VOLUME VI, NO. 25
JUNE 24, 1953

A DUBIOUS UNITY

EVER since publication of Andrew D. White's epoch-making work, A *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, in 1896, there has been a growing effort to draw science and religion together—with results, however, that we choose to describe as indifferent, despite the enthusiasm which has animated this movement since the second world war. While attempts at reconciliation between the two outlooks or attitudes are almost always marked by a certain breadth of mind, and reflect as well a public-spirited feeling seldom found in any sort of specialist, whether in physics or theology—the great majority of the reconcilers, it seems to us, instead of achieving actual synthesis, succeed only in subverting either religion or science while hiding this effect with a show of well-bred piety. There have been, of course, some exceptions. One is bound to respect the speculations of Alfred North Whitehead, the intense ponderings of Erwin Schroedinger *(What Is Life?)*, and the philosophical asides of Albert Einstein. But these thinkers do not go "far enough" for the more eager of the "reconcilers," who will have it that the *churches* are embodiments of true religion, and this, we think, represents a species of willful blindness or casual ignorance that cannot be taken seriously.

One thing is certain, however: the reconcilers are practically all men of great good will, if sometimes superficial in other respects. You might argue that they represent the best of the stream of conventional thought, and that what they do helps to prepare the climate of public opinion for more revolutionary changes—changes which give genuine promise of an infusion into science of the sort of religious feeling which will not dissolve the discipline on which science is based, and bring to religion a breath of the scientific spirit which will not chill the heart of religious aspiration.

The most sophisticated debate between a scientist and a religionist that we recall is one which took place in the pages of *Fortune* some years ago between Julian Huxley and Jacques Maritain. Huxley went a long way toward the spirit of religion, but he would not concede the possibility of an immortality for the soul of man after the death of the body. Maritain was ready to submit to the rigors of science on many counts, but he was not ready to forego an irrational or dogmatic version of deity—it was, after all, the "God of our Fathers" whom he defined. So there was no reconciliation, and rightly, it seems to us.

Why should we, here, consider the question of "immortality" so important? Simply for the reason that the idea of immortality is an expression of the human need to find an immanent and transcendent reality in man which is more than "matter"—to recognize in all men a core of spiritual self-existence which endures and belongs to the Eternal. If a man can develop a conviction of this sort without the idea of immortality, as, for example, the Stoics were able to do—well and good; but we are unable to conceive of an ethical position or point of view which can survive serious adversity if it lacks a foundation in the premise of the spiritual nature of man. The capacity of the human individual for moral responsibility cannot be any greater than that individual himself, and if the human individual is to act out of consideration for principles which reach beyond time and mortality, he must himself *be*, in some aspect of his being, beyond time and mortality.

Why should we so unalterably oppose the idea of a God who has personal relationship with humans? Because such a "God," it seems to us, is

wholly incompatible with the dignity of man. It is also incompatible with the dignity of God. The idea of the Highest should at least be beyond ordinary human efforts at "definition," for a man is as great or greater than anything he can define, since definition is the art of setting limits to a measurable object. God is not an object, nor is God a "being," for "beings" have parts and natures which separate them from other beings which are different. Dr. Einstein's account of this subject seems one of the best:

> It is enough for me to contemplate the mystery of conscious life perpetuating itself through all eternity, to reflect upon the marvelous structure of the Universe which we can dimly perceive, and to try humbly to comprehend even an infinitesimal part of the intelligence manifested in nature.

But views such as Dr. Einstein's, while quoted by the more popular reconcilers, seldom form the main strain of their efforts to bring science and religion together. You can't exactly "pray" to "the intelligence manifested in nature," and what the reconcilers attempt is to bring science and religion together without any important concessions on either side. You can *think* about the intelligence in nature, and if you think hard enough, you may even discover some great truth about life and nature, as Einstein did. But to call this "salvation" will come hard for those who have low opinions of themselves and their thinking capacities—who want to be "saved" the old-fashioned way, "by God."

The trouble with the reconcilers is that they persuade too many people that the unity of science and religion can somehow be established over their heads, by the experts, who from time to time will report their progress to the general public by means of learned books such as Lecomte du Noüy's *Human Destiny*. Such books, if so regarded, we submit, can be little more than obstacles to human progress. A report from headquarters will never help the man in the street, since the real headquarters for the man in the street is in the street.

One of the better known reconcilers of our time is Robert A. Millikan, leading physicist, a founder and for many years President of the California Institute of Technology, and eminent citizen of the United States. Let us first pay Dr. Millikan a tribute he richly deserves. Among American scientists, he is one of the few with a genuine appreciation of the role of the great Humanists of the Renaissance in stimulating the rise of modern science. In the days of the Florentine Revival of Learning, it was the scholars, the lovers of the philosophy of ancient Greece, who, like Prometheus of old, lit the fire of mind for the intellectual and moral rebirth of the West. Scholars unearthed the writings of Platonic and Pythagorean philosophers, awakening the hunger for a similar knowledge in men like Copernicus and Galileo. Dr. Millikan has pointed this out in his works, and he honored Humanism in deed as well as in word, by doing his best to see that the Humanities received some attention from the hard-working physics students at Cal. Tech. It was Dr. Millikan, also, who, as long ago as 1932, called attention to the fact that the new physics has practically ruined most of the assumptions of dogmatic, nineteenth-century materialism. This latter perception of his, doubtless, had something to do with his interest in reconciling science and religion.

An excellent sample of his efforts in this direction is to be found in his *Autobiography*, published by Prentice-Hall in 1950. In the last chapter of this volume, which he titles "The Two Supreme Elements in Human Progress," Dr. Millikan declares his conviction that science and religion *can* unite and work together. Early in the chapter, he suggests that by "reIigion" he means something very close to conscience—the feeling of "I ought or I ought not," adding the view that the common and essential element in all religions is *"the attitude of altruistic idealism"* typified in the life and teachings of Jesus. Next he borrows from Alfred North Whitehead the definition: *"Religion is world loyalty."* This, Dr. Millikan proceeds,

> . . . necessarily involves faith in the existence of an ultimate Good (Einstein calls it "The Intelligence manifested in nature") which is worth living or dying for—a Good which justifies one in sacrificing his life, if need be, to promote it, as our boys did in the terrible war just past. If there is a better definition of a belief in God than that, I, at least, do not know what it is.
>
> . . . The main purpose, and indeed the main activity, I think, of the churches should consist, and indeed does consist, in the effort to spread as widely as possible throughout society this attitude of *world loyalty*.
>
> The Christian Church is unquestionably the greatest institution in the country—an institution which, according to. . . 1948 statistics . . . now has an all-time high membership of 77,386,186. . . .In my judgment, it is the great dynamo which is largely responsible for pumping into human society the spirit of altruistic idealism.... The scientist is apt to underrate the importance of this effort to spread the spirit or attitude of world loyalty. I think he is fundamentally wrong! And to convince himself of his error he has only to ask himself: How many of us live up to what we ourselves know we ought to do?

We, along with Dr. Millikan, have a high estimate of self-examination, but just why self-examination should lead the scientist to a better appreciation of the work of the churches is not entirely clear. We do not get to church very often, but the last time we did the occasion was a discussion of the racial tensions in South Africa, and some of the speakers—thoughtful church people—were quick to say that the churches are not very good soldiers in the fight for racial equality right here in America. The churches, that is, or a great many of them, are notably disloyal to that section of the world population *whose skin is not white!* Most scientists, we suspect, do a lot better than the churches in this regard. The practice of racial segregation in the churches is *not* Jesus' attitude of "altruistic idealism," but its very opposite. If Dr. Millikan had taken the trouble to pursue his course of reconciliation in a scientific spirit, he would, we think, have pointed this out.

Another aspect of his exhortation for unity needing attention is the claim that "our boys" "sacrificed" their lives in the recent war, and that this is somehow helpful in formulating what one means by believing in God. The suggestion might apply if the great majority of the boys who went to war had volunteered to go; but the great majority did not. They were obliged to go, under penalty of the law. Thus those who did not volunteer, and who were killed, may have been sacrificed, but they did not sacrifice themselves. There is a difference.

Dr. Millikan would probably regard these remarks as a bit ungentlemanly, at least. Yet they seem very much to the point. For the nobility of giving oneself to a cause is a precious thing, and the loss of the distinction between freely giving and submitting to an order to give has the effect of hiding this value under what amounts to a dark, paternalist shadow—some might call it a totalitarian shadow.

Our point, here, is that you cannot have great religious thinking without complete freedom of choice, and you cannot have complete freedom of choice unless you are willing to honor it in all instances and never overlook its subjection to any sort of orthodoxy—whether the orthodoxy of a church or the orthodoxy of nationalism, or even patriotism. And only in truly great religious thinking will the creative spirits of science be able to find the counterpart of their own deep wonderings about the reality which lies within the heart of all.

Letter from CHILE

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—North American people seem to know very little of the "Military Pact" which was signed on April 9 of this year between the United States and Chile, and is already ratified by both Governments. For more than two months the discussions on this Military Pact kept the Chilean people alert in defense of their sovereignty. Chilean women were the first to arouse public opinion, spending days and days in the cold Chilean winter bearing posters in the streets and picketing the doors of the legislature to warn people against the enormous danger of sacrificing the lives of their children and the independence of their country by allying themselves with foreign imperialistic powers!

The text of the Pact might be analysed as follows:

The Pact and the Military Aid: The Pact appears to be a natural consequence of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Aid signed in Rio de Janeiro by the American Republics in 1947. The purpose of the Río de Janeiro Treaty was to organize a system of collective and mutual defense in case of any "aggression" against an American country, but whatever its purposes, it does not entitle the United States to take the initiative in signing any separate bilateral defense pacts with the South American countries, as the Rio de Janeiro agreements should be put in practice by the Organisation of Inter-American States, and fall under their authority. According to the new Military Pact, the United States agrees to provide the Republic of Chile with equipment, materiel, services and other military aid. This equipment is to be lent or sold, its importation being tax exempt, its purpose to "encourage the defense plans of the Hemisphere." In return, Chile agrees to give facilities to the United States for the production and transfer of raw, semi-manufactured and manufactured strategic materials that the U.S. may need. This means that our copper, steel, coal, nitrate, petrol, and possibly uranium would be submitted to controls of production, of prices, of quotas, etc. Comment is obvious: Chile will lose millions of dollars that she could obtain with the free exploitation and exportation of her own resources. Article 8 of the Pact admits that our external commerce will be controlled under the pretext of continental security.

The Pact and our Civil Rights: Though our Constitution guarantees every citizen of our Republic "equality before the law," the Military Pact states that the North American staff appointed to administer this agreement should enjoy "diplomatic status," free, that is, from payment of taxes, their civil acts, and criminal acts, if any, being excluded from Chilean jurisdiction. This is discrimination against the Chilean staff, and it is the Chilean tax-payer who will have to bear the expenses of the American staff in Chile.

Article 2, it is interesting to remark, states that each Government should take measures to keep public opinion well informed of the steps toward the application of the agreement, "providing," however, "these measures are compatible with security." Thus, under the pretext of "security," our liberty of information can be restricted.

The Pact and the National and International Policies of Chile: We have been told that these arms and matériel are being introduced in our country for the "defense of our Hemisphere." Article 9 affirms in detail how Chile will be "fully contributing with its human power, its wealth, its economy and all possible facilities to add its defensive force to the defensive force of the 'free world'." Now, what the Chilean common men and women ask themselves is this: What is the danger against which we are supposed to defend ourselves? Our country, traditionally democratic and peaceful, has no problems with its neighbours, no international conflicts, and what we really need is not arms but food, schools, hospitals, buildings

and a balanced budget. Further: What does this "defense" really mean? It means that any extracontinental conflict in which the United States of America becomes involved, through specific acts in behalf of the U.S. foreign policy, would necessarily involve Chile, too, in view of this agreement to deliver our men, resources and "facilities."

Any Chilean with any sense of dignity and respect for his country—and, I dare say, any Latin American (similar pacts have already been signed with Ecuador and Colombia, and discussions are pending with Brazil)—cannot but seriously condemn an "agreement" which subordinates his own country's policies to an outside power, thus renouncing our sovereign right to deciding our own policies according to our own legitimate interests.

The Chilean people don't even have the right to dismiss the agreement in a moment of emergency, because Article II states that the agreement will remain in force until one year after its dismissal by any of the signatories.

It should be clearly stated, however, that condemnation of this Pact does not mean that the Chilean people refuse to accept their duty of "international solidarity" with other countries, or as members of the United Nations. On the contrary, the very fact that we are members of the United Nations entitles us to try to resolve by peaceful means any international difficulty in which we might be implicated, and, in any case, to refuse to sign any "defense pact," particularly with any Government out of the UN sphere.

Though most of the Americans that come here are businessmen and soldiers, I have had the opportunity of meeting several young Americans, and I realize their very sincere interest in knowing the truth about South America. At the same time, we believe there is in the American people a deep religious and humanitarian feeling, that makes them help with a real sense of justice and generosity once it is possible to penetrate through the thick veils of propaganda and arrive at the truth about things. That is why we ask Americans to help not only in destroying the iron curtain that prevents the Russian people from seeing many aspects of this side of the world, but to take down, also, the "nylon curtain," as we call it, that hides from the common men of your country the facts about South America. We are firmly convinced that the women and people of Chile, by condemning the Military Pact, are making a great contribution to the defense of peace. We know that the United States needs us in case of a war, as we have always been, it is sad to say, an important source of the raw materials of war, but we are determined not to cooperate with any imperialistic bloc in any military plans whatsoever. Is the same determined attitude to be expected from the American people?

CHILEAN CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW
"THE INVISIBLE ISLAND"

THE dialogue recently quoted from Reginald Reynolds' imaginary conversation between a Draft Board composed of pacifists and a young man who applies for permission to join the Army, suggests mention of books in which the same theme of "reversed mores" finds development. In principle we feel bound to recommend all imaginative reversals of conventional attitudes regarding crucial questions, although, in emphasizing the value of considering minority deviations, we are not necessarily implying our addiction to those which are discussed. In the case described by Reynolds; for example, we by no means suggest that the C.O.'s refusal to support war was the only ethically justifiable choice, but that philosophical understanding involves sympathetic attention to unorthodox views.

The January-February *WRL News*, abbreviated periodical of the War Resisters League, describes a symposium held by the New York WRL featuring two pacifist novelists, Irwin Stark and Jeb Stuart. Stark, who has had some success as a writer, reported that he becomes more convinced of the validity of conscientious objection with every passing year. His book, *The Invisible Island* (Viking Press, 1948), deals with the pacifist theme with interest and subtlety. One of the characters belongs to a distinguished pacifist family, and when he decides to enlist in the Army, he is forced to face his father and brother in a manner reminiscent of Mr. Reynolds' candidate for "conscientious" soldiering. Howard Whitman, who finally leaves for overseas and is later killed, adopts this course of action because he is impatient of standing outside the arena of human suffering. While his rational beliefs are still those of a pacifist, his feelings rebel against isolation from the community of men in battle. He sees, too, that the intellectual "rightness" of a position is not sufficient to give a man depth and breadth of understanding. Stark wishes to emphasize that whether one refuses to fight a war, or chooses to fight in one, the same need for *personal involvement* in the suffering of the times will be subconsciously felt by all ethically sensitive individuals.

Stark suggests that most of the stirring struggles of history, including the social as well as the military conflicts, have been in behalf of causes subsequently lost, and that the strongest and best men are apt to be those who play an often thankless role in "lost causes." The concluding paragraphs of *The Invisible Island* embody this idea as expressed by Matt, the C.O. friend of Howard Whitman, who himself long avoided personal identification with any strenuous efforts on behalf of "making a better world." Matt finally saw a new light—though it did not lead him into uniform:

> "There are lots of lost battles," Ben said.
>
> "Yes," Matthew said. "And you can't fight them without being part of them—without being involved, physically, up to your neck. You can't fight them from a clean, safe rampart on the outside because if you're outside you can't feel them with your guts, and you're the enemy, you're part of the violence and the hate and the acquiescence, and you're doing the enemy's work all the time. And it's not even enough to be inside the dirty mess. You've got to be in it and know there's an outside. To be in it and know there's a way to destroy it without destroying yourself and the people who count. . . ."

The Invisible Island may perhaps be found wanting in certain literary respects. Like Willard Motley's *They Fished All Night*, the task the author sets himself is so great and his efforts to do the theme justice so apparently tense, that the result is less a work of art than a working out of the author's musings through the interaction of his characters. While some, therefore, have found *The Invisible Island* provocative, others have found it obscure and inept. The title derives from a conversation in which an older man, the head of a civil rights organization, attempts to show that the work of fighting for noble causes is one and the same thing as labor towards self-understanding:

> Karnap said simply: "I do know this, Matt. About you as well as Annie. You wouldn't be happy if you didn't have ideas to believe in. And it's no use trying to think you could make a go of it on any cheaper terms. No use trying to think you could make peace with yourself. You're just not that kind of person."
>
> "What kind of person?"
>
> "The kind that can live comfortably apart from every broken sparrow that falls—"

> "The world's full of broken sparrows," Matthew said.
>
> Karnap smiled. "Exactly," he said. "Too many to ignore. And while I'm making metaphors let me suggest another . . ." His eyes sought the mountain summit in the landscape. "I like to think, Matt, that our minds hold a thousand undiscovered points, dusters of little islands, invisible islands. We don't have to recognize them if we don't want to. If we're clever enough we can even forget their existence. We can close our eyes to them, drink them away, live or love them away. But they're inescapable, Matt, whether we see them or not. And I'm sure you've seen them, some of the islands, and somehow you'll make your bridges to them. . . ."

Stark's Matthew Stratton "builds bridges" by dedicating himself to the cause of race relations, becoming a teacher in a Negro school of the South. There, he encounters every sort of obstacle, especially from school administrations. He sees hate and distrust gleam in his students' eyes, while his advances toward genuine friendship with the young Negroes are checked by perversities of circumstance. But when he finally learns to accept his defeats, and judges his efforts by something besides success or failure, he becomes a man of strength and serenity. Inclined to fight as hard as before for what he believes in, he no longer gives energy to useless regrets. (Stark certainly has a point here: trouble does dog the footsteps of those who try to stem the mighty tide of prejudice and injustice, and such fighters had better get used to "lost battles.")

Jeb Stuart's book (reviewed in MANAS for Feb. 28, 1951) *is The Objector,* the story of a man who accepted non-combatant medical service in the armed forces. In the recent WRL meeting, Stuart told how he first became a C.O.; then how, perhaps in the manner of Irwin Stark's Howard Whitman, he relinquished his position in order to become a combat soldier; and how he finally reasserted his pacifist convictions. One is hardly inclined to challenge such a man's courage and idealism, especially when, as in the case of "the objector" in Stuart's novel, he finds some of the most ennobling human experiences at the front lines. Both Stuart and Stark, incidentally, are Socialists, believing that altering social conditions and establishing social cooperation can eliminate the causes of war. According to the WRL story, Stark "expressed the viewpoint that pacifists should function as such in their professions and vocations, adding that he as a teacher is attempting to accomplish this. Regarding pacifism, he concluded: 'as a force in the world, it is insignificant: as an idea, it is inescapable.' " The WRL account continues:

> Stuart told of how he first became a CO because there were so many military men in his family. He started out in World War II as a non-combatant. Then he became a machine gunner "because I thought pacifism was ineffective against Nazism and because I wanted to fight Nazism. I discovered actually that we weren't fighting Nazism." At that point he altered his stand. He thinks that war will be eliminated eventually when the people reach mental maturity. A most important objective, he believes, is the attainment of socialism—but even if such a system is established and people have not yet reached a state of mental maturity, there will still be war.

Books like *The Invisible Island* and *The Objector* call to mind an unusual novel by Elizabeth Goudge which appeared during the war years. *The Castle on the Hill* told the story of two brothers, one a combat pilot, the other a determined conscientious objector. These two maintained a nearly perfect understanding and love despite their diametrically opposed courses. All three of these novels, it seems to us, are serious attempts to advance the thesis that only those soldiers and those CO's who are big enough and broad enough to bridge by understanding the gap between their different ethical positions can possibly build a world fit to live in. The dogmatic militarist and the merely doctrinaire pacifist are made of lesser stuff, and here we may perhaps reflect that the issues concerning warfare are very much like the issues concerning religious differences of opinion—the differences *can* be regarded as the very material from which to learn greater understanding.

COMMENTARY
THE GREAT REUNION

WHILE we hesitate to attempt to "date" great historical transitions, it seems fairly clear that the world of modern thought is moving toward the close of a long and dreary epoch—the epoch of man's alienation from nature. This alienation has been both a theological and a scientific effect. The formulators of the religious orthodoxy of the West established a radical separation between man and God (God having taken the place of Nature as the source of life), and the scientific opponents of theology confirmed the separation by claiming that all true reality lies outside of man, in the blind forces and laws of the material universe. Accordingly, most popular religions have emphasized the dependence of man on God, while scientific philosophizing has promoted Determinism, withdrawing from the individuality of human beings practically all its significance.

It is perhaps the barrenness of these low estimates of the human being that has opened the way to more intuitive convictions about the nature of man and the sources of knowledge accessible to him. A good illustration of the new spirit is found in the Foreword of a recent book, *Strange Empire*, the story of the tragic attempt of the *Metis*—people of both Indian and white parentage—to attain political independence in the American Northwest. The author, the late Joseph Kinsey Howard, who was himself a historian, suggests that "history," as ordinarily written, has been neglectful of what might be called the "Communion of Life":

> . . . history is impatient with intangibles: the mystic meaning of a shadow pattern on a sacred butte, or that of the order of wild geese in flight. It cannot pause to describe the roar of the black wind, the Plains chinook, which is a welcome sound; or the silence of the white cold, which is terrible. It cannot bother to reflect upon why some men, primitive and civilized alike, should believe that in personal contest or communion with the elemental fury of a blizzard, the loneliness of the prairie or the aloof majesty of an unclimbed mountain, they may chance upon the essential core of truth and meaning of life, revealed to them in an instant of intuitive experience as a reward for superhuman effort.

Here, with something like "scriptural" beauty, is a return to the ancient idea of the potentialities of man, and a call to daring and "superhuman effort" as the means to self-discovery. How different, this, from the pleas of piety or the boasts of empiricism and inductive method as the sole pathway to truth!

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

[The problems focussed by the following communication from a first grade elementary school teacher take us, for once, away from the realm of the theoretical. The writer of this letter, at least, is not primarily concerned with finding an "ideal" method of educating five-year-olds, but rather with what is apparently a new opportunity opening for her work. She is interested in how a first-grade year can really be spent to best advantage. We shall be glad to implement her suggestion that readers contribute their thoughts on the subject by providing space for further discussion in later issues.]

I AM writing in high hopes that one ever-recurring first grade problem, and the solution we are searching for, will be of sufficient interest to you to elicit some guidance (from you to me); or some discussion some day in your column.

As a first-grade teacher, I am sick and tired of my "annual neurosis"; and of having to live through most of the year as a split-personality. It comes from having a certain percentage of children in the first grade each year who are not ready for the beginning reading program. Of course, I could refuse to subject them to the strain and struggle involved; but there are always the disbelieving parents who feel disgraced, or think that the school lacks "discipline." California has handicapped its children by lowering the entrance age to five and one-half years, and it is almost impossible to break down the tradition that reading is the first grade's chief business. Next fall, the new legal age of five years and nine months will be in effect, and it will help some. But out of thirty-two enrolled this year in my group, only two would have been excluded (and both have learned to read exceptionally well!); and last year, out of thirty-four, only two also. So in my experience the new law will not change the situation much.

The general practice is to break the room into three reading groups (four would be better, but there is not time for so many) according to their learning ability. Almost invariably, as the year goes on, the "top" (fast) group is composed largely, or even exclusively, of girls; the middle group is roughly half and half; and the slow group is of boys, with possibly one or two girls. And it is those little fellows, with that all-too-young look on their faces, that make the heart ache and rebel. Why are they in here, anyway? What is the matter with the adults who control and arrange these affairs and make these immature boys the victims of a system?

This is my eighth year of teaching in a "privileged" community. In the past the administration has attempted a so-called "ungraded" primary set-up, with no testing until the end of the third year; and those not ready to go on to have four primary years. But the parents were furious about it. Also, a "Junior First" has no chance here. It might if we were on a half-year basis; but very few parents have the courage to put their child in a "Junior First" for a whole year. It's all right for your child, but not for *mine.*

About ten years ago, Dr. Pottenger, Jr. (Monrovia) happened to say, in conversation with me, that boys have a slower tempo than girls, and that boys who have younger sisters coming on who overtake them in academic progress experience a terrific psychological hurdle—all the aunts, uncles, and grandparents saying, "What's the matter with you? Little Susie can read better than you can!" etc., etc. He further stated that some schools in Europe take this factor into consideration and enter their boys in school six months or a year later than the girls.

To make a long story short: at last it looks as though the time may be right to stick our necks out and try to do something constructive about this. A very small group met about ten nights ago at Adelle Davis' home. (She is the nutritionist—*Let's Cook It Right,* and *Let's Have Healthy Children.*) Her adopted boy is in my room this year, and one of those "too young" for the reading program. It turned out to be an exciting evening for me, due to the unusual courage of two of the mothers. After discussion, the final decision was

to try to assemble a purely voluntary group of mothers of affected boys, to keep these boys out of school a year (probably between nursery school and Kindergarten), *and* to have an "enriched First Grade program" (meaning no formal reading or writing until second grade). I can't believe it yet! But, of course, it hasn't really happened yet.

We all felt that this movement must come entirely from parents, without any pushing from school administrators or teachers, else the whole cause would be lost before it got started. One mother present felt she could gather a group of about twenty-four parents who would be interested to have their children start this way. If such a voluntary group were assembled, the Superintendent would ask the Board (and the County Office) to permit this "enriched" program to be established. The Superintendent is heartily in favor of the move, and would like to carry it through for a period of years on as sound a scientific basis as possible. That is, have a comparative group (I.Q.'s, etc.) go through in the traditional way, and test both groups periodically. We feel that the delayed group would catch up (and probably surpass) the traditional group by the end of the third grade.

The main thing is, what is wrong *now?* And what would be a valid constructive change? Keeping the boys out of school a year might work in such a place as ours (although the mothers here seem as eager to "get rid of them" as working mothers, or mothers whose children have only city streets to play in), but it would not be a general solution. Should a radical change be made in the beginning school curriculum? We feel that if a valid program can actually be worked through successfully, in one community, the chances of its acceptance elsewhere would be far greater.

Have *you* done any thinking along these lines? Would you have any suggestions to offer? Do you think it is worth while to have an exploratory discussion in your column to get reactions from parents? We feel that all parents really want the best for their youngsters, and that if they understood that too much pressure too soon is very bad for their children's long-term development, they may demand a change.

How could that First-Grade year be spent to the best advantage? (Of course, I would like each school district to own and maintain a small farm, and have all the five- and six-year-olds spend most of their time there, thus getting that warm earthy rapport William Sheldon thinks is invaluable and only obtainable during childhood.) But I mean, *practically,* here and now, in Los Angeles County, under present crowded conditions, and with the present reactionary sentiment? We need to know what other people are thinking, and what has been done elsewhere. We need to know authorities.

So far, we have a few encouraging helps. On good firsthand report, we know that Dr. Spencer, the reading expert, of Claremont, has felt for some time that boys should start the reading program a year later than girls. When we tried to engage him for a panel discussion on the subject, he said he had only "flirted" with the idea and did not have the background or research necessary; but he is interested in any experiment we may work on. Rhoda Kellogg, in her new book, *Babies Need Fathers, Too,* discusses the first-grade reading program in strong terms for several pages, at the conclusion of her chapter on the six-year-old. Other points of interest are: that Common Law recognizes the difference in maturity between boys and girls; and has so recognized it for centuries both in old England and in Rome; girls being of legal age at eighteen, boys at twenty-one. Most primitive peoples nursed their male children from one to two years, and their female from nine months to a year, recognizing that the male child required a longer time to stabilize its physiology. The eye fuses earlier in girls—at about seven—in boys at about eight. Also the hand and wrist mature about seven years of age in girls and eight in boys. (Two potent reasons for delaying a reading and writing program until 2nd grade!) Children in Mexico are taught fine silver work at 8 years—it is impossible before. The United States

is (or isn't it?) the only important or major country using the coeducational system throughout. Most other countries now and in the past have segregated young boys and girls, and thus the boys have not been subject to competition with girls of their own age. Scholastic awards in elementary, junior and senior high schools go largely to girls—ten girls to two boys. But in college the tables turn; and in graduate school the awards go to the boys. (We must never forget to emphasize that the males only have a slow *start.* They catch up to the females later on!) In any case, in remedial reading classes, boys outnumber girls four to one (or more); and this is not due to intelligence, but to some other factor.

I also wish to say that this year I have a number of very young boys who are doing astonishing reading. The problem, of course, is with the "average," so-called. If only there were a possibility of small classes and an approach to the problem on the basis of individual abilities! But that seems even more remote.

[Our correspondent leaves us with two problems to exert ourselves upon: the first, clearly, is to assimilate the revelation—or assertion if you prefer—that boys and girls are just plain different. The second involves suggestions for first grade curricula which would make experience the more worthwhile for those slow to begin reading.]

FRONTIERS

"We View with Alarm" . . . .

NOT many readers, we suspect, have read more than once or twice the small "box" which appears each week on page 4, which is intended to suggest, in brief space, the editorial orientation of MANAS. The editors, however, read it over frequently, for the ideas there expressed are fairly definitive of the MANAS enterprise. Here, for instance, is explanation of our reluctance to use the scanty space of an eight-page weekly for exposés of corruption, or fulminations against the evils of our time or society. Yet the determination to spend most of our energies in "search for contrasting principles" to those responsible for destructive trends in modern society does not mean that the editors are necessarily Utopian, "sweetness-and-light" worshippers or confirmed optimists. Our chosen orientation derives, we think, from the fact that what is wrong with the world is much more obvious than what to do about it.

When we quote denunciations of dangerous tendencies and procedures from some other writer's pen, however, we imagine ourselves to be doing something more than "viewing with alarm." We are also "pointing with pride" to the fact that such vigorous criticisms are being made, and thus it is that we would rather find five or six writers condemning any specific injustice than to write an article excoriating the injustice ourselves—such writers help to remind readers that, if they are opponents of injustice themselves, they have articulate companions.

With this sort of introduction, we should like to present a significant "view with alarm" document, consisting of remarks to the House of Representatives on January 22, 1952 by the Honorable Howard H. Buffett of Nebraska. What Mr. Buffett says is of itself important, but of equal value to our readers, or any readers, should be the fact that these remarks are entered in the Congressional Record of the 82nd Congress, and that the other members of Congress were obliged to listen to what the Honorable Buffett said. It is not easy to castigate military preparedness at a time when most of the experts are recommending more of the same, but Mr. Buffett took on the job. He begins:

Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent asked me to find out for him how many foreign countries had troops training in America.

> I knew that military activity was mushrooming in America. Yet I was amazed to learn from the Department of Defense that 41 foreign governments have troops in training in the United States.
>
> The expense of this 41-nation war dance is quite largely paid for by the American taxpayer.
>
> Added to this drum beating here, I found that we are actively training the troops of 19 nations on foreign soil.
>
> Incidentally, a curious taxpayer might wonder why we train troops of nations that have "included themselves out" of the war in Korea.
>
> If history records a more extensive military training operation, I have not discovered it.
>
> The astounding scope of these operations is set put in a letter to me from Gen. George Olmstead, as follows:
>
> Office of the Secretary of Defense,
> *Washington, D.C., 9, January 1952*
>
> Hon. Howard Buffett,
> *House of Representatives.*
>
> Dear Mr. Buffett: The information with respect to all training of foreign nationals in service schools in the United States, requested in the first paragraph of your letter of 19 December 1951 to Mr. Foster Adams, is furnished below. The data are as of 30 September 1951, the latest information readily available.
>
> The following forty-one (41) foreign governments had personnel in training in the United States on 30 September 1951: Belgium; Luxembourg; Brazil; Canada; Nationalist Government, Republic of China; Denmark; France; Great Britain; Greece; Indonesia; Iran; Italy; Mexico; Netherlands; Norway; Philippines; Portugal; Saudi Arabia; Spain; Thailand; Turkey; Argentina; Australia; Bolivia; Chile; Colombia; Cuba; Ecuador; Egypt; E1 Salvador;

Guatemala; Haiti; India; Lebanon; Pakistan; Paraguay; Peru; Uruguay; Venezuela; Syria; Switzerland.

The approximate total of such foreign military personnel was 8,000.

These foreign personnel were being given the following types of training by the three services:

Army: Armor, artillery, infantry, engineer, ordnance, quarter-master, signal, command and staff instruction, military police, transportation, medical.

Navy: Aviation flight training, gunnery and fire control, engineering, antisubmarine warfare; mine warfare, electronics, ship transfer, operations and staff.

Air Force: Flying training; aircraft and aero equipment maintenance; armament; construction and utility; electronics, communications, and weather; supply administration, and service; staff, instruction, and orientation.

Approximately 14,000 additional courses of instructions to commence during fiscal year 1952 in United States service schools have been programmed for foreign military personnel.

More French nationals are being trained by the United States in United States service schools than nationals of any other country.

In answer to the second paragraph of your letter, there were a total of forty (40) United States Army, Navy, and Air Force training missions in the following nineteen (19) foreign countries on 31 December 1951: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, El Salvador, Venezuela, Iran, Liberia.

In addition, United States military assistance advisory groups (MAAG) are stationed in Belgium-Luxemburg, Denmark, France, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Indochina, Indonesia, Formosa, Korea, Philippines, and Thailand for the purpose of administering the training activities programmed under the mutual defense assistance program. A similar group known as Military Assistance Section of the United States Embassy in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, was established on 10 December 1951 to administer the training activities programmed for Yugoslavia under the mutual defense assistance program. Of the above, the military assistance advisory groups located in Greece, Turkey, Thailand, Korea, Philippines, and Formosa are also engaged in active training of foreign troops.

Sincerely yours,
H. H. Fischer,
For George Olmstead
Major General, United States Army, Director,
Office of Military Assistance.

NOT SECURITY, BUT WAR AND DISASTER WILL RESULT

Mr. Speaker, people to whom I have shown this letter have been astounded and frightened by the militarism it portends. I am familiar with the claims of the advocates of these intensive and far-flung military operations—the glib assertion that we are developing strength that will act both to prevent war or to win it, if it occurs.

Copies of Rep. Buffett's speech may be procured from an association called "Promoting Enduring Peace," 489 Ocean Avenue, West Haven, Connecticut. This organization's special interest in Mr. Buffett's remarks is best illustrated by one of the latter's concluding statements:

> In the struggle for men's minds, this impetuous military activity on our part has played into the hands of the Kremlin. Already leaders in Europe and other continents are voicing the belief that America is forcing Russia into war.
>
> The deadly effects of this conclusion in the minds of many people cannot be measured.
>
> That belief will not diminish so long as feverish militarism continues to run unchecked here.

This seems an appropriate place at which to quote again from Gordon Keith Chalmers' *The Republic and the Person*. Discussing the great amount of talking and small amount of thinking done on the word "freedom," he says:

> Before reflecting upon the learning and thinking requisite to this treatment of the philosophical basis of freedom, we do well to consider what is at stake. It is surely within the scope of possibility that in conducting the cold war we may become so engrossed in its technique—the transport, the mobilization, the control and manufacture of bombs, and alliances and treaties, the mechanics of the United Nations, the agreements among groups at home, the avoidance of a depression, the securing of industrial peace—that

> we have no heart for the arduous intellectual labor of redefining and rediscovering in terms of today the subtle philosophical proposition which occasions our disagreement with all totalitarians. The issue of the century concerns the nature of individual man and how order may be maintained without violence to him.

Finally, it is clear that if we ever reach a time when men like Buffett and Chalmers no longer receive attention, we will have lost entirely our ability to appreciate "freedom," and ultimately suffer the consequences of the loss. As Henry Steele Commager said recently:

> There is no real choice between freedom and security. Only those societies that actively encourage freedom—that encourage, for example, scientific and scholarly research, the questioning of scientific and social orthodoxies and the discovery of new truths—only such societies can hope to solve the problems that assail them and preserve their security. A nation that silences or intimidates original minds is left only with unoriginal minds and cannot hope to hold its own in the competition of peace or of war.

So, while Buffett, Chalmers, and Commager are telling us what is presently going wrong in the United States, their persuasiveness, sincerity and personal efforts—combined with the efforts of similar men—indicate a number of things that are also "right." Our country's most precious heritage needs to be defended in ways more suitable than those provided by matchless armaments.