

DILEMMAS OF A FREE SOCIETY

IN March, 1945, Robert H. Scott, of Palo Alto, California, petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to revoke the licenses of three broadcasting stations, one in San Jose, two in San Francisco, for refusing to give or sell him time to broadcast his talks on atheism. Claiming that the existence of a Divine Being is a controversial issue of some importance, Mr. Scott asserted that these stations, by barring from the air the atheist side of the argument, were "not operating in the public interest," as the Communications Act requires.

It came as no great surprise, some sixteen months later, that the Commission denied the petition. But the Opinion of the Commission in commenting on the issue—"lest," it was explained, the "denial of Mr. Scott's petition be misconstrued"—examined in some detail the implications of the constitutional provisions for freedom of religion and freedom of speech. The views expressed in this Opinion were such that a House of Representatives Resolution authorized a Select Committee to investigate the Federal Communications Commission, to determine whether or not its activities accorded "with law and the public interest." Apparently, it was feared that a foundation had been laid in this decision for the granting of similar petitions by atheists in the future. The Commission had said, in effect, that Mr. Scott was right in his argument, that the broadcasting stations were wrong, and that the petition was denied only because the problem was "far broader in scope than the particular stations here involved. . . ."

The particular fears of the Investigating Committee are made plain in its interim report, communicated to Congress in September of this year. If the Scott decision were strictly enforced, the members of the Committee said,

it would have the effect of either driving religious programs from the air or flooding the homes

of listeners with a barrage of unwelcome attacks on religion. Broadcasters normally carry programs of the three leading religious groups on their stations. If the dictum contained in the Scott decision were literally applied, atheists would be entitled to answer each Protestant, Catholic or Jewish program. Thus, though numerically infinitesimal, the apostles of unbelief would have as many programs as were given to all the religious groups combined. To avoid that effect, the broadcasters could only solve their dilemma by refusing to accept any religious programs. This obviously would be advantageous only to the atheists and to the Communists. For any method or means that blocks the words of God, the enemy of these groups, is a victory for their cause of Godlessness.

The report anticipates that under this decision millions of children listeners might be exposed to a "vortex of blasphemous attacks on religion" coming over the air, while elderly persons would find their declining years haunted by inconsiderate criticisms of "the very principles which had guided them throughout their lives." One witness heard by the committee further contended that, to be consistent with the Scott decision, the Federal Government would have to remove "In God we trust" from the coins of the realm, provide atheist chapels at West Point and Annapolis, and either abolish all denominational chaplains in the Armed Services or supply atheist "chaplains" as well. The Investigating Committee also complained that the decision of the Commission was "unintelligible."

If the Committee had called the decision "distasteful" to its members, the designation would have been more accurate. We found the analysis easy enough to understand, and of particular value in developing the meaning of the Constitution as to freedom of religion and freedom of speech. In summary, the Commission found:

1. That Mr. Scott indulges in no intemperate or abusive attacks on either the God-idea or any religious belief or organization, making "only such criticisms as would necessarily apply in the logical development of arguments supporting atheism."

2. That religious freedom, embedded in the Constitution in Articles II, VI, and the First Amendment, means both freedom to believe and freedom to disbelieve.

3. That freedom of speech means the right to express unpopular as well as popular ideas.

4. That while an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States believe in the existence of a Divine Being, the conception of the nature of that Being varies widely with individuals and sects. "God" may be thought of as "Infinite Spirit," or as "having a tangible form resembling man," and in many other ways. Some believe in a personal link with the Deity, while others believe in "a God to be approached only through ordained intermediaries." For the man who thinks his idea of God is the only true one, all who disagree are atheists. The ancient Romans called the early Christians atheists because they denied the reality of the Roman gods. If free and equal expression is to be denied to atheists, who, then, shall define what atheism is? Atheism may turn out to be any doctrine which those in power disapprove, and, the Opinion states, "Under such a course, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and others whose names we revere could, today, be barred from access to the air to express their own particular religious philosophies." Both Jefferson and Jackson were vigorously denounced from the pulpits by their orthodox contemporaries, and Jefferson was freely called an "atheist" by persons who saw in his views a threat to the special privileges bestowed upon them by *their* Deity.

5. That the admitted sacredness of religion does not raise it above all criticism. How else but through criticism shall those who use religion as a cloak for personal gain be exposed? To silence criticism of religion is to award special protection to all "false prophets." Sound teachings are

nourished by criticism. Immunity from criticism for religion would endanger not only the public good, but religion itself. Hence the importance of the free flow of ideas for the effective functioning of democratic ways of life.

We can find no ground for objecting to the opinion of the Federal Communications Commission in this case. It seems justly based on the Constitution and wisely developed for the general good. Even extreme partisans of denominational religion ought to be able to see that if the federal authority can today be turned in their favor, it may as easily be turned against them tomorrow, and that security for religion, unless it be the sort of religion that thrives on coercion and legal enforcement, is to be sought in the indifference, not in the illegal interference, of government.

What is disturbing in the Congressional Committee's findings is the bland assumption of Federal responsibility for "protecting" the religious orthodoxy of the people of the United States. The citizens of this country have generally assumed their capacity and right to choose for themselves in the matter of religion. Lively discussions of religious issues have characterized the American scene for centuries, and avowed atheists like Robert Ingersoll and Clarence Darrow, both of whom spoke frequently in public concerning their critical views of religion, hold honorable place in American history.

An interesting aspect of the Select Committee's Report is its lack of emphasis on actual complaints against atheistic discourses received from radio listeners, although these may exist. On the other hand, great prominence is given in the Report to the uneasiness of the broadcasting companies concerning the Scott decision. An attorney representing the broadcasting industry, called as a witness, said that the broadcasters are wondering what they should do when atheists request time. Their uneasiness is natural enough, we suppose, in consideration of the fact that the radio industry is

primarily interested in profits. Atheism is admittedly unpopular, and a station which broadcasts atheistic addresses will quite possibly lose some listeners. The reasoning, for the manager of a broadcasting station, probably runs something like this: No listeners, no sale of time; no sale of time, no profits. Therefore, atheism is commercially evil. But it is also theologically evil, and can be more vigorously attacked from the high ground of religious truth. It also happens that, today, atheism can be attacked from the persuasive eminence of political truth. As one broadcaster asked: "Does this Commission decision mean that I must put Communists on, even though all my listeners will turn off their sets?" Anyone can see that the Scott decision is practically subversive. The Investigating Committee called it a dangerous "policy of 'thought-policing' that has no basis in law."

Some contrasting facts are also of interest. According to Morris L. Ernst's study of freedom of speech and press, *The First Freedom* (Macmillan), four great broadcasting networks dominate radio almost to the point of control. A total of 144 advertisers account for 97 per cent of all network income, and eleven advertisers supply about half of this income. A third of all radio stations have newspaper connections. As to the press, no city in ten states has competing daily newspapers. The motion picture industry is controlled by five giant companies.

These corporate entities virtually control access to most of the organs of mass communication in the United States. They are all vast sales agencies for the products of American industry and assiduously spread the supporting doctrine of the American "standard of living." Selling goods is their practical religion. We have no doubt that if Mohammedanism, Buddhism or voodooism would sell more products to the American public, the editors and the advertising agencies and the broadcasting companies would see rich virtues in these faiths and become

Moslems, Buddhists or witch doctors over night—in two weeks, anyway.

This won't happen, of course. Islam would be bad for the liquor business. Good Moslems don't drink. Buddhism would probably be bad for nearly every kind of business, as it teaches the overcoming of desire for unnecessary objects. And we have our own kind of voodooism, already, under other names.

In any event, it would not be good business to have atheists on the air, upsetting the people. What we need for religion is Respect, that's all. Don't ever question it; don't make any unpleasant advances to it with Reason as a guide. If the people get to asking questions about religion, anything might happen. They might even want to understand our foreign policy. . . .

Again, of course, nobody—or almost nobody—talks like that. Not yet. But if the people of America continue to allow their lives to be managed by the pleasing suggestions of the advocates of complacent orthodoxy, *some* people will begin to think like that, and then to talk like that, because, to them, it will seem to be true.

The comments of Henry Hough, author of *Country Editor*, on the policies of large metropolitan newspapers bear out this view. Speaking of the great dailies which occasionally attempted to invade Martha's Vineyard, the domain of Mr. Hough's weekly *Gazette*, a paper now more than a century old, he said:

Working as we were in one area of the newspaper field, we could not help forming an opinion of the daily press. This opinion was not that of the most hostile critics, who, it seemed to us, often attacked the newspapers which were most conspicuous in independence and ability, whereas the real trouble was with the rank and file of smaller daily newspapers. The great trouble was that the dailies as a group had lost the power, the authority and especially the will to sing "One's-self, as a simple separate person," although they continued, with too much stridency always to be sincere, to "utter the word Democratic, utter the word En Masse."

They were, after all, in a boiler plate age. Their syndicated contents . . . were merchandised rather than edited. They catered to averages rather than readers—in fact they looked upon the reader as a fall guy, and he knew it. They were usually honest, in a rationalizing sort of way, but seldom sensitive or perspicacious or journalistically trenchant. They did not need to be, for the balance had long ago shifted from the professional side.

Mr. Hough adds his particular observations to the broader judgment of Oswald Garrison Villard in *The Disappearing Daily*. Both help to explain the decline of the American newspaper, which has been from a total of 2600 papers in 1910 to 1800 in 1940, according to Mr. Ernst. And what was lost in diversity of editorial expression, was gained in uniformity of opinion—the uniformity that leaves the business of "merchandising" undisturbed by moral or "intellectual" issues. It was this uniformity which Mr. Scott threatened to interrupt with his unsettling "atheism" over the air.

It is possible to live without a radio. It is also possible to get along without the metropolitan newspapers. And it is still possible to find, here and there, a newspaper with editorial individuality and a mind of its own. Take for example the Monterey Peninsula *Herald*, which prints under the hospitable title of News Comments a daily column containing, instead of commonplaces about current events, such things as a pleasant essay on Desiderius Erasmus, or a reflective comparison of Julian and Aldous Huxley.

The writer of News Comments, while discussing many subjects, returns again and again to a theme which frequently appears in MANAS—which is in fact the question now under discussion, the question of civil rights. In one such article, the columnist tells his readers about an acquaintance whom he describes as "a great business success." This man is "completely upright," with "a humane regard for all who work for him." He is highly respected in the community, serves "on at least a dozen boards of industry, charity and education." Yet this is what he thinks and says, to his friends:

"Popular sovereignty? It is a very great mistake. Most people are sheep. They are incapable of the combination of opinion and responsibility. They are the inevitable followers of demagogues, bosses, dictators and evil men."

"Civil rights," too, as now phrased and administered, are a great mistake, in this man's opinion. "Religion, statecraft, instruments of communication, should be under the direction of responsible, trained and intelligent people and there are not many such. These are tremendous forces and they are not to be handled by children." And so on. The column proceeds:

You do not like him? You think he is a fascist? You fear his dominion and his kind?

Very well, then what's to be done? Will you scoff at me when I tell you what it seems to me should be done? I hope not.

Drop the page of the funnies and read the columnists and the news. Turn off the soap opera. Read the periodicals of news doctored by those you despise. Drop the cards, the escape books and decline the next cocktail. Let's try to figure out, in the morass of conflicting and directed news, what's going on.

Let's accept the rights of free men and the necessary discipline and responsibilities. It can be variously done according to your temperament. But, if we don't do it, we shall lose this beautiful freedom we praise so on occasion, and we shall lose it perhaps to some gentleman like the one whom I have described—or to some others not so merciful.

One does not expect to find in a daily newspaper the burden of a great book by Erasmus, *In Praise of Folly*, brought up to date. Yet that is what this column accomplished for its readers.

Letter from **ENGLAND**

LONDON.—The annual political party conferences have come and gone, and no one is any wiser about the solution of crises. Events continue to determine policies, and there are not enough or sufficiently powerful individuals to alter the relentless drive of the historical process. Meanwhile, the shorter working week in this country, following upon the social phenomena that have characterized the years 1914-48, has magnified a special problem of the time. Education for leisure has become of incalculable importance. The vast urban populations that have grown up side by side with the machine age have lost touch with the familiar rhythm of nature known to country-dwellers. The consequences are more than physical. In *The Bleak Age*, J. L. and Barbara Hammond mention that three observers (English, French, and German) were all struck, when visiting English industrial areas in the first half of the nineteenth century, "by the social incoherence of these towns, their cold unhappiness, the class division of interests and pleasures, the concentration on a limited and limiting purpose." With some modifications, the picture today is much the same.

Prof. F. Zweig has written a book (*Labour, Life and Poverty*, Gollancz, 1948) which is a striking contribution to the full understanding of our industrial society. Mr. Seebohm Rowntree had asked the author for a study on British spending habits. Prof. Zweig found there was not enough material, and went out to look for it himself. He visited public-houses, dog-races, amusement arcades, hostels and institutions, and, without mentioning research, talked informally with about 400 men, mostly earning between £4 and £8 a week. What did he find? The average regular drinker spends about one-fifth to one-quarter of his income in drink. A considerable minority spend between one-third and one-half on cigarettes and drink alone, in the search for

company. About one in five London workers attend dog-racing tracks all the year round. The author met people who spend £2 a week on slot machines. In London a whole industry lives by thinking out novel and more exciting amusements. With all this, Prof. Zweig found "astonishing generosity," a sense of fun, and common sense.

The problem of the modern working-man is set out cogently:

In conversations at the stadiums or in public bars I was struck by the number of men . . . who found a void within themselves—a psychological and moral vacuum . . . they are in desperate need of substituting something for their lost endeavour and purpose. The restlessness finds expression in the boom conditions of all exciting recreations, which, however, do not give him satisfaction but add to his restlessness. They give him minutes of self-forgetfulness . . . the majority of those who leave the stadium are discontented, having lost their money and time in a fruitless endeavour to get more money. The craving for more excitement seems to grow. The interviews I had confirmed my belief that man is a moral creature who needs for his health and mental balance a creed and a purpose which can warm his heart and excite his imagination. . . . Full employment or a planned economy in general cannot provide such a purpose.

It has been said that one of the most horrible and insensate forms of cruelty is killing time! It is not peculiar, perhaps, to modern civilization, but the use and abuse of machinery, and the lack of any adequate philosophy of education, have added special phases to the problem. Dr. C. E. M. Joad pointed out in his *Decadence, a Philosophical Enquiry* (1948), that the continuous increase in the secondary school population in this country has produced an army of admirable technicians, but has failed to effect any noticeable improvement in taste. Carrying the story further, Viscount Montgomery, Chief of the General Staff, has emphasized that the man called up to the Armed Forces under National Service legislation, has no idea how to organize his leisure. He has asked Army officers to get men interested in a hobby during their year of service (he cited bird-watching clubs, presumably in the intervals of

learning the most efficient ways of killing an enemy).

Whether we like it or not, we are in many directions being driven to question our complacent assumptions. The Hammonds quote Rostovtzeff, the social historian of the Roman Empire, who, when discussing the decay that set in during the third century, asked a disconcerting question: "Is not every civilization bound to decay as soon as it begins to penetrate the masses?" This question grows more pertinent, day by day.

ENGLISH CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW

ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE

WHILE there is no apparent correlation between such events as the atomic destruction of Hiroshima or the rise of totalitarian power and a revival of belief in witches and fairy godmothers, it *seems* to us that doctrinaire materialism has been noticeably losing ground of late, and that the scientific and political "achievements" of recent years have done much to hasten this trend. Both physics and politics, left sovereign in their spheres, have evolved hope-shattering techniques of destruction and control, and the common man, looking around for some kind of "balance of power" over these menacing forces, may be turning, in half-conscious desperation, to the supernatural world to find a superior potency. If the natural world and natural man are not equal to control over physics and politics, why not, then, try God, Kabalism, or the Yoga philosophy?

Supernaturalism, of course, has had popular representation in the West for about a hundred years—ever since, in 1848, the Fox sisters of Hydesville, New York, startled their neighbors with "Trappings" and an extraordinary tale of a murdered man buried in the cellar of their house—but Spiritualism usually attracts, with occasional exceptions, only the alienated and eccentric members of society. Although influential at the fringes of our culture, Spiritualism, as a religion, has never been taken seriously by the great majority. To become a believing Spiritualist is a kind of intellectual surrender; it may also mean a declaration of faith that cuts one off from conventional circles. Astrology, for example, makes less claim on the individual. It can be taken up without joining a church or a "circle." Astrology is not so personally engrossing as Spiritualism, yet affords to its believers a channel to special "knowledge" not given to the common herd. The popularity of astrology is easily measured by the number of pulp magazines devoted to this subject, to be found on any large newsstand.

Another phase of popular supernaturalism is developing in the voluminous field of fantastic science fiction. The pioneer in such literature was

Jules Verne, but today, with the vast extension of the scientifically possible since his time, the modern scientific fiction writer has no hesitancy in combining the methods of Verne with the magical themes of Marion Crawford and Rider Haggard. Contributors to the pulps have obviously ransacked every possible source of mystic and occult lore to find new "angles" for their stories. The world created by scientific fiction has a strange geography and a stranger astronomy—each writer invents his own—and it is reasonable to conclude that the millions of readers of these tales no longer possess any effective scepticism in harmony with conventional scientific denials of the supernatural. A consistent diet of this sort of reading, one may think, must wear away the foundations of critical unbelief until it remains but a thin shell of outward attitude. The hysterical response to the Martian invasion sponsored by Orson Welles some years ago gave evidence of how easily that shell is cracked.

Since the war, stories of this sort have begun to appear in the big-circulation magazines read by the middle classes—the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Collier's*. Within a year or two, *Collier's* ran a serial devoted to the exploits in America of the sinister yet fascinating Oriental, Dr. Fu Manchu. The *Post* has taken up the theme of the Time Machine and recently a real live mermaid appeared in one of its stories, who disappointingly swam away out to sea without explaining herself at all. The *Post* never used to do that to its readers. In the time fantasy, a Japanese wrestler, tattooed from head to foot, was blown by the atomic bomb all the way to the English channel and back three hundred years to 1645. Seems a little improbable, but the *Post* editors must know what they're doing.

The intellectuals are not immune to the general trend, although they take their supernaturalism with debilitating refinements. One well-trodden avenue to mystery for the intelligentsia is Henry James' delicately told but inordinately horrifying *Turn of the Screw*, in which obsession is the theme. The *Partisan Review*, long the champion of James' subtleties, recently printed a literary foray into the supernatural, discussing the psychological mechanisms of effigy-making for magical purposes.

Primitive lore on this subject is shown to have been carried forward into modern literature by authors like Poe, Wilde and Gogol. The writer reviews anthropological data on the idea of the Separable Soul, a universal belief among ancient peoples and all primitive races, noting that, today, the story of a portrait said to contain some token of life belonging to the one portrayed still exerts "its troublous, equivocal effect upon the fancy" of its readers, suggesting that "some deeper and darker levels of existence have been penetrated, and their mysterious waters stirred."

The literary approach to the supernatural, while indiscriminate, rude and unabashed at the level of the pulps, becomes reflective, noncommittal and psychologically sophisticated at the hands of the intellectuals. But in either case, a continual infiltration of the waters of belief is softening up the hard terrain of the natural world constructed out of the scientific ideas of the nineteenth century. The erosion is constant and its effect as plain as the wearing away of the soil of Middle Western America. Watchful exponents of the scientific method noticed the general weakening of scientific scepticism several years ago, calling it "The Failure of Nerve." It was, they said, symptomatic of an unwillingness to come to terms with the facts of life. The masses were looking for false gods, the intellectuals exhibiting "metaphysical" tendencies.

It was true, of course—at least partly true. Bizarre, new cults were making inroads in the ranks of religious orthodoxy. The *Christian Century* ran an article or two on the subject, asking if conventional Christianity was not lackluster and stodgy in its appeal. And there *was* a new interest in metaphysics, typified, in academic circles, by Dr. Hutchins' campaign to popularize the Great Books, and by a renewed interest in Plato and the Platonic tradition. There was and is, a "failure of nerve." Books like Le Comte du Noüy's *Human Destiny* illustrate its tendency and natural direction—to remembrance of things past, the traditional religion of the West. But there was also, and is, something else—a kind of Promethean restlessness and forward-looking throughout the world. We cannot define it; it is, we think, not something capable of

private description, but only of collective and progressive creation. Those who tell us exactly what is happening only betray their misplaced confidence in some narrow, isolated mysticism of the twentieth century.

A soberer transition proceeds in medicine. In 1935, Alexis Carrel wrote *Man the Unknown*, giving recognition to extra sensory perception and the reports of faith-cures at Lourdes. Later, the psychosomatic movement, while offering no supernaturalist views, nevertheless emphasized the psychic side of health and disease. Meanwhile, the rising interest of clinical psychologists in telepathy and hypnotism reflects the general surge away from mechanist theories of man.

It goes without saying that with the passing of an age of denial—a denial that seems as bleak and uninspired as the dogmas it destroyed—the new age will be ushered in with a tumult of credos and a circus parade of competing "faiths." But underlying them all will be, we think, some fundamental principle of release, the connecting link between past and future and the key idea of the epoch that is begun. Its vulgar phrasing, its dangerous half-truth, may tell us, "Anything is possible"; its inner meaning, however we interpret it, may be a new conception of man as a spiritual being—a being freed from both the despairs of religious pessimism and the psychological confinements of unbelief.

COMMENTARY

INSTITUTIONS

JUDGING from the conclusions of John Collier's book, discussed in this week's Review, the tribal institutions of the Indians have had more to do with their survival through four hundred years of oppression and mistreatment than any other factor in their lives. In contrast with the cultural institutions of white civilization, the Indian social pattern is the source of a common renewal of hope and of undying faith.

Probably the greatest value of Mr. Collier's book will be in its stimulus to pursue this contrast in search of a further conclusion. At the outset, one major difference between the Indian institutions and those of the white men is the unifying character of the former. In principle, at least, all members of the tribe play an organic part in the life of the whole Indian community. The Hopi, for example, have a strange belief that the world is kept in being—prevented from dissolution—by the collective Hopi will. This Atlas-like function of the tribe must have an extraordinary effect on every believing member, providing a sense of importance—not of egotism, but of giving and doing.

Western institutions, unlike the Indian pattern, tend to divide and separate not only labor and conscious function, but also participation and responsibility. Such institutions often become substitutes for personal action, personal moral choice, instead of a focus that relates the part to the whole. Government, religious organizations, both public and private welfare agencies and other social forms grow into barriers which exclude the individual from personal action, personal responsibility. They also become the virtual "property," by right of managerial possession, of pressure groups and change-resisting partisans of the status quo. Western institutions, instead of being the organs for both personal and social growth, possessed in common by all members of the community, are rigid shells of custom and

habit, made mighty by the accretions of time. Such institutions eventually constitute the vast impersonal "they" which confront and awe the private, individual man. They are no longer a part of *his* society, but the despotism which rules him.

One might say that living institutions are organs of discipline and release; that when they frustrate free instead of merely rebellious men, and when they stultify instead of conserving the common idealism of a society, their usefulness is at an end.

CHILDREN ... AND OURSELVES

[We are all familiar with the logic and illogic of political propaganda. Another logic, which may be termed non-partisan or philosophical, has always been available, although reserved for those who have the habit of seeking it out. For example, the journalists responsible for the production of the Wisconsin weekly, *The Progressive* (now a monthly), represented a viewpoint on world affairs and national values entirely unfamiliar to the habitual readers of the Big-Enterprise publications. Mr. Ernest L. Meyer's "When Logic goes Loco," which we reprint from the *Progressive* of Aug. 25, 1947, is to our mind an unpretentiously suggestive masterpiece on the interconnectedness of politics and the education of our young.]

"FATHER," said young Waldo, looking up from the evening paper which he was studying with his usual earnestness, "what is bull fighting?"

"A very atrocious form of public entertainment, my son," replied Mr. Julep. "It is a brutal pastime in which men torture an innocent animal and then kill him with a sword while thousands of men and women look on and applaud."

"Do we have bull fights in our town, father?"

"Of course not, my son. We are civilized people. Only savage people like Mexicans and Spaniards would kill bulls."

"But, father, I remember reading that thousands and thousands of bulls are killed every day in the Chicago slaughter-houses, and that men take a hammer and knock them on the head till they are real dead."

"We don't torture them, Waldo. They don't suffer much."

"But they do suffer before they get knocked on the head," said Waldo. "I've heard them often when I pass the freight yard. They're all squeezed in a freight car and they make loud sounds as if they're crying and maybe it was because it was so awfully hot."

"Well, my boy," said Mr. Julep, "of course it may be true that the bulls do suffer a little, but you see, Waldo, we need them for food. We have to kill them to get food, and that makes it all right, don't you see?"

"Oh," nodded Waldo, "as long as we eat a bull we can make him suffer and knock him on the head with a hammer. That makes it all right, doesn't it? And we're really not bad people like the Mexicans."

"That's right, my boy."

"But look, father, is it all right to take a man and knock him on the head and cut him all up and maybe chop off his arm or leg and put his eyes out?"

"Heavens, no!" cried Mr. Julep, horrified. "Whatever put such a notion in your head, my boy? Only murderers and barbarians would do a thing like that."

"But look, daddy," persisted Waldo, "I was reading that thousands and thousands of men in the war got knocked on the head and cut up like that, and Mr. Jepson across the street told me himself that he killed more'n a dozen people in the war and he says once he stuck his bayonet in one man and he—"

"Yes, yes," interrupted Mr. Julep, "I know all about that. But don't you see, Waldo, that killing a man in war makes it all right?"

"Oh," said Waldo brightly, "we eat the people we kill in war and that makes it all right, just like killing bulls."

"No, my boy, of course we don't eat people."

"But some of them do," exclaimed Waldo. "Cannibals do. So if a cannibal eats up a missionary it's all right because he uses him for food, isn't that so, father?"

"No, Waldo. You're getting me a little confused. Cannibals are bad people. People like Americans and British are good people when they

go to war because they want to save their countries from invasion.'

"What does that mean, daddy?"

"Well, it means that if we don't kill our enemies they will come in and take away our country."

"And so it's all right, isn't it, father, if we kill people because they want to take away our country?"

"Of course, my boy."

"Then it's all right if a great big Indian came in our house and shot you all full of arrows, and scalped mama, and took sister away, and burned me at the stake, and—"

"Why, no, Waldo," cried Mr. Julep, shuddering. "That would be just plain murder."

"But listen, daddy, didn't we take the Indians' country away?"

"Hum," said Mr. Julep. "Well, er—. Waldo, I think that one of your little playmates is whistling for you outside."

"It's all so funny, and I don't understand it one little bit," complained Waldo bitterly. "The Mexicans are bad people because they torture bulls and don't eat them. We are good people because we torture bulls and do eat them. A cannibal is bad because he kills somebody and eats him. A soldier is good because he kills somebody and doesn't eat him. A soldier is good because he kills people that want to take away our country, but an Indian is bad if he kills people who took away his country. It's all kind of silly, father."

"Hum," said Mr. Julep "Well, you're a little too small to understand about such things, Waldo. just wait till you grow up and it will be perfectly plain—perfectly plain. Now run along, my boy, you must go outdoors and play. The fresh air is good for you."

Waldo left with furrowed brow, and Mr. Julep turned back to the box-score of the Dodger-Cardinal game with a grunt of relief. But the

names and figures got all mixed up with bulls, cannibals, and Indians, and he wondered angrily for a second who in hell had invented children anyhow.

FRONTIERS

THE GREAT RESISTANCE

IT would be hard to exaggerate the importance of John Collier's book, *The Indians of the Americas*, published this year by Norton (\$3.75). Mr. Collier has admired, studied and tried to understand and help the American Indians throughout his life. He was appointed U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1933, under Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and he served the Indians and his country in this post until 1945. His book overflows with the enthusiasm of his lifework. Some may say it is too enthusiastic, but we had no such feeling. Some may say that his sentiments often overcome a "practical" view of the Indian problem. This, if it is a fact, is quite possibly good. It will take strong sentiments to hew a path to justice for the American Indian. It may take considerable "impracticality" to undo the injustices against them of centuries past and present. And it will take extraordinary vision, under the circumstances, to give a just program for the American Indians intelligent formulation. Suppose Hitler, by some miraculous change of heart, had wanted, and had had opportunity, to right the wrongs of the Nazis against the Jews. What would be the program for such an enterprise? Where would it begin? This is the kind of a problem, or something like it, which confronted Mr. Collier in 1933. If you don't think our treatment of the Indians was that "bad," you'd better read his book.

The Indians of the Americas, however, it not a macabre recital of man's inhumanity to man. It has nothing of the sinful Calvinist's impotent self-reproach, but is rather the stirring history of the almost unbelievable capacity of the Indian community—in North, South and Central America—to withstand the brutal impact of Western civilization; to give and give, to resist and resist, and finally, to adopt and to adjust, in many instances, to maintain inviolate a cultural integrity which preserves to this day certain "secrets" of harmonious human life that the West has all but lost entirely. Mr. Collier tells this story in a paragraph:

There was no method of destruction that was not used against them, and most of them coped with all the methods of destruction. Legal proscription, administrative proscription; military slaughter; enslavement, *encomienda*, forced labor, peonage; confiscation of nearly all lands, forced individualization of residual lands; forced dispersal, forced mass-migration, forced religious conversions; religious persecutions which hunted down the social soul to its depths, and the propaganda of scorn; catastrophic depopulation, which mowed down the native leadership and the repositories of tradition; bribery of leadership, and the intrusion of quisling governments by the exploiting powers. Indian group life—Indian societies—outwore all the destructions.

The renaissance of Indian life and its cultural institutions, today, is dramatically illustrated by Mr. Collier in several instances of tribal reconstruction among groups given half a chance by their political overseers. The Indians, for example, take naturally to cooperative enterprise. It is a logical form to give expression to their traditional community life. In South America, in Indian communities in Bolivia and Peru, conceptions of social service survive from Inca days. One Peruvian Indian community or *comunidad* bought, with money earned by its members in the mines, a thousand acres of alfalfa land. In ten years, the community had saved enough to build a hydroelectric plant which now gives light and power to its own and a neighboring town. An electrically powered flour mill releases the women of the community from the drudgery of hand-grinding, so that they have more leisure and time for crafts. The Indians also built a rural school for 300 pupils and gave it to the government. This was the custom among the Incas, who contributed a part of their time to the common welfare. The government of the community is democratic, with every office of responsibility rotated so that every male at some time serves in an important function. The youth who wishes university training is subsidized by the communal treasury. Such communities, says Mr. Collier, of which there are many, and even cooperative federations of Indian communities—

demonstrate not merely the "staying" capacity of Indian societies but their competence for new adjustment. It has brought to life many of the ancient values, has modernized the immemorial man-nature

cooperation, and has displayed readiness for innovation and the capacity to innovate.

Of crimes against the Indians, we select two of a different sort, each, we think, illustrative of the extreme within its class. The first is the reduction of the Indian population of Haiti by the policy of enslaving the Indians established by Columbus. They were literally worked to death. The population of Espanola (Haiti) was between two and three hundred thousand in 1492. By 1514 there were only 14,000 natives left, and hardly 500 by 1548.

This, it may be said, is ancient history. The second illustration is not. After the Civil War in the United States, although the Five Tribes living in the Indian Territory (now Oklahoma) lost all their western lands for having aided the Confederacy, there remained in eastern Oklahoma nearly 20,000,000 acres belonging to the Indians by treaty. The white men wanted this land, and the problem was how to get it without more violations of treaties and more Indian wars. Indian wars had become unpopular. In five years—1862-67—Indian wars had cost the Federal Government \$100,000,000. In 1868 the Commissioner of Indian affairs estimated that it cost approximately a million dollars to kill an Indian in war with the tribes. It was finally decided that the best way to get the Indian lands would be to destroy the structure of Indian society. The vitality of the Indians lay in their tribal culture, in their co-ownership of their land and their cooperative use of it. The Indian society was attacked at its roots by taking away from the Indians their collective ownership of the land and returning the land to them in small parcels for individual ownership. This was the "land allotment" system, which Mr. Collier calls "the most universal and fatal of all the methods" used to destroy the tribal society. He writes:

By the time it [land allotment] had become fully formulated as a project (the early 1880's), all ethical scruples had been disposed of. The tribal societies were barriers against civilization, spiritual prisons of their members, insuring hell-fire for most of them after death. The detribalized Indian on his individual parcel of land would become thrifty, a go-getter; and if he did not, it would be right to have created the situation wherein his sins would overwhelm him.

By 1906, through various means, the expropriation was complete. The tribal self-government of the Five Tribes had melted away, the coherence of their culture virtually non-existent. The Indians, possessors of a socially responsible culture, had been atomized—first made psychologically homeless, then physically so. Another course of the attack on Indian culture was directed at the Indian religion, which took the form of federal regulations against religious practices and ceremonies. This, as Mr. Collier says, "was to forbid tribal existence and to cut the tap-root of Plains Indian personality." Christian missionaries in the Sioux country caused the Indian Bureau to prohibit all "pagan" ceremonies and the Department of the Interior devised a criminal code providing penalties for Indian religious practices. When these regulations failed, the Government resorted to outright massacre, as at the "battle" of Wounded Knee in 1890, when 98 disarmed warriors and 200 women and children were killed by the United States Army.

We leave to the reader to learn from Mr. Collier's book the character of the policies he instituted in 1933, on becoming Indian Commissioner. We feel certain that the reading of this book, for many, will mark the beginning of an enduring interest, and for some, their entry to active efforts on behalf of the American Indians.

The Indians, Mr. Collier believes, could not deal intelligently with the white invaders because "they could not conceive what it was the white man was after, and what manner of man he was." The predatory greed of both Spanish and English was beyond the scope of Indian experience; likewise, the proselytizing zeal of the Latin colonizers. The Indians made the white man welcome, and his maniacal lust for gold, his religious imperialism, overpowered them. But this very incomprehensibility of the white man's motives may be the key to the inner strength of the Indian's way of life, through these four hundred years of suffering and exploitation. And if the Indians could not assimilate motives which are leading the white men to collective self-destruction, this inflexibility of nature may finally prove the key to Indian regeneration and cultural rebirth.