

THE FEAR OF REASON

IT is a fact of some significance, surely, that in arguments about religion, whether for or against, the men who go to the greatest extremes in insisting that they are "right" are usually partisans of complete acceptance or complete denial of familiar religious ideas. Pick up a copy of any Catholic parochial newspaper, anywhere, and you are likely to find the contents about evenly divided between unqualified declarations of faith and angry denunciations of those who have publicly criticized or rejected that faith. Pick up any volume which espouses the "old-time" atheist view, and you will probably encounter a similar zest for over-simplification, and while the denouncing takes a more impersonal form, it is there, nevertheless, by implication.

In a recent book, *Man and his Gods*, which candidly espouses the "atheist" position, the author, Prof. Homer W. Smith, biologist of the New York University School of Medicine, makes a devastating criticism of the influence of Christianity on the West, declaring:

The age called Dark derived its gloom not from any pall cast by the fall of Rome, nor the ignorance of barbarian invaders, nor plague, nor famine, and most certainly not by any decadence of the human intellect, but simply from the circumstance that reason and criticism had been condemned and displaced by the Christian faith.

While this statement needs a lot of historical evidence, it can, we think, be supported. However, Prof. Smith has another generalization to offer:

All human history reveals that transcendental metaphysics is not only futile but dangerous. Those who have foisted, frequently by not too honest means, their unsupported speculations upon the naive and gullible as truth have served to retard man's self-realization more than any other misfortune that has befallen him.

The NYU biologist apparently sees no important difference between the dogmas of institutional religion and "transcendental metaphysics." (This book bears the blessing of Albert Einstein, which might lead the reader to think that the great physicist endorses

everything in it; but Dr. Einstein also approved Gustav Strömberg's *The Soul of the Universe*, which offers extensive "transcendental metaphysics," so that Dr. Einstein evidently thinks well of any work which honestly and seriously deviates from orthodoxy in religion.) We are still waiting for *the* modern book which distinguishes categorically between the: philosophical inspiration of religion and the claims of the sects and creeds. Some of the ancients wrote along these lines—the Neoplatonists, for example, and a great medieval heretic or two, such as Johannes Scotus Erigena,—but modern thinkers seem not to have recovered sufficiently from the late war between science and religion to discuss the subject with anything but either intellectual or emotional bludgeons.

Between the two extremes of blind acceptance and blind denial of religion, there is surely a middle ground, although the "middle ground" we have in mind will be as unpopular with orthodox religionists as with "atheists" like Prof. Smith; and, unfortunately, not many people are left, after you eliminate both orthodox believers and orthodox unbelievers. Still, it is to those few who *are* left that MANAS makes its appeal. Dogmatic religion's flight from reason can have no serious defense. And the atheist's flight from inner, psychological fact, while more difficult to arraign, is still a flight, a neglect of a profoundly important area of human experience. Actually, it seems to us, the aggressive atheist is an honest man who thinks it is *easy* to overthrow the claims of organized religion. He wants to make a clean sweep, and if idealist philosophy must go, too, this is no more than a necessary "purge" in the interests of the greatest good for the greatest number.

The masses of mankind, however, have sounder instincts than the occasional atheist and intellectual materialist. The masses *feel* the reality of some great spiritual force or process at work in the world. They are less alienated from nature than over-civilized intellectuals, and less susceptible to the skepticism which sophisticated people adopt almost as a fashion. And precisely because the intellectuals reject transcendental metaphysics along with the dogmas of

religion, they abandon the masses to the churches and the priests as the only remaining interpreters of the spiritual reality which underlies the world. This, we think, in the vulgar terms of political controversy, amounts to "selling out" the masses, who have no choice, then, except to continue in their narrow beliefs, or, in a rebellion of equal blindness, to become communists.

It is certain, on the other hand, that not all the defenders of orthodox religious ideas are scheming Machiavellis of the cloth. There is an obvious benevolence in the declarations of many of the supporters of religion. Take for example the article, "Religion and Our Schools," by Liston Pope, dean of the Yale Divinity School, in the May *American Magazine*. This article, like most of the contents of *American Magazine*, is "forward-looking," optimistic, and vastly friendly to nearly everyone. Mr. Pope feels sure that intelligent good-will can quash the controversy over religion in the schools. He has a program he thinks will please Protestants, Catholics, and Jews alike. (He considers even "atheist" children, for they, he suggests, may be permitted to stay away from the nonsectarian religious program he outlines.) The *AM* editors single out five of Mr. Pope's "basic points" which, they say, provide a common ground to Catholics, Protestants, and Jews (also affording a united front against the communists), and urge an educational program built around them. They are:

Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—

. . . agree that there is a just and merciful God above all human events to Whom all men are responsible. . . .

. . . believe in the brotherhood of all men as the children of God. . . .

. . . believe in the worth and dignity of every man as a free and responsible creature under God. . . .

. . . believe that religion is the way to the highest truth.

. . . hold that the example of righteousness and justice set by God should be the basis of all human morality. . . .

The occasion for this article is the atmosphere of controversy engendered by the fight for religious influence in the public schools of the United States. The *McCullum* Decision of the Supreme Court, which

banned religious instruction on public school premises, has lately been matched by Supreme Court approval of the New York Released Time Program, in which religious instruction is given, *off* the school premises, but during the school day. Justice Douglas wrote the deciding majority opinion, but the dissenting opinions, by Justices Black, Jackson, and Frankfurter are so impressive as to add fuel to the conflict over religion in the schools. Justice Douglas concluded:

We follow the *McCullum* case. But we cannot expand it to cover the present released time program unless separation of church and state means that public institutions can make no adjustment of their schedules to accommodate the religious needs of the people. We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion.

The dissents are more than adequate. Justice Black said in part:

. . . the sole question is whether New York can use its compulsory education laws to help religious sects get attendants presumably too unenthusiastic to go unless moved to do so by the use of this state machinery.

That it is the plan, purpose, design and consequence of the New York program cannot be denied. The state thus makes religious sects beneficiaries of its power to compel children to attend secular schools. Any use of such coercive power by the state to help or hinder some religious sects or to prefer all religious sects over non-believers or vice versa is just what I think the First Amendment forbids.

In considering whether a state has entered this forbidden field the question is not whether it has entered too far but whether it has entered at all. New York is manipulating its compulsory education laws to help religious sects get pupils. This is not separation but combination of church and state.

Justice Jackson, also dissenting:

My evangelistic brethren confuse an objection to compulsion with an objection to religion. It is possible to hold a faith with enough confidence to believe that what should be rendered to God does not need to be decided and collected by Caesar.

The day that this country ceases to be free for irreligion it will cease to be free for religion—except for the sect that can win political power. The same epithetical jurisprudence used by the court today to

beat down those who oppose pressuring children into some religion can devise as good epithets tomorrow against those who object to pressuring them into a favored religion.

Justice Frankfurter, who agreed with Justice Jackson, added in conclusion:

The unwillingness of the promoters of this movement to dispense with such use of the public schools betrays a surprising want of confidence in the inherent power of the various faiths to draw children to outside sectarian classes—an attitude that hardly reflects the faith of the greatest religious spirits.

The somewhat withering remark of Justice Jackson, "Today's judgment will be more interesting to students of psychology and of the judicial process than to students of constitutional law," is probably the best capsule comment on the majority decision, which seems to reflect the intense pressure which the Court must have felt—a pressure "in the air," promulgated by national anxiety rather than by overt approaches to the august body of the Supreme Court.

Further, as Justice Frankfurter points out, the majority decision bespeaks a "no-confidence" vote of the sponsors of Released Time concerning the inherent persuasiveness or reasonableness of their respective religions. They do not rely upon reason, they do not rely upon faith or innate feeling: they rely upon the State and its coercive power. This much is plain. This the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish advocates of Released Time have in common, along with the articles of belief listed by Mr. Pope. (Not all the followers of these faiths believe in and advocate Released Time, which is a fact that should be borne in mind. Jews in particular are skeptical, and even the *Christian Century* discusses the Supreme Court victory for Released Time with a note of editorial warning. Enough of all three denominations, however, have wanted it to win legality for the form practiced in New York.)

There is no danger of anyone charging the New York State Board of Regents with "atheistic tendencies." The following prayer has been recommended by the Board for the beginning of every school day:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

A similar trend is noticeable in the Parent-Teacher Association groups throughout the country. Not long ago, in a suburban California community, three mothers, members of the local PTA, met to discuss means of making "God more real" to their children. There was no question of "which God," of course—only a broadminded, nonsectarian "God" of the sort Mr. Pope is talking about, and which the New York Board of Regents would have all the children of the state pray to every morning.

We come now to the question which has been haunting this discussion almost from the beginning: *What is the origin of this emotionally insistent clinging to the idea of a personal God?*—a God of whom man is the "creature"?—who is "almighty," on whom we acknowledge "our dependence"?—to whom we pray for "favor," and in whose alleged behavior we are to seek for examples of "righteousness and justice"?

It should be obvious that once the existence of such a God is established, we have licensed his interpreters to disregard the commonly accepted canons of reason. God is the one being in the universe who has no need of explaining his inconsistencies. How can a man challenge his own "Creator"?

We can only conclude that the personal God idea is a basic symptom of self-distrust and a revelation of the tendency of many minds to want to be able to invoke a sacred irrational whenever the going gets rough. It follows that the desire of orthodox religionists for practical assistance from the State in propagating their doctrines is related to this central weakness. The man who wants an outside authority in the highest department of his existence—his moral life—will want similar authorities to enforce his ends all down the line.

Logically enough, this state of mind leads to sentimentality and a lack of realism in the conduct of human affairs. Mr. Pope, for example, argues for his program of religious education with these words:

In the face of growing laxity in public morals we need today youngsters with well-founded loyalties, including a loyalty beyond one's self. We need youngsters who have firm standards of right and wrong. We need youngsters who feel morally responsible for their own conduct, and will not fall into dubious conduct just because "everybody's doing

it." We need youngsters with a sense of reverence and awe for the universe in which they live.

Fine words, and no one can quarrel with them. Mr. Pope's actual program, however, through which he would "bring more spiritual content into our schools without also bringing in sectarian beliefs," while involving some excellent subjects for study, includes a proposed course, "History of the Christian Church." And when he expresses confidence that "textbooks could be written by educators, in cooperation with Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant scholars, that all three groups would find commendable," we wonder at the blessed optimism of the Dean of the Yale Divinity School!

What sort of a history of the Christian Church would be found "commendable" alike by Jews, Protestants, and Catholics? Surely not one worth studying. The Jews would prefer that Christ be left out, the Catholics would like to ignore the Reformation, and the Protestants, certainly, would never assent to a history that in any sense agreed with the Catholic claim of being the One True Church. How could the young in whom we hope to develop the sterling moral qualities Mr. Pope lists have any respect for a course in "religious history" which accomplishes no more than a sickly compromise for all three of these representatives of "the Judeo-Christian tradition"?

Mr. Pope says: "Teachers in our schools should be sympathetic to, and respectful of, all religious faiths. And they should be trained to teach about religion objectively and accurately." This would be splendid, but does he suppose that this can be done while making Protestants, Jews, and Catholics all happy at the same time? The thing is manifestly impossible.

Further, how would you describe or define "objectivity" in religion? Obviously, the "objective" student of religion will be obliged to question *all* religious dogmas. He can accept none of them without examination. And if we turn to history, we find that the men who have examined religious dogmas critically usually end up as either atheists or pantheists. "Objective" study of religion would be more likely to destroy orthodox belief than to support it, as Mr. Pope fondly hopes. If the Yale faculty, incidentally, can be regarded as a collection of scholars who practice "objectivity," then Christianity has not fared very well

at their hands, according to William F. Buckley's *God and Man at Yale*. The Christian Mr. Buckley is troubled by the rampant skepticism, if not atheism, at his alma mater, and is distinctly against the kind of "objectivity" now in practice at Yale. He wants True Believers on the faculty, to make the Faith of our Fathers plain to Yale's young men.

What *could* be taught with objectivity is the method of transcendental metaphysics, a study of the inner content of religion, of the spiritual ideas behind the dogmas—ideas which, for the most part, the churches have inverted, perverted, and turned into almost unrecognizable caricatures of their original meaning.

Letter from **MOROCCO**

CASABLANCA.—In slamming around this world, one is bound to miss current movements of monumental significance, book reviews that might change your life, and definite strides in history's progress which, if understood and studied, could lead to a much fuller existence. One more or less accepts this as the price you pay for a sunset over Manila Bay, the flight of wild birds down the Nile, or native musicians moving over a wind-swept hill with their typical costume snapping in the breeze. When you're stranded in some out-of-the-way hole, you read what classics have managed to filter to this forgotten area, perhaps a style magazine long since dated or a big book with fascinating illustrations but an unintelligible language. On the whole, you return from the interior, uninformed and a little more blunted to sophistication than when you left. Conversations, at home, don't mean much at first . . . you don't know which movie stars to admire, or what Senator to berate.

But when you work in Paris for an International Organization which publishes its releases in three official languages, and you receive periodicals in every known idiom, you are ready to be treated like a man of the world who is "on his toes," and has a grip on vital information. Still, the standard question when I remark (a little too casually, perhaps) that I worked for Unesco is simply and bluntly, "What's that?"

Well, even straight out of the brush I knew that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was one of the most progressive organizations in the world. Its Constitution, adopted by the London Conference on Nov. 16, 1945, set forth the new Organization's aims and functions as being "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law

and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations."

So, I had to ask myself, Why is Unesco so little known in the United States? It seems that releases can't be sent from Paris all over the world because:

(1) All releases to the United States must be screened through Washington, or through New York;

(2) You must be careful what you send to South Africa: they're ticklish on the colored problem;

(3) The Commonwealth of Australia has certain hard and fixed rules which must not be infringed upon;

(4) And on and on. . . .

In the past five years, Unesco's membership has risen from 30 countries to 59 countries, representatives of which meet once a year to further the aforementioned plans. But it is these same governments which, during the year, place restrictions on passports, currency, student exchange, etc., etc., and for the rest of the year defeat the very aims that Unesco is trying to realize, in its struggle against ignorance and prejudice.

One couldn't help but be a little sceptical on the original, overly-ambitious program, but now that the organization has concentrated on fundamental education, it does seem that it could be given more of a boost.

Fundamental education is simply helping people to help themselves. A man is taught the three R's so that he can further his own needs and keep from being swindled by the grocer on the corner.

Unesco's pilot project that first caught my eye was the educational training center set up in Patzcuaro, Mexico. I have my favorite squinklies

there, just as everyone else who has traveled through that wild and passionate land. A squinkly is a little boy who hangs on your car when you enter a strange town and directs you. No one ever thinks of squinklies as having futures. They just grow up, go to work in the cane fields or silver factories, and that's the end. That they might be able to improve their lot and become literate ought not to be a world-shaking idea. That the child in India might be able to maintain himself better during famine if he had some help isn't such a difficult concept to embrace. That Unesco tries to staff libraries, reconstruct museums, salvage what art-forms it can from the turmoil, certainly makes it worthy of more of our attention. But all Unesco seems to merit is criticism from a group of reporters and columnists who, with their quonset-hutted minds, slide away from any constructive thinking. They point out that Unesco for a long time marched under the banner "Peace in the Minds of Men," which is, apparently, a "dubious" objective.

The cold fact remains that Unesco helps refugee children and gives the underprivileged the one thing they need, that all of us need—a chance.

—ROVING CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW

"STRANGE LANDS AND FRIENDLY PEOPLE"

FOR this review, we borrow from William O. Douglas the title of his philosophical travelogue, for the very phrase suggests a form of adventurous pioneering which has immeasurably served the progress of human understanding. Men have "gone out" from the safe confines of their own countries either as *conquistadores*, seeking to impose on others the conditions of life they have always known, or in search of enlightenment. In the latter case, they are able to see the inhabitants of other lands more as instructors than as potential servants—"victims," really. The actual travelling, in point of time and geographically, of course, is far less important than the motive which prompts the journeying, although the braving of physical perils signifies the fearlessness which must characterize any man who is willing to look beyond the horizons to which circumstances of birth have restricted him. Thus in the tales of all wanderers—so long as they have not been primarily *conquistadores*—we are morally entitled to find some inspiration, and may even legitimately show tolerance for the obviously tall yarns which imaginative travellers relate. The spirit of constructive adventure is so priceless a thing, in other words, that we may well go to great lengths to encourage it.

Some such introduction seems appropriate to the hair-raising travels of Dana Lamb and wife, described in *Enchanted Vagabonds* (Harper, 1938), and again in *Quest for the Lost City* (1951). Whatever the questions aroused in readers by the Lambs' fabulous account of a canoe voyage down the coast of Central America to the Panama Canal, the fact is of record that they *did* make such a trip, which is adventurous enough for anyone. Readers may be intrigued both by this spirit of adventure itself, as displayed, and by the thoughtful tolerance which they exhibited toward "strange lands," bringing both friendship and wisdom into the midst of the most primitive surroundings.

The Lambs' sojourn with the Indians, descendants of the Mayas, occasioned reflections such as the following:

Indians, where they have had the good fortune to escape the contaminating effects of white civilization, are highly ethical in their human relationships—indeed, that one thing has contributed more than any other to their spoliation by the whites. An Indian would scorn to do for personal gain the things that are the very bone and sinew of commercial civilizations. They are chaste and moral to a degree that should bring the blush of shame to the cheeks of those who seek to "civilize," "convert," or "exploit" them as savages. Indian men are frequently forced to deal summarily with white men because of their casual attitude toward Indian women.

Everywhere we went, wherever we had a chance to talk with them at length, we found them not only holding to the tradition of a past greatness, but believing profoundly in their future greatness.

There is a crying need for white men, who ask nothing for themselves, to go among these people and patiently teach and patiently learn. Much may reward such a seeker. It is not improbable that there are men living in Central America today who can read the great calendar stone of the Aztecs and the Mayans and who know where invaluable source material relating to these nations lies hidden; men who know the secrets of medicinal plants and nature lore. The investigator, however, will have to cast his lot with the Indians, eat their food, live in huts as they do, and not concern himself overmuch with the gold that lies in their hills and rivers.

This sense of universal human fraternity is the only stuff, certainly, out of which One World can ever be made. And the Lambs, while apparently quite "brash" at times, show a genius for applying the theory. For instance, when looking for the supposed location of a hidden city, and wishing to engage the help of reputedly fierce natives, they decided to live quietly within range of the Indians' observation, until discovered by them! The plan worked to perfection. After many days during which the habits of the newcomers were watched from behind thick foliage, the natives were willing to extend trust and friendship. It is also to the Lambs' credit that they felt a high honor had been bestowed on them when, after living with the

natives and participating in their daily labors, they were awarded their "first God," a symbol of accomplishment usually won by the Indians in early childhood!

The Lambs lived off the land they traversed, gaining from the Indians a "reverence for life" that precluded any unnecessary hunting or any undue interference with the harmonies of nature they came to feel about them. In consequence, their hearts and minds opened to the lessons of the "primitive" religion still practiced by the descendants of the Mayas. These people lived happily in the presence of their Gods, considering, quite logically, that such supernatural beings might be expected to be amusedly tolerant of the failings of men; at any rate, the awesome fascination of a jealous and vengeful God was unknown to them. Closer acquaintanceship with the Gods, however, could be attained only by painstaking acquirement of the virtues, while the unvirtuous were conceived as being obligated to undergo ridicule from the Gods—but never "punishment." This same psychology, too, permeated the relationships between adults and children. The Lambs found no evidence of the religiously inspired fears our own psychologists have been kept so busy dislodging.

"We discovered we were living in a happy society," wrote Lamb, "among people of good feeling and good humor. The word 'savage' when it came up in conversation between the two of us rang harshly on our ears." He adds:

It did not take us long to understand the fundamentals of the people among whom we lived: a plot of ground, a roof overhead, self-sufficiency, and a supreme respect for the rights and properties of others.

In all the time we were with this group, we saw not the slightest evidence of crime, not even a petty theft. I doubt there is a word in their language for such an act.

Since their first incredible voyage down the Central American coast—including an even more incredible penetration to the Mayan ruins they report in *The Forbidden Land*—the Lambs have

become professional adventurers. They have travelled extensively with their cameras and obviously intend to continue as a sort of "Osa and Martín Johnson" combine. Yet the role of the professional adventurer can hardly be frowned upon, especially if there is willingness to learn from "strange lands and friendly people," and if something of the sensitive, almost mystical awareness of the harmony in which man may live with nature, comes to us through their words.

A final note in summation of the Lambs' contribution is sounded in the respect for the ancients obviously generated by their sojourn in the land of the Mayas. Respect for the greatness of ancient races often seems necessary in order to understand the "backward peoples" whom we now discover to also have human and economic rights. True "one-world" vision, perhaps, will contain many of the perspectives once belonging to great civilizations of the past, so that human evolution may be seen as an infinitely complicated synthesis of subtleties rather than a simple march towards ever more imposing technical achievements.

COMMENTARY

REASON VERSUS GOD

WE first made the acquaintance of Anthony West (who is the son of H. G. Wells) through his impressively thoughtful novel, *The Vintage*, which deals philosophically, although quite fantastically, with the question of what may happen to a man after he dies. This is really a bit of exaggeration, for Mr. West would not have to *believe* in a life after death to write this book—it is simply his idea of how a man might receive his due under moral law, and it is the "due" that seems important to Mr. West, not the immortality. What interested us at the time was the fact that this writer found the idea of immortality a useful vehicle for his moral and psychological analysis of human beings. It enabled him to work out a scheme which threw moral values into high relief, instead of being more or less obscured, as they seem to be on earth.

It is pleasant, therefore, to meet Mr. West again, this time in the pages of the *New Yorker*, where, in the issue for May 3, he reviews *The Irony of American History* by Reinhold Niebuhr. Dr. Niebuhr is generally accounted to be America's smartest theologian. It seems fair to say that his is the most respected theological mind in the United States. He is good enough to write for the *Nation*, which by no stretch of the imagination can be accused of theological interests; and he is responsible for at least the best non-fiction *title* of the century—"Moral Man and Immoral Society."

In the *New Yorker* review of Dr. Niebuhr's new book, however—which we urge everyone to read carefully—Mr. West does not agree with Dr. Niebuhr at all. Actually, Mr. West confirms rather effectively the thesis of our lead article for this week. For all his fine language, says the critic, Reinhold Niebuhr is really making out a case for God which turns out to be a case against man. The theme has become a familiar one in recent years. Mr. West picks out the telltale expressions:

Some phrases in this [he has quoted a passage from Niebuhr] are danger signals—"man as creature of history," "historical destiny," "powerful forces may be beguiled." They show that a theological statement is being translated into the seedy language of politics. The religious dogma is that man cannot by the use of reason control or plan his future; his destiny is arranged for him by God, and it is sin for him to try to do it. . . .

. . . there can be no doubt about what he means. God laughs at human pretensions and brings them to nothing in a spirit which one would call savage and unkind if the relationship were that of a parent and child but which Dr. Niebuhr, since it is that of God and man, can call merciful.

That there is something missing in the way in which the world has tried to rely upon "reason" can hardly be denied. Likewise, Mr. West's argument from eighteenth-century idealism may be subject to criticism; but Dr. Niebuhr's flight from reason is not the same as attempting to use it more wisely. How strange it is that the idea of "God" should serve chiefly as an excuse—a "sacred irrational"—for not trying to become better reasoners!

The abandonment of reason in obedience to God is surely a slander on both God and man.

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

QUITE often, these days, one may hear parents pondering Catholic claims that parochial schooling provides more thorough education than can be gained from public institutions. Adolescents sometimes confirm these representations, as, for example, when girl or boy transfers from parochial schools easily surpass their non-parochial schoolmates in basic matters such as spelling, arithmetic, and reading. Inasmuch as such facts often become the basis for Catholic arguments in behalf of Government subsidies for their schools, it is time, we think, for most of our non-Catholic parents and teachers to take up the challenge *without* underestimating the opposition.

Why are parochial schools so successful? In the first place, the Catholics save a great deal of time when they go about instructing the young. They have no doubt about *how* to instruct them, what to instruct them in, nor about what the end-result of all the instruction—or indoctrination—is meant to be. So-called "secular" educators, on the other hand, are usually prone to consider each essay in education as something of an experiment. Not claiming to know precisely what mysterious elements compose the child, whether or not he has a "soul," and inclining to accept the philosophical assumptions of democracy, the teacher is apt to follow a free and individualistic course. "Self-expression" on the part of the child becomes very important, while all systems or methods of pedagogy are regarded as probably needing constant revision to meet the particular needs of particular children.

Then there are the teachers as individuals. As someone recently remarked during a discussion of the differences between parochial and public schools, "Who ever heard of a nun being worried about the carburetion on her V8?" The nuns, like some others who embrace the religious life, are apt to be supremely dedicated and one-pointed. Teaching, for such persons, is never simply a

means of gainful employment, but instead often becomes the very breath of life. Much of the energy public school teachers usually deploy into social, financial and marital channels is still bubbling around in religious devotees, and teaching is an outlet seemingly made to order. It offers the opportunity for gaining one's own salvation and that of the children at the same time. So Catholic teachers are apt to have their minds thoroughly on their jobs.

While we ought not to forget the other side of this picture—the fact that teachers consecrated in this particular way are hardly living well-balanced, normal, creative lives, but often tend, instead, to live vicariously on their contact with children—the matter of consecration or dedication *of itself* needs to be given thoughtful attention. For instance, while one can be all "for" married and marriageable teachers, it is also possible to see that no one should teach unless the process of teaching means so much that the *desire* to continue the calling, at least, will outlive marriage, providing circumstances permit. We cannot, of course, formally set up any such requirement, especially during the days of an acute shortage of teachers, but we can call attention to the fact that the best teachers will have a passion for their work. It is only this breed which is fitted to avoid the pitfall of emotional liking and disliking of particular children, a hazard as subtle as it is real in every schoolroom. The true teacher is "selfless" during instruction and, in a sense, certainly is thinking of each child as a "soul," regardless of appearance or propensity.

A recent Metropolitan Life Insurance bulletin on the health of teachers contains some interesting thoughts which are related to our present subject. Teachers' health, like health in general, is now seen to be more and more a psychological matter. The good teacher must be full of "teaching energy." This sort of energy can be dissipated in a thousand different ways—ways natural enough to "normal American living"—yet seldom are they on the program for Catholic instructors. The health

bulletin sums up the difficulties of energy conservation in a fast-moving society:

The continual adjustment of a mature mind to what is going on in each one of many immature minds is bound to consume nervous energy.

The need for teachers to do what they themselves can do to conserve their health is even greater than formerly, because recent events have tended to add to the teaching load and to multiply sources of annoyance and friction which are not subject to their control. The rise in the birth rate which began in 1940 caught many schools wholly unprepared to meet the tidal wave of new pupils who began entering school five or six years later. This tidal wave is now approaching the secondary schools. There have not been enough teachers entering the profession to balance the increase in the number of children entering school. School buildings are antiquated and classes are overcrowded in many communities; aids to teaching are often woefully inadequate. To the strain of teaching larger classes is added the tension which arises when teachers see their ideals being sacrificed on the altar of mass education.

Teachers, however, have an excellent record in some respects. Statistics reveal that the death rates of school teachers are consistently among the lowest recorded for any occupation. There must be something about the profession of teaching the young which aids in what the health bulletin calls "replenishing vitality," and which is subsequently explained:

The fresh approach of young minds to new material is a constant joy to healthy, well-adjusted teachers. They have within themselves a little spring which continuously wells up to replenish their reservoirs of physical energies and intellectual and spiritual enthusiasms. Healthy bodies and minds possess lavish reserves of strength and recuperative power. However, these margins of safety have not been provided to permit waste. As the years go by, they are needed to compensate for the normal wear and tear of living. They can be conserved by a sensible regard for health practices that permit body and mind to replenish depleted stores of energy.

A good teacher seems instinctively to know something about this process. A good teacher wants to be "fit to teach," because he feels a direct

responsibility for the mental and psychological welfare of the children entrusted to him. Perhaps the very "sense of responsibility" tends to drive away illness and assists in the conservation of energy, both physical and mental. And perhaps it is this Sense of Responsibility which is the most important heritage a teacher can pass on, in turn, to a pupil. Yet it is doubtful whether this sense of responsibility, flowing from *spontaneous* dedication, can ever be equalled by those who conceive duty and responsibility in rigid theological terms. Thus we think it will always be that the most easily applied external disciplines can never carry quite where we want to have our children taken, even though, admittedly, they may take them *somewhere* in a hurry.

FRONTIERS Patriot and Liberal

ONE may easily overlook the spirit of international understanding which is sought as a matter of course by the men who shape the policies of the great universities of the world. Recently, in reading a slender volume from England by J. C. J. Metford, the thought occurred that no one, surely, would ever publish such a book as a "business proposition." Nor would anyone ever write it out of a hunger for gold or glory. Yet this book, *San Martín, the Liberator*, is an important one to read. It unfolds the dramatic struggle for freedom of nearly half a hemisphere, and North Americans—people who revere the name of George Washington as the "Father" of the United States—will probably be surprised to learn that Argentina, Chile, and Peru all look back upon a single military hero of equal greatness, equal republican integrity, and equal moral stature.

The author of the book is a professor in the Department of Hispanic Studies, University of Glasgow. His first visit to Argentina was a part of the (London) Hudson Institute's plan "to send out British University men to Argentina and Uruguay in an endeavor to develop a new movement in cultural relations with them." The spirit of the undertaking is well put in the Foreword by Eugen Millington-Drake, chairman of the Hudson Institute:

It is my sincere hope that the interest and utility of the present biography at this time [1950—the centenary of San Martín's death] will draw the attention of the authorities in Argentina, and indeed all other Latin-American countries, to the need for inviting to their own countries a few university lecturers and highly-qualified graduates for serious study. In addition to being a gesture of reciprocity for the scholarships regularly given by the British Council and others to Latin-American graduates for study in Britain during the last ten years, it would greatly add to the interest taken in Latin-American affairs by the British public, and would lead to more

serious and satisfactory studies of the history and development of these friendly countries.

Cynics may grant that such arrangements are usually made "with an eye to trade," but there are easier ways to drum up business than publishing the fruits of painstaking research. The genuine scholar, like the genuine artist, in our civilization, should be acknowledged as an uncompromised and a disinterested man. That scholars and artists—and even true patriots, as the life of San Martín will show—are seldom honored by our civilization gives no excuse for minimizing their importance. Conceivably, they are two reasons, among a total of very few, which make our civilization tolerable at all.

But who was San Martín? Briefly, he was an Argentine *criollo* (of Spanish blood, American born) who was sent to Madrid as a boy to be trained as a soldier, his active service beginning when he was only fifteen. After twenty years in the Spanish army, for reasons not altogether clear he went home to Argentina and joined the forces of the Revolution. In any event, he had somehow become an ardent believer in republican government. The Spanish colonists in Argentina had set up a provisional government of their own in 1810, and when San Martín arrived in Buenos Aires early in 1812 he was given 300 Indians to make into an army.

We hold no brief for military discipline, but if you are going to have an army, it might as well be a good one. San Martín's army was good:

Any officer who failed to measure up to San Martín's high standards was dismissed. "I want only lions in my regiment," he proclaimed. He lived for the day when he would dispel any armed threat to the independence of the United Provinces of La Plata, as the former Viceroyalty came to be called, . . .

San Martín's great opportunity came several years later, when he led a highly trained military force across the Andes—an exploit which has been compared to Hannibal's crossing the Alps—and descended upon Chile, where he drove out the Spanish in a series of encounters, then marched

South, and, with the naval aid of Admiral Cochran, liberated Peru as well. San Martín believed that Argentina would never be safe from reconquest by the Spanish until their strongholds in Chile and Peru were eliminated. This done, he retired. His eminence, however, was such that he could not live in South America in peace, and he escaped the jealous suspicions of his countrymen only by returning to Europe, where he lived out his years in almost abject poverty. Philip Guedalla says of San Martín:

His retirement was the greatest victory that man can achieve, for it was a victory over himself. . . . The resignation of San Martín is one of the most singular events in all history. . . . If San Martín was a great soldier he also had in him something of a saint.

The quality of the man is hinted at in the account of a British observer, Captain Basil Hall, who interviewed San Martín on the eve of the victory in Peru. Hall writes:

The contest in Peru, he [San Martín] said, was not of an ordinary description—not a war of conquest and glory, but entirely of opinion; it was a war of new and liberal principles, against prejudice, bigotry and tyranny. "People ask," said San Martín, "why I don't march to Lima at once; so I might, and instantly would, were it suitable to my views—which it is not. I do not want military renown.—I have no ambition to be the conqueror of Peru—I want solely to liberate the country from oppression. Of what use would Lima be to me if the inhabitants were hostile in political principles? How could the cause of independence be advanced by my holding Lima, or even the whole country, in military possession? Far different are my views. I wish to have all men thinking with me and to not choose to advance a step beyond the gradual march of public opinion. . . . The country has now become sensible of its true interests and it is right the inhabitants should have the means of expressing what they think. Public opinion is an engine newly introduced into this country; the Spaniards, who are utterly incapable of directing it, have prohibited its use; but they shall now experience its strength and importance."

So San Martín waited at the gates of Lima. Finally, the Spanish Viceroy went away, taking his government and his troops with him. San Martín scored a bloodless victory. Further, he refused to

advance unless the citizens would declare their independence. They did so, and San Martín's men marched into the city on July 9, 1821. Mr. Metford puts the sequel simply:

San Martín delayed his own entry until July 12th but modestly declined to enter in state. Instead, in the evening of that day, and attended only by an aide-de-camp, he rode quietly into the city, content in the knowledge that he had reached his goal.

Of San Martín's disillusionment with the countries he liberated, of the abuses of the freedom he brought, we leave Mr. Metford to tell. The striking thing about this man is his absolute devotion to liberal principles, his freedom from all pettiness, and his great practical ability for what he set out to do. His life is a heart-warming chapter in the story of man's emancipation from man.