

# motive

It was a must meeting. Of course we had many must meetings—initiation rehearsals, Monday night chapter meetings, song practices for the funfest and serenades. But this call (or order) because it was election eve was to a must must meeting. For awhile we just sat around, dumb like. Then the lineup began: "Now every one of you write this down so you don't get it all mixed up. Vote Bailey student body president, Kline vice presi-

dent, Roberts and Schneider secretary and treasurer . . ." So the next day little men from all over, being very careful not to get it all mixed up, gripped the wheel of a machine and gave it a turn. Student government through degenerate politics again replaced the puppets for next year's show.

With pretty hair, a nice smile, the capacity to be photogenic and make appealing speeches as the qualifications of the front of a machine, the better students soon find that campus politics is in reality no more interesting or fun than trying to digest a prewar can of professor's notes. So they regularly leave the politics stuff flat. They leave it to the adolescents and others unoccupied by college. The board of trustees and most administrations aren't going to get riled over this situation, either. Their work is much simpler as long as politics is kept more of a lark than three dances. A machine in a campus situation takes so much repairing and rebuilding that it's much safer to let the students be occupied that way than with the products it does or does not turn out.

Woe to faculties who let such conditions get started and let their decadence grow year after year. Caught with a freshman year behind, a senior year in front, and only four years over-all, the student doesn't have a chance to see real issues through. Nor does he have long enough to hammer away and break up the machine. Woe to the faculty member who is capable, liked, and a superior person but does not get into the fight. Woe to rationalizers who, because of the fear of superiors and a few tomatoes, say: "Let them have their fun, after all they're still a bunch of kids." Woe to the educator who won't see effective political living as a part of educational living—who doesn't see the responsibility of college to be a laboratory and training ground for democracy.

Politics, even though it may be a tug-of-war between the Greeks and the Independents about the length of the lines in the cafeteria, is important. It goes to the core of life. It's interesting to play stairs with a quotation from a man by the name of Ely: "Every political question is becoming a social question and every social question is becoming a religious question." If we come up the back way we get: Every religious question is becoming a social question and every social question is becoming a political question. It's hardly necessary to do the airplanes again—how big they are, how fast they go, and consequently how small the world is. We know what used to be an individual problem and an isolated situation is now a social problem and a social situation. John Bennett, in his excellent work, *Social Salvation*, shows beyond question the kinship of religious and political living for every single member of society.

Those who have seen the Pulitzer Prize play, *State of the Union*, have heard Ralph Bellamy, playing Grant, say about political and social responsibility: "I'm not running for president. But that doesn't mean I'm out of politics. Nobody can afford to be out of politics. I'm going to be yelling from the side lines; you've got to be yelling; everybody's got to be yelling. I'm going to be in there asking questions, and I'm going to see the people get the answers." And Mary, his wife, played by the attractive Ruth Hussey, has her say about religious responsibility: "I've tried to get out of this room, but you wouldn't let me, so I'll tell you! I've sat here all evening listening to all you people make plans for my husband to trade away the peace of the world to get a few votes! Don't you know what's happening to the world? None of you had guts enough to see that those men here tonight are starting another war and to slap them down for it. Everybody here was thinking of the next election. Well, it's time somebody began thinking of the next generation."

Politics is hard. It's a gamble. More than half of the time it's a case of falling down the elevator shaft because somebody switched signs and you read, "Turn Right for Escalator." It's also a cross. Betrayal, disgrace, defeat—dirty and getting hit below the belt. The heroes in the Wendell Willkie inspired plays and films we've been having make their exits to the side lines, waving their arms, making big speeches, and keeping clean, uncorrupted, and pure as a lily of the valley—but making their exits before the end of the drama. They can do that. They are actors portraying citizens.

But politics is harder for those people whose religion as well as their citizenship lands them in this arena. If they are Christian, and if democracy is Chris-

tianity in government, and if politics is the inevitable tool of democracy, then it is the tool of Christianity. When a man throws down the tool, he has ceased to be a Christian worker. In the religious man's case, there is no exit to the side lines before the end of the drama. He stays to play it through. Oh, we know that jacking up society isn't the whole story—that the success of world government, FEPC, amnesty, the opportunity for refugees to come to this country, the defeat of military conscription isn't the whole of the solution. There is plenty of work to be done on and by and for the individual too. That's granted.

We also know however, and we can't forget it, that the man with a Christian conscience, regardless of his success or failure, is forced to reject party and side lines for inside lines. The man with this kind of conscience sees the panorama of the world's ruin and misery with the perspective of a father looking upon his family. And he has no other choice than flouting self-interest for society-interest and staying in the arena—fighting hard, all the time, on the inside of the most inside lines he can get hold of, because the life of a brother is at stake.

# CONTENTS

MARCH 1947 VOL. VII. NO. 6

History Roller Coaster . . .	William B. Hesseltine	5
What Color Politics? . . .	Jerry Voorhis	7
Christian Politico-Catechism . . .	Donald Frazier	8
It's No Sin to Have a Problem . . .	Edward L. Parsons	10
Responsibility Is a Heavy Thing . . .	James M. Read	11
Think With Facts . . .	Kenneth Underwood	12
Little Man's Last Stand . . .	Charles Markham	13
Campus Checkerboard		14
March on the Goose-Steppers . . .	Bill Morris	15
Dictionary of New Propaganda Tricks . . .	Merrimon Cuninggim	16
The Fine Art of Reading . . .	Edgar Dale	19
The Mocking Sting of . . . Questions . . .	Harold Ehrensperger	20
On Campus They Say		22
China's Gallup Poll . . .	Geraldine Fitch	23
Profound and Calm Like Waters Deep and Still . . .	Anna Paul	26

## DEPARTMENTS

Reading Between the Lines . . .	Marion Wefer	28
Marriage . . .	Katharine Whiteside Taylor	29
Skeptic's Corner . . .	Robert Hamill	30
Question Box . . .	Thomas S. Kepler	31
Movies . . .	Margaret Frakes	32
Books . . .	Don A. Bundy	33
Letters		34

—a magazine of the Methodist Student Movement, published eight times each year, October through May, by the Division of Educational Institutions of the Board of Education of The Methodist Church; HARRY WRIGHT MCPHERSON, Executive Secretary. Copyright, 1947, by the Board of Education of The Methodist Church.

*Subscription rates.* Single subscriptions, 8 issues, \$1.00. In group subscriptions of ten or more to one address, 75 cents. Single copies, 15 cents. All communications should be addressed to  *motive*, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, and authorized on July 5, 1918.

# History Roller Coaster

*It climbs, plunges, swoops, and swerves.*

*And at dangerous points sometimes jumps and crashes.*

*The ride's safety is determined by the upkeep of the political tracks.*

---

## WILLIAM B. HESSELTINE

---

THIS DICTUM "History is past politics. Present politics is future history" was tacked on the wall of the first American class in the "scientific" study of history. This happened to be the dictum of Freeman and was not tacked up when Professor Herbert Baxter Adams, who initiated this history seminar at Johns Hopkins University, had his back turned. The first historical scholars in this country left that classroom knowingly imbued with the idea that the political activities of man were the very essence of history.

Historical scholarship has long since rejected Freeman's narrow concept, and historians have inquired into areas of human experience far beyond the ken of Adams, Freeman, and other early devotees of political history. Yet, even as they have done so, they have become more certain that an essential truth lay hidden in this rejected dictum. As they have learned that the roots of the present—the economic, the social, the psychological, as well as the political roots—lay deep in the past, they have become aware that the present is pregnant with the seeds of the future. Present politics is indeed future history. Present economics is future history. Present social organizations, present moral concepts, present psychic attitudes, and present intellectual dogmas are all making their contributions to the future.

Yet in this deep conviction that the future will be the result of the present, there is no satisfaction, for the historian has no foreknowledge of which of the myriad situations of the present will emerge as the dominant feature of the future. The historian cannot prophesy—although the phonies among them, and their name is legion, pitch their tents on the midway and read palms, feel bumps, and cast horoscopes with the same fine abandon and the same vacuous glibness as the phrenologists, palmists, and astrologers. The laws of cause and effect operate in the physical universe and the scientist who knows their operation can "predict" that a certain chemical in a test-tube will turn litmus paper blue. The laws of cause and effect operate as well in the social world, but the social scientist, who can identify their operation after they have acted, cannot "predict" which cause will produce which effect in the future. Moreover, since the conclusions of the so-called social scientists are strained through the subjective attitudes of the individual prophet, and partake of the religious, economic, social and political biases to which the individual is subject, no "prediction" from such a source is worth the traditional tinker's dime. At best the historian—or economist, sociologist, psychotic psychologist, or politician scientist—who sets up as a prophet is a windbag

talking through his hat; at worst, he is a propagandist with predacious or partisan purposes.

Part of the reason why the historian or the social scientist cannot predict the future lies in the fact that human beings can control their own future. There are no "laws of history" working with inexorable force to mold the future. There have been no times in the past when the events of the day have not been the results of human action, of human decision, and of human choice. John Calvin and the New England Puritans may have believed that they were predestined for salvation, but they could not predict which man among them could get through St. Peter's gate. Instead, they worked diligently to insure their entrance to the Golden City. No man could have predicted the American Revolution, or the American Civil War. They were not predestined or inexorable. They were man made, and those who prophesied them were also busily engaged in bringing them about. There was nothing inevitable about the American entry into the last two world wars. Human determination, manipulation, and planning brought them about. Human minds and human hands dropped the bomb on Hiroshima. Men have made the past, they have made the present, and they can and will make the future.

But if no man can predict how the future will look, any man—be he historian, social scientist, or swami—can analyze the present, see how it has come about, and improve his judgment by borrowing from the experience of the race. And if, having made such an analysis, his vision of the future provokes a shudder, he need not recoil in horror and seek an escape. He may determine, with faith and courage, that the present shall be changed and the future left to take care of itself.

No analysis of the present can ignore the atom bomb. This, say all the pundits, is the Atomic Age! Two problems face us at the beginning of this Age: how can we avert the catastrophe of atomic war, and how can we use atomic energy for the benefit of humanity? How, in other words, can we deflect this malevolent weapon and transform it into a benevolent instrument? Shall we be destroyed by our own technical efficiency and by an insane lust for suicide, or shall we go forward into a new world of human brotherhood, unbelievable speed, comfort, and happiness?

The significant thing about the atom bomb is that *we* have made it. The atom bomb is the product of our civilization. It is significant, too, that in the years we were making the bomb we did not know what we were doing. We were making the bomb by our technical efficiency,

and we were making a world in which it could be murderously exploded by our social inefficiency, by our political selfishness, and by our moral negligence. This is more than an interesting commentary on our civilization: it's a basic symbol of our civilization that men could labor for months and years without any comprehension of the meaning of their acts. We have, through the deliberate choice of men, made ourselves a nation of interchangeable parts, not individuals with independent wills. We are instead individuals chained to an assembly line, routinized in school, church, and home, *devoid of a feeling of responsibility for the outcome of our meaningless labors.*

The atom bomb has, in reality, suddenly hurled us into the twenty-fifth century and confronted us with the horrible fact that our political, economic, and social thinking has not caught up with our technical development. We are technically in the twenty-fifth century with Buck Rogers and the space-ships, and culturally in the fifteenth century with Machiavelli and Borgias.

Thus the atomic bomb has—as the most dramatic event of the present—illustrated two basic problems of modern civilization: The lack of individual responsibility in a complex, integrated, assembly-line society, and the lag of social and political arrangements behind technical efficiency. Closely related to these are two other aspects of modern civilization which any honest analysis would reveal: One is the search for the quick and easy answer, and the other is the glorification of the state. Both of these phenomena strike their roots into the past, influence the present, and carry warning for the future.

The search for the quick and easy answer has many manifestations. During the war the educational program of the army was swamped by requests from the soldiers for courses in philosophy. These misguided youths were not seeking the wisdom of the ages, they were seeking to be told something easy. And they had been getting easy answers. They had been told that they were fighting a war for the Four Freedoms, and that this was one world—and suddenly, they had discovered that it wasn't one world, and look where they might they could find no sign of the Four much publicized Freedoms. So they were seeking, once again, to be told something easy.

Many evil powers capitalize upon the pervading willingness to seek the quick and easy answer. Among them are many of the political rulers of our society. They have an easy answer to give: They contend that the state can cure everything that Lifebuoy cannot touch. They contend that the state is, in some mystic manner, the embodiment of the people, and that it is all-wise, and that the bureaucracy knows best. And they contend that the individual exists for the state. Hence the state may interfere in every aspect of life—its police, its gestapo, its FBI; it can investi-

gate, persecute, and execute without hindrance. This was the basic philosophy of the Axis nations, which we professed to abhor.

These then, statism, the search for quick and easy answers, the lag of culture behind technical efficiency, and the frustration of human personality in the assembly line of standardized civilization are the characteristics of the Atomic Age, and they are the roots of the future. No historian or social scientist can predict the shape of things to come from these seeds, but any decent man might shudder at the prospects. Fortunately, however, the decent man need not shudder, and the man of courage need not flee. He can, as the old evangelists once preached, stop sinning. He can stop an educational system which makes men into cogs in an industrial machine. He can stop the refusal of schools and churches, pulpit and press, to face the facts of political and economic life. And he can apply the moral judgments which he knows to the facts of social, political, and economic problems.

The decent citizen, concerned about the future which is taking root in the present, can stop the sin of perpetuating the myths that fairy godmamas, luck, and magic remedies as simple as those bought in the drug store can cure the ills of society. He knows that no device of government can cure the evils of the world. He knows that peace, decency, democracy, and brotherhood have to be worked for. He knows that the atomic bomb will not be outlawed until murder, and hate, and injustice are eliminated from the hearts of men.

The decent citizen, too, can stop the sin of giving unquestioned adherence to wicked and evil ideas that come from government. He can challenge the idea that man exists for the state and insist that the state exists for man. He knows that wars will cease when it ceases to be possible for the vicious rulers of the state to call out the manpower of the country. And he knows that "Thou shalt do no murder" does not have any qualifying clauses attached.

But stopping these sins is not enough. More is needed to build a decent future. If the decent citizens of the world refuse to bear arms and do murder at the behest of the militarists, the imperialists, and the politically ambitious, if they reject the concept that the state possesses wisdom, and deserves loyalty which transcends reason, if they refuse to give uncritical acceptance to every starry-eyed idea and every glib formula of the propagandists, then they may begin to make a future where present ideals will be realities.

The roots of the future are growing in the present. What form the future will have, no man can predict. But whatever its form, it will be the product of human will, of human choice, and of human deeds. If the decent citizens do not mold it, the minions of hell will.

## SOURCE

Freedom in a democracy is the glory of the state, and therefore, only in a democracy will the free man deign to dwell.—*Plato.*

The politics of those whose goal is beyond time is always pacific; it is the idolators of past and future, of reactionary memory and Utopian dream who do the persecuting and make the wars.—*Aldous Huxley.*

If all mankind, minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of contrary

opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.—*John Stuart Mill.*

When a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

There is an amazing strength in the expression of the will of the whole people; and when it declares itself, even the imagination

of those who would wish to contest it is overawed.—*Alexis de Tocqueville.*

The punishment which the wise suffer who refuse to take part in the government is to live under the government of worse men.—*Plato.*

If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost.—*Aristotle.*

# What Color Politics?

*Troubled by remembrances of votes cast  
many a congressman has lain awake nights  
weighing the blackness of his "yes" or the whiteness of his "no."*

---

JERRY VOORHIS

---

CAN A MAN BE thoroughly honest and be active in politics? Can he be true to his convictions and be effective in political work? Can a man be a Christian and also be a politician?

My answer to all three questions is "yes." Certainly there have been men in American political life who were thoroughly honest, true to their convictions, and sincere Christians. One of them was Senator George W. Norris. Another is at present a member of the city council of Los Angeles. Another was once a member of the state senate of Ohio. Abraham Lincoln would certainly qualify as a fourth.

Though others could be named, let us take these four—a senator, a president, a state legislator, and a city official. The state senator retired from active politics to return to the publishing business. He tells me, had he not done so, he would surely have been defeated. The city councilman expects to be defeated at the next election. Senator Norris was defeated, and Abraham Lincoln was assassinated. So the first point that must be understood is that the cross is still the symbol of Christianity and while man can certainly fight the political battle and remain a Christian, he has to expect defeat if he does so. At least, most of the time.

It would be a fatal mistake for anyone to hold the idea that honesty, sincerity of conviction, and Christian devotion are in themselves paths to political success. Votes can be had for much less. Only when it costs us something to hold our convictions can they possibly be strong and true.

On the other hand, the devoted Christian may be able to hold a political position long enough to accomplish a real good for his country, his state, or his city. He cannot do this if he is afraid of defeat. Nor if he sacrifices any of his principles to accomplish it.

Neither can he do it unless he understands the essential nature of democratic government. That government is, by its very definition, a process of compromise. All people in a democracy are free to express their opinions and to pursue their own goals. All the people never agree on any question. A sixty per cent agreement is a high rate. This is only another way of saying that hardly any measure taken by a democratic governmental body can be perfect from anyone's point of view. Any member of a democratic legislative body—national, city, or state—who decided to vote against every measure that had any features about it which he believed wrong would have to vote "no" on practically every single question. The best anyone in such

a position can do is to vote on every issue on the side that in his judgment has the preponderance of right. Even this is in many cases hard to determine. And there are bound to be many, many nights when any man who tries to be a Christian and must say "yes" or "no" on practical governmental issues will be troubled by remembering the good arguments of the side to which he did not cast his vote. But this is a part of the job of being a Christian politician.

It is quite another matter for a man to deliberately decide to compromise his convictions in order to remain in office. There are those who will argue that since he "cannot do any good if he is out of office" there are times when even conscientious politicians should decide to compromise. I don't agree, for two reasons. When such a man knows he has sacrificed his beliefs for the sake of continued office-holding, he will not be much good in the office any longer. The inner knowledge of what he has done will inevitably have its effect, and he will find it easier and easier to commit the same wrong again and again until at last he will perhaps still be an office holder, but will no longer be a devoted Christian.

It is an altogether false conception of "politics" to conceive it as consisting only of holding an elective or appointive office. That is perhaps the greatest weakness in American politics today. There are plenty of good, honest Christian men and women who could do great good in political positions if only they could depend upon the lines to hold for them in the voting precincts. The number of convinced Christians who are willing to hold those lines is appallingly small. For this is the work that has no glory and little reward. But by the same token it is the very kind of task the true Christian should seek.

If we want a better and more Christian country, a country in which the Christian in public office who is ready to be defeated for the sake of his convictions will *not be defeated*, then some of us must take up the more difficult and less dramatic tasks that lie at the root of politics. These are the development of a strong public opinion on all moral issues, the building up of organizations truly devoted to the common good and to Christian ideals, the matching of the zeal of the professional political worker with equivalent zeal on the part of the Christian political worker.

It is possible for a person to be active in American politics and to be honest, true to his convictions, and a sincere Christian. And American "politics" includes not only political position but the whole gamut of our lives.

# Christian Politico-Catechism

*A completely different outlook faces the man  
who says, when it comes to politics,  
"I am a Christian, therefore . . ."*

**DONALD FRAZIER**

WHAT MARKS A CHRISTIAN in politics? What is the difference between the Christian and every other citizen? It can be argued that it is only a Christian who can be a good citizen and that any good citizen to the extent of his goodness is Christian. But there are some differences between citizens which this sweeping statement tends to blur.

First, a Christian does from principle what a technically good, law-abiding citizen may do from compulsion of circumstances. That citizen is good who, informed by party associates or by law that his demands are gross, cooperates by becoming reasonable. A Christian is careful about the expression of his self-interest and seeks to be just in the first place. If he makes a mistake in his judgment he possesses a basic desire for justice which leads him to repent and pursue without reluctance a more just policy. Truly Christian motivation is different in quality from the motivation of a man who does not look beyond self-interest under pressure.

Second, the root of a Christian's political activity is in worship. A secular citizen is likely to have sponged up his ideals from the community reservoir. When circumstances squeeze out his acts of citizenship, he is dry. Repeated often enough the reservoir itself goes dry. The Christian, on the other hand, has scouted the wooded hill lands and has visited the springs whose waters "make glad the city of God." When he uses the community's ideas and resources he remembers their origins and is eager to keep open the channel of communication between God, the source of all ideals, and the community—a channel which is his own conscience and life.

Third, a Christian votes not in order to have his say but in order to express, however inadequately, God's say. Men make their own political lives along with their houses and pictures, poetry, and machines. They make them by many patterns—a laissez-faire state; a totalitarian state; a social service state; an administrative state. But a Christian works at citizenship, as he works at all else, to please God and serve men, not to please men and serve himself. When he learns of his mistakes he remembers the gospel of forgiveness and the duty of repentance.

Fourth, a Christian does not try to delegate to someone else the burden of political decision. Because of a profound and quite modern change in the structure of political living the burden now rests on every citizen. When the community was monarchical or more strictly aristocratic than now, little men fought for a voice in affairs which seemed always to run against their interests. To get a hearing for their interests was their just aim. Today, however, the problem is reversed. Every special interest gets a hearing,

but no one in particular holds the public interest as his special vocation. What used to be regarded as the peculiar function of the king or aristocracy now devolves upon the whole citizenry. To meet that change the Christian must reinterpret the act of voting.

A Christian citizen does some public as opposed to self-interest thinking. He knows that there is no public conscience except that possessed by individual persons. It is true that a man's conscience is not public property, but it is equally true that no community can endure when the fruits of private conscience—decisions, appraisals of facts, a sense of justice, etc.—are withheld from the public. In the final analysis conscience is the community's only defender. All else—laws, services, armies—is plate glass; these things reveal the outer form of social obligations and opportunities and afford a certain defense against predatory agents, but without the active conscience of every citizen they are easily broken.

A squeamishness about public utterance on the part of some citizens reveals all too plainly the spirit of Pilate. The life and death of a democratic community is in its citizens' hands as completely as the life and death of Jesus were in the hands of the Roman judge. A Christian will never try to escape hard decision by washing his hands of the social problems of his day.

Voting, properly interpreted, is a matter of conscience. That at once explains why it is a duty and why no compulsory voting law can ever work satisfactorily. It also tells Christians something about the sort of state they are trying to build. For conscience is always free. It cannot be compelled.

Fifth, a Christian citizen seeks to build a society which is an appropriate expression of the Christian spirit. His aim conflicts with the purpose of men who would erect or bolster a social structure of racial dominance, economic exploitation and inequality before the law.

The Christian's goals are freedom and fellowship, not fear-motivated obedience. The dominant consideration is loyalty or love. He guides his conduct by the faith that his efforts and sacrifice may help to produce the beloved community, a free fellowship.

When moderns talk of freedom they usually pun, using the word in one sense and implying another. Christians recognize two sorts of freedom: that which law and social recognition give through their systems of rights and social policies, and that which God gives through truth and integrity of character. It is clear that in the long last the former is dependent upon the latter. Therefore, the Christian always works for a system of rights and social policies

[Concluded on page 25]



THE DELEGATION

ROBERT HODGELL

# It's No Sin to Have a Problem

*... but it is pretty important how the problem is solved.*

*The issues before the country's legislature demand the concern of alert collegians.*

EDWARD L. PARSONS

LEGISLATION HAS TWO functions in relation to social problems. In some cases the desired end can be attained only by legislative action; in others law is largely educative. It points the direction and helps to shape public opinion. Here are noted some fields in which in one or the other way legislation can help us as we struggle towards a Christian social order.

1. Take first the problems of racial minorities. Here more than in any other field of social welfare the attitudes of people are concerned; but legislation can correct some injustices and help us forward. Three fields for action may be noted:

- a. The abolition of the poll tax, in spite of the obvious majority sentiment in its favor in Congress, needs continuous pressure from outside.
- b. Adequate FEPC legislation both national and state. The New York law seems to work successfully.
- c. Federal legislation can abolish Jim Crowism in interstate transportation, but the field for work within the states is immense.

These three types of legislation can accomplish in themselves really very little but they do point the right direction, and they do help in shaping peoples' judgments.

2. Next to the long-continuing race problem we have the immediate pressure of the labor-management situation. In this field a good deal of effort must go in opposition. Nothing can be accomplished but increased trouble by drastic laws which endeavor to force labor or management to do this or that. Compulsory arbitration has certain features which make it seem at a glance very desirable, but there is almost unanimous opposition, and there is great uncertainty as to the areas which any such provisions should cover. It ought to be opposed unless it becomes completely impossible to deal in any other way with strikes which endanger public health and community services and which disrupt the whole economic structure. On the opposite side there are two areas in which legislation would seem to me desirable. The Wagner Bill must not be repealed, although many of the enemies

of union labor desire to do so. But there is some ground for the feeling that it is not just to management. That can be corrected.

But when it comes to the great problem of action on disruptive strikes, about all that can be done, it seems to me, with hope of success, is to put through legislation along the general lines, let us say of the Railroad Act. The requirement of a long period for conciliation would not only serve a direct purpose, but help towards the fundamental necessity in the whole situation; namely that both labor and management should see more clearly than they do that they are socially responsible. Both sides know that in the end a settlement is to be reached. Both sides must learn to see clearly that they cannot bring suffering upon the whole community to serve the interests of a very small part of the community. In order to do this effectively the federal conciliation service must be widely extended. Legislation may properly deal also with jurisdictional strikes, and it is possible that a way may be found to help democratic processes in the internal activities of the unions themselves.

All measures which are based on collective bargaining are after all only a temporary expedient. There can be no final satisfactory adjustment of these great industrial and economic problems until labor has itself a share of responsibility for management. The survival principle for which both unions and management now struggle must give way to the recognition of the common responsibility of both.

3. We can greatly help the health and security of the nation by the development of social security legislation.

4. The vast increase in the concentration of wealth must be met by legislation dealing effectively with monopolies and with international cartels. We move at present towards an economy in which the community at large may find itself helpless in the hands of those who control the essentials of life.

5. On the negative side every effort should be made to prevent the enactment of universal military training. The pro-

posals may be camouflaged as training in citizenship and the like, but they do mean essentially the attempt to militarize our youth. Inevitably they move in the direction of fascism.

6. Legislation is essential in the vastly important conservation of our natural resources and in the development of projects like the TVA.

7. Although perhaps it hardly comes within the scope of our question, it is clear that a great part of the problems which we call internal, bear directly upon international relations. We need to support the United Nations in every way, and that means to support domestic legislation which furthers its best plans and programs. Genuine disarmament as well as control of atomic energy is primary. Economic imperialism must be avoided, but economic assistance to both the backward peoples of the world and those suffering through the tragedies of war must be part of our responsibility to the world. We cannot account ourselves in any sense a nation acting according to Christian ideals of service unless we are ready to give where we do not receive.

8. It is not an immediate problem of legislation in most places, but it seems to me clear that in our national life we must move further along the lines of social democratic programs, taking over essential public services and the like. The freedom of the people, the workers, everybody is our Christian goal, and that is hardly attained by what many mean by "free-enterprise."

Here then are eight fields in which legislation can actually help more or less effectively. No one of us can do active work in all these lines, but we can all give our sympathy and backing to those who carry the burden of the struggle. But everywhere Christian people have to remember that legislation itself while it can be used in many cases, and in some cases must be used if social welfare is to be achieved, never reaches to the root of the matter. The root of the matter is the human heart and to change that takes more than legislation.



# Responsibility Is a Heavy Thing

*Congressmen may vote "yes" on universal military conscription,  
and "no" on relief, immigration, and the FEPC.  
Or vice-versa, depending on what we do.*

**JAMES M. READ**

IN OUR WORK here in Washington, we are constantly impressed with the fact that congressmen are the most misunderstood people in America. College students, especially, are in the habit of considering them to be lazy, incompetent, and ignorant as a class. This is not only unfair to the people who elected them, and unchristian in its general outlook, but also simply is not true. We hear so much about two or three outstanding cases of representatives who are prejudiced and backward that we forget that most of our representatives are certainly of an average, if not somewhat superior, level of intelligence and integrity. They are among the most hard working and harassed men of the country.

This view of college people is particularly unjust, inasmuch as it is characteristic of congressmen to have a much higher opinion of college students than students have of themselves. We are constantly impressed with the accessibility of most congressmen to students, and with their confidence in them. It is greatly to be hoped that American college students will become increasingly aware of their own political prestige, whether they write their legislators or come to see them personally.

Among the issues to be faced by the Eightieth Congress of interest to students and world-minded citizens, are the proposals in the field of military training, relief abroad, aid to refugees, improved race relations, and measures for the strengthening and improvement of the United Nations.

The appointment of a nine-man commission by the President on universal military training was ominous. Presidential commissions carry great weight; they are considered to be impartial as well as expert. Unfortunately the Commission on Universal Training (the term "military" being omitted by special request of the President) seems to be far from impartial. At least eight of the nine members have gone on record in the recent past, publicly, for peacetime conscription. Labor is not represented and the one Protestant clergyman is the outstanding proponent of universal military training amongst an

almost unanimous chorus of recorded and official church opposition.

Certain changes in the committees dealing with military and naval affairs in both Houses may make it easier for the War Department to get favorable consideration of draft extension. The Standing Committee of Naval Affairs was merged in the Senate and in the House with that of Military Affairs into one Committee on Armed Forces, as required in the Reorganization Act. These committees will have greatly increased staffs, along with all other standing committees—four staff assistants and six clerks. The new chairmen in both Houses are much greater friends of the military than were their predecessors. These are some of the things to be kept in mind in the face of the prevailing optimism that the new Republican Congress will have nothing to do with conscription.

IN the field of relief, many people do not realize how much effort is needed to inspire congressmen to vote American money for relief efforts. And yet this is the only way that mass starvation abroad can be prevented since the resources of voluntary and church groups can be only a drop in the bucket. Now that UNRRA has been ended, it is all the more necessary that our government should appropriate sufficient money to prevent hunger and mal-nourishment among our political friends and foes in less fortunate countries. The State Department will probably introduce a bill for direct relief of something like four hundred million dollars, and religious bodies especially should be mobilized to support of that request in its entirety and without any paring down by an economy-minded Congress. In matters of relief, politics and paring are out of place in the world today, where half of the peoples starve while America stuffs.

Increasing attention is being given to the problem of refugees and displaced persons. This is as it should be. There are over a million people abroad, deteriorating in camps and unable to be repatriated to their homelands. To help care for this problem in human misery the International

Refugee Organization has been set up. It will be necessary for the Congress to ratify this charter and to appropriate 45 per cent of the \$160,000,000 which that organization will require for one year. But the establishment of the I.R.O. will be of little avail if the United States does not take its fair share of these refugees as immigrants. It is generally agreed among people who have studied this problem that over the next two or three emergency years we should be ready to open our doors to something like 425,000 of these unfortunate people. This number would only be about half of those that might have come in during the war years and whose quota numbers are lost. The problem is not a Jewish one, 80 per cent of the people in the camps being Greek, Roman Catholic, and Protestant. On the other hand, it would be necessary to stipulate that for this emergency the matter of national origin of the immigrants be disregarded. Otherwise the quota numbers for the people who need the possibility of immigration would be too small.

A half a dozen antipoll tax bills and bills for the establishment of F.E.P.C. were introduced in the first week of the new session of Congress. A like number of antilynching bills were introduced at the same time. It would not, however, surprise some of us if the voices of caution and conservatism did not gain the upper hand so that this Congress might end up by being content with the expulsion of Bilbo as its contribution to the improvement of race relations. The Department of Interior will reintroduce its bill for the establishment of a Japanese-American Claims Commission to enable those who suffered from the process of relocation to procure some material redress from the government. This bill passed the Senate last time and should have good chances of success in both Houses during this session.

These are only a few of the pieces of legislation which are of major concern to those interested in the cause of world co-operation and peace. Among the thousands of bills yet to be introduced will be many others which will need the support of alert and Christian citizens.

# Think With Facts

Picks and shovels for political action

KENNETH UNDERWOOD

No one can take part intelligently in political action, which is necessarily piecemeal, unless he understands the alternative programs of social reconstruction (or destruction) open to him, and unless he has some theoretical framework for judging the various action pleas presented to him by pressure and educational groups. So here are representative books of the major species of programs proposed for American democracy:

## I. An unregulated, competitive, free enterprise system

- John T. Flynn, *As We Go Marching*. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1944.  
Friedrich A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

## II. Middle-of-the-road program (moderate compared with authors in group I)

- Eric Johnston, *America Unlimited*. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1944.  
Beardsley Ruml, *Tomorrow's Business*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1944.  
Republican Party platform, 1944.

## III. New Deal policy

- Stuart Chase, *Democracy Under Pressure*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1942.  
H. Gordon Hayes, *Spending, Saving, and Employment*. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1945.  
Henry Wallace, *Sixty Million Jobs*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945.  
Democratic Party platform, 1944.

## IV. Liberal socialist programs

### American:

- Norman Thomas, *What Is Our Destiny?* New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1944.  
Socialist Party of the United States, platform, 1944.

### British:

- Harold J. Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution in Our Times*. New York: Viking Press, 1943.  
British Labour Party, "Let Us Face the Future": Election Declaration, April, 1945; in Harry W. Laidler, *British Labor's Rise to Power*, 1945, pp. 20-30.  
Ronald Preston, "Britain Under a Labor Government," *Social Action* magazine, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York. 15c.

\* \* \*

The two best books on Congress written in the past few years are listed below. They provide excellent descriptions of the way congressional organization makes possible the delay of legislation, the block-

ing of majority will, the stalemate between Congress and the President. Proposals of reforms, most essential ones of which are yet to be enacted by Congress, are suggested.

Thomas K. Finletter, *Can Representative Government Do the Job?* New York, 1945.

Roland Young, *This Is Congress*. New York, 1943.

## I. Following is a list of key books on pressure groups and American democracy:

- Donald C. Blaisdell, *Economic Power and Political Pressures*, T.N.E.C. Monograph No. 26, 76th Congress, 3rd Session, 1941.  
Robert A. Brady, *Business as a System of Power*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.  
Kenneth G. Crawford, *The Pressure Boys*. New York: Julius Messner, 1939.  
E. P. Herring, *Public Administration and Public Interest*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936.  
Liston Pope, "Preachers Under Pressure." Reprint from *Social Action*, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. 5c.  
Elmer E. Schattschneider, *Politics, Pressures, and the Tariff: A Study of Free Enterprise in Pressure Policies*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1935.

## II. For two opposing but important interpretations of the role of parties in America, read:

- E. P. Herring, *The Politics of Democracy*. New York: Norton & Co., 1940.  
E. E. Schattschneider, *Party Government*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1942.

## III. For an understanding of the growing role of the executive read:

- Edward S. Corwin, *The Presidency, Office, and Powers*. New York: New York University Press, 1941.

## IV. For an appreciation of the necessity for, dangers of, and democratic safeguards in American bureaucracy read:

- Paul H. Appleby, *Big Democracy*. New York: A. Knopf, 1945.

## V. For an understanding of the role to be played by a Christian churchman in politics, read:

- The Christian Churchman in Politics*, Department of Christian Education of Adults, The Methodist Church, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tenn. Free in limited quantities.

\* \* \*

Information on techniques of political action, current issues and voting records can be obtained from the following sources:

## I. Techniques:

Lowell Mellett, *Handbook of Politics and Voters' Guide*. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1947.

"Guide to Political Action," United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, C.I.O., 11 East 51st St., New York 22, N. Y., 1946, 35c.

"Citizen Organization for Political Activity; the Cincinnati Plan," New York: National Municipal League, 1941, 35c.

*Christian Citizens Series*—"Church and Stage," "Voting," and "Will You Run?" Department of Christian Education of Adults, The Methodist Church, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tenn. Free in limited quantities.

## II. Current issues and voting records: Subscribe to one or both of the following newsletters:

- Washington Report*, edited by Tom Keehn, Council for Social Action, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. 50c a year.  
*Americans for Democratic Action Congressional Newsletter*, edited by James Loeb, Americans for Democratic Action, 9 East 46th St., New York 17, N. Y.  
Bulletin of Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue N.W., Washington 8, D. C. \$2.00 a year.

\* \* \*

## Following are Protestant theologies of political and social action.

- Karl Barth, *This Christian Cause*, New York: Macmillan, 1941.  
John Bennett, *Social Salvation*. New York: Scribner's 1935.  
Emil Brunner, *The Divine Imperative*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1937.  
Emil Brunner, *Justice and the Social Order*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945.  
V. A. Demant, *Christian Polity*. London: Faber & Faber, 1936.  
T. S. Eliot, *The Idea of a Christian Society*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1940.  
Charles D. Kean, *Christianity and the Cultural Crisis*. New York: Association Press, 1945.  
John Lewis (ed.), *Christianity and the Social Revolution*. London: V. Gallancz, 1935.  
F. J. McConnell, *The Christian Ideal and Social Control*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932.  
D. C. Macintosh, *Social Religion*. New York: Scribner's, 1939.  
John Macmurray, *Creative Society*. New York: Eddy and Page, 1936.  
R. Niebuhr, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935.  
R. Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*. New York: Scribner's, 1940.  
R. Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness*. New York: Scribner's, 1944.  
M. B. Reckitt, *Religion in Social Action*. London: The Unicorn Press, 1937.



## Little Man's Last Stand

*Wine . . . coeds . . . dancing under the stars . . .  
and then the final moment at the ballot box.*

—CHARLES MARKHAM—

Little Man on the campus (average height: 5-8) (you see him everywhere) was exhausted. A week of screeching and preaching at him by adherents of the BVD and P.J. parties, enlisting his support for presidential candidates Hi Fellow and Hotstuff Waffleburner, was too much. Little Man stumbled to his rabbit hutch on the fifth floor of the dormitory to sleep it off—for a month, he hoped.

But far below, along Deans' Row, Pub Row, and the smoke-filled dens of the fraternity quadrangle, there was no rest. For so tiring had been the reams of bombastic, chapel-shaking propaganda about "Give The Laundry Representatives A Chance" that Little Man had neglected to vote.

In consequence of this fatal failure to exercise his democratic privilege, Little Man had provoked an unprecedented dilemma in the history of Student Goldfish Association

elections. The election had ended in a dead heat; Fellow 998, Waffleburner 998, Kilroy (the champion of Little Man) 2.

When Little Man crawled from his dorm tower to the barren quads below, he was aghast at the grim visages of those politicians who, only yesterday it seemed, had jovially greeted him in the Union chow line. A massive hulk, who had given him a stick of gum and a free ticket to the Bassett dance, sneered disdainfully, "You did it, Little Man."

"Why, Thug Axter, whatever do you mean?"

"Everybody knows. You forgot to vote. And after all that gum too! We don't have an SGA any more. Fellow and Waffleburner are tied 998 to 998!"

*Chronicle* editor Horace Hodgepodge, analyzing the situation in a three-column editorial, proposed a captivating solution. Why

not let Little Man cast the deciding ballot at the intermission of the Coed Ball? If Coach Stonecole Dade would permit it, the stadium could be thrown open for the occasion—dancing under the stars! Politics! Drama! A breath-taking spectacle!

The idea spread like wildfire. The politicians were gleeful, their problems solved. Little Man, the man of the hour, was wine and dined for weeks. Waffleburner served him breakfast in bed. Fellow performed his math homework. The SGA would live again!

With the tense thousands watching, Little Man cast his fateful ballot at the Coed Ball. Beauty Queen Huffa Puffa opened the tiny slip of paper. Would it be Waffleburner? Oh, let it be Fellow!

Queen Huffa gasped as she lisped dramatically the name on Little Man's ballot—Kilroy, the champion of Little Man!

—*The Duke Chronicle.*



# Campus Checkerboard

	Yale* New Haven, Conn. 8,500	U.C.L.A. Los Angeles, Calif. 18,000	Willamette Salem, Ore. 1,000	Northwestern Evanston, Ill. 22,000	Smith Northampton, Mass. 2,200	U. of Nebraska Lincoln, Neb. 9,500	Emory Atlanta, Ga. 3,000	Ohio Wesleyan Delaware, Ohio 2,100	Iowa Iowa City 8,400	U.N.C. Chapel Hill, N. C. 4,000	Millsaps Jackson, Miss. 600	Arizona Tucson, Ariz. 4,100	Poll Average
	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NO ANSWER —
Prior to student elections, is your campus alerted into knowing who the candidates are and what they stand for?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Despite platforms and personalities, are votes on your campus controlled by cliques and combines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	—	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there penalties for those who do not vote as cliques and combines dictate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	—	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
What percentage (approximately) of your college constituency voted in the last election?	25%	15%	66%	17%	75%	10%	50%	75%	41%	20%	60%	25%	40%
After elections do most officers forget their platform and avoid facing major campus issues?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	—	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does your campus paper have the influence to awaken issues and arouse action from the student government?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do professors and campus officials demonstrate active interest in the student government on campus?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	—	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the student government feel harmfully limited in its scope of thought and action by unprogressive college officials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	—	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	—	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have veterans affected the campus politically toward more democratic procedures?	—	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Despite handicaps, do you feel there is a sincere and over-all concern on your campus as to whether politics is "clean" or "dirty"?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Contributed by Student Editorial Board

\* Yale does not have student government in the usual sense.

# March on the Goose-Steppers

When fifteen hundred Georgian students  
marched on the state capitol, dictator Talmadge "declined" to speak.

BILL MORRIS

STUDENTS in Georgia are taking their politics seriously since the death of Governor Eugene "White Supremacy" Talmadge. The legislature's election of son Herman Talmadge on the basis of 675 write-in votes touched off popular feeling that was climaxed by a student protest demonstration at the state capitol in Atlanta on January 21. Fifteen hundred students made the march.

The two claimants to the governorship, M. E. Thompson and Herman Talmadge, are using these two paragraphs out of the state's constitution to support their claims:

The executive power shall be vested in a Governor who shall hold his office during the term of four years and until his successor shall be chosen and qualified. (Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 1.) In the case of the death, resignation or disability of the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor shall exercise the executive power. . . . (Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 7.)

And the person having the majority of the whole number of votes shall be declared duly elected Governor of this state; but, if no person shall have such a majority, then from the two persons having the highest number of votes who shall be in life and shall not decline an election at the time appointed for the General Assembly to elect, the General Assembly shall immediately elect a Governor viva voce. (Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 4.)

Thompson, as the elected lieutenant governor, and Talmadge, elected in a tumultuous session by the general assembly, have both set up offices as governor while state-wide mass meetings have asked settlement of the dispute by Georgia's supreme court.

Chief objection to Talmadge's claim has been the methods employed to gain the office. Reports are circulating that as much as two thousand dollars was used to buy a single vote during the general assembly's election, that liquor flowed freely in smoke-filled rooms, that one of Talmadge's assistants beat up outgoing Governor Ellis Arnall's aide while occupying the chief executive's offices.

Arnall refused to turn over the office, saying that he remained governor until the lieutenant governor was sworn in. That night, Talmadge's assistants changed locks on the doors and moved in the next day with armed guards. One representative who voted for Talmadge, Jimmy Dykes, offered to fight any of his opponents for the cause of white supremacy.

A week later on January 21st, thirty-six Methodist ministers made this statement public:

"We, the undersigned Methodist ministers, view with great alarm the present situation in Georgia concerning the governorship. It appears to us that the seizure of the governor's office and of the governor's mansion by troops is dictatorship of the worst order. It is a setting aside of the democratic processes, and, in our opinion, is sure to create disrespect for law.

"Our very homes are insecure when a group of men can flagrantly disregard the fundamental rights of the people as a whole, and, by force, place a man in the office and mansion of the governor. We urge all freedom-loving Georgians to rise up quickly in protest against such un-American tactics. Georgia will be in grave danger until this awful wrong has been set aside and law once more reigns."

THE student demonstration, representing at least eight Georgia colleges, paraded down historic Peachtree Street in Atlanta in a crusading mood. Office-workers gazed from skyscrapers and heard the students singing *The Battle Hymn of the Republic* as they moved along in a noisy, but orderly procession. Reaching the capitol, the fifteen hundred students passed a resolution condemning the use of force and violence and the usurpation of their right as citizens to vote for their candidate. They shouted for Talmadge to come out and speak, but he declined.

During the demonstration, presided over by Emory students, James Clark and Margaret Lilly, John Morris, Jim Workman, and other students made impromptu speeches, vowing to "clean up dirty politics in Georgia."

James Clark summed up their feelings in this manner: "Any governor is the servant of the people rather than the people's being the servants of the governor. The forces of evil depend on a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the forces of good. We don't intend to take the gubernatorial seat sitting down. We aren't people making a career of politics. We are just private citizens who have been done wrong and are going to be heard."

It was estimated that 40 per cent of those in the demonstration were World War II veterans—still willing to march.

These were the surface events and facts in a tense political situation in Georgia. Behind the emotional outbursts, cooler and more intelligent heads were searching for the social and psychological implications. Even while influential journalist Ralph McGill described the situation as a battle between two factions within the Democratic Party, others suspected that the implications were deeper and more meaningful.

It is possible that the Talmadge *coup d'etat* is another symptom of the Ku-Klux and Columbian hate disease. Bred on poverty, ignorance, and failure, it is the cumulative result of a defensive mentality dating from the disastrous War Between the States.

The solution is in the slow process of Christian education. The sobering realization for many Georgians (and Southerners) has come that an enlightened, liberal democracy will not come in this generation. One hopeful sign that it will come eventually is the evidenced determination of students and ministers to keep up the fight.

Following are suggestions as to what all students as well as Georgian students can do to further this process of education. (1) Continue in Georgia and all similarly situated places to work for truly democratic suffrage—that is fighting against every sort of a white primary bill. (In Georgia it's a battle against Big Jim Folsom and the present poll tax. Over the nation it's a matter of fighting to pass the national anti-poll tax.) (2) Work for the establishment of a progressive and truly democratic second party in Georgia and other similarly situated places. (This party would be made up of Negro and socially awakened white people. Such a second party has been organized and has won decisive elections in Augusta and Savannah.) (3) Write to Ellis Arnall and let him know that you appreciate his courageous stand for decent government. (4) Write to your local newspaper expressing your convictions on this subject. (5) Write to President Harry S. Truman at the White House and to Attorney General Tom Clark, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., asking that the federal government give some aid to the people of Georgia who want decent and democratic government.

# Dictionary of New Propaganda Tricks

*Whether it is buying the baby's strained asparagus,  
or casting your ballot; you may be taken for a sucker.  
Beware of having a red herring dragged across your trail.*

MERRIMON CUNINGGIM

THE PEN GETS MIGHTIER all the time. When the sword was still the fitting symbol of military efficiency, the pen was judged its superior. But the sword is long since outmoded, and we have made "progress." Now it's the atomic bomb. Yet the pen has kept pace, for it still calls the tune for today's most lethal weapon. The pen gives the direction; the pen furnishes the motive; the pen is mightier. . . .

Which is simply another way of saying that today's problems are matters of language, its use and its misuse. They are, of course, much more, but they are at least that. Words have shaped our history, and words are shaping our destiny. The written and the spoken word beat upon us to influence the opinions we hold, and finally to determine the course we shall follow.

Thus it behooves us to pay close attention to the ways in which words are used. Their use to affect the events of our time is called propaganda. Are we to be simply pawns, easily moved about at the whim of any word-wielder? How much are we to believe? What are we to disbelieve? How do words try to influence us? Why? What are the motives of those who use them? To guide us we need a dictionary of propaganda and its techniques.

Propaganda is (we had better begin at the beginning and define propaganda itself. The Institute for Propaganda Analysis defines it as) the "expression of opinion or action by individuals or groups deliberately designed to influence opinions or actions of other individuals or groups with reference to predetermined ends." To put it more simply, it is *the effort to influence others through the use of suggestion.*

Thus the favorite definition, "What the other fellow does," is incomplete, for though propaganda covers what they do to us it also includes what we may do to them. In spite of our usual use of the word, propaganda is not necessarily bad. It is a neutral word; the nature of its use and the ends which it is made to serve determine whether or not it is good or bad. By itself, it is simply **salesmanship** on a glorified scale, the effort to *sell an idea* and in the process to arouse our opposition to opposing ideas. Thus one of its allies is  **censorship**, for censorship prevents counter-propaganda. We understand propaganda better when we consider it in relation to—

**Education** which has as primary the objective to inform. Propaganda's primary effort is to influence. Thus, they should be, and often are, partners, for each should include something of the other in its proper presentation. But they are, also, potential and quite often actual opponents. Propaganda is most likely to be dangerous when it omits the educative element. Propaganda is definitely bad when it joins hands with censorship, for bad propaganda feeds on restricted information and the closed mind, while education feeds on free inquiry and the open mind. Whether good or bad, there are at least three types of propaganda:

**Revealed propaganda** is that in which the underlying purpose can be readily grasped by most people: "Vote for Joe Doakes"; "Support the United Nations"; "Save Food."

**Concealed propaganda** relies on indirect suggestion, and hides or seeks to hide its real purpose: examples are furnished by nearly all of the following tricks of the trade.

**Counter-propaganda** consists in attacking the opposite side; thus it may be "revealed" or "concealed." Actually, all three types often blend together in the same piece of propaganda.

It's the "concealed" type, of course, which may most easily be misused; yet it is also this type which lends itself most readily to the—

**Tricks of the trade**, namely, those techniques of the propagandist which are the "come-on" for the "sale." Some of these tricks are, by definition, dishonest; all of them may be used dishonestly and all may be made to serve unworthy ends. Of the many which might be identified we shall consider sixteen, beginning with those used largely as attacks upon the other side, proceeding to those employed primarily for the defense of the propagandist's own idea, and ending with those centering attention more on the recipients than on the idea itself, more on the potential "buyers" than on the article for sale.

1. **Name-calling** depends, like many other tricks in our list, upon **association**: the conscious employment of words which carry, for the hearers, many overtones and implications growing out of their previous use. "Name-calling" is a particular kind of "association," involving the use of words carrying complimentary meanings for the opposition: "Red," "Jew," "Jap," "nigger," "capitalist." These and many others are **omnibus words**, the use of which is calculated to imply more than the speaker wants to say directly. Or the job may be done by an "omnibus phrase": the Republicans' "Had enough?" of the last campaign might be called a subtle and "polite" form of "name-calling."

2. **Faint praise** is, superficially, almost the reverse of "name-calling": the opponent "means well," the opposed plan is a "fine ideal," but "but" is the next word, and the praise gets fainter and fainter. Thus the propagandist hopes to gain the reputation of being "generous" while still pursuing his major purpose: damning the opposition.

3. **Lofty impartiality** is an even more subtle form of direct attack upon the opposition: "We must look at both sides," pro and con, judicious weighing of the balances. Thus, when the propagandist finally comes out for his own side and condemns the other, he hopes he is recognized not merely as "generous" but as "impartial."

4. **Glittering generality** takes us from attack on the enemy over to defense of the propagandist's position. It is the true counterpart of "name-calling," for it, too, depends upon "association" and the use of "omnibus words," this time to arouse the hearers' sympathy and approval. Words thus used are called **virtue words**: "freedom," "brotherhood," "democracy," "justice." The "generality" may "glitter," also, by "association" with a series of words commonly linked together; thus **sloganeering** is one form of the trick: "Liberty, equality, fraternity," "No taxation without representation," "The Four Freedoms," "Make the world safe for democracy."

5. **Dust** which is thrown in the eyes of the audience is one step removed from the preceding trick. "Glittering generality" and "name-calling" may stay close to the subject, involving only **over-simplification**, but throwing "dust" means the introduction of irrelevancies. Like the "omnibus word," which it often uses, it may form part of the attack or the defense. In the defense of the propagandist's own position it might be called **stardust**: "From the rock-bound coast of Maine to the sunny shores of California," "In the name of all that is holy," ". . . learned at my blessed mother's knee."

6. **Hysteria** is the throwing of "dust" in large quantities. Whether for attack or defense—and it, too, lends itself to either approach—it consists of conscious, purposeful **over-emphasis**, the exaggeration of issues designed to inflame, not merely influence, the audience: "arson," "murder," "rape," "white supremacy," "little yellow-bellied rats"; accompanied by flailing arms, flowing mane and fire in the eye.

7. **Red herring** means dragging across the trail a scent so strong that the original direction of interest is lost. It is not merely confusing the subject with a little "dust"; it is actually changing the subject to one less debatable or less vulnerable. When the "red herring" is introduced at the very beginning and continues throughout the presentation, then it might be called a **smokescreen**. The following subjects unfortunately lend themselves to such substitutionary tactics: "patriotism," "religion," "the home," "service."

8. **Back door** is the long-way-round but less-likely-to-be-locked entrance for the propagandist. It is the incomplete "smokescreen" which disappears to reveal the true subject of concern only after the audience has been adequately prepared. Thus it involves **suspense** and **delayed action** or any other round-about maneuver designed to gain the attention of the un-

suspecting victim. The potential candidate may use silence; the actual candidate, an innocent story of, say, his college days.

9. **Transfer** is the use by the propagandist of something which most people automatically respect and honor—the flag, the cross, the Good Book—by which he applies that revered object to his own cause. This trick, too, depends on "association," for the trickster hopes that the object will thereby lend its authority or prestige to his purposes.

10. **Card-stacking** consists of giving partial or false information. The propagandist picks-and-chooses, he loads the dice; his method is the careful **selection**, among all the available facts, of only those he wants his audience to know: accomplishments as opposed to failures, benefits without reference to detriments.

11. **Both sides of the street** as to subject matter, and **both sides of the mouth** as to method of presentation, are the two parts of the same refinement of "card-stacking" by which the propagandist "adjusts" his message to differing audiences; "isolationism" to one group and "internationalism" to the next; "controlled economy" at one place and "free enterprise" at the other.

12. **Plain folks** carries further the propagandist's attention to his audience rather than to his subject. "One of the gang," "Old home week," "Son of the soil," augmented fully by the photographer's art, constitute his **identification** with the "common people."

13. **Testimonial** is a form of "transfer," in which respected persons—"men of distinction"—are quoted in support of the propagandist's position, in the hope that their names will give distinguished sanction to the point he wants to get across. It pays attention to both subject and audience: "Mr. Big likes me and my idea; therefore, you should too."

14. **Band wagon** is a bid for mass "testimonial." It ignores the subject altogether and concentrates on the audience: "Follow



PRESSURE

H. G. HODGELL

ROBERT HODGELL

the leader," "Join the parade," "Everybody's doing it now."

15. **Lather** on the brush of the bad propagandist is always preparatory to the shave. Whether good or bad, he uses this trick to compliment his audience and thereby gets a more sympathetic hearing: "Beautiful city," "The most intelligent group I ever faced," "The greatest country in the world."

16. **The sweet bye and bye** is the deft direction of the victim's attention to the future, that glorious time of peace and prosperity which will result from the acceptance of the propagandist's argument. This is the trick of the large **promise**: "A full dinner pail," "Two cars in every garage," "Freedom from want and fear." The "promise" is, of course, conditional: "If you vote for me, then. . . ." Thus the trick involves an **invitation to partnership**: "If . . . , then together we will build the new world." By this method the propagandist rolls easily into his rosy-colored climax, and under the guise of "giving the public what they want to hear," he makes them want what he has to give!

This is an imposing list of tricks. But remember, they're not always used for dishonest or unworthy ends. "Both sides of the street," for example, is always unethical, but many of the tricks can be used by the good as well as the bad propagandist. Some of the illustrations were consciously chosen from among the causes which the author believes to be "good." Can you identify them? Or better, can you furnish, from your own point of view, "good" examples as well as "bad"?

But it remains true that it is much easier for propaganda to be "bad" than "good." The dishonest man finds the "tricks of the trade" very adaptable to his evil purposes. Our task, then, is to overcome, and nullify the effectiveness of, the "bad" propaganda in our own day. How? For our own protection we need to have a few more words defined:

**Prejudice** What all of us have! We can't become unprejudiced, but we can try to understand more completely our

own prejudices, and thus to allow for them. Then the propagandist won't have such an easy time playing upon them.

**Detective work** What we've got to do! Realizing our own prejudices, we will recognize that opinions and actions with which we agree, as well as those with which we disagree, may be propaganda. Then we are ready for our "detective work"; a thorough *examination* of all the influences and arguments beating upon us. Learn to identify the "tricks of the trade," and to analyze them. Watch especially for "omnibus words" and the dangerous trick of "card-stacking."

**Hidden motive** What we've got to find! We must carry our "detective work" beyond what the propagandist says into what he doesn't say; we must try to discover the purposes which the propagandist has in mind. What he says may sound innocent, but his motive may be thoroughly evil; and we must learn to make the *distinction*. Remember this: *No just cause ever suffered, and many an unjust cause has been revealed, by an unmasking of the purposes behind the propaganda.*

**Slow** How we've got to go! We should never decide what to believe and do on the basis of one piece of propaganda alone. We must keep from being stampeded. This means the *suspension* of judgment until the other side can be heard from, until all the facts are in, and the motives are clarified.

**Conviction** What, at last, we must possess! And—

**Decision** What, at last, we must make! If we have taken the previous steps, then we are prepared for this final stage. But on what basis can we decide? In other words, what dependable *standard of judgment* can guide us? The Christian has such a standard in Jesus' principle of love of God and love of neighbor. Its application to the world of propaganda won't be easy, for propaganda is a world not of blacks and whites but of various shades of gray. Yet the application must be made, for in doing so lies whatever hope we may have for resisting, successfully and nobly, the pressures of today's propaganda.

I came to nature worn and tired and old:  
The mountains' green and purple were not clear  
Because my eyes were veiled with city fear—  
Because my heart was muffled round with cold.  
Across me all of nature's silence rolled  
Unnoticed: all the sounds that I could hear  
Were city noises ringing in my ear—  
My mind had all of cities it could hold.

I felt that I must run and stamp and shout  
Until I got the city madness out:  
When I had cried my troubles to the hill  
The mountain silences were twice as still.  
The stillness made my eyes and ears rejoice  
For then I heard the echo of God's voice.

—Dean M. Kelley



# The Fine Art of Reading

*Having read the lines, try reading between the lines,  
and then you will be ready to read beyond the lines.*

EDGAR DALE

WE READ AND HEAR a great deal these days about general education. But in all this discussion not enough is being said about the role of reading in achieving it. Indeed, one of the most important outcomes of a general education is *learning how to learn*. And there is no more important element in reaching this goal than effective reading ability.

We too often assume that reading is a mechanical process, a skill subject, something to be completed in the lower elementary school. We think we've gone far enough in teaching reading when the student can read without undue consciousness of the words—when he has learned what we call the reading skills.

Yet there is a vast difference between the *skill* of reading, in which we concentrate on what the book "says," and the *art* of reading, which enables us to discover what the article, pamphlet, or book meant to the author and what it now means to us. Certainly if we wish to master the art of reading, we have shaped up a big job for ourselves.

Let's look a little closer at what it means to read. First, there is the job of getting the simple sense of what the writer says. This means noting the words and phrases of the passage and relating them one to the other. Let's call this *reading the lines*. This is no easy task, but it is the task to which teachers of reading usually devote themselves. It is the simple level of reproducing what was said.

The second job in reading is to discover what the author meant to say. The literal meaning of the passage may lead to a wrong interpretation. The author may have written in an ironical or sarcastic sense. Indeed I have noticed again and again that when a satirical letter appears in the newspaper, many persons misinterpret it and write scathing replies.

Metaphors may lead us astray. More than one person has failed to realize that to accept the metaphor of the Twenty-Third Psalm one must think of himself as a sheep (without, of course, extending the metaphor to carry the idea of being sheep-like). We may call this second aspect *reading between the lines*.

There is a third aspect of reading which is highly individual. We judge or interpret what is read in the light of our own

problems. We may call this *reading beyond the lines*. We say to ourselves after reading an article or an editorial: What does this mean to me? How can I make use of it? It is the "so-what?" phase of reading.

Let's look now and see how these three aspects of reading apply to the reading of a newspaper. We'll first examine the problem of getting the simple sense of what appears in a newspaper—reading the lines. Note the huge job facing an individual who reads the *New York Times* on Sunday. Estimating about 3,000 words on a page, this means the equivalent of two full-length novels in the whole paper. Reading at the rate of 400 words a minute, we must devote seven minutes to a page, and several hours if we read every line in the paper.

Now we won't want to read every line. Some of it is of no interest or importance to us. We shall want to skip. But how? The answer is to learn to read headlines intelligently. The headline, we remember, is the conclusion of the article. Thus by reading the headline and at least the first paragraph, we can determine whether we want to read further.

But even here we must read between the lines. The headline may be inaccurate. We may discover that the headline is willfully, unwittingly, or carelessly distorted. The informed reader, of course, knows that headlines do not come with the story. They are written in the local newspaper office.

LET'S suppose that we have decided to read a certain story. There are still some problems in getting the simple sense meaning, reading the lines. We must master the wide range of technical vocabulary—business, health, art, science, economic, governmental, political.

Let's suppose that you wish to read some dispatches, some stories out of Washington. What's involved here in reading between the lines? Certainly you should watch the source of the story. Who stands back of it? Is it a news service such as the AP, the UP or the INS? Is it signed by the name of some Washington correspondent? If so, what is his reputation for telling the truth?

What about reading beyond the lines of the newspaper? Here is where the syn-

thesis of reading from other sources—from books, pamphlets, and articles—comes in. Here is where we turn to our scrapbook or file of clippings and tie a number of ideas together. We may wish to reflect on the editorial we have just read. Is it true, as Kingsley Martin indicates in *The New Statesman and Nation*, that our sharp criticism of Soviet and British policies is conditioned in part by our sense of guilt because we are living in so much comfort in a world so near starvation, a sense of guilt coupled with a fear of the wrath to come?

Perhaps the writer has extended the metaphor of reading the lines, between the lines, and beyond the lines too much, made it cover too much ground. Nevertheless, it is enormously important to develop the art of reading as a part of general education. Just think what it would mean if a majority of our citizens could read the newspaper in the precise and critical way just suggested.

The newspaper might then be an agency for building a great common denominator of information. It would not be slightly referred to, as it was by Britain's Foreign Secretary Bevin when he said its purposes were to amuse, to entertain, and to confuse. Instead, it could become our basic source of general enlightenment. The same newspaper, purchased and read by the poor and the rich, the owner and the worker, white and black, Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, could be a great common denominator in an age of increasing conflict. Two things are necessary, however, before we can reach this goal. We need newspapers that do not betray their ownership in their news columns, and we need disciplined readers.

The writer has referred elsewhere to the newspaper as "democracy's textbook." Perhaps the promise has been greater than the performance. Yet there are great newspapers, great editors, great correspondents. Perhaps if we had better newspapers, we would have better readers. And more exacting, more critical readers can demand better newspapers. More than forty million newspapers are printed every day in the United States. What a pity that they aren't more effective. Good readers can help to make them so.



HAROLD  
EHRENSPERGER

I HAVE BEEN THROUGH a catharsis, or in plain English, a purgation, and it has not been due to any patent medicine. In fact, I have been far from any kind of quackery. I have been facing myself and my beliefs in a way that I did not know could be possible. It has all come about through my sojourn in India, through my representation of Christianity, democracy, America, the West; and, I say it blushing, through my representation of the whites of the world. *I now know that representation without realization is hypocrisy.*

Shanth has just left me at the station, and I am riding in the compartment of an Indian train with three Hindus, a Moslem, and two Sikhs. There are no whites anywhere about. I am alone with my Western self, but not lonely; anyone who rides in an Indian train is never lonely. He is thrust at once into the midst of intimacy and relationship that would not be possible in any other common carrier in the world. Yet here on this train, in this country of reputed leisure and slow-paced living, there is at last time to reflect and think. My thoughts first go to this twenty-four year old student who has just said goodbye to me. He is a Hindu doing graduate work at Lucknow University—one of the state universities of the Central Provinces. He sought me out after a lecture I had given to one hundred and fifty students and professors who make up the literary society of the school. They filled the small assembly room and spilled over into the hall; they peered at me through the windows and stopped up the doors with their white-robed bodies and black, sleek haired heads. An American was to give an address. There would be questions! That would mean a circus for the mischievous young people who love nothing so much as to put an American on the spot.

And what questions there were! Shanth repeated them when he sought me out at my residence in Isabella Thoburn College. The first question Shanth shot at me was "What do Americans think of India?" This was followed by a series of inquiries that included such spell-

binders as, "Is America afraid of Russia? How do you account for race discrimination in Christian America? From what have women been emancipated in America—and into what freedom?" Then these prize winners! "What do you think of India? Is America like the movies represent it?"

THESE and similar questions have been fired at me everywhere I have been in India. At the dinner table the night before Shanth's visit, Kusum had told me that her relatives were furious with her because she was going to a Christian school and had given up *pardab*. She wanted to know a hundred things about American college girls, about drinking, sex relationships, and other things she had learned from the movies. Always there was the word "Christian" placed before American, as if it were the distinguishing characteristic of our country. When she did not use Christian, she used "white" or "democratic." These words stung me that evening as they have been stinging me all over India.

Kusum went on to say that she believed in the reforms that have freed women from *pardab* and from some of the other customs that we think medieval. But she hastened to tell me that her father's opinion was law to her, and that she respected and followed it no matter what it meant. She admitted that it meant an arranged marriage and a good many things that we regard as benighted, but she assured me that no intelligent daughter would be adverse to what her father wanted. It

would be an impossible situation, and it would not be worth the trouble and sorrow it would cause.

Shanth had presented a different point of view. As a Hindu, he had talked to me about marriage, and he had told me that when he married (and of course, he would sometime) he would bring his bride to his home, and his mother would rule the household. His grandmother had been a law unto herself. She was the most respected member of the family. This boy was one of the 50 per cent of unmarried

## The Mocking Sting of

students at the university. Most of the married students are not living with their wives; some of them have never lived with them, even though they may have been married a long time. Others had been married as young men to girls who were still much younger than they were. As any American can see, this situation presents problems that are not found in our boy and girl relationships. These boys in the university did not pick their brides—the family did that. Perhaps they had a friend who spoiled the tradition by inviting them to a party so that they could meet each other. Most of them, however, had not seen their brides until the wedding celebration. In strict Moslem weddings this is done by having the groom look into a mirror while the bride raises her veil.

In the course of the conversation with the girls, I had protested against this kind of marriage and what often results in the home life. I had pointed out that boys had told me that if they get a "practical" girl who is not very attractive, she can remain at home and raise the family while they go out to sport and play with other women. Unfortunately, the night before, the local newspaper published a story of a report from an American city where the divorce rate last year was greater than the marriage rate. These students were quick to point this out to me. I had little to say that sounded like anything else than a defense of my Christian conception of marriage.

SHELA and Bimla sat across the table from us. They were movie enthusiasts and their first question concerned domestic life in America. What was all this talk about the home? Did the movies ever show decent home life founded upon simple, cooperative living? They called off a dozen films I had not seen, and in quick succession asked me if these situations were typical? Do you wonder that

I am feeling somewhat meek and almost apologetic?

Shanth's black eyes were flashing when he asked me about race relations in America. His closest friend is now at one of our state universities. His friend has had all varieties of experiences in his Western sojourn. He has been asked to leave a restaurant because he was colored and one of the campus fraternities had refused to allow him to room in their house when solvent during the war.

"He's developing a sense of humor,"

## ... Questions

he said, "and he feels more sorry for than angry with the people who must go this far to preserve their color supremacy. He refuses to wear a dhoti and turban because he refuses to fall back on costume to save him from the insults in your country."

The questions on Russia were equally searching. Students here want to know why a successful democracy is so fearful of communism. They insist on my telling them what we intend to do with the atomic bomb, and whether we think that weapon will help us preserve our civilization as well as our color supremacy.

Indian students are somewhat out of hand as far as the university authorities are concerned. They use strikes as a weapon which has all but ruined academic integrity in one or two of the great universities. But Indian students are also fed up with the pride and arrogance of the West. They are guilty of all the faults of American students, and

they have many of the same virtues. They have learned the fine art of getting by, and they have discovered the social value of degrees.

But they are keen. They are great talkers. They have budding orators galore in their midst, and they are often impudent and inconsiderate. No group will have to change any more rapidly in the new India. The more keen they are, the more they question. I have enjoyed talking to them and living with them. They are up against frustrating and baffling situations that will never touch our students. As a reward for their degrees they are likely to get a clerk's job or a government position. Fortunately they are young and they are alive. They resent

sham and hypocrisy. They respond to the genuine even when they don't have much of it themselves. They have unbounded admiration for honesty in the other fellow.

I have been through a purgation and it has strengthened rather than weakened me. Another medieval medical cure-all, blood letting, I have also had. For I offered my white American blood to the blood bank to help sufferers who had been stabbed in the riots of Hindu-Moslem, brown India. And my attempt at honesty and sincerity has been accepted. There is still no barrier where love is and where giving grows out of love. This, it seems to me, is the secret of representation—for it is realization on the highest level.



Garlanding a visitor is a popular way of greeting people in India; it seems to be a pleasant and happy mode of welcome to Harold Ehrensperger.



Groups of Indian students like these at Chilkur Camp Conference will build the new India.

## Castor oil for Mr. Bigot

Within the American social framework, superiority is based on two attributes—white skin and money. The person who possesses both becomes in his own eyes and in the eyes of all (who hope to emulate him) a being superior, somehow entitled to better than the common rabble.

This type of person looks aghast at any suggestion that his "inferiors" might have rights or sensibilities and almost drops dead of surprise and rage when any "commoner" attempts to exercise his democracy-promised right to, for example, the "privilege" of voting despite the color of his skin; or the right to a living wage or decent job.

The promise and dream of democracy in the United States is not yet dead despite all attempts to smother and twist it. But as long as people separate themselves off into arbitrary classes on such artificial bases as money, skin color, race, military rank, or even intellectual superiority, the world will be torn by strife and bloodshed and wars will continue despite all we do to stop them.

—*The Daily Bruin*, University of California, Los Angeles

## The non-smoker gets a break, ain't life beautiful!

O.K. so you smoke. A lot of people do. Then again a lot of others don't—and these long-suffering studes are slightly weary of having to weave their way blindly through a haze of smoke that covers the territory immediately bounding the campus. It's more than enough to play a blindman's buff out there without spreading the smoke-screen all over the grounds.

Fort Hays State has always had a good looking campus, and cigarette stubs don't add much to the landscape. Inconspicuous receptacles may be placed all over the campus, and ten-to-one they'll be completely ignored. Of course we could always have some of the frosh on fatigue duty and let them police the area. Yeah!

It seems that a better idea would be to cut off smoking on the campus walks completely—and enforce that ruling which says "No Smoking on the Campus." Instead, why couldn't rooms be set aside in each building where smoking would be permitted and students could have their cigarettes between classes without making like the light brigade for Park Avenue or making campus walks into Tobacco Roads, j.g.?

—*State College Leader*, State College, Fort Hays, Kansas

## The fine art of appreciation

The flag flew at half mast at the university today in respect to William

# On Campus They Say--

Joseph Bray, UA's oldest employee. In the university auditorium funeral services were held for one of the best-known and best-loved men in the city.

Bill Bray, on the staff of the university for thirty-nine years and superintendent of buildings and grounds since 1914, leaves as a fitting memorial the beautiful grounds of the university which were a result of his management.

Perhaps one of the best tributes ever paid to Bill Bray was during the school year of 1944-5 when a series of posters were placed on the campus which read, "Hurrah for Bill Bray." A letter was written to the *Wildcat* by Dan Ricker on Feb. 2, 1945. He explained that the posters had been put up by students who appreciated the services of the man who was responsible for the comfort and beauty that surround our campus.

He wrote in part: "We are all proud of our beautiful campus and the way it's maintained. We should make it a duty to become acquainted with Bill Bray and his staff . . . Greet those fellows on the university trucks—they're on the students' side in everything that they do. Get to know them, and you will be taking your hat off to Bill Bray and his ever working department and saying "Hurrah."

So we say goodbye to you, Bill Bray, Thanks for everything and "Hurrah."  
—*Arizona Wildcat*, University of Arizona



## What About Religious Toleration, Anyway?

What is religious toleration, anyway? I think one aspect of it is aptly expressed in a good old hymn, which has these words:

"You go to your church and I'll go to mine

But let's walk along together."

That's a fine attitude, but what about the people who don't go to any church whatsoever? Can they have a religion? Is there a place in religious toleration for them, or do they become objects for the missionary instinct in church-goers?

Perhaps we should stop and consider what religion is. Mr. Webster claims that it's "an awareness or conviction of the existence of a supreme being, arousing reverence, love, gratitude, the will to obey and serve, and the like." That definition doesn't include attending church.

A person's religion should be something between him and his God. If he gets inspiration from a gnarled old pine tree or worships the supreme being which created a magnificent sunset, he may still be deeply religious. One may draw his inspiration from a good sermon or from a symphony and each have religion satisfactory for his own needs.

—*The Alabamian*, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa

## For Thinking Southerners

Lately we college students have been accused of lackadaisical thinking. We have not been worrying about and searching out solutions for the real problems that must someday be solved. But we cannot take all the blame. Our "present leaders" have not given us, the "future leaders," much of an example to follow.

To our way of thinking, a problem cannot be solved if it is ignored. Here in the South we have an extra problem, one that has been gathering potency for eight decades. The race question is staring us in the face, yet we are encouraged to pretend it is not here. Yet any realist knows that the question has become too large to ignore and that it is time we recognized it and began looking for a workable remedy.

We have not been doing any serious thinking, they tell us. Yet we students are discouraged if we utter our thoughts aloud.

Pulling the South out of the coma of racial intolerance and suppression would be a long, slow, discouraging and difficult task. We of college age are young and inexperienced. Yet we believe that in our time perhaps we could almost solve this problem if we were openly encouraged to study it and begin that long, hard search for a solution.

—*The Reveille*, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge

# China's Gallup Poll

GERALDINE FITCH

THE STUDENTS OF CHINA have long been mobilizers of public opinion. They are still the barometer of political weather in that country. It was the students of Peking who first discovered (and aroused public opinion against) Japan's nefarious designs. In 1919, attacking three Chinese ministers of state, who were conniving to sell China's birthright to Japan, they inspired college and university students throughout the country to strike in protest. An effective anti-Japanese boycott was initiated. We who lived in China saw a spirit of nationalism kindled by these patriotic students. In subsequent years, whenever Chinese officials were on the verge of granting Japan economic or political concessions inimical to China's sovereignty, these student-inspired, anti-Japanese boycotts would break out afresh. On Japan's insistence the League of Nations induced China to halt the student-sponsored boycott of Japanese goods and to suppress the National Salvation Societies as a pledge of sincere desire to restore friendly relations. China was persuaded to put her faith in the League and in the Lytton Commission appointed to investigate Manchuria. To what purpose? To see appeasement of Japan gradually lead to World War II.

TODAY newspapers and radio help crystallize public opinion in China, but the students are still China's Gallup Poll. I was in Kunming at the time of the student troubles there. The student government associations of the two amalgamated government university centers, Lien-Ta and Yun-Ta, called a mass meeting to protest the civil war between the Chinese communists and the troops of the national government.

There were two schools of thought among the students. There were pro-communist students who blamed the Kuomintang and the Chungking governments for the incipient civil war, who wanted to send a protest to Generalissimo Chiang



Chinese students have been injured and killed in their demonstrations and riotings concerning the political activities of their country.

Kai-shek and even to petition President Truman in America to "Get the GI's out of China!"

But there were other students who said, "If you protest to the Generalissimo against civil war, then you should also send a protest to Mao Tze-tung, the communist leader!" This group said, "Send a petition to President Truman to get the GI's out of China? Then also petition Premier Stalin to withdraw his troops from Manchuria as promised by treaty!"

When there are two opposing schools of thought amongst students it is well to let them meet and debate the issues, however fiercely. But the Chinese military authorities tried to prevent the spread of Communism during the war by sitting on the lid. The garrison commander of Yunnan issued a proclamation prohibiting mass meetings without special military permit. The proposed meeting was already announced. Yun-Ta University backed out when the military order was posted, refusing to participate. Lien-Ta University decided to go ahead. Seven thousand were present. They sat in orderly rows on the ground. This was fortunate, because during the meeting soldiers fired over their heads, and the bullets hit the wall of the compound not more than six or seven feet above the ground. Firing over the heads of the students at the mass meeting was only the beginning of the trouble.

Groups of students went out to talk to people on street-corners to tell them how their constitutional rights were being violated. While engaged in this traditional role of mobilizing public opinion, they had agreed that if anyone in uniform approached they would disperse and walk away in different directions as if on shopping errands. But the late Tai-Li's men (secret police) were clever. They appeared from nowhere in plain-clothes and fell upon the students. Some were badly injured. Three died.

The next day plain-clothes men slipped unnoticed into the college compound, went into various buildings, including the University hospital. They found a student giving a blood transfusion to a friend who had been badly beaten up. Knocking the equipment aside, they beat up the blood-donor, while the shock and lack of transfused blood caused the death of the one previously injured. A teacher was shot on the road near the college. One University girl was killed. All told, four students and the teacher met death.

This was serious. Serious and *stupid*. It was enough to drive all students into the communist camp. It united the students in resentment against the military, and back of that the government. Fortunately, for the cause of justice and Chungking, the Generalissimo acted promptly. He removed the garrison com-

mander at Kunming, ordered an investigation of the whole affair. The two soldiers found guilty of firing upon students and teachers were executed. Justice was not dead in China, nor were the rights of free speech and assemblage to be denied even to communist students.

That those who initiated the mass-meeting were pro-communist is evident from the posters they put up on compound walls and public buildings. I secured copies of most of the posters in both English and Chinese. In them three classes are called upon to strike: Students, workmen, and merchants. This was the three-fold program of the communists last winter in China: to foment strikes among students, laborers, and business employees.

**B**UT before I left the country, China's "Gallup Poll" indicated a marked shift in public opinion. This was only three months after the pro-communist sentiment had initiated the serious troubles in Kunming. There were two causes for the change: First, the secret clauses of the Yalta agreement had come to light; secondly, at almost the same moment, the Russian looting of Manchuria leaked out. Moreover, for the third time Russia had set a date for evacuating Manchuria and had failed to keep it. All students now

were seemingly of one mind. All were protesting. And, to all appearances, all were parading.

Students, three thousand strong, from Chiao Tung University and the Temporary Amalgamated University demonstrated against Russia's broken promise and the secret clauses of Yalta which appeased Russia at China's expense.

It was an orderly parade with microphones set up on open trucks so student leaders could harangue the people as they moved slowly along the thoroughfare. Dozens on foot carried banners in both Chinese and Russian language, which translated read: "Down With the New Imperialism," "Return Us Our Lands," "Down With the Secret Yalta Agreement."

On that same day in Chungking, fifty thousand students from fourteen schools and universities were out on parade. In three days the zenith in mobilizing and polling public opinion was reached. It was the day I enplaned for the States. The last Shanghai newspaper I saw announced a great mass demonstration for the Race Course (centrally located recreation grounds of the former International Settlement) to be staged by seventy high schools and colleges.

**T**HE students now had public support. There was no more criticism of "students parading instead of studying"; no charge as sometimes before that "the younger students have no idea what it's all about." One comment I overheard was: "If Soviet Russia has the right to take back what Tzarist Russia once possessed, China should certainly have the right to claim what the Manchu dynasty once held—Indo-China, Burma, Hongkong, and Kowloon!"

Older Chinese, usually so tolerant and restrained, were obviously worried and openly questioning Russia's designs on China. The secret Yalta agreement, one Chinese official said, came as a diplomatic atomic bomb to the people of China. The Control Yuan, highest supervisory organ of the government, declared it violated China's sovereignty and territorial integrity to a greater extent than Japan's demands clamped down on China after the Mukden incident of 1931.

Editorial comment of both newspapers and magazines agreed. *Current Affairs*, published in Shanghai, criticized the Yalta Pact as "sowing the seeds of another war." Perhaps no editorial comment was more succinct than this by the *China Critic*:

"If Roosevelt and Churchill were so anxious to please the Russians, why didn't they give them concessions in Alaska or in India, instead of giving away what didn't belong to them?"

There is no question today how the Chinese people feel about the Russian stripping of Manchuria, about their delay in evacuating, about their aid to the Chinese communist minority, or about western appeasement of Russia at Yalta. The students no longer need to crystallize public opinion. But they still gauge it, report it to the world. In this sense they are still a barometer in one of the storm centers of the world. They are still China's Gallup Poll.

#### SOURCE

Democracy is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people.—Harry Emerson Fosdick.

Energy expended in fighting communism, if devoted to preserving democracy, would make totalitarianism undesirable and democracy impregnable. Men who summon us to a holy war against communism are not only declaring war on Russia, but are diverting our attention from the primary obligation to democratize our own economic, political, ecclesiastical, and social life.—G. Bromley Oxnam.

Has it ever occurred to you that in our social system the politician is enabled to reach a position of responsibility without having any training? He serves no apprenticeship. He masters no course of study. He need pass no ex-



What is there to stop us from coming out for the elimination of wages entirely?

amination as to his ability. He receives neither a diploma nor a license to practice. Yet the veterinary who doctors our dogs and cats is required to show more careful preparation for his calling than is the politician who seeks to assume the right to direct not only our industrial but much of our personal life.—*The Kalends*.

No matter what theory of the origin of government you adopt, if you follow it out to its legitimate conclusions it will bring you face to face with the moral law.—*Henry van Dyke*.

Our total vote may be about fifty-three million. We will have about twenty-three million Republicans and twenty-three million Democrats who will vote straight regardless of ticket, thus cancelling each other. The election will be determined by the approximate six or seven million independent voters. The recent shifts that could have changed the results were:

1932, shift of 3,530,008 votes  
 1936, shift of 5,398,545 votes  
 1940, shift of 2,457,375 votes  
 1944, shift of 1,788,268 votes

In 1948 we will have about eight million potential new voters. Young people can determine the next election and the destiny of our people.—*Samuel S. Wyer*.

### Church and State

Fundamental in American life is the theory of the separation of the church and the state. Equally fundamental is the conviction that the ideals and principles for which the church stands must be carried into our civic and political life. There is only one way in which that can be done. Members of the church of the highest Christian ideals must carry those ideals into the practical working program of modern politics.

The church as an organization must not go into politics, but churchmen must become politicians and use political life as an area in which to give expression to their Christian ideals. Indeed, if any nation is to be Christianized, Christian men and women must use politics as one of the channels through which their Christian ideals and convictions find expression.

The church must come to recognize that individual members must be encouraged to be active in the life of their political party as an expression of their Christian convictions.

The church should provide for forum and discussion groups for the consideration of vital political issues and problems.

The church must seek in every way possible to hold moral and ethical issues before the community. Church members as active members of their political parties must seek to carry out those values so that they will find expression in the policy of their party and in the convictions of their candidates.

The church must get all its members possible to register so that they may vote. The church will not tell its members how to vote. But it will urge them to exercise their franchise. How a person votes must be left to his Christian conscience. The church should urge its members to the



And furthermore, not to make use of our atom bombs would be a criminal waste of the taxpayer's money!

fullest expression of their citizenship by becoming active members of a political party. Which party must be the choice of their own religious conviction. How they act as members must be dictated by the enlightened Christian conscience which the church constantly seeks to develop in its members.

Our conviction that moral principles should govern men in all their relations must be the basic motivation for our participation in political action.

If we are convinced that all life is to be brought under the rule of the Kingdom of God, then we see in political action another and effective way to give living expression to our abiding faith and hope.

*Roy Burt*

[Continued from page 8]

which will encourage or make room for the freedom which legislation can never create.

On the surface it looks as if laissez-faire law and policy give widest scope for freedom of soul. Leave men alone so they are free to be good and kind. This is much too optimistic. Pilate, avoiding the determination of community policy, talked laissez-faire. History none the less holds him responsible for the events that ensued. Furthermore, it is quite evident that nobody ever did really want a laissez-faire social policy. No society, Christian

or otherwise, can be built on the theory of leaving men and things alone to work out their own tendencies.

Lastly, unlike certain mystics who sigh "the world is too much with us" and wait for a specialized rebirth, the main stream of Christian thought from the beginning has tended to assert that the spiritual and physical energies necessary for community building are renewed by grace from hour to hour. Sentimental longings for another sort of world are a non-violent form of "kicking against the pricks," a sin which is on a par with worldliness itself. Indeed it is not another world that is needed but a right reading of the world that is here and a right use of its substance. The social problem is not a Promethean one of bringing down new powers from on high. Much progress can be made by releasing men from man-made hindrances to the expression of the powers they have. The problem is to discover for life's traffic those highways which produce the fewest accidents, yield the highest rewards for travel, and get travelers most efficiently to their proper destinations. Christians face social questions with the assurance that men are free moral beings, partners with God, his sons, inheritors of effective tools and a promise. Therefore they plant and build and vote and legislate with vigor, testing the methods rationally by their effects on the character and happiness of all men.

## Profound and Calm Like Waters Deep and Still

*An hour or two in the cell of Thomas à Kempis can lift us out of the range of the traffic jam. The lyric affirmations of his Imitation of Christ uncover the best that is hidden the deepest in man's soul.*

ANNA PAUL

THE STORY OF MAN, the religious animal, is full of contradictions—some tragic, some funny, all illuminating. I have just come across a new one. General Gordon and John Wesley, two of the most strenuous Christians who ever went galloping up the straight-and-narrow with the road smoking behind them, both carried into the thick of their furious activities *The Imitation of Christ*. It just happens to be the most pietistic, quietistic of devotional classics! And these two men are only striking illustrations of a widespread circumstance. *The Imitation*, edited thousands of times, has been by all odds the most popular manual of its kind in a practical, Protestant world that is generally disdainful of the monastic one that produced the book. It might be worth our while to inquire into this paradox.

First, however, we shall need to see the man whom the weight of scholarly evidence has determined as its author. Thomas Hammerken of Kempen, near Düsseldorf, is frequently referred to (even by Roman Catholics who should know better) as St. Thomas à Kempis. Perhaps the mistake is made by unconscious analogy with St. Thomas à Becket. Perhaps it is due to a natural assumption that he deserves canonization. Indeed there was, long ago, a half-hearted consideration of the case for his beatification; but nothing came of it, and he has remained plain Thomas to this day. Perhaps it will be to your advantage, as you try to bridge the gap between your kind of religious life and his, that there is no halo to burn your fingers.

In his early youth, in the last decade of the fourteenth century, he went to Deventer, in Holland, where he joined the Community of Brothers, living eventually at Mount St. Agnes, in Zolle. It was a short-lived but attractive fellowship, its members simply people who took their religion with absolute seriousness, making no elaborate vows, but living plainly and devoutly—the clergy in houses, the laity in their homes. They could not beg, like the Franciscans, but were bound to work for their living and were expected to give away their surplus—a reasonable enough Christian code, when you come to think about it. Thomas,

who took priestly orders, taught children, preached a little, and was a beautiful copyist, writing out four full Bibles. The last was a touching anachronism, for it was not completed until after the Gutenberg Bible had made its appearance.

Comments from his contemporaries give us scanty but vivid details about Thomas. We see a little man, dark and bright-eyed, carrying a child's red cheeks and a child's ardor into advanced old age. We know he was respected enough to be made sub-prior, and absent-minded enough to be deprived of the management of chapter charities. We know he found peace only "in little nooks with little books." We hear that he always chanted the psalter with his face tilted, rising on tip-toe as he sang. In that little, unconscious mannerism is revealed the basic nature of the born worshipper. If you understand that impulsive uprush of uncalculating devotion, you have at least one bond with Thomas, even if you intend to build skyscrapers or practice law. You will find a second tie if you can understand why the brassy, superficial chatter of the brothers sometimes hurt him, so that he would slip away to his cell and to better company.

And what is his book like, that lends its medieval, monastic bias to serve our modern, public lives? It will be best to eliminate false hopes at the start. In the first place, you need not look for originality. Thomas assumed that Christ, the apostles, and the church fathers had pretty well covered the essentials. He is satisfied to quote, paraphrase, simplify. Nor will you find any reasoned defense of faith. The book was written for people who had fixed beliefs already; therefore all statements are made within the framework of orthodoxy. Most of the pitfalls of this method are escaped, however, because Thomas had a feeling for what is basic, and hardly mentioned the elaborate dogmas that narrow the sympathetic audience of many medieval writers. Finally, it would be futile to hope for much fresh application of religion to life. The brothers within the monastery walls knew well how they were expected to live.

The positive and nearly universal aspects of *The Imitation* are of a different sort: the lyric reaffirmation of love, humility,

and generosity; a controlled delight in penitence, forgiveness, communion; and a skilled technique in exciting and conveying genuinely Christian moods. If Thomas does not give you everything you want, neither does Jeremiah, nor St. John of the Fourth Gospel. Nobody says it all.

*The Imitation* is composed of four books, each divided into very short "capitula." Book I, which gives the whole its inaccurate title, is a set of directions for the professional "religious." The most monastic of the four, it counsels obedience, decorum, etc. The tone is very like St. Paul's when he is lecturing the churches.

The admonitions of Book II "draw greatly inward," as the title page has it. That is, they are concerned less with outward behavior and more with the hidden attitudes, emotions, and values of the Christian soul. It is less hortatory in tone, more personal in feeling.

Book III, "of inward consolation," is longer than the first two together, and reveals much more of the writer's individuality. Some of the chapters are little colloquies with God, engaging as a child's conversation with an unseen playmate. It is lyrical and psalm-like in places, and often quoted. Many of its transparent petitions have found their way into classic collections of prayers.

The last book is a manual of preparation for the Communion. Unfortunately, it is omitted from the editions put out by Protestant publishing houses, on the ground that it assumes a theory of that sacrament acceptable only to Catholics. As we have been insisting all along in similar cases, that is not a very good reason for depriving the reader of other, universal values, also present. Reverence is the most subtle and exquisite of the arts of religion, and Protestants are sometimes not very adept at it. All of us could learn a good deal about the encouragement of that lovely attitude from the hushed happiness and awe of this book.

NOW let us see what are some of the familiar concepts that Thomas makes convincing with his limpid phrasing. There is, of course, constant stress on other-worldliness. Now this is not a popular emphasis with young people, per-



haps not with Americans in general. Yet anyone who tries to rule it completely out of Christianity will be forced to revise that faith. When you stop to consider the havoc that one blunderer, even a well-meaning one, can cause in a lifetime, you discover a certain penetration in the saying of Thomas: "If it be dreadful to die, peradventure it is more perilous to live long."

Another theme that returns like a refrain is what he calls "inwardness," or "gathering oneself within oneself." Here he exhibits the great strength of the mystic, the ability to probe toward essentials: "If we put the profiting of religion alone in outward observances, our devotion shall soon have an end."

Also, in common with more philosophical mystics, he is vexed by the multiplicity of phenomena, and drives his mind persistently toward the all-embracing one. "Of one Word cometh all," he says. And again, "He to whom all things are one . . . and who seeth all things in one, may be stable in heart and peaceably abide in God. O God of truth, make me one with Thee in everlasting charity."

Thomas' only grief seems to be that so much of the human race has given its devotion to disappointing trash. That knowledge casts just the right artistic shadow across his "coats of quiet." The expressive lines that convey it are too gentle to be called satire—just a rueful realism: "For a little prebend a man runneth a long way; but for everlasting life scarce the foot is once lift up from the earth." Not that he has much use for the devotion that keeps one eye on even spiritual rewards. "Where is there found one that will serve God for naught?" he queries plaintively. The answer is, of course, where there is a man of the spiritual caliber to conceive such a question.

We begin to see him, now, as a man who, with utter singleness of aim, made a whole life out of what is only a facet of yours and mine, and so helps us to understand this neglected or submerged side of our nature. Moreover, he makes of religion a secret affair of the heart, and so satisfies the only half-acknowledged romanticism that colors the religious moods of most people. Not one of us can, or should, despise the world as he did—though if we were living in a world we could not try to change by votes, committees, and pressure campaigns, perhaps we should find more sense than futility in his retreat. Yet anybody over twenty-five is likely to be a little tired sometimes, and an hour or two in the cell of Thomas à Kempis carries us out of the range of traffic noise, where we can hear the whisperings of infinitude. His was a narrow life? Of course. But why be smug? So is an insurance salesman's—and it is not so deep nor so high.



Frederick Bohn Fisher Memorial—the only imported Hindu temple in the United States

In the midst of the citrus-grove campus of Florida Southern College, at Lakeland, stands a prick to a Christian conscience. It is a small, sandstone temple.

Methodist Bishop Frederick Bohn Fisher, before leaving India for the last time, was permitted to remove it from Benares, the holy city of Hinduism. Carefully, the handcarved blocks of sandstone were dismantled and transplanted to a sloping site on the Florida Southern campus. There it stands today reflecting its strange cross into the placid waters of a pool surrounded by trees and flowers.

And yet, it stands in Florida not in India. It is torn from the midst of the culture that created it and in which it had meaning; from the midst of the people who believing in individual worship found within it kneeling space for one alone; from the midst of the Hindu religious men who saw in each arch and design, a deep symbolism hidden from the eyes of the Western world.

To those who recognize this, the little temple must be an uncomfortable prick of the conscience. It may torment their memories with the knowledge of the plundering, disrespectful way Western peoples have trampled the culture of others because of their insatiable desire for exotic loot. Or it may remind them of the demanding, slavish way Western peoples have imposed their "civilization" upon the rest of the "pagan" world.

It must hurt the Christian conscience even deeper to see the patient work of a Hindu sculptor of five hundred years ago, blasphemed in the name of Christianity—for a metal cross will never change the creative intent of the artist. It must hurt just as much to realize how often well-intentioned but unknowing Christian missionaries have trampled the culture of India by stamping in its gothic arch, medieval steeple, and the hard-set building forms of a Christianity which is alien, unreal, uncreative.

But this forlorn, little temple is not the story of Florida Southern. Not far from the reflecting pool is the modern, extremely functional chapel created by the greatest of all American architects—Frank Lloyd Wright. This is only the first of fourteen buildings created by Wright for a "Shrine to Protestantism"—religion in stone, and cement; creative, free, purposeful.

# Philly Is No Pin-Up Gal

MARION WEFER

CHAPTER Forty-Seven. Poltics," wrote the foreign gentleman in *Pickwick Papers* who was gathering material for his great work on England, "The word politics surprises himself. . . ." And merrily on, neatly hashing a rounded period of Mr. Pickwick's who had just informed him that the word politics "comprises a difficult study of no inconsiderable magnitude."

Now that books, the stage, radio, and screen are making psychoanalysts of us all, and we glibly patter the jargon of the consulting room as prettily as we please, the old word association test is, I suppose, rather elementary. I say "politics" to you and you, what do you say to me? Doesn't the word "rotten" immediately leap to your lips? "Rotten politics"? The association clicks with the snap of handcuffs linking them together. "Rotten politics." One and inseparable, now and forever! But are they? Must they be? Why?

There have been notable times when they were jolted apart. Politics and civic decency have made yokemates occasionally although the union seems invariably to be of short duration. Always, always rottenness crept back again while decent citizens slept. Always, always they forgot that there is no discharge in the war between darkness and light.

Philadelphia, the city which I now call home, is a perfect example of this and a good many fingers are pointed at the old colonial cradle of liberty. You probably read about us lately in the *Saturday Evening Post*. The book, old but accurate, *Steps Going Down*, describes us perfectly. There are any number of jokes about Philadelphia. But a city that is "corrupt and contented" is not funny. It is tragic and pitiable.

Pouring out his soul in an agony of entreaty for his "fair, green town," William Penn prayed, "And thou, Philadelphia, what love, what care, what service and what travail there have been to bring thee forth and to preserve thee from such as would abuse and defile thee. Oh that thou mayest be kept from the evil that would overwhelm thee. . . ."

A good thing that the eyes of William Penn atop City Hall are not seeing eyes! It would mean pain a plenty for him to

scan the sanctum of City Hall and appraise the inhabitants thereof! As one candid politician of Philadelphia today said apropos of some revelations that he might have made—and did not: "If I was to tell you that, you'd drop right outta your pants!"

Sadly enough we know that Philadelphia is not alone at grips with "such as would abuse and defile" her. What to do as Christian citizens? Certainly to hold aloof does not make sense. Sir Ernest Barker, England's most noted classical scholar, has just published his translation of *The Politics of Aristotle*. Says the *Saturday Review of Literature*, a publication not given to choking its writers with butter, "This is an unconditionally first-rate book. It deserves nothing less than a 'rave-notice,' and that is what it is going to get." Aristotle, the "finest intellect of antiquity," held that one may learn much from one's opponents. So one may. From the average "rotten politician" we may yet learn with humility teamwork, perseverance, pace! Especially pace! Why must the children of light be so slow on their feet? Time and time again they trail when they should leap like harts and mount on eagle's wings. The ungodly are not so, as you have probably remarked. Their achievements in the political field are abundantly remarkable.

It resolves into what the Christian is going to do with his vote. Don't throw up your hands and say "What is my vote among so many?" Politicians make no such mistake. During the past few years our family has moved three times. In



each case the local leaders were promptly upon our doorsteps almost before our feet had become accustomed to mounting them. We were reminded to register. We were entreated to register. We were all but borne in their arms to register. Three votes are three votes.

In the last move it was wryly amusing to see how our political mentor had us all taped out. We had come to transform a proud mansion used as a Hospitality House by the Presbyterians for the thousands of servicemen passing through the city, into an executive center called Presbyterian House. Church people. Oh, yes, he understood them. He deplored for us the "class of people" coming and going in the large house across the street. He was so wrong. I had been watching that house with pleasure ever since we came into the city. It was neatly maintained with venetian blinds in every window, a gracious colonial doorway, and a graceful staircase winding to the third floor which I could glimpse from my apartment windows. Occasionally I saw white capped figures within. It was a health center for the Union of the International Ladies Garment Workers. This Union has not had a strike in the last twenty years. Their educational program is excellent. Years ago in New York, Mr. Mark Starr, their director of education, was one of the leaders in a church forum which my husband conducted. Years ago, also, the I.L.G.W.U. Players made theatrical history with *Pins and Needles*, one of the best satirical reviews ever staged. I can still whistle *Sunday in the Park* or sing you a *Song of Social Significance*. It was a wonderful show. Far from deploring the "class of people" opposite me, I was all for dashing across to visit the neighbors.

The politician might also have been surprised by the variety of information which a young people's group in a church a few blocks away is acquiring in their meetings. They are addressed by all sorts of experts. I went to hear a brain surgeon, but owing to the vagaries of air travel, what I found was a flutist and a policewoman. The policewoman pulled no punches. These young people wanted to know the facts of life about their city and they found them. The solution of matters lay largely, as she advised us, in clean politics. Which brings us around again to the Christian and his vote. It is a tool which our forefathers put into our hands and our foremothers fought valiantly to present to us. Even yet we might build the city of God with it. Even yet! But if we neglect it, there is every chance that our great cities will make, as the High Tor Indian said, "Good ruins!"

# Open the Door, Wifey

KATHARINE WHITESIDE TAYLOR

Couldn't Dr. Taylor point out that girls are going to work anyway, and they'd be happier spending their salaries to help a loved husband through school than spending the checks for new clothes? And that being a housewife is an ancient and honorable estate, fully on a par with being a stenographer? It certainly is a profession.

The answer to the first query is "Yes, certainly" for girls who have reached a stage of maturity where giving of one's self for love is really more satisfying than making one's self beautiful. It is gratifying that as one looks about there seem to be many such young wives in our communities today, shouldering much of the financial burden of their families with grace and dignity; and they have not lost one whit of their womanliness in so-doing!

Being womanly in the deepest sense means fulfilling the needs of loved ones, promoting their happiness and best development. If this means helping as breadwinner rather than bread maker, helping clean up a city as well as one's own house, then it is womanly, wifely, and motherly to do those things!

The second query demands a fuller discussion. Being a housewife is certainly the calling which for generations has claimed the largest part of women's energies. Yet it has too seldom been considered "honorable" in the same way of some out-of-home professions. For instance, this writer attended a "Women's Day" celebration in a certain community where "the most outstanding" women of the community were asked to give short talks. There were educators, writers, actresses, lawyers, doctors, but not one was invited for being an outstanding homemaker. Yet in that community lived one mother of five grown children, all of whom had reached unusual distinction.

Too generally women are apologetic about their vocation. When asked to fill in questionnaires, they typically say, "I'm only a housewife!" And often during the war, when asked why they didn't do this or that in the community, women would say with a new note of pride, "I'm *working* now!" They may have made a home for a husband and several children, but felt they were not "working" unless they had a paid outside job. Because on the whole, society rates the value of a job by the pay received. Yet, if any homemaker were paid by the hour for the many services she performs during all of her waking day and often into the nights, her husband would be bankrupt in a few weeks. In most families long hours of overtime service are taken for granted, and no bonuses are given even in the form of very deep appreciation. To

what degree does homemaking deserve to be considered a profession? Webster says "a profession is a calling in which one professes to have acquired some special knowledge used by way either of instructing, guiding or advising others, or of serving them in some art." To what extent have homemakers devoted themselves to acquiring "some special knowledge"? Even with excellent offerings in courses on family relations, child development, home management, household art, nutrition, and cooking, the great majority still come to their basically important tasks with no preparation at all. And too often the quality of their work shows it. Furthermore homemakers frequently devote their most serious attention to details of cooking, cleaning, and home decoration, rather than to "instructing and guiding" their children, or serving their families in that most difficult art of human relations which releases the best of each by the creative interaction of all. For instance, a mother of a two-year-old said, "If only I could get someone to take care of Barbara I could get my work done!" She saw her chief work as keeping the house, not guiding the development of her child. Also how many women devote serious study and reading to developing the best possible love relationship with their husbands?

If homemaking is to reach the level of excellence expected of a profession, several things are needed. First of all, there is great need for more widespread education as to the importance of family living and of the mother's task as central coordinator, one as delicate and complex as that of any personnel director. Along with this, there must be more thoroughgoing preparation of *both* men and women for marriage and family life. And as a part of this education, if it is creative and free and not hide-bound, there

will come an ever-deepening concept of the meaning of homemaking, the realization that if parents are to promote their own children's safe and wholesome development, they can no longer feel the job is done in their own home and garden, but is coextensive with the world itself.

**Is infatuation necessary to marriage?**

Webster says infatuation means "thoroughly under the influence of foolish passion, acting without sense or reason." While the state that we call being in love is an important ingredient in the elements that make for joy in marriage, it should not be allowed to carry people off their feet and into situations and relationships which are really foolish. The great psychiatrist, Karl Jung, says that if we follow instinct alone in guiding our behavior, we will be right half the time; if we follow intellectual judgment alone, we will be right half the time. The part of wisdom is to use all parts of one's nature in making the decisions that will determine one's life. In so doing, we can work out a balance which satisfies the complete man or woman.

As pointed out in this column in November, while a strong feeling of in-loveness is one of the basic cornerstones for happiness in marriage, the other facets of companionship, of similar ideals and goals, should be checked also. Using the engagement as marriage insurance is perhaps its most important function.

On the other hand, it is true that some girls who have come from an inhibited background may not respond in the way typically recognized as erotic but may yet know they love a man with all their power to love. In such cases, it is quite possible that the girl may develop her capacity for complete response after marriage. If it does not come about naturally in the course of a year or so, the help of a marriage counselor should be sought. In not more than one per cent of all cases is there any physical reason for lack of adequate satisfaction in the sexual aspects of marriage. Barriers are almost entirely psychic and can be worked through with adequate help.

(Dr. Taylor may be addressed at the Univ. of Illinois YMCA, Champaign, Ill.)



# Hallelujah Bandwagon

*Any similarity between this diatribe and the faith of an intelligent Christian, living or dead, is purely coincidental.*

**ROBERT HAMILL**

Dear Jack-of-all . . . I mean, Dear Editor:

You are dabbling again. In other men's business. Why do you persist in slopping over your religion into other affairs? Can't you be a gentleman and live at home? In the very beginning, you know, the Lord parceled things out: education he gave to the Phi Betes and likely-old-maids; business he handed to the go-getters; religion to the priests and preachers; and politics to the politicians. Are you wiser than God, to think that politics belongs under religion? You Christians claim, and I don't dispute you nor Chancellor Hutchins, that religion is queen of the humanities. That's all right with me, and what's more, it may be true. But why do you hog the whole field? You want to lay down principles for politics, you say. Politics is immune to morality, dear fellow. Besides, how would you like it if we called on the Republican caucus to revise the Apostles' Creed?

Now understand me, I am not a politician, and I don't have any other bad habits. "My pollertics, like my religion, being of an exceedin' accommodatin' character" (Artemus Ward), gets me into no trouble except with those who take their "pollertics" seriously, as men do in Georgia. In Iowa we wouldn't fight to be governor; we fight to get out of the job, for no man's reputation can afford to be governor over two years.

I can see it plain as the blush on your face, that this man Jesus would never make a show in a good political scrap these days.

For one thing, he wasn't a democrat—small d. He didn't even pretend to be democratic. Did he ever put his ideas up for a public vote? He didn't dare. The only time he ever stood up for a popular vote the crowd voted one hundred to one for Barabbas. Did he ever ask the twelve disciples for a vote of confidence? The story never tells of Jesus' sitting down with the boys and talking things over. No, "all power is given to me in heaven and in earth," he said, and they said too. He didn't try to be democratic in method. "He spoke as one having authority." Very well, but don't expect him to get far in a democratic country like ours.

Futhermore, he had a mild intolerance

which doesn't set well with modern Americans. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." Now you can't be dogmatic about things. A politician, if he expects to get into office, and a statesman, if he expects to remain there, has to work out a bi-partisan program with the opposition. That is not compromise; just common sense. "I am *the way, the truth and the life.*" Demagogues rant and stamp their feet and shout, "Follow me, men. I've got *the only way* out of this mess!"—but they never last long in this free country. Witness . . . well, you know. Granted, Jesus had a high regard for the individual, especially for the down-and-outer. Yet he also had a cocksureness about himself. Without self-criticism or caution, he set his face steadily to go to Jerusalem and to defeat. Now don't misunderstand. I do not suggest that Jesus did wrong. I only point out that he wouldn't get far with those tactics in a political campaign in America.

Then look at his platform. What would Jesus suggest as a workable political program? You can't do better than to take his own words. Imagine the billboards of America plastered with:

GOOD NEWS FOR THE POOR

SET THE PRISONERS FREE

RECOVERY OF SIGHT TO BLIND

Now, with the blind and the jailbirds and the poor you might build a political machine, but you would never get contributions from them! Then, Walter Lippmann says we need a farsighted foreign policy, but Jesus said "take no thought for the morrow." I wonder. "Take no gold nor silver nor copper in your purse, no bag for your journey, nor two tunics, nor sandals, nor a staff; for the laborer deserves his food." Would that program get out the labor vote? And how can you get anyone elected without the portal-to-portal boys?

Suppose by some chance, he got into office. How could he hold authority? "The rulers of the gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant." How many presidential executive orders would that put the national guard behind? "They

that take the sword will perish by the sword." How many billions would that wring out of Congress for the army and navy?

Tell me, Editor, what would happen to a Christian man who got into politics? Happen to his soul, I mean? Once in office, the pressures twist and torment him if he hopes to stay there. Politicians are marvels of energy and principle when they're out of office, as Galsworthy said, but when they get into office, they have to log roll, pork barrel, feather nest, and do a thousand other connivings. "There's just one rule for politicians all over the world: don't say in power what you say in opposition; if you do, you only have to carry out what the other fellows have found impossible." (*Maid In Waiting*, Galsworthy.) Politicians cannot love their neighbors. Best they can do is balance off contrary claims of selfish lobbies. They have to choose between two evils. That makes it mighty tough to "let your speech be yea, yea, and nay, nay." Hamlet was no fool either: "A politician [is] one that would circumvent God." Either that or circumvent his friends, and his friends can vote.

I would not object to your tempting young campus Christians with the wiles of politics, if you could show me a single example in all human history of a government following a true Christian policy. In *Darkness at Noon*, Ivanov accuses Rubashov of this same point.

"In times of need—and politics is chronically in a time of need—the rulers were always able to evoke 'exceptional circumstances' which demanded exceptional measures of self-defense."

Exhibit A: it is the big nations today that talk about self-defense, as though little Norway and Greece were vicious bears devouring the lambs who have no self-protection.

"Since the beginning of nations . . . they live in a permanent state of mutual self-defense, which forces them to defer to another time the putting into practice of humanism." Which gives point to Bismarck's observation, that when he was in the bosom of his family he felt sure of God, but when he walked into the foreign office and breathed its atmosphere of deceit and intrigue, he had his doubts.

To sum it up, I would say it is easier for a camel to get through the eye of a needle than for a Christian to get elected to office, and, *v. v.*, it is easier for a camel to be a good Christian than for a politician to remain pure and unspotted from the world.

Regretfully yours,

*Skeptic*

What is the position of miracles in contemporary religious thought?

Modern science has attempted to convince us that this is a law-abiding universe. The law of gravitation will always work; light will always travel at the same rate. We cannot *break* the laws of the universe; we can only *illustrate* them. However, in the realm of spiritual living, there are unusual things which can happen. Unhappy, frustrated men and women can be "miraculously" changed into vibrant strong personalities. When men let God's spirit touch them wholly, unusual events accrue. Stanley Jones, in *The Christ of the Indian Road*, tells of his experience: he was ready to quit and go back to America—defeated and enervated. But the voice of God told him that he was trying to do the job by himself; instead he should surrender his life to God and let God work through him completely and support him. Stanley Jones made that surrender, and the way his life has touched millions of others through his writings and lectures has indicated that "miracles" do happen in the realm of spiritual living. However, men like Stanley Jones have not broken the spiritual laws of the universe; they have only illustrated them.

Different churches hold various attitudes toward the problem of changing the physical laws of the universe to fit particular needs. The Roman Catholic Church believes that miracles which alter the physical laws of the universe are continuously occurring. Many Fundamentalists feel that such miracles occurred in biblical times, but that they no longer do. Liberal Protestant theologians assent to the fact that the physical laws of the universe are dependable, that they are not to be broken, but that there is always the possibility of the unusual happening when a peculiar combination of forces in the universe eventuates.

My own position is this: I realize that there is much about the physical universe and its laws that we do not know; unusual things do happen. But there is so much on the side of the universe having dependable physical laws, that we should act each day with a confidence in the physical laws of the universe. Religion for me is not to ask for a physical law, such as that which affects rain, to meet my whims or needs. Rather, religion is a means by which I seek power, wisdom, and patience to meet the difficulties brought upon me by both personal and impersonal forces of the universe. Prayer can cause unusual ("miraculous") events to happen in personalities!

Most of the New Testament miracles are those of mental healings, which still are basic in the lives of modern men when the principles of the New Testament become effective. To forgive seventy

## It's the Gospel Truth

The question box is open. Ask and ye shall receive answers to your doubts, misgiving, or just plain confusion.

THOMAS S. KEPLER

times seven, to overcome evil with good, to take no anxious thought for the morrow, to have faith which could remove mountains, to refrain from censoriousness, to lose oneself in something bigger than oneself are still basic laws by which the unusual or the "miraculous" can happen in Christian personalities. If the world is to become the Kingdom, I feel that such a "miracle" must happen in myriads of individuals. Jesus is the real "miracle" of history and replicas of him will be the hope of the world!

Why does the creed say the "resurrection of the body," rather than "of the flesh"?

The Pharisees generally agreed upon the soul and the physical body joining each other on the resurrection day, since it was a part of the oral rabbinical tradition. Paul, however, in writing to the Corinthians, spoke of the "glorified" or "spiritual" body. In apocalyptic literature there is a belief that the physical body will join the soul on the resurrection day—such as we find in the Avesta of Zoroastrianism or the Koran of Islam; in these religions, especially in Islam, there are many sensual factors related to the resurrection of the physical body. However, since Christianity is basically related to the spiritual resurrection of Christ, its concept of a resurrected body is consequently based on a "spiritual body." Christianity founded its first century premise upon the fact that the spirit of Christ lived in the lives of his followers; hence the creed ought to say today "the resurrection of the (spiritual) body" rather than of "the flesh," since it is the corporate spirit of man which is worthy of life after the grave. The body is only a temporary vehicle through which the spirit functions. The more we can live the spirit of Christ in our lives, the more we shall possess that which is worthy of conserving in a friendly universe when our physical bodies have worn out! Personally I believe in whatever fashion our spirits are clothed after the grave, that we shall keep growing, creating, living with God, and facing interesting things to do. Like my eighty-year-

old grandfather, I anticipate the experiences after the grave with great thrill! While I know this is but a conjecture, I feel that it is rationally based upon present experiences. Life without growth and void of companionship with God would be unbearable, both in this life and in the life after the grave. Yes, I believe in the resurrection of the spiritual body of man, because I believe in a God who cares and who is desirous of conserving the values of personalities!

Will you please give me a few general books for a library in religious philosophy?

There is a galaxy of books for you to choose from; but I shall select a few which will give you a broad view of religion. I mention these without much comment. (1) Ferm, *An Encyclopedia of Religion*. Recently published, its scholarship is fresh and you will find in a concise way an insight into most religious terms. (2) Wieman-Meland, *American Philosophies of Religion*. Published in 1936, the book is still comprehensive in giving you a perspective of a large number of American thinkers, their viewpoints, and their books. It will also acquaint you with types of schools of thought. (3) Kepler, *Contemporary Religious Thought*. I rather apologize for mentioning my own anthology, but it was prepared for students and ministers who wished to become better acquainted with various minds as they thought upon religion, religious truth, God, suffering, prayer, and immortality. (4) Wright, *A Student's Philosophy of Religion*. This is not a new book; it still ranks well in giving an acute study of religious philosophy and the living religions of the world. (5) Bewkes, and others, *A Survey in Philosophy and Religion*. A par excellent book used at Colgate University. (6) Burt, *Types of Religious Philosophy*. An excellent historical survey which shows how various schools of religious thought have come into existence. The reading is a bit hard but rewarding.

(Dr. Kepler may be addressed at the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.)

# Celluloid Censorship

MARGARET FRAKES

THE scientists who have been trying to awaken us to the implications of atomic research and the probability that the entire human race is headed for destruction if it doesn't wake up to those implications, admit that they see little hope of Hollywood as an ally in their campaign. Realizing that the screen offered a grand chance to get their ideas before the public, they have been trying to convince producers of the necessity of doing something, but so far they have been discouraged in their efforts. The *March of Time* did a short that had some suggestions of the possible doom if the nations go on using the discoveries for military means, but most of the footage was devoted to pictures of what a splash the bomb made.

At first the producers were eager to take advantage of the timeliness of the subject. Several of them announced at once films based on the bomb. The scientists were interested. But they discovered that the first film dealing with the subject, *Cloak and Dagger*, was to be just another chase film. Then MGM's *Beginning of the End* was announced. Actors in that film take the parts of men who had much to do with development of the bomb. One of the scientists who worked on the project, Niels Bohr, a Dane, even appeared in the film himself. But when he saw in what direction the film turned out to be heading—towards a boy-meets-girl theme with atomic dressings—he requested that the parts in which he played be deleted. Now an actor is taking that part, with the scientist's name and appearance changed. According to a story in the *New Yorker* the company offered the Federation of American Scientists, a group formed to lobby for effective civilian control of atomic research, a much-needed sum of money for the right to say on the credit shots of the film that the group had provided "technical supervision." Although that money would have meant a lot to the struggling organization, it refused to consent to such a distortion of fact—particularly in view of what the film seems destined to be. This little intelligence gives one pause when he remembers how often films announce themselves as made with the "technical advice" of some reputable organization or

other. That note has always seemed to give a certain prestige to otherwise routine films. In the future, we can hardly be so confident.

\* \* \*

The question of Hollywood's "technical advisers" is involved in another news note from the West Coast. Fox has bought *Captain from Castile*, a novel by Samuel Shellabarger dealing with the Spanish conquest of Mexico, and is proceeding with plans to film it. According to an announcement in the press by Father John J. Devlin, pastor of St. Victor's Roman Catholic Church in Los Angeles, who is also the Hollywood representative of the Legion of Decency and "adviser to the producers' association on matters religious," he warned the company when it purchased the novel that it would not be acceptable to "the church." It seems that the novel painted a vivid picture of the Inquisition as a cruel institution. The villain is Father DeLora, a cruel and corrupt priest of the Inquisition. Father Devlin pointed out that that wasn't the truth at all, that the Inquisition was just a little campaign aimed at Jews who had become Roman Catholic converts for the purpose of subverting Roman Catholic thought. Well, as might have been expected, the writers went to work to meet this objection. Now, according to the "adviser on matters religious," the treatment of the Inquisition has been toned down, so that DeLora appears very briefly and is not shown to be cruel. A bribe which he took in the novel has been explained as an outright gift to the church.

I suppose the only way to insure pure technical advice would be to have all the different interpretations of all the different bodies concerned presented, then cancel off one side against the other and make a film with what is left. Sometimes it almost seems as if that is what has been done, so that what you get says nothing that could possibly offend anyone.



And if you think it is only the Roman Catholic Church which protects, you should see the letters I received after I recommended *The Green Years* as a fine film! It paints Protestants in an ugly manner, I was told, and the review was entirely out of place in a Protestant magazine. Well, that is a matter of opinion. Roman Catholicism was painted nicely in the film, indeed, but it seemed to me as if the Protestant grandmother came off far better than she did in the novel on which the film was based. Certainly what resulted was a good movie, with commendable virtues celebrated as a young man sought to keep his moral integrity in the face of severe difficulties. And a film which recognizes moral problems and the way of the human soul is seldom to be found.

\* \* \*

Censorship in its purest form can be found only in a dictatorship. No one wants to see it come to our own channels of communication. So far the movies have done a fairly good job themselves, so far as the *letter* of the Production Code on moral standards is concerned.

There has been a lot of talk lately about the desirability of having the state department—or some other government agency—pass on all films proposed for export. It has arisen because for many years some of the producers have been "dumping" second-rate films abroad, knowing that people in other countries go to see American movies no matter what they contain, and because even some of our technically most excellent films portray a frivolous, callous, over-sumptuous and sometimes brutal way of life that gives an entirely misleading story about how Americans really live and act. Late in December, a House of Representatives subcommittee held a hearing on the matter. Producers then promised to do some "self-policing" if only the government would lay off official censorship. That sounds like a good idea; often a remedy can be more dangerous than the malady, and in this case it seems as if this might be the case. How the policing works should, however, be a matter for close watching.

\* \* \*

"Why bother reviewing movies at all?" critics and the journals that pay them to write film estimates may well ask after reading the results of a Gallup poll taken among audiences going into motion picture theaters. This poll revealed that 85 per cent of those people questioned do not know what reviewers have said about the film being shown. Furthermore, the poll showed that of the 15 per cent who do read reviews, many persist in going in spite of the fact that the reviews may have been unfavorable.

## AMONG CURRENT FILMS

It's a Wonderful Life brings Jimmy Stewart back to the screen in one of those parts he does so well—that of a well-meaning, good natured small town business man who can't help doing good and what he feels is right, even though it means he must give up his heartfelt ambitions. Some parts are just a little too whimsical for discriminating observers, but the heart's in the right place, and the whole is moving and shows considerable insight into human nature.

The Jolson Story has Al Jolson's voice on the soundtrack and the singer's person represented by a young actor new to the screen by name of Larry Parks. You'll squirm a bit at the maudlin part of the trumped-up story of Jolson's life, but you cannot quarrel with the singing, which shows you why the entertainer was one of the most popular "single acts" the stage in this country has known.

Margie is an entirely entertaining story of high school life twenty or so years ago. There are nostalgic tunes and settings, and a lot of incidents done with verve and spontaneity.

Notorious Gentleman is a British film in which Rex Harrison gives you the successive events in the career of a complete no-good, and he does it convincingly and well. The original title in England, *The Rake's Progress*, describes what happens to a "T."

Operation Underground is a remarkable documentary, shot clandestinely by the French underground right under the noses of the occupying nazis as a record of how they managed to rescue Allied fliers and spirit them back to England. It is a simple, ingenuous short, and valuable as a historical item.

The Razor's Edge, an expert filming of the novel of the same name by W. Somerset Maugham, follows the original story more consistently than any previous motion picture I recall. Much of the struggle of the hero to find a satisfactory set of spiritual values is retained, and it is excellently cast and performed.

The Return of Monte Cristo has serious gaps in action, so that it never quite convinces, but it is refreshing in its intention simply to tell a tale of adventure. It is yet another item in the Monte Cristo series, in which a nephew of the original Edmond Dantes has been invented to carry on the fight for justice begun by his ancestor. *Motive* readers will be interested to note that Barbara Britton, a former Wesley Foundationite, who has written for this magazine, is the heroine.

The Show-off is a grand farce in the simple, unassuming manner of the old Harold Lloyd films. You'll appreciate it if you see in the character, excellently projected by Red Skelton, someone you know who is most obnoxious in his brashness, his unquenchable belief that he is the grandest "fixit" on earth, and who never gets wise to how others feel about him.

The Stone Flower is the Technicolor fantasy with which Soviet film makers won first place at a recent "international film festival" in France. The film is interesting and has some delightful colored sequences, but the rumor that the festival was "rigged" is borne out by its quality, for it in no way approaches color techniques which we have had from Hollywood.

Undercurrent, a widely heralded Robert Taylor-Katharine Hepburn effort, is a phony throughout, overwrought and unconvincing—about on a par, I'd say, with the most representative soap operas.

The Best Years of Our Lives is not what you might think from the stress in advertising on the fact that it is "the first three-hour picture since *Gone With the Wind*." It manages to be very human as it recounts the experiences of a group of veterans as they try to adjust to home living again. There is more use of liquor as a pleasant aid than might be desired, but on the whole the film is honest and convincing.

## President for a Day

DON A. BUNDY

POLITICS runs in our family. My father was once a deputy sheriff and my mother worked on the election board. In the eighth grade I was elected President of the United States for one day in civics class. (This was a course in government popular some years ago. The new trend is toward a more enlightened view of politics called "Americanism" in which students take turns representing the cotton block or the anti-oleo faction or the people's lobby for the preservation of animal life through anti-vivisection legislation.)

This forty-five minute term as Chief Executive of the most powerful country in the world, even without the bomb, sobered me considerably in my attitude toward politics of all kinds, and as a result I was never elected president of anything until my senior year in Oberlin when I was drafted as committee of one to report to a dining hall chef that we'd eaten all the macaroni and cheese that was good for us for that particular week.

But even with this sparse background I can tell you that my heart goes out to the spirit of Mr. Roosevelt about whom more political pot boilers are being written than he justly deserves. Thumbing through the book catalogues you are impressed by the fact that practically everyone who could type knew Mr. Roosevelt "intimately" and kept a complete file of notes on which to base a book, containing, of course, "hitherto unrevealed secrets."

No longer do mothers fondly hope that their baby boy will grow up to be President. Too risky. Better have a nice quiet drug store clerk for a son. At least Mr. Pegler hasn't picked on them.

But this is digressing. The point: so far no decent appraisal of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt has appeared, and perhaps one would be helpful now.

ANOTHER historical politician about whom books are only coincidental and have only fictional characters is Huey Long, late of Louisiana. Hamilton Basso, author of one of the books, *Sun in Capri-corn*, had an enlightening piece on "The Huey Long Legend" in the December 9, 1946 issue of *Life*. Three other novels dealing with a mythical figure who resembles Huey are: *Number One* by John Dos Passos, *A Lion Is in the Streets* by

Adria Langley, and *All the King's Men* by Robert Penn Warren. Mr. Basso's article points out that Mr. Long is well on the way to becoming a part of the "American Legend" along with the other great heroes of history who've had much to do with the democratic experiment in the United States. Mr. Basso would leave Huey in the legend, but make him not a hero but a villain "to remind us that heaven itself was once threatened and that our democracy, which is a long way from being heaven, is threatened now as never before—even though he, like Lucifer, has been hurled down."

We read *Number One* some time ago and recall it as a diverting book, but not on a par with other Dos Passos works. We began, with anticipation, to read *A Lion Is in the Streets*, but gave up halfway through and inscribed it to our wife as a gift. She liked it.

The interesting and perhaps terrifying thing about all these fictionalized versions of somebody like Huey Long is that all end with the hero very dead. Although two of the books are much kinder to the political genius who romps through their pages than the other two, it is still clear that Huey's way is not the democratic (or healthy) way to political leadership.

## GOOD STUFF . . .

Harpers is publishing a fine set of books known as the Interseminary Series. Four commissions consisting of top-flight thinkers and writers have produced four of the volumes, and a fifth volume is by Henry P. Van Dusen, who ties all of the previous four studies together with an "interpretive volume." The titles are: *The Challenge of Our Culture*, Clarence T. Craig, chairman; *The Church and Organized Movements*, Randolph Crump Miller, chairman; *The Gospel, the Church and the World*, Kenneth Scott Latourette, chairman; *Toward World-Wide Christianity*, O. Frederick Nolde, chairman; and *What Must the Church Do?* by Dr. Van Dusen.

Each one is a solid book by qualified men and comprises a real contribution to clear thinking. Each of the first four volumes costs a dollar and a half—or four for five bucks—a real buy, if you'll be sure to read them carefully.

## CONTRIBUTORS

- William B. Hesseltine is professor of history at the University of Wisconsin.
- Jerry Voorhis is an ex-representative from California to the Congress of the United States.
- Donald Frazier is pastor of the Congregational Christian Church, Shelton, Connecticut.
- Edward L. Parsons is a retired bishop of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of California.
- James M. Read is associate secretary of the Friends Committee on National Legislation.
- Kenneth Underwood is managing editor of *Social Action* magazine.
- Charles Markham is a student at Duke University where his article first appeared in the *Duke Chronicle*.
- Bill Morris is a senior at Emory University.
- Merrimon Cuninggim is professor of religion at Pomona College, Claremont, California.
- Dean M. Kelley is a student at Iliff Theological Seminary.
- Edgar Dale is professor of education, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University. Professor Dale has just had a new book to come from the press, *Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching*.
- Geraldine Fitch is a lecturer, author, and regular visitor to her adopted land, China.

## LETTERS

### SIRS:

There is something which has been bothering me for some time. It crops out in different ways, but all of them have to do with some effective way of meeting people with more traditional, fundamentalistic religious faith and helping them to realize that religion to be alive must be constantly growing—otherwise it stagnates. There is no problem when one is among like-minded people, but we have found that the majority of religious people are quite happy in their groove. As a result, religion is often divorced from life. Perhaps one example will help to clarify what I mean. In a conversation with a friend the other day we were discussing the world situation, when she asked me if I believed in the second coming of Jesus. I was quite surprised and replied that I didn't. "Well," she said, "I do and we feel that nothing can be done about the world situation until he does come again." Perhaps this is an extreme illustration, but the basic problem is the same and is one which is found everywhere. In the January issue of  *motive*, there were many fine discussions of science and religion, evolution, etc. but I wonder if we can find a creative way of expressing differences. Or is there just nothing which can be done about it? It sometimes almost seems that the only way is to say well, you believe your way and I'll believe mine—but is that a solution? I think it would be especially helpful for young people to know how to present points

of view to the more orthodox members of their churches.

PORTIA FOSTER

Ithaca, N. Y.

### SIRS:

Apparently the Babbitts still infest our culture to such an extent that even the president of a university may be drawn into some of their patterns of thinking. To Frank Kingdon, it seems, democracy means American democracy (and implies capitalism); communism means Russian communism, and socialism means the German and Italian forms of it; his analysis of socialism is the only reasonably accurate portion of his chart. (December  *motive*, p. 11.) However, his inaccuracies stem from a deeper misunderstanding; he has tried to make direct comparison between forms of government and economic systems; the two entirely different classifications may not be so compared.

For example, there are three known types of economic systems: capitalist, communist, and socialist; but no one of these exists in a pure form. Russia has a predominantly socialist economy with less communism and a few noticeable traces of capitalism. The United States has a predominantly capitalist economy with socialized education and communized old-age pensions (two of many examples of socialism or communism). Likewise there are a number of forms of government: democracy, dictatorship, anarchy, etc., and these too are never found in pure form. The important thing to remember is that any given set of governmental institutions may adopt any given combination of economic policies or may exist side-by-side with any economic system. However, there are always concessions to be made in adjusting the one to fit the other, as our political corruption stems from the conflict between democratic "equality" and capitalist "special privileges" or "franchises."

If we are to have any unprejudiced discussion of economic or political problems, we must recognize this distinction between our economic system and a form of government as surely as we recognize that the Russian communists have not achieved communism nearly so well as first-century Christians, and as neither Democrats nor Republicans have achieved a real democracy or republic in this country.

CARTER PATE

Sulphur Springs, Texas.

### SIRS:

It was with deep interest that I read your report on Youth for Christ in the January 1947 issue of  *motive* (page 27). Much of it I disagreed with; and when I turned to "Letters" and read Ralph Beane's little epistle concerning the part Wheaton, Bob Jones, William Jennings Bryan and the Kings College play in "belittling the divine mission of Jesus' work," my disagreement became so violent that this letter practically wrote itself.

Living in a small town I had not had the opportunity to become well acquainted with the work of Youth for Christ in the United States. However, for five months in Tokyo, I was privileged to work with the G.I. Gospel Hour and Youth for Christ organizations. These were conducted by fundamentalistic chaplains and other men who stemmed from Wheaton and like schools. The G.I. Gospel Hour was an evangelistic service aimed at service men and women; the Youth for Christ was conducted through interpreters and reached Japanese young people. The same group of chaplains and service men conducted both.

This group was, and still is, engaged in the following activities: two services of the G.I.

Gospel Hours each week; twelve weekly Youth for Christ services at civilian churches; weekly bed-to-bed visitations; the conducting of religious services in two tuberculosis sanatoria, three hospitals (including a Japanese military hospital), and a delinquent boys' home; a weekly prayer meeting and a weekly Bible study for G.I.'s; two medical missions in the slum sections of Tokyo; weekly night schools, teaching English and Bible to a total of three hundred Japanese. They also gave assistance, in the matter of getting textbooks, to the first theological seminary to be found in Japan after the war.

There was no "challenge to build a better world" and the message may have been "self-centered," to quote  *motive's* quotation of Harold Fey, but this group of men was building a better world because of the compulsion of Christ within them. They had grasped the fact that modernistic churches often try to disregard—that we cannot change persons—by first changing the social order. We can only change the social order by changing the individuals who make up that order. And the only thing that will change a person, down to the very root and core of his being, is the spirit of God entering his life.

There was no preaching on social equality, yet I saw a young lieutenant from Alabama greet at the door, shake hands with, and seat two Negro enlisted men with as much enthusiasm as he seated anyone else; simply because the love of Christ in his soul blotted out racial barriers, and not because he'd been told from the pulpit that racial prejudice was evil.

Lastly, in all of Tokyo, so far as I could ascertain, the Youth for Christ is the only group attempting in any way to bring the good news of Christ to the Japanese. Perhaps before modernistic churches condemn Wheaton, Bob Jones College, and the Youth for Christ, we'd better try to match their effort. I've a notion that if we did a bit more for him, we'd not have the time to talk against others who are serving him also.

THAINE BILLINGSLEY

Baker University  
Baldwin, Kansas

### SIRS:

In view of your publishing the article on the Youth for Christ movement in the January issue of  *motive*, I thought you might be interested in a comment on the movement which I received from a friend in Rotterdam:

"Do you know the Youth for Christ movement? Sometime ago some Americans came to our country to reclaim us. Last week they were in Rotterdam in the big Riviera Hall. The hall is very big but not big enough to contain all the people. Within a few hours the American leaders asked who wanted to follow Jesus Christ. Several people lifted their hands. Well, I think it is very good and sympathetic that the Americans come to us. They work what we call American, that is very rapidly and a little rashly. Our Dutch character is a little otherwise, but we admire yours."

I thought this a priceless statement about the Youth for Christ Movement

NANCY HALL

Michigan State College  
East Lansing, Michigan

### SIRS:

I noticed "Paavo the Yeoman" in your December issue (page 23) by Runeberg, but I was disappointed not to see the name of the translator. He is Howard T. Lutz, former C. P. S. Minnesota starvation unit man, now teaching at Viggelsholme School, Sweden.

LEONARD S. KENWORTHY  
Paris, France