

Winter 2008–2009
Vol. 82, No. 2

Features

- 2 Campaign Finance Reform—Find the Problem Before You Fix the Car**
By Harry Holloway
- 8 Aerial Warfare And The Ethics Of Collateral Damage**
By Dennis A.J. Morey, M.D.
- 13 Benedict, Bernard, And Bill W: The Legacy Of Twelve-Step Spirituality**
By The Rev. Dr. Susan Warren Smith
- 19 Immigration: Is The Melting Pot Boiling Over?**
By Paul E. Irion
- 25 Appearance vs Reality: Plato’s Problem—Our Problem**
By Allan Powell
- 28 In Defense Of Buck Weaver**
By John Fockler, Jr.
- 32 Music—An Art to be Reckoned With**
By Robert Bruce McLean
- 36 Guilt of Selective Omission: How Countries Write Their Histories**
By Donald K. Allen, B.S., M.S., DVM

Departments

- 1 From the President**
- 1 Gold & Silver Torch Awards**
- 40 Paxton Lectureship Award**
- 41 2009 Call to Business and Convention Registration**

Find out more about Torch...visit our web site, www.torch.org.

Paxton Lectureship Winners

Edward B. Latimer–Awards Committee Chair

1976 – W. Norris Paxton	1993 – Charles G. Beaudette
1977 – Seymour A. Horwitz	1994 – Thomas L. Minnick
1978 – James E. Ingram	1995 – C. Walter Clark
1979 – Jack E. Gieck	1996 – Richard Schellhase
1980 – John W. Allen	1997 – Leanne Wade Beorne
1981 – John F. Brown	1998 – Gerald G. Eggert
1982 – Robert E. Shepherd, Jr.	1999 – Mary Frances Forcier
1983 – Harry D. Lewis	2000 – Robert G. Neuhauser
1984 – Dan Pletta	2001 – Jonathan B. Wight
1985 – Jerry L. Petr	2002 – Richard T. Schellhase
1986 – John H. D. Bryan	2003 – Mark Lore
1987 – E. Cabell Brand	2004 – Matthew T. Taylor, Sr.
1988 – Hubert J. Davis	2005 – Robert G. Neuhauser
1989 – Warner M. Montgomery	2006 – Malcolm M. Marsden
1990 – Jesse R. Long	2007 – Edward P. Blazer
1991 – Earnest R. Oney	2008 – Arthur B. Gunlicks
1992 – Kathryn P. Clausen	

Editorial Advisory Committee

Mary E. Banzhof	English
Susan Bailey	History, Social Change, Humanities, Higher Ed.
Peggy C. Bowen	Forensic Psychology
Eileen Burke	Literature, Professional Education, Literacy
Edward N. Clarke	Physics, Engineering
Peter E. Demmin	Science, Education, Chemistry
Shirley T. Echelman	History, Literature
Dale M. Herder	American History/Lit., Philosophy, Journalism
Paul E. Irion	Religion, Ethics, Psychology, History
Vicken V. Kalbian	Medicine, Near Eastern Affairs
William S. Kilborne, Jr.	Literature, Arts, Theater
Beverly J. Leisten	Education
Eknath V. Marathe	Science, Technology, Society Education
Claudia Martin	Religion, Philosophy, Anthropology, Music
William McDonald	General
Robert G. Neuhauser	Engineering
Scott Stanfield	English
Richard G. Teske	Science, Engineering
Stephen T. Toy	Medical Science, History
Edith R. White	Literature, Art

Published for the International Association of Torch Clubs, Inc. by Strickland & Jones, P.C. Torch never knowingly presents any but original unpublished manuscripts. Opinions expressed are those of the contributors. Neither Torch nor Strickland & Jones, P.C. assumes responsibility for errors or omissions in the articles.

The Torch is published three times per year by the International Association of Torch Clubs, Inc. for its members. Second class postage paid at Norfolk, VA 23510-1517. Postmaster: If undeliverable, return form 3579, postage for which is guaranteed, to 749 Boush Street, Norfolk, VA 23510-1517. ISSN 0040-9448.

Permission to reprint material may be granted by the editor upon agreement with the contributor. Manuscript submissions, reprint requests, and club reports should also be mailed to the central office. Address changes and subscription requests should also be mailed to the central office. Subscription \$20/year in the U.S.; \$25/year elsewhere. Library rate: \$10.00/year.

Copyright © 2008 by International Association of Torch Clubs, Inc.

Past Presidents

● 1924–28	F. Denton White (Minneapolis, MN)
● 1928–31	Burdette R. Buckingham (Columbus, OH)
● 1931–32	George B. Cutten (Chapel Hill, NC)
● 1932–34	Arthur Webster (Detroit, MI)
● 1934–35	George H. Ashley (Harrisburg, PA)
● 1936–37	W. Howard Pillsbury (Schenectady, NY)
● 1937–38	George B. Woods (Washington, DC)
● 1938–39	Lee A. White (Detroit, MI)
● 1939–40	Clarence E. Howell (Trenton, NJ)
● 1940–41	Clement G. Bowers (Binghamton, NY)
● 1941–42	Edgar L. Weinland (Columbus, OH)
● 1942–46	John C. Krantz, Jr. (Baltimore, MD)
● 1946–47	F.R. Murgatroyd (Hamilton, ON)
● 1947–48	Glenn H. Reams (Toledo, OH)
● 1948–49	William J. Wilcox (Allentown, PA)
● 1949–51	James W. Kennedy (Cincinnati, OH)
● 1951–52	Leonard H. Freiberg (Cincinnati, OH)
● 1952–53	Elwood Street (Washington, DC)
● 1953–54	C.H. Stearn (Hamilton, ON)
● 1954–55	Marius P. Johnson (Baltimore, MD)
● 1955–56	W. Norris Paxton (Albany, NY)
● 1956–57	Karl L. Kaufman (Indianapolis, IN)
● 1957–58	Leonard C. Kercher (Kalamazoo, MI)
● 1958–59	C.A. Jones (Columbus, OH)
● 1959–60	Edward M. Shortt (London, ON)
● 1960–61	Bertram S. Nusbaum (Norfolk, VA)
● 1961–62	Eaton V.W. Reed (Bridgeport, CT)
● 1962–63	J.J. Witt (Utica, NY)
● 1963–64	Lon L. Nusom (San Antonio, TX)
● 1964–65	E. Vernon Lewis (Collegeville, PA)
● 1965–66	James S. Owens (Detroit, MI)
● 1966–67	H. Fred Heisner (Redlands, CA)
● 1967–68	Edgar T. Peer (St. Catharines, ON)
● 1968–69	Leonard M. Josephson (Knoxville, TN)
● 1969–70	John P. Vitko (St. Paul, MN)
● 1970–71	Leo M. Hauptman (Muncie, IN)
● 1971–72	Hilmar C. Krueger (Cincinnati, OH)
● 1972–73	R. Nelson Torbet (Toledo, OH)
● 1973–74	Norman P. Crawford (Jacksonville, FL)
● 1974–75	Leo G. Glasser (Wilmington, DE)
● 1975–76	Harry J. Krusz (Laguna Hills, CA)
● 1976–77	Forest M. Smith (San Antonio, TX)
● 1977–78	Arthur I. Palmer, Jr. (Richmond, VA)
● 1978–79	Douglas M. Knudson (Wabash Valley, IN)
● 1979–80	Clifton E. Rogers (Harrisburg, PA)
● 1980–81	Fred R. Whaley, Jr. (Buffalo, NY)
● 1981–82	Everett H. Hopkins (Durham, NC)
● 1982–84	Clarence A. Peterson (Columbus, OH)
● 1984–86	Paul Stanfield (Des Moines, IA)
● 1986–88	Robert S. Rosow (San Antonio, TX)
● 1988–90	John M. Adams (Naples, FL)
● 1990–92	George P. Crepeau (Columbus, OH)
● 1992–94	Richard R. Lynch (Albany, NY)
● 1994–97	A. Reed Taylor (Buffalo, NY)
● 1997–99	Ruth Giller (Grand Rapids, MI)
● 1999–02	Ralph C. Falconer (Akron, OH)
● 2002–04	Thomas J. Bird (Chicago, IL)
● 2004–06	Wayne M. Davis (Loudonville, NY)
● 2006–08	Anne D. Sterling (Richmond, VA)

2008–2009 Officers and Directors

President

Stephen T. Toy
Newark, DE 19711
302 / 733-7513

President-Elect

Edward B. Latimer
Columbia, SC 29209
803 / 776-4765

Immediate Past President

Anne D. Sterling
Richmond, VA 23229
804 / 285-8354

Director – Region 1

Charles E. Carlson
Newtonville, NY 12128
518 / 786-8014 (Oct–Mar.)
508 / 627-5694 (Apr–Sept.)

Director – Region 2

John B. Cornish
Bethlehem, PA 18017
610 / 866-8442 (W)

Director – Region 3

Theodore E. Haas
Frederick, MD 21701
301 / 663-4733

Director – Region 4

Warner M. Montgomery, Jr.
Columbia, SC 29250
803 / 771-0219

Director – Region 5

Linda Porter
Youngstown, OH 44515
330 / 792-7351

Director – Region 6

George R. Heron
Essexville, MI 48732
989 / 894-4396

Director – Region 7

Richard H. Allen
Lincoln, NE 68510
402 / 435-4052

Director – Region 8

James J. Owen
Blacksburg, VA 24060
540 / 552-1109

Director – Region 9

Arthur F. Dawes, III
San Antonio 78232
210 / 499-4058

Director-at-Large (Membership)

Allan R. Powell
Hagerstown, MD 21740
301 / 797-4916

Director-at-Large (Conventions)

John A. Horner, Jr.
Shaker Heights, OH 44120
216 / 752-8448

Member – Ex-Officio

President, The Torch Foundation


Ralph C. Falconer
Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44224
330 / 688-7477

Headquarters Office

Executive Secretary **Editor**
James V. Strickland, Jr. Reed Taylor
749 Boush Street – Norfolk, VA 23510-1517
757/622-3927 FAX 757/623-9740
E-mail: iatc@infonline.net

From the President

A New Life



My favorite opening line from literature is “I read a book one day and my whole life was changed” (Orhan Pamuk’s *The New Life*). Pamuk’s quote made me think about those books that had shaped my intellectual philosophy. That exercise motivated me to focus also on decisions that became life-changing. One such decision was electing to attend the 1991 Buffalo IATC Convention.

How did my life change by going to Buffalo? The Torch experience there convinced my spouse and me that we should attend future conventions, no matter where they were held. The concept of visiting a city (even cities that might not normally rank high on your list of places to visit) and having

your entire visit orchestrated by a local Torch Club appealed to our sense of adventure. Following three more conventions and with encouragement from new-found friends in IATC, my Torch colleagues in Delaware and I hosted the 1997 IATC convention in Wilmington. The convention must have been a success because I was elected to the IATC Board, responsible for organizing future conventions. Six years later, I became IATC’s 57th President.

So, should you consider Torch Conventions? Yes, definitely!

(To be continued next issue)

— Stephen T. Toy, IATC President

Gold & Silver Torch Awards

At our annual convention, special Gold and Silver Torch Awards may be given to individual members for truly outstanding service, through nomination by their local clubs, submitted in advance through the Awards Chairman.

Gold Award

The Gold Torch Award honors members who have served Torch at the local, regional, and—most importantly—the International level. To qualify for this award, the nominee must have been a Torch member for at least 10 years. In any one year, the number of Gold Torch Awards may not exceed 0.1% (rounded to the nearest whole number) of the membership of the International Association of Torch Clubs (i.e., three awards for membership of 2,500 to 3,499).

Silver Award

The Silver Torch Award recognizes members who have served in an exemplary manner at the local club level. To qualify for the Silver Torch Award, the nominee must have been a member for at least 5 years. In a given year, the number of Silver Torch Awards nominees by a local club may not exceed one for each 25 members or portion thereof.

Nominations for both Gold and Silver awards should be sent by March 31, 2009 to Edward B. Latimer, c/o IATC, 749 Boush Street, Norfolk, VA 23510-1517, with copies to your regional director.

Campaign Finance Reform—Find the Problem Before You Fix the Car

Allowing no limits and trusting in full disclosure may provide a campaign finance repair that keeps the political car running, though not in top shape.

By Harry Holloway



About the Author

Harry Holloway received his BA in History and Mathematics from the University of Oklahoma and his MS in Mathematics from the University of Delaware. He has taught Mathematics or History for levels ranging from College to second graders. Harry has developed a love for the middle school students at Powhatan School in Boyce, Virginia where he has been teaching mostly math for the past twenty years. He is quick to describe his teaching role as part salesman and part actor, as he seeks to inspire young minds. When not teaching, he can be found doing origami and spending time with his family or church.

Presented to the Winchester Torch Club on November 1, 2006.

As the tires were replaced for the third time, it suddenly occurred to the driver that maybe the tire store he was dealing with had not found the real problem. Maybe it was more than just poor alignment or under-inflated tires. Well it was. The axle was a little bent. But it took going to a dealership to find this out. Symptoms send us in one direction, but we eventually end up somewhere else.

Campaign finance laws often fit the same description. They are designed to fix a problem, often based on polls or a single event. But the perceived problem may be very different from the real issues. We often focus on large donations that create the perception that

How were these corporations and later unions picking candidates? They were not really interested in changing the views of politicians. They gave to candidates who held views that would benefit their company or union.

a candidate is “bought” by one group or another. We question who is influencing our leaders; so much so, that it has led to the weakening of the First Amendment to the Constitution. But do large donations really undermine our process? Are we asking the right questions about campaign finance? In 1974, following the revelations of Watergate and the highly questionable campaign dealings of the Committee to Re-Elect the President (CREEP), campaign finance laws were passed that ended up testing the limits of the Freedom of Speech. What problems were they trying to fix? Were they the real problems?

The dilemma of how to pay for political campaigns is not a new one. Self-financing was common in colonial days when people sought a seat in the House of Burgesses. Candidates were expected to provide food and liquor to the voters at parties leading up the election. It is unclear how much impact

better catering might have had, but in 1777, Madison lost his seat in the Virginia legislature because he refused to provide liquor at his rallies. 1 The arrival of the Constitution in 1789 created federal offices that needed to be won, and consequently new, more expensive ways to reach voters had to be discovered. Like today, the mass media was the best avenue for campaigning; but rather than take out ads, the parties would recruit newspaper owners to their side or start their own newspapers. These papers would often mix news and editorializing in ways that would shock us today. The papers would push hard for their side; bending the news was in the public interest if it helped the “right” cause win.

The election of 1800 and the development of political parties allowed the fundraising to be more focused. Often, a few large contributions supported by a scattering of much smaller ones were sufficient. Sometimes an issue would drive the contributions. The formation of the Bank of the United States in 1832 was one of the earliest issues to drive a campaign. The Civil War greatly increased the number of federal contracts with corporations, which in turn made every effort to secure contracts with the government. Lincoln considered this a dangerous connection, observing, “As a result of the war, corporations have become enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow.”2 The appearance of corporate funds in political campaigns grew, but not as donations. From the 1830’s until the early 1880’s, Federal office holders were expected to pay a

small percentage of their salary to their political party in gratitude for their position. Business contracts were often awarded based on the same kind of patronage. In 1878, these kickbacks were 90% of the parties' finances. With the creation of the civil service in 1883, this source of revenue dried up completely.³ Presidential campaigns were expensive propositions, and new revenue sources had to be found when patronage kickbacks were lost. The parties turned to corporations in earnest, seeking large donations from the economic leaders of the time.

In one of the first major organized efforts to bring in corporate funds, Marcus Hanna, national chair of the Republican Party in 1895-96 told large corporations they could depend on Republicans to be pro-business, in contrast to Democrat William Jennings Bryan's anti-business bias, at the same time insulating his party's candidate, William McKinley, from the process. Based on the size of the companies, he even told them how much to give. Due to Hanna's work, McKinley amassed over three million dollars to spend in his victory over Bryan. This amount would not be surpassed until the 1920's. Moreover, Hanna created the pro-business label that the Republican Party carries to this day. The flow of corporate money continued unquestioned until the size of the donations was made public in 1904, causing a public outcry based on the perception that votes were being bought. The irony here was that President Teddy Roosevelt never showed the pro-business attitudes that the public feared. But the public unrest still led to the first campaign finance law, the Tillman Act (passed about 1907), forbidding certain corporations from giving directly to presidential campaigns. Later, this was expanded to include all corporations and, later still, labor unions. Laws requiring reporting of larger donations and limiting contributions from Federal employees were also passed over the next thirty

years. Just as our repairman often finds more to "fix" than the original problem, so it was with the laws limiting corporate and union donations. No acts of vote buying or corruption were identified; the only issue was the "appearance of corruption." Yet the system was still "fixed." How were these corporations and later unions picking candidates? They were not really interested in changing the views of politicians. They gave to candidates who held views that would benefit their company or union. Much as when we buy a car, we want the best deal, but no matter how good the deal, if the car will not do what we want, we are not going to buy it.

There have been many scandals in the Federal government but most were like Teapot Dome in the 1920's, a case of straight bribery of a non-elected official. Every scandal involving money often led to new campaign finance laws, but always with loopholes. The first PAC's (political action committees) for example, political organizations whose members share a common goal, were designed to get around laws like the Tillman Act. Since a PAC was not a corporation, it could give money to campaigns. With the cost of campaigns always on the rise, the parties were going to find ways to raise money. By 1971 Congress had started looking at ways to streamline and improve existing laws. Watergate supercharged that movement. What the public saw was the break-in, a cover up, "dirty tricks" and tapes of the President speaking in ways they could not imagine; but the other issues were the funds that paid for all this. The hearings revealed that CREEP (the Committee to Re-Elect the President) had used hidden accounts, slush funds, and pressure to acquire huge sums of money in a campaign to win at all costs. In some cases, "donors" were even told that if they expected the President's support, they had better ante-up. Many of their activities violated existing laws. The belief in

political circles was that CREEP got out of hand because it was not under Republican Party control. The parties had to have more control over campaign committees. Or, was the real issue something else? Reformers used the public outcry to take the work that was started in 1971 and strengthen it in the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1974. This included maximum donations, limits on expenditures, reporting requirements, and even Federal funds for Presidential campaigns. The spending limits were even indexed for inflation. The Federal Election Commission (FEC) was set up to interpret and enforce the new laws.

The First Amendment states, "*Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press; or the right of people to peaceably assemble, and to petition the government for redress of grievances.*" The extent and power of this amendment cannot be overstated. The later interpretations of it have made it one of the strongest expressions for free speech in the world. It is both the bane and the boon of who we are. It makes it possible for some remarkably stupid things to be said, but also for remarkable change. Combined with our strong belief in free enterprise, the First Amendment establishes a fundamental belief in a lack of control over what is said. Even today we would cringe at the thought of state-run television. As much as we complain about the mass media, some part of the population still tunes in enough for it to be profitable.

With campaign finance laws limiting the size of donations and the amount of money that could be spent, the law was limiting the ability to speak; this meant that free speech was being infringed on. Several groups led by James Buckley took the FECA to court on First Amendment grounds in 1975. The Supreme Court handed down a decision in the case *Buckley et al. v.*

Valeo in January of 1976, a ruling that was somewhat contradictory and confusing. The court declared that limiting campaign expenditures was unconstitutional, since it limited free speech. But once the court was convinced that limits on **contributions** would not prevent the candidate from raising funds, they felt contribution limits would not impinge the **candidate's speech**, and were therefore constitutional. The Court drew a distinction between contributions and expenditures. Limiting expenditures was an unconstitutional limit on free speech. But limits on contributions were acceptable, since it is the candidate who is speaking and not the contributor. The Court also kept the reporting procedures and Federal funds for elections. They specifically referred to the CREEP activities and emphasized the need to avoid the "appearance of corruption." Justice Stephen Breyer, in explaining the reasoning behind this decision (and the ones that followed it), focused on the need to build public confidence in the electoral system and encourage the free exchange of ideas by citizens, not corporate groups.⁴ The court felt justified in limiting speech in the hope that candidates would have to seek a larger base of support for their finances. Remarkably, the only other times the courts have limited free speech have been in cases of public safety.

Among the goals of the 1974 laws was the creation of a system giving the two main parties stronger oversight, requiring candidates to rely on many more sources for their finances. The FEC, appointed by the President, and made up of three Democrats and three Republicans, gave the parties direct oversight of the campaign laws. But the equity made it difficult for it to be decisive. With a commission that lacked much stomach for enforcement, it is difficult to tell if loopholes are built-in to campaign finance laws or discovered afterwards. One thing is for sure; campaign lawyers were quick to find

creative ways to use the new laws. The big discovery was called "soft money," contributions made to the political parties that are not for the support of a particular candidate in a Federal election. Since there were no limits on these funds, they created large sums of money that could be used to support "party activities." This money could be used to pay support staff, office rent or ads that did not refer directly to a candidate. This freed up "hard money" for the candidate to use for other things. In 1980 only 8% of campaign spending was "soft money." In 1992 it was 42%. So instead of reaching out to the public, the candidates reached back to their party for the extra money they needed.

In the 1980's, the savings and loan crisis revealed that large amounts of money were still sneaking into campaigns through various loopholes. Men like Charles Keating, the head of Lincoln Savings and Loan, made major contributions to several Senators. When asked under indictment about these contributions, Keating made it clear that he expected some kind of return on his "contributions." When Lincoln S&L started getting in trouble, some of these Senators became involved. There was no evidence that they had applied undue pressure to alter penalties on Lincoln S&L, but the sense of corruption was evident, and Mr. Keating made it clear he felt his donations helped him. There were cries for reform, but the main focus was on banking regulations and not campaign finance.

In 1996, when President Clinton went to extremes in using the White House as a fundraising tool, campaign finance took center stage. In addition, there was strong evidence that money from foreign governments had also flowed into the coffers of both parties. One of the reasons there was not a deeper investigation into campaign financing in 1996 was the realization that neither party would come out looking good. The extent of these practices gave enough push for the

eventual passage of the McCain-Feingold or Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA) in 2002. Soft money was abolished, disclosure laws were expanded, ads were outlawed that pretended to be "issue ads" but were really campaign ads, contribution limits were raised, and fundraising on Federal property or donations made through children were forbidden. The latter was a common way to get around the \$1000 limit established by the FEC. For example, in his race for re-election in 1980, Senator Ted Kennedy received \$65,000 from children under 18. McCain-Feingold (or BCRA) is highly complex, and was quickly taken to court. The Supreme Court upheld most of it and, referring back to the 1976 Buckley decision, endorsed the idea of limits on donations. The vote was five to four and was very contentious with far more serious concern for the First Amendment than was evident in 1974.

As quickly as BCRA came into practice, groups found their way around the law. The most recent has been what are called "527 groups" who are not covered by FEC regulations and can advocate a view independent of a political organization. A 527 group is a non-profit political group that falls under IRS code 527. Since they are not affiliated with the political parties in any way, campaign finance laws do not apply to them. These organizations played a major role in the election of 2004. In spite of BCRA, the presidential election of 2004 was the most expensive in history with totals over \$1.3 billion. So if we look over the past, we will notice several patterns:

- 1) Special interests have always worked to support candidates that will help their cause.
- 2) Scandals or the appearance of influence-buying has led to reform movements.
- 3) The public's interest is always short term. They accept that politicians are in general corrupt, but not the one they voted for.

4) The laws are written by incumbents, so they often favor those in power, and will have loopholes favoring them.

5) All meaningful campaign finance laws limit freedom of speech.

6) Elections cost far more than the salaries that the candidates will receive. They seek office for the honor of serving, or for power and prestige.

Through the years, with a collection of motivating scandals that have prompted confusing and questionable court decisions, we have arrived at our current system. The car has been repaired and upgraded so often we barely recognize it. But does it really run any better?

Now, under BCRA, you can no longer run for President with the financial support of just a few thousand wealthy people. It will cost at least \$400 million, and at the maximum PAC donation of \$6000, that is 80,000 PAC's or 200,000 individuals giving their maximum \$2300. Thus BCRA accomplished one of its major goals, to broaden the financial base of candidates. In the process, it created new challenges in finding ways to raise these funds. President Bush created a group called the "Rangers" who were able to find at least 100 people who would give the maximum, and guarantee \$200,000 for the Bush re-election bid. Pioneers were supporters that were only able to raise \$100,000. Thus the old pyramid scheme takes on a new form. Recently contributors and candidates have discovered that by setting up different committees and PAC's it is possible to make several \$2000 contributions that will all end up being used to support a single candidate. In addition, individuals might give to several candidates. It should be clear, however, that it is much more difficult for a group or single person (other than the candidate) to be a major financial backer of a campaign. For the election of 2006, a significant 86% of all donations came from just .3% of the

voting population. The costs continue to spiral out of control, with only a small number of citizens giving.

To run for the US House of Representatives now costs close to \$800,000. Depending on the state, a run for the Senate can cost several million. To give this some perspective, an incumbent House member needs to raise an average of \$7900 a week to keep his job. This means that unless you can put in a large amount of your own funds, support from outside your state is often critical. In addition, since a candidate must raise money from many sources, it requires a larger staff to be successful, including a lawyer on retainer who specializes in campaign finance law. With all these new employment opportunities, we can also look at campaign finance reform as a kind of jobs program. In any case, being an incumbent in Federal office can be a significant advantage, since the incumbent wins about 90% of house races, and 80% of Senate races.

We also need to keep in mind that money wins about 90% of the time. Before the advent of television, the most money did not always win. FDR, for example, was outspent in all of his elections. Nowadays, however, if the candidate with the most money does not win, it is because of some scandal, or a decision to be self-financed. Most candidates who try to run a campaign out of their own pocket fail. It is just hard to develop a public connection if you don't need them for money. Prior to the 2006 election, moderates were the least likely to give. Fear is one of the few reasons moderates donate. This means that to raise funds, candidates needed either to appeal to groups more to the right or left, or else to terrify the middle ground. Thus rhetoric can easily become more aggressive, or else the money for the next set of commercials might not come in.

Under the present system what does it take to be a successful candidate?

1) Be able to raise medium size

funds from thousands of individuals;

2) Have some personal wealth you can invest in the campaign (particularly the primary);

3) Have the support of groups with strong views who are likely to give funds;

4) Be able to appeal to a large number of PACs;

5) Assume that money normally wins; and

6) Be an incumbent, making fundraising much easier.

Since the FEC is still controlled by the political parties, we still expect the politicians to police themselves. Just as we take our car to an independent garage to check the quality of the repair, so we want to test the quality of our campaign "fix." With the present campaign finance system, however, we are taking it to the repairman's cousin. She might give us an honest answer, but then she also might just cover up the errors or even lie to us. In fact the system is really designed to keep out the competition. As we said, the incumbent has an advantage, but members of the two main parties have an even greater advantage. Over the years we have had parties come and go, but not anymore. The need for many contributors requires a political party structure, the amount of money involved makes it difficult for a new party to start, and the FEC being run by the existing parties all but guarantees that we are stuck with Elephants and Donkeys.

In the process we have created new special interest groups—professional fundraisers and campaign lawyers. The campaign finance lawyers are very good at finding ways around these laws. For example, one creative trick was noting that contributions under a certain amount (I believe \$200 in the current law) do not have to be tracked. So a candidate could receive many donations of, say, \$150 without having to verify who exactly the contributor was. We also have professional fundraisers with demographic data and the tools of the

Internet who are equally good at finding new ways to increase contributions. To achieve this complex system, the Supreme Court limited the free speech of contributors to campaigns. Like our car repairman, they “fixed” it by just telling us not to drive it in bad weather.

Congress has tried to “fix” campaign finance many times, often creating new loopholes, in attempts to prevent perceived abuses. In fact, their main focus has been to limit the size of contributions and prevent a single group or person from having too much influence. To accomplish this, Congress is willing to limit our ability to freely give and express our views through the candidates of our choice. The courts and Congress feel that our rights can be limited a little so as to avoid the “appearance of corruption.”

But how much does BCRA really limit free speech? Under BCRA my maximum donation to a candidate for Federal office is \$2100. After giving that amount, I can’t even make my own signs supporting my candidate (unless I keep it secret from his or her office). Now, how much is my speech being limited? Some might say only a little. But the first amendment says *Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech, or the press*. There does not seem to be much gray area there. I should mention that some parts of BCRA (like limits on issue ads 30 days before an election) still have cases pending in the courts.

Rodney Smith in *Money Power and Elections* argues that no weakening of the First Amendment is acceptable. His lack of faith in Congress and particularly the Supreme Court leads him to suggest a Constitutional amendment forbidding all campaign finance reform (since the courts have allowed it), and only requiring complete campaign financial disclosure. This means that contributions could be any size, but candidates would have to disclose the source of all their funds. So we would at least know who was

buying the election. This full-disclosure approach has its advantages. First, even without a new Constitutional amendment, it does not require any modification of the First Amendment. It would also mean that candidates would focus on large donors and reduce the number of annoying e-mails and letters asking most of us for money. Full disclosure would (in theory) make it clear what groups were supporting what candidates, and then the free press would expose candidates who were accepting too much from one group or another. However, full disclosure is trickier than it sounds. It would be quite possible to hide donations and make it difficult to track their source. This can even happen by accident. I was playing with the FEC web site and found that the total contributions of my mother, Irene Holloway, for 2004 included \$250 to the Republican Congressional campaign committee. A proud life-long Democrat, she found this disturbing. Eventually I found out it was a different Irene Holloway; the Social Security numbers had been mixed up—an easy error. Still, with donors around 500,000, full disclosure is hard, and expensive. But the FEC had still grouped them all together. In any case, with costs spiraling out of control, candidates might be forced to compromise their already questionable values to get that critical donation. It would certainly be possible for some candidates to end up “owing” some special interest a little too much. Do we have enough faith in the public and the press to risk this much potential corruption? In addition, important groups without deep pockets would lose influence, causing several serious ramifications. Rodney Smith is not a scholar, but a professional fundraiser who proudly worked with CREEP, and understands that if there are no limits, the Republican special interests are richer and will win. In spite of this bias, his concerns over the First Amendment are real, and cannot be lightly discarded.

The reforms have always focused on mandatory spending limits, yet such limits have always been ruled unconstitutional. So finding another approach to level the playing field or reduce cost is needed. There have been various attempts at requiring free TV time for candidates, some pending before Congress this year. A recent solution at the state level is the “clean election law,” providing a candidate whose public support is shown by a large number of small donations enough money to run for the chosen state office. This means that all candidates basically have the same amount of money, most of it publicly funded. If a candidate chooses to use only private funding, the state will increase the funds to the other candidates so as to level the playing field. Arizona has had clean elections since 2002, and with great success. State-funded campaigns provide a control on the costs, and it is easier to negotiate television time. They do not violate the First Amendment, since a candidate can choose to spend as much as he or she wants, and not accept the state’s funds. We have tried something like this at the national level, but the total available to candidates is governed by the number of voters who check it off on their IRS forms. With only around 10% checking it off, the totals promised by the government for primary elections are so small that both parties have recently turned the funds down. For the General election, both parties still accept public financing, mainly because they can stop spending time raising money during the election. However, in 2004 Karl Rove did consider rejecting public financing since he was sure he could raise the money while President Bush campaigned.

Another suggestion is that term limits would help solve some of the problems. By reducing the number of incumbents, term limits would free up officials in their last years in office to focus on the work of government rather

than campaigning. Such a plan creates other problems, however. First, it would require a Constitutional amendment, and second, it would increase inexperience in Congress. The result might well be more poorly-written laws, since lawmakers will be pushing legislation through faster, with more loopholes. In addition, although there is verbal public support for term limits, we rarely show it in the polling booth.

But we have lost focus. What is the problem? It is not the large donations that most reform has focused on. The problem is the overall cost of Federal campaigns. The amounts of money involved are so large that candidates must spend a great deal of time raising money, work with professional fundraisers, and in the process, often lose perspective on their job as Congressman, Senator, or even President. This is not because they are corrupt. It is the corrupting nature of the process. The need for funds, along with the often sleazy nature of the campaigns themselves, creates a level of disgust that most would want to avoid. So how can we escape the spiral of escalating costs without infringing on the First Amendment to the Constitution? We cannot. Could we pass a Constitutional amendment allowing Congress to limit expenditures? This was my intention when I started this paper. But phrasing such an amendment would be very difficult, since it could easily be used to support one group or another. The Law of Unintended Consequences prevents me from creating any limits on free speech.

Sometimes, when we really find out what is wrong with the car, we realize that no tinkering will fix the problem. What has been done by BCRA may be the best we can hope for without radical change. Nevertheless, I am convinced that BCRA is unconstitutional. Melvin Urofsky, a noted Constitutional scholar, in his book *Money and Free Speech* reached the same conclusion. Like Rodney Smith (but by a very different

path), Urofsky declared that he could not justify the separation between expenditures and contributions. He also reached the conclusion that all well-meaning campaign finance laws violate the First Amendment. So we start heading back to a dependence on disclosure and an active press to control campaign finance.

Many web sites show that money wins elections. Does this mean that if we allow the Constitution to do its job, we are allowing the rich to take over the country? Maybe; but maybe not. Self-financed campaigns almost always lose. In the election of 2006, of the 22 candidates who spent more than a million dollars of their own money, only one took office. Why? Because in the end, money is speech but it is not votes. Votes are those around you. If a candidate wants to win, he must get enough of us to support him. And "us" includes those sitting here reading the *Torch* magazine, as well as the men and women who prepared and printed it and sent it in the mail to us. To generate that support is not cheap. But candidates have the right to raise as much money as they can, and I should have the right to give what I can to help candidates that I truly care about.

Since the presentation of this paper right after the elections of 2006, we have had a new Presidential election which has moved campaign funding to yet higher levels. Then-Senator Barack Obama rejected public financing and raised far more money while he was running than Senator McCain received in public financing. Obama outspent McCain 2 to 1, while the Republican Party itself was only able to outspend the Democratic Party by about 1.4 to 1. The money spent by 527s was about the same on both sides, a situation which had not been true in 2000 or 2004. President-elect Barack Obama's fundraising success appears largely to have been the result of his having supporters who were willing to give their money to see him in office. Again, the total

number of donors was no more than .5% (yes, the decimal is in the right place .005) of the voters. True, this money only gave him the opportunity to distribute his message. He still had to sell himself. His large number of small donors would still make full disclosure difficult and expensive, but such an expense (which the candidates could generally cover) is a small price to pay to protect our First Amendment rights. In the case of my car, if I want it to run well, I must maintain it. I have to know what questions to ask, and regular maintenance makes a big difference. When we take our car's health for granted, we are apt to have problems that need fixing. But as we look at the repairs, we find that the car was not broken in the first place. Similarly, if we allow no limits on campaign spending and trust full disclosure of sources, we may find a system that runs well only as long as we are proactive in our election process. The system is not really broken at all; it just does not run the way we thought it would.

1 Melvin I. Urofsky. *Money and Free Speech*, p.4.

2 *Ibid.* p.7.

3 *Ibid.* p.8.

4 Breyer, Stephen. *Active Liberty*, p.47.

Bibliography

Breyer, Stephen. (2005). *Active Liberty*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Drew, Elizabeth. (1999). *The Corruption of American Politics*. Secaucus, NJ: Carol/Birch Lane.

Federal Election Commission, <http://www.fec.gov/>.

Klein, Joe. (2006). *Politics Lost*. New York: Doubleday.

Opensecrets.org. <http://www.opensecrets.org/>.

Smith, Rodney. (2006). *Money, Power and Elections*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Urofsky, Melvin I. (2005). *Money and Free Speech*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Aerial Warfare and the Ethics Of Collateral Damage

A first-hand account of Allied bombing raids in Germany in WWII that raises troubling moral questions

By Dennis A. J. Morey, M.D.



About the Author

Dennis A. J. Morey, a native of England, interrupted his studies at the University of London during the Second World War to join the RAF as a navigator, bombardier, and gunner, flying a total of 64 missions over the coast as well as occupied Europe and Germany. His wartime service against the Third Reich earned him two Distinguished Flying Crosses and the rank of Squadron Leader. After the war, Morey attended medical school at the University of Western Ontario, Canada, graduating with his M.D. degree in 1950. Following his first years of practice as a gastroenterologist and internist in Florida and Texas, he came to Richmond in 1956, where he practiced medicine and served as chief of staff for Henrico Doctors' Hospital from 1986 to his retirement in 1989. He chaired the Ethics Committee for the hospital, and was Assistant Professor of Clinical Medicine at the Medical College of Virginia Hospitals. He shares his wartime education by teaching meteorology, navigation and compass correction for the Richmond Power Squadron, and math and electronics for the Richmond Amateur Radio Club. A former college letterman in fencing, he has served as fencing coach at Virginia Commonwealth University, and was a founding member of the Richmond Rugby

Football Club. His meticulous research earned him the History Award Medal (1996) of the D.A.R. and the Award of Merit (2004) of the Henrico Historic Advisory Committee. Dr. Morey, a long-time member of the Richmond Torch Club, has recently published two textbooks for sailors, *The Magnetic Compass: Its Installation, Maintenance and Correction*, and *Mathematics for the Mariner*.

Presented to the Richmond Torch Club on December 4, 2007.



Introduction

This paper is written with two thoughts in mind. First, to expiate the lingering regret for the role I played over 60 years ago in the inadvertent, collateral damage to numerous innocent German citizens, especially their little ones. Second, to enhance awareness of the section of the United Nations Charter that attempts to dissuade its members from resorting to war to resolve their differences. This would essentially eliminate the enormous loss of innocent lives that inevitably occurs during modern wars, especially if the doctrine of “mutual assured destruction” is continued in this age of nuclear capability and the threat of terrorism.

Development of Aerial Warfare

A review of recorded history reveals that wars were common and that a conquering army routinely sacked the town of the losing side, carrying out murder, rape and looting, and finally igniting fires to burn the town, before leaving and carrying with them the

children to become domestic slaves. Fortunately, over time, this brutality inflicted on the non-combatant populace declined. However, with the technological changes in weapons, the deliberate harm to the citizens was replaced by inadvertent shelling and bombing which fell upon the defenseless citizenry. The incidence of this harm culminated in the use of atomic weapons dropped on two Japanese cities, with horrific numbers of dead and injured. The concept of aerial warfare tends to leave the impression that this is a modern development of war, but, in fact, it is the Darwinian evolution of war fought at a distance. Its initiation was probably begun when a stone-age *homo erectus* picked up a cobblestone and threw it at his enemy, thus initiating the first use of artillery.

Thereafter the process slowly evolved with progressively longer ranges for weapons, including the javelin, the bow and arrow, the Roman war machines — large mobile catapults—and with the discovery of gunpowder, the mortar, the match-lock musket, the snaphaunce, the wheel lock and flintlock, and eventually the machine gun and long-range land and naval artillery. All of this “progress” was accompanied by the progressive destructiveness of the missiles delivered at longer and longer distances.

Mankind has long envied the birds and the freedom of flight. However, it was not until the last centuries of the second millennium that the technical knowledge to escape the tug of gravity was acquired, which allowed the

emergence of balloons, blimps, and powered aircraft. Benjamin Franklin, in Paris at the time of the first ascents of the Montgolfier balloons, wrote prophetically: "This method of filling the balloon with hot air is cheap and expeditious, and it is supposed may be sufficient for certain purposes, such as elevating an engineer to take a view of an enemy's army, works, etc., conveying intelligence into or out of besieged towns, giving signals to distant places, or the like." Military observation balloons, tethered to the ground by long cables, were actually used as early as 1794, and again during the American Civil War (1861-1865) by both sides. A city was first bombed from the air in 1849 when the Austrians used pilot-less hot air balloons to bomb Venice. During the 1870-71 war, during the siege of Paris, balloons had strategic importance. Improved balloons were developed by the French in World War I, which could withstand a gale of 790 mph, and rise to 6000 feet.

The development of the airplane eliminated the use of balloons in warfare, although captive balloons were employed during WW II over British cities, forcing bombers to higher altitudes and with less effective bombing. During WWI, the Germans developed a powered blimp—a hydrogen-filled airship—the Zeppelin, measuring 650 feet long and moving at 36 mph, which began sorties over London and other cities in England. Initially they could fly higher than the early British fighter biplanes. The British fighters also lacked effective fire power. During 1915 and 1916, the zeppelins dropped 200 tons of bombs, killing 557 people and injuring 1,358. These attacks prompted the British to develop more effective anti-aircraft guns, searchlights, and better fighter aircraft, plus a fleet of bombers with a top speed of 97 mph and carrying a bomb load of 2000 lbs. As a result of this increased vulnerability, the zeppelins switched to night-time raids

only. By November 1916, after suffering horrendous casualties, the Zs disappeared from the skies over England, but were replaced by the Gotha, a three-seat biplane with a top speed of 85 mph, a ceiling of 20,000 feet, and a bomb load of 450 Kg (Ca 1000 lbs.).

With further improvement in British defenses, the Germans switched to night raids with a larger aircraft capable of carrying 1800 Kg of bombs. These aircraft flew 52 raids over Britain, 19 of which were on London—dropping 16 tons of bombs that killed 857 people and injured 2050. These raids did not target military or war-related industries, but were clearly intended to demoralize the British people and lead them to demand surrender by their government.

World War II began in Britain on September 3, 1939—14 months prior to the Pearl Harbor attack. The RAF had a moderately well-prepared fighter command, but was poorly prepared for a bombing campaign into Germany. Germany carried out a concerted blitz against Britain, mainly concentrated on London at night, killing 30,000 civilians and injuring more than 50,000, and using incendiary bombs that destroyed large areas of residential buildings. The Battle of Britain fought by the Fighter Command finally blunted the attack and reduced the raids to small sporadic incursions. Meanwhile, the British aircraft industry began to produce increasing numbers of larger bombers which could penetrate deeply into Germany. By 1941, Britain was able to carry out attacks upon the German military/industrial complexes, with large fleets which finally reached 1000 aircraft carrying large bomb loads to the enemy's furthest industrial sites, especially those producing synthetic fuel on the far side of Germany, adjacent to Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Collateral Damage

Collateral damage is a relatively modern term which implies death and

injury to non-combatants, and inadvertent damage to cultural institutions such as cathedrals, museums, and other structures which have no relationship to the war effort. The involvement of innocent bystanders during war is not new, but it was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that the advanced nations began to think about the problem, meeting in Geneva in 1864 to attempt to derive an international body of law which would clarify the justification of war and the humanitarian problems associated with it. Since that time, the Convention has met periodically, including sessions in 1949, 1954, 1977, and 1984, and issued their opinions in the form of Protocols, addressing such problems as torture, treatment of prisoners of war, and genocide.

With the introduction of powered aircraft into the war-fighting machinery, the modes of war were altered immeasurably, as were the ethical problems. When Hitler invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, President Roosevelt appealed to all combatants, reminding them that in recent years thousands of civilian casualties had been caused by the raiding of unfortified centers of populations, and declaring that the continuation of this inhuman barbarism would lead to the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of innocent human beings. He said, "I am, therefore, addressing this urgent appeal to every government which may be engaged in hostilities to publicly affirm its determination that the armed forces shall in no event, and under no circumstances, undertake bombardment from the air of civilian populations and unfortified cities." He added that the "same rules of warfare will be scrupulously observed by all opponents." In Germany, Hitler told the Reichstag, "I will not make war against women and children. I have ordered my Air Force to restrict itself to attacks on military objectives," and added the proviso that "these same rules will be

scrupulously observed by all opponents.”

If one has to fight a war, the foregoing ethical principles are indeed the moral high-ground to which one should aspire. Unfortunately, between the two world wars, a number of war strategists expressed opposition to these principles. In the view of many strategists, the greatest weakness in a nation’s defensive chain was civilian morale. If that link could be snapped, a government would be compelled by its citizens to make peace. In Britain in 1923, Major General Fuller wrote, “Today entire nations go to war, not only as soldiers, but as moral and material suppliers of soldiers. In which case to attack the civilian workers of a nation will then be justifiable as to attack its soldiers.” In this country, Brigadier General Billy Mitchell wrote in 1930: “To gain a lasting victory in war, the hostile nation’s power to make war must be destroyed, which includes the factories, the means of communication, the food producers, even the farms, the fuel and oil suppliers, and the places where the people live and carry on their lives.”

It didn’t take Hitler long to heed this advice, in spite of his earlier agreement with President Roosevelt’s request. His initial attack upon the British Isles had failed in the Battle of Britain, and he therefore initiated the eight-month Night Blitz on London, in which the Luftwaffe attempted to pound Britain into submission by bombing economic and civilian targets, hoping to cause material destruction and to break morale. This, too, failed. He then carried out air raids upon British cities and finally employed the V1 flying bomb, and the V2 rockets, which were essentially “terror weapons” aimed deliberately at the civilian population. The number of casualties attributed to the Night Blitz was estimated to be approximately 60,000 civilians—men, women, and children.

During this early period of the war,

I was flying on a Coastal Command torpedo-bomber squadron, and in addition to torpedo patrols, I carried out bombing runs into the Dutch harbors where the enemy was constructing invasion barges. I dropped magnetic sea mines into the narrow straits between the Frisian Islands, through which those invasion barges would sail. Most of this work was over the sea; hence, we were not involved with civilian populations. Later in the war, after teaching navigation in Canada for two years, I returned to England and was privileged to be accepted to the RAF’s elite force, the Pathfinders, flying the Lancaster heavy bomber, and marking the targets throughout Germany for the 1000 bomber raids. I am happy to report that during the seven years of flying I was never asked to attack civilians or their treasured institutions.

Nevertheless, the bombing ballistics involved in my marking targets linked me to the ethics of warfare. On these missions, the Lancaster heavy bomber would fly at 20,000 feet at an air speed of 240 knots. To achieve the necessary precision and timing, I would obtain a radar fix every two minutes and the wind velocity every six minutes in order to arrive on the target on the correct heading and within 30 seconds of the designated time on target. In addition to the target marker, each plane carried a 4000-pound “cookie”—the blockbuster—and nine 1000-pound bombs. When the first bomb was dropped, it had the same speed and heading as the plane, but having no intrinsic propulsion, the moment it hit the atmosphere it began to slow down and also fall under the influence of gravity. These combined influences caused the bomb to follow a parabolic curve which made it lag behind the plane’s track over the ground, so that at impact it might be 5 to 10 degrees behind the plane — if 5 degrees, that is 1750 feet, 583 yards, or one-third of a mile. If 10 degrees, it is 3526 feet, or 1175 yards, or two-thirds of a mile.

Furthermore, the plane’s course and initial course of the bomb were determined by the wind speed and direction. At 20,000 feet the winds were quite steady and uniform, whereas near the ground the wind was influenced by the terrain, such as mountains, high hills, forests, and tall buildings, deflecting the wind and producing eddies which displaced the bomb’s path as it neared the ground away from the target and into adjacent residential areas, causing inadvertent civilian casualties. Also, the plane’s bomb load was not dropped en masse, but one bomb at a time, at intervals of one or two seconds. This sounds inconsequential, but at 240 knots, one second means that the bombs are separated by 135 yards, while at two seconds they will be 270 yards apart. Thus for the one-second time, the total distance between the first and last bomb will be three-quarters of a mile, and for two seconds, the total distance will be approximately 1.5 miles. It is hard to envision a target which is three-quarters of a mile, or even 1.5 miles long. Hence it may safely be assumed that a significant number of bombs will fall well outside the target area, causing collateral damage. Thus in spite of the very best of intentions, the foregoing factors—together with human error, a target obscured by flak and blinding searchlights, the threat of collision with friendly aircraft, and the presence of fire, smoke, and dust in the target area after the first wave of aircraft carry out their mission—will inevitably contribute to an inadvertent placement, resulting in regrettable harm to innocent men, women, and children.

The most horrendous example of collateral damage in Europe occurred on February 13, 1945, at Dresden, a city where the administration of the German army fighting the Russians on the Eastern front was located, with marshalling yards bringing supplies to the German troops, numerous refugees fleeing the advancing Russian armies, numerous German wounded from the

Eastern front, and 127 small factories producing military hardware. Ours was a combined operation with the USAF bombing during daylight, and the RAF at night whose enormous tonnage of high explosives and incendiaries resulted in a devastating firestorm that killed approximately 250,000 people. Many were asphyxiated in the air-raid shelters due to the firestorm sucking out the oxygen, while outside in the streets people were collapsing and dying from carbon monoxide and dioxide inhalation. This city was called the “Florence of the Elbe” due to its treasured antiquities, most of which were destroyed by the attack. My crew was detailed for this mission, and took off at dusk, but just as we entered enemy territory, just south of Cologne, we lost our port (outer) engine. The Lancaster can fly well on three engines, but the loss of 25% of our thrust ensured that we would be late on target. Since we could not fulfill our mission we turned back and returned to base, greatly disappointed. However, 48 hours later as the intelligence reports came in, we were thankful that we had not been party to the appalling carnage. The British and American people were equally revulsed as they learned that most of the victims were refugees, women, and children. The actual numbers killed in Dresden is still uncertain, but several historians have concluded that the number was between 100,000 and 300,000. Wilhelm Berthold, writing in 1986, claimed that the 135,000 dead made the operation “the most murderous of the whole war, Hiroshima included.”

In the modern era aerial warfare has developed remarkable changes, such as the “smart bomb,” which can be dropped from a plane and directed by laser beam or GPS coordinates to its target; it is even claimed that the bombardier can guide it to go down a chimney. Are these techniques foolproof, guaranteed not to inflict harm on nearby innocents? I doubt it, simply because a human being is involved in

the process. Besides, what if there are three little children below the chimney? Furthermore, modern high-explosive devices have greatly increased their effective blast area.

The enormous death rate and the perceived brutality of the Dresden attack appalled the sensibilities of the British public, and after the war ended there were those who felt that Churchill and the leaders of Bomber Command should be charged in the international courts as war criminals. This expression of disgust was reserved for the Dresden affair, but nothing was said for the other bombed cities. I marked the target for Pforzheim on February 23, 1945, and learned subsequently that although the attack lasted only 25 minutes, between 20,000 and 25,000 people were killed, reducing the city to a towering hill of rubble. Similar results were noted at Wurzburg, Wuppertal, and Hamburg. I was flying at the latter two cities. Subsequently, in the Pacific, the fire bombing of Tokyo killed enormous numbers of people. The single bomb on Hiroshima killed 66,000 and, three days later, the bomb on Nagasaki killed 39,000.

It is quite evident that in spite of the pretentious announcements by all sides following President Roosevelt’s 1939 recommendation, very few restrictions to avoid collateral damage were particularly effective. In 1945, the United Nations Charter made self-defense or humanitarian/human rights intervention the only legal justification for going to war. Much earlier, in 1923, a conference of jurists at The Hague, convened by the Western powers, had proposed a ban on bombing purely as a means of terrorizing civilian populations. The conference had declared that air raids against military targets should be permitted only if they avoided all damage against civilians—a useless restriction in a military campaign relying on whatever weapons it possesses to achieve victory as cheaply as can be managed, unless faced

with overwhelming deterrence. Churchill has been accused of hypocrisy over Dresden, but he was the first to grasp the fact that area bombing had been stretched beyond the bounds of moral or military reason. He concluded that the attack on the city remains a serious query against the conduct of allied bombing.

Conclusion

What then should we do about this ethical dilemma? It would appear that in spite of the Geneva Conventions and its subsequent Protocols, and the plea of President Roosevelt, the basic international laws and ethical standards were essentially ignored by the antagonists during WW II. The Charter of the United Nations states, “We the Peoples of the United Nations are determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind.” The principles by which the Charter seeks to save us from war include:

All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such manner that international peace, security, and justice are not endangered; and

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

During an 8-month-long Night Blitz on London, it was reported that one civilian was killed for each bomb dropped. This prompted me to keep a mental note of the number of bombs I dropped over enemy territory. The result was 282 bombs, all of which were larger and more powerful than those used on London, and weighed a total of over 177 tons. My research leads me to believe that I was responsible for the deaths of over 300 civilians. The thought that this number included a significant number

of children leaves me with more than a twinge of guilt.

The basic concepts established by the international jurists as well as the United Nations and the Geneva Conventions have developed a reasonable body of law, which attempts to prevent war or to establish the guidelines for humanitarian behavior during the offensives that do arise. However, the leaders of the warring countries have demonstrated a willingness to ignore the laws of war and resort to any means to avoid being conquered or forced to surrender. Churchill was quite prepared to use poison gas against a German invasion of Britain in the early days of WW II. So what should we do about it? Can we declare war to be illegal and morally unacceptable? I doubt it. The Geneva Convention outlawed the use of poison gas, with fairly good results as far as war was concerned. A rare exception was Saddam Hussein's use of gas against the Kurds.

I was about to conclude this paper with the thought that the only reasonable hope for a solution to this dilemma is for the establishment of a World Government to enforce the international laws related to war, equipped with a military style police force to ensure that the leading causes of war could be nipped in the bud. However, just recently I received a letter from the American Criminal Justice Center, a project of the National Center for Public Policy Research in Washington, D.C., which requested funds and the signing of a petition asking President Bush to retract a proposal made by President Clinton to the United Nations, suggesting that the U.N. should establish a standing army, to be located on American soil. He apparently said that national sovereignty and territorial integrity should take a back seat to the U.N. peacekeeping efforts. The letter goes on to say that "Bill Clinton essentially invited a power-hungry, overtly anti-American organization to

USE OUR MONEY, OUR FORCES, and OUR SOLDIERS to fight whatever wars it chooses," including even attacking our own citizens if they are deemed to be a threat to international security. I am not privy to the arguments behind Clinton's decision to make his proposal to the U.N., although I suspect he had many of the concerns stressed in my paper. However, it is quite apparent that the writer of this letter had little, if any, concern for the humanitarian advantages of the proposal. Now as an octogenarian I look back and realize that at no time during the missions to the German industrial cities was I ever given any orders which might endanger the German civilians or their cultural institutions. However, I am aware of the psychological and physical variables involved in the process of navigating and bombing with precision to a specific target several hundred miles into enemy territory, influenced by weather fronts, variable wind velocities, fighters, flak, temperature at -30 degrees Centigrade, and at heights which demand an adequate oxygen supply. All of these factors are further influenced by the challenges to the emotional resilience of the seven-man crews of each of the 1000 bombers assigned to the raid. These variables inevitably result in a significant number of high explosive bombs falling outside the target area and into nearby residential areas.

Following my discharge from the R.A.F., I studied medicine in Canada, taking the Hippocratic Oath and joining the Hippocratic Honor Society. My private practice in Richmond was most gratifying, but it did not compensate for or eradicate the persistent guilt associated with the collateral damage inflicted during the war-time raids. In my practice I adhered consistently to the principles embodied in the Hippocratic Oath, and took correspondence courses from three different universities on basic ethics, biological ethics and medical ethics. Unfortunately, observing high moral standards serving American

patients does not outweigh inflicting collateral damage upon an innocent German population six decades earlier. I am, therefore, forced to conclude that the only hope for the eradication of this inadvertent but obnoxious side-effect of modern warfare is universal democratization, the total eradication of terrorism, the rigid control of nuclear proliferation and other weapons of mass destruction such as viral and bacterial agents, and more effective application of the international laws of warfare, together with the aggressive use of the International Court in the prosecution of those breaking the rules established by the United Nations, and published in its Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

References

- Addison, Paul, & Jeremy A. Crang, eds. (2006). *Firestorm: The Bombing of Dresden, 1945*. London: Pimlico Publishing.
- Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice*. (1948). New York: UN Department of Public Information.
- Encyclopedia Britannica*. (1965). International Law. Rules of War. War Crimes.
- Lament, Corlis. (1982). *The Philosophy of Humanism*. Chapter VI: The Affirmation of Life. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- Lapp, Ralph E. (1962). *Kill and Overkill: The Strategy of Annihilation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lifton, Robert Jay. (1972). "Beyond Atrocity," in Visscher, Maurice.B., ed. *Humanistic Perspectives in Medical Ethics*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books.
- Martin, James. (2006). *Meaning of the 21st Century, The*. New York: Riverhead Books/Penguin.
- Taylor, Frederick. (2005). *Dresden: Tuesday, 13 February 1945*. New York: Harper Collins/Bloomsbury.
- Taylor, James, & Martin Davidson. (2004). *Bomber Crew*. London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd.

Benedict, Bernard, and Bill W.: The Legacy of Twelve-Step Spirituality

The surprising congruence between AA's Twelve Steps and the spiritual steps of the monastic tradition

By The Rev. Dr. Susan Warrenner Smith



About the Author

Susan Warrenner Smith has been Associate Pastor at Indianola, Ohio, since 1996. She received her B.A. from Boston University with a major in History of Art, and she received her M.A. in the same subject from the University of Michigan. She then received her Ph.D. in Theological and Religious Studies from Drew University, where she concentrated in medieval theology and monastic spirituality. While serving a church in New Jersey, she taught religion as Adjunct Professor of Religious Studies at Seton Hall University. Rev. Smith has published numerous articles in the *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* and has presented at the International Medieval Studies Congress. In the Presbytery of Scioto Valley, she is currently serving on the Committee on Preparation for Ministry and manages the labyrinth owned by the presbytery and synod. She served for many years as a board member of the Interfaith Center for Peace. She is a member of the Columbus chapter of the Torch Club. Her husband, Bruce, is an Episcopal priest; they have three grown children and three grandchildren.

Presented to the Columbus Torch Club on November 3, 2005.



Part I

A broad spectrum of the public knows exactly what is meant when someone talks about a twelve-step program. What is generally less well known is the fact that the twelve steps seem to have roots planted deep in the

Bernard was, among other things, a prolific writer of treatises on topics as diverse as love, art, monastic decor, and the spiritual and temporal power of the papacy.

annals of history. The protagonists identified in the title of this paper have a mysterious and fascinating connection with one another, but in order to establish a helpful context for my exploration, I begin with an introduction to these three: Benedict of Nursia, Bernard of Clairvaux, and William Griffith Wilson.

1. Benedict of Nursia

Details about the fifth-century founder of strict monastic life, Benedict of Nursia, are a bit sketchy because they are based largely on the second *Dialogue* of Pope Gregory the Great, written a generation later with didactic rather than historic goals, in order to implant virtue in the reader. Gregory tells us that Benedict was born in Nursia in Tuscany, Italy, around 480, into a noble Italian family, and that he was sent to Rome to receive a liberal education. Horrified by the debauchery and immorality of his fellow students, "Benedict abandoned his studies, gave up [both] his home and his inheritance, and entered upon the single-minded quest for God."¹ This quest took the form of penitential

solitude, living three years in a cave at Subiaco. There Benedict wrestled with his inner demons, not unlike his predecessor St. Anthony of Egypt, and especially confronted his lustful temptations which ultimately he subdued once and for all by rolling in a nettle patch.

Once Benedict attained this virtuous state, others discovered his whereabouts and began to gather around him, seeking advice and spiritual guidance. He even agreed to leave his solitude and serve as abbot to a group of monks. Once these monks discovered the strict discipline of Benedict, however, they rebelled, eventually even trying to poison him. Gregory tells us Benedict thankfully was saved when the vessel of poison shattered upon the saintly abbot's touch.

After this episode Benedict retreated once more into solitude. Again disciples gathered around him. Eventually he organized these disciples into a dozen monastic communities, and Benedict himself went south and founded the monastery at Monte Cassino where he spent the remainder of his life, dying there in 547. It was here that Benedict completed the writing of his *regula monachorum* *The Rule of Benedict*, which became a guidebook for monastic life in western Europe. At the center of this *Rule* and crucial to Benedictine spirituality are the twelve steps of humility, outlined in chapter 7.

2. Bernard of Clairvaux

About 500 years later, in 1090, Bernard of Clairvaux was born, also of noble parents, at Fontaines-les-Dijon in Burgundy, France, and given a regional religious education. After his mother's

*The meeting worked.
Bill stayed sober, and on
June 10, 1935, Dr. Bob, as
he is fondly called, took
his last drink, and
Alcoholics Anonymous
was born.*

death when he was sixteen, he spent the next five years wrestling with his vocation, feeling increasingly drawn to the newly-founded, austere order at Cîteaux. Under the guidance of its abbot, Stephen Harding, a monk from Sherbourne in north Dorset, England, the monks at Cîteaux sought to reform the Benedictine tradition by recapturing the essence of Benedict's Rule and establishing more faithful adherence to its principles, disciplines, and guidelines. These monks developed the Cistercian order, well known today for its "strict observance." In 1111, while praying in a roadside church, Bernard resolved to join the monks at Cîteaux, having persuaded four of his brothers, his uncle, and a number of companions to go with him. Bernard spent his novitiate studying scripture and the Latin Fathers. Then in 1115, Stephen Harding sent Bernard and a group of brothers to establish a new monastery at Clairvaux. Over the next twenty years under Bernard's extraordinary leadership, thirty-one new houses were added to the Cistercian order; this tremendous expansion continued throughout Bernard's life, reflecting his charismatic and persuasive personality. He died at Clairvaux in 1153.

Bernard was, among other things, a prolific writer of treatises on topics as diverse as love, art, monastic decor, and the spiritual and temporal power of the papacy. Bernard also attended the Synod of Troyes in 1128 and drew up the rules for the new Order of the Knights Templar. In addition, we have some 454 extant letters written by him to kings,

popes, cardinals, chancellors, abbots, monks, bishops, nuns, counts, countesses, family, and friends. For a "solitary" monk, Bernard was quite a man of the world. He probably is best known for his magnificent sermons, especially the 86 sermons he wrote on the first few chapters of the *Song of Songs* from the Hebrew Bible. Bernard's first published work, written about ten years after he became abbot of Clairvaux, is titled *The Steps of Humility and Pride*. It was written at the request of Godfrey of Langres who had been prior of Clairvaux for a time but was later sent to become abbot of Fontenay Abbey, Clairvaux's second foundation. Next to scripture and the early church fathers, Bernard's primary source for this treatise was *The Rule of Benedict*, especially the twelve steps of humility in Chapter 7, cited above.

3. William Griffith Wilson

About 900 years later, William Griffith Wilson, known in Alcoholics Anonymous as Bill W., was born November 26, 1895, in the blue-collar quarry town of East Dorset, Vermont. Early in his life, his parents were divorced and, when his mother went to Boston to study osteopathy, Bill and his sister remained in Vermont under the care of his grandparents. He attended boarding school in Manchester and then Norwich, a military college in Vermont. During those years he met his future wife, Lois Burnham. In 1917 Bill went to Fort Monroe, Virginia, to become an artillery officer in World War I. It was later at Fort Rodman, outside of New Bedford, MA, that he was introduced to alcohol, which he called "the elixir of life." Lois and he were married in January 1918. Eventually he was shipped off to Europe where he not only experienced war but had a profound spiritual experience while visiting Westminster Cathedral in London.

Following the Armistice and Bill's return to the states, Lois and he moved to New York where he worked as a clerk for the New York Central Railroad. He

was fired from that job, bounced from job to job, worked for U.S. Fidelity and Guaranty Company while attending Brooklyn Law School at night, and fell more and more heavily into drinking. After law school he began circulating among Wall Street stockbrokers and, despite constant drinking and hangovers, managed to make a great deal of money. In an effort to regain his losses following the stock market crash of 1929, he took a job requiring a signed contract promising he would not drink. He remained sober for several months, but succumbed to temptation at a poker game, and the deal was off. He began stealing from Lois and hocking odds and ends to pay for booze. In 1933, having become isolated and alone, he admitted himself to Towns Hospital under the enlightened, compassionate care of Dr. William Duncan Silkworth, who treated alcoholism as an obsessive illness which causes one to drink against one's will. A happy and sober interlude followed, then relapse. He was back in Towns again in 1934. Sobriety, then once again relapse. About this time, his old drinking buddy Ebby Thacher—now sober, to Bill's surprise—introduced him to the non-denominational evangelical Oxford Groups. This movement stressed four major principles for living:

First, personal standards of Absolute Honesty, Absolute Purity, Absolute Unselfishness, and Absolute Love; second, confession one to another; third, making amends for wrongs done; and finally, meditation and prayer. Moved by Ebby's witness and curious about the movement, Bill decided to visit Rev. Sam Shoemaker's Oxford group at Calvary Church in New York. There Bill had a powerful spiritual experience that taught him for the first time what it means to be truly sorry, especially for the people like his faithful wife Lois who had been hurt or betrayed by his drinking. Despite efforts toward sobriety, however, Bill found himself back at Towns Hospital yet again in the depths of despair.

Then in his autobiography, he

describes what would be a life-changing event: "I remember saying to myself, 'I'll do anything at all. If there be a Great Physician, I'll call on him.' Then with neither faith nor hope I cried out, 'If there is a God, let him show himself.' The effect was instant, electric. Suddenly my room blazed with an indescribably white light. I was seized with an ecstasy beyond description. Then, seen in the mind's eye, there was a mountain. I stood upon its summit where a great wind blew. A wind, not of air, but of spirit. In great, clean strength it blew right through me. Then came the blazing thought, 'You are a free man'—I became acutely conscious of a presence which seemed like a veritable sea of living spirit. I lay on the shores of a new world. 'This,' I thought, 'must be the great reality. The God of the preachers.'"2 Two crucial pieces to the aftermath of this experience were, first, Dr. Silkworth's assurance that Bill was NOT crazy and that he had had a genuine spiritual experience, and secondly, Ebby's gift of the classic book *Varieties of Religious Experience* by William James. Bill especially was inspired and reassured by James' conviction that "spiritual experience could have objective reality; almost like gifts from the blue, they could transform people. Some were sudden illuminations; others came on very gradually. Some flowed out of religious channels; others did not. But nearly all had the great common denominators of pain, suffering, calamity. Complete hopelessness and deflation at depth were almost always required to make the recipient ready."³

After Bill was discharged from the hospital, the support of Sam Shoemaker and the spiritual guidance of the Oxford Groups continued to influence and inspire him. While on a business trip to Akron, Ohio, Bill worried that he would yield once more to temptation. Remembering how important it had been for him to talk to his friend Ebby, he thought that by being helpful to another drunk he might keep himself from drinking. After calling numerous

churches, he finally was put in touch with Dr. Robert Smith. And, as they say, the rest is history. The meeting worked. Bill stayed sober, and on June 10, 1935, Dr. Bob, as he is fondly called, took his last drink, and Alcoholics Anonymous was born. Bill lived until 1971 when he died of emphysema on his fifty-third wedding anniversary. True to his commitment to seek humility and never claim any power and fame following the tremendous success of AA, his headstone simply reads: William G. Wilson, 1895–1971.

In the spring of 1938, Bill W. wrote the book *Alcoholics Anonymous*, more commonly known as "The Big Book," laying out the Twelve Steps of Alcoholics Anonymous. "Most of the basic ideas," he later wrote, "had come from the Oxford Groups, William James, and Dr. Silkworth. Though subject to considerable variation, it all boiled down into a pretty consistent procedure which comprised six steps. This was the substance of what, by the fall of 1938, we were telling newcomers. I set out to draft more than six steps; how many more I did not know. I relaxed and asked for guidance. With speed that was astonishing, I completed the first draft. It took perhaps half an hour. The words kept right on coming. When I reached a stopping point, I numbered the new steps. They added up to twelve. Somehow this number seemed significant. Without any special rhyme or reason I connected them with the twelve apostles."⁴

Part II

This historical context for Benedict, Bernard, and Bill W. lays the groundwork for the focus of this paper, a comparison of the mystical grounding of Bernard's treatise *The Steps of Humility and Pride* with twelve-step spirituality modeled by Alcoholics Anonymous, today's most successful self-help program within or outside traditional religious societies, which has become the model for over 100 other addiction groups.

I begin with four observations: First, while most of the mainline Protestant denominations, one of which I serve as a pastor, have been declining in membership in recent years, the American culture abounds with support groups for almost every life-changing event or crisis human beings encounter. The most successful self-help organization and the one that forms the model for over 120 self-help groups is Alcoholics Anonymous. Second, AA's twelve steps serve as a paradigm for spiritual development which has deep roots in religious history. This observation is hardly unique and has been articulated by others. At the Convention in St. Louis held in 1955 to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the founding of AA, Bill W. himself acknowledged that "each of AA's principles, *every one of them*, has been borrowed from ancient sources."⁵ In particular, the parallels between AA and western monastic spirituality have not gone unnoted. A contemporary example assembled for the average public is found in a video series entitled "Touch Life Gently," featuring Jesuit Dick Rice, founder of the Loyola Spiritual Direction Center in St. Paul, Minnesota, and Dr. George Mann, Medical Director of St. Mary's Chemical Dependency Services in Minneapolis. Third, while it is not possible to perfectly match up the twelve steps of AA with the twelve steps of *The Rule of Benedict* or Bernard's *Steps of Humility and Pride*, the fundamental principles of the steps manifest striking points of intersection. So what this paper will do is look at an ethos that undergirds monastic spirituality, specifically here in the context of the Cistercian order, as well as the spirituality of AA, and will seek to identify the corresponding principles of that ethos. Finally, while Benedict, Bernard, and Bill W. seem like an unlikely combo, their writings emerged nonetheless from mystical experiences. For those interested in spirituality, this final observation perhaps is the most provocative. Thus we proceed to a

discussion of five of the guiding principles or standards which are fundamental ingredients of the Benedictine tradition, Bernard's treatise, and AA, concentrating extensively on the first and commenting more briefly on the other four.

1. Humility

In *The Steps of Humility and Pride* Bernard begins by making sure that the steps are understood not as an end in themselves but rather as part of the overall goal of finding truth.⁶ That truth about which Bernard speaks, however, is not the truth of science or philosophy or history, but rather is, of course, the truth of faith. For the Christian Bernard, that truth translates to Jesus Christ who is "the way, the truth, and the life." (John 8:12)⁷ Likewise the guidebook of AA, *Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions*, makes it clear that the steps of AA are not of value in and of themselves. The steps are of value because they nurture a spiritual growth which is grounded in kindness, justice, and love⁸ which themselves are grounded in surrender to "the only authority worth having," which is a loving God.⁹ The foundational principle of such faith and spiritual growth, whether in Benedict, Bernard, or AA, is *the principle of humility* grounded in an attitude toward the self, toward others, and toward God.

For Bernard, one's humility begins with "a low opinion of himself because he knows himself well."¹⁰ For Bernard, humility is a virtue that enables us to recognize we are all victims of pride, which is reflected in our selfishness and our misplaced sense of importance. Bernard says that a man seeking self-awareness must "get rid of the beam of pride which blocks out the light from his eye, and then set up in his heart a ladder of humility so that he can search into himself."¹¹ The slippery slope down from humility into a life of pride moves in twelve stages, from initial curiosity about others through envy that begets giddiness and boasting, rapidly becoming self-focus, self-conceit, and

presumption, to self-justification that fosters hypocrisy and an open contempt for others that soon translates to open contempt for God, and the final step of chronic, habitual sinning.¹² Until each of us realizes how slippery this slope is, we will not begin the ascent to humility. So for Bernard, humility begins with an attitude toward the self. Secondly, for Bernard, if we establish a humble attitude with regard to ourselves, then we can nurture a humble attitude toward others which will allow us to model our lives upon the compassion of Christ. Bernard says, "A man who does not live in harmony with his brothers can never really see the truth in others. You will never have real mercy for the failings of another until you know and realize that you have the same failings in your soul. Our Savior has given us the example."¹³ Bernard goes on to say, "When in the light of Truth men know themselves, [they] blush at what they see. They look beyond their own needs to the needs of their neighbors, and from the things they themselves have suffered they learn compassion."¹⁴ Humility, then, is also an attitude toward others.

Finally, for Bernard, a humble attitude toward the self leads to a compassionate attitude toward others, and ultimately to a self-understanding that brings surrender to the power and glory of God. For Bernard, God is "assessor of mind and heart [who] knows everything about you; it is God who molds every heart and takes thought of all we do [Psalm 32:15]"¹⁵ and "the untiring and ever-watchful eye of [God's] extraordinary kindness watches over us."¹⁶ Furthermore, "the world could not subsist without God to whom it owes its very existence."¹⁷

Humility is also at the heart of *The Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions*. Discussing **Step 7**, which is "humbly ask God to remove our shortcomings," Bill W. says, that "humility is the foundation principle of each of AA's Twelve Steps."¹⁸ Like Bernard before him, Bill W. understands humility to be an attitude toward the self, toward God, and toward

others. To advocate humility is extremely counter-cultural today, for in our twenty-first-century world, pride in winning is our cultural norm. AA, however, calls us to a humble attitude, which, as in Bernard, is understood not as a degrading position or low self-esteem but as an attitude that is healing and reconciling. Bill W. says that humility helps us to stop trying to play God, or to rely solely upon our accomplishments, and to remember we are dependent upon God. He says, "We could actually have earnest religious beliefs which remained barren because we were still trying to play God ourselves. As long as we placed self-reliance first, a genuine reliance upon a Higher Power was out of the question. That basic ingredient of all humility, a desire to see and do God's will, was missing."¹⁹

Thus humility toward ourselves leads to humility in the face of God. Speaking at the 1955 St. Louis Convention, Bill W. attributed the miracle of AA's success to the fact that "the principles of AA coincide with the highest precepts that we know, with the fundamental laws of the universe. These principles teach us how to step aside so that God can act through us."²⁰ Humility toward God is expressed succinctly in the first three steps of AA: 1) "We admitted we were powerless over alcohol"; 2) "We came to believe that a Power greater than ourselves could restore us to sanity"; and 3) "We made a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of God," an echo of the second of AA's "Traditions" that the bedrock of AA is that its "sole authority is a loving God."²¹ Bill W. says of his own experience, "Selfishness—self-centeredness! That is the root of our troubles. First of all, we had to quit playing God. Next, we decided that hereafter in this drama of life God was going to be our Director. He is the Principle; we are his agents. [T]his concept was the keystone of the new and triumphant arch through which we passed to freedom."²² To foster such

humility, AA became a group of anonymous people who gain no public benefit from their membership. No causes may be promoted by using the AA name. It is a non-professional, non-profit organization which grounds its public relations in attraction rather than promotion.²³ **Steps 1 to 4**—admitting powerlessness, believing in something greater than yourself, deciding to turn your life over to the care of God, making a searching and honest inventory of yourself—are the means by which this aspect of personal humility is nurtured.

Finally, in twelve-step spirituality humility is an attitude toward others. **Steps 8, 9, and 10** speak specifically to this attitude. In these steps one makes a list of all persons harmed and becomes willing to make amends, and then one makes direct amends to those who have been harmed. *The Big Book* tells us, “The alcoholic is like a tornado roaring his way through the lives of others. Hearts are broken. Sweet relationships are dead. Affections have been uprooted. Selfish and inconsiderate habits have kept the home in turmoil. We feel a man is unthinking when he says that sobriety is enough... [T]here is a long period of reconstruction ahead. A remorseful mumbling that we are sorry won’t fill the bill at all. The spiritual life is not a theory. We have to live it!”²⁴ Elsewhere Bill W. says, “Steps eight and nine are concerned with personal relations... [W]e consider how, with our newfound knowledge of ourselves, we may develop the best possible relations with every human being we know. If we are now about to ask forgiveness for ourselves, why shouldn’t we start out forgiving them, one and all?”²⁵ So for Bernard and Bill W. humility is foundational to a healthy life and is established by an appropriate attitude toward the self, toward others, and toward God.

2. Confession

Confession, whether in a monastery or in AA, depends upon the utmost honesty and absolute integrity. **Step 5**

in Bernard’s *Steps of Humility and Pride* speaks about singularity, a proud esteem of oneself which drives one to present a false image to the world. **Step 5** in *The Rule of Benedict* calls one to confess one’s sins. And **Step 5** in AA is: “Admitted to God, to ourselves, and to another human being the exact nature of our wrongs.” Here in **Step 5** is the heart of our honesty and dishonesty, the heart of our humility and pride. Bernard’s system is rooted in *The Rule of Benedict* where a moral imperative is the confession of one’s sins, the honesty of confession, the letting go of one’s inflated self-image and arrogance. This importance of confession is rooted in scripture, especially the Psalms, and Benedict quotes Psalm 106: “Confess to the Lord because [the Lord’s] mercy endures forever.”²⁶ Boasting and singularity, **Steps 4 and 5** in Bernard, represent the opposite of such honesty and humility. Boasting reflects our lack of interest in anything or anyone but ourselves, and singularity reflects our motives. Bernard says, “When man has been bragging that he is better than others he would feel ashamed of himself if he did not live up to his boast and show how much better than others he is. He does not so much want to be better as to [appear] to be better.”²⁷ So pride undermines honesty and integrity which are essential to humility.

Dick Rice, the Jesuit priest and founder of Loyola Spiritual Direction Center, says that while confession is a fundamental guideline of the twelve steps of AA and is an instrument of attaining honesty, AA’s fifth step differs from the sacrament of confession in the church in the area of culpability. According to Rice, **Step 5** does not ask for forgiveness, whereas confession in the church does. I would contend that this is not accurate. In *The Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions*, we read that **Step 5** “[is] the means by which we [begin] to get the feeling that we [can] be forgiven, no matter what we [have] thought or done. Our moral inventory [has] persuaded us that all-around

forgiveness [is] desirable, but it [is] only when we resolutely [tackle] Step Five that we inwardly [know] we [are] able to receive forgiveness and give it, too.” So it seems clear that forgiveness is indeed a fundamental ingredient of **Step 5** of the Benedictine tradition as well as a fundamental ingredient of the spiritual development accomplished through AA’s twelve steps. The benefits of AA’s **Step 5** are described in this way: “We pocket our pride and go to it, illuminating every twist of character, every dark cranny of the past. We can look the world in the eye. We can be alone at perfect peace and ease. Our fears fall from us. We begin to feel the nearness of our Creator... [W]e begin to have a spiritual experience.”²⁸

3. Prayer

The importance of prayer in both monastic life as well as twelve-step spirituality cannot be overemphasized. Again Bernard’s approach is rooted in *The Rule of Benedict* where prayer is a guiding principle of daily life, and time is marked and sanctified by regular return to prayer. **Step 5** in Bernard, singularity, reflects complete disregard for this fundamental ingredient of monastic life. Bernard says the monk who succumbs to singularity “is very exact about his own particular doings and slack about the common exercises. He will stay awake in bed and sleep in choir.”²⁹ So **Step 5** in our descent into pride manifests itself in complete disregard for the integrity of prayer.

Step 11 in AA declares that sobriety is to be “sought through prayer and meditation to improve our conscious contact with God as we understood Him, praying only for knowledge of His will for us and the power to carry that out.” In AA prayer and meditation are the “principal means of conscious contact with God.” According to Bill W., the fruits of meditation and prayer are emotional balance and a sense of belonging to each other and to God.³⁰

4. Conversion and the Care of Others

Two other important points of

contact between Bernard in his tradition and modern twelve-step spirituality are the constant daily working and reclaiming of the steps and the ultimate purpose of service to others. According to *The Rule of Benedict*, monastic life is an ongoing conversion of life where humility is sought and nurtured in a regulated program that daily and constantly seeks to redirect us from ourselves toward God.³¹ AA also involves an ongoing conversion of life so that everybody is, in the end, on ALL the steps—ALL the time—“one day at a time.” This constant conversion of life taken on a daily basis in the end seeks to mold and shape servants of God who offer their lives for the betterment of others. **Step 12** of AA says: “Having had a spiritual awakening as the result of these steps, we tried to carry this message to alcoholics, and to practice these principles in all our affairs.” For this reason Bill W. says, “The members [of AA] ...are...servants, not senators.”³² And in *The Big Book*, he says, “To be vital, faith must be accompanied by self-sacrifice and unselfish, constructive action. Helping others is the foundation stone of your recovery. A kindly act once in a while isn’t enough. You have to act the Good Samaritan every day, if need be.”³³ **Step 12** in Bernard’s descent into pride reflects complete and total lack of concern for others and being totally consumed by selfishness. In other words, for Bernard the highest form of humility will be reflected in our compassion for others.

Concluding Remarks

While I would never assume that Bill W. knew or read either Benedict or Bernard, although he did at one time study the Roman Catholic tradition, it is nonetheless quite remarkable how similar the ethos, the standards, the guiding principles are between contemporary twelve-step spirituality and the Benedictine tradition. Humility, nurtured by prayer, ownership of one’s wrongdoings, confession, forgiveness,

ongoing dedication to the process, and service to others, seems to be the fundamental ingredient of spiritual progress. We might ask, “So what?” But I would like to ask instead what all of us might learn, regardless of our religious tradition, from this spirituality. Let me suggest a few things for consideration.

1. There is value in taking sin seriously and in taking ownership of our mistakes.
2. Pride and selfishness are universally considered the root of all evil. Going outside ourselves and considering the possibility of something greater than ourselves is a road to healing and wholeness, humility and generosity.

3. One’s spiritual life is a daily process, not a once-in-a-lifetime mountaintop experience.

4. A life of service takes us outside ourselves, undermines selfishness, honors our interdependence, and ultimately benefits the whole of creation.

5. We need each other.

And finally, for myself—as a Christian and as a Presbyterian pastor—in examining the lives and spirituality of these three men who appear to be an unlikely group, I cannot help wondering about the profound and mysterious ways in which that force we in the Christian tradition call the Holy Spirit moves and shapes our lives and our history.

End Notes

¹*The Rule of St. Benedict*, translated, with introduction and notes by Anthony C. Meisel and M.L. del Mastro. (1975) Garden City, NY: Image Books, p.25.

²Wilson, William G. (2000). *Bill W.: My First 40 Years*. Center City, Minnesota: Hazelden, pp.145-146.

³*Alcoholics Anonymous Comes of Age: A Brief History of A.A.* (1985). New York: Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, Inc., p.64.

⁴*Ibid.*, p.161.

⁵*Ibid.*, p.231.

⁶Bernard of Clairvaux. (1989). *The Steps of Humility and Pride* (hereafter noted as Hum), Cistercian Fathers Series: Number Thirteen A. Kalamazoo,

MI: Cistercian Publications, p.29.

⁷*Ibid.*, p.30.

⁸*Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions* (hereafter noted as TSTT) (1952) New York: Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, Inc., p.114.

⁹*Ibid.*, p.132.

¹⁰Hum, p.30.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p.41-43.

¹²*Ibid.*, pp.57, 66-68, 70-77.

¹³*Ibid.*, p.35.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p.45-46.

¹⁵Bernard of Clairvaux. (1981). *On the Song of Songs I*, Cistercian Fathers Series 4. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, p.56.

¹⁶Bernard of Clairvaux. (1981). *Sermons on Conversion: On Conversion, A Sermon to Clerics and Lenten Sermons on the Psalm ‘He Who Dwells’*, Cistercian Fathers Series 25. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, p.243.

¹⁷Bernard of Clairvaux. (1974). *Treatises II: Steps of Humility, On Loving God*, Cistercian Fathers Series 13. Washington, D.C.: Cistercian Publications, p.117.

¹⁸TSTT, p.70.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, pp.70, 72.

²⁰*Alcoholics Anonymous Comes of Age*, pp.228.

²¹TSTT, p.132.

²²*Alcoholics Anonymous: The Story of How Many Thousands of Men and Women Have Recovered from Alcoholism* (also known as *The Big Book*). (1976). New York, NY: Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, Inc., p.62.

²³*Alcoholics Anonymous Comes of Age*, p.198.

²⁴*The Big Book*, pp.82-83.

²⁵TSTT, pp.77-78.

²⁶*The Rule of Benedict VII*, p.59.

²⁷Hum, p.70.

²⁸*The Big Book*, p.75.

²⁹Hum, p.71.

³⁰TSTT, pp.96, 101-102, 105.

³¹*The Rule of Benedict*, p.58.

³²*Alcoholics Anonymous Comes of Age*, p.122.

³³*The Big Book*, pp.93, 97.

Immigration: Is The Melting Pot Boiling Over?

What our experience of dealing with immigration in the past can contribute to our present quest for solutions

By Paul E. Irion



About the Author

Paul Irion is Professor Emeritus of Pastoral Theology at Lancaster Theological Seminary of the United Church of Christ, where he taught for 27 years prior to retirement in 1987. He was educated at Elmhurst College, Eden Theological Seminary, The University of Chicago, with post-graduate study at Oxford and Cambridge Universities. His interest in immigration was piqued by researching his great-grandparents' coming to America from Germany in 1857. The project developed into writing a novel, *That Far Land We Dream About*.

Presented to the Lancaster (PA) Torch Club on June 5, 2007 and at the International Torch Convention on June 29, 2008.

.....

[Note: This essay was delivered to the Lancaster Torch Club just as Congress was debating the 2007 Immigration Bill, which ultimately failed to pass. As the immigration issue remains a dynamic issue, as it was when this paper was given, I have made some modest updates for publication.]

From America's earliest history to the present, this nation of immigrants has been torn by tensions between earlier immigrants and their descendents and subsequent waves of immigrants. The plot of the drama is essentially the same from the seventeenth into the twenty-first centuries; only the actors change. My

thesis is that the similarities of the stories of each of these centuries suggest that our learnings from history have not accrued into a solution for the national problem of immigration. As George Santayana said, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."¹ The issues are always the same, as a 2001 review of current Congressional testimony on immigration observed: "Can the country accommodate the new immigrants? Who benefits from the arrival of the immigrants? Who is harmed? Can the immigrants be absorbed and integrated, or are they simply too 'different' from the rest of the country? Will the country change as a result of the immigrants, and how?"² A brief historical survey, largely based on the work of Prof. Thomas Archdeacon³ of the University of Wisconsin, will identify patterns, events, and reactions mirrored in today's immigration concerns that will support my thesis.

By the early 1600s, the first wave of European immigrants in Jamestown and Massachusetts Bay were greeted by a small number of the estimated half million Native Americans, whose inferior technology kept them from resisting the invasion or assimilating the newcomers. Following a few temporary settlements by Dutch, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Swedes, waves of English immigrants established permanent colonies, founding a colonial society rooted in English law, English traditions, and the English language. Into these early

colonies came Scotch-Irish, German, Welsh immigrants, some arriving as indentured workers to help build America. When more labor was required, a new wave of forced immigration brought hundreds of thousands of African slaves, concentrated in the agricultural South. The European settlers made no effort to assimilate either the Native American or African immigrants. A new sense of American identity emerged as the colonial period ended with the Revolutionary War. Many non-English immigrants had fought in the Continental Army, validating their citizenship in the new country. There had been general acceptance of non-English immigrants until their numbers became significant. Benjamin Franklin in 1751 had decried the growing number of German immigrants in Pennsylvania, warning, "The Palatine boors will Germanize Pennsylvania."⁴ The beginning of the nation marked the beginning of controlled immigration. In 1790 a Naturalization Act was adopted which made immigrants eligible for citizenship only after waiting two years, a limit increased to five years in 1795. The French Revolution had a negative impact on immigration because of fears of political contagion. Though Jefferson and Madison were supportive of the Revolution, Hamilton and Federalists were suspicious. Under President John Adams, fear of European politics produced the Alien and Sedition Acts, under which male immigrants who had

not applied for citizenship could be arrested, imprisoned and deported on orders of the President. Federalists justified this in the interest of national security, arguing that immigrants had no protection under the Constitution. The Alien and Sedition Acts were modified and mostly repealed in 1802.

The 1800s were a time of major westward and industrial expansion. The United States needed workers and actually sent agents to Europe to recruit. Immigrants were welcomed in periods of prosperity. In the nineteenth century more than 15 million immigrants came: 4.4 million Germans, 3.4 million from southern Catholic Ireland; 2.6 million British, and 1 million Scandinavians. When the economy tightened, as it did in frequent financial panics, immigrants kept wages low, and tensions developed between them and American workers. Many cities became full of immigrant ethnic enclaves, often in tenement slums. Unemployment and poverty caused crime to increase in the immigrant population. These close-knit ethnic communities produced gangs, pressured by feeling that they were “outsiders.” The native born came to view immigrants as bad people, rather than understanding the larger social causes: poverty, lack of education, and discrimination.

Many immigrants took part in the Civil War. Twenty-two percent of enlistments in the Union Army were immigrants and ten percent in the Confederate Army. However, at the same time, Irish immigrants instigated draft riots in New York City in 1863, lynching blacks and burning their charitable institutions. The Irish maintained their separate ethnic identity longer than any other English-speaking immigrants, and tended to stay in northeastern cities rather than moving to the frontier. Grievously discriminated against, they fought

back. The Irish mastered the urban political systems, rising to leadership in the Democratic Party and joining the police and fire service through patronage. The Irish also moved into the hierarchy of the American Roman Catholic church. In the 1850s the Know Nothing Party became an anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic political force, gaining sufficient popular support to elect 75 Congressmen and take over several state governments. The Know Nothings wanted immigrants to wait 21 years before applying for citizenship and to be prohibited from holding public office. Most Protestant churches feared Papist domination, becoming virulently anti-Catholic as members recalled the religious strife and persecutions in Europe. Wedge issues of temperance, sabbatarianism, anti-gambling, and tax support for parochial schools flourished. A *de facto* Protestant establishment emerged in spite of *de jure* constitutional separation of church and state, beginning with Puritans and lasting until the Kennedy era.

Following the Civil War, large numbers of Chinese were brought in to the far west to build transcontinental railroads, but when that work was done, strong negative reaction stopped Chinese immigration with Exclusion Acts in the 1880's. Throughout the nineteenth century the ethnic cleansing of American Indians pushed them west of Mississippi; then as the West was settled, pushed them onto reservations. Resistance was put down brutally. Reservation life brought a concerted effort to obliterate Indian culture, particularly in children and youth. At the same time, emancipated southern Blacks were being exploited by the carpetbaggers, with little Federal support for adequate freedmen's education, leaving most freed slaves only fit for unskilled labor. In the subsequent backlash to

Reconstruction, the South became the scene of the Ku Klux Klan, Jim Crow, inadequate segregated schools, and lynchings, while the North practiced *de facto* segregation and political exploitation. No serious effort was made to integrate Blacks into the social order, or even into the work force. White fears of low wage competition and miscegenation were rampant. Meanwhile, European immigrants gradually were assimilated into the work force and the social structure. As long as immigrants met the norms of prevailing English domination, they could be assimilated. They had to accept implicitly the supremacy of Protestantism and conform reasonably to the moral disciplines advocated by the establishment, allowing their European traditions to slowly disappear.⁵ States began taxing immigrants and passing anti-immigration laws. In the Immigration Act of 1891 the Federal government established control of immigration. Immigrants had to be here five years before becoming citizens or voting.

The period from 1890 to 1920 saw heavy immigration, mostly from countries not part of earlier immigration waves: southern and eastern Europeans, Jews, Asians, Mexicans, and many others. This early twentieth century wave increased the heterogeneity and complexity of the American population. Archdeacon writes, “Many Americans, all descendents of immigrants, did not see this as the fulfillment of the nation's destiny but as a threatening departure from the social and cultural homogeneity necessary for unity and stability. In their opinion, something had to be done to control the influx of newcomers and to prevent what they feared was the mongrelization of the American identity.”⁶ This period of increased immigration prompted efforts to control the influx by law,

often rationalized with the notion of returning America to a mythic pristine state. As an increase in social problems such as poverty and alcoholism afflicted the newer immigrant population, a kind of social Darwinism, popular at the time, led to the assumption that descendents of earlier immigrants were superior to the later wave, who were less educated, poorer, less politically savvy. Anti-immigrant sentiment reflected resistance to non-Protestant or non-Christian newcomers, as well as latent or overt racism resisting the coming of non-whites, often expressed as fear of corrupting bloodlines through interracial marriage. At a time of social ferment in Europe, American labor unrest was attributed to immigrant socialists and anarchists. As the frontier disappeared, the end of westward expansion brought a growing perception of limits. Meanwhile, developing industrial technology was reducing the need for unskilled labor.

Japanese immigration, largely in Hawaii and California, was curbed in a negotiated diplomatic arrangement called the Gentlemen's Agreement, in which Japan pledged not to issue passports to laborers who wanted to come to the US. California passed laws prohibiting Japanese from leasing or owning farmland. In the 1920s the call to defend American values was raised by fundamentalists, prohibitionists, and the Ku Klux Klan. In 1921 Congress limited immigration from each European country to 3% of its natives counted in the 1910 census with a total of 357,000 annually. Three years later it was reduced to 2 % of natives in the 1890 census, limited to 150,000 annually. The new ethnic quotas favored the nations of origin of the older waves. This clearly discriminated against the twentieth century wave. This stance was basically reaffirmed in the McCarran-

Walters Immigration Act of 1952. As they entered WWII, Americans questioned much less the loyalty of unassimilated German immigrants and their descendents than they had in WW I.⁷ This time anxiety focused on the more recently arrived Japanese, whose loyalty was questioned. When Nazism forced many Jews to become refugees in the late 1930s, they found no welcome in America. After the War, the United States admitted 200,000 displaced persons, 40% from Baltic countries. In 1950 there were 340,000 non-quota DPs admitted.

In our present day, many immigrants come through legal channels. In 1965 under Lyndon Johnson the national quota system was dropped when the McCarran-Walters Act was amended. Annually, there could be 170,000 from the Eastern Hemisphere, no more than 20,000 from any country, with 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere. Admissions reflected preference for skilled workers, professionals, and relatives of citizens. However, political crises created a new concern for refugees, so an additional 17,400 were authorized annually. But major political eruptions produced the admission of many more refugees: 30,000 from Hungary in 1965; 650,000 from Cuba in the 1960s and 1970s; and 360,000 Indochinese between 1975 and 1980. In the 1990's more immigrants came than in any other decade, due to legislative increases in legal admission ceilings, acceptance of political refugees, and, of course, large scale undocumented immigration (which really cannot be measured).

Some groups advocate restricting all immigration. For example, the website www.21stCenturyPaulRevereRide.us quotes the Center for Immigration Studies (claiming "a pro-immigrant, low-immigration vision which seeks few immigrants but a warmer welcome for those admitted"):

"The average immigrant costs the US taxpayer \$55,000 over a lifetime in social services.... Because much immigrant income is under the table, \$301 billion is lost to income taxes not collected. 1.5 million children of illegal immigrants each cost taxpayers \$7,000 annually for schools and billions for medical services. As the world population grows by 85 million annually, there is no end to the line of desperate people trying to gain access to the US."⁸

[A Parenthetical Caveat: It is very important to evaluate sources in the immigration debate. It is wise to Google the name of the source and carefully examine its website, mission statement, and significant individuals in its governance to determine which sources are authoritative.]

In dealing with immigration we face massive problems at four levels:

1. Shaping our national attitude toward immigration. As the preceding historical survey and the recent Congressional debate show, this is still unfinished business on the national agenda. The option of open borders is supported by some, who cite the original historical precedent, even though only highly skilled and low wage agricultural and construction jobs are available. The mythos of America sees it as the refuge for those seeking freedom, as noted in an interesting article in *The Wilson Quarterly*⁹ on the history of the Statue of Liberty, which was a gift of the French people to America in the centennial year, 1876, as a symbol of the ideal of *liberty* characterizing the American and French Revolutions. It had no associations with immigration. Linking the Statue to immigration began in 1886, when in a fund raiser to build the platform, the familiar "Give me your tired, your poor..." sonnet by Emma Lazarus was auctioned, remaining obscure until 1903, when an admirer of her father

had the words put on a bronze plaque placed in an out-of-the-way interior wall of the platform. Many Americans mistakenly now think it is inscribed on the tablet held in the left arm of the Statue. It got attention only after Louis Adamic, an American journalist, wrote a series of articles on immigrants in the 1930s and quoted the sonnet several times. This romantic view is poetic license: not all immigrants came seeking freedom, many were just looking for work; not all were tired, poor, wretched refuse; not all intended to settle permanently. However, this poem certainly does provide emotional mythic support for open borders.

Shaping immigration policy in our time involves reviewing our national quota system for regulating immigration. Most agree that it is desirable to maintain control in an orderly way. Immigration controls have always been arbitrary. We have moved from open borders to national quotas, to hemispheric quotas. We have given priority to relatives of citizens, to needed professionals. We have made pressing exceptions for refugees. Some have suggested declaring a moratorium on immigration, hanging out the No Vacancy sign until we can solve some of the problems of regulation and assimilation of immigrants already here. The problem has become so massive that it is going to take time to reach resolution. Unquestionably, we need to sort out the shape of our national attitude toward immigration. Obviously, we are lacking consensus.

2. Refining policies governing the assimilation of legal immigrants. Our current ideology of cultural pluralism has contended with the expectation of assimilation, posing the second major problem of immigration policy. In the past several decades some social scientists have questioned the romantic notion of homogeneity, the metaphor of the melting-pot,

because it encouraged the obliteration of immigrant cultures. Many ethnic groups wanted to preserve elements of their own culture: holidays, cuisine, and language. Immigration scholars like Archdeacon have proposed a new metaphor, the mosaic, where many diverse identifiable ethnic elements are valued for contributing to one picture, one nation. We have to ask seriously: is homogeneity a romantic illusion? What have we learned from assimilation of former waves? We know from our own family experiences that successive waves of immigrants, especially their second and third generations, were by and large assimilated. While we may retain a few vestiges of our ethnic background, we have become part of the American mainstream.

But the record of assimilation is not a total success. We must admit that, in spite of the relatively successful assimilation of European immigrants, as Archdeacon writes, "In practice race has been a much more fundamental factor than ethnicity for most of America's history. Race has pointed to more striking and immutable differences; racism has had a more fixed, focused target than the changing collection of ethnic prejudices has had, and the existence of a strong color line has provided a reliable criterion for the implementation of institutionalized discrimination."¹⁰ History demonstrates that the major difficulties of assimilation have involved people of color: American Indians, African-Americans, Hispanics, and Asians. For instance, although courts and protests reduced discrimination against blacks, only blacks who were able to rise to the middle class benefited. A great many blacks have not assimilated despite the removal of racial barriers. Laws ended segregation but did not end prejudice. We need to learn from these significant assimilation failures, as well as from examples of successful

integration.

We are finding, as in the past, that is one of the challenges of assimilation. As successive waves of immigrants gave up their native language and began to use English, earlier foreign language communities declined. The second generation became bilingual, while the third generation used English almost exclusively, and foreign language newspapers and churches disappeared. Multiculturalism has brought new tension to the problem of language assimilation. Today's official accommodation to the Spanish language of the Latino immigrants in lieu of learning English is a sign that learning English has weakened as a mark of assimilation. Business establishments become bi-lingual to court Hispanic customers. The government provides literature, signage, services, legal forms, even ballots in English and Spanish. This new emphasis on bilingualism is often resisted as a barrier to assimilation, carrying with it a corresponding dilution of the unifying force of the English language in America. Will this change the phenomenon of second and third generations becoming Anglophones? Ironically, the US Constitution was first printed in Philadelphia in both English and German, and in 1831 the Pennsylvania legislature allowed public school instruction in English OR German. Assimilation takes time. Do we need more patience, or will the accommodation of Spanish speaking immigrants increasingly "ghettoized" in ethnic communities, make assimilation unlikely?

3. Gaining control of borders to curtail illegal immigration. Dealing with immigration at this third level has often proved ineffective. Prior efforts to tighten the borders by the Reagan administration in the 1980s did not stop illegal immigration. Congress recently authorized deployment of the

National Guard and building a wall along much of the Mexican border. Passports are being required, even of US citizens, to enter from Canada. Total border control would require draconian measures; a fortified wall with shoot-to-kill enforcement, by a nation that decried the Berlin Wall.

4. Dealing with the millions of undocumented persons already within our borders. This fourth issue facing immigration policy poses a tough question. What are we to do with illegal immigrants already here? Antagonists want to punish and deport them. Supporters want to find a way to make them Americans. It is estimated that 500,000 illegal immigrants enter annually; the total number already here estimated between 11 and 14 million: it is estimated that 50% of the undocumented are Mexican, 25% are other Latin Americans, and 20% from many countries have overstayed their visas.¹¹ This no longer affects just border states; there are now significant populations of undocumented immigrants in most states.

A number of options are advanced for coping with undocumented immigrants. One is to pressure them to return to their homelands by making life here difficult or to capture and deport them. (221,664 were deported in 2006.) In 1996, Federal welfare reform limited access to the welfare system for many categories of non-citizens. Responsibility devolved on the states, making a heavy burden for some. California passed Proposition 187, which denied undocumented immigrants access to public schools, medical care and other social services and required reporting of undocumented aliens to authorities. It was enjoined in Federal Court and died after a new governor refused to appeal. Recently the Virginia House of Delegates voted 70 to 29 that no organization receiving state or local

funds “shall use those funds to provide benefits or assistance to ineligible persons such as undocumented immigrants.”¹² Hazelton, PA is seeking legal validation for ordinances strongly discriminating against employment or housing for undocumented immigrants. In one of the Immigration and Naturalization Service raids across the country on plants employing the undocumented workers, 10% of the Swift work force was arrested and detained. *NY Times* editorial on June 3, 2008 points out that these detainees are just being warehoused in jails all over the country without legal representation. “Every time this country has singled out a group of newly arrived immigrants for unjust punishment, the shame has echoed across history.”¹³ The *NY Times* on June 9, 2008 reported that local police forces in a number of states are taking matters into their own hands, arresting and jailing undocumented Hispanics.¹⁴

The other approach to the issue of undocumented immigrants is to work toward some reasonable assimilation. Some advance a humanitarian approach. Reagan gave amnesty in 1980s. This solved the problem temporarily, but did not stop illegal immigration. It is pointed out that if we legitimize by amnesty, the tendency is for new citizens to start bringing extended family members—so it increases chain immigration. Rather than blanket amnesty, the unsuccessful 2007 Senate bill proposed a system in which most undocumented persons already here could earn the right to become citizens over a period of years if they followed an arduous procedure: a \$5000 fine, background check, and temporary return to the country of origin by the head of the household to make application.

In addition to the four levels we have been discussing for dealing with

immigration issues, there is another which has not received as much serious attention as it deserves. That is the approach of addressing the problem at its source in the countries of origin. There is incredible poverty in the countries from which people try to escape. Archdeacon asserts, “Probably the most effective way to control undocumented immigration is to make it unnecessary by actively encouraging the quick development of nearby donor nations. The US will have to do much to improve the level of general education and of medical knowledge in neighboring countries.”¹⁵ The endemic poverty in Latin American countries must be approached from two directions: economic development and population control. Support for local economies can make immigration for employment unnecessary. But this is not an easy solution. Promoting private investment by US companies poses problems for Americans, because it means more outsourcing of American jobs. Removing or reducing tariffs can support productive economies in Latin America but disadvantages American products. NAFTA has not reduced undocumented immigration. These measures have not provided sufficient economic development and employment opportunities to eradicate or reduce the serious poverty of the Latin countries. This raises the second avenue for reducing poverty in nations to our south. As part of the massive population explosion in Latin America, the birthrate in Mexico is two to three times that of the United States.¹⁶ It seems to assure massive unemployment and poverty for decades to come. Birth control is not easy in the face of religious and cultural opposition both in those countries and in the current United States government. China was able to remove the scourge of famine only by draconian limits on family size. Such

a solution seems unlikely in Latin America.

The difficulty of accomplishing these economic and social solutions reinforces the position of those who simply want to bar the door, build an impervious wall, fortify the border, severely punishing anyone who slips through. One suggestion which would somewhat moderate the impact of such stringent border control is a guest worker program proposed by the recent legislation, which would permit temporary admission to meet our need for well-trained, low-salary computer technicians, or low-wage, low-skilled agricultural and construction workers. Europe has used guest workers extensively following the loss of manpower in World War II, but in time problems have developed because these workers have not been assimilated, remain ethnically identified and marginalized. Let us be candid. Guest worker proposals are not designed to relieve poverty in Latin America but to meet the needs of American employers. This is not new. Fifty years ago a similar approach, the *bracero* program, became synonymous with worker abuse. Not only were the vulnerable temporary workers exploited by unscrupulous employers, their low wages undercut the wage structure of American workers.

But we do not have to repeat past mistakes. The immigration bill the Senate passed in 2006 (which was roundly rejected by the House) contained many more protections against the exploitation of guest workers than the compromise bill which failed in 2007. Instead of enabling workers to change jobs to avoid abusive employers and empowering them to alert authorities to mistreatment as in the 2006 bill, the old *bracero* program is recreated with the additional feature of having to

return home for a year after every two years of guest working. There is no longer any mention of guest workers having to be paid the prevailing wage to prevent undercutting American workers. To achieve bipartisan compromise, portions of the 2006 bill were sizably modified or eliminated.¹⁷ The problems of immigration seem almost insurmountable, demonstrated by the fact that for more than three centuries we have confronted the same issues and have repeatedly failed to find lasting solutions. "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." So we cannot abandon the quest for solutions. Our major challenge is: how do we profit from the lessons of dealing with past immigration, both the positive and the negative lessons. Most earlier waves of immigrants were successfully assimilated, although not without constructive efforts on the part of both earlier arrivals and the newcomers. The best thing we can do personally is to refine our own attitudes toward present immigration with fairness and thoughtfulness, to reduce the level of hysterical xenophobia, to approach the complex problems ethically as well as pragmatically, to encourage a civil discourse which will embolden legislators to devise and pass creatively innovative remedies without fear of being voted out of office. I almost hesitate to use the word "comprehensive" because it has become a partisan term. But a many-faceted, comprehensive approach seems the only path to dealing constructively with this vast systemic problem. We have to take seriously the *legitimate*, yet *conflicting*, concerns of many groups (employers, American workers, unions, legal and illegal immigrants). Slogans and Band-aids or cynical pandering to special interests will not do the job. Truly, national good will is the only answer.

References

- 1 Santayana, Georges. (1905). *Life of Reason, Reason in Common Sense*, New York: Scribner's, p.284.
- 2 Fix, Michael E.; & Jeffrey S. Passel. (Aug. 2, 2001). "U.S. Immigration at the Beginning of the 21st Century," published on the web by The Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=900417>. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims Hearing on "The U.S. Population and Immigration" Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives.
- 3 Archdeacon, Thomas J. (1983). *Becoming American: An Ethnic History*. New York: The Free Press.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 20.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 93.
- 6 *Ibid.*, 142.
- 7 *Ibid.*, 166.
- 8 Center for Immigration Studies website. www.cis.org
- 9 *The Wilson Quarterly* (summer 2006), 44-47.
- 10 Archdeacon, 234.
- 11 Passel, Jeffrey S.; Randolph Capps; & Michael E. Fix. "Undocumented Immigrants: Facts and Figures." Urban Institute Immigration Studies, 1. www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=1000587
- 12 Lyall, Nancy; & Teresita Jacinto. (February 15, 2007). "In Virginia, the Harm of an Anti-Immigrant Bill." *The Washington Post*, A27.
- 13 *New York Times*. (June 3, 2008). Editorial.
- 14 Damien Cave. (June 9, 2008). "States Take a New Tack on Illegal Immigration." *New York Times*.
- 15 Archdeacon, 246.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 243
- 17 Morgula, Janet. (Sunday, February 11, 2007). "A Change of Heart on Guest Workers." *The Washington Post*. www.washingtonpost.com.

Appearance vs. Reality: Plato's Problem— Our Problem

Platonic dualism has attracted thinkers for 2,400 years, but is it valid?

By Allan Powell



About the Author

Allan Powell received a BS degree from Anderson College and Theological Seminary and an MS from Ball State University. He has earned extensive post graduate credits at Maryland University. A teacher for forty-one years, Powell was named Professor Emeritus in Philosophy by Hagerstown Community College. He was also awarded four outstanding young educator certificates. During his teaching career, Professor Powell has authored six books on the French and Indian War period and one book on philosophical theology. In WWII, Powell was a gunner in a PBY flying boat, serving as reconnaissance anti-sub patrol in the Solomon Islands. He has served as President of the Hagerstown Torch Club for three separate terms and is currently Director-at-Large for Membership on the Board of IATC.

Presented to the Hagerstown Torch Club on November 20, 2007.

.....

Introduction

In the February 24, 2005 issue of the *Washington Post*, veteran reporter David Broder tells the story about an attempt to reclaim high school dropouts. This human reclamation project begins by introducing seriously at-risk students to the writings of Plato and Malcolm X. At first glance there seems to be little in common between the venerable ancient and a modern rabble rouser. But the teacher, Aurora del Val at Portland Community College, in a project sponsored by the Bill and Melinda Gates

Foundation, assigns readings in Philosophy classes linking Plato's timeless allegory of the cave and Malcolm X's claim that his intellectual freedom began when he entered prison and discovered its library. Of what educative value is a comparison of a troubled black civil rights activist and an allegory first told in an olive grove near Athens about 400 BCE?

The purpose of this paper is to evaluate some of Plato's ideas which illustrate his solution to the problem of being a prisoner of appearances imposed by the senses, not unlike the problem of a prisoner of society whose cell appears to be all there is. Each individual must decide if Plato's use of reason leads to the discovery of reality. Also included are several modern illustrations of the clash between appearance and reality which may be helpful in judging Platonism.

Appearance vs. Reality: Plato's Allegory of the Cave

We are all, philosophers and ordinary citizens alike, aware of the difficulty of being assured that we are not fooled by appearances. We hope that our opinions represent "reality" without a critical analysis of what the word "reality" might mean. Perceptive people readily recognize that our senses are faulty, that we selectively perceive events, and that unstable persons are delusional about the pink elephants they claim to "really" see. Few of us have not at one time or another been fooled by the alignment of parallel lines in perspective, such as railroad tracks which "really" appear to converge in the distance.

An understanding of how our

As Socrates put it: "The unexamined life is not worth living."

perceptions do not square with reality is a rather innocent introduction to Plato's problem. In Book VII of *The Republic* Plato introduces the reader to the oft-used allegory of the cave. He has us imagine that we humans are prisoners in a cave, bound in a fixed position on the floor facing a white wall. Behind the prisoners is a raised platform upon which persons carry cut-out models representing people and objects known in everyday experience—a horse, a human figure, etc. Still further to the rear is a fire whose light casts shadows of these models on the wall of the cave. Since these prisoners cannot see the source of these images, they mistakenly suppose these shadows are real objects. This condition is permanent – we, like the prisoners, are condemned to live out our existence as though in a cave – unable to perceive reality.

How can we have an ideal Republic in such a situation? Only an adequate plan of education can meet the demands of such a condition. In Plato's educational plan—elitist and designed to produce a meritocracy—all citizens in the Republic would be eligible for a common curriculum of gymnastics and music. At age twenty those who showed promise would be eligible to move on to the study of the sciences—arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. At age 30, those recognized as able would be given five years of study in philosophy, with an emphasis on reasoning. Then would follow a fifteen-year period of exposure

to worldly experience. During this training period they would be observed for aptitudes in civic affairs. Upon reaching the age of fifty the most able would then be qualified to become rulers, or “philosopher-kings.” This, Plato says, provides the best arrangement we can hope for in a life governed by an illusive search for reality.

Plato’s Copy Theory of Reality

It will be recalled that in the allegory of the cave Plato regarded the shadows on the wall of the cave as mere appearances. These shadows were projected shadows of figures behind the prisoners and hence unknown. Plato then adds some very surprising elements to the story. Assuming that the prisoner could glance to the side and see an actual horse, apprehended by the senses as “existing,” Plato notes that there is still an “idea” of what a horse is that one can only infer from his perception of a copy or example of one. This copy, although “real” to the senses, is for Plato only an appearance of the horse “idea” that exists apart from experience. Such “ideas” or “forms” are for Plato the only true reality. Needless to say, this is a bold set of claims that goes against common sense. There are other features of Plato’s thinking which are questionable to those of a more empirical outlook. The idea that our senses only produce opinions while reason alone gives truth is surely open for debate. The association of transience with sensory data, and reason with what is eternal, is also a real stretch for many. Plato tries to give empiricism a drubbing.

How is it possible to explain satisfactorily the prevalence of dualistic beliefs which assert with assurance a “higher” (although unseen and unknowable) order of reality, with the material realm relegated to a backseat as a “lower” order of being? The power and influence of Platonism has always been a mystery to me but its persistence shows that Plato has tapped into a human need buried deep in the human psyche

to believe in an ideal “Other.” One can also account for the success of Platonic idealism because of its incorporation into Christianity, biblically and theologically. A ready example is found in St. Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians, chapter IV, lines 16-18:

So we do not lose heart. Though our outer nature is wasting away, our inner nature is being renewed every day. For this momentary affliction is preparing for us an eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison, because we look not to the things that are seen but to the things that are unseen; for the things that are seen are transient, but the things that are unseen are eternal.

This sure looks like a page taken directly from Plato. St. Paul certainly had plenty of chances to become acquainted with Platonism. He traveled to several Greek cities, including Athens, as he spread his new found faith. It is apparent that Plato is alive and well in the world of ideas. But it is important to take a very brief and critical look at Plato’s idealism.

Conclusions

It should be no surprise that the ancient issue of appearance vs. reality will not go away. In maturing, each person must find anew how to sort out the subjectively real from the objectively real. Each generation must wrestle with increasingly complicated situations. Those who supposed that time, space and mass were fixed “realities” must gasp in amazement to read that time is not a thing but an “event” of motion in space. Instead of a ubiquitous river flowing from past to present to future, time turns out to be a purely local event. What we call an hour is actually a measurement in space.

A year is one rotation of the earth in its orbit. But if we happened to live on Mercury, things would be much different. It takes eighty-eight of our days for Mercury to complete its orbital journey around the sun. At the same time it rotates once on its axis. Thus, a year and a day are the same – on Mercury. In

a word, there is no universal simultaneity of time. Time is more akin to a verb than a noun. Mass also appears to be a fixed entity — a brute, hard reality. But physicists have peered behind this hard reality and discovered that its molecules may be reduced to atoms and these in turn to subatomic particles. These infinitely tiny particles are “really” energy. The famous formula presented by Albert Einstein, $E = MC^2$, reminds us that in nature there is an equivalence of mass and energy. Like time, mass is not what it used to be.

With everything in flux it is not surprising that human beings react as did Blaise Pascal who cried out in his memorable essay, *Penses*:

We sail on a vast expanse of being, ever uncertain, ever drifting, ever hurried from one goal to another. If we seek to attach ourselves to any one point, it totters and fails us; if we follow it eludes our grasp, vanishing forever. Nothing stays for us, this is our natural condition most contrary to our inclination, for we burn with desire to find a steadfast place and a fixed basis wherein we may build. But our whole foundation breaks up and the abysses open before us

Another feature of my conclusions is the recognition that some very able minds simply do not accept Plato’s idea of parallel worlds that are radically different from each other. Two instances will suffice to illustrate the point. Albert Einstein, in his 1950 publication, *Out Of My Later Years*, asserts (p. 28):

The more a man is imbued with the ordered regularity of events the firmer becomes his conviction that there is no room left by the side of this ordered regularity for causes of a different nature. For him neither the rule of human nor the rule of divine will exist as an independent cause of natural events.

Likewise, in a recent (2004) publication, the eminent scientist Richard Dawkins questions Plato’s ideas. In *The Ancestor’s Tale* (p.308), he flatly asserts:

Plato, whose philosophy can be seen as the inspiration for Essentialism, believed that actual things are imperfect versions of an ideal archetype of their kind. Hanging somewhere in ideal space is an essential perfect rabbit, which bears the same relation to a real rabbit as a mathematician's circle bears to a circle drawn in the dust. To this day many people are deeply imbued with the idea that sheep are sheep and goats are goats, and no species can ever give rise to another because to do so they'd have to change their 'essence'. There is no such thing as essence....

I would like to conclude this critical portion of my paper with a very brief statement about why informed, intelligent people might gain by sharpening their perceptions about the problem of appearance vs. reality. Both examples—taken from the domain of religion—are useful because of the emergence of televised evangelism. Specifically, I am referring to faith healing and “speaking in tongues.” With regard to faith healing, there certainly appears to be healing as row after row of those who claim a wide range of illnesses publicly testify that they are “healed.” But Dr. William Nolen, who has studied faith healing throughout his professional career, avers that he cannot produce evidence that one certified case of organic healing by a faith healer actually occurred. No doctors were present to certify that the claimed sicknesses were valid claims. Equally important, there was no follow-up to verify whether there may have been a relapse. Dr. Nolen in *Healing: A Doctor In Search of a Miracle* (p.308) has this to say:

Two years ago I began looking for a healing miracle. When I started my search I hoped to find some evidence that someone, somewhere, had supernatural powers that he or she could employ to cure those patients we doctors, with all our knowledge and training, must still label “incurable.” As I have said before, I have been unable to find any such miracle worker.

A more recent exhaustive study of faith healers by James Randi offers the same result. Using sophisticated monitoring devices in analyzing the methods used by several well-known spiritual healers, Randi has no confidence in their claims. In his 1987 publication, *The Faith Healers* (p.292), he bluntly declares:

The claims made by faith healers are nothing more than hollow boasts and do not stand up to examination. Prepared culturally to expect miracles, convinced they are helpless without supernatural intervention, and bullied into supporting their gurus far beyond their means, the pathetic victims of the healers have become a disillusioned subculture playing a dangerous game. “The Healing Show,” with its cruel lies, promises and glittering trickery, has blinded them to reality and removed them from productive society. They are the dupes of clever glib, highly organized swindlers who are immune from justice and are confidently aware of that fact.

With respect to the practice of “speaking in unknown tongues” it is not difficult to produce the appearance of strange verbal activity. But those who study this unusual style of religious expression are not convinced that this behavior is the result of being “filled with the Holy Spirit.” The way glossolalia (as it is called by psychiatrists) is perceived by students of abnormal behavior is most unflattering. The reality is that these utterances erupt during a state of religious ecstasy and are considered to be “fabricated languages.” These ecstatic expressions, also called neologisms (newly created words) and “word salads,” are interpreted to signify regression to childish behavior which, while acceptable—even praiseworthy—in a religious context, would be recognized as abnormal conduct in other settings. The *Psychiatric Dictionary* (p.302) makes a direct association with abnormality in noting that “glossolalia

is most often seen in ecstatic and somnambulistic states, and somewhat less commonly in schizophrenia.” Enough has been given to indicate the difference between divine communication (appearance) and crowd behavior involving unstable and suggestible seekers of ecstasy (reality).

As we conclude this brief examination of Plato's allegory it might be instructive to reflect on Plato's own pessimism about the possibility of escaping from the cave of appearance to the sunlight of reality. This is not a good option because, once exposed to the open sunlight, the escapee would be blinded by the light after being so long accustomed to the darkness of the cave. What is worse, assuming for the moment that the prisoner actually saw the true realities outside the cave, he would, no doubt, be regarded as a lunatic and possibly murdered when he reentered the cave to share his newfound vision. This was not idle speculation when it is recalled what happened to his beloved friend Socrates. But we must desperately try to escape our cave of shadows. As Socrates put it: “The unexamined life is not worth living.”

Bibliography

Bodanis, David. (2000). *E = MC²: A Biography Of The World's Most Famous Equation*. New York: Walker & Company.

Campbell, Robert, J. (Ed.). (1996). *Psychiatric Dictionary* (7th Ed.) New York: Oxford University Press.

Dawkins, Richard. (2004). *The Ancestor's Tale*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Einstein, Albert. (1950). *Out Of My Later Years*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Mead, Hunter. (1959). *Types and Problems Of Philosophy*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Nolen, William, MD. (1974). *Healing: A Doctor In Search Of A Miracle*. New York: Random House.

Randi, James. (1987). *The Faith Healers*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books.

In Defense of Buck Weaver

After 78 years of oblivion it's time to restore the good name of a legendary baseball hero.

By John Fockler, Jr.



About the Author

John Fockler, Jr., admits to having wasted a good part of the 1980's in the upper deck at Cleveland Municipal Stadium. Anyone who remembers the Indians teams of that era knows that was less entertainment than penance. Fockler holds a BA in history from Colgate University. He has spent twenty-five years in the hotel industry in Ohio and Pennsylvania, and taught Hotel Front Office Procedures at Youngstown State University. He served the Akron Torch Club as president in 2007-08, and currently serves as president of the Youngstown Torch Club. Fockler is also chairing the committee organizing the 2010 IATC Convention in Youngstown. This is his fifth appearance in *The Torch*.

Presented to the Youngstown Torch Club on April 16, 2007 and to the Akron Torch Club on May 7, 2007.

.....
Regardless of the verdicts of juries, no player who throws a ball game, no player that undertakes or promises to throw a ball game, no player that sits in conference with a bunch of crooked players and gamblers where the ways and means of throwing games are discussed and does not promptly tell his club about it, will ever play professional baseball.

With these words spoken in 1921 by Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis, the baseball careers of eight men were consigned to oblivion. Landis was the newly-anointed Commissioner of Baseball. The eight men were members of the Chicago White Sox who were alleged to have thrown the 1919 World Series to the Cincinnati Reds, an event usually referred to as the "Black Sox

The American League pennant race that year was closely contested between the White Sox and the Cleveland Indians.

Scandal." They were pitchers Eddie Cicotte and Claude "Lefty" Williams, first baseman Arnold "Chick" Gandil, shortstop Charles "Swede" Risberg, utility infielder Fred McMullin, outfielders Oscar "Happy" Felsch and "Shoeless" Joe Jackson, and third baseman George "Buck" Weaver. My purpose in presenting this paper is to review the facts of the scandal, so far as they can be known, and to make a case that one member of the "Black Sox," Buck Weaver, should not have been banned from the game then, and should be pardoned by baseball officials now. Ninety years since these events, this story is still as fresh as the latest Washington scandal. Two of my sources have been published since 2005. For many years, the general source was Eliot Asinof's book, *Eight Men Out*, published in 1963 when it was widely believed that the main facts of the case were well established. The discovery of new documents since then has only made the conclusions seem less certain.

The White Sox were the betting favorites going into the 1919 World Series, which that year was a best-five-of-nine contest. Rumors of a fix were so well known in the gambling world that by the time the Series opened on October 1, 1919, the odds on the Series in some cities had swung over to favor the Reds. Word of the fix had certainly reached baseball's powers-that-be, and White Sox manager William "Kid"

Gleason addressed the subject at a team meeting before game two. His players assured him that everything was "on the level." The Sox lost games one and two, pitched by Cicotte and Williams respectively, won game three behind Dickie Kerr, a rookie pitcher not in on the fix, and lost four and five, again behind Cicotte and Williams. Kerr won again in game six and Cicotte won game seven. Williams then lost game eight (and the Series), getting shelled in the first inning. Suspecting that something might be happening, Hugh Fullerton, a sportswriter for a Chicago paper, and Christy Mathewson, the former Reds manager and future Hall-of-Famer who covered the Series for a New York paper, had agreed in advance to keep separate scorecards during the Series and to mark plays they found "suspicious." Several suspect players, including Felsch, Cicotte and Gandil, made fielding errors that some observers thought smelled fishy. According to some reports, fiery White Sox catcher Ray Schalk physically attacked "Lefty" Williams after game two because he felt Williams had deliberately crossed him up by not throwing the pitches Schalk had called. Although reports of a fix continued to air in the press throughout the off-season, other members of the press defended the White Sox. White Sox owner Charles Comiskey repeatedly claimed the Series had been honest, although he certainly knew better, and even offered a \$10,000 reward for proof that a fix had occurred. However, Comiskey withheld the World Series shares of the eight accused players, and reportedly hired a detective agency to trail seven players; all of the accused except Buck Weaver. According to Asinof, Comiskey told Fullerton after the Series loss, "There are seven boys

who will never play ball on this team again.” Asinof says, “Apparently, in counting seven rather than eight players, Comiskey had – and with reason – left out Buck Weaver.”

How was the fix arranged? “Sleepy” Bill Burns, a former White Sox pitcher known to have gambling connections, said the idea came from Gandil and/or Cicotte. One or the other of these players then contacted Burns and his partner, a former player and boxer named Billy Maharg. Other sources claim the fix originated with Burns and Maharg who then contacted the players. In either of these scenarios, Burns and Maharg apparently approached a former featherweight boxing champion named Abe Attell in order to finance the scheme. Attell conveyed the idea to his boss, Arnold Rothstein, a New Yorker who was probably the best-known gambler of the day and someone who was easily capable of bankrolling the fix. Once again, sources disagree on how the deal was set up. The players in on the fix apparently never received all of the money they were promised, but beyond question some money did find its way from gamblers to the players. No action was taken by any authority during the off-season, and all of the suspect players except Gandil returned to the White Sox for the 1920 season. The American League pennant race that year was closely contested between the White Sox and the Cleveland Indians. According to most sources, White Sox players who had been involved in the 1919 Series fix threw at least a few games during the 1920 season, resulting in an Indians pennant, their first ever. The White Sox players were motivated either by more money, by threats from gamblers based on their complicity in the 1919 fix, or both.

On September 7, 1920, the Grand Jury of Cook County, Illinois, convened. Their initial investigation had to do with allegations that an August 31, 1920, game between the National League’s

Chicago Cubs and Philadelphia Phillies had been fixed, but the presiding judge, Charles MacDonald, commissioned the grand jury to consider allegations that the 1919 World Series had also been fixed. White Sox players Cicotte and Jackson were deposed by prosecutors and appeared before the grand jury. Each signed a confession, and each also signed a waiver of immunity— incredible in this day and age. Unfortunately for the players, their legal advice on that day came from attorney Alfred Austrian, who worked for Charles Comiskey. On September 28, Comiskey suspended all eight suspected players, just three days before the end of the 1920 season. The eight were indicted on several charges, including conspiracy to commit a confidence game, in that they defrauded gamblers who had bet on them. Their trial opened in Chicago on June 21, 1921. Along with the players, several gamblers were accused, but most did not attend the trial for various reasons; at least one had fled the country. The witness list included Comiskey, Kid Gleason, and “clean” White Sox stars second baseman Eddie Collins and catcher Ray Schalk (both future Hall-of-Famers). Comiskey testified that he thought his players were clean, but that he’d be satisfied with whatever the court decided. Gleason also backed his players.

The key witness proved to be Sleepy Bill Burns. Burns detailed his version of the fix, from the contacts with the players through the financial negotiations with the gambling powers. Burns described a meeting at the Hotel Ansonia in New York on September 16, 1919. Present at that meeting were Chick Gandil and Eddie Cicotte. Burns quoted Gandil as saying, “If I could get \$100,000, I would throw the World Series.” According to Burns, while \$100,000 had been promised the players, a much smaller amount was actually delivered. Burns said that he and his partner, Billy Maharg, had gone bust betting on Cincinnati in game three,

the game won by “clean” Sox pitcher Dickie Kerr. Burns claimed the players had double-crossed him. Defense attorney Ben Short tried to paint Burns as a man motivated by revenge. He asked Burns, “Do you think you are even with the boys now?” Burns responded, “I am liable to be before I leave here!” The final shock of the trial occurred in connection with the signed confessions and waivers of immunity from Cicotte and Joe Jackson. State’s Attorney George Gorman advised the court that the original copies had disappeared. Gorman said he did not know what became of these documents, but hinted that Arnold Rothstein might have paid to make them disappear. According to Asinof, the jury in the “Black Sox” case was charged and filed into the jury room to begin deliberations at 7:52 p.m. on August 2, 1921. They came out before 10 p.m. the same night. The verdict on each of the players was the same: not guilty on all charges.

Why would Major League Baseball players risk their careers to gain a little quick cash? We must realize that Major League Baseball has changed quite a lot since 1919. On the field, this was the last year of the so-called “Dead Ball Era.” Home runs were a rarity and teams had to scratch out hits to score. In fact, some baseball experts actually credit the rise of the home run era in baseball in part to the “Black Sox” scandal. Throughout the history of the game, any time offense and pitching have gotten out of balance, the authorities have altered the rules to restore that balance. 1920 was Babe Ruth’s first year with the New York Yankees, his first year as a full-time outfielder, and his first 50-home run year. The thinking is that had the reputation of baseball not been threatened by the scandal, the Lords of Baseball would have altered the rules to make home runs more rare. As it was, baseball seemed to need the boost provided by the feats of the Mighty Babe.

The biggest differences were off the

field. The 1918 season had been shortened by almost a month due to World War I, and many star players had gone off to war. Revenues had rebounded nicely in 1919, but salaries still reflected the hard time. An established player was paid about the same as a middle-level executive might have been, but not much more. The best-paid of the eight “Black Sox,” Eddie Cicotte, made \$10,000 in 1919. To use the famous words of Curt Flood more than half a century later, a player in 1919 was a “well-paid slave.” What kept him in bondage was the Reserve Clause. This clause, part of every player’s contract, stated that a player’s team had an automatic option on his services for the following year. Since this was interpreted as renewing automatically each year, a player’s services were owned by his team for as long as it wished to keep him, and they could be assigned to another team, through trade or purchase, at any time without the player’s consent. Under this system, a player had virtually no bargaining power with his team. He could sit out or retire, but he was not free to sell his services elsewhere. An early attempt to form a players’ union had collapsed, and there would be no such union for another fifty years.

Also, in 1919, gambling was much more prevalent in professional sports, including baseball, than it is today. At that time, both horse racing and boxing were considered to be thoroughly crooked. While baseball didn’t have quite the same bad reputation, regular contacts between players and gamblers were common. There were persistent rumors of fixes going back to at least 1903. During the 1917 pennant race, White Sox players took up a collection for Detroit Tigers pitchers, either to thank them for beating a key rival or for laying down against the White Sox. Interestingly, the only player on the White Sox known to have refused to contribute was Buck Weaver. In her biography of her grandfather, Edd

Roush of the 1919 Reds, Susan Dellinger calls attention to rumors that Reds pitchers may have been paid to throw games six and seven of the 1919 Series to the White Sox.

The White Sox players may have had a more personal reason for dumping the Series—Charles Comiskey. Comiskey himself was a former major league player and manager. He had been one of the original owners who had worked with Ban Johnson to found the American League in 1901. But Comiskey also had a reputation as a cheapskate, at least in terms of his relationship with the players. Most sources agree that all of Comiskey’s star players, except Eddie Collins, were underpaid compared to similarly talented players of the time. Then, as now, professional athletes tended to have considerable egos. The feeling that their owner did not respect them or pay them properly, along with the general powerlessness of players of the era and simple greed, was enough to provoke them to action.

Did members of the 1919 White Sox actually throw the World Series? Probably. Beyond any reasonable doubt, at least six members of the team made some sort of commitment to throw at least the first two games of the Series. Those six were Cicotte, Williams, Gandil, Risberg, McMullin, and Felsch. Sleepy Bill Burns said seven players, those six plus Weaver, attended at least one meeting in which throwing the Series was discussed. Most of the evidence indicates that seven players, the first six plus Jackson but *not* Weaver, received some payment from gamblers. The degree to which the players actually rolled over during games is somewhat harder to prove. Eddie Cicotte’s signed confession admitted that he received money to throw game one, and that deliberately hitting the first Reds batter with a pitched ball in that game was a signal to the gamblers that “the fix was in.” Game four was lost on two rather incredibly boneheaded fielding plays by

Cicotte. Williams pitched very poorly in games two and eight. Tradition, and Asinof’s book, claims that the fix had collapsed after game five, because money due to the players remained unpaid. Williams dumped the final game, it is said, only because gamblers had threatened his wife. Gandil, Risberg, and Felsch all hit below .250 in the Series, although Gandil drove in key runs in a couple of the White Sox wins. On the other hand, Eddie Collins also hit only .233 in the Series, and he was never suspected of being in on the fix. McMullin, who was in on it, batted only twice in the Series, but got one hit. Cicotte threw a masterful game in game seven. Few experts suspect either Jackson or Weaver of trying to lose, and their statistics from the Series bear that out. Weaver played errorless ball and batted .324. Jackson batted .375 and hit the only Series home run by either team. Did Buck Weaver deserve to be punished? Let’s go back to Judge Landis’s three points. There is no credible evidence that Weaver took any action to hurt his team’s efforts to win. None of the other players involved accused him of doing so, and Abe Attell, a key figure in creating the fix, later went to Landis on more than one occasion to attempt to clear Weaver. There is absolutely no evidence that Weaver made any promise to throw a game. In his support, every single participant said that Weaver, alone among the eight accused players, received no money from the gamblers. The entire case against Weaver rests on the third of Landis’s points, that Weaver sat in on discussions of the fix and didn’t tell his club. There are two separate problems with this argument. Weaver may not have known, with certainty, that the fix was on, or if so, which players were in on it. Bill Burns said Weaver did sit in on one meeting in which the subject was discussed. Neither Burns nor anyone else says conclusively that an agreement was reached at that meeting or that any player actually

signed on. Weaver certainly knew that he hadn't agreed to anything. As the Series progressed, he must have suspected that something was up, but evidence indicates that by that time, the whole clubhouse knew that much.

The other problem stems from what Weaver's club knew. If Weaver had reason to believe that his club already knew everything he knew, then there was no reason to tell them. I maintain that Weaver did have reason to believe just that. As mentioned before, White Sox manager Kid Gleason brought up the subject of a rumored fix prior to the start of game two. There are reports that Gleason told Cicotte before game seven that he was starting someone else, but that Cicotte convinced Gleason that he was on the level. Cicotte went on to win that game. On the train trip back to Chicago from Cincinnati after game two, sportswriter Ring Lardner was heard to sing a catchy little ditty to the tune of the popular song, "I'm Forever Blowing Bubbles." Lardner's version began, "I'm Forever Blowing Ballgames."

What did Charles Comiskey know, and when did he know it? Both Comiskey and Kid Gleason had received several telegrams from gamblers prior to the Series warning of the fix. After game one, Comiskey certainly did take his suspicions to National League president John Heydler, who in turn brought them to the attention of Ban Johnson. Heydler is reported as telling Comiskey, "You can't fix a World Series, Commy!" Comiskey's actions show that, no later than the last day of the Series, he had *detailed* knowledge of the conspiracy, including a complete list of the players involved. How can we be sure? As we have seen, Fullerton said Comiskey told him seven players would not be back. But there is no credible way that Comiskey could have known about all seven players just from watching the Series. A discerning fan would have surely suspected Williams and Cicotte.

Fullerton and Mathewson reportedly saw something questionable in the play of Gandil, Risberg and Felsch. As indicated earlier, though, there was nothing in the play of Joe Jackson, Fred McMullin or Buck Weaver that would have tipped off an observer. The fact that Comiskey said seven players would be gone, and hired detectives to investigate Jackson and McMullin along with the other five shows that Comiskey knew exactly who had done what.

If all this is true, why was Weaver included in the 1921 trial and the Landis ban when Comiskey knew he was innocent? The answer, of course, is, "money"—in this case, Charles Comiskey's money. No matter what Comiskey knew while the Series was underway, he had too much to lose by disrupting play. Gate receipts for the eight games were fantastic. One source claims that receipts for game eight alone totaled \$100,000. This was important money for Comiskey. By the time the affair went to trial in 1921, Comiskey couldn't say he knew Weaver was innocent without admitting he knew the other seven were guilty. Since he had let the Series progress without taking action, such an admission would have damaged public confidence in baseball, and could have cost Comiskey control of his team. Comiskey probably also hoped to get back *all* of the suspect players in the wake of their acquittal in court. Cicotte, Williams, and Jackson, along with Weaver, were all star players. Without them, the 1921 White Sox finished below .500. Landis was widely regarded as a blowhard and an egomaniac, but he probably had baseball's best interests in mind. A case could be made that firm action on his part was the only thing that would restore the public's confidence in baseball. That, as he saw it, required the removal of any player even tainted by scandal, regardless of his guilt or innocence. This same argument would explain why Landis refused Weaver's repeated requests for reinstatement and

Attell's avowals of Weaver's innocence. Many people did know that Weaver did not deserve his punishment. Christy Mathewson told his biographer Eddie Frierson that Weaver had gotten a raw deal. Near the end of the 1921 trial, Judge Hugo Friend said he thought that he would have to set aside a guilty verdict against Weaver.

Buck Weaver continued to ask the commissioner's office for reinstatement through Landis's term, which ended in 1944, and on until Weaver's death in 1956. Weaver was the only "Black Sox" player who stayed in Chicago. Like the other seven exiles, he played some semipro baseball, owned and managed a drug store, and for a time managed a women's softball team. He had no children, but he and his wife raised two of Weaver's nieces. One of those is still active in efforts to obtain posthumous reinstatement for Weaver. Anyone wishing to support this effort can sign a petition to Commissioner of Baseball Allan H. "Bud" Selig at www.clearbuck.com.

References

Asinof, Eliot. (1963). *Eight Men Out*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.

Carney, Gene. (2006). *Burying the Black Sox: How Baseball's Cover-Up of the 1919 World Series Fix Almost Succeeded*. Dulles, VA: Potomac Books, Inc.

Dellinger, Susan, PhD. (2006). *Red Legs and Black Sox: Edd Roush and the Untold Story of the 1919 World Series*. Cincinnati: Emmis Books.

www.baseball-almanac.com. Baseball Almanac, a prime source for team player rosters, team histories, and statistics.

www.clearbuck.com. This is the website dedicated to persuading Commissioner Selig to reverse the suspension of Buck Weaver.

www.gingerkid.com. This website is dedicated to Buck Weaver.

Music—An Art To Be Reckoned With

As old as mankind itself, music promotes well-being in our moral, emotional, and intellectual life.

By Robert Bruce McLean



About the Author

Robert Bruce McLean, born and raised in a home that has been in the family since 1740, is a 1950 graduate of Penn State University with a BS

in Dairy Science. Following service in the military, he pursued a career in advertising and public relations. Active in the arts community in Reading and Berks County, PA, he and his late wife Betty Lou were recipients of the Berks Arts Council's prestigious "Pagoda Award" in 1996 for their outstanding contributions to the arts. For 36 years, he directed the Reading Civic Opera, staging some 70 Broadway musicals in Reading's 1800-seat Sovereign Performing Arts Center, and assuming leading roles himself in *The King and I*, *Camelot*, and *My Fair Lady*. He has been active in other community organizations, such as the Reading Choral Society, the United Way, and Christ Episcopal Church.

Presented to the Torch Club of Reading, PA on May 20, 2004.



This paper looks at a field that has, over the last 100 years, profoundly impacted our society, speaking to the healing of the mind, body and spirit of the individuals that make up that society. Music is indeed an art to be reckoned with.

The *American Heritage Dictionary* defines music as "the art of organizing tones to produce a coherent sequence of sounds intended to elicit an aesthetic response in a listener." Without getting too technical, I believe all of us tend to think of music as, well, music. For the

*... a lot of the form
music takes may
depend upon how we
learn to utilize the art
form for our health
and well-being.*

purposes of this paper I am dealing only with music of the Western world. I am defining music as an art, since music is both created and performed.

Music, as we think of it today, has been a long time coming. Very little is known about this art before the ancient days of the Greek empire. We can only speculate on what form music took before the first millennium because we have no record of music in either composition or sound form before that time. Ancient pottery and mosaics assure us that musical instruments existed many centuries BC. It is believed that mankind learned early on how to make musical sounds from resonating and vibrating objects of nature. Music has probably been an essential part of the development of language, however primitive its structure. The first mention of music is in Genesis, chapter 4, verse 21, and elsewhere the Old Testament recalls stories such as David allaying Saul's madness by playing the harp, and the walls of Jericho falling as a result of shouting and trumpet blasts.

Until 1998, the oldest evidence of musical instruments dated back some 35,000 years to Siberia where huge mammoth bones were unearthed which bore markings for the spots of best resonance. Also uncovered were a beater and two small flutes carved from bone. Each flute has four small holes on the

top and two on the bottom, indicating some form of sophisticated fingering used to produce a primitive sort of music. However, in 1998, the now oldest musical instrument known to exist was found in Slovenia. The instrument is a bone flute that dates back 43,000 to 82,000 years, which would place it about the time of the advent of *homo sapiens*. As further evidence of the early existence of music, Confucius wrote some 2500 years ago that "Character is the backbone of human culture. Music is the flowering of culture."

Music has long been associated with morality and sacred mysteries. In fact, we can credit the discovery of many instruments still in existence to the belief that they would help the way of the departed to heaven. For that purpose, musical instruments were buried with dead rulers in their tombs, thus preserving the instruments until the present day. There was, perhaps, no culture that revered music more than ancient Greece. Their word for an educated and distinguished man was a musical man. To be called unmusical was to be labeled as crude and uncouth. Poetry and music went hand in hand. The recitation of poetry was chanted. The great Greek philosophers spoke in no uncertain terms about the influence of music upon the moral character of the people and the emotional well-being of the individual. Even with our knowledge of the great esteem in which classical Greece held music, there is very little remaining of the music itself. Some forty fragments of Greek music have been found, but they tell us little except that they did have a system of notation, although crude by today's standards. Their music was believed to be entirely monophonic, which means it had melody but no harmony or counterpoint. The lyre, lute, pipe, horn, drum, and hydraulic

organ were the principal instruments, which, as far as we know, were played as solo instruments. Probably much music was extemporaneous and much was learned by ear and passed on in that fashion from generation to generation. One of the most important fundamentals passed on to us by classical Greek culture was the philosophy that music was not simply art for art's sake, but rather an orderly system intertwined with nature—a force capable of affecting human thought and conduct, an ever more important aspect of music in our present-day society.

Practically no documentation of Roman music survives. It is, however, believed to have followed very much in the Greek tradition. Most music philosophy and treatises from the early centuries of the Christian era, largely written in monasteries, were based on Greek writings. As Christianity began spreading throughout Western Europe, the fathers of the church came to believe that music has the power to uplift the soul to contemplation of divine things. Secular music was frowned upon by the church leaders and, as a consequence, almost entirely disappeared during the first centuries of the Christian era. The tradition of the chanting of psalms and prayers in the Jewish faith was carried on into the Christian church, becoming almost the only music in the Dark Ages and on into the Middle Ages. Pope Gregory was credited with developing and writing down much of what we now call Gregorian chant, whose continued use today makes it the longest existing documented form of Western music.

Music remained basically monophonic until the tenth century, when polyphony—multiple notes being joined together—began entering the picture. Minstrels, or troubadours, traveled about the country performing for the common folk as well as the royal courts, and are credited with the spread of secular music which had mostly disappeared for centuries. By the mid-eleventh century, composition began to replace improvisation, though the struggle with notation persisted because no

standardized system had yet been devised. By this time the principal instruments were the psaltery, a zither-like instrument; the flute, both horizontally held and recorder-like; the shawm, an oboe-like instrument; the trumpet, which was used only for royal affairs; and the drum (probably the oldest instrument) to keep rhythm. Between the middle of the twelfth century and the end of the thirteenth century, polyphony made significant strides, as did advancements in musical notation. This, in turn, led to the development of more sophisticated instruments and more sophisticated composition. Named composers began to appear in the fourteenth century and, in the fifteenth century, composers such as Mauchant and Dufay, whose music is still played today, contributed significantly to the further development of music throughout France, Germany, England, and Italy. Until the seventeenth century there was no differentiation made between chamber music and orchestral music. It was simply larger or smaller groups of musicians, or instruments. By the eighteenth century, Antonio Vivaldi, George Frederic Handel, and Johann Sebastian Bach lent their brilliance to the world and expanded the scope of chamber, orchestral, and choral music that would forever carry us forward. Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven quickly followed, moving the process to increasing heights.

Until the nineteenth century, composers had sponsors who provided them with the means of subsistence. That changed when most of the brilliant classical composers of the nineteenth century had to literally fend for themselves. Their livelihood depended upon their appeal to a public that was limited by status, finances, and taste. The larger middle class was unprepared for “higher” type music and preferred the neighborhood vocal or instrumental ensembles, or the bombastic and trivial saloon music, or perhaps the singing of simple songs and hymns at home. But those great composers hung in there and made our world a far better place through their gifts and tenacity. During this time

the United States, new on the scene, was pretty much left out of the golden age of the classical/romantic music of Western Europe. But musical culture in this nascent democracy was beginning to stir. A whole new approach to music was starting to take shape in America by the end of the nineteenth century. The folk music of European immigrants and African-American slaves was blending into a new genre that would have a powerful impact on music here and abroad in the twentieth century. Jazz, a totally new and different type of music raised in America, became the single most powerful influence in the world of music. At the same time along came such neoclassical composers as Schoenberg, Prokofiev, and Stravinsky, whose new and exciting approach to rhythms, timbre, tone, and harmonic composition began blending with the new jazz and moved the world of music into a whole different realm. Composers were utilizing all these new approaches to music in new, exciting and diverse ways.

Thus the twentieth century experienced an unprecedented explosion in music. An art that was largely inaccessible to the average person prior to the 1900s now became easily accessible to almost everyone. The development of motion pictures, radio, television, and sound recording fostered the outpouring of music to the general public on a daily basis, no matter where a person might be. Musical groups of all types came upon the scene and could be numbered by the thousands, giving opportunities to musical performers that never existed before. Music is proliferating in the schools, turning out more and better musicians among our young people. The stage musical progressed from light opera and operetta to vaudeville and stories with music and dance to fully integrated musical plays which gave us a whole outpouring of composition and inventive ways of telling a story for emotional impact.

Can we imagine a motion picture without music? The recording industry has turned into a multi-billion-dollar blockbuster impacting strongly upon our

economy. We outgrew the phonograph and have almost outgrown the audio tape, and the CD may be the next victim. Who knows what may be in the future? We stroll about with a Walkman covering our ears, and we listen to background music at work, at the doctor's office, in our home, and at sporting events. Practically nothing is presented on television without music. We are surrounded by music that permeates our very existence on this planet. Unfortunately, this ubiquity of music is not without its downside. The playing of music has become so loud in many venues and among our young people that it poses a serious hearing risk. It's loud in the concert halls, in the movies, in the sports arenas, in cars, and even through Walkman headphones, which subject the listener to dangerously intense frequencies without the person realizing it. More than twenty years ago, Dr. David Lipscomb of the University of Tennessee found that 60% of incoming freshmen had significant hearing loss in the high frequency range, comparable to the loss of persons sixty to sixty-nine years of age. Unfortunately, a great part of that hearing loss is associated with the music listened to by young people throughout the world. Music played in fitness centers can have distinctly negative effects. The rhythms can actually weaken the strength of the muscles. Many times the sound coming from the speakers is unpleasantly distorted, further weakening the body, and can therefore negate some of the benefits of the workout.

In his book *The Music of Man*, renowned violinist Yehudi Menuhin looks at music in rather exotic terms, which may help lay a finger on some of the downsides of the art. He says, "Music weds the spiritual with the sensual, conveys ecstasy free of guilt, faith without dogma, love as homage and man at home with nature and the universe." Even though we may not take that as gospel, it no doubt has a ring of truth to it, and points to the fact that music can be both good and bad. We have to look at what many people consider music as a potential cause of societal degeneration.

Among the music that is frowned upon as morally and psychologically detrimental to our children are rap, MTV, and the lewd lyrics offered by the Britney Spears, Eminems, Michael Jacksons and Madonnas of the entertainment world. We may argue that it isn't the music, but, rather, the suggestive gyrations of the performers coupled with lyrics that give our young ones a questionable glimpse into the seamier side of life, contributing to the moral decay of another generation. However, without the music and rhythms there would be very little impact. So what do we do? Society will no doubt go on debating the issue without a great deal of resolution. How do we protect ourselves against the effects of music on what we have long maintained as standards of societal behavior for our youth? The level of morality is certainly not dependent on music, but we have come to understand that it can be greatly influenced by it.

This dilemma is not new. Both Plato and Aristotle discussed the effects of music on the human psyche. They deplored the rhythms connected with orgiastic rites, and the types of music that roused ignoble passions, arguing that such music shaped man into an ignoble form. Certain types of music were prohibited in ancient Greece and were constitutionally regulated in Athens and Sparta because of their negative effect on their culture. The "Church Fathers" in early Christendom warned against specific types of music, and even into the twentieth century Fascist and Communist dictatorships tried to control the musical activity of the people. It was recognized by the dictators of those regimes that music can promote patriotism, nationalism, and bravery, and can break down societal barriers which they could use for their own benefit.

Without question music has given us so much more that is good than what is bad. It has added beauty to our lives, it has enhanced our enjoyment of many things, it has stimulated our emotional connections, and it has brought tranquility and pleasure to our well-being. Plato, in speaking to the subject

of music, said: "Music is the essence of order and leads to all that is just and beautiful, of which it is the invisible, but, nevertheless dazzling, passionate and eternal force." And to think he said that long before music had taken the emotionally stimulating forms and beauty of composition and instrumentation of today's music. Imagine what he might say of music today, as it promises even greater rewards in its application to serving the needs of our physical and mental well-being. Music therapy appears to be a field that is only in its infancy because we have found out that music affects the cognitive function in our brain. Lorin Hollander, the concert pianist and advocate for the use of music to heal societal dysfunction, pointed out that "music involves more of the brain than any other activity according to MRI scan studies. It empowers every cognitive ability." Music can evoke feelings of love and tenderness, can make a person sing or cry or dance or go off to fight for a cause. It can release anger, quiet anxiety, give us strength and courage, alter consciousness, and promote healing. Studies have shown that music benefits the mind and body in many ways. It masks unpleasant sounds and feelings; slows down and equalizes brain waves; affects respiration, heartbeat, pulse rate, blood pressure, and body temperature; reduces muscle tension and improves body movement; and increases endorphin levels. It can also reduce pain, boost the immune function, strengthen memory and learning, enhance romance and sexuality, and boost productivity. All this seems sufficient to warrant its serious application in medicine, emotional therapy, and our own personal well-being and productivity.

Music is in fact being used in hospital nurseries to stimulate growth in babies born prematurely. In fact, studies show that premature babies exposed to lullaby-type music are able to be discharged an average of 5 to 7 days earlier than those not exposed to the music. Today mothers are encouraged to sing to their unborn babies or play lullaby music for them. Embryologists have

found that the ear is the first organ to develop in the fetus. Singing or playing soothing music steadies the heart beat and reduces the kicking in the unborn. In the course of studying the effects of music on the unborn fetus, it was determined that music such as rock played for mothers carrying unborn babies had a negative effect on the babies and caused violent kicking. And after birth, the playing of lullaby music generally had a very calming effect on the newborn and reduced yawning and kicking. At the Helen Keller Hospital in Alabama an experiment was conducted that involved fifty-nine newborns. Taped lullaby music was played for them, and 94% of the babies fell asleep immediately without the use of a bottle or pacifier. It is no wonder then that hundreds of hospital nurseries throughout the country use music to stimulate growth and calm infants. Laurel Trainor, a researcher at McMaster University in Canada, has found in her studies that young babies can discriminate changes of one note in a melody and show an emotional response to music before they can understand a single word. At the age of six months they can remember melodies for weeks. Trainor points out that before they are linguistic, they communicate and interact through music.

In leading hospitals throughout the country such as Sloan Kettering in New York, the University of Massachusetts Medical Center, and the University of Louisville School of Medicine, music therapy is being used to reduce stress and anxiety in pre-op as a calming device for patients, and in operating rooms for the benefit of the operating staff. It is also being used in post-op recovery rooms because it has been determined that it promotes more rapid healing. In one of its most important applications, music is being used in intensive care units to promote recovery from trauma. It is also being seriously applied to reduce pain during dental procedures. In cases on record, the application of music during painful dental procedures has entirely negated the need for pain killers.

The experimentations in the use of

music go beyond that of the human population. In applied studies it has been shown that music played in poultry houses increases the egg-laying production of hens, and music played in dairy barns increases the production of milk in cows. Even plants react to music according to current studies. Dorothy Ratallack, a researcher in botany, has studied the effects of music on plant growth and come up with some interesting results. When certain types of music were played the plants actually turned away from the sound, while other types of music made the plants grow toward that music, indicating a like and dislike for types of music. Interestingly enough, some of the plants so disliked the rock and heavy metal music played for them that they actually shriveled and died. All this apparently has to do with the effect of vibrations on the plant cells, not that they actually respond to the music emotionally as do humans. In the case of humans, even though the effects of sound are received primarily through the ears, the cells in our bodies have vibratory properties and therefore respond to sound even when our mind is not conscious of it. This cellular response to vibrations is believed to be one of the reasons the body seems to heal itself faster when exposed to music that is most in harmony with our own vibration system.

David Lazear, one of the foremost educators creating practical applications to the theory of multiple-intelligence, claims, "The auditory and rhythmic intelligence that music contains teaches us language, movement, communication, emotions, and visual/spatial intelligence. By connecting sound, movement, speech, and interaction with a musical component it is possible to activate and integrate more of the brain than any other educational tool." Even with all of the application of music today for therapeutic use, we are still in the early stages of learning about how we can get the greatest benefit from this fascinating new therapy. What forms music will take in the future is anyone's guess. There is no question it will go on enhancing the pleasures of the world about us. But a lot

of the form music takes may depend upon how we learn to utilize the art form for our health and well-being. The type of music known as "new age," which came into being back in the 1970s, is music without a true melody or predictable sequence of notes, but it has been found to be very effective in soothing anxieties and blending with the body's rhythms. It is felt among scholars that music will continue to change and be an even more important part of our health, our societal interplay, and our personal pleasure well into the future. As Corrine Heline stated in *Esoteric Music* in 1969, "The time is fast approaching when people will select their music with the same intelligent care and knowledge they now use to select their food. When that time comes, music will become the principal source of healing for many individuals and social ills, and human evolution will be tremendously accelerated." It does seem, then, that music is certainly an art to be reckoned with.

References

Campbell, Don. (1995). *Mozart Effect for Children: Awakening Your Child's Mind, Health, and Creativity with Music*. New York: William Morrow, p.195.

Campbell, Don. (1997). *The Mozart Effect: Tapping the Power of Music to Heal the Body, Strengthen the Mind, and Unlock the Creative Spirit*. NY: Avon Books.

Grout, Donald J., and Claude V. Palesca. (1988). *A History of Western Music*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Halpern, Steven, and Louis Savary. (1985). *Sound Health: The Music and Sounds that Make Us Whole*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Heline, Corrine. (1969). *Esoteric Music, Based on the Musical Seership of Richard Wagner*. New York: Harold Branch Publishing.

Interviews with Lorin Hollander. (8 February 2004; and 5 April 2004, A7). *Reading (PA) Eagle*.

Sacks, Oliver. (31 March 2002). "When Music Heals." *Parade Magazine*, pp.4-5.

Guilt of Selective Omission—How Countries Write Their Histories

What our high school history textbooks are not teaching about World War II—an opportunity for reconciliation.

By Donald K. Allen, B.S., M.S., DVM



About the Author

Born, raised, and educated in Illinois, Donald Allen served in the U.S. Air Force in the late 1960s as photographer, reporter, and editor of an award-winning base newspaper in the Philippines, later assigned to California. In 1971 he started a horseshoeing business while earning his BS in animal science, MS in animal nutrition, and veterinary degrees (BS and DVM), serving for a year as Animal Commissary Manager of Chicago's Brookfield Zoo. After four years of practice in Illinois, Dr. Allen moved to Youngstown, OH, in 1984, eventually opening a veterinary practice there in 1992 that currently serves over 4,600 clients with 8,500 pets. For several years he hosted a call-in "Pet Talk" radio show, has been featured on local TV, and even appeared on NBC's "Dateline" show discussing puppy mills and pet stores in 2000. He has lectured and engaged in business in Lithuania and Latvia. In 2005 he received the Masonic Community Builder's Award in Youngstown, and in 2007 the Ohio Animal Health Foundation gave him a Distinguished Service Award. Dr. Allen is active in the military reserves, and in 2005 ran a free vaccination clinic for military personnel pets at Camp Lejeune, NC. An amateur World War II historian, he wrote and published *Tarawa—the Aftermath* in 2001. The

book includes many accounts by veterans who served on Tarawa in 1943.

Presented to the Youngstown Torch Club on September 19, 2005.

.....

It has long been said that the victors write the history. Of course they do—from their standpoint and about their actions in particular. It is generally the truth (or at least the truth as they know it) and is usually agreed upon by a majority of people who witnessed the actual events. Coverage of events obviously cannot include everything that happened—the high school history curriculum just hasn't enough time for all the individual actions that occurred in World War II. Just as it is natural for us to downplay a family "black sheep" to our children, so educators may choose to elevate the good and downplay the bad in presenting their country's history. This paper will look at how different perspectives influence various countries in presenting World War II in their history curriculum.

Perspective can be the view of a battle from one man's foxhole, or the view of the entire battle from a command center. It can be a view of the whole war from a military historian's perspective, and it can also be the view of a governmental body regarding the welfare of a nation. We try to give our children a broad education, covering as many topics as possible in a general and necessarily selective manner in the twelve years we have them. If they develop a particular interest in one subject, they can pursue that subject to whatever depth they desire, all the way

to a PhD. In my case I became interested in World War II, and from junior high school onward I read books about it as often as I could. I didn't expect my school to dwell in depth on World War II or explore its millions of stories; the class moved on.

After World War II the two major Axis powers, Japan and Germany, revealed very different perspectives on their roles in the war. Japan used reparations to try to heal the wounds of war without ever bringing itself to apologize for its war crimes. Germany's political leaders, on the other hand, accepted full responsibility for the holocaust and criminality of the whole event. We'll first take a look at the island nation of Japan.

Japan

Japan is quite unique in many ways. It is a homogeneous society, isolated on a group of islands, and you are either Japanese or an "outsider." Historically the formal education system in Japan was designed to create total dedication to the country and the Emperor. Japan's first education minister, Arinori Mori, declared in 1885 that "Education in Japan is not intended to create people accomplished in the techniques of the arts and sciences, but rather to manufacture the persons required by the State." This worked very well for the country as it eventually produced multitudes of soldiers ready to fight and die for the Emperor.

In essence, the Japanese considered themselves a race of divine origin, with the Emperor a living god, and Shinto the national religion. Shinto recognizes

sacred spirits, both natural and human, called “kami,” and promotes honoring parents and ancestors, respect for teachers, and ultimate devotion to the Emperor. The education system promoted nationalism through rote memorization, the foundation of Japanese education before and after World War II. Rote learning has emerged as the key to passing exams that will determine which university accepts you; your entire future may hinge on this one exam. Independent thinking does not fit into this Japanese society. Japan’s plan for a “Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere” began with wars against China and Russia at the turn of the century, the annexation of Korea in 1910, and the gaining of special rights in Manchuria. Taiwan was ceded to Japan as part of China’s peace settlement. The foothold in Manchuria opened the door to an advance on all of China in 1931, generally referred to as the beginning of the “Greater East Asian War,” which eventually included World War II. Abruptly, unconditional surrender at the end of World War II in the Pacific opened Japan to widespread changes in government, society, and education. The politics of hunger made the population pliable to change, and General Douglas MacArthur now ruled the land with a silk-gloved fist as supreme commander for the Allied Powers.

Major purges of the education system began shortly after occupation. Use of the term “Greater East Asian War” was forbidden, to be replaced by “Pacific War.” Undesirable militaristic terms and references were deleted from all textbooks and teaching materials. All teachers were screened for nationalist and militarist tendencies and purged. The subjects of morals, Japanese history and geography were suspended in textbooks printed after Dec. 31, 1945. The day before, the Japanese Emperor declared to his subjects that he was not, indeed, divine. The editing and destruction of textbooks throughout the

country resulted in a textbook shortage in early 1946. Like everything else in the country, printing paper was in short supply. Censorship was imposed on all forms of communication within the country, to include topics such as discussion of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and the atomic bomb. Paramount in all forms of education and communication was recognition of Japan’s responsibility for the war. The virtues of pacifism now permeated social science courses. The Japanese Ministry of Education’s manual for teachers, “Guiding Principles for Instruction in Japanese History,” approved by General Headquarters, stated, “In teaching history, materials which propagate militarism, ultra-nationalism, and State Shinto shall be excluded, as well as anti-foreign ideas.” It further said, “Stress should be put on concrete aspects of the development of national life from social, economic and cultural viewpoints rather than on the history of peace and war and the vicissitudes of powers and struggles for political power.” This meant that for Japan, the period of 1868 to 1945 should be skipped entirely.

Japanese history courses, now greatly revised, were allowed to resume in October 1946. The American occupation ended in 1952. Democracy was established and the Japanese people made adjustments to the revolutionary changes in their lives. In time the rich history of an authentic Japan reemerged, including the centuries of samurai warrior regimes and military codes of honor. The Nation’s historic roots regrew. Then, in January 1972, the country was jolted by an incredible event. An Imperial Army soldier emerged from the jungles of Guam, twenty-eight years after the end of the war. He had followed the former national code of conduct which held that surrender was worse than death, even though he knew the war was over. He told reporters, “I continued to survive by believing in the Emperor and

the Japanese spirit.” He had idealized the spirit the people of Japan had given up. His amazing story reminded many of the blind loyalty that had led the nation to catastrophe.

Today World War II is simply not a socially accepted topic of discussion in Japan. The consensus is they “regret” the war, but do not apologize for it. They simply want to forget it and move on. The stimulus for writing this paper was the publicized outrage in China over Japan’s failure to own up to its misdeeds. Japanese textbooks are controlled by a government that refuses to apologize for anything. Prime ministers have offered official and personal apologies in recent years, but the Diet of Japan has voted 2 to 1 against an official apology. They apparently believe the hundreds of billions of dollars spent on reparations since the war, and which continue today, is adequate apology. Nevertheless, a particularly sharp thorn in the side of China (and others) is the fact that all of Japan’s war criminals are enshrined and honored at Tokyo’s Yasukuni Shrine. A pamphlet published by the shrine for children, and viewable in English at www.yasukuni.or.jp/english/ reads, “Moreover, there were those who gave up their lives after the end of the Great East Asian War, taking upon themselves the responsibility for the war. There were also 1,068 ‘Martyrs of Showa’ who were cruelly and unjustly tried as war criminals by a sham-like tribunal of the Allied forces (United States, England, the Netherlands, China, and others). These martyrs are also the kami of the Yasukuni Jinja.” For decades now, Japanese children have been taught that Japan’s actions in World War II were justified. As the Yasukuni pamphlet puts it, “War is a really tragic thing to happen, but it was necessary in order for us to protect the independence of Japan and to prosper together with Asian neighbors.” It’s no wonder that countries overrun by Japan during the war do not agree. Nevertheless, a strong,

though minor opposition in Japan believes the children are not being told the truth.

Germany

Germany is not an island nation. It has to live shoulder-to-shoulder with countries it devastated during World War II, and the only way to survive required total capitulation and subjugation. Its future also depended on accepting full responsibility for what it did. Germany's overall response to its war crimes has been accepted with approval by the Allies and its neighbors. The Potsdam Conference concluded that, "German education shall be so controlled as completely to eliminate Nazi and militarist doctrines and to make possible the successful development of democratic ideas." The Federal Republic of Germany offered official apologies for its role in the Holocaust. Many German leaders have repeatedly expressed repentance, especially Chancellor Willy Brandt, who knelt in front of the Holocaust memorial in the Warsaw Ghetto in 1970. Compensation to Israel over the past sixty years has amounted to nearly seventy billion dollars. Holocaust survivors have received fifteen billion dollars, and their compensation will continue until 2015. Nevertheless, the German government has never apologized for the attacks on neighbors that led to the start of World War II. It places the blame solely on Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party instead of the government itself. Even since German reunification in 1990, it has rejected claims for reparations by France and Britain.

On the other hand, Germany has promoted an unusual cooperation with its neighbors regarding textbooks and the way subsequent generations would be taught history. In the early 1950s a German-French textbook cooperation began to "change textbooks in favour of an active promotion of reconciliation," according to Wolfgang

Höpken of the Georg-Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research. This effort helped to eliminate stereotypes and biased contents in textbooks and teaching materials in both countries. It took nearly twenty more years before a similar agreement was made between Germany and Poland, primarily due to Cold War pressures and resistance. In the early 1970s, however, a younger generation helped make reconciliation more acceptable and attractive for both teachers and students. When the textbook committees first met, the German working group was led by a man who had served as a young soldier in Nazi-occupied Poland. His Polish colleague had spent the war in a German concentration camp. The passage of time is generally needed for reconciliation through education and textbooks to be successful. There must be a consensus within the societies seeking this change, and it is usually the younger generation that helps provide this support. Today the German education system teaches about the Holocaust and the Third Reich, denouncing the crimes committed during World War II. German legislation also outlawed Nazi symbols and Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, and made Holocaust denial a criminal offense. Overall, Germany deserves high marks for its efforts to accept responsibility for its calamitous deeds of the past, and its work to reconcile with its neighbors.

Russia

Who defeated Germany in World War II? If you grew up in the Soviet Union there was only one answer. Rūta Agrestis grew up in Lithuanian SSR, entering school in 1977 and graduating from twelfth grade in 1989. She saw the beginning of transition from an "old history" to a "new history" of Lithuania and the world in general. Old (Soviet) history told the story of how Mother Russia rescued the Baltic countries from the murderous Germans during the "Great Patriotic War 1941–1945," as

the Soviets refer to World War II. Since she had not lived through the war, she tended to believe what was taught in her school. They were rescued from the Germans and the Lithuanian people elected a new government—communist. Old history taught that Russia was the most powerful and capable country, with the strongest army ever. There wasn't much to learn about anything else but Germany versus Russia. And Russia had heroes upon heroes. The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact was unheard of by the newer generation, but the elders knew. Lend-lease was another term unheard of in the Soviet school system, where Rūta was taught that World War II was ignited by the imperialists—England, France, and the USA—in conflict with the fascist aggressors—Germany, Italy, and Japan. The fascists wanted to destroy the first soviet country, the Soviet Union, and their imperialistic opponents, and then divide the world. She learned that England, France, and the USA were the dominant capitalistic countries, and that they had encouraged the aggressors to attack the Soviet Union in hopes that both sides would get weaker, enabling England, France, and the USA to strengthen their positions after the war ended. According to this "old history" view, the three countries (not referred to as the "Allies") had delayed opening a second front in order to weaken the Soviet Union and Germany. Consequently, the Soviet Union had fought practically on its own for three years, rescuing the world's civilization from the Nazis. Through her school years Soviet soldiers occupied Lithuania, then a state within the greater USSR. Forged elections took place periodically and they were often told that if there were enemies of the government, more troops could be brought in. You just didn't talk about or question Soviet rule. The threat of banishment to Siberia was all too real for many years after World War II. Nearly every family in the country lost

someone to Siberia. Later it was just threats of jail or losing your job. Although religion was essentially forbidden, it was still followed. Open celebration of Easter or Christmas, however, could cost you your job. When it was time for Rūta's First Communion, her parents took her to a church in another town to avoid recognition. Her father also secretly listened to "Voice of America" on his radio every week.

In the late 1980s, a new current could be felt throughout the population in Lithuania. Things were loosening up and Soviet Premier Gorbachev's "perestroika" seemed to allow more openness. Or so it was thought. On the old Independence Day in her school, students covered lamps in three adjacent rooms with the red, yellow, and green colors of the free Lithuanian flag. The colors were seen through the classroom's windows and the students were reprimanded. The current of change was flowing too fast in Lithuania, so Gorbachev paid a visit. He held an open discussion on television, stating it was "impossible" for Lithuania to survive on its own. The audience was calm, but the facts were clearly in favor of breaking away. Gorbachev thought that if they let off a little steam everything would return to the status quo. He was mistaken.

Rūta remembers the night when Soviet troops moved into the capital, Vilnius, and took over the television tower. Several Lithuanians died during this passive resistance and the show of Soviet force only served to strengthen their resolve. The next day Russian television announced that Lithuanians put dead bodies from car accidents under the Russian tanks, and that the Russians didn't really kill anybody. Lithuania was the first Soviet state to declare independence—their "new" independence. As Russian soldiers left in convoys of trucks many shouted out to the Lithuanians, "We'll be back!" Now shocking and unbelievable stories began to come out in the newspapers

and classrooms about Siberia's survivors. One couple, whose "crime" was owning considerable land in Lithuania, survived for eight years living in a communal cabin with no doors and only a bed and a table in their room. When they returned to Lithuania after the fall of the Soviet Union they were able to recover their land through legal claims. Today Lithuania and other former Eastern Bloc countries write their own versions of history to teach their children, without the influence of Soviet control. They are now being taught the "new history."

United States

So what about our own history books? What are we teaching our children about World War II? A study by the Albert Shanker Institute, titled "Educating Democracy: State Standards to Ensure a Civic Core," found that among eighth graders, "most were not sure whom we fought in World War II." Political correctness has made it more important to discuss Japanese internment camps and the atomic bomb attacks on Japan than all the other facts of the war. We have a system where our state and local school boards decide which texts are to be adopted for teaching our children. There are many publishers out there that want the business, and they are trying hard to please the teachers unions and liberal revisionists. Victor Hanson of the *National Review* has observed that "American textbooks discuss World War II as if a Patton, Le May, or Nimitz did not exist, as if the war was essentially the Japanese internment and Hiroshima. That blinkered and politically correct focus explains why so many Americans under 30 are simply ignorant about the nature and course of World War II itself."

I checked three history textbooks in current use in Boardman (Ohio) High School regarding Mr. Hanson's statement, and found the following. Tojo is mentioned in two, Nimitz in

none, Le May in none, Patton in two, Tarawa in none, and Japanese internment camps in two. So the teaching of what went on in World War II depends on which textbook your class is using and how much in depth your teacher wants to go. The teachers may not have a whole lot more knowledge of World War II than what the books provide. Nevertheless, in our society we are open to learning as much about World War II as there is information available. Television and motion pictures have created numerous factual (and some fantasy) accounts of famous battles and crises. Our public libraries are packed with books about World War II, and there are even World War II roundtable groups that meet regularly to hear veteran guest speakers. If that is not enough, you can go to our National Archives and view nearly any U.S. document created during the war, as well as millions of photographs.

No, our high school history courses do not discuss the Japanese chemical and biological warfare unit that worked in China, or our country's secret confiscation of all its records, data, equipment, and deep interrogation of its scientists. No, our textbooks do not mention that our country grabbed as much scientific information and scientists working on Germany's rocket and atomic projects as we could get at the end of the war, even if they were Nazis. Nor are we likely to see a reference to Agent Orange in the section on the Vietnam conflict. But I learned about all those things somewhere along the way, perhaps through our free press and news programs. Is World War II given adequate coverage in our education system? Are our children learning everything they should know about what was undoubtedly the most world-shattering event in the Twentieth Century? Maybe it is time we asked them.

References

Agresti, Rūta. (2005). Native of

Lithuania under Soviet rule. Telephone interview.

Answers.com. (June 2005). Responses of Germany and Japan to World War II Crimes.

Diamantis, Michelle. (August 2005). Interpreter and English teacher in Japan 2000–2002. E-mail interviews.

Fearey, Robert A. (1950). *The Occupation of Japan, Second Phase: 1948–50*. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Hanson, Victor Davis. (May 13, 2005). “Remembering World War II—Revisionists Get it Wrong,” *National Review Online*.

Harris, Sheldon H. (1994). *Factories of Death: Japanese*

Biological Warfare, 1932–45, and the American Cover-Up. London and New York: Routledge.

Höpken, Wolfgang. (November 11, 2004). “History-Textbooks and Reconciliation—Preconditions and Experiences in a Comparative Perspective.” Draft manuscript, World Bank Meeting, Washington, DC.

Ienaga, Saburo. (1978). *The Pacific War, 1931–1945: A Critical Perspective on Japan’s Role in World War II*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Moulton, Harold G.; & Marlio, Louis. (1944). *The Control of Germany and Japan*. Washington, DC, The Brookings Institution.

Nishi, Toshio. (1982, 2005).

Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan, 1945–1952. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Sholty, Alva H. (1946). *Twice in 2000 Years*. Dayton, OH: Otterbein Press.

Smith, Patrick. (1997). *Japan-A Reinterpretation*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Stuebing, Friedemann. (Aug.–Sept 2005). Former history teacher for classes 5–13 in Germany, now German language professor at Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, IL. (E-mail interviews).

2009 Paxton Lectureship Award

The Paxton Award, created in honor and memory of W. Norris Paxton, past president of the International Association of Torch Clubs and editor emeritus of *The Torch*, is given to the author of an outstanding paper presented by a Torch member at a Torch club meeting during the calendar year 2008. The winning author will receive an appropriate trophy, a \$250 honorarium, and paid registration to the 2009 IATC convention in Appleton, WI. The winner will be introduced at the convention banquet where he or she (or a designated representative) delivers the paper on June 27, 2009.

Eligibility: The author must be a member of a Torch club and the paper must have been delivered to a Torch club meeting or a regional Torch meeting between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2008 (inclusive). Current officers and directors of IATC are ineligible for this award during their terms of office.

Procedure: Entries are to be typed (double or triple spaced, one side of paper only). Include a cover sheet with the author’s name, address, daytime telephone number, and the date and place of presentation of the paper. All other identification, including identifying references, should be removed prior to submission. Entries may be submitted at any time, but the deadline is March 1, 2009. Send to: Paxton Award, c/o Editor, International Association of Torch Clubs, 749 Boush Street, Norfolk, VA 23510-1517.

Judging: The reading and judging panel comprises five people: a member of the Board of Directors of the IATC, one of the last five winners of the Paxton Award, a member of the Editorial Advisory Committee, and two members selected by the IATC Board of Directors. Judging is based on the principles set forth in the IATC brochure, “The Torch Paper.” The winner of the Paxton Award and other contestants will be notified approximately May 1, 2009.

Additional Information:

- There is no limit to the number of papers which may be submitted from any one Torch club for this award.
- Papers should not exceed 3,000 words in length.
- A paper may be submitted by the author, by a Torch club colleague, or by a Torch Club officer. It is preferred that, however the paper is submitted, it receive the endorsement of the club as a Paxton Lectureship Award submission through its officers, secretary, or the executive or program committee.
- The winning paper is to be presented at the 2009 annual convention by the author or an author-designated representative from the author’s Torch club.
- The Paxton Lectureship Award paper will be published in the Fall 2009 issue of *The Torch* magazine. Other entries will be forwarded to the Editorial Advisory Committee for possible publication in later issues of the magazine.

Call to Annual Business Meeting and Torch Convention — Appleton, WI — June 25-28, 2009

Thursday, June 25..... 3:00PM Officers' Exchange • 4:00PM Business Session I • 5:30PM Dinner & Torch Paper #1

Friday, June 26..... 9:00AM Business Session II • 10:30AM Torch Paper #2 • 12:15PM Box Lunch & Tours
5:30PM Dinner and Musical Performance: The North Star Nordic Dancers

Saturday, June 27..... 8:30AM Meet the Editor • 9:15AM Membership Development • 10:30AM Torch Paper #3
12:30PM Lunch & Tours • 6:00PM Reception (cash bar) • 6:30PM Banquet & Paxton Paper

Sunday, June 28..... 7:30AM Interfaith Service • 9:00AM Torch Paper #4 • 10:00AM Business Session III & Closing

2009 Torch Convention Highlights

The Torch Club of the Fox Valley, located in Appleton, Wisconsin, is pleased to be hosting the International Torch Convention, June 25–28, 2009. We have been working to arrange some fantastic speakers, and will offer exciting tours of local attractions.

Papers at this year's convention will be presented by noted authorities from the University of Wisconsin, Madison as well as local experts. Dr. Nancy Mathews, of the UW will speak on Environmental Issues. Dr. Mathews teaches Ecosystem Management and Conservation Planning for Endangered Species on Private Lands. Dr. Rupa Shevde, also of the UW, will speak on Ethics and Stem Cell Research. The UW Madison is a major center of stem cell research worldwide. Ellen Kort, Wisconsin's First Poet Laureate, will entertain and stimulate your thinking.

Friday tours will offer choices including visits to three local historic house museums – the Paine Art Museum, a beautiful historic home surrounded by fabulous gardens; the Bergstrom-Mahler Museum featuring a world famous paperweight collection; and Neenah's Baron Homes. Those with a more outdoor interest will be able to see the local emergence of the Niagara Escarpment at High Cliff State Park, and maps for a walking tour of historic downtown Appleton on your own will be offered. Friday evening we will be entertained by the North Star Nordic Dancers.

On Saturday, the afternoon tours will rotate between the Hearthstone house, first home in the world powered by a centralized hydro-electric plant; the Paper Discovery Museum on the beautiful Fox River, and the Weis Earth Science Museum on the UW Fox Valley campus.

Of course, the best thing about any Torch Convention is the chance to meet old friends, share warm fellowship and fascinating ideas. We will do our best to make this one of the best ever!

Please join us.

Convention Registration

International Torch Convention
Appleton, Wisconsin
June 25–28, 2009

Please go to our website listed below right and complete a registration form and return it along with a check payable to: **Torch Club of the Fox Cities.**

(If you would like us to mail you a registration form, please complete and return the request form below.)

Mail to:

Barbara Kelly
Attention: Torch Convention
2645 Sunnyview Road
Appleton, WI 54914
920-731-2610 (home)
920-915-6173 (cell)
Bkelly48@gmail.com

Convention Rates:

By Feb 1, 2009: \$320 US
By May 15, 2009: \$330 US
After May 15, 2009: \$350 US

Name: _____

Phone: _____

Address: _____

Email: _____

Torch Club: _____

Names of Guests: _____

Special Needs: _____

Radisson Paper Valley Hotel and Convention Center

The Radisson Paper Valley Hotel, located in Downtown Appleton, (www.radisson.com/appletonwi) will be the center of most of our activities. The hotel offers free shuttle transportation from the Outagamie County Regional Airport, and luxurious accommodations.

Please call the hotel directly to reserve your room before May 27, 2009. A special block of rooms will be held for the Torch Convention until that date. Be sure to mention that you are a part of the Torch Convention.

Torch Club rates have been fixed at \$104 plus taxes, but to upgrade your room to the concierge level, you may do so for a small extra fee.

Please Reserve your room EARLY!! The Fox Cities will be hosting a major event called the Badger State Games at the same time as Torch. Rooms may not be available at the last minute.

Radisson Paper Valley Hotel

333 W. College Avenue
Appleton WI 54911

Reservations: (888) 201-1718

Telephone: (920) 733-8000

Fax: (920) 733-9220

Email: info@radissonpapervalley.com

Fox Cities Information for Planning Your Trip

Torch Club of the Fox Valley Website
www.focol.org/torchfoxvalley/Convention

Fox Cities Convention and Visitor's Bureau www.foxcities.org

Fox Cities Online www.focol.org

WE LOOK FORWARD TO YOUR VISIT!

The International Association of Torch Clubs, Inc.
749 Boush Street
Norfolk, VA 23510-1517
www.torch.org

PRSRT STD
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
NORFOLK, VA
PERMIT NO.
2135

Reflections

To know how to
wonder is the first step
of the mind toward
discovery.

—Louis Pasteur

Looking for TORCH Web popular content, reviews and catchy facts? Here we go: we found that torchweb.org is getting little traffic and thus ranked low, according to Alexa. We also discovered that the most significant portion of the traffic comes from USA (88,3%). Reputation of this domain is mostly fine, but you should stay cautious when browsing it as child safety remains unrated yet. Domain information. Owner: Torah Outreach (TORCH). Registrar: Public Interest Registry.