

We showed human waste in slack work, car-pushing, bad housing, disease, low annual wages, and accidents. The miners have everything to gain by entering into an agreement with the public and an alliance with the technicians for good service. Our objective is a reorganized industry, which will lessen waste, cure over-development, give a full working year to the miners, and bring a regular supply of coal to the public at a reasonable price.

The result of these pamphlets was that the United Mine Workers of America at the 1921 Convention created the Nationalization Research Committee. The members are William Mitch, Secretary of the Indiana miners, Christ J. Golden, president of District Nine of the anthracite miners, and John Brophy as chairman.

Our first publication as a committee was *Compulsory Information in Coal—A Fact-Finding Agency*. We proposed a permanent federal compulsory fact-finding agency. We showed that the facts about coal are not known. We do not know the capital investment in mining, nor who owns the coal beds. We do not know the proper elements of current cost nor the proper basis for profit de-

termination. But we mean to know, and we ask the public to join us. We are putting the interest of the people of this country above the interest of one class of workers.

Our latest miners' publication is *How to Run Coal*. This is a plan of nationalization. It calls for the purchase of the mines and the coal by the nation at a price of four and a half billion dollars. It proposes a Secretary of Mines in the Cabinet and a federal commission of mines of eleven members, in control, representing the public. For management, the plan proposes a national administrative council, and district councils, with three kinds of representatives—the technicians, the miners, the consumers. Collective bargaining is safeguarded. No other plan so complete has come out of the American labor movement.

Nationalization has caught the rank and file with a fervor. Opposition will be broken. At the next miners' convention nationalization will doubtless be the one living issue resulting in a legislative bill. This in turn will precipitate political action. And we expect to see a powerful trades union Labor party rise within these next years.

JOHN BROPHY.

The Need for a New Social Concept

I.

I RECALL saying in 1914 that even if the war brought the radicals their coveted opportunity, they wouldn't be able to accomplish anything because they had no technique, and being rewarded for it through the radical press with the opprobrium that your simon pure radical even more than your out-and-out reactionary loves to heap upon his critics.

And yet what less wounding to their own susceptibilities can radicals find to say than that they find themselves unequal to the task of routing their ideals through the common consciousness? They will at least find themselves in good company, for the plight of the wildest Bolshevik is no worse than that of every partisan of social regeneration whose scheme involves the full registry of our intellectual inheritance in terms of political behavior. Not only do we fail to produce a rationalized society, but even in the more restricted fields, such as public health, we have not, as a social entity, succeeded in establishing working terms with our intelligence. We die of typhus and tuberculosis, not because it is not known how such diseases are prevented, but because we have proved incapable of the concerted activity which prevents them.

The discrepancy between our social accomplishment and the mounting sum of our intellectual inheritance is much greater than our realization of it, obscured as it is by the widespread use of other people's brains in the form of public utilities. The man who installs a radio apparatus in his home fancies himself as an exponent of the latest thing in electrical science. Actually his relation to the whole body of scientific learning may be purely parasitic. If the few people who really know electricity were to go on a prolonged strike, the million users of it would be incapable of any sort of restoration. No such catastrophic stroke being at all probable, we happily call this the Scientific Age without any reservations. But in fields in which scientific findings cannot be converted into utilities, the widespread incapacity of the masses to make use of the whole sum of such findings at any given moment, constitutes an all but intolerable drag on the human procession.

The average man is reluctant to admit his share of the drag. Perhaps in the very nature of intelligence there are irreducible obstacles to such admission. But no one with intelligence enough to read the newspapers can deny that there is in existence vastly more knowledge than we have been

able to work up into any scheme of living. Nor can we in an age of increasing objective efficiency, go on with entire comfort charging our failure to the moral obliquity of the other party. Americans in particular, in their dealings with larger issues, are becoming conscious of the lack of the familiar push-button directness. The communal mind is vaguely and irritatedly aware of unused potentialities within itself as a healthy man might be aware of the ache of unused members, and something analogous to the repressions that are recognized as sources of neuroses in the individual, is suffered by the social body. There is nothing to stand aghast at, as we have been doing, at the spectacle of a people surcharged with intellectual potentialities for which no outlet is found in the scheme of average living, running amuck. Where else can it run under those conditions, except down the deeply graven track of war and revolution?

Science unassimilated into the average life is an explosive sort of baggage for any people to carry about with it. No lesson of the great war is so significant as that the mere objective handling of scientific findings in the shape of utilities fails utterly to fit the user for scientific functioning in group determination.

When we examine into the nature of this discrepancy between what we know and the use we can make of it, we discover that our incapacity increases in proportion to the length of time that the activity to which it applies has been an object of social concern. The longer we have thought about any department of living, the less we seem able to know about it.

Clearly there must be a retarding factor in the very constitution of mind itself, which renders it indurate to new presentations of old concerns, since it is shown to be acutely receptive to concerns toward which it is comparatively virgin. Discoveries in instantaneous communication are "eaten up" as fast as they are made public, but new findings in the field of education or political organization threaten the disruption of society with their accumulating drag. The same man who permits his vital organs to be operated upon by a total stranger for a disease he never before heard of, in the interests of a theory of remedial surgery not disclosed, still insists on "making up his own mind" on matters of educational or political import; his notion of the process known as making up his mind involving the necessity, as he sees it, of making it up exclusively out of his own mind stuff, the sum of information and experience of which he is at the moment possessed. He will without any diminution of self-esteem, utilize our common inheritance of engineering science to get

from New York to Brooklyn, but regards with deep distrust any attempt to administer the public schools in the interest of a similar inheritance of subjective knowledge. Apologists for democracy will tell you that you can't expect man to do any better than he knows. As a matter of fact he can and does. The whole material magnificence of the United States is built up out of the willingness of average men to handle and work up into their daily lives, material findings of which they know no more than enough to handle them according to the rules. If all the processes that led up to public schools and Brooklyn bridges were swept out of mind, it would be easier to restore the schools out of the common consciousness than the bridges. The source of our social arrest, the uneasiness of the common people, and the despair of the intellectuals, lies somewhere in the nature of the difference between our rates of objective and subjective change.

2.

Obviously we shall never be able again to present a virgin attitude toward the problem of living together in groups.

It appears that the track of any habit of living through consciousness, if persisted in long enough, sinks to subconscious levels, out of the immediate ken of the intelligence, and takes on from its appearance of sourcelessness, connotations of authority. Once this has happened, every adaptation of ourselves to the problem that first gave rise to the habit, follows more or less the subconscious pull of the earliest pattern. The reason why we could reconstruct an educational system more easily than we could build a suspension bridge out of a denuded common consciousness, is that we have been thinking of education long enough to form a pattern in our minds, but not long enough of the multitudinous processes involved in the building of steel bridges. For the same reason it is easier to have a new type of bridge than a new educational system. Thus we find the retarding factor of subjective change in the pattern-forming habit of the mind itself, the more obstinate as it is widely distributed in the group consciousness.

Before the dawn of history, the mind of Europe had "set" in a concept of the relation of men to one another, and of the group to Allness, of which all our present systems of living together are exteriorizations. Roughly this pattern is patriarchal, the items of the group arranged around a dominating personality in whom is constituted some kind of responsibility for the welfare of the group. "Divine Right" and a God of Judgment

are the highest convolutions of that pattern, and in spite of all our talk we have not succeeded in altering the main lines of that pattern, in the group consciousness. Deeply, we still proceed by the concept of government as something set over us. Democratically it was to be produced out of our coordinated wills. Once produced, except for our power to shift the individual items of it, it has proved as detached, as untouchable as the divine right itself. The difference between a divinely anointed sovereign and an elective president seems to work out as the difference between your natural father and a step-father who may, in the event of proving unsatisfactory, be lightly divorced. It is this tendency of thought patterns, shaped by the unconscious trend of social habit toward fixation, that renders new discoveries in the department of human living inoperative. The measure of that fixation can be taken in the manner in which we observe, after all the breakage in Europe, social living flowing back in the grooves of the ancient social concept, a concept of life as being best lived under the dominance of an exceptional individual, with items of the group disposed on the basis of the main economic chance.

So far all attempts materially to alter this concept by ratiocination have failed. They have failed even when, as in the Russian and the French Revolutions, the breakage of existing exteriorizations of the pattern has been complete, and when, as in the case of early Christianity, the emotional voltage has been of the highest. Christianity has not fulfilled our expectation of the millennial state, theoretic democracy has not brought us where it promised. Socialism and communism have proved but a brittle hardening of social surfaces, eventually shattered by the pull of human nature along the deeply graven paths of the old pattern. Is it not time to wonder whether it is worth while trying to alter the course of the river by sketching patterns on its surface? No doubt there will be always socialists, or communists, or what-not advocates of intellectualized social systems, just as there will always be people who think they can cross the course of human destiny by the numbers in a dream book, but why not admit that for the vast majority of human kind these hand-made millenniums take no hold upon their social impulses? One suspects, indeed, that much of present depression, the arrest of social effort, is owing to the number of thinking people, radicals and liberals alike, who have already privately admitted it.

We cannot displace a social concept except with another social concept. And since we cannot make up anything in our heads that will successfully

compete with our submerged experience, where then is the new concept to come from? This appears to be the predicament of practically all the thinkers who looked for some alteration of our method of living together in groups, more expeditious than the slow attrition of objective experience.

Where indeed are we to find a new social concept *except in the source of all social pattern, our racial subconsciousness?* This is the one place where we have not yet deeply looked for it. We have looked for it in the revelation of some wonder working prophet. We have looked for it in the suffrages of the crowd, and in the eldest sons of the eldest sons of conquerors. We have looked for it in the schools and among the "ologies." We have not yet looked within at the realities of human relations. Or if we have looked, it has always been with the assumption that the reality is already more or less expressed in existing institutions, and we have simply been trying to find points at which that supposed reality is to be altered to fit some intellectually conceived ideal.

The little vogue that formal socialism has had in the world, derives its authority chiefly from its assumption that its doctrine of economic determinism is the primary reality of human society. The vogue of aristocratic forms has been owed to our concurrence in the reality of the essential difference in values among the individual items of society. Democracy derives from another estimate of the relation of those individual values to the undebated economic basis. And all of these are founded on the belief that what we describe as human nature is accurately interpreted by the current conception of it. On this assumption all the so-called social solutions have been plotted.

Now, as it becomes evident that society,—that cumulating betterment of social outlook and condition which we call civilization,—refuses to flow along any of the lines we have mapped out for it, finding that there is backwater, flood, disaster, dessication, we conclude either that there is no true flow, or that we must think up some other direction in our heads in the hope that we may eventually hit upon the right one. But suppose that the difficulty is in our concept of society itself? Suppose that human nature, the relations of human beings one to the other and to the Allness, is quite other than we have conceived it to be? Suppose that in spite of having lived with our nature uncounted centuries, we know very little about it?

Consider how long ago our present concept of

society was shaped, how little light the intelligence of that time could throw. Consider that all forms and rituals of society, kings, presidents, courts, creeds, are symbols, exteriorizations of what man believes about himself and his fellow men. Was it not by the habit of the use of these symbols that the track was laid down upon which our social thinking runs? A king—any sort of government—is a gesture made by the masses on behalf of their need for social direction. But have we any real reason to insist that direction shall always come to us from some such source?

What I am trying to suggest is that we leave off our meticulous examinations of forms, leave off propaganda for or against particular types of social organization, and reexamine the intrinsic relations of men. Obviously society cannot be made to flow in any direction that is not intrinsic, natural to its nature.

Actually there has been no appearance even of progress, except when men have been actuated by the conviction that they have discovered some sort of intrinsicness. What I propose is that instead of trying to utilize the findings of science to create a social objective, we undertake to discover the deeper seated realities governing the movements of human life upon the earth.

Doubtless much of our present dissatisfaction is due to subconscious recognition of the want of harmony between the intrinsic trends of society and our present location in the movement of history. Probably a large part of our incapacity to work up the findings of science into our scheme of living is owing to the discrepancy between that scheme and the reality of human life. We could scarcely expect to assimilate our new concepts of reality in time and space and the structure of the atom and the nature of disease, with anything less than an approximate reality in our concept of society. Nor can we quarrel with the rejection by the masses of much of our science on the ground that it is unassimilable to the common life and human nature, so long as we continue to assume the finality of our notion of the relation of men to one another and of the whole to Allness.

Probably we have never made this reexamination of the grounds of our present concept, because we have lacked adequate concepts of the items of the life scheme which would have to be taken into account in any such reconsideration of accepted notions of why the human race is here, what, if any, is its business, where is it going, what, if anything, have we to do with the rate of that going, and in what way is its progress affected by our dealings one with another. Now the very fact of the existence of new concepts of such es-

sential items as the nature and relations of mind and matter, the effect of mind over mind, and, most astounding discovery! the effect of mind upon itself, seems to call for a new rating of these items in the social scheme. I find it impossible myself to think of the amelioration of labor conditions under any of the present categories, since every one of them ignores the newer concepts of the mode of development of consciousness in its relations to time-space. This may seem far fetched to one who is still thinking of the labor problem as revolving around the partition of the heap. But once you have thought of the mastery of the material environment as the mode of the development of consciousness itself, you cannot again think of the human participators in that mode as mere items of material expense. Or, if you think, as increasing millions do think, of materiality as affected more by attitude of mind toward it than by any form of organized activity, then no scheme of human affairs which does not accommodate that way of thinking will seem properly conformable to your type. Then there is the hovering suggestion that we are on the eve of discovery of the fact, and possibly of the law of continuity of personality, and a whole new scale of relative life values contingent upon such a discovery. All these things are so much in the common mind at present that it may account for the large measure of public indifference to current political activities. The detachment of the American people, for instance, from much that is going on in the politically extraneous world, may not be so much due to ignorance or doltishness as is sometimes imagined. It may be due to the fact that there is forming in the public consciousness a new appreciation of intrinsic social relationships, uncovered equally by the devastations of war and the less obtrusive adaptations to the new environment created by natural science. Actually much of the instinctive practice of the masses is now shown to be closer to the realities of science than the intellectuals have been for two thousand years. The masses, I mean, never did give up their faith in the influence of mind on matter, never lost their belief in the efficacy of the rightly spoken word, which the intellectuals have had to readmit as auto-suggestion. The masses always have regarded the criminal as unfortunate, and refused to distinguish between the highwayman and the robber baron. It is the intellectuals who have rationalized—in the psycho-analytic sense—the deductions of the dominant groups. This has been obscured from them by having crowded on them through the schools all the clichés of formal intellectualization.

Much of the progress of modern psychology has consisted simply in uncovering the natural operations of the mind, as opposed to the earlier method of creating categories. Something of the same sort must be undertaken in all departments of social living. The one hope of establishing a social flow is in being able to make a statement of such uncovered realities in a manner conformable to the average experience of them. Here is a task for all that we have of critical inquiry and discrimination; to trace, and state, in some form in which it can be handled, the essential realities of social relationships.

There does not at present appear to be any other method by which a livable social concept can be established. If there is anything at all in the results announced by the application of present standards for the measurement of intelligence, it will never be possible on any democratic basis to produce an intellectually coordinated society. One is apparently reduced to the choice of an intellectual aristocracy—some such innately superior group as Mr. Lippmann has in mind—who out of their natural capacity for discerning reality in public events will tell the people what to do; or to producing some sort of concept which will be followed by the masses because of its correspondence to something moving within themselves.

In the more fundamental forms of life, where intelligence has not yet created obscuring complexities, biologists are aware of influences that tend to keep the axis of the organism in line with the axis of the source of that influence. These influences and the response to them are called tropisms, and the result on the behavior of the organism is called directive orientation. Probably as the basis of all racial life there is always something analogous to this tropism, which keeps the race in the line of development, some sort of directive orientation which can be called the Will of God, or the racial urge, or by any other name that fits with the changing description of it.

Perhaps, for the purpose of embodying our innate sense of such directive orientation of human society in a new social concept, it is better to leave the source unnamed. At times like this, when society seems lost in the confusion of its minor adjustments, something might be done by turning attention away from the multiplicity of intellectual devices for saving society, and fixing it upon the evidences, both subjective and objective, of the existence and nature of such orientation of the human race with influences that keep it going.

MARY AUSTIN.

The Cooks of Yesterday

THE greatest achievement in country life is not a garden, or the privilege of wearing your old clothes. It is getting a cook, and keeping her. Methods by which she is inveigled to remain in one's kitchen are many and various. Caroline Weston, who lived thirty-six miles from New York City, and on the Putnam Division at that, used to boast that anyone could have a staying servant who understood human relations. Her own Johanna had lived in Wildwood Heights, in apparent contentment, for five years.

Those of us who visited Caroline did not marvel that Johanna remained. The attention of the entire Weston family was focussed on making the "D. D."—debutante daughter, we called her, happy. They took her to the movies in the neighboring town, provided novels and magazines for her leisure and even stimulated romance by hiring a beau to take her to dances in the village school centre. They always asked her permission to invite guests to dinner and they ate what she liked to cook and made no comments or suggestions.

When Johanna contracted a dislike for daylight saving, because her evenings seemed so long, Bobby, back from college, taught her to run the Ford on the theory that it would amuse her to drive around. It did. She took to the car with such avidity that it was almost impossible to get her out of it and into the kitchen. She drove to market, she met people at the station, she carried them into town, she did all the errands. She suggested taking them on tours and when she was supposed to be dusting the parlor would be found instead cleaning spark plugs in the garage. Before long, the driving occupied her so completely that Caroline was obliged to give up all her time to housework. The end was tragic. Johanna drove so well that the owner of the village garage hired her as a chauffeur. Curiously, Johanna, who had refused to wear a maid's dress and apron, preferring Caroline's old sport clothes, fairly gloried in a driver's uniform. She looked exceedingly trim in the gray Norfolk suit with Wildwood Garage on the visored cap, and she knew it.

Caroline couldn't understand it. She became bitter on the subject of the ingratitude of servants, but Johanna was not a whit apologetic.

"Sure," she said cheerfully, "who would be standing over that boiling hot stove and washing dishes, when they could be dressed fine, and out seeing all the people?"

Mrs. Harvey, a neighbor of the Weston's,