VOLUME IV, NO. 21
MAY 23, 1951

TRIPLE ALLIANCE

FOR reasons that are not really obscure, but require some reflection to establish, the men who have been most active in humanitarian and social movements during the past hundred years have shown little or no interest in transcendental theories of human nature. Their revolt has always been against social and economic injustice—and, it is true, against theological tyranny over the human mind—but the tyranny of a low estimate of human individuality has not seemed important to them.

Marxists, for example, sought alliances with Darwinism and with Freud. The materialism of the Marxist is not only candid and explicit; it is also supremely contemptuous of any view of man which suggests he may be more than a highly developed physiological organism. The same general analysis applies, if in lesser degree, to socialists and liberals of various persuasions. In years past, the member of reformist or revolutionary groups who confessed to "metaphysical" leanings was mercilessly ridiculed by his comrades, it often being suggested that he was subject to softening of the brain, and in danger of "selling out" to the socio-ecomonic status quo. The theory was that a man who will allow himself to think in terms of "soul," who will take seriously the possibility of immortality, or is willing to ponder the mysteries of clairvoyance, telepathy, and other psychical phenomena, is a man who gives tacit if not outspoken support to the churches—and the churches, as "everyone" knows, are firm supporters of the class society and reap the benefits of the capitalist system of exploitation.

The Darwinists had their own complaints against the churches, although on somewhat different grounds. As scientists, they were concerned with freedom of thought in scientific investigation. The early nineteenth-century opposition to the theorists of evolution arose from the school of geologists known as the Catastrophists. The background of their contention was that if God created the world, "He" did it, according to the Bible account, in something of a hurry (six days, to be exact), and this meant that geological history would have to be interpreted in a way that would allow for extraordinarily sudden changes. The evolutionists, on the other hand, maintained that Nature takes her time in fabricating a universe or a planet. They claimed that the evidence was on the side of Gradualism in the becoming of the earth, thus placing themselves, it seemed, on the side of the unbelievers in religion. This basic controversy raged throughout the last half of the nineteenth century, and one of its notable results was that modern biological science, as much from its struggle with dogmatic religion as from any other cause, developed in a strongly materialistic atmosphere.

The Freudians, coming a little later, had similar tussles with religious orthodoxy. The hush-hush policy of conventional society on the subject of sex soon made men like Havelock Ellis and Freud into virtual heroes of the freethinking minority. The idea of the "soul" was for them a symbol of hypocrisy, fear, and blind belief. So, again, materialism became the banner of liberty of thought, in the psychological as well as the biological and social sciences. And how could any up-and-coming individual, filled with progressive thoughts and high social purposes, do other than frown upon the lingering effects of medieval superstition, such as belief in "spirits," a hankering after immortality, or an interest in psychic research?

In consequence of these broad tendencies, free-thinking in *religion* was driven underground by the two-fold opposition of both religious and

scientific orthodoxy, while a kind of psychological isolationism claimed the specialists in science and in the social movements of the time. Only within the past decade or so has there been any serious attempt on the part of scientists to link psychological problems with social problems—an endeavor which has grown out of the writings of a handful of pioneers in the fields of psychiatry and psychoanalysis. Meanwhile, the transformation of the only successful political movement founded on materialistic assumptions, the Communist Revolution, into a system of unparalleled oppression and reaction, has made any further free development along similar lines practically impossible.

One result of psychological isolationism toward any department of human experience is a lush growth of extravagant theory in the ignored field, developed mostly by undisciplined enthusiasts and rebels against learned denials. Anti-intellectualism always thrives outside the pale of any sort of academic or scientific orthodoxy, opening great fissures in the unity of culture and winning the grateful support of the lazily obtuse. In time, a runaway, wildcat, pseudo-science for the masses springs up along the margins of conventional learning and science, and competes vigorously with the stodgy academic doctrines. Visit any newsstand for the evidence, There are scores of magazines dealing with astrology, New Thought, and other semi-occult subjects, while scientific journals are seldom found on the stands at all. The United States, and the Pacific Coast in particular, is filled with prophets, performers, traveling hypnotists, mediums and both long- and short-haired revealers of new revelations. These eager seers and "yogis" of the West have filled the gaping emptiness left by academic psychology, biology, anthropology, and the social theorists and reformers, in the modern explanation of human experience. They have filled it with superficial pap and useless mumbo-jumbo, for the most part, but their great activity and often obvious sincerity are enough to suggest that, while what they say and do may have little meaning, the gap they are trying to fill is very real indeed.

A good illustration of the type of periodical that has risen to almost immediate success by catering to the human longing for psychic knowledge is the magazine, *Fate*, now in its fourth volume. In a recent issue of *Fate*, "The Astounding Jim Walker," a Texas telepathist of considerable local fame, tells how he convinced Dr. George McClenahan of the University of Texas Department of psychology that telepathy is a fact in nature. Walker was challenged by McClenahan to read the latter's mind. One day, while the two were discussing over the telephone the project of testing Walker's powers, Walker proposed that the psychologist hold in mind three words he had selected and told to no one else:

> I asked him to think [Walker recounts], to concentrate, and to mentally spell out the three words. We were separated by some 70 miles, but I began to receive definite letter impressions in my brain.
>
> Obviously, Dr. McClenahan had powerful mental resources. I asked the doctor to continue to concentrate. There was silence and a period of waiting. Finally I had written three words on my pad. I did not recognize the words; so I spelled them to McClenahan. There was a whoop at the other end of the line and a shout of, "My God, man, you did it!"
>
> I smiled dully and slowly replaced the receiver on the cradle. I looked down at the three words I had received by thought waves. They were, PISIFORM, CUNEFORM, and TRAPEZIUM. I later found that these were names for bones in the human hand! After a few days, a letter arrived from McClenahan confirming the results of the foregoing experiment. (This letter was reproduced in *Fate* for December, 1950.)

Thus, another academician was won for ESP and the reality of psychic phenomena. But what a bizarre routine to go through to establish powers of mind which have been known and practiced for centuries without number, in all parts of the world!

The fact, however, is that modern psychology, both in England and the United States, has for nearly twenty years been pursuing

experiments in telepathy and other forms of psychism. Conceivably, in the science of tomorrow, the abyss between popular culture and serious scientific inquiry into the nature of man will be closed entirely. The work of Dr. J. B. Rhine, in particular, at Duke University, reveals an interest in man's life, not only as a psychological problem, but also for its philosophical implications. Last year, discussing the question of spirit-survival of death, in the Myers Memorial Lecture sponsored by the London Society for Psychical Research, Dr. Rhine made these observations:

> . . . the ineffectual efforts . . . to prove spirit communication through mediumship overlook two crucial needs: First, the need to appraise the messages objectively, to escape uncontrolled variables of bias and error in judgment. Second, the need to know the extent of the natural psychic powers of the medium herself (telepathy, clairvoyance, precognition, etc.) so as to know what might be considered to have come from other agencies.
>
> Bogged down as survival research has evidently been, there is no chance for its resumption on old lines. True, new methods of objective appraisal of verbal material are now available, and much more is known of the reach of the medium's own personal powers. But we still do not know how to do a crucial experiment bearing on the hypothesis of spirit agency. This situation is due mainly to our ignorance as yet of whether there is a distinctive spiritual division of personality, or merely certain spiritual powers that function (as they do extraphysically in our ESP tests) only during the living interaction of the body-mind unit.
>
> Our lessons of the past would teach us to steer clear of entangling theologies and speculative hypotheses, and start out right here where we now are on the research front to follow up what leads we have toward differentiating between the physical and nonphysical. Given sufficient success we will, of course, find what we all want to know—just how much of a distinct mind, or soul, or spirit man has, and what its powers and destiny are if it does show a degree of separability or at least of distinctiveness. . . . Our objective is not to try to prove survival, rather it is to discover how far personality is independent of physics and where that interrelationship really takes us, when followed up. . . .

There is reason to think that we are gradually approaching an end to the formal denial of psychical phenomena by the academic world. The cautious reconsideration of such powers as telepathy, clairvoyance, and precognition by such investigators as Dr. Rhine may do much to reclaim psychic discovery from the fields of entertainment and new religious cults, and thus gradually establish a new body of scientific theory on the nature of man. The direction that this thinking may take was suggested in an article in the New York *Times* for June 11 of last year. The writer, Prof. S. G. Soal, a mathematician of the university of London, recounts the progress made in psychic research in recent years, giving also a generalized theory of explanation:

> The only explanation for the whole subject of telepathy which seems at all plausible was made by the late W. Whately Carington, a noted psychical researcher, who based it on the phenomenon of the association of ideas. Carington said that, although our conscious minds are more or less isolated units, our subconscious minds are not. When people engage in a telepathic experiment, he reasoned, their minds behave, for the time being, as though they were a single mind. And, in this joint mind, the law of association operates as it always does.
>
> From this, it follows that people who are acquainted with each other and who have common interests and associations are more likely to reach success in an experiment than are people who are total strangers: they have more numerous "association objects" in their conscious minds which serve to recall the image out of the joint subconscious.

Already, Prof. Soal reports, about half the educated section of the American public believes that telepathy takes place, and he adds that in England the proportion is probably higher. The basic question, however, is, what can we do with this newly-acknowledged power? What is it "for"? Perhaps its principal value, at present, is as evidence of a new dimension in human consciousness—hinting at hidden potentialities of mind and soul for every human being. Then there is the question of our psychic unity, at whatever level of our being that telepathy takes place. Is this some sort of Emersonian Over Soul? We

doubt it, for the "subconscious," whatever it contains, is hardly the *highest* aspect of human nature.

In any event, the social movements of the future will very likely take account of these new-found powers of the human being. Either the promise of further psychological potentialities will give greater breadth to our conception of the dignity of the individual, or it will open up new channels of psychological exploitation and oppression. We have often noted in these pages the exhaustion of the liberal inspiration of the past, and the need for new roots of idealism. If these tendencies in psychic research have the significance that we are proposing, then tomorrow's revolutionary credo will represent a dramatic break with the familiar materialistic humanitarian doctrines of the past. We seem to be gradually reaching more deeply into the realities of human nature, with the result that future theories of man are destined to be far more powerful for either good or evil. A revolution which acknowledges the reality of subjective man, and attempts to give this side of human nature definition, will be very close to proposing a new religious philosophy. Scientists like Dr. Rhine may try to avoid this crucial development, but the implications are there, and will surely be made use of.

Eventually, it seems to us, the problem of human freedom will take on an almost entirely psychological and metaphysical significance, and the questions of Deity, Immortality, and Moral Independence will then become intensely practical problems for every human being.

Letter from GERMANY

BERLIN.—When after the war the new regime in Czecho-Slovakia expelled the German-speaking minority from the Sudetan Mountains (about three million people), one of the probably unforeseen consequences was a considerable lack of manpower. It became necessary, therefore, to attempt to draw women into the factories, to lessen their housework by modern facilities, and to increase the general efficiency of labor. It is interesting that propaganda plays were written for this purpose, and one of them, *Brigade Karhan*, by Vazek Kana, has found its way into the Eastern sector of Berlin.

The time is 1948, the first year of Czecho-Slovakia's Five Year Plan. Karhan is a grinder in a "people's-owned factory" in Prague and "has not the clear political consciousness" of his son, working in the same factory. (One wonders why. Whereas Karhan has gone through the school of unionism and fought many battles for higher wages and shorter working hours, his son had only the opportunity to be stupefied by the Nazi occupation and to be imbued with propaganda thereafter. "Clear political consciousness"—it follows—can only be acquired by moderate experience and by willingly submitting to indoctrination.)

Brigade Karhan demonstrates the victory of the young over the resisting old workers; finally the old ones give up their opposition against modern forms of exploitation of their manpower and unite together with the young ones to fulfill the Five Year Plan.

This fairy tale with educational purposes—its first presentations were before an audience of Berlin workers, given inside the factories—reveals a rather serious background worth discussing. We have mentioned the urgent need for manpower in Czecho-Slovakia; but the lack of manpower is the rule in all countries under Russian influence, and it is easy to understand that full employment together with security of jobs and scarcity of consumer goods fails to arouse the enthusiasm of the workers to give their all to their jobs. "Pep" talks, slogans, shows, and similar stimuli turn out to be necessary.

The big question-mark is the relation of the workers to their "own" factories. What do they feel towards them? Would it really be necessary to give propaganda shows, if they believed they worked in their "own" shops? Who will get the product the workers are making? To whom will go the benefits of huge efforts which once provoked the aggressive epithet, "exploitation"? At this decisive point the play showed its greatest weakness, of course. The workers are offered vague phrases promising that in the end all will be for their good. But we know that this is a big lie, for in all totalitarian countries heavy industry is abnormally developed, while the quantity of consumer goods will never be sufficient. The artificially increased efforts of the workmen go wholly into heavy industry, which industry, however, does not produce cars, refrigerators, radios, but ordnance, rails, machinery. The result is not a better standard of life, but the broad technical foundation for the industrial support of an outspoken power policy by Soviet Russia.

Whereas in all old industrial nations, the early phase of industrialization started with light industry (especially in textiles), Soviet Russia and her satellites start with the building of heavy industry. This kind of industrialization therefore assumes a character which might be called "misanthropic" (hostile to mankind), because of its utter disregard of everyday human needs. To disguise this character, a brand new and special "ideology of production" is required, which we have before us in all Eastern totalitarian countries, with their slogans and "X-Years-Plans," "people's-owned shops," and shows like ***Brigade Karhan.*** This new ideology bears some likeness to conventional religion: a better life is promised only for the unknown future.

GERMAN CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW
QUARTER KALEIDOSCOPE

READERS of this Department can hardly fail to have noted the many reviews devoted to twenty-five-cent novel reprints. The usefulness of the "pocket" editions in bringing a number of excellent books within the reach of every drug-store and newsstand customer seems to us to have been emphatically demonstrated. War novels such as *The Young Lions, The Steeper Cliff, Call it Treason,* and *Mr. Roberts* are often excellent points of departure for social reflections. A particularly valuable book dealing with mental illness was featured in a lead article some months ago—*The World Next Door,* by Fritz Peters. Crime and delinquency problems have had their share of comment through reprints of such books as Ira Wolfert's *The Underworld* and Willard Motley's *Knock on Any Door.* George R. Stuart's book *Fire* combines originality with useful instruction. Howard Fast's *Freedom Road,* Sinclair Lewis' *Kingsblood Royal,* James Weldon Johnson's *The Autobiography of an ex-Colored Man,* Richard Wright's *Black Boy,* and Worth Tuttle Hedden's *The Other Room* give fresh and unusual insights into the "race problem."

Publishers such as Signet-Mentor take pride in their determination to "carry" a number of truly excellent volumes, with the inevitable effect of reducing their rate of profits from the more sensational literature. Thus have Arthur Koestler and Ignazio Silone come to the drug stores; also, many of the classics, including *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey.* In other words, if one is thoughtfully selective, the availability of such inexpensive literature can only be praised. It seems clear to us, too, that the majority of casual magazine readers can make several steps on the way to psychological maturity by substituting full-length books for the short stories to which America is especially addicted. Even when a novel or biography is a very poor one, inspired by attitudes, motives or philosophies in need of reproach, the reader has a better chance to sum up the entire impression and to compare it with other works of greater merit; the magazine-short-stories reader, on the contrary, has little encouragement to comparative evaluation, his impressions being of necessity brief and fragmentary.

But if one is to praise the comparatively few good books available for a quarter, a certain obligation is also assumed for noticing other characteristics encountered in the majority of volumes. The backbone of the paperbound industry is murder and detective stories, plus shoot-'em-dead Westerns. Erskine Caldwell, who is reported to have made $175,000 in royalties on the sale of six million books, has, so far as we know, produced only one which can be, by a slight stretch of the imagination, regarded as contributing to understanding of the South's problems. Despite his great literary reputation, we find ourselves feeling the same way about William Faulkner, with the reservation that *Intruder in the Dust* was an exceptionally fine volume.

It is expected that 225,000,000 paper-covered books will be produced in the United States in 1951, and this may turn out to be a conservative estimate. The general public can obviously use some education in respect to this new flood of literature. Certainly the covers, almost universally featuring physiology, either male or female, provide the unsophisticated reader no clue as to their content. Even *The Damon Runyon Story* and P. G. Wodehouse's *Uncle Dynamite,* volumes entirely devoid of sensational sex interest, have lurid jackets.

Our suggestion for evaluation of these books is simple. While we do not mean to naively claim that such a yardstick is original, it still seems a good beginning to ask: *Is the philosophy and attitude of the author affirmative? Is he writing with any desire at all to increase the enlightenment of his fellowmen? Is he in favor of human evolution?*

A great many authors who sell a great many volumes do not qualify. Plot after plot is

saturated with the negative outlook. The erotic novels of Vivian Connell, beginning with *The Chinese Room*, are mere sensual excitations. Little if any instructiveness will be found in the brutally fascinating works of James M. Cain. We can find nothing good to say for ninety-nine percent of the murder and detective efforts, those peculiarly popular opiates which make people happy that they themselves are not at present particularly murderous, perverted, or likely to be murdered. Most of the Westerns have no psychological content whatsoever, and deal out second-hand violence to an audience haunted by repressed hostility.

The out-of-balance character portraits of some of these books are supposed to be of "psychological" or "social" value. Remembering Dostoevsky, we have no desire to preach wholesale against plots revolving around perverted personalities. The ones we will preach against are simply those, completely unoriginal, which are pervaded by an atmosphere of hopelessness and without any valuable insights. Usually, we see a human being caught in the toils of hereditary and environmental influences over which no real control is imagined as even theoretically possible. Intentionally, it seems, no opportunity for heroism or originality is left in such a character. Readers who absorb enough of such volumes will, perhaps, cease to believe that heroism or originality ever really existed in human history. Books permeated by the atmosphere of hopelessness could be listed, reaching well up into the hundreds. One coming immediately to mind is Alberto Moravia's *Woman of Rome*, although more can be said of the "social significance" of this book than of Theodore Pratt's *The Tormented*. (This latter volume, a "Gold Medal" offering, bears the special endorsement of a "renowned New York psychiatrist" who assures prospective readers that Mr. Pratt's recital of the adventures of a "nymphomaniac" has great clinical value! But the book, to our way of thinking, deals only with humdrum self-indulgence in customary tabloid style. All Gold Medal jackets, incidentally, are masterpieces of brash salesmanship. They carry a pictured medal, suggesting that the book, probably third-rate, has won a literary award.)

All the books which imply that the only beauty or drama of life is to be found in sensual experience may summarily be pronounced bad, for this denies what we naturally hope of man. The *positive* approach to human experience flows from a feeling or conviction that there is a "higher life," a bit beyond, though not necessarily antagonistic to, that of the senses. Powerful and capable young writers such as Howard Hunt and Frederic Wakeman seem tarred by this "negativistic" brush, although Wakeman's characters are happier company and for that very reason actually more instructive and encouraging.

Last December's issue of *Tomorrow* featured an informative article, "The Quarter Books," by Robert Shaplen, to which our present comments may be regarded as supplementary, or vice versa. One thing that Shaplen proves beyond doubt is that quarter books are here to stay; they will never be given up by the populace of the United States. Here is his computation of the factors of our commercialized culture:

> There are 500,000,000 comic books printed annually in the U.S. Seventy million Americans go to the movies each week. Radios, in the thirty-four million homes that have them, are turned on three hours a day. It is still too early to gauge the effects of television, but one survey found that school children watch it twenty-seven hours a week.
>
> Still too often a book that was at least seriously received by the critics will be slugged in reprint with such enticing phrases as "His wife let him go to the tropics to learn how to love," "The story of a woman on the loose," or "When this woman loves, anything can happen." The big houses have been re-doing some of their old books in new dress. Steinbeck's *Cannery Row*, when Bantam first published it several years ago, had a slightly stylized cover showing three men watching the small, adequately dressed figure of a girl in the street below. There was no blurb. Now the three men are in the background and the girl has been blown up. . . . and the blurb reads: "The street where love comes easy." Bantam, incidentally, has

offered a large-size print of one of its best jackets for $2.50, to be framed for the home.

Shaplen's article, by the way, also calls attention to a matter of educational interest—the series of heated debates presently going on in respect to the paper libraries, reporting that, "part of the latest examination for college scholarships in New York state high schools was devoted to a question of the meaning of pocket books as a cultural medium."

There is only one thing to do about the pocket books, and that is to learn how to use them, by learning how to evaluate them. In order to do either, we submit, one has to become a philosopher. Here, the pocket books will not, as yet, help us. Philosophy is neither popular nor commercial, therefore a very rare commodity. But one *can* philosophize about full-scale volumes, discuss and compare them and possibly gradually arrive at a wider and more enlightened perspective. And the quarter books at least have definite advantages over television. We defy even philosophers to make much of the latter.

COMMENTARY
FAITH OF OPINIONS

OFFHAND we would say that a man with convictions is bound to be effective. There is no contagion like enthusiasm, and no technique of persuasion can match straight sincerity and open avowal. Yet we sometimes wonder. The fanatic is unquestionably impressive, but if it is the fanaticism which attracts attention, rather than the beliefs held, we could hardly recommend the technique. An idea salesman, a propagandist, has a measurable influence, also, but how many of his audience are merely lost in contemplation of his facility? The child's ingenuous credo may touch the heart—or the sentiments—but we do not for a moment imagine that the notion so innocently advanced is necessarily a true one. We conclude that sincerity, conviction, and enthusiasm may be indispensable, and valuable in themselves, but these high personal qualities do not guarantee a transfer of certainty.

According to ancient proverb, "The man who reasons without learning is in great danger, but the man who learns without reasoning, is lost." What is presented—whether with fervor, faith, showmanship, or artlessness—must recommend itself to our reason, our judgment, and since the power of judgment is highly specialized in each individual, having been developed in terms of the experiences peculiar, in their aggregate, to himself alone, there is no formula for appealing to that power. While men in general are moved by certain standard appeals, the precise influence of one or another cannot be calculated, any more than the exact interpretation and application which the individual will make of impressions received can be assessed in advance.

This unfathomable power of judgment may be at times a handicap, for who would contend that his private fund of experience is complete and completely understood, so as to constitute him an *infallible* court of appeal? Still, the inviolable process of forming one's own opinion is perhaps the last frontier of personal integrity. We may be wrong, we may be ignorant, misinformed, or prejudiced and we may be committed to a gigantic logical fallacy, but it is well to have formed our opinion, consciously or not, on the basis of our own notions and our own experience. Then, when we change, if we change, it will be the result of an added perception or a subtracted error: not, and never, wholly the result of overt or subtle interference from some outside source.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

PARENTS who, either by way of spontaneous interest or by way of conscientiousness, endeavor to familiarize themselves with the technical writings of educators, will inevitably have many difficult times in relating abstract discussions to the immediate personal problems which confront them. One worth-while educational journal of the present time is the quarterly, *Measure.* Robert Hutchins is chairman of the *Measure* editorial board, and certainly the articles to be found in *Measure* are given to intellectual abstraction. But we may often discover that examination of the fundamental principles involved in the educational dilemmas of our time is the best preparation for generating a few original ideas.

The spring issue of *Measure* contains an article by T. S. Eliot entitled "The Aims of Education," which provides a good opportunity for parents or teachers to exercise their capacity for reasoning from universals to particulars. Mr. Eliot, of course, is not so much concerned with advancing a particular educational credo as with bringing logical clarification to the complex phases of "education" in the modern world. His opening paragraph, borrowing from C. E. M. Joad, summarizes the "three aims of education":

> The professional, or, in the humblest way of putting it, training to earn a living; the social, or, in Dr. Joad's way of putting it, preparation for citizenship, and the individual, or, in Matthew Arnold's way of putting it, the pursuit of perfection. But we cannot define education as merely the *sum* of these three activities; for if the term "education" is to cover all three and not be wholly applicable to any one of them separately, we must appreciate some relationship, or rather some mutual implication, between them, such that each, while it may still be called education, is not the whole of education by itself.

There is nothing pertaining to education of greater present importance, as we see it, than learning how to integrate man's "pursuit of perfection" with his earning of a livelihood and with his political or social ideals. We have had more than one question from readers—some from youths presently concerned with whether or not they have to subordinate the "pursuit of perfection" to occupational routines—on the great difficulty of feeling that any conventional work is sufficiently worth-while to make it a lifetime business. The trend towards specialization has become something of a downhill rush during our most recent years of militarization and industrial expansion.

Most young people know that they can live more *conveniently* if they attach themselves to a huge corporation. Their work will be less arduous, surer, and probably better paid than would be the case if they ventured into more interesting and challenging fields. But unless or at least until one has decided to follow a line of least resistance, there is usually some awareness of how difficult it has become to be economically successful at the same time. Many know enough to dislike the routinization to which their capacities are likely to be subjected in any given field of business or even art. Original thinkers with aspirations of their own are needed in all fields, as will be abstractly granted by anyone, but what we must investigate are the ways in which originality and independence can be encouraged from earliest childhood. For, unless such independence is asserted when a person is young, a man's creative qualities may never reach beyond being merely "potential." Both our choice of livelihood and our conception of "perfection" are too easily determined by the kinds of activity favored or discouraged by the society in which the individual finds himself.

One of the serious deficiencies in modern society is the almost total lack of opportunity for children to share with their parents any of the work that the parents do. Yet it is from that work that the child derives his daily sustenance. If his father works as a chemist for a large corporation, or as a bank clerk, or, in fact, in any capacity at all save that of a farmer or fisherman, the child learns

nothing of what "work" is. He grows up on recreational rather than productive activities, and though he knows that he will some day have to "work," he is most apt to think of future employment chiefly as his opportunity for proving a hoped-for superiority in winning financial rewards. Though our heavily equipped schools may offer many opportunities for learning the theory of engineering, of medicine, law, journalism, etc., these opportunities are also surrounded, during the school years, with the aura of competition and, what is more important, no actual work is done.

The child-parent relationship in all such instances has insufficient organic connectedness in everyday life. We know of only one recommendation to make, which is derived from a personal theory developed and successfully practiced by Arthur E. Morgan. Dr. Morgan held that every man should have not one occupation, but two. Ideally, the man or woman who works long hours apart from not only his child's presence, but also from his child's capacity to understand the work the parents do, should have some other means of gainful employment in which the child can assist, or, at the very least, understand. Just as the farmer brought to his children the opportunity for developing an early sense of responsibility by apportioning a fair share of remuneration for their small labors, so may each parent have an obligation to initiate his child into the real meaning of productive work.

But what is an airlines or a factory employee going to do, even if he grants the theoretical validity of this suggestion? Arthur Morgan's impulse toward having a secondary occupation derived from his desire to maintain some roots of independence, so that he would never be intimidated by fear of losing his position. This in itself must have been educational to Morgan's children, for they learned that the *man* was greater than whatever he happened to be doing. He could take or leave an occupation, being always prepared to shift his focus to another area. His beliefs or initiatives would not be overridden by the fear of losing his security. In such an approach we have a focus for the view which Mr. Eliot assures us must be taken by the intelligent man—that until we have learned to correlate a way of earning a living with our "pursuit of perfection," and with our social and political beliefs, we have not been educated.

FRONTIERS

Our Forty Years' War

MOST if not all the material appearing in MANAS on the American Indians has been drawn from distinctly pro-Indian sources. It is natural, therefore, to raise the question of whether or not there is "another side" to the story. What about setting aside Howard Fast's somewhat imaginative tale of *The Last Frontier*, and overlooking John Collier's manifest devotion to the American aborigines, for a more "realistic" account of the struggle between the two cultures? *Warpath and Council Fire*, by Stanley Vestal (Random House, 1948), is, we think, such a book. It is the story of the Plains Indians from 1851 to 1891—the story of "good shots, good riders, and the best fighters the sun ever shone on," as an American General, drawing on personal experience, described them. The Plains Indians, predominantly Sioux, are still eager for a fight. "Since when," the Sioux demanded, at the beginning of World War II, "has it been necessary to draft a Sioux to fight?" And the Southern Cheyennes claim that not a man of them was drafted, but that all volunteered for war service. As Mr. Vestal puts it:

> The Plains Indians understand war. They know all about teamwork for victory. In the old days they listened skeptically to white men who called them "Brothers," and the wars dragged on. But once the white man invited them to fight in his Army, peace was soon established. To the Plains Indians the word "Brother" had no meaning until it meant "Brother-in-Arms." The history of their struggle on the warpath and in council is a great American story.

The Plains Indians looked upon war as a kind of game. So do we, the headlines tell us. Journalese reports of the Korean war use the sporting language of competitive athletics to tell the folks at home what is happening at the front. But one of the reasons why the Plains Indians were defeated by the invading whites was that the Indians carried the "game" idea to impractical extremes. They fought for the pleasure of combat and glory. They might steal some horses from a neighboring tribe, but the wars between the Indians were not acquisitive struggles for possessions. The Indians would never fight for *land*, and that is what the white man fought the Indian for. The idea of "owning" land was almost incomprehensible to the Indians. This was particularly true of the Plains Indians. Masters of sudden attack, they would swoop down upon an enemy, "count coup" by touching the bodies of their antagonists, and ride away. Casualties in Indian battles were always few. They had no interest in genocide. That would spoil the "game." The Plains Indian, as Mr. Vestal relates,

> was no Pueblo, content to shine only in his own village. Never narrowly tribal, he was something of an internationalist, as his highly developed sign language shows. Much as he loved his own kin, he was forever visiting, trading, gambling, dancing, hunting, fighting, and intermarrying with people of other tribes. He might hunt in Canada one summer, and raid in Mexico the next; he might spend one winter in the Rockies and pass the next on the Missouri. He bitterly resented his confinement to a reservation, though it might contain eleven million acres. He was a great joiner always eager to display his talents before a larger audience, the limited prestige attainable in his own tribe had never been enough for him.
>
> Had our government made more appeal to this dominant trait by providing the tribesmen with better means of attaining prestige in the white man's world, the Plains Indians might have adopted our ways sooner and with less difficulty for all concerned. Instead, everything possible was done to humiliate them.
>
> Their religious ceremonies were suppressed; their hunting economy abolished; their political organization shattered; their marriage customs banned, their doctors forbidden to practice; their children carried away to distant schools where, having no written language, they could not communicate with their anxious parents at home; even their favorite foods were withheld; and they were told that they must become like white men—like their oppressors—*without delay.* This frightful tyranny was the work of idealists who called themselves the Indian's "friends," who only wished to do him good.

> It is a curious fact that the only dance the white men permitted the Sioux to keep up was the Victory or Scalp Dance, called by the whites the War Dance.
>
> Within a few years the Indian Bureau destroyed the culture of most of the tribes.

Mr. Vestal likes courage and integrity and enjoys writing about these qualities, but has no blinding sympathy for the Red Man. One massacre is as bad as another, in his view, and if at times he sounds "pro-Indian," this is simply because he is also pro-human. At other times, he manifests a warm regard for some of the American Army officers who tried to maintain peace along the frontier, and were prevented from being really effective by the meddling of civilian officials and the half-sentimental, half-corrupt policies of the Indian Bureau. The over-all picture, however, is the same as that obtained from other books. Admirers of Mr. Fast's *Last Frontier* will do well to turn to *Warpath and Council Fire* for the actual history of several of the events which Fast weaves into his story. The tragedy and betrayal are there; the simplicity of the chronicle cannot hide them.

Books about the Indians really present two problems. The first and most obvious consideration deals with the need for undoing, as best we can, the wrongs of the past. For those who wonder what is left of the Plains Indians and how they are faring, today, *Warriors without Weapons,* by Gordon MacGregor (University of Chicago Press, 1946) would be a good book to read. It is a part of the series of studies undertaken jointly by the University and the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs, in which *The Hopi Way*, by Laura Thompson and Alice Joseph, was also published. The purpose of this series is to discover, if possible, the best way of helping the American Indians to regain for themselves a constructive, normal way of life.

The second problem is more complex in that it involves subjective issues of both history and contemporary war psychology. "History," says Mr. Vestal, "shows that whenever a nation has no military power it has no influence." If this is a fact, and it seems to be, then what are its moral implications? The Sioux nation lost its power with its military influence; shall we say, then, that the Sioux had the misfortune to get in the way of the "wave of the future" that was rolling westward from 1851 to 1891? What would you have had the white settlers do? Among other things, the whites killed off the buffalo, on which the Indians lived. The Indian societies, therefore, were doomed sooner or later, unless they could change their way of living.

Mr. Vestal's book is helpful in getting the "feel" of the moral ideas of both the Plains Indians and the American frontier families. But after the feelings on both sides are better understood, there still remains the sense of a terrible dilemma. It is as though a kind of injustice was written in the stars, so far as the settling of the West was concerned. It is difficult to imagine anyone trying to roll back that wave of surging population, traveling westward in wagon trains. It is difficult to imagine the Indians welcoming them in peace, so long as the settlers, without exactly wanting or intending to, were certain to make it impossible for the Indians to continue with their accustomed way of life.

There were those who tried to explain to the Indians the futility of resisting with arms the white invasion. But the Indians, especially the young braves, were "unreasonable." They preferred to die fighting. Suppose the United States was now invaded by some alien breed from another planet, and that a few kindly spirits among the "aggressors" took the trouble to explain to us that their weapons were superior, their culture more powerful, their forces resistless in the long run—wouldn't we be "unreasonable," too?

And where would the "right" and "wrong" lie, in this case? The invaders, we may postulate, are not natively "evil" men. It is simply that some inner law of their own development has compelled them to expand from one planet to another—like travelling from Massachusetts or Ohio to Kansas

or Montana or South Dakota to find new lands. There is a logic with which such questions may be met, and Mr. Vestal reproduces it for consideration:

> Probably no American now wishes to give the Plains back to the Indian, although many have an uneasy feeling that the Indian has received a raw deal. Yet it may be argued: (1) that we legally acquired the Plains country by purchase from the French and by cession from the Mexicans; (2) that, at the time of the Louisiana Purchase (1803), many of the Plains tribes had not yet occupied the lands which we afterward paid them for; (3) that the Indians themselves had acquired their lands on the Plains by the recent conquest of weaker tribes; (4) that the Indians had acknowledged our supremacy in repeated treaties and afterward rebelled against it; (5) that in spite of having acquired title to the Indian lands from powers which had previously held them, our government also paid the Indians for the lands it took and has since spent huge sums for Indian relief, free education, medical care and other benefits; and (6) that the result has been a loyalty to the United States on the part of our Indians far more complete even than that of the Filipinos.

The obvious answer to these contentions is that the Indians didn't see it that way. They couldn't. Their way of life, barbarous, perhaps, in some respects, made it impossible for them to think in these terms; so they succumbed to the nation which had more "military power," and consequently more "influence."

So far as we can see, the only conceivable justification for what happened to the Indians lies in the doctrine that something "great and thrilling" was happening on this continent—a destiny was unfolding, called "manifest destiny" by some, and that the Indians made their contribution by being displaced. But what about this doctrine? Do we still believe in it? Can death, indignity and destruction be assuaged by a great historical evolution? Does the incineration of a Korean village—a little village caught between *two* great "historical evolutions" contending against each other—contribute to the glory of either one?

Are we, in short, willing that innocent people should die for us, to make our future more secure—to guarantee that this "destiny" of ours, of which we are so proud, will continue for the sake of our children, and our children's children?

The historical justification of genocide seems to us a strange doctrine for the believers in democracy and the sanctity of the individual to preach.