THE EGYPTIANS

YEAR 1959-1960

THE EGYPTIANS

YEAR 1959-1960

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 1959-1960

CONTENTS

A DIAMOND CROWN FOR THE GREAT LADY OF OPERA

The Metropolitan Celebrates Its 76th Year

By I. L. Myers

Read at a Meeting of "The Egyptians," October 15, 1959

When the Metropolitan Opera opens its doors on October 26 for the new season of 1959-1960, seventy-six years and four days will have passed since the first opening night. *Travatore* was the opera on the modern occasion; *Faust* had been honored on the earlier one. Today's audience will hear Renata Tebaldi, Mario Del Monaco and George London, while Christine Nilsson, Italo Campanini and Franco Novara gave the fashionable throng of 1883 its first taste of "uptown" opera. Astors, Goelets, Iselins, Roosevelts and Vanderbilts had broken away from the Academy of Music on 14th Street, where the old "Knickerbocker" society jealously guarded its privileges, and had built their own temple of lyric art—with plenty of boxes around a horseshoe-shaped audience chamber so that the ladies could inspect each others' elaborate toilettes without turning their lorgnettes more than 15 degrees to either side.

The "new yellow brewery on Broadway," as the Metropolitan was dubbed by Colonel Mapleson, impresario of the rival Academy, stands today as the one remaining midtown cultural landmarks in a welter of teeming streets and office buildings dedicated to commerce. The Metropolitan is the oldest edifice in the city which has continuously housed "legitimate," that is, "live," entertainment since its inception. Only one or two theatres now demeaned to showing films outrank it in antiquity; the Academy has long since vanished.

Proud in its diamond jubilee year, the venerated house will not live to greet its centenary, however, thus losing the chance to follow the example of Philadelphia's Academy of Music, which boasted 100 years of continuous operations as of 1957. Plans for the new Lincoln Center of the Performing Arts a score of blocks to the north make it fairly certain that the old Met is doomed. Primitive backstage accommodations, cramped administrative quarters and non-existent storage

space have inhibited the smooth functioning of the company almost since the beginning. The house was not well designed for performance, as its architect, J. Cleaveland Cady, had had no experience with theatres. In the auditorium at least 500 customers might as well hear the performances over the radio, so little do they see of the stage.

What dedicated hearts and hands can do to preserve the glamor and tradition of the old house will be done; it is certain. Seventy-six years of memories constitute a treasure house not lightly to be dismissed.

From the very first, the history of the Metropolitan was the stuff that legends are built on. Henry E. Abbey, the tall, mustachioed, elegantly bejewelled theatre manager who was called in to pilot the new company, dressed his operas in highest style and at unprecedented cost. Every costume—down to the last button—came from Worth's in Paris. Scenery blossomed under fine Italian hands. Although Abbey's orchestra and chorus commanded only a pittance in those pre-union days, his top singers received fees that parallel today's—$1,000 for Nilsson's every Marguerite, Elvira or Mignon. It took only 40 performances to pile up a quarter of a million deficit!

Then Abbey, a theatrical road man of considerable experience with Sir Henry Irving and Ellen Terry and other dramatic stars, took his opera troupe on tour to recoup his fortunes. An unkind fate sent storms in St. Louis and Chicago and a flood in Cincinnati to dampen his spirits, while Colonel Mapleson's rivalry followed him disastrously into several cities. His losses mounted to the unprecedented sum of $600,000.

Impresarios in those days took all the risk of their enterprises and kept all the profits. The Metropolitan's board allowed Abbey a mere $1,000 for each performance; above that he was on his own. Needless to say, he was not reengaged. But before he retired to bind up his financial wounds, the directors granted him a benefit, which netted him $16,000 and also made musical history. All through the season, the charms of a young Polish singer had captivated audiences and critics at home and on tour. Her Lucia, Rosina, Elvira in *Puritani,* and her Gilda and Zerlina brought out the scribes' most eloquent language. Marcella Sembrich was a

musician as well as a florid singer. At Abbey's benefit, she proved the triple-threat attraction, playing the violin and piano as well as warbling several coloratura numbers. This remarkable versatility was to be displayed once again in the Met's history, also in a charitable cause.

High German standards and low German fees were the rule for the next seven years. Leopold Damrosch launched the regime, but worked too long and too conscientiously; he succumbed to pneumonia in February, leaving his 23-year-old son Walter to carry on. The youth completed the season and took the company to three cities in a tour, but his inexperience prompted the engagement of a first conductor and a new manager for the next season.

The conductor was Anton Seidl, Wagner's disciple and friend. To him we owe the establishment of the master's popularity in America. He introduced the *Ring* operas, even took them to five other cities in 1888-89. To this era belong the fabulous Lilli Lehmann, the handsome Max Alvary and a half-dozen redoubtable German stars—although the "star system" was played down in favor of "ensemble"—the first time these two expressions were brought into opposition. The manager was Edmund Stanton, young, highly social and not too experienced.

All operas, regardless of their origin, were sung in German, as all had been in Italian in Abbey's year. Even *Carmen,* in which Lehmann made her debut, wore Teutonic guise. The great soprano was to return in later years, to sing in other languages a repertoire embracing the florid Philine in *Mignon* down the weight scale to the three Brünnhildes.

With 1891, public taste had swung back to Italian opera, and the Met directors, slightly bored with their "heavy" fare, harkened to Abbey's siren song. He had brought Adelina Patti, Francesco Tamagno, Lillian Nordica and Emma Albani to the house for a guest season in the spring. Stanton's program held little appeal; nothing could take away the fundamental respect and affection for Wagner's music which the era had brought, but change was at hand.

The trio whose every appearance together thereafter brought forth the cry, "Ideal cast!" set the mark for the years that followed. Emma Eames, the coolly beautiful American who had been born in China, and the De Reszke brothers,

Jean and Edouard, who had been born in Poland, brought their international art together in a fusion that earned for the next decade the indisputable title of "The Golden Age of Song." To their effulgence was added that of Nellie Melba, the Australian nightingale; Emma Calvé, the passionate French diva who made Bizet's flaming Carmen her own creation; Lillian Nordica, the American whose real name was Norton and who achieved her highest triumphs as the Wagnerian heroines; Jean Lasalle, a burly French baritone; Pol Plancon, the dapper giant whose bass voice ran scales and arpeggios as flexibly as any coloratura's; and the great Lehmann, whose star waxed ever higher.

At the De Reszkes' insistence, every opera was sung in the original language—the basis of our international opera today. The Metropolitan shares with Covent Garden the distinction of being the only opera house not to employ its native language exclusively. This is our tradition since the first *Roméo et Juliette* of that 1891 season, sung in French for the first time in New York.

After only one season, the house suffered a calamitous fire, which burned out the stage and part of the auditorium. One year of inactivity interrupted the triumphal progress. When the new season of 1893-94 brought *Faust* as an opener for the second time, the stars were again in their courses—and on Abbey's roster.

Other glorious artists were soon added—Ernestine Schumann-Heink, Victor Maurel (the Iago and Falstaff of Verdi's choice), Tamagno, Johanna Gadski, David Bispham, Ernst Van Dyck and Anton Van Rooy. Sembrich returned as a keystone of the soprano arch. The young Louise Homer made her debut in San Francisco on tour; Marcel Journet sang with the company for the first time in Los Angeles. The perennially gallant Don Giovanni, Antonio Scotti, who was to outlast many Donnas, began his 34-year career in 1899.

The century was turning and the fortunes of the country's leading lyric troupe, with all opposition silenced, never seemed brighter. After a disappointing season on the road, Abbey had died in 1897. His mantle had fallen on the shoulders of the capable Maurice Grau, his long-time associate, who had impresario blood in his veins. Grau wisely allowed a season to pass while reorganizing his forces. (The two periods of darkness are the reason for the discrepancy in anniversary years—while the house is in its 77th year [as of 1959-1960], the company has only 75 seasons to its credit.)

Grau, the barnstormer, engaged the company in its longest tours to date. Early forays in the fall and spring journeys brought the total of out-of-town performances in 1899-1900 to 112 and in 1901-02 to 145. Many of the cities on the current tours were subject to these earlier visitations, but the memories of Memphis, Atlanta, Birmingham, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Boston and Chicago do not always reach back to the beginning of the century, and Grau's musical invasions may be forgotten. It is the pleasure of the historian to restore these buried treasures to current coinage.

Grau cared less for "novelties" than for stars; yet two operas destined to be all-time favorites were introduced under his banner: Puccini's *La Bohème* and *Tosca.* Mimi was considered far too little a role for a first-class prima donna at first. Every time Melba sang it, she appended the "Mad Scene" from *Lucia* as a kind of wildly inappropriate but frenetically enjoyed encore.

Illness forced the doughty little Grau to retire in 1903. His place was hotly contested by Walter Damrosch, a Pittsburgh manager named George Wilson, and a German actor-manager named Heinrich Conried. New York's millionaires triumphed over Pittsburgh's, so that it was Otto Kahn's tastes and not Andrew Carnegie's that prevailed. Wilson lost out. And among New York's wealthy men, six voted for Damrosch, seven for Conried.

The rotund, leonine, vain German came into office breathing fire and flame: There was to be no more star system; no one-night stands in Philadelphia and Brooklyn; above all, discipline was to be the watch-word. Brave promises, which he was forced to eat almost to the word. The out-of-town posts stayed on the calendar. While discipline improved, many artists rebelled. Several prima donnas left in lofty huffs, among them Calvé and Gadski. Calvé by this time could subject herself to no man's discipline; her performances of *Carmen* grew more "individual" and wayward and her caprices became notorious. Gadski grumbled that "vocal artists cannot be bullied, driven or whipped into getting around for 8 a.m. rehearsal like the little German actors of Conried's little German theatre."

But Conried's greatest retraction brought also his highest reward. Far from suppressing the star system, he fostered, almost unwittingly, the greatest star of all: Enrico Caruso. The tenor's contract had been an inheritance from Grau. Conried thought so little of it that he did not pursue the matter until 1904-05, when rumors of the phenomenal voice began to percolate. Even though Caruso's debut as the Duke in *Rigoletto* did not shake any foundations, he went on to become the idolized figure of two generations—the "perfect" artist, the genial colleague and the lovable man.

Aside from the fortuitous presence of this great singer, Conried made two distinctions for himself, both of them performances. Both caused scandals, for different reasons. Richard Strauss' *Salome,* mounted for the statuesque American prima donna Olive Fremstad, so horrified certain of the directors' wives who attended dress rehearsal that it was withdrawn as "objectionable" after one showing on January 22, 1907. One reviewer spoke of "the moral stench with which *Salome* fills the nostrils of mankind." The decadent princess was not to tread the Metropolitan's boards again in song and seven-veiled dance until 1933.

Conried's other *tour-de-force* brought objections on moral grounds also. He had determined to produce Wagner's Festival Play, *Parsifal,* over the proscription of Bayreuth. Cosima Wagner, the composer's widow, resorted finally to New York courts in her agonized disapproval, but to no avail. *Parsifal* was produced and proceeded to sweep the country. After a season's trial in New York (11 performances, which brought in a profit of $100,000), the wily manager took the huge spectacle on the road for 19 exhibits, reaping $167,000, probably an all-time record for a single opera production.

In all its vicissitudes at home and its tribulations on tour, our most durable opera company stood up well, seldom actually canceling performances, never materially curtailing seasons. It took an earthquake to stop the gallant troupe in its tracks. Caught in the holocaust of 1906 in San Francisco, Conried's company lost all its belongings but fortunately no lives. Scenery and costumes for 19 operas, stored in the old Opera House at Third and Mission, went up in flames. All large orchestra instruments burned. (Sembrich again gave her three-fold services in a benefit concert to replace them.) For two days the company scattered, eventually finding its

separate ways to Oakland, a train and safety. Caruso alone saved any clothes; a devoted valet rescued three little trunks, so that the popular tenor supplied his colleagues with here a shirt there a tie until they could reach New York.

Caruso had sung in *Carmen* the previous night, but never saw the newspaper review that recommended the opera's name be changed to *Don José.* Before the papers reached the street, the fatal tremblors had shaken the Golden Gate city to its knees. Caruso, reminded of Vesuvius, swore he would never return to San Francisco. He never did. (Some year later, the tenor suffered a double—and rare—infliction of an indifferent criticism and a case of mumps in Boston, which noticeably cooled his affection for this city).

The reigning queen of Conried's time was undoubtedly an American princess. Young Geraldine Farrar entranced the courts of Europe, then made Americans her devoted subjects. When she retired voluntarily in 1922, her "fan club," known as "Gerryflappers," were inconsolable.

With Giulio Gatti Casazza's advent in 1908, many radical changes took place in the opera house, as well as in the conception of the organization behind it. For the first time, a manager was engaged for salary, the directorate assuming the responsibility for loss or profit. The magic words, "The Metropolitan Opera Company," were used alone for the first time to designate the performing unit. They had appeared in Conried's regime, but with his name prefixed. Gatti, the experienced general director at Milan's La Scala, brought Arturo Toscanini with him, and the achievements of his 27 years of generalship were heralded at his opening performance of *Aida,* when Toscanini conducted, Emmy Destinn made her debut in company with Caruso, Homer and Scotti.

Oscar Hammerstein, the unpredictable and adventurous impresario, had been giving the Metropolitan keener competition than the older institution relished since 1906, bringing Mary Garden, Tetrazzini and other luminaries to his Manhattan Opera House in New York and spreading his tentacles in many other cities the Met visited regularly. During Gatti's first two years, the Metropolitan fought fire with fire, enlarging its forces to include two orchestras and separate German and Italian-French wings. The peak of this activity was

reached in 1909-10, when in addition to a heavy home schedule, the Met played 21 times in Brooklyn, 25 in Philadelphia and 20 in Baltimore during the season. Then the dual company embarked on a split tour which took in 15 cities and capped it all with a visit to Paris in May and June, racking up a total of 163 performances out of town for the season, an all-time record. Hammerstein gave up at last, the Metropolitan buying him out. His singers and conductors scattered, many of them to grace the new companies in Chicago and Boston, which came under Metropolitan advisement with interlocking boards and a token exchange of artists. It seemed as if an opera "monopoly" were about to be intrenched. But widely differing interests and personalities soon blew the lyric forces of four cities (Philadelphia shared in the Chicago seasons) centrifugally apart. Only the Metropolitan itself has survived.

Eames, Sembrich and Nordica all said farewell in 1909, but in opera as in kingdoms and in life itself, kings and queens and experiences depart only to make way for new kings and queens and experiences. Farrar and Caruso and Scotti still reigned. On the scene now appeared a dainty seniorita who had made an unexpected debut in Paris, when Lina Cavalieri had exercised her capricious right to claim appendicities the week before a scheduled *Manon Lescaut*. Andrès de Segurola, the suave Spanish bass who never was seen without his monocle, counseled Gatti to send for a little soprano he knew; from Milan came the youthful Lucrezia Bori, a proud desendant of the Borgias, who conquered the captious Parisian public on sight. Also as Puccini's Manon, the incomparable Bori was introduced to New York. After a distinguished singing career, this gentle lady still retains her eminence and popularity as honorary chairman of the Metropolitan Opera Guild; when she appeared in one Southern city to found its local branch, a newspaper man dubbed her "the perennial *jeune fille* of opera."

Gatti-Casazza's 27-year reign—the longest in Metropolitan history—is clearly too long and too pivotal to be dismissed with a catchphrase. Reforms were instituted and decayed; the long curve shows several dips for war and depression. Although innumerable "novelties" of all stamp—American as well as European—peppered the repertoire (more than two-thirds of them flat failures, it was the nuclear core of Wagner, Verdi and Puccini—the Father, Son and Holy Ghost of

Metropolitan orthodoxy, as Irving Kolodin says in his "Story of the Metropolitan Opera"—around which Gatti "spun a pattern intricate, diverting, ear-filling, and profitable."

The profits disappeared with the depression. Not even wartime, which erased Wagner from the repertoire except for an occasional performance sung in English, had cast so deep a shadow. The promise of a new house had not been fulfilled; buckling down to the inadequacies of the old one proved the bitterer for the lost opportunity. New patches were applied to scenery that crumbled under them; the huge establishment brushed off the top layer of dust and went bravely on.

Stars never ceased to shine, though the darkness gathered outside the periphery of their radiance. Chaliapin returned in the '20s to the country he felt had not appreciated him in 1907-08. His Boris Gorunov was one of the artistic achievements of the generation. Frieda Hempel and Maria Jeritza lent their blonde beauty and vocal opulence. Giuseppe De Lucca became the most durable baritone; Giovanni Martinelli the dependable tenor. Lotte Lehmann entranced the Wagner and Strauss lover's; Friedrich Schorr left an indelible imprint as Hans Sachs. The range of idols climbed to Lily Pons in *alt*, descended to Ezio Pinza below the staff. Americans rose like the cream to the top. Ponselle became the focal point for a whole generation of worshipers. Grace Moore epitomized the "glamor girl" of both Broadways—musical comedy and opera. Lawrence Tibbett made a surprise sensation as Ford in Falstaff and stayed on as a pillar of the company.

And, just as Gatti was ready to put the seal on more than a quarter-century of service, one of the brightest of all dawned on the Metropolitan horizon. Little heralded, a new Sieglinde swept open the doors to a new springtime at the Met. Lawrence Gilman wrote about the 1935 debutante: "I cannot swear that Mme. Flagstad is in her thirties, but the point is that she looks as if she were, and sings as if she were." In the quarter century that has elapsed, this eternally youthful voice has never left our memory's ears, although its owner has made almost as many "farewell" tours as Patti, Bernhardt and Schumann-Heink before her.

Meanwhile, a personable tenor in Gatti's company was soon to receive the wand of authority. Gatti's successor, Herbert Witherspoon, a distinguished bass who had sung with the company in earlier days, died suddenly of a heart attack one

May morning. Gatti's own nominee, who had already been assigned to organize a spring season, automatically was the logical choice. Thus Edward Johnson began the reign that was to last 15 years. A man of enormous charm, he invariably commanded public affection and loyalty. It is interesting to note here that the management of our great opera house has swung with pendulum-like regularity from professional to "amateur"—amateur, that is, in the sense of management experience. First Abbey, then Stanton; Abbey and Grau, then Conried; Gatti then Johnson; now Bing. Prophets and seers may speculate to their heart's content on the future.

Johnson contended with almost insuperable obstacles: depression, war and its aftermath, the realization that the opera must belong to the nation instead of to the few. It was a painful period of readjustment, during which the Opera Guild came into being as a staunch friend and ally, tours assumed an ever-increasing importance in the morale as well as the budget, radio appeals brought hearts as well as dollars into more intimate contact with the venerable institution.

The miracle of the Johnson regime, was, in short, the simple financial fact of the survival of the house, as the script of the Opera Guild's celebration of the 75th anniversary points out. "Through thick and thin, the company went right on performing. What's more, it performed in an opera house which the Association managed to purchase.

"If the performances of the Johnson years wore a new profile of personality, the configuration was unmistakably American. More singers than ever before were American-born and American-trained."

The orchestra pit assumed a new importance. Where Conried had placed Gustav Mahler and Gatti-Casazza Toscanini, Johnson summoned up Bruno Walter, George Szell, Sir Thomas Beecham, and a trio of Fritzes—Busch, Reiner, and Stiedry.

Rudolph Bing, perhaps quite properly, feels that his regime belongs to the present and not to the past, and thus automatically excludes itself from any historical survey. As he said on one recent occasion, "perhaps the Bing regime will be remembered on the hundredth anniversary of the Metropolitan. You can be reasonably sure that by that time it will be over."

For those of us who like a rounded picture as well as the assurance that this masterpiece is no where near completion, it is enough to point to Mr. Bing's three "D's"—daring, determination and dedication."

His daring dictated the conception that drama belongs on the operatic stage and to get it there, designers and directors from the "legitimate" stage must be drafted. His determination held fast to a course that promised renovation and improvement, even in the face of snipers from press and public —and doubtless a few behind scenes as well. His dedication was posed in his very first statement: We shall strive for quality.

So the Metropolitan advances, an old lady in years, a prima donna of unquenchable vitality in spirit. Before every curtain, whether it be the fabled "great golden" one in the house itself or those in the auditoriums where the Met is a cherished visitor, the pleasurable tension grows as the houselights dim to a moment of rustle and exhaled breath. Then—the patter of applause for the conductor's entrance, the tap of a baton, the first sound on the air in the suddenly hushed chamber—and once again we are caught in a magic spell—the magic of the Metropolitan Opera.

TWENTIETH CENTURY DECISIONS THAT SPARKED HISTORY

By W. A. Danielson

Read at a Meeting of "The Egyptians," November 19, 1959

PROLOGUE

The centuries since the Roman period had almost completed the grouping of the European economy and the reaching out of Europe to the control of the backward peoples of the world including both savages and the older civilizations of Asia and Africa, that ante-dated Western Culture. This Colonial development was, the business man's way of spreading the extensive experience of Greece and Rome, as moderated by the Christian effect on the Jewish viewpoint of the individual. This colonization included of course, the material side of living, which offered profit, the only way this effective missionary work could be financed. States, excepting for the handling of the clerical work on charters, could do little towards this cost excepting that the heads of the administrative groups, the kings and their flunkies, saw that they shared in whatever profits there were, in addition to their increase in prestige. The final outcome of this work of centuries was the group of dedicated citizens, in effect, an oligarchy, that took over as the result of some seven years of retreating and fighting and negotiating abroad, and four years of a wandering civil government that lacked an executive with fixed duties and power. Thus, our constitution came which, when the system is boiled down, has meant "payment for work in proportion to the effort". About this time, Watt had laid the foundation for inanimate power and Pasteur came along later with the fundamentals that began to destroy the mysteries of biology, and the minute workings of life became known. Two recent events that were of vital importance in bringing our country from the local isolationism of Washington into the world drama; the industrialism of Japan 30 years previous and the annexation of Hawaii 2 years before the end of the 19th century.

The stage was set for the new century and the curtain-raising for this new drama took place on an afternoon in late

winter of 1898. Secretary Long of the Navy took an afternoon off and left the Asst. Sec'y. in charge. This official of many facets, broad experience and historical knowledge saw from his excellent observation point, the increasing drift towards eventualities with Spain over Cuba. He knew that War meant striking the enemy where there was strength. Among memoranda that he wrote that afternoon was one to Commodore Dewey in charge of our Asiatic squadron, then at Hongkong. These instructions were to have his ships ready, provisioned and coaled, so that upon receiving a cable, he could and would immediately proceed to Manila and destroy the Spanish fleet there. The order left Washington that afternoon. The next day when Secy. Long came to his office, the serenity of that normal quietness was considerably disturbed; but it was too late to recall the various orders, both from a physical and future political standpoint.

THE DECISIONS

The Major McKinley of the '60's knew the elemental life of the camp and battlefields and of the frontier, for his immediate forebears had settled in Ohio when it was young. Before becoming President, he had been in active local politics, served in Congress and had been Gov. of the State. His extensive experience and knowledge caused him as President much mental anguish of what to do with the Philippines. He had 3 choices as he saw it, (This did not include returning them to the control of the inept Spanish rule). Turn them over to the experienced Colonial power, England, and help a commercial competitor; give them independence for which the illiterate, half civilized people were not ready; make this alien people part of the United States, for which there was no constitutional provision. As he searched his soul, he reached the final conclusion; keep them now, educate and prepare them for future independence. A sensing of the Domestic political feeling of the country clinched this decision. $20,-000,000 was paid to Spain so that the Philippines came under our control by annexation rather than as the spoils of war. The treaty could not get the necessary 2/3 majority in the Senate until Bryan arranged for some 30 of his Senate following to vote favorably and leave the final determination to the voters at the next election.

It is fitting here to stress the McKinley appreciation of the importance of preparation for self-government and its allied economic aspects that successors in their half baked idealism have overlooked.

Cuba as promised was given her independence but the Senate would not approve the Treaty bringing this about without the reservations of the Platt Amendment, and which was agreed to by Cuba. This decision gave the U. S., among other items, authority to intervene in Cuba, if necessary to maintain a government adequate for the protection of life, property and individual liberty. Had this safe-guard not been set aside in 1934, the present Communistic condition in this Island, less than 100 miles from our shores, might be authoritatively solved today.

At the Republican Convention in the opening year of the new century, Senator Platt, dominant politician of New York, decided to get rid locally of the "wild man", that San Juan Hill had made Governor of New York. He took steps to bury this serious headstrong philosopher, politician, student, writer and decisive executive, in the Vice Presidency. This was quickly approved by the man who backed the conservative McKinley throughout his career but for another reason. Mark Hanna sensed the necessity of appealing to the liberal votes that had been for Bryan in 1896. The unwilling corpse soon turned out to be the equal of the 'silver-tongued' Bryan in spell-binding the electorate while Pres. McKinley sat at home and let the gold standard prosperity of his administration speak for itself. The election vindicated the entry into "imperialism" that began with the capture of Manila and treaty with Spain. An assassin's bullet at Buffalo after eight days, gave McKinley to the ages and an all-around stage director at age 40 took over to vigorously guide a changing U. S. into the initial role of world leadership.

Theodore Roosevelt became quickly a President for whom people had either extreme love or deep hatred. This was, of course, normal, in a period of change, for old practices and their followers had to be discarded, and the new changes for an expanding economy had to be undertaken. Historian Beards says—"McKinley had been timid about foreign adventures in spite of all that had happened in recent years. He had belonged to the old generation brought up in the belief

that the foreign policy of Washington, Jefferson and Monroe was the correct policy for the Republic. Theo. Roosevelt, on the other hand, was of a new generation and besides loving power for its own sake, he insisted that the new nation should pursue a course of power politics in dealing with foreign governments. At the same time, he was far less conservative in declaring new domestic policies than were the old leaders of his party. With his imperialism, he coupled pledges of reform on the home front almost in the spirit of Bryanism. He assailed trusts, combines, concentrated wealth and Plutocrats as fiercely as Bryan and the populists had done. He spoke openly of a more equitable distribution of wealth, of the povety in great cities, and of social perils within the U. S. due to the inequalities of wealth. In fact, as President, Theo. Roosevelt, by uniting world power politics and domestic social reform—pomp and prestige, in world affairs, with the conciliation of discontented farmers and industrial workers at home—formed a combination of policies that made a strong appeal to the American electorate."

Muzzey of Columbia University in 1928 wrote "The old politicians and shrewd bankers in Wall St. soon discovered that they had in Roosevelt a president who, like Grover Cleveland interpreted his oath to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the U.S." to mean not waiting docilely in the White House for bills to come from the Capitol, but initiating, directing and restraining the legislation of Congress, in the name and interest of the great American people, whose representative he was.

The initial draft on this comprehensive subject was longer than time for presentation and space for record, permitted. Mention only will be made of some of the decisions and the discussion on these eliminated.

In Pres. Roosevelt's message to Congress in 1901, he decided to include in the authority that had been given to Harrison in 1891, to withdraw timber lands from entry for public sale, also to withdraw mineral lands. The Congressional approval of this request brought the area of our reserve forests and mineral lands to more than 150,000,000 acres, an area greater than France and the Netherlands combined. Our increasing leisure time today stresses the importance of this decision as well as in the conservation of our resources. In today's little aware transition to a "have not" country. A sister decision

was the establishment of the Reclamation Service in 1902 and today's resulting tremendous power development, with its sister TVA conception.

When every effort to develop a vaccine or serum for stopping the increasing death toll from yellow fever in Cuba in 1901, Col. Gorgas, with the approval of Gen. Leonard Wood, a doctor turned line officer, told the young Sanitary Engineer whom he had brought there, to go ahead with his pet project of eliminating the mosquito. This energetic operator ditched, emptied barrels, and oiled all Havana and in 6 weeks the mosquito was hard to find. The yellow jack was eliminated.

When a severe strike in the anthracite mines of Penn. brought on the coal famine in the summer of 1902, and threatened to cause untold suffering the following winter, the Pres. called together representative of the miners and of the owners of coal fields, in a conference at the White House, and prevailed upon them to submit their dispute to the arbitration of a commission which he appointed. There is no phrase in the constitution of the U. S. in the definition of the President's powers and duties that could be interpreted as giving him the right to intervene in a dispute between capital and labor. But he did intervene for the relief of millions of his anxious fellow countrymen and no public act ever brought him a greater or more deserved reward of praise.

Subsequent to the close of the Spanish American War, the condition of affairs demanded that the Office of Secy. of War should be filled by a lawyer of great administrative ability and one in the full possession of his mental and physical powers; the duties of the office were most intricate and complicated, and called for physical self-sacrifice that few men are able to give to the work; no Secy. of War since the day of Edward N. Stanton had anything like the difficulties to adjust, the opposition to overcome and new systems to inaugurate. On Aug. 1st, 1902, Elihu Root probably the most outstanding, progressive, honorable lawyer in America was called suddenly from his legal profession in N. Y. City to become Secy. of War. In a few months, this comprehensive brain reached the decision that a new system must be provided for our growing Army. He asked Congress to create a General Staff. The Army had grown to the point as in any major organization where the man in direct charge can no longer effectively control its affairs, plan, co-ordinate, execute.

A group must systematically carry on these functions. The staff provides the information upon which the commander bases his action. It is headed by a Chief of Staff but in our country, the Civilian Commander is the President through the Secy of War. Both of these civilians have so many other duties that in effect, the Chief of the Staff really becomes the Commander and therefore requires extensive, outstanding ability to ably carry on this duty as chief of the General Staff. Two victorious World Wars and the evolution of today's scientific warfare have proved the importance of the Root decision. The creation of a Defense Dept. Career General Staff is today vital for the existence of the free states of the whole world.

In 1903, the mechanical tinkerer, especially with the spark plug, decided to mass produce the horseless carriage, and succeeded in raising a capital of $28,000 to do this. He figured that the assembly line would enable him to sell at low prices within the reach of millions, and the "tin lizzie" for a quarter of a century did this. Others of course, followed, the horse and the fly that would in the fall coolness blacken the screen doors, have disappeared, along with parking space in the cities. What a difference from the hey-dey of the railroads and the isolated life on the farms.

Almost at the same time, two Wright Bros. in Dayton, decided to build a gasoline engine light enough to be carried by a box kite. They looked around for a place to try out this with—no people, winds just right—a ground slope that would help. Found Kitty Hawk—assembled the contrivance—put in the gasoline—Wilbur slid in on his belly. The engine started —he took off—flew less than 1000 feet. In ten years, this fantastic conveyance, held in the air by the inertia of the air particles, became an instrument of warfare, and determined the outcome of a World War a quarter of a century later. Now, any part of the world is less than a day's travel from any other part. No one will argue that the Wright's dream did not spark history. I am proud to belong to the building group that placed the marker at Kitty Hawk.

Ever since the time of Columbus, men have dreamed and discussed how to get a boat from the Carribean to the Pacific across a strip of land that extended from Yucatan to Columbia. The Frenchman De Lesseps, because he had succeeded

in cutting through the sand dunes at Suez, thought that he could do it, and the fevers and the mountains stopped him. Our country, in 1850, made a treaty for joint construction with England and when Roosevelt became President, this had been set aside to permit the U. S. to proceed alone, provided there would be no discrimination in passage rates. A draft of a treaty was rejected by Columbia, the residents of Panama who lived meagerly on the work of the Trans-Isthmian Railroad, of course, were stunned. When they recovered, they formed a new country, which was not difficult, because of the distance from the Columbian capital, water and tropical jungles, where a few years ago I saw Indians that only wore deficient G-strings. Roosevelt immediately decided to recognize the new country. A treaty with the new officials was drafted. Soon the dirt began to fly, and for 50 years the two oceans have been united for commerce and war. Much has been said about the high-handedness of T.R.'s actions but little is accomplished in any field without a combination of reason and decisive action.

With the start of the Canal in 1904, Col. Gorgas of yellow fever fame in Cuba was naturally assigned to care for the health of that operation. And just as naturally, sanitary engineer, La Prince went with him. Here the problem that had largely caused French failure was, 10 by 50 miles, somewhat larger than a city, with the tropical swamp jungles everywhere. When La Prince started to work, the other engineers knew he was crazy. To ascertain the extent of the necessary drainage, he closed an empty barrack and the next morning found no mosquitos in it. The following night the barrack was filled with men and in the morning, there were plenty of mosquitos, showing that the mosquitos were led by human odor carried by the wind. Then he colored some captured mosquitos with various dyes, released them at different distances in the swamps and ascertained the maximum flight distance of that female killer was 2 miles. Now he knew the extent of the drainage required and the Canal became free of the "yellow jack."

When I came from Panama to Memphis in 1942, I wondered how the Panama type drainage ditch with its half round tile in the bottom happened to be used here. Soon I met La Prince and understood. At the completion of the canal in 1914, La Prince reported to his Chief in Washington, was told that he should now eliminate malaria. A review

of the limited literature was soon covered. La Prince went to his Chief again and said that if he was going to do a job, he must make headquarters where the malaria mosquito was really active, Memphis, Tenn., and so he came here. You older men must know the extensive publicity thru schools, lectures, newspapers, competitions, and drainage. He made Memphis and the whole South free from malaria. His methods spread through the world and another scourge is almost eliminated from today's history.

In 1905, the decision by President Theodore Roosevelt, to intervene and bring the war between Russian and Japan to a close, rather than permit it to run its course, no doubt, was a vital factor in the later Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

The century old Monroe Doctrine had been basic in our foreign decisions. This prohibited interference by Europeans in political affairs of the Western Hemisphere. This, in theory, placed upon the U.S. the obligation to protect the life and property of European Nationals in Latin America, against attack. President Roosevelt in this connection reached a decision that the exercise of an unlimited police power rested with the U.S. Consequently in order to satisfy the creditors of Santo Domingo, the Pres. in 1905, appointed, by agreement with that government, a receiver to manage its bankrupt treasury. This practice extended to other central American countries in trouble and became known as "dollar diplomacy." Those who have not had considerable contact with these "county nations" little appreciate how the common people generally suffer from the dominance of the local unscrupulous groups and individuals that take over fiscal affairs and government. Dollar Diplomacy, as history shows, was a sound policy that was carried on by both political parties when in power until the New Deal came.

In 1906, President Roosevelt reached the decision to back the "Wiley Movement" for a Pure Food and Drug Law. In the 50 years, this has been a vital factor in the everyday life of our people and has reached into foreign countries.

Here we shall note in passing, that the U.S. injected itself into one of the major issues of purely European concerns. The Moroccoan crisis of 1905 involving Germany and France directly and the other European powers indirectly, seemed for a time to threaten general war. Pres. Roosevelt decided

to offer his good offices to help settle the crisis and it was largely due to this effort that the Algeciras Conf. was called. Here the U.S. had official delegates; there was no pretense of isolation. Americans negotiated, composed differences and played a large part in the procedings. There was some soul searching in the U.S. over this adventure, for it was in clear violation of the non-involvment policy of hallowed memory. Nobody was particularly pleased about it, but its apologists justified American intervention on grounds of sheer necessity. One scholar suggests that Roosevelt added a new corollary to the Monroe doctrine; the U.S. would be justified intervening any where in the world if it seemed necessary to maintain world peace. Monroe Doctrine or not, the Moroccoan intervention foreshadowed the eventual total irrelevance of non involvment in Europe to the working interest of the U.S."

And now comes a decision, when viewed in all its aspects was undoubtedly the most important from the standpoint of our country and the world that was made in this drama of the 20th century. Today's debt here might not be approaching 300 billions. There probably would be no Red menace and no atomic dangers, at least for another 100 years. In previous European treaties, Germany was given the opportunity to secure undeveloped lands and had an increasing outlet for her products. Instead of a period of World Wars, peace would have been the rule. All this resulted from Theo. Roosevelt's choice of a candidate to succeed himself in the Presidency, as he had promised in the campaign of 1904, that he would not run, as his own successor. Root and Hughes of New York and Taft of Ohio were under consideration. Roosevelt finally decided upon Taft, then his Secy. of War. He concluded that Taft would satisfy all elements of the Republican Party better and would therefore be sure of election. All three backed the Platform that would carry on the policies of the Roosevelt Administration. Taft did not have the leadership or the personality that was necessary to popularize these forward policies. He gradually sided more with the business interests than with the Progressives and a split took place in the party, which carried into the next Republican convention; a separate Bull Moose slate and the election of the minority Democratic candidate, Woodrow Wilson.

Had Roosevelt backed Elihu Root, the decisive majority that Taft obtained in 1908 showed Root would have been

elected. His stature and work as a leader in business would have insured the confidence in domestic policies; that of Secy. of State and of War would have carried the confidence and faith of other governments in our foreign relations. When the peace of the world was at stake for the whole month of July 1914, this twin personality of a former President would have been present to "knock heads together" especially after Teddy had directly impressed the Kaiser on the return from the African safari. All the rulers and prime ministers were against this war and it would have taken comparatively little influence on our President's part to have stopped it. This decision against Root was Theo. Roosevelt's greatest decision and a failure, and how the world has and is suffering from it!

During the period of the Balkan troubles and the young Turk elimination of the Sultan, Root would have been a decisive influence as Theo. Roosevelt was at Algeciras. The annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria would have been prevented or brought about in such a way that no serious animosities would have developed.

Now there comes one of the minor decisions that in 50 years has grown into a tremendous national and world influence. In 1905, Paul P. Harris decided to invite some of his friends in different businesses and professions to meet weekly and discuss matters of interest and importance. Other similar organizations were soon formed like this new Rotary and today these have grown to such size throughout the nation and internationally, that they definitely affect the affairs of men, and make history.

In 1914, none of the European leaders wanted war. The spark that set off the explosion was a false statement made to Emperor Franz Joseph by Count Berchtold, Austrian Foreign minister, that the Serbians had attacked. The Emperor therefore signed a declaration of War on July 28th. The alleged attack could not be confirmed but the military began taking over in Russia and Germany. The record of this month of July 1914 shows such a preference for peace, that Elihu Root as President would have been the influence as Roosevelt was at Algeciras, on the side of peace and there would not have been World War I. Here was the inexperienced President Wilson's greatest oversight.

In 1917, the selection of President Wilson of Pershing as Commander of the A. E. F., instead of the generally accepted by both Democrats and Republicans, logical choice of General Wood resulted in later years to the choice of Franklin Roosevelt of George Marshall as Chief of Staff. The results are covered later.

The decision in 1917 of the German Government to destroy Russia as one of the Allies by transporting Lenin and his cohorts in a sealed train from Switzerland to Russia, was undoubtedly the most devastating one made during the war period. We here tonight have lived through it and each are paying the resulting bills in cash today. What history will record of its ultimate effect on individual freedom can hardly be guessed. There is every reason to conclude that the general education of the Russian people so effectively under way, will be freedom's ultimate salvation.

Pres. Wilson's decision to go to Europe and personally take part in the peace conference, was, for the world, as history indicates, a fatal mistake. Had he, like McKinley, let the Commissioners in Paris carry on the negotiations for what he wanted, he would also have, like McKinley, but with far greater accepted power, made the final decisions and secured what he wanted, but modified by other minds, to include the vital economic factors that were absent from his 14 points, and his almost total lack of experience in such mundane matters. Pres. Wilson was not alone in his desire for some overall world consultive body, even those who opposed the treaty which included the League of Nations had so expressed themselves. One fatal result of the trips abroad was the stroke that came on his western selling trip, in that the U.S. at this critical period, really had no President for some two years.

"They hired the money, didn't they" was Coolidge's way of making a decision in 1922 on the war debts owed to the U.S., should be paid in full. Our country already had most of the gold—real money—in the world, so the only way these billions of dollars could be paid was in goods, raw materials and man hours. The first, the countries of Western Europe, had within their borders only limited amounts—and the second would interfere with our own use of man hours, as the end of the decade showed. The reparations of Germany were paid with the loans of our bankers, to England and France, and the

smaller payments made by them to the U.S. thus came from our own loans. When the loans stopped, neither interest nor principal payment could continue—the world economic structure blew up. The increased production of the industrial age could not be distributed and consumed, the world depression took place.

In 1924, the U.S. Attorney General Stone, on the advice of Secy. Hoover of Commerce, decided to appoint J. Edgar Hoover to do a house cleaning job in the Bureau of Investigation. This organization, created under Pres. Theo. Roosevelt in 1908, to unearth frauds in the Land Office, had through the years been administered so loosely that it had reached the point where it was threatened with destruction by the indignant public reaction to dishonesty. Little needs to be said about the vital activity of the FBI on our nationwide racketeers. Communist infiltration after the Diplomatic recognition of Russia in 1934 which included the promise to discontinue undermining our institutions by Communist subversion, was checked by the combined efforts of Hoover and Congressman Dick Nixon. The appointment of Hoover was a momentous choice for our individual freedom.

A decision made in 1928 by the Tammany leaders in N. Y. City resulted in domination by one individual in the next decade and a half, and the effects are still with us today and will continue. The decision was to wait on election night until the Republican majority came in from up-state and then to "stuff" the metropolitan boxes under their control until Franklin D. Roosevelt the nominee had a majority state-wide of about 25,000. If Averill Harriman could have done this 30 years later, he would not be a "dead duck" politically today. The Roosevelt name largely caused Smith and his associates to give a rather unwilling FDR the nomination for Governor and later the defection of McAdoo, and the promises of conservative policies, the election to the Presidency.

President Hindenburg's ambition to possess a country estate was a constant desire which his small army pay had never fulfilled. When the East Prussian land owners presented him with a heavily mortgaged country mansion in the name of his son, to avoid death taxes, his ambition was satisfied. When the Reichstag began looking into the amounts paid by the Government to aid the Eastern Junker farmers, other friends

in the Ruhr paid off the mortgage. The President asked the Chancellor when he was making some report "What is happening to the investigation." He answered that the findings would be reported to the Reichstag next day. "You are fired" said Hindenburg. This decision led directly to the subsequent appointment of Hitler as Chancellor. Previous to this there was every reason to conclude that this meglomaniac could be contained, and the march into the Ruhr that ended with the Russians taking Berlin, would not continue into the cold war of today.

Late in the fall of 1933, President Roosevelt decided to change the price of gold in order, as he thought, to quickly raise prices. When later he was urged by the silverites to do something for silver, he laughingly told them, "I experimented with gold and that was a flop, why shouldn't I experiment a little with silver?" And so our country went off the gold standard. History shows that money cannot be managed politically. It must have direct connection with some product that has stable value in itself.

A decision unknown, even today, excepting for the probable author, resulted in "a day of ignominy," death and destruction to our country. As Dec. 1941 approached, a senior staff officer called my classmate, Gen. Fred Martin and passed on verbally instructions that had been received from Washington, to assemble all planes at Hickam Field and further to remove the fighting gear. This unusual verbal order caused Martin to ask for confirmation in writing. This was given. On reaching his office, he had photostats made of this written document which he sent to his bank in the U.S. to be placed in his lock box. Other copies were filed. In the investigation that followed the catastrophe, this instruction did not appear. While in San Francisco a year ago, I met two retired Air Force Officers. While we were discussing various top officers that we had known, one of the Air Force officers suddenly asked if we knew where Hap Arnold was on Pearl Harbor Day. I brought up that Gen. Marshall had never been able to explain his whereabouts satisfactorily. The officer then answered his own question—"Arnold of the Air Force, King of the Navy and Marshall had instructions not to be found that morning of Pearl Harbor Day." The U. S. had now a reason to enter the war that then spread to include the whole world.

Sen. McKellar told me just after Hiroshima that the hardest decision he ever had to make was whether or not, as Chairman of the Committee of Appropriations, he should further the tremendous appropriation for something that was little more than pure theory. Pres. Roosevelt had, in 1942, on the recommendation of Dr. Vannivar Bush, and the approval of a policy group composed of Vice Pres. Wallace, Secy. Stimson, Gen. Marshall and Dr. Conant, made the decision to proceed with the enormous war-time construction that was ultimately to cost nearly 2 billion dollars. As Gordon Dean, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Com. of 1950-53 said: "This was the month when the bets of the 'Magnificent Gamble' were placed."

In Jan. 1939, wind had come that 2 German scientists had split the uranium atom. A group of European scientists saw the military possibilities, had the Russian born financier Alex Sachs take a letter dated Aug. 2, 1939 signed by Einstein to the President. Result—a committee from Army, Navy, Bureau of Standards, that described the "bomb as a possibility." By April, scientists have effective voluntary censorship—the atom vanished behind a barrier of secrecy that partially remains today. In June, entered Dr. Bush with his National Defense Research Committee spending in the next 6 months $300,000. Optimistic reports. About Pearl Harbor time, Bush had a new tool—Office of Scientific Research and Development; when construction came, Army would take over. Commitment between 4 and 5 million dollars. Next Pres. Roosevelt's decision, a different mind might have refused. Always the bomb was being pushed for war purposes to be ahead of Germany. There was no other reason, but Bush and others always had in mind its peaceful uses. Now the problem is, how to safely dispose of the waste products of the fantastic atom. With the wild expenditures for war, a hundred years had been covered in 5.

Now a final decision, evolving from many, in which one man had important leads to play. With this gentleman at the time of the Rio pact, Sen. Vandenburg developed a close working relationship based on mutual respect and affection. This reached to their wives. Mrs. Vandenburg wrote in her diary of a visit to the "Marshalls." "Just to illustrate how wonderful they are with each other, I found them playing Chinese checkers on the porch here after a ride to an especially beautiful sight. They are completely congenial and

simply a grand pair. If nothing else comes out of this conference, it has been a rare privilege to know them better and Dad feels the same way. There is nothing stuffy about him, in fact, a lot of fun and so human." Every one who has had contact with Gen. Marshall has almost invariably this same estimate and I am also one of them because of some personal experience.

This officer was a staff man with some one else making the ultimate decisions. He never held a major command; one small post and a regiment. After a year, the inspector found it had moved from top to low efficiency. Relieved. Pershing asked FDR to make his aid of former years a Brig. General. Board of General Officers had found "not then qualified." Two more years of training duty. Pershing again to the President. Promotion to Brig. General. Next duty, training command in the distant sticks. Two years, then to Washington. Asst., then Chief of Staff. Jumped some 200 seniors including Drum with top record. My contact begins and interest in capacity grows. First real job, reorganization of Army took place on lines that McNarney developed, to place decisions for building up new army in hands of 3 people, McNair for organization and training, Arnold for Air and Brehon Somervell for supplies. The last able, hard-boiled and ruthless. A driver, extravagant with your money, ambitious, friend of FDR thru Hopkins, won his war of supply and the big portion of the whole war, not to be disagreed with or destination elsewhere, Memphis in my case.

Marshall strategist (?) wanted to land in Europe in '42 —reason end the war quickly. Alanbrooke's answer "Yes, but not the way we want it to." Fight thru Churchill to FDR. 1942 campaign changed to North African, clearing Mediterranean for supply thru Suez. Near Florence, Clarke and Alexander want to go next to Vienna. Marshall blocks by taking half of Clark's troops away. Ike asks about April 3, 1945— what next? Marshall's answer April 23, let Russia take Berlin. Before this last second Quebec conference. "What about China?" Marshall approves staff study. 18 months. Lots of casualties. Russian help needed. Adm. Leahy disagrees, says war already won and Arnold not there agrees, later, with Leahy. Roosevelt believes his "shadow." Next Yalta. Stalin accepts Marshall's recommended help. Gets rights in Chinese Manchuria, Sakhalin Island. Promises air fields; when needed,

reneges. Japs tell Stalin "want to quit." Stalin keeps mum. Declaration of war four days before Japs surrendered, no Russian casualties.

A little side play item that becomes the main show. Marshall sent Stilwell in '42 to guide Chiang Kishek. Muffs. Marshall sticks by buddy. Reports and Peanuts' kicks force FDR order Marshall "get him out." Unprepared Truman sends Marshall to China in 1946 with big decision, prepared by "pinks," including the Red "Hiss," in State Dept., whom Hurley had sent home and who had become his bosses. This is big decision—vital. Chiang must form coalition government with Reds. Always had failed. Sen. George told that Secy. Marshall said to him later that he hardly knew what he thought at the time, that there was so much confusion in his mind as to what he thought could be done or could not be done. An apparently purposely bungled aid to Chiang makes today slaves for the Red bosses of over a half billion human beings.

Next decision 1948, known as the Marshall Plan. Four years of temporary help to "busted" Europe, getting no place, aid must be definite and for years. Secy. Marshall tells of this need to the Democracies on June 5, 1948 at Harvard, providing countries make sound plans and estimates. This done. Congress approves. And the Marshall Plan revives the sick world. Now, these nations must take over their share in developing backward nations. Additional note: President at lunch offers Marshall choice of taking over European campaign or remaining Chief of Staff. Marshall refuses to accept or decline, leaves decision to Pres. who keeps him in Washington. Did Marshall remember regimental command fluke, and shy away from decisions commanders of Armies must make? So different from MacArthur, one wonders if there was any telepathic influence on Pres. Truman that caused this great soldier's relief from Korea and took this statesman away from Japan.

But why so much about Marshall? He was so intimately a part of this war period and the peace, which the war was fought for, that a glance at his service covers a lot of detail, which explains the problems we are suffering under today.

Will the blessings of the Marshall Plan overcome these? In passing, I must emphasize that I have no personal animus only respect for the gentleman who was so recently laid at rest on the Potomac Hills of his beloved Virginia.

FINALE

And now to close with a look into the crystal ball. Will today's decisions to block the Red menace from destroying human freedom be fervently kept? Can this be done before our resources here are exhausted as then the U. S. becomes easy prey. In vital items, we are now a "have not" nation like so much of the world. Will working time shorten as automation increases by making sound decisions or will there be a drift to crisis that will bring chaos? Will wholesome leisure be sufficient to bring true happiness in the idle time? Will the population exploration sink civilization? Will adequate measures be decided upon and taken in time?

Sen. Vandenburg in the approval discussion for the North Atlantic Treaty two years before his death recalled the words of Theo. Roosevelt—"that the U.S. had no choice but to play a great part in the world—the choice was whether it was to play it well or ill." The Senator continued "I submit to my countrymen that these words were written for the ages. Never did they more vividly point the goal than they do this afternoon. Much as we might crave the easier way of lesser responsibility, we are denied the privilege. We cannot turn back the clock—we cannot sail by the old and easier charts.—That his been determined for us by the march of events. We have no choice as to whether we shall play a great part in the world. We *have* to play this part. We have to play it in sheer defense of our own self-interest. All we can decide is whether we can play it well or ill." I shall add, may the crystal ball not fog so that the decisions will give the greatest possible happiness to all peoples.

And now the great present decision for you—I bring a job only partially done to a close.

PUBLIC RELATIONS
or
PEASANTRY

By Ed Lipscomb

Read at a Meeting of "The Egyptians," December 17, 1959

Agriculture, as never before, is face to face with public disfavor on a gravely dangerous scale.

It is being blamed for inflation, high taxes, federal deficits, unbalanced family budgets, and socialistic skulduggery in government.

The farmer is accused of piling up profits at public expense, of forcing fancy prices in the midst of surplus, of jeopardizing friendly relations with foreign countries through dumping, and of general political panhandling.

Flogging the farmer has become a popular national pastime with most of the public press. Metropolitan newspapers, magazines, newscasters, columnists, cartoonists—even church papers—all are laying on their whips.

From the standpoint of the farmer's present public relations position, it matters not at all that here and there a charge may be false, or that droplets of truth may cause excitable readers to gulp down gallons of exaggeration and insinuation. What does matter, and matter immensely, is that public hostility has reached a point where it presents serious threats to farm progress.

Condemnation of the farmer, of course, is not new. One of the most savage and satirical attacks he ever sustained appeared in the 1930's. Derogatory articles and speeches were the order of the day in 1951-52, when the farmer was fighting successfully to prevent the fraud of price controls. A typical cartoon presented a fat politician planting greenbacks in a farm field while grinning happily at a seed catalog which promised a bumper crop of farm votes.

Two things in the present situation, however, are new: (1) the broad base and determined temper of the attacks; (2) the depth of public distrust of farm programs, and of the motives of the farmer himself.

It is in such an atmosphere that the farmer faces the choice of improving his public relations or taking a precipitous turn toward peasantry.

This is not a matter of returning to conditions like those which exist today in fields near the world's second oldest university, in a country that helped colonize our hemisphere, where European farmers still harvest wheat with hand sickles and carry it to their barns on burros. The prospect, instead, is one of severely limited opportunity, oppressive restraints, powerless bargaining positions, and economic mediocrity which are the basic ingredients of peasant life.

The farmer today accounts for 8% of the U. S. population —a statistic which means, in more ominous form, that he does not account for 92%. Such a fact alone should make it clear that if current provocative attacks against him continue, if public antagonism keeps growing with the momentum and in the mood of the recent past, the following sequence of events may be expected:

(1) Politicians, who must respond to public opinion or be removed from office, will abandon the farmer in increasingly greater numbers;

(2) Instead of sound and orderly consideration of farm programs, there will come sudden, jolting, even punitive measures and actions;

(3) Surpluses now on hand, regardless of legal provisions intended to cushion their effects, will put the farmer's income on the toboggan;

(4) Little concern will be shown for him in matters affecting wages and hours, tax allowances, social schemes, and other areas where exemptions or modifications to fit agriculture's unique conditions are now provided;

(5) Political impotency and public disfavor will invite more determined efforts by Labor and by his business customers to take advantage of the deterioration in his bargaining power;

(6) Today's progress on essential fronts—mechanization, land improvement, standard of farm living, efficiency of production—will be replaced by ruinous retreat.

This is the precipitous turn toward peasantry of which we speak.

The farmer himself is the only man who can prevent it. Even he cannot prevent it by pleading with Congressmen to vote contrary to public sentiment.

He can prevent it only by bringing about a change in public attitudes toward him.

This is a substantial assignment, but not an impossible one. The handicaps are severe, but not insurmountable. Identification of five of the public relations problems involved will serve to illustrate the dimensions of his difficulties.

No. 1, *the house already is blazing.* In public relations, as in everyday physical circumstances, it is always easier to prevent a fire than it is to extinguish one when the roof is ready to fall in. Blazes of today's size are difficult to control, especially when important sections of the public press are pouring on fresh supplies of flammable fuel.

The heat of today's antagonism multiplies, many times over, the amount of effort which will be required to gain for agriculture the degree of public confidence and good will which are essential to its welfare and further development.

No. 2, *agriculture is on the defensive.* It would be much easier and simpler to start a public relations program in an atmosphere of neutrality, or even to start in the early stages of an attack.

In the present situation, the defensive position involves two special handicaps.

The first is the fact that there is enough truth in some of the charges being made against agriculture to cause uninformed people, which includes almost everybody, to give full credence to the entire onslaught.

Headlines proclaim, for example, that "agriculture" last year represented the third largest item in the federal budget, being exceeded in size only by national defense and interest on the public debt. This is true, even though it is equally true that portions of the agricultural budget went for items which benefited other groups and purposes more than farmers.

Inflammatory attacks regarding increases in food costs are also accurate, insofar as retail prices are concerned. It is equally true, however, that farmers have received only a tiny fraction of the increases, and that the factory worker today is earning his bread with fewer hours of work than ever before in history.

These and other accusations call for answers or explanations more complex than the average consumer wants to be bothered with. On the whole, the man-in-the-street wants his concepts simple. He is more of a sucker for slogans and a follower of fighting phrases than a student willing to give attention to elucidation. In addition, he is especially skeptical of complicated explanations when they come from an individual or a group already under widespread attack.

The second special handicap is a mathematical one. It is the simple fact of the farmer's unprecedented, and still dwindling, minority position. More and more members of Congress are finding that sympathetic concern for consumers who are critical of agriculture is politically more attractive than seeking solutions for the farmer's problems.

Interpreted in terms of dollars, agriculture's minority position is even more disadvantageous. Net farm income represents approximately 4½% of national income, which is to say that a drop of 25% in farm income, in itself, would represent only about a 1% decline in the national level.

Problem No. 3 is that *the farmer, as one of his very first moves, must convert his attackers.* The most conspicuous torch-carriers in the current crusade are people on whom he must depend, in part at least, to tell his story—the editors of mass and metropolitan media.

Such media appeal purposely to urban points of view, primarily because of the fact that there are nine present or potential subscribers who are not living on farms for each one who is. They can be counted on to support agriculture's cause only when, in their opinion, it is compatible with consumer attitudes and interests.

Obviously they have not thought, of late, that such is the case. This is the underlying source of the campaign they have been conducting. Superimpose on such a foundation the prevailing journalistic practice of seeking impact and attention through dramatization, creation of excitement, and injection of maximum heat into the light that is available, and the pattern of the attack becomes understandable. Assignments to reporters to dig out glaring, even if isolated, instances of abuse —editorials which start with a fact and wander far into the field of insinuation—feature articles which berate weaknesses and ignore worth . . . these are normal products of the basic pattern.

The farmer, however, cannot afford to slug back at the biggest slugger among those who have ganged up on him. It would be unsound to get pugnacious with those whose aid he must enlist.

His job, instead, is one of continuing to take a whipping while trying to convince his editorial attackers—through action to correct faults as well as words to emphasize virtues—that he and the consumer, after all, are on the same side.

Problem No. 4 is the fact that *the farmer has no adequate public relations machinery in place.*

At the national level, there is no coordinated inter-organizational program or approach, no central staff or funds. A few major agricultural groups do have public relations programs in operation. These for the most part, however, were created to promote the organization, or its positions, or a particular agricultural product. In no case is the effort devoted predominantly to public relations in behalf of the farmer, as such; and in no case are the staff and budget sufficient to execute the type and size of program today's situation calls for.

No. 5, *the farmer has no central source of public relations ammunition*—no place from which to obtain adequate, well-considered, well-prepared information for use in answering false charges or presenting positive merits. This is obviously a corollary, to some extent, of the absence of machinery.

With the house already blazing, with a defensive position as his starting point, with attackers who must be converted into exponents of his cause, with no adequate machinery in place, and with no central source of ammunition, the problems of the farmer's present public relations position are—to say the least—highly unenviable.

Such a situation offers exceptional temptations for the farmer, in seeking solutions, to take off down blind alleys or to try answers which are not answers at all.

One temptation, widely prevalent, is to assume that *there is some sort of magic in a public relations effort,* and to expect results in keeping with that assumption.

The "magic" mirage probably arises from the fact that public relations deals in abstractions. It plants ideas and in-

formation instead of seeds. It cultivates attitudes and opinions instead of young plants; and it hopes to harvest good will instead of food or fiber.

It may use the hand hoe of person-to-person persuasion, or it may be highly mechanized through scientific instruments of communication. However, it can no more plant its particular type of seed one afternoon and harvest a bumper crop the next morning than can the farmer.

If anything, its results are even slower. An idea clothed in perfectly clear words may be flashed around the earth in the time it takes to blink an eye, but may require months to penetrate a quarter inch of human skull.

Today's public attitude toward agriculture has been at least a decade in developing. A few favorable news or feature articles and an energetic editorial or two that "gets them told" will not reverse it.

A second temptation is to assume that a public relations effort—if adequately financed, and if worked at hard enough and long enough—will *"make people love me as I am"*. This is not necessarily so.

One of the most common of all misconceptions concerning public relations, in fact, is that it is a broom with which to sweep sins under the rug, or some sort of painting procedure to make culprits look like cherubs. Good public relations is composed of two inseparable parts: (1) policies and conduct which, if known to the public and properly understood, will meet with its approval; (2) the necessary steps to make sure that the public knows and understands the policies and conduct.

It is not particularly unusual for a man or a group to deserve public approval and not get it, for lack of public knowledge. Also, it is possible that shrewd gimmicks or pious pronouncements may bring, for a time, public approval which is undeserved. It is not possible, however, to fool most of the people much of the time.

To the extent that any group, agriculture included, may have skeletons with their toes sticking out of the closet, or off-color chickens trying to get home to roost, good public relations is patently impossible until the skeletons are disposed of and the chickens caught and culled. No public relations program can make the public love anybody merely because he longs to be loved.

A third temptation is for the farmer to answer his critics with the countercharge that *others get subsidies too.*

Here is a particularly enticing trap. The bait is appealing, and there is plenty of it. The very magazines and newspapers which complain of agricultural subsidies are delivered to their readers at subsidized postal rates. The farmer is compelled to pay subsidies in the form of tariffs to protect the makers of much of what he buys. He could compile a list as long as his pantry shelf of people and places and projects that are taking cash, in one form or another, from the public till.

Far from being an effective answer to an accusation, however, this approach constitutes an admission of the charge. It suggests not only that the charge is accurate, but that the defendant was conscious of guilt before the charge was made. Use of the "others too" technique as a major component of the farmer's public relations program might yield some inner satisfaction to those who employed it, and it might even bring public wrath on "others too", but it would not improve the farmer's own position.

Another, and fourth, temptation is to make a major point of the claim that *today's public relations situation is the politicians' fault.*

The case against the politician would run about like this: (1) developments growing out of federal farm programs are the major source of attacks against the farmer; (2) the politicians prepared these programs, passed them through Congress, and are responsible for them; (3) therefore, it is the politicians' fault that the farmer is under attack.

There is truth here. Appraised entirely in terms of public relations, the politician does in fact top the list of the farm-

er's liabilities. Whether he is denouncing the opposition or is waving from his medicine wagon a new nostrum of his own, he tends to view with excessive alarm or point with excessive pride. The press in turn gives intense attention to the more dramatic of his excesses, with the result that relationships between the farmer and the public are more often hurt than helped.

The farmer cannot, however, improve his public relations position to any important extent by publicly blaming the politician, for the consumer's rejoinder is going to run about as follows: (1) all the things for which you farmers are denouncing the politicians were indeed brought about by "farm" politicians, either directly or through "trades" with non-farm politicians; (2) you marked the ballots that provided the margin that put them in office; (3) therefore, it still is your fault.

Right or wrong—and, again, purely from a standpoint of public relations procedure—"It's the Politicians' Fault" is not an adequate base on which to build an effective program.

Unlike the preceding four pitfalls, all of which constitute false approaches, the fifth in our list has to do with the danger that many farmers may exclude themselves from any responsibility or participation on the grounds that *"I'm not involved."*

Less than half of the nation's farmers are directly concerned with the programs and crops which are the most prominent targets of current attacks; and it therefore is natural for many of the remainder to feel that they have no major interest in the matter, and no reason for special fuss or bother about it.

For any farmer to yield to such a temptation is to take a head-in-the-sand position which leaves vital and tender parts conspicuously exposed. A man does not need to grow cotton or corn or wheat in order to share the consequences of continued public antagonism toward agriculture.

This is no rifle-shooting situation in which clear distinctions are being made between one kind of farmer and another. When newspapers excite subscribers with tables of figures showing food costs in 1959 as compared with 1939, they do not bother to explain that bread is made from wheat which has a price support and that liver comes from livestock which

do not. Coffee and tea prices have even been included, with the implication that U. S. farmers are responsible for these too.

The most alarming element in the whole structure of today's attacks, in fact, is that they have gone far past the area of selective criticism. As previously pointed out, the public likes its concepts simple, and there is no farmer in America, of any kind, who is not "involved".

The sixth and final temptation to be identified here is one which must be faced by every group which considers a public relations program. In the case of a group as large and important as farmers it is particularly acute. It is the temptation to assume that *"the public is interested in our problems."*

There was a time when the farmer could say with validity that this was true. Food and fiber in America today, however, are taken for granted. City people are concerned about taxes, installment payments, places to park, the Cold War, and the high cost of high living standards. They live on pavements, view pastures from car windows, and don't care whether their mushrooms grow in dry deserts or damp basements.

They are busy trying to crowd more things into a day than it will hold; and they are striving to keep up with the Joneses under circumstances where even the Joneses are having trouble keeping up.

They become interested in a farm problem only when it becomes, quite concretely, their problem. An excellent example is the present interest of the public in agricultural surpluses. If the man-in-the-street had been concerned over these as a problem for farmers, he would have been concerned long ago. He would not have withheld his complaints until he found that these surpluses represent several billion dollars of tax liability, that it takes another billion or so each year to store them, and that the end is not yet.

It is his own highly personal problems of taxes and rising prices which have stirred him—not his interest in the farmer's problems.

Added, then, to the frustrating handicaps of the farmer's present public relations position, is the need for firm rejection of seductive but unsound concepts and approaches which are made exceptionally appealing by the very extremity of his

current situation. Among them: there is magic in public relations; public relations will make people love me as I am; others get subsidies too; it's the politicians' fault; I'm not involved; the public is interested in my problems.

Under such conditions, what can the individual farmer do? Normally his first thought might be to contribute cash to a central national fund, employ the most competent professional talent available, and sit back to await results.

In many situations this will work, but it will not work for agriculture.

The money perhaps could be raised, in that even one dollar from each farmer would yield a fund of several million. An insurmountable difficulty would arise, however, in arranging for its control and disbursement. "The farmer" is not a homogeneous group, but many groups, with varied organizations.

His organizations have different and often divergent points of view. In order to operate a central program it would be necessary to agree on a central committee to represent all, and to authorize such a committee to determine public relations policies and procedures. To expect major organizations to do this, and thereby accept the risk that a public relations machine potentially larger than their own annual budgets might operate in ways not in keeping with their own policies, is to expect—at this point, at least—the impossible.

A considerable amount of exploration already has been done in high places in search of some mechanism through which a central effort might be set up. Thus far such a mechanism has not been found.

This does not mean, however, that the farmer is left helpless. It means, on the contrary, that he is left with an alternative program which—while more difficult than making a modest donation—is more certain of success provided he is willing to adopt it and execute it diligently. It is in three parts.

Part One consists of pushing his own organizational headquarters—hard.

It has previously been pointed out that nowhere in the U. S. is there a major group which has an adequate public relations program in behalf of farmers, as such.

The individual's first and vitally important responsibility, therefore, is to demand with unmistakable vigor and determination that his own headquarters set up a program dedicated to the single goal of improving the farmer's position, and that it give that program emphasis and priority commensurate with the problem.

He should let it be known that he does not mean a piddling effort, or a nominal assignment to members of the present staff who already have all the work they can do. He must insist—strongly, even sharply if necessary—that he wants enough money raised or diverted, enough staff assigned or employed, and enough management attention applied to get the job done.

An utterly simple way of making his voice loud and clear on this subject is by personal letter to the proper official. A letter directed there, under today's conditions, may do more good than half a dozen to his Congressman. Letters from each of several thousand members would make rapid action a certainty. Another effective procedure would be to sponsor a formal resolution by his local unit. Both would be still better.

A headquarters program of the kind being proposed here must include two basic provisions in order to be fully productive. The first is that personnel at the central office be assigned active and direct responsibility for national and metropolitan media. Except in rare instances, neither the individual farmer nor his local unit can do much about them. Unless his headquarters staff does the job, it will not be done.

There are not so many people involved as to preclude personal attention. Twenty-three men sit at the top of 23 chains which publish 248 daily newspapers in 191 of the nation's cities. Add to these a dozen major independents, and the total will cover a substantial majority of the metropolitan areas of the United States. There are no more than eight or ten important consumer magazines which are likely to comment on agricultural problems one way or the other.

It is at such control points as these that the headquarters staff, even top officials, must necessarily act as the farmer's representative.

The second provision is that headquarters personnel supply the farmer's local unit with essential guidance and material for a task as impractical for the central office to carry out as it is for local members to make the rounds of national media. That is the task of conducting a convincing campaign in its own area.

In a public relations climate where local attitudes are neutral or mildly favorable, and where savage assaults from outside sources are not prevalent, the individual farmer with a group of his neighbors can do an adequate job without any assistance beyond a general handbook of suggestions and techniques.

In today's charged atmosphere, however, he needs more. He needs a continuing flow of information which can be supplied more easily and economically from a central source than it can be assembled in the field. He needs ready-written material for local placement or adaptation. He needs current suggestions based on new facts and opportunities as they develop.

The farmer's initial responsibility, then—the very first and very easiest thing he can do toward improvement of public attitudes toward him—is to insist, absolutely insist, that his parent organization establish a program as substantial as the problem is serious. If he is not willing, in fact, to "push his own headquarters—hard", he is unlikely to be willing to carry out the other two steps of the three essential ones outlined here.

Part Two of the individual's job is to see to it that his "local" accepts responsibility for, and gives high and permanent priority to, a public relations program in its own area. This is an indispensable and wholly practical assignment.

In 2,413 of the 3,070 counties in the continental U. S., one-half or more of the population is either on farms or in areas classified by the census as rural. This means that in at least 80% of all counties, local farmers have inescapable responsibility for public attitudes, and for the public relations activities necessary to keep them favorable.

The need for such activities today is so urgent, the number of things which can be done immediately is so great, and a

blueprint of local suggestions so readily available, that there is no reason or excuse for delay while new or improved services at headquarters are set up.

Furthermore, there is no point in a headquarters office sending even the best public relations material to a local unit which is not ready to use it. Much of the most valuable of such material is perishable; and certainly there is nothing more fruitless than timely publicity lying in an envelope on an unprepared and unresponsive desk.

The individual's second job, then, is to give whatever leadership is necessary to assure the establishment of a vigorous public relations program by his own local organization, in his own area. This may involve only simple persuasion of alert and well-informed friends. It may require a crusade. Whatever it takes, it is part of the choice which is the title of this text.

Part Three is the most difficult, by far, of the three essential sections of the program. Unless it can be accomplished, however — accomplished consistently and successfully — the other two parts will never be effective; and there is no justification for expecting them to be.

It is this: *The farmer must make absolutely certain—in every position he takes, every resolution he favors, every vote he casts in his own organization—that he is entitled to public support* or, at the very least, acquiescence.

This is the real test, the personal showdown. It is, as nothing else, the genuine center and core of good public relations.

If—sincerely and honestly—down in his heart—the farmer can say that the things he and his fellow-members support and vote for are things the public will approve if it knows about them and understands them, then *all else* in his program becomes a matter of adequate and accurate communications. It becomes a matter of relatively simple mechanics in seeing to it that the public does know and does understand.

On the other hand, if he refuses to take or cannot pass this test, any so-called "public relations" activity is more likely to become a liability than an asset, in that the very efforts devoted to such a program tend to draw attention to the unsound positions involved.

It is not the function of this text to attempt to outline what positions are "right" and what are "wrong". This is a matter of the farmer's conscience and personal judgment—a matter of putting himself in the public's place and determining how he would feel about a particular proposition if he were not a farmer.

For our purposes here, the question is not one of morals and ethics, but a highly materialistic consideration. Like it or not, it is the public who will determine the kind of treatment the farmer gets. Therefore, ultimately, the practice of making sure he is entitled to public approval of his attitudes and actions is the only route to real progress. Without it, no public relations program, however pretentious, will be profitable.

The principle of course applies not only to future actions, but to present positions as well. The individual farmer can make no more important preparation for his personal contribution to improved public attitudes than to pause for a realistic mental review of where his own organization now stands.

Are there positions it now holds—points of view to which it subscribes—legislative actions it urges—or resolutions it endorses—which the public would not approve if it had knowledge and understanding of them?

If there are, then the first and most fundamental need of his public relations program is to change the image he sees in the mirror.

Despite the problems of his present public relations position, and despite high exposure to tempting but unsound approaches to their solution, today's farmer has before him a solid opportunity to bring about a significant change in public attitudes toward him.

If individually he will push his own headquarters—hard; if he will lead his local unit—boldly; if he will look in his mirror—often and carefully, he can revive and maintain prestige and economic progress which farmers in no other modern land and no other historical period have even approached. He can renew with increasing success his unprecedented rise above the precarious subsistence and empty outlook which have been the lot of most of his predecessors and foreign counterparts.

"Public relations or peasantry" will no longer be either a problem or a prospect.

WALTER IN POLITICSLAND

By Walter P. Armstrong, Jr.

Read at a Meeting of "THE EGYPTIANS," January 21, 1960

"When *I* use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "Whether you *can* make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "Which is to be master—that's all."

There is no indication that the character with whom Alice engaged in the dialogue which I have quoted either held or was a candidate for any political office. However his approach to semantics reflects a turn of mind which would appear to make him eminently eligible for such a position. For words are the stock in trade of the politician, and his problem frequently resolves itself into Humpty Dumpty's question of which is to be master, he or they. And only when they come to mean precisely what he chooses for them to mean, and neither more nor less, can he consider himself master of his trade.

This is one of the many things which I have learned during the four years since I stepped through the looking glass which separates the average citizen from the world of politics and entered a realm as fanciful as any which intrigued Alice Hargreaves a century ago. I do not wish to press the metaphore too far; but while those outside see in political institutions and their administrators the reflection of their own activities, from the other side of the mirror the scene presented is that of a multitude of conflicting interests, each of which must be weighed in terms of vote getting potential, and all of which must be reconciled insofar as possible with a minimum of ruffled feelings and disappointed hopes. The trouble is that each individual project is perfectly feasible; but it is manifestly impossible to accomplish all of them, no matter how desirable. And for every satisfied constituent there must in the

nature of things be a dozen or more whose disappointment makes them wonder either vocally or in their hearts why their pet project was not selected, and if perhaps another incumbent might not have made a wiser choice. For this reason it becomes the politician's first rule never to make a negative comment, which gives rise to the famous distinction between a politician and a lady. It has been said that the former, if he says yes means maybe, if he says maybe means no, and if he says no is no politician; while the latter if she says no means maybe, if she says maybe means yes, and if she says yes is no lady.

I was certainly as naive four years ago as Alice ever was, and am perhaps little less so now. However, my job as President of the Board of Education has been considerably simplified by the fact that I had only one point of view to maintain, that of the continued advancement and improvement of our school system. Thus in a sense I am the sponsor of a special interest; but because of the peculiar relationship between the Board of Education (representing literally thousands of potential votes) and the true politicians at City Hall, I have also been privileged to see some of the councils from the inside as well. In fact, I have been in the unique position of being able to observe both sides of the mirror simultaneously; of both pushing the button to start the machine and watching it operate. It is a fascinating if sometimes a heartrending experience.

I hope that you will not get the impression that because I shall speak frankly I am being critical of politicians. Quite the contrary. I have found those with whom I have come in contact (and in this I suspect that I have been and that we all in this community are most fortunate) upright, honest and conscientious. It is simply that they develop rules of conduct and ways of looking at things which differ from those in general use outside of political circles. There is no stigma attached to this; it is simply their way of life. After all it would not be surprising if a man who lived on the slope of an active volcano or in the shadow of a dam of doubtful strength were to develop a few idiosyncrasies.

Something else which must not be overlooked is that these men are professionals. They are as expert at their business as each of you is at yours, and they have devoted the equivalent number of years to studying, practicing and perfecting themselves in it. An amateur who enters the political arena stands about as much chance as would a spectator who wandered onto the field and was taken for a substitute during a football game between the Baltimore Colts and the New York Giants. There are only two choices for the amateur politician; turn pro or get out. Anything else can result only in disaster.

This brings me to the heart of what I am trying to express. For rectitude, it seems to me from my very slight observation and experience, is for the politician a pragmatic rather than an abstract question. His first duty, it has been said, is to get elected; or if he is already in office, to remain there. Accordingly, from his point of view it is little less than foolhardy for him to assume some position which, no matter how correct in the abstract, will lose him the support of his constituents. This way he sacrifices his effectiveness; in fact he loses his character as a politician completely, and becomes either a prophet or a martyr. And the practical politician wishes to be neither.

On the other hand the political expert, by constantly sounding the temper of his audience and tailoring his product to their receptivity, can gradually guide the recalcitrant majority towards desirable goals, while at the same time preserving the illusion that he is the sounding board and not the trumpet. I am tempted by concrete examples; let me give only two, one from the past and one from the future. When we of the Board of Education determined that our new administration building should not be in the proposed Civic Center, we had the temerity to say so. Eventually we prevailed, from what I like to believe are sound reasons, but over vociferous opposition. Yet after the turmoil had subsided, when I spoke to one of our most determined opponents of the views which he had expressed, he assured me that he did not really think that we should necessarily be included in the Civic Center, but that we had expressed a disinclination to be included in it at the wrong time. He believed in a Civic Center; we had expressed a view which was detrimental to its accomplishment; therefore, he opposed that view. But as soon as the exclusion of the Board of Education ceased to be a danger to the Civic Center idea, his opposition disappeared.

My next example also deals with the Civic Center. The overall plan for it calls for the closing of Main Street north of Adams. This must be done, otherwise the entire plan, which

is based upon the idea of a master block encompassing four city blocks of present size, will be a fiasco. It will be done; the Federal Government is investing almost fifteen million dollars in a new building and the City over a million in a new City Hall upon the assumption that it will be done. Yet not a single politician has made a positive statement to that effect. They know that the time is not yet ripe. Five years from now, when the Civic Center will be closer to reality, one day quietly Main Street will be closed, and the public will be so used to the idea that it will hardly notice. But to suggest it now is unthinkable.

This is not a pessimistic point of view. On the contrary, it is essentially optimistic. For I have discovered that there is a tremendous amount of long-range planning going on in our City. Quietly, without fanfare or any great amount of notoriety, men are working over drawing boards upon plans for our City which will only be implemented ten, fifteen, twenty-five or even more years from now. The function of the politician is to get these plans off of the drawing boards and into the realm of reality. And this is in many respects a harder job than the planning itself. For those who deal in steel and bricks and mortar can always predict with a fair amount of certainty their reaction under conditions of stress and strain; but the human element is essentially unpredictable, and a wrong guess has been the end of many a promising political career.

That is of course why the politician cannot be troubled by the requirements of consistency. The only consistency which he knows is that of always being acceptable to his constituents. I do not mean that he is two-faced; the honest politician, and I have said that that is the only kind with which I have had contact, is far from that. I have seen some remarkable examples of courage in adhering to a principle, which made me proud of our elected representatives. But they simply do not talk before labor groups about the contributions which they have made to industrial management, nor before the Chamber of Commerce about their support of union demands. Therefore what they say can only be understood in context. After all, Emerson described consistency as the bugaboo of little minds, which puts them in good company.

Again a pair of examples must suffice. Early in my career at the Board of Education, when we first suggested that the

salaries paid to the teachers of our City were not properly comparable with those paid elsewhere, I was somewhat shocked to hear one member of our city government express the view that teachers should be paid less than stenographers, because the latter required special training, while anyone with a B.A. degree could teach. I was even more shocked to read in the newspapers during the recent campaign a report of a speech by this same person reciting what he had done for the teachers of Memphis during his term of office. And yet, upon reflection, I realized that both statements, taken in context, represented his honest views. The first occurred in a budget discussion at City Hall, when his objective was to avoid the necessity for a tax raise; the second was part of a speech before a teachers' group, when he was trying to get re-elected. Both were entirely true; he didn't think much of teachers as compared to stenographers, but he had done a lot for them. I was simply trying to look at both sides of the mirror at the same time.

My second example also arose out of the teachers' pay situation. It is the only time to my knowledge that I have been accused of being a socialist. The accusation perplexed me so that it was several minutes before I could inquire why. The answer came promptly and unequivocally; because I wanted to take money from the rich in the form of increased taxes and redistribute it to the poor in the form of increased salaries to teachers. Now admittedly I did want to do that; and admittedly taking from the rich and giving to the poor is socialism. And so by his lights my accuser was quite right. But of course his point of view was completely conditioned by the assumption that this was not a good thing to do. Perhaps mine was equally conditioned by my belief that it was; but I was so startled that I couldn't think of anything to call him.

One of the rewards of the political experience is that occasionally one sees others hoist by their own petard, although of course it isn't so pleasant when it happens to yourself. I should like to cite a recent example. Sometime ago, in order to balance our budget, we of the School Board were called upon to dip into certain reserves which we had accumulated for capital improvements. We did this with reluctance, I might even say under compulsion, for we were given no alternative; and I still believe that it was unwise. But the City fathers assured us that it was necessary, so we did it. The

other day I read with interest that it had been suggested that in order to avoid a rise in electric power rates the light, gas and water division should utilize its capital reserves to defray operating expenses. The indignation of the City Commission at this suggestion fairly shone through the lines of print. My first thought was that it seemed to depend upon whose ox was being gored; but on second thought I realized that there was no lack of consistency when taken in context. It was simply that what was right for us was wrong for them.

This fluctuating viewpoint is of course inextricably interwoven with political technique. As I have said, this is largely a matter of timing. The important thing is to prevent matters from coming to a head when it is politically inexpedient for them to do so. There are many means of accomplishing this; but one of my favorites, because of its stark simplicity, is the committee. I do not mean to imply that committees do not accomplish a great deal of good, for of course they do; but it is an inescapable fact that by referring a matter to a committee one can assure an appreciable lapse of time before any decision is reached. This is particularly true of citizens' committees, where the members can devote only a fraction of their time to its function, and meetings must of necessity be infrequent. At the same time such a committee has an aura of democracy which endears it to the populace, and consequently frequently gets the politician off the hook. It is a good insulator; it spreads the decision so as to prevent individual assignment of responsibility; and if a mistake is made, its members were only amateurs anyway, and as such are largely exonerated. A timely reference to a committee has gotten many a politician past election time.

The functional opposite of the committee is of course the court. Courts make decisions in accordance with fixed rules of law and evidence and without regard to expediency, a procedure which is anathema to the politician. After proper appeal their judgments are irrevocable and their mandates must be obeyed, while the report of a committee can always be rejected or tabled. Politicians have the same instinctive fear of courts that motorists have of policemen, and with as little reason. Both are there to direct traffic in an orderly manner, to help the law abider as much as to hinder the malfeasor. The law, for right or wrong, is what the courts say it is. If we don't like it, we must look to the legislatures to change it.

Again it is a matter of context. When the Board of Education determined to file suit against Shelby County in regard to the distribution of school funds, it was only after every alternative had been suggested and virtually all of them exhausted that we were permitted to do so. This was as it should be; any court is ultimately a court of last resort and should not be approached lightly. But there comes a time when the issue is the simple one of the interpretation of the validity and meaning of a law, and nothing but the decision of a court will suffice. In our case, it was even suggested that the matter should be referred to a committee. Suppose that the committee had studied the situation and come up with the report that the law was unconstitutional. Would we then ignore the law? At this point the whole idea becomes ridiculous.

And yet, even at this extreme, the politicians hesitate to go to court. They feel that there is something inherently reprehensible about it. Like a family squabble they say it should be settled behind closed doors. The trouble is in this case it wasn't. And the courts are full of family squabbles which haven't been.

But when the politicians can't agree among themselves about the reallocation of seats in the state legislature, it is a different matter. Although the dispute is just as much between political subdivisions of the same unit and therefore partakes just as much of the nature of a family squabble, here the context apparently requires the intervention of the courts. It is just that goose sauce never goes well with gander.

I have spoken freely tonight because I am addressing a small group of friends with no axes to grind, secure in my knowledge of the inflexible rule of our organization that no report of our activities is to appear in any newspaper. Otherwise my remarks might be misunderstood. For the approach of the average citizen to political issues is too often that of the gentleman who appeared before our Board and announced that he was in favor of higher salaries for teachers and lower taxes. He saw no necessity for reconciling the two. The practical politician on the other hand must reconcile them; that is his job. The surprising thing is not that he develops professional techniques for doing so; the surprising thing is that he and his prototypes are able to accomplish so much through

the use of those techniques. The chief thing which I have learned through my venture into politics is unbound admiration for those who are better versed in it than I.

The politician, no matter how much of an idealist, must, if he is to preserve his effectiveness, continue to be elected and re-elected. The sword of Damocles hangs over him, and with one false move the thread will break. So often I have heard it said of a certain project that now is not the time because it is just before election, or just after election. But this should not be a deterrent; for in the life of a politician it is always just before or after election; if not his own, then of one of his supporters or one whom he supports which will materially effect his situation by its outcome. Thus a politician is in effect always running. I began with Alice, and to preserve my theme I should return to her. For if Humpty Dumpty was a politician, the Red Queen must have been one as well. At least she knew the ardours of continuous campaigning, as demonstrated by this bit of dialogue, with which I may appropriately end what is I am afraid an inept description by an amateur of a process in which only professionals are fully qualified:

"Well, in *our* country," said Alice, still panting a little, "you'd generally get to somewhere else—if you ran very fast for a long time as we've been doing."

"A slow sort of country!," said the Queen. "Now, *here,* you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!"

TOMORROW'S WORLD—WESTERN REACTION TO THE RISE OF DARK-SKINNED COLONIAL PEOPLES

By Francis C. Hickman

Read at a Meeting of "The Egyptians," February 18, 1960

A more specific meaning of this title, "Tomorrow's World," will depend on how the West responds, as the dark-skinned colonial people emerge from obscurity. It is not a question of whether we approve or disapprove these newly created countries, freed from former colonial powers, any more than it is a question of whether we approve or disapprove of integration here in America. Both situations are with us, and we have to deal with them. I think the following words in Stephen Vincent Benet's well known book, "John Brown's Body," are appropriate in this respect: "If *you* at last must have a word to say, say neither 'It is a deadly magic and accursed' nor 'It is blessed,' but only, 'It is here.' "

Let us trace the past, present and possible future status of the underdeveloped nations. With the exception of the United States, the Western countries rather begrudgingly freed their colonies. Great Britain gave up India the hard way; the Dutch struggled to retain Indonesia; the French lost Indo-China only after terrific loss of life from the pick of her military officers and tens of thousands of troops—and France still holds tenaciously to North Africa. The British, when they saw the "handwriting on the wall," left India graciously, as did the French when they finally accepted the loss of South Vietnam. The result is, both England and France are now carrying on more commerce with India and South Vietnam than was the case when these countries were their colonies. On the other hand, the Dutch took as a bitter pill leaving Indonesia, and today Holland is persona non grata in Indonesia.

The United States has contributed liberally to the non-committed countries. The aid, however, has sought temporary solutions and the results are far from satisfactory. Since World War II, the U. S. has given military aid to the Middle East and Africa amounting to 3.6 billion dollars, and also 3.4 billion in economic aid. To Asia, the United States

has given 6.1 billion in military aid and a total of 9.2 billion in economic aid. The question people are asking is, how much can, and should, the United States spend on foreign aid.

The other Western nations until recently had contributed little to the underdeveloped countries because they were busy mending their own fences. Now, however, manufacturing industries of Western Europe have been rebuilt; international trade has revived; and the reserves of European central banks have greatly increased. Under-Secretary of State Dillon, on his recent trip abroad, dwelled heavily on the fact that the European nations should actively participate in aiding these underdeveloped countries; and that the U. S. can no longer do it alone. He said the common objective of both sides of the Atlantic should be to help solve the North-South problems. It is no longer just one of the East-West.

Let us start with one of the more advanced noncommitted countries, India. I shall never forget the words of Pandit Nehru when I was having tea at his modest dwelling in Bombay in the summer of 1940. The tea was being poured by his illustrious sister, Madam Pandit, who later became Indian ambassador to Washington and also served as president of the United Nations Assembly.

I had interviewed Mr. Nehru on two previous occasions that summer, and he posed for a picture with me sitting beside him.

Nehru, like his great master, Mahatma Gandhi, had been a disturbing element to the British, who were making every effort to align India in the war then taking place against Germany. Mr. Nehru was at this time saying the British Government had dissolved India's Congress and were now trying to bring the country into a state of war without India's consent. He said that India was sympathetic but did not wish to be forced into this action. Several incidents had occurred in the nature of Satyagraha, or nonviolence. Satyagraha is a

means whereby people express their strong nationalist feelings by lying down in the streets and halting traffic, or on railroad tracks and stopping trains. It was in protest against British colonial autocracy. A mass Satyagraha was threatened throughout the country. Gandhi, fearing a crisis, called a special meeting of the former Congressmen at Bombay in the summer of 1940, at the very time I was there. There he pleaded with the delegates not to rebel openly against England and he promised to go personally to London and bring India's case before Parliament.

I was a special guest at this important gathering of the former Congressmen; my sponsor, however, had to pay $30 to get me in. All of us, numbering two or three hundred, sat on the floor, cross-legged fashion. In addition to seeing Nehru that summer, I had a special interview with Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah. The last named was head of the All Union Moslem League. When partition took place, following the war, you remember Mr. Jinnah became head of Pakistan. At that time I also met Dr. Ambedkar, the leader of the Untouchables, who wrote the Constitution for India. I kept up my contacts with him until his death a few years ago.

Now I said I shall never forget the words of Pandit Nehru when I was having tea at his home. In trying to draw him out in conversation, I listed some of the many improvements in India for which England was responsible—changes that had contributed to the people's welfare. For instance, I told him England had given India protection against the encroachment of the Japanese, that the British had built schools, roads, hospitals, had enacted good laws, allowed India an outlet for her exports.

After finishing his second cup of tea, I remember Nehru drew himself up and, emphasizing his words with gestures, said, "Why, if the British remained here 575 years longer, India would be no more advanced than she is today." Having seen what India has accomplished during the *few years* she has been free, I think Nehru sized up the situation correctly.

Nehru, member of the Brahman sect, and the rich son of a well known barrister, became a devoted disciple of Gandhi and gave most of his fortune to the cause of freeing India. While he was educated at an English university, I believe he has always harbored a certain antipathy or dislike for the British.

When I bade Nehru goodby, on leaving India that summer, he said, "Well, the next time you hear from me I shall probably be in prison." That is what happened, for the following year, Nehru, as well as Gandhi and thousands of others, men and women, were arrested and kept in prison anywhere from three months to three years.

India's problems have always seemed insurmountable, but underneath one sees a hopeful people, expressing inherent pride. Their civilization goes back 6,000 years. Maybe it is this fact which gives them self-confidence for the future.

To some extent I have seen the Indian people in every mood—at their prayers and religious ceremonies; I have watched their medical men and fakirs perform; have seen their dancing girls; have traveled on Indian ships, Indian airplanes and on Indian railroads.

India stands as a *good example* today of the rise of a dark-skinned former colonial people. This is due largely to the fact that Great Britain *had* controlled India for 200 years, and although she is accused of doing many wrongs while governing the country for her selfish interest, nevertheless England did a good job colony-wise. Other colonial powers cannot show an equally good record—for example, the Dutch in Indonesia, the French in Indo-China and North Africa, and the Japanese in Formosa and Korea. None of these colonies was given opportunities for self-government as was India. Therefore, in many of the recently liberated countries, self-government has been confronted with a difficult task.

Personally, I *had* been of the opinion that the United States was wrong in urging that all colonial countries be given their freedom, and in using American influence directly or indirectly toward that end. I saw where apparently many of the freed countries were not ready for self-government. My thinking on this matter has changed, however, after witnessing the extent of progress which many of these newly born nations have displayed in the last twelve years. Any impartial observer would say India, Pakistan and Egypt have definitely improved their position as more enlightened nations.

As regards the progress of India, freed from the British in 1947 partly at the insistence of the USA, their accomplishments in the past twelve years have been phenomenal. In agricultural production, India has increased her cotton yield. India with 1,175,000 square miles, about one-third the area of the United States, is now growing about the same quantity of cotton—5,000,000 bales or more—as she did with one-third more land before partition. Food and grain output has increased by more than 28 per cent in the past ten years, and other farm output more than 36 per cent. India has greatly increased her jute production. New factories have been built, and the output of industry has risen more than 30 per cent above that of even 1950.

Along educational and civic welfare lines, India has substantially improved her school facilities and hospitals. She has not only absorbed a very large Moslem population about forty-five million, who preferred to remain in India after the partition, but she has assimilated the nine million Hindu refugees who migrated from Pakistan during the tragic days following partition.

As to India's civil service—while still not too efficient, native Indians have moved into top management posts admirably. In this respect, an Indian friend who visited me last year said, "India would rather have her freedom and be poorly governed than to be well governed under the British."

The fact that Nehru has voted with the communists in every public assembly has irritated many of us; yet recently we saw him stand up to Mao Tse Tung in regard to Tibet and flatly refuse even a conference. A meeting in New Delhi, however, is now suggested.

A year and a half ago I was terribly worried as to whether Pakistan would experience a revolt against its established regime. Bad government, punctuated by corruption, had almost reached a saturation point. But at the right moment we saw General Mohammad Ayub Khan step in and take over the government and bring progress where chaos prevailed before.

A very troublesome situation also existed in Thailand until a year and a half ago. Corruption was prevalent, and a communist faction was awaiting the opportunity to take over. When visiting Thailand's chief city, Bangkok, in August, 1958, I found it looking quite prosperous, and a tourist heaven. But I soon learned that it was our aid that was keeping the country afloat. It did not take over three or four interviews with local businessmen to see that Thailand was headed for trouble. But what happened? In November, 1958, the military, Marshall Sarit Thanaret, took over the Government and prevented his country from falling to communist influence.

In Indonesia, I found an equally bad situation—or worse. President Sukarno had several communists, or men with communist leanings, in his cabinet. He gave lip service to the West, which was supplying him with military and economic aid, but he seemed indifferent to the political and economic danger confronting his land. Indonesia was left in an almost hopeless situation when the Dutch were forced out, as far as governing itself was concerned. Only seven per cent of the people were literate. Last year there were only 1,200 doctors for the 84,000,000 population, or one for every 72,000 citizens; there are only 120 native trained engineers in the whole nation. The last 10,000 of the former 80,000 Dutchmen were leaving the country when I was there. The lack of trained personnel poses many of the difficulties for the Indonesians in exercising self-government. Last year there was only one native college graduate in the entire Department of Agriculture, numbering 40,000 employees. However, heartening is the fact that *since* Indonesia has been free, the percentage of people who can read and write is said to have increased from less than 10 to 60 per cent.

Indonesia, with its scarcity of trained men, is also terribly handicapped in developing the economy of the country. Concerned over the fact that the Chinese have such a strong hold on the business of the country, recently President Sukarno issued a decree prohibiting anyone but Indonesians from conducting a business. The Chinese not only handle 90 per cent of the business in Indonesia, but they are the controlling factors in all business enterprises throughout Southeast Asia.

Now let us look at Africa. In the last few years, the drive for independence has brought Ghana, the Sudan, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco, and most recently, Guinea, into the United Nations. And this year Nigeria, the French Camaroons, and Togoland will join the ranks of independent countries. Throughout this emergent Africa, we find an *explosive Africa* where the youth have a new fetish—the ability to read and write.

What will tomorrow's world be? The key lies in the hands of these presently independent but underprivileged countries. As far as the United States is concerned, my hope is that we will have a clearer concept of the international situation and keep in mind that it is to our self-interest to help the underdeveloped countries build up their economies as quickly as possible; that the USA take a bona fide interest in the internal and external affairs of these areas; that they always be ready to advise; that this country extend to them at least a minimum of financial aid, on a loan basis and not as gifts, for most of these countries have large natural resources. A special department or agency of our government should be set up to develop ways and means for the repayment of the loans made to these countries. My hope is that a minimum of direct aid be extended in the form of schools, hospitals and roads in order that the rank and file of the people see some direct tangible results of our aid; that we show a human and spiritual interest as well as a material and political concern; that such plans be projected as five and ten-year programs and not just temporary relief.

If these ideas are carried out, there may still be a chance to keep these noncommitted countries from sliding into the communist orbit. Otherwise, depending on the communist time table, some of these countries can easily fall into communist hands within the next five years or sooner. Take, for example, that vast archipelago extending down as Southeast Asia. It is rich in very important natural resources, and its people are yearning for a change. If this area should come under red domination, the two flanks, India and Japan will no doubt fall in the following five years. In my opinion, these latter two countries could not withstand the communist trade pressure if Indonesia should succumb to Red China. It is generally conceded that, should India be enveloped by communism, all of Asia will follow. And when Asia falls, Europe will follow suit.

While the urge is to make haste, spend millions and build up safeguards against the threat of communism, a tight U. S. budget will put the brakes on any unnecessary spending. However, no time should be lost in developing a plan for improving the standard of living of these millions in the several underdeveloped areas. Let me briefly outline a plan which I think might be put into practice. It is the launching of a great Southeast Asia Development Corporation, a subsidiary of the International Development Corporation, and financed by the World Bank. Headquarters for the organization could be in Colombo or Singapore. This corporation should have subsidiaries in each country of the Southeast Asian area. All such banks would be run by native management, and part of the capital raised locally, but the majority supplied by the Southeast Asia Development Corporation.

I figure that 10 per cent of the capital would be local investment and 90 per cent loaned to the branch by the parent corporation. For example, if a million-dollar company was set up in Burma, $100,000 would be supplied by local capital and $900,000 by the Southeast Asia Development Corporation. The Burma bank would be permitted to borrow from the parent corporation up to five times its capital. This bank would have branch offices in different parts of the country. Loans would be made at the discretion of the local manager; loans of $100 or $200 made to thousands of small individual enterprises. The money would frequently furnish the capital to put these individuals into business. The program could provide incentive for private enterprise, make possible the establishment of a badly needed middle class. Such a plan would inspire confidence in the respective governments, for the people would see an interest being taken in their individual welfare. Loans of $5,000 or more to larger businesses would have to be approved by a committee of the Southeast Asia Development Corporation. An attempt would be made to have all loans secured, although they would be considered soft loans. The parent company of course would keep general supervision over the banks in the various countries, which in turn would be responsible to the World Bank, from which it got its money.

With the idea that the money is loaned and not given, such a procedure would help to maintain the dignity and self-respect of the borrowers. Moreover, *aid extended* to thou-

sands of "little fellows" would give hope to the underprivileged and develop local resources. The propaganda value of this kind of a program would be priceless. Moreover, such an enterprise would bring hidden capital out into circulation.

In 1958, I made a country to country survey in South East Asia with this plan, just described, and I found enthusiastic response everywhere it was explained. On my return to the United States, I met with Far Eastern experts in our State Department and discussed the plan with them. *Only now* do I see our Government taking steps to extend the Development Loan Bank idea. However, I am wondering if our Government will exercise sufficient care—or will they do it the easy way? Will they make loans to the large enterprises in the various countries and to governments? Will they miss making contact with the rank and file? The latter seldom receives anything from aid programs. This is the reason we are accused so often of just helping to make the rich richer, and at the same time open the door to dishonest practices in foreign government circles.

There is no doubt that a concrete program such as I have just outlined is now needed to capitalize on the revived feeling of goodwill towards America, generated by President Eisenhower's recent three-continent, eleven-nation tour. As Peter Edson, Washington correspondent, said, "This mission has been given free world acclaim as a great public relations achievement, which is important but not enough. To let it go as a personal triumph of the President or the Republican Administration would be to lose all the regained American prestige. The program which the President broadly outlines will call for an effort by every American to help some other human beings in other lands on a person-to-person, or personal sacrifice, basis. Already there is developing criticism that the Eisenhower mission promised more illusion than substance, that the official communiques in each country were merely affirmatives of old generalities."

If you will recall, back in the second half of 1947 when concentrated work first began on the Marshall Plan in Western Europe, it was doubtful if any real recovery in Western Europe was possible. Europe's collapse would have tilted the world balance in favor of communism. After twelve years we find Europe no longer on the threshold of catastrophe, but a Europe which has not only substantially recovered, but has passed its prewar productivity. A parallel situation now exists in relation to the so-called underdeveloped countries. The world balance is in jeopardy, and these countries need a rescue plan—a counterpart of the Marshall Plan. Today it is no longer a problem of East-West, but a North-South one. Therefore the situation presents a problem of equal importance to that of Western Europe twelve years ago.

While the International Development Bank is now coming into being and will undoubtedly make soft loans to the underdeveloped countries, it is not enough. A Southeast Asia Development Corporation idea, with subsidiaries in each of the Southeast Asian countries, which I have just outlined, might provide a practical plan into which we go wholeheartedly and see it through. I favor it because I see our Government has the tendency to make loans, or give-aways, with no strings attached, and we cannot expect these underdeveloped countries to be sufficiently organized for receiving such forms of help. In fact, it just isn't possible. Of course, it takes a great deal of finesse as well as courage on our part to say to these people, "We will give you the necessary aid, but on these terms."

In almost any underdeveloped country, and in many newly developed ones, there is a restlessness among the people. They have long lived in depredation, poverty, sickness and ignorance. They are not looking for political salvation, but economic deliverance—to put it simply, they want something to eat. And if we do not help them, the Soviet bloc will.

In fact, the Soviet bloc is pressing its economic offenses at a record pace and has nearly doubled the number of communist technicians in foreign countries in the past year. New figures disclosed by diplomatic officials show that Russia, Red China and their Eastern European allies have poured in $900,000,000 for long term development projects during the first ten months of last year. In 1958, the communist bloc pledged $1,029,000,000, and last year it was greater—*actually,* in the last five years the communist bloc has extended a total of $3,400,000,000 to the underdeveloped countries.

To be more specific, last year India received $420,000,000 from the Soviet Union. There are 1,000 Red technicians in India alone. Communist technicians are also elsewhere—Iraq has 220; Egypt, 655; Afghanistan, 800; Pakistan, 285; Yugoslavia, 380.

In extending help to these developing and underdeveloped countries, we should demonstrate that we are interested in them for their own sakes as members of the world community and not just concerned with keeping them from going communist. We need a specific program incorporating our aims —and it is no longer a problem of whether we should act more imaginatively or boldly, but how soon we can really get going.

As Paul Van Zeeland, former Prime Minister of Belgium, said, "It is for us a moral duty to help the underprivileged countries. It is in the line of our tradition, and it is in the spirit of our civilization." But the problem is so vast and so difficult that it is beyond the reach and the possibilities of any single nation. Then, too, the need is not to lend financial aid to these underdeveloped people, but to place them in a position to help themselves.

While our method of extending economic aid is of great consequence, it is equally important to assist these people in solving their tremendous literacy problem. This can be done at relatively little cost. Viewed on a world scale, three out of five persons cannot read or write. Mass ignorance is a weapon in the hands of the communists. The illiterate population of Asia and Africa indicate a great thirst for learning.

Illiteracy rates range from 98 per cent of the population in such countries as Afghanistan, Ethiopia and Yemen to almost

none in Japan. Generally, the industrial advancement, material prosperity, and responsibility of nations vary in direct ratio to the proportion of their citizens who can read and write. It is therefore incumbent upon Americans to seek to overcome this problem wherever it exists.

Fortunately, a Foundation for World Literacy has been established right here in Memphis. The object of this Foundation is to train experts and develop literacy sources to help overcome adult illiteracy in the United States as well as in the underdeveloped countries of the world. It proposes to teach the people of the world to read and write by utilizing recently developed mass reading and writing techniques, communicated by means of the radio, the printed word, television and the motion picture.

This system has already been developed and used successfully in a Memphis experiment. Starting its international program modestly in 1960, probably with one nation of low literacy rate, the Foundation will expand in foreign countries gradually.

The Foundation will abstain from propaganda and remain free of national, racial or religious sponsorship. However, it will co-operate, where possible, with existing overseas philanthropic agencies.

The literacy campaign in each nation will be conducted by native experts—men who have been trained at the Memphis headquarters of the Foundation.

My visits to many of the underdeveloped countries have convinced me of the urgency of such assistance if our economic aid is to be effective and we are to build a bulwark of strong, free men. Only as mankind becomes literate can we hope for the communication of ideas that can make for greater spiritual and lasting peace.

Therefore, steps taken towards the eradication of illiteracy among the dark-skinned former colonial people should go hand in hand with the seemingly more urgent contribution—that of proper handling of economic aid.

I have tried to show "tomorrow's world" will depend on whether the West heeds their responsibility of giving correct assistance in time to the newly freed and present colonial peoples. Or will the West allow these people to slide into the communist orbit by default? It seems inevitable to me that the course these noncommitted nations follow will determine the status of our future world—communist or free.

A DIP INTO THE FUTURE

By Lucius E. Burch, Jr.

Read at a Meeting of "The Egyptians," March 17, 1960

Anyone who attempts to talk about the future had better be able to cite his qualifications as a prophet. Alas, I have none—I was not born with a caul, have experienced no revelations, and have no followers who claim that I am gifted with a second sight. I have assumed the role as your conductor in a journey into tomorrow, principally because I yearn to go there myself and have an unutterable resentment against the impossibility of doing so, but I claim more than anger and imagination as a patent for my right to prophesy. There are generally recognized processes for making forecasts. For instance, if on some clear, spring day we watch the vapor trail of a jet as it crawls across the dome of Heaven, a trained observer with very simple instruments could make an informed guess at where the plane was going and about when it would get there. If he had more information about where it had taken off, its fuel reserves, and rate of fuel consumption, by eliminating places that it could not possibly go, could guess somewhat more accurately where it might be going. Such a method is, of course, subject to all kinds of errors. The plane might not continue on a straight line, but might alter its course; its throttles might be opened thereby increasing its speed but decreasing its range; or there might be errors in the accuracy of the tracking by the observer or in his making of the computation. Such errors, and others, are possible in this forecast or any other which seeks to infer a future condition from a known past. Some of the conclusions reached by the application of this method are offensive to the existing concensus of opinion. I can only say with Descartes: "All I say is by way of discourse . . . I should not speak so boldly if it were my due to be believed." To those not responsive to an appeal of philosophic nature, I ask you to imagine as being over my head the sign that used to be displayed over the piano

in the pioneer towns: "Don't shoot the piano player—he's doing the very best he can!"

Now, to see where we are going, let us see where we have been.

The chart displayed on the wall before you is a piece of adding machine tape twenty feet long. It denotes a very short period of the earth's history, the roughly one million years in which primates have inhabited the earth. If the chart were extended to indicate the more than three billion years of the earth's history, it would be, instead of twenty feet, more than twelve miles long. We hear a great deal these days about the explosive growth of population, and I intend to say a good deal about that, but we should first consider the explosive nature of our emergence as a species. The infancy of mankind is a matter of recent discovery. The exposure of the Piltdown skull as a hoax and the more recent and accurate datings using carbon[14] and oxygen[18] to date the geological periods in which the earliest remains of man are found give us an age of not more than 150,000 years. The black mark, only about fifteen inches from the terminal edge of the tape, shows the relative point in time when the species first had the power of conceptual thought and to reflect upon stored recollections. It was not until about 5,000 years ago that man had assembled the foundation stones for his later culture, such as learning the art of fire-making, the fabrication of stone and bone artifacts, and the development of language by which the experience of the individual could be communicated verbally and then in primitive forms of writing to other individuals. The red mark is at 5,000 years ago only an inch and a half from the terminal end of the tape. The manner of living did not vary greatly until about 200 years ago. The Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, and the Europeans, to the time of the Industrial Revolution, are characterized by more similiarity in their modes of life than by their differences. It is impossible to indicate visually on the 20 foot chart which symbolizes a million years the 200 year period in which all these changes occurred.

A great part of the men who have ever lived are now alive. Some say as many as one and five. This is of some significance to the infancy of the species but more significant as indicating the explosive growth of its numbers. During the years before to the recent emergence of agricultural cultures, men lived entirely as food gatherers, and something over two square miles of moderately fertile country is necessary to support a single person dependent upon this activity for a living. Indeed, the best estimates are that Great Britain did not support more than a few hundred inhabitants in the food gathering era. As recently as 3,000 years ago, when agriculture was first practiced, the population of Great Britain did not exceed a few thousand and it was not until after the Norman Invasion, or about 900 years ago, that the population reached a million. Here in the United States, the population has increased almost 80 times in a hundred years—from 20 millions in 1850 to over a 160 millions now. Stating it a different way, from the time of Christ to the year that DeSoto stood on the site of Memphis, or about 1600 years, the population of the earth had doubled. At present rates, the population of the earth will double in less than 50 years. And, now, please consider that the commencing figure which it took 1600 years to double was only 250 million, whereas, the population now, which will be doubled in the next 50 years, is 3 billion! Hence, I feel on firm prophetic ground in saying that the race will continue to increase for some time.

However, it does not follow that the Malthusian prophecy will come to fulfillment within the reasonably foreseeable future. The food supply is not the problem that many assume it to be. Merely by discarding animals as a food source and living on a vegetarian diet, which many peoples already do quite comfortably and healthily, the caloric availability can be increased sevenfold, as it requires an intake of 7 calories of vegetable energy to produce one calorie of protein. Astronom-

ical numbers of people can be fed by the cultivation of chlorella algae and edible yeast. But, even so, the population limit is not very far off. Metals are already in very short supply, and in the next generation, when our principal reliance will be on aluminum, magnesium, and titanium, and long before these abundant metallic substances in the earth's crust are exhausted, there will not be, even taking into account known supplies of fissionable material, anything like enough available energy to make these metals available by smelting and reduction on the scale which will be required for the 6 billion or so inhabitants of only 50 years hence.

If we assume any rationality for the community mind of the near future, widespread and rigid birth control is a necessity. We are told that "the pill" is nearly ready to emerge from the laboratories, and that there is little doubt that it will be perfected and widely used within the next decade. Some contraceptive method which is cheap, effective, aesthetically unobjectionable, is one of the most socially desirable things that can be imagined at this time. Although I am not ready to follow Aldous Huxley and predict future generations by the process of conditioned parthogenesis, I am reasonably certain that in time to come parenthood will be a very high privilege and, perhaps, the highest civic award bestowed on outstanding individuals.

I believe that there will be no war involving large nuclear weapons. History shows that people rarely engage in an activity that they know at the outset to be self-destructive. The story is told of the Swedish court, which I repeat here as a fable. In the sixteenth century, the Swedes were renowned through Europe as duelists. Some king, maybe Gustavus Adolphus, on ascending the throne, convened his court and praised the practice of dueling. "It is something to be generally encouraged," he said. "It makes our young men spirited, punctilious of their honor, and promotes skill in the use of weapons. We will have more duelling instead of less, but it will be of a less haphazard and more meaningful sort. Henceforth, our

duels will be fought with the contestants stripped to the waist, bound chest to chest by a leather belt, and each given a knife." With that, he took his tongue out of his cheek and went about his kingly business, since which time there has been no duelling in Sweden. It seems likely that with improved education, better means of communication, the inevitable destruction of all participants in war will be so generally understood as to be given an effective deterrent. Then, too, there is an increasing similarity in the world which will continue to progress with the democratic nations tending towards increasing collectivization and the younger nations, as they attain some measure of economic security, seeking more liberal personal privileges for their citizens, and thus the gap will narrow. Then, too, there must emerge some sort of a common government, not just to control wars and armaments, but made necessary by the complete annihilation of artificial limits of sovereignty. It will not be long before all nations are nuclear powers, and it is no longer a matter of national sovereignty if one nation releases strontium in its upper air currents that turns up in the vegetable patches of a nation half the world away. It is entirely foreseeable that a country like Iceland might wish to thaw out some of its ice cap, which might be entirely practicable with nuclear fuels, but that would hardly be a matter of local concern if it would put the canals in the Venetian parlors and breach the sea dikes upon which the Dutch depend for survival. Since it will become apparent that there are many areas of government which, by their very nature, can best be administered at supernational levels, there will emerge a supernational government with the constituent nations delegating such aspects of their sovereignty as by common consent they agree can best be administered at such level. Since the collective mind of man has thus far thought of no form of government by which a government of laws can be instituted among sovereign entities other than by a partial delegation of sovereignty, it seems safe to assume that such government will be in federal form.

Unless this prediction of a continued ability to avoid nuclear war is correct, there is not much need to speculate about the rest, because we may assume that even though a substantial part of the population survives such a catastrophe it must revert to a less complex form of society than we now have for the world can never recover from any very widespread and substantial interruption of our present industrial processes. Our industrial society evolved from the ready availability of plenteous resources. There was coal in wide seams near the surface, oil that could be reached with drilling equipment not much more elaborate than was needed for water wells, copper and iron greatly concentrated in native ores, and placer gold. These and other basic raw materials could be obtained simply and used to build a more elaborate industrial structure which, in turn, provided the complicated means of continuing to gather the raw materials when it became necessary to go 15,000 feet beneath the surface of the sea for oil and to refine ores containing so little of iron, copper, manganese, tungsten, and other necessary minerals that such ores would have been beyond our capacity to work even twenty-five years ago. Hence, if our present industrial organization is ever destroyed for whatever reason, it can never be rebuilt because the building blocks that can be used by people not having such an industrial organization do not exist.

If we survive the possibility of self-destruction, which I both believe and assume we shall, the world of tomorrow will be a very leisurely place. In only 80 years, the average work week has been shortened from 70 to less than 40 hours and automation is just beginning. There will be a multiplication of the service occupations, the professions, artists of all sorts, and those engaged in providing comfort, recreation, entertainment, information, and the like. Ultimately, this should be all to the good, but it brings with it much that now seems bad and the problems are already beginning to press upon us. Since there is already such a material similarity in our lives, there being no great disparity between the goods and services

available to the very rich and very poor, already there is an alarming trend toward stratification of our society which is emphasized by the search for status by which each individual seeks to distinguish himself and to associate himself with some status group of his choosing. Already the membership of any given church is composed of members of generally similar social and economic status. The same is true of housing and of neighborhoods. This stratification will become more rigid by the virtually complete elimination of the stepping stone jobs which were formerly available and by which it was possible for a person to progress from one economic and social level to another. Traditionally, it was possible for the ambitious and able laborer to become a skilled worker, then a foreman, then a manager, and perhaps even an owner. This was possible as lately as 25 years ago, but it is not possible today. Even now in the first years of automation the stepping stones have been abolished. Manufacturing procedure is carried out by automatic precision tools; one skilled toolmaker is more than enough to service the machines of an entire plant. The most efficient bookkeepers, those who run the IBM machines, need know absolutely nothing of the principles of bookkeeping. As Vance Packard well points out, there already exists but two levels of employment: the semi-skilled workers who run the machines, and the engineers, researchers, market analysts, and those involved in financing. The gulf between these two levels is even now impassable. This situation is permanently frozen not only by the nature of the processes involved but by labor unions creating fixed estates of employment by rigid insistence that men work only within their job classifications.

As horrible as this seems, it is not hopeless and there are even some encouraging aspects of it. When the operator of an IBM machine and Vice President in Charge of Sales have about the same amount of goods and services available to them and each has an abundance of leisure, they will try to distinguish themselves and earn a good opinion of their

fellow man in some way or other. The society may then bestow the highest civic kudos upon the products of mental creativity. I cannot believe that it would be a bad thing if the most highly regarded members of society were teachers, politicians, writers, scientists, painters, and musicians. When the possibility of economic distinction is so slight as it will become, it may well be that the interests and energies of the people will be pointed in those directions.

Another of the great problems which will be among those most difficult of solution is already being felt. It is the breaking down of the concensus of belief that has been the ethical mortar of our society. A short time ago, about there where you see the red mark on the chart, our species had approached a point where it had sufficient cerebral capacity to ask questions about itself. Our ancestors at this period, in common with all other animals, had a love of life and a reluctance to give it up. Then, as now, they were perplexed by their place in the world that surrounded them and about their fundamental nature. Some primitive philosopher, ventured the hypothesis of a soul—something within a man, yet apart from his carnal nature, which survived after him. The idea spread rapidly because it provided an answer for otherwise unanswerable questions and was extremely comfortable. There then emerged in every society men whose profession it was to minister to the soul and to define its nature. These early ministers, of course, require some authority and a host of deities was created. This early priesthood recognized the obvious psychological efficacy of the complementary forces of punishment and reward to the soul, one course of conduct insuring the perpetuation of the soul under pleasurable circumstances and the other resulting in its extermination or eternal damnation. These primitive religions differed widely as to the identity of the supposed supernatural being from which divine authority was derived, in methods of propitiation which ranged from abnegation of the world to tearing out the living hearts of maidens under the full moon. Gradually, as communication improved and as the great land masses were overrun by conquests and migrations, the religions became stratified until at present they consist principally of a few, differing greatly in the identity of the deity, his prophets and interpreters, in ritual and doctrinal matters, but all having more or less in common a belief in some divine authority and some degree of immortality of the soul which will be favorably or unfavorably affected by earthly conduct. For nearly two thousand years, a generally accepted religious ethic has prevailed in the western world, although the ethic which the numerous Islamic peoples hold is considerably less than half that old, and the religious ethic is breaking down everywhere for numerous causes. With increased education, means of communication, and the relaxing of a religious discipline which is impossible under such conditions, the basic stimuli of religious conduct, i.e., punishment and reward, no longer suffice. A real old-time fire and brimstone eternal damnation sermon which some of us remember, much relied on in earlier generations and excellently portrayed in Joyce's "Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man," would not be well received in many churches today, and the aspect of reward seems to be of diminishing importance, there remaining but few preachers who assert a literal interpretation of the scriptures relating to Paradise. The great trouble is that we have nothing to replace what we are losing and our society is frustrated by the urges of its animal nature, its ability to rationalize a desired course of individual conduct, and a sense of guilt from conflict with an ethic generally accepted but no longer certainly believed. There will emerge some new concensus of belief, some generally accepted ethic. Upon what it will be based, what will be its chief doctrinal points, or the standard of conduct, I do not profess to say, but it will be very different from ours. In only a generation, we have seen one of the principal sacramental observances of our religion, that is, matrimony, changed so that divorce, a rarity only 50 years ago, now occurs in nearly 50% of marriages and the rate is increasing. Our religious ethic regarding sex relations, crystallized in our

laws anciently enacted for the governing of such matters, is so completely unrealistic that the respectable and conservative Institute For Sex Research estimates that 95% total male population could at some time be prosecuted for sex law violation of one sort or another. The advent of "the pill," the elimination of venereal disease, and the less stable marital relationship may reasonably be expected to bring about some future ethical and legal change of opinion on this subject.

We are upon the verge of the greatest occurrence in the past or future history of our species. It has already commenced and had its beginnings in the minds of a few men who were willing to question whether or not death is the inevitable consequence of all life. The carnal immortalization of the individual appears, as problems go, to be not too difficult of solution.

In our own time, more apparently difficult tasks have been accomplished. For instance, when the youngest man at this table was in college, there was one proposition that could be safely stated. It was that all of nature was composed of combinations of something less than a hundred elements. Virtually all of these elements had been discovered and identified but the few that were undiscovered could be accurately described as to their weights and valences. There was nothing wrong with the analytical chemistry and the theoretical calculations that produced this conclusion. They were exactly right. What has happened is that we have manufactured, made, created, if you please, not discovered or found, many elements which exist no where in nature. To have suggested a generation ago that man could exceed the creativity of the Creator would have been scientifically ridiculous as well as heretical. The job was a big one, requiring the expenditure of billions of dollars and accomplished by assigning the best scientific brains of the generation to the specific task with the full resources of government behind them. The task of understanding and arresting the aging process appears to be simple compared to this. Nature, herself, furnishes clues.

Consider the interesting and rare disease of progeria. It occurs in babies normal at birth. It is first manifested about the end of the first year by loss of hair and a later slowing up in growth both in weight and height, although these remain in the zone of a normal child during the second or third year. Intelligence is always normal and generally above normal. Arteriosclerosis appears in these cases as early as the fifth year; arthritis occurs about the sixth year; the remaining hair becomes white and death usually results from coronary thrombosis at about 16 years. Blood chlorestrol is high, and autopsies always reveal advanced arteriosclerotic changes. Something happens in these cases to speed up the aging process so that the whole span of life is shortened into a brief period and the patient dies from senility before a normal child has emerged from adolescence. What causes this? If some natural disorder can make the clock run so fast, could not a contrary influence make it run slow, or stop it at a given point? No one yet knows the answer but a significant number of people are beginning to speculate and to seek. We have known for 30 years that the life stuff of which we are made can live forever—Loeb, among the first, working with the eggs of sea urchins; then Alexis Carrel and Ebeling, immortalizing the heart muscle of higher animals in a soupy environment of chemical nutrients. Just recently a British biologist, V. B. Wigglesworth, decapitated some insects in an early stage of development. This was followed by a rapid metamorphosis into the mature insect without going through the intermediate form. From this, he made one of those intuitive guesses upon which scientific progress so much depends. He deduced that the head of the insect must secret some hormone slowing up growth and that it was probably secreted by a very small gland, the corpora allata. Both of these guesses proved to be right and were confirmed when Dr. Carol M. Williams at Harvard University identified and isolated the hormone. This information first became generally known to lay readers about February, 1958. In February, 1959, Dr. Williams, and a team

partly financed by the U. S. Public Health Service, announced the isolation of the juvenile hormone in man. It has now been demonstrated in countless experiments that this hormone will completely arrest aging in insects. What will it do in man? When will it be synthesized? The answer to these questions is needlessly slow in coming because so many active and trained brains that could assist are conditioned to the inevitability of death and only the most meager funds are available. Last year in the United States we spent over a billion dollars in new brick and mortar to house ecclesiastical establishments to preach the immortality of the soul. A tithe of this properly available would hasten the attainment of carnal immortality that is sure to come. Probably not in our time, possibly not in our children's time, but certainly in their children's time this greatest of all development will occur and then begins the future.

You and I and all who have gone before us have aged in the same way. At puberty we begin to accumulate a fatty lining in our arterial system. As the lining thickened, the transfer of oxygen to the brain became more difficult and our mental efficiency started to deteriorate. This probably occurred in the early twenties, but certainly by the early thirties. Nevertheless, for a long time after that, our total mental output was greater than when our brain was working at peak efficiency because we gather and accumulate rather than make the ideas, the organization and arrangement of which is reflective thought. Thus, while our brain was deteriorating, we were accumulating more frames of reference and improving our intellectual circuitry. For a while, the weakening brain with better tools for thought out performs the stronger and more vital young brain but the result of the struggle is inevitable and aging of the brain sets in much earlier than we are prepared to admit. There are few of us past 40 who will commence to learn Russian, organic chemistry, nuclear physics, or many other things that even a tolerably educated person needs to know. Tomorrow it will not be like that. The

brain will not age and will retain its early vigor and efficiency indefinitely. Frames of reference will be accumulated over a much longer period and will accumulate in geometric progression within brains forever vigorous in their relationship and use. Such a brain will have available for its use the output of three billion such other brains, the best result of the best brain immediately becoming the intellectual furniture of every other brain. It is impossible to describe or even imagine the life that will result from such an intellectual proliferation for the conceptual material for imagining nor the terminology for description nowhere exists.

Gentlemen, as we look behind us along the short road which our race has come, we can say that we have come a little further up the slope and we have climbed more steeply than any who have gone before us but we are just emerging from the foothills. The steep climb towards towering pinnacles unsuspected and shrouded by mists of the future impenetrable even to the imagination is just about to begin. Gladly would I make the Faustian covenant with Mephistopheles to be allowed only the space of one millimeter beyond the terminal end of yonder chart, because then I know I would be among those climbers instead of being among the last of us unreprieved from the universal doom.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE GOVERNMENT MARKET

By Edward F. Thompson

Read at a Meeting of "The Egyptians," April 21, 1960

Mr. Howard Banker of C. J. Devine & Company, Cincinnati, specialists in U. S. Government securities, made an address several years ago on the same subject to a Bank Conference sponsored by the Memphis Clearing House Association. He later told me in preparing his talk that you "review the past developments in the market for about twenty minutes, spend about five minutes on current developments, and about five more minutes on the future outlook." Well, this subject encompasses more than I can talk about in about thirty minutes. But I ask your indulgence and bear with me.

Government obligations represent promises to pay on the part of the Federal Government. They are outstanding in larger amounts than any other class of investments, an amount that a comparatively few years ago would have appeared astronomical. They are secured by the same thing—the credit of the United States of America. The Federal Government has never defaulted in its history either on its principal or interest payments; nor is there any likelihood of default as long as the vast wealth of the nation provides a credit base of unquestioned integrity. These securities rank as the nation's highest quality investments, and it is impossible to envision any circumstances under which United States Treasury obligations would rate below state, local government, or corporate securities.

When we look back at the past history of the federal debt, the investor must realize that we face a different situation today than that prevailing before the 1930's. Prior to that date, long term borrowing by the Federal Government was resorted to[1] "only for purposes of financing" the succession of

[1] *"Investments" American Institute of Banking, Page 442.*

wars in which this country was engaged, the acquisition of additional territory, and the construction of the Panama Canal." The first debt was created by the Revolutionary War. Between wars there were substantial reductions in the federal debt, and at one time the debt was entirely liquidated. The government operated under a balanced budget that allowed the payment of interest and the repayment of the principal. Since the beginning of the fiscal year July 1, 1930, the Federal Government has operated under a balanced budget in only five of the past 30 years. "Deficit financing has become a habit—an established pattern which may be hard to turn away from and perilous to pursue too far."[2] There has been little effort to reduce the debt, in fact, more and more demands are being made upon Congress to provide additional expenditures for special groups.

The history of the public debt of the Federal Government is an interesting one. It is not our purpose here to go into this subject in a broad manner. The history previous to the 1930's was primarily to wage the succession of wars in which our country was engaged. At the beginning of World War I the Federal debt amounted to only $1,225 million in 1916, and rose to $26.6 billion by August 31, 1919. The government operated with a balanced budget during the 1920's and the debt was reduced more than $10 billion during this period, bringing the debt to about $16 billion by December 31, 1930.

The Federal debt rose rapidly during the depression years and reached a peak of $61.4 billion by November 30, 1941. These years included government spending for alleviating the depression, including unemployment relief, vast public works program, conservation work, and advances to distressed corporations and individuals through the RFC, FFMC, and the HOLC. After our entrance into World War II in 1941, every one is familiar with the public debt. Despite the imposition

[2]*"Investments" American Institute of Banking. Page 443.*

of heavy wartime taxes, the staggering costs of World War II added more than $205 billion for the five years ended June 30, 1945, and a total debt of $279.8 billion for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945. The debt has continued to rise in the post war period and now aggregates $290.9 billions as of December 31, 1959.

Composition of the Federal Debt

	December 31, 1945 (in billions)		*December 31, 1959 (in billions)*	
Marketable Issues:				
Treasury Bills	17.0		39.6	
Certificates of Indebtedness	38.2		19.7	
Treasury Notes	23.0		44.2	
Treasury Bonds	120.4		84.8	
Other Issues	0.2		7.1	
Total Marketable Issues		198.8		195.4
Non Marketable Issues:				
Savings Bonds	48.2		48.2	
Savings Notes	8.2		—0—	
Other Issues Publicly Held	0.5		0.7	
Total Issues Publicly Held	56.9		48.9	
Special Issues	20.0		43.5	
Total Non Marketable Issues		76.9		92.4
Total Interest Bearing Debt		275.7		287.9
Non-Interest Bearing Debt		2.4		2.9
Total Direct Federal Debt		278.1		290.8

The market on United States Government securities is limited to dealings in the marketable issues. The individual investor buys a United States Savings bond, Series E or Series H, currently available, because it is the safest thing that he can invest in. There is no market risk involved, for on the back of the bond the Treasury Department has a schedule of dollars that it will return for the Series E and he can redeem the Series H at par, provided he holds it for six

months and then gives the Treasury Department a thirty days written notice for redemption. The interest rate on these two issues now aggregate 3.75% when held to maturity with no market risk and no credit risk. The dollar he gets back may not have the same buying power as the dollars he invested. This factor alone has been a powerful deterrent to the entire savings bond program, especially in view of the sharp rise in the stock market and the inflationary impact of World War II and the postwar period.

Maturity Distribution of Marketable Federal Debt

Maturity Classification	*December 31, 1945*		*December 31, 1959*	
	Amount	*Percent*	*Amount*	*Percent*
Within 1 Year	$ 70.4	35.4%	$ 79.9	40.9%
1 to 5 Years	35.4	17.8%	61.6	31.5%
5 to 10 Years	33.0	16.6%	22.1	11.3%
Over 10 Years	59.8	30.1%	31.8*	16.3%
Total	$198.6	100.0%	$195.4	100.0%
Average length			4 Years 2 Months	

*Includes Investment Series Bonds

The increase in the percentage of Federal debt maturing within one year and within five years reflects the postwar policy of refunding with short term issues, the substantial deficit created within past few years, the imposition of the 4¼% ceiling on long term bond issues, the rapid rise in interest rates within the past two years, coupled with the passage of time.

The chief factor in the deficit of the past thirty years has been the unbalanced budget of the Treasury Department. The budget act became law in 1921, and the initial procedures have been improved from time to time. The fiscal year begins on July 1, and ends June 30. The President presents his budget message to Congress six months before

the fiscal year begins and therefore eighteen months must elapse before the fiscal year ends. As a result of this time lapse, the original budget estimates are always revised both at the beginning of and halfway through the fiscal year. The Budget Bureau usually assumes a level of economic activity current at the time. Therefore, the original estimates tend to understate receipts in the period of rising prices and increasing income and to overstate receipts in a period of falling activity. Expense items also may show wide variations from one estimate date to another. These variations may be caused by changed economic conditions, or by congressional action in increasing expenditures.

Fiscal Year	*1957*	*1958*	*1959*	*Estimate 1960*	*Estimate 1961*
Net Receipts	$ 71,029	$ 69,117	$ 68,270	$ 78,600	$ 84,000
Expenditures	69,433	71,936	80,697	78,383	79,816
Surplus or Deficit (-)	$+ 1,596	$- 2,819	$-12,457	$+ 217	$+ 4,184

Space does not allow us to detail the major items of receipts or expenses of the budget. Taxes are the main sources of income. National defense expenses are projected at $45.6 billion in fiscal 1961. The President pointed out in his Budget Message that "strategy and tactics of the United States military forces are now undergoing one of the greatest transitions in history."[3] Thus airplanes are being gradually displaced by missiles. These expenditures also represent the terrific cost of the Cold War, which is borne principally by the United States. However, the non-defense budget totals over $32 billion, led by interest charges $9,595 million, agriculture $5,628 million, and veterans services and benefits $5,471 million. Budget Director Maurice H. Stans last December mentioned some of the factors pushing Federal spending up:

"We spend great sums on interest charges on our national debt, but we do not reduce the principal.

[3]*"Business and Economic Conditions" — First National City Bank Bulletin, February, 1960, Page 17.*

"We carry on massive Federal programs which State and local governments could do better.

"We devote large amounts of money to farm price supports to reduce surpluses, with the opposite results.

"We lend money to benefit special groups at rates below those which the government must pay to its own creditors, when private sources could do the job.

"We perpetuate Federal programs which have long since met the objectives for which they were created."[4]

The high investment rating of Federal obligations is based upon the huge wealth of the United States and the ability and the desire of the government to control the money market and to manage the debt successfully. To substantiate the first point we only need to say that we accept the premise that United States Treasury obligations are "no credit risk" securities. In April, 1946 United States Treasury 2½% bonds of September 1972/67 reached an all time peak of $110, and plunged to an all time low of $78.75 in December, 1959. Although these dollar figures do not seem to be much, suppose you owned $10,000 of this issue, or $1,000,000, or $5,000,000, or $10,000,000? You can see the substantial depreciation in the value of your investment portfolio. What caused this tremendous fluctuation in government securities in a comparatively short period of several years? The answer may be given briefly and with considerable damage of oversimplification: a free money market.

The money market is not a market in the sense of being a meeting place and it is not like a stock exchange or a produce market. Transactions in any city or town may be said to be transactions in the national money market due to our central banking system and the highly developed systems of com-

[4]*"Business and Economic Conditions"—First National City Bank Bulletin, February, 1960, Page 18.*

munication. The money market is the composite result of the law of supply and demand as related to the country's money and credit. It denotes primarily short term riskless credit—hence its name, since short term riskless credit is about the same thing as money.

The price or interest (rent) paid for the use of money varies from time to time. If there is an abundance of money in relation to the demand for its use, money is "easy" and the cost for its use (interest) is low. If at any one time there is a scarcity of money in relation to its use, money is "tight" and the cost for its use (interest) is high. The rates of interest on short term United States Treasury offerings of new government securities can be affected by the supply and demand for money as well as by the purchases and sales of government securities by the Federal Reserve System.

To understand the money market it is necessary to study the basic forces in the nation's monetary and banking system which cause expansion (increase) or contraction (decrease) in the supply of money and to know how government controls affect the money market, especially what part is played by the Federal Reserve System in watching over this market and in preventing market fluctuations from becoming too violent. "The money market then is the national market for short term funds. Changes in the money market itself and in rates, supply, and demand for short term funds affect and are affected by changes in rates, supply, and demand for customer loans and for long term capital. Accordingly, the money market is a focal point of overall supply of and demand for funds in the economy."[5]

There are many participants in the overall money market. The commercial banks play a major role in the money market, but particularly the New York City and Chicago banks. They hold short term United States Treasury obligations in large

[5]*"Investments"—American Institute of Banking, Page 456.*

amounts and make short term loans to security dealers and others. Sometimes they are in the money market on the demand side when they borrow temporarily from the Federal Reserve Bank or when they purchase Federal Funds from other banks for the same purpose. Federal Funds is the term for excess reserve balances which are loaned to other member banks whose reserves may be deficient at the moment. Business corporations hold large amounts of short term government obligations, as well as life insurance companies, savings banks, foreign central banks, government security dealers, and other investing institutions.

The largest borrower by far in the money market today is the United States Treasury. United States Treasury bills are the most important money market instrument at the present time. The Treasury Department's operations relating to the government debt must be undertaken with appropriate consideration for the condition of the money market. In addition, the debt management decisions of the Treasury Department concerning the rates and terms for new marketable and non-marketable obligations in refunding, retirement, and new borrowing have a vital impact on the money market.

The Federal Reserve System plays the most crucial role in the money market as a lender of last resort, as a banker for the commercial banks, as fiscal agent for the Treasury Department, and as the monetary authority of the nation. Sometimes it plays a passive role as member banks borrow from the Federal Reserve Bank and sell government securities to it through dealers in adjustment of their reserve positions. At other times it plays a most active role, in an effort to ease or tighten the reserve positions of members banks, through the purchase or sale of government securities in the open market, changes in the discount rates, and changes in reserve requirements of member banks. Thus, the Federal Reserve System is in a focal point to influence the cost, supply, and availability of funds.

The monetary structure of the nation is affected by a number of items. Time or space permits only a brief mention of these items. They are as follows:

The reserve of the Federal Reserve Banks.

The reserve of the member banks—(increase in member bank reserves ease the money market, resulting in lower rates and a larger supply of loanable funds; decreases tighten the money market, resulting in higher rates and a smaller supply of loanable funds.)

Changes in the gold stock.
Changes in money in circulation.
Changes in Federal Reserve Bank credit.
  Holdings of United States Government securities.
  Loans, discounts, and advances to member banks.
  Float items.
Treasury cash and Treasury deposits.
The level of required reserves of member banks.
Excess reserves of member banks.

During the 1930's the excess reserves of member banks increased to very high levels, as banks did not have sufficient loans and investment outlets for funds due to the gold inflow which increased member bank reserve balances. These excess reserves were greatly reduced during the war years and in recent years they have been deficient at times. Excess reserves allow the member banks to increase their loans and investments without borrowing from the Federal Reserve Bank. For the most part, deposits are created through credit extension in the form of either loans or investments. Thus it is said that deposits are manufactured out of credit. The relationship between deposits and credit explains why changes in member bank reserve balances are so important a factor in the money market. Excess reserves of member banks provide the basis for the expansion of deposits. Thus the increased wartime deposits created in the banking system were made possible by the large existing deposit base-reserves, which in turn resulted

from the large gold supply. This increase in holdings of United States Government securities by banks during World War II with an increase in deposits was called monetization of the public debt.

During the 1930's, the Federal Reserve open market committee adopted the new objective of maintaining an orderly market for government securities. Later on during World War II, this policy led to support of the government securities market at a fixed pattern of low yields determined by the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve authorities. These rates were as follows:

Treasury bills (91 days)	3/8%
Certificates of Indebtedness	7/8%
Bonds up to 10 years	2%
Bonds up to 20-25 years	2½%

During the postwar period short term money rates were allowed to rise, but the Federal Reserve Bank supported the long term rate of 2½% through open market purchases. This support policy increased the reserve balances of member banks, and therefore the basis for a multiple expansion of deposits. Thus the Federal Reserve's policy of supporting the government bond market during this period of inflation tended to increase bank reserves and deposits when contraction of the monetary base for inflation appeared to be desirable.

The Federal Reserve System was criticised as being "an engine of inflation." A conflict developed between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System on this point, since the Treasury Department desired a continuation of relatively low interest rates. Finally in March, 1951, it was announced that "the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System have reached full accord with respect to debt-management and monetary policies to be pursued in furthering their common purpose to assure the successful financing of the

Government's requirements and, at the same time, to minimize the monetization of the public debt." As a result, the Federal Reserve finally withdrew official bids for governments, and prices were allowed to seek their own levels. The purpose now of the Federal Reserve System is to maintain an orderly market for government securities rather than support fixed levels and patterns of prices and yields in the market. "The Federal Reserve will be able to make a more effective contribution toward restraint of both further inflation of prices and further depreciation in the value of the dollar. Interest rates will go up and down more freely in response to the market, as demands for funds change in relation to their supply in the money and capital markets."

What has been the effect of these changes in monetary policies on the government market in recent years? There are a number of changes that have been wrought in the market. Interest rates have fluctuated more in respect to the demand and supply of loanable funds, and as a consequence the government market has fluctuated more widely than in many years. The high short term rates prevalent in the United States have attracted short term funds from many countries which have sought a safe haven in United States Treasury bills. This influx of foreign funds has helped us meet the postwar demand for loans and capital funds in the long term market. The Treasury Department has been hampered in its efforts to extend the debt through the 4¼% ceiling rate on bonds with a maturity in excess of five years. The problem of a balanced budget remains with us. Can we tighten our belts and pay our taxes and reduce our expenditures to have an excess of revenues to retire at least a portion of our staggering national debt?

XIII. LEARNING BY DOING: JOHN DEWEY

By Dr. A. P. Kelso

Read at a Meeting of The Egyptians," May 19, 1960

John Dewey (1859-1952), called by the Chinese the Confucius of the West, has been productive of theories for over fifty years. His philosophical metamorphosis, from the days of the Concord Summer School in the eighties to the verge of World War II, is more than the conscious adaptation of himself to the changing culture of America; the role he has played in America has been so active and effective that no other individual can be held to be responsible in an equal degree for the current situation. No political leader, no scientist, no popular novelist, can quite match his influence, and the tragedy of the situation lies in his mind's being basically a responsive, and not a creative mind. He has the uncanny gift, necessary for success in a democratic society, for gauging the coming new, national desires and making it easier to realize them, a gift essentially opportunistic, a fact disguised, possibly even to his own mind, by a stubborn insistence, all along the line, on maintaining certain irrelevant details.

Historically, Dewey was another poor New England youth, and according to him the people of the Vermont of his youth would not have recognized the Mellons and Hoovers as Americans; and the transfer from the atmosphere of the University of Vermont to that of the then recently founded Johns Hopkins University subjected him to a conflict of ideals. Hopkins was German in spirit as well as method at its start. Charles Peirce whose theory of logic underlies the one Dewey arrived at, later on, had little effect on him. Rather, he was caught in the struggle between G. Stanley Hall, the psychologist, and George Sylvester Morris, the philosopher. Hall, for whom any and all philosophy should be replaced by psychology, triumphed and Morris returned to Michigan, taking with him his protege, John Dewey.

Morris, whose studies were mainly in British philosophy, is responsible for Dewey's falling under the spell of T. H. Green, the greatest though least known of the Oxford Hegelians. Green's gospel of self-realization, with necessary social reforms to make such self-realization possible, has always been—I believe—a permanent element in Dewey's thought; also the objectified self, that is, a self-dedicated to a cause, is obviously the origin of a theory of thinking by which the problem, objective to the mind, creates new ideas. New ideas, obviously, are less difficult of attainment than a new self.

Then in 1894, Dewey transferred to the recently established University of Chicago where he became a member of the "Chicago School." The dominating idea of the group was that of Albion Small's "dynamic sociology," that a sociology can transfer a society. Such a claim means that the sociologist has abandoned the theory that the subject is a science, for science is purely descriptive, and presents sociology as an agency of reform. And reform means propaganda. Professor Tufts, the translator of Windleband's *History of Philosophy*, who admits that he himself was perhaps more active in community activities and maintained a greater faith in the function of the church in society, also contributed a leading thought: ethics itself is evolving; thus it is that the idealist doctrine of self-realization was acquiring new meanings. However, apparently it was not Tufts, with whom Dewey collaborated in producing the most influential of recent texts on ethics, who had the greatest effect on Dewey's mind; that honor belongs to George Herbert Mead who, as late as 1936, was surveying the *Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century*. Mead credits Dewey with a certain independence from James. Whereas they both agree, as good pragmatists, that the test of the truth of an idea, or hypothesis, lies in its actual working, Dewey has seen the need for instruments as well. Not merely tools and scientific apparatus, but ideas, equations, theories, become instruments.

The social aspect of science was another contribution of Mead, though with the presence of Veblen in the Chicago School, some might credit him with that item. Be that as it may, science in the modern world (that is, the universe as viewed from the keyhole of the University of Chicago) is to the modern thinker what magic was to primitive *shaman:* "We cannot brush our teeth without it"—science being now all pervasive. Hence Dewey's scepticism towards the effort of Royce to utilize religion, the creation of loyalty to a beloved community, as a solution of our ills; a scepticism also seen in Dewey who, for a generation, rebuffed inquisitiveness about the religious aspects of his philosophy, on the grounds that an individual's religion is a personal matter, and ignored religion until very late in his *Common Faith.*

No doubt this unduly simplifies the problem of John Dewey to see his thought as a conflict set up in his mind, between the mind of T. H. Green which he reverenced, and that of an ultra-empiricist like G. H. Mead; nevertheless, it enables us to understand the meaning of the step which he took. The old idealism had a logic of its own. If pragmatism was to save America, it too must have a *logic for use.*

This idea was reinforced by Dewey's own "plan" at Chicago, an experimental school on the campus where with the experts in physiology, psychology, sociology, and philosophy acting as observers, a pedagogic revolution, optimistically compared to the Copernican, could be realized. Some years ago, some of Dewey's feminine admirers called for contributions to preserve the building where the first progressive school was projected; the analogy and contrast with the little church at Ravenna is striking: like St. Francis, Dewey was able to win devotion to his ideas, perhaps for the same reason; that emotional minds can usually assimilate only one idea at a time. However, one must allow history to assess the new venture.

School and Society is what might be termed Dewey's manifesto. The attack on the then existing schools is that they are wasteful, aiming at the preparation of the one percent that receive a higher education; by the attempt to create individuals they destroy the natural social attitudes of children; most monstrous of all, in some schools, the desire to help a fellow in need, on an examination, is treated as a crime!

His proposals can be reduced to two. First, the creation of little socialists; second, the substitute of activities for studies. He does not make the extreme claim that the school creates society, but that it will regenerate it.

The principles of this "plan" are adopted from Froebel, and are three: 1) cooperation, interdependence, or adjustments "that will carry this spirit into overt deeds"; 2) instinctive, impulsive attitudes—expressed in play and games; 3) reproduction on a child's plans of mature living. And although in 1916, Dewey gathered his logic, his social philosophy, and his educational plan into one volume, the bible of the progressive educators, under the title of *Democracy and Education,* that was in itself but part of the harvest sown by *School and Society* which is to pragmatic education what Descartes' *Meditations* were to rationalism.

An example may make clear the distinction between the idealism that Dewey rejected and the instrumentalism he invented: for a Hegelian, the idea of *heat* immediately produces its antithesis, *cold.* This is synthesized as *temperature.* To an instrumentalist, these ideas are due to the experiences, uncomfortable and even dangerous, both of the weather and of objects such as fire and ice, and lead both to the mental construction of the scientific concept of heat and to the scientific instrument, the thermometer, an example showing the appeal of the new logic.

However, Dewey is no old-fashioned empiricist; his final label for his philosophy is neo-empiricism. The truth of the

matter is that he could not shake off Green whose introduction to Hume's philosophy is supposed to have demolished empiricism as such, once and for all. In his *Psychology* Dewey defined "thinking" as "knowledge of universal elements; that is, of ideas as such, or of relations." His observation of the child's development intervened, from the early Chicago years, and was modified until he reached the poistion of *Democracy and Education,* his own philosophy of education (1916). Since any "separation of the active doing phases from the passive undergoing phase destroys the vital meaning of an experience," his definition then becomes "thinking is the accurate and deliberate instituting of connections between what is done and its consequences."

In any controversy, if one enters it, the position of arbiter becomes steadily more difficult, so while Dewey aimed at a logic, useful throughout the intellectual enterprise, from the kindergarten to the research laboratory of the university, he was never as hard on the empiricists as on the idealists, for, in an article in the *Monist,* he declared nobody now takes the technical subject of formal logic seriously, unless here and there some belated "professor." The statement is unfortunately true, and the effect of the attitude is far-reaching. A contempt for logic is at heart a contempt for thought; it may even be a cynical attitude towards truth.

The great weakness in thus viewing thought as scheming is its failure to explain why a given situation constitutes a problem to certain minds and not to others. "Close to the question is the answer bound," said Goethe, a believer in the rationalist's dogma of self-evident propositions. Here one has apparently a reversal in thinking: the answer is expected to explain the question. Every answer will raise new problems, as Hegel saw; but can it ever replace that original inquiring mind? In other words, there are vast assumptions in Dewey's mind which he has carefully "repressed." His logic is part of the equalitarian myth that all minds are quick with life and

interest. The myriad tragedies of the American schoolrooms of the twentieth century are rooted in the passion to get results or answers to very partially conceived problems. As soon as a problem is intellectually conceived, it becomes a question, but attempting to eliminate the intellect as such, Dewey leaves man only in difficulties—unwilling and unable to think his way through.

Moreover, such a logic leaves philosophy with a very humble role. Since the philosopher is himself a product of a given environment, the child of a certain epoch, his attempt to generalize or universalize his opinions is absurd; and since it is the function of the various sciences to deal with facts, all that remains for the philosopher are the *values;* but since the economists and sociologists have devoted themselves to a study of human values for the past half-century, even here the philosopher's task is reduced to needing to produce the tentative hypothesis that may bring some order or intelligibility out of the maelstrom of conflicting ideals and beliefs in which we find ourselves. To become a professor is the tragedy of the American philosopher generally, for while the view of the American university as a system of ivory towers is absurdly inappropriate, the abnormality of the environment is certain.

Since in his ethics the various final ends or *summa bona* are presented and analyzed and tested by their consequences, Dewey knew that there was such a problem. Egoistic hedonism, the social hedonism of the utilitarians, the various forms, intellectual, romantic, voluntaristic, of self-realization—the glory of God or the happiness of men or man—are all open to pragmatic tests. But what is the pragmatic test of pragmatism?

Friendship, wisdom, beauty, courage, security, are immediate goods, not final goods. "There is no good in the large any more than there is truth in the large." The only end is the ending of the conflict about life; the scientific method and its universal adoption would bring men to such a peace

of mind. By this faith in human nature, springing largely from a typical American canonizing of the scientists, Dewey seems unaware that the present tendency of science is away from any and all teleology. Expressing it crassly, does any intelligent observer today imagine that science, even the science of anthropology, can promise national peace, much less world peace?

But how is this inquirer's mind to be liberated from his prejudice? Rationalism from the days of Plato had a specific answer; ideals will free minds. Dewey cannot accept such a preposterous faith; free inquiry will demand a collective test.

> In spite of science's dependence for its development upon the free initiative, invention, and enterprise of individual inquirers, the authority of science issues from and is based upon collective activity, cooperatively organized.

Such a proposition is that of a mind not very sure of itself. Athanasius *contra mundum* is replaced by Dewey *cum mundo.*

As far as his social program springs from the current thinking of social scientists, speaking in the voice of authority, it proposes nothing very different from socialism; no palliatives can give this scientifically inspired liberal true satisfaction.

> The cause of liberalism will be lost for a considerable period if it is not prepared to go further (than F. D. R. he means) and socialize the forces of production, now at hand, so that the liberty of individuals will be supported by the very structure of economic organization.

At best, he believes if academic freedom—to inquire, publish, and expose—is retained, a socialist state is our destiny. But will the socialist state allow such a dangerous freedom? His criticism of the New Deal was that it was "a coordinating and directing council" of representatives of big business, labor leaders, and government officials; and that had, for him, evil

consequences. It made the strong stronger. In lieu of that, his pragmatic scheme was to propose an alliance of all workers, farmers, and professional men to plan the over-due social change. He actually called for a new party, just before Roosevelt's election, and the one practical hypothesis, or plank in his platform, which, in a way, did come true was—national salvation through increased taxation.

Somewhat late in life, Dewey undertook to examine what his instrumentalism would do to art and religion. The Hegelian desire to answer all questions thus triumphs over the self-denying ordinance of free experimentation by free minds, and since, on his theory, questions concerning a first-cause or a final-end are self-defeating, Dewey's interpretation of religion cannot be metaphysical. The existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the absolute meaning of life are questions for which he has no answer, but he explains why we have the questions—the enlarging a series of experiences into an "imaginative totality." Bewilderment, fear, and curiosity have produced the ideas of Fate and Fortune, of Chance and Providence.

This is not much, but it does leave religion a contributory role in the coming social revolution. Religious faith is "the unification of the self," which is following James, though he does not accept the uniqueness, much less the supernatural quality of such a faith, as did James, because this unification is "through allegiance to inclusive ideal ends which imagination presents to us and to which human will responds as worthy of controlling our desires and choices."

The will controlled by the imagination is a fair, though novel statement of the pragmatist's first step, but he will never —one supposes does not desire to—arrive at the last step. Dewey's willingness to call this imaginary projection of ideals God, is a proceeding that his followers "can't take", and is excused on the example of Shelley, Paine, and Feuerbach.

The disciples of Dewey had already drawn the conclusions from his theory of experimentation and given us a formula, rather than a definition, for art: form follows function; largely ignoring them, Dewey undertook in *Art as Experience* his own application of his theory.

Moreover, since he never comes closer to defining art than to call it a quality of experience, it seems that he is content to examine the possible functions of art. The aesthetic experience is common to all animals; it can be seen in the wary glances, the sharp sufferings, the abrupt cocking of ears; at the lowest level of humanity, the life of the savage, much of which is "sodden", can be made "taut with energy", when the savage observes. The change in quality is our old psychological acquaintance, attention, and such a change is necessary to transform an experience into an interest. "Art is thus prefigured in the very processes of living." Thus art, through imagination, becomes the intensification of life. The patterns and structure of experience are projected by the artist into art. When excitement about subject matter goes deep, it stirs up a store of attitudes and meanings derived from prior experience." And since all emotion is either *to* or *from* some object, "expression is the clarification of turbid emotion." In this way, Dewey places himself among the romanticists and even endorses Croce's definition of art as expression. He really links it in with his educational and logical theories.

He has no difficulty in accepting objects as expressive, since he has organically united the self with its environment; however, those who see in all this a unique contribution reveal their ignorance of Hegel. In his old age Dewey has returned to his inspiration, though not as frankly as did Croce. Inasmuch as he follows Hegel in his denial of the dualism, so dear to the rationalists, between the substance and form of art, he is almost an Aristotelian. Critics in their blindness are separating what the artists have joined together.

He cites Galsworthy to the effect that art is "the imaginative expression of energy which through technical concretion of feeling and perception, tends to reconcile the individual with the universal by exciting in him impersonal emotion."

Thus art as much as science deals with things, but "art weds man and nature." The mood of art is submissive and proprietory while that of science is dominating and exploratory.

Paying his respects to art critics who often fail to realize their function in stimulating art and succeed only in crippling it, he returns to his original thesis that it can and does permeate all experience. He endorses T. E. Hulme's dictum that "art cannot be understood by itself, but must be taken as one element in a general process of adjustment between man and the outside world." To this extent, art will play its part in reconciling man to man. Presumably men who, through the influence of art, are thus adjusted to their environment will, since all men are parts of the environment of others, be reconciled to one another.

The *Common Faith* of mankind, to which he reduces religion, can be reached through transforming experience of life by the qualitative change of the aesthetic experience.

American pragmatism, like America itself, has been tested by historical events; in the final phase of Dewey's thought, this somewhat irrational optimism, so different from the rational optimism of the eighteenth century, or the irrational pessimism of the nineteenth, has been tested by the problem of war.

Consider Dewey's final message on *Freedom and Culture,* published on the verge of World War II (1939) after seven years of the New Deal which one of his colleagues at Columbia has labelled *The Third Revolution,* the others being the War for Independence and the War Between the States. He opens with a typical double-barrelled question: "What is freedom and why is it prized?" After a century and a half of constitutional government, according to Dewey, men are still asking what is freedom. The answer is not direct; it is pragmatic. Evaluation of freedom will determine its meaning; "did man ever care as much for it as we in this country have been taught to believe?" Given the choice of security or freedom, which will man choose? This implies that choice determines what is right—what he ought to choose. It is naively optimistic, a truly American faith. The problems Dewey will not face directly—the rising tide of class hatred in America, the impending struggle between Communism and Democracy in the world—are not susceptible of solution by good-humored tolerance, and the liberal in America is caught in a crossfire.

> The democratic tradition, call it dream or call it penetrating vision, was so closely allied with beliefs about human nature and about moral ends which political institutions should serve, that a rude shock occurs, when these affiliations break down. In other words the ideas and principles on which America was built are gone.

Just what is gone is not specified. Most men who think in this way want those ideas to go, and it is quite clear that Dewey places the ultimate authority in contemporary society.

This position might justify change on the ground that society has a hand in the changes, but it can never satisfy the out-and-out revolutionist who pins his faith on the state. Hence as an educator Dewey argues what is the totalitarian position, the right of the state to control the culture—i. e. "the control of the whole life of all its subjects by its hold over feelings, desires, emotions, as well as opinions," but attempts to save it from totalitarianism by this reliance on American society to act on and react with the state. He is no individualist; times have changed, as if time were a cause. Hence the freedom he aims at seems to be the freedom of society. Society can save us from a tyrannical government. How any observer can be-

lieve that American Society as a whole is superior to the American government is difficult to conceive. The social forces in American society focus into the government. There are elements, individuals and institutions, working in and attempting to redeem American society, but taken as a whole, the American people as master is not morally or spiritually superior to the American government.

Freedom of society, rather than the freedom of the individual, is the essential difference between America and Nazi Germany, or Communist Russia; culture-control, rather than military (political) control or political (military) control. "Culture as a complex body of customs tends to maintain itself. . . . Each culture has its own pattern (see Spengler, Toynbee), its own characteristic arrangement of its constituent energies." It transforms automatically or deliberately the "raw or original nature of those born immature."

Well, all of us are born immature; therefore, society makes us what we are. The American can never break loose from America; and all that personal freedom means is "freedom of cooperative individualities"—we can learn to live with and for others, and that is freedom. The proof offered for this view is that the meaning of freedom varies with the "different culture contexts"—I should say social structures. In Jefferson's America the farmers were the exponents of the new freedom; in the England of the same era they were the chief reactionaries. Culture, the central concept of anthropology, explains such apparent paradoxes.

THE EGYPTIANS

PROGRAM

YEAR 1960-1961

1960

Oct. 20—The Mule and The Hoe—Disappearing Partners
DR. W. C. LASSETTER

Nov. 17—Japan Resurgent
DR. C. B. WEISS

Dec. 15—Tobacco and The Body
DR. THOMAS N. STERN

1961

Jan. 19—Experts and Specialists
THOS. F. TURLEY, JR.

Feb. 16—The Nature Of Prejudice (Review)
ARTHUR MCCAIN

Mar. 16—Man in Space Flight—Some Psychological and Physiological Considerations
DR. T. S. HILL

Mar. 21—Fiftieth Anniversary
DR. ANDREW HOLT
President, University of Tennessee

Apr. 20—Leadership in Industrial Management
DR. RALPH HON

May 18—Economics of the Deep South
DR. MCD. K. HORNE, JR.

THE EGYPTIANS

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS
YEAR 1959-1960

Officers

Dr. Ralph C. Hon.....President
John F. Moloney.....Vice-President
Hubert Garrecht .....Secretary-Treasurer

Honorary Members

Rabbi W. H. Fineshriber
Dr. Charles E. Diehl

Members

Walter P. Armstrong, Jr.
Lucius E. Burch, Jr.
Gen. W. A. Danielson
Dr. John E. Farrior
Frank Faux
Hubert Garrecht
Wesley Halliburton
Francis G. Hickman
Dr. T. S. Hill
Dr. Ralph C. Hon
Paul K. Honey
Dr. McDonald K. Horne, Jr.
Dr. A. P. Kelso
Dr. W. C. Lassetter
Ed Lipscomb
Arthur W. McCain
John F. Moloney
I. L. Myers
Clark Porteous
Dr. Peyton N. Rhodes
Willard W. Scott
Dr. W. Likely Simpson
Dr. Neuton S. Stern
Dr. Thomas N. Stern
Edward F. Thompson
Thomas F. Turley, Jr.
Dr. C. B. Weiss
Dr. Marshall Wingfield
W. A. Wooten

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

As Amended to May 31, 1960

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 $2.25 (or such an amount as shall be determined from year to year) per meeting for each guest.

THE EGYPTIANS record with sorrow the deaths of Members during the year:

Charles G. Henry, April 8, 1959
Gilmer Richardson, May 27, 1959
George Awsumb, Nov. 24, 1959
I. L. Myers, Sept. 23, 1960