

AFTER FOUR YEARS

IN the days immediately following the war, when explicit disapproval of Soviet policy began to be heard, a Catholic Bishop with a sense of humor remarked that if a week went by in which he had not been called a communist, he examined his conscience. The Bishop was not, of course, a communist sympathizer, but he was willing to speak out on issues which were much in the mouths of the communists, and if he happened to condemn the same injustices as they had spoken against, as man and Christian he accepted the consequence of being misunderstood.

In some measure, the MANAS editorial policy places this weekly in a similar position. And when we receive a letter of praise from an unexpected quarter, we, too, feel obliged to examine our conscience. The MANAS mailbag, however, sometimes presents more complicated problems. There have been instances when the same day's mail has brought letters disparaging our "radical" tendencies and other communications approving our criticisms of socialism. Some readers seem to feel that we exhibit too great an interest in "social questions," while others complain that we sometimes allow our feet to leave the ground.

Friendly letters of appreciation, however, are more generally the rule, and for these the editors are especially grateful—not simply for the "praise" they contain, but rather for the evidence that something is being accomplished in the direction toward which we set our aim in the beginning, just four years ago.

How may the MANAS intent and editorial policy be defined? A more particularized form of this question is: Why is MANAS published? What services does it perform, or endeavor to perform, which are unique, and, therefore, important?

Basically, the MANAS editorial outlook is founded upon the classical Humanist viewpoint, as expressed by Pico della Mirandola in his *Oration on the Dignity of Man*. Pico, like Julian Huxley, declared for the uniqueness of Man, as contrasted with the rest of the world's natural inhabitants. The perfection of the animals is in being the best of their species, but the perfection of man lies in his capacity for innovation, creativity, and constructive change. In short, the man who is not at work building his own destiny and shaping his own ends is not living as a human being can and should.

MANAS is not wedded to any particular theory of human development, although the expression soul-evolution carries more of the meaning, however inadequately, than any other brief formulation of the version of human possibility to which we incline. Soul-evolution, for this purpose, includes the ideas of growth in philosophical and psychological understanding, and involves the growing capacity to feel and be equal to meeting any situation which may come to pass. MANAS is completely in sympathy with the disciplined spirit of scientific inquiry, and admires the habit of suspended judgment which the scientist endeavors to practice, but does not participate in any of the stereotyped agnosticism of scientific orthodoxy. We think that there is as much evidence for spiritual reality as there is for material reality, and that the determination or investigation of spiritual reality is the more important quest.

On the other hand, conventional religion seems less comprehending of the meaning of "spiritual" than many individual scientists. Most of modern religion, its practices and customs, that is, and its doctrines and dogmas as to the nature of man, seem morally debilitating when not outright anti-human. In short, the

institutionalization of religion has meant, historically, the death of the spirit of religious or spiritual discovery and a practical denial of the dignity of man. And this has led to a denial of human brotherhood, for how can creatures without dignity act as brothers? According to several of the dominant religions of the world, man's highest obligations are not to Man and Nature, but to some God who, from what is said of him by his worshippers, is often against both Man and Nature. In such case, whatever the verbal expressions of the creed, the religion is anti-human and amounts to an insidious psychic materialism masquerading in the guise of sweetness and light.

Most of the arguments about religion, pro and con, make reality of "spiritual things" hinge on the existence of "God." To our way of thinking, a God whose actions violate the laws of nature (miracles), whose disclosures violate the canons of reason (revelation), and commands involve submission and obedience rather than independent moral choice and self-discovery, is the ultimate destroyer of spiritual things, making them impossible of human conception. And, moreover, we offer this proposition in partial explanation of the dreary cycle of materialism—materialism in thought, materialism in life—which has well-nigh destroyed the modern world.

Accordingly, in our view, the reality of spiritual things hinges on the non-existence of God—the non-existence, that is, of any sort of God who is in *any sense* separate from man and nature, or is to be distinguished as a "being" from the universal life and consciousness in which we "live and move and have *our* being." There is no God to pray to; there is only Life and Self to be known, to be understood. Prayer, it seems to us, is the root of the power of priestcraft, that worst of all possible forms of exploitation. Even at the cost of saying that *Man is God*, we shall affirm that there is not, and in the nature of things cannot be, a mediator between God and man or an "interpreter" of "His" will. The mystery

confronting human beings, then, and which they must solve in order to find peace and strength, is not the mystery of God but the mystery of good and evil.

We stand, therefore, for the abolition of God and the restoration of the religious spirit—for the divine potentialities of man. "Divine," as we understand the term, describes the capacity to be wholly creative for good while understanding perfectly the nature of evil. We believe that there is no other divinity than this, and that it is within the potentialities of the human being. We believe, therefore, in Godlike men—products of evolution. We regard the immortality of the soul as not only a possibility but a probability, and are particularly interested in the kind of immortality which may be an intrinsic part of the natural order of things.

We believe that there are no exceptions to the laws of nature, but that we have much to learn concerning the nature and extent of those laws. Hence our interest in mysticism, in psychic research, and in the problems and formulations of metaphysics.

We turn, now, to the question of "social problems," which is encompassed by the region of Justice. Because of the ideological and practical materialism of our time, the expression of spiritual ideas, it seems to us, has been almost entirely limited to the struggle for justice in human affairs. To contend for justice is to contend for natural law, rational inquiry, the dignity of man, and for the brotherhood of life which is implied in all these ideas. Whether or not this sort of contention for justice demands the metaphysical foundation we have outlined, in order to attain logical consistency, is of course arguable. We think it does. Meanwhile, there is the undeniable fact that religious or philosophical investigation which ignores the practical issues of justice is pretentious, wasteful of human effort and, in the long run, fruitless. *Justice is the one spiritual idea which is common to all men.* Many men, perhaps most men, will recognize the issues of justice in connection with social questions, while

maintaining an understandable skepticism toward other problems of justice and other phases of human existence. The social problems of our age, therefore, constitute the present common vocabulary of idealism. Those who would discuss idealism must, at least at times, use a common tongue, and if they do it reluctantly, or superficially, they do not wish to discuss idealism, but to do something else, which may or many not be worth doing.

Then there are the "hot" subjects of discussion. At present, these seem to be "communism" and "sex," which are "hot" for considerably different reasons. We bow to no one in our distaste and distrust of communism, but are continually impressed by the fact that communism is usually distrusted for the wrong reasons—which, to our way of thinking, could easily lead to installing some similar authoritarian system of our own. The consistent neglect of abuses and injustices of which the communists make great capital, simply because the communists oppose—or say they oppose them, seems an excellent way to help convert to communism people who have very practical reasons for distrusting the claims of the free enterprise system. There is certainly nothing wrong with sharing work and sharing the proceeds of work, from each according to his ability, to each according to his need. Families, tribes, and even small communities have been doing this for generations and to fail to admire the achievement involved, simply because some demagogue says it is "communitistic," would be both stupid and timid. The evil of communism, as we presently understand this term, lies in its arbitrary exercise of unregulated power over the lives and decisions of human beings. Political communism is tyranny; as such, it has nothing in principle to do with the ideal of shared community life. Shared community life, it is true, unless undertaken by exceptional people, usually succumbs to the power drive of some individual or group, if it does not fail from other causes; but that an ideal is difficult to attain and easily corruptible does not make it a bad ideal—rather,

these susceptibilities show simply that we do not understand the ideal well enough, or are going at it backwards. People who are not acquisitive, who are not possessive, who care more about the goods of the mind than the lesser goods of body and senses, would probably practice many features of communist theory without knowing it or bothering to name the methods of cooperation they had adopted. The rule, here, seems to be that social ideals—any sort of ideals—can never be *imposed*; they have to be adopted, and if the factor of coercion ever becomes important enough to be the least bit noticeable, it is better to call the whole thing off rather than to try to force it on to "success." In social undertakings, success by force is another name for betrayal and failure.

Sex is not a matter we have any great desire to expatiate upon; in the first place, we don't know enough; and in the second place, it represents a field of experience in which knowledge seems to result from personal discrimination and insight rather than from the study of manuals or the following of rules. It is nevertheless a subject on which there is vast confusion, and it keeps on coming up. If the records of psychiatry are any indication, there is a close relationship between sexual problems and religious problems. If a man takes his God out of a book, he is likely to get his beliefs about "morality" from a similar source, and, in both cases, he is likely to get all twisted up. There being this connection between religion and sex, the current break-up of conventional religion is naturally accompanied by a break-up of traditional restraints—the sort of restraints which for many generations have "kept up appearances," supported the "double standard," and assisted in the murder of reputations and the persecution of those who ignored convention, either from carelessness, simplicity, or hatred of hypocrisy. The modern world seems now to be in process of evolving new standards of morality in the relations between the sexes. For those who fear even the normal manifestations of sex in human life, this process is frightening and even hateful. It has, of

course, its ugly side. There are those who suppose that candid sensualism is a prepossessing form of "honesty," and those who imagine that jeering at hypocrisy is the same as growth in moral depth. But there are signs that the new morality which may emerge from the ferment of feelings and ideas about sex will mark a return to the primary reality of morality in all human relationships—which is full acceptance of responsibility for one's actions. The one way to fail completely in solving this personal problem—and it is a *personal* problem—is to fear to think it through to some constructive solution, and to cringe, inwardly, whenever the problem presents itself. There must be more than coincidence in the fact that those who are most vocally "against" sex are often persons who exhibit the least comprehension of what it means. And this applies with equal force to those who are most vocally "for" it. In both cases, the idea obviously exercises a morbid fascination over these votaries of materialism—the materialism of self-indulgence and the materialism of self-righteousness. And in both cases, it is the fascination which must be overcome, before anything constructive can follow.

But the real solution to all human problems, both social and personal, is, it seems to us, in the development of engrossing ideals and corresponding practical objectives. Nothing straightens out the kinks in human nature so well and so permanently as having important work to do. Here, finally, is the true field of inquiry for MANAS. In the first issue of this magazine, we spoke of Socrates and Thomas Paine as embodying in their lives the kind of work that seems to us most important. Both were social idealists and private philosophers. Both said what they thought without estimating the cost. And both paid the price exacted by society for their freedom.

If we were in the habit of proposing texts for "meditation," we should recommend a reading of Plato's *Apology* at least once a year, and the

Phaedo twice a year, or more frequently. There is a clear, mountain-top atmosphere in these writings. They show the courage of the philosopher in the market place, and the serenity of the sage at the time of death. Further, there is the self-animated drive of mind which eternally questions until the best possible answer is found. To be satisfied with nothing less than the best-possible—this ought to be the rule of the philosopher within every one of us.

Of Paine, we would suggest the study of his life. What sort of man is this, who so loved the freedom of his fellow men—and loved their freedom of mind as much or more than their freedom as citizens? For Paine, the human question *was* the social question, and the social solution grew out of the philosophy of human worth.

Letter from **SOUTH AFRICA**

JOHANNESBURG.—During the past few years the Nationalist government in South Africa appears to have been able to pass reactionary legislation at will, despite the fact that it has had only a small working majority in the House Assembly, while the opposition, the United Party, represents the greater majority of the country's voters.

The present year has seen the introduction and passage of a bill which seems to show that the existing government does not even hold sacred the country's constitution. This measure, the Separate Voters Act, provides for the removal of the names of coloured voters from the general electoral roll, and the placing of them on a separate roll for the election of their own representatives. The coloured peoples (peoples of mixed blood) of South Africa have held very dear their right to vote alongside the European electorate, and this measure appears to them to be the first step towards their gradual disfranchisement. Little faith in the government reassurances is possible when the measure itself is a most flagrant example of bad faith. The reason for its introduction is very clear. By removing the coloured peoples' votes in certain constituencies the way is cleared for Nationalist majorities in these places at the next general election.

It is "natural," perhaps, for any democratic government to take whatever steps are possible to ensure its return at the next elections, but this step roused the most intense opposition and bitterness both inside the House of Assembly as well as outside. The right of the coloured community to vote on the same basis as Europeans was not only a cherished right, but was provided for in the 1910 Act of Union in what are known as the Entrenched Clauses. The Act laid down that these Entrenched Clauses might only be changed by a two-thirds majority in Parliament, in place of the bare majority required for ordinary legislation. This two-thirds majority is not enjoyed by the Nationalists even with the reinforcements obtained from the six supporting seats of South-West Africa, and with the help of the Afrikaaner party. The measure was carried, therefore, in the full knowledge that it was against the will of the majority of the voting public and widely regarded as an infringement of the country's democratic rights. The resulting consternation has not been limited to the parliamentary opposition, but has also been voiced by many who count

themselves as Nationalists. At the time when the controversy was at its height and the measure under debate in the House, a number of war veterans formed themselves into a new organisation called the Torch Commando and converged upon Cape Town where Parliament was assembled by motor conveyance from distances, in many cases, hundreds of miles away. The demonstration parade held subsequently in the town and before the House passed off quietly, but was followed before the crowd had dispersed by a clash between crowd and police.

The coloured people of South Africa now feel that they have little more say in the government of the country than have the Africans, and, indeed, the sense grows in all sections of the community that the recognised forms of democratic government are not even safe for Europeans. It is felt generally that if the present government is returned to power at the next elections, it will consider itself free to take even greater liberties with the constitution, and democracy in any form may be doomed to suffer eclipse for a long period. It is therefore most pertinent to ask whether those South Africans who enjoy the power to vote are likely to return the Nationalists to power at the next election. To such a question there can be no sure reply. While the majority of the voting public is disquieted at the trend of the country's affairs, the United Party has so far failed lamentably to produce a clear progressive policy to be offered as a substitute. The Torch Commando, however, may provide a new factor. It is clearly specified that it is no new political party, but aims at closing the ranks of those who wish to work for a united South Africa and the preservation of democratic freedom. Originally formed by ex-servicemen, the membership is now open to the general public and during a recent campaign it rose so sharply as now to be nearing the hundred thousand mark. The idealistic appeal which this new organisation offers may provide a means of protest against the threats of the extreme Nationalists, and it may become a unifying force in the future of this sorely divided country.

SOUTH AFRICAN CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW

OUT OF THIS WORLD

ONE of the most useful functions a short novel can perform is that of presenting a clear view of personal or societal complexes which differ sharply from our own. Such contrasts can easily be proved beneficial by logical argument, and comparative statistics in our scientific age have often helped to lessen the insularity of our notions. Yet the various "art forms" sometimes accomplish more with less effort. A novel may reach many facets of our receptivity, perhaps helping us to identify ourselves for a time with some very different sort of person who lives in a very different sort of society.

For all of these reasons, then, we are happy to pass along a suggestion from one of our subscribers to try a story by Hans Reusch, *Top of the World*. For years Mr. Reusch has been writing tales of the northern polar regions for such periodicals as *The Saturday Evening Post* and *Collier's*. His *Top of the World* gathers up the material of these stories, plus, we infer, some new material. It appears that it would be difficult to select a better people for comparison with ourselves than the polar Eskimos, who have, until very recently, managed to remain isolated from the ravages of civilization:

While most other tribes had been touched and tainted by civilization, the scattering of Polar Eskimos, who confined their nomad existence to the Central Arctic near the Magnetic Pole, a region too remote and forbidding for white men to reach, had not changed their crude mode of living since the world was young. They were like children, forthright, pitiless, and gay. In the age of tanks they still hunted with bow and stone-tipped arrows, shared the fruit of their hunt, and were too artless to lie. So crude were they.

Mr. Reusch apparently knows a great deal about the Eskimos who weave the thread of his story, and his sympathy for the type of primitivism they represent is amply conveyed by the above passage. Reusch was evidently led to ponder the implications of the views held by the Eskimos in

regard to property, death and religion. For instance, the Eskimo "man of distinction" in the farthest northern regions is the man who *gives away* the most in worldly possessions, who can supply relatives and guests with the most food, the best skins, and spare implements for the continuously necessary hunting of fish and game.

The old people among these Eskimos have traditionally regarded death as simply a sleep which each should allow to overtake him when he has outlived his usefulness to family and friends. In *Top of the World*, we see representatives of two generations composedly walking forth from their daughters' igloos to meet voluntarily a not unpleasant death by freezing. (While offering no approval of euthanasia, we can admire the spirit of *useful* self-sacrifice which seems to have incarnated so strongly in the Eskimo ethos. To hold on frantically to life during senility is, perhaps, but another way of expressing selfishness, and the Eskimo who lets death come to him is said *never to fear his fate*. He feels that he has *borrowed* life on earth, rather than feeling that he *owns* it. Trusting without fear the "law of life" as he sees it, he is probably a much more useful and happy old man while he lives than many of us will manage to be. If he wants to stop living when he is no longer able to provide his own necessities, and after he has passed on whatever instruction he can to younger generations, perhaps that should be his business.)

For the Eskimo, the termination of earthly life is but the expected close of a cycle precisely the same as that of the seasons which, after the Great Night of winter, usher in a new kind of life with the beginning of another Great Day. These "primitives" seem to find it easier to separate the idea of Spirit, or Soul, from the concept of Body than do we, with all of our religions, philosophies and formal idealisms.

Mr. Reusch also develops the full savor of the northern Eskimo's endearing quality of impersonality, each character speaking of himself,

modestly, as "somebody"—a member of the race or family, rather than as a prideful individual.

By far the most compelling passages in Reusch's story have to do with the contrast between the white man's religion, as represented by ambitious missionaries who penetrated to the southern extremities of the polar icecap, and the common sense of an old "medicine man," or "angakok." Ivaloo, comely daughter of one of the northern families which ventured south and allowed Ivaloo to become housekeeper for the missionary, is generously happy to oblige the whims of her new preceptor, even to the extent of bearing him a child whose paternity he promptly denies. But she is perplexed by the strange ways of the Man of God and his later successor, even while she learns the Biblical stories and dutifully preaches the verbal ethics of Christianity to her kinfolk. Finally the old angakok feels that her confusion calls for his assistance, and proceeds to explain to her why the white men, despite the impressiveness of first appearance, are psychiatrically in bad shape:

"The white men are exceedingly narrow-minded and conceited people, and that's the reason why they dare say there exists, at the most, one spirit—theirs, of course!—and that only he should be obeyed, and all the others thrown away. It isn't so, but to contradict them would be rude, maybe dangerous even. If somebody acts or thinks otherwise than they do, they consider it a sin. Do you know why they don't allow more than one wife or husband? Because none of them would be able to deal equitably with several. If they borrow other people's wives they do it on the sly, without even asking the husband's permission—that's how contemptible they are! Now, Ivaloo, if these people's god doesn't make you happy, and it would be surprising if he did, but fills you with suffering instead, it means he isn't the god you want. Do you understand?"

"Each tribe has the god it deserves, for gods are made in the image of those that believe in them. Therefore the stupid have a stupid god, the intelligent an intelligent god, the good a good god, the wicked a wicked god. The god of the white men is jealous, selfish and greedy because they themselves are jealous, selfish and greedy.

"An angakok hasn't met, nor wishes to meet, the god of the white men. We always got along very well without him. But an angakok's inner light reveals to him that the spirit who made us Men wants his children to be happy, not unhappy. He doesn't want to hear complaints, but laughter, so he can laugh a little too. And he wants his creatures to be happy because happy people are good, while the unhappy are wicked. Do you understand that? Happy people feel like bestowing kindness upon everybody. Only the unhappy will thief and fight and kill."

Mr. Reusch finally provides readers with the happy ending they have all been wishing for from the time that the polar Eskimo family entangles itself with the life of the white man: Ivaloo, with a worthy husband, leaves the sins of lust, fear and shame behind her and moves again toward the world she knows, following this advice of the angakok, given in kindness and in wisdom:

"Where the white men reign you are ignorant, Ivaloo, but in your land it is they who are ignorant. So an angakok tells you; go back to the land of the long shadows where you are wise, for there is no sin so great as ignorance, and forget about the white men's god if he is made in their own ugly image—a vengeful and jealous bully who sets a price on salvation and shackles his children instead of releasing them."

We understand that a considerable number of expeditions may be expected to traipse across the forbidding vastness of the polar icecap in search of uranium and other potential sources of highest explosive. But, for the sake of the remaining polar Eskimos, we can almost hope that the white men will blow themselves to bits, down under, before they completely destroy the remoteness, primitive purity and seclusion of a land where people are "so crude" that they are also "too artless" to lie or to wage organized warfare.

COMMENTARY **BUSY PARTISANS**

THE effort to win the world for Christianity, particularly Catholic Christianity, is becoming so strenuous as to deserve special notice. In November, we had the Pope's declaration that modern physical science has brought new evidences of the existence of God. In October, as though to confirm by advance notice the myth of Papal infallibility, a Cardinal reported to pilgrims at the Shrine of Fatima in Portugal that the Virgin Mary appeared three times to Pope Pius XIII during the Holy Year of 1950. The Mother of God, the Cardinal related, disclosed her presence to the Roman Pontiff on two successive days before and on the day (November 1) on which the Pope formally proclaimed the dogma of the Virgin Mary's bodily assumption into heaven. The lady, apparently, was pleased at this new honor.

Then, in New York, a few days before publication of the Pope's intelligence concerning science and God, the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States released to the press a statement which included the affirmation that the truth of the true religion must be held of more importance than merely human laws or opinions:

No state, no group of educators may reject a truth of the moral order to suit the claim of convenience. The process of determining moral values by the consent of the majority is false in principle and sanction. Morality has its source in God and binds all men.

It was our impression that the principle of separation of church and state reserves the determination of moral values to a minority of one—the single individual, who remains free to choose for himself, without hindrance of law or prejudice of public institutions. The bishops also declare:

Man must either acknowledge that a personal God exists or he must deny His existence altogether. There is no middle ground. . . . Man is a creature. As a creature, he is subject to his Creator in all that he does. . . .

Meanwhile, also in New York, the Board of Regents has proposed that the school day in all public schools be opened with a prayer beginning, "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon thee. . . ." There is of course opposition, but school officials have been safely noncommittal. One of them remarked that the prayer would be "a refreshing answer to the charge of ungodliness wrongly leveled at the public school system."

The true believers are very busy.

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

DEAR Away-From-Home Son:

Quite a few people write letters to their sons and daughters on birthdays, and a few good religious souls have a try at Easter, I understand. Sad to say, according to what I have heard, such efforts are not apt to be altogether well received; probably the thought occurs to the young recipient that such extra-earnest parents are working a little too hard at their jobs—even being a little professional as parents—while everybody who isn't trying to be a professional parent knows that things go much better when Fathers and Mothers are simply themselves.

This letter to you is on the theme of The New Year, and what I have just said is meant as the sort of introduction which is supposed to disarm you by its revelation that I am myself fully aware of the special hazards that attend Letters for Special Occasions. And in this day and age it is absolutely necessary for me to try to disarm you, since I intend to talk about New Year's Resolutions and High Resolves, which certainly sounds a bit thick, as the English say. Of course, it can at least be claimed that this is something of a radical attempt, for which I am glad, for you know how fond I am of thinking myself a "radical." Most people, if they attempt special letters to their children at all, are apt to pick much more personal occasions than the beginning of a new year. A birthday, for instance, calls attention to the close ties that exist in the family, to the period of complete dependence of the child when it was a baby, and so on. Also, there are "presents" on birthdays, and the giving and receiving of presents may be taken to be subtle reminders of a special and benevolent relationship which is supposed to obtain within the family. Christmas, likewise, with perhaps a bit of religion added for good—or confusing—measure.

Now "New Year's" has a different background. In the first place the occasion

doesn't call attention to any group or personal relationship. A new Year is simply a new cycle of time, a symbol for a new awakening for everything that lives and moves. And each individual has his own contract with time, entirely his own, whether he be large, small, or in between, young or old, wise or foolish. New Year's might even be taken as a reminder of that independence which makes it impossible for anyone else to live our lives for us.

Unfortunately, "New Year's Resolutions" have become largely comic strip material, both because of standardization of what most people think "Resolutions" are supposed to be, and because they are supposed to concern the things that one promises *not* to do any more. This has always seemed to me very silly, for how can one get anywhere with oneself by trying *not* to do things? The wisest philosophers and psychologists have always known that what we call "bad habits" can only be escaped when we find something much better to put in their place. Or, to put it another way, you can't go forward by trying to go backward. Bad habits, I suspect, are those things people do because they can't stop *doing*, and because they haven't yet found anything better than the "bad habits" with which to occupy their time.

The phrase "High Resolves," as we have already admitted, sounds a bit thick. But whatever other kinds of resolves are worth having? The mere fact that people almost invariably fail to carry out the usual resolutions is only proof that they are not high enough, and fail to really evoke the best that is in man. Today it is somewhat radical to talk about High Resolves and mean what we say, because general opinion of what a single individual is capable of is not very high. If we are radical enough, however, to search inside ourselves to the very roots of our being, we shall know that the highest feelings of happiness indeed come from these resolves, and from nothing else. Religions are apt to tell you that man is a poor, weak creature, who not only

needs the help of God and Christ, but also of some duly constituted church. Some of those who fancy that they have the "scientific attitude" give us much the same story, talking of the way matters are already fixed for us by things called heredity and environment. But both of these ways of thinking express types of mere orthodoxy. Neither really expects much of man, which is too bad, for without great expectations we can never hope for great results.

A great deal is always said about the "joys of youth." The chief advantage of youth is that young people have not yet been wholly discouraged from dreaming and aspiring. Many older ones look back on their earlier years with longing, imagining that what they miss is the intense physical energy they remember once having. But what they really miss is their capacity for thinking Big Thoughts, and dreaming sublime accomplishments. Society sooner or later contrives to impose upon us a "thus far and no farther shalt thou go," and this is because there *are* statistical limits upon what a man may accomplish in the way of wealth or position. But the real dreams go far beyond these things, having instead to do with the kind of man we wish to be.

The old stories of the knights in shining armor had quite a point after all. The hero-tales of legend were simply the story of "High Resolve," and the reason they so captured imaginations in days when stories were fewer, and the more effective because they were fewer, was because there was then, as there is now, something inside man to respond. That something needs to be awakened if one is to feel he has reached his highest happiness, yet that same something is easily covered over. Each one has, or has had, in mind an ideal story for his own life; it is, we might say, the story of the Soul. For those who set their minds on making this story come true there is no failure—the money and position we hold in life have very little to do with how well this story may be unfolding. Disappointments and doubts, failures, and even mortal sickness are only

incidents in the story, not essentials, and they may even inspire men with courage to greater heroism than might otherwise have been managed.

I suppose this sounds religious, with such talk of the "soul." But actually it has little to do with religion as we commonly know it. It probably has more to do with the athletic field, in fact, than with churches. For man rises to great heights when he is determined that he is capable of them, and religions, as I have said, usually insist that man unaided is capable of very little. On the athletic field a person learns something of great significance—that happiness comes, win or lose, when he has played his heart out. The key to our happiness is really that simple, too, in things more important than athletics, which is itself but a symbol of self-discipline and all-out effort.

All this at New Year's—or approximately at the beginning of the new year, which actually begins with the swing of the sun northward at the winter solstice of December 21—because the whole of great Nature at this time seems readying itself for another strong impulse. Some of the "pagan" peoples, who lived closer to nature than those of our own history, realized this, and held special ceremonies at this auspicious time. "High resolves" and great expectations are by no means out of place, then, at the time when people are making their "resolutions." But to me, the cycle of the season is more a reminder that a man truly knows life only when he strives to make himself capable of the greatest effort and the highest dreams.

FRONTIERS The Spoils of Sport

READERS who happened to see the film, *Saturday's Hero*, or to have read Millard Lampell's book, *The Hero*, on which it was based, ought to take the trouble to read in the *New York Times* (Nov. 20) Judge Saul S. Streit's statement about conditions in intercollegiate athletics in the United States. Mr. Lampell's account, it seems, is by no means an exaggerated version of the facts. While Judge Streit's observations were largely based upon an investigation of the "fixing" of intercollegiate basketball games in New York City, his facts and conclusions cover interscholastic sports generally. Concerning the New York basketball players, he said:

I found among other vices that the sport was commercialized and professionalized; devices and probable forgery were employed to matriculate unqualified students to college; flagrant violations of amateur rules by colleges, coaches and players; and "illegal" scouting, recruiting and subsidization of players. . . .

Many of the players with the knowledge of the coaches obtained summer jobs, ostensibly as bus boys, waiters and lifeguards, but in effect were required to and did play basketball two and three times a week. They received wages, huge tips, and participated in gambling pools, made contact with gamblers and some earned as much as \$1,500 to \$2,000 for the summer.

One player defendant told the Judge that his athletic scholarship consisted of tuition, a room, books, four meal tickets (valued at \$5 each) a week, and a job. He was not, however, required to show up for work at the job, although if he scored well during the week he would receive credit for extra hours and was paid an additional five or ten dollars.

Judge Streit's survey covered various regions:

At Bradley University, a spot check of fifteen athletes shows that eight were majoring in physical education and among the courses for which credit was given were handball, elementary swimming, social dancing, football and first aid.

At Ohio State, football players worked as State House pages and were on the payroll of the Highway Department and other state agencies.

At Denver, the Colorado State Industrial Commission ruled that Ernest Nemeth, a former University of Denver football player, had been hired to play football and was entitled to disability pay for his gridiron injury.

At the University of Pennsylvania, football showed a profit last year of \$461,000. At Kentucky last year, the football team played to 407,000 paid admissions, with an average of \$3, for a gross of over \$1,200,000. . . .

At William and Mary there is the shocking situation of the alteration of a preparatory school transcript to admit an athlete. With less than 1,000 undergraduates, William and Mary has a sixty-man football squad, costing in the neighborhood of \$100,000 a year.

Concerning the institutions attended by the players before him for sentence, Judge Streit observed:

The records of City College show that the profits of basketball paid for all the other sports. The head coach at City College has been advanced to the title of associate professor.

The salary of the head coach at L.I.U. [Long Island University] has been increased from \$3,000 in 1941 to \$12,000 in 1950 and he has been advanced to a full professorship and vice president of the university. Mr. Bee [L.I.U. head coach] very modestly admitted to me that the prominence of the basketball team "which he created" and his efforts in large measure contributed to the increase in the number of undergraduates from 1,500 to 4,500.

In brief, all of the players entrusted to the care of L.I.U. were openly exploited in behalf of Mr. Bee and the university. He handed out athletic scholarships at will. He admitted advancing \$75 to \$80 to Sherman White as a loan. He admitted paying Gard's tuition at the Brooklyn Academy. He stated that when the boys were scouted and recruited they were told about the advantages of playing in the Garden. . . .

The naïveté, the equivocation and the denials of the coaches and their assistants concerning their knowledge of gambling, recruiting and subsidizing would be comical were they not so despicable.

All this, of course, goes on with the aid and comfort of wealthy alumni, who "sponsor" athletes by paying their expenses, and who exert pressure on college officials to "develop" their athletic programs. The country, naturally, is "shocked," and college presidents have formed a special committee, headed by Dr. John A. Hannah of Michigan State, to investigate the "entire sorry mess." But the question of what is to be done, we think, will remain unsolved. Here and there, a coach may be displaced, or even a college president, as at William and Mary, but the real problem, which is one of basic attitudes, not toward athletics, but toward life, can hardly be even examined without disclosing facts of a distinctly "subversive" flavor.

The analysis that we would propose is really an old story in these pages, yet one which, it seems to us, can hardly be repeated too often. It is an old story, too, in the works of certain psychiatrists, among them Karen Homey, but it is obviously not an old story to members of the general public. It is simply that, almost from birth, we present our children with conflicting ideals and objectives. In school and church, we stress the importance of the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, truth-telling, consideration for others, but in daily life we give so much evidence that our attachment to these virtues is merely sentimental that the combination of these two sets of influences amounts to a practical course of instruction in hypocrisy. Only a suavely self-conscious schizophrenic can be really "well-adjusted" in our society. There are those who, somehow or other, have become convinced that a smoothly working insincerity, carefully apparelled in bluff heartiness, schooled in the sophistication which enables one to express badly hackneyed slogans in slightly original terms, is the proper way to get on in the world. Like clever lawyers, they always avoid the legally dishonest, and are often found in the most prominent pews on Sunday. They make themselves useful to the "people who matter," and show a politic courtesy to those who don't. In sum, they represent the upper crust of a society which sets out to worship God and Mammon at the same time, for they have worked out and mastered the rather complicated skills which are involved.

The rest of the population, made up of people who have not been able to achieve this rather extraordinary "integration," gets into more or less trouble—trouble such as has overtaken the basketball players of New York, the West Point cadets who were recently expelled for cheating, the tax officials who are now under fire in Washington . . . and so on and on.

The fanatical intensity of revolutionary movements, as more than one student of social psychology has pointed out, probably grows in part from disgust for the requirements of "success" in modern bourgeois society. Some who won't play the game become gamblers and thieves, while others may choose to remain craftsmen who work with their hands, refusing any administrative responsibility in a world where pretense seems almost as important as wearing a clean shirt. Still others try to play the game, but not understanding the rules well enough, they get caught and are punished with a great show of righteousness by the rest of us, who attain, thereby, a kind of vicarious atonement for the sins which are hidden behind the curtain of sophistication.

The churches will never attack the problem at this level, for the moral indictment is too far-reaching. The churches are not really sure of anything except the old-fashioned virtues, and even here we are not expected to do very well because of the inherent moral weakness to which, religious dogma insists, the flesh is heir.

Nor can educators or city fathers do much about it, so long as they only tinker with the gross symptoms of moral confusion in collegiate athletics and like instances of corruption. Actually, it is a problem which must be returned to the people, not with requests to approve a daily "prayer" at the start of each school day, or with campaigns for more "released time" for religious instruction, but with an honest and humble confession of failure. Problems of this sort are not institutional problems, and institutional methods cannot solve them. They must be attacked at their root.