VOLUME VI, NO. 3
JANUARY 21, 1953

THE FACES OF MEN

IT is the gift of poets and often of other writers to restore the faith of men in man—to touch those chords, however gently, whose vibration keys up the lagging loyalties of the heart. Lovers of Wordsworth, of Shelley, of Whitman and Emerson, will recall the thrill of conviction which may be born from the lines of these poets. It is as though wounds are bound up, doubts withered and discharged, and a glowing promise fixed upon the horizon of human hopes. That mere words may be charged with the life of the spirit is indeed one of the mysteries of man, yet a mystery we gladly accept without final explanation. Some years ago, W. H. Auden, writing in the *Nation*, had reason to speak of Abraham Lincoln, and in a paragraph or so the English poet shored up the confidence of at least one reader in the intuitive trust that is felt in a man with a face like Lincoln's. Auden felt this trust. He needed no exhaustive biographical confirmations to persuade him of Lincoln's greatness. There, in the lines and planes, the furrows, even, of character upon his face, Lincoln's nobility stood revealed as clearly as the profile of a mountain on a cloudless day. It takes a certain courage or confidence in the intuitive sense to declare such perceptions, but those poets who have the power to see sometimes declare their vision. It is a power possessed, we think, by all men, yet only a few will trust it, and fewer still find in it a strength of purpose and a guiding light.

It was another commentary on the human face, also found in the *Nation* (Dec. 27), which recalled Auden's words. But this commentary, by Nelson Algren, is in saddening contrast, although as perceptive, in its way, as the other. Algren has been looking about him, and is led to question:

> Do American faces so often look so lost because they are most tragically trapped between a very real dread of coming alive to something more than merely existing and an equal dread of going down to the grave without having done more than merely live? . . .
>
> Here in the back streets and the boulevards of New York and Chicago and Los Angeles, unused, unusable, and useless faces, so purposeless, yet so smug, harassed, yet somehow so abject—for complacency struggles strangely there with guilt. Faces of the American Century, full of such an immense responsibility toward themselves.
>
> As though the human cost of our marvelous technology has indeed been much too great.

The vision is authentic, unameliorated, stark. What doctor of the mind has more accurately diagnosed than this:

> Never before till here and now have men and women been so divided by the discrepancy between life and the representation of life. . . .
>
> So accustomed have we become to the testimony of the photo-weeklies, backed by witnesses from radio and TV, establishing us as the happiest, healthiest, sanest, wealthiest, most inventive, fun-loving, and tolerant folks yet to grace the earth of man that we tend to forget that these are bought-and-paid-for witnesses and that all their testimony is perfumed. . . .
>
> Nowhere has any people set itself a moral code so rigid while applying it so flexibly.
>
> Never has any people been so outwardly confident that God is on its side while inwardly terrified lest He be not:
>
> "It is as if we are being endowed with a vast and thoroughly appointed body," Walt Whitman prophesied, "and left with little or no soul."

One tires, perhaps, of these desperate portraits of disaster. Let us look for brighter omens, which surely exist. Exist they must, but what are they worth if there is no more hope of confirmation of their promise than the fear and withdrawal Algren found upon the faces of the multitude? The hopes of the present are of the sort which belong among the phenomena of crisis; and if the crisis brings no fever of self-

consciousness, precipitates no heroic symptoms, then omens will remain but omens, the hopes at best forlorn.

Algren defines the modern sickness of the soul as well as anyone. The dread of living and the dread of not living fully: Are these, he asks, the root of our uselessness in life?

> If so, this is truly the great American disease, and would account in part for the fact that we lead the world today in incidence of insanity, criminality, alcoholism, narcoticism, cancer, homicide, and perversion in sex as well as perversion just for the pure hell of the thing.

Whitman saw these things in the making, but he also saw other things, great things, and even the worst of his prophecies did not destroy his faith in human beings. Algren and we, all of us, with him, have seen the mass-man aspect of the faces of our generation. We see the faces in relaxation, forgetful of their audience, indifferent to the impersonal observer who threatens nothing, promises nothing. It is like seeing the memory of a thousand years of ghetto existence in the face of a tired Jew going home from work in the subway. It is like seeing the unconscious memory of an overseer's lash, generations ago, in a Negro "messenger boy" with a college degree. It is like seeing the unsatisfied desires, the unslaked thirsts, the unshielded and uncomforted anguish of a million incomplete and suffering human beings, in the hours when they are not lifted beyond themselves, when the world and its pressures are too much with them, bearing them down.

Yet we cannot generalize the whole of man from this. To do so creates justification for the Machiavellians and the Inquisitors, the ruthless saviors who would redeem the mass by destroying the individual. We must never forget that only individuals can redeem the mass, by exchanging their sorrow and anxiety for the deeper emotion of compassion, by finding the peace which accepts uncertainty and thrives on walking the razor's edge.

But who among the masses, some will ask, is capable of this? *More than are attempting it,* is the answer. Nature has a balance to support all such ordeals. Not every branch raises its tender buds to the March winds. There are rhythms of striving and rhythms of repose. There are somatic cells and germ cells in every body. If all those whose hour has come to stand as men among half-men and quarter-men would do so, the struggle would not be too hard. It was surely the emergence of individuality from the mass, and not the mass itself, which made Shakespeare exclaim—

> What a piece of work is a man ! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god!

There is instinct for good in every man, however frustrated and turned to evil purposes. And in an age like this, when hope after hope is cut off, when the pseudo-satisfactions of desire create their corresponding disgusts almost before the fleeting pleasures are felt, the instincts of the natural man may begin to assert themselves. We learn, for example, from *Collier's* for Nov. 8, that "Half our soldiers fail to shoot." The psychiatrists speak of this as an "inhibition" which must be removed, but why not admit, instead, that modern war has become so remote from the issues of the life of the individual that the soldiers feel no need to kill other human beings?

Meanwhile, the men responsible for making the soldiers shoot have sought advice from experts, who tell them that it is necessary to "remould the human material." How? By subjecting the troops to a mob psychology in which the individual loses his individual identity? By strengthening the soldier's feeling of attachment to his "side" so that he will feel able to set aside his inhibition to killing? Finally, by providing him with a father-like leader—allwise, strong, just—whose orders take the place of all sense of moral responsibility?

These familiar "techniques" adopted to make killers out of ordinary, kindly men are not important. The Nazis used them; the Communists use them; every military leader of modern armies made up of civilians drafted to fight has *had* to use them, in order to have any war at all. What is important is that so many young men exhibit a growing insusceptibility to the routine psychological preparation for war, and oblige their leaders to ask for psychiatric aid.

We don't want to make too much of this. A dislike of killing is natural to all but practically insane human beings. But the unwillingness of soldiers to shoot is at least a straw in the wind; or a breeze which might, conceivably, at some distant time become a gale of rejection of war and all its works. There is the further fact that the more strenuous and self-conscious the methods of getting men to fight, the more aware men become that they are being manipulated to move toward ends in which they have no real interest, which are really abhorrent to them.

This is true of men all over the world, and true, not only of war-making activities, but of all the wasteful, aimless motions which are required of modern man to maintain the artificial structure so well described by Nelson Algren.

It comes back, in the end, to the power of our faith in man. There is really no need to condemn with bitterness the leaders who are captives of the same delusions. We need only to expose the delusions, and keep on exposing them, and to work toward ways of life which produce their own natural immunities to the false appetites which keep men afraid, and upon which their feelings of insecurity are largely based. It is a matter of refusing, more and more, to nourish those delusions, ourselves, and we become able to do this only as we see them for what they are.

Letter from
JAPAN

TOKYO.—The general election of Oct. 1 gave Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida and his Liberal Party a vote of confidence. Mr. Yoshida picked his new Cabinet with speed and dispatch, and the Liberal Administration seems to be all set to go for another four years. But political experts are all unanimous in predicting a short life for the Yoshida Government; they look for another general election within the next half year.

One of the reasons why the outlook for the Yoshida Government is considered gloomy is the fact that Mr. Yoshida's political rival within his own party has sent only one member of his group—the Hatoyama faction—into the new Cabinet. This, together with the fact that the Liberal Party's majority in the Lower House is extremely shaky, makes Mr. Yoshida's position weaker than before the election. The Hatoyama faction in the Liberal Party controls about 40 seats and its deflection on any issue could send the Yoshida Administration into a fatal tailspin, for the Liberal Party margin is less than 10 seats.

But an even more pressing reason is the general feeling that the Yoshida Government will be pressed into pushing more vigorously the program for national rearmament. This will, of course, entail the revision of the Constitution, and it is felt that Mr. Yoshida will not be strong enough to carry it out.

Prime Minister Yoshida's position has been for gradual rearmament in step with Japan's economic capabilities. While the nation is actually making its first moves toward rearming, the Prime Minister has seen no need to revise the Constitution. But as the tempo of remilitarization speeds up—and indications are that it will—the Government must consider the revision of the Constitution, if it does not want to make a complete travesty of the highest law of the land, which renounces war and pledges that the nation will never maintain "land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential."

According to the Constitution, amendments to it "shall be initiated by the Diet, through a concurring vote of two-thirds of all the members of each House and shall thereupon be submitted to the people for ratification, which shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of all votes cast thereon, at a special referendum or at such election as the Diet shall specify."

From the point of view of practical politics, it would be extremely unwise to place a proposition which has no chance of winning before the Diet or the people. It can be said with assurance at the present time that an amendment of the "war renunciation" clause in the Constitution has no chance of passing. The majority of the Japanese people do not favor rearmament; they are absolutely opposed to war. But the fact remains that they could be persuaded to change their minds. A propaganda campaign could do the trick, and speeches and statements by prominent Japanese and American leaders would be part of the program. Part of that process is already in the making.

But if the pressure for rearmament should get ahead of the readiness of the people to accept it, Prime Minister Yoshida might find himself forced to lay the issue of a constitutional amendment before the Diet and the people prematurely. This could result in his political demise. And it is certain that the pressure is building up—within Japan as well as from the United States. The Republican Party victory in the recent American presidential election may increase the forces working for Japanese rearmament. President-Elect Eisenhower has voiced his hopes that Asian peoples would look to their own defense. This, of course, can be interpreted as an indication that intensive rearmament will be encouraged in unarmed Japan. It is, of course, no secret that the United States holds the keys to the health of the Japanese economy, and Japan could be influenced

one way or the other, depending on the American program for economic assistance to this nation.

While Japan has come a long way since the dreary days of the period immediately following the war defeat, her economy today is supported chiefly by the placing of orders—special procurements—from the U.S. with Japanese plants in connection with the UN war efforts in Korea. On the other hand, while trade is in a terrific slump, the Japanese population continues to grow—it is now about 85 million. Already insistent demands are being made for the early payment of cash reparations, yet there is only small hope of Japan's entrance into the General Agreement for Trade and Tariff which would grant Japan the right to apply for "most-favored-nation" treatment in her trade with other GATT members; and Japan cannot trade with Red China.

A rearmament bill on top of these depressing factors would be more than the Japanese economy could bear without outside help. Indeed, the outlook is far from inviting and therein lies the reason for the pessimistic views on the future life of the new Yoshida Government.

JAPANESE CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW
THE EDUCATIVE JURIST

WE do not know how many public figures belong on our private list of "the best and wisest men we know," but are sure that Justice William O. Douglas must be included. His *Strange Lands and Friendly People*, BoM selection of many months ago, was only one chapter in the author's determination to fight the lonely fight for reasonable and humane consideration for the people of the Far East—regardless of their political affiliations. Douglas' trips to Asia have convinced him that avoidance of international fratricide is hardly possible unless the American people become less irrationally hostile to Communism, and more diligent in their attempts to understand the elements of which present Asiatic communism is composed.

The latest Douglas book is entitled *Beyond the High Himalayas* (Doubleday, 1952), chronicling journeys undertaken to the remote districts of Pakistan and Tibet. Again the author sees "friendly people" everywhere he goes, including the many peasants and priests who have been led to believe that their destiny lies more with Communism than with capitalism. Douglas feels such beliefs to be tragically mistaken, even though Western Imperialism is not much of a prospect either, but he is always willing to show respect for another man's sincere convictions, even when they seem deluded. And, Douglas points out, some of the Asian converts to Communism have, in a sense, made a logical choice, for the Communist appeal has been directed to the peasants, while Western influence has often supported the old feudal hierarchies, presumably on the theory that the maintenance of peace and the maintenance of the *status quo* are identical. Such a conclusion is an illiterate and ignorant one, in Douglas' opinion—a form of ignorance that is proving tremendously costly:

> All the Point Four agricultural aid that one can imagine will amount to little or nothing if the increased production inures largely to the landlord. All of the health measures taken under Point Four—elimination of malaria, vaccination for smallpox and cholera, purification of the water supply, improved methods of midwifery—will by themselves add up only to misery if a few men continue to own the whole country. Unless there is to be a distribution of wealth and a broad popular base for the spreading of the returns of production, public-health measures will merely increase the number of people among whom the existing poverty must be rationed.
>
> It is feudalism—the ownership by a few of the wealth of a nation and the management of the country for the benefit of the few—that begat Communism in Russia. It is feudalism that is making the spread of Communism in Asia so easy.
>
> America in its new role of world leadership will either promote the revolution or it will promote the perpetuation of feudalism. When we do nothing, we promote feudalism. When we support reactionary governments, we promote feudalism. When we use ECA "to stabilize the situation," we promote feudalism. That is what we have done to date. That is the road to disaster. That is why the free world continues to shrink. That is why the Red tide sweeps on and on.

Despite the unpopularity which so easily accrues to one expressing this idea, Douglas dares to advocate U.S. and U.N. recognition of "Red" China. Then—and this is the important point for those who would derogate Douglas' sentiments—the unorthodox jurist reveals his deep American patriotism. For he wishes to see America assume world leadership. He knows, however, that successful American leadership must be based upon a determination to effect the liberation of human bodies from economic exploitation and human minds from the exploitation of emotional factionalism. The popular American attitude toward Asia, he feels, is pre-eminently materialistic. Our foreign policy reveals that most of our thinking is in terms of guns and dollars. Precisely for this reason, Douglas contends, Red China is "being driven farther and farther into the arms of Soviet Russia." He writes from deep personal conviction:

> The awful thought I had on this moon-drenched night above Leh was that our ignorance and arrogance were depleting our strength, impairing our power, and losing us our influence and prestige in Asia. We had mistaken our real enemy. Soviet Communism, evil as it is, is not our important enemy. Our real enemy—our implacable enemy—is Soviet imperialism that uses Communism as its instrument for expansion.
>
> Now it was clear to me why we were losing Asia. Now the pattern of world politics was taking shape. The eerie moonlight above Leh seemed to make plain the great disaster that was being laid for

> the United States, the country I love. I could not sleep. I walked the valley of Leh for hours, this awful thought pounding in my head. And the depression that had seized me grew and grew as I realized the fury of the press, the fury of official Washington at anyone who would dare propose that our differences with Red China be resolved, a political settlement worked out, and recognition of Red China afforded.

The Douglas version of world affairs, it should be made clear, is more than an opinion in regard to Communism. It is rather an expression of a lifetime of thinking, and of his whole personality. For instance, he is never derisive of the often strange religious customs he encounters in an alien culture, and recognizes many values upheld in Buddhist lands of which we know too little. Concerning the forms of address in the high mountain passes, he says:

> Strangers even are greeted with "Staray Mashy"—"May you never be tired." The return greeting, "Kwar Mashy"—"May you never be poor." "And," he says, "these are greetings that go back to the beginning, to the time when men lived unto themselves, content with daily work and love of families—Afghans, a thousand years behind us, have a warmth of human relations that is often missing all the way from New York to San Francisco."

Indicating his respect for traditional rites, Justice Douglas joined a Tibetan religious "shout" at Staglang La Pass:

> There is a power lurking in these Himalayas greater than any man. And our shouting was an act of fellowship, a religious service as moving as any I have ever attended. Yet there were no candles, no altar, no organs, no stained-glass windows. All around soaring peaks, gripped by massive glaciers, and decorated with dazzling snow fields . . . the solitude, and grandeur as far as the eye could see. Staglang La was indeed a church, the most beautiful perhaps in all the world.

During the interval between publication of *Strange Lands and Friendly People* and *Beyond the High Himalayas,* Douglas has been a crusading educator, giving lavishly of his time and energy to lectures and press interviews. He has tried to awaken his countrymen to the insidious danger of allowing themselves to be confined behind blank walls of "anti-Communism." A Douglas address of last March focusses his classic liberalism on our many self-created threats to civil liberty. This is his challenge on the domestic front:

> Irresponsible talk by irresponsible people has fanned the flames of fear. Accusations have been loosely made. Character assassinations have become common. Suspicion has taken the place of good will. Suspicion grows until only the orthodox idea is the safe one. Suspicion grows until only the person who loudly proclaims the orthodox view, or who, once having been a Communist, has been converted, is trustworthy.
>
> Competition for embracing the new orthodoxy increases. Those who are unorthodox are suspect. Everyone who does not follow the military policy-makers is suspect. Some who are opposed are indeed subversive. Therefore, the thundering edict commands that all who are opposed are "subversive." Fear is fanned to a fury. Good and honest men are pilloried. Character is assassinated. Fear runs rampant.
>
> Fear even strikes at the lawyers and the bar. Those accused of illegal Communist activity—all presumed innocent, of course, until found guilty—have difficulty getting reputable lawyers to defend them. Lawyers have talked with me about it. Many are worried.
>
> Fear has driven more and more men and women of all walks of life either to silence or to the folds of the orthodox. Fear has mounted—fear of losing one's job, fear of being investigated, fear of being pilloried.
>
> This fear has stereotyped our thinking, narrowed the range of free public discussion, and driven many thoughtful people to despair. This fear has even entered universities, great citadels of our spiritual strength, and corrupted them. We have the spectacle of university officials lending themselves to one of the worst kinds of witch hunts we have seen since the early days.

"We see Asia through a glass darkly," writes Justice Douglas at the conclusion of *Beyond the High Himalayas.* "We have not," he says, "caught the spirit of the revolution sweeping Asia." In other words, we are not continuing the revolution for the liberation of the human spirit, to which our country was originally dedicated.

COMMENTARY
THE DEEPER DILEMMA

THE obvious and familiar dilemma facing progressive-minded men of the present lies in the contradiction between the promises and the results of the social revolution. A reorganization of the economic and social relationships of people in terms of ownership of the means of production often produces not more, but less, freedom. While the loss of freedom is not a uniquely socialist phenomenon, the socialization of production, as our English correspondent pointed out last week, certainly accelerates the trend toward government by bureaus and functionaries instead of by impartial law and democratic decision. The necessity for almost royal power in the administration of a Welfare State—the sort of Welfare State it is possible to establish in this epoch—can hardly be denied.

Seeing these developments, the social reformer and liberal who, twenty or thirty years ago, was an articulate and enthusiastic advocate of measures about which he had no doubts at all, is today a confused and indecisive man. He does not know what to do; and more difficult, perhaps, for some, he does not know what to tell others to do.

This is the dilemma which has been endlessly discussed and defined, directly or by implication, during recent years. But it is not, we think, the real dilemma of our age. The real dilemma, we have become convinced, is that which emerges from a comparison of this week's lead article with the review of E. S. Sachs' book, *The Choice Before South Africa*, appearing in Frontiers.

How will Mr. Sachs propose to avoid the *psychological* results of the "progress" for which he is striving—results already apparent in Nelson Algren's essay on American civilization, the civilization whose social legislation Mr. Sachs so much admires?

We do not say this to minimize or to discourage the brave struggle of men like Sachs to eliminate concrete conditions of poverty and injustice. That struggle is necessary and the protagonists of change in South Africa deserve all the support they can get. We ask only that this deeper dilemma of modern civilization be recognized, that it become the subject of profound reflection.

So far, investigation of this dilemma has been undertaken by Gandhi in the East, by men like Arthur Morgan and Ralph Borsodi in the United States, by Wilfred Wellock in England, Friedrich Juenger in Germany, and Simone Weil in France. As we see it, there is no more important direction of discovery to be pursued.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

LOOKING back over five years of contributions to these columns, we are made aware that certain themes seem to call for continual reiteration. There really are no "new" topics in the discussion of education, unless one considers the development of complicated political and ethical factors at the university level to become something of a fresh subject every ten years, and a parent's relationship to a child will certainly always revolve around the same psychological foci.

We do, however, invariably choose certain points of emphasis according to our convictions as to the specific needs of this epoch. There may, for instance, be a time when the popular trend is toward too much conditioning and disciplining of the young, and another time when enthusiasm for "self-expression" obscures the need for parental insistence upon the disciplines of responsibility. In this latter case, it has seemed clear to us that the best synthesis is achieved when parents have enough respect for their children to make sure that the relationship with them is *basically* oriented around the desire to allow the child a maximum of self-expression, for once the child recognizes this as the fundamental intent of the parent, an organic discipline and obedience can play a proper role. As one psychologist recently observed, there is a certain "natural" security—even a pleasure—in "obedience," provided that the child has had an opportunity to become convinced that the parents' character and motivations merit the trust which should accompany obedience.

One of the eternal needs of children, it has always seemed to us, is for something which we can only express as the need for "nature-contact." Whatever the prejudices and predilections of the adult world, and whether parents are good or bad parents, the child can always benefit from experiences which increase his awareness of beauty and stability in the natural order of things. His spontaneous urge to adventure, when channeled toward the exploration of natural phenomena, may bring him, even at an early age, some of the qualities of the poet, some of the qualities of the scientist, and quite a few of the qualifications of the philosopher. But, the fewer and further between are our forests and quiet countrysides, the more do adults need to realize that the precious heritage of nature exploration should be made available in whatever way possible. For it there are no substitutes, especially during the earliest years.

This theme of the need for "nature-contact," to which, since 1948, we have often alluded, sometimes gains provocative dimensions from the naturalist. Aldo Leopold's *Sand County Almanac*, for example, already reviewed (MANAS, July 30) in terms of its definitions of "conservation," also has much to say about the need of the young for some kind of "wilderness." Mr. Leopold enjoyed the blessings—we can hardly call them "advantages," since the latter term sounds so sociological—of boyhood contact with field and stream. In later life he became not only a great conservationist and a beloved naturalist, but also a man of keen perception in respect to the psychological needs of youth. Here, we think, is a fine example:

> When I call to mind my earliest impressions, I wonder whether the process ordinarily referred to as growing up is not actually a process of growing down; whether experience, so much touted among adults as the thing children lack, is not actually a progressive dilution of the essentials by the trivialities of living. This much at least is sure: my earliest impressions of wildlife and its pursuit retain a vivid sharpness of form, color, and atmosphere that half a century of professional wildlife experience has failed to obliterate or to improve upon.

Here, so to speak, is an eagerness in nature, and if we grant that of all human qualities, enthusiasm is perhaps the greatest and most necessary, we can further appreciate the sort of spiritual sustenance which men like Leopold have been able to derive from their solitary meditations in the wild places. He reflects:

> I sit in happy meditation on my rock, pondering, while my line dries again, upon the ways of trout and men. How like fish we are: ready, nay eager, to seize upon whatever new thing some wind of circumstance shakes down upon the river of time! And how we rue our haste, finding the gilded morsel to contain a hook. Even so, I think there is some virtue in eagerness, whether its object prove true or false. How utterly dull would be a wholly prudent man, or trout, or world!

Apparently the young Leopold was also able to meditate, for what is meditation if it be not the creation of a deep impression upon one's whole nature? Impressions gained from nature-experience seem, for some basic reason, to be less kaleidoscopic than experiences and impressions gained in the whirl of social living. Leopold's "earliest impressions" *lasted*, and because he retained his kinship with the wild things of earth he resisted the process of "growing down," to which he also refers. Finally, as a result of all this, he was able to see how beautiful it is to allow children and youths the opportunity for establishing contact with that mysterious, beautiful, unchanged world children have always known when able to escape from the cities. Leopold writes suggestively of one of his own encounters with young woodsmen:

> Around the bend came two boys in a canoe. Spying us, they edged in to pass the time of day.
>
> "What time is it?" was their first question. They explained that their watches had run down, and for the first time in their lives there was no clock, whistle, or radio to set watches by. For two days they had lived by "sun-time," and were getting a thrill out of it. No servant brought them meals: they got their meat out of the river, or went without. No traffic cop whistled them off the hidden rock in the next rapids. No friendly roof kept them dry when they misguessed whether or not to pitch the tent. No guide showed them which camping spots offered a nightlong breeze, and which a nightlong misery of mosquitoes; which firewood made clean coals, and which only smoke.
>
> Before our young adventurers pushed off downstream, we learned that both were slated for the Army upon the conclusion of their trip. Now the *motif* was clear. This trip was their first and last taste of freedom, an interlude between two regimentations: the campus and the barracks. The elemental simplicities of wilderness travel were thrills not only because of their novelty, but because they represented complete freedom to make mistakes. The wilderness gave them their first taste of those rewards and penalties for wise and foolish acts which every woodsman faces daily, but against which civilization has built a thousand buffers. These boys were "on their own" in this particular sense.
>
> Perhaps every one needs an occasional wilderness trip, in order to learn the meaning of this particular freedom.

We think that many parents and teachers will find such remarks useful reminders of the wonderful opportunities for learning and sharing afforded by explorations with their child or children during the summer; the teacher, too, may miss a chance to share the enthusiasm natural to youthful minds if he fails to refresh himself with occasional peregrinations to mountains or deserts, streams or lakes. More and more does the pattern of political and social life create a wall of regimentation around the young, but it is seldom necessary to let the walls close in as soon or as completely as they often do. The tremendous current problem of land impoverishment throughout the world may have a direct bearing upon the impoverishment of children in respect to nature contact. Gandhi insisted that the young citizens who were to build a greater and better India should early learn to work upon and care for the land, and Mr. Leopold nicely summarizes the relationship between economics and ethics:

> It is inconceivable to me that an ethical relation to land can exist without love, respect, and admiration for land, and a high regard for its value. By value, I of course mean something far broader than mere economic value! I mean value in the philosophical sense.

FRONTIERS

Choice Before South Africa

MANAS readers who take the trouble to obtain and study *The Choice Before South Africa* (London: Turnstile, 1952) by E. S. Sachs are likely to set this book down with confused or at least mingled feelings. It is a book which will enlist all their sympathies in behalf of the endlessly exploited black population of the Union of South Africa, win their unqualified admiration for the author—best known as "Solly" Sachs, veteran trade union official, secretary of the powerful Garment Workers' Union of South Africa for many years—yet arouse some doubts concerning the outcome of even the best laid plans for South African liberal democracy.

Unlike many critics of the Malan regime in South Africa, Mr. Sachs has a program with which to replace the blind and vindictive nationalism now being imposed upon the Union population. Basically, it is a program which would promote further industrialization of South Africa, as both a solution to the country's desperate economic problems and a means of establishing racial equality. Sachs has no interest in compromised ideals, although he seems to recognize that the re-education of a people who have been thoroughly indoctrinated in the dogma of "white superiority" cannot be accomplished overnight. He has learned, however, that the trade union type of human association, in which people of various races learn to make common cause by facing together their common problems, *can* be—although often it is not—a practical school in the fact of human equality.

Some of the doubts concerning the road Mr. Sachs proposes grow from his obvious admiration for the social legislation enacted by the United States. Industrialize and educate, he seems to say, and South Africa's problems will be solved, or will at least be well on the way to solution. Anxious to press the industrial revolution to a prosperous fulfillment, he does not consider the possibility that new and subtler problems may result from the very theory of progress so embraced. However, having noted these doubts, we may pass to an appreciation of Mr. Sachs' book, for, actually, we can think of nothing better to suggest than what he is doing right now.

We should say, "was doing," for right now Solly Sachs is in prison, having been arrested by the Government about six months ago, tried, convicted, and sent to jail. Under the Riotous Assemblies Act, the South African Minister of Justice is empowered to order any person to leave any designated area within seven days, and to stay out of that area for a specified length of time, whenever "the Minister is satisfied that any person is in any area promoting feelings of hostility between the European inhabitants on the one hand and any other section of the inhabitants of the Union on the other hand, . .." The Riotous Assemblies Act was passed in 1930. A more recent measure with the same implications, also used by the Union Government against Sachs, is the Suppression of Communism Act passed in 1950. This law, as Mr. Sachs says:

> contains a definition of "Communism" which is sufficiently wide to embrace any liberal who advocates racial tolerance or any trade unionist who urges higher wages for workers. The question of who is a communist or what constitutes communism is to be decided by the Minister. The Governor-General will then act on his advice. The case will not be determined by the Courts of the country on factual evidence in accordance with recognised legal procedure. Thus no one is immune from arbitrary classification as a communist. Nationalist Ministers can easily satisfy themselves that every opponent of the Nationalist Party is a communist. At the beginning of 1951 Mr. Swart [Minister of Justice] introduced an amendment to the Act which is designed to give him even greater despotic authority by making the Act retroactive, thus making criminal an action which was lawful when it was committed.

The Choice Before South Africa is much more than a recital of the wrongs for which South African nationalism and racism must be held responsible, although these are amply described. Rather the book is an understanding account of the multiple relationships between the three major cultural groups in South Africa—the Natives, the Boers, and the English—with particular emphasis on the economic role of each group and the social concepts which tend to govern their behavior. There are two other population segments—the Coloreds (persons of

mixed white and native blood), and the Indians—but for understanding of the particular problems of these groups the reader will have to go to more specialized studies.

The South Africa of today is a product of radically different outlooks and attitudes. Mr. Sachs has only praise for the original Dutch settlers whose courage and ingenuity brought European civilization to the region. He remarks:

> The matchless courage and heroism shown by the Boer people in their magnificent struggle for national independence gained for them the warmest admiration of the whole world, including all liberal-minded Englishmen. But today its memory should be used only to inculcate the love of liberty and the spirit of self-sacrifice. To exploit it for the purposes of engendering national and racial hatred, of fostering the ugly theories of the Master Race and of securing petty party political advantages, is to traduce and prostitute a glorious past and to sow hatred and sorrow for the future.

In connection with the English influence in South Africa, Mr. Sachs points out that the exploitation of both the mineral wealth and the native population of the region has brought tragedy to the Africans and a backward, unstable economy to the country. Only about 15 per cent of the profits from the mines has remained in South Africa, the rest going to absentee shareholders in England and elsewhere. Meanwhile, the Chamber of Mines, devoted to the interests of a few wealthy men, has sponsored a "cheap labor" policy in South Africa, leading, historically, to almost unbelievable cruelties to the African natives. This policy has been to seize upon every device which might assist in driving the natives off the land and into the compounds maintained for the semi-slave labor of the mines. Native workers in the mines are separated from their families for as much as a year at a time, and obliged to work for only a fraction of the wages received by Europeans.

Farmers, too, like the "cheap labor" policy, since agricultural methods in South Africa have not changed much in fifty years. The case of the Bondels, a tribe of Hottentots who came under South African jurisdiction after World War I, will illustrate one of the more infamous methods used to swell the labor force of impoverished natives. The Bondels supported themselves by hunting with dogs. Soon after undertaking the "trusteeship" of the Bondels' welfare, the South African Government imposed a "dog tax" on these people, the purpose of which, as Sachs says, "was to force the Bondels to become labourers for the European farmers in the district at the starvation wages of 10s. a month, or less." The dog tax started at a pound for one dog, and was ten pounds for five dogs, being progressively increased for additional dogs. When the Bondels failed to pay the tax, a military force armed with heavy artillery and machine guns took the field against these miserable and practically unarmed natives. More than a hundred Bondels were killed outright. Sachs concludes:

> The "rebels" were taught that independence and decent living conditions were not for them; their only right, that of working for a pittance for European farmers. It was a bitter and ghastly lesson. The Bulhoek and Bondelzwarts massacres exemplify Christian Trusteeship for the non-Europeans of Africa. It is not Christian charity, love or humanism. It is the crucifixion of peoples.

Throughout this book, Sachs insists that the Europeans have no reason to fear the natives of South Africa, save by continuing such crimes of injustice against them. There need be no hatred between races and between peoples of different skin colors. It is the injustice which breeds fear, suspicion, and hate.

Only industrialization and training of the native population to take part in industrial enterprise can end the poverty and suffering of South Africa, Sachs maintains. The evidence he offers in support of this contention seems sound. Statistics show that South African agriculture is practically a lost cause. Only by radical reforms can the farmers produce crops sufficient to earn a decent living, and it seems highly improbable that South African agriculture will ever be able to compete in the world grain market. The mining industry, while profitable for a few, will eventually play itself out. The diamond market is relatively inactive at the present time, and the gold of the Witwatersrand will ultimately be exhausted.

The manufacturing industries, as Sachs sees the problem, hold the promise of economic stability and progress for South Africa. Relatively small capital is needed to start an industrial enterprise, and the growth of industry in recent years, despite numerous disadvantages, points to the natural development of the country. South Africa has large resources of iron and coal deposits, much wool, and other raw materials. The whole of Africa is a natural market for Union industry.

The development of industry will draw increasingly on the native population as a labor force, gradually bringing educational opportunity to these long-oppressed people. To Europeans who fear that their jobs will be taken by natives, Sachs makes this reply:

> An examination of industrial development in South Africa conclusively disproves the fears of the white workers. In the past 25 years the number of non-European workers in industry has risen from about 117,000 to over 400,000 but during the same period the number of European workers has increased substantially from approximately 75,000 to over 200,000. During this period, too, the wages of European workers generally have increased substantially as well as the number of higher paid European workers. The wages of non-European workers have also risen but to a lesser degree.

It is unnecessary, perhaps, to say that men like Sachs are continually harassed and attacked by the Malan Government and spokesmen for the Nationalist Party. In one instance, that of a meeting of the Garment Workers Union in 1948, hoodlums interrupted the proceedings and attacked the members, both men and women suffering assault. The government turned its investigation of the incident into an attempt to convict the union of provoking the disturbance. At a hearing before a Commission of Inquiry, a witness testifying against the union insisted that the union paper, the *Garment Worker*, was full of Communist propaganda. When asked by union counsel for evidence, "she pointed to a picture of Abraham Lincoln in one issue and said, 'In my opinion, this man is one of the greatest communists'." Again and again, after slanders with foundations similar to this, Mr. Sachs has recovered damages from Nationalist publishers, totalling hundreds and even thousands of pounds.

Those who take a somewhat jaundiced view of the trade union movement in the United States owe it to themselves to read a book like this one. Here, in South Africa, are meeting not only two or three cultures, but also the psychological conditions of two or three centuries. There are Feudalism, Colonialism, Mercantilism, Racism, Nazism, Non-Violent Resistance, Trade Unionism, and the spirit of liberal Democracy in South Africa today. Each one of these great historical conditions or tendencies on the European and American scene called out balancing social forces. Today, from a study of current history, one can see them in interaction all in one place. If the scene is bewildering, it is also instructive. So far as we can see, there is more actual brotherhood—brotherhood in practice—in the platform and recommendations of E. S. Sachs than anywhere else in South Africa. For the exploiters of deep-rooted Boer nationalism, he has only contempt, but for the victims of this indoctrination he has patience and sympathy. To the native population he gives a practical hope of economic survival and justice.

His book deals in sober facts. It strikes no attitudes, yet uncompromisingly exposes the folly, villainy, and blindness of a political regime which would turn back the clock and hold in intolerable servitude nearly 80 per cent of the population of South Africa (Native, 68.6%; Colored, 8.1%; Asiatic, 2.5%, European, 20.8%).

Our discussion of *The Choice Before South Africa* is sadly inadequate in its portrayal of the complicated problems confronting some twelve million people. The book should be read as a whole.