but gradually surrenders to soul atrophy. How does man depart from striving? He finally discovers how to concoct dream-worlds in which he can live for thousands of years. He forsakes the evolutionary impulse quite voluntarily, but is destroyed just as surely as if his species had been wiped out in some war by the more proficient air-fleets of another planet.

The beginning of the decay, however, seems innocuous, as revealed in Simak's first chapter. The following describes a fifty-year trend, supplied by an oldster of 1990:

The years had moved too fast. Years that had brought the family plane and helicopter, leaving the auto to rust in some forgotten place, the unused roads to fall into disrepair. Years that had virtually wiped out the tilling of the soil with the rise of hydroponics. Years that had brought cheap land with the disappearance of the farm as an economic unit, had sent city people scurrying out into the country where each man, for less than the price of a city lot, might own broad acres. Years that had revolutionized the construction of homes to a point where families simply walked away from their old homes to the new ones that could be bought, custom-made, for less than half the price of a prewar structure and could be changed at a small cost, to accommodate need of additional space or just a passing whim.

Several thousand years later a descendant of the same family sits down with a plastic "thinking-

cap" on his head to arrange the pattern of a history he is constructing. An author of great ability, incidentally, he is understandably disturbed when he realizes that his monumental labor will never be read by anyone—since not one of his acquaintances, let alone the general public, has any interest in painstaking explorations of the mind. Robots take care of the necessary arrangements of life's details, including all purely practical forms of "thinking"; humanity indulges fantasy-dreams instead of pursuing a questing life of the mind. The whole thing could be summed up in this way, by the historian's opinion: "Life was good. Why worry? There was food and clothes and shelter, human companionship and luxury and entertainment—there was everything that one could ever wish. Man gave up trying. Man enjoyed himself. Human achievement became a zero factor and human life a senseless paradise."

Yet the dreams of many Utopians had really come true:

The machines ran on, tended by the robots as they had been before, producing all the things they had produced before.

And the robots worked as they knew it was their right to work, their right and duty, doing the things they had been made to do.

The machines went on and the robots went on, producing wealth as if there were men to use it, as if there were millions of men instead of a bare five thousand.

And the five thousand who had stayed behind or who had been left behind suddenly found themselves the masters of a world that had been geared to the millions, found themselves possessed of the wealth and services that only months before had been the wealth and services that had been due the millions.

There was no government, but there was no need of government, for all the crimes and abuses that government had held in check were as effectively held in check by the sudden wealth the five thousand had inherited. No man will steal when he can pick up what he wants without the bother of thievery. No man will contest with his neighbor over real estate when the entire world is real estate for the simple taking. Property rights almost overnight became a

phrase that had no meaning in a world where there was more than enough for all.

Crimes of violence long before had been virtually eliminated from human society and with the economic pressure eased to a point where property rights ceased to be a point of friction, there was no need of government. No need, in fact, of many of the encumbrances of custom and convenience which man had carried forward from the beginnings of commerce. There was no need of currency, for exchange had no meaning in a world where to get a thing one need but to ask for it or take it.

Relieved of economic pressure, the social pressures lessened, too. A man no longer found it necessary to conform to the standards and the acts of custom which had played so large a part in the world as an indication of commercial character.

Religion, which had been losing ground for centuries, entirely disappeared. The family unit, held together by tradition and by economic necessity of a provider and protector, fell apart.

What was missing? Neither Mr. Simak nor his "thinking-cap" historian tells us. It does seem, however, that though City has no clear delineated point to make, the book reminds us once again that without courageous striving and mental adventure, man simply ceases to live in any meaningful sense. Even the absence of violence means little of itself. Conquest of crime is important only when its motivations are transcended by men who are reaching to nobler perspectives. To be relieved of the woes of the world, including all psychological torments, as a mere automatic matter of convenience would not, we think, increase the sense of discovering purpose; yet upon such discovery all other happiness depends.

Vincent Sheean's latest novel, *Lily*, may not be a particularly impressive book, but at least its psychological orientation effectively counteracts the gossip that Mr. Sheean, along with Dorothy Thompson, has been taken into the Roman Catholic fold.

A rumor that the noted foreign correspondent, who was inspired to philosophy by

his prolonged stay with Gandhi just before the latter's assassination, had returned to the church of his boyhood, received wide currency about a year ago—principally through the agency of Walter Winchell. Having read Sheean's next to latest, *Rage of the Soul*, illustrating the Gandhi outlook, this did not make sense to the MANAS review editor. Consequently, we wrote Mr. Sheean personally, learning from his reply that the report had not one iota of foundation. (Mr. Sheean was a bit annoyed by the rumor-mongers' implication that when he wrote as he did about Gandhi, he did not know his own mind.)

Lily does deal, though somewhat obliquely, with traditional Roman Catholicism, setting it off against the superficial amorality of international sophistication. But one complex of mores fares no better than the other, the suggestion obviously being that *both* traditions have missed the point of human existence. *Rage of the Soul* was similarly oriented, the only grains of real wisdom featured by Mr. Sheean supplied by an unpretentious Indian sage. Obviously, Sheean is attempting to constitute himself a "Kindly-Light," to illuminate the road man must travel for rediscovery of purpose.

COMMENTARY VINOBA AT WORK

THE press of today is filled with forebodings of violence, and the leaders of powerful nations seem practically obsessed by the commanding force of violence. Meanwhile, in India today, there is interesting exercise of an entirely different sort of force—the force of public opinion.

Vinoba Bhave, Gandhian leader of the land gift movement, has explained that he is perfectly willing to use the pressure of public opinion in persuading Indian landowners to give land to the landless Indian peasants. Vinoba maintains that social progress must ultimately depend upon faith in man. Even communist theory, he argues, adopts this view. As he puts it:

Marx has said: The power of the State will be captured by the poor people to begin with, but in the end "the State will wither away." This means that there will be no State authority towards the end, and the governance of the country will go on without the interference or function of any central power. If the Communists respect this maxim enunciated by Marx, then they have to believe in the goodness in man and trust the people.

The April 1954 issue of *Sarvodaya*, a magazine devoted to Gandhian ideals and the *Bhoodan* (land-giving) movement, contains evidence of how Vinoba works to spread trust among men. The following is extracted from a report of his conversation with some reluctant landowners:

Landowner: Suppose we give them land. They will simply receive it and walk off. They will go and work under another landlord. How do we benefit thereby? But if we lend 100 rupees to one of them, he will feel indebted and respect us.

Vinoba: The object of my work is not to give you also a benefit along with the landless laborer. Even if I had not taken up their cause, they will themselves stand up and claim their right. And it may so happen that worse consequences will follow. There is no question of pressure at all in gifts. But in the loan that you talk of there is the element of indirect coercion. . . .

Landowner: Didn't Gandhiji, in fact, do service all through his life? Yet what happened in the end? He was shot down.

Vinoba: That is true. Then, don't do any service! Do you think that you will be left alone, if the poor are left to live like this?

Landowner: Well, then, will they give us in writing that they will come and work in our fields if we give them land as a gift?

Vinoba: Why should they give a writing? . . . Your wife is there by your side. Have you taken a written document from her that she will serve you? The main thing is the relationship—it is the love that keeps it on. . . . You demand a written contract. Will you also give them a paper saying that you will always engage them? . . . You say "Yes." But suppose tomorrow your son wants to cultivate his share of the family land. Can you say "No"? Where is your contract?

Landowner: All right, you receive whatever we decide to offer as gifts. Won't you?

Vinoba: Well, come on, how much will you give? . . . One twentieth? If you think that is enough to solve the land problem of your village, I will not object to receive it. But if more is found necessary, more has to be given. Every one of the landless peasants should be provided with land. With this object before you, you yourselves estimate the share and give accordingly. . . .

The landlords are responding to this appeal, which combines the compulsion of conscience with the pressure of public opinion. What can such methods accomplish? So far according to reports, more than 2,500,000 acres have been given to landless peasants. Thus proceeds a redistribution of India's natural resources, without conflict and without bitterness.

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

MANAS: Thank you for your article, "Fratricide among Educators." (MANAS April 21.) You have done an excellent job in explaining, and thereby defending, the course, direction, and practices of modern education. I, as an educator, feel encouraged when someone "outside" the field presents such a fair picture of the problems confronting all educators today.

Perhaps I show the bias of my profession when I say that I believe that in this cycle of the development of our civilization, "education" is doing a better job of elevating the mind than was done by religions, or philosophies, or political ideologies in past centuries. I see—or think I see—men of great vision among our educators, demonstrating that sort of love for humanity which carries a willingness to sacrifice much of personal life for the furtherance of a vision. (As is characteristic of any dynamic movement, there is the core or nucleus made up of these dedicated individuals, while surrounding them are many who are only imitative at best, and insincere at the worst.)

In the field—the classroom, that is—are thousands of teachers. Among those thousands, one teacher strives for greater skill on the basis of the larger philosophy, and among these few, one here and there begins to see what it is all about. I grant, then, that though there are many sincere teachers, they may also often be inexperienced, or become easily discouraged, and there are many reasons why their efforts are not creative. At the same time creativeness is in a very special sense the magic key to modern teaching. The days of textbook memorization are gone. Modern educational ideals are based on the premise (though we may not admit it) that every teacher can be and should try to be *something* of a Mark Hopkins or a Bronson Alcott: this vision is ambitious rather than pretentious, we think.

There was a time when men and women who were not fit for more dynamic pursuits went into teaching to save face. Now teaching has become the most dynamic of all professions, because of its contemporary challenges. Yet we will have to be patient, for the individuals involved cannot become "enlightened" all at once. The process is so slow (oftentimes due to so much outside criticism) that it could become discouraging. Nevertheless, it seems worth the struggle, for it is the only way human growth can take place. We cannot vote in a new era; we cannot fight battles for it; but we can educate for it. This means educating children. It means educating the teachers of children. It means educating the parents of children. If all adults interested in education were to indulge in some constructive reading such as (1) *National Society for the Study of Education*—"Philosophies of Education" (41st Yearbook), (2) *Social Studies for Children in a Democracy*, John Michaelis, (3) *Teaching for Better Schools*, Kimball Wiles, (4) *Education for What is Real*, Earl C. Kelley, it would be possible to discuss with them the right use and application of these ideas, and their implications in the classroom. This would be so much more constructive than merely trying to duck brickbats hurled by Lynd, Whitman, and their like.

Educators are the first to criticize each other's ideas, methods and procedures. Yet there is no fratricide really, because they do have respect for one another. I cannot, therefore, quite understand the meaning of your title.

Further, according to your lists of assumptions for "traditionalist" and "anti-traditionalist," I cannot place myself. I am not alone in this quandary. Other educators of my acquaintance who have read your article find that they do not belong in either category. As a matter of fact, I doubt that it would be possible to find very many active workers in the educational field who can be so classified. Most of these people are too individual to be labeled this or that. Actually, I wonder if those who stand on the

sidelines aren't just dividing educators into sheep and goats, opposing gladiators, in order to get some excitement—a "kick"—out of the whole thing. The old Roman urge for blood is still with us. Only the arena is education, and "thumbs up" or "thumbs down" depends not on true understanding of the problems and the efforts made, but on the whim of those who lounge in the viewing stands.

Let us just assume then for sporting purposes that I am an "anti-traditionalist." From this corner let me comment on your list of assumptions:

- (a) Rigorous discipline can be achieved, but not by authoritarian methods, for true discipline is self control. Every teacher (worthy of the name) plans a daily schedule to include some time during the day when quiet is maintained by the children (not superimposed by the teacher).
- (b) Helping children to avoid serious emotional difficulty is often a prerequisite to education, or it may accompany it (as a child forgets his own personal problems in contributing to a group project), but education is *much more* than the emotional adjustment.
- (c) *Everyone* upholds high standards of scholarship; but every teacher seeks to understand what is high scholarship for each child. (Shall we expect the poor little spastic eighth grader with an IQ of about 65 or so to read and comprehend the *Idylls of the King*?) And please don't say that IQ is the God of the "educationist." It is merely a useful and very general measuring tool.
- (d) Modern educators who are really doing the work in the field are too busy to bother labeling traditionalists this or that. They leave such superficial classification to the spectators.
- (e) There are many philosophies of education (see 41st Yearbook mentioned above), each with its values and concepts. Each contributes to education, each is studied (in university classes) by students of education.
- (f) Modern education has two major goals, as far as the child is concerned: (1) to develop a completely integrated, well-adjusted individual who can stand alone, take responsibility, and live with himself (as a hermit, if need be), and (2) to help that individual understand how he can best contribute to the group in which he finds himself,

by becoming aware of the needs of others in that group.

Please do not assume that this is a purely individual or personal analysis. A careful reading of the books listed earlier will show that educators everywhere agree on these points of view. If I were to plead for anything I would say: Please do not cry "fratricide," and "anti this" or "anti that," or "hot war," when you talk about education. We cannot stress too often, or too strongly, the fact that many thoughtful individuals are concerned with improving education. They are struggling with problems of over-loaded classrooms, teacher shortages, increased emotional tensions in children, migratory families, teachers' inability to cope with individual differences, segregation, the attacks on Unesco, and many more. How silly for the spectators of the educational scene to make combatants out of us all. If the spectators came down off their high perches, came into the arena with us, they would find that we are building, not fighting, cooperating, not quarreling, enlightening one another, not killing our educational brothers.

* * *

Apparently our title, "Fratricide among Educators," was not a good one. If this correspondent failed to understand the sense in which it was employed, so, probably, did everyone else. The intent, however, was to make several of the points which introduced the foregoing communication. First of all, we included in our definition of "educator" parents as well as teachers—also included Mr. Albert Lynd. It is not difficult to see why teachers and principals object to Mr. Lynd's inclusion as an "educator"—he is not currently teaching—but we held that since he discussed educational trends and focussed a number of pointed criticisms, he merits the designation whether we happen to agree with him or not. Our next point was that when either Mr. Lynd or those who disagree with him become "factional" rather than "philosophical," they are *poor* educators, engaged, at least emotionally, in "fratricide." We are against the "factional,

political approach" to educational controversy and to every other form of disagreement, and it seems necessary to call attention to the fact that many laymen, and many teachers as well, are today taking sides in educational controversy in a highly political, factional manner. (A good case in point is furnished by the emotional furor accompanying the dismissal of Pasadena School Superintendent Willard Goslin. Both those who attacked Dr. Goslin and a number of those who defended him were long on name-calling and short on philosophical analysis. A reading of David Hurlburd's *It Happened at Pasadena* should serve as an example of how easy it is for partisans on both sides to shake loaded dice.)

Returning to the latter part of our correspondent's letter, we are not surprised she notes an inability to recognize her own personal philosophy of education in terms of the assumptions we attributed to "factional anti-traditionalists." In the first place, perhaps our correspondent is not "factional" enough to fall into the category! Also, most "traditionalists" would similarly feel that their position on educational questions is merely caricatured by our April 21 list of "factional traditionalist" assumptions. To the best of our knowledge, however, we reported accurately on attitudes frequently encountered for some fifteen years, and if we highlighted these attitudes by over-emphasis, this was with the hope of stimulating further discussion.

We suspect that much of the present controversy revolves around emotional and cultural backgrounds more than around clearly defined issues. For instance, every person we have met agrees that "true discipline is self-control" and is not to be reached by "authoritarian" methods. Some feel, however, that the teacher has the right and something of an obligation to "impose" a certain amount of quiet time in the classroom. Here intelligent argument would evolve around the need for "quiet itself"—what it is good for, and how much of it will best

serve the needs of the child in school—not whether most modern teachers, or their critics, are stupid.

In conclusion, we have used words such as "fratricide," "anti-this" and "anti-that," and "hot war" simply because this is, regrettably, the atmosphere of debate at present. We agree with our correspondent that this, of itself, is both deplorable and subversive of the ends of education. Thus we intended to encourage readers to climb *over* the factional fence, from whatever side they happen to approach it, and to look at the needs of our children and the unresolved problem of how they may best be taught from a reasonably impartial perspective.

It is true that most working teachers in our public schools are not fighting each other tooth and nail, but Albert Lynd is not the only critic who views highschools from a university-teaching perspective and finds much to complain about. Several others have lately made a number of the points belabored by Mr. Lynd, although, perhaps, in gentler and more constructive mood. And, really, no one who writes or thinks about education is entirely a "spectator" of the educational scene. We are all *on* the scene, whether or not we are shallow enough to cavort childishly like "combatants."

FRONTIERS

Warning from Berlin

IN your article, "We Are All Very Much Alike" (MANAS, Jan. 13), you quote Dr. Radhakrishnan. Good as his speech undoubtedly is, I do not see why it is "in the twentieth century somewhat historic." What he says is far from being new, for anyone who knows a little of Gandhism.

Gandhi in his evening prayers used to emphasize the following five points, which could perhaps be considered as the essence of his life:

- (1) I will keep to Truth.
- (2) I will not use violent means.
- (3) I will not surrender to injustice.
- (4) I will be free of Fear.
- (5) I will see the divine spark in every human being and appeal to it.

Some comment concerning the way these principles operated for Gandhi may be of interest.

(1) Keeping to Truth does not mean only abstaining from lying. Gandhi had no secrets. Once a young Englishman had stolen a long manuscript from the Bombay Government, containing all the measures the British had in mind against the Gandhian movement. He showed it to Gandhi, proud of his achievement. But Gandhi asked him: "May I refer to this when writing to the government?"

The young man replied: "In no case, I have to bring it back, it is confidential." "Then I will not even read it," said Gandhi.

Before taking any action against the British government, he used to inform the government of what he intended, to give them the opportunity to prepare counter-measures. This is why he never had to be afraid of spies.

His esteem for Truth was such that his autobiography was titled, *My Experiment with Truth*.

- (2) This is what is best known of him.

(3) This is his indomitable fighting spirit, but I am afraid that it is the one principle he could not always really keep to.

(4) Consider how far away all our civilization is from this pledge. Our politics, both East and West, are based on fearing and trying to cause fear. Both Moscow and Washington attempt to intimidate the presumed adversary by threats, in order to create fear, and at the same time to exaggerate the power and bad intentions of the other side, in order to bully their own people into making the utmost effort in the production of war materiel and to win consent to the maddest expenditure for preparedness for war. There is not the slightest difference between Moscow and Washington in this respect.

Look at all our civil laws! Each of them, including decrees, orders, etc., ends with a menace, as to how one will be punished if he does not comply with that special law. Jurists even claim that a law is not complete or valid if it does not prescribe a punishment for its violation. So, creating fear is the very base of our civilization, in both the capitalist and the Communist part of the Western World—while Gandhi is definitely opposed to fear. This helps us to understand why Moscow and Washington, the two hostile poles of Western civilization, look so much alike when seen from India.

(5) This is the point to which Radhakrishnan refers in his speech. Gandhi lived up to it. One day a Pathan tried to kill him, believing that Gandhi was a traitor to the movement for independence. Gandhi did not deliver him to the police, but explained to him what his intentions were, and converted him into one of his most devoted followers.

I am absolutely sure that the Communist world would democratize a good deal, if given a chance. It has never been tried. The general opinion that Gandhian ideas and methods were applicable only in India and would fail completely when used against a totalitarian regime such as the Soviet is, I think, wrong. I know many examples

of full success with non-violent action in Europe. During the rioting of June 16-17 in East Berlin and the Soviet Zone, nonviolent action was taken by people who never in their life had heard the name of Gandhi, and was often very successful.

I was greatly surprised when reading that the *Wall Street Journal* (quoted in MANAS for Jan. 13) has uttered such sound ideas about the best way to meet the Communist world. This is really good news, showing that there are people in the U.S.A. who really understand what the situation is. But I should like to call your attention to a thing which really worries us Europeans.

If I remember correctly, the U.S. Congress recently voted an enormous sum of money to finance subversive activities in the Satellite States and the Soviet world. This seems to me a dangerous course. Here in Berlin, the hottest spot in the Cold War, there are underground organizations with practically unlimited resources who are busy in this way. They send innumerable spies into the East, they try to corrupt all civil servants in the Soviet Zone, they even once tried to blow up a railway train from Berlin to Warsaw. Let us not consider whether these tactics will be successful or not (I think they will not). Let us think only of the moral aspect.

Who are the people who are doing practically all of this sort of subversive work? In many cases they are spies, saboteurs, etc., who are without any moral standard at all. We know them pretty well, from the time they were serving the Nazis. They need not change their attitude or their methods. They have experience in the art of deceiving, of killing, of any kind of brutality, as they practiced these things while they policed the Nazi occupation of Poland, France, Russia, Greece, and other countries.

As a matter of course, such people will now try to get jobs in the underground movement built up with American money and under the guidance of the CIC. They are suited for this work, and the fact that they formerly belonged to the SS does not bother their new employers. They are the only

people capable of illegal and terroristic activities. Could you or I do these things . . . ?

I do not think such means can overthrow the Soviet regime. Yet there will be consequences.

These activities will keep the Communist world from democratizing itself. The worst feature of the Communist regime is its horrible distrust of everybody. This distrust is intensified by the Western underground movement. The Russians and the German Communists cannot trust anybody, so they will hit back by arresting all suspected persons, by punishing them cruelly. Very often they make mistakes and innocent people suffer. When this happens, the innocent victims become wonderful objects of anti-Communist propaganda in the West. But I know of cases when such arrests of innocent people in the Eastern Zone were almost provoked by subversive propaganda from the West.

There is still another aspect of the matter, even more dangerous. The Hitler regime brought into activity a class of men who were utterly unscrupulous, insincere, brutal, without any respect for law and order. The underground struggle of today, financed in Germany with American dollars (and doubtless elsewhere in countries near to Russia) is once more giving life to such men. We know them well. They are unwilling to do any real work. They think it is foolish to be a carpenter, a teacher, a grocer, or anything like that. They prefer the risky, adventurous life of the secret agent, with little work and much money. They are often without any principles. They would serve *anybody*, if it enabled them to maintain this sort of life. Some among them have served very different masters. They claim to be patriots, but I know some who have served several countries, who might have been found anywhere in the world, if only there was trouble, rioting, adventures. They are a class of people that can really be called amoral and anti-social.

Suppose for a moment that their work is successful, that they actually overthrow the Soviet

regime. What then? Would they then take any normal job? They hate working. They hate legality. They are corrupt to their bones. They are accustomed to deceive everybody, including their employers. They would remain a danger to society.

These men and women are the exact opposite of what Gandhi thought men ought to be. Let us consider them in connection with his five principles:

- (1) They never tell the truth, deception is their nourishment.
- (2) They prefer violent means.
- (3) They do not fight against injustice, but spread it.
- (4) They create fear and mostly are full of fear themselves.
- (5) The idea that they should think of "that of God" in every other man is simply absurd.

I think that the American appropriation for subversive activities is wasted money. Wouldn't it be better to try to democratize the Communist world by treating it as fairly as possible?

Then there is this question: What shall we say when others do unto us what we are doing unto them? What would be the reaction in the United States if a gang were caught in Germany, after having tried to blow up an American train from Berlin to Frankfurt, confessing at the trial that it was done upon order and with money from the Russian government? We should be not far from a declaration of war in such a case. But when the Burianek gang was caught after having tried to blow up a train at Erkner, the members of the gang confessed that they were paid by the "Fighting group against Inhumanity," itself financed by the Americans. What would you in the U.S.A. say if in a nearby country, say Guatemala, an army was maintained with Russian money with the open and admitted aim to create as much trouble as possible in America in order, finally, to overthrow your government? But American government officials have admitted that

the Formosa government and army are maintained for no other purpose than to create subversive movements on the Chinese mainland.

All this is immoral; it cannot lead to a moral society.

Please excuse me for having written so much, but I think these things are really dangerous.

Should you publish anything of this, please do not mention my name. We have our McCarthys here, too.