


Spring 1948

# Yale Political Journal; A Magazine of Student Opinion 1948 Spring

The Politic, Inc.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://elischolar.library.yale.edu/politic>

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [International Relations Commons](#), [Policy Design, Analysis, and Evaluation Commons](#), [Policy History, Theory, and Methods Commons](#), [Political Theory Commons](#), [Public Affairs Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

The Politic, Inc., "Yale Political Journal; A Magazine of Student Opinion 1948 Spring" (1948). *The Politic*. 4.  
<http://elischolar.library.yale.edu/politic/4>

This Yale Political Journal; A Magazine of Student Opinion is brought to you for free and open access by the Yale University Publications at EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Politic by an authorized administrator of EliScholar – A Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. For more information, please contact [elischolar@yale.edu](mailto:elischolar@yale.edu).



SPRING

1948



# Yale POLITICAL JOURNAL

*A Magazine of Student Opinion*

*An Examination Of Some Of The Problems And Solutions*  
OF  
EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY

*Featuring Articles By*

Homer D. Babbidge, Robert S. Smith, E. O. McCue,  
Robert P. Lyons, Seymour I. Toll

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS



*Convertibles!*

*Sedans!*

*Coupes!*

A Complete Stock of

## **AUTOMOBILES**

*... Including 1948 Models*

*At Reasonable Prices!*

**Commercial Garage**

"complete automobile service"

178 George Street  
in New Haven  
Phone 7-0267

*A truly prized  
possession to be treasured  
with the passing years,—  
the endearing moments  
captured forever on your  
wedding day with Candid  
photographs before, during  
and after your wedding  
ceremony!*

*Samuel Kravitt*

**PHOTOGRAPHER**

288 YORK STREET  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT  
PHONE 6-1219



# Yale POLITICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME ONE, NUMBER THREE

SPRING, 1948

## *Executive Editor*

CHARLES M. LICHENSTEIN

## *Associate Editors*

JOHN R. FARNSWORTH

RICHARD E. SHAPIRO

## *Business Board*

ROBERT HAAS, *Manager*

CHARLES W. BARNES

ROBERT BAST

CHARLES BLANK

WILLIAM BRADNER

DAVID MANN

ALEX WEISBERG

NORMAN WOLFE

## *Faculty Advisors*

FRANCIS W. COKER

DAVID M. POTTER

HAROLD F. WILLIAMSON

## Table of Contents

### *An Introduction And A Warning*

EDITORIAL . . . . . page 3

### THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION

by HOMER D. BABBIDGE . . . . . page 5

### NORWAY: EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY

by SEYMOUR I. TOLL . . . . . page 9

### AMBASSADORS OF DEMOCRACY

by ROBERT P. LYONS . . . . . page 13

### A NEW OUTLOOK IN THE OLD DOMINION

by EDWARD O. McCUE . . . . . page 16

### STUDENTS IN ACTION

by ROBERT S. SMITH . . . . . page 19

### *Reviews Of Current Books*

PEACE OR ANARCHY by CORD MEYER, JR. . . . . page 23

COMMUNITY OF THE FREE by YVES SIMON . . . . . page 24

WHERE I STAND! by HAROLD STASSEN . . . . . page 25

THE MEANING OF TREASON by REBECCA WEST . . . . . page 26

A RUSSIAN JOURNAL by JOHN STEINBECK . . . . . page 26

A PATTERN OF POLITICS by AUGUST HECKSCHER . . . . . page 28

Copyright 1948 By

YALE POLITICAL JOURNAL  
1621 YALE STATION  
NEW HAVEN, CONN.



*The Meaning  
of Treason*

by

Rebecca West

*In her first major work in seven years,  
REBECCA WEST tells the story of Eng-  
land's recent traitors and the world they  
turned against.*

**YALE CO-OP**

**ROSEY'S TAILORS**

*Established 1888*

**86 Wall Street — Opposite Silliman**

*Cleaning  
Altering*

*Reweaving  
Rewaterproofing*

**Packing and Shipping**

Complete Transfer  
Service

*Phone for us to call and give you an estimate*

**COHEN & POWELL, Inc.**

33 Olive Street

Tel. 8-3181

**New Haven Band Instrument Co.**

*Sheet Music    :-:-    Instruments  
Instrument Repairing*

26 CENTER STREET  
NEW HAVEN, CONN.  
PHONE 6-0908

**C. A. Stonehill**  
Inc.

198½ YORK STREET  
(UPSTAIRS)  
New Haven, Conn.

ROBERT J. BARRY, Mgr.

**OLD & RARE BOOKS  
MANUSCRIPTS       PRINTS**

*Affiliated with*

C. A. STONEHILL, LIMITED  
45 St. James's Place, London S.W. 1

Catalogs issued from  
New Haven and New York

*Let us add your name to our  
mailing list.*

**Magazine Subscription Service**

Specializing in

- LIFE
- TIME
- FORTUNE
- READERS DIGEST

87 NORTON ST.  
NEW HAVEN 11, CONN.  
Tel. 8-5243 or 6-4508



## Editorial

THE MOST INTELLIGENT, the most profoundly sounded examination of education in such a magazine as this would be to have none at all — or at least not without a warning prefaced to it. The danger to be avoided, and one which is not commonly avoided by either professional educator or legislator, is the removal of the problem from the specific social context in which it is engrained. A thorough discussion of *Education For Democracy* would have to set the particular institutional structure squarely within the society which contains it and which it trains and vivifies. Thus the complete treatment which the subject deserves would demand an analysis of the intricate mutual relationships existing ideally and actually in societies. In twenty-odd pages such faithful reporting is impossible. Instead we offer only two or three records of fact-finding and some sincere reflections on the most elementary of the complex of inter-relationships between education and the whole of society. Our hope is that this issue will clear up factual misconceptions and suggest some lines of speculation that we have not fully developed.

We shall have been very successful, though, with this consideration of education for democracy if we are able to leave with the reader the one thread that runs through every article. And that is the necessity of thinking of the problems of education in terms of the values that various societies organize to preserve. Mr. Toll points to this value-training positively in a society which cherishes the school that performs this function; Mr. Lyons draws the same line of argument in terms of the lack of such training and of the disaster which may attend the lack. But both men leave the same conclusion with us: and that is the necessity to think out problems of education in terms of the values that it *can* instill — and, they conclude, *should* instill.

The necessity has become an imperative. There is no time left us for delightful speculation on what education might do in our American society. This period of our national experience is one of desperate groping after meaning and coherence for the direction of individual desire and public policy. We have a ground for our action only in words that once were vital, in documents that once set broad

## *An Introduction And A Warning*

goals for us. But we have not, as a society, written the sequel to the battle-born national faith in terms of positive action. We have not as a geographic and legal community transformed natural boundaries into an area of avowed and shared values. I submit that there is no time left us for continued failure, that the tragedy of our foreign policy and our incomplete socio-economic "New Deal" is positive proof that more failure will destroy the hope for a national contribution commensurate with the great promise of our resources and of the early years of our history. This may not mean physical destruction or losing wars, which seems to be the primary concern of popular pressure groups; but our ability to win wars is a pitiful achievement measured against the cultural and intellectual greatness that should be our lot as a nation to achieve. We have all the mechanisms — national wealth, fine physical plants, immense collections of books and other works of art — but we have not invested the gadgets of greatness with life in the form of an ethically-secure and well-understood national cultural *raison d'être*.

What a pathetic failure the professional man in education has made in divorcing his specialty from the social needs of a nation which is seeking a starting point for a re-interpretation or certainly a re-vivification of the democratic faith. So long as raising salaries and building new equipment is the *sole* concern of educator and legislator and common citizen, the "educative process" will remain a gadget. It could become an instrument for the creation of a real community adhering to objectively sound values. Money and scale-drawings are useful always, but they are to the final degree meaningful only when accompanied by an appreciation of potentiality and a passionate desire to use this potential for aims born of deep convictions. I suggest that these convictions should be of this nature: a recognition of the spiritual plight of our society, an understanding of the need for a well-grounded faith, a perception of the instrumentation of this goal, a profound use of the institutions which might train our society in these new terms.

I have mentioned the "need for a well-grounded faith". Here perhaps is the last stage in a spiritual renaissance, and the most important. Now is



not the time, as indeed it is never proper, for the atheist to become religious, the aristocrat to turn democrat, the materialist to turn mystic — merely for the sake of a change, any change from the present perplexities. Lasting value-standards and lasting convictions as to the proper use of social institutions like education must be the fruit of profound reflection and no form of intellectual es-

capism. I have a deep faith that the way out of our present spiritual morass can be found in a searching analysis into our own minds and hearts and into the total context of society with its mass of institutional frameworks. I like to think of one such frame — education — in such a total context. There are easier ways for us, but none more meaningful.

### *Notes on Contributors*

HOMER D. BABIDGE, whose article leads off in this issue of the *Journal*, graduated from Yale in 1945. He is now a graduate student in education and a member of the staff of the Yale Student Appointment Bureau. The other graduate student represented, from Harvard, is ROBERT S. SMITH, Yale, '47. Again not solely devoted to studies, Mr. Smith is Vice-President for International Student Affairs of the U. S. National Student Association. Certainly through their various studies and outside activities, both these men are eminently fitted to discuss phases of the problem, *Education For Democracy*.

Three Yale undergraduates are represented in this issue. SEYMOUR I. TOLL, '47M, a government major, visited and studied in Norway this past summer. His article is the fruit of first-hand observations there. ROBERT P. LYONS, '47M, served with the Counter Intelligence Corps in Germany during 1946-47. His major is philosophy and government. The *Journal* records a "first" with this issue: a civil engineering student, in the person of EDWARD O. McCUE, '50, is among our contributors. Mr. McCue's father, whom he aided, presented a report recently to the Virginia State Legislature covering the points stressed in the *Journal* article.

In addition to members of the Editorial Board, two Yale seniors have contributed reviews for this issue; they are FRANK LOGUE and OSCAR GRAY. Mr. Gray was represented in the *Journal* once before with his co-authorship of *Palestine In Crisis* (February 1947).



# The Federal Government and Education

by Homer D. Babbidge

JUST 100 YEARS AGO, in May of 1848, Horace Mann tendered his resignation to the Massachusetts Board of Education, thereby bringing to a close eleven years of devoted service to public education in that state. It is significant that Mann resigned his position as Secretary of the Board in order to enter national politics, in the belief that opportunities for successful service to the American public were greater in that milieu. This move by the person who is now recognized as the most outstanding figure in American educational history foreshadowed one of the most prominent trends in American life nearly a century later: the trend toward national solutions to pressing social problems.

Since 1848, the progress made in the movement led by Horace Mann to establish broader and better public schooling has been considerable, if slow. The long, hard battle for tax-supported schools was won by the close of the Civil War, and the system of free secondary education has developed to the point where a leading popular magazine can call a high school education "a U. S. civic birth-right". Thomas Jefferson, no matter what other feelings he might have, would be pleased to see that the struggle to free schools from the control of religious groups has been won. The efforts of Mary Lyon and Catherine Beecher have come to fruition with the opening of the doors of education to women. Negroes have begun to get an education; vast numbers of immigrant peoples have been assimilated; and illiteracy has been slashed to a fraction.

Through all these historical developments there runs the strain of the basic American educational ideal — the development of the competent individual. That the individual is the traditional focal point of our national creed is obvious; that the success of community life depends on the degree of development of the innate abilities of the individual has been the belief of every American leader since Jefferson. From these beliefs which are basic to democracy has come the educational desire for competence — moral, intellectual, physical and social—*provided that training for such centers around the individual.*

The individualistic emphasis in American education has expressed itself in a localized system of schools, both with regard to support and control. The value of local control lies in the fact that it avoids the use of schools on a large scale as instruments for the promotion of the aims of governmental leaders. The lay boards which govern most of our school systems are an expression of the belief that the parents of the children being educated can best insure that their offspring will not be used as powers for the advancement of nationalistic aims. The spectre of governmental control haunts the dreams of educators as well as those of businessmen.

And yet even this localization of authority has lessened in recent years, the result of a change in emphasis on the individual in democratic societies. As a feeling of nationalism has grown in Americans, so has a broader consciousness grown. Developing America, with its extensive means of mass communication and transportation, has increased the number of everybody's "neighbors", and the community conscience has broadened. Our educational aim has now become a competent individualistic *society*; the individual still is the important instructional unit, but the community has assumed the role of ultimate recipient of the benefits of enlightenment. Just as in all walks of life, the social responsibility, the spouse of individual liberty, has come in recent years to receive the belated attentions of American educators, so long devoted to her mate.

We find ourselves now with an extensive local system of support and control and a public which will jealously guard it, along with an increasing public desire for greater competence. Whether or not the present program of support and control can satisfy the desire for localism and competence is the basic problem facing American education today.

One indication that there is a widely-held belief that the local tradition will not suffice is to be found in the forthcoming Senate Bill Number 472, a document which if made into law would oblige the Federal Government to subsidize local school



systems to the extent of \$300,000,000 a year. In addition to a flat-rate subsidy of \$5 for each child between 5 and 17 years, Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, the author of this bill, would have the government give poorer states in the Union as much as \$20 per child in addition, on the basis of a rather complex formula which takes into account the state's ability to pay and its willingness to pay.

In the history of the relationship of education and government, this bill can be of great significance. It is not a new idea, but one which has been brought to the attention of Congress since the post-Civil War period, and which has been most keenly endorsed since then in two other post-war periods. The Prosser Bill of 1870 was a foreshadowing of the flurry of agitation and proposed legislation for federal aid to education which grew out of the dismay over illiteracy and enlisted men's I.Q.'s in World War I, and out of America's fear of Bolshevism and concern over "hyphenated-Americans." But to date, the Federal Government has not actually established itself in the field of public education, and the Aiken Bill's chances for significance in American educational history will hinge on a Congressional vote, which theoretically will reflect our attitude towards the system of localism as well as concern over education engendered by World War II.

We now hear Senator Aiken stating boldly that "... the time has come when the Federal Government must assume its rightful responsibility in (the field of public education)." Why a Republican Senator from a state whose educational system represents to a high degree the local and individualistic traditions of American education should speak so may be puzzling at first. But the leader of the Senate sub-committee on education has his facts and sees the educational picture pretty clearly.

He knows that every state in the nation, like his own, has long had plenty of the individual emphasis — at the appalling expense of competence. He knows, if he has consulted the Bureau of the Census, that nearly 17,000,000 American above the age of 19 years have never been to school or have never completed the fifth grade. He may also know that, in 1947, 1,600,000, or 19% of our high-school age children were not attending any kind of school — in a day when a high-school education is called a "civic birthright".

Senator Aiken is well aware that the traditional excuses for poor state school systems are misleading, that it is not simply political graft or Southern stubbornness that cause some states to spend on education only a small fraction of what the leaders

like New York and California do. His own state suffers from a sort of financial anemia, and he can sympathize with Mississippi whose annual per capita income is but one-third of New York State's, a fact which strikes to the core of our school finance problem today. It is not that some of our states *don't want* to educate their children; the fact is that the "Poor" South is poor — and so are our Northern New England States. In many cases the effort, measured in terms of the ratio of proportion of state income expended to proportion to the national income, made by a state with a poor educational system is greater than that of a better educational state. The marginal farmer in Maine spends a larger proportion of his hard earned dollars for education than do the comfortable citizens of many a wealthier state.

There can be no doubt in the mind of the sponsor of Senate Bill 472 that this problem now transcends state borders — that is a fact emphasized by wars, and this last was no no exception, with its draft statistics on illiteracy. The fact that under the Senate Reorganization Act a committee of the Senate was to be called "Labor and Education" is an indication that the schooling of American youth is a prominent *national* problem. We must remember that our aim in providing education is to benefit the individual and only incidentally the state, but we must be realistic in recognizing that the individual is no longer free to go and do as he pleases without regard for the rest of the nation. Both the nation and the individual can benefit from broader and better education. After the last war we recognized the need for educating foreign-born Americans, because they were in fact a part of our society, though they may have passed their school days in Southern Europe. Today we must recognize that 60% of the people in the U. S. are not living in the states in which they were born. We must realize that poorly educated people from other states are now citizens of our own — that it is to our benefit, as well as to the benefit of the individual, to give him an adequate education no matter where he happens to spend his boyhood.

It is the intention of Senator Aiken to establish the adequacy of our school system by providing subsidies which would place the minimum expenditure per pupil at \$50 a year, while allowing a state to spend as much more than that as it can or cares to. This is adequacy without its treacherous sometime-companion, uniformity. And Senate Bill 472 definitely provides that "the administration of education and the control of school systems must be left completely in the hands of organizational units within the states", a provision designed to safeguard the tradition of local control.



When Senator Aiken says that "now is the time" for Federal Aid to our state educational systems, a clear majority of educators are in agreement. No one can know so well as a school administrator the need for such aid. How much opposition will be afforded by the wealthier states, the Catholic Church, or election-minded legislators is a big question mark. It was the resistance of these elements which hog-tied similar legislation after World War I.

The ability of the Federal Government to take such a unique step in the solution of a pressing social problem seems clear. We already have seen national solutions of this sort. The Federal Government, in fact, spent millions of dollars on educational matters in 1947, without colliding with state systems, the constitution, or anybody else. That Congress can tax to provide for the general welfare of the public and can expend its finances for the use of agencies over which it can have no control, is now an established part of our constitutional law.

Considering that Federal Aid to education has been in the congressional mill for nearly eighty years, and since the present U. S. Commissioner of Education has recently stated that "there has never been a more widespread concern for education than there is today", there seems to be a distinct possibility that Senator Aiken's optimism over his bill is well founded.

There has been one other recent development in the field of the relationship of the Federal Government and education which has attracted widespread attention. I refer to the report of the President's Committee on Higher Education, a six volume work by prominent American educators entitled *Higher Education for American Democracy*. It is the opinion expressed in this report that the "time has come" for a larger number of American youths to be provided with education beyond the twelfth grade. It is the considered opinion of this committee that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to help provide the facilities for such increased learning. The recommended program would have the Congress embark in 1948-49 on a developing program of aid to public institutions which would cost the U. S. government \$1,000,000,000 in 1960 for current operations in addition to probably another \$1,000,000,000 a year in fellowships and scholarships. This ambitious program, coupled with greatly increased state appropriations, would, the committee believes, provide education beyond the 12th grade to 4,600,000 people (including those students educated in private institutions), according to the following distribution: 2,500,000 students in two-year "col-

leges", 1,500,000 in four-year colleges, and 600,000 engaged in study or research beyond the college level.

The President's committee apparently bases its statement of the projected higher educational needs of the nation solely on the results of Army Classification tests which they say indicated that "at least 49% of the population of college age could profit from and could complete 2 years of the current type of college education; and that at least 32% could profit from and could complete 4 years of college." It is true that "there has never been a year when as much as 16% of the college age population was enrolled in institutions of higher education."

In an attempt to avoid some of the very attractive opportunities for discussion of the significance of this report for private institutions of higher learning, I should like to consider the report only as it affects public education; what its chances are of being transposed into legislation, and its relationship to the earlier discussion of the Aiken Bill.

I think the chances of the President's committee's program being legislated according to its schedule are nil. It is true that college education is now everybody's business; that it is a public concern. But Dr. Zook's committee will have to bargain with people like Bernard Iddings Bell, who, writing in the *N. Y. Times*, recently made the statement:

"Of the multitudes which overcrowd our . . . universities and colleges . . . most of them could never be made into persons competent to lead anyone, even themselves, competent to exhibit wise discrimination, no matter what was done to, for, or with them.

"The great majority of the human race is composed of those who were not born with minds that can be developed for such activity as this; from birth their synaptic connections have been too slow for that . . . their chief activity is bound to be the hewing of wood and drawing of water and tending of machines . . ."

Mr. Bell is an American, an educator, and an advisor to the Episcopal Church. Less skeptical people than he will fail to be convinced by Army test figures. That is the first obstacle to the success of the program — the fact that vast sections of the American people do not yet believe that college is "for the people".

There is another group of Americans who will understand that the authors of this report have done the nation a great service in bringing to its attention a problem which must be faced. They will realize that the "colleges" described in the re-



port do not all fit our traditional concept of such; that they are in many cases vocational schools of an advanced level which might well be used to train a class of lesser grade government officials, business men, and semi-professional workers. It is this group of people who recognize the fact that there are many young men and women who deserve and warrant good college educations and who do not get them today. There will be many people within this group who believe that there is plenty of "dead wood" in our undergraduate bodies today that owes its present position to the meaningless fact that it can afford to be in college.

And yet, of this group I have been describing, few will actively support legislation designed to effect the program of "Higher Education for American Democracy." Their reasons for not encouraging such legislation are as follows:

1. There are more important things to be done in the field of education, namely the establishment of a firmer foundation of primary and secondary schools.
2. They fear the menace of Federal control on the college level even more than on lower levels.
3. They feel that the private and present public institutions can and will do a more adequate job in the future.
4. They are skeptical of the extreme statements of the President's committee — that numbers and figures are unnecessarily large.

In addition to this opposition, or lack of support, the committee's program will meet with the same public apathy which bills of the Aiken order have faced for nearly 80 years, and the entrenched opposition of the same established factions of wealth, states with already adequate systems, the Catholic Church, reactionary legislators, educators fearful of insidious government control, and a host of jealous college alumni.

Both the Aiken Bill and the Higher Education Report embody the principle of Federal aid to

public education with state and local control, and that is the really significant issue involved. That the Federal Government has expended plenty of money already in the field of education is a fact; in 1947 it spent \$1,772,000,000 on post-high school education alone! Whether or not it will continue after the veterans have been cared for remains to be seen. American educators believe almost unanimously that Federal aid in subsidy form can be given and received without necessity of governmental control of policy or curriculum, and legal barriers have already been broken down. Uncle Sam is free to become a partner in the business of educating his nephews and nieces, now that they recognize the need for assistance. The trend toward national solutions may soon be evident in the field of education.

Senator Aiken offers a 300 million-dollars-a-year program to meet an immediate and pressing need in our basic public school system. Mr. Zook's presidential committee offers a rather more expensive program to enlarge and improve the bell-tower of our educational system, which is a need not apparent to all. We must give the utmost attention to such plans as the one expressed in *Higher Education for American Democracy*, and I hope that we shall not have to wait 80 years for Congress to do something about higher education. But right now we must devote our energies to establishing what we have undertaken but failed to accomplish. To do otherwise would seem to be building on sand.

The future of American education looks good. If we can successfully establish a program such as is provided for in the Aiken Bill which would maintain the democratic tradition of local control and at the same time provide our public school system with an increased potential for developing competent young people, we will be justified in being somewhat optimistic about the future. To hold that such advances in education are a panacea for the ills of America would be extremely dangerous, but they can and will serve as an effective initial treatment.



# Norway: Education for Democracy

by Seymour I. Toll

THE "MIDDLE WAY" IDEAL pervades the educational structure of Norway as it pervades so many social enterprises throughout Scandinavia. Combining many of the happiest features of freedom and authority, it provides for the educational training of the Norwegian youth up through the post-graduate levels of liberal and technical education.

The children of Norway grow up in the context of commonly shared values which are made explicit in the public schools of the land. In a real sense there is congruency between education and life in this land. Young Norwegians are trained to a set of values which integrate with the direction in which their society is going, and it seems to me that the importance of this fact cannot be too strongly emphasized. A good share of the strength of any society is grounded in the impression it makes through its members' education, for here is one of the critical points at which a value scheme is instilled. Furthermore, such strength as that society has, depends upon the opportunities it gives its youth in expressing that value scheme in daily living. To teach children that political democracy is a good which requires certain egalitarian principles and then to send them out into a society where this value is denied, is to create skepticism and uncertainty of a kind that weakens the integrity of the society. Gross disparity between the actual and the ideal creates social frustration and its consequent harms. Myrdal's study of the American Negro problem has become a classic demonstration of this principle, and it is significant, I think, that the statement of the nature of this problem was made by a Scandinavian.

The disparity between the ideals of Norwegian society and its actualities is minimized. Norway's children learn that democracy as a political pursuit is an ideal to be sought, and every day of their lives they look about and find the actuality giving meaning to that ideal. Their teachers tell them that every Norwegian has a responsibility to his society to keep it vigorous and free, and they see a great amount of citizen participation in cooperatives and local government going on all through the land: the ideal is made meaningful as a result.

On the 9th of April, 1940, the German army moved into peaceful Norway, and from that day until the 8th of May, 1945, the acid test of the vitality and strength of Norwegian education was made. A word about the historical background that preceded this dramatic crisis in education may serve to point up the reasons why the system came out so well in its trial.

The system originated in a Royal decree of 1739 which established instruction in the fundamentals of education. (Reading, writing, etc.) Because of the heavy financial burden and severe administrative difficulties this decree would have imposed had it been fully operative at once, it could be but partially realized in its early years. Slowly the parish-type school developed, and with the reconstruction of the Norwegian state in 1814 came new responsibilities for the youthful democratic state.

Realizing the great need for an enlightened citizenry, the people of Norway accepted a series of legislative acts which, during the 19th century, established an evolutionary system of permanent, uniformly adequate public schools, new subjects of instruction, and the very important principle of freedom at the local administrative level. (Each municipality has a popularly-elected School Board, which has much supervisory power over the elementary schools in that area). Concurrently, the popularly elected representatives of each county of the land gained enough influence to help those districts which were placed at a disadvantage financially or geographically. The state, meanwhile, was giving generously from its resources to help strengthen and expand the entire system.

The first seven years of education became compulsory for all the children in the nation. Since the system provided itself with competent teachers (through adequate preparation) it built upon a firm basis for the democratic education of its young citizens. Post-elementary schools developed as pre-University gymnasias and vocational-type schools (with variants between these extremes), and the young student was given much freedom in choosing the direction of his higher education. Professional training was offered at the University of



Oslo (the Bergen Museum is now being considered as the country's second university), the Technical Highschool (i.e. College) at Trondheim, and other schools ranging from agriculture to medicine in curricula. Save for the College of Dentists, the instruction at every level was free, and the guiding aim of the entire system had been the fullest development of the individual student's potential abilities.

Private schools were very few in number, and, unlike the Anglo-American private schools, they did not necessarily offer a better education than that given publicly. (Perhaps the fact that the Royal family's children are educated at public schools is a comment on the schools' quality.) As in so many other social pursuits, here was a reflection of the degree of democratization that this people had achieved. The finest education had become available to the best minds in the country, and its cost for the individual was not the great deterrent that it is in America and in Britain.

Exposition veils the great historical sacrifices that were made in creating public education for the nation. Norway has been a land of extremely limited economic resources. Furthermore, the geography of the country has been a barrier to progress. The land is heavily ridged with great mountains and indented with long and deep fjords which made communication difficult. The great extremes in climate added to the problem, but in spite of the great natural and financial obstacles, Norway had by 1940 achieved an advanced state of public education of which any democratic state could well be proud. The condition of education was quite accurately a tribute to the will and desire of the people to gain knowledge in spite of the large sacrifices it had to make in doing so. The state bore a heavy financial share of the upkeep of the physical plant. In addition, it provided increasingly for the free dental care of the young as well as offering elementary school children the nutritious (and free) "Oslo Breakfast".

It was this educational structure that was critically tested through the occupation. The occupation dramatized its validity as it could not have been dramatized during the peaceful, progressive years leading up to World War II. Could a small nation of less than four million inhabitants maintain its deep traditions of democratic education in the face of the mighty threat that the German occupation posed? The answer, one of the lesser known acts of national heroism of the recent war, was found in the splendid bearing of Norwegian parents, students and teachers throughout the entire period of stress.

Soon after the occupation began it became clear that the Germans were determined to use the Norwegian schools as a propaganda instrument for the nazification of the country. The imposition of an anti-democratic ideology was attempted through the hated offices of Quisling's *Nasjonal Samling* government. The first attempts took the form of overt changes in the system—German was to replace English as the first foreign language, basic history and constitutional law texts were to be revised, Quisling's picture was to be displayed in all schools, and the doctrines of the *N.S.* were to be promulgated in the schools.

The last order led to school strikes all over the country. Teachers, students, and parents all supported the strikes which spread across Norway early in 1941. Faced with such unyielding determination, the Quisling government took a second and more indirect approach. Teachers were now quietly threatened with loss of their jobs and physical injury. School boards were "reorganized". Meanwhile dissident students and teachers were openly dragged from their homes and classrooms to be made examples of for the rest of the "uncooperative" Norwegians.

Protests grew early in 1942. Students were increasingly engaged in the contravention of Quisling decrees. Even tiny youngsters went about the streets with red knit caps on their heads, symbols of their devotion to the Norway of Haakon VII. Older students of high school and college ages were secretly engaged in circulating underground information for the official Norwegian government in London. Many Norwegian parents saw their children slip quietly from their homes after dark to return hours later from underground missions which could not be divulged even to parents. University students escaped across the border to Sweden or took to the open sea in fragile craft which got most of them to Britain or Sweden where they joined the Norwegian forces abroad.

In February, 1942, the Quisling government promulgated a decree demanding that all Norwegian teachers join the "Teachers' Front", an organization dedicated to the totalitarian ideology of nazism. In addition, all youths between ten and eighteen were ordered into the *N. S.* Youth Movement, and measures were taken to strengthen discipline for the rebellious. Mass teacher resignations followed these governmental decrees, and on April 9th, 1942, one of the war's most stirring documents was published by the overwhelming majority of Norway's teachers: *The Norwegian Teachers' Pledge to Their Pupils*. Several excerpts should serve to indicate the inner strength that fortifies Norwegian education:



"One of our dearest national songs tells us that 'every child's soul we unfold, is another province added to the country.' Together with church and home we teachers have the responsibility to see to it that this unfolding occurs in Christian love and understanding, and in conformity with our national cultural traditions. We have been charged with the task of giving you children the knowledge and training for the thorough work which is necessary if every single one of you is to receive complete development as a human being, so that you can fulfill your place in society to the benefit of others and yourself. This is the duty with which we have been entrusted by the Norwegian people, and the Norwegian people can call us to account for it.

"However, the teacher's duty is not only to give the children knowledge. He must also teach the children to have faith in, and to earnestly desire that which is true and right. Therefore he cannot, without betraying his calling, teach anything against his conscience. He who does so sins against the pupils he is supposed to lead and against himself. This, I promise you, I shall not do.

"I will not call upon you to do anything which I regard as wrong. Nor will I teach you anything which I regard as not conforming with the truth. I will, as I have done heretofore, let my conscience be my guide, and I am confident that I shall then be in step with the great majority of the people who have entrusted to me the duties of an educator."

Mass arrests of teachers soon followed the publication of "The Pledge." Some were sent to concentration camps and forced labor camps in Norway. A hell-ship, the *S. S. Skjerstad*, was jammed with five hundred teachers and sent to Kirkenes on the arctic North Cape of Norway. The teachers were subjected to the worst kind of indignities, and upon arrival at Kirkenes they were forced into labor on the docks there.

The determination of Norwegians to preserve their freedom in spite of the oppressive heel of the occupying Germans and their Quisling cohorts was manifest in their daily lives. Teachers and students formed a close bond which could not be broken by any efforts attempted by the enemy. And the fight went on outside Norway as well as within it. Those Norwegians who had escaped to Britain or Sweden had opportunity to make their contributions to the war effort. Liberation came in 1945 and with it the full reassertion of the kind of free education that had obtained in Norway down to 1940. There

can be no doubt that the institution of education emerged no less purposeful and at one with itself than it was on the eve of the occupation.

Since liberation, the academic life has taken a swing back to pre-war conditions. Academic freedom prevails once more in the schools and University, and enrollment in the University is at an all time high. Most of the students at the University must work at part-time jobs in order to support themselves while in school, but this is not a problem from which they shy. Their interest in learning is keen and unflagging, and they are a highly informed, alert group of men and women.

They have their clubs and societies through which they find expression. Political groups in the University publish various papers and journals which reflect student opinion on political matters, and the present Labor government draws upon students for opinion and assistance in its operation. Social life at the University is in striking contrast to that which one finds at any great American university. Since the students have very limited means, there is little of the expensive, gay life which is rampant in America during the football season. A good deal of the Norwegian student's amusement centers about nature rather than the dormitory room.

Attendance at University classes is a voluntary matter, and the student sets his own pace, taking his examinations when he feels capable of passing them. Examinations are notoriously long and difficult, and as a result, only a very few students are where they do not belong academically.

Norwegians are an intensely outdoor people, and students generally spend more time in outdoor activities than American students do. Skiing is a favorite winter sport, and the Sunday trams running out to Oslo's fine suburbs are usually filled with students and burghers going out to the hills for their recreation. Many students go to the mountains for their winter holidays, there to live in the open, hunting and skiing and spending very little money in the process. Summer holidays are spent at the sea or walking and climbing in the mountains, and from early June until the latter part of the summer the country roads are bustling with rucksack-laden students who are off again to renew their acquaintance with nature. They seem to have struck a healthy balance between town and country, and without romanticizing their devotion to the outdoors, I cannot help but conclude that they are the better for it. Living too much in the limited world of the city and the classroom is not conducive to the making of the whole man.



Recently Evelyn Waugh charged all of Scandinavia with being in a process of spiritual decay.\* In Vigeland's statuary he saw "an expression of Scandinavian piety" as something "uncompromisingly phallic"; for him the Oslo Town Hall "promises to be the most hideous building in the world"; social leveling seems to bring decadence with it; and the end point of it all is apparently going to be Scandinavia's spiritual death.

Waugh's interpretation of what is going on in Scandinavia is pretty clearly that of the religious artist, and as such he has a point of view. I frankly failed to see in it, however, any real indication of something other than the most superficial kind of observation. Waugh seems to be disturbed about spiritual values, and yet nowhere does he stress the sort of life that is going on in the day-to-day existences of men all over Scandinavia. He says that Scandinavia "no longer forms a part of Christendom", and this statement has no meaning for me. If he is talking about Christianity as an institution, the spiritual fight that the Church of Norway waged against the Germans denies his charge at every turn. If he is talking about Christianity in its simple sense, he has closed his eyes to perhaps the most truly Christian people in the West. Nowhere have I seen men show more respect for the worth of other men than I did in Norway (and I do not forget Norway's bitterness about Germans). Nowhere have I seen a better expression of the good life, the life of peaceful progress filled with the realization that material values are not the most important values to cherish, than I did in Norway. It does not take profound observation to see the light in a Norwegian's eyes when he talks about his coming walking trip in the mountains or to watch his face become somber when you tell him of the minority problem in America. The material attractions of city life in no way block the Norwegian from spending a good deal of his leisure time in natural surroundings where he sees life in a more wholesome perspective than the view the city alone offers. And

\* *Dreary Paradise*; *THIS WEEK*, 25 Jan., 1948.

in his cities he does not live in the degrading surroundings of slums where indecent conditions turn what could be healthy, constructive citizens into the diseased, the criminal, and the unhappy people who abound in many of the cities of America.

There is no need for deep insight to understand that Norwegian education fought a battle involving the spiritual resources of a whole people and that that battle was won because of the strength and uncompromising nature of their values, because of the meaning and richness decades of Norwegian education had given democratic living. Norwegian education, as part of the whole social complex of the country, came through the crisis of war still assured of its purpose as an important factor in the molding of a free people's spirit.

Denmark and Norway have recently passed through the severities of occupation, and Sweden walked the precarious tight-rope of neutrality during that time. The impact of war could not but bring great problems to these traditionally peaceful people, and these problems will be with them for many years to come. Scandinavians are very aware of the physical and psychological disruption caused by the war. Having been forced into difficulties which were in great part not of their creation, they have nevertheless taken up peaceful living with their characteristic vigor and direction. Expanding democracy can find no better example than Scandinavia. It seems to me that Waugh's indictment of the "Middle Way" is fundamentally an indictment of democracy as a social and political pursuit. Scandinavia demonstrates the direction in which democracy can go if given free rein. Politically, it represents an entire nation sharing in the activities of governing on an equal basis. Socially, it has eliminated extremes at both ends of the scale and in so doing has provided much equal opportunity for all its people. Education in Norway exemplifies this leveling process which goes on in such varied activities as medicine, housing and unemployment benefits. And for Waugh it all seems to lead to spiritual death. He has a point of view.



# Ambassadors of Democracy

by Robert P. Lyons

THE AMERICAN SOLDIER OF the occupation pauses only briefly at Bremerhaven, the port of entry into Germany. He proceeds almost immediately to the Third Replacement Depot in Marburg, Greater Hesse, where he is billeted in what was formerly an insane asylum. In the shadow of Marburg's twelfth century cathedral, Occupation Joe is "oriented": he learns that he is to be an "ambassador of democracy" to the German people. But here the orientation lectures stop short; they never reveal the denotative meaning of democracy. The assumption is implicit in these lectures that the occupation soldier, as a product of American society and its educational system, is well aware of the ideals and values on which the democratic tradition is founded. Occupation Joe's activities in the ensuing months reveal the invalidity of that assumption. Democracy remains for him a nebulous, ineffable concept associated with certain pleasant images and national symbols; for all practical purposes the notion ceases to concern him when he leaves Marburg and orientation lectures.

Occupation Joe is not a good "ambassador of democracy." The press of this nation has been too absorbed with recounting on-the-spot stories of his questionable activities to rehash them here with any profit. His actions are understandable when examined in the light of the attitudes most prevalent among the soldiers of the Regular Army. The re-enlistee may still bear a sincere hatred of all Germans, whom he has never ceased to identify with "the enemy," but more likely he is a forthright sort of individual who returned to civilian life momentarily, found it not to his liking, and now is primarily interested in securing for himself a comfortable existence demanding a minimum of personal exertion. On the other hand, the young enlistee, fresh from the "States," often feels bitterly resentful about the fact that he was too young to fight the *Wehrmacht* and illogically transfers this resentment onto a defeated people. None of these three types, into which the vast majority of occupation troops can be classified, is concerned about teaching the Germans democracy—or anything like it. There are a few individuals sincerely devoted to molding the future state of German thought, but they are so obscured by the great mass of pleasure-

seekers, brass-hats, "operators," illiterates, and vengeful youths that their influence is negligible.

The lack of an understanding of and concern with the problems of re-educating the German people is as noticeable among officers and War Department employees as it is among the enlisted men. But in regard to the less lowly levels of the army hierarchy another criticism must be raised, for from these heights democracy is not only to be taught by exemplary action: it is also to be administered. The complete inadequacy of the American Military Government to cope with the situation which it faces is illustrated in numerous sub-regional offices throughout the American zone where the real "boss" proves to be the bi-lingual German secretary. In a recent dispatch from Berlin, printed in the *New York Times*, AMG admitted having lost contact with the several hundred German ex-prisoners of war who had been trained in the United States at the Fort Getty (R.I.) "democratization school," claiming that it "did not have a clear idea of the project" and that it was "too busy" with other matters. Implicit in this dispatch are two fundamental shortcomings in the actual administration of occupied Germany: the lack of co-ordination between AMG and the War Department and the bureaucratic morass in which both organizations find themselves. Both the Army and the Military Government spend a considerable time unwinding the red tape with which they have bound themselves; the figure becomes even more complex when a third factor, the German civil government, is introduced. The military does not reveal the democratic process either in its actions or in its administration.

The Germans have received our "ambassadors of democracy" with considerable tolerance—perhaps more than they deserve. For many, however, it has meant the death of an illusion. Even the Hitler propaganda machine was unequal to the task of completely demolishing the almost child-like faith which so many Germans maintained in the United States—a material Utopia offering unbounded opportunity and freedom. That illusion is not completely dissipated but it is severely restricted. The hope that the blissful state which



America connotes can ever be extended to the German nation by the American Army is frankly disallowed by the German people. The impossibility of the extension of the democratic tradition to Germany is a belief engendered in the people of Hesse, Bavaria, and Wurtemberg-Baden by the observation of the action and administration of the occupying forces, who have never seriously attempted to divest themselves of the cloak of the conqueror.

The word "democracy" has a hollow ring for the present day German. When he looks about him he is impressed first of all by the privileged position of the occupying forces. He hears of colonels squabbling for castles in Heidelberg; he sees satisfied-looking army wives carrying quantities of food from the commissaries; and he watches Streetcar No. 29, reserved for American military and civilian personnel, roll along the Frankfurt streets in all its magnificent emptiness. Perhaps he is contemplating these injustices as he leaves the single room which he shares with his wife in a bomb-scarred apartment building; as he patiently waits in a sinuous queue for the meager rations, which he will supplement with American products bought for fantastic prices on the black market; and as he shoves his way to within clutching distance of a streetcar overflowing with people thinking the same thoughts. If he has to fumble in his wallet for change to pay the conductor, he may well ponder the myriad official papers he has placed there. Like all other Germans, he carries on his person an amazing number of documents necessary for normal existence in the German state. They consist of several voluminous identification papers, plus ration cards, discharge papers, work permits, housing permits, and so on indefinitely. These papers reflect accurately the restrictions which limit freedom of movement within his society. It is not remarkable that our streetcar-riding German, conscious of inequality, injustice, and oppressive restrictions, is somewhat contemptuous of the word "democracy."

The Germans may be cynical about learning democracy from the soldiers of the occupation, but there exists, nonetheless, an intense and earnest desire for the basic human liberties and rights which democracy denotes. Arthur Koestler once wrote that "only those realize what oxygen means who have known the torture of suffocation." For over a decade the citizens of Nazi Germany survived the suffocation of a police state; the destruction of that state gave them a tantalizing breath of oxygen. Men (other than fanatics) do not choose to live in a society which has destined them to death by slow suffocation; but sometimes it seems the lesser of two evils. It must be recognized that the "Ger-

man problem" in its widest ramifications involves a determination of the entire pattern of the post-war world; to suggest that Germany can ever obtain a stable democratic government while it is being tossed about in the maelstrom of *Realpolitik* is intellectually dishonest. At the same time we must realize that today Germany is a country without a creed, without a faith; it is a nation without ethical or political ballast. There exists an almost nostalgic urge to reach out and grasp the ideals and values of the democratic countries of western civilization; a fervent fear of the Russians and all they represent exerts an even stronger force which operates to the same end. At no moment in history has the opportunity for providing the Germans with a democratic ideal been so great and so compelling.

It is incumbent upon us to discern why we are apparently failing to accomplish the mission which so clearly is ordained us. On the level of the obvious is the suggestion made earlier: the United States Army in Germany does not reveal in its organization or its ideology an institution for administering or teaching democracy. The low esteem into which the Regular Army has fallen even in this country is not entirely unjustified; it is more than justified with respect to the Army of Occupation. The military is simply not a proper instrument for instilling a creed and a faith in the German citizen. If it is necessary to maintain armed forces in Europe for strategic purposes, then maintain and strengthen them; but they should not be harnessed with functions for which they were not designed and which they cannot perform. The administration of Germany by a single, unified, civilian organization would certainly be a step in the right direction. It would be desirable gradually to increase the power and scope of the German institutions which would grow under its tutelage, until in the final phase its functions would be only supervisory. Such an organization should require men of the highest caliber for its members—men who have clearly in mind the end which they are seeking, men who have clearly in mind the values of their society. If such men are available, educating the Germans to democracy is only a superficial problem of technique.

The crucial point, implicit in the entire argument, is precisely that western civilization (and the United States in particular) is *not* aware of the values upon which it is founded; that our society and our schools have *not* taught us the fundamentals of our way of living and governing. We are failing in our attempt to re-educate the Germans primarily because we have not been made aware of our own ideals; we have no banner, no program, no creed to offer the peoples of the world. We can only op-



pose the flaming Gospel of dynamic communism with a static inertia based on the tenuous hope of restoring the *status quo ante bellum*. The bankruptcy of our ideology is partially the result of our conservative bias—of the timorousness with which we approach the conception of government as an active and constructive force in the social organism; of the slight regard which our schools and universities have of fostering and examining a positive political ideal. And so we continue to lament the fanaticism of the Hitler *Jugend*, but we offer them no alternative creed to which they can transfer their faith. Potentially Germany is capable of joining the democratic countries of western civilization and of assuming a leading role in Europe. It is the inability of the United States, the foremost power on earth, to direct Germany's footsteps along the proper path which provides the substance for living tragedy.

The inspiring words which re-echo throughout the history of western civilization in the documents of human rights and liberties seem cold and moribund today. In country after country these words have been erased—or remain to mock reality. But now, when they are directly challenged, is the time when they become all-important. Our present task is to breathe new life into the decaying values upon which our society is founded, to restore them to the vigor of their youth. But simultaneously they must be re-examined and adapted to the ever-changing patterns of social organization; only the forces of progress can revitalize our traditional values. Until our ideals have been recreated within the context of social and political progress, we have nothing to teach the Germans.

The time allotted us may extend into several decades; but with each passing day our task becomes more difficult.



## A New Outlook in the Old Dominion

by Edward O. McCue, III

DISSATISFACTION WITH VIRGINIA'S public school system has stemmed from several sources. Most of the complaints have been based on supposedly insufficient appropriations for education by the Legislature. Teachers complained of low salaries and undesirable sick leave and retirement plans. (The funds for the existing retirement system were exhausted.) Various civic organizations clamored for more and better physical facilities. Alarm was expressed at the lack of opportunities for training and educating the greater masses of the youth of Virginia since only 2.2% of all school enrollment ever complete college training. Many critics called this phenomenon the result of inadequate high school training. The instruction and curriculum were felt to be in great need of improvement. Others expressed dissatisfaction with the administration of the school system itself. It can readily be recognized that all of these factors were in some part responsible for Virginia's low ranking in the nation's public school system.

In December, 1944, the Virginia Education Commission, after exhaustive research and study throughout the state, submitted a report to the Governor which resulted in the calling of a Special Session of the Legislature in January, 1945. Acting on the recommendations of the Commission, the state appropriations for education for the biennium 1945-1946 were increased to \$41,726,585.00, an increase of about 50% over that of the preceding biennium. In the regular session of the General Assembly in 1946, the allocation of state funds for education was increased to \$53,147,287.00 for the biennium 1947-1948. This appropriation was 343% of that of the 1935-1936 period.

In January, 1947, a Special Session of the Legislature was called by the Governor during which cognizance was taken of the necessity for formulating some policy for the drastically needed improvement of the public school system. Additional appropriations for education for the 1947-1948 biennium were increased \$7,850,000.00. Two resolutions were adopted which resulted in the setting up of two study groups; one, the Commission on Public

Schools, composed of legislators and educators; and the other composed of the members of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council. Subcommittees of legislators, business men and educators rendered invaluable service in alleviating the difficult and complex assignments of the two groups. Public hearings throughout the state were conducted by both study groups in order to obtain as broad a picture as possible of the current educational set up in the Old Dominion. Ample opportunity was afforded all citizens for expressing their criticisms.

In its report, the Commission on Public Schools set forth the following problems as most urgent:

- (1) Higher salaries for teachers;
- (2) Increase in the maintenance of minimum educational program funds for the assistance of needy counties;
- (3) Enlarged vocational training facilities including general shop programs and more adequate commercial and business training courses in high schools;
- (4) Improvement in transportation facilities;
- (5) A more attractive retirement plan; and
- (6) Sick leave benefits for teachers.

Significantly enough, recommendations for the solutions of these problems were concerned primarily with an increase in school appropriations to the extent of \$39,157,001.00 for the biennium 1948-1949. A sales tax and an increase in personal income and corporation taxes were advocated for the provision of funds for the necessary increase. In view of the fact that over 50% of the general fund is at present allocated for school purposes, the recommendations of this Commission were universally said to be extremely extravagant and impractical. The proposals set forth met with harsh editorial criticism from the Commonwealth's newspapers.

The report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council was broader in its scope. In view of the fact that since 1940 the outlays for education by the State had trebled and the average teacher's pay had been more than doubled, it was obvious that



increasing appropriations was not a panacea for all educational ills. Also, since Virginia, a predominately rural and agricultural state, ranks 36th in the nation in its ability to pay, it cannot possibly keep pace with the expenditures of states more greatly populated and more heavily industrialized. It was felt that certain civic groups in their zeal to improve the school situation had, in effect, rendered disservice to their cause. The state teachers colleges were found not to be pursuing the original objective for which they were set up — the training of teachers for public schools. There are at present ten state supported institutions of the college level; in addition, there are other private colleges. It was observed that some localities were not supplementing state appropriations for teachers' salaries to a justifiable extent. Since, at present, the State Board of Education functions part-time only, and since it is humanly impossible that the present qualifications of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction be filled by one person, it was considered that the administration of the public school system was not being executed with a desired degree of efficiency. The vocational training program of the State was compared with that of the "hobby shop" level.

The Council recommended that a reaffirmation of the duties, powers and functions of the State Board of Education as a supervisory agency be made. There should be more frequent meetings and a closer contact with school problems should be maintained. The chairman of this board should be an experienced business man with full time responsibility. The Superintendent of Public Instruction should be an experienced educator, concerned only with the training and curriculum of the school system. There should be a broadening of the scholarship plan for students desiring to become public school teachers. The present teacher training colleges should be reorganized and rededicated to their original purpose of training teachers, rather than serving as liberal arts colleges. A re-examination of teachers' salaries should be made with special consideration of ability, training, experience and scholastic standing. Local contributions toward the salaries of teachers should be increased. The vocational educational program should be improved and enlarged.

Since, in its report, the Council advocated drastic administrative changes, its impact upon the public was explosive. However, favorable comments have outweighed outright criticism. Upon careful examination of the Council's report, it may readily be seen that a practical and sound approach to the solution of Virginia's school problems has been offered.

But today it is of vital importance that improvements other than physical, financial and administrative be made. The United States is one of the most powerful nations in the world today. Never before has one nation been faced with such great responsibilities as those incurred by this nation in undertaking the European recovery plan. If Virginia is to contribute substantially to the fulfillment of the nation's worldwide commitments, her school children must be prepared to discharge creditably the duties which will be their lot. The youths of today are the citizens of tomorrow, and the success of the United States' program for world peace and prosperity depends on their ability to cope with the complex problems certain to be encountered. A strong sense of political awareness must be developed. Familiarity with all forms and functions of government must be brought about.

The present curriculum of Virginia schools in the history and civics department should include a more detailed study of past and present forms of governments with emphasis on the following:

- (1) Events leading to establishment.
- (2) How various departments (legislative, executive, judicial) are administered.
- (3) Outstanding advantages.
- (5) Contributions to progress of civilization.
- (6) Events leading to expiration of past governments.

A very comprehensive study of government in the United States should be made from the federal to the local levels.

There should be developed a closer relationship with the world's peoples and a greater understanding of their ways of life. These may be brought about by the studying of each people's nationalistic tendencies, their customs, traditions, philosophies, religions, and cultures. The exchange of students should be encouraged in order that the relationship among the world's peoples may be as personal as possible. Time and time again, it has been shown that efforts to establish world peace have been in vain because of the failure of diplomats to understand the nature and background of the nationalities with which they were dealing.

The scope of activities of civics groups, foreign affairs clubs, etc. should be enlarged. Forum and discussion groups led by well informed moderators should be regularly and frequently held to discuss current issues. Whenever possible, the services of recognized authorities should be made available to the groups. Frequent talks by representatives of all



the departments of this nation's political system should be arranged in order that the students may become more thoroughly familiar with the workings of their own government. Student tours to legislatures, court rooms and political conventions would afford excellent opportunities for the observation of their government in action. As a result, the students will be in much closer contact with the political system under which they live.

With extensive knowledge of the rise and fall

of past governments, a thorough understanding of the world's nationalities, and familiarity with their own government, Virginia's citizens of tomorrow can look to the future with extreme confidence. They will affirm their ability to help keep strong and lasting the institutions that have made this nation the greatest in the world. No longer would it be said that Virginia's government was run by many politicians and few statesmen — the reverse would be true.



## Students in Action

*by Robert S. Smith*

THE STUDENT "ELITE" IN MANY countries has led the way in progress and reforms. Students are a small minority, destined for positions of leadership in their countries, and are active in pressing ahead. This has been manifested, for example, by student-led riots in Egypt against the British, student-led revolutions in Latin America to overthrow oppressive governments. On a more constructive level, student leadership in Canada has made possible reduced railway fares for members of the university community. But what about U. S. students?

Fortunately, the unfettered growth of the United States, free from outside domination, and protected against oppressive governmental measures, has given us no cause for the action taken by Egyptian and Latin American students. But the very absence of political pressure has also kept us from getting together on common constructive causes, such as the Canadians espoused.

Travelling in Europe last summer, I met students from at least fifty countries from all parts of the globe. Their living and studying conditions ranged from our own easy campus life to that of students in India who slept in doorways and gutters, ate what they could scrounge, and attended classes in the open air — when the weather permitted. I began to understand what they faced, and why they were so politically conscious. The young men and women who are willing to face the hardships involved in the learning process in many countries of the world are bound to be a respected, privileged class.

One reason, then, that students here are not heeded as they are in other countries is that we happily do not have to struggle to go to school the way so many students abroad do. There are several other reasons. First, is the number of students; I should estimate that our two and a half million students comprise about one-third of the total world student population; almost two percent of our population is in schools of higher education at the present time. A fair average for other nations is well under one-half of one percent; in the USSR, for example, it is about seven hundred thousand out of a population of one hundred and seventy mil-

lion. Thus, education here is easy to acquire, we tend to take it more for granted, and we consider less seriously the responsibilities which go along with it — of effective citizenship and leadership.

Secondly, education is traditionally scorned in America by the practical, hardheaded businessman, who has learned by experience and the proverbial school of hardknocks. Why should he listen to a mere college student!

Thirdly, and really concomitant to the above reason, students are considered to be immature and inexperienced, and to have no place in their nation's public affairs, to say nothing of a voice in their own education.

Finally, it is pointed out, when students do organize, when they do begin to assert themselves, they are usually "taken over" by radical minorities, who have inspired the movement in the first place, gotten some respectable youths to lead it, and then carefully infiltrated. Result: a situation bordering on the one of some of the countries abroad.

With all these counts against them, most students have had little opportunity or desire to express themselves publicly as students, or to work constructively toward bettering their own educational standards.

The recent war seems to have changed matters somewhat. Students have returned to college more mature, more aware of the problems to be faced in "real life"; the G.I. Bill has made it possible for many capable young men and women to attend universities who might never have been able to — bringing a broader outlook to many an ivy-covered campus. And the United States has emerged from the war as a dominant world power, determined to retain its extended horizons; the whole population is thinking in larger terms and is made sharply cognizant of the effect of international and national political issues in its day-by-day affairs.

A significant manifestation of the changing outlook is the rise of the U. S. National Student Association.

Considering the greater awareness and activity of students abroad, it is hardly surprising that the



original impetus for the NSA came from a delegation of twenty-five American students who attended the World Student Congress in Czechoslovakia in the summer of 1946. They became acquainted with student leaders from many lands. They learned of the worthwhile student unions in other countries: the Norwegian National Union of Students was formed in 1911, the Finnish in 1920, the British in 1921, others have been in existence since the early years of the last decade, and many more have been formed since the end of the war. The Americans, on the other hand, represented ten universities including Harvard, Chicago, California, Texas, North Carolina, and several religious and political organizations, such as the National Intercollegiate Christian Council, the Catholic students, the AYD, the United World Federalists. They had been chosen by a group of educators, Congressmen, and other public figures. There was little common policy among them.

The resultant effect of the experience of the American delegation has now become history. They called the Chicago Student Conference in December, 1946. Its delegates from three hundred colleges met for three days, outlined a plan, elected officers for a preparatory organization, and empowered the latter to write a constitution and arrange a conference for the following summer. The draft constitution was framed, and the convention was held at the University of Wisconsin last September. Over seven hundred delegates from three hundred and sixty-one colleges attended, reviewed, revised, and ratified the constitution, considered a program for the coming year, and established the organization. At this writing, one hundred and twenty-one of the colleges have already ratified the constitution, and NSA is well on its way to becoming the voice of American students.

How is NSA serving to increase awareness among American students?

By bringing students together in conferences, by means of publications, and in common projects, the NSA is striving to make them more conscious of the importance of their education and the responsibilities it entails.

The basis of NSA representation is the student government, or equivalent representative organization on each campus. Student government, while serving a rather cursory role on many campuses, provides a needed experience in leadership and community responsibility, which is so important to effective citizenship both as a student and afterwards.

The regional and national conventions become meeting grounds for students from many types of colleges and varied sections of the country. Since

students in this country so well mirror the views of their families and communities, the conferences bring to light social, political, and sectional differences. This was clearly demonstrated at the NSA Constitutional Convention, for example, by the sharp controversy over the Race Question, between Northern and Southern delegates. Significantly, on this and other issues, a spirit of compromise and the desire for concerted action brought forth an adequate if not inspiring solution, satisfactory to all concerned.

In serving student needs, NSA has already prepared two pamphlets for general distribution. One, *Study, Travel, and Work — Abroad, Summer, 1948*, provides concise information on a multitude of experiences available to students who are interested in travelling outside of the country this summer. The other, *Student Leadership and Government in Higher Education*, is an intelligent discussion of the theories, problems, and some solutions to the difficulties involved in the conduct of student activities.

Curriculum studies, cost of living surveys, housing inquiries, on a nation-wide scale, serve to make students all over the country aware of the problems of their fellows. A recent "kit" of articles and bibliography, on both sides of the proposed Universal Military Training legislation, distributed by NSA, is promoting studies of the UMT question by student governments. The result of these studies will be a far more enlightened student population — not merely following one "party-line" or another on the question, but clear on all the issues involved.

The importance of the voice of American students has already been recognized by the acceptance of NSA for a seat on the United States National Commission for UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). NSA will have the only student place on the 100-member National Commission, whose other members are prominent educators, scientists, and publishers. Students are thereby placed in the position of advising the Department of State on matters of educational policy. To do this, they must work together, consider important policy questions, and take stands on significant issues.

Faced with the responsibility of speaking for American students on important matters of policy, how is NSA to proceed?

In describing NSA, I have so far emphasized the "service" characteristics of the organization. The very formation of such a body, however, is a political act, and implementation of its program necessitates what is distrustfully referred to as "political action". Yes, it can hardly be denied that



NSA is engaging in, and will continue to engage in, political action. The question is: what kind? A brief discussion of the following four fields of student political action should give the answers: 1) non-controversial student issues; 2) controversial student issues; 3) controversial issues indirectly relating to students as students; 4) controversial issues unrelated to students as students.

In the first field, the student contribution can be most effectively carried out by a large, representative organization, expressing itself on matters which have been fully considered by the organization's representatives in conference or are in keeping with lines of policy previously expounded. The best example of this type of student action is NSA's role in making available "student ships" for this coming summer — to provide transportation at reasonable cost for students going abroad. The national, regional, and campus units have all written to the appropriate Congressmen requesting action on the ships.

In the second field, controversial student issues, political action is more limited. When a violation of student rights or academic freedom (carefully defined in the By-Laws to the NSA Constitution) is reported, little is accomplished by a barrage of letters, protests, or demonstrations. It must first be clearly established that there has been a violation, not merely that it has been *interpreted as such* by a few individuals. If it is truly a violation, a full report should be made on the matter, and this can then serve as a basis for official protests to the proper authorities. Calling the matter to the attention of the whole university community in a thorough manner is the constructive way to take political action. Rather than act on incomplete information and partial interpretation, students should not act at all; they may only jeopardize their opportunity to be heard at a later date on more important issues.

The third field concerns controversial issues indirectly relating to students as students. NSA's aforementioned position on the UMT question is a good example of this type of issue and how it should be treated. Students most certainly have a stake in the military training question, but it is something which resolves itself outside of the student community. The most effective action for NSA is to make student bodies well-informed. Then, individual students can take sides by means of groups specially designed for this purpose: political parties, clubs, etc. One further step, which NSA has not yet tried but probably will in the future, is that of student opinion polls after an education campaign; the results would stand for all to see, as the enlightened opinion of students.

Finally, controversial issues unrelated to students as students, such as national elections, are outside the province of a representative student service organization. Again, individual students can participate in the political parties or political action groups which do take sides on these matters.

Education for citizenship should not be disregarded in the regular college curriculum. Many colleges have only come to realize in recent years that history and politics can not be separated, that political parties are an important sociological phenomenon, and that students should be made aware of these matters. In teaching politics it is important that the professor, himself, has had practical experience in his field. It has been pointed out that a teacher has no business giving a course in practical politics if he has never successfully run for an office himself.

It is extremely important to study political theory and history, but the most effective courses are those in which the theoretical is taught alongside some practical aspect, or prior to which the student has had political experience. The student should be encouraged to work in his ward at election time, to see what it's all about. He should participate in the administration of some organization, be it student, fraternity, or a dance committee, to see what is required of a leader. Studies mean a great deal more when so coupled with "field work".

So far I have been pointing out the merits of the student in action. I have discussed participation in student organizations as a means of increasing recognition of student opinion in this country. I have spoken of the value of college organizations and curriculum in creating an awareness of politics. Before concluding, however, a warning is in order. There is a tendency among student leaders when they first become involved in student politics to treat the political considerations as ends in themselves. It is mighty exciting to participate in a pre-convention caucus, lay plans, and see them materialize. The feelings of triumph, power, and self-importance — the "I told you so!" attitude — can become so exciting that one stops looking at the larger issues involved. Or, in the case of being on the minority end of a political issue, the desire to get control or merely to "get even" with the victors can so overpower one that he, too, does not see beyond his own ego. In both cases, the individuals concerned have become so politically conscious that their actions as citizens manifest decreased awareness rather than the looked-for enlightenment. The ill-repute of the label "politician" is due to such a situation.

It is the rare student who can get involved in political action and not go through a phase of this



type of thinking. The problem for too many individuals is that it is more than a phase. Such a "rut" can only be avoided by a constant consciousness of the overall goals which are being sought by the political action — a constructive solution to whatever the problem at hand.

Aristotle, in his *Politics* goes into a lengthy discussion of tyranny (Book V, Chapter ii) and the methods employed in maintaining it. He is hardly advocating that form of government; rather is he attempting to educate leaders in the problems

which they must face, so that they will know how to avoid tyrannical conditions. So it is with political awareness among students. Experience in political matters, facing the problems of leadership and group action, will make possible the achievement of more constructive programs which can win support and respect. Minority control is not possible when the majority is putting its efforts in this direction. Alert students, conscious of their capabilities and limitations, co-operating for common goals, will become better citizens. In so doing, they will truly attain the status of an elite.



## Book Reviews

### PEACE OR ANARCHY —

By CORD MEYER, JR.

—Little, Brown

THE CURRENT VOGUE ENJOYED by the historical novel and the continued public aversion to serious political tracts contain more than a touch of ironic pathos in this fear-plagued, anxiety-ridden, escape-proof contemporary world.

Cord Meyer's thin, eloquent little book pleads cogently for an end to the international schizophrenia with which we are plowing the seed of our destruction. He argues simply that we should act now, while time remains, to strengthen the United Nations into a world government with specific, limited powers adequate to prevent war.

Written in the fearful prose of a realist who knows the odds are against him, *Peace Or Anarchy* proceeds with incisive logical clarity to dissect the problem of peace and to present carefully worked-out remedies.

Mr. Meyer first sketches vividly the world anarchy that results from the existence of completely sovereign national states in possession of the means with which to obliterate each other. Incontrovertible is his analysis of the factors, scientific and political, which are leading us irrevocably toward "hot war".

He then describes the price of preparedness in an atomic age in terms of the necessary sacrifices in democratic freedoms entailed. To those fearful of a tyrannical world federation, little solace is offered by the inevitable logic of the armaments race we are now engaged in. Perhaps the only choice before us is between world government by consent now and world government by authoritarian conquest after World War III. There can be no doubt as to which alternative would be more conducive to civil liberties and social justice.

Next Mr. Meyer treats with the struggle for security which both underlies and paralyzes the United Nations. Clearly demonstrable is his contention that the great shortcoming in schemes for collective security such as the UN is in the lack of adequate power on a world level to carry out the job assigned to the organization. This leads to his "plan for survival". Non-utopian in the ex-

treme, it is a closely reasoned series of proposals rooted in the belief that social and economic problems which divide nations cannot be solved within a context of physical violence.

Through amendment of the UN Charter, Mr. Meyer would have us seek three objectives: (a) an end to national armies and armaments beyond the level required for internal policing; (b) the creation of a world authority to control atomic energy and all weapons of mass destruction; and (c) the establishment of effective governmental machinery to preserve peace. This last goal he would achieve by giving the UN power (now possessed by national governments) to enact, interpret and enforce binding world law in the field of planning or making war. Such law would apply to individuals as well as to nations. At the disposal of the UN would be an inspection staff and a police force to perform the technical and functional tasks involved.

Many savants have been perplexed by the transitional phase into world government. Mr. Meyer lays down a flexible time-table to this end, consisting of: (1) global inventory of weapons and forces; (2) demobilization of national armies and the transferral of power to the authority; and (3) the assumption of responsibilities for preventing war by the UN.

Finally he deals with stumbling blocks: the U.S. and Russia. Realizing the difficulties which befog acceptance of world government by these powers, he is still hopeful that realism, dictated by the necessity for survival, will prevail over fear and mistrust if we act in time to stem the trend toward war. If industrial civilization as we know it depends on developing a new institutional arrangement in which war must be renounced as an instrument of national policy, then perhaps we can develop such an arrangement.

*Peace Or Anarchy* is not dogmatic or technically specific. The author realizes that the United Nations must amend itself, and that while individuals and groups (such as the United World Federalists of which Mr. Meyer is president) can prepare and point the way, they cannot prescribe the actual form.

It would be delusive to assume for a moment that this book will be widely read or pondered



among the ranks of those who now determine the destinies of nations. But though the task is herculean of arousing mankind and moving men, and the path is tortuous and fraught with failures, Cord Meyer has asked himself the searching question from Donald Ogden Stewart's play, *How I Wonder*: "If not I, who? If not now, when?" *Peace Or Anarchy* is his answer.

R.E.S.

## COMMUNITY OF THE FREE —

By YVES SIMON

—Henry Holt

PROFESSOR SIMON WRITES as a Catholic liberal, influenced strongly by St. Thomas and Maritain, and as a most sincere and perceptive humanitarian. His book is a fascinating analysis of the "confusion of conscience" with which the contemporary world is afflicted, largely, he believes, as a result of our misunderstanding of the meaning of freedom and our fallacious ethics and philosophy of history.

For Simon, "the law is by essence a rule relative to the common welfare; authority . . . is a specialized prudence in the pursuit of a welfare which is not individual, but common." Real freedom consists in the interiorization of law. "We have had the privilege of being born into societies in which the influence of true religion informs every man of the strictly infinite and eternal value of every reasonable being." Simon advocates the old idea of a Christian republic under God, but the real value of his political observations is essentially independent of the theological basis of his reasoning.

In the second section of the book, "Secret Sources of the Success of the Racist Ideology", he investigates the economic and psychological stresses that undermine the morality of decent, well-educated, civilized men. In the first place, so long as privileged classes live in luxury created by the depressed standard of living of the rest of society, "the idea of a racial inferiority will make things incomparably easier for a society in quest of obvious justifications for the advantages of cheap labor . . . To lessen the rigors of competition through eliminating those competitive forces for whom we feel no sympathy, and reserving the monopoly of the market for the groups we call *ours*", has been a cogent economic motive for racism. Further, there is the quest for aristocratic distinction. "I have often been struck by the analogy which exists between race prejudice in the United States and class preju-

dice in Europe . . . One must have the soul of a broken man before one can feel proud to belong to an aristocracy open to any tramp."

The third section of the book, "Pessimism and the Philosophy of Progress", is a discussion of the romantic philosophy of progress, Rousseauism, the idea of the necessity of progress, and the optimistic conception of human nature. "Realistic" would have been a better word than "pessimistic" to describe Simon's idea that progress requires "a thorough sense of the immense difficulties which the accomplishment of good presents", and that progress can be understood only in limited specified contexts, relating not to humanity generally, but to certain particular aspects of morality, within definite duration of time, among particular groups, and without escapist prejudgments which lead only to corrosive disillusion. "Science and technique lend themselves indifferently to the service of good and the service of evil . . . it could (never) have been reasonable to expect them to provide any guarantee of right use." There have been some advances in human conscience. Destitution is no longer considered either inevitable or necessary. But "these millions of representatives of ordinary humanity demonstrated that the moral conscience of the common man lends itself to every kind of perversion when it no longer finds, in the daily framework of social relations, a discipline which ensures protection and promotion of moral truths . . . Optimistic and individualistic liberalism has always postulated that moral truth spreads and maintains itself *easily* . . . without the necessity for intervention on the part of the conscious centers of society. This postulate has been refuted by the most striking fact in the history of morals in our time: confusion of conscience in the presence of colossal crimes, amongst ordinary people, decent people, worthy people."

The fourth section, "Socialism and the Democracy of the Common Man", is concerned with the brotherhood of man, rationalism ("But we know by experience that when the job of realizing a rational society is taken in hand by men who mean business, ruthless destruction is likely to follow . . . Human societies are destined by nature to exist in a world of chance"); the theory of the withering away of the state, which he believes originates in traditional liberalism; democracy and totalitarianism; utopia and justice; and the advocacy of an objective theory of value.

All in all, *Community of the Free* is an outstanding treatise on the moral and the intellectual problems of modern politics. Its central thesis is a brilliant argument for the restoration of an integrally universalist ethics as the only possible defense



against tyranny, which springs, Simon believes, fundamentally from materialism, liberalism, and confused optimism. A short book (172pp.), it is a most rewarding afternoon's reading, if only for the best recent affirmation of the subordination of politics to ethical ends.

OSCAR GRAY

## WHERE I STAND ! —

By HAROLD E. STASSEN

—Doubleday

MR. STASSEN PREFERS TO BE known as a "liberal Republican". If the views expressed in this book receive wide acceptance as the "liberal Republican" outlook, no group will be more offended than those who previously claimed that label. There are Republicans, of whom Senator Morse is the chief spokesman, who believe that the Truman administration has provided the Republican Party with the opportunity to seize the initiative in social reform and other such liberal endeavors. This unfortunate minority has had its standard, but not its principles, purloined by Mr. Stassen. For, in *Where I Stand!*, Mr. Stassen reveals himself to them and to all of us, as an essentially conservative Republican, whose departures from that fine tradition are much rarer and milder than the prefix "liberal" would lead one to believe.

Nearly one-third of this book consists of a reprint of Mr. Stassen's testimony before the Senate Labor Committee, and there is ample proof in his remarks that he has a sincere belief in the principle of collective bargaining. Perhaps this does not constitute a rebellion from the dominant Republican creed; certainly it comes as close to heresy as does any view which he urges in this book.

We have certain evidence, straight from the committee's records, that Mr. Stassen boldly told Senators Ball and Taft that he saw the problems of labor as the problems of human beings. This statement recalls Mr. Stassen's opening chapter, where he describes his horrified reaction to an episode in the twenties, in which the bayonets of the Minnesota State Militia were used to break up a picket line. But by 1947, in his own words, "the pendulum has swung". Organized labor has become too powerful, and, the implication is, its wage demands are the chief cause for post-war inflation. Business is victimized by labor and government. Somehow, with the living conditions of working people still firmly in mind, he has come to accept the fiction that labor emerged from the war with

both feet planted firmly in the midriff of the business community.

There is no indication that he is any more aware than is Senator Taft of the great concentration of the ownership of capital which took place during the war. Nowhere do we find that demand for a vigorous enforcement of the anti-trust laws which has characterized the liberal platform. In the manner of the traditional Republican, he treats abuses of this sort as of interest, primarily, to the historian. The handling of the housing situation infuriates him, and his denunciation of the Truman administration is so bitter, in this regard, as to drive from one's mind (as apparently has been driven from Mr. Stassen's mind) the recollection of the activities of the real estate lobby.

The greatest travesty of liberal principles in Mr. Stassen's domestic program is found in his views on taxation. He regards 'dynamic capital' — capital used for new investment — as one of the most important, and least recognized, needs of our economy. To insure its continued availability, he would not permit the government to take more than 50% of anyone's income. His remedy for any consequent deficiency in revenue refutes, beyond all doubt, his claim to be a liberal:

"the balance, if any, which the government needs to balance its budget and pay three billion dollars per year on the accumulated federal debt, should be raised by general taxes of a nature we all pay as consumers".

In the analysis which is the basis for his stand on foreign affairs, Mr. Stassen's hopes triumph over the realities of the situation. He will not tolerate the separation of socialism and communism. With incredible naivete he assures us that the peoples of the Western European nations which have adopted socialistic measures have come to see the folly of attempting to preserve social, economic and religious freedom for the individual while doing away with free enterprise. Because governmental industries in Sweden are to be operated as separate corporations (still publicly-owned), and Swedish co-operatives (still owned by consumers) engage in competition, Mr. Stassen concludes that the Swedes are taking healthy steps in the direction of American capitalism. Both his boundless faith in American capitalism, and his infinitesimal appreciation of the Soviet mind are indicated in his notion of the ultimate resolution of the ideological conflict between Russia and the United States. He states that if we show the Russians how well capitalism can work "there will be a powerful incentive . . . (to their leaders) . . . to profit by our experience, and to develop a modern capitalism".



An American president should possess a certain degree of optimism. A candidate for that office should make clear his views on important issues; and this condition for responsible government Mr. Stassen has fulfilled in a rare and praiseworthy manner. But anyone writing a book on politics today should realize that there are in Europe millions of people, and several governments, who are just as opposed as is Mr. Stassen to the brutalities and denials of political and civil liberties in the Soviet Union; and that these same people regard private ownership of great economic power as inimical to democracy. Whatever Mr. Stassen thinks of the wisdom of these people, he is unjustified in acting as if they did not exist.

F. F. LOGUE.

### THE MEANING OF TREASON —

By REBECCA WEST

—Viking

REBECCA WEST IS ONE OF FEW living writers able to fuse real stylistic brilliance with deep insight into modern society. Because of this combination *The Meaning of Treason* is one of the most impressive books to come out of the war and post-war period; because of this also it has climbed quickly to a high place on the best-seller lists. Superficially the book is about the war, insofar as it is the story of those Britons who could not make their personal convictions jibe with the cause of the country to which they owed allegiance. These few unfortunates chose to disregard the ties of family, birthplace, and country, and to side with a losing enemy. Of these William Joyce, "Lord Haw Haw", is at once the most prominent and the arch-type of them all; under Miss West's skilled hand he appears as a Satan among a tiny flock of lost and lunatic angels. It is to an explanation of the history and motivations of this Irish outcast that the major part of the study is devoted. But in addition there are sketches of John Amery and Norman Baillie-Stewart, whom the author has chosen to call "The Insane Root" because their betrayal of England is explained by their real madness. And then there are "The Children", those prisoners of war too uncertain or weak to resist German temptation. The treachery of these small men, however, was a result of the compulsions of war; that of the major traitors was deliberately begun in peacetime by their own initiative.

There is an intrinsic fascination to those of us with secure loyalties in the stories of these strange disordered people on the fringes of normal society,

who found a temporary fitness for their personal abnormalities in the grand abnormality of war. But there is much more than narrative in *The Meaning of Treason*. As a psychologist might study the case histories of men like these traitors to help explain normal behavior, so Miss West uses the stories of these societal misfits as a starting point in an examination of the roots of our society. From the very personal experiences of individuals she has drawn general morals. This is the real "meaning" of treason in the sense of the title. In her discussion the author has brought to bear with great skill and effectiveness all the applicable learning of history, law, psychology, and sociology. It is through the use of these tools that the book impresses the reader with its breadth and massiveness in brevity.

Miss West finds that by the industrialism and pseudo-internationalism of this century, as capitalized upon by Fascism and Communism, the natural loyalties and links of kinship and membership in society have been obscured. William Joyce was driven to deny these bonds by an insoluble personal dilemma: he was unable to satisfy his craving for political power in the normal channels of a democratic order because of his unsavory personality, his "failure to please", so he became a rebel and an outcast. But as an outcast his consuming ambition had no more chance of satisfaction than before. Thus Joyce is the great tragic figure of this book, overshadowing the others with their overtones of madness or imbecility.

By these arguments Rebecca West makes of her study of the nature of treason a condemnation of the fallacy of our time, which is the self-deception that replaces the old emotional ties with social ligaments of cold logic and precise techniques. She illustrates her own point: beneath the book's surface gloss lie realms of emotion and intuition as well as logic.

J.R.F.

### A RUSSIAN JOURNAL —

By JOHN STEINBECK

—Viking

ALTHOUGH MR. STEINBECK HAS MADE every effort to keep *A Russian Journal* straight, simple narrative, this is a difficult book to read and an even more difficult one of which to form a clear impression. The difficulty arises in a confusion between what he *claims* he has written and what he really *has* written, what I suppose one *must* write of the Russian people. He claims to have written a book which indicates what Russians think about,



what they talk about, what they eat and how they dress and make love — all apart from the Russian government and Marxist philosophy and international politics. He seems to think that the Russian people can validly be thought of apart from the fact that they are Russian. He thinks of Russian as an adjective, along with good, honest, kindly, and moral, all used to describe people. As people, the Russians probably are all these things — *but they are also Russian*, which to me connotes a certain system, a certain philosophy-structure that assigns a specific meaning to words like good, honest, kindly and moral. The Russian people don't think the same way as we do, they don't mean the same thing by the same words as we do. This is, necessarily, neither a good thing nor a bad thing; but it is a fact which Mr. Steinbeck himself implicitly affirms time after time in his narrative, even as he claims that he is interested only in the Russians as people, apart from their government.

A book of this nature — which inevitably is read with a good deal of current news in mind which relates to the Russian system — is a little meaningless and a little dangerous when the confusion is not cleared. Meaningless, because apart from their social system — of which the Russians, especially, hear and learn a great deal all the time — a people are not fully understood. And dangerous, because many readers are going to make a final evaluation of *Russia* from incomplete material on the *Russians*.

What are some of the things that Russians think because they are Russians? Almost on page one of the journal proper, Mr. Steinbeck gets into an argument with a Russian official over the meaning of government and how governments ought to affect people. He says: "there is no successful argument here, it is just the failure of two systems to communicate one with the other." Right here at the outset, he is in conversation with an individual Russian and yet he suddenly starts talking about a system. He is using the words people and system interchangeably, still insisting that he wants to write about people and not systems, about people apart from systems.

Just a bit later, commenting on the general fear of war and the passionate desire for peace that he found in all of the Russians he talked to, Mr. Steinbeck adds this warning: "If a war should break out between Russia and the United States, these people would believe that we are the villains." I'm sure that a Russian Steinbeck touring America would find exactly this same sentiment, only in

reverse. And again it is the system that in either case moulds public opinion and the focus of power in the system that are the most interesting subjects of speculation, more interesting and much more important than the discovery that people who are informed wholly by the system agree with its interpretations. Again, Mr. Steinbeck claims that he is writing about people and not about systems at all.

Further on in the book, we hear about the "impression book" in which he is forced to write an instant impression of what he sees in a Russian factory. He comments that "impressions, with me at least, require a little time to cook up. They are not full grown immediately." Perhaps not for Mr. Steinbeck, but he notes that they are for most Russians who merely relate what they see to what they know, philosophically, to be true. They have a simple reference point, a simple, known reality to explain appearances; most of us in America do not have one, simple idea of reality. We have many such ideas, and they are mostly vague and ambiguous. But to know the American people, one must know these ideas; and to know the Russians, we must know their point of reference — which is really another way of saying their system. Always the optimist, Mr. Steinbeck still thinks that he is writing, validly, about people, not systems.

If this book were called *Inside Russia*, and if John's last name were Gunther, I wouldn't have been at all surprised to find this confusion. The World Almanac approach is all right as far as it goes — but this distance is merely from eye to surface to printed page. What I had hoped for from this book was a journal of observations, set clearly in a context of institutional analysis and philosophy and history, all of which would invest the observations with meaning. What I had hoped for, I suppose, was a Russian *Grapes of Wrath* in the sense in which that story gave us a clue to the "why" of the denotatively observed.

As a journal of his observations of people in general — not validly of the Russian people — Mr. Steinbeck's book is beautiful in its simplicity, rich in its sympathy and very enjoyable in its rather broad humor. Added to these qualifications are the merits of some very fine photography by Robert Capa and a handsome publishing job by the Viking Press. But I still wanted more than this: I wanted *A Russian Journal* free from narrow confusions and rich with a valid, complete story of what the Russian people are like and why they are that way.

C.M.L.



## A PATTERN OF POLITICS —

By AUGUST HECKSCHER

—*Reynal and Hitchcock*

**B**USINESSMEN HAVE ENTERED POLITICS, which is a commendable thing in itself, but in the process politics have been discarded into the same scrap-heap with the pressure group and the party organization. Polite, efficient reform movements no longer talk about politics — in the new and narrow definition which equates it with graft, corruption, fraud, and ignorance — except in an unfriendly way. Mr. Heckscher attempts to reclaim politics from its discard and reaffirm its vital place in a growing democracy. He attempts to redefine, realistically, the role of a creative political process which relates barren institutions of government to the people who are governed.

He finds that the traditional, transcendental democrats and their theory of government had no place for politics. The presence of politics — a process of mediating between conflicting interests which are united by common social aims — was for them an imperfection in the true democracy. For the perfect state was, for them, one in which a readily discoverable law — whether of nature or man or God — answered all questions, a law which when known would eliminate at the root all conflicts of interest. Eliminated, too, would be the need for politics, the mediator.

But how well does this theory answer to political realities? How well does this theory fit the need of a people who in 1948 are facing peculiarly new problems which were different last year and will probably be different next year. We assign generic names — like the problems of labor and business in their relations — to problems for which we must find new answers with every new set of circumstances. And these answers are not to be found

in universal laws other than that of a dynamic process of political mediation, carried on in an atmosphere of free associations and free expression, this variety to be “brought into harmony by the common values of the community.” Mr. Heckscher carries this political process back to the society itself and to the men who live in that society, the men who desire certain things and who use social means to satisfy their desires. The society of men who value this political process will avoid, he thinks, the excesses of barren dogmatism and of groundless anarchy alike, so long as mediation is pointed to commonly shared and commonly recognized values which in turn give a direction to our creative choice between conflicting interests.

It is interesting — and disappointing — to find Mr. Heckscher concluding that the place to relearn the best use of politics, to “recover the sources of an ancient strength”, is none other than the university campus. I say this is disappointing because this is such an incomplete conclusion. Mr. Heckscher should have said that *everywhere* is the proper place to relearn the use of creative politics in a democracy — in his own newspaper office, at the Rotary Club luncheons that he undoubtedly attends, in civic groups that his own up-state New York community must support. “Everywhere” is anywhere that people gather to think and talk about the values that they especially cherish and which they will preserve even in the face of conflicting interests. Certainly the university campus has no exclusive claim on education of this nature.

But more important than the fact that he concludes weakly, Mr. Heckscher does analyze politics toward some conclusion that is as uncommonly heard these days as it is vitally important if America is to fulfill an exacting destiny — and remain *democratic America*.

C.M.L.



**BELLOWS**  
SPECIAL RESERVE  
*Whiskey - A Blend*

*A superior all purpose whiskey  
of light body but generous flavor*

*Distributed by*  
**BELLOWS & COMPANY, Inc.**

**BELLOWS**  
**FINE CLUB**  
DISTILLED DRY GIN

BUSINESS ESTABLISHED 1830

**BELLOWS**  
PARTNERS CHOICE  
WHISKEY - A BLEND

*Carefully selected to meet the  
exacting requirements of a century  
old trade and private clientele*

*Distributed by*  
**BELLOWS & COMPANY, Inc.**  
ESTABLISHED 1830 - NEW YORK CITY  
BRANCHES  
COLORADO SPRINGS - CHICAGO

Bellows, for over a hundred years,  
has appeared on the labels of only  
the best wines and spirits. Having  
been identified with the products  
of Bellows & Company for many  
years we can attest to the reputa-  
tion they enjoy among those who  
appreciate quality at a reasonable  
price.

The items featured here are only a  
few of the leaders in this disting-  
uished family. We are proud to  
carry the complete Bellows listing  
and will be happy to suggest the  
appropriate wines and spirits for  
your particular requirements.

**M. LEHMANN, Inc.**

374 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

160 Post Road  
Darien, Conn.

70 South Street  
Morristown, N. J.

**CRUZAN RUM**  
GOLD LABEL

*Distilled directly from whole  
sugar cane juice on the island  
of St. Croix, and shipped by*

*Sugar Cane Industries*  
**BELLOWS & COMPANY**  
ESTABLISHED 1830

**V E**  
**FINE COGNAC BRANDY**  
PRIVATE SELECTION

*Specially reserved and bottled by  
Société des Propriétaires Viniçoles de Cognac  
Cognac France Founded 1838*  
IMPORTED BY  
**BELLOWS & COMPANY, Inc.** NEW YORK CITY  
PRODUCE OF FRANCE  
4/5 Quart 86 Proof

**FINEST**  
**JAMAICA RUM**  
LONDON DOCK

PARTNERS CHOICE 86.8 proof 60% grain neutral spirits • SPECIAL RESERVE 86 proof 70% grain neutral spirits • FINE CLUB GIN 90 proof  
distilled from 100% grain neutral spirits • CRUZAN RUM 86 proof • FINEST JAMAICA RUM 86 proof • V. E. COGNAC 86 proof



# SCHENECTADY PRINTING COMPANY

INCORPORATED



*Creators of*  
**DISTINGUISHED  
CRAFTSMANSHIP**



---

PUBLISHERS of the YALE POLITICAL JOURNAL

---