

**THE
EGYPTIANS**



**1961-62
YEAR BOOK**

**THE
EGYPTIANS**



**1961-62
YEAR BOOK**

THE EGYPTIANS

YEAR 1961-62

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Historical	iii
Constitution and By-Laws	iv
Officers and Members, 1961-62	vii
Program, 1962-63	viii
Enemies of Books C. LAMAR WALLIS	1
Living to One's Self WESLEY HALLIBURTON	17
The European Common Market and the American Economy W. A. WOOTEN	33
Roark Bradford: The End of a Literary Tradition JOHN E. FARRIOR	49
The Changing Religious Scene—New Wine, New Bottles? FRANK E. FAUX	65
Our Agricultural Blessing: Opportunity or Problem RUDI E. SCHEIDT	77
Ethics in Business HUBERT GARRECHT	101
Evolution of Human Nature O. H. ALDERKS	113

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.

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

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS

YEAR 1961-62

Officers

Arthur W. McCain.....President
Willard W. Scott.....Vice-President
John F. Moloney.....Secretary-Treasurer

Honorary Members

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

Members

Otto H. Alderks	Dr. A. P. Kelso
Walter P. Armstrong, Jr.	Ed Lipscomb
Dr. S. J. Buckman	Arthur W. McCain
Lucius E. Burch, Jr.	John F. Moloney
T. Herbert Darnell	Clark Porteous
Dr. John E. Farrow	Dr. Peyton N. Rhodes
Frank Faux	Rudi E. Scheidt
Hubert Garrecht	Willard W. Scott
Dr. Henry B. Gotten	Elder L. Shearon, Jr.
A. Arthur Halle, Jr.	Dr. Neuton S. Stern
Wesley Halliburton	Dr. Thomas N. Stern
Francis G. Hickman	Edward F. Thompson
Dr. T. S. Hill	John H. Todd
Dr. Ralph C. Hon	Thomas F. Turley, Jr.
Dr. McDonald K. Horne, Jr.	C. Lamar Wallis
Dr. Paul T. Jones	Dr. C. B. Weiss
	W. A. Wooten

THE EGYPTIANS

PROGRAM

YEAR 1962-63

1962

October 18—Laws and Semantics
DR. NEUTON S. STERN

November 15—Cuba: Failure of American Foreign Policy
JOHN F. MOLONEY

December 13—The Challenge of Survival for the Air Transport
Industry
WILLARD W. SCOTT

1963

January 17—Aging—A Review and Speculation
DR. S. J. BUCKMAN

February 21—Federal Aid to Higher Education
DR. PEYTON N. RHODES

March 21—Memphis Politics—Past and Present
CLARK PORTEOUS

April 18—Wine and Vine—an Appreciation
A. ARTHUR HALLE, JR.

May 16—Thermo-Nuclear War
T. HERBERT DARNELL

ENEMIES OF BOOKS

By C. LAMAR WALLIS

Read at a meeting of THE EGYPTIANS, October 19, 1961

When I was comparatively young in my profession of librarianship, the president of my library board, who was a discerning book collector, took great delight in presenting me with a pamphlet entitled "Librarians as Enemies of Books."¹ I recall how my good friend and counsellor gleefully pointed to a quotation in this little pamphlet in which a gentleman of the New York Public Library wrote scathingly of "librarians who mutilate books with embossing stamps or rubber stamps, write upon and muss the title pages, cut open leaves with scarred and ragged edges, write class-marks with white ink on the backs of the bindings, and do with them as one librarian said, 'We fix our books so they will not be of use to anyone else.'"

I hasten to say that the enemies of books whom I have in mind on this occasion are not librarians, guilty though they sometimes are, nor do I propose to discuss the controversy over whether today's librarian should be bookman or administrator or an ingenious combination of both.

Perhaps the saving grace of librarians is that they can sometimes laugh at themselves. A few years ago there appeared a pamphlet alleged to be the work of a librarian living in the eighteenth century named Jared Bean. This literary hoax, entitled *The Old Librarian's Almanack*, later was discovered to be a spoofing of the library profession by some of its own practitioners. Jared Bean knew who the enemies of books were in his day, but among them he obviously did not include himself. His own good judgment in selecting books he set forth in the couplet:

¹ Randolph G. Adams, "Librarians as Enemies of Books," published in *The Library Quarterly*, July, 1937, p. 317.

Yourself must judge the books you buy
And let the vulgar rabble cry.

After careful selection of books came the question of who should use them:

Better the Library be clos'd
Than to the ignorant expos'd.

Among the enemies of books Jared Bean considered those who kept the library's treasures the chief offenders:

Lend not your books to learned men,
If you would see your books again.
In any land where I am king
Who steals a book has got to swing.
And he who marks or tears the leaves
A wholesome flogging he receives.
On gallows fifty cubits high
Hang the wretch and let him die,
A dozen of my books he stole,
May God have mercy on his soul!

Courtesy in libraries had its place, but Bean warned first of all of vigilance:

Tho' spiders build across the shelf,
Admit no others but yourself.
Let no intruders put your ease in doubt,
Lock fast the doors & keep the rascals out.

Other enemies of the librarian's peace of mind are the bookworm, the silverfish, the cockroach, too much humidity, not enough humidity, too much sunlight, dust, mildew, mice, and a thousand other things, but Jared Bean was most concerned with the cockroach:

The agile bookworm eats, concealed from sight,
Also the prowling mouse abhors the light,
But be assured Philobiblos knows,
The hellish Cockroach is the chief of foes.

While books find enemies among all the persons, insects, and climatic conditions enumerated by Jared Bean, I am persuaded that their greatest enemy through the ages—and certainly in today's unsettled world—is the misguided group or individual in our society whom we designate by the unpopular term “censor.” If we set out to find a censor by asking the question, “Do you believe in censorship?,” we should undoubtedly uncover no one, for there is almost none today who will answer that question in the affirmative; but if we set out to find those who are willing to “protect” their less fortunate neighbors from “questionable” writings, we should discover this species in abundance. The self-appointed guardians of the nation's moral and political health are flourishing today in greater number than at any period in our history, for it is in times of great international tension that these pressure groups seek to enforce their special point of view. Whereas our own city of Memphis has been relatively free of the more vicious types of censorship, cities and towns all over America, from San Antonio to New York, have seen their libraries raided by the zealous and the ignorant, the well-meaning and the destructive, the blind and the half-learned.

The freedom to write, publish, and read books is so closely bound up with freedom of speech that a brief look at man's struggle for such freedom in the English-speaking world would seem appropriate at this point. Freedom of speech—or the lack of it—in England in the 16th and 17th centuries was closely associated with religious persecution. Of the hundreds who defied the authorities during the dark days of suppression under the notorious Star Chamber, perhaps the most persevering and heroic was John Lilburne. Printers were licensed by the Star Chamber, and licenses were swiftly revoked when anything offensive to current religious and political thought appeared. John Lilburne printed Puritan books in Rotterdam and was promptly clapped into prison in England in 1637. For the next twenty years Lilburne

was alternately in and out of prison for his constant defiance of the laws forbidding free speech. His persistence in openly defying what he knew to be unjust suppression is still an inspiration to freedom-loving men everywhere.

In 1644 John Milton defiantly printed his *Areopagitica*, the most often quoted passage of which reads:

And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to mis-doubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter. Her confuting is the best and surest suppressing.

Milton was not molested by the government for his boldness, and his brilliant protest appeared to go for naught in his own time. It was later generations who discovered the soundness of his views and used them so often to defend freedom of the press.

Another radical of the times was Algernon Sidney, whose *Discourses Concerning Government* "implied government by the consent of the governed," "tolerance of dissent," and "belief in human progress through inquiry and through free dissemination of knowledge."² In 1683 Sidney was tried before Lord Jeffreys, who declared: "This book contains all the malice and revenge and treason that mankind can be guilty of." Sidney's last words on the scaffold might well be considered in our times: "This is an Age which makes truth pass for Treason."

The struggle in England went on until 1694, when Parliament finally refused to re-enact the law licensing printing. At the same time the American colonies were suffering under an equally heavy hand of state censorship. In 1733 a New

² Julian Boyd, "Free Communication—An American Heritage" in *Freedom of Communication*, edited by William Dix and Paul Bixler, Chicago, 1954.

York printer named John Peter Zenger accused the colonial governor of New York of corruption in office. Through the columns of his *New York Weekly Journal*, Zenger dared to print what many knew to be the truth. At Zenger's trial in 1735, a famous precedent was set when the court was persuaded by a Philadelphia lawyer to allow the case to be decided on the question of whether or not Zenger's charges were true. Up to that time it had been considered a crime to criticize the government regardless of whether the charges were true or false. Since it was simple enough to prove the truth of the statements about the governor, Zenger was acquitted and freedom of the press had its legal precedent in America.

Following the Zenger case many dates in American history signify important steps both for and against this fundamental freedom. The Bill of Rights in 1791 made the foundations for freedom of speech and press secure, while the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 again threatened freedom. Thomas Jefferson in the years that followed said and wrote much to strengthen these fundamental freedoms, but by the time of the Civil War the lesson had not been fully learned. Under the Conspiracy Act of 1861 thousands were arrested and imprisoned without trial for writing or speaking their minds. World War I brought on such a hysteria that some 877 persons were convicted for publishing and speaking thoughts that were deemed contrary to the best interests of the government. In 1919 Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes enunciated his famous "clear and present danger" doctrine, which remains a landmark in the history of free speech. With World War II came another wave of hysteria, and today in the midst of international crises we still find freedom to read threatened throughout our land.

Until recent years the commonest form of censorship was that brought against the so-called obscene book. It is, and always will be, a troublesome question. Moral censors range all the way from the parent wishing to protect her

young to the religious fanatic who would protect everybody. Just about every important book has at sometime, somewhere, been the object of a censor's wrath. The Bible has been most often banned or censored, while important literary creations such as Homer's *Odyssey*, Shakespeare's *Plays*, Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter*, Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*, Mark Twain's *Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Dreiser's *American Tragedy*, to name only a few of many hundreds, have been banned at one time or another.

The moral censor, like the political censor, will never admit that the work in question did him harm, but he will quickly express his concern over what it may do to people without his maturity or understanding. He is unwilling to give his fellow readers credit for the good sense which he exercised in either accepting the raw portions of the book as representative of the seamy side of life or rejecting the book as offensive to his sense of decency and returning it to the shelf unfinished. The flaw in his reasoning is in thinking that the portions of the book which are shocking to him will do actual harm to someone else. He seems to forget that people are not compelled to read whatever they find on library shelves—that any person is free to reject whatever offends his good taste.

Those who would protect the young from some of the more shocking adult books do not take into account the fact that the young are bored by such writing and reject it themselves, or if they understand it, are usually ready to absorb it without injury. Young adults often know more about the shocking side of life than their elders suspect and usually take such writing in their stride without being either disturbed or impressed. Most of them ignore it for the wholesome books written on their own interest level.

The fourth proposition of the "Freedom to Read" statement published by the American Library Association and the American Book Publishers Council reads in part as follows:³

The present laws dealing with obscenity should be vigorously enforced. Beyond that, there is no place in our society for extra-legal efforts to coerce the taste of others, to confine adults to the reading matter deemed suitable for adolescents, or to inhibit the efforts of writers to achieve artistic expression.

To some, much of modern literature is shocking. But is not much of life itself shocking? . . . Parents and teachers have a responsibility to prepare the young to meet the diversity of experiences in life to which they will be exposed . . . taste cannot be legislated; nor can machinery be devised which will suit the demands of one group without limiting the freedom of others . . .

The basic test of obscenity before the courts is whether or not the book in its entirety is obscene. Words and passages lifted out of context, while they may be offensive, do not prove that the whole work is pornographic. Some of the world's greatest literature would be banned if isolated portions could be used to prove the whole intent of the work. A further test of obscenity was provided as recently as 1957 when Justice Brennan of the United States Supreme Court, writing the majority opinion in the Roth and Alberts cases, said the test of obscenity is "whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest."⁴ While this "community standards" concept, when wisely applied, has benefitted the cause of intellectual freedom (it was applied in the *Lady Chatterly's Lover* case against the Post Office), there is some cause for concern that

³ Prepared by the Westchester Conference in May, 1953.

⁴ Donald E. Stout, "Intellectual Freedom Landmarks: 1955-1960," *Library Journal*, June 1, 1961, pp. 2035-42.

it is, in the words of Justices Douglas and Black, "too loose, too capricious, too destructive of freedom of expression to be squared with the First Amendment." By this test it is conceivable that a book might be ruled obscene in Memphis but not so in San Francisco, or vice versa.

Another landmark of recent times was a decision of Federal Judge Palmieri in 1958 when he declared that a collection of erotica and sexualia from abroad was not obscene because it was to be used by scholars at the Kinsey Institute for Research. One sentence of his decision said, "What is obscenity to one person is but a subject of scientific inquiry to another."⁵ This new test of who is to use the material and the purpose for which it is to be used may add to the legal confusion. While a social scientist was allowed to bring in a copy of Henry Miller's long-banned *Tropic of Cancer* from abroad, one wonders whether a graduate student in English might have been allowed to do likewise, or a college freshman, or one of us around this table who might have wanted it for his own private library.

Of some comfort to libraries was the U. S. Supreme Court decision in 1959 which held that a Los Angeles book dealer Eleazar Smith could not be held criminally liable for possessing an obscene book whether he knew its contents or not. Librarians can sympathize with Mr. Smith since they, too, are unable to read every book that comes into their collections. The ruling of the Court that such a requirement would tend to restrict the public's access by limiting the bookseller to selling only those books which he was able to inspect gave librarians some hope in the maze of rulings on obscenity.

One more decision on obscenity and then we shall turn to political censorship. In 1957 U. S. Supreme Court held that a Detroit book dealer named Butler did not have to restrict his books to those which would not, in the language

⁵ *Ibid.*

of the Michigan statute, "incite minors to violent or depraved or immoral acts." The Court went on to say that "the incidence of this enactment is to reduce the adult population to reading only what is fit for children" and commented further that "this is to burn the house to roast the pig."⁶ Following this decision many states had to re-examine their own obscenity statutes to see whether they might stand up under similar challenge.

While the problem of the obscene book has been steadily increasing during the past quarter century, the type of censorship generally referred to as "political" took a rather sudden upswing immediately after the close of World War II. This rapid increase in political censorship has been gravely watched by librarians and library boards as the pressure against non-conformity has gone to such ridiculous lengths as the urging by a textbook commission member that Robin Hood be removed from school texts in one state on the grounds that his robbing the rich and giving to the poor incited to Communism. At the same time it was urged that the mention of Quakers be deleted from texts since they did not believe in fighting wars. In Alabama a state legislator wanted to remove a children's book from the State Library because it told of white rabbits who were married to black rabbits! If all political censors were so naive as the textbook man or the legislator, the danger would not be great; but the cold facts are that some of the best intentioned and best thought-of people in our communities are among the ranks of the political censors. Driven by the fear that they may lose their present way of life if men are left free to read what they please, many people in our land have turned to suppression—or "protection," as they would prefer to call it—as the answer to strange ideologies. Turning their backs on a fundamental

⁶ *Ibid.*

concept of democracy—"that the ordinary citizen, by exercising his critical judgment, will accept the good and reject the bad"⁷—they set themselves up as judges of what their fellows may be allowed to examine for themselves.

The first three propositions of the "Freedom to Read" statement of librarians and publishers bear directly on the question of allowing people to read books which set forth controversial ideas:

- 1) It is in the public interest for publishers and librarians to make available the widest diversity of views and expressions, including those which are unorthodox or unpopular with the majority.
- 2) Publishers and librarians do not need to endorse every idea or presentation contained in the books they make available. It would conflict with the public interest for them to establish their own political, moral or aesthetic views as the sole standard for determining what books should be published or circulated.
- 3) It is contrary to the public interest for publishers or librarians to determine the acceptability of a book solely on the basis of the personal history or political affiliations of the author.

A book should be judged as a book . . . No society of free men can flourish which draws up lists of writers to whom it will not listen, whatever they may have to say.

Much has been made of the fact that some authors joined organizations in the '30s and '40s which came under Communist influence or domination. To understand this tendency we must recognize that authors are creative people who are likely to be attracted to groups who protest the *status quo*. But because they are creative and gifted with a superabundance of originality, they are most likely, also, to recognize any attempt to dictate what they should think. It was

⁷ "Freedom to Read," American Library Association, 1953, p. 3.

natural, then, that when the Communists began taking over the "liberal" organizations and handing down the line which all should follow, most of the authors withdrew in protest at such regimentation. Yet there are censors who would burn or label the books of authors who belong, or once belonged, to organizations suspected by anyone of being subversive, regardless of the time of their membership or their reason for joining. But even though an author knows exactly what he is doing in belonging to subversive groups, and even though the organization is truly dedicated to the destruction of our form of government, this author's books especially ought to be on library shelves; for he is the man whom we *must* read, and read very carefully, if we are to survive the struggle for men's minds. Not to read this author in particular is to bury our heads in the sand.

The enemies of books fall into three broad types, according to Robert J. Blakely of the Fund for Adult Education.⁸ These he classifies as the intellectual zealot, the anti-intellectual, and the ignorant:

The intellectual zealot has the Truth but does not have confidence that Truth can win—in a fair fight. He speaks for God but does not trust God to speak for Himself.

He claims to seek the welfare of man but would keep man "under a perpetual childhood of prescription."

Zealots must have the Answer. The Answer may change dramatically from Black to White, but the tentative grey remains unendurable . . . Another characteristic of the zealot is his perennial suspicion of the free intellect. The zealot cannot understand those who are capable of sustained worry . . .

⁸ "Threats to Books," *ALA Bulletin*, October, 1952, p. 291.

The non-intellectual anti-intellectual, like the intellectual, zealot, is never in doubt. Doubt is a stigma of weakness . . . (He) is intolerant of mistakes. He is impatient with the suspension of judgment. He is grandly scornful of the idea that there is or ever was a problem incapable of simple and immediate solution . . .

Because life is so simple and because his opponents' motives are so vile, the anti-intellectual brands a mistake—defined as an action with which he disagrees—as treason . . .

The third enemy of free communication is the ignorant. He is passive rather than active, played upon and exploited by the zealots and the anti-intellectuals, but capable of being aroused to brief spurts of violent exertion.

Blakely also speaks of the "triple fallacy of those who would curb free communication in a free society—first, that the curbers can be trusted, second, that the ability to choose wisely can be promoted by a narrowing of the knowledge of alternatives, and third, that the American people need such protection."

While the enemies of books keep saying that they are aiming at the communicator—the writer—their target is actually the reader, for it is he whom they consider dangerous, who cannot be trusted to recognize what the author is saying. They refuse to believe that our American democracy is based on a faith in man, in his ability to choose the correct over the incorrect, the good over the bad. They refuse to recognize that the "knowledge of good is inextricably involved with the knowledge of evil" and that even an occasional wrong choice can add to man's education.

The greatest danger from the efforts of these enemies of books today lies in the probability that many writers who have a unique contribution to make to human knowledge will be coerced into silence. So strong has become the pressure

against any expression of the idea which goes counter to popular opinion that a potential Jefferson or a Woodrow Wilson may remain mute rather than face the intolerance of the arbiters of moral and political opinion. A distinguished justice of the Texas Supreme Court once spoke to this point before the "Friends" of the Galveston *Rosenberg* Library, which I had the privilege of serving from 1947 to 1955, and I cannot refrain from quoting one paragraph here:

How can politics progress, if every Cicero must hide his republican views for fear of the prevailing absolutism, or of the good editor of *La Prensa* or writers behind Iron Curtains must write only in favor of, and not against, that which they know to be evil—if John Stuart Mill is not free to write on liberty—if Tom Paine cannot publish his *Common Sense*, or Voltaire or Rousseau be restricted to essays or odes glorifying the *status quo*? How can philosophy or morals be dynamic, if every Socrates must drink hemlock, if Horace and Juvenal must restrict their satires to that which all their contemporary world would agree to despise, if Hawthorne must suppress his *Scarlet Letter* out of respect for the holy memory of pious bigotry?⁹

Every day the timid ones in our society raise the question about the risks involved in allowing free men to write and read what they please. The timid would believe in free speech, they say, if it were not for the occasional fellow who may fail to distinguish between truth and falsehood; and so to protect this rare individual who can be misled, this exception to the rule, they would impose a censorship on us all. We can only answer that the danger of stifling original thought outweighs the risks associated with liberty. We can only remind the timid that democracy is a dangerous form of government, that it is for bold men, and that those who

⁹ W. St. John Garwood, "Free Speech and the Public Library," *Library Journal*, July, 1952, p. 1131.

are most secure are least free. Judge Learned Hand made a bold statement of this risk in an address before the Board of Regents of New York State: "Risk for risk, for myself, I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust, which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry."¹⁰

There is no doubt that some risk is involved, but we stand to lose something infinitely more important if we refuse to take that risk. So long as free men think strange thoughts and dream new dreams and are left free to express these thoughts and dreams, just so long will the bounds remain limitless for the human spirit.

¹⁰ Judge Learned Hand, "The Future of Wisdom in America," *Saturday Review*, November 22, 1952, p. 8.

LIVING TO ONES SELF

By WESLEY HALLIBURTON

Read at a Meeting of "THE EGYPTIANS," Nov. 16, 1961

When a child is born it cries and this cry is the cry of loneliness. To appease this loneliness has been life's aim. The cumulative gregariousness we manifest as we develop is an attempt to escape from this inherent loneliness and to the degree that we do escape it, depends on our happiness.

All animals know by instinct that the principal business of life is to enjoy it. Man, in that dim past, by some quirk in nature, developed a super intelligence. This was, perhaps, unfortunate, since, as he grew wiser he must labor harder and enjoy life less. Now, he is his own slave.

This is the short history of Homo Sapiens. Probably, I should end my paper here, but then there wouldn't be much to argue over.

We must define "enjoyment" as experiencing something pleasing to the Ego. The animal will not do anything that is unpleasant to it of its own volition. Man will. He has developed a great selectivity too, and in his enjoyments one man says: "My greatest enjoyment is fishing" while his friend may reply: "My greatest enjoyment is eating them." So it evens up, provided one does enjoy something, and most of us do.

In all cases "enjoyment" is an ant-acid to a sour disposition, and without enjoyment one's attitude towards life is likely to be sour.

The day will come, however, when the fisherman can not fish and his friend may require a blander diet than fried perch, and the question becomes: "What will poor Robin do then?" The theme of this paper is to discuss the answers to this question.

This is more or less a subject for the trained philosophic mind but we are all philosophers, even though we may never have heard of Plato, but we may lack the ring of the philosopher's fine words and the depth of his searching mind. The lives of the multitudes who have gone before have left no answers, and there are as many ways to live as there have been elderly people. My discussion will consider only a certain class of minds—such as you gentlemen have, sitting around this board, and who will have the least trouble in finding answers. Most of you are now sensing that there is something in the offing. There *is*, and this something is *old age*. It is you who must begin to learn to “live to one's self.”

To live to one's self does not mean to retire into the desert as the apostles of old nor to descend into a cave as a hermit and beg his bread. It means to become, more or less, a silent spectator of the age without compulsion to take part in it. Thus freed from the duties he must lay aside, he should be so mentally prepared as to be able to find new enjoyments and pastimes to fit his new position in society. If he can not do this he becomes restless and unhappy. Old age and retirement are used as meaning the same stage in life. All men do not retire, but there is no escaping old age, if they live long enough.

Most of us are afraid of old age. It is a sad commentary on human behavior that so few of us live to enjoy the virtues and rewards of old age and must therefore suffer the tragic ordeal of death at the time we are still young and most dread it and most desire to live.

But old age is not that bad. Too many are denied the privilege of trying it out. Over in Arkansas we have a plantation philosopher, Dr. McDaniel, who frequently utters gems of philosophy that rank with our own philosopher — Ham-bone. The Arkansas philosopher put it: “Growing old is not half bad when you consider the alternative.”

The old man has gone to his work all his major life, but tomorrow he quits — He is to take a long vacation and there is a revolution in his daily habits. Is he prepared, half prepared or will he wander? When the old man retires, the world begins to close in on him; he loses contact with what's going on and it is inevitable that he must think more about himself and his growing solitude, and he must create much of his new enjoyments.

Living contentedly to one's self might imply great love of one's self, great egotism. However, the egotist lives for himself and not to himself. The attitude of the one is to show off, he is self-conscious, is self-worshiping, becomes childish, while that of the other is to see and enjoy, even into the solitude. An egotist will not like solitude and his egotism will not suffice to the end if he lives over long, while the other, who has learned to live to himself, can live peacefully till the final curtain.

SOLITUDE

Solitude is the handmaiden of old age and there is no escape from it, and as the years pass, the hours that the old man must spend in solitude grow apace. It is therefore, well to discuss this subject in our endeavor to find how to adjust ourselves to a new way of life in which it plays the major part.

Solitude is a favorite theme for some philosophers and they have written much about it. It soon appears, though, when reading them, that they are not a happy group — these Stoic Philosophers, who are strong for solitude. Their gloomy philosophy would aid one *to learn to try to love un-happiness* rather than *how to learn to be happy*. To the Hindu, lying on his pallet of nails or to the aesthete, wearing his hair-suit, these philosophers would say: “Now smile, damn you, smile. You must learn to like it.” But it takes more than a grimace to constitute a smile.

I have not read much philosophy because of the difficulty of understanding its involved rhetoric. I need a philosophy book in words of one syllable as I had in my early reading of Robinson Crusoe — and I never forgot that story. I have, however, read thumb-nail sketches of some of them who write about Solitude, but I find little that is exciting or applicable to my theme.

These stoic-minded writers propose that one should seek, by thought and habit, some free and independent way to adjust a more or less *confused outlook* during *adult life*. My theme is to seek a free and independent way of life during the years *after* retirement, presupposing one has already lived a quite average, good mannered life while one was practicing his law or medicine or teaching or tending his store or whatever may have been his life's occupation. It is not the mid-years I'm considering. Solitude is essentially a part of one's late years but the philosophy of solitude, as expounded by the stoics, is unthinkable as guide and mentor for the rational old man.

It will not be amiss, though, to review the temper and mood of some of these stoic philosophers and it will become obvious that there is too much gloom and loneliness in their stoicism.

Laotze, an early Chinese philosopher wrote "The noblest classic of the lonely wisdom. His philosophy taught strength in complete inactivity — complete passivity." Not very cheerful! Heraclitus is described in these words: "There is something about his thought which is at once startling and a little sinister." "Proud and fierce in his loneliness, he became a hater of his kind and wandered on the mountains, and there he continued to live making his diet of grass and herbs." Not a fit companion for the old man.

Epictetus, a stoic whose doctrine was simplification of life. "Reduce your own possessiveness to the limit, simplify your own life to the limit and concentrate upon the power of your own mind which is itself a portion of the Divine Mind." And Marcus Aurelius whose "Meditations is the saddest, the most disillusioned, the most tragic of all self-colloquies. He accepts the whole grim Stolic Philosophy without a qualm." And Wordsworth with his "Rugged, tough, taciturn nature would isolate himself austere and grimly from the levities and banalities of Society" and to use his own words:

"I am not One who much or oft delight
To season my fireside with personal talk.
Better than such discourse doth silence long,
Long, barren silence square with my desire."

For a more descriptive word, these fellows could well be called "Sour Doughs," and the reading of their philosophy of solitude hinders rather than helps the old man in his effort to re-adjust his life, to learn to live to one's self, and to love solitude.

The Stoic treats his Ego as if there were some universal law that requires it to accept this loneliness. There can not be any such evil law, but there is an intelligence in us that strives against this loneliness, and this intelligence is creative. To quote Thomas Aquinas: "To create is the prerogative of the human mind."

So why not seek to create a life of *happiness* instead of creating a way to get along with unhappiness? How much more pleasing when Rousseau writes: "I got up at sunrise and was happy, I walked and was happy, I roamed the forests and hills, I wandered in the valleys, I read, I did nothing, and happiness followed me everywhere — a happiness which followed every where since it dwelt entirely within myself."

While Rousseau was somewhat of a misanthrope himself — he could find freedom to his soul in his communion with nature. In the old man's five foot bookshelf he should have Rousseau, and the sturdy cheerfulness of Thoreau and the serenity of Emerson. He needs the optimism of Whitman and the pleasing high attitude of Ruskin, all of whom loved solitude. The stoic's philosophy leads into the psychiatric's field and may well be used to treat the neurotic and the mal-adjusted but unquestionably not for the old man whose infirmities are largely those of old age.

I do not want to leave the impression that I think these stoic philosophers do not have a larger purpose and a deeper meaning, but when they drift into their stream-lined metaphysics I get lost and, for practical purposes, it has no value in directing the old man who is fading out, to live his last days in reasonable contentment and with solitude.

REMINISCENCE

As the stoic's philosophy of Solitude is a negative attitude, so also is the habit of reminiscing a negative attitude. In a paper I read before this group six years ago, in which I discussed "Growing Old", this passage was written. "Old age has memories and nothing is so fine as meditating over happy episodes of the past." I have lived in the "Age of Wisdom" six more years since I wrote that. When it was written, I had to argue with myself if it were true, but I gave that passage the benefit of my doubt. Now, at well into the 90s, and old age is high upon me, all doubt is dispelled. One must live with old age and experience it before Wisdom tells you that reminiscing is a negative attitude.

I speak of the "Age of Wisdom" as if it was a package to be handed us on our arrival at that psychological age. Rabelais, the wise fool, says of Wisdom: "If one conscientiously seeks wisdom, he soon will grow weary. Wisdom comes from the elements of all time and one must be receptive."

One's wisdom does not come from the general intelligence but from one's individual intelligence. It is only the wisdom accumulated by the individual's own thinking that aids him in re-arranging his life at this time. This is his own private problem and no set of rules worked out from the general intelligence will help him. It is with our accumulated wisdom that we determine that reminiscing is a negative attitude and that one must look forward always. Yet a personal philosophy is essential to all of us, for we must have it to reason out the questions that develop our wisdom.

Reminiscence is a surrender, a cease to struggle, a walking backwards. It stops creative thinking and dulls the mind and also it makes big liars out of some of us. One must face forward and look to the horizons ahead of us with a curious and searching and interested mind. It matters little what our past has been, but when we consider it, the results are mostly impotent regrets. There always should be plenty ahead to think about, if one has a creative mind, and only in front of us will we find positive enjoyment, not behind. The chill of old age can not be warmed by reminiscent sunshine which has no warmth. We must find warmth in what lies ahead.

SECOND CHILDHOOD

Second childhood, as a state of mind of the aged, is a misnomer. Our conception of childhood is a character that is very demanding and is "Ego" to the limit. Some old men are just that and if they have not learned how to live to themselves, they fall back to their creature comforts and need to be entertained as a child, but they are not children. The old man veers off by one of many routes, all of which lead away from the happy land of early childhood. Such a man can not live to its self, and yes, it must be tended like a child, but he is not one. Usually, they are nuisance in any household.

The child does not start life with a consciousness, but an old man carries his consciousness to his grave, and unless he has developed the art of living comfortably within himself, he will be just as miserable as he thinks he is, and he will be a sorry old man and not a child.

RETIREMENT

Some who drift into retirement have the idea it is a time for doing nothing the easiest way. That is a woeful mistake. Retirement should begin with a purposeful program. His physical and mental attitude determines when he is an old man, of which state he, himself, will be aware and the tense of his verbs will tell one where his mind dwells. The creative mind does not use the past tense. Developing the proper mental attitude for old age is like putting away some dollars for old age, and if you haven't put something away you will not find anything when you get there.

The far-seeing man will have developed some of the art of living to one's self by the time he retires but if he has not he soon will become restless and filled with childish whims. The monotony of time is soon upon him and it is the bane of those who aimlessly drift into old age. Monotony disturbs mental poise at all ages, but it is definitely more catastrophic after retirement. A man is just as miserable as he thinks he is and the unprepared mind has nothing to think about but itself and that isn't much — Hence his boredom!

Facetiously, our late president said when asked what he was going to do when he retired to his farm remarked: "I'll put a rocking chair on the front porch and sit quietly for a while." Then what will you do? "When I tire of that I'll rock." That is all the undeveloped mind can do, and that is not enough.

To decline into the vale of years and not a vale of tears, one must be so mentally instructed as to be able to get along fairly well without other people, but this certainly does not imply getting along without other people's minds. Indeed without the companionship of other people's minds it would be like living alone in the desert with only sun and wind and solitude. The companionship of selected minds will prove far more comforting than the companionship of dispensers of disjointed, common place incidences of our daily living. Old men are rarely interesting unless they are able to create a proper attitude and keep an active mind.

Many thoughtful men have built up plans and specifications for living after retirement. They plan to write a book, do some special reading, visit some old friends, maybe travel some, improve their golf, do some deep sea fishing — They've always wanted to do these things. These plans, too often, were made in vain. These old men did not take into consideration the decline in their physical and mental and spiritual vigor from their 50s into their 70s or 80s or 90s. The would be writer arranges his desk for some work he has planned to do and he begins to assemble his thoughts. Too often, after a few starts, his mind wanders, he lays his pen down, he nods, and look! The old man is beginning a short trip into never-never land. His fingers, his mind, nothing responds to his weak urge. There are, of course, exceptions and half exceptions — but they do not disprove the rule. They find that their new enjoyments must be built to fit a different order of living. To do this successfully is the problem of each individual.

To illustrate. Take William Lyon Phelps, long a professor of Literature at Yale and George Santayana, long a professor of Philosophy at Harvard. They could not dwell in the same house in peace, so contrary were their minds. Phelps possessed a magnificent gregariousness, a colossal conceit and was an out-pouring extrovert. He knew everybody, carried

on an exaggerated correspondence, traveled extensively and hobnobbed with royalty or with the common man with equal grace. At 75, when he passed on, he was doing right well. Then there was Santayana, a contemporary, who spent his adult life always drawing away from gregarious confusion and after retirement went happily into the solitude, until he passed on at 89. Each one was well prepared to live his retirement years — but how different! And then the two old ladies discussing their troubles of living their late years, one said: "I just read the Bible a lot every day," while the other one avered: "I cries a lot every day." Poor souls!

HOBBIES

It is well for the old man to yield to an instinctive love of something special in nature. He should make some kind of a hobby in some channel that can help him in using what might be surplus hours. A character in an old novel — "Ships that Pass in the Night" — encouraged his friends to do something on the side — "even to studying the different kinds of cheese mites." Butterflies was his hobby! He was right.

With me, I travel a good deal and when at home, I walk daily. When walking, at times, I walk with sprightly steps and then again I loaf along, looking at things along my path and usually talking with every one whom I chance to meet — white or black. They all like it and I do too. (It has come to my mind that suburban sidewalks are becoming obsolete, so few people use them.) The old man who prefers the auto for his out-of-doors recreation errs in his judgment—he must put his feet on the ground. He will sit over time anyway.

At no time do I feel so free as when rambling along the trails in Overton Park, or along some street, swinging an old hickory walking stick I cut in the woods fifty years ago. I do this not in imitation of Rousseau but being of a kindred spirit. And why? Walking isolates one from the crowd-minded, which is, more or less, unsympathetic to the old man. It

liberates ones thoughts to wander into harmonious areas, either for thinking of pleasant things or just not feeling compelled to think at all, either of which states of mind are always restful. I have always maintained that if one reads an hour or two every day and walks a mile or two every day, he will have a fair general knowledge and will add pleasant years to his span of life.

In my travels in foreign lands, with their handicaps of speech, I find great pleasure in walking, it may be along a mountain trail in the Swiss Alps, or in the wilderness of a great city and more often, alone. There is no greater solitude than wandering along the crowded streets of a foreign city, and particularly so if one cannot understand their alphabet as Arabic, Greek or Russian.

To enjoy these experiences, one must have inner resources lest loneliness overcomes him. An interesting experience happened to me in Milan, Italy. I must take a walk. Without guide book or map, by preference, I took down the street; turned into another, and into another and another. In a couple of hours, when I felt I had wandered long enough, I had no idea where I was, but would inquire. Every one I asked how to get to the "Milan Cathedral" stared blankly at me and shook their heads. I asked again and again but no one understood my lingo. Finally I took an envelope from my pocket and drew a rough sketch of the front facade of the Milan Cathedral. The man scrutinized my sketch closely and then the light of understanding came over his countenance. He looked at me with a smile and said: "Ah! Ah! Duomo!" They did not recognize my word "Cathedral", it is "Duomo" to them, and without "Milan". I did enjoy the walk. Many pleasing thoughts pass through ones mind as one rambles if ones mind is alert. I have had similar experiences elsewhere.

Pedestrianism is free to us and it contains the germs of elemental happiness — a tonic for both mind and body. Ones mind becomes composed and the old man's apprehensions of the fast approaching end, associated with the old legends of "hell fire and damnation", evaporates into the clean air. And again! The eye brings more peace to the soul than all the other senses combined. It sees things close; it reads the page; it scans the treetops, the clouds, the distant mountain crests and their snow-capped peaks. It sees infinity when they behold the starry firmament. Words and human actions are finite. One must walk to be in "Tune with the Infinite." Perhaps walking is my hobby!

NEARING THE END

Walking is about the last physical activity left to the old man. Then solitude begins to settle down heavily upon him and, with it, a more rapid weakening of his faculties, but he does not die wholly at one time and these last lingering days may try his faith.

Perhaps it were wise that I should not continue my discussion beyond the pale, for surely then I am outside the limits of my reckoning. But I feel that I should not only follow the old man to the end of his consciousness, but consider the effect on his peace of mind from meditating over his uncertain state after death.

Perfection is never realized in human actions. The old man may strive for peace and serenity during the closing lines of his play, but there is always an inherent anxiety about the final curtain that may disturb him, and he should not be disturbed at this time.

These last years of the old man's living should be peaceful ones. With a clear mind, the fast approaching end should not cause him anxious moments. He does not know what comes after this life but he does know that he can not know. So why worry?

Yet he is wont to go into serious discussions of life beyond the bourne. He gets in over his head in these discussions, forgetting the simplicity of it all. There has been read into the Bible tons of theology, when the life and teachings of Jesus were set so that a child could understand. When he meditates over his final days, he should not struggle with the imponderable, but in good faith feel that all will be well. "Let not your hearts be troubled" saith the Lord.

☆ ☆ ☆

The thoughts in this paper are the accumulations from long living and meditating as I go along in my home, in my work, in my reading, in my travels, in my walks and in my solitude and contemplation of them has made a more pleasant journey along the way for me. I have written in simple, homely language but with no thought of being a teacher. My aim was to find comfort for myself during what has become a long retirement and what has required that I should live much to myself and with solitude. In these retirement years I have never felt lonely or in the least oppressed by a sense of solitude. But always have I born in mind that solitude must be tempered with contacts with life around us, even to the end.

☆ ☆ ☆

The proper old man should be able to say:

*"Solitude is sweet,
Yet grant me still a friend in my retreat,
To whom I may whisper
Solitude is sweet."*

**THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AND
THE AMERICAN ECONOMY**

By W. A. WOOTEN

(Read at a Meeting of "THE EGYPTIANS," Jan. 18, 1962)

At the President's press conference last October 8, a reporter stated that there are people inside and outside of the Government who feel that the United States needs a major change in its foreign trade policy and he inquired as to the President's views. Mr. Kennedy replied that the Administration had had several meetings about the matter and that recommendations would be made to the Congress the first of the year. He stated: "I think quite obviously we have to begin to realize how important The Common Market is going to be to the United States. One-third of our trade generally is in Western Europe. If the United States should be denied that market, we will either find a flight of capital from this country to construct factories within that wall, or we will find ourselves in serious economic trouble."

As a matter of fact, the ill effects of the Common Market on our economy are already in evidence as a number of American companies, both large and small, have established or are establishing branches abroad or forming business associations with European concerns through the media of licenses, etc. Such a trend, of course, tends to intensify our balance of payment problems. This, in turn, could create a further drain on our supply of gold which recently declined to the lowest level since October, 1939.

Surprising developments have taken place in Western Europe in recent years. As the result of two world wars, which occurred within twenty-one years of each other, that area was practically reduced to shambles. Between the two wars, almost stagnation prevailed; population growth was

only about one-half of what it had been prior to 1913; inflation took a very heavy toll and unemployment generally was very serious. Efforts to improve economic conditions through currency devaluation aggravated the situation. Many of the European countries were practically bankrupt at the end of World War II, with most of their internal wealth destroyed and their foreign investments liquidated and their colonies lost. Hence, a few years ago, many wrote Europe off as being in a hopeless situation.

Soon after World War II, most of the European nations were inclined to a policy of Nationalism, in the hopes of being able to keep to a minimum their dependence on the outside world, particularly for raw materials, as most of them are processors. They had not forgotten the destructive effects of our Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, passed in 1930, which imposed the highest duties on record and, in the minds of many, contributed materially to the outbreak of World War II.

A few years ago, after much reconstruction had been accomplished, a policy of Nationalism gave way to a rapid growth in a feeling of the need of more economic and political unity among the Western European nations. The industrial and military growth of Russia and her mistreatment of the states in Eastern Europe were important factors. In addition, the anti-colonial movement made it quite apparent that cooperation of these areas could not be obtained, as in the past. A remarkable improvement has taken place in most of these countries; their currencies had been very weak whereas today, they are strong and their reserves of gold have grown to the extent that there is talk of full convertibility in the near future.

As a step toward unity, six nations formed The European Economic Community, generally known as The Common Market. It is a union composed of Italy, West Germany, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, and Luxembourg, often

referred to as "The Little Europe" or "The Six." The plan for The Common Market was made at a meeting held in 1955 by the foreign ministers of The Six countries, which were already members of The European Steel and Coal Community and were making very satisfactory progress. The Common Market Treaty was signed in Rome on March 25, 1957 and was ratified by The Six governments the latter part of that year. The Treaty became effective on January 1, 1958. It places emphasis on the economic aspects of the union, though there are many indications that ultimately the goal is to achieve political unity also.

The Common Market provides a Customs Union, ultimately free of trade barriers such as tariffs, quotas, etc. and, like the states of America, protected by a common tariff wall between these countries and the outside world. Also, it provides for the free movement of people, capital, and labor. The Treaty anticipated that it would take between twelve and fifteen years for gradual elimination of tariffs and quotas among The Six nations and the adjustment of external tariffs to the same level.

In May, 1960, The Six agreed to accelerate the time table. Internal tariffs had been reduced 30% below their 1957 rate by January, 1961. It is anticipated that another reduction of 20% will be made early this year. The goal now is for total elimination of trade barriers between nations by 1966.

One of the objectives is to harmonize the economic and social policies, including farm, transportation, and other programs similar to the United States. The importance of fair competition is stressed by the employment of a trade code. It makes subsidies and dumping illegal. The Treaty also provides for means to deal with cartels that fix prices, limit production, and divide markets. If these provisions are enforced, it should lead to much more efficient economies.

At the end of the transition period, as previously stated, now estimated to be in 1966, The Six member nations will impose the same external tariffs on products outside of the Common Market. In most instances, the rates will be the average of the tariffs levied by The Six nations prior to the formation of The Common Market. Much will depend on the outcome of reciprocal trade negotiations in which The Six act as a unit. Ultimately, therefore, there should be one list for external tariffs and no internal barriers.

Time does not permit a detailed description of the agencies employed to govern the operation of The Common Market. Suffice it to state that under the Rome Treaty, The Six nations delegated to the following newly created agencies the authority for operating The Market:

- (1) The Common Market Commission, which supervises the establishment of The Market and speaks and acts for it.
- (2) The Council of Ministers, which represents the national interests of The Six nations. It makes final decisions on proposals submitted only by the Commission and sees that policies of The Common Market are in harmony with those of the National Governments.
- (3) European Parliament, whose members are elected by and from the Legislatures of the member countries. The Common Market Commission is required to report to the Parliament annually. Two-thirds majority of the Parliament can dismiss the Commission.
- (4) Finally, The Court of Justice—A Supreme Court which is the final arbiter of the application of the Rome Treaty. The headquarters are in Brussels and Dr. Walter Hallstein is President.

It is recognized that serious economic problems will arise within The Six nations during the period of transition. Therefore, a social or unemployment fund has been created to assist labor in the interim. An Investment Bank has been established to provide capital for undeveloped areas within The Six nation members. Also, there is a development fund for use in overseas territories.

Briefly then, The Common Market is a large mass market which provides for the free exchange of goods, labor, and capital. The question logically arises, "Will it work satisfactorily?" Many people here and abroad think that it will. Since World War II, there have been several organizations in Western Europe involving economic cooperation, most of which have been successful. The OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), formed in 1947, administered The Marshall Plan and has been very active in sponsoring a policy for liberalizing trade in the seventeen nations of Western Europe. Another experience was Benelux—a customs union between Belgium, The Netherlands, and Luxembourg, which has been successful. It provided a common market in coal and steel by the same nations which now constitute The European Common Market.

The EEC is off to a good start. As previously stated, it is ahead of schedule in tariff reductions and seems to have the enthusiastic support of the peoples of the nations involved. Trade activities have already increased very materially and the prospects for a higher living standard appear favorable. In fact, the outlook is so promising that England, who, up until recently, refused to join, has applied for membership. It is believed that her reluctance to join was fear that the EEC might have an adverse effect on her economic relationship with the Commonwealth. However, she now sees the many difficulties confronting her by remaining outside and the advantages she will enjoy by becoming a member.

Trade within The Common Market increased approximately 40% between 1957 and 1960, during which period British exports to The Common Market advanced approximately 20%. Hence, the rapid improvement which has recently taken place in economic conditions of the EEC nations, evidently influenced her to change her decision. England's admittance to membership in EEC would be of tremendous benefit to Europe economically and politically. It would create the largest single market in the world and should lead to expansion in world trade.

In July, 1959, representatives of England, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Denmark, Austria, and Portugal formed The European Free Trade Association (known as EFTA), which began operating in May, 1960. Both organizations, i.e. EEC and EFTA have the same goal, the distinct difference being the modus operandi. The Common Market Countries have a tight, closely knit economic integration, supervised by community institutions; the EFTA also desires economic cooperation but as independent nations. Incidentally, this is another feature that is unattractive to England. However, she hopes to remove this and other objectionable features through negotiations.

EEC and EFTA do not desire an economic or political division in Western Europe and reports are current that other members of EFTA will apply for membership in EEC. It is probable that ultimately the two organizations will combine, in which event, the population will be about 300,000,000. Apparently, a pattern has been set, which will spread to other parts of the world. In fact, discussions are now under way with a view to forming similar organizations in South and Central America. There are some in this country who think that the United States should seek admission to The Common Market. It is doubtful if this is possible or desirable, but the fact remains, the existence of the EEC presents new problems for our economy.

The Administration, on many occasions lately, has stressed the necessity for liberalizing our trade policy, a highly controversial subject, which involves both capital and labor, especially now when there seems to be a growing feeling of the need for more protectionism. Aggravating the problem is the fact that the reciprocal trade agreements act (GATT—General Agreement for Tariff and Trade) expires in June and the further fact that this is an election year.

Probably one of the most difficult problems facing the United States is the agricultural policy of The Common Market. Doubtless, it will be difficult for the Common Market nations to agree on a policy because of a conflict of interests. The objective of its policies is to "increase productivity, stabilize markets, increase farm incomes, and assure reasonable prices to the consumer." Central marketing organizations for each of the major farm products are contemplated. Tariff on imported food products would be sufficiently high to make up the difference between world prices and the fixed internal prices of the EEC. It is estimated that over 20% of the Common Market workers live from the land. About 60% of the farms are small, averaging less than twelve acres. As in America, The Six nations endeavor to protect farmers though many of them are inefficient operators. Efforts are being made to induce high cost operators to find employment in industry.

As an indication of the importance of the EEC agricultural policy to the United States, in 1960 our total exports of farm commodities were about \$4,800,000,000, of which approximately one-fourth, or \$1,100,000,000, were sold to the EEC. These nations provide substantial outlets for corn, oats, barley, tobacco, fats, oils, cotton, soybeans, etc. Last year, we exported about 6,500,000 bales of cotton, valued at approximately \$1,000,000,000, one-third of which went to Common Market Nations. Under normal conditions, American cotton is one of our principal farm exports and usually

the chief contributor to a favorable trade balance. One bright spot is the outlet for American soybeans, on which no proposal has been made for a tariff, probably because the Common Market countries do not grow them to any appreciable extent. During 1960, The Six took about 57% of our export of soybeans, or 54,825,000 bushels. It is apparent, therefore, that this market is a most important outlet for American farm products and unfavorable treatment, doubtless, would have very serious economic repercussions, including the perplexing balance of payment problem.

Practically all of The Six nations comprising EEC are protectionists in matters relating to agriculture. They are accustomed to quotas, tariffs, price supports, etc., the policies varying considerably among The Six nations. The great temptation may be to give preference to their own production, though it may be uneconomic.

The Six nations have a population of approximately the same as the United States—180,000,000. Its purchasing power is about one-half that of ours. As a group, The Common Market is the world's largest importer of raw materials. It is making rapid progress and its markets, as previously stated, are of paramount importance to our economy, which means that it is an opportunity and a challenge to America.

The Administration is seriously concerned regarding the effects of the operation of the EEC and similar organizations on our economy. Recently, in addresses to the AF of L, CIO, and The National Association of Manufacturers, this problem was discussed at length by President Kennedy. Directly involved, in recent years, are the deficits in the balance of payments in international trade and the substantial loss of gold which we have sustained—both new experiences for us. Incidentally, in order to refresh our memories, it may be helpful to distinguish between balance of payment and bal-

ance of trade. Balance of payment is a system of accounting which reflects a summary of all of our international transactions such as foreign investments, expenses incident to maintaining military forces abroad, sales of goods, services, etc.

On the receipts side of the statement are proceeds of sales of goods and services, investments by foreigners in American securities, transfer of earnings of American investments abroad, receipts from abroad of interest and principal on loans and sale of gold to foreigners. On the payments side are the costs of imports and services, expenditures of American forces abroad, grants of economic and military aid to foreign countries, expense of American tourists, investments abroad, etc.

The expression "balance of trade" is restricted to receipts and payments for commodities (designated as "visible") and does not include invisible items such as services, etc. When our exports of commodities exceed imports, we are said to have a favorable balance of trade and vice versa. When our total receipts are less than our total payments, we are said to have a deficit in the balance of payment. In this computation, purchases and sales of gold and short term American securities and changes in foreign-held bank balances are excluded. Our deficits are made up by sales of gold to foreigners, increase in foreign bank balances here, or increase in sales of short term dollar assets to foreigners.

In 1958, there was a sudden change in the international monetary situation. For several years prior to that, there was a serious shortage of dollars in most of the foreign countries. Then suddenly, there seemed to be a dollar glut. In that year, the outflow of gold to Europe was approximately \$2¼ billion and the following year it was held down to about \$1 billion, principally because of much higher interest rates here, which induced many foreigners to keep their balances in America. Incidentally, interest rates in the large financial centers of the world are a most important factor in determining the flow

of funds. In addition, in that year, United States exports declined approximately \$3 billion and the next year, 1959, there was an increase in imports of about \$3 billion. At that time, American dollars exchanged at a slight discount in some European countries instead of at a premium, as was formerly the case.

Generally, our balance of trade has been favorable. What then causes adverse balances in our total foreign payment? There are a number of services we exchange with other countries, such as tourism, banking, shipping, insurance, etc. Most of the time, there is little difference between the amount we receive and that which we pay out. However, the aid we give of economic, political, and military character aggregates about \$10 billion annually. For instance, it costs in excess of \$3 billion to maintain our troops, bases, etc. abroad. A substantial portion of this aid has consisted of surplus farm commodities, so if this aid is reduced, farm surpluses increase here. Some contend that this type of aid has a domestic political tinge, particularly those commodities sold under Public Law 480, which permits our Government to accept payment in foreign currencies.

Direct investments, made by United States firms in branches abroad are not tied to exports, but to pay for plants and equipment purchased in foreign countries. The earnings from these investments, when brought back here, create needed foreign exchange. In 1960, this item was estimated to be approximately \$2½ billion. During recent years, Americans have made substantial investments in Canada. The trend toward establishing plants abroad (now estimated at around one thousand, seven hundred of which are in Western Europe) is increasing rapidly and likely to reduce our exports and increase our payment problem. Some fear, if continued, it could invite the imposition of restrictions on the transfer of funds for this purpose.

One of the pressing problems ahead is to conserve our supply of gold. We have a dual monetary standard. Except for art and industrial uses, it is illegal to hold gold in the United States. For international transaction, we are on a gold bullion standard.

When the Treasury purchases gold, it issues its check on the Federal Reserve Bank in payment and then issues gold certificates to cover. These certificates are lawful money but are not to be used in general circulation. The law requires a reserve in gold of 25% of Federal Reserve deposits and Federal Reserve notes. As an illustration:

Recently Federal Reserve notes amounted to	\$27,250,000,000
At that time, deposits in Federal Reserve were	19,121,000,000
Or a total of.....	\$46,371,000,000
Required reserve of 25% or.....	11,590,000,000
At that time, the gold supply was.....	16,900,000,000
Excess	\$ 5,310,000,000
Net short term liabilities, such as foreign bank balances here.....	17,500,000,000
Deficit to liquidate same in gold.....	\$12,190,000,000

The Government has authority to waive gold reserve requirements, but much confusion would follow such action. The reserves are now down to about 37%—only 12% over legal requirements. Until recent years, the gold reserve has averaged almost twice that much. In fact, at one time, the required reserve was 50%, but it was found necessary, some years ago, to reduce it to 25%. Now there is talk, in some quarters, of removing the gold reserve requirements. While this has been advocated by a few leaders in the financial world, it is not believed such a proposal would meet with the approval of a majority of the people. It would remove a

restriction which may prevent the free use of the printing press. Also, it would have the effect of showing our lack of confidence in the dollar and our inability to manage successfully our fiscal affairs. In addition, it would probably lead to a raid on our gold supply.

The Treasury has authority to buy gold at the legal mint price of \$35.00 per ounce and sell to foreign governments and central banks at that price. The Treasury also has the authority to discontinue the sale of gold but, should it do so, unfortunate repercussions probably would follow. Because of the large decline in our gold supply, the dollar is rather on the defensive. Heretofore, in international settlement, dollars would be gladly accepted, but recently the trend has been to demand gold instead. The attention of the world, particularly of those holding American short term obligations abroad, is focused on the dollar situation.

Nearly one-half of our exports to Europe are manufactured products, including chemicals, transportation equipment, and machinery. Practically all of these items will have tariffs against them, while eventually, these barriers will disappear inside of the EEC and the EFTA. Hence, many American producers may find it difficult to compete for awhile, but our experience has demonstrated our ability through research, as well as promotional work, to improve products, reduce costs, and increase volume.

Of course, one of the most serious handicaps encountered in competition with Europe is the lower wages prevailing there. In 1959, the average pay for workers in manufacturing industries there was between 70c and 80c per hour, including fringe benefits, as compared to \$2.68 in the United States. However, when wage rates are related to productivity, the difference is not nearly so great. Generally, American workers have more modern equipment, which increases the amount of work they can accomplish in an hour.

There is a shortage of skilled labor in some countries in Western Europe, which, along with the industrial expansion that has taken place, is resulting in an increase in wages. In addition, union activity is expanding and collective bargaining is much more common in recent years. However, man-hour output is increasing there as modern equipment is installed. There are operating costs that offset, to some extent, their competitive advantages. Much of their raw material is imported, which increases its cost because of the expense of transportation, insurance, financing, etc. Cost of power, including coal and electricity, is generally considerably more expensive in Europe than here. Also, fringe benefits, including pensions, unemployment insurance, etc., make up a larger part of labor expense there than in the United States. Machinery does exist to protect American industry from serious hardships resulting from the importation of goods at extremely depressed prices. Textiles are a notable example. The Tariff Commission will hold hearings on this subject next month.

The time has arrived for the adoption of a realistic policy to increase our foreign trade. Otherwise, we run the risk of real danger. As so much depends on attitude, a continuation of the present trend for only a short while, could result in virtual collapse of our monetary system. What can be done to achieve this objective? Some advocate discontinuing foreign aid, recalling our troops from foreign countries and, when necessary, increasing our tariff, etc. It is believed that such a course would be most impractical under current world conditions. Instead, it would appear a better policy would be to redouble our efforts with a view of expanding our trade abroad. Temporarily, it may be unfortunate that economic integration is taking place in Western Europe when, in the minds of many, the competitive position of America is declining in foreign countries. It will be necessary for American firms to conduct dynamic promotional work in order to increase sales and also to study foreign markets with a view of producing products which will be competitive. Often,

through study and research, quality can be downgraded some, thereby reducing the cost but producing a product that will be entirely satisfactory in certain foreign markets. Many firms have looked upon outlets abroad as a place for surpluses from our own domestic markets. Other firms are not interested because of differences in languages, customs, and lack of knowledge of the opportunities that do exist in many foreign markets.

We should exercise care in formulating our farm policies, to see that our support levels for these commodities leave us in a competitive position abroad. For several years, we have been employing subsidies in an effort to retain our share of world markets for those products that enjoy government support. We have made mistakes that have proved costly. For instance, soon after the present Administration took office, the support price on cotton was increased \$18.75 per bale (weight 500 pounds) and the subsidy increased from \$30.00, the rate for the previous year, to \$42.50 per bale, which was tantamount to increasing the world price of our cotton \$6.25 per bale—a rather severe handicap, which is a factor in the decline in sales of our cotton abroad—about 1,750,000 bales so far this season, as compared with the previous year. We need to employ greater effort to attract more tourists. Also, we should endeavor to keep our nearby interest rates at a level that will attract the inflow of funds.

In addition to the reasons previously mentioned, we need to expand our exports because our productive capacity in many lines is much greater than our domestic offtake. If exports are not increased, unemployment here will become much more general than it is now. To encourage more interest in exporting, the Government is making provision to provide credit insurance against loss from expropriation, devaluation of currencies abroad, and other risks of this character, coverage for which cannot be obtained from commercial insurance companies.

Conditions in most of the nations of Western Europe have improved to the extent that they can now assume some of the foreign aid burden that we are carrying. In addition, they are in a position to make substantial contribution to the military expense which we are encountering abroad for our common defense.

We have the potential with which to compete in foreign fields to a much greater extent than we are now doing. We lead the world in man-hour productivity, in the development of new products, in the skill of our labor force, managerial ability, and natural resources. There are two objectives that should be achieved in the near future and they are a balanced budget and the avoidance of any steps that lead to further inflation. It will take real statesmanship to attain these goals but if we do, we can successfully resolve the problems of balance in payment, conserve our gold supply and restore full confidence in the dollar. The European Common Market should become a vast market for American ingenuity, and, hence, a source of great benefit rather than a handicap to our economy.

ROARK BRADFORD: THE END OF A LITERARY TRADITION

By JOHN E. FARRIOR

(Read at a meeting of "THE EGYPTIANS," February 15, 1962)

Literary themes and literary traditions rise, endure for a time, and then disappear, often to reappear later in a different guise. The reason for this is obvious. Literature must, to a certain degree, mirror life if it is to be at all true and to endure. When the pattern of life itself changes, then Literature must show those changes, the reason for them, and how they affect men.

In the romantic tales of the middle ages the hero must always be of noble birth, even though, as in *Havelock the Dane*, he has to appear for a time to be only a kitchen-boy. He had to overcome all obstacles, usually physical ones, and fight through to power, victory, and the love of a beautiful lady. At this time there were only high and low, with very little middle class. In the more complex life of the Renaissance, Shakespeare shows us much more complex characters dealing with mental and spiritual problems, for this was a complex age; and already the levels of society were shifting because the old static laws of society, of government, and of religion were changing.

If we move to the late 18th and early 19th centuries, we find one of the great themes of literature is the natural man, the simple man, living close to nature and exemplifying all its virtues. Wordsworth shows us Michael, a simple shepherd, as possessing the best qualities of mankind as well as some less desirable ones. Cooper and Sims in America show us common men of low degree who embody perfectly the Platonic virtues of prudence, fortitude, temperance, and justice, and who are capable of noble deeds and great sacrifices for love of their country and of their fellowman.

As a part of the same romantic tradition we have, on the less serious side, the tall tale which began among the pioneers. The man who made a nation out of a wilderness had to labor terrifically hard and sometimes to fight hard. When he relaxed, he did so with as much vitality, spontaneity, and gusto as he worked. The telling of tall tales became an art and is still one of the most popular sub-literary forms in America.

From the same romantic concept of man came the old idea that life in the country is healthier, more moral, and altogether better than life in the city. Thomas Jefferson believed this when he hoped that this country would not have an urban civilization. In much of the popular fiction of the latter half of the nineteenth century the hero must have trousers that bag at the knee and be somewhat uncouth in his social manners to prove his sterling worth. The tradition of the beauty and purity of rural life has been pretty well exploded by such debunkers as Erskine Caldwell his imitators.

One of the most interesting traditions of American letters has been the depiction of the Negro as the white man has seen him in various stages of our culture. Though there had been a good deal written about Negroes before the end of the 18th century, it is not until after 1830 that we get the fully developed Negro character in fiction, poetry, and songs.

Edgar Allan Poe, so far as I know, used only one Negro character, Jupiter, in "The Gold Bug." As the locale is Charlestown, S. C., Poe tries to have Jupiter use the Gullah dialect, but Jupiter's speeches are poor Gullah. He does exhibit several characteristics which have become traditional in the Negro character in literature who is a trusted body-servant. First is his fierce independence and his insistence on using his own judgment, even when it goes contrary to that of his master. He also has a strong sense of responsibility to his master. Breckinridge, the master, is ill, and once when

he is absent all day, contrary to Jupiter's commands, Jupiter prepares a stick to thrash him but relents when he sees how tired and feeble his master is. Jupiter has an intense aversion to touching the skull and the bones which are dug up in seeking for the treasure. Any Southerner who has known Negroes well recognizes characteristic traits in Jupiter.

John Pendleton Kennedy in *Swallow Barn*, a novel about life on a Virginia plantation written in 1832, has several Negroes as characters. Usually, they are simply children mentally, repeating their master's statements with an air of profound wisdom and a sadly hashed-up vocabulary, and not working very much when they are not watched. One of them, the old stable boss, is a distinctly original character. When the master, Frank Meriwether ventures to criticize the old man's method of training and feeding the colts, he takes issue sharply. He tells Meriwether that he has taught him all he knows about horses and he will have no criticism from one whom he does not believe knows as much as he does. He wins his point.

A few years later, William Gilmore Simms used Negroes in several of his novels about the American Revolution, but does not develop but one of them fully. Old Tom, is the body-servant, cook, and general factotum of Captain Porgy, a Falstaffian character who appears in four of the seven novels. Tom serves with his master all through the war, is devotedly loyal, but is extremely crabbed to anyone who interferes with his own arrangements or who tries to get him to do anything for anyone but his master. In *Woodcraft*, the last of the novels, Porgy tries to set Tom free because he is so poor that he thinks Tom may do better elsewhere. But he meets with a firm refusal from Tom.

"No! no! maussa, he cried, with a sly shake of his head, "I kain't t'ink ob letting you off dis way. Ef *I* doesn't b'long to *you*, *you* b'longs to *me!* You hab for to keep dis nigger long as he lib; and him for keep you. You hab for fin' he

dinner, and Tom hab for cook'em. Free nigger no hab any body for fin' 'em he vittle; and de man wha hab sense and good maussa, at de same time, he's a d--n pertickilar great big fool, for let he maussa off from keep'em and fin'em. . . . Da's it! You yerry now? I say de wud for all! *You* b'longs to *me* Tom, jes as much as *me* Tom b'long to *you*; and you nebber guine git *you* free paper from me as long as you lib."¹ Thus Simms shows in the words of Tom quite accurately the ideal relation of master and slave, mutual affection and mutual dependence.

After the Civil War, there was a regional development in literature in that story writers sought out the peculiar dialects, local customs, manners, and folkways of people on the lower levels. Mountain people, Maine fishermen, western miners, farmers in secluded rural areas were all exploited by the writers in order to show the quaint and the unusual in American life. Many Southern authors turned to the Negro for material. The most notable of these were Thomas Nelson Page in Virginia, Joel Chandler Harris in Georgia, and Irwin Russell in Port Gibson, Mississippi. Though the amount of Russell's work is slight, he wrote "Christmas Night in the Quarters," which for exactness of dialect and the portrayal of certain aspects of Negro character is the finest work that had been done up to this time (about 1877). The poem has several parts, some in dialect and some not. One of the most delightful passages is the old Negro parson's prayer for a blessing on the dance. He knows that dancing is wrong, but he knows that the crowd is going to dance anyway, and he must justify himself and the crowd with God. He makes a very good case:

¹ William Gilmore Simms, *Woodcraft*, (Chicago: Belford Clark and Co., 1888), p. 509.

Remember Mahsr,—min' dis now—de sinfulness of sin
Is pendin' 'pon de sperret what we goes an' does it in.
An' in a righchis frame of min' we's gwine to dance an'
sing;

A-feelin' like King David, when he cut de pigeon-wing.²

This shrewd reminder that King David, a man after God's own heart, danced and capered publicly in the streets is a telling point. A little farther along in the same prayer he makes another shrewd point.

You bless us, please sah, eben ef we's doin' wrong tonight;
Kase den we'll need de blessin' more'n of we's doin' right;
An' let de blessin' stay wid us, untell we comes to die,
An' goes to keep our Chritmas wid dem sheriffs in de
sky!³

In this prayer we get a pretty good idea of the Negro's religion. He knows he is a sinner, but he knows that God is a good fellow who understands that it is impossible for a man to resist all the pleasures of life, even if they are sinful. He expects God to have the same forgiving nature as the best white landlord, who is forgiving and kind, who will put up with a boy's foolishness, and who will help and protect a boy when he gets in trouble. In return he will give his entire loyalty and his best efforts.

Another part of the poem tells the story of the first banjo. It is a story of the building of the ark, but with quite a difference. Noah, having read the papers, knows that there is going to be an overflow of the Mississippi, builds a boat bigger than the steamer *Natchez*, and loads it with Jersey cattle, a Morgan colt, and various other animals. After a long time of sailing, the animals become unruly and the humans are quarreling. Ham, the only nigger sailing on the packet, gets

² Irwin Russell, "Christmas Night in the Quarters" in *Southern Poets*, edited by Edd W. Parks (American Book Co., New York, 1936), p. 213.

³ *Ibid.*

lonesome in the barber shop and to amuse himself constructs a banjo. He has no wires to string it with, but he observes that the possum has fine long hair on his tail just right to string a banjo. He shaves all the hairs from the possum's tail, and strings the banjo, tunes it, and plays "Never Mind the Weather" so spiritedly that peace returns and Noah calls the figures for a dance. Since then no possum has had hair on his tail.

In Russell's poem we have two things that have not emerged in stories about Negroes before: the Negro as Negro, not in his relation with the white man but in relation with his own nature and his religion; the Negro as myth-maker: The possum loses the hair on his tail and thereafter all possums are without hair on their tails.

Except for delineating the character of Uncle Remus, Joel Chandler Harris did not do very much with Negro character. Uncle Remus is a distinct individual of great dignity who is usually kindly and long-suffering with an inquisitive little boy, but he will not be hurried and he will tell his tale in his own way. When the small boy becomes too inquisitive or too brash, he is met with evasion or with a fierce silence. Yet he opens to the little boy, and to all of us, a world of wonder and of beauty in the marvelous tales that he tells.

Harris really takes a place alongside of La Fontaine and Chaucer in the excellence of his beast fables in which his animals have human characteristics and symbolize human character or human actions. It has often been said that B'r'er Rabbit symbolizes the Negro. He is weak and cannot fight the fox, the wolf, or the bear (Different guises of the white man), but he can outwit them and survive. Harris was surprised when scholars told him that many of these tales were in existence in India and Africa thousands of years before he wrote them. He said that he only wrote the tales that he had

heard from Negroes on the plantation of Joseph Addison Turner when he was a boy. In Harris's tales we have the myth-making element developed to its best. The rabbit, the fox and the other animals are archtypes, and all other animals since then must do as they did.

Thomas Nelson Page, writing long after the war, first gained reputation with a volume of short stories, *In Ole Virginia*. One of the stories, "Marse Chan," is told by a Negro body-servant after the death of his master. The qualities and character of the Negro are brought out as being loyalty, gentleness, love of his master and his folks, and a feeling that the world has lost much in the death of the young "white gemmuns" who have died in the war. Page also wrote one of the best of what I call the "plantation novels" in *Red Rock*. (The plantation novel is one about plantation life, giving a rosy picture of the kind and humane relations between master and slave and the romantic life of the whites who live on the plantation. The last of this kind was *Gone With The Wind*.) In *Red Rock* there is a short account of the life on two Virginia plantations before the war, a very brief account of events during the war, and a long account of what happens to the community after the war. In this book there are many Negro characters that vary all the way from "Doctor Moses" the "trick doctor" and consummate villain, to old Tarquin, the servant of Dr. Carey, who speaks as correct English as his master and is moved by the same high principles. One of the carpet-baggers tries to bribe Tarquin to betray some of the secrets of his master and other gentlemen of the community, but is met only with cold contempt. Much of the book presents a picture of the dilemma of newly freed Negroes who do not know what to do with freedom nor whom to trust. In many respects the book is a realistic account of what happened in many places in the South during the reconstruction period.

So far, I have been trying to trace in a sketchy manner the way the Negro has been presented in books and stories by white writers through the nineteenth century. All the writers I have mentioned were of the South and have shown the Negro with different degrees of love and understanding. Except for showing a few villains, all of the writers have shown the good and valuable qualities. They have particularly delighted in his humor and his highly poetic speech. None of us who grew up in the South can read any of these books or stories without recognizing traits that we have known and loved in Negroes.

Roark Bradford, the last of the writers that I wish to discuss, was born in Lauderdale County, Tennessee, August 21, 1896, the eighth of eleven children of Richard Clarence Bradford and Patricia Adelaide Tillman Bradford. He is a direct descendant of William Bradford of Massachusetts, but his family has lived in the South since Colonial days. He attended schools in Tennessee and Arkansas but did not go to college. During the First World War he was a lieutenant of artillery, but did not get across. He served as a ballistics instructor and in other capacities and was discharged in Athens, Georgia, in 1920. He then went to work on the *Atlanta Georgian*, for which he did regular reporting and wrote feature articles. In 1922 he went to New Orleans to the *Times Picayune*, serving as night city editor and later as Sunday editor.

Bradford's first published fiction was about Negroes—a series of stories for the *New York World*. His second story won the O. Henry Prize for the best story in 1927. Later, these stories were collected and published as *Ol' Man Adam and His Chillun* in 1927. The book was very successful, and Marc Connelly reworked it into the play *The Green Pastures* to win the Pulitzer Prize in 1930.

In this book Bradford has retold many of the Bible stories from the point of view and on the level of understanding of the illiterate Negro. All of the Biblical characters are Negro in speech, in thought, and in actions. Even the Lawd, though he is pictured by the illustrators as a genial, elderly white plantation owner, is Negro in his reactions to the actions of humans and in his speech and logic. Connelly was quite right in making him an elderly, wise, genial Negro, for he retained Bradford's own characterization.

In the first story, "Eve and That Snake," God has simply rented Adam and Eve a farm and has instructed them not to eat the apples because they will sell well in the fall. Neither of them care anything about apples, but unfortunately Eve gets to chasing a snake and throwing rocks at it. It glides into the orchard and under the apple tree. Eve makes a wild throw, misses the snake, and knocks an apple off the tree. As it is already off the tree, she decides to try it, but after taking a bite she doesn't like it and decides to carry it to Adam. He doesn't want it and complains that she never brings him anything he likes. This hurts her feelings so that she cries, and Adam has to promise to buy her a new dress to cheer her up. He eats the apple, but doesn't care for it. He buys Eve the new dress, but when the Lawd arrives and sees it he knows that something is up. He makes them tell him the whole affair and becomes very angry and says that he will have nobody on the place that steals his apples. "So he bailed old Adam's trover and leveled on his crop and mule, and put Adam and Eve off'n de place." Adam had to get a job working on the levee at six bits a day.

The whole book is full of just such delightful anachronisms. When Cain speaks to the gal ape whom he meets in the land of Nod, she threatens to call the police. The Lawd comes to the earth before the flood and finds the men and boys shooting dice. Noah is a preacher who has to do the preaching and the bassing in the choir too. After a chicken dinner, the Lawd

reveals himself. The ark that Noah builds is a Mississippi River steamer. The Gypsies kidnap Joseph and ask five hundred dollars ransom for him and his sheep. Jacob will not pay it. The Pharaoh "who knew not Joseph" is concerned because the sheriff tells him the Hebrew boys are out-voting the Egyptians at the polls. He asks the sheriff why he doesn't "granddaddy-clause dem Hebrews." The sheriff tells Pharaoh that this will not work because all the Hebrew boys know who their granddaddy and their great-granddaddy is. Pharaoh then asks why he doesn't Jim Crow them. The sheriff replies "De las man Jim Crowed'em Uncle Sam got him dragging a ball and chain." Moses is a trickster who out-tricks Pharaoh's magicians. Salome does a striptease act for Judge Pilate. Fact and fancy from the Bible are inextricably mixed. Everything that the unlearned Negro mind cannot understand is changed into something that is within his comprehension.

Anyone who has seen *The Green Pastures* has seen the characters and enjoyed the humor of the book to some extent. The play, however, has a tightness of structure and proceeds to a logical climax and ending. It is clearly the product of an educated person's mind. The book, on the other hand, has a loose structure and no story is finished logically and completely. Each separate story records an experience of man in the trials and temptations of human life and is never finished completely as the struggle between good and evil is never finished. The book is far more realistic than the play in its approach to revealing the Negro mind.

Bradford, in 1929, published *This Side of Jordan*, a straight novel about Negroes on a Delta plantation. It is a wonderful study of Negro character and a vivid account of what happened on the plantation during the time of a great flood. The next year he published *Ol' King David and the Philistine Boys*. Though this book is delightful, it seems to lack the spontaneity and freshness of *Ol' Man Adam*. In 1930, also, he published *How Come Christmas*, a tender and beautiful story

showing the Negro's idea of the origin of Christmas. Santa Claus comes home tired one night, but after supper his wife tells him that there is a new baby up at Miss Mary's house. He loves babies so much that, against his wife's opinion, he decides to go and see the new baby. He has no gift to take but a red apple. When he arrives at the house, he sees all the wise men and the kings with their costly gifts and is ashamed of his apple. Nevertheless, he gives it to the child. The baby likes the apple better than all his treasures. Santa plays with the baby and makes him laugh. The Lawd is present and tells Santa that since he loves children and since he has made the Po' Little Jesus happy for an hour, he is to have the task of making all children happy. Santa demurs and asks if he has to make them happy all the time, for there are times when "all chilluns gits in de dozens." The Lawd agrees that he need make them happy only once a year. Thus comes Christmas.

In 1930 Bradford published his epic *John Henry*. John Henry is to the Negro laborer what Paul Bunyan is to the logger. It is evident that Bradford borrowed from Rabelais, for the birth of John Henry somewhat parallels the birth of Gargantua, and he lives as largely as does the latter. He walks up the gang plank carrying six hundred pounds of sugar instead of the usual two hundred because he wants to carry his woman on the boat, and it takes twice what an ordinary roustabout makes to pay her fare and he wants to earn wages besides. No job is too big for him. He builds a railroad, he fires the redball freight for Old Man One-Eyed Billy Shelley, and he drives more steel in one day than any other man can do. Yet, there is a deeply tragic note in the book, for John Henry, with all his strength, can never find happiness, rest, or content. No job is too great for him and no woman can hold him, but there is a *gris-gris* on him, and the immanence

of death is always in his consciousness. He is never beaten on any job until the last when he loads more cotton in a day than a steam-driven machine can do and dies with his cotton hook in his hand.

Bradford wrote a number of other books, *Kingdom Coming*, *Let the Band Play Dixie*, *The Three-Headed Angel*, and *The Green Roller*, but none of these attained the success of *Ol' Man Adam* and *John Henry*. During the late 1930's and early 1940's he wrote a number of stories for *Colliers's Magazine* about the Negroes on his Little Bee Bend Plantation in Louisiana. Some of the characters in these stories are the Widow Duck, who always says that God will change conditions, Giles, the Negro foreman, Modom Aw-bear the witch, Play-Mama Perkins, Newman Dyke who is a tremendous worker and the desire of all the girls, and Splitting Samuel, the preacher. These stories have never been collected and published in book form.

During the Second World War, Bradford was on duty with the Navy, spending some time in French West Africa. While there, he contracted amebiasis and never recovered from it. He taught creative writing at Tulane University up until his death in 1948.

David L. Cohn wrote the most fitting epitaph for him in a short article in the *Saturday Review of Literature*.⁴ He tells of his long friendship with Bradford and of the many pleasant hours they spent together. One incident was very amusing. Cohn and Bradford were both fishing in the same pool for a big catfish. Cohn was lucky enough to catch him, and Bradford, disconcerted, swore that he would get revenge. Cohn did not take this threat seriously. Some time later they were visiting William Alexander Percy at Greenville and Percy told them that a group of Negroes were dedicating a new church. The three went and sat through a series of ser-

⁴ David L. Cohn, "Straight to Heaven," *Saturday Review of Literature*, XXXI (December 4, 1948), 20.

mons by Negro ministers. Finally, the chairman asked if one of the white gentlemen would like to say something. Bradford rose and, pacing up and down in front of the pulpit, began to tell the Negroes about Cohn. Cohn was a local boy, he told them, who had grown up in Greenville, had become very successful, and had gone to Chicago and bought out Sears Roebuck with twenty thousand one-dollar bills. Not content with that, he had gone abroad to live in sin. He had bought a house with twenty-eight rooms in it with a case of drinkin'-likker and a lady in every room. Now he had wearied of sin and had come home to do good and was going to give all his money to the churches. The Negro pastor arose after this and let it be known that he would expect at least a hundred dollars of this money.

The enormity of Bradford's act did not dawn on Cohn for some hours. Back at Percy's house that night, instead of sleeping he began to think of all the Negro churches in and around Greenville that needed paint and repairs or even entirely new structures. He knew that the story about him would be spread all over the country before daylight. He arose early and, leaving the hundred dollars for the church with Will Percy's cook, he took Percy's car and set out for New Orleans. He was never able to even the score with Bradford.

Cohn said that Bradford was one of the pure in heart who lived his life in love and gentleness. He was one of the few white men whom ordinary Negroes liked and trusted enough to tell about their own lives and troubles. He had written of the Negro as no one else had before and no one else ever would again.

"Brad spent most of his adult years recording tenderly, often with moving eloquence, and always sympathetically, the life of the southern Negro. . . . It is, we now perceive, a way of life that is rapidly passing, for the plantation Negro, like

the rest of us, has latterly become the victim, or beneficiary . . . of what is called progress. Hence we are doubly indebted to Brad. First for the joy of reading him; second, for recording a way of life that will soon vanish."⁵

The old way of life has indeed passed. The old plantation life in which the work was done by hand by the Negroes and the plantation was maintained by the brains and capital of the white owner has ended. Machinery has replaced the unskilled laborer, and many Negroes have left the South to find employment elsewhere. The Negro has realized the necessity of education and has applied himself to it. Yet he has lost the security that the old way of life gave him. Now the Negro, if we judge from the statements of his spokesman, views all whites with suspicion and sometimes with hatred.

Truly, the death of Bradford marked the end of an era and the end of a literary tradition. It is hardly possible that there will exist in the future a relation between white and Negro such as existed when Bradford began to write nearly forty years ago. And the Negro that Bradford portrays, irresponsible, poetic in language, rich in humor, and very lovable, is practically gone from the American scene. The modern Negro is determined to have a better life, in material things anyway, than he was ever able to have in the plantation life, and it is only right that he should have. But something joyous and beautiful is lost.

⁵ Ibid.

**THE CHANGING RELIGIOUS SCENE:
NEW WINE, NEW BOTTLES?**

By FRANK E. FAUX

Read at a meeting of The Egyptians, March 15, 1962

At the turn of the century, Henry Adams, his nostalgia to the contrary, found the movement from unity into multiplicity, between the years 1200 and 1900, to be unbroken in sequence and rapid in acceleration. The Virgin, as a symbol of life energy, or life force, had been replaced by the Dynamo.

By 1850, science and technology had accelerated at such a rapid pace that the average mind was having difficulty in reconciling their results with the then current areas of human relationships. In 1900, Adams predicted should science and technology prolong the accelerated pace one generation longer, a new social mind would be required. This was a startling prediction, because for five or ten thousand years the mind had successfully reacted, and nothing had yet proved that it would not continue to react. But now, said Adams, it would need to *jump*. The progression of science since Adams' prediction has intensified still more, and the jump to be taken by the mind is over an ever-widening chasm—a chasm whose yawning could well devour us. Tomorrow, the genetic code may be cracked. If the social mind—our politics and education and religion—is laggard now, how can it possibly cope with the awesome and the awful tomorrow?

A new social mind *is* needed. The day when one man could be scientist, politician, and theologian is gone. It is gone because the religion which shaped and controlled the sciences and politics from Alexander to the Enlightenment is a thing of the past. Religion has not fully recovered from the errors of Aristotle, and, although it has sought, in part, to adapt to the ever expanding new truths of modern science and the problems these new truths present, it has not been willing to

fashion the full cloth. Politics and education have suffered while religion has been hesitant to recognize the changing world of knowledge and of thought. The Virgin *has* given way to the Dynamo. Let us face up to the necessity for our jump, and that our efforts to avoid it have only complicated the take-off. The techniques of the board jump are quite different now than they were fifty years ago. As the required distance for a successful leap has continually increased, more and more have the old patterns changed. The doctrine and the ritual that made possible a leap of twenty feet in 1896 cannot suffice for the twenty seven feet in 1962. The coaches, the athletes, and the spectators experienced disturbance and shock and resistance during the transition, but the ideal of rest is never safe and must give way to change. So it is with the social mind, of which religion is the major part.

Please do not imply from the sub-title of this paper, *New Wine, New Bottles*, that I must be thinking in terms of a new religion. That a new wine is fermenting, I think there can be no doubt; that new bottles are required to contain it does not necessarily follow. The bottles may have to assume new shapes, however, as they have done on other occasions in history. It is the process of fermentation that is significant. Are we properly aiding the natural change developing? Are we adding the proper ingredients? Are we skimming the froth off the substance?

We in the United States have long prided ourselves as living in a Christian nation, of being a religious nation, yet, it was not until 1941 that church membership included 50% of the population. By 1960, 63% was claimed for church membership by the 254 sects and denominations, including the non-Christian. Membership is at an all time high. Before we get too excited about numbers, however, we should recall that several of the large denominations never drop names from the rolls, except by death, thus continuing to count the inactive and doubling up the transfers; that others are hesitant

to reduce their official numbers; that persons join a church just because it is of new construction, and there are many of these; that holding church membership is the socially accepted and proper thing to do, regardless of theological beliefs; that none of these has anything to do with religion. Growth in church membership has gone hand in hand with the great depression of the thirties, the world war in the forties, and the development of nuclear weapons in the fifties. Through fear—not adoration or love or gratitude or reverence—through fear, millions who had neglected religion suddenly felt an urgent need to return to the church; preferably, a church that had moved from depressed areas where it could have been of service to a more fashionable section of town where dirt and decay would not bother the conscience. During those years, religious books became best sellers, movies featured God in the leading roles, civic organizations sponsored *Go To Church Sundays* (always in October, never in July), business men's prayer rooms appeared in contemporary architecture, a room for meditation was provided in the United Nations headquarters. It was not enough that *In God We Trust* was stamped on our coins; it must be emblazoned on our folding money. We learned to pledge loyalty, not simply under the flag, but under God, also, no matter what the addition did to the rhythm of the liturgy. Popular music picked up the gospel beat. Homage was paid to the peace of soul and peace of mind boys and the spiritual leaders were not an Amos or a Jeremiah but Fulton Sheen, Norman Vincent Peale, Billy Graham, and Dwight Eisenhower. As results of their leadership, came a highly visible conformity, as outer fears and inner doubts were played upon for rigidity in thought and in life patterns. The mass media successfully replaced the Muezzin's call to prayer, the sound of the shophar, and the tolling of the bells—so successfully that one could say, "Henry Luce *does* more than Niebuhr *can* to justify God's ways to

man." The joiners turned out full force; and the Lord God of Hosts, The Alpha and Omega had become a psychiatrist. You will forgive my failure to see any manifestation of the Holy Spirit in any of this.

It may be that what has been called a "return to religion" was only a growing interest in religion by alienated modern man. If so, I suggest there is a vast gulf between them. There are indications that, despite the high percentage of church members, interest is flagging. The new piety is becoming a little aged. It is neither as vocal nor insistent as it was five years ago. The pseudo-prophets are no longer at their peak. Dr. Marty has pointed out that Billy Graham's finest hour came in 1957 in New York; the rest is repetition, and Roy Eckhardt has added that David met Goliath and "Goliath yawned." So did the other Philistines. If the analysis is in error, and interest in religion remains high, we know that interest is not enough; commitment is required. The actions of Christians—and others—do not offer proof of their stated belief in hell, nor do they support the expressed desire for heaven. C. S. Lewis has put it this way, "In the days when most people had a religion, what is meant by an interest in religion could hardly have existed. For of course religious people—that is, people when they are being religious—are not interested in religion. Men who have gods worship those gods; it is the spectators who describe this as an interest in religion. The moment a man seriously accepts a deity his interest in religion is at an end. He has something else to think about."

Three men of the past century and one of this have advanced ideas that have shaken complacent religious beliefs to their very roots. Their influence has been tremendous. I suggest religion has not yet learned to deal with the ideas of Marx, of Darwin, of Freud, and of Einstein. It is they who are bringing about the changing religious scene and we know it. Religious truth cannot be contrary to truth from any other

source, and no matter how much we may dislike the products of these men's ideas, we ignore them at our peril. When they have been attacked, too often has confusion and disillusionment been compounded. That men of religion are concerned about its condition is readily discernible. They are trying to deal with change and to accommodate their religion to it. Whether the various forms of accommodation are valid is, in my opinion, questionable. But, there is an inner tension tearing at every denomination, be it Roman Catholic or Unitarian, orthodox or liberal, conservative or progressive. The conflict between science and religion affects all orthodoxy. As science recognizes the values of religion and religion those of science, we can be hopeful of eventual reconciliation, but I fear religion is dragging its feet. Any pre-scientific elements remaining in theology must be eliminated. This does not mean that empirical, scientific knowledge is the only knowledge available to man. I do not for one minute believe that, but in our search for spiritual truth there must be complete mental freedom rather than bondage, reason rather than reliance, a generous tolerance rather than certitude.

Only two days ago, an eminent divine in Memphis for the conducting of a religious emphasis week, was quoted in the press as saying, "Our capacity for scientific development has outrun our capacity for moral development. We cannot regress to Victorianism, or to Calvinist authoritarianism. We need a new, dynamic Puritanism which must replace the 19th century idea of hell-fire which frightened people into conversion." Quite so. Here is a man of religion concerned about its present condition. He has recognized the inevitableness of change and wants to do something about it. He does not stand alone; there are many changes in the making. I do not know what his "new, dynamic Puritanism" is, but I approve his rejection of the old. The old Puritan ethic built into its theology is a mill stone about the neck of Protestantism. The idea of working from sunup to sundown, of creating for utility and subsistence only, of saving now for some future

happiness in the realm of economics, and of denial and forbearance in the realm of the spirit now in exchange for some future reward is not longer valid. Modern man not only wants, but feels he is entitled to the greatest possible degree of material and spiritual happiness now. He is willing to take one world at a time. Think, too, upon the day when automation reduces the work week to twenty hours and makes millions unemployable in the usual sense of that term. Salvation is no longer a personal thing; it is now social in character.

Another contributor to the changing religious scene is urbanization. I suggest the theology of cities differs from that of rural areas. The "old time religion" about which we so joyfully sing was pitched to an agricultural economy, as was that of the deistic Founding Fathers who believed in "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God." You recall Cain, who went away from the presence of the Lord because he had violated the ground with the blood of Abel. Cain, the evil one, dwelt in the land of Nod, where he builded a city. You will recall that Father Abraham avoided the cities as being evil and that Lot was a city dweller. And, as we view the migrations of our own people from the farms and plantations to the cities, we are mindful of the admonition given the people of Israel by Moses as they were about to enter the promised land, "And it shall be, when the Lord thy God shall have brought thee into the land to give thee great and goodly cities which thou buildest not, and houses of all good things which thou fillest not, and wells digged which thou diggedst not; when thou shalt have eaten and be full, then beware lest thou forget the Lord." Yes, the theologies are different, but the cities bring civilization and its discontents and they call for a new theology. The laws of Nature have been changed from those accepted in 1776. So has the economy and the religion. Urbanization is related to the industrial economy, to specialization, to scientific advancement, to auto-

mation, to social salvation. It has even changed the Sabbath day as more and more churches, confronted with longer and longer weekends, cease to observe Sunday as the day of worship.

As the old theologies are being re-evaluated, we find persons who do not subscribe to them granted church membership, even in Memphis, through the simple procedure of not replying "yes" to questions of belief. The old theologies are being ignored by the clergy and laity alike. It is not uncommon to learn through the public press of the disbelief of Episcopal, Lutheran, and Southern Baptist clergymen—to name only a few—in the immaculate conception, virgin birth, and other doctrines. Indeed, so old fashioned has become the God of our Fathers that many semantics-frightened clergymen, in both liberal and orthodox churches, tremble in terror and distaste at speaking His name. Statistics of Methodist Districts recently published show every church gaining in membership, but many reporting no new members accepted on profession of faith.

In an effort to stem or direct the tide, some men of religion are desperately involved in formulating a new means to the same old end. Two of the new means are neo-orthodoxy and existentialism. I do not agree with a close friend who said the only difference between the neo-orthodox and the orthodox is that the neo-orthodox have gone to college, for Niebuhr has gone to great lengths to assure us the neo-orthodox are not interested in the furnishings of heaven nor the temperatures of hell. Yet, neo-orthodoxy brings us out at the same point as does the old, and its interpretation of history is blasphemy against a loving God. I see some of my Southern Presbyterian and Lutheran friends in an almost frenzied obsession with existentialism—that of Kierkegaard and Tillich, of course, not that of Sartre. Now surely, existence is of the essence, but is it the essence? True, man does not determine his entry into this world nor his exit from it. Life in it is beset with troublesome days, sleepless nights, calamities beyond his

making and control, but to call life tragic because it is to no avail and ends in death, modern man does not accept. He rejoices in life and he grows in spirit as he meets its challenges and fulfills its purposes. It is in the struggle, not some promised rest, he finds his God. So, I find it frightening that men of religion—men who were unable to accept all the numerous old theologies—are now struggling to master existential theology in all its Heinz varieties.

A secular humanism is contributing to the changing scene. It is the product of rational thought and empirical science; it cannot be ignored. The measure of man is man, says the humanist, and have we another rod with which to measure him? Its denial of much that was once considered sacred is no longer a problem for modern man. But, it seems to me, humanism presents itself with the great problem of determining how nature, undirected by any cosmic purpose and containing no cosmic absolutes, could give birth to the humanistic ideal, the absolute value of truth. Then too, in this day of hustle and bustle, amid noise and confusion, and along with a worship of empiricism, we note a rise of mysticism: a mysticism not a part of existing religions, but a sort of no-religion. The outstanding movement in this area is Zen Buddhism. Perhaps, in the re-evaluation, it is recalled that all the great men of the spirit were mystics. It is good to withdraw and gain new insights. It is too early to know how the Western disciples of Zen will function. We can only hope they will return to share their spiritual insights with us, else they remain incomplete even for the possessor.

The change and attempted reconciliation most prominent in the public eye is that of ecumenicity. Some denominations seem to be ashamed there is so much division within the house of the one God. It is a shame that so much money and so many human resources are wasted in supporting 254 denominations, but we thank God there is not only one. That there are too many, we agree, and will watch with interest the progress of the ecumenical movement. One wonders if merg-

ers and consolidations so willingly entered into and agreed upon are not indications of a weakening theology by one party or both. There are those who say it is not so. Many persons, however, have so little interest in doctrines and dogmas that they find themselves holding on to old values in theory, but observing new values in practice. Thus, what was once a very clear and well defined religion is now quite blurred and fuzzy. Where once a particular religion was of prime importance, many now have the assurance that all religions are working toward the same goal and it no longer makes any difference which is embraced. What was once the vital part of religion is often ignored by both the clergy and the laity. If theologians are no longer vital, would one be naive to think of Micah asking, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?"

The evolution of religious thought is similar to evolution in other areas. Change, in itself, does not guarantee progress, yet, in pursuit of spiritual truths, the non-truths must be omitted. Change is a continuous process, sometimes so slow and quiet as to be almost undiscernible; at other times, so rapid and so loud as to bring radical measures into play in order to combat or reconcile it. The religious scene today presents, on one hand, an erosion that has swept away the top soil in which cherished beliefs were nurtured; on the other hand, an attempt to fill in the gullies and to plant shelter belts of trees of various species. Every now and then in the course of human events—and in divine, too, I have no doubt—it becomes necessary to reform religion. History tells us this is so, and may be telling us this is another of the times. It tells us, also, that nothing can reform religion but religion. Buddhism, Christianity, Islam—all began as reform movements within an established religion, but could not function within the old framework. The new wine of reform called for new bottles in which to mature. The Western, Christian world after only 1900 years is threatening to destroy itself. Whether or not it will is not yet clear, but if it is ready to commit

suicide, is it time for the old religion to give way to a new? If so, no formula will bring the needed reform, only a spirit will do that. As the men of religion, the men of good will, seek to adapt themselves and their religion through the procedures I have mentioned, let them be mindful of the terrible responsibility that rested upon those who reformed religion in the past. They had to look humbly into their own souls and then make the awesome decision as to whether or not they possessed that quality of spiritual life which, if followed, would make for a better world.

Seven hundred and fifty years ago, in an era now called the Age of Faith, the Church was very unhappy with Joachim of Flora and his heretical thought. He had divided the history of man into three stages: the first, under the rule of God the Father, ended at the Nativity; the second, ruled by the Son, would last, according to apocalyptic calculations, 1260 years; the third, under the Holy Ghost, would be preceded by a time of troubles, of war and poverty and ecclesiastical corruption, and would be ushered in by the rise of a new religious order which would cleanse the Church, and would realize peace, justice, and happiness. Ah, Joachim, you may yet be the greatest of all prophets! The age of the Father is past; the age of the Son is passing; the age of the Spirit is yet to come! I am so glad Dante saw him in paradise.

One day after a lengthy dissertation such as this, Socrates was of the opinion that he had spoken true, but was willing to admit he could have been in error. "Reflect well," he said to his listeners, "and when you have found the truth, come and tell me." Will you do the same?

**OUR AGRICULTURAL BLESSING:
OPPORTUNITY OR PROBLEM**

By RUDI E. SCHEIDT

(Read at a meeting of "THE EGYPTIANS," December 14, 1961)

When John Maloney questioned me several months ago as to the topic I wished to address the Egyptians, the first one that came to mind was a review of our agricultural situation today. This, despite the fact that in doing so, I must ask the indulgence of those of you present who are so well versed on this subject, and who, I hope will freely criticize, add to, and comment, upon the conclusion of this paper. However, I felt that for those not so familiar with our agricultural blessing and problem, this would be an appropriate time to discuss the subject because

(1) basic critical decisions must be made in the near future that will change the course of agriculture and

(2) we have reached the stage where agriculture—its abundance, its surpluses, its problems, etc.—has come to be regarded as the outcast of our economic structure rather than the enabler of our economic boom.

First of all, then, let us examine American agriculture. Just what is it?

It is, today, America's largest industry. The American farm industry can count its assets at over 200 billion dollars. Of this total, 185 billion represent physical assets: land, machinery, equipment, etc. The physical assets of American agriculture are 50% larger than the physical assets of all manufacturing industries in the United States.—And here is one that may be as much of a surprise to you as it was to me—The depreciated value of farm equipment, machinery and motor vehicles used on today's farms is twice as great as the physical assets of the entire automobile and farm

machinery industries. The value of farm machinery and motor vehicles on American farms today is greater than the combined physical assets of the chemical and paper industries.

But, more important, let us look at the progress of this industry. The total assets of American agriculture have increased fourfold since 1940 and have increased 80% since 1950—a remarkable growth record. And this growth in assets of 150 billion dollars was accomplished with a debt increase of only 14 billion dollars. The total farm debt today is only 24 billion compared to assets of over 200 billion dollars.

How about productivity on the farm? Comparing 1960 with 1947, which might be considered the first full year in an economic sense after World War II, farm productivity, or output per manhour, increased over 100%—while non-farm productivity increased only about 40%. Since 1950 productivity in farming has been increasing at the rate of about 9% a year, a productivity gain greater than in any other major industry. Farm output in 1960 was 30% higher than the 1947/49 average. Today in the United States it takes less than 10% of the nation's work force to produce an overabundance of food. In Western Europe the percentage needed to produce an adequate supply is close to 25%, and in the Soviet Union more than 40%. I think we are all aware of the advances made in farm technology—particularly in the last five years. To illustrate: the average annual yield per acre of corn increased from 39 bushels during the 10 year period 1947-56, to 51½ bushels in 1959. In cotton the rise was from 317 pounds to 462—in wheat the earlier figure was 17.7 bushels while the yield in 1959 was 21.3. For all crops, comparing the 1947-56 average with 1959, the increase in yield per acre has been about 20½%.

I am sure that in the minds of most of you there now arises a very natural question; What is the agricultural problem? You have seen illustrated the very rapid growth of agriculture, its excellent record in productivity, and the out-

standing advances made in technology. Additionally, it might be stated that this forward progress in agriculture has served to provide the American people with the lowest food cost on earth and, at the same time, one of the world's richest and most nutritious diets. Only about 20% of average consumer income was spent for food in 1961 compared with 28% in 1948. A smaller percentage of consumer income is required for today's diet than was required in the depression mid-Thirties.

Considering the above, what then is the basic problem inherent in our agricultural blessing? Briefly—and we will come back to detail the problem later—the phenomenal assets mentioned above have in recent years produced the lowest return to the American farmer in history. In 1946/47/48 income per person living on farms averaged about 60% as much as income per person on the non-farm population. This dropped to 45% for the period 1957/58/59. In 1960 average income per person for the non-farm population was \$2,247, and for the farm population, only \$885. In other words, in recent years per capita farm income has not kept pace with the non-farm population—and all this despite soaring public cost, large production, and multiple panaceas by Government.

To understand the problem better, perhaps we should now look at the changes that have recently taken place down on the farm. All of us here, if not now at least some time during very recent years, have visualized in our mind the American farmer as a man in his late fifties, weatherbeaten, bespectacled, clad in faded blue overalls, holding a pitchfork in his hand, his straight-haired wife in a calico apron, and behind the two, the white farm house and the red barn. Their eyes proclaim to the world their pride in the soil, and their manner bespeaks prairie independence. Despite this glorified perception, these two Americans and their world are passing gradually into the realm of folklore and folk-song—much in the same way that the horse-drawn buggy and the wood plow are now being collected at antique fairs.

The technological revolution has overtaken the American farm, and the stereotype of the unbusinesslike dirt farmer is being erased, slowly, by the sure but inexorable march of technology and economics—in a still capitalistic society. Today's farmer is a specialist. He is a businessman. His farm is mechanized. His capital needs are extensive. Although the family farm is King, large corporate farms are emerging on the American landscape. Oldtime self-sufficiency—the all-round farmer—raising hogs, chickens, vegetables, fruits, grains, and a little of just about everything else, has long since yielded to specialization and virtually complete dependence on the market . . . And this, perhaps, is the crux of the problem.

Do you remember the farmer's life—rustic, rigorous, kerosene lamps, horse-power provided by, of all things, horses! The farmer's life was hard. Toil was back-breaking from sun-up to sun-down. Cows were milked by hand with only the aid of a three-legged stool. Breakfast was cooked on a wood-burning stove which also served to warm the wintry farm house. Wood was chopped with an ax and the portable powered chain saw was not even heard of. The farmer guided his plow and trudged behind his team of two horses. A good deal of sowing was done as in Biblical days—broadcasting seed from a sack slung over the shoulder. In the farmer's home the laundry was done on a wash-board. Clothes were few and they were cut, sewed, patched, darned, and made over many times into various sizes. Since the harvest came almost all at one time, the canning, pickling, jellifying, and meat smoking were all performed by the farmer's wife. Today's increasingly mechanized farmer, like his father, is still a planter, harvester, veterinarian, and do-it-yourselfer; but today's farmer is also a price conscious, cost conscious busi-

nessman—an agronomist and a soil engineer—and, with his investment in land and equipment, a capitalist. As a businessman, today's farmer must know when to buy more land and how much per acre he can pay in view of its prospective yield. He must be able to prorate the purchase price of new farm equipment in terms of productivity, depreciation, and income tax allowances. With an eye on market conditions, he must select the right cash crop and animals for his farm. He must know the right time to sell his crops and the animals he raises. He must be an expert in irrigation and soil conservation. If he continually makes bad decisions, he will—like all businessmen who do so—fail.

And like all of us, today's farmer is, and in a sense unfortunately so, a political man. It is here—in politics—that his dilemma lies; for the political arena is the battleground of old and new—of pitiful dependence and stimulating independence—of assumed mendicancy and free enterprise. Finally then, the farm problem is a political problem.

Returning to the technological revolution on the American farm, a quotation from President Eisenhower's farm message to the Congress in 1958 sums it up this way:

"The rapid changes taking place in agriculture are largely the result of a major breakthrough in agricultural science and technology. In recent years agriculture has been experiencing a veritable revolution in productivity. A century ago, an American farm worker fed himself and three others. Today he feeds himself and twenty others. A century ago, our population was 82% rural. Today it is only one-third rural and only 12% of our population actually lives on farms. There has been more change in agriculture within the lifetime of men now living than in the previous two thousand years."

Farm productivity has increased more in the last 12 years than in the previous 120 years. Today a farmer with modern equipment can plow one acre in 48 minutes as compared to 2.6 hours in 1920. He can dig sixty post holes in 2.5 hours

as compared to ten hours in 1920. Today he can do by machine what only recently he did by hand: bale hay, shuck corn, pick cotton, chop forage, plant seed, cut grain, and fertilize land. A mechanical cotton-picker replaces forty to eighty human pickers. A potato-digging machine can outpace seventeen men. A mechanical celery-picker not only does the picking but also packs the celery in cartons on the field.

Remember the horse and mule? Allow me to introduce to you the tractor—particularly one equipped with such standard equipment as fluid drive, power steering, and headlights. It can pump, lift, pull, carry, dig, push, and level. With a generator it can provide electricity. With a pump attachment, it can spray insecticides and weed-killing chemicals. There are now approximately 4,800,000 tractors on the American farm, or an average of $1\frac{1}{3}$ tractors per farm. Just this one facet of horsepower revolution gives an inkling as to what has been happening down on the farm.

This revolution, however, embraces not only mechanical wonders but also major changes in chemicals, fertilizers, insecticides, weed killers and plant hormones. In 1960, for example, the farmer used three times as much fertilizer on his fields than he did in 1940, and better than four to five times as much as he used in 1930.

Probably one of the more important successes of the technological revolution has been to negate the old expression "You can't do anything about the weather." With today's advanced machinery and modern farming methods, crop failures and like farm disasters due to weather factors have been significantly reduced. Just think how much faster crops can be planted with the use of mechanization and how much faster they can be picked, or harvested, by these means. In fact, the technological revolution may indeed make a disbeliever out of The Reverend Thomas Malthus, whose "law"

predicted a perpetual scarcity of food with a surplus of population ever pressing on the available food. Malthus' "Law," which may now be dated, from his "Essay on Population" reads as follows:

"It must ever be true that the surplus produce of the cultivators, taken in its most enlarged sense, measures and limits the growth of that part of the society which is not employed on the land. Throughout the whole world, the number of manufacturers, of merchants, of proprietors, and of persons engaged in the civil and military professions, must be exactly proportioned to this surplus produce and cannot in the nature of things increase beyond it."

The big economic upshot of this revolution is that bigger farms with fewer workers are feeding more people. In 1930 there were approximately $12\frac{1}{4}$ million farm workers; in 1940 this figure was reduced to 11 million; and in 1960 this figure is slightly over 7 million—including both farmers and hired workers. Technology in a sense forces up the size of farms in order to get greater utilization of farm machinery and reduced per-unit overhead. In 1940 the average farm acreage was 174 acres; in 1950, 215 acres; and in 1959, 303 acres. In 1940 the farm population was not significantly changed and it represented 23% of our national population. By 1950, however, there were over 5 million people less on the farm, and farm population represented only 17% of our total population. Today's farm population is under 20 million and represents about 10% to 11% of our population. What the farm technological revolution has obviously done is replace human labor with capital assets. Farming has become a capital-intensive rather than a labor-intensive industry.

Much as in the manufacturing industry—only on a larger and faster scale—automation has come to the farm. Man is being replaced by the machine. Today's average farm has capital value somewhere between 35,000 and 40,000 dollars. This includes only real estate, machinery and livestock. The average capital asset per farm worker is about \$25,000.

With this background, we are now in position to examine the problem. We have established the basic soundness of the largest industry in the United States, namely Agriculture. We have established its growth, its efficiency, its potential for economic production and, most of all, I hope you can now visualize in your mind the rapid change in the nature of American farming during our time. Just what, then, are our problems?

(1) The farmer has not been able to realize any financial benefit whatsoever, on an average, from the vast technological improvements and large increases in efficiency effected in farming over the last 20 to 30 years. Today's farmer obtains a smaller return from his assets than at any time in history. Average income per farm family is less than \$2,200 a year.

(2) We have produced the most serious problem of farm poverty. There are today 1½ million farm operators who earn less than \$1500 per year farming. These people live in poverty in good times as well as in bad times. The 1959 Census showed there were 1,638,000 farms with total sales less than \$2,500 annually.

(3) The problem of declining farm income and farm poverty has arisen despite 7 billion dollar Federal Government agricultural budgets, despite a Government owned inventory of 5.5 billion dollars of agricultural commodities, and despite the fact that in recent years we have given away vast hoards of our farm products both in the United States and abroad.

With regard to the Department of Agriculture budget, it should be said that only about 2 billion to 3 billion dollars can truthfully be directly charged to farm price-support operations. Approximately 2 billion dollars of the Agricultural Department budget relates to the export sale of agricultural commodities, most of it in the form of our foreign aid program, which money probably should be allocated to the Department of State. Over 1 billion dollars of our agricultural

budget is allocated to conservation programs and the Forest Service, which carry out the doctrine of the preservation of our natural resources. This program has been a cornerstone of American policy since Theodore Roosevelt.

(4) At one time it could be said that the demand for farm products represented a non-competitive marketing situation. With the assistance of Government programs which have raised prices and—more important—made future commodity planning uncertain, outside competition has actively entered the farm market and threatens to become more serious in the years ahead. Farm fibers have lost about one-half of their former market and, whereas some percentage of this has been due to superior products, the majority of the loss has been due to high prices and lack of dependable supply. Synthetic detergents have taken over two-thirds of the household soap market, reducing the farmers' market for inedible tallow and grease. Today, 62% of our domestic shoe soles are made of synthetics rather than leather. The same might be said of the use of plastics and metals in the manufacture of luggage. Agricultural commodities are seldom used any more as the basic raw materials for making alcohol, chemicals, and plastics. One of our large American chemical companies is experimenting with a chemical substitute for flour and a pilot plant will be in operation next year. The protective umbrella of price supports has not only proven to be a boon for the synthetics manufacturer but also for the foreign farmer whose competition is severely affecting the market for American farm products both at home and abroad.

(5) The farmer today realizes a smaller share of the consumer dollar than at any time in history. This is compounded by the farmer, in turn, receiving directly only 40% of what the consumer spends on food. The other 60% is absorbed by such sales inducers as the popular cellophane-windowed, carton-packaged meat product.

(6) The aforementioned facts are true despite the Government's numerous attempts to assist the farmer. This assistance has taken the form of legislation large and complex, expensive and compromised—legislation that now affects 50% to 60% of all farm product sales. A compilation of the various laws and statutes relating to agriculture is put out by the United States Department of Agriculture and occupies 283 pages of fine print. To delve into our present farm legislation in detail would be a large and technical undertaking, so allow me to summarize for you some of the salient features of our present agricultural program.

The backbone of our farm legislation is a combination of acreage limitation with price support. The Secretary of Agriculture annually determines a national marketing quota for a particular commodity which is then converted into the corresponding acreage. This acreage is then divided among the nation's farmers on a historical basis. The price support guaranteed to the farmer is usually expressed in terms of a certain percentage of parity. Parity is the formula which equates the prices received by the farmer with the prices paid out by the farmer. One hundred percent of parity would mean, theoretically, that the farmer received for his products the same commensurate purchasing power as the average for the past 10 years. The price support mechanism is, in most cases, a non-recourse loan. There are many other control devices, some of which are direct payments to farmers, soil diversion payments, purchase programs, and the Soil Bank. The Soil Bank pays the farmer to take acreage out of production and put it into grass lands for a certain period of time.

What then are the causes of these farm problems?

The farm problem is certainly not unique in world history. Joseph had his farm problem in Biblical days. The Romans burned their vineyards. In some ways, our problems today are similar to those of past history. Our problem is one of over-

production, of cost-price squeeze, an over abundance of farmers and a lack of farmer bargaining power due to extreme fragmentation of the industry. Underlying these factors, government intervention must assume its share of blame.

It is not that Government intervention is the cause of all problems but merely that Government intervention, i.e., interfering with free choice and the free working of supply and demand (an attempt to supplant nature's laws by man's laws) has accentuated the problems that would normally occur in business or farm life. Government programs have not kept pace with the technological revolution on the farm, which most likely would have occurred whether or not there were Government farm programs. Government programs have greatly assisted in the creation and the perpetuation of farm poverty. It might be wise, therefore, to quickly review some of the Government intervention in our recent history and its effects on agriculture.

The present phase of our farm problems got its start in the period immediately prior to World War I, which can indeed be characterized the "Golden Age of American Agriculture." The West was largely settled, little new acreage was going into production. Europe, undergoing an extensive industrialization, was an enormous, growing buyer of American farm commodities. Immigration into the big American cities was providing growing urban consumption. In short, farm commodities and farm land prices were relatively high and trending upward. And then—the first shots of World War I were fired. European farm lands were converted into battlefields and the United States farmers filled the breach. The American farmer had hit a bonanza!

Twenty million additional acres of wheat and five million acres of rye were brought into production by wartime demand. Prices climbed to record highs. European farm production was out of competition "for the duration." "Food

Will Win the War" became the slogan of World War I. The world market seemingly belonged to the American farmer, but—not for long. The basic foundation for the severe farm depression that was to follow had been laid.

It was not long after the cessation of hostilities that the American farmer came face to face with normalcy. From 1919 to 1920 the price of wheat dropped to one-half; cotton prices were reduced two-thirds. Mortgage payments, predicated on high crop prices produced on sub-marginal lands, became impossible. The farm depression of the early Twenties arrived. The Farm Bloc in Congress was born. National farm organizations opened their offices in Washington with the cry—"Get prices higher!" The first reaction was to appeal to the Government for high tariffs in order to keep out so-called "cheap imports" from reborn Europe. Further steps were necessary and in 1922 the Capper-Volstead Act provided for the establishment of cooperatives, under the guise of substituting "orderly marketing" for unbridled farm competition. Co-ops and credit became the solution for pulling out of the farm depression. Cheap Government credit was provided to the cooperatives through the farm credit banks. Tax concessions were given to cooperatives and a division of the Department of Agriculture was set up for the sole purpose of furthering the growth of cooperatives.

Right here, if I may digress for a moment, is an example of how perhaps well-intentioned government aid can become an all-enveloping octopus. I hope that some time in the not too distant future one of you will present a paper to this group on the subject of cooperatives. In theory, I think all of us would be for the principle of cooperatives; namely, that farmers should be able to pool their interests in the marketing of their products so as to give them greater bargaining power in the market place. Cooperatives, however, were set up in the Twenties, and they still operate today without any Federal income tax whatsoever on retained earnings. They

can borrow money through the intermediate credit banks at rates of interests appreciably lower than private enterprise, since cooperative credit is guaranteed by the Federal Government. The result of this situation has not been, as a whole, "orderly marketing" to help the small farmer; but rather a tax gimmick to compete with private enterprise, and mainly benefiting the large producer. Today, cooperative marketing and purchasing associations use their tax-free retained earnings to participate in such varied businesses as insurance, chemical manufacture, petroleum pipe lines, cotton gins, cotton seed oil mills, and many other such non-farmer directly allied ventures. Farm purchasing and marketing cooperatives today have a net worth of well over 2 billion dollars and do over 10 billion dollars worth of business annually without paying a cent of corporate federal income tax.

But to get back to the history of our farm problem.

Cooperatives and credit, and tariffs, failed to retard the farm depression of the Twenties. This resulted in 1929 in the establishment of the Federal Farm Board, empowered to form "stabilization corporations," with a revolving fund of one-half billion dollars. These stabilization corporations were to buy up commodities to prevent a further descent of farm prices and, also, to engage actively in the business of trading in farm commodities. 1929 was hardly a good time to commence this operation, and the severe general depression that followed resulted in the Farm Board's one-half billion dollar revolving fund becoming more accurately a dissolving fund. Farmers dumped their wheat on the Farmers' National Grain Corporation instead of the market. A year later, in 1930, a new venture, the Grain Stabilization Corporation, was forced to purchase over one-half the visible supply of wheat, despite dumping considerable amounts on Germany, China, Brazil and other countries. This massive, active intervention in the marketing of farm commodities was mercifully liquidated by Presidential order in 1933. Its lesson has not yet been learned, however.

The New Deal's first venture into the farmers' business was the now-historical Agricultural Adjustment Act. It was set up in 1933 "to re-establish prices to farmers at a level that will give agricultural commodities a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy, equivalent to the purchasing power of agricultural commodities in the base 1909-1914 period." This was the introduction of the parity concept still in effect today. The AAA was also responsible at this time for the implementation of acreage controls, the lack of which was considered by many to be largely responsible for the ever-mounting surpluses. It endeavored to carry out its program through a policy of planned-scarcity; by effecting a vast reduction of farm acreage and animal population by authorizing market quota agreements with farmers. During the first year the United States Government contracted with 3 million individual farmers to control their individual crop production and marketing plans. These farmers signed a government contract; each farmer was paid a cash bonus which was financed by processing taxes on farm products and fiber processors, such as millers, packers, and cotton-textile manufacturers. In 1936 the U. S. Supreme Court held the AAA unconstitutional. Its main principles, however, were retained as part of the farm policy of the Roosevelt administration in the years to follow. The two big aims continued: (1) to replenish farm income and (2) to reduce production, not by resort to the free market, but by Government adjustment.

Benefit payments to farmers were stepped up—such as cash rental for land taken out of production, parity payments to subsidize market prices, etc.; the theory being that these payments were temporary until high farm prices obviated their need. Needless to say, this was only the beginning. The farmer merely shifted his land from a restricted crop to a non-restricted crop, thus creating new surpluses for old. It might be interesting to note that benefit and rental payments to farmers totaled 800 million dollars in 1939 and a like amount in 1940.

One of the strangest corporations ever chartered by the state of Delaware was the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation. Begun in 1933, it was "to make loans without recourse" to eligible farmers. Without recourse meant that if the market price of the crop used as collateral fell below the support price, the farmer would permanently turn his crop over to the CCC. If the market price rose above the support price, the farmer would repay his loan and retake his crop and the profit. The CCC has been a major tool in the structure of American farm laws to this day and it is by this means that our Government accumulates farm commodity surpluses.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 continued the prior policies of the AAA—only more so, despite the fact that the farm depression worsened. Embodied in the concept of the AA Act of 1938 was the Josephian concept of the "ever normal granary." The Government would buy farm products when prices were low, and sell them when prices were high. The AAA of 1938 also set "marketing quotas keyed to acreage allotments which were intended to keep supplies of certain commodities, designated as the basic agricultural commodities, in line with market demand." Yet for all the controls, year-to-year crop carry-overs continued to increase.

The farm planners, baffled over surpluses, tried various other schemes—the School Lunch Program, the Food-Stamp Plan, and many others about which you have heard a great deal. During World War II much of the pattern of World War I was repeated—expansion and over-capacity. The European phase of the Second World War, 1939-1941, pushed American farm prices up. Inflation and the expansion of money and credit was soon at work and total economic planning was soon to follow.

It was reasoned that with war-time subsidies likely to terminate at war's end, the farmers would not expand their acreage sufficiently to fulfill war time needs for fear of a

post-war price collapse. Therefore, as a further incentive to agriculture during the war, legislation was written to extend the price support of twenty major farm commodities at 90% of parity for two years after the War. Thusly, the farm problem was securely fastened onto the back of the Treasury until 1949.

Whatever farm benefits were obtained by the government policies from World War I through World War II prevented the free market from adjusting production to consumption, from effecting a shift of farm resources from inefficient operators to the efficient, from cutting back from over-capacity to a balance with market demand.

From Truman to Eisenhower the farm budget grew steadily while the farmer suffered, and the general public enjoyed an era of unprecedented prosperity. Throughout this period the evolution of farm policy has steadily moved toward more government involvement, and resulted in the increasing encroachment upon the farmer's range of management. The farm programs of the current period are largely variations of those tried in the Thirties . . . high price supports, acreage allotments; then flexible price supports giving the Secretary of Agriculture some discretion as to the price support level; and finally, the Soil Bank. The basic purpose of the Soil Bank was to prevent the farmer from taking his land out of production, and planting it into another crop, thusly creating other surpluses. Meanwhile the objectives of farm policy—the elimination of surplus, and an increase in farm income—failed to result.

Where do we stand today then?

After 32 years of temporary solutions, of reaction rather than action, of spur of the moment compromise rather than long range planning, we are faced with a greater problem than at any time within those 32 years. Our government programs, obviously, have not been successful. We are, decisively so, at the crossroads. A decision must be made

based on one of two basic questions. (1) Has the failure of government intervention and planning resulted from the insufficiency and incompleteness of such intervention and planning?—or—(2) Is this failure resultant from the intervention and planning itself?

The confirmed believers in the former assert that the only answer to the farm problem is complete Government control—complete control not only over the half of agriculture that has heretofore been under government controls, but an extension of control to cover all of agriculture; control to include not only how many acres the farmer can plant, but how many bushels, bales, and pounds he can market. Supply control, production and marketing control, or “managed abundance,” is the slogan used by those advocating complete government control. The basis for “managed abundance” is perhaps best summed up by Professor Willard W. Cochrane, formerly with the University of Minnesota, now serving as advisor to the Secretary of Agriculture, in his book “Farm Prices—Myth or Reality.” Mr. Cochrane and his followers maintain that because of the high value that society places on technological development and the incentive to farmers to adopt these new developments in order to reduce costs in a competitive market, plus the inelasticity of the aggregate demand, make it mandatory that farm income be upheld by complete production and marketing controls. They contend that without such complete control, severe farm depressions and higher Treasury costs can only result.

The other road of action, that of less government in agriculture as a solution to the problem, is perhaps best summarized by the recent Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, in his last annual report to the President. Mr. Benson said, “The principles of economic freedom are applicable to farm problems. Agriculture needs a minimum of restrictions on farm production and marketing to permit the maximum of dependence on competitive free market prices as the best guides to production and consumption. Farmers should not

be placed in a position of working for government bounty rather than producing for a free market. Inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture or any other segment of our economy. Relief programs should be operated as such—not as an aid to the entire agricultural industry. Emergency programs should be terminated as soon as the emergency is over. A completely planned and subsidized economy weakens initiative, discourages industry, destroys character, and demoralizes the people.”

The time for a definite decision between these two courses of action has arrived. The failure of past programs is recognized by all. The next Congress will have to make the choice between the two basic approaches open to them. You, too, must make a choice between these two approaches to the American agricultural problem, because the problem belongs not only to the farmer but to each of us. The farmer does not only supply our food and clothing, he is also a fourteen billion dollar customer of industry and labor each year, in addition to his purchases for family living. The farmer uses annually 22 billion kilowatt hours of electricity, 17 billion gallons of petroleum/gasoline products, 300 million pounds of rubber, and 2 million tons of steel. His problem, therefore, is our problem.

It would be remiss of me not to take this opportunity to explain to you which road I would suggest in this dilemma and why. I have tried to point out in this paper that agriculture, basically, is a progressive, sound, competent industry. It is as able as any other American industry to function, expand, and prosper under the American capitalistic system of free enterprise. I cannot agree with the theorists who recommend complete control. More specifically, I cannot agree with them because I cannot accept one of the main premises for their reasoning, namely, the inelasticity of market demand. Their view fails to take into consideration the fact that farm products today are subject to direct competition in the market place. Complete marketing controls would penalize the efficient to support the inefficient.

The farmer's gross income results from multiplying price times volume. Governmental programs in the past 30 odd years have been aimed at raising the price and ignoring the volume. Today's efficient farmer should be allowed to compete in the market place . . . to compete for larger world markets . . . to compete with other raw materials in industrial processes . . . to compete actively for the consumer dollar through his own initiative. It is difficult to reverse thirty years of government control, and perhaps it would be best to advocate a period of disengagement between Government and Agriculture. Disengagement does not mean abandonment; nor does it mean one ignoring the existence of the other. The responsibility for the agricultural dilemma, particularly the social responsibility that has been incurred by governmental intervention, must be fulfilled. If I might recommend a few remedial steps, they would be as follows:

(1) A massive effort should be made to eliminate the national disgrace of farm poverty. A voluntary rural development program should be undertaken by the Government to include re-education, vocational training, benefits to industries that locate in farm poverty areas, and other steps that would encourage farmer relocation. Our present farm surpluses should be used as financial assistance to liquidate farm poverty and by this means, retire acreage from further production.

You may ask, in view of what I have said before, why should the Government undertake such a project? First of all because the Government partly caused and contributed to this poverty, and secondly, we should not forget that when times are bad for industry, hundreds of thousands of unemployed persons are thrown on government relief rolls; when times are bad for these farmers, however, it merely means, and has meant, a little more tightening of the belt. The time for such a program is now since practically all economists predict an economic boom in the period 1964 and through 1968. This prediction is predicated upon population/

age statistics. The economists tell us that we may actually face a labor shortage in the middle Sixties due to the greater percentage of population in the under-20 and over-60 age bracket. It is, therefore, urgent now that farm poverty programs be initiated so that those wishing relocation from the farm can be assisted so that they will be in a position to fill the potential labor gap expected in the mid Sixties.

(2) Commodity group sponsored, large scale agricultural research should be initiated. This should include both production and marketing research; research to enable the farmer to grow his products cheaper and to find new outlets for these products. This effort should be self-financed by farmers much in the manner that the National Cotton Council is now using to initiate a farmer-financed program. Research programs should be coordinated and perhaps co-sponsored with such industries as insecticides, chemical, fertilizer, and machinery manufacturers, which have a key stake in agriculture.

(3) A gradual government disengagement from farm marketing should be effected. This should be done initially by improving the price support mechanism by providing levels of support that will allow farm commodities to move into regular marketing channels while at the same time affording price protection. The price support mechanism should not prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in terms of demand, and should not encourage uneconomic production which results in continuing surpluses and subsidies. The price support mechanism should be improved so as to give credit to the efficient farmer, whether he be big or little. An improvement in this direction will be a first step toward further relaxation of existing controls and toward a free, sound, and profitable agriculture.

(4) There should be a revision in legislation with regard to cooperatives. Agriculture is a much fragmented industry; as such, the farmers' bargaining power in certain instances

is extremely limited. Cooperatives should, therefore, be encouraged as an aid to the small farmer. Present laws, however, must be changed so that cooperatives provide this service rather than becoming an all extensive, non-tax-paying, corporate octopus.

(5) Many, many farm commodity groups are now engaged in market development work abroad. This effort should be extended. Today the production from one out of every six acres goes into the export market. The so-called underdeveloped nations of the world represent a tremendous market for American farm products. The world is hungry! Starvation is prevalent in many countries. The potential demand for food and clothing is unbelievable. It is in this underdeveloped area of the world that an almost insatiable market lies for the American farmer, and we are on the brink of a broad expansion in this direction. It is essential, therefore, that market development work by commodity groups be furthered, and perhaps even with the use of foreign currencies now lying dormant in the U. S. Treasury and charged to the Department of Agriculture as a result of Public Law 480 programs in past years.

We are in a Cold War today with Russia. In this conflict agriculture is one of our greatest assets. Last year the head of a trade mission to the United States representing an Iron Curtain country was visiting Memphis. In a conversation he casually observed that one thing he could not understand about us Americans was that we regarded our agricultural surpluses as a curse. He further remarked that if we were to win the Cold War, it would not be with bullets, but with our agricultural surpluses. The failure of the completely controlled Russian and Chinese farm economies present, not only a lesson to us, but also an opportunity. In the United States today we have the most advanced agricultural plant in the history of the world. We have the most skillful, best equipped farmers. If we resolutely advance along the lines of a free agricultural

economy in which the initiative, self-reliance, and personal responsibility of the individual determine his course of action, the American farmer will cease to be the outcast of our economical society and become the star in the firmament of an advancing capitalistic economy.

Before I close, I would like to suggest to you two books from which I have quoted freely and whose authors arrive at widely divergent views using basically the same set of facts. If I have inspired any of you to a further interest in this subject, I suggest that you read Stanley Andrews' "The Farmer's Dilemma," and Mr. William Peterson's "The Great Farm Problem."

In conclusion I want to read to you these words written some 100 years ago by Ralph Waldo Emerson.

"The harvest will be better preserved and go farther, laid up in private bins, in each farmer's corn-barn, and each woman's basket, than if it were kept in national granaries. In like manner, an amount of money will go farther if expended by each man and woman for their own wants, and in the feeling that this is their all, than if expended by a Great Steward, or National Commissioners of the Treasury. Take away from me the feeling that I must depend upon myself, give me the least hint that I have good friends and backers there in reserve who will gladly help me and instantly I relax my diligence. Give no bounties, make equal laws, secure life and property, and you will not need to give alms. Open the doors of opportunity to talent and virtue and they will do themselves justice and property will not be in bad hands. In a free and just commonwealth, property rushes from the idle and imbecile to the industrious, brave, and persevering. The level of the sea is not more surely kept than is the equilibrium of value in society by demand and supply; and artifice and legislation punish themselves by reactions, gluts, and bankruptcies."

ETHICS IN BUSINESS

By HUBERT GARRECHT

(*Read at a meeting of "THE EGYPTIANS,"* April 19, 1962)

Ethics is defined by Webster as "the science of moral duty; broadly the science of ideal human character. Moral principles, quality or practice."

The same motive of gain that actuates individuals also actuates corporations, and as businesses grow larger they become more impersonal. Large sums of money are spent by them to create a good image as ethical organizations manufacturing and distributing products and services of worth at fair prices. They want to be known as good citizens of good character, interested in their employees, stockholders, customers and their communities. The dishonest business of the turn of the century whose motto "caveat emptor" and ruthlessness brought on anti-trust laws and other legislation was pretty well eliminated by the 1920's.

Growth of business size has developed a line of professional managers which has largely replaced the owner-manager of small businesses of earlier years.

The great depression of the 1930's stagnated all business. The Federal Government frantically tried expedient after expedient to stimulate business, stop failures, to make jobs, to increase the economy. The NRA-National Recovery Administration—got whole industries together to work out codes of fair trade practices and encouraged competitors to work together. The almost thirty years since then have brought vast changes in every way, including the eye with which Government watches Business. Now businesses getting together and identical prices signal thorough investigation.

Just recently a Chicago suburb received four identical bids on rock salt for use on icy streets. Three of the companies are currently under indictment on charges of conspiring to fix prices on the product. The fourth was named as a co-conspirator in the Federal indictment but not a defendant.

A spokesman for Morton Salt said, "All rock salt is the same and established prices are known. This is not an uncommon situation."

Another said, "There was absolutely no collusion in establishing these bids. Near the start of the current salt-buying season, bids ranging from \$15.30 to \$13.30 a ton were submitted to a nearby community. Naturally the lowest bid was accepted and in following weeks other salt contracts in the Chicago area were awarded at \$13.30 a ton."

"Everyone knew that to get the business in the Chicago area they would have to bid \$13.30 a ton," he said.

The spokesman explained that competing companies would hesitate to go below the \$13.30 bid to get the business "because they did that last year and the price of salt got so low some of the companies couldn't even afford to bid."

The 4 bids were rejected and the city manager said he will notify the U.S. Department of Justice and supply it with copies of the bids.

Eight major manufacturers awaited possible fines just a week ago after pleading no contest to charges of conspiracy to fix prices and eliminate competition in the metal office furniture industry.

Indictments in 1960 charged that the companies agreed to divide the country into sales zones, to set prices in each zone, and to limit the colors of furniture produced by each manufacturer.

The Federal Government filed a civil action against Time, Inc. and its national distributor, Select Magazines, Inc., charging they have discriminated in sales of Time in favor of Union News Co. and 10 other retail chains. Under negotiated display agreements, the suit said, the chains received an extra three cents for each copy of Time sold in return for assuring the magazine a prominent place on their newsstands.

The Government claims the agreement was "tailored" to enable chains but not independent operators to obtain the premium. Some retailers were never told of the plan, while others received "vague and obscure" announcements, distributed in bundles of magazines, which failed to mention the three cent discount.

One of the biggest and most notorious anti-trust cases of our era was that taken by the Department of Justice when 20 criminal actions and 19 civil actions, involving many apparatus lines, were instituted against 29 manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment based on alleged conspiracies to violate the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. The complaints and indictments involved substantially the entire industry in each case.

In a letter to its stockholders, Westinghouse made the following explanation:

"The acts charged in the suits were unauthorized and strictly contrary to Westinghouse policy, which requires that antitrust laws must be obeyed.

"All of the actions were resolved without trial on December 8, 1960, when the Company, on advice of counsel and after long discussions with the Department of Justice, changed its pleas from not guilty to guilty in seven cases and to nolo contendere in twelve. In entering such pleas for the Company, its counsel advised the Court that the Company did not thereby admit the allegations of the indictments but changed its pleas for the purpose of

promptly disposing of the mass of pending litigation. Counsel for the Government stated to the Court that the Government did not charge that any member of the Westinghouse Board of Directors had any knowledge of or participated in the alleged unlawful activities. In February, 1961, the Court imposed fines on the corporate defendants; the fines paid by the Company amounting to \$372,500 in the aggregate.

"It is anticipated that consent decrees will be entered into to dispose of the civil actions.

"The Company has adopted a policy of voluntarily participating in cooperative studies for the purpose of learning whether any actions by its employes have reacted financially upon its customers. It is not feasible at this time to predict the outcome of such studies or what claims may be asserted. It is our conviction that our customers have at all times received fair and full values. The record of the electric power industry testifies to the values received from electrical manufacturers. Without the values and technological advances provided by manufacturers and utilities, the price of electricity to the public today would be almost double the actual cost in cents per kilowatt-hour.

"In its 75 years of steady growth and outstanding technological achievement, the Westinghouse Company has been regarded as an honorable corporate citizen. Corporations, like families, develop a corporate character, and the Westinghouse character has long been a source of pride to the organization. Generations of Westinghouse employes have exemplified this good character. Some of these employes of past generations who are also stockholders have written to me to express their shock and their concern that Westinghouse employes were involved in the antitrust cases.

"I want to assure them, and all stockholders, that I personally and my associates in top management, including the Board of Directors, were equally shocked, and that we are deeply concerned. The antitrust cases have brought many problems which have required long hours of careful deliberation. One of these was the determination of the futures of the individuals involved. Another was the prompt and positive action we must take to assure that nothing of the sort can ever again happen in Westinghouse."

The vast powers granted labor unions during the last thirty years have had an impact on all industry. Their immunity from anti-trust laws and other powers which have been traded for votes have multiplied their influence in affecting labor contracts and whole industry costs.

Add to this Government pressure in labor negotiations such as has taken place in the steel industry during the past 4 years and we have what U. S. Steel's Robert Tyson calls "fiat wage inflation."

A Labor "arbitrator" has been defined as one who unctiously gives to the lion the lion's share.

Just this past week we witnessed the spectacle of the President of the U. S. excoriating heads of the nation's steel companies for increasing prices to compensate for rising costs. By weight of threats of investigation, anti-trust action, and actual cancellation of contracts, the steel companies withdrew the price increases within a few days. Free enterprise died some more last week.

The increasing entrance of Government into business is much greater than most people realize. Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois called attention to the 279 commissaries operated by the armed forces. They sell food and almost any other commodity at near-cost prices. In addition to subsidizing military buyers at about 15%, they employ as store workers some

5,000 enlisted men, and compete unfairly with tax paying business men in their areas. The Naval installation at Millington operates such a commissary to the discomfort of all retail business.

Even closer home we have the example of the Memphis public transit operation which was taken over by our local government and assigned to an "authority" to operate.

When the old private corporation sought fare increases they were almost invariably denied. Since publicly owned, fares have been increased several times, including those paid by school children riders. Three percent of revenues is paid to the city in lieu of taxes. Profits under the new ownership are expected to run from \$800,000 to one million dollars a year. This is about the total which would have been paid in gasoline and excise taxes by the privately operated company, and which the government owned authority does not have to pay.

Closer to the writer personally is the milk industry. Seven of the largest companies in the U. S. are under Federal Trade Commission indictment on various charges. Some have been ordered to divest themselves of plants bought and taken over since World War II.

Surprise is expressed that milk prices in a community are identical. Yet the price paid the farmer for the raw milk is set by the Federal or State Government in most areas. This cost averages 58% of the sales dollar.

Labor prices are set by labor unions and even plants with no union must be in line. This cost averages 21%.

State and local health departments tell the milk dealer how the milk must be processed and distributed, and utilities such as power, gas, and water, cost all the same, as do containers and other supplies. At best dealers have only 15% of gross income on which to exercise their ingenuity. Greater efficiency

of one over another would make a difference of only a small fraction of a cent per quart. Incidentally net profits for the entire industry average only 1.73%—less than 4/10 cent per quart.

Logically one distributor cannot sell for more than his competitors and logically too, he cannot sell for less—his price would be met.

Until the last ten years, a big company desiring to distribute milk in a new market, would negotiate and buy out a small operator in the market and build from there.

Good roads and refrigerated trucks have made possible the transportation of milk over great distances. Aggressive concerns began breaking into the market by offering grocery stores free milk and refrigerated boxes, advertising, and cut prices—all difficult to resist. After a considerable volume foothold had been gained, the new competitor became interested in "stabilizing" the market.

Add to this a raw milk buying price advantage and foreign milk can take over. Actually the farm price in Paducah in several months of the past two years was \$1.08 per cwt. under the price Memphis dealers were required to pay, and for the year averaged 57c less—almost 1½c per quart.

Two years have passed, several hearings have been held, and the Government is just beginning to correct this inequity.

The harassed business man sometimes confuses efficiency and new procedures with unethical practices. Newer, more economical methods will prevail and protective legislation is not the answer. However, is it unfair for an industry to ask for protection against below-cost sale of its products by a merchant who has thousands of other items on which to regain his loss from sales of his loss leader?

Discount houses and cooperatives are mushrooming. All industries are diversifying and crossing traditional borders.

Middle men are being eliminated and many dislocations are taking place, particularly among small businesses. "Adjust to change or perish" is the watchword. And where change and ethics meet is not always clearly seen.

Young aggressive "tigers" seek to gain control of big corporations and small. Which are ethical and merely progressive—and which are the opposite?

Does government go too far in regulating and investigating? An example is the consent order involving the bulk of domestic tire and tube production.

"An unusual clause in the order forbids each company to "adopt, use or in any way follow" the prices or terms announced by a competitor "whereby prices, discounts, bonuses, allowances, terms or conditions of sales, or any other pricing policies are made identical or substantially uniform.

Among the activities prohibited by the consent order are: (1) fixing prices, discounts and terms of sale; (2) making quotations based on a single zone-delivered price system; (3) quoting by cost formula; (4) providing cost data to a trade association; (5) setting customer classifications; (6) matching, by formula or any other agreed-on means, prices on government business; (7) policing prices to any class of customers; (8) circulating price information among the companies under announcement; (9) adopting "standardization or simplification programs" that tamper with prices; (10) setting dealer resale prices; (11) allocating government business; and (12) using the respondent trade associations to suppress competition."

Does the acceptance of these FTC consent decrees indicate admission of guilt—or is it the result of bureaucratic pressures? Is it the easy way out?

More Government in Business seems inevitable. In many fields this regulation has upset the entire industry, and in trying to solve problems it has created, more regulation is needed. In some areas it will be necessary to call a halt and start all over.

Now there appears a new Super-Government regulator in the European Common Market. The Wall Street Journal just recently reported that "on August 1, Common Market authorities will begin enforcing new regulations forbidding industrial combines from rigging international prices, freezing foreign competitors out of their markets, or otherwise restricting the free flow of capital and goods across the borders of the Common Market's member states. Violators can be fined up to \$1 million or even 10% of gross sales."

This is a striking departure for Europe, where national laws have long allowed business practices which would put U.S. industrialists in jail.

A doctoral candidate at the Harvard Graduate School of Business, a Jesuit priest, recently conducted a survey among business men over the country and found among other things, that 99 out of 100 queried agree that "sound ethics is good business in the long run." 94% disagree with this statement by Theodore Levitt: "The business man exists for only one purpose, to create and deliver value satisfactions at a profit to himself . . . If what is offered can be sold at a profit . . . then it is legitimate. The cultural, spiritual, social and moral consequences . . . are none of his occupational concern." 88% regard providing a "call girl" as always unethical. 15% agree that "whatever is good business is good ethics."

Interestingly, while voting one way, these executives indicated that the "average business man" might vote the opposite.

Polybius, Greek historian who observed the fall of Carthage, wrote: "At Carthage nothing which results in profit is regarded as disgraceful."

Refreshing in the current scene is the conception by a Chicago executive of a practical code known as Rotary International's Four Way Test:

1. Is it the truth?
2. Is it fair to all concerned?
3. Will it build good will and better friendships?
4. Will it be beneficial to all concerned?

EVOLUTION OF HUMAN NATURE

By O. H. ALDERKS

(*Read at a meeting of "THE EGYPTIANS,"* May 17, 1962)

This subject has been of keen interest to me since about 1920,—hence, over 40 years, when we discussed the theory of evolution in a college biology class. There was extensive discussion pro and con about Lamarck's ideas about the inheritance of acquired characteristics. I am sure that some of us young idealists, and most students fall into this category, considered the alternative method of changing human nature by means of mutation and natural selection altogether too uncertain and too slow a process for the improvement of human nature.

Most of us concluded at that time, however, that variations induced by changes in environment or the result of individual experience, namely, acquired characteristics, were non-transmissible. Only those variations in the gene-complex of the reproductive cells we concluded were permanently transmissible.

What are some of the more important traits of man which collectively we classify as his human nature, and how may these be changed through evolutionary processes?

Perhaps before trying to answer this question, it would be well to sketch briefly in outline form man's evolutionary background on this planet as we know about it today.

During the past half century there has been a very great increase in our knowledge of the physical universe and particularly of our planet. The scientists engaged in this work are extending our "knowledge frontier" at a remarkable rate, and what is considered as "truth" today may be altered tomorrow by the discovery of new knowledge.

I think it is important to know that scientists strive to obtain knowledge about any subject, to try to arrive at the "truth" of the matter. They explicitly recognize that man's knowledge can never be *complete* or his *truths absolute*, but by scientific study man is enabled to discover more knowledge and so arrive at a fuller approximation of the truth.

This is very important and many people not engaged in scientific pursuits do not understand this.

The new scientific frontiers which I shall mention and discuss in this paper are not represented as absolute truths but as approximation of the truth in the light of today's knowledge.

During my lifetime there has been a tremendous increase in knowledge about our physical universe, its almost limitless extent. Astronomers, in discussing *cosmic evolution*, namely the change in the stars and nebulae in their inorganic constitution, tell us that these changes are exceedingly slow—almost beyond our imagination. The life of stars is expressed in billions of years. Our sun is one of a billion stars in *our galaxy*, and there are millions of other galaxies equally large or larger in the universe. The faintest of these outer galaxies as seen today on the photographic plates of the 200-inch telescope at Palomar are calculated to be 2 billion light years distant. This is, as you will recall, with light traveling at the rate of 186,000 miles per second. These are figures of distances and of time beyond our comprehension. I mention them only to give us a glimpse of the unimaginable extent and size of the universe and of the place of our very, very small planet, Earth, within it. Scientists have learned much about the physical evolution of our planet during recent years. By methods of dating based on radio isotopes which have exceedingly long half-life, they now estimate its age to be about 4-5 billion years. These methods of dating were developed by Dr. Willard Libby, at the University of Chicago in 1946. For this work with C_{14} , he later won the Nobel prize. The earth's physical evolution,

mostly as the result of chemical reactions, was exceedingly slow and it is estimated today that our Creator caused the first cell of organic life on this globe to be formed about 2 billion years ago. This creation took place when the physical evolution of this planet had produced conditions of temperature both of the land and water and atmospheric relationships between oxygen, nitrogen, methane, carbon dioxide and other gases, conducive to the support of elemental organic "life." As one reflects about this, there exist today very critical physical conditions on this globe which are a prime necessity for the existence of all life, both vegetable and animal. As a single example, imagine what an *appreciable change* in temperature either up or down would do to life on earth. Similarly, a change in any one of several physical changes would be equally catastrophic to life as we know it today.

The evolutionary age of our planet of say about 4 billion years is insignificant in terms of evolutionary time of our universe, and as one reflects about these tremendous unimaginable spans of time, one wonders and raises the question, "was there ever a beginning of time?"

It is important for what follows in this paper to try to obtain some comprehension of the time scale involved in the evolution of this planet, particularly the evolutionary time, since the creation of that first organic cell, perhaps a simple amino acid, about 2 billion years ago.

Here, on the table is a volume of the Encyclopedia Britannica. It contains about 1,000 pages, as does each volume. Let us say that *each page* of this book represents a time in past evolutionary history of 10,000 years,—hence, each volume represents 10 million years of elapsed time. On this basis the creation of the first living cell would have been recorded in Volume 200, counting backwards.

Since that first speck of life on the planet, there have evolved about 1½ million species of all living organisms on this planet (about half of these are species of insects). Along this evolutionary path perhaps some 1,750,000 years ago according to the most recent estimates based on recent new discoveries in Africa a new mutation occurred,—a new breakthrough in a species,—and “mind” developed in a species through the possession of a much larger brain. This gave its possessor exceptional powers for self preservation and dominance over other animal species. It was the creation of the species *Homo sapiens*,—thinking man. It led eventually to the development by him of simple tools, of speech, of language, and finally of conceptional thought, and all this we would find recorded as the history of man in the last 175 pages of this present volume.

Homo sapiens' development has been slow, up a very long slope of a high mountain, the summit of which he has not yet reached. He early evolved his deep instincts for self-preservation, for search of food, for the protection of his family, and later for the protection of his clan, his tribe, his nation. Later came man's desire for achievement, for recognition, for power to influence and control others.

The life of man in his early hostile environment was a continual struggle for existence. He was dependent on the cycles of nature whose laws he did not understand. He could only wonder about and fear many sudden disasters caused by winds, floods, volcanic eruptions, lightning, fire and earthquakes. He early formed conceptional ideas of the super-human control of the forces of nature,—this led to a variety of myths and ceremonies led by “Medicine Men.” He was faced by the mystery of birth and death. The “something” which animated a body could be finished in an instant. What was it? The body must be only the temporary abode of this something. Where did it go? These and other conceptional thoughts led man to develop abstract ideas. These ideas led first to the development of simple

tools and methods for the better control of his environment and his food supply, but also gradually to the development of a conscience, an awareness of his “choice” between his selfish desires and his responsibility for the welfare of others.

Man, of all animals, is the most helpless at the time of birth. He requires devoted care for a long time before he can provide for his own safety and for his daily needs. He is thus exposed to a long educational period which today at times extends to a third or more of his life span. Early man obtained his knowledge from his parents and family, and later in his life from members of the tribe. Thus the growing traditions, the myths, the attainments, the wisdom of the group, the culture of the group was passed on and added to from generation to generation.

We come now to the last page of the evolutionary time scale, the last 10,000 years. The last ice age has just receded. The rate of human progress begins now to accelerate by geometric progression.

During the middle Stone Age, about 10-11,000 years ago, man developed tremendous improvements in the techniques of hunting and gathering food,—he developed the bow and arrow, traps for fish, and dried his food for future use. He, or more likely his womenfolk, hunted nuts and berries, roots and fruits, and learned to store them for later use. About 1,000 years later in the New Stone Age, man discovered and developed the secret of agriculture,—the sowing of seed, the harvesting and storing of grain. He also began to domesticate animals, both for food supply and for use for travel and for work. These two achievements are perhaps the most important developments in early human progress. It stabilized man's food supply and won for him necessary time to engage in other pursuits,—such as time for fabrication of tools, boats and other articles, for trading, for war, for politics, for education, and for science and the arts. These changes extended over a period of a thousand years.

With this marked change in food production, man changed also his *social status* from early family life to tribal and village life, and later with the development of trading using rivers and other waters for his transportation, man developed cities, states, and nations.

The rate of growth in man's *social status* was relatively quite rapid from the time of the discovery and practice of agriculture. With a more stabilized food supply man increased in numbers; and over a period of about 3,000 years he mastered the secrets of agriculture and of domesticating animals. About 6,000 years ago he had developed orchards and was practicing selective breeding of both plants and animals. He had developed the art of flood control and the irrigation of farm land along the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers.

About 1,000 years later, namely 5,000 years ago, *Recorded History* began in this Sumerian civilization in Mesopotamia when man first began the art of writing. Recovered clay tablets have revealed how man in Sumer first learned to write. Scribes used sharpened sticks and scratched pictures of human heads, fish, birds, etc. on soft clay tablets. Over a period of 1,000 years, note the length of time, temple scribes reduced the old pictograms to a system of wedgeshaped marks impressed on soft clay tablets,—hence, cuneiform (meaning wedgeshaped) was developed and was later used by others. At least *a thousand years* before the Hebrews wrote down the Old Testament and Homer wrote the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey," the Sumerians had created a rich literature of their own. Many episodes and concepts of the Old Testament resemble Sumerian myths.

We note the great stride forward in man's *social status* as he developed the civilization of the self-sufficient and politically autonomous city-states of Sumer along the banks of the two large rivers. But with this advance in *social* evolution, problems of civilization also developed. Conflicts over

land and water rights developed, and full-scale war was initiated to settle these disputes. War stimulated man's technology tremendously, resulted in the perfection of the wheel, and new weapons resulted from the discovery that tin and copper fused together produced a tough alloy, namely bronze. Man had discovered the art of metallurgy, and so left the Stone Age for the Metal Age. Man had also discovered as a result of these wars, that man could be domesticated, and so we have the beginning of human slavery.

At this point should be mentioned the formation of two entirely independent and separate urban civilizations,—both developed and flourished shortly after the Sumerian civilization. One in the Indus Valley of India, the other in the valley of the Nile in Egypt. Both developed written records, although those of the Indus have not been deciphered to date. Both developed great wealth and creative arts, and both developed different religions. Hinduism, said to be the oldest living religion today, was developed in the Indus Valley, and the Egyptians developed a religion along the Nile in which they deified their Kings.

A few additional highlights of recorded history with which we are all familiar will bring our time scale to the present.

Abraham lived in Mesopotamia about 4,000 years ago and Moses led the Israelites out of their Egyptian bondage about 3400 years ago. He gave man the Ten Commandments and the concept of the worship of one God,—Jehovah. The Phoenicians, a great trading and seafaring people along the Mediterranean, invented the Phonetic alphabet about 3,000 years ago, and brought their trade and influence westward to Carthage and Spain. Next we have the great Greek civilization, followed by the great Roman civilization about 2,000 years ago,—then the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, the slow development of the Christian religion, and its remarkable effect on western civilization. Today, after almost 2,000 years, about a third of mankind practice this religion.

About 750 years ago (1215 A.D.) the English barons and people obtained the first detailed statement of feudal law, with elimination of many abuses, when they compelled the granting of the Magna Charta. Some historians contend that this charter was the forerunner of (1) trial by Jury, (2) the principle of habeas corpus and (3) the right of parliament to control taxation. Less than 500 years ago Columbus discovered America, and less than 200 years ago a new nation was created on this continent,—a new type of government based on new concepts of freedom and the equality of man. All of this we find very near the bottom of our last page, and so we come to the great age of scientific discovery and technological advance during the last 50-100 years.

This sets the stage and shows the background in a sketchy manner, noting some of the highlights of man's progress along his evolutionary trail.

How has the evolution of his human nature fared during this time?

Man has survived under a none-too-friendly environment for perhaps about $1\frac{3}{4}$ million years, mainly because of his superior intellect. He survived three interglacial periods of about 100,000 years each. These ice ages lowered the ocean water by as much as 300 feet, creating natural land bridges which had a marked effect on his migration to various parts of this globe.

Throughout most of man's existence, hunting has been one of his main occupations. Some of man's native character was formed during these early Stone Age times. He had to be greedy, selfish, crafty, even vicious at times to obtain his precarious food supply and to preserve his life. He had to be a fighter,—hostile, rude, avaricious, and even rapacious, to get his food and his mates. He practiced excessive reproduction to maintain a desirable high birth rate because of the very high mortality. All of these characteristics were considered *virtues* for survival of the individual and for the group, and all are considered as vices today.

When one contemplates human behavior today as revealed by recent Nazi extermination camps, by Communist purges, by the treatment of captives during the past wars,—these and the many other examples of day-to-day living in most parts of this planet, it is evident that man still has a long way to go in the conquest of his own nature.

Do the recent great strides which have been made in the science of genetics promise *us now* new hope for changing man's human nature?

Genetics is recognized today as the central and most fundamental of all the life sciences through the recent discovery of the *material basis* of heredity. This subject has been summarized splendidly in two publications in 1961. One, "The Chemistry of Life," in 3 papers in *Chemical & Engineering News*, is also available in combined reprint form. The other, contributions by 13 authors collected in the September 1961 issue of the *Scientific American*. The first summarizes the subject based on today's knowledge how cells synthesize proteins. The prime purpose of this work by a great many biochemists is to shed light on the complex route from *simple amino acids to protein*. Proteins are the underlying structure of all living organisms and protein synthesis is the major path for putting genetic information to work. Through protein synthesis the genes influence their inherited law,—they build cells, organs and organisms, and they govern their metabolism. Many workers believe that the full picture will show an unbroken chain of events leading to deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA). This material carries all the hereditary traits of a species and of an individual coded in the nucleotide sequence along its chain length.

Other papers discuss recent findings of the "Chemistry of Life," studies with a simple virus and how life originated on earth, and perhaps somewhere in the world beyond,—also the work in a number of laboratories endeavoring to synthesize life from a number of inorganic substrates. If you are at all chemically minded, you will find this subject fascinating reading.

The other publication referred to above is a series of papers by eminent molecular biologists revealing today's knowledge about the structure and activities of the cell,—a highly complex organism that is the fundamental unit of all life. By means of new techniques and with the aid of the electron microscope it has been possible to unravel more about the structure of the cell. Briefly, the results of this work show that the cell is now recognized as a *highly organized structure*, the center of the complex process of metabolism, growth, and of *heredity*.

It is not possible, nor desirable because of considerations of time, to review here the extensive research on cells and the function of the many new cell components. Suffice it to say here that very much new knowledge has been found explaining the mechanism of heredity.

Does this great new store of knowledge about the mechanism of genetics suggest how human nature may be changed appreciably by biological evolution? The answer is the same today as it was 40 years ago, namely, "No." Man has reached a biological evolutionary maturity and no changes as the result of biological evolution are likely to affect his human nature,—unless it were possible in a very distant culture for man to practice voluntary selective reproduction. How then can human nature change,—how can it be improved?

As man slowly developed from early family to tribal village life, to early city life along important rivers and inland seas, and finally to the formation of nations, we note that he obtained more time, because of a division of labor among men, to engage in other pursuits. We have noted how man thus changed his *social status*, his status within his group. Some men engaged in farming, some in manufacture, others in trade, and others in a variety of creative arts, in religion, and some in *organized education*.

From the beginning organized education was associated with the religious activities of man. Selected youths were taught the art of writing by scribes in the Sumerian, Egyptian, and Indus temples. From these early beginnings, education expanded in Jewish temples and synagogues, in church schools, and in church-related colleges, and finally also in village, city and state public schools and universities.

The growth and development of education, of man's knowledge about his physical environment, his searching and study of his own nature and of his destiny, is perhaps the greatest force to influence the changing of his nature.

With the gradual growth in education, man also developed the art of recording and transmission of his accumulated knowledge, of his conceptional thoughts, to following generations. Thus from early oral passing of knowledge, we pass on to cuneiform writing, to the alphabet, to printing, to photography, to telegraphy, to radio, and to television,—all a continuing development to the ever faster and more accurate transmission of knowledge, of new understanding, of wisdom and ideals to following generations.

This marked growth in education and in the effective transmission of accumulated knowledge is the hallmark of man's amazing progress in some sectors of this globe. For example, it is estimated that 90% of the scientists of all time are living and working today to extend our intellectual frontiers. Also that in about 10 years we will need to double many of our educational facilities in this country. This great increase in mass education, of better education for all men, is, it seems to me, the great promise for changing man's nature.

By what means can this possibly be accomplished?

It seems to me that it can be accomplished by *cultural evolution*—by the creation of continually better human societies composed of men and women having much higher levels of general education and much higher moral standards than is apparent in many individuals today.

The higher standard of general education will come relatively easily and fast. Consider the education which you and I received 40 to 50 years ago compared with that received by the youth of today in our better schools and universities. The youth of today in our land are receiving much better education in most areas, and this is a normal expected occurrence. The problem is to extend this to all sectors of this planet.

The development of much higher moral standards in people is a really difficult assignment.

Both the development of higher levels of education and of higher moral standards for all people on this globe will not be accomplished in a short time. We are so prone to think in terms of our lifetime,—of 50 to 100 years,—rarely do we think in terms of evolutionary time,—of a thousand years,—of 10,000 years.

It appears inevitable that cultural evolution will proceed and that man's society will gradually improve, but at least two ingredients, it seems to me, are necessary to effectively improve man's nature. One is the improvement of man's material basis. The material basis has a great influence on a culture. It is not possible for a society dependent on hunting for its livelihood to develop the kind of culture found in an agricultural society, or for a pre-scientific society to develop the kind of culture found in our present day technological civilization based on machine power. We in the western civilization and particularly we in most of North America have attained a relatively abundant affluent material basis of living. The great majority of people in our society live in relative comfort with adequate food and housing, good health and medical facilities, all of which has extended our life's expectancy on the average to the proverbial three score years plus ten.

We have leisure for service to our community, to our schools, to our religion, and we have time and money to enjoy the cultural arts and a variety of recreation. Compared with the living standards of the great majority of mankind, ours is truly an affluent society and this has been attained largely during my lifetime.

A great majority of people on this globe live today, however, under conditions of misery resulting in a life span about $\frac{1}{2}$ of ours. Theirs is a life of poverty and disease, of cruelty and oppression. Due to the great shrinking in the size of our world because of the great technological developments in transportation and because of the export of knowledge by means of books, magazines, moving pictures, and radio, some of these people have learned about our standard of living and they are determined to improve their miserable state of existence. Their leaders want technological and financial assistance to improve their undeveloped countries rapidly. The unrest is there,—we need to realize it and give it constructive thought and action. One other example, which has a direct bearing on man's material improvement,—the rate of population increase in the United States is annually almost 1.5%. This means that we are adding annually 5 cities the size of Memphis, Tenn. (500,000 people). In the rest of the world, particularly in the large undeveloped areas of Asia and Africa, the rate of population increase is at least as rapid, in spite of the average higher mortality. It means that a city with the population of Memphis is added every 4 days. This poses a question of food supply, of disease and health, and of social unrest which will certainly affect us. We need constructive thought and action here.

Mankind has much to do to improve the material basis of life for all. It seems to me that only when people are liberated from the compulsion of material misery, of ill health, and of ignorance will they be able to turn their attention, their thoughts away from themselves and direct it to their relationship with others.

The last ingredient which I think is essential for cultural evolution of human nature is religion. I mention it last because I think it is perhaps the most important, together with education.

Man has been a religious being from the time of his early beginning. His type of god or gods has changed with his understanding of his physical environment in which he found himself. He feared the unknown and prepared sacrifices and worshiped a variety of gods which his mind conjured and which he thought affected his livelihood, his well being, and his destiny. Religion is then a product of man's mind, of his conceptional thought about the unknown, about the origin of the universe, about its functioning and purpose, about man's own destiny.

Man, of all animals, is a spiritual creature, he has spiritual experiences which are an important part of reality. His spiritual experiences are as real, and often more satisfying as many people have testified, as observing a most glorious sunset. Many men have learned that there is a "*spiritual something*," call it a "divinity," to be found within us. Perhaps it is a quantitative characteristic which man can develop,—some men, a Paul of Tarsus, a St. Francis, or a Gandhi, for example allow us all to discern it in them.

How can we develop this spiritual characteristic in all men? Is it something which can be taught,—like mathematics, or an appreciation for good music, or an appreciation for art? Perhaps it can be taught, and here man's long period of nurture after birth stands him in good stead. It is undoubtedly the dominant character-building period of his life. Man needs to "grow up" in an atmosphere of a loving, religious, moral family circle. The breakdown in our "family life" is undoubtedly responsible for much of our juvenile irresponsibility. Youth needs to be taught the difference between right and wrong, the basic concepts which all moral men embrace, the Golden Rule, the *importance of each*

individual human being, the desire to assist others, to help "the least of these our brethren,"—and the need to establish a ready, free communication between himself and his God.

We need to study how we can bring out the latent capacity of men for achieving understanding of and enjoying spiritual experience. We need to develop the conscience of man so that he will want to live by the highest standard of morality. Man needs to experience the satisfaction which comes from understanding the meaning of love in its broadest sense and from the inner spiritual feeling of peace, and assurance.

Many great men and also many lesser men not known have acquired this great inner spiritual force. It has been my privilege to know intimately a number of men who lived the tenets of their religion daily, in their every action. These men were intelligent, intellectual persons,—they were the noblest of men I have had the privilege and pleasure to know. Their sincere, cheerful, spiritual capacity was recognized by all with whom they came in contact. Several of these men were university professors, and so their Christian influence was great on many students. Some of this spiritual influence certainly rubbed off on many, and from them in turn to others. This is a *very important point*,—it illustrates the effect which each of us can have to influence others,—to ultimately improve man's nature.

In summary, the improvement of human nature it seems to me can be effected by *cultural evolution* and man definitely can control its direction.

Man needs to develop a new social order and a new culture which will eliminate want and misery, and furnish maximum formal education for all people. Man needs to develop the broadest possible education for all, and to improve the quality of education continually.

We need to develop in man a much higher inner spiritual awareness and enjoyment of spiritual experiences. Man needs to understand and to develop the basic concepts of morality and the desire and the will to live by these daily. He needs to develop an unrelenting conscience and a happy communion with his God, and finally he needs to understand the *importance of each individual, and that no two of us are alike or have the same point of view.*

These are idealistic goals, but man needs such goals and a purpose to evolve a better society for mankind. I can visualize that in the future, not in the near future because these educational changes for all men will come very slowly, that the average man in a very much advanced culture will be quite distressed, perhaps even ashamed, if he is unable to contribute effectively his spiritual growth to improve the well being of his community.

Man has tremendous possibilities for future achievements in all fields of endeavor. Perhaps the greatest development during my lifetime has been the *new vision* that we have as the result of the enormous growth of our knowledge. We need to realize that this great increase in knowledge brings with it *constant change*. Our religion to be really influential must also change in keeping with our new knowledge.

Human nature is not unchangeable, it can be changed for the better by evolving a better human society, a better, fuller culture for all men. This is the challenge for each of us.

It would be a great pleasure indeed to "look in" on man's progress a page later (10,000 years) on our time scale.