THE
EGYPTIANS

YEAR 1955-1956

THE EGYPTIANS

YEAR 1955-1956

HISTORICAL SKETCH

The Egyptians, "a club for the discussion of scientific, religious, economic, and other topics pertaining to the welfare, culture and happiness of the people," was organized at a meeting of fifteen men held in the home of the late A. S. Caldwell on June 21, 1913. These men had been meeting as an unorganized group since 1911. The fifteen founders were: Charles N. Burch, A. S. Caldwell, J. B. Cannon, Elias Gates, Charles J. Haase, E. M. Markham, C. P. J. Mooney, Sanford Morison, J. Craik Morris, A. B. Pittman, J. W. Rowlett, A. Y. Scott, Bolton Smith, B. F. Turner and J. C. Wilson.

Before the organization was completed, fifteen others were enrolled as charter members, namely: Albert W. Biggs, E. C. Ellett, W. H. Fineshriber, J. R. Flippin, Thomas F. Gailor, Marcus Haase, Herman Katz, James P. Kranz, Walter Malone, R. B. Maury, H. Dent Minor, A. E. Morgan, Israel Peres, Alfred H. Stone and Luke E. Wright.

The name chosen for the organization was proposed by W. H. Fineshriber. The fact that ancient Memphis was in Egypt suggested the name. The by-laws stated that the membership should "consist of not more than thirty-three men of recognized standing, ability and influence in Memphis and Shelby County, Tennessee." It was further stated that members were to present their contributions in the form of papers and that all papers were to be issued in printed form. This clause has resulted in the largest and most significant literary production of a general nature ever made by any group of Memphians.

From the beginning, The Egyptians were guarded against internal friction by a constitutional provision that "no resolution shall ever be passed committing the club as a body to any proposition." The club is unique in the unwritten law that its name is not to appear in the press in any connection.

THE EGYPTIANS

YEAR 1955 - 1956

CONTENTS

1955

Page

Oct. 20—Growing Old 1
WESLEY HALLIBURTON

Nov. 17—The Psychology of Judaism 53
DR. JAMES A. WAX

Dec. 15—Government Acreage Controls 17
CHARLES G. HENRY

1956

Jan. 19—Some Problems in the Administration of Criminal Justice 29
WALTER P. ARMSTRONG, JR.

Feb. 16—The American Myth and Its Development in the American Novel 37
DR. JOHN E. FARRIOR

Mar. 15—Prehistoric Discoveries in Art 69
DR. NEUTON S. STERN

Apr. 19—Analysis of a Newspaper 81
W. C. TEAGUE

May 17—Research and Society 97
DR. C. B. WEISS

GROWING OLD

By Wesley Halliburton

(*Read at a meeting of* "The Egyptians," October 20, 1955)

My theme shall be "Growing Old and its Compensations," and I shall take for my "text" a more or less original poem, to-wit:

'Tis sweet to live
But oh! how bitter
To shuffle off
In Life's full glitter.

This poem is not exactly a Lyric, but it makes a statement that I shall undertake to develop.

Ecclesiastes 12:1 has this to say:

"Remember now thy creator in the days of thy youth, while the evil days come not. Nor the years draw nigh when thou shalt say I have no pleasure in them."

And again, Psalms 90:10:

"The days of our years are threescore years and ten, and if by reason of strength they be fourscore, yet is their strength, labor and sorrow, - - -."

I shall not ponder the inconsistencies of these old Biblical writers. They warn us against these evil "eighties," when Methuselah lived over nine hundred years.

I shall consider the Arts of growing old and attempt to emphasize what I believe to be true, that these days need not be evil days nor filled with sorrow, and that these statements made by the old Biblical pessimists have disturbed those of the Christian and Jewish faiths who are approaching senescence, and made them fearful that evil will descend upon them as they stumble into the ruins of old age.

It may be naive in me and out of character to undertake such a paper as I am to read to you tonight. While I am looking squarely at the subject with the benefit of almost a score of experiencing years, I am without the benefit of philosophy or theology or medicine or even literary training to shape my thoughts. I am like Mark Twain in reverse: I may have the tune but not the words. I shall, nevertheless, present to you a medley of thoughts built around the subject of old age, which becomes more vital to all of us as the days of our years pass. I must also say by way of preface, that this discussion will be intimate and frequently personal.

Life begins as a frolic. We make our start in life with abounding youth, and are smug with energy and appetite and our father's car. We rush into maturity, delightfully unconscious of whither we are bound, or that nerves and aches and pills and responsibilities are soon in the offing. Yes, I have been over the route, and I know. I'm now taking pills and bicarbonates and am making sly glances at a walking cane.

Old age! When does it begin?

A lecturer was invited to speak on "Modern History," but was not told when modern history began. So there may be some doubt as to when old age begins.

Roger Bacon acknowledged himself to be an old man at 53; Sir Walter Scott lamented his years at 52; Dante regretted at 45; Montague quarreled with Father Time at 38; Dr. Johnson felt the evil days approaching at 35, and Richard, my son, —but listen. In a letter from Princeton to his parents on his 21st birthday, he was taking a dim view of life. He wrote, "Tonight I feel like Conrad in quest of his youth. Nine more years and I'll be thirty and the last vestige of youth will be gone."

Some one with smiling wrinkles in his face put it this way. "You are definitely getting old when you find yourself giving good advice instead of setting a bad example." Notwithstanding the differences as to "time when," the best authorities place it between 65 and 70. Anyway, if you live long enough, old age will surely overtake you.

Regardless of definition, old age is relative. To a mathematical mind, it has the quality of a variable that admits of many values. However the writers on old age must mirror the time in which they live and must speak its idiom. We can evaluate old age in endeavoring to determine if its days are evil, only by looking at those about us now and not those who have been buried for centuries.

Cicero's essay, DE SENECTUTE is a classic. I have read it and found it interesting. But Mr. Cicero, in the complacency of his 62 years, writes pretentious portraits of the Roman aged, which, without the benefit of experience and the feel of old age, are out of focus. Moreover, America is a brave new world, freed from old conventions, and must be measured by new standards. So I shall not use ancient history nor look backward beyond one generation. The thoughts that I wish to put into this paper concerning old age are those of one who is your contemporary and who is well past the fateful forescore years which I claim are experiencing.

Stressed in the social philosophy of our immediate age, and in a big way, is the idea that one must retire somewhere along the last lap. It is based on the principle that a stable society cannot be maintained while old men work and young men play, and, indeed, this is true. Too often though, before one's experiencing years are upon him, the word "retirement" acts as a kind of sedative, suggesting a "Rocked in the Cradle of the Deep" time when one expects to do nothing the easiest way.

There should be no such thing as retirement except to go to bed to sleep and rest and build up energy for another day. This does not mean that a man should continue at his daily task into the years until he becomes sere and withered and must be sprayed every day. Old age must be green to be enjoyed. False teeth, hearing aids and spectacles lead some men into believing they are reconditioned and as good as new. Old men cannot be reconditioned.

Some who have worked hard vision retirement happily, as a time with nothing to do, but it is wistful thinking to believe that you can go fishing a little every day and spend the remaining hours in a rocking chair with epic lassitude. The man who rejoiced over his discovery that he had been working too hard until he discovered laziness and then allowed himself to become stranded on a davenport, will soon be looking for an antidote to laziness. Idleness is a bad thing at any stage of the life of man; in old age it is catastrophic. It is the principal cause of "second childhood." At the approach of old age, one should begin to relieve his ship of cargo: ambitions, accumulated prejudices and his armor, for he has no further need for combat. Thus relieved, one can begin to live comfortably and meditatively and feel a sense of liberation.

The most rewarding old age is that which has its foundation well laid in earlier years. Cathrine Drinkard Bowen says, "A man at 80 finds himself reaping a harvest or a whirlwind, depending on how he spent his forties and his thirties and his twenties." But I would add, "If it's a whirlwind he reaps, he doesn't usually reach 80.

Havelock Ellis says, "All the art in living lies in the fine mingling of holding on and letting go," and surely the man who gives no consideration throughout his laboring years until the time comes to "let go," will have a rough road till the end. One cannot be a successful doctor without studying medicine, nor can he be a maestro without much practice. Why then

should he be prepared to play his retirement act without some preparation during his approaching years? He would certainly be a ham actor.

Correlated with the idea of retirement is the idea of a "hobby." Till yet, we have not integrated these two ideas very well. Ask the average man who is approaching the "letting go" period what he is going to do, the usual answer is, "Well, I'm going to catch up on my fishing." He will find it doesn't take very long to do that, and then what is he going to do.

As for a hobby, such things are for the relatively young or for weekends or longer vacation periods of golf or fishing or hunting or motoring or reading, according to one's likes, instead of frittering these spare periods of time away. When one has retired a new order of life should have gradually developed that has a higher meaning than the word "hobby" implies.

The Zin Buddhists believe that enlightenment comes, not from reading books and metaphysical speculations, but from disciplined meditation, when sudden flashes of revelations come. Conaro says, "A man may grow learned by other men's thoughts, he will grow wise only by his own," and one needs to be wise to cope with old age. One can meditate successfully only with one's own thoughts, and we do more meditating as we advance in years—and grow wiser. We accumulate too much undigested knowledge as we rush along in active life, and old age is the time we digest it. Old Bossy grazes all day on the green pastures and lies down at eventide calmly to chew her cud—and meditate.

Meditation depends on one's ability to concentrate. To sit idly and look out the window and see a thousand things and think a thousand things only frazzles the nerves and has no kinship with meditation. Meditation is the deep freeze that keeps those of us that stand at the brink from "spoiling." We are "ripe," and meditation is the preserving process.

A bit of stoicism enables one to accept denials without fretting too much, but one should guard against too great a habit of being impassive or insensitive to outward things. Solitude is a part of old age. Powys says, "If a solitary man can't adjust himself to being alone, he will devour himself and his brain will crack." Meditation covers a wide field, and it is the only hope for overcoming prolonged loneliness.

We shall now call upon some witnesses who have lived through "experiencing" years and who are or were seeing the same world from the same point of vantage as we Egyptians, to prove that our Biblical preacher and the old Psalmist are guilty of perpetuating an evil spell on all who read their doleful words. Mr. Binford, our moving picture censor, and himself a good witness, should have purged Ecclesiastes and the Psalms of these evil verses.

Consider the men you know who have recently passed on or who have reached into the twilight of life. We do not have to seek our case histories among the ancient Chinese or the less ancient Romans. We can find an ample number of good witnesses right here in Memphis, men who are in the same social and intellectual circles as we Egyptians. They speak our language and think our thoughts. Many essays may be written about old age which have fundamental differences depending on the social and financial conditions under which the various groups lived their lives. One essay cannot be all-inclusive unless it be a master volume.

We will start with Bishop Gailor, a charter member of the Egyptians and now on its honor roll. He was high and mighty in his church and maintained his leadership and usefulness and his good health to the end of his years. He is a good witness.

Then there is the great humanitarian, Mr. Mooney, also a charter member, who was mellowed by his observations of and meditations over the ambitions and frailties of his fellow man. These made him a great editor, and he will make a good witness.

Then there is the late and versatile Mr. Crump, who lived well and happily into these years when our guide Book says, "I have no pleasure in them." He was a witness to the building of his own monument—the City of Memphis. I am sure he would make a good witness.

Then there was my late brother, the Rev. Garland Halliburton, who, in his retirement, became all things to all people in his village home: father confessor, teacher, preacher, arbiter and grower of flowers. He enjoyed good health till after 91. He is a good witness that old age has its compensations.

Then there is the zestful Judge Camille Kelly, who loved the bad boys and thrilled, during her last days, over the production of a movie based on her life's work; and our recently deceased honorary member, Mr. Alfred Stone, from down in Mississippi, who enjoyed his latter years more than his middle span; and Mr. Lemaster, Sr., meditating long over industrial Memphis and watching it grow; and Judge Heiskell, who dignified the Bench and loved his cottage home and meditated much sitting on his front porch; and W. J. Abston with his cotton business and his big plantations, but who had rather fish than work at any stage of life; and Hardwig Peres, ever alive and alert even into his nineties, and on and on and on. I knew them all and they were comfortable and undisturbed old men and found compensation a plenty during these "evil days."

And among the living, there are many on whom I can call to the witness stand and get testimony against these evil verses.

I would name first our revered Dr. Diehl. Even with his present infirmities, he is wise, smiling and an interesting witness and has had many compensating years. He can close his dimming eyes and behold the glory of his monument—Southwestern at Memphis—an honor to architectural beauty and a monument to Christian education. Dr. Diehl is on my side.

Then there is Aaron Burrow, who has more than fourscore years behind him. He has built his monument—the crowning jewel of the Southwestern group—The Burrow Library, and he is yet active and useful and is a good witness.

Then there is my neighbor, John Flippin, who stepped out of commerce and now concerns himself, among other things, with the Old Men's Home and the Methodist Hospital and with his own delightful home and flower garden. He is my friend, and I know he is a good witness.

Then there is E. O. Bailey and Rowlett Paine and George Person who recently together rated a full page of the Feature Section of our Sunday's COMMERCIAL APPEAL, extolling their virtues along with their old age. All are good citizens, who have given of themselves unselfishly to the development of the City of Memphis. Each one is a good witness.

Then there is among our membership Mr. Herstein, the wise old man, and Charles G. Henry, who put oleomargarine on our tables, and Hodges Honnoll who loves to see the wheels of travel go round, who are all good witnesses. And on the outside we find such men as W. R. King and Clarence Ogilvie and George Randolph and W. I. Moody and many, many, many others, who have spent active lives and now have reasons to stand back and look upon their activities with satisfaction, and who find pleasant ways to pass their remaining days. All are good witnesses.

Then there is the serene and lovable Mary G. Hutchison, well past the fourscore years, with her splendid monument—The Hutchison School for Girls—to meditate over. After a

life well spent educating the young girls of Memphis for a generation and a half, in books and in culture and in Christian attitude, she has retired to a peaceful and contented old age while the Hutchison School goes on. She is a good witness.

Then there is my prize witness—"Tah," sometimes called Miss Callie P. Gates of Jackson, Tennessee, who devoted her entire active life to the education of youth, and who has lived *past* the century mark in years. She says, "I spend much time in meditation, especially on pleasant things. Old age is a good time of life to me, a great peace after heavy responsibilities of middle age." This fine lady is a perfect witness.

Then—a bit in contrast—there is the old lady at Whitehaven who frequently just walks in a bus, takes her seat and rides to town and back only for the ride. She pays no fare nor is asked to pay—Compensation?

Then there is our blind, black, Handy with his savage African origin, who has an ear attuned to music different from white man's music, from which he evolved music symbolic of the troubled life his race has led—his moaning "Blues" with their haunting rhythm. I am sure he is sustained by the adulation he has received in his late years. Handy will make a good witness.

Then there is Wesley Halliburton, if I may become personal. He should make a good witness having lived well beyond the allotted span of fourscore years and still finds life good. Where along this path was life the finest? He will deny the sad pronouncements of the Biblical preacher and the dour Psalmist that the ripe fruit of old age is crab apples and sour grapes.

It has been about fifteen years that I have been experiencing old age and retirement. I retired with a well groomed hobby-horse champing at the bit, ready and willing to go. I had already ridden him to Europe, on conventional trips, several times and over much of the Western hemisphere. Now I was ready to see the world in a leisurely manner and enjoy its classic landscapes and its cultural spots, along with, perhaps, some of its cultural night spots.

World War II barred European travel at this time, so my wife and I spent six winters in the desert Southwest and the summers in green and cooler places. Now that Europe was safe again, we planned to spend the winter of '49 and '50 in Egypt. The plans of mice and men "gang aft aglee." That fall, my wife fell and broke her hip while visiting, with friends, the Memphis Museum. This tragedy consigned her to live forever in a smaller world—her home, and her Pegasus became her wheel chair. Alas! Poor hobby-horses! For she would have ridden with me.

It is difficult to understand the ironies of fate. Surely our sins had not been so great as to deserve this punishment. Even so there seems to be a purpose in everything that becomes one's fate. There is no doubt that we became better souls during the nearly six years that I sat, much of the time, beside my broken wife's bedside. A quality of grace and love and charity developed in us that would never have been aroused had we spent these years in cultural and refined, but perhaps Pagan travel over the choice spots of the earth.

But listen! The provender we had gradually laid away for this period of our lives was not wasted. We found that sheep and cows would eat our hay, and that the hobby-horses were not indispensable. The essential thing was the provender that we had stored during the active period of our lives.

And of what does this provender consist? It is not corn and oats and alfalfa hay, substantial though they are. It is not fishing tackle nor golf clubs nor a convertible auto. It is a mental attitude that we built up by a conscious consideration of things to come during these developing years; a timely realization in these earlier years that peace in old age must come largely from within. If this attitude is acquired, this

state of mind will adapt itself to the exigencies of any situation and will enable one to swap a horse for a sheep or a cow for a hobby if one must have a hobby.

To answer the question then, "Where along the trail of eighty-five years have I found life the finest?" I can frankly say, "The last fifteen of them."

We shall now take a more impersonal view of these "Latter Day Saints," for they really do approach nearest to the significance of Saints. After considerable meditating, one discovers that the higher order of compensations for old age is found in that other life which, too often, lies smothered and forgotten in our earlier years—the spiritual one. These compensations may be epitomized in a series of aphorisms.

Many of these aphorisms have more or less the same deeper meaning, and to sum them all up and take the average, one might express them thus, "If you have been a good little boy and learned your lessons, you will be happy ever afterwards." Please note the essential thing is to *learn* the lessons. These aphorisms do give one a broader view of the subject and do afford the greatest solace in old age. Here are some of them.

When old men retire without reservation, they can shed their feeling of responsibility and acquiesce, with composure, in the fact that there are others to carry on. For them to work overlong, is to become conscious that they are usurpers.

With old age, passions and lusts and ambitions for a place in the sun have abated, nor does it mourn the passing of physical strength.

With old age men become more judicial and benevolent, and with their distilled knowledge, which is wisdom, they can better understand the unchanging verities of life.

Old age is manifestly nearer the truth than middle age, and truth is the ultimate goal of wisdom. It develops spiritual honesty and untangles repressions and conflicts. It adjusts its view of men and things, and these views assume proportions more nearly the truth.

Old age is a retirement from the restive individualism of middle age. It becomes conscious of humanity and that it is a part of humanity, and sees in humanity the harvest of all things of the past and ponders them.

Old age perceives, in the ceaseless turmoil, but the restless endeavor, of man to produce a higher order of life, and delights in his perception.

Old age has memories which youth cannot have and, with them, the power of reminiscence. The fleeing Sodomites were enjoined not to look back, but to old men, nothing is so fine as meditating over happy episodes of the past.

Old age has also the reverse of reminiscence, the blessed power of forgetfulness, which sifts from one's memory many of the unpleasant episodes of the past.

Old age is less concerned with trifles, and sees the futility of vanity. Walt Mason puts it, "There is no light in anybody's window for the old man with dyed whiskers."

A rather inclusive aphorism comes from our "Hambone." "One o' de bes' things 'bout gittin' ole is you larns how few things meks much diff'unce!"

These are a few of the aphorisms and while they are not very exciting they do reflect more the spiritual side of the solaces of old age, and to the contemplative mind these truths are a great source of contentment.

Ellis Parker Butler says, "The greatest satisfactions are nearly all on the outward side of life. At age 20, my life was a feverish adventure; at thirty it was a problem; at 40, it was labor and at 50, it was a joyful journey just begun."

Elmer Davis is not hopeful as old age approaches. "But no matter how long I may last," he says, "I am not persuaded that the best is yet to be." Well, maybe Elmer will grow wiser as he grows older.

Most of us are afraid of old age and do not like to think of it in our earlier years. The result is a feeling of apprehension as old age approaches. This creates a pervading pessimism that is more deadly than disease. This is too bad.

A provocative thought came to me in the development of this paper. I have done a good bit of reading and meditating about the subject of old age, and it is becoming a kind of personality I'm thinking about. By the exercise of the power to form mental images, I am becoming able to invest old age with personality. It has taken the form of a likeable old man with flowing grey beard and carrying a walking cane and takes long walks with me.

I'm trying this unique experiment and feel that I am making a friend of him. I am finding him to be genial and an optimist, and I like the feel of his presence. In some way he communicates with me, and I listen. An unimaginative person to whom I made the suggestion of cultivating this "friend" and making him like you as you would your wife, countered with, "If you fail with your wife, you can kill her, but you can't kill this old man."

In due course all living things stop growing, show signs of aging, and ultimately die. So the end of the old man is death. Youth has no developed consciousness of death. Middle age finds death an unhappy thought and does not like to contemplate it. He has learned to love life. Since death, in old age, threatens every hour, old age accepts it as a natural order of life and is less concerned. He feels the bands that hold him to this life weakening, the purposes for living growing less, and the spiritual side of his being on the ascendency, and at the end he should pass quietly away as does the ripe fruit drop from the tree. Death should not be a fearsome thing.

It is a sad commentary of human behavior that such a small percentage of men live to enjoy the virtues and rewards of old age and must therefore undergo the tragic ordeal of death at the time they most dread it and most desire to live. This is the time when their seasoned experiences are most useful to the world.

Seneca wrote, "Man does not die, he kills himself." I would amend this thought into, "Young men kill themselves, only old men die."

It is the fate of men who have lived full long to die. It should also be the fate of papers read before the Egyptians to die. Often both carry on too long. So I shall bring this one to an end on my last personal note.

At well past 85, I am standing on the brink and am looking both ways, conscious of the experiences of the past while meditating over what stands ahead, though the time for meditating may not be too long.

I have been a mildly rugged individualist. In most of my business life, I have played a lone hand. I have worked for no one and few have worked for me. My contacts with my fellow man have, therefore, been rather meager and rarely very intimate. I do not know much of what they think concerning what happens after physical dissolution, and I rarely ever discuss my own views. I am franker in this paper than I have ever been and would not present some of these thoughts to any other group but you Egyptians, with whom I have had long and pleasant associations. This may be my last paper to be read before you. 85 plus 4, the time for another one, is an equation I am unable to solve.

I have grown up in a Protestant, Christian environment, but am not a member of any organized church. I have heard only the teaching of the Bible on rules of conduct in this life and for hope in the life hereafter. I have read not at all on the subject of the ultimate destiny of man. No writer knows the answer and as Balzac says, "Mankind does not need to be instructed how to doubt." My views are my own, simple and naive though they may be. The past is irrevocable. For the short end of my life I have no fears. When the curtain falls, I can say "Life was a good show." When my heart makes its last pulsation and the silver cord is broken, I shall know then what awaits me and not till then. I hope there awaits me a long, long voyage into a new world, for I am sure my soul will love to travel.

"For these reasons, Scipio, my old age sits light upon me."

Finis.

GOVERNMENT ACREAGE CONTROLS

By CHAS. G. HENRY

(*Read at a meeting of* "THE EGYPTIANS,"
December 15th, 1955)

Only a very few of this Club are directly affected by the acreage control laws, but the price support legislation of which they are a part is of extreme importance to everyone, and it is a live and controversial subject.

Government control of acreage sounds like real socialism. These controls, however, are not edicts of government, but have been voted by the producers of the crops controlled. The government is simply carrying out the mandate of the producers.

Most of us in agriculture feel that government has specific responsibilities in areas when individuals cannot perform. Two or three million cotton growers who asked for the control program, and obey it, cannot direct it themselves; so the government does it for them. In my opinion this is the exact opposite of socialism. No one seems to know exactly what socialism means and none of us like the name, but we cannot always identify it. We accept public schools, public parks, old age pensions, social security and many other activities which some folks call socialism.

Farmers learned long ago by experience that agricultural plans and controls could only be directed by government agencies.

Between 1920 and 1930 agriculture was in a desperate condition. In 1928 when Herbert Hoover was elected President, the principal issue in the campaign was *"Relief for Agriculture"* although the economy generally was booming.

His first act was to create the Federal Farm Board composed of agricultural leaders and appropriate for their use 500 million dollars to assist in marketing farm products and to sustain prices. They did a tremendous amount of good by making loans on surplus crops, but farmers continued to produce and they soon swamped the Board, and it ran out of money and prices did not materially advance. At that time a half billion dollars was considered a large amount of money. A great many economists maintain that this imbalance of agriculture and industry was the immediate cause of the panic and depression of 1929 which was disastrous to our entire economy. Farmers had lost their purchasing power and industry and other business had to take their natural punishment.

The Farm Board's operations clearly demonstrated that a price support program could not succeed unless tied in with acreage controls, and this experience has affected all agricultural legislation since. The parity price theories as a basis for legislative help were evaluated then and are now generally accepted as fair and proper.

During that period, wheat sold as low as 30 cents per bushel; corn 25 cents; oats 15 cents; cotton 5 and 6 cents per pound; tobacco 8 cents per pound, and good beef cattle 15 dollars per head. Over 9,000 banks, most of them located in the agricultural sections, failed between 1922 and 1932, and a majority of the remainder suffered severe losses. Close to 100 banks closed in Arkansas in one day.

When Franklin Roosevelt became president in 1933, one of his first acts was to close temporarily all the banks in the country and his next step was to abolish the Farm Board and create the Farm Credit Administration. This was followed in 1933 by the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and later the formation of Commodity Credit Corporation and the Soil Conservation Administration. The Department of Agriculture since then has carried on its price support programs through these organizations. Congress has made many plans and changes since, but all the laws are tied in with the original Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

American agriculture, during this past twenty years, has gone through some drastic changes that have not been understood by those out of agriculture and in fact, by some farmers. Production of food and fiber has become a highly specialized business, requiring technical skill, good management, and plenty of capital.

In the early days 85 percent of our people lived on farms and 15 percent in the city. Today this is completely reversed and only 13 percent of our population are now on farms to furnish food and fiber to the other 87 percent.

Just a few years ago there was a prevailing opinion in high places that our large farms should be cut up to provide family sized farms for a greater number of operators. This trend of thought has changed and we now have a smaller number of farm owners who operate on much larger farms where machinery and new methods can be used to best advantage. Fifteen years ago there was an average financial investment for land and machinery of $3,500 for each farm owner or laborer, but now the Department of Agriculture estimates that there is an average investment for each farmer or farm laborer of $14,000.00. Some corn farms in Iowa and Illinois rate as high as $50,000 per man. Compare that with industry which talks loudly of having $8,000 or $9,000 invested capital for each employee.

In the past 15 years we have had two wars during which the government called on farmers for greatly increased production. They responded splendidly with some of the largest crops on record, even with a much reduced labor supply.

When foreign production was resumed, (which had been off during the war) our exports rapidly declined and we now find ourselves with large surpluses and a production machine larger than consumption demands. Production and consumption are badly out of balance. Farmers have not been stubborn or unreasonable about this, they have voted for controls and reductions in acreage to meet the situation so they could operate on a business basis. The changes in acreage figures will probably surprise you.

COTTON—During the five year period between 1925 and 1930 we planted around 44 million acres of cotton. This year we have reduced that acreage of 44 million to only 16,800,000, and that includes the new acreage in the far West. Our crop this year will be around 15 million bales and we will still be hampered at the end of the season with the largest surplus on record—about 15 million bales. Just this week 93 per cent of the cotton producers voting, approved the continuation of control program for cotton for 1956.

WHEAT—A few years ago we had 88 million acres in wheat, but this year we are down to 55 million. There are wheat surpluses over the world and our elevators are full. Wheat farmers have voted for further acreage reduction and controls.

There has been a change in our eating habits. In 1917 the average annual consumption of wheat in the United States was 201 pounds per person. Whereas today it is down to 130 pounds. Please note that in the past seven years wheat prices have gone down 32 percent, but the price of bread has gone up 25 percent. A farmer now receives about 2 cents for the wheat in a 20 cent loaf of bread. It is not especially important to you whether the farmer gets 2 cents or 3 cents per loaf, but it is extremely important to you that he gets enough to keep him in business—that is, if you like bread.

CORN—Twenty years ago we had a corn acreage of 113 million and this year the allotment is only 59 million and our warehouses are all full of corn.

RICE—Last year we planted 2½ million acres of rice. This year by a vote of 90 percent of the growers, the acreage has been cut to 1 million 900 thousand. There is a tremendous supply on hand and undoubtedly rice farmers will cut acreage for 1956. Rice is the most important food crop in the world, but our exports recently have been greatly reduced.

TOBACCO—About 10 years ago we planted 500 thousand acres of burley tobacco, but now we are down to 300 thousand acres and tobacco farmers have recently voted for a 25 percent reduction for a three year period. In 1953 farmers received 800 million dollars for their tobacco, but the United States government collected 2 billion 100 million dollars internal revenue on the sales.

On three crops alone—cotton, corn and wheat, we have reduced our acreage 134 million acres. This is eight times as much as our entire cotton acreage. The Department of Agriculture estimates that the use of tractor power has released 55 million acres which were formerly necessary to grow feed for the work stock on the farms. We are also told there is an annual loss of a million acres of cultivated land going into highways, airports, industrial plants and residential districts. You can see from these figures that farm acreage is a rather liquid commodity.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers recently reported to Congress that agricultural requirements can be met up to 1975 without any material increase in lands now in cultivation and that by improved methods, production from present acres might be increased as much as 200 percent and, that no new land is needed to feed America. This is a surprising, interesting and important statement.

The United States Bureau of Reclamation reports that they now have before them 269 irrigation projects for approval; that Congress has already approved 50 projects that are either under construction or authorized, which will cost 4 billion dollars. In addition to this, during the past session of Congress, 16 bills were introduced on projects which would cost around 3 billion dollars. When completed, these lands will have cost from 100 to 2,000 dollars per acre and would be no more valuable than lands all over the country now worth 100 or 200 dollars per acre. It is certainly ridiculous to spend all this money when present farmers are compelled to reduce the acres now in use, with a production capacity for the next twenty years.

It is estimated that in the next 25 years, production will increase 40 percent, yet the total number of farms will decrease from 5 million 200 thousand down to 4 million 300 thousand and farm population from 13½ to 8 percent of our total population.

To continue to feed ourselves, the American farmer must produce more and more with fewer man hours. The fact that they are doing so is the major reason why the great problem of over production is here with us now. These great surpluses have arisen out of wars which increased demands sharply but only temporarily. However, the farmers rising efficiency not only intensifies the demand generated by war, but it endows agriculture with a permanent bias toward high production. Farmers cannot greatly increase normal peace time consumption, but unlike industry cannot adjust costs quickly to meet new situations.

A farm is just like a factory. It has a plant and machinery and with raw materials and labor turns out wheat, cotton, cattle, hogs and other necessities of life. A manufacturer can accurately plan his output on probable sales and consumption and can increase or decrease his output quickly. He can run half time, double time or close down completely. A farmer's business is a yearly operation and once his crop is started, he must mature it and his volume is always affected by weather and insects. If farmers played safe and only planted what they were certain they could produce and sell at a profit, there would be many years when people would go hungry. We can use our last year's automobile and wear old clothes, but last year's food is gone.

We hear much about the terrible losses sustained by the government in operating the price support program. From the time the program started in 1932 for 20 years, up to the close of the Korean war, the total net cost to the government was 1 billion 828 million dollars, or less than 100 million dollars per year. Incidentally, the cotton loan program, which saved the South billions of dollars, returned a net profit to the government of 294 million dollars after the cotton had all been disposed of. Those figures do not include the past three years.

The Department of Agriculture has made an estimate that without the price support program on 1953 crop, the cotton farmers would have received 1 billion dollars less than they did receive. When the government sustains a loss of 1 million dollars carrying part of some surplus crop, it does not mean just that much gain to the producers. It probably means the price structure of that whole crop was protected and may have increased producers total income to 50 or 100 million dollars. If our price supports for the 1955 crop had been withdrawn, I am sure any cotton man would tell you our crop would sell for over a billion dollars less than it will, and no one could guess the effect on our Southern economy.

I have never seen any claim or estimate on this, but am sure the increased income taxes paid to the government by reason of the support prices is many, many times the cost of the program. In other words, the government is building up its own income.

The Bureau of Budget, whose figures we can depend upon, recently reported that the government in the past 7 years including 1955, will have paid out in subsidies to various groups at home (not abroad) over 53 billion dollars. Of this only 3 billion 700 million went to agriculture. The other 49 billion went to business, labor, veterans and other general aids. Agriculture got 6 percent of these subsidies. Certainly no one should claim it received too much.

The Postmaster General reports that losses on operation of the Postal Department since World War Two are 3 billion 800 million dollars and on second class mail alone the loss is 1½ billion dollars.

In the past ten years the subsidy to Saturday Evening Post amounts to 10 million dollars per year; to Life magazine 9 million dollars and to Literary Digest 4 million. In this ten year period the loss on letter mail was twice the cost of the farm price support program for 20 years. Certainly the production of food on our farms is more important than the food we get from these magazines.

In the past 8 years the government has paid the Merchant Marine 440 million dollars, and recommendations are now before Congress to spend 350 million dollars to expand ship building.

Since 1942 tax amortizations to industry has amounted to 24 billion dollars which is 25 times as much as had been spent for support prices for farmers during that period. Costs of government assistance to farmers has been a mere pittance compared to expenditures made to help other business.

Recent government statistical figures on weekly purchasing power of various groups show:

Auto workers	72.84
Other factory workers	61.37
Coal miners	69.20
Railway employees	64.41
Government employees	63.60
Farm owners	37.24

Purchasing power is what makes the wheels go around, but these farmer figures give us a flat wheel. This is important as the farmer is considered to be the largest individual buyer of merchandise. He has to buy everything the city man does and in addition, must have tractors, trucks, all kinds of farm implements, fertilizers, poisons, and building materials for his poultry, cattle, storage barns and fences. Large crops do not necessarily mean large profits. For the past 5 years the farmers net income has steadily declined because of increased production costs.

There seems to be a basic misconception of the role of the farmer in our economy. Most people think of him only as a producer. He is also a consumer and about the largest one in America.

For example: The tractors and other machinery used on farms have a total horse power greater than the combined horse power used in all American factories. Think of the petroleum products necessary to keep that power in operation. The manufacture and distribution of farm machinery and equipment has become one of the leading industries of the country. The farmer is their only customer and carries the load. Legislation on minimum wages, fair trade acts, tariffs, freight rates and many other operations force him to pay higher prices for the things he has to buy to produce crops.

The government estimates that the recent minimum wage law of $1 per hour will cost farmers 350 million dollars per year and will increase food costs to consumers 2½ billion dollars.

It is natural for consumers who each year seem to have to pay more for food to question the farmers complaints, but you must remember there are usually several parties between the farmer and yourself, and that is where your high costs come in. In the past seven years the farm operators net income has declined 25 percent, but look at these figures of handlers of food products.

In 1954

Atlantic & Pacific Co.	79 million dollars profit
Swift & Company	58 million dollars profit
National Dairies	103 million dollars profit
General Foods	73 million dollars profit
Borden & Company	59 million dollars profit

The American farmer can compete in a free economy, but when the entire economy is not free, he is compelled to buy goods and services in a protected economy and unless he has adequate price support, he is doomed to failure and that would automatically seriously effect all the other segments of our economy.

Because of government aid and protection to labor, industry and business, the farmer is forced to pay more for the things he has to purchase. Unless he can sell his products for more than these costs, he will be forced out of business and soon go bankrupt. The government price support program and acreage controls have been trying to meet that situation.

We are all familiar with and accept government controls and protection of railroads, truck routes, airplane routes, radio rights, rent controls, labor restrictions and minimum wage laws.

The philosophy of these policies is to protect the man or firm already in business and stop unnecessary production. With plenty of capital and character apply for a bank charter and you will find the government and state officials will turn down your application if they believe there is already sufficient banking facilities in that community.

The acreage controls are simply part of the effort to stop unnecessary and disastrous production.

A properly administered reserve of food and fiber as consumers insurance is better than money in the bank. In time of a shortage or failure of food supply, a big bank balance would not feed the hungry. The cost of maintaining these food reserves has been small in comparison with the cost to the government of stock piles of chemicals, minerals, rubber, tin and other materials required for armaments.

Neither industry nor agriculture should be expected to pay for the protection of our entire Nation against the risk of unforeseen disasters. We should be grateful to farmers for producing so abundantly. Certainly a surplus is better than a scarcity.

Acreage controls voted by the farmers themselves are in effect now on the six major crops; cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, but the price support program has also been taking in dairy, poultry and some other farm commodities. Farm crops now under loan to the government are the largest we have ever had. Most of these have been accumulated since the close of the Korean war. The government had been urging high production and when the exports and consumption fell off, our farm machine was still grinding in high gear. Favorable weather has given us bumper crops and even with the reduced acreages our surpluses have increased.

Right now in cotton, we have a good illustration of the difficulty of controls. In 1954 and 1955 our acreage control allotments of 36 million acres were expected to produce 22 million bales. Instead of that we produced 28 million. That 6 million plus the loss of expected consumption has put the cotton surplus up to a serious figure.

How to dispose of these surpluses and still maintain prices on future crops so that farmers can continue in production is the big problem.

The probable losses to the government in the final liquidation of these loans will be a large sum, but not serious when compared to our other war and emergency expenditures.

The national income of the United States is the highest in its history, yet agriculture is at the lowest point since World War Two.

Unfortunately the farm legislation question is fast becoming a political issue and that will not help.

Brotherly love and good neighbor policies have been carried to the point where we have apparently, permanently lost a large part of our exports, although over half the world is hungry.

With production greater than consumption it is quite evident to anyone that we must either curtail production or increase consumption. Farmers themselves do not know or agree upon the best solution.

Regardless of the cost to the government, the situation must be met and improved, and the farmers as well as the government will have to take some of the punishment.

SOME PROBLEMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

By Walter P. Armstrong, Jr.

(*Read at a meeting of* "The Egyptians," January 19th, 1956)

Problems in the Administration of Criminal Justice begin before a crime is committed, in the social background which gives rise to criminal proclivities, and extend far beyond apprehension, conviction and sentence to embrace questions of penology, probation and parole, leading to the ultimate restoration of the criminal to society freed of those proclivities. They are problems which concern all of us more intimately than we often fully realize or are willing to admit, for their solution determines in large part the character and framework of the society in which we live; whether it is anarchistic, breeding a lawless disregard for the rights of others, or whether it is based upon a mutual respect for those rights leading to a common tolerance and identity of interest. As an example of the latter, we may take any honest, well-regulated, law abiding community; and I am glad to say that among them we may class our own. Unfortunately, however, there are many examples of the former available as well. One which attracted nation wide notoriety not long ago was Phenix City, Alabama. Perhaps it is the archtype of what can happen when law enforcement goes by the board. For although Phenix City has been cleaned up, the social conditions which created it, or at least permitted it to exist, are still potentially present; and what happened there can happen again elsewhere. As a man who saw it from behind the scenes said recently:

> "Phenix City was not merely a community where crime was rampant and violence was shrugged off by law enforcement officers and citizens. It was a state of mind—the philosophy of 'get it while you can and the methods will not be questioned'."[1]

This illustration cannot therefore be treated as an isolated instance, and we cannot afford to take an "It can't happen here" attitude towards it. So long as the type of thinking which gives rise to such phenomena continues to be prevelant, just so long will outbursts of lawlessness continue to appear like spurts of steam from a dormant but seething volcano.

Only a few days ago the governor of a sister state testified before the Federal Communications Committee that illegal gambling and the sale of liquor were permitted on the Gulf Coast because they attracted the tourist trade. How much more brazen than this is it possible to be? If gambling and bootlegging are permitted as tourist attractions, then why not prostitution and dope peddling? Or, for that matter, why have any laws at all if they are not to be enforced?

How widespread is this attitude? Perhaps the crime rate will supply an index, for crime can only exist where it is tolerated. During 1955 there were 2,255,000 major crimes committed in this country, more than four for every minute during the entire year. While this is one half of one per cent less than in 1954, this is little cause for encouragement, for in 1954 more crimes were committed than in any previous year on record, and 1955 is the first year since 1947 in which crime has not increased. Furthermore the decrease in the past year did not represent a general decline in the crime rate, but simply a shifting as between various types of crimes. The entire change was in urban crime, the rural rate remaining almost constant; and while robberies and burglaries decreased substantially and auto thefts somewhat less (all, it will be noted, crimes against property), rape, aggravated assault and larceny increased to an almost equal extent, the only crime against the person showing any reduction being murder and that only to a limited extent.[2] It is therefore apparent that a general and increasing disregard for law and order has grown up since the close of World War II, and that no moderation of this trend in the immediate future can be predicated upon currently available statistics.

Students of the subject believe that the deterrent effect of punishment depends not upon its severity, but upon its immediacy and certainty. As to immediacy, I will deal with that at length later. But a word now about certainty. During 1954, the last year for which complete figures are available, only 40.6% of the robberies committed led to arrests. Of the burglaries, only 29.6%. Auto theft, 27.5%. And larceny, 20.9%. Again, it will be noted that all of these are crimes against property, the ratio of arrests ranging from two-fifths to one-fifth. Actually the average in this category is 24.6%, or one-fourth; while in the case of crimes against the person, it is 76.8%, or better than three-fourths. In this class of crime,

murder rates highest with 93.1% arrests; negligent manslaughter next with 88%; and rape and aggravated assault are almost identical at 75.8% and 75.6% respectively. With arrests averaging over three times as high in crimes against the person as in the case of crimes against property, it is obvious that enforcement in the former case is much more stringent than in the latter.

On the other hand, in regard to convictions after arrest, the situation is reversed. 80% of the persons charged with robbery are tried and convicted; and 78.1% in the cases of burglary and larceny. But only 67.2% of the murder arrests result in convictions; 66.7% in the case of rape; and more than half of the persons arrested for aggravated assault and negligent manslaughter eventually go free, with 49.5% convictions in the former and 42.5% in the latter instance. Combining these two sets of figures, it appears that while on an average five out of every seven persons charged with a major crime are convicted, there is only one conviction for every seven crimes reported. And this of course does not take into account the many crimes which are unreported or unrecognized as such. As long as at least six out of every seven criminals go unscathed, it can hardly be said that criminal justice as presently administered is certain.

Nor has the severity of sentences acted as a deterrent. On this point I can do no better than to quote the Solicitor General of the United States, who recently wrote:

"It is a striking fact that although the British and we have a common legal heritage there is a wide difference between them and us in the amount of crime and in the character of the penalties. We have two and a half times the number of prisoners they have per 100,000 population, and our sentences are longer. In all England in a recent year not more than 588 men received terms of five years or more and in the United States in the same year 18,000 offenders were committed for maximum terms of five years or more. The disparity is out of proportion to the size of the respective populations of the two countries; the difference is partly in the crime rate and partly in the unequal values the two countries ascribe to long sentences.

Likewise, to the north of us in the province of Alberta, Canada, is a population of a million with less than 500 in prison. In contrast the District of Columbia with a population of slightly more than 800,000 has some 4,000 prisoners—more than eight times as many."[3]

Now to return to the question of immediacy. In a report made two years ago by a special committee on habeas corpus to the Conference of Chief Justices nine typical criminal cases are described. In three of these the period from conviction to final disposition was three years. In one it was four. In two others it was ten. In one it was sixteen, and the case was still pending at the time the report was written. And in two nineteen years elapsed between the original conviction and the final end of litigation. In each case the ends of justice were delayed over these long periods by adroit legal maneuvering.

Perhaps two recent examples will serve to further point up the potentialities inherent in this situation. The first is the notorious Rosenberg case. Julius Rosenberg was arrested on July 17, 1950, and his wife on August 20 of the same year. They were executed on June 19, 1953. During the intervening period there was a seventeen day trial which was twice reviewed by the United States Court of Appeals and on eight separate occasions considered by the United States Supreme Court. Two different petitions for clemency were presented to the President of the United States. Yet despite the delay of almost three years from arrest to execution and the intricate legal procedures involved, President Eisenhower in denying the last of these petitions was able to say that "No Judge has ever expressed any doubt that (they) committed the most serious act of espionage." In other words, the pleas which they interposed were purely dilatory.

The end of the story cannot yet be told in regard to my second example. In 1948 Caryl Chessman, accused of being the highly publicized "Red Light Bandit," was convicted on seventeen counts of kidnapping, robbery, grand theft and sex offenses in a California court and sentenced to execution. Today, over seven years later, he is still awaiting the carrying out of that sentence in Death Row at San Quentin. His case is still pending, a petition for review having recently been granted by the United States Supreme Court. He has told his story in two books, "Cell 2455, Death Row" and "Trial by Ordeal." I do not know whether Caryl Chessman is guilty or innocent, and I express no opinion. But I do know that if he is guilty his sentence should long since have been carried out, and if he is innocent he should have been released long ago.

Do not misunderstand me. I do not blame the courts for this delay. They are doing the best they can to clear their dockets and to expedite the matters which are brought before them. But they are operating under an overwhelming burden. For example, to take only the Federal Courts (those being the ones for which figures are most readily available), there were 35,310 criminal cases brought in 1955; and while this was substantially less than the 41,808 in 1954, almost the entire difference was due to 6,111 fewer immigration cases, a decrease which affected only a relatively few districts, most of which lie along the Mexican border. With 228 District Judges, and eliminating immigration cases for the reasons given, this gives a case load per judge of 104 criminal cases. When it is remembered that in addition each of these judges handled an average of 212 civil cases, it is apparent that they are far from loafing on the job. On the contrary, during the year they succeeded in disposing of 1500 more cases than were filed, thus reducing the number of pending cases to 8,643, the smallest number since 1951. At this rate, in another six years, the criminal dockets of these courts should be current. But at the present time this is far from the situation and we can take pride in the fact that ours is one of only four districts in the country where the average case is disposed of in six months or less.

Faced with this prospect, it is no wonder that District Attorneys are inclined to accept guilty pleas to a lesser offense in many cases so as to dispose of them summarily rather than insist upon a trial on a more serious charge which would add to the court's work load and further congest its docket. Yet this very fact, this ability to "make a deal with the D.A.," has a tendency to encourage crime; for it minimizes the risk in relation to the rewards involved. Only where the prosecuting attorney can take the position that if the defendant is guilty he should be punished for the crime committed, while if he is innocent he should go entirely free, can the ends of justice be properly served. This is of course an ideal situation which can never be achieved; but surely it is capable of being more nearly approached than it is at present.

One of the chief tools which the clever and unscrupulous criminal lawyer uses to procur delay in the judicial process is the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. 1474 of these petitions (including Motions to Vacate Sentence which are similar in purpose) were filed in the District Courts last year; and while this was a decline of 81 over 1954, except for that year it was the highest number on record. Undoubtedly a substantial increase can be expected this year and in years to come in view of the open invitation issued by the United States Supreme Court on the second Monday of this year to all who are heavy ladened to come and lay their burdens at the bar of the Federal Courts.

This historical importance of the writ of Habeas Corpus cannot be exaggerated. So significant did our founding fathers believe it to be that they wrote into the Constitution a prohibition against its suspension, except in cases of rebellion or invasion when the public safety might require it. But like the Fifth Amendment, what was originally designed as a safeguard has become through abuse of the privilege a method of avoiding just retribution by those who are clever enough, or prosperous enough to hire unscrupulous attorneys who are clever enough, to hide behind it. Here is what the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts has to say in regard to the report of the Committee of the Conference of Chief Justices previously referred to:

"The information presented to the committee showed that the proceedings for habeas corpus for relief against judgments of conviction in state courts were nearly all without merit and frivolous and often several times repeated by the same prisoner in a state institution. An insignificant number of proceedings for habeas corpus against judgments of conviction in state courts were granted, and an even smaller number brought to the petitioner the ultimate objective of release from prison. Yet in the district courts of districts in which there are state correctional institutions, such proceedings consume a considerable amount of time of the federal judges to no purpose. They entail delay in the enforcement of the judgments of the state courts which is always vexatious, and they interfere with the promptness in the administration of criminal justice which is so essential to its effectiveness."

What can be done to alleviate this situation? One way, of course, would be to limit the scope and effect of the writ. This cannot be done effectively by federal legislation, because

it runs head on into the constitutional prohibition; but it can be done to some extent by the enactment of state laws guaranteeing rights co-extensive with those granted under the writ. This is the purpose of the so-called Uniform Post-Conviction Procedures Act promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

But while such legislation may help to control the problem, it will never eliminate it, especially in view of the recently announced policy of the Supreme Court. For a permanent solution we must turn to other means. Obviously the first requirement is for additional personnel to handle the flood of litigation which is threatening to engulf the federal courts. In these days of hopes for a tax cut and a balanced budget this may not prove a very popular proposal; but before it is rejected, let us look at the facts. During 1955, the entire cost of operating the Federal judiciary system, exclusive of the Supreme Court, was $29,991,576. Out of a 65 billion dollar budget, this represents less than five one hundredths of one per cent. It is less than was appropriated for the conduct of the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the same period. On a per capita basis, it is about 20c for each person in the United States. Surely it would not be unreasonable to increase these expenditures in view of those being made for other and perhaps less vital purposes.

Criminals today play for big stakes. In its interim report in 1950, the Kefauver Committee estimated that over $20 billion dollars changed hands annually over gambling tables in this country, and it called this estimate conservative. In another field, it pointed out that a kilogram of pure heroin, costing a few hundred dollars in Turkey, could after dilution be sold for $50,000 to $100,000 or more in this country.

With these fantastic profits in view, organized criminal gangs can well afford to buy protection at whatever the current market price may be. They can employ the best obtainable lawyers to find them legal loopholes, and unfortunately such talent is frequently available to them. The only way to meet this situation is to plug up those loopholes. No doubt it will be said that the lawyers should clean up their own house, and this they are doing. For example, the American Law Institute is at work on a Model Penal Code which when completed will be the most extensive and carefully studied codification of the substantive criminal law ever undertaken.

At the same time the American Bar Association has embarked upon an investigation of the actual administration of criminal justice in the courts, the police departments, the prosecutor's offices, and the prisons which far exceeds anything similar heretofore undertaken both in scope and completeness. These studies will supply the basic data for improvement both in our laws and our procedures; but without public support, they will be useless. For in the ultimate analysis only an aroused public interest can solve any of the problems presented. As the Kefauver Committee reported, "Public apathy has in large measure been responsible for many of the conditions disclosed by the Committee."

And yet on the whole the future appears bright. While the problems inherent in the administration of criminal justice are by their very nature insoluble, we can at least anticipate a nearer approach to a solution than in the past. As the late Justice Robert H. Jackson wrote, "The dilemma is that no method for conviction of the wrongdoer has been devised that does not hold some danger to the bystander, while no system can fully safeguard the innocent without affording loopholes through which some guilty persons will escape. Achievement of proper balance between means to these two goals is the ultimate problem in criminal law administration."[4] The objective is clear; the means are at hand; if we fail to achieve it, then the fault is in ourselves that we do not care enough for the society in which we live to protect it from those who would destroy its very foundations. Our greatest enemy is not the criminal, but the inertia and apathy which tolerate him.

[1] Emmett Perry, Solicitor for the Tenth Judicial Circuit of Alabama, before the Criminal Law Section of the American Bar Association at its Regional Meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana on November 30, 1955.

[2] 62 out of 1805, or 3.4% as of June, 1955. Data taken from Uniform Crime Reports of the F.B.I. Sept. 26, 1955 and from J. Edgar Hoover's news release of January 1, 1956.

[3] Sobeloff, "The Sentence of the Court," 41 A.B.A. Journal (January, 1955) 13.

[4] 39 A.B.A. Journal (August, 1953) 743.

THE AMERICAN MYTH AS DEVELOPED IN THE AMERICAN NOVEL

By John E. Farrior

(Read at a Meeting of "The Egyptians," *February* 16, 1956)

For the purpose of this paper, the word *myth* is used in a manner slightly other than its ordinary meaning. Ordinarily, the word is used to mean a tale about a god, an event, or a thing that exists only in imagination and is not verifiable by any manner of actual proof. But by common usage in America the word has also taken on the usual meaning of the word *legend*, which is actually a story about a great man, a hero, or a part of the country. We speak of the Davy Crocket myths, the Lincoln myths, or the Paul Bunyan myths, not distinguishing between the actual and imaginary men at all. What I shall try to present this evening are some of the mental concepts of America and Americans which have been set forth in American novels and have in process of time become adopted as real conceptions of American men and of the American scene. All of these conceptions have more or less basis of fact, but it is difficult if not impossible to separate fact from fancy or truth from error. These concepts have, moreover, assumed the proportion of myths and have been accepted by Americans and by people of other countries with the same faith as is shown by the followers of religious myths.

All through the nineteenth century and early in the twentieth, people read novels and gained ideas of people and places they had not seen. There was time for careful reading and leisurely discussion because there were few other forms of entertainment. Southerners who read Hawthorne had reason to believe that all New England men had twisted and tortured minds. Northerners who read Harriet Beecher Stowe had reason to think that all Southern white men were weak and ineffective or vicious and cruel. All people east of the Mississippi who read Owen Wister's *Virginian* formed a mental picture of the Western man and the Western country which has hardly been shaken by any subsequent facts they may have learned. If this was true for Americans, it was much more true for people in other countries who knew nothing of America and little of Americans.

After reading a great many American novels, I have reached the conclusion that there are two myths, or, rather the two opposite parts of the same myth, that run through all the novels from Cooper to Faulkner. The first is the hero-myth in which the ideal qualities of American man appear. The second, or complement of the first, is what I call "the great guilt myth" with its accompanying themes of disintegration and destruction. I shall discuss these two themes separately and then try to show how they are related, or rather how they form one theme.

James Fenimore Cooper is our first great myth-maker. In his Leather-Stocking Tales he shows us the physical America as a sublime scene of illimitable forests, great rivers, wild and rugged mountains, and lakes as great as seas. Upon this magnificently set stage is enacted the great epic struggle of a people striving to build a nation. And the central character, the protagonist, is Leather-Stocking himself, Natty Bumpo, the Original American.

Natty is truly a child of nature. Left an orphan at an early age, he has grown up with the Indians and learned all their wisdom; yet, somehow, he retains all the best of the teachings of white civilization. He often speaks of the white man's "gifts," which to him mean courage, truthfulness, honor, and faithfulness and loyalty to all to whom he has a duty, whether they are great or humble men. His best friend is the Delaware chief Chingachgook, who has the Indian's "gifts" in the same degree that Natty has those of white men. Chingachgook has courage and endurance, but

he is cunning and deceitful to his enemies. Natty does not scorn his friend for these qualities; he accepts him for what he is without trying to reform him. Deeply religious himself, he does not scorn the religion of his friend or that of any other men.

Natty never fails in courage or resourcefulness. He has the habit of success in all that he undertakes. He is no creature of the settlement or of what is usually called civilized life. The great forests of the East and finally the prairies of the West are his home. He is sometimes spoken of as a pioneer, but he was never a pioneer in the usual sense. He had no desire to possess, to own farm or homestead. He loves the wild, unspoiled natural scene, and when white men come too thickly into his territory and towns and settlements grow up, he moves on to the prairies to find unspoiled territory. He is truly the Noble Savage who cannot live in a world defiled by his own kind. Natty never existed in the flesh. He is Cooper's dream of the ideal man living in a world of nature, greater than men are, but having all of the better human qualities unspoiled by greed or ambition.

A foreign view of Cooper's work is shown in the comment of D. H. Lawrence, the English novelist, when he says of the Leather-Stocking Tales: "They form a sort of American Odyssey, with Natty Bumpo as Odysseus."[1] And he further says of Natty and these stories:

> But you have there the myth of the essential white America. All the other stuff, the love, the democracy, the floundering into lust, is a sort of by-play. The essential American soul is hard, isolate, stoic, and a killer.[2]

He grants Natty the two qualities of moral integrity and stoic hardness. And he adds something in the nature of a warning: "When *this* man breaks from his static isolation, and makes a new move, then look out, something will be happening."[3]

---

[1] D. H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature*. Anchor edition. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1953). P. 58.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

In Natty Bumpo, Cooper created the hero of all future tales of action and adventure in America. Natty represents certain elements of character that all Americans admire. "Hard, isolate, stoic, and killer" though he may be, he also possesses moral integrity, resourcefulness, and the ability to accomplish what he sets out to do. In one sense he has become the true American man, not only as the hero of countless novels, but as an ideal of American character. In him are the seeds of all the Hopalong Cassidys, all the Lone Rangers, all the Davy Crocketts, and all the Sergeant Yorks and Audie Murphys.

There were, in the following century, many attempts to recreate Cooper's natural man who is in harmony with his environment. The most notable of these was Owen Wister's *The Virginian* (1902), the prototype of all western stories written since then. The hero has all of the admirable qualities of Leather-Stocking and some others that Leather-Stocking never had. He is as much at home on the plains as was Cooper's hero in the forests. He endures tirelessly the long rides, the scorching heat of summer and the bitter cold of winter. His righteousness makes him help to hang his best friend who has become a rustler; and his revolver brings down the villain Trampass as unerringly as Natty's rifle brought down an Indian.

In contrast to the heroic myth is the guilt myth with its accompanying themes of disintegration and destruction. There is only a hint of this theme in Cooper's Leather-stocking tales. In *The Pioneers,* Natty watches a group of villagers fire a cannon loaded with shot and scrap iron into a huge flock of passenger pigeons. He says, though no one pays any attention to him, that such wastefulness and destruction is evil and will bring evil to the country. In contempt of such wholesale slaughter, he shoots one bird from the air and takes it home for his dinner. But in Cooper's three Anti-Rent Novels, *Satanstoe, The Chainbearer,* and *The Redskins,* he portrays the break-up of the old patroon system of the Hudson. To him the whole process means the break-down of law and order and the triumph of the mob, savage, greedy, and vicious, who force the courts to violate the laws of property and give them title to the land they have squatted upon. Here is one of the early manifestations of that feeling of guilt, that America as a country is somehow cursed because it cannot preserve that which is best and finest. In the democratic process of pulling the great down to a common level Cooper saw a destructive force that boded ill for the future.

In the works of Cooper's contemporary, Nathaniel Hawthorne, there are no heroes and no heroic tradition. Over all his main characters there hangs a brooding sense of impending evil which they may hardly escape. The cause of this threatening nemesis lies partly in their own action, their sins or their weakness of character, and partly it is a heritage of evil from past generations.

In *The Scarlett Letter,* Dimmesdale, a young Puritan minister, has committed adultery with Hester Prynne, the wife of a doctor who has not yet arrived from Europe. A child is born, and Hester is forced to stand on the public pillory as a figure of shame, to wear the scarlet letter A upon her breast, and to remain a pariah for the rest of her life. The people, and even Dimmesdale, urge her to name the father of her child but she refuses. Dimmesdale does not have the courage to reveal himself and excuses his weakness to himself by saying that it would destroy the faith of his people if the minister admits to being so vile a sinner. Yet he suffers the agonies of the damned because he is a man of tender conscience. The husband arrives disguised as a foreign doctor and undertakes to revive the declining health of the minister. Knowing intuitively that Dimmesdale is the father of Hester's child, he tortures him every day in conversation. Ironically enough, Dimmesdale is a far more effective minister as a sinner than he could have been as a saint.

---

[3] *Ibid.*

As one reads through the novel, one feels that Dimmesdale's worst sin is his denial of human love, his failure to claim Hester and little Pearl as his own in spite of church and state. Instead he dies inwardly and is practically a walking corpse on the day when he finally summons courage enough to mount the scaffold with Hester and Pearl and makes a public confession. He dies in the act.

In *The House of Seven Gables* we see a household in the last stages of decay because of the curse brought upon the house by the original Col. Pyncheon because he had deprived another man of the land upon which it was built and by accusing him of witchcraft had brought about his death. The curse remained on the family; and two hundred years later the family is still suffering from it. Hepzibah is a poor, suffering old woman, bent with sorrow and labor; Clifford, her brother, after serving a term in the penitentiary for a crime which he did not commit, has come home broken in mind and body to die. Their cousin, Judge Pyncheon, the real villain who had sent Clifford to prison, comes in to gloat over his victim and is stricken with death as he waits. Clifford too, dies, and Hepzibah is left as the sole direct descendant of the line. It is possible that Hawthorne was writing spiritual autobiography here, for one of his own ancestors had been the famous Colonel Hathorne who had been present at the murder of a whole village of Pequod Indians when, after the carnage was over, he joined the other Puritans in psalms of praise and thanksgiving. Another ancestor had been the cruel "hanging justice" Hathorne

who had sentenced many men and women to death for witchcraft. In this novel Hawthorne wrote out of his own guilt and the guilt of his land.

Hawthorne, more than any of the other early authors seemed to be oppressed with human guilt and human misery. In spite of his great art, if one reads only his books of American novels, one would gain the impression that the America of his day had few if any whole and admirable men and that all light and joy were still hidden under the dark cloud of Puritanism.

Though Poe was not a novelist (he wrote only one long story, the *Narrative of A. Gordon Pym,*) his works too are filled with the theme of decay and dissolution. He was not a moralist nor did he seek to show the causes that brought disaster into the lives of his characters, but he actually *shows* us many times. Roderick Usher is the last of a long line of illustrious men who have had such pride of race that they have always married their cousins to keep the blood pure and whose interest has always turned inward to themselves, never outward to humanity. "The Black Cat" is the study of an alcoholic who has lost all power to discipline himself. "The Tell-Tale Heart" is the story of a murder committed by an insane man. All Poe's characters are tortured men. There is hardly a healthy or fully sane man among them.

Neither of the two, Hawthorne nor Poe, drew any picture of the American scene. In their works we find very little of the bustling America of their own time, the new inventions being put to work, the great mercantile operations by land and sea, the westward expansion, the railroads and telegraph lines linking the country together, or the growing portent of a great civil war. Both turned their light on the inner man, and the forces of guilt, decay, and decadence that beset him.

The Civil War had almost no realistic chroniclers among the novelists. The realists were the soldiers who wrote letters home, the newspaper men, and the photographers, and even the first two were not entirely realistic. The whole country seemed to go back mentally to the imaginary world of Sir Walter Scott and his knights of the middle ages. Northern soldiers, to their own people and to the writers of fiction like Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, were champions of right, fighting a holy war for the redemption of their dark brothers. Southern men were gallant and gentle knights who were defending the sacred soil of their homeland against the barbarian hordes of the North. One poet, Henry Timrod of Charleston, reminded his readers that Satan had his kingdom in the northern part of Heaven at the time that he rebelled against the Almighty and was cast out of Paradise into Hell.

For more than a decade after the war there was very little of any real significance in the novels concerning the American character or any real view of American life. Mark Twain, the great humorist, emerged finally and wrote the great saga of the Mississippi. *Huckleberry Finn* and *Tom Sawyer* are two of our immortal classics. But when one examines them today he finds in them little portrayal of America of the time. *Tom Sawyer* is a boy's book and has little to offer except its humor. *Huckleberry Finn* is much more than that: it is a bitter satire of the whole way of life in the Mississippi valley in the ante-bellum period. Huck is actually a noble savage with a natural sense of right and wrong which clashes continually with ethics taught in the school and the church. He knows that he will go to hell if he helps the runaway slave Jim to escape, but his love for Jim as a friend conquers his man-made ethics and he tears up the letter to Jim's owner and says, "All right. I'll go to hell then." He sees his friends and Grangerfords all killed in a feud. He visits an Arkansas town where each house "mostly has hogs in the garden and folks driving them out." The men seem to

be chiefly loafers who spend most of their time whittling, borrowing chews of tobacco, and to relieve the boredom of their existence occasionally pouring kerosene on a stray dog and setting him afire.

In all his later books and lectures there is a bitter, mocking satire and a sense of deep despair that man has failed to achieve anything noble or to live up to any set of standards that he has made for himself. He sums up the lot of all mankind in the phrase "The damned human race."

The work of Mark Twain marks more or less of a turning point in American fiction. Among intellectuals, the philosophies of Leibnitz, Hagel, and Kant were replaced by the theories of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. The transcendentalism of Emerson was replaced near the end of the century by the pragmatism of William James. The novelists often sought to show that man was what he was because of outside forces working on and in his character rather than seeking the causes within his own nature. Thus environment became a very important factor to be considered in the study of any character. There are, among the novels of the last part of the nineteenth century, many adaptations of these concepts of the relation of man to his environment. In general, three types of novels developed in the period from about 1890 to 1910. We have the illustration of Schopenhauer's "will-to-live" concept in stories of man pitted against the hostile forces of nature in such stories as Crane's "The Open Boat" and Jack London's "Love of Life." Nietzsche's "will to power" is illustrated in the degenerate Wolf Larsen in London's *The Sea Beast* and in Frank Norris's *McTeague*, which show strong men in conflict with other men and with nature. Both are abysmal brutes. Another phase of the Nietzschean philosophy is apparent in the superman in business, the great magnate controlling a great corporation, crushing all opposition and grinding his workers in the dust to achieve his ends.

In Ernest Poole's *The Harbor,* we see the engineer Dillon who is faced with the gigantic task of rebuilding the whole New York harbor to connect rail and ship lines to facilitate trade. He controls the disposition of millions of dollars worth of materials and the destinies of thousands of workers. Living in a tower that overlooks the whole project, he goes calmly on with his task in spite of strikes, riots and sabotage. Many men die in accidents and riots. Many are brought to the point of starvation because of attempts to organize the workers. But none of these things matter to Dillon. He goes on serenely to the accomplishment of his task.

Curtis Jadwin, the speculator in wheat in Frank Norris's *The Pit* is another superman. His attempt to control the wheat market is the cause of pauperizing first the farmers and then the workers in industry who can no longer afford bread. In the end it is the great tide of wheat that comes from the land that breaks him.

There were many more of these novels in the first part of the century. From the depiction of these utterly ruthless supermen has developed the world-wide conception of the American capitalist which apparently will not die out. The old cartoons used to show him dressed in a silk hat and a Prince Albert coat, always lurking near his lair in Wall Street. He furnishes the theme song for the Russian propaganda-makers.

The theories of Karl Marx also had a tremendous impact on the American novel from 1890 on. These novels demonstrate the effect of the superman's actions on society, or at least the lower strata of society. Stephen Crane probably initiated this genre with his entire naturalistic novel *Maggie: a Girl of the Streets* (1893). It is an utterly frank revelation of the miserable and sordid life of a girl of the Bowery who grows up in a home utterly devoid of beauty

or love, where the mere struggle for existence is a bitter burden. She is seduced by a bartender who, low as he is, seems a noble person to her because he shows her some tenderness. Later, he discards her and she commits suicide.

The most bitter denunciation of the practices of great corporations comes in the novels of Upton Sinclair. In *The Jungle* (1906) we see the miserable condition of workes in a packing plant. The utterly ruthless exploitation of immigrant workers in a cold, unsanitary, dangerous working condition is told at length. It is a terrible tale of sordid human misery.

In all of these novels is the theme of human suffering. Contrary to the early novels in which the guilt theme lay in the individual's failure to keep the laws of God, these novels deal with man's inhumanity to man and the guilt of a callous society which permits the strong to exploit the weak.

Two later portrayals of the American scene are in the works of Sinclair Lewis and William Faulkner, two American novelists who won the Nobel prize. One wonders if the European judges were inclined favorably toward these men because they both give unflattering pictures of America. Certainly they do not pull their punches.

In *Main Street* Lewis wrote what he intended as a portrayal of life in Gopher Prairie and of life in all small towns in the United States. What he attacks is the low standard of values in the town. To quote Mr. Lewis: "Its conception of a community ideal is not the grand manner, the noble aspiration, the fine aristocratic pride, but cheap labor for the kitchen and rapid increase in the price of land." The people think only in terms of things, of possessions. They have lost the vision of the pioneers and have gained nothing in its place.

Babbitt and *Dodsworth* are both portraits of men who have achieved success according to the standards of their home city, Zenith, but both are enmeshed in the web of affairs that strangle their individuality. Babbitt does not escape.

He would like to be honest but never achieves it; he does not desire to be unfaithful in his marriage but is bored into an intrigue; he would like to be more than a standpatter but cannot face the disapproval of a gang of good fellows. He falls into the pattern and is swallowed in it. Dodsworth, a manufacturer of motor cars, does escape from the pattern. On a trip to Europe, he becomes disgusted with the cheap romantic intrigues of his wife, who represents the intellectual and ethical level of Zenith society. He finds a new set of values and sets out to find some nobler purpose in life.

Lewis too writes stories of guilt and failure. The guilt lies with the American middle class in that it has failed to find any nobler level of living. In pursuing the cheap and gaudy, Americans have failed to become anything more than trivial.

As Lewis wrote of his imaginary city of Zenith, William Faulkner writes of his own Yoknapatawpha County. He gives the chronicle of the decay and dissolution of the old aristocratic families, the Sartorises, the Comptons, the Varners, the Sutphens, and the rise of the Snopeses. It is the end of the old aristocratic tradition that he tells. And it ends "not with a bang but a whimper." In *Absalom, Absalom,* Thomas Sutphen comes into a Mississippi community in 1833, stakes out a large plantation, marries Ellen Coldfield, and has two children. He amuses himself and his neighbors by having fights between his wild Negro bucks, sometimes fighting one of them himself. His first wife, a negress whom he had married in the West Indies and then cast off, comes with their son Charles Bon. Charles becomes acquainted with Sutphen's children, Judith and Henry, and falls in love with Judith. Sutphen never acknowledges his dark child, and Charles Bon's search for a father ends in tragedy, for Henry kills his half-brother to keep him from marrying Judith. Sutphen himself is killed long after by Wash, a white tenant and drinking companion, because he thinks his own child by Wash's daughter is of less value than a newly foaled colt.

In *Sanctuary* we have the ultimate horror in human form in Popeye the gangster and Temple Drake his victim. In *The Hamlet* we are shown the manners and mores of the Snopeses, the lower level of humanity which is rising to power. The protagonist of this group is Flem Snopes, treacherous, secretive, greedy, and utterly amoral.

As one reads Faulkner one feels that he has used the shock technique to its ultimate limit. He shows the monstrous perversions of mankind in a continual recountal of cruelty, murder, suicide, lust, and pathologic degeneration.

Of all our novelists, he is most concerned with the theme of guilt. Again and again he shows the reason for the decay of the aristocracy. They came as strong men and took the land from the Indians by force or fraud. They built a society based upon the blood and sweat of the Negro. And he shows the dreadfulness of the atonement.

One writer has lamented that the present day American novel shows only the worst of America and does not show our great national virtues, our hearty and tremendous love of life, our boldness and audacity, our great genius, and our genuine kindness, our pity and compassion. He said that the novel of today seemed to have been written by a homosexual out of work, living in a shack he had patched up on a city dump.

Cooper's dream of the heroic natural man perfectly suited to his environment was after all a dream and passed along with Daniel Boone, Jim Bridger, and Kit Carson. These were all men who could not live in a settled community; and America is chiefly made up of settled communities. The heroic quality has certainly survived in all men of great actions, alloyed with cruelty and greed as it sometimes has been. The great business entrepreneur who undertakes and carries through a great enterprise is as great and perhaps kills no more men than did Natty Bumpo leading a party through the wilderness.

I think the reason for so many depressing novels lies in two things: The normal man who owns his home, pays his debts and his taxes, and goes to church on Sunday is not interesting to the novelist. The novelist must have aberation above or below the normal. Perhaps our novelists have been moved too much by the humanistic tradition and have been too concerned in showing the plight of the miserable and unfortunate. But we must grant the artist the right to work in the materials of his own choosing.

The other reason for the novel of violence with its gruesome dwelling on lust and murder is the great appetite of the reading public for garbage. The writer who must sell his work to live must write to suit the taste of the public.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF JUDAISM

By Rabbi James A. Wax

(*Read at a meeting of* "The Egyptians,"
November 17, 1955)

The subject of this paper, though limited to the discussion of one religion, will touch upon theological problems common to many if not all the great religious traditions of the Western World. If the writer seems zealous for the particular religious tradition which he espouses, he would state at the outset that he has in his heart the profoundest respect and deepest reverence for the principles and practices of the other great religions.

Likewise, it ought to be said that the writer believes that it is not necessary for religious truths to have scientific verification. Religious truths, representing Divine Wisdom, are in no need of scientific or philosophical affirmations. Religious teachings expressing the Will of God are eternal and inherently right and intrinsically ethical, whether they are confirmed or rejected by the research and findings of modern scholars or scientists. The proclamations of Moses do not need the endorsement of Einstein; the teachings of Isaiah do not need the affirmation of Comte; the utterances of Jesus do not need the confirmation of Eddington. Religious truths, divine truths, stand on their own!

Nevertheless, it is wise and well to examine from time to time certain religious teachings and traditions and to note the degree of compatibility, for example, between science and religion. If certain scientific theories coincide with and confirm certain religious teachings, this might be an added source of faith—though of course faith is not dependent upon such confirmation. In this paper we shall examine some of the major teachings of Judaism in the light of the relatively new science of psychoanalysis. Both psychology and psychoanalysis are concerned with human behavior. Though one is more profound and far-reaching than the other, both attempt to understand and explain, as Dorsey puts it, "why we behave like human beings."

The nature of man is intricate and involved. Human personality is complex and has many components. Freud declared that man is divided into three parts—instinct, consciousness, and conscience. These three components of human personality are, by their nature, in conflict with one another. The "id"—the psychonalytical term for our instincts, provides the driving energy for life, our loves, anger, and ambitions. Our consciousness, or our ego, is that part of the mind which is in contact with the external world and which enables us to judge reality correctly; and our conscience, or super-ego, built up of commandments and prohibitions as we learn them from our first teachers, our parents, or their substitutes. The goal of man should be to harmonize these three basic divisions. To the degree that we wisely balance these three components do we become integrated personalities, productive and creative members of society.

Stating the goal of man less technically and in more popular language, we should say that man should try to achieve maturity—that maturity which, as Rabbi Liebman says, "enables a person to accept life as full of tensions, when he does not torment himself with childish guilt feelings, but avoids tragic adult sins; when he knows how to postpone immediate pleasures for the sake of some long-term values; when he makes peace with the unarguable fact that he is not omnipotent, nor is anyone else on earth, but that all men must share each other's frailties and draw from each other's powers . . . a maturity that manifests itself in the qualities of tenacity, dependability, cooperation and the inner desire to work and sacrifice for a nobler future of mankind." The aim of man can thus be stated in one or two ways: The reconciliation of the conflicting desires inherent in his nature, or the

quest for maturity—the realization of which gives the individual a realistic and a reasonably wise understanding of God, man, the world, and life.

Keeping in mind these criteria of successful, creative, and happy living, let us ask, "Does Judaism help man reconcile his conflicts and achieve maturity? Does Judaism give man those insights by which he can understand the issues of life and enable him to find in religion that source of faith which will equip him to live confidently and creatively?"

Judaism, like all religions, is God-centered. The ancient Hebrews, with rare intuition and unique genius, found God—the universal God Whose love extended to all men. We are not concerned in this paper with a discussion of all the attributes ascribed to God, save only those that are relevant to our subject. The God of Israel was a God from everlasting to everlasting—a God without beginning and without end. When Moses inquired of God concerning His name, God answered, "I am that I am"—a God who is eternal, not subject to the laws of life and death. The infinity of God in the matter of time, as in all other aspects, is in no wise compromised. God is envisaged as all-powerful, a mighty and ever-present Power, without being authoritarian or tyrannical. God is regarded as all-powerful but not as a despotic deity. The finite mind of the Jew conceived of God as One possessed of the qualities of mercy, kindness, love, and compassion. He was an accessible God—a God who was remote yet near. He was a God Who, though sovereign and supreme, would not dominate.

Erich Fromm, a brilliant psychoanalyst, in his book *Psychoanalysis and Religion*, speaks of the two concepts of God: the authoritarian and the humanistic. The Jewish concept more closely approximates the humanistic. In the Talmud man is spoken of as a co-worker, a partner of God—not a God so exalted above man that He cannot be reached, but so nigh that God and man are partners. Unlike an earthly monarch, He can be approached and in a spirit of warm informality. Many of the prayers of the Hassidim (modern mystics) represent a speaking to God as informally as to a human being. The Jew felt sufficiently close to God to question His ways and even to challenge them. Rabbi Levi Itzhak Berditchev had the spiritual daring to come before God and say, "Why don't You, O God, emulate some of our attributes?" Indeed, such questions and challenges were spoken with reverence and awe.

Although no mortal could, in the Jewish view, become God—God was the model after whom finite man should fashion himself: "Even as God is merciful, so should you be merciful; even as God is loving, so should you be loving," declared the sages of the Midrash. God cannot be equalled, but God can and should be imitated morally and ethically. "Ye shall be as holy as I, the Lord your God, am holy," summarizes the sublime thought. God wants man to be ethically and morally like Himself. While recognizing the infinity of God, Judaism emphasized what the Divine and man had in common and could have in common. Of the many attributes which are ascribed to the Deity, one in particular must be mentioned: In Judaism God is a God of life—He gives life and in His hands is life. He is a living God. In the ritual of the penitential season, starting with the New Year and culminating in the Day of Atonement, God is referred to as a King who delightest in life—a God of life, a living God who *is* life, who gives life. At no time did the Jew identify death with the Deity or believe that the Deity preferred death to life.

Evaluating the Jewish concept of God in terms of modern psychoanalytical criteria, we note that God is living, eternal, and accessible. There is in this concept the positive—the affirmative. Inner security can be found in the God of Judaism. Attachment to Him Who was, is, and always will be, gives the individual a sense of assurance. The spirit of Judaism's ideas of God is one of cheerfulness. No morbid thought of death, no intimation of annihilation (even if softened by faith in the afterlife) mars the spirit of man and accentuates the brevity of his earthly pilgrimage. To dwell upon death is, in a sense, to embitter life and to make man less useful. To think of God as a God of life should exalt the spirit and help man live more confidently. The concept of the "human," the "friendly," the "understanding" God, who is easily approached, is psychologically important. Man is not dwarfed and made insignificant in the presence of a Deity Who is too great, too mighty to be concerned with the needs of the humblest mortal. The relationship is a close one, like a human father and his child. Even as a child feels a nearness, a closeness and intimacy with his earthly father, so man enjoys the same propinquity with his Heavenly Father.

Maturity comes through stressing what is held in common rather than emphasizing distinctive differences. Where differences in a situation—in status, quality, virtue, knowledge—are accentuated, there immaturity is fostered. To belong to the family of which God is the Head is to have and enjoy that divine warmth and fellowship which makes man feel that he counts for something and that he is wanted and appreciated. The God of Judaism, though above and beyond man, is yet very close, ethically, spiritually, psychologically. This close relationship between God and man in no wise compromises the true nature of God or detracts from His dignity or divinity. The Jewish concept of the Deity, interpreted in psychoanalytical terms, is salutary and sound, giving man that feeling and faith which will enable him to meet the issues of life.

Man, according to Freud, as we have noted, is divided into three areas often in conflict with one another—instinct, consciousness, and conscience. He described rather than evaluated him. Religion, long before Freud, taught that man is tormented and often torn by conflicts. Religion characterized the conflict as one between the flesh and the spirit, the body and the soul. Judiasm, too, recognized that man was motivated by conflicting impulses. The rabbis in the Talmud spoke of the impulse toward evil and the impulse toward good. The impulse toward evil, though real and ever-present, was not necessarily dominant. The moral challenge of man was to strengthen his impulse toward good, so that it would prevail. Man, in the Jewish view, is not inherently or basically evil. If one could state the matter mathematically, man would be fifty percent evil and fifty percent good, but it is the good that is predominant.

Even the sex instinct which is identified with evil is, in Judaism, ennobled and invested with a sense of sanctity. Freud, who declared that sex was a strong motivating factor in human life, was anticipated by the rabbis of the Talmud, who asserted that were it not for the sex impulse man would never marry, establish a home, till the fields, or work for a living. Sexual life, in conformity with the laws of morality, was not a concession but a commandment. In the Shulchon Aruch, the medieval Jewish law code that became the norm of Jewish life, cohabitation between husband and wife at certain times was definitely encouraged. Birth control was looked upon favorably by the rabbis of the Talmud. Thus we see that what is usually referred to as "evil" is, in Judaism, interpreted as good. The darker side of life is made lighter by a profound understanding of human nature and an earnest attempt to guide the inherent forces in human beings toward good. Man's baseness is to a degree obscured by his nobility as a child of God.

The point is well made by Prof. Samuel Cohon: "Judaism holds that man's nature is free from moral depravity and innate evil. Moral, as distinguished from physical evil, ensues only at man's own will; by his self-alienation from Torah and good deeds. The idea of original sin was considered by the rabbis of the Talmud and rejected. Crescas, a fourteenth century philosopher, summarized the rabbinical attitude: "The punishment which Adam suffered for his sin was physical and not spiritual." Judaism does not believe that the misdeeds of

the first couple defiled or infected the generations that followed. Judaism believes very clearly and definitely that man does sin—but not that he is a sinner. The belief that man is a born sinner is inconsistent with the belief that man was created in the image of God. If it is true that man, who was created in God's image, is a sinner—what does that make God?

In Judaism as in the other religions, man, because of his finite character and limitations, does not know God—yet we attribute to God human traits. How can we attribute to God human traits if man is by nature a sinner and given to evil? Judaism does not accept this low estimate of man, but rather affirms that he is "but little lower than the angels." However one reads the account of creation in Scripture, man stands supreme. "Man was created in the image of God"—what a lofty concept! "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" —what an exalted position! Prof. Cohon states that "man holds the position of viceroy in creation." In Biblical literature, in the writings of the Talmud and in the medieval philosophers there is agreement that man is a child of God who ranks above all else that God has created. The world and all that is therein exists for man, according to Judaism. This anthropocentric view of Judaism has been shared by other religions and affirmed by philosophers.

The Jewish view that man is important, that he does indeed count for something, is of tremendous and far-reaching significance. Its psychological implications are manifold and momentous. Man is not an insignificant creature—unattached to an eternal power—making a meaningless journey from the cradle to the grave. That he stands close to God means that man has the power of resolving the conflicts that beset him. Man has it within himself to lead a creative, productive, happy life. This exalted view of man should minimize his feeling of inferiority and inadequacy, which is the curse of contemporary man. If men held the Jewish view, it may well be that we would overcome the feeling that we are merely puppets drawn from one war into another and forever living in a world defiled by needless poverty and misery. Man cannot solve his personal problems by regarding himself as "fallen man." The Jewish view of man gives the individual a sense of just and proportionate significance and makes for self-confidence. Man, being conscious of his power, can resolve the conflicts of which Freud spoke—he can achieve that maturity which will enable him to bear the inevitable tensions of life and enjoy a workable, realistic and harmonious relationship with his fellowman. Rabbi Liebman, speaking of the Jewish view of man, declared: "I believe that the psychological insight of Judaism is at this point verified a thousandfold by psychiatry."

It must be added further that the Jewish attitude toward sex, which is an integral part of the nature of man, is wholesome. To regard sex as sinful, as vile, is to give one a sense of guilt, even where the relationship is legitimate and moral. Much of the neuroses of our time has its origin in the mistaken notion that any sexual relationship is inherently evil. Judaism, aware of man's real nature, has evolved no attitude toward sex that would make man feel an unwarranted sense of guilt. This is a negative assertion but a vital one. There are sufficient moral laws for man to observe. Why then, create an attitude toward an aspect of life that is not intrinsically sinful? Let man feel a sense of guilt for the sins against God and against man, but not encourage a neurotic guilt because man was created by God with certain animal instincts. The Jewish view of man, considered in both positive and negative terms, is an essentially healthy view.

Both the Jewish concept of God and of man are psychologically sound, and the effect of the Jewish beliefs in these areas of religion will enable man to resolve the basic issues of life and help to establish a better social order.

The Jewish view of the world is likewise wholesome, sound, and salutary. The focus of attention in Judaism is on this world rather than the next. It should, however, be stated at this point that Judaism very definitely believes in the afterlife. We need not consider the problem of immortality in this paper except to say that Judaism believes in it. Only one reference in Talmudic literature would suggest that this world is less important than the next. In the Ethics of the Fathers, one sage is recorded as having said that this world is a vestibule to the next. This world in which we live, despite the many ugly spots in it, is basically a good and beautiful world. God exclaimed after He made it, "Behold! It is good." To eliminate the ugly spots, Judaism is committed. The purpose of Judaism is well stated in the words: "The perfection of the world under the sovereignty of God." To perfect this world is the supreme aim of Judaism; to work for the establishment of God's kingdom on this earth is the sublime goal of Judaism. In times past and among some Jews today, there has been the expectation of the Messiah. Among other Jews there is the hope of attaining the Messianic Age, when "swords shall be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, and every man shall sit under his vine and fig tree, with none to make him afraid." What does this high and holy ambition mean, in psychological terms?

Stated negatively, this is not an unpleasant place, less to be desired than the next world. It is not unattractive, a place from which we should wish to withdraw. The next world may be better, but this is still a good world, worth perfecting. We are not in a prison waiting for the messenger of death to release us and lead us into the other world. No man can enjoy life if he feels that the place in which he lives is unattractive and ugly. Judaism teaches us to appreciate our environment, despite its blotches. This appreciation is important if man is to be interested in improving the world and finding joy in life.

In a more positive manner of speaking, the worthwhileness of this world and its challenge to us to improve it redirects our attention from ourselves to our fellowman. As we have seen earlier, Judaism does not regard man as a sinner by nature, who must ever dwell on achieving his personal salvation. While Judaism believes that man must achieve his salvation in order to merit the bliss of the next world, this is not an all-consuming concern. Judaism says, "Lead the good life for the sake of your soul, but seek also the salvation of the society of which you are a member." The prophets of Israel who developed Judaism to its loftiest ethical and moral standards, emphasized the need for improving this world. Redeem the world from the sins of injustice, cruelty, oppression, hate, and war—this call or challenge is not only ethically sound; it is also psychologically valid. Ashley Montague, in his book, *On Being Human*, asserts that it is natural for man to co-operate, to work with others in a common cause. Failure to encourage men to engage in group or social enterprises is really, then, contrary to the nature of man. Self-centeredness, exclusive or predominant concern with self has no place in Judaism. Maturity, the total growing-up of a person, comes in part, at least, from joining with others in common tasks. Linking yourself with your fellowman in a common cause helps one to grow and develop in the fullest sense. Concern with self makes for morbidity and retards maturity. The people of the Western World would be happier and their morals in every regard higher, if they thought less of their personal salvation and earning the right to heaven, and would concern themselves more with the common social, ethical, and political problems which involve the destiny of mankind. In helping to solve the problems of society, many of our personal problems would be solved. The Jewish view of the world and its challenge to perfection is a psychologically sound view, one that would help both man and men.

Lastly, we consider the Jewish attitude toward life. Here, too, we shall find that the Jewish attitude makes for confident living. Of the six hundred and thirteen laws of the Torah, the first is: "Be fruitful and multiply." What a simple yet profound declaration—let life increase and flourish. How sublime is the statement in Deuteronomy: "I set before you this day life and death, the blessing and the curse; choose life." This life is not unimportant, to be regarded merely as a prelude to a greater life beyond. Man, according to Jewish law, may not take his own life. How significant is the traditional toast of the Jew: "L'chaim"—"To life!" How Judaism glorifies life! God's most precious gift to man is the gift of life, and man is enjoined to make the most of it—not to retreat from it but to share its manifold experiences with zest and earnestness. It is significant that, in all the long history of the Jew, no ascetic or monastic movements of any consequence ever developed. The Essenes were the only group who believed in withdrawal from life, but this group was small and exerted no widespread or permanent influence in Judaism. To deny oneself the legitimate joys of life has not been the Jewish attitude. During the awesome days of the penitential season, the Jew prays, "Inscribe us in the Book of Life." Even in the darkest moments of countless centuries of adversity, the Jew held tenaciously to life. The Jew does not share the view that this life is secondary to the afterlife. We are not to forfeit our opportunities or ignore our obligations here because our stay in this world is brief. We are enjoined to find in life joy and happiness. Judaism does not believe that a denial of the legitimate joys and pleasure of life is essential to morality. The Hasidic Movement of the late middle ages emphasized morality and encouraged joy. Even the fulfillment of the Commandments was associated with joy. The rabbis declared that the reward of doing a good deed was inner joy. One could multiply examples and cite endless statements from the vast ethical literature of Judaism which attest to the worthwhileness of life and the admonition to enjoy life. How sound is this view psychologically!

Modern man, burdened with his personal problems, living in a time of uncertainty and insecurity, needs to feel that life, with all its travail, its trouble is worthwhile—that life need not be bereft of those legitimate experiences that please and satisfy man. How can man solve his problems if he is discouraged by the thought that, really, this life doesn't matter? How can man live creatively if he is dominated by the idea that life is not worthwhile? Why reconcile the conflicts of which Freud spoke or harmonize the opposing impulses of which religion speaks, if it really does not matter? Contemporary man must be made to feel that our sojourn here, though brief and beset by numerous conflicts and problems is worthwhile. The Jewish concept of life would be approved by every physician who understands and works with the emotional and spiritual problems of man.

The limitations of time necessarily curtail the number of Jewish teachings and concepts that we can consider in this paper. It is safe to assert, and true, that even as the Jewish idea of God, man, the world, and life are psychologically sound so, too, are the other basic and fundamental views of Judaism. Judaism recognizes the true character of nature and human nature. It has, perhaps intuitively, respected the nature of man and his needs, and thus espouses an ethical code that makes for moral growth and ultimate perfection—while simultaneously giving man inner security and peace of mind.

The advancement of mankind toward a better world depends upon the mental health of the men and women who comprise society. People who feel their status is inferior, who feel inadequate, who lack confidence cannot really comprehend the moral precepts of religion and translate them into a living reality. We must keep before us always the thought that the supreme blessing is peace—peace for the individual and peace for mankind. In Hebrew the word for peace is "sholom," which comes from the root word "sholam," meaning completeness, wholeness. Let us strive

by our utterances and our preachments, to harmonize the ambivalent forces in man and the world, in order to achieve a complete man—and the *one world*. The psychological insights of Jewish teachings and traditions are not exclusively Jewish. They have found their way into the moral codes of mankind. It is for each of us to understand the true nature of man, his needs and strivings, and to make possible the fulfillment of man's needs.

PREHISTORIC DISCOVERIES IN ART

By Neuton S. Stern, M.D.

(*Read at a meeting of* "The Egyptians," *March* 15, 1956)

It is certain that art as expressed in drawing and painting existed long before the age of history began. Four or five thousand years ago writing was invented and we have found inscriptions on rock, tombs, tablets, and ceramics dating from that time. By then art was well developed in Egypt and Sumeria, and in older sites now exposed by the archeologist's shovel. The earliest art that we know dates back 20,000 years. We may well call what we have found art, because form, painting and motion were even then admirably depicted. You are all familiar with the animal paintings on the cave walls in France and Spain, supposed to have been done by the Cro-Magnon men. But rock paintings, carved bones and ivories have been found of equal age elsewhere, and indicate that art was no new thing. Even these were probably the results of centuries of skill, because only fine artists would have been delegated to do such work, and supported during the weeks and months these must have taken. So the beginnings go back into the dim past; to put ourselves into those very distant days, we shall have to use our best imagination based on human nature as we find it, and on art as it was first revealed to our eyes.

The more modern scientists make psychological tests on animals. We are now aware that animals have intelligence and solve problems and even that they think abstractly. It was recently shown that a canary could be taught to find food beneath an aspirin tablet among five red checkers or chess men. When the food was placed under an odd object among several screws standing on their heads, the canary found its reward without difficulty. This indicated abstract thinking —find this odd object and search there. Not only was the aspirin tablet a symbol of food to be found, but the difference between one object and others was a symbol of the hiding place. So no longer can man claim to be the sole user of abstract thought and symbolism. But man is its supreme user, and he applies his powers in the field of art.

It is not sure, but probable, that language had already been developed, but it is sure that in his communication he had learned to use significant gestures. These would mean, as we could easily interpret, "come here," or "look there," or "keep quiet," or "I am hungry." Just as surely they learned to mimic the calls of birds, and the cries of animals. They showed by posture the characteristic movements or size of animals they were to hunt. These gestures, probably elaborate at first became simplified symbols, but carrying the larger meaning. It was easy to identify certain animals, a stag with antlers, a bird flying, or a snake. Our own children do this as a game, with much imagination and complete understanding. With a single chair they can ride an automobile or a train, sail the seven seas, live in a hut or cave.

Primitive men in the childhood of civilization were careful observers and noted animal tracks in the dust or sand. In their fiddling with toes or fingers or a stick they could easily imitate those tracks, reproduce them in smooth mud, or on a smooth sandy beach. If well done, their neighbors might recognize the resemblance, so that a wiggly line might represent the snake, a long narrow curving triangle the bull's horn, or a branching tree, the stag's antlers. Once this idea caught on you may be sure that the beach was full of simple representations. And all the group learned to make them and interpret them. Nor need they have been accurate copies, they served as long as they were understood by all.

Then they began to delineate what we call "stick men," those straight lines combined at the joints, by means of which they could represent all types of human activities. Today's artists use these to help students learn how to demonstrate the postures of men in action.

As always some men in each human field are more skillful than others. The shaman or chieftain was probably the most skillful; or perhaps the most skilled became the shamans. They had time to be trained and to practice, since others hunted for them and supplied their needs. With artistic temperament, a man might do good work. He would discard useless lines and make every stroke and curve tell. Every posture and activity could be portrayed. Some lines might then be thickened or put in extra for shadow, or be used for texture as hair. Thus line drawing developed with depiction of all the things in which they were most interested, animals, fish, hunting, spears, bows and arrows—and men.

When a man began to feel the artistic urge you may imagine that as today he would want to draw as much and as often as he could. When he left the smooth dusty spot, or the beach, he might pick up a piece of gray clay and draw against a dark stone. This could be erased, as well as his lines in the sand, and he might try again. When he got back to the fire a piece of charred wood would serve instead of the clay. He would remember how children laughed when they put a daub on each other's face in play. Now he could do the same with different intent. He could try to represent some animal by lines on his neighbor's body or face or he might try merely to give him an unusual appearance and try to make him horrible and frightening like a god. Thus began the art of bodily decoration.

As times wore on, and skills descended from teacher to pupil, high degrees of artistic results were obtained. Since drawings on sand or mud, or with clay on rock could be destroyed, smoothed out, or rubbed or washed off, artists began to think of some way in which their work could be made less evanescent. They had noticed that their flint knives could scratch bone, or scrape soft stone away, and this led them to the idea that they could carve on wood or bone or ivory, or peck or carve on stone. Some of the objects thus made have been found and are among earliest examples of artistic endeavor.

In using solid materials, solid effects were obtained and this probably led to simple modeling out of mudpie and clay. The earliest art we find then represented a late stage, because they were types that could be permanent. There were outline carvings in bone and ivory, there were line drawings in caves and line carvings on flat rock cliffs.

Some of these latter types were at times drawn in colors, so that for similar reasons to those above we know that the use of colors was already ancient. The colors were the simplest ones, such as could be made from charcoal, ashes, clay, or earth colors.

When colors were used, the user—and the observer—got pleasure merely from the color. Today you hear it said "I love pink," or "blue is my favorite color." There is a sensitivity, a fine emotional reaction, to the color alone. Blue tends to be depressing. Red has an exciting, or a passionate effect, probably because of its relation to blood. Thus a flat surface could be coated by a single or a combination of colors without more ado. Some of our famous artists today, such as Kandinsky, use this simple primitive technic. This arouses emotions, pleasurable or otherwise, but has no meaning.

Since drawing had already depicted natural forms and figures, the primitives filled in their outlines with colors which our own children do in their color books. Eventually the outlines themselves were delineated in color, and later patches of color were shaped to have form but no outlines were used. This was the beginning of real painting. This type of picture is found on cliffs and cave walls along side of the outline drawings. Eventually even some carved figures were pecked into the stone without definite outlining. Some of these paintings in the Altamira caves for instance were done in three colors. There are wonderfully lifelike representations of mammoths, deer, antelopes, horses, boars and bisons.

Aside from these early carvings and paintings, the earliest decorative motifs were those found on pottery when pottery forms were advanced enough. Sensitivity to line and form was manifested in the jar's beauty of form. Not satisfied with this, decorations were added, perhaps a simple line about the lip or base, but more likely geometric patterns. Do you think they used these because they had a science of geometry at this early stage? Modern archeologists think not. They believe that these designs were borrowed from the weaves of basketry. Simple in and out patterns, over and under I should say, were surely the easiest and earliest in weaving. As awareness of patterns developed, experiments were tried, two or three over and under, or alternate one and two, or weaving a quarter of the pattern, turning 90° and repeating the pattern four times. In this way diagonals, squares, chevrons, and the most famous of all designs, the so-called Greek Key or fret were formed. With increasing skill in basket and mat weaving came more and more complicated patterns. These designs were taken and transferred to the soft clays, and were incised on them or painted on them before they were baked, or even impressed from the baskets used as molds.

Only later did some of these designs crudely resemble animal or bird forms, and gradually slightly more suggestive patterns were introduced. These were not the beginnings of animal forms. Already the artists knew better than that, and could do better in their line drawings and their carvings. Of course in time animal, human, and vegetable forms were added to the pattern designs and were used in varying proportions.

The repetitive forms in weaving helped them no doubt in what we call composition, the balancing of design and the satisfactory and pleasing filling of the empty spaces. In Greece the favorite fret pattern was used extensively. Marine plants of great beauty and delicacy encircled the cups, and pictures of all types of human activity were eventually introduced. We find these mixtures of patterns not only on ceramics, but in the wall paintings in the tombs and ruins of Tiryns, Mycenæ and Knossus.

In the earliest art of Egypt, the drawings of the human figure, unlike the Grecian ones, were already conventionalized —head in profile, eye frontal, shoulders and torso frontal, legs and feet in profile. Why this convention was used, no one knows, but the reasons were significant enough to maintain the convention over hundreds of centuries without change. No doubt there was some religious motive back of it. No other reason, I believe, would be so powerful and so "permanent." That their skill was sufficient so that they need not have done this we may conclude from their beautiful bird, fish, and animal drawings, along side of these human beings.

Let us become somewhat more technical for a little while and discuss the materials of artistic endeavor, rather than the endeavor itself.

Dust and sand drawings were well enough to start and to practice because they could be erased and repeated over and over, but there was no permanency to them. A footstep, the wind, high tide were enough to destroy them. As suggested above, probably the earliest pigment was the charcoal of partly burned wood saved from the fire. Its blackness was sufficient to give it contrast on any surface including a dark skin. White ashes left from completely consumed embers or bones would offer an excellent contrast to the black. It was first noted when the dirtied fingers from picking up the charcoal were by accident passed across the face or body. The idea of using the charcoal in stick form naturally followed. And just as naturally followed the charcoal rubbed to a powder. Soot was just as black, and was in fact purer, but it must have come later, when it was obtained from the bottom of a cooking vessel, or from some sort of flue when fireplaces were used.

These black or white pigments could be applied as a dry powder in lines or other figurations, but soon rubbed off or dried and fell off. Moreover, applied with the finger the lines were rather broad.

Some of this powder was kept in the hollow of a stone, or in a gourd or small pot. Left in the rain one day, the water mixed with the powder and became a paste. The artist discovered this to his surprise, and found that it could be applied more effectively and with better control than the dry powder. It could even be applied with a slender twig and thus make finer lines. If the twig were one whose end had been idly chewed, it worked even better, since it formed a sort of brush.

There remained the difficulty of drying and falling off however. The artist's wife, who prepared the grain for cooking, suggested that since the flour mixed with water was sticky this might be used to make the design last longer. So it did. But still it eventually dried and flaked off. The first glue that I was given as a child was paste made of flour and water.

Then the artist noted that the "paint" applied to a greasy skin after a day's work stayed on very much better than after the "paintee" had cleaned up and taken his bath in the river or lake. This led him to think of grease as a base for mixing this paint. With the next meal he collected grease from the top of the pot, and he carefully rubbed his pigment into this. The result was good, a fine smooth paste that did not readily dry.

Later, other sticky substances were used; oils pressed from seeds, waxes, gums and resins from trees were all tried, different ones in different parts of the world. Among the Maya of Mexico who were still in the stone age when found by the Spaniards, copal was the excipient. From the resin of the copal tree, a varnish was made and mixed with the pigments. It is quite possible that eventually egg albumen was used, and was satisfactory enough to be continued into the historical Renaissance, when it was replaced by linseed oil. By using these bases for holding the pigments, and by means of which they might be smoothly spread, the drawings and paintings achieved a relative permanence, especially if they were protected against the elements, as in tombs, and caves, or buried walls.

The next most likely pigment after the carbon, was white ashes of wood or bones. No doubt this was promptly supplemented by clay which might dry or be pulverized into white or gray. The keen observant eye of our prehistoric man who was interested in art did not pass by a red rock when he chanced upon it. An iron ore that we call hematite was blood red, and if enough "elbow grease" was used it could be powdered and used for painting. Red is a beautiful color and an exciting one since it had associations with wounds and bleeding, and soon was used whenever its effects were desired. The Mayans found a red pigment by roasting the superstructure of large ant hills that they found in the forests. They used too a blue pigment whose source we do not know with any certainty.

There were other earth colors obtained from the ground or soft stones. Some were dull colored when originally found; they were ochres, yellow and brown. When roasted they became more brilliant. We still use burnt sienna and burnt umber as two of the most important pigments today. They seemed to become lighter and almost to change color when thinned and especially if mixed with white.

These pigments when found were usually not pure, so they were selected, ground or crushed roughly, picked over, washed and reground by stone against stone, either by what we could call mortar and pestle, or by a roller on a flat stone. Then they were saved, or mixed with the base at once.

Some colored substances were not just suspended as these were in paste or grease, but were actually soluble in water. Such colors could be used to stain reeds for baskets, or yarn for cloth, and they learned simple ways of fixing, that is, making them permanent, by boiling in water or in salt water.

But for painting only certain pigments were useful, and by experience it was learned what these requirments were. Otherwise the paintings soon disintegrated or washed off and disappeared. These pigments must be insoluble in the vehicle in which they were mixed. They must be—in our modern terms—non-reactive with each other, or they would change color and constitution. They must be stable on exposure to air and light. Now of course our primitive man did not have or make these rules. He only found by sad experience that certain ones, or certain mixtures, were unsatisfactory, and so he no longer used them. Enough good ones were found to carry on the art of painting. This is an example of natural selection. The knowledge of the pigments that were satisfactory was handed on from generation to generation and became part of the artistic tradition.

When history began, drawing, painting, and sculpture of which we have said nothing, had already reached a high degree of skill through the discoveries of many centuries.

ANALYSIS OF A NEWSPAPER

By W. C. Teague

(*Read at a meeting of* "The Egyptians," *April* 19, 1956)

The reader of a newspaper, it has often been said by newspaper people, ordinarily feels that it arrives on his porch or in his mailbox through processes he regards as remarkable but mysterious. In attempting an analysis of a modern newspaper, I shall endeavor to indicate how much of truth or error there may be in that concept.

Primarily a newspaper is the end product of an organization that gathers and distributes the news. News, essentially, is information about what has just happened or is just about to happen.

Perhaps the best known definition of news is that which holds that it develops only when a man bites a dog. A somewhat more accurate statement is that news is made up by the same old things happening to a different set of people.

A well known but probably erroneous impression is that the word was born when a publisher long ago headed his columns of reports from North, East, West and South with initials to spell NEWS.

Considering the content of present-day newspapers, I think you may agree that there is no single word elastic enough to take it all in. The fact is that the newspaper of today is supposed to inform, entertain, educate, admonish and on occasion to reprove and indict.

First I shall ask you to consider your newspaper, or any other, as the center of a series of concentric circles from which information is gathered, edited and processed for distribution in printed and pictorial form.

The first circle is made up of the metropoliton area of the community in which publication is had. Next comes one that includes the region the newspaper serves. Third is the nation and finally there is the world at large.

So-called local news is gathered by what newspaper people call the city side, namely reporters whose activities are directed to getting and writing the happenings in the first circle of coverage. The major part of such news is obtained from established beats or rounds to which reporters are regularly assigned.

I may mention the courts, governmental offices, police stations, the sheriff's office and other places where business is done and news always originates. Other reporters are kept available for assignment when and as news develops.

Regional news is handled in the main by correspondents who live in the communities it is advisable to cover. News services such as the Associated Press, United Press and International News Service are likewise available on regional coverage.

In addition, newspapers of any considerable size have special representatives in appropriate state capitals, the national capital and any other locations regarded as strategic as far as news of interest and value to the newspaper and its readers is concerned.

The news services mentioned, as well as a host of others at home and abroad, help take care of national and international developments. Many of the larger newspapers of the world maintain their own news services, especially in the realm of foreign affairs, and usually make their reports available to others at a price.

Otherwise there is a vast complex of so-called syndicates that will provide comic strips, advertising matter, feature articles, pattern services, advice to the lovelorn, columns of all sorts, polls of public opinion, poetry of a kind, allegedly humorous matter and what have you.

Flooding into every newspaper office, too, are the brain children of press agents, or public relations counsellors, all of whom bend their energies and dedicate their talents to the promotion of special causes and interests. Nearly everybody has a press agent these days.

Into every newspaper office, too, comes a steady stream of men and women who want to get something into the paper for one reason or other. They range all the way from a socially ambitious mother to a politically ambitious man, from the giant corporation to the president of a church circle.

There are also a few people, by the way, who want to keep something out of the paper and they usually make up in earnestness and vigor whatever they may lack in numbers.

Practically every group, large or small, has a publicity chairman and he or she does his or her level best to get something published. By and large these publicity chairmen supply a good deal of news.

To sum up, the newspaper is asked to support and further every worthy cause, every charitable and civic endeavor, and their name is legion. Its duty includes promoting education, religion, respect for law and anything and everything of a worthwhile nature.

The newspaper is also expected to be alert and to detect and attack that which is evil, but it must in self-defense try to avoid being lured into spending time, energy and space on the trivial or worse. In this field the newspaper's problem is to make the best use of necessarily limited space.

A considerable portion of every newspaper that remains in business must be devoted to the publication of paid advertising, or the news of business, as it is sometimes called. The major portion of newspaper revenues comes from advertising, for paper sales and subscriptions are never anywhere nearly sufficient to keep things going.

Advertising is sold by a local staff and by agencies, both local and national in scope. Agencies represent newspapers as well as corporate and individual clients.

Advertising is a highly specialized and fascinating aspect of modern newspapering, particularly in the manner of preparing and presenting appeals for whatever commodities and services are offered. The reputable newspaper screens the copy offered with a great deal of care in the effort to keep our fraudulent or improper material. In a limited time I can do no more than allude to advertising.

Contrary to what you may have heard, as a rule a sort of armed neutrality prevails between the news and advertising departments of a newspaper. There is a daily conflict of opinion as to proper balance between news and advertising. No editor ever had enough news space and no advertising manager ever thought there could be too much advertising.

Now, after having presented what I am aware is a highly sketchy account of how and where a newspaper obtains its subject matter, I shall try to suggest to you what happens to those portions of the invariable overabundance that are chosen for publication.

Everything that comes out in a newspaper originally appears in written or pictorial form on paper or the equivalent thereof. After it has been edited, corrected, revised, cut down and marked for the printer, including headlines, it goes to the composing room.

From the paper the material is transferred to metal, chiefly through the medium of typesetting machines of one remarkable sort or another, for there is little hand work these days. In the case of photographs or drawings, metal plates known as cuts are made.

Once the material is in metal, proofs are taken, pulled we say, and are checked for errors of any or all sorts. In certain instances revisions will be ordered. After the necessary changes have been made, we hope, the type, cuts and so on are placed in shallow forms that are page size.

The form is covered with another paper product, this one called a matrix, or mat for short. The matrix is sent under a roller that exerts sufficient pressure to impress on the mat a reproduction of the type and cuts in the form.

Your material is back to paper again, but not for long. The mat is placed in a machine that squirts molten metal into another form or mold that is semi-circular and makes up one page. The result is called a plate.

These plates in whatever number may be designated, within the size limits established or possible in relation to the capacity of a given press, are clamped on rollers. Ink is put into fountains, newsprint paper is threaded through the press and a button is pressed to start newspapers rolling out at a more or less rapid clip.

Your material with which we began has gone back to paper again and is ready to pass into the hands of the mailers and the circulation forces.

Newspapers go in a steady stream on elevators to the circulation forces to be tied into bundles for carrier or other delivery or to be wrapped and labeled for mailing.

Papers for city and metropolitan area delivery are taken in trucks to division points where carriers get their quota and start out on foot, by car or bicycle on their appointed rounds. There are still a few routes in the Mid-South, I am told, where the youngsters ride ponies or horses.

In the sections outside the more thickly settled areas men in cars make deliveries along so-called motor routes, some of which may be 30 or 40 miles long.

Otherwise delivery is effected by all available means of transportation, sometimes including airplanes. Trucks and trains are the main reliance, with trucks employed in handling other commodities doubling as newspaper carrier to a great many points.

Such, in brief and with the omission of many highly interesting machines and processes, is substantially what the newspaper does every day in the year in the course of producing and delivering its product.

There are several editions of a newspaper each day, partly to take care of late-breaking news and partly to allow time for delivery to more distant points. Usually one edition is planned for each of the main circulation areas. News of special interest to one section will be replaced by news of special interest to the other and so on until the final or city edition is put to bed.

The goal is to retain throughout news of general concern, which simplifies the process of assembly and also holds down costs.

At this moment, I dare say, every known means of transportation and communication is being employed in the transmission of news and in the delivery of newspapers.

The main reliance for transmitting information these days is the teletype machine, or electrically operated typewriter effect that you may have seen and heard. Copy prepared for sending on the teletype is punched onto waxed paper tape, with assigned combinations of holes representing letters and symbols.

After the tape has been punched, it is set in a sending machine which pulls it over a set of points that generate electrical impulses so that every receiving machine hooked up along the line will write the same thing at the same instant at the rate of about 60 words a minute.

There are also teletype machines, equipped with keyboards, on which one may either send or receive material. You punch a button and the machine brings stuff in. You punch a button and the machine sends whatever you peck and hunt out on its keyboard.

Pictures may be sent and received by wire at a rapid rate and in very good quality. Radio transmission of pictures is possible, though not yet as reliable as could be desired. The telephone is a mainstay, as is the telegraph setup. Short wave receivers maintain contact with fire and police departments and the like. Short wave is also used to send news over great distances from isolated areas.

Transocean cables are employed when desirable and before long a transocean telephone cable between the United States and Europe will serve as a new asset in gathering news.

In short, if the news appears to justify the expense, anything that happens in almost any part of the world can be reported to your newspaper in a matter of minutes after word of it has been received at any main news source. Reports from the Antarctic, for example, are obtained regularly by short wave.

Now for a summary of how all this never-ending flood of news and features is handled after it is received in a newspaper office.

The editor is in charge of everything as a rule, though he may and frequently does delegate administrative authority to others as far as day to day operation is concerned. In the final analysis, however, the responsibility lies with the editor.

In addition to the editor in chief, however, a newspaper has other editors all over the place.

The managing editor is charged with general supervision of the placing and handling of everything that goes into the newspaper after decisions have been made about what to use and where and how much.

The city editor looks out for local items. The stream of telegraphic copy is handled by the telegraph editor as far as national and international news is concerned. The news editor supervises the reading and editing of copy, the writing of headlines and so on. The make-up editor must see that type is placed where it is wanted in the forms.

If a paper has a Sunday edition, it also has a Sunday editor who labors with the special features that appear in such an affair.

The man who cares for state and regional matter is ordinarily known as state news editor—at The Commercial Appeal he is a tri-state editor. Then we have editors for radio and television, amusements, society, markets, churches, schools, sports and who knows what all. The theory is the same but the application of it varies somewhat from paper to paper.

In other words, the handling of news, pictures and features is departmentalized with responsibility for accuracy, clarity and so on rising in increasing measure from the original reporter, reviewer, photographer or whatever through a series of checkpoints.

As for the objective in newspaper writing, the main emphasis is on simple language and accuracy as to names, addresses, dates, and facts generally rather than on fine writing. The underlying theory is that if a reporter gets the facts and puts them down so people can understand them he will have as good a story as the circumstances permit.

Brevity is more often demanded than obtained, but it is sought after. To employ a newspaper cliche, if you tell it to the Sweeneys then the Van Stuyvesants can understand it.

A word about freedom of the press. It might more propertly be called freedom to print, but in any event the newspaper in this country is free to print and say what it pleases subject to whatever laws may be in force on the subject and in relation to whatever discretion the editor may have in regard to what is fit and proper to print.

The question as to how a newspaper editor decides what to print and what to leave out, after the field of obviously important events is passed, is often asked. As I have tried to indicate, a newspaper always has at hand a vast deal more than it can possibly use.

It is a matter of news judgment that affects everybody from the individual reporter on through a succession of editors who may have the power of decision.

Rarity makes news, as does the unusually humorous, especially if it can be treated briefly so as to become available to fill gaps in columns. Stories about children and animals are proverbially good. Almost anything about the weather is well read, especially news of freakish weather.

Determination of which important stories shall be used and how they shall be placed and displayed lies with a staff meeting composed of the chief editor, the managing editor and various other editors. These worthies hash matters over among themselves, always keeping in mind the desirability of news balance.

The newspaper goes to every sort, shape and description of person, young, old, middle-aged, rich, poor and all. It is taken by people of all shades of political affiliation and all sorts of racial and religious connections. It goes to the doctor of philosophy and the man who moves his lips when he reads. Within bounds, the newspaper feels obligated to offer everyone something that meets his tastes.

The dominating principle in American newspapering today is that facts should be told in news stories without slant or bias and that the expression of opinion should be reserved for the editorial page. It is an ideal difficult to realize, but the effort is made as a rule, barring scandal sheets and what is left of the so-called yellow press.

Now editorials are ordinarily written on assignment and after careful consideration and discussion at an editorial conference held daily and including editorial writers, the editor in chief, the editorial page cartoonist and other key members of the staff when and as their presence may be desired.

An editorial writer is supposed to continue to be a reporter and keep in touch with what goes on in the world through contacts as well as reading and observation. The old idea that an editorial writer dwelt in an ivory tower has been entirely abandoned in theory and largely in practice.

In current concepts editorials are not confined largely to politics and economics, as used to be the case in great measure. There is more comment on manners, morals and customs. The trend today is also away from personalities in political discussions. The editorial is more apt to be directed to the reader's reason than to his emotions.

There is no one left today, as far as I can recall, who thunders down from an editorial Olympus as did the giants of the era of what has been termed personal journalism. That, I think, is attributable to the fact that the newspaper is no longer the only major factor in informing the people, though it continues to be the largest medium in the field as far as detailed information is concerned. A changed approach has been dictated.

People still like the personal touch, however, and newspapers have turned to columnists of many kinds and varieties who write under their own names. Practically all newspapers carry one of more columns, often as an editorial page feature.

In increasing measure the substantial newspapers of the day are using a sufficient variety of columns to present both the liberal and conservative points of view. The vogue of keyhole peepers and gossip columns is on the decline outside the largest cities and not a bad thing, either, as far as I am concerned.

There are columns dealing with every major interest, as far as that goes, including humor.

On the whole, there is far less campaigning than there used to be, with less scolding and more care displayed in choosing objectives.

It is not always realized by the layman that the newspaper that hopes to live, grow and do well must advertise on its own behalf. In the profession this is known as promotion and nearly every newspaper has a promotions manager or two or three. There is no way of knowing just what form a promotion will take. The range is from prize contests on to substantial undertakings calculated to show cumulative results for community betterment. On the average there is less frippery than once was true.

A great many newspapers conduct annual campaigns at Christmas to provide some measure of holiday cheer for the unfortunate. Papers in the larger cities usually raise money to send underprivileged youngsters to summer camps. An annual spelling bee has wide approval and so it goes on down to releasing dollar bills and paying premiums to the people who locate them.

Steadily rising costs of production during the last several years have tended to put the newspapers that survived in places of more than traditional positions of scope and influence. The number of daily papers has dwindled steadily through consolidations. By the same token, few new papers have appeared.

In numerous other cases, newspapers have retained individual ownership and control of news and editorial policies, but have formed corporations to handle all business affairs jointly, including the sale of advertising. The trend toward so-called chain newspaper operations has been accelerated by the same conditions, though the chains themselves have eliminated losers by shutting them down or through the purchase of direct competition in the morning or evening field, as the case might be.

There are numerous cities where both afternoon and morning papers are owned by the same individual or chain. Kansas City, Memphis and Atlanta are examples, but there are others in plenty.

It is pertinent to ask, then, whether apprehension as to monopoly and charges that it exists are valid. While it may lie within the realm of semantics, I question the accuracy of accusations of monopoly if the term is applied in the opprobious sense it acquired in trust-busting and muck-raking days.

In other words, anyone who has the money and cares to risk it can start a newspaper today anywhere he likes. He can without any difficulty obtain the necessary equipment and the services of the press associations, either the Associated Press, which is co-operative, or of the others that make a business of providing news and features.

In a case or so where a newspaper organization has appeared to exploit its so-called monopoly position, the courts have dealt harshly, for one thing.

For another thing, it seems to me unrealistic to feel that today's newspapers, however owned and sponsored, could long get away with slanting or suppressing news, even if they were unwise enough to attempt it. That is to say there are too many radio and television stations, too many news magazines, too many news letters, too much ease of travel and communication to permit any one medium of information to spoon feed the people it serves.

On higher ground, journalistic ethics as conceived and sponsored by the vast majority of newspapers through their professional associations are dead set against tampering with the reporting of news. In another manner of speaking, the newspapers do not want to fool the people and could not if they would over the long pull.

To sum up, the American newspaper, though a business enterprise that is not endowed or subsidized, is likewise a public service institution in all essential respects. It has nothing to sell but service.

Allowing for mistakes in judgment and for certain irresponsible elements such as appear in every business and profession, the newspaper remains in the main a vehicle for free expression and the gathering and distribution of information and opinion patterned on the conviction that people who know what is going on can do something about it whether they like it or dislike it.

As far as I am concerned at the moment I can only hope I have given you some idea of the number and variety of wheels that have to turn and mesh before you can get your newspaper.

RESEARCH AND SOCIETY

BY DR. C. B. WEISS

(*Read at a meeting of* "THE EGYPTIANS," *May* 17, 1956)

Research according to Webster is—"Careful search, a close searching, studious inquiry, usually critical and exhausting investigation or experimentations having for its aim the revision of accepted conclusions in the light of newly accepted facts." This definition fits both classifications of research, pure and applied.

Pure research is done for the sake of finding new information, it adds new facts to those we already have, or dispels old beliefs. It may have no important value at the time and indeed may never have any. It may start in one direction but then branch out in any.

Applied research has a definite goal in mind; the development of a new product, the improvement in quality of the present one, or production at a lower cost. It is planned and kept going in one direction and always in that direction, regardless of how interesting sideroads may seem. Applied research has been called the insurance policy of industry. It outlines the route for industrial expansion or improvement. Today's competitive markets practically demand large scale laboratories of applied research. Industry must move forward to live. The idea in the laboratory today is the industrial plant of tomorrow.

Now, what has research to do with society? Very much but not enough. It improves our food and even provides some; it supplies us with new and longer lasting clothes, helps keep us warm in winter and cool in summer, provides us with new and faster means of transportation, and permits communication via many media. In fact the list of things research has done to provide creature comforts would make a library in itself. These specific items that are the fruits of research are not the items under discussion in this paper. The general effect of research on the men and women of the past, the present and the future are to receive our attention.

Earliest man did research. A recent paper on the early forms of painting shows how these people progressed from sketches in the sand to colored drawings on cave walls. At the same time research, accidental discoveries in many cases, improved his garments, shelter, procurement and preparation of his food, and means of defense and offense. The old story of the first roast pig is one of the first research stories. Progress was slow because there was no organized effort with a definite end in view. But some how the knife, the wheel, and the use of fire were discovered. Perhaps these aren't the fruits of research, perhaps they were all accidents, but even so, progress was made.

Unrecorded history gives us only the things that were discovered. We can only surmise how these discoveries were made and the benefits they yielded. What about the earliest eras of recorded history? Did the great civilizations of Greece and Rome devote much time to research? They did, their efforts however differed from those of today. They were the great individual thinkers; they were not the doers.

This is evidenced by the great strides that were made in mathematics, astronomy, government, literature, and religion. The world will probably never see a similar period of greater thinkers. This was a weakness in itself in that what they said was accepted. They nor anyone else spent much time in the laboratory to prove or disprove their ideas. They said the universe was composed of four substances, earth, air, fire, and water and there it remained for a long, long time. Progress was made, but it would have been much faster had they worked on their ideas. They didn't have organized research. Even so, mankind benefitted tremendously. The religious precepts were laid out, ships could navigate, better government resulted, and the mathematical tools for future work were fashioned.

The "doing" part in research started in the days of the alchemists. These were the people that were trying to make gold from base metals. Their mysterious experiments recorded with intentionally obscure terminology gradually revealed metallic arsenic, antimony and bismuth. Even elemental phosphorus was isolated and its story illustrates well the research of that day. It is the first element that had one known discoverer. Hennig Brand was a soldier in his youth and it is said that he later became "an uncouth physician that knew not a word of Latin." He had a wealthy wife and she supported his researches. In an effort to improve his own financial standing, he endeavored to find the "King of Metals." No one knows why this alchemist hoped to find in human urine a liquid capable of converting silver into gold but it is well known that his experiments made in 1669 produced a substance that was both startling and beautiful. It would catch on fire in the open air and glow in the dark. He had isolated phosphorus. He sold his secret for two hundred thaler. Others with better equipment and training then went on to perfect simpler methods and discover better means of preparation.

The European civilization was very fortunate in that they had the alchemists who were interested in finding a "Philosophers Stone" that would turn base metals to gold. These were the men that gave birth to the great scientific advances that followed from their crude work. No other civilization had a similar group and likewise, no other civilization has made the technical progress we today enjoy. The alchemists slowly and crudely discovered some of the elements. The reactions of these elements one with another and with new substances stirred the interest of other research minded men. We owe much to this group. It is one of the chief reasons why the white race is so far ahead of the other races in science and technology.

These alchemist laboratories and their discoveries evolved slowly into the first crude laboratories as we know them today. The results slowly found their way into benefits for society but again there were no large organized research groups. Scientific progress was still in the hands of the independent researcher who was fortunate enough to receive financial support from his wife, his friends or the rulers of the kingdom.

These scientists of the eighteenth century, because we can now begin to call them as such, devoted a great deal of their time to the solids. Zinc, cobalt and manganese were discovered. And then their attentions were turned to the gases. One of them said, "the generality of men are so accustomed to judge of things by their senses, that because the air is invisible, they ascribe but little do it, and think it but one remove from nothing." Interesting experiments isolated hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen. Interest and excitement of discovery bestirred interest in others and the number of trained workers in the chemical field steadily increased.

The collection of information and technical discoveries continued at an accelerated pace. The processes of reasoning were improved and we now truly became "scientific." This approach brought about the industrial revolution in the 18th century. Men like Whitney, Fulton, Morse, Bell, Goodyear, Edison, and Hall brought out discoveries that gave birth to whole new industries. The blessings these men have poured out on mankind are untold. We can hardly imagine what life would be like without the telephone, rubber tires or electric lights.

In Germany toward the end of the nineteenth century another phase began. German science with a push from the Kaiser, formed institutes to improve and enrich industrial processes. This was the beginning of organized research. Many of us know the results. That country prior to World War I published one third of the worlds technical articles.

Their industries, because of advances in technology, grabbed more and more of the world's trade. We had but one recourse and that was to engage them in war and take away by force the technical advantages they had gained. That was done in World War I. Even so, we hadn't learned our lesson. We didn't do too much about organized research even after that. Our resources were so plentiful that we didn't have the necessary stimilus. Some research was going on, but most of it was done in the Universities. Industry had some but most of that was for the improvement of known processes. We didn't recognize the importance or the value of research.

Then World War II broke out and we suddenly found that we were lacking some of the essentials necessary for war. We were suddenly forced to intensify our research activities. A paper read before this group on synthetic rubber cited the results of some of that work. If anything good comes out of war, we can say that we learned the value of research. Added to this are the spoils of war which are the results of the research done by the enemy. This time the new things we found were put to use and improved.

This time we had learned our lesson. We now knew the value of research and new products that it could unearth. How quickly we realized this is best shown by our increased expenditures for research—the amount of money spent per year in 1941 was around five hundred million. The present rate is a towering five billion dollars per year, and the end is not in sight. This represents the combined expenditures of industry and government. It is admitted that a great portion of the governmental expenditures are directed to weapons of defense but even from them many beneficial things result. Practically all the rest of the effort is directed toward lengthening life and providing creature comforts.

It is estimated that this effort will continue, and that by 1960 we will be spending around seven billion dollars per year on research. This will result in faster automobiles and planes, more entertainment, fresher, and more abundant foods, easier ways to lower weight, cooler clothes, less work and disease with more years to live. We will also be finding better and more efficient means of killing ourselves and our enemies. The overall effect, however, will be beneficial to society just as it has been in the past. We survived the discovery of gunpowder even though there were dire predictions that we would gradually eliminate the human race.

This interest in research is one of the most important things that could happen to the individual citizens and to his country. It insures him a steady and continuous improvement of health and standards of living. It provides the continuous renewal of manufacturing equipment and the building of new plants and processes that eliminates the serious dips in mans economic life. It should eliminate any serious depressions similar to those of the early thirties.

Research will remove the fears of insufficiencies of the future because it can provide substitutes that are often better than the old. We are no longer tied to the oil and gas stored underground by nature for our energy requirements. We can make oil and gas out of coal, and when the coal reserves are depleted we can turn to atomic energy and when that is gone there is the as yet untapped supply of solar energy. All material things are insured, food, clothing, shelter, communication and transportation. All in all it seems to paint a rosy picture for the future.

These things seem to make possible the long looked for Utopia until man's weaknesses start showing through. These deficiencies have caused the misuse of technical progress in the past and will probably continue to misuse them in the future. World War I became possible because the fixation of nitrogen from the air was discovered and the complete dependence on natural deposits of nitrates was no longer necessary. World War II ended with an atomic explosion

that was the culmination of one of the greatest organized research efforts ever before made. It is to the discredit of all mankind that all this work was bent toward the destruction of our fellow man.

All of the past, present and future efforts we have looked at are research on the things that man uses. We have described tremendous advances and predict an accelerated flow of new things, and improvements of the old. Has mans other activities, his social behavior, economic life, and mental improvement kept pace with his work in technical fields? They have not, and much to his shame, he has done very little work along those endeavors except to look backward and then he doesn't heed the lessons he sees.

The human race has been having babies for a long time. We should by this time know how best to rear them. What has happened? In my own time I have seen the cycle swing from feeding every "four hours on the hour, and do not pick them up when they cry because you will spoil them" to "feed them when they cry and pick them up because they need love." Which is correct, which treatment does result in an improved man or woman? Why haven't we run the necessary tests on groups? Surely we are interested enough because we all say that people are the most important item in any endeavor, yet we spend all our research money on material things.

Has anyone done any research to determine why teen ages act as they do, or have individuals given weighty opinions only on the subject? Will fathers and mothers continue to suffer through those years as the fathers and mothers of the past have? Isn't it possible to establish a definite pattern? Can some one determine whether chores have a beneficial effect and if the amount of spending money has a definite range. The pattern of their behavior has been studied and detailed but must we stop there? Can it be changed?

Are we to continue the present method of selection of marriage partners in which physical attraction is in too many cases the governing factor? Industry usually selects its workers with much greater care than people in general select their wives or husbands. Most of us will agree that when a Memphis truck driver can abandon his job and become a national attraction with a guitar and so called vocal abilities, that some improvement in the race is necessary.

How about the man at his job? Industry spends large amounts on equipment, and processes but how much on finding a job a man can do best? How many men seek the job they like and enjoy, seek the type of work they can do better than any other? We take men because they profess to certain crafts, or we try to train them for certain jobs. The man that can't do the job is eliminated but we are too often satisfied with mediocrity.

It has been stated that air with negative ions produces a feeling of satisfaction, confidence, and well being in workers but I haven't seen any work in that direction in our country. (This article appeared shortly after the end of the war and may have been in error). Further work is warranted but to date results haven't been published.

The opportunities for research in government are tremendous. Which type is the best? If it is agreed that a benevolent dictatorship may be the most efficient type of government, why not modify it with controls and make it work instead of being afraid of what could happen? If we call history the results of governmental research then we should pay more attention to the results. If we knowingly disregard the results then further experimentation should be avoided. Intelligent men surely could find the best type of government and then live under it. What a fertile field we have here in our country to solve this problem. There are forty-eight states and if we are unwilling to try one or two of those, then consider the counties of these states. But we

say there are laws that prohibit any such action. There were laws in science that stated that atoms were indivisible and matter indestructible. Man has divided the atom any way and converted matter into energy.

We smile at the work of Dr. Joseph Rhine head of the Parapsychology laboratory at Duke University because the research work he is doing on the "extra senses" have no logical explanation. He should be helped, not hindered. We are placing Dr. Rhine in the same position that the men of yesteryear placed the chemist who synthesized the first organic chemical, urea, in the laboratory; they said he was invading God's territory. We need to know more about the mind and the things it can do. If some of us have an extra sense of clairvoyance then we should improve it, or at least find out if it can be improved and what it can do.

Our behavior, one toward another, hasn't changed for over two thousand years. Nation becomes aligned against nation and war results. Surely these things aren't inevitable. There must be some way in which man can live in peace. Are we really trying to find it or will we continue to pile up ways and means of destroying one another?

It is admitted that probably we can't do much about man and his behavoir toward man. The greatest Teacher that ever lived hasn't changed our society too much. If His teachings of love have been pushed aside time after time then all that is left to Western civilization is to remain so strong that no one can challenge us. The only hope we have for survival is to stay ahead in the research race. We must continue to utilize the technical skills and engineering know how if we are to survive. It is sad that so much effort must be directed toward the destruction of our parts of the worlds society. The materials we have to sustain life are carefully placed into government surpluses and withheld from those that need them most.

It is heartening to note that people are thinking about improvements in living other than research in technical fields. They are as yet far behind the doing stage of chemistry and medicine and physics and biology. For our future society to enjoy the undiscovered benefits of science that are on the way, we must get to work on all phases of human improvement. It is later than we think.

THE EGYPTIANS

PROGRAM

YEAR 1956 - 1957

1956

Oct. 25—Moving a College
DR. CHARLES E. DIEHL

Nov. 15—The Erskine Tradition and the Free Society
LUCIUS E. BURCH, JR.

Dec. 13—The Booker T. Washington of Mississippi
W. C. LASSETTER

1957

Jan. 17—Trends in Farm Lands
GILMER RICHARDSON

Feb. 21—The Approach of Nuclear Power
MAJOR THOMAS H. ALLEN

Mar. 21—Judicial Selection and Tenure
THOMAS F. TURLEY, JR.

Apr. 18—Community Design
GEORGE AWSUMB

May 16—Chronic Alcoholism—Its Significance to the Individual, His Family and Society
DR. T. S. HILL

THE EGYPTIANS

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS
YEAR 1955-1956

Officers

Dr. Marshall Wingfield	President
Walter P. Armstrong, Jr.	Vice-President
Hubert Garrecht	Secretary-Treasurer

Honorary Members

Rabbi W. H. Fineshriber
Alfred H. Stone
Dr. R. B. Maury
Bishop Thomas F. Gailor
Sanford Morison
Dr. Charles E. Diehl

Members

Major Thomas H. Allen
Walter P. Armstrong, Jr.
George Awsumb
Lucius E. Burch, Jr.
Dr. Charles E. Diehl
Dr. John E. Farrior
Frank Faux
Hubert Garrecht
Wesley Halliburton
Charles C. Henry
W. R. Herstein
Dr. T. S. Hill
Dr. Ralph C. Hon
Hodges H. Honnoll
Dr. McDonald K. Horne, Jr.
Dr. A. P. Kelso
W. C. Lassetter
Arthur W. McCain
John F. Moloney
I. L. Myers
Dr. Peyton N. Rhodes
Gilmer Richardson
W. W. Scott
Dr. W. Likely Simpson
Dr. Neuton S. Stern
W. C. Teague
Thomas F. Turley, Jr.
Dr. James A. Wax
Dr. C. B. Weiss
Dr. Marshall Wingfield
W. A. Wooten

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

As Amended to May 31, 1956

ARTICLE I.—Objects.

Section 1. The subscribers hereto associate themselves for the purpose of discussing, at stated times and in a social way, such topics as pertain to the welfare, culture and happiness of the people, particularly of our own locality, state or nation. No resolution shall ever be passed committing the club as a body to any proposition.

ARTICLE II.—Name and Membership.

Section 1. This organization shall be known as THE EGYPTIANS, and shall consist of not more than thirty-three regular contributing members, who shall be citizens or residents of Shelby County, Tennessee, of recognized standing, ability and influence in the community, with other associates as provided in Section 2.

Section 2. Honorary membership may be tendered only to non-resident persons distinguished in the walks of education, literature, science or art; and such associates having no votes, shall be exempt from payment of all dues and assessments.

Section 3. Any member may nominate an individual for membership, submitting a brief statement of the candidate's qualifications to the officers of the club. If by majority vote of the officers, the candidate is acceptable, the officers shall circularize these qualifications to the members of the club at least one week prior to the following meeting. A secret ballot shall be cast by mail, with the minimum number of affirmative votes for election equalling at least two-thirds of the total membership, and if not more than two adverse votes be cast by the members, it shall be the duty of the secretary to invite such person to become a member.

ARTICLE III—Officers.

Section 1. The Officers of the club shall be a President, Vice-President and Secretary-Treasurer, each to be chosen by ballot at the last meeting in May, to serve one year, or until a successor shall be elected.

Section 2. As a compensation for his services, the Secretary-Treasurer shall be exempt from the payment of all dues, charges and assessments.

ARTICLE IV.—Meetings.

Section 1. Regular meetings of the club shall be held at 6:30 p.m., the third Thursday in each month, between October 1st, and June 1st, beginning the third Thursday in October, except as provided in Section 2.

Section 2. The club may, at any session, change the date of a succeeding meeting, or the President, with reason therefor, may change the date of the next meeting or call a special meeting as may be required.

Section 3. In the event of change or call for special meeting, as provided in Section 2, the President shall direct the Secretary to notify members thereof.

Section 4. Any member who shall fail to attend at least three meetings during a season without excuse shall be conclusively presumed to have resigned and such implied resignation shall become effective without action of the club. He shall, however, be sent the publications of the club for the full period for which he has paid dues.

Section 5. The time consumed by any paper shall not exceed thirty minutes and in the discussion which follows, no member shall speak more than once and not exceeding ten minutes, until all other members present shall have had the opportunity of speaking.

ARTICLE V.—Dues and Assessments.

Section 1. The annual dues shall be nine dollars and ninety cents, payable in advance, provided that a member admitted after February 1st shall be required to pay only one half the annual dues for the balance of the year.

Section 2. A special assessment, if necessity arises, may be levied at any regular meeting by an affirmative vote of a majority of all the members of the club.

Section 3. Failure to pay dues or assessments within sixty days of notice shall be considered as forfeit of membership.

ARTICLE VI.—Quorum.

Section 1. Eight members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE VII.—Amendments.

Section 1. This Constitution and By-Laws may be amended at any regular meeting, provided the proposed change has been announced at the previous meeting and is adopted by an affirmative vote of a majority of those present; and provided, that not less than eight affirmative votes shall be necessary.

Section 2. Article II may be altered or amended only at the annual meeting (last meeting in May), previous notice of proposed change having been given.

ARTICLE VIII.—Papers.

Section 1. Any member of the club who shall fail to present a paper or deliver an address on the date assigned him, without an excuse that shall be satisfactory to the Officers, shall thereupon forfeit his membership. The Secretary shall give each member, to whom a paper or address is assigned, at least three months notice of the date assigned to such member. The subject of any paper or address shall be selected by the writer with the advice of the Officers and the Secretary shall announce topics for discussion not less than two months in advance.

Addendum.

On January 10, 1922, the following rule was, on motion, unanimously adopted and recorded: That out of town guests brought by members of the club be welcome; That members introducing guests who are residents of Memphis, be charged $2.00 (or such an amount as shall be determined from year to year) per meeting for each guest.