

PROBLEMS OF PEACE MAKING

A SUBSCRIBER in Holland, having read in MANAS for Jan. 13 the article, "We Are All Very Much Alike," which quoted with approval Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's United Nations Day address, writes at length to question what seem to him to be the assumptions of this article. There is not space to examine this reader's comments in detail, but his chief points are brief and merit attention. They are (1) "That the world being what it is, it will long be impossible to do away with capitalism," and (2) "That we cannot make too sharp a distinction between the 'Masters of the Kremlin' and their subjects, their slaves, their victims."

While admitting that American Indian tribes and other "primitive" people may have been able to get along without much "private property," our critic maintains that for Caucasian Westerners, "capitalism is the natural order of things." He adds that "to rail at capitalism and try to replace it by some system, is merely to create a hell on earth, as we can see in Russia."

It is perhaps to the point to note, at the outset, that Americans practice a very "impure" form of capitalism, as Seba Eldridge's *Development of Collective Enterprise* makes abundantly clear. The trend to collectivization in the United States, that staunchly capitalist country, has been fairly rapid during the past half century or so, and has proceeded, as Eldridge points out, without much stimulus from ideological propaganda. Collectivization in America has rather been in response to the common sense judgment of Americans. The evil of "systems," which our subscriber is very much against, lies in their *rigidity*, and in the doctrinaire claims which are made in their behalf. A rigid capitalism, we have no doubt, would soon develop most of the objectionable features of a rigid communism. The chief virtue of capitalism as a

theory of economic relations is that it allows more practical freedom than any other theory we know of, for human beings living in an industrial society. This does not mean we have any great admiration for the industrial society of the present, nor for capitalism, but rather, simply that we agree with our correspondent when he implies that trying to "do away" with capitalism in order to substitute some other system would be a great mistake. We take the view that the acquisitive drive in human beings is what gives capitalism its energy and makes it seem like the "natural order of things." It happens that there are better drives or motives for human enterprise, and when they replace the acquisitive drive, capitalism as a "way of life" will doubtless be replaced by something better' also.

Concerning our correspondent's view of the "Masters of the Kremlin," we agree in part, but would tend rather to call them "Captives of the Kremlin" and victims of Marxist ideology. Perhaps we should make clear that we have no sympathy with the Communist theory of progress. Its utter contempt for the individual, as such, its assumption that men are wholly creatures of their environment, and the methods of social control which result from these beliefs have the effect of tearing down what little is left of genuine civilization. Worst of all is the complete cynicism which seems to pervade Soviet diplomacy—the rejection of any regard for the traditional idea of truth in human relations. The Western or "democratic" nations still honor this idea, if only by a kind of hypocritical allegiance to a value-charged vocabulary of traditional ethics.

Finally, our correspondent seems to feel that we are ignorant of the horror of the Soviet forced labor camps. We have no illusions on this score, having several times recommended to our readers Vladimir Tchernavin's *I Speak for the Silent Prisoners of the Soviets*, as an impartial,

dispassionate study of the labor camp system by one of its victims; and we are familiar with and have reviewed *The Dark Side of the Moon*, a documentary account of what happened to about a million Poles after the Soviet invasion of Poland during World War II. The Soviet system of terror as the means of suppressing every sort of deviation from communist orthodoxy is the final fulfillment of the materialism of a revolutionary movement which began by flying humanitarian banners and claiming to continue the gains of the Renaissance and the French Revolution.

But recognizing these things about the Soviet system is not enough. We still have to understand why intelligent men—for the founders of modern communism *were* intelligent, even brilliant—led their people in this direction. If we find ourselves unable to account for their decisions and behavior, we shall be unable to discover any *rational* means of dealing with communism, and those who are still able to believe in the personal devil theory of evil will then insist that we join them in another bloody crusade to rid the world of another tribe of demons.

Simply on pragmatic grounds, the personal devil theory of evil may be rejected. It does not work. You may be able to kill a few of the devils by going to war, but war seems to be the best possible soil for breeding more devils, with even the people on the "Right Side" now and then exhibiting some devilish propensities, after they have been through two or three wars. We submit that the personal devil theory is a lazy man's solution of a difficult problem; further, it is very like the communist theory, which also seeks a solution in liquidation of the enemy. Thus war, or large-scale liquidation, is the night in which all shirts are black, or red.

The Germans, fighting a last-ditch struggle in World War I, sealed Lenin in a railroad car and sent him to the Finland station to proceed to Russia to make a revolution. Did the Germans want Communism in Russia? No, but they wanted less action on the Eastern front, and helping Lenin

to make a revolution was one way of slowing down the attacks of the Russian troops. During war, victory defines all morality.

The Russian revolution came into being with this sort of midwifery. Then, after it was accomplished, the European nations surrounded the new Soviet nation with a ring of steel. Japanese troops harassed the Bolshevik frontiers in Siberia, and even an American army, commanded by General Graves, landed on the frigid peninsula to . . . well, we have never understood just what business American troops had in Siberia. The fact, however, is that the Western nations did everything in their power to confirm the Bolshevik theory that no peace would be possible between communist and non-communist countries. The philosophy of communism was originally formulated by men alienated from traditional values of Western culture. This alienation was not without cause. There is truth in the *Communist Manifesto of 1848*—it is not the whole truth, but there is truth in it. There is guilt of bloodshed in it, also, but the guilt attaches, also, to all those who refused to read it as a warning. It is surely a mistake to believe that the revolution of the communists is the path to a better world, but it is a mistake equally great to suppose that, since the communists are wrong, there is no need to consider in what way they may have been right and to work for a better world along other lines.

So, the alienation which began with the ruthless exploitation of factory labor in England and elsewhere—creating what Marx called the proletariat—continued as a result of the policies of the Western nations in respect to Soviet Russia. That the Western nations are ready to spring at the throat of the Soviets, if they exhibit the slightest weakness, has been drilled into the Russian people by their leaders for more than a generation. It will take time, and considerable patience among Westerners, to correct this view.

Suppose that our correspondent is entirely correct in his analysis of the rulers of Soviet

Russia. Suppose that it is indeed impossible to affect their decisions by displays of friendliness and honest efforts to treat with them on a civilized basis. There is still the question of the Russian people themselves, who, our correspondent believes, are by no means solidly behind "the men in the Kremlin." The one way to *push* them solidly behind the men in the Kremlin is to keep on threatening them with dire disaster from the West. Atom and hydrogen bombs will not distinguish between rulers and ruled, between MVD operatives and their hapless victims. Our correspondent writes:

I have never been inside Russia, . . . but I know Russian and have been studying the subject for some twenty years. I have perused books and periodicals, both European and Russian, and have had long talks about Russia and Russian history with a Russian friend. It is my considered opinion that ninety per cent of the Russians are not communists at heart. They pay only lip-service to communism, partly through ignorance of something better, partly because they are compelled by a ruthless MVD.

Suppose our subscriber's estimate is correct—that only ten percent of the Russian population is "communist at heart"—then this is the strongest possible argument for accepting Radhakrishnan's hope that the Russian system may democratize itself. For if the present rulers of Russia are no longer able to claim with ample evidence in their support that the West is poised to destroy the U.S.S.R., the internal "discipline" of the communist State may relax a bit and the people may begin to have opportunity to affect their country's policies. It seems clear that *fear* welds the popular unity of Soviet Russia, just as fear causes no end of other unhappy alliances, such as the American relations with Franco's Spain and the similar support of the French in Indo-China. Somewhere, somehow, the vicious circle of fear must be broken. Dr. Radhakrishnan, it seems to us, has only pointed out that it is the natural duty of the democracies to make an effort in this direction.

It goes without saying that, properly speaking, no "system" can democratize itself. A

system is no more than a set of rules or procedures to which people, for various reasons, conform. But if the system is distasteful at best, and is maintained largely through the unnatural tensions which its managers are able to exploit, then there is always the possibility that the people will alter the system when given the opportunity by an interval of relative peace. The objective of the West, then, should be to provide that interval. Any other policy on any other view would be to set out to punish the ninety per cent for the tyranny of the ten per cent. This, we submit, is morally indefensible and politically unnecessary.

As to the practical steps, we leave these to persons more experienced in planning such programs. The West is not lacking in such persons, as for example, men like Chester Bowles, former U.S. Ambassador to India, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, and Stringfellow Barr, to name but three.

Finally, there is no need to suppose that Dr. Radhakrishnan would advise the nations of the West to lay down their arms and strike Gandhian postures of harmlessness before the Kremlin gates. Radhakrishnan, like Gandhi, is a man with some knowledge of Western civilization, and he knows that the West is far from harmless, at this juncture of history. Non-violence, to be successful, requires a basic honesty of purpose which is exceedingly rare, and the West is not yet qualified to practice it. There is a difference between refusing to use violence oneself, and advocating it for use by others. The legions of Gandhi's non-violent "army" were genuine *volunteers*.

There is, we think, a middle ground of policy which the West is capable of adopting with sincerity—a policy predicated on the premise declared by Radhakrishnan, that "we are all very much alike." But for this policy to be successful, it must be genuinely believed and consistently followed.

REVIEW

PERSPECTIVE ON JAPAN

AN article in a recent *Friends Intelligencer* (a Quaker monthly) by Howard Brinton contains an interesting sidelight on Japanese culture and character. Mr. Brinton is well known to American Quakers, having, with Anna Brinton, for years directed the Pendle Hill Quaker center for graduate studies. Both he and Anna Brinton are now in charge of the Friends Center in Tokyo, and this article has the insights of leisurely observation at firsthand. After detailing matters of current interest, Mr. Brinton says:

But politics and economics present only a part, and perhaps not the most important part, of the present scene in Japan. People here are trained to endure disaster with resignation. Life goes on cheerfully and hopefully. Buddhism, which still has a strong hold on some and an undercurrent of influence on most, teaches an inner superiority to circumstances and sympathy for every form of life.

The idea of "resignation," of course, is at fundamental odds with the popular Western credo of "progress," but Japan somehow managed to combine the habits and attitudes of a traditional, hierarchical society with Western progressive notions more effectively than any other Oriental people, and this, perhaps, is explanation enough for the fact that Japan was for several years the most frightening of the new-born Eastern powers and at the same time precipitated upon herself the most frightful disasters—with, of course, the "cooperation" of the West. Meanwhile the West, never having understood the deep-rooted values of a traditional society, has understood Japan less even than other Eastern countries. Mr. Brinton, however, an exceptional observer, provides this note on Japanese attitudes:

In Kure, near Hiroshima, a Buddhist memorial service was observed for the repose of the souls of two million departed flies. The souls thus commemorated were those of all the flies exterminated in an elaborate sanitation drive for making Kure a "Town without a Fly." The prayer, dedicated to the dead "victims" and read in front of the altar by a black-robed priest, went as follows: "Dear flies . . . we always wish to live

amicably with any creature in this world. It is, therefore, really to be regretted that you do nothing but harm to man and that we have, in consequence, to exterminate you—to the last member of your species. Dear flies . . . have no rancor against us for killing you but accept in manly spirit the inevitable consequence of your being born in this world as flies." Similar services have been held in other places for eels, toads, and fishes.

Among Buddhist peoples more indifferent to "progress," the flies would probably have been permitted to infest the community without hindrance, a program of calculated "slaughter" being practically out of the question. But the Japanese, feeling the twofold obligation to be progressively sanitary and at the same time reverent toward all life, worked out this curious formula, which has both a ruthless and a gentle flavor! To the Westerner—especially a young Westerner who may have experienced being attacked by Japanese Zeros—the elaborate apology to the flies would probably seem ridiculous, and possibly be irritating, yet the psychological compulsion which obliged the community to declare its respect for life in this way represents a quality in the traditional societies of the East from which all Westerners might learn a great deal. It could even be argued, from a long-term point of view, that the sense of responsibility toward other forms of life is of far greater importance than "sanitation," and with even greater "survival value," over the centuries. It seems certain, at any rate, that a people in whom the sense of brotherhood with all creatures is strong will find friendly relations with other countries less difficult to arrange. Even if the overlay of Western notions led the Japanese into imperialistic adventures, there remains this foundation of ethical thinking, which may have much to do with the fact that the Japanese people have surprisingly little resentment toward their American conquerors, and have managed by extraordinary effort to make the best of their present economic situation. As Howard Brinton says:

Compared with European and American countries Japan is very poor. India, China, and Indonesia are poorer, but they have unused natural resources, whereas Japan has not. Japan has no oil, iron, cotton, nor rare metals. A population half that of the U.S.A. is living in an area smaller than the state of California. Japan has an invaluable resource

in the character of the people. By their extraordinary efforts the country in eight years recovered the prewar standard of living in spite of having lost more than a quarter of the national wealth and nearly half of the territory.

Facts of this sort about other countries are seldom regarded with serious consideration by Americans, who, enjoying the bounty of a great continent, fall into the habit of thinking that they have been especially favored by Providence, and that this prosperity is their "right," simply in virtue of having been born in North America. A little attention to the past, however, should show that the favors of Providence have a tendency to move around. Actually, the oldest countries in the world, today, are India and China, both of which now seem to be moving forward on an upward cycle of development. For all we know, in another century "Providence" may transfer its affections to Oriental peoples, whose earthly fortunes have been under eclipse for many centuries.

Meanwhile, Mr. Brinton's notes on contemporary Japan are worthy of review, since he writes without cultural or political partisanship. First of all, the prospect of a strong communist movement in Japan seems to have entirely disappeared. Communist representation in the Diet has gone from 35 members to no members, and no Japanese to whom Brinton has talked feels that there is any danger of Japan going communist unless economic conditions become extremely bad. Japanese economic recovery, however, is confronted by serious obstacles. While at the first Asian conference of the International Labor Organization, held in Tokyo last year, it was pointed out that Japan has a higher standard of living than other Asiatic countries, the wage rates now prevailing in Japan are not encouraging:

Average hourly wages in the U.S.A. were said to be 160 cents; in Japan, 20 cents. Unemployment in Japan is slowly increasing. Employable Japanese are said to be increasing at the rate of 800,000 a year and jobs at the rate of about 300,000 a year. Other economic difficulties are, it is hoped, temporary.

Serious floods have recently caused great devastation in Japan, and last fall's rice crop was the

worst in forty years. It is not remarkable, therefore, that the Japanese must seek in other countries the food products needed to feed their growing population and the raw materials to keep their factories busy. Unless Japan can arrange trade agreements with sources of food and materials and find markets for her manufactures, her economic problems may become insuperable. As Brinton asks: ". . . how can Japan continue to pay for the necessary two billion dollars of imports without assistance from American spending?" When American military procurement orders are entirely withdrawn, the problem of securing sufficient foreign exchange will become acute.

Brinton fears that Japan may be led by economic pressure to abandon its constitutional prohibition against rearmament, not because the country is in a war-making mood, but because "Japan is still dependent upon America for financial help and is compelled to dance to the American tune." Other Asian countries, however, are not being especially helpful. South Korea has prohibited Japanese fishing boats from coming within sixty miles of the South Korean shore and has seized forty-two boats for violating this rule and imprisoned their crews—despite the familiar three-mile limit of international law. Australia, too, has imposed burdensome restrictions on Japanese pearl-divers. In such circumstances, rearmament begins to seem attractive.

On the plus-side of American policy is the fact that requisitioned property is being restored to Japanese owners; further, both Britain and the U.S.A. have agreed that their troops stationed in Japan be tried in Japanese courts for offences committed while off duty and outside military installations. This is sound democratic practice, appreciated by the Japanese. The larger problems, however, remain, and the simple facts here recited give little evidence that they will be solved in the immediate future.

COMMENTARY **THE ECONOMIC MANIA**

WE find it a little tiresome to be continually told that all the virtues of American life are the result of "Capitalism" and "Free Enterprise." Such claims give far too much credit to economics, and not enough to the intangibles which, taken together, constitute the American contribution to world civilization.

Most readers will surely have noted, by this time, that while MANAS is amply critical of America, we are not sour on the subject. There are things notable and fine in American tradition—things nearly unknown in the political world before the great documents which ushered this republic into being were formulated. By such instruments, an age of opportunities began for the common man. It is a mistake, we think, and a perversion of the intentions of these first great Americans to claim that these opportunities were essentially economic in character. This is too superficial an account of a genius which embraces qualities as wide-ranging as those found in Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, Lincoln, Walt Whitman, Emerson, and a number of others. In such men lies America's claim to be remembered, not in her economic "way of life." Actually, these men were at odds with cheap and chauvinistic versions of Americanism, and for none of them did "free enterprise" play an extremely important role.

Concentration on economics and economic theory as the panacea for all human ills has corrupted the standards of genuine civilization in large areas of the modern world. The concentration has been natural enough, since it resulted from indefensible economic exploitation. Americans, noting this corruption abroad, refer to it as "materialism," but the worship of another sort of economic arrangement, now to be hallowed by the expression, "under God," may easily turn out to be just as "materialistic" in the long run.

It was probably inevitable that the nineteenth-century "discovery" of economics should lead to elaborate doctrines concerning economic processes. The old ethical compulsions were worn out by hypocritical applications, whereas the economic doctrines, supported by humanitarian fervor, were new, and sanctified by the spirit of "science."

But are we not able, now, to say that we have learned our lesson, to admit that economic justice is important, just as all forms of justice are important, and to stop making the mistake of assuming that economics is somehow a total "philosophy of life"? It seems a most peculiar folly to imitate the communists in this way.

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

WHILE MANAS is seldom able to deal with current issues while they are most current, it sometimes seems that "calls to action" on political issues are less important than efforts to give those issues prolonged evaluation. In respect to the currently proposed amendment to the Pledge of Allegiance, by which a Senate subcommittee has unanimously approved the addition of the words "under God" to the chant every school boy knows, it might be more useful for teachers and parents to think about the implications of the addition rather than simply react pro or con according to previous conditioning. This topic, incidentally, certainly fits our idea of what a "Children . . . and Ourselves" subject should be. First of all, while it is the children who are exposed to continued repetitions of the "flag pledge," only adults are capable of perspectives on its content.

We can easily sympathize with the sincere churchmen who may support the introduction of "God" to the Pledge, since a mere temporal ideal is not the highest of which man is capable. The framers of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, according to one historian, decided to vote God out of all Federal documents, not because they did not believe in man's need to respect a higher law than that of the State, but because they thought the concept of Deity should be approached philosophically rather than politically. The men we most revere have acknowledged the voice of principle and conscience above all things else—and, further, felt the existence of a universal spiritual kinship among all human beings, regardless of creed, color, or caste. For some men, the word God undoubtedly serves as a reminder that the spiritual aspirations and beliefs of men must be respected by any liberal government.

But there are other considerations. God has also frequently been a symbol of Power, and as

psychologists such as Brock Chisholm and Erich Fromm constantly remind us, power is a dangerous tool in the hand of the demagogue. Further, though there are many classes of tyrants, self-righteous moralists are of the worst. When a man feels that God is definitely on "his side," he is insufferable to live with and unreachable by any appeal of reason. Nations, like people, do more credit to human history when they avoid the delusion of being divinely appointed. If the American people, and their children, come to believe that none of the people in Communist states are worthy to "know God," because they do not speak of religion, one of the vital concepts of liberal democracy has been ignored.

There is little doubt that the proposed amendment to the Pledge of Allegiance is inspired by the feeling that Americans are now embattled against the "Communitic atheists." And when we feel ourselves embattled, we are furthest from a philosophical conception of deity—had best leave "God" alone, at least until we feel that all men partake of divinity in their essential natures.

We lately came across a mimeographed criticism of the proposed addition to the Pledge, and we feel that some of the ideas there offered are worth consideration. This letter, incidentally, does not represent an "organized" effort to block the bill; its writers, apparently, have no factional political affiliation, and simply express the concern of philosophically-minded persons. The fact that the letter is unsigned is explained more or less in harmony with MANAS' own attempt to let ideas rest upon their inherent worth, leaving out of account the personality of their formulators. A large portion of the letter follows:

We note by the press of May 9th that an amendment to the Pledge of Allegiance, in the form of inserting "Under God," appears about to pass. We are afraid that some important history has been forgotten, and that all the implications of this amendment have not been realized.

The Founders of this Republic were, for excellent historical reasons, especially solicitous that no shred of attachment between church and state

remain in its Constitution. This complete severance was one of the most important and most novel features of a Constitution that aroused the admiration and respect of free and progressive minds all over the world, and which emplaced this Republic in a wholly new position of respect in that world.

This proposed amendment is nothing more, and nothing less, than an incursion of religion into the region of temporal power; for it places a *forced* religious observance upon every child. The shadow of material compulsion in matters of the soul, even if inflicted upon one in millions, is an abomination to the spirit of true religion. If all men were agreed upon the nature of God, as such nature is implied in the wording and context of this amendment: if all such men believed in a God at all, if it were a proven fact that not to believe in such a God inevitably betokens bad character or bad citizenship—then a case could be made out for it. But none of these things is true.

Among us we have also thousands of excellent citizens and sojourners in this country, of other faiths than Christian, whose ideals of moral behavior are the same as those of Christ. . . .

But the word "God" in English, and with its historical connotations and current associations, does not mean what the word Brahm means to a Buddhist or a Hindu; it does not mean what Tao means to a Chinese, it does not mean what Allah means to a Moslem. Yet to each of these the conception held under the name of his own faith is the fountainhead of his morality and the repository of his hope in the here and the hereafter; it means to him what Christianity means to the Christian. A major portion of our standing in the world abroad, among men of all faiths, has been our rigid adherence to a non-sectarian attitude on religion, that has been a safeguard against insult to and friction with, all these tribes and peoples. Are we now, when friends were never more needed, when indeed the gaining and retaining of friends of many faiths may be the only salvation for this hard-pressed Republic—are we now to fling, as a national political act, an insult into the faces of these people as well as of millions of our own? It is our solemn opinion that no more damage could be done had this amendment originated in the Kremlin itself. And here we also have a point. In adopting atheism as a political creed, and the basis of a social order, it is precisely the Kremlin that has set the chief example in modern times of State interference with religion and religious belief. Is this the sort of example we propose to follow?

Freedom of religion means freedom to be non-religious, also, or it means nothing more than the freedom of the Russian press, which is free only to propagate ideas within the framework of Communist faith. This would be one thing if "atheist" were synonymous with "Communist." This is far from being the case. There were thousands of agnostics and atheists long before Communism was on the scene, there are thousands of them today who have no use for Communism. Albert Einstein is an agnostic. Thomas Edison was signatory to a philosophy which held, as we do, that there is no God in the form of a person, but that there is a Divine Principle, eternal and boundless, from which all things emerge and into which all return. There have been innumerable other eminent men, some of great altruism and high character, who found themselves conscientiously unable to accept the figure of God as portrayed in the major Christian creeds, and who have thus been called agnostics or atheists. This amendment, by unmistakable inference, and in some cases directly, makes of all such men second-class citizens, placing them on the same level as card-carrying Communists, no matter how much they may loathe that cult.

The letter further speaks of the character of the United States from the beginning as a "sanctuary of liberty of the soul in which under no conditions could a man be made to suffer officially, be penalized legally, on a matter of religious belief or non-belief." Though the following may seem unnecessarily alarmist to many, the writers then conclude that if God thus becomes official, "the next logical step is to incorporate a recognition of the credal God into oaths of office and the requirements for naturalization, thus barring from office and citizenship all but Christians and Jews of specifically defined creeds." We are not at all sure that this deplorable "next step" will actually take place if the Pledge of Allegiance is altered, but it is certainly not impossible that it may.

A *certain* danger, though, as we see it, is that which arises whenever any sort of religious symbol is adopted uncritically by a group, whether it be large or small. "Group symbols," unless really understood by all men in the same way, after prolonged opportunity for individual philosophizing (a happy state of affairs which has

never come about, so far as we know), are productive of considerable misunderstanding and, in some instances, of angry dissension.

So the question we should like to have discussed by parents and teachers, whether or not God and the American flag are presently to join hands, is the question of group symbols generally. Are such steps philosophically *wise*? Has the impulsion come from wisdom attained, in the slow sure way that philosophers deepen their understanding, or has it come from nationalistic emotion? In the latter event, it behooves all teachers who venerate the conceptions upon which the "Founding Fathers" based their work to make sure that God is given a non-creedal interpretation. The God of the Christians alone is not altogether acceptable from a Jeffersonian or Washingtonian position—certainly most unacceptable from the perspective of Thomas Paine. Perhaps we should have a "sub-subcommittee" of semanticists serving the Senate to insure that terms added to our traditional expressions of faith in democracy will be rejected unless they represent an aspiration which *all* men can share, regardless of religious affiliation or lack of it.

FRONTIERS

The Federal Prison System

[A welcome response to our many recommendations of "prison literature" is the following article by a correctional officer now serving at McNeil Island. This writer, Mr. Frank Moore, balances the tendency to regard whatever goes on in prison, from a radical standpoint, as "total evil." The theory of punishment indeed may be such, but the practical problem remains—how to work out of a situation created by a combination of Mosaic law with an "immoral society." This article persuades us that the transformations already accomplished in the field of penology would not have been dreamed possible some thirty years ago, while Mr. Moore's "progress report" prepared for MANAS readers is an earnest of the dedication felt by many "correctional officers" as well as wardens.]

To suggest the Prison Service as a career to any ambitious young man of twenty-five or thirty years ago was tantamount to offering him a figurative ancestral sword of suicide as far as a respectable occupation and a place in the community were concerned. There was probably no better way in which a young man could pass into limbo and anonymity and there is some doubt as to who was held in lower esteem—the prison guard or the man he guarded.

Since 1930, however, thanks to the enlightened and unceasing efforts of the Federal Bureau of Prisons—and with the aid of many progressive State officials—the status of prison personnel has risen until today a prison career is a real challenge to those interested in one of the more pressing problems of our day. It stands out as one of the better civil service positions offered to young men and women of altruistic instincts by the United States Government.

Gone is the old routine and brutality of the traditional prison; gone, too, are the old-time guards, the hard-bitten clubmen who—like the two-gun Sheriffs and Wild Bills of the Old West—are now seen only in Grade B movies and, perhaps, in a few of the more backward State institutions. In their place stands the Correctional Officer; a man dedicated to progressive penology, whose aim is

rehabilitation and whose activities follow the line of the old Chinese proverb that one should "only pursue an offender to show him the way."

The change has not come about rapidly or easily. It has been a slow, hard process bogged down at times by human inertia, plenty of opposition and a number of mistakes. In the recent NBC program, "The Challenge of our Prisons," Mr. Teeters remarked that prison is an experiment that has failed. Yet, in spite of the failures—or rather, just because of them—the Federal Bureau and many state institutions such as those of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Minnesota and California (to mention only a few), have continuously pushed a program of experiment, inquiry, and endeavor that offers real opportunity to those whose imagination rises to an undertaking in which all the principal problems are still unsolved and are willing to pit their ingenuity against one of the more discouraging dilemmas of our time—how to reverse the trend of our growing criminal element. In the 1953 annual conference of State Governors held in Seattle, one whole day was devoted to the problem of our penitentiaries. Some of the greatest penologists in the country participated.

The oldest of the Federal prisons still in operation is the penitentiary at McNeil Island, Washington. It is located between two and three miles out in the water of Puget Sound, across from Steilacoom, Washington, where the first legend-laden, territorial jail of the Pacific Northwest was established nearly a hundred years ago.

Today, the Government Institution covers the whole of McNeil Island. Here, under the progressive guidance of Warden Fred T. Wilkinson, the trend of modern penology has taken the form of greater educational activities along all lines. Shops, offices, general maintenance programs, the farm and the cannery have become training centers for inmates as far as is feasible.

A school staff conducts courses in everything from elementary reading and writing to correspondence courses in college. There is an auditorium where inmates write and put on their own entertainment. Sports of all kinds are encouraged.

Religious instruction is offered. In every way, the inmate is encouraged to develop latent traits and talents other than those which were the original cause of his incarceration.

As early as the late '30s, the Bureau had set its standards high in the recruiting of Correctional Officers to operate effectively in this new type of institution. The duties listed in the early circulars included a responsibility for the supervision and instruction of inmates; to assist the rehabilitative agencies organized for institutional training; to lay out work assignments and supervise groups in construction, training and recreational activities.

Because of these arduous duties, an applicant had to be in the prime of life, over 25 (although this age has been reduced since the war to include veterans), and under 45 years of age, in perfect health, cool and fearless in emergencies, able to pass high standard intelligence and aptitude tests, undergo a rigorous training course and successfully pass a year of probationary work. He had to be of excellent character and morals and was thoroughly investigated by government agencies. He had to possess patience, capacity for leadership, and an influence for uprightness.

One warden tells of receiving a letter from an applicant after he had been sent the circular in which he inquired: "But Warden, can the Government afford to *pay* for such a collection of assets?" However, the Bureau did attract men of high calibre and the results in the Federal system have shown that the policy has paid off in revolutionary and intelligent prison practices. Whether the prison itself is a contradiction is today open to serious debate among Federal and State governments, but until something better is discovered, the Bureau continues to improve and experiment in their continual search for solutions.

Too often the Correctional Officer is regarded as that triple threat, that sinister triumvirate—the policeman whom nobody loves, the reformer whom nobody likes, and the dreamer whom nobody listens to. Consequently, there are moments when he feels like following the advice of the happy philosopher, Kai Lung, turning in the insignia of his profession

and beginning life anew as a trainer of performing elephants.

The Correctional Officer deals with illiterates and college graduates. He meets the moron. He matches wits with inmates more intelligent than himself ("about every five minutes," as one officer put it), and he comes to the conclusion that most inmates do not have the so-called, innate "criminal" tendencies. They have, merely, the common failings of us all, but carried to an acute degree. The majority lack appreciation, as do we all, but it is painfully obvious. Samuel Liebowitz, the great lawyer, saved 78 men from the electric chair, none of whom ever sent him a Christmas card.

The average inmate is selfish—a universal infirmity—but his lack of consideration for others is, at times, amazing. Only a small proportion seem to realize that, in all walks of life, the man who "asks without offering, begs with a closed fist." In fact, regarding the "closed fist" as an asset rather than a liability has infected law-breakers and law-enforcers alike.

But the most characteristic trait that confounds the Correctional Officer and retards the rehabilitation program is the firm belief with the average inmate that his fate is not his fault. The "bum beef," the "frame-up," and the attitude of injured innocence are so common in a penitentiary it has become a standing joke among the inmates themselves. But individually, the belief is so strongly entrenched and the arguments so convincing, a Correctional Officer tends to fall back on the affirmation of philosophy that "nothing ever happens to a person that is not, intrinsically, like the person that it happens to," and work out his daily contacts from there. In this regard, I recall the words of a psychiatrist to a Correctional Officer who had asked him for a few pointers.

"To begin with," said the doctor, "no psychiatrist has ever cured a patient and no Correctional Officer ever rehabilitated an inmate. The thing is always done by the patient or individual himself. To personally change anyone mentally or morally, you need two factors. First, the person must want to effect the change himself; second, the influencing

agent must be an understanding example of the change being effected. If the agent is an officer, he must not only practice what he preaches, but show a credit balance.

"You have, under your supervision, a group of men, many of whom have grown belligerent and anti-social struggling with the problem of themselves and calling it 'the law', 'the social system' or 'the police'. Once you learn the subtle art of showing a man where his real trouble lies, without arousing his antagonism, he does most of the work himself and you both become expert craftsmen."

In order to make the Federal Correctional Officer just such an "expert craftsman" in his line, the Bureau has organized a system of officer in-training that, in all probability, is unsurpassed by any other prison system in the world. Every employee who enters the service is required to take the training and the results show in the few times a Federal prison makes the headlines or fails to handle a situation efficiently and quickly without assistance.

Every officer must begin with a course of basic training under a skillful and competent training supervisor. He is made acquainted with all phases of prison activities and stands by on all posts studying the procedure under friendly instructors.

Besides the basic training there are yearly courses in advanced training. These classes are made up of older officers and men from other departments; all meet for a two-week period and pool their collective experience in discussions aimed at improving the personnel and ironing out the wrinkles that constantly arise in the administration of a prison. At the end of the course, each man writes a personal thesis giving suggestions on the subjects with which he is the most familiar.

A third sort of study is known as the "quarterly training" and consists of a group of refresher courses on all departments and activities of the institution. Thus, an officer might take a two-hour course on "Problems of the culinary department" and another two hours on "Methods of transporting prisoners," if he feels he has grown rusty in these departments. The research is conducted by the heads of departments and consists of short talks followed by a

lively question and answer period in which the heads "meet the press," as it were, and explain or defend their way of conducting their departments. All leave with a better understanding of the over-all objectives of the institution.

To make an all-around officer, a system of post changes has been established which shifts men from post to post approximately every eight weeks, thus keeping the men constantly alert and informed as to all activities of the institution. As a result the personnel are kept interested, unaffected by routine, and at top efficiency in all the interlocking departments.

The Correctional Officer has many duties, but the majority are those of a custodial nature for, above all else, he is responsible for the safe-keeping of prisoners, the protection of society, and the prevention of escapes. Each year the Bureau issues a performance standard sheet in which each officer is graded along many lines. He is examined on his ability to supervise inmates, expedite work projects, and maintain a high state of morale; on his ability to give job instructions to new personnel and to carry out long-range plans for inmate training and correctional treatment in cooperation with other departments.

The officer is graded on his oral and written reports; his performance of regular and unusual duties. He is closely checked on his appearance and conduct on the job, the maintenance of custody and discipline, his skill in following proscribed procedures on post assignments, and he must adapt established procedures to meet emergencies such as fire, riot, assault, escape, or serious illness or injury. Careful observation is made to his efforts at self-improvement and his participation in the various training programs.

It is the Correctional Officer who manages the cell-houses and the dormitories. He mans the towers and patrols the yard areas. He has charge of the work crews and must know and account for every man under his supervision, submitting a daily written report on work accomplished.

During meals officers are constantly on the alert for disagreement or neglect of duty. A

conversational coffee-pourer who forgets to pour can raise the collective blood-pressure of a group whose morning tempers tend to the brittle stage—through natural human irascibility at having to crawl out of a warm bed at 6:30 A.M. There is also the constant threat that arises when you attempt to integrate a group of men which includes Mexicans, Indians, colored, white and even Eskimos. It is seldom done successfully on the outside, yet it is one of those problems the prison personnel is expected to solve. Said Mr. James V. Bennett:

It should be clearly understood the prison officer's job is essentially a young man's job. It is hard work, requiring mental alertness and physical vigor, and carrying a considerable element of personal risk and creating nervous tensions of a high degree.

In all this, remember, the Correctional Officer is dealing with men that society as a whole has found it difficult to deal with. Any rebuff is considered personal, planned, or just plain pernicious. An across-the-board "yes" to requests would mean that other inmates would be quick to spot an "easy officer" and would wait till he was on duty to swamp him with demands. On the other hand, a general "no" won't get good results, either.

This man wants to go to the hospital. Rules state he should wait till sick line—but is he really in need of emergency treatment? Will he be throwing additional problems on the hospital officer, who has problems enough of his own? The cell-house officer must know his man, his background, and weigh the possibilities. The officer must make an instant decision among hundreds of others and he had better be right most of the time or he won't remain a cell-house officer.

In all fairness to the inmate population, however, it must be admitted that most of the time the inmates regulate themselves and rather successfully. The more intelligent among them, the inmate committee, throw the weight of inmate opinion against the wanton "fouling up" of privileges, so that the pressure on the Correctional Officer is being lessened year by year. Many a Correctional Officer is indebted to the moral support of intelligent inmates in correcting a sensitive situation.

The job of Correctional Officer is one of constant change and variation. He is always on the move, facing new situations, new faces, new problems. It is a job in which interest seldom lags for you are working with men—which is not only the "proper study," as has often been said, but also the most interesting one.

I agree that prisons are not good; that there must be another solution; that all men have potentialities for better things. But I tremble to think what would happen if all guards and authority were withdrawn.

For tales of doom and destiny relate
How life to life each man works out his fate.
We'd do it now! The Gods move slow—or wait!

FRANK B. MOORE

Steilacoom, Washington