

Winter 2013
Vol. 86, No. 2

Features

- 2 Variable Interpretation of the Constitution as a Key to the Supreme Court's Power**
By Malcolm Marsden
- 7 The Grapes of Wrath: An Epic in the Shadow of the Apocalypse**
By Lynn Dickerson
- 11 Surprising Sources of Our Religious Beliefs**
By John Northover
- 15 Cussing: Its Uses and Abuses**
By David Isaacson
- 19 George Catlett Marshall: The Man and the Plan**
By Anne H. Thomas
- 24 A History of Three Jewish Widows from Munich**
By Ronald Kammer
- 28 The Art of Caving**
By Donald Butler
- 31 Wind Power, Solar Energy, Electric Cars—and Other Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds**
By Franklin E. Wright

Departments

- 1 From the President**
- 1 Gold and Silver Awards**
- 36 Paxton Lectureship**
- 37 2013 Call to Business Meeting and Convention Registration**

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

Paxton Lectureship Winners

Norine Haas—Awards Committee Chair

1976— W. Norris Paxton	1995— C. Walter Clark
1977— Seymour A. Horwitz	1996— Richard Schellhase
1978— James E. Ingram	1997— Leanne Wade Beorn
1979— Jack E. Gieck	1998— Gerald G. Eggert
1980— John W. Allen	1999— Mary Frances Forcier
1981— John F. Brown	2000— Robert G. Neuhauser
1982— Robert E. Shepherd, Jr.	2001— Jonathan B. Wight
1983— Harry D. Lewis	2002— Richard T. Schellhase
1984— Dan Pletta	2003— Mark Lore
1985— Jerry L. Petr	2004— Matthew T. Taylor Sr.
1986— John H. D. Bryan	2005— Robert G. Neuhauser
1987— E. Cabell Brand	2006— Malcolm M. Marsden
1988— Hubert J. Davis	2007— Edward P. Blazer
1989— Warner M. Montgomery	2008— Arthur B. Gunlicks
1990— Jesse R. Long	2009— Charles W. Darling
1991— Earnest R. Oney	2010— Barton C. Shaw
1992— Kathryn P. Clausen	2011— Danny J. Krebs
1993— Charles G. Beaudette	2012— Roland F. Moy
1994— Thomas L. Minnick	

Editorial Advisory Committee

Susan Bailey	Humanities, Higher Education
Ernst Behrens	Science, Technology, European History
Gerry Case	General, Science, Technology, Art, Music
Edward N. Clarke	Physics, Engineering
Richard Davison	Theater, American Literature
Paul Douglas	Astronomy, Physics, Law
John T. Evers	History, Politics, Philosophy, Religion
John K. Fockler Jr.	History, Politics, Literature, Current Events
Arthur B. Gunlicks	Politics, Europe, Current Events, History
Dale M. Herder	American History/Literature, Philosophy, Journalism
Anna Johnson-Winegar	Science, Health, Religion, Government Relations, Women's Issues
Vicken V. Kalbian	Medicine, Near Eastern Affairs
Beverly J. Leisten	Education
Mark Lore	History, Foreign Policy, Film/Theater
William P. McDonald	General
Robert G. Neuhauser	Engineering
Scott Stanfield	English
Richard G. Teske	Astronomy, Cosmology, Physics
Stephen T. Toy	Medical Science, History
Edith R. White	Literature, Art

Published for the International Association of Torch Clubs, Inc. by Association Builders, LLC. Torch never knowingly presents any but original unpublished manuscripts. Opinions expressed are those of the contributors. Neither Torch nor Association Builders, LLC 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. (IATC) for its members. Second class postage paid at Norfolk, VA 23510-1517. Postmaster: If undeliverable, return form 3579, postage for which is guaranteed, to IATC, 11712C Jefferson Ave #246, Newport News, VA 23606. 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 be mailed to the IATC office (see above). Address changes and subscription requests should also be mailed to the IATC office. Subscription \$20/year in the U.S.; \$25/year elsewhere. Library rate: \$10/year.

Copyright © 2013 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)
• 1935–36	William S. Linell (Portland, ME)
• 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	G.C. Carey (Buffalo, NY)
• 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	W.H. Powe Sr. (Greenville, SC)
• 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	Dean C. Gross (South Hampton Roads)
• 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)
• 2008–10	Stephen T. Toy (Newark, DE)
• 2010–12	Edward B. Latimer (Columbia, SC)

2012–2013 Officers and Directors

President

Charles E. Carlson
Newtonville, NY 12128-0402
518 / 786-8014

President-Elect

Norine Haas
Frederick, MD 21701
301 / 663-4733

Immediate Past President

Edward B. Latimer
Columbia, SC 29209-2053
803 / 776-4765

Director – Region 1

John R.A. Mayer
Fenwick, Ont. L0S 1C0, Canada
905 / 892-9315

Director – Region 2

Joe Vincent
Allentown, PA 18104-3309
610 / 398-0016

Director – Region 3

Ted Haas
Frederick, MD 21701
301 / 663-4733

Director – Region 4

Warner M. Montgomery Jr.
Columbia, SC 29250-5955
803 / 771-0219

Director – Region 5

Linda Jefferson
Columbus, OH 43227
614 / 239-8696

Director – Region 6

James D. Coppinger
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
269 / 345-3718

Director – Region 7

Paul Douglas
Boulder, CO 80301
303 / 530-4343

Director – Region 8

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

Director – Region 9

Felix Almaraz
San Antonio, TX 78228
210 / 435-3305

Director-at-Large (Membership)

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

Director-at-Large (Conventions)

Robert G. Bass
Lynchburg, VA 24503
434 / 386-3326

IATC Office

11712C Jefferson Avenue #246
Newport News, VA 23606
888 / 622-4101, Fax: 866 / 873-3690
torchclubsinternational@gmail.com

Executive Secretary

Elizabeth A. Garrett

Editor, Torch Magazine

A. Reed Taylor

Editor, Torchlight / Webmaster

Charles E. Carlson

President, The Torch Foundation

Anne D. Sterling

From the President

Our Torch Family



We need your help to help our Torch family thrive as we seek new Directors for Regions 1, 2, 3, 8, and 9. Please consider this opportunity to work as a colleague of the clubs in your region, and to take your place at the IATC management table as the Board makes decisions to assist in club management and membership development. Contact Nominations Chair Ed Latimer, (803) 776-4765 or eblatimer03@aol.com, or your Regional Director if you are interested.

Help wanted! In future issues of *Torchlight* and the spring edition of the *Torch*, I will discuss our effort to improve our communications. Regional Director Jim Coppinger has made a good start, and is looking for members to assist with graphics, photography, art, and computer technology. Join this effort by contacting Jim at (269) 345-3718, or JamesCoppinger@att.net.

In the last *Torchlight*, I described the efforts of President-Elect Norine Haas and her husband Ted in region 3 to encourage leaders of the Hagerstown Torch Club to mentor some smaller clubs that were rapidly losing members. It worked. The

clubs grew, enabling more people to enjoy the fellowship of Torch. Elsewhere, in a recent joint meeting of Region 6 Torch clubs, many attendees said they had never before met a member of another Torch club. They shared ideas and had an honest discussion about the future of Torch. I encourage interclub meetings as a place to get and share ideas.

When I am asked, “What does Torch do for me?” I respond, “What are you doing for Torch?” Many people out there would enjoy the Torch dinner conversation but were never invited to join Torch. In Nebraska, we have established two new clubs in 2012, with sixty new members. We salute the Lincoln Torch Club for its focus on growing Torch in the Great Plains. At our recent Annual Meeting in Portsmouth we budgeted new funds for local clubs and Torch Regions to develop membership and create new clubs. You can really make a difference in the future of Torch by getting involved in these efforts to make our association even more enjoyable and relevant.

—Charles E. Carlson, President
[IATC, \[esccec@gmail.com\]\(mailto:IATC_esccec@gmail.com\)](mailto:IATC_esccec@gmail.com)

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, 2013 to Norine Haas at IATC, 11712C Jefferson Ave #246, Newport News, VA 23606 with copies to your regional director.

Variable Interpretation of the Constitution as a Key to the Supreme Court's Power

A close look at the history of Court decisions shows an evolving balance in favoring literal vs. invisible elements in the Constitution.

By Malcolm Marsden



About the Author

Malcolm Marsden received his BA from Yale, his MA from Harvard, and his PhD from Syracuse University. During World War II, he served in France, the Netherlands, and Germany, earning a Purple Heart and the Combat Infantry Badge. He taught English for five years at Syracuse, four at South Dakota State University, and thirty-seven at Elmira College, where he retired in 1993 as Dana Professor of English Emeritus. A longtime member of the Elmira (NY) Torch Club, he has published several dozen articles, including four in *Torch*.

Presented to the Elmira Torch Club on February 3, 2011.

.....

One of the rituals of American citizenship is to receive the annual report of our President in his State of the Union address, delivered since the time of George Washington not only to the legislative branch but also to the nine justices serving on the Supreme Court. The report is also heard today by millions of citizens on television. In January 2010 the report surprised many of the listeners when the President strongly censured the Supreme Court for its recent ruling on *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* that declared unconstitutional a previous ruling many had regarded as an established precedent. What made this State of the Union Report so dramatic was that the President, the head of the executive

We can, then, rest assured that the Court will rarely promulgate a decision that the American public will not sooner or later come to support.

branch of the government, had used the occasion to publicly rebuke a recent decision of the judicial branch. And now the dramatic effect of the President's public rebuke was intensified when watchful observers of the Supreme Court saw Justice Samuel A. Alito Jr. shaking his head and mouthing the words "Not true." The ramifications of this verbal quarrel continued as Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. a few days later publicly suggested that members of the Supreme Court should not attend future State of the Union reports.

It is easy to understand why the Court's ruling on *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* had aroused the passions of so many. The current ruling had struck down a law that distinguished between private citizens on the one hand, whom the law permitted to contribute unlimited financial support to political causes, and corporations and unions, on the other hand, to whom this law had for several decades denied the right to contribute large sums to political causes. The Court's majority based its decision on its reading of the Constitution. The First Amendment of the Constitution

affirms, among other things, the right of "the people" to "freedom of speech." The Court had hitherto interpreted the word "people" in the First Amendment as referring to individuals, not to an organized group such as a corporation or a trade union. But a Court majority had now interpreted the First Amendment's affirmation of the right of "the people" to "freedom of speech" as applying to organized groups like corporations and unions as well as to individuals. The First Amendment itself does not specify what its ratifiers intended the word "people" to mean.

Interpreting the Constitution

The verbal debate back in 2010 is useful as a means of illustrating how flexible and open to varying interpretations the Constitution actually is, despite the efforts of the Founding Fathers and subsequent ratifiers of its twenty-seven amendments to avoid ambiguity. Many parts of the written Constitution contain words that have more than one meaning, leading one learned justice to interpret them differently than will another equally learned judge. In interpreting the First Amendment, for example, the Supreme Court has had a much more complex mandate than merely to interpret the meaning of "the right of the people" to "freedom of speech." For, as we have seen, the individual justices of the current Court cannot agree on whether the word "people" was intended to mean individuals only or organized groups of individuals as well. The First Amendment also guarantees the citizens' "right" to

religious freedom; the Second Amendment their “right” “to keep and bear arms,” and the Fourth Amendment “the right of the people to be secure in their persons, homes, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures”; the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Amendments focus on the “rights” of a citizen who has been accused of committing a crime. But many words in these amendments invite different judges to interpret them in different ways. For example, the right of the accused to “a speedy trial” guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment provides no definition of what constitutes “speediness.” Nor does the Seventh’s protection against “excessive bail,” “excessive fines” and “cruel and unusual punishment” state precisely what makes a fine “excessive” and what makes a punishment “cruel.”

The Ninth Amendment poses perhaps the greatest interpretive challenge in asserting that the Constitution’s “enumeration” of “certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” The people, then, in agreeing to live under the Constitution, “retained” “certain rights” not stated in the words of the Constitution—unspecified rights that must be considered valid. What are these rights? And how does the Supreme Court go about distinguishing between claims for rights that ought to be recognized as protected by the Constitution and claims for rights that are not constitutionally protected?

Fortunately, the American people have always insisted that prospective Supreme Court justices be well educated, highly able, and of high moral character. For those nine justices have been given the charge to determine what the Founding Fathers and the subsequent ratifiers of the twenty-seven amendments meant by a “speedy trial,” “excessive” bail, “excessive” fines, “cruel and unusual punishments,” and

many, many other words or phrases in the Constitution. They must also distinguish between those unspecified rights which the Ninth Amendment declared were retained by the people and rights that, though claimed by some, fail to qualify for constitutional protection. However difficult the Court’s challenge, the larger question is how the Court goes about making these crucial decisions. Should the justices rely on their gut reaction? Their instinctive response? On systematic reasoning and/or logical speculation? On ethical standards generally accepted in the nation? The decisions of the nine justices are subject to the same passions that affect us all.

The “Invisible Constitution”

In 2008, Harvard Law Professor Lawrence Tribe concluded in *The Invisible Constitution* that the justices have historically based their decisions on a large body of United States Constitutional Law, none of which can be found in the written Constitution. The Court has traditionally interpreted very broadly the First Amendment’s affirmation that “Congress...make no law...abridging the freedom of speech or of the press....” From the beginning, the Court has interpreted the word “speech” to mean not just audible or oral expression, but “visually readable, written, pictorial, and at least some...symbolic expression as well, including music and dance and mime, as well as novels, pamphlets and posters and films and videos.”¹ Nevertheless, the nation was long uncertain whether the word “speech” included all symbolic protest—for example, flag burning. Does the phrase “freedom of the press” ensure a journalist’s right to keep secret the identity of his journalistic sources? For decades no one knew whether the Fourth Amendment’s ban on “unreasonable searches and seizures” encompassed “wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping...” But in 1967,

the Court decreed that the Fourth did indeed forbid such surveillance and thus the ban on wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping became part of the invisible Constitution.

In two recent books, current Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer presents a rationale for supporting the validity of the “invisible” Constitution, arguing that the Court should be wary about “adopting an overly rigid method of interpreting the Constitution”; that is, of “placing weight upon eighteenth-century details to a point at which it becomes difficult for a twenty-first-century court to apply the Constitution’s underlying values.”² When Justice Breyer currently decides on the constitutionality of a statute, he bases his decision on whether or not the statute promotes what he regards as these “underlying values”; that is, whether the statute promotes the individual citizen’s freedom “to participate in the government and thereby to share with others the right to make or to control the nation’s public acts.”³ To judge the constitutionality of a statute on the basis of whether it promotes participatory democracy is surely to rely on the invisible Constitution. As Tribe noted, much of the Constitution’s meaning “cannot be found in the written text alone but resides only in much that one cannot perceive from reading it.”⁴ Since Justice Breyer is so willing to express his liberal views both in his writings and in his interviews with the press, he seems to have become the *de facto* spokesman for the three other liberal justices serving on the current Court.⁵

The *Brown v. Board of Education* decision of 1954 is one well-known example of the continuous extension of the invisible Constitution. In 1868, the Fourteenth Amendment had guaranteed “equal protection of the laws” for all Americans. But in 1868, few if any Americans interpreted the Amendment as a means of bringing about the

integration of black and white schoolchildren. In fact, in 1896, almost thirty years later, the Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* had rendered its “separate but equal” decision, affirming the legality of the segregation of the races. Thus, in 1954, defenders of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision had to concede that those who had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment almost a century earlier had never consciously intended that the “equal protection” clause would be used in the *Brown* decision of 1954 to declare racial segregation unconstitutional. This decision declared the “separate but equal” policy promulgated in 1896 to be a contradiction of terms, considering not just the conscious intent of the ratifiers of the Fourteenth Amendment but rather “what concept... [these ratifiers] intended to enshrine...and what that concept, rightly understood, had come to demand”; that is, that racially separate education is inherently unequal education. In 1910, 1964, and 1971 this way of extending the meaning of the visible Constitution’s “equal protection of the laws” phrase gave Constitutional sanction to amendments granting the vote to women, to those unable to afford to pay a poll tax, and to those citizens who were eighteen to twenty years of age.⁶

In the 2003 *Grutter v. Bollinger* decision, the Court’s liberals and conservatives both based opposing decisions on the same part of the written Constitution: the Fourteenth Amendment. A majority of the justices gave legal sanction to the University of Michigan Law School’s use of “affirmative action” “favoring groups historically discriminated against, like African-Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans.” The minority argued that the use of affirmative action would deny “equal protection” to whites and Asians. But the majority claimed that the Constitution’s basic democratic

objectives required the use of affirmative action and thus superseded the literal words of the Fourteenth Amendment.⁷ The minority based its decision on a literal interpretation of the Fourteenth, while the majority seemed to argue that, in order to give “equal protection” to disadvantaged ethnic groups, the nation must grant them a somewhat favored treatment for what (the Court hoped) would last just a short time. With each application of the invisible Constitution, the Court gains more leeway in making its decisions. In the *Westbury v. Sanders* decision (1964), the Court relied on the “equal protection” clause in ruling that states must enforce the principle of “one person, one vote” in the election of members of the House of Representatives. The Court imposed this ruling despite the fact that the written Constitution specifies only that individual members of the House be chosen “by the People of the several States.” In 1967, when the Court’s *Loving v. Virginia* decision struck down Virginia’s ban on interracial marriage, the Court decreed that the ban was depriving citizens of “a fundamental liberty—in this case, the freedom to decide whom to marry....”⁸

In 1965, the invisible Constitution provided the basis for the Court’s *Griswold v. Connecticut* decision, banning the prosecution of physicians who provide married couples with birth control devices, a right that the *Eisenstadt v. Baird* decision seven years later extended to physicians treating unmarried couples desiring birth control. And in 1973, *Roe v. Wade* recognized a woman’s “right,” up to a point, to get an abortion. In all three cases, the Court based its decision on the individual’s “right” to “private self-government,” a right which the Court presumably decided was at least partially based on the Ninth Amendment’s statement ratified back in 1791, that the people retained “certain rights” which are not

enumerated in the written Constitution. And then in 2003, the *Lawrence v. Texas* decision affirmed that “gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and transsexuals” had the same “relational rights of personal self-government” that *Griswold v. Connecticut* had recognized thirty-eight years earlier. In 1992 the *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* decision reaffirmed *Roe v. Wade*, this time basing its argument on the Ninth Amendment’s provision that the people retained certain rights not expressed in the written Constitution. In the last thirty or forty years, liberals have insisted that the Ninth Amendment should someday be recognized as guaranteeing the “right” to “decent housing, nutrition, health care, employment, even a sound environment.”⁹

Strict Interpretation of the “Originalists”

Such liberal demands that the Supreme Court, basing its decision on the Ninth Amendment, should recognize “rights” that go so far beyond anything explicitly stated in the written Constitution have inevitably alarmed such conservatives as Robert H. Bork, once a judge on the U.S. Appeals Court for the District of Columbia. Bork is an “originalist” or a “textualist,” the names given to those who believe that judicial decisions should be based as closely as possible on the explicit words of the written Constitution. In particular, originalists denounce the free use of the Ninth Amendment to legalize newly-claimed “rights” that the originalists perceive as going wildly beyond the intent of the Constitution’s ratifiers. Four members of the present Supreme Court are foremost opponents of “judicial activism.” The spokesman for this group of four is often Justice Antonin Scalia, whose recent book *A Matter of Interpretation: Federal Courts and the Law* is a highly readable, witty and quotable defense of the premises of

originalism and an attack on what seems to him the unjustified evolution of the invisible Constitution. According to Justice Scalia, “My fidelity to the methodology [of originalism] should be judged...by [my skepticism of the liberal Court majority’s discovery of] a novel constitutional right against statewide laws denying special protection to homosexuals, a novel constitutional right against excessive jury awards,...a novel constitutional prohibition of single-sex state schools, and a novel constitutional approval of federal appellate review of jury verdicts.”¹⁰

An examination of the process through which the Court in 1973 arrived at its *Roe v. Wade* decision may help us to understand why the originalists believe the Court has gone too far in its extension of the invisible Constitution. In legalizing a woman’s right, up to a point, to have an abortion, *Roe v. Wade* based its decision on a “right” that is nowhere stated in the Constitution. But the Court majority held this “right” to be valid because it derives directly from the Court’s earlier recognition of another “right” which, incidentally, is also unmentioned in the written Constitution; that is, each citizen’s “right to self-government.” And the right to self-government derives in turn from the Fourth Amendment’s affirmation of “the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects.” Thus, the Court in *Roe v. Wade* affirmed that a woman’s “right” to control of her own body derives ultimately, though indirectly, from the written Constitution.

Justice Scalia concedes the jurists’ need for leeway, up to a point, in interpreting the Constitution’s abstract principles. But he denies that any reasonable reading of the Constitution permits one to find in its actual words anything close to a sufficient cause for judging abortion as a “constitutional right.” According to Justice Scalia, “No textualist-originalist interpretation that

passes the laugh test could...[find in the written] United States Constitution... [any legal basis for] the prohibition of [anti-] abortion laws that a majority of the Court has found.”¹¹ Originalists insist that the “so-called ‘right to privacy’ means everything and nothing. It has no constitutional basis and no tangible form.” Furthermore, the Court’s liberal justices, the originalists argue, in “substituting their personal judgments for those of Congress,” have gradually usurped “the legislative’s [*sic*] authority to set social policy.”¹²

The *Roe v. Wade* case reveals the intellectual tension often present among the justices of the Court. One might well wonder how they succeed in reaching a workable settlement of so many cases each year. Conveniently, the *Marbury v. Madison* decision of 1803 has become a legal precedent which enables the nation to know rather precisely what it must accept as the legal interpretation of the Constitution’s words and phrases. In the *Brown v. Allen* decision of 1953, the late Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson summed up *Marbury v. Madison* succinctly: “Supreme Court decisions are not final because we are infallible; we are infallible because we are final.”

A Balancing Act

Despite this seeming infallibility, the Supreme Court has usually exercised its authority responsibly, thanks in part to the checks and balances provided by the Founding Fathers to restrain the Court from overreaching. It was Congress, not the Court, that would propose amendments to the Constitution—amendments which would become integral parts of the Constitution after being ratified by three-fourths of the states. After the Civil War, Congress exercised this power to correct the *Dred Scott v. Sanford* decision of 1856, which had outraged the majority of Americans in decreeing that slaves of African

descent had “no rights which the white man was bound to respect.” Congress’s “correction” of the *Dred Scott* decision in 1870 came through proposing to the states three amendments, the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth, which respectively abolished slavery in the nation; granted the right to citizenship to former slaves and to “all persons born or naturalized in the United States;” and affirmed the right of all citizens to vote, regardless of their “race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” Such a “correction” of a “bad” Court decision may take a long time, but when the proposed amendments are duly ratified, the Court must be ruled by the amended Constitution as it now reads.

The Constitution provides still other means through which the Court may be reined in. It gives to the Executive branch, not to the Court itself, the power to nominate new members of the Court. In 1937, President Franklin D. Roosevelt attempted to pack the Court with new members who would approve the New Deal legislation, legislation which the incumbent, conservative Court had declared unconstitutional. At the time, public opinion prevented Roosevelt from increasing the number of sitting justices. But time enabled him to get his way. Within a year or two, several sitting justices retired, thus enabling Roosevelt to nominate to the Court people who would support New Deal policies. As yet another means of reining in a willful Court, the Constitution grants to the House of Representatives the power to impeach those justices who fail to exhibit “good behavior.” No justice yet has ever been impeached, but impeachment always remains a possibility and thus constitutes a moderating force.

In 2009, the legal scholar Barry Friedman published *The Will of the People: How Public Opinion Influenced the Supreme Court and Shaped the Meaning of the Constitution*. The book explores yet a

fourth factor that restrains the Court from interpreting the Constitution arbitrarily. An analysis of the Court's behavior over the past two centuries reveals that the justices themselves have recognized the need to affirm the kind of law that the American public is apt to accept and abide by. Whenever Court members have sensed their danger of overstepping too much the public's understanding of what ought to be legal, the Court has made new decisions which have had the effect of "correcting" decisions which the Court itself had decreed in the past. In a well-known instance of such a correction, a hitherto conservative justice, Owen J. Roberts, abruptly began in the mid-1930s to find New Deal legislation constitutional, legislation very similar to that which, only a year or two earlier, he had found unconstitutional. Presumably, Justice Roberts sensed that the Great Depression had weakened the American public's faith in individualism, on the one hand, and on the other hand had nurtured the public's willingness to expect its government to solve problems that the twentieth-century individual, acting alone, could no longer handle. If so, Justice Roberts would have been responding to the changing values of the public by altering somewhat his concept of the intent of the Constitution's ratifiers.

Almost a century and a half earlier, Alexander Hamilton, in *Federalist* no. 78, had tried to convince the American public to ratify the newly-drawn-up constitution. In this document, Hamilton had explained why the public need not fear that the Court would endanger democracy, but would generally make only those decisions which are in accord with the public will. Why? Because the Court lacks both the executive branch's "control of the sword" and the legislative branch's "control of the purse." Lacking both the military power to enforce its decrees and the financial power to fund

the carrying out of its programs, the Court "must ultimately depend on the aid of the executive [branch] even for the efficacy of its judgments."

A well-remembered instance of the Court's weakness in possessing neither "the sword" nor "the purse" occurred in 1957, three years after the Court's unanimous *Brown v. Board of Education* decision had ruled unconstitutional the earlier "separate but equal" attempt to reconcile the principle of equality with racial segregation. Although a majority of Americans were willing to carry out the *Brown* decision, Mississippi Senator James O. Eastland had warned that "the South will not abide by nor enforce this legislative decision by a political court." And indeed, the judicial branch's weakness, when supported by neither the executive nor the legislative branch, seemed evident when, three years after the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, desegregation had yet to begin. This delay might have continued longer had not the failure of Arkansas' Governor Orval Faubus to maintain public order so embarrassed a reluctant President Eisenhower that he felt forced to send Federal troops to Little Rock to carry out the law. Even so, "Southern schools were not desegregated until the nation as a whole demanded it in the mid-1960s."¹³ Thus, the Court's gradual acceptance of New Deal legislation in the 1930s and the final implementation of *Brown v. Board of Education* in the late 1960s both constantly remind the individual justices that workable Court decisions must eventually reflect the will of the people.

The nine members of the Court, then, will always differ to some extent on the intent of the Constitution's ratifiers; on the nature of those "certain rights" not specifically enumerated in the Ninth Amendment; on whether a specified right such as "the right of the people" to "freedom of speech" applies to

corporations and unions as well as to individuals; on how broadly to apply the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of "equal protection of the law" to all. But the justices all consider themselves obliged to carry out the law as defined by the Court majority; they tacitly recognize and respect the four factors which restrain them from making decisions that will not work, given the nature of American society. We can, then, rest assured that the Court will rarely promulgate a decision that the American public will not sooner or later come to support.

Endnotes

1. Lawrence H. Tribe, *The Invisible Constitution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 25-6.
2. Stephen Breyer, *Active Liberty* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 73; Breyer, *Making Our Democracy Work: A Judge's View* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010).
3. *Ibid.*, 3.
4. Tribe, 21.
5. Jeffrey Toobin, "Without a Paddle: Stephen Breyer and the Liberal Agenda," *The New Yorker*, Sept. 27, 2010, 34-41.
6. Tribe, 70, 76-77.
7. Breyer, 76, 82-83.
8. Tribe, 121, 113-114.
9. *Ibid.*, 133-136, 146-147.
10. Antonin Scalia, *A Matter of Interpretation: Federal Courts and the Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 139.
11. *Ibid.*, 132.
12. Mark Levin, *Men in Black: How the Supreme Court is Destroying America* (Washington: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2005), 60.
13. Barry Friedman, *The Will of the People: How Public Opinion Has Influenced the Supreme Court and Shaped the Meaning of the Constitution* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009), 248.

The Grapes of Wrath: An Epic in the Shadow of the Apocalypse

The classic novel of the Dust Bowl resonates with biblical overtones.

By Lynn Dickerson



About the Author

Holding BA, BD, ThM, and PhD degrees, Lynn Dickerson served as Coordinator of the American Studies Program at the University of Richmond for twelve years, where he is now Professor of English, Emeritus. His teaching and publications have focused on environmental issues in literature and in life. In 2006 the Virginia Forestry Association conferred on him its Distinguished Service Award. Lynn has been a member of the Richmond Torch Club since 1972, honored by his club with a Silver Torch Award.

Presented to the Richmond Torch Club on June 6, 2011.

.....
When the California realist Frank Norris lamented in 1902 that the great epic of the American West had yet to be written, the legendary novelist was sure that it would be written, and would deal not only with the particulars of American life but also with the experience of the nation as a whole. Norris died unexpectedly in late 1902, unaware that John Steinbeck, the man who would write that epic, had just been born.¹ Steinbeck's prizewinning classic, *The Grapes of Wrath*, is today considered one of the hundred most influential novels in his century. The story of the Joad family, evicted from their Oklahoma land by its corporate owners, portrays their hard journey to California, where their dreams of a better life are

betrayed by an overcrowded labor pool and subhuman living conditions amidst a land of abundance.

The story reflects in epic scale the complex challenges of three major historical events of the 1930s—the Dust Bowl, the Great Depression, and the growing plight of the depressed worker. Steinbeck sensitively articulates the struggle of a nation whose vision of itself had been shattered. In his 1989 critical study of *The Grapes of Wrath*, subtitled *Trouble in the Promised Land*, Louis Owens writes:

Behind the [novel's] political and historical message lies the archetypal pattern of American consciousness, the so-called American myth. Behind the preacher Casy's eloquence lies Emersonian Transcendentalism as well as Steinbeck's interest in biology and ecology. Behind the hunger for land expressed in both the narrator's and the characters' words lies Jeffersonian agrarianism,....Behind the exodus from the Dust Bowl to the Eden of California lies the inevitable human need to believe in a new beginning, a second chance, the possibility of Eden rediscovered.²

This paper will show that through the idealism, harsh realism, and social catastrophe posed by the forces of nature, a depressed economy, and corporate greed, Steinbeck has tapped into nothing less than the "End of Time" envisioned by apocalyptic writers in the

Throughout The Grapes of Wrath, one can sense apocalyptic allusions to both recent and ancient historical events, to both the Bolshevik revolution and the Biblical narrative. Americans living during the nineteen-thirties could see the shadow of the Apocalypse in both.

Bible. From the sacrifice of ex-preacher Jim Casy (initials J.C.), who gave his life for others, to Tom Joad's growing spirituality, the novel moves through the travails of specific human beings to the apocalyptic hope of humankind.

Agrarian Idealism

Westward expansion in nineteenth-century America was fueled to a great extent by an ideology which Henry Nash Smith called the "myth of the garden." This myth was the belief that the good life is the agrarian life and that America's abundant land on the frontier would make this life possible for the masses. In *Virgin Land*, Smith noted that "the master symbol of the garden embraced a cluster of metaphors

expressing fecundity, growth, increase, and blissful labor in the earth, all centering about the heroic figure of the idealized frontier farmer armed with that supreme agrarian weapon, the sacred plow.”³ From the idealized yeoman farmer of the nation’s founding to the 1943 Rodgers and Hammerstein musical *Oklahoma!* Americans have drawn comfort and inspiration from the land. The popular musical praised the new territory of its title as offering “plenty of air and plenty of room. . . , plenty of heart and plenty of hope,” ending with an enthusiastic endorsement of the myth of the garden:

We know we belong to the land,

And the land we belong to is grand.
The Oklahoma farm people in *The Grapes of Wrath* find life to be quite different from the idealized version in the musical. They love the land and appreciate what it has to offer, but they cannot make a living from farming land that is too arid to be cultivated. Muley Graves, a neighboring farmer, confesses to Tom Joad:

“Well, you know I ain’t a fool. I know this land ain’t much good. Never was much good ‘cept for grazin’. Never should a broke her up. An’ now she’s cottoned damn near to death. If only they didn’t tell me I got to get off, why I’d prob’ly be in California right now. . . .”⁴

The Homestead Act of 1862, derived in part from a belief in the myth of the garden, was flawed legislation when applied to the western prairie. One hundred sixty acres was insufficient land for dry farming or grazing. Moreover, the program allowed land speculation and failed to offer settlers any financial assistance. Forced to mortgage their land to finance their farming, they had no money to pay the mortgage when crops failed, becoming tenant farmers when the lenders

*In the fourteenth chapter
of the Book
of Revelation...
the writer describes
his vision of the
coming of the lord
in judgment and
redemption, with the
destruction of the old
and the beginning of
a new age.*

foreclosed on the land. In a short time, small farms were combined by large land companies that cultivated the acreage with tractors that literally pushed the tenants off the land. On the road to California, the Joads find that they are not alone in being dispossessed:

Pa spoke generally to the circle. “It’s dirt hard for folks like us to tear up an’ go. Folks like us that had our place. We ain’t shif’less. Till we got tractored off, we was people with a farm.” A young thin man, with eyebrows sunburned yellow, turned his head slowly. “Croppin’?” he asked. “Sure we was sharecroppin’. Use ta own the place.” The young man faced forward again. “Same as us,” he said.⁵

The American dream perpetuated by a belief in the myth of the garden created expectations in the minds of settlers that could not be fulfilled. What happens in *The Grapes of Wrath* is not only a personal tragedy but also a national tragedy. At another level, the novel is about the impact of the industrial revolution on pastoral America. In his book, *The Machine in the Garden*, Leo Marx states that “the ominous

sounds of machines...reverberate endlessly in our literature.” The one machine that best symbolizes the power of this revolution, Marx adds, is the locomotive, for its meaning “is inherent in its physical attributes.”⁶ These attributes are apparent in the locomotive the poet Walt Whitman calls a “fierce-throated beauty,” whose ominous power may be a law unto itself:

Thy trills of shrieks by rocks and
hills return’d,
Launch’d o’er the prairies wide,
across the lakes,
To the free skies unpent and glad
and strong.⁷

The Harsh Reality

As an adaptation of the steam locomotive, the original tractor even looked like a locomotive, rendering even more vivid Steinbeck’s description of the Caterpillar tractors pushing the people off the land. But unlike the locomotive, its descendent is no longer confined to the tracks put down before it, but lays its own tracks where it wills, a law unto itself. Steinbeck describes these machines as “great crawlers moving like insects” that

crawled over the ground, laying the track and rolling on it and picking it up. . . . Snub nosed monsters, raising the dust and sticking their snouts into it, straight down the country, through fences, through dooryards, in and out of gullies in straight lines. They did not run on the ground, but on their own roadbeds. They ignored hills and gulches, water courses, fences, houses.

The man sitting in the iron seat did not look like a man; gloved, goggled, rubber dust mask over nose and mouth, he was part of the monster, a robot in the seat. . . .⁸

The tractor is not evil in itself. It can be a blessing, as the narrator observes later:

Amos later speaks of the reasons for the wrath of God, some very similar to the social injustice in Steinbeck's novel, accusing the people of trampling upon the poor, of taking bribes, and of "turning aside the poor in the gate."

Is a tractor bad?... If this tractor were ours it would be good—not mine, but ours. If our tractor turned the long furrows of our land, it would be good. Not my land, but ours. We could love that tractor then as we have loved this land when it was ours. But this tractor does two things—it turns the land and it turns us off the land... We must think about this.⁹

Steinbeck warns of the dire consequences of social and economic injustice as “the farms grew larger and the owners fewer. ... [W]hen a majority of the people are hungry and cold they will take by force what they need. ... [R]epression works only to strengthen and knit the repressed.” He makes the injustice clear as the owners destroy surplus produce in the presence of hungry people in order to stabilize prices:

The people come with nets to fish for potatoes in the river, and the guards hold them back; they come in rattling cars to get dumped oranges but the kerosene is sprayed. And they stand still and watch the potatoes float by, listen to the screaming pigs being killed

in a ditch and covered with quicklime, watch the mountains of oranges slop down to a putrefying ooze; and in the eyes of the people there is a growing wrath. In the souls of the people the grapes of wrath are filling and growing heavy, growing heavy for the vintage.¹⁰

A Glimpse of the Apocalypse

The issues of social justice in *The Grapes of Wrath* have a long history in the Old Testament books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Amos. Isaiah writes, “Woe to them that join house to house, that lay field to field.”(5:8) Jeremiah speaks of a drought, comparable to that in the novel, as a judgment of God upon a sinful people.(14:1-6) The Book of Amos opens with a portrayal of God’s wrath as an arid landscape resembling that in the opening chapter of *The Grapes of Wrath*: “The Lord roars from Zion, and utters his voice from Jerusalem; the pastures of the shepherds mourn, and the top of Carmel withers.”(1:1-2) Amos later speaks of the reasons for the wrath of God, some very similar to the social injustice in Steinbeck’s novel, accusing the people of trampling upon the poor, of taking bribes, and of “turning aside the poor in the gate.” Because of these and other sins, the lord will pass through the midst of his people and there shall be “wailing in all the vineyards.”(5:10-17, 14:14-19)

The title of Steinbeck’s novel, however, comes not from the writings of the Old Testament prophets but from the imagery in the apocalyptic literature of the New Testament by way of “The Battle Hymn of the Republic.” In the fourteenth chapter of the Book of Revelation, or Apocalypse, the writer describes his vision of the coming of the lord in judgment and redemption, with the destruction of the old and the

beginning of a new age:

Then I looked, and lo, a white cloud, and seated on the cloud one like a son of man, with a golden crown on his head, and a sharp sickle in his hand. ... Then another angel came out from the altar. ... and he called with a loud voice to him who had the sharp sickle, “Put in your sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth, for its grapes are ripe.” So the angel swung his sickle on the earth and gathered the vintage of the earth, and threw it into the great wine press of the wrath of God. (14:14-19)

This vision of the Apocalypse that appears in the first stanza of Julia Ward Howe’s *Battle Hymn of the Republic* follows the Biblical narrative very closely:

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord:

He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored. ...

The significance of this Civil War hymn’s apocalyptic vision to a reading of Steinbeck’s novel comes to light in a letter Steinbeck wrote about the hymn to his agent, Elizabeth Otis: “I like it because it is a march and this book is a kind of march—because it is our own revolutionary tradition and because in reference to this book it has a larger meaning.”¹¹ It is not surprising, then, to learn that Steinbeck insisted that the entire first stanza of the hymn be printed inside the cover of the book.¹²

Apocalyptic literature differs from prophetic literature in its emphasis upon deliverance.

“The righteous are in trouble,” Frank C. Porter writes in the 1909 *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, and “the message is that deliverance is soon to come, and for this men are to wait in patience and trust.” The message of the Old Testament

prophets like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Amos, on the other hand, emphasized judgment, not deliverance. The line between apocalyptic and prophetic literature, however, is not rigid. In the Old Testament, the transition from prophecy to apocalypse was “not a sudden but a gradual transition, nor is the contrast at the end an absolute one.” The element of prediction is in both. “Unfilled prophecy is the foundation upon which the whole structure of the apocalypse was built.”¹³

Throughout *The Grapes of Wrath*, one can sense apocalyptic allusions to both recent and ancient historical events, to both the Bolshevik revolution and the Biblical narrative. Americans living during the nineteen-thirties could see the shadow of the Apocalypse in both. For some Americans, the rise of the Soviet Union was a sign that the Apocalypse was at hand. In the New Testament vision of the Apocalypse, Matthew records the words of Jesus concerning His second coming, or *parousia*, at the time of revelation (apocalypse): “And you will hear of wars and rumors of wars, . . . and there will be famines and earthquakes in various places: all this is but the beginning of the sufferings.” (24:6-8) Matthew’s depiction of the day of judgment in the *parousia* stresses mankind’s obligation to care for one another:

When the Son of man comes in his glory, . . . he will separate [all the people] from one another [and] will say to those at his right hand, ‘Come, O blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you. . . ; for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was naked and you clothed me, I was sick, and you

visited me, I was in prison and you came to me. Then the righteous will answer him, ‘Lord, when did we see thee hungry and feed thee, or thirsty and give thee drink? And when did we see thee a stranger and welcome thee, or naked and clothe thee? And when did we see thee sick or in prison and visit thee?’ And the King will answer them, ‘Truly I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it unto me.’ (25:31-45)

This social gospel is implicit in passage after passage in the novel, but it is explicit in the words of Tom Joad in speaking of the deceased Jim Casy in terms reminiscent of Emerson’s Transcendentalism:

Tom laughed uneasily. “Well, maybe like Casy says, a fella ain’t got a soul of his own, but on’y a piece of a big one—an’ then—”
 “Then what, Tom?”
 “Then it don’ matter. Then I’ll be aroun’ in the dark. I’ll be everywhere—wherever you look. Wherever they’s a fight so hungry people can eat, I’ll be there. Wherever they’s a cop beatin’ up a guy, I’ll be there. If Casy knowed, why, I’ll be in the way guys yell when they’re mad an’—I’ll be in the way kids laugh when they’re hungry an’ they know supper’s ready. An’ when our folks eat the stuff they raise an’ live in the houses they build—why, I’ll be there. See? God. I’m talkin’ like Casy. Comes of thinkin’ about him so much. Seems like I can see him sometimes.”¹⁴

The Grapes of Wrath portrays tragedy and disappointment, but also hope. At one level of meaning, the story of tragedy, disappointment, and hope is the very personal story of the Joad family. At another level, it is the story of a nation from its beginning to the

twentieth century. At a third level, it is a story about humanity, the earth and God. And at all levels of meaning, as the title suggests, is the shadow of the Apocalypse; because the scope of these meanings is so great, *The Grapes of Wrath* can best be described as an epic in the shadow of the Apocalypse.

Notes

1. Donald Pizer, ed., *The Literary Criticism of Frank Norris* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964), 107, 121.
2. Louis Owens, “*The Grapes of Wrath*”: *Trouble in the Promised Land* (Boston: Twayne, 1989), 8.
3. Henry Nash Smith, *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 138.
4. John Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939; repr., New York: Viking Penguin, 1976), 61.
5. *Ibid.*, 242.
6. Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 16, 192.
7. Walt Whitman, *Complete Poetry and Selected Prose*, ed. James E. Miller Jr. (Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1959), 328.
8. Steinbeck, 45.
9. *Ibid.*, 193-94.
10. *Ibid.*, 306, 449.
11. Robert DeMott, introduction to *Working Days: The Journals of “The Grapes of Wrath,” 1938-1941*, by John Steinbeck (New York: Viking, 1989), 65.
12. Owens, 40.
13. Frank C. Porter, “Book of Revelation,” *Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1909), 244-46.
14. Steinbeck, 537.

Surprising Sources of Our Religious Beliefs

Have religions arisen from our ancestors' neurological traits and psychological views?

By John Northover



About the Author

John Northover obtained a BSc in Botany in 1960 from the university in his home city of Bristol, England, and a PhD from the University of London, in 1965 in plant pathology. He immigrated to Canada for a Postdoctoral Fellowship in Ottawa. From 1966 to 2001, John was a scientist with Agriculture Canada, researching the infection and prevention of fungal diseases of fruit crops in Ontario. He published thirty-five research papers and one hundred forty reports and growers' articles. John's interests include genealogy, gardening, grandparenting and the origins of religions. Significantly, John was not introduced to Christianity until age ten, but rejected it by sixteen. With his wife and two daughters, he attended Catholic churches as a critical observer. Since 2005, John has been actively involved with the Unitarian Congregation of Niagara in St. Catharines, Ontario.

Presented to the St. Catharines Torch Club on April 10, 2008.



“Our genes can predispose us to believe. But they don't tell us what to believe in. Our faith is part of our cultural heritage, and some of the beliefs in any religion evolve over time.”¹

Introduction

Religious beliefs are important to us because they provide a philosophical framework for our lives, and may promise a life after death. Religious

scriptures, often regarded as the principal sources of moral and ethical values for individuals and societies, emphasize beliefs common to general spirituality and all religions, particularly Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. These three religions have enduring cultural traditions and a belief in the same supernatural personal god that supposedly assists the faithful in response to prayers. For some people the proof of the biblical creator god is seen in the beauty and intricacy of nature and the awe-inspiring immensity of the cosmos. They believe that the same god also provides love and protection to humans. In the absence of scientific evidence of a creator god, this paper will nevertheless examine what have been considered his origins and personal attributes.

Historically, each religion must have had its origin as an experience of an individual or of a group of like-minded people which was interpreted as an important message from a supernatural power. For those of us who have received religious training, our faith may have grown with further study, or it may have become unconvincing. In both the origination of a religion or the acceptance of an old religion, the brain is very much involved. So to what degree is religious belief attributable to the brain's receptivity or creativity?

Religious Texts

Children are taught the biblical miracles as true stories providing evidence of the power of the Judeo-Christian God. Yet surprisingly, Christian scholar Hans Küng writes that in our scientific age of verifiable facts, these stories should not be understood as true historical events.² Indeed, if the miracle

stories were created to deliberately delude and deceive unsuspecting innocents, we might ask if any of the biblical accounts are reliable. Einstein believed that the cosmos functions according to a very precise set of physical laws which cannot be changed to perform miracles in response to human or divine wishes.³ Both orthodox Jews and fundamentalist Christians believe that the Torah is inspired scripture, representing the very words of Yahweh. Conversely, recent scholarly analyses of the language and writing styles of Hebrew texts reveal that there were several authors with different backgrounds who recorded these oral traditions.⁴ Furthermore, our knowledge of geology, biology, and cosmology powerfully contradicts the two differing creation stories in the first two chapters of Genesis. Analyses of contradictory biblical accounts of God's biblical acts using logic and reason reveal a moral inconsistency.⁵

The long list of sufferings of Yahweh's 'chosen people,' including those affected by the genocidal Holocaust of the 1940s, does not inspire confidence in the reality of a personal, helpful Hebrew god. So perhaps Yahweh was conveniently created by the Hebrews as a tribal, personal god promoting societal cohesion and justifying their biblically recorded genocidal conquests. Similarly, the Christians believe that Jesus was crucified and was bodily resurrected from a single-burial tomb on the third day, later ascending to heaven to join his spiritual father, is a New Testament account by later second century Christian writers espousing the Holy Trinity, not made official church doctrine until Jesus'

divinity was formally decided in 325 CE by a majority of bishops attending Emperor Constantine's Council of Nicaea. The discovery in 1980 of a family tomb in a suburb of Jerusalem, however, suggests that Jesus was entombed with several relatives.⁶ The tomb contained ten ossuaries, six of which bore the inscriptions "Jesus, son of Joseph," "Maria," his mother, "Mariamne" (Mary Magdalene), thought to be Jesus' wife because of different maternal DNA, "Judah," perhaps their son, two brothers, "Jos'e" and "James, the son of Joseph," and a Matthew perhaps related to Maria. The probability of this group's being Jesus' family is considered greater than six hundred to one.

Jesus must have been highly regarded as a social activist whose reputation may have increased greatly after his death, making him a legend. The early church appears to have endowed him with the pre-Christian gnostic attributes derived from the mythical Horus (Iusu) of the early Egyptian religion.⁷ Horus was the only son of the sun god Ra (Osiris), and Iusaas (Isis) who was Ra's sister and wife. Horus had a virgin birth and as the moon god, was 'resurrected' three days after his death at the end of each lunar cycle. Most importantly, Horus spoke for his father with whom he was equal and interchangeable. Jesus' moral teachings are valuable but not original. His divinity and claims of an almighty father God are plagiarized Egyptian mythology made literal and enforced by Roman rule.⁸

The holy text of Islam, the Koran, is believed to be a "transcript of the eternal book in Our (Allah's) keeping, sublime and full of wisdom" (surah 43:1). It was revealed to forty-year-old Prophet Muhammad by the Angel Gabriel over a period of twenty-two years. Received as revelations during solitary retreats, the words were memorized and later recorded by others since Muhammad was illiterate. Muhammad was impressed with the monotheism of

Judaism and Christianity, but he accused the Jews of corrupting God's commandments, and criticized the Christians for their idolatry of Jesus instead of God.⁹ The texts of all three Abrahamic religions owe their origin to earlier mythological traditions and to human creativity rather than to communications from a divine power. The human need for a spiritual or religious belief is still strong, so what factors may contribute to our human desire for a protective power that is beyond our understanding?

A Family Life Religion

Young children readily acquire language skills, new information and loyalties, but they lack knowledge, so that new ideas are learned without a full understanding.¹⁰ For this reason they are vulnerable to misinformation such as that about the reality of Santa Claus and the Tooth Fairy. Usually, children are introduced to the religious beliefs and practices of their parents by the age of three years. They may sit with their parents in the church or synagogue, so that the religious service becomes an extension of family life and family love. This is a subtle but very significant process of association with religious practices from which some youths and adults may never want to free themselves and reevaluate their beliefs objectively. For Christian children, the early family introduction may be followed by a more formal instruction in religious beliefs in preparation for first communion and later confirmation. These events are arranged strategically for children at the impressionable ages of eight and fourteen years. Children welcome these ceremonies as significant stages in growing up with their friends; such occasions are often accompanied by an impressive family gathering to celebrate the religious accomplishment.

Parents have the best intentions for their children and initiating them into the parents' religion helps confirm for the

parents the correctness of their religious beliefs, but it seems doubtful that the religious doctrines are being fully understood and seriously accepted by children. By following their parents' wishes, children continue to earn recognition, support, and parental love. The slow transfer of the feelings of love and protection to an unseen and mysterious god is too abstract for eight-year-old children. Instead they accept the teaching on trust that their parents and other teachers know what is true. Quite unjustly, God is given the attributes of an attentive, patient, protective, strict but loving parent. In my view, parental love becomes God, rather than as the Bible exhorts, that God is love. The dogma that 'God is love' is unproven and must have been copied from the human family experience.

The Parent God in the Subconscious

A surprising source of spiritual or religious belief is the hypothesis of the "parent god." Professor Mel Faber extended the earlier views of Freud that young babies are conscious of being fed, cared for, embraced lovingly, and protected by large forces beyond their understanding. Memories of these experiences, reinforced by later memories of family love during childhood, may be retained subconsciously into adult life. This hypothesis helps explain why adults may have a religious or spiritual feeling that ultimately there must be a sympathetic source of justice. Convinced that the unconscious or subconscious mind was the source of religious feelings, Freud felt that the helplessness of infants and young children arose from their need for protection through love, and that the projection of this need led to the creation of a God or gods.¹¹ He also believed that some experiences prior to the age of eight may be lost from the conscious mind (infantile amnesia) but remain as influential memories in the subconscious mind.¹²

Evidence of a subconscious memory

has been shown experimentally where subjects are given brief exposures of less than fifty milliseconds to an image on a monitor. Many subjects know the message but are unaware of having seen it. The thalamus appears to be the part of the brain that directs subconscious stimuli to the frontal cortex and other parts of the brain which decide from archived memories whether or not to inform the conscious mind for action.¹³ Some researchers believe that the subconscious mind organizes much of our conscious life, including repetitive physical activities and creative thought processes. Reaching the subconscious mind without alerting the conscious mind is the technique used in subliminal auditory and visual advertising.

The significant involvement of the subconscious mind in our daily lives supports the concept of the parent god. Children and adults may have a subconscious memory of the unknown forces that sustained them as young babies. This allows them to accept religious myths or aspects of spirituality. Furthermore, some adults defend their religious beliefs very forcefully perhaps because of their strong subconscious emotional memories of family love and religious practices in early life. For them, denying their family's religion is equivalent to abandoning their childhood feelings of identity, love, and protection. It is possible that the subconscious mind orchestrates this denial to protect the individual.

The Spirituality Gene

Several authors have speculated that over millennia there may have been a selective advantage for people with considerate rather than belligerent personalities. Dean Hamer has suggested that religious practices are a beneficial means of reaching a personal spiritual state in which people feel a respect for nature and a compassion and empathy for their neighbors. This enabled them to live harmoniously in

large communities. Hamer has identified the VMAT2 gene that codes for the production of monoamines that create transcendent emotional feelings. He calls it the God gene. However, this is a spiritual god rather than a biblical god, and it does not imply receptiveness to divine communications. Rather it is a state of personal well-being.¹⁴ A recent study measuring the brain activity of meditating Buddhist monks and Franciscan nuns using a radioisotope and a SPECT detector showed a marked reduction of activity in the parietal lobes and an increased activity of the prefrontal cortex. While meditating, the subjects lost their feelings of space and time. The monks reported a feeling of being part of the universe, whereas the nuns felt that they had been in the presence of God. These researchers promote meditation as a means of developing feelings of peace, compassion, and empathy which for some religious people resembles their feelings about the biblical God.¹⁵ Similar research using MRI and EEG methods showed that during religious experiences several parts of the brain were involved including the parietal lobe, the temporal lobe, and the prefrontal cortex. That study concluded that there was no single 'God spot'. The 'God' discussed by these researchers refers to a personal mental state of euphoria.¹⁶

Another, more extreme out-of-body experience occurs during a near-death experience. Some survivors report traveling through a brightly-lit tunnel with a feeling of great calm, meeting relatives and friends dressed in white garments. This experience is similar for people from different cultures and religions. Survivors usually have a dramatically changed philosophy, and become more caring and compassionate. Tom Harpur regards this phenomenon as a possible glimpse of the life after death, going well beyond the more cautious conclusion reached by Raymond Moody thirty-five years earlier.¹⁷ In medical terms, the

condition might result from an oxygen deficiency in the brain that is more severe than that associated with meditation. Our early ancestors must have had many experiences gained through meditation, near death experience, food deprivation, or the use of hallucinogenic plants.¹⁸ Such experiences may have given the ancient Egyptians the conviction of having experienced god and an afterlife.

The Bicameral Mind

Our brain consists of the left and right hemispheres connected by the corpus callosum. The left side manages language, organization, and reasoning, while the right side is better suited to artistic skills, intuition, and the memory of emotional experiences.¹⁹ Language skills are learned easily by young children and this is combined with a creative ability. Reasoning develops later in the frontal lobes as the child accumulates more knowledge. The child's religious beliefs, associated emotionally with family love and protection, probably accumulate in the right hemisphere. This occurs before the left hemisphere has developed sufficient reasoning ability. If the emotional memories are very strong, the young adult may be unable to use reason to objectively examine the correctness of religious dogma. The subconscious mind appears to decide that the memories of family love associated with religious training, must take precedence. For this reason, says Harvard's humanist chaplain Greg Epstein, it is imperative to teach children secular humanism and a love for other people rather than a belief in a mystical and unproven god.²⁰

Thirty-five years ago, Julian Jaynes noted a bicameral mind trait in ancient people that has since been lost. A careful reading of Homer's *Iliad* displayed the main characters' belief that they received directions from gods rather than from their own conscious reasoning. These messages may have arisen in the intuitive right hemisphere and were

perceived in the left hemisphere as voices calling them to action.²¹ The Book of Samuel (1 Samuel 3) reports that Samuel heard God calling to him. In a similar manner Muhammad believed that he was hearing messages from Allah. Other religious figures have testified to similar but lesser revelations that were probably temporary malfunctions of the brain, interpreted as divine communications. Modern drugs have been shown to reduce the frequency and severity of epileptic attacks.²²

Conclusion

During the last fifty years, neurological and psychological researchers have provided surprising insights into the functioning of the human brain. When we look at spirituality and various religions, we should wonder to what extent revelations, hallucinations, near death experiences, starvation, and drug use led people to create these beliefs. The Egyptian mystery religion of the sun god originated about 4,000 BCE or earlier and was probably the model for the many later Mesopotamian mythological religions including Christianity. Abrahamic religious texts should be regarded with great suspicion because of the theological bias of the authors and the political environment in which the texts were written. Many texts should be seen as allegorical rather than literal. Also they probably give exaggerated accounts in the ancient tradition of storytelling and drama enactment.

The human need for a religious or spiritual belief that provides protection may be quite natural. Adults worry about the threat of forces beyond their control. This feeling of helplessness may very well have stemmed from a person's subconscious memory of their protected life during babyhood and early childhood, a period when their parents assisted them like gods. In the understandable human search for a similar source of love and protection, the biblical God appears to

be no more than a mirror image of parental love. Children are unable to reason the truth of theological dogma, so the Abrahamic religions are perpetuated as an emotional experience of parental love rather than of a verified theology. Religions are of value for their humanitarian aspects, and because they may elicit a spiritual, personal transcendence. Humanitarian approaches should be more strongly emphasized while the mythological and allegorical aspects of religions should be minimized as much as possible.

Notes

1. Dean Hamer, *The God Gene* (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 215.
2. Hans Küng, *Does God Exist?* (New York: Doubleday, 1978), 651.
3. Walter Isaacson, *Einstein: His Life and Universe* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007), 391.
4. Roland Zimany, "Who Wrote the Bible?" *Torch* 84, no. 3 (Spring 2011): 2-6.
5. Matthew T. Taylor, "Tent Revival for Agnostics," *Torch* 78, no. 1 (Fall 2004): 3-10; Charles Templeton, *Farewell to God* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1996), 66, 72-77.
6. This discovery is reported in Simcha Jacobovici and Charles Pellegrino, *The Jesus Family Tomb: The Discovery, the Investigation, and the Evidence That Could Change History* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2007), 203-10.
7. Timothy Freke and Peter Gandy, *The Jesus Mysteries* (London, HarperCollins, 1999), 27, 109-135.
8. Tom Harpur, *The Pagan Christ* (Toronto, Thomas Allen Publishers, 2004), 67-85.
9. Dawood, N. J., trans., *The Koran* (London, Penguin Books, 2003), 2, 343; see also Shaykh Muhammad Sarwar and Brandon Toropov, *The Complete Idiot's Guide to the Koran* (New York: Penguin, 2003), 7-23.
10. Ann St. Clair Lesman, "How

Children Learn Language (and Why Adults Cannot Learn the Same Way)," *Torch* 84, no. 2 (Winter 2011): 23-26.

11. Mel D. Faber, *The Psychological Roots of Religious Belief* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2004), 27-34; Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, trans. James Strachey (New York: W.W Norton, 1961), 24.

12. Peter Gay, *The Freud Reader* (New York: Norton and Co., 1989), 259.

13. Kate Douglas, "The Other You," *New Scientist* (December 2007), 42-46.

14. Hamer, 67-72, 213.

15. Andrew Newberg and Mark R. Waldman, *How God Changes Your Brain* (New York, Ballantine Books, 2009), 51. See also David Biello, "Searching for God in the Brain," *Scientific American Mind*, October/November, 2007, 38-46.

16. Mario Beauregard and Denyse O'Leary. *The Spiritual Brain: A Neuroscientist's Case for the Existence of the Soul* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 255-272.

17. Tom Harpur, *There is Life after Death* (Toronto, Thomas Allen, 2011), 268; Raymond A. Moody Jr., *Life After Death* (St. Simons Island, GA: Mockingbird Books, 1975), 173-76.

18. John M. Allegro, *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*. London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1970; Newberg and Waldman, 189-90.

19. R. E. Ornstein, "Right and Left Thinking," in *Growing Edges in the Psychology of Religion*, ed. John R. Tisdale (Chicago, Nelson-Hall, 1980), 227-33.

20. Greg M. Epstein, *Good Without God: What a Billion Nonreligious People Do Believe* (New York. HarperCollins, 2009), 221-25.

21. Julian Jaynes, *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976), 67-73.

22. Biello, 38-45.

Cussing: Its Uses and Abuses

Tell your mother to bring a bar of soap!

By David Isaacson



About the Author

David Isaacson has a BA (Summa Cum Laude) in English from Indiana University (1965), a Masters in American Studies from Claremont Graduate School (1966), and a Masters in Library Science from the University of Illinois (1973). A member of Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Beta Mu, David taught college English at MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Illinois and Bradley University, Peoria, from 1967-1972. Reference and Humanities Librarian at Waldo Library, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, from 1973 until retirement in 2005, he has published numerous articles about language, literature, and culture in a variety of journals. He is active in the Unitarian church, acts in and writes radio plays, helps to lead a book discussion group called "Classics Revisited," and is a docent at the Kalamazoo Institute of Arts.

Presented to the Kalamazoo Torch Club on October, 19, 2011.



"Now Gol Darn it to heck; I fudged up again!" These words just don't have the same force as "God damn it to hell; I fucked up again." As the linguist Ruth Wajnryb notes, in her book *Expletive Deleted: A Good Look at Bad Language*, swear words usually have two functions: they are used cathartically to express negative emotions like anger, pain, or dismay, and/or they are used to irritate or offend. The cathartic use does not require an audience, but the intention to harm someone obviously

Sometimes slurs are used with such innocence that the only sane response is cleansing laughter. In one of Doonesbury's cartoons years ago, a white child sitting next to a black child on the bus calls the black kid a "honky."

does. You are not likely to euphemize, or substitute soft words for hard ones, if you are alone; but you might use euphemisms for four-letter words if you think your audience would blanch at the raw words. The very term "four-letter words" is a euphemism for cursing. Euphemisms, depending on your point of view, are either prudent or cowardly. They are prudent if you think your audience will be offended by the cuss words, but cowardly if the euphemism calls more attention to itself than the original cuss word.¹

This paper will explore the many uses and abuses of cuss words and make some distinctions among some closely related types of offensive words, such as cursing, swearing, oath-taking, calumny, castigation, profanity, obscenity, blasphemy, scatology, vulgarity, invective, vituperation, taboo words, and insults. Let's understand cussing to mean the expression of

negative feelings through profanity, or, more informally, the use of so-called "bad" words to injure, harm, blame, or denounce someone. I think it will be easier to understand what cussing is by distinguishing it from other related forms of offensive language.

What Cussing Is Not

Invective is language that denounces, illustrated by the *Oxford English Dictionary* with "His invective against his enemies included phrases like 'slimy bastard.'" Vituperation, a little different from invective, is characterized by blame or censure. "I'll kill the guy who insulted my mother" is vituperative language. Cursing is not always a synonym for cussing because a curse can be a religious term signifying ecclesiastical censure, or a supernatural power's way of allotting divine retribution. You can't always substitute the word "swear" for "cuss" because swearing sometimes refers to words one uses to promise, by means of an oath, allegiance to a god or other sacred person or thing. Ordinary cussing simply can't compete with sincere swearing in this religious sense.

The word "oath" is just as ambiguous as the word "swear" because you can take a solemn oath to serve a higher power, but in a much different sense you can also use derisive oaths to curse someone. Oaths in a religious or legal sense are more than serious; they are solemn and sometimes sacred pledges that you will act truthfully. That is why one has to take an oath "to speak the truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God." in courtrooms. Swearing falsely in a

courtroom is a criminal act. If you believe in God but take the Lord's name in vain, you don't simply swear falsely: you blaspheme. Blasphemy also refers to speaking irreverently of anything supposed to be sacred. Technically, atheists cannot blaspheme because they do not attribute divine power to the being or power they curse, but this has never stopped true believers from telling the blasphemer he's going to hell. You can sometimes use profanity without cussing because profanity is closer to blasphemy than to cussing: you are profane if you show contempt for sacred things. But there is also a neutral meaning of profanity: sometimes the profane is just a synonym for secular, meaning *anything* that is not religious. Calumny is most often a legal term meaning the act of slandering, defaming, or making false charges against someone. Calumny is harsher than castigation, because if you castigate people you only criticize them severely. The obscene often refers to sexually offensive or lewd words or deeds, but you can also be obscene if you do or say anything that is regarded as morally repugnant. In law, the word "obscenity" usually means something that depraves or corrupts those who read, see, or hear the offensive content. Scatology literally means writing about excrement, but the word sometimes serves as a loose synonym for obscenity. You can certainly be scatological without cussing because paleontologists who study fossil excrements or coprolites are known as scatologists. You can be vulgar without cussing because the word vulgar refers to that which is common, ordinary, or popular. Translating the Bible from Latin or Greek into the vernacular language of the populace gives us the *Vulgate* edition of this sacred book. Although we often use vulgarity as a synonym for

cussing, this is a snobbish assumption that the common or vulgar tongue is necessarily rude and crude. This ain't necessarily so. Taboo words aren't necessarily cuss words, because if something is taboo it has been put under a social ban. There are lots of relatively innocuous cuss words that come nowhere near being taboo words. However, different societies have different ideas about what is taboo. Years ago when I was an overnight guest at Brigham Young University, upon losing a bar of soap in the shower, I said "God damn it," only to be vehemently rebuked by a Mormon student in an adjacent stall warning me that language like that was not tolerated at his school.

The Offensiveness of Cussing

Some cuss words are deeply offensive all by themselves, such as racial, ethnic, religious, and sexual epithets. Despite their offensiveness, some cuss words are verbally memorable. I was brought up Jewish and was fortunate to seldom experience anti-Semitism. My last name is Isaacson and I was a teenager during the Eisenhower years. A fellow student evidently thought he was being clever when he called me "Ike the kike." Although the slur still stings, the part of me that admires picturesque and vivid language grudgingly admires this guy's verbal facility. Sometimes cuss words are simply called "dirty words" but these terms are considerably less precise than cuss words. It is not the words themselves that are dirty; it is the emotional context in which they are used that seems to equate these words with filth. It may be fun to refer to someone as having a shit-eating grin but the literal image is disgusting.

Some slurs seem offensive regardless of context. Politically correct

people, for instance, assert that the word "nigger" is so denigrating that **no** use, in speech or writing, is defensible. These bowdlerizers on the left are just as censorious as those on the right, just as narrow-minded in 2012 as their Victorian ancestors in the nineteenth-century. Arguing that the original edition of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* can't be taught today because of the over two hundred uses of "nigger," Alan Gribben, the editor of a recently revised edition, substitutes the word "slave" or other non-offensive or less offensive words like "Injun Joe" instead.² The justification is that students and teachers will be able to more fully discuss the subject of race in this classic novel without the embarrassment of reading this epithet. The counter-argument is that this substitution robs the text of its authenticity and insults Twain by assuming that he himself was a racist for using the word. When celebrities use slurs they get into more trouble than the average citizen. After the basketball star Kobe Bryant got benched on a technical foul he called the referee, Bennie Adams, a fag, an epithet that led NBA Commissioner, David Stern, to fine Bryant \$100,000. Kobe half apologized but even though Adams is not gay the inaccurate slur was regarded as deeply offensive.³ Sometimes slurs are used with such innocence that the only sane response is cleansing laughter. In one of Doonesbury's cartoons years ago, a white child sitting next to a black child on the bus calls the black kid a "honky."

Cussing As Therapy

Many of us cuss because it lets off steam. A recent scientific study demonstrates that the physiological changes that occur when we curse often have salubrious psychological effects. According to a recent article in *The*

Grand Rapids Press: “Researchers at Keele University in the U.K. observed that swearing relieves pain.⁴ Subjects in the study placed their hands in ice-cold water and cursed repeatedly. Then the volunteers repeated the same exercise, but instead of swearing, they repeated an innocuous phrase. When they swore, researchers observed the subjects were able to keep their hands submerged in the icy water longer.” Besides the instant emotional relief of cussing there is an enjoyable aesthetic dimension. It is curious that when cussing is enjoyable we often call this language colorful, but if we are offended by this language we call it “off-color.” I’d much rather call someone a bull’s pizzle than a horse’s ass but I find it nearly impossible to be angry enough to curse someone and remember my Shakespeare at the same time. It is safer, not to mention more fun, to cuss someone out at a safe distance. Cussing people in writing may be safer and more effective than cussing them orally. In fact, you may be able to formulate in writing what you might not be able to fashion in speech. Your enemy does not even have to be real: imaginary enemies are just as deserving of our contempt. Invective is quite defensible if it has literary status. One of the most colorful bouts of invective in Shakespeare occurs in *Henry IV, Part 1* between the young Prince Henry (known as Hal) and his boon drinking companion, Falstaff, one of the most verbally inventive cussers in all of literature. At one point in the play, Hal excoriates Falstaff by referring to him as follows: “Thou clay-brained guts, thou knotty-pated fool, thou whoreson, obscene, greasy tallow catch...” and Falstaff replies: “Sblood, you starveling, you elfskin, you dried neat’s tongue, you bull’s pizzle, you stockfish! O, for breath to utter what is like thee! You tailor’s-yard, you sheath,

you bowcase, you vile standing tuck—Dammit! You scarecrow, you skin of an elf, you dried-out ox’s tongue, you bull’s penis, you salted cod! Oh, I wish I had enough breath to tell you all the things you are...”⁵ The most frequent cuss words—shit, piss, fuck, cunt, cocksucker, motherfucker, and tits—have not, despite constant repetition, completely lost their force, as comedian George Carlin observed.⁶ Carlin had been forbidden from using these words in a television broadcast but another potty-mouthed comedian, Lenny Bruce, said he was arrested for saying nine words: “ass, balls, cocksucker, cunt, fuck, motherfucker, piss, shit, tits.”⁷ Ruth Wajnryb has singled out what she calls the “dirty dozen” of these words, adding bitch, bastard, damn, hell, fart, crap, and dick to five in Carlin’s list.⁸

Fun with the F-Word

Cussing sometimes involves a variety of sound effects that are fun to say which may employ hissing sibilants, onomatopoeia, alliteration, or vivid imagery, such as the Southernism “she was faster than a freshly fucked fox in a forest fire.”⁹ It sometimes detracts from humor to analyze it, but this phrase is especially funny for its potential in word play as well as for the visual image it conveys. The sounds in this phrase obviously include the “f” alliteration at the beginning of six words in this twelve-word phrase, but also employ assonance, or similar vowel sounds and consonant sounds. Take the “f” away and you get the not unpleasant run of sounds: “she was aster than a reshly ucked ox in a(n) orest ire.”

There isn’t much doubt that the f-word, the most common and flexible cuss word in English, is both very offensive and yet also the source of much fun and fancy. A most delightful scholarly book, *The F-Word*, published

by Random House in 1999, was edited by a prominent lexicographer, Jesse Sheidlower, editor of slang and other forms of informal language for the *Random House Unabridged Dictionary*.¹⁰ The *F-Word* dictionary is organized in the same way as the most revered scholarly dictionary of English, *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Each entry in this dictionary not only has a carefully worded definition, but its origin is traced in published sources as far back as possible. Different shades of meaning for the same word are distinguished, including how that word may exist in different parts of speech. Most importantly, for scholarly purposes, each entry is supported by chronologically arranged quotations from published sources. These quotations sometimes are more helpful than the definitions in giving the reader a clearer understanding not only of the denotative but also the connotative meanings of the word.

Whether it is used as a noun or a verb, “fuck” has two basic meanings: it is either a literal synonym for the act of sexual intercourse or a figurative way of saying something is quite messed up. But the word is so flexible it can function both as a cruel insult or delightful poetry and all manner of uses in between these extremes. The humorist Ray Blount, in a foreword to the first edition of this dictionary, takes great pains to admire the variety of ways in which the sound of the word fuck, either alone or in hundreds of combining forms, easily functions as the most all-purpose cuss word in English. As Blount points out, you can rhyme the word with lots of other words that are fun to say, such as duck, tuck, suck, muck, and so on. The word has some utility for love-making but even more uses in serious or playful insults. It’s all in the context, of course. You can use the word in a limerick, as

for instance in this one that Blount cites:

There once was a fellow named
Chuck
Who offered a hooker a buck.
She turned him down flat,
Explaining that that
Would almost be *giving* a fuck.¹¹

One reason people keep using this word is that the hard “c” and “k” sounds in English are found in many other words associated with sex, such as *screw*, *bonk*, *poke*, *nookie*, *prick*, *cock*, *schmuck*, and hundreds of others. The word can be traced back to various German, Dutch, Swedish, or Norse words whose meanings are associated with thrusting and poking, not only as synonyms for copulation. It has taken hundreds of years for the word to be accepted in dictionaries. But now that we have this specialized dictionary we can be edified as well as entertained by such words and phrases as the adverb, *absofuckinglutely* (a strong intensifier), *buddy-fuck* (to betray a close friend), *bumblefuck*, (a very remote place, as in Bumfuck, Egypt), *clusterfuck* (a military term meaning to congregate in an offensive manner), *dumbfuck* (a contemptibly stupid person), *em-eff* (a variant of M.F., itself a form of mofo, or motherfucker), *feck* (an Irish euphemism), *flying fuck* (usually preceded by go, meaning to go to hell in a euphemistic manner), *FUBAR* (military acronym for fucked up beyond recognition), *fuckable* (sexually desirable), *fuckathon* (a prolonged orgy), *fuck-you money* (in business, a financial windfall), *futz* (a foolish or unpleasant person), *GFO* (military for general fuck-off), *jug-fuck* (a drinking bout), and hundreds more.

But you don’t have to use the f-word to cuss with sass. Our repertoire of cuss words is so varied that we can disarm by inference or suggestion rather than by a verbal tsunami. Instead of cussing a blue streak it is often more

fun and effective to use innuendo as so many Jewish insults do. Here’s one of my favorites, which starts as a blessing, but quickly becomes a curse: “May you grow so rich that your widow’s second husband never has to worry about making a living.” Sometimes it is insulting not to cuss. Not to swear in the military, or on a sports team, or in prison would mark you as a threatening outsider. But sometimes cuss words are very offensive, severely testing the limits of the First Amendment. Even if you are not the brunt of a cursing rant, innocent bystanders may be not just shocked, but terrorized by a fusillade of cussing. Some months ago, I was the unwilling witness of a woman apoplectic with rage against a grocery store clerk who had dared to change the order of the grocery bags in her cart. Every one of us within hearing wanted to duck for cover as this woman cussed this poor man up and down for at least five minutes before she finally was cussed out.

A friend of mine in his mid-eighties told me that when he was a teenager he once used the F-word in his mother’s presence. Instead of commanding him to wash out his mouth with soap (as my mother did once), Charles’s mother began to cry. She told Charles that this word made her feel very sad because it equated the act of love with filth. “You wouldn’t be here at all, you know, Charles,” she explained, “unless your father and I had not cared for each other so much that we made love. I can assure you, Charles, that what we did to make you was the opposite of the word you used.” Charles told me he has never uttered the F-word since that time more than sixty years ago.

Notes

1. Ruth Wajnryb, *Expletive Deleted: A Good Look at Bad Language*. (New York: Free Press,

2005). See also Timothy Jay, *Cursing in America: A Psycholinguistic Study of Dirty Language in the Courts, in the Movies, in the Schoolyards, and on the Streets*. (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1992).

2. Alan Gribben, ed., Mark Twain’s *Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn: The NewSouth Edition*. (Montgomery, AL: NewSouth Books, 2011). *Wikipedia* notes that this edition “replaces the word ‘nigger’ (which occurs 219 times in the original *Huckleberry Finn* novel) with ‘slave,’ ‘Injun Joe’ with ‘Indian Joe,’ and ‘half-breed’ with ‘half-blood.’ No other changes to the original texts are planned besides these word replacements.” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alan_Gribben [accessed Oct. 8, 2012].

3. “Kobe Bryant Calls Referee Bennie Adams ‘F—king F—got’.” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/13/kobe-bryant-curses-ref-bennie-adams_n_848574.html [accessed Oct. 8, 2012].

4. “Swearing Relieves Pain,” Grand Rapids Press, April 29, 2011.

5. William Shakespeare, *Henry IV*, Part I, Act II, Scene 4, lines 249-52.

6. “Seven Dirty Words,” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_dirty_words [accessed November 2, 2012].

7. <http://video.search.yahoo.com/search/video?p=nine+dirty+words+lenny+bruce> [accessed November 2, 2012].

8. Wajnryb, 24.

9. http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/a_fresh_fucked_fox_in_a_forest_fire [accessed November 2, 2012].

10. Jesse Sheidlower, ed., *The F-Word*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1995).

11. *Ibid.*, xiv.

George Catlett Marshall: The Man and the Plan

Both Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill called him “the greatest American of the twentieth century.”

By Anne H. Thomas



About the Author

With a BA from Oberlin and an MA from Lehigh University, Anne Thomas enjoys a distinguished career as a high school social studies teacher and Director of International Education at Lehigh. She was a finalist for Pennsylvania’s Teacher of the Year award, and received Fulbright grants to study in China, India, and Germany. Active in the Woman’s National Democratic Club, serving as Vice-president for Political Affairs and then President (2004-2006), Anne is on the Board of Directors of Planned Parenthood for Northeast Pennsylvania and Washington, DC. Currently a docent at the George C. Marshall House in Leesburg, Virginia, she is past president of the Blue Ridge-Leesburg Torch Club and a Torch member in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and Frederick, Maryland. She and her husband David have three grown children and six grandchildren.

Presented to the Blue Ridge-Leesburg Torch Club on November 15, 2011.



George Marshall was both soldier and statesman. First, as soldier, he developed the strategy which led to our victory in WWII. A fierce defender of civilian control over the military, he owed his allegiance only to the

President. Then, as statesman, he led the creation of American foreign policy outlined in the Marshall Plan, which saved the free world and laid the basis for what became known as the American Century. He had vision; he had leadership; he had absolute integrity; he had the ability to surround himself with brilliant leaders, forging them into alliances focused on the good of the country and the world. Most historians agree that only George Marshall had the reputation, first to create, and then to convince the American people of the need for what became known as the Marshall Plan. Totally non-partisan, he never registered to vote. When asked what his political affiliation was, he replied that his mother was a Democrat, his father a Republican, and that “I, sir, am an Episcopalian.” He refused to profit from his fame, and had to be cajoled into being interviewed by Forrest Pogue for his official biography that is a major source for this paper.

The Man

Raised in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, Marshall graduated in 1901 from Virginia Military Institute near the top of his class. After his first wife and college sweetheart died from heart disease, he married Katherine Tupper

The man and the plan are intertwined. The plan would not have achieved its form without the vision and leadership of George Marshall, and it probably would not have been adopted by Congress without the power of his reputation.

Brown in 1930, a widow with three children. His military career developed in various assignments, including teaching at the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Georgia, where he designed new military strategies and trained future generals who later served under him in WWII. He served under General John Pershing in WWI, becoming his *aide de camp*, and was later sent to China. Back in America, in 1932 he was given command of several Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camps, the program under FDR which hired unemployed young men for vast public works projects. It was excellent experience for Marshall when he later had to create a

fighting force for WWII almost from scratch. Looking for good generals, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt reached down in the ranks and pulled up Marshall, a one star general, to be Chief of Staff of the Army. He was sworn in on September 1, 1939, as a four-star general. That same day Hitler invaded Poland.

As head of the U.S. army high command, General Marshall had the huge task of drafting, outfitting, and training over eight million men in very short order. His was also the task of military strategy on the battlefield, a challenge intensified when the attack on Pearl Harbor two years later created the military's biggest nightmare, a war on two fronts. His leadership genius was evident in two areas: planning, and creating alliances. With Roosevelt's complete support he promoted the best and the brightest—Eisenhower, Bradley, MacArthur, and Patton. He and the President put together a Grand Alliance—practically unheard of in military history—with Churchill, Stalin, and De Gaulle, keeping it going throughout the war as the key to final victory.

When Roosevelt asked General Marshall if he wanted to command the June 1944 invasion of Normandy, Marshall said it was up to the President, on the principle that elected officials must control the military. Roosevelt chose Eisenhower, saying that Marshall was vital to the war effort at home, and that "he could not sleep at night knowing that Marshall was out of the country." Aware that he was making Eisenhower a hero for the ages, Roosevelt later gave Marshall

In his travels across the country, Marshall called on the women of the country to help make the final push for approval of the plan.

a comparable reputation by promoting him to the rank of five-star general.

After the war, when the Marshalls moved to their Leesburg, Virginia, home, Dodona Manor, Marshall's solid reputation for wisdom and personal integrity led the now President Truman to continue to call on him to serve his country.¹ First, he was sent to China to try to resolve the Nationalist-Communist conflict, an impossible task. Next, in 1947, Truman appointed him Secretary of State, and from that grew the European Recovery Program, later known as the Marshall Plan. He left the State Department in 1949 to head the Red Cross, and was then appointed Secretary of Defense from 1950 to 1951. The hot potatoes of his tenure as Secretary of Defense were the Korean War and the defiance by General MacArthur of President Truman's authority, which led to Truman's relieving him of his command. When the President sought Marshall's advice on relieving MacArthur over his desire to invade Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel against the express orders of Truman, Marshall replied—again on principle—that as the one in control of the military, Truman had no choice but to relieve

MacArthur of his command.

Marshall was also Secretary of Defense in the era of Senator Joseph McCarthy, who vilified Marshall in a 60,000-word document before the U.S. Senate in 1951, accusing him of leading a vast conspiracy to weaken the U.S. so that Communism could prevail. He blamed Marshall for the "loss" of China to Mao Tse-tung. In 1953 came the Nobel Peace Prize which honored Marshall for his role in the Marshall Plan and the salvation of Europe. Marshall died in 1959 at Walter Reed Army Hospital, and was buried with honors at Arlington National Cemetery. As he lay dying, Churchill went to visit him, and left his hospital room in tears.

The Plan

At the end of WWII it became obvious that without help the political systems of Europe would collapse: its industry was destroyed; banking and financial institutions were bankrupt; and the people were slowly starving, both physically and spiritually. As Secretary of State, General Marshall had brilliant official and unofficial advisors—Dean Acheson, Charles Bohlen, George Kennan, Averill Harriman, William Clayton, and others—who saw the new U.S. foreign policy as the American moral destiny. He insisted on honest advice from them, declaring that he had no personal feelings in these matters "except for those I reserve for Mrs. Marshall."² Looming from the East was the Soviet Union, willing to bide its time and move in after the final collapse of Europe. It was already doing so in Poland and

Czechoslovakia. Also obvious was that Congress and the American people needed to be told about the new threat coming from Europe. However, the country was tired from war and wanted only to renew itself and “drink Coke.” So Marshall made the decision to accept an honorary degree from Harvard, and to give a major speech on June 5, 1947, indicating he would be pleased to make a few remarks and perhaps “a little more.” The “little more” became the essence of the Marshall Plan.

The Harvard talk outlined the plight of Europe and its economic and social chaos, and announced the need for aid from the U.S. for the next three to five years. Marshall laid out an original idea that the Europeans take the initiative and draft a joint program for recovery which included, if possible, all the European nations. Well aware of the Soviet desire to take over as much of Europe as they could, Marshall stated that those countries which opposed the plan to restore their economies would get no aid from the U.S. The speech was politely received in the U.S., but the Europeans, led by the British, then the French, jumped at it. Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin of Great Britain and Foreign Minister Georges Bidault of France called a major conference in Paris, inviting all the European nations. Such collaboration was a first for Europe, but it was a main requirement of the plan. During the session, Vyacheslav Molotov, Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, stormed out of the meeting, and subsequently forbade Eastern bloc nations to participate.

The time was ripe for cooperation within Western Europe, but also for an East-West divide. In late September, 1947, the Soviet Union called a meeting of European Communist parties in southwest Poland. At that meeting, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union read a strongly anti-Western report which said that the bosses of Wall Street were taking the place of Germany, Japan, and Italy and that the Marshall Plan is the “American Plan for the enslavement of Europe.” It urged all resistance to the plan, including sabotage.³ When Churchill later made his famous Iron Curtain speech, the stage was set for the Cold War. The next step was for both the Americans and the Europeans to quickly gather as much information as possible on the situation in each European country. The major U.S. diplomatic missions were asked to survey economic conditions and also to determine the likely degree of opposition from the Soviets. The Soviet paranoia saw the U.S. and Europe in a conspiracy to destroy them, also causing concern in Western European countries such as Greece, Italy, and France that were struggling with home-grown Communist parties.

While the plan was being written by State Department officials (some later dubbed “The Wise Men” by journalists), President Truman, at Marshall’s request, sent a bill to Congress for interim foreign aid to Europe. With both houses of Congress controlled by Republicans, influenced by its strong isolationist wing, Senator Taft of Ohio led the

opposition to foreign aid, using the arguments of a balanced budget and lower taxes. However, Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan, the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, had become a staunch convert to Marshall’s concept of aid to war-torn Europe, agreeing that the rebuilding of Europe was essential to the prevention of another war and the takeover of Europe by the Communists. Containment of Soviet Russia became a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy and was the clincher argument against the isolationists. The bill for interim funding passed December 15, 1947.

The President then sent to Congress the proposal for the European Recovery Program (ERP), referring to it as the Marshall Plan in recognition of Marshall’s leadership and excellent reputation in the country. He joked to his supporters that its chances of passage in an election year in a Republican Congress would be diminished if it were called the Truman Plan. Now to sell it to the American people. Marshall took to the road, meeting with groups across the country. His reputation as a war hero, along with his personal integrity and leadership, filled the halls; gradually his message began to sink in. Beginning his campaign in the Midwest in the heart of opposition territory, he later commented, “I worked on that as if I was running for the Senate or the Presidency. That’s what I am proud of, that part of it... It was just a struggle from start to finish and that’s what I am proud of...we put it over.”⁴ His message was clear and concise,

with six major ideas based on pragmatic idealism:

- This was a world-wide struggle between good and evil, between freedom and tyranny, and U.S. aid would provide the survival of a world in which democracy, individual liberty, economic stability, and peace could be maintained.
- A groundswell of anger was becoming a tidal wave among the disadvantaged, and they were turning to the Communist Party. Modern communications such as radio and telegraph contributed to the groundswell.
- The Europeans themselves must agree and cooperate in designing a program and a permanent administrative organization.
- Tax dollars were to fund the ERP, not borrowing, and they would be recovered by the revived trade, freer markets, and increased global commerce—which indeed happened.
- Germany must be included, and Western Europe would be free of Communist domination, which then would provide national security for the U.S.
- If any European nation voted Communist, the U.S. would assume they were voting not to be a part of the ERP, and they would receive no U.S. aid.

In his travels across the country, Marshall called on the women of the country to help make the final push for approval of the plan. Speaking to the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Portland, Oregon, he focused on the poor and disenfranchised, the starving children and desperate

families. In an interview with his biographer, Forrest Pogue, Marshall said:

I talked to the representatives of a number of women's organizations about ERP. "You will put it over," I said, and then I went into it. My goodness, they went back home and they scared Congress to death in the next twenty-four hours. You never saw such rapid action as I got out of that. I said, 'The men will agree with me but they won't do a damn thing.' This [Federation] represented, I think, 10,000 subsidiary little clubs and the [leaders] went to those and everybody went after these [congressmen]. It was electric, what happened, just electric.⁵

The final passage of the Marshall Plan through Congress was the work of many people. The Truman administration was solidly behind it, the State Department under the leadership of Marshall, Dean Acheson, and others was effective, and Senator Vandenberg brought the Republican Party along. Dean Acheson, Deputy Secretary of State after Marshall, modestly called his own role in the process "Present at the Creation."⁶ The decision to limit the ERP to Europe was based on the immediacy of the European disaster, though funding was also provided for the rebuilding of Japan, under the leadership of General MacArthur. Proposed aid for Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist China developed more slowly, over concerns that help for his weak and corrupt regime would simply go to waste.

Without bipartisan support, the ERP probably would not have passed. However, Marshall deserves special credit for his reputation and his warm relationship with Vandenberg. Indeed, Marshall once said that he and Vandenberg could not have been any closer if they were sitting in each other's laps. After the defeat of conservative efforts in the House to add amendments and tinker with the form of the plan, a compromise bill was finally passed in the House 318-75 and in the Senate by voice vote, and signed by President Truman on April 3, 1948. The bill included \$5.3 billion for seventeen Western European countries for a twelve-month period, plus \$150 million in military aid and more than \$400 million in economic aid for China, and an additional \$275 million in military aid for Greece and Turkey. The aid to Europe, both loans as well as outright grants, was extended until 1951 for a total of about \$15 billion.⁷ A new American agency, the European Cooperation Administration, was established to administer the program in Europe, assessing requests from the beneficiary countries and translating the need into plans that met the Marshall Plan standards.

The preamble to Public Law 472, The Economic Recovery Act, already known as The Marshall Plan, really says it all:

To promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures necessary to the maintenance of conditions

abroad in which free institutions may survive and consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States.

U.S. ships set out immediately and every day, for the next four years, dozens were en route to Europe with food, supplies, and technical information. As we know now, this became a forerunner of the Berlin Airlift of 1948-49. Upon the advice of Senator Vandenberg, Truman appointed Paul G. Hoffman, CEO of the Studebaker Corporation and a prominent figure in the business world, to administer the plan, and assigned Averill Harriman to carry out his directives in Europe. Typical of General Marshall, he stayed out of the selection of the leaders and their administration. He moved on to other serious issues such as the creation of NATO and the Korean War, both based on our foreign policy of containment.

The Legacy of the Marshall Plan

The main legacy of the Marshall Plan was the restoration of Europe's economy, bringing the original seventeen nations back to their pre-war economic levels within two years. By the rules of the plan, the Europeans were required to cooperate in order to share the equipment and know-how of the Americans, and for almost the first time in their very long history, they began to work together in a fashion reminiscent of the WWII Grand Alliance, designed by FDR, Churchill, and Marshall, which led to the final victory over the Nazis. Out of this

rebirth of the European economy grew the Common Market and the European Union. The U.S. economy was stimulated at the same time as Europeans began to buy goods and services from America using Marshall Plan funding. One permanent piece of this legacy is the USAID (U.S. Agency for International Development) which promotes the Marshall Plan vision of spreading knowledge and equipment, and encouraging those in need to provide for themselves.

A second piece of the legacy was the containment of the Soviet expansion and the prevention of the spread of Soviet domination. Containment—initially the idea of George Kennan as his major argument for the Marshall Plan—gave birth to NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The containment policy was carried to the extreme in the Vietnam War, which a horrified Kennan called the “bastard legacy.” At the same time, the Soviets demanded money and equipment in reparation from East Germany and other eastern bloc countries in a sum about equal to the Marshall Plan funding. So, while the west built up, the Soviets destroyed—at the same rate.

The man and the plan are intertwined. The plan would not have achieved its form without the vision and leadership of George Marshall, and it probably would not have been adopted by Congress without the power of his reputation. Scholars agree that “Marshall’s character cast a giant historic shadow.”⁸ It established the direction of American foreign policy for the last half of the

twentieth century, and is behind much of our current foreign policy. Of course he was not alone. He enjoyed the support of two presidents and Congress, and the wisdom of expert advisors. But it was General George C. Marshall who led the U.S. to victory in WWII and implemented the Marshall Plan, for which he was fittingly awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

Notes

1. For Truman’s interaction with Marshall, see David McCullough, *Truman* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992). Dodona Manor, purchased by concerned citizens in 1995, was restored and opened to the public in 2005

2. Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas. *The Wise Men. Six Friends and the World They Made* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), 390.

3. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marshall_Plan [accessed November 1, 2011].

4. Forrest Pogue. *George C. Marshall. Statesman 1945-1959*. (New York: Penguin Books, 1987) 236, 244-45.

5. *Ibid*, 253.

6. See Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department*. (New York: Harper, 1961).

7. Numbers vary by scholars depending on what was counted as Marshall Plan aid and what was other aid.

8. Mark A. Stoler. *George C. Marshall: Soldier-Statesman of the Twentieth Century*. (New York: Twayne Publishers. 1989), ix.

A History of Three Jewish Widows from Munich

Signals ignored in childhood assume greater significance decades later.

By Ronald Kammer



About the Author

Ronald Kammer, a graduate of Penn State University with a BS in

Electrical Engineering, has had a thirty-four-year career in the Electric Utility Division of UGI Utilities in Northeastern Pennsylvania, representing UGI on the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnection Planning Committee. He and his wife Nadine, members of the Jewish community in Wilkes-Barre, have two daughters and two grandsons. This paper benefitted from Nadine's genealogical skills.

Presented to the Wyoming Valley Torch Club on May 9, 2011.

.....
Life can only be understood backwards; but it must be lived forwards. — Søren Kierkegaard

Most European Jews in the 1930s and 1940s experienced what is now known as the Holocaust; the majority did not survive. Their "ultimate fate" varied considerably, depending on where they lived, their opportunity to emigrate or go into hiding, and their ties to the gentile community. This paper deals with the connection between Munich, Germany's third-largest city, and three Jewish women who once lived there—Miriam, Malvine, and Helene—all born about 1880. Miriam came there as a young mother, Malvine as a teenager, and Helene as a young bride. I am connected to all three of these women: Miriam was my maternal

grandmother, Malvine my paternal great aunt, and Helene my paternal grandmother.

Miriam

Miriam was born in 1880 in Jaroslau, Poland, in a region known as Galicia, which had a large Jewish population. The daughter of merchants, Miriam was part of a large extended family, including an older cousin, Sarah, who would play a significant part in her life. In 1908 she and her husband Chaim, along with their son Max, emigrated to Munich in search of economic opportunity away from the threat of anti-Jewish riots, or *pogroms*, in nearby Russia. Her cousin Sarah and her husband had moved to the same area and ran a clothing store in Bad Toelz (a charming Alpine village south of Munich with only a tiny Jewish population and no synagogue, but boasting a fine hotel that served kosher food). Miriam and Chaim opened a similar store in Munich, enjoying success and welcoming their daughter Fanni into the world. Even though Chaim changed his name to Joachim, he and Miriam continued to maintain their Jewish identity and to pass that heritage on to their children. Life for Miriam and Joachim in Munich was very pleasant. Their business interests prospered, their daughter attended the University of Munich, and their children had many friends in the sophisticated Bavarian city. Sarah apparently celebrated her fiftieth wedding anniversary at that Bad Toelz hotel in 1934. Many members of Sarah's extended family gathered to observe this

festive anniversary celebration, carefree and joyous in a surviving photo. Undoubtedly there was talk about the ruling Nazis, and of the ever-present anti-semitism familiar to most German Jews. Then, in September 1935, the Nuremberg Laws stripped Jews of their citizenship rights. Jewish emigration from Germany rose again, having declined after the initial panic flight in 1933. Many German Jews agonized over how to escape Nazism. Joachim had a sister who had emigrated to Newark, New Jersey, forty years earlier, and perhaps it was time for his immediate family to leave Germany too. In July 1937, Joachim traveled alone to visit his sister. In fact, a Newark newspaper published a picture of their reunion. Nevertheless, Joachim decided against leaving Germany at this time.

Malvine

Malvine, the second woman of this story, was born in Rethe, in western Hungary. Although they were a traditional Jewish family, her father, a textile merchant, identified himself as Austrian rather than Hungarian, speaking German in the home as they moved first to Vienna—where Malvine spent her formative years—and then to Munich, home to some 10,000 Jews, where Malvine and her older brother, Moritz, enjoyed better educational opportunities. Malvine eventually became a professor at the University of Munich, while Moritz launched his career as a commercial artist. Malvine's marriage to a gentile Austrian artist, Otto, produced no children; Otto died in the

1930s of natural causes.

Helene

Helene, the third woman in this story, was born in Frankfurt, then—as now—Germany’s financial center. Helene’s father, a banker, provided Helene and her two brothers and sisters with a very comfortable childhood. The family belonged to the Liberal branch of Judaism, developed in Frankfurt in the nineteenth century. At the age of twenty-five, Helene married Malvine’s brother Moritz, the commercial artist from Munich, and in 1907 she gave birth to their only child, a son they named Fritz (my father), whose marriage thirty years later in 1936 to Miriam and Joachim’s daughter Fanni (my mother) in Munich provided a final moment of joy before the onslaught of tragedy. Helene and Moritz’s comfortable life in Munich was interrupted by World War I when Moritz was required to serve in the Austrian Army, even though he was then living in Munich. Events sometimes can have long-term unforeseen and significant consequences. On November 11, 1918, Helene’s youngest sister Else lost her German soldier fiancé in the final surge of Allied fighting. Else’s subsequent marriage in the 1920s to Hans, a non-Jew, came to determine Helene’s fate some twenty-five years later.

The Night of Broken Glass

The situation of the Jews in Germany deteriorated sharply in the fall of 1938. A group of Polish Jews, stripped of their possessions, was deported from Germany to Poland, left at the border in a dreadful condition because the Polish government would not accept them. On November 6, 1938, Hershel Grynzpan, the son of one of the deportees, shot and killed a German embassy official in Paris. Three nights later, on November 9, while the top

This visit to Central Europe, ostensibly prompted by genealogical curiosity, made me considerably more aware of my family’s history—especially my German-Jewish heritage.

Nazi leaders were in Munich to commemorate their unsuccessful beer hall uprising or *putsch* of 1923, Hitler left the meeting without giving his customary speech; instead Goebbels, the propaganda minister, remarked that if the Paris assassination provoked riots against the country’s Jewish population, nothing ought to be done to control the “righteous anger” of the rioters. Such riots did, in fact, begin shortly thereafter. Miriam, Joachim, and their son Max were coming home from a movie that evening. While their son parked the car, Miriam and Joachim entered their apartment, only to find five of the rioters waiting for them. They beat Miriam and shot and killed Joachim. The rioter who killed Joachim would later claim that it was accidental, but the forensic evidence showed that the bullet entered the victim just above the bridge of his nose. That horrible night in Germany would become known as “the night of broken glass,” or *Kristallnacht*, because the storm troopers shattered the windows of about 7,500 Jewish stores. They also damaged or destroyed nearly all of the 200 German synagogues, while the police arrested 30,000 Jewish men and took them to Dachau and other concentration camps. The official Nazi government estimate

was that about ninety-one Jews were murdered that evening, but it is likely that 2,000-2,500 deaths were directly or indirectly attributable to the events of *Kristallnacht*.¹

The world press was not silent about the events in Germany and Austria during this fateful night. The *New York Times* even published an article about the murder of Joachim on the front page of its November 13, 1938 edition. Unfortunately the moral outrage expressed over *Kristallnacht* did not continue in the press or elsewhere as the Holocaust unfolded. Some historians cite *Kristallnacht* as the beginning of the Holocaust.

Three Jewish Widows Stranded in Munich

In the fall of 1939, as World War II began, Miriam’s daughter Fanni and Helene’s son Fritz (my parents) were able to leave Germany. But Miriam, Malvine, and Helene were three Jewish widows remaining in Munich where their future looked grim. Miriam may have sought help from her cousin Sarah’s family, but the latter’s situation was also desperate. As Polish Jews living in Germany, they were classified as the lowest sub-humans, or *Untermenschen*. One of Sarah’s sons would perish in Sachsenhausen concentration camp in January 1940, and another would die at Dachau in January 1941. By the summer of 1941, there were about three to four thousand Jews left in Munich out of the original ten thousand. On November 16, 1941, Miriam wrote her last will and testament at the Milbertshofen train station, the collection point for Jews in Munich, probably giving the document to Helene. A few days later Miriam, together with 1000 other Jewish residents of Munich, would be forced to board a train for an unknown destination in the east.

As 1942 dawned, the horror for the

Jews of Europe would reach unimaginable levels. Most of Munich's remaining Jews would be sent to Theresienstadt (Terezin), a town in German-occupied Czechoslovakia. This so-called model camp was a cynical attempt by the Nazis to show the outside world that relocated Jews were leading happy and productive lives. The reality of Theresienstadt was either death through hunger and disease or deportation to the nearby death camp at Auschwitz on former Polish soil. Miriam's cousin Sarah and her husband would perish at Theresienstadt, while Sarah's teenage granddaughter and grandson would perish in the death camps. When the Nazis came for Malvine in the summer of 1942, her brother couldn't help her because he had fled to France, where he later died under unknown circumstances, while his wife and son had been deported to perish in Minsk. After the Nazis auctioned off her collection of paintings, they deported Malvine to die at or en route to Theresienstadt.

The last widow, Helene, was first sent to Dachau in late 1941 or early 1942. However, her sister Else, who was not interned, was able to pass food clandestinely through the fence at Dachau, enabling Helene to survive and subsequently be deported to Budapest, where she stayed with relatives of her deceased husband Moritz. The Jews of Hungary were still relatively safe, but this changed in March 1944 when the Germans invaded the country and sent most of its Jews to Auschwitz or other death camps. The Jews of Budapest were more fortunate, however, with many—including Helene—surviving until January 1945, when the Russian Army liberated the city. Having survived evil on both sides of her journey from Munich to Budapest, the sixty-four-year-old Helene was determined to embrace life, moving to Paris, and then

*That horrible night in
Germany would
become known as “the
night of broken glass,”
or Kristallnacht,
because the storm
troopers shattered the
windows of about
7,500 Jewish stores.*

on to Pennsylvania, settling in the Wyoming Valley for the next fourteen years to help my widowed mother raise me and my brother.

Unlike most German Jews who remained behind during those dark years, neither my mother nor my grandmother Helene had seen the death camps, and didn't talk much about what they had seen happening around them. Helene's parents, one sibling, and her husband had died before the Nazi era, while a brother and her son (my father) escaped to the USA in 1939, one sister escaped to Sweden, and another sister survived in Munich during the war. Thus I did not see the scars often noted by children of survivors. Before my mother died in 1973, she never talked about what happened to her father; the only thing I remember her saying about her mother was that “her last whereabouts are known only to God.” Although she possessed Miriam's will, she never knew, and likely didn't want to know, what eventually had happened to her mother.

As for Helene, I had always attributed her survival during the Holocaust to luck, pragmatism, and the fact that her husband had been born in Hungary. Had I thought about it more

closely, I might have thought it odd that Malvine, who actually was born in Hungary, was not deported there as Helene had been. Helene's visits to Europe in the 1950s to see her sisters in Sweden and in Munich gave her the chance to relive some of what she had known in the past before she died in 1960 and was buried in Munich beside her husband, Moritz, who had died a natural death in the 1930s. In that same year, at the age of sixteen, I accompanied my mother on a visit to Munich and met Helene's youngest sister, Else, and her husband, Hans. Hans was not Jewish and my mother told me he had been either a civilian pilot or associated with the German Air Force during World War I. This meant nothing to me at the time, and I just put it in the back of my memory.

Discoveries after Four Decades

In 1997 I came across an interesting article in the *London Daily Telegraph* on people of partial Jewish background who had served in the German military during World War II. This was not a subject on which much Holocaust research had been done up to that point. However, Jewish assimilation in Germany was quite common. What was surprising about the article was the high military rank attained by some of these *Mischlinge* (half breed). Of course most of them, like German Air Force Chief and future German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt (who had a Jewish grandfather), had not been raised as Jews. Likewise, Erhard Milch, chief of the German Air Force in World War II, founder of Lufthansa Airlines in the 1920s, a personal friend of Goering, and later convicted of war crimes at Nuremberg, had a Jewish father. Most remarkable in the article was the note that Goering protected the Jewish wives of his fliers—a comment that recalled my mother's comment forty

years earlier that Helene's brother-in-law had been a flier in World War I. If that's why Helene survived, her fate had indeed been altered by the bullet that killed her sister's fiancé on the last day of World War I. Possibly her husband, Hans, had saved his sister-in-law.

That summer of 1997, seeking to validate what I had seen on the Internet, I wrote a letter about my family history to the National Holocaust Museum in Washington, aware of publicity about attempts to recover looted assets from World War II, including gold, Swiss bank accounts, insurance policies, and works of art. Many of these recovery efforts were initiated in the United States and got a sympathetic hearing from the Clinton Administration, but soon took on an international character. When the names of insurance policy holders from World War II were listed on the Internet, I thought I saw my parents and grandparents listed and filed a claim. The only insurance policy that could be validated was one taken out by my paternal grandfather, Moritz in the 1920s, who died in 1935 of a heart attack. Despite the Holocaust Era Insurance Commission's ruling that no payments would be made for persons who died between 1933 and 1938 unless it could be proved they were harassed by the Nazis, I submitted a document that supported the normal pre-Holocaust death, citing my father's statement that he was "grateful for the divine providence that prevented Moritz from witnessing the breakdown in human morals and decency." The nominal payment I received, which I used for my younger daughter's college education, gave me the satisfaction of knowing that a legacy from my parents and grandparents would directly help one of their descendants. When I filed the claim for my maternal grandfather Joachim, I recalled the prophetic comment by the local Nazi *Gauleiter*

in November 1938 that "one Polish Jew [my grandfather] who could not hold his tongue had been killed." I recall my mother, seeing a film clip of Goebbels, showing an unaccustomed look of hate and anger, though I later found proof in his diaries that he was only following Hitler's orders in promoting the riots that killed her father.

The Nazis were not only the world's worst mass murderers; they were big-time thieves. Hitler and Goering had a special passion for acquiring works of art. When the Germans occupied Paris during the summer of 1940, Goering's Air Force staff was concerned that he was too busy looking for French-owned art works to pay attention to the Battle of Britain. American state and federal commissions, as well as international ones, were formed to look into looted art from the World War II era. Because my mother had filed a restitution claim on Malvine's behalf about fifty years earlier and recovered three poor quality paintings by Malvine's husband Otto, and in the light of extensive publicity about the restitution of looted art, I filed a claim with one of the commissions, but had no documentation or photos of paintings owned by Malvine. My efforts with the commission were unsuccessful.

Lessons Learned in a Recent Trip

During a trip to Munich in 2005, my wife and I attended Friday night services at the synagogue at 27 Reichenbach Strasse, which had miraculously survived destruction because of its proximity to other buildings. It was a very moving service for me as I thought about the members of my family who had once prayed in Munich. I treasured my visit to the grave of my grandmother Helene, who was buried beside her husband Moritz and his parents—who were also Malvine's parents. Remembering Helene's sister

Else, I thought how precious sibling loyalty is in times of adversity. While touring in Munich, my wife and I spotted in a Jewish bookstore a book about Munich's "*Kristallnacht*" that provided details about the murder of Joachim and the tragic fate of his wife Miriam. She and the thousand other Jewish residents from Munich boarded the train at Milbershofen station and were murdered five days later on November 25, 1941, at the Ninth Fort outside Kaunas, Lithuania. We also took a one-day side trip to Salzburg, where a branch of Vienna's Dorchheim Auction House was said to have sold a painting by Malvine's husband. Returning home, I looked at a picture of it on the Internet and could only wonder if that painting had once graced Malvine's home.

This visit to Central Europe, ostensibly prompted by genealogical curiosity, made me considerably more aware of my family's history—especially my German-Jewish heritage. People I had known through the sketchy recollections of previous generations or through old photographs became far more real. Moreover, my comprehension of that often incomprehensible event—the Holocaust—increased as I examined its diverse effects on the lives of the three Jewish women of Munich.

Notes

1. Andreas Heusler and Tobias Weger. "*Kristallnacht*" *Gewalt gegen die Munchner Juden im November 1938*. Munich: Buchendorfer Verlag, 1998.

2. Bryan Rigg. *Hitler's Jewish Soldiers: The Untold Story of Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Descent in the German Military*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2002.

The Art of Caving

A wonder-filled world awaits those who explore realms beneath the earth.

By Donald Butler



About the Author

Donald Butler is a retired scientist with a degree in Physics and additional majors in Chemistry and Mathematics from Mount Union College. His professional career was devoted to research and development at Case Western University, NASA, Cleveland's University Hospitals, and the Cleveland Clinic.

Presented to the Youngstown Torch Club on September 19, 2011.

.....
Family visits to Kentucky's Mammoth Cave and the Ohio Caverns in West Liberty, Ohio in the 1950s left a lasting impression on me as a teenager. During one tour, the guide mentioned that an area off the "beaten path" was being prepared for future tours. My mother commented, "Wouldn't it be nice to go over there?" I enthusiastically agreed and a mindset was formed. At Mammoth Cave, we took the "Old Cave Tour," where the guide let my sister and me go ahead of the main group because we were smaller than the adults and could easily pass through the tight areas. My enthusiasm for caving was now ingrained.

This caving desire lay dormant until 1967 when I overheard Paul School, a co-worker at Case Western University, talking about a caving trip he and his wife were planning with another couple in Pennsylvania over the weekend. I asked him many questions about

what caving was like, and found myself invited to join the four of them for a weekend of caving. That was all I needed to start a lifetime of cave exploration.

One common misconception about cave exploration, or caving, is to call it spelunking. In very general terms, spelunking is caving, but in specific terms, the two vary greatly. The best and simplest explanation of the difference is to say that cavers rescue spelunkers. Cavers are serious cave explorers. Spelunkers are tourists. Cavers are careful and considerate. Spelunkers are careless, inconsiderate tourists in a cave. Spelunkers occasionally need rescuing and hope that there are cavers available to help them.

I have been a caver all these years for two reasons. First, imagine the adventure and excitement that the explorers felt when they first entered the "New World" of the Americas. Imagine hunting for a Fountain of Youth, or a lost city of Gold, or a Northwest Water Passage to the Pacific Ocean. Imagine the excitement Lewis and Clark felt when they left to find a land passage to the Pacific Ocean. Now imagine a cave that is centuries old and you are trying to find a second exit from that cave. Maybe you will find a room that no one else has yet discovered. Imagine entering a cave and finding a huge waterfall that surface dwellers know nothing about. Imagine finding that the cave you

My favorite spot is Mystic Cave, which one enters in the middle. After a short distance, you come to a rock ledge where incoming water forms a waterfall.

are in is linked to another close cave and you find that link between them. I have searched for all of these and have been successful at all but one of these adventures.

A second reason for my love of caving is that the formations in these caves are beautiful and varied. Most people have viewed them in commercial caves, such as stalactites growing from the ceiling. An oversimplified way of gauging the age of a stalactite formation is to consider that it grows an inch per century.¹ A fifty-inch stalactite started its lifetime while the Great Pyramid of Egypt was being built, about 5,000 years ago. That same formation was thirty inches long when Rome was in power and Jesus walked the earth, and forty-five inches long when Columbus set sail from Spain. When you are in a cave, you are seeing more history than the earth's surface can offer. I leave it to the reader to guess man's activities when a thirty-foot stalactite started forming.

Caving can be a safe and rewarding pursuit by following several simple rules.

For Safety:

1. Never go caving alone.
2. Never go caving in the rain, or when rain is expected.
3. Have a good reliable light that will last hours longer than needed.
4. Carry at least one sturdy rope of 50 feet or more.
5. Leave a message outside the cave, with time and location information.
6. Dress for a wet, dirty, 54-degree environment.
7. Wear shoes with good traction.
8. Wear a hard hat with a chinstrap. It is best if your primary light source is attached to the hard hat.
9. Wear leather or similar gloves.

For Consideration of others:

10. Leave the cave, as much as possible, the way it was when you entered it. It will last lifetimes; don't ruin it in one.

By adhering to these few rules, cavers can make dangerous situations into what seems like a carefree hobby.

The basic equipment for caving is simple, inexpensive, and effective. I purchase my hard hats at local hardwood stores. The attached LED headlight, the primary light, can be found at an outdoor store where there is a large selection of flashlights. The chinstrap is made from an elastic band one inch or more in width. The batteries should allow for eight to twelve hours of use. An extra

I trust this brief overview explains some of the appeal of caves. Every caver has a different feel for the experience. For some it is the closeness of something as mysterious as an unknown cave passage. It could lead to a large room or formation—or a magnificent waterfall—or an unknown entrance—or a bottomless pit. Perhaps it is the challenge of wandering around in a world that many dared not even enter. Perhaps it is the age of these formations that astounds you.

battery should be carried in a waterproof bag. To complete the light package for a caving party, the second light source is a water resistant flashlight with alkaline batteries. The third light source is several chemical light sticks. I use two ropes: a one-hundred-foot hemp rope with three prusiks, and a fifty-foot waterproof rope.

Most of my caving experiences have started in Ohio and consisted of two- to three-day excursions to

private caves in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and West Virginia. Of the twenty-seven caves I have searched for and/or explored in these states, my favorite area was Germany Valley in West Virginia, where I have visited ten caves. Of those, my favorites are Mystic Cave, with seven waterfalls, two entrances and a possible third; Big Lime, a long cave with many large rooms; and the Sinks of Gandy, where a river flows into one side of a mountain and then out the other side.

The best way to find a private cave is to use a hand-drawn map. The worst situation is that you have only the name of the cave. Some landmarks for cave-searching include fence lines, dead trees, gullies, or sink holes in a pasture. If we know we are in the area of caves, we can look for rock outcroppings in an open area, sink holes (depressions in flat land), streams of water that disappear, or blow holes (fast-moving air coming from the ground).

Finding private caves poses a time problem. They are not easy to locate. And when you do locate one, you need permission to enter the cave. The owners are generally very congenial people but protective of their property, including their cave. They need to be assured that you are not a threat to their property. Generally that means a fifteen- to forty-five-minute conversation while they evaluate who you are. With all of this, a caver can spend a whole day finding a cave, or failing to find it, and can be refused entrance to it. But the end result is worth the effort, and the people you meet are

charming and interesting. Rural West Virginia people are some of the friendliest I have ever met.

Preparing to enter a cave, I assemble my climbing equipment. My main rope is the one-hundred-foot rope with three prusiks, which I carry in a coil over my shoulder. Each prusik is a slipknot rope apparatus for climbing or descending the main rope. I use two prusiks for my feet and one for safety around the chest. Most cavers are quite good at using prusiks. The main rope can be used for its full length either up or down. The fifty-foot rope is smaller in diameter, completely waterproof, and wrapped around my waist and under the sweatshirt. Even when the main rope is attached to the cave, waiting for the return trip, the second rope will allow for additional climbing.

My favorite spot is Mystic Cave, which one enters in the middle. After a short distance, you come to a rock ledge where incoming water forms a waterfall. At this point, you see a large room. Ahead and slightly to the left is the upper cave. To the right is the lower cave. The upper cave has its own separate small entrance. The lower cave has the dragon's corner and a twelve-foot waterfall (rope recommended). Mystic is a wet cave, a little under a mile in length, with its seven waterfalls. It has many formations and is ideal for taking pictures. The ideal camera for cave pictures is the disposable camera. It works well, is small, and easy to keep dry. It costs little and includes the flash you will need. It you ruin it, your loss is less than twenty dollars. To take pictures in

a cave you need to know two basic facts: 1) the flash will only light a small area, and light dies quickly in a cave; and 2) you must hold your breath when you take a picture, since every breath you exhale makes a cloud and the flash will light it and the camera will record it as fog.

What sort of life will we see in this cave? We can expect to see bats that are common to every cave, though mostly they are sleeping, or absent if it is night time. They fly very carefully and will not fly into you. Leave them alone and they will leave you alone. Since this is a wet cave, as are three-fourths of caves, you will likely see fish, crawfish, or millipedes. These will be bleached of color and very light for lack of sunlight. You will not see snakes or pack rats inside the cave; they cannot tolerate the cool temperature. In a wet cave, we are always checking the water running through the cave. If it starts to increase in volume or turns from clear to muddy, we can guess that it is raining outside and we should exit the cave.

I trust this brief overview explains some of the appeal of caves. Every caver has a different feel for the experience. For some it is the closeness of something as mysterious as an unknown cave passage. It could lead to a large room or formation—or a magnificent waterfall—or an unknown entrance—or a bottomless pit. Perhaps it is the challenge of wandering around in a world that many dared not even enter. Perhaps it is the age of these formations that astounds you. All of these things and more are available to the caver

in exploring a cave. If you do have an interest in caving, contact an active caver and join him in a visit to a cave. You may find it as interesting as I do.

Note

1. Steven Kramer & Kendrick Day, *Caves* (Minneapolis, MN: Carolrhoda Books, 1994), 23.

Additional Reading

Bretz, J. Harlen. *Caves of Missouri*. Jefferson City: Missouri Department of Business and Administration, 1970.

Falsom, Franklin. *Exploring American Caves*. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

Halliday, William R. *American Caves and Caving*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Kramer, Steven, and Kendrick Day. *Caves*. Minneapolis, MN: Carolrhoda Books, 1994.

McClurg, David R. *Caves and Caving*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1972.

Nymeyer, R., and William Halliday. *Carlsbad Cavern, the Early Years*. Carlsbad, NM: Guadalupe Mountains Association, 1991.

McGrain, Preston. *Geology of the Carter Caves Area*. Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1966.

Morris, Deborah. "Caught in a Deadly Maze." *Reader's Digest*, March 1991, 103-109.

Stone, Ralph W. *Pennsylvania Caves*. Harrisburg: State of Pennsylvania, 1931.

Tabor, James M. *Blind Descent*. New York: Random House, 2010.

Wind Power, Solar Energy, Electric Cars— and Other Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds

Enthusiasm runs high for various solutions to our energy crisis, but not all fixes are smart.

By Franklin E. Wright



About the Author

Upon graduating from Old Dominion College, Franklin Eastwood Wright served in the U.S. Air Force as a munitions officer in Missouri, Thailand, and Denver. Earning a law degree from the University of Denver College of Law, he later served as Assistant Professor of Law at the United States Air Force Academy. Upon receiving his Master of Laws degree from the University of Michigan Law School, he received assignments to Georgia, Texas, New Jersey, and Hawaii. After he retired as Judge Advocate in 1988, Colonel Wright entered private practice in San Antonio and later Dallas, specializing in Labor and Employment Law. Following his second retirement in 2004, he and Susan, his wife of 48 years, relocated to Winchester, Virginia, where he has been active in historic preservation.

Presented to the Winchester Torch Club on May 4, 2011.

.....

Scottish journalist Charles MacKay published *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* in 1841, describing the folly of such economic “bubbles” as the “Tulipomania” that raged in 1635, when entire fortunes were paid for a single tulip bulb.¹ The phenomenon is not unlike the recent technology and

housing “bubbles” in the United States or the recent obsession with all things “green,” especially our media-generated focus on “renewable” energy, and its proposed utilization to “solve global warming.” Neither separately nor combined can renewable energy sources supply the world’s power needs. We need to focus our money and attention on developing and using cleaner hydrocarbon resources in a transition to nuclear power.

Beginning Assumptions

Far from being a “Denialist,” I begin with the following assumptions:

1. The Earth is warming
2. This warming may be harmful and undesirable.
3. We humans can do something about it.

Energy is everywhere—and cannot be destroyed, according to the physical law of energy conservation, but it can be converted to another form. The energy of wind may be converted to wind power—as it has been for millennia—by use of sails. The energy of falling water may be converted to water power by the use of waterwheels to turn millstones. The energy contained in wood can be converted by burning it to produce heat. These forms of energy, along with animal and human power, have sustained the human race for most of its existence.

The improvement of the steam engine by James Watt, however,

changed everything. Engine power made possible geometric increases in productivity and the invention and development of innumerable processes and devices. As Robert Bryce recently observed, “Power allows us to do things that make us happy, wealthy and comfortable. Power gets us up in the air and down the road. Power fetches the e-mail, makes the coffee and bakes the cake. Power allows us to cut the grass, roast the turkey, cool the beer, fly to Rome, and of course, keep the lights on. While those facts may seem self-evident, here’s the essential truth about our power-driven world: the overwhelming majority of the power we use comes from hydrocarbons because they can provide us with the reliable and abundant power that we desire.”²

“Captured” Carbon-based Fuels

The conversion of energy to various forms of power has transformed human civilization in the past centuries, revealing a direct correlation between prosperity and the production and consumption of power. Though often criticized for consuming the most power in the world per capita, the United States owes its status as the world’s most prosperous nation to this fact. Wasteful and inefficient though our use of energy may be, our high standard of living is directly related to our power consumption.³ We produce much of our power today from hydrocarbons, not because we like them but because they

produce lots of heat energy, from small spaces, at prices we can afford, and in quantities that we demand.⁴ James Fallows has pointed out that nearly half of our electricity in 2010 came from coal-burning power plants, with another twenty-three percent from gas, and twenty percent from nuclear energy. China, by contrast, derived seventy percent of its electrical power from coal. Oil, along with its derivatives, has become the preferred energy source of the planet not because of a grand conspiracy of oilmen, but because of oil's power "punch" and the ease of its transportation, storage, and dispensing. Only uranium has matched its efficiency as a source of power. Even more plentiful than oil is coal—with the largest concentration in the United States—and natural gas is even more plentiful than we thought just a few years ago. All of these are based on carbon "captured" millions of years ago by plants and compressed under enormous pressure. Burning these fuels produces a lot of pollutants, and carbon is "released," primarily in the form of CO₂. While we once worried about the amount of NO, CO and other "harmful" gases, scientists tell us now that CO₂ is one of the major culprits behind global warming. And while there are many sources of greenhouse gases other than the burning of fossil fuels—like methane—"which ton for ton," says Fallows, "can be more powerful in the greenhouse effect, we have focused on CO₂ because we produce so much of it and because its effects are so long-lasting."⁵

Non-Renewable Alternatives to "Captured" Carbon

If we are to reduce the rate of increase in CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere, we need to find alternative power sources. Some are carbon-

based, but are "alternative" in the sense that they aren't oil, gas, or coal.

Ethanol

The effort to produce ethanol began in the 1970s with government subsidies—promoted by farm-belt politicians of both parties to benefit farmers—to derive fuel from corn, a policy strengthened by EPA mandates to use a given amount of ethanol in gasoline. Even Al Gore regrets his support of ethanol, admitting its benefits are "trivial," but acknowledging "it's hard once a program is put in place to deal with the lobbies that keep it going."⁶ Ethanol also benefits from government incentives, such as a blender's credit of fifty-four cents a gallon, and from tariffs that stifle competition from such foreign suppliers as Brazil. All this for a product that no one wants; it holds one-third less energy per gallon than gas and is hydrostatic (absorbs water), corrosive, and potentially harmful to gasoline engines.⁷ Its environmental "burden" is greater than gasoline in that it takes more energy to produce than it offers. The mandate to use corn to produce gasoline for the world's largest industrialized nation, thereby limiting the amount of food and/or increasing the cost of food in the developing world, raises serious ethical questions. Today, four out of every ten rows of corn go for ethanol production.⁸ Government subsidies and mandates have the effect of distorting the corn market, increasing the cost of food products around the world. In any event, even if the entire United States corn crop were devoted to ethanol production, it would satisfy only **four** percent of United States oil consumption.⁹ As Robert Bryce observes, "Whether the issue is subsidies, food supplies, land use, air pollution, energy balance, Brazilian ethanol, or the way ethanol affects the selection of America's presidential

candidates, ethanol is one of the biggest frauds ever perpetuated on United States taxpayers."¹⁰

Biomass

The other carbon-based alternative power source is biomass. Its simplest—and most common form—is the burning of "leftover" organic waste from logging (wood chips) and agriculture (sugarcane stalks) to produce cellulosic ethanol. Despite government mandates, grants and loans, this year **perhaps** four million gallons of cellulosic ethanol will be produced—rather than the 250 million gallons mandated by Congress in 2007—at a cost of at least \$162 million of tax dollars and an equivalent amount of venture capital.¹¹ Cutting down trees, which absorb CO₂, in order to **burn** them (thereby producing CO₂) to generate electric power, given the fuel costs of harvesting and transporting the trees to the power plant, strikes many as folly.

Renewable Energy

Wind

Far preferable to ethanol and biomass—costly to the food supply, the environment, and the economy—are renewable energy sources, the most popular of which is wind power, perhaps the oldest power-producing technology. Man has used sail power to propel boats for millennia and windmills to operate mills for centuries. But as any sailor knows, wind is highly variable; the chances of being becalmed or being demasted are ever present.

Modern technology has attempted to moderate the wind's variability, but even the best wind turbine can begin to generate power only when the wind is **above** a certain speed, and has a "governor" to limit the turbine speed in high winds in order to prevent damage to the turbine. Because wind and the power it produces is variable, and

because of the physical properties of power production, wind farms must be supplemented by coal- or gas-fired generators of similar capacity.¹²

The “windiest” places are generally far from the metropolitan areas that most need electricity, requiring an extensive transmission infrastructure. Added to the ecological impact of wind farms—bird and bat kills, noise, visual “pollution”—is the impact of transmission towers and lines on otherwise pristine spaces which accounts for a “NIMBY” reaction.¹³

The Sun

Solar power is the second most popular alternative energy source in the environmentalists’ pantheon. Solar energy obviously is not available for ten to fourteen hours a day, and in many parts of the country is unavailable on many days altogether. The methods of collecting solar energy are presently costly and require large amounts of real estate. Where the sun shines brightest and most directly is in the desert—often remote from the major population centers that require power.

The availability of sunlight is often not in synch with residential power needs. Because solar power production varies, the inefficiency of solar facilities increases their cost and the cost of the electricity they produce. This variability, like that of wind power, requires backup power sources. Thus construction and maintenance costs of traditional energy sources are not reduced; the only “savings” may be fuel costs.¹⁴ The use of solar panels or wind mills may be efficacious for fairly limited production of power in remote locations where electricity is otherwise unavailable. Roof solar panels or small wind turbines could reduce the cost of electricity for individual homeowners, and even in some cases provide excess power to the grid. But neither solar

energy nor wind power can be available in sufficient quantity to supply more than a **small** fraction of the world’s power demands. And no amount of wishing, or good intentions, or government (taxpayer) subsidies can change that! You can’t run a steel plant with solar panels. As Julio Friedmann recently noted, “Solar and wind power are going to be important but it is really hard to get them beyond ten percent of total power supply.”¹⁵

Water

Water power may have been used by humans even longer than wind power. All that is needed to harness the power of falling water is an adequate flow of water to turn a water wheel or turbine. It is relatively cheap and efficient, but it requires a constant flow of water. Most streams flow seasonally and thus quite variably. To solve this, dams are constructed to store water during high rainfall and/or snow melt in order to permit an orderly flow of water through the turbine.

The damming of streams adds environmental and ecological costs to hydroelectric generation. In any event, there are a limited number of streams, in a limited number of locations, providing a limited amount of water flow to generators. And, there is a movement afoot presently to dismantle dams because of their ecological impact. Tidal power—generating power from the fluctuations of tidal waters twice a day—also seems promising, but devising devices that can economically harness this power has been elusive. Wave power also has proved difficult to harness efficiently.

Nuclear Energy

Finally, let me address the ultimate (so far) alternative source—nuclear power. If we are to reduce our dependence upon the devil fuels—hydrocarbons—we **must**, at least until

we can develop hydrogen fuel cells, increasingly rely upon nuclear power.

Nuclear energy generates practically no greenhouse gases and is highly efficient in producing power, which is readily available to supplement variable power sources (like wind). Admittedly, it is costly—mainly because of safety requirements, the permitting process, and the lengthy lead-time measured in decades. Nuclear waste is also an enduring problem—though not insolvable. “However you slice it,” wrote Holman Jenkins last year, “coal is more dangerous than nuclear.... Thousands more die in coal mining accidents each year (especially in China) than have been killed in all nuclear-related accidents since the beginning of time. What’s more, coal plants spew toxins like mercury and other metals, along with more radioactive thorium and uranium than a nuclear plant.... The EPA estimated a new emissions standard [for coal-fired plants]... would, by itself, save 17,000 lives a year.”¹⁶

Flaws in Government Mandates

Governments have responded to global warming with mandates and with subsidies—all designed to slow the rate of increase in CO₂ concentrations. This is all at great expense, and with too little effect. Greenhouse gas emissions already present cannot be appreciably reduced by the end of the century.¹⁷ Mandates will result in much higher energy costs for ratepayers. Government (taxpayer) subsidies prop up industries and technologies that are not cost-efficient, and the subsidies themselves are not sustainable.

Spain, for example, like most European nations, has adopted tough targets for cutting greenhouse gas emissions, adopting a government subsidy system which guarantees prices

for “low carbon” electricity and assures renewable companies a higher rate of return than they could expect from the free market. Solar-PV plants receive a “feed-in” tariff ten times the price utilities pay for power produced from conventional sources. As a result, investors built huge installations of PV panels across the country—**six times** (3,200 megawatts) what was predicted—and the tariffs cost the government 2.6 billion Euros in 2009 alone. Because of Spain’s current financial difficulties, the government is now proposing to cap the number of subsidized hours the solar plants can sell to the grid. With twenty billion Euros already invested by banks, pension funds, and private investors in Solar-PV plants, the tariff charges “could force many solar producers into default on their debts, which would mean big write-downs for Spanish banks already saddled with bad loans in the real estate sector.”¹⁸

Electric Cars

Finally, to complete the triune of my title, let’s talk about electric cars. Electric cars have been around for 170 years. There were a number of electric cars manufactured in the first two decades of the twentieth century. But gasoline-burning internal combustion engine cars quickly buried the electric cars—not because of a conspiracy (e.g., “Who Killed the Electric Car”), but because gasoline is energy dense, and easily transported. The main limitation of electric cars, the **battery**, is heavy, expensive to manufacture, and has limited storage capacity. While significant advances have been made in battery technology, far greater improvements will be necessary before electric cars will be a viable alternative to gasoline-powered vehicles. Also, the rare earths used to make batteries are almost entirely mined and refined in

China, which has taken steps to restrict their export.¹⁹ Electric cars cost up to twice what conventional vehicles cost (Chevy Volt, \$41K vs. Chevy Malibu, \$22K), rely upon batteries that are heavy and have a limited life span, provide highly variable ranges (23-80 miles depending upon temperature and vigorousness of driving), require the establishment of an infrastructure providing on-the-road recharge or battery exchange, to supplement overnight recharge at home—leaving out the forty percent of Americans who do not have access to a garage or other place to charge their cars at home—using electricity most likely produced by a coal-fired plant.

Those who want to make a “contribution” to the environment, or whose lifestyle is adaptable to the electric car’s limitations (short trips, access to another vehicle for longer trips) should be encouraged to buy a plug-in vehicle, but they should **not** be subsidized by taxpayers at \$7,500 per vehicle for their decision. The environmental benefits simply are not proportional to the cost.

What to Do? What to Do!

When all around us are losing their heads, it is important that we “Cool It.”²⁰ Rather than rush to impose the most onerous “remedy” in order to “solve this generation’s greatest challenge,” let’s take a deep breath. A decade ago Robert Bradley declared, “The economic risks of intervention in limiting greenhouse gas emissions must be evaluated along with environmental ones. The major threat to energy sustainability is statism, not depletion, pollution, reliability or anthropogenic climate change. Major government interventions in energy markets, such as price controls, access restrictions or carbon suppression, create the energy

problems that non-politicized, free-market processes work to prevent.”²¹ For the foreseeable future, the world’s demand for power will require a continued reliance on fossil fuels. We must, then, take these steps:

1. Develop “Clean Coal” technology. The coal industry’s slogan “Clean Coal” is “an insulting oxymoron” for environmentalists. One underlying idea, notes Fallows, is that “coal can be used in less damaging, more sustainable ways than it is now. The other is that... there is no plausible other way to meet what will be, absent an economic or social cataclysm, the world’s unavoidable energy demands.” Friedmann asserts that “coal is by far the most prevalent and efficient way to generate electricity.” Another observer notes that “[U.S. Energy Secretary] Steven Chu has said, ‘we have to face the nightmare of coal for a while’.”²²
2. Transition power generation to increased use of abundant natural gas, which produces one-half of the CO₂ of coal.²³
3. Increase the amount of nuclear power, and develop new reactor technology that can use depleted uranium (spent fuel rods) to produce ten to 20 times more energy.²⁴
4. Explore geo-engineering solutions to global warming, such as injecting a relatively modest amount of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere to reflect one percent of the light that hits the earth, thereby, cooling the earth one percent.²⁵
5. Continue energy efficiency efforts.
6. Adopt adaptation strategies such as seawalls to save the enormous sums of money proposed in a futile effort to stamp out carbon usage, and spend it on the mitigation of global

human hunger and suffering.²⁶

Summary

The “madness of crowds”—the rush by environmentalists and governments to “fix” global warming—has focused on unsustainable “solutions” to CO₂ emissions. When power production/consumption is central to economic prosperity, the emerging economies of China and India will require even more power. Unless these countries are willing to forego progress and resulting prosperity so that the developed economies can maintain what they have achieved, more—**much more**—power must be produced.²⁷ With present or foreseeable technologies, “renewable” sources simply cannot provide the energy required. Only by smarter use of “clean” technology and “cleaner” fuel sources, increased efficiencies, and adaptation strategies can the challenge of global warming be met.

Notes

1. Charles MacKay, *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (1841, repr. New York: Crown Trade Paperbacks 1980).

2. Robert Bryce, *Power Hungry: The Myths of “Green” Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future* (New York: Public Affairs, 2010), 14.

3. See Alan D. Pasternak, *Global Energy Futures and Human Development: A Framework for Analysis* (Livermore, CA: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 2000), 5, at <https://e-report-ext.llnl.gov/pdf/239193.pdf> [accessed November 30, 2012].

4. Bryce, 42.

5. James Fallows, “Dirty Coal, Clean Future,” *Atlantic*, December 2010, 66, 70.

6. *Wall Street Journal*, Review and Outlook, November 27, 2010.

7. Bryce, 6.

8. *Wall Street Journal*, Review and Outlook, January 13, 2011.

9. David Pimentel, quoted in “Amber Waves of Grain,” *Wall Street Journal*, January 22, 2011.

10. Robert Bryce, *Gusher of Lies: The Dangerous Delusions of “Energy Independence”* (New York: Public Affairs, 2008), 11.

11. “The Range Fuels Fiasco,” *Wall Street Journal*, Review and Outlook, February 10, 2011.

12. John Etherington, *The Wind Farm Scam: An Ecologist’s Evaluation* (London: Stacey International, 2009), 25, Table 1.1; 62-68.

13. Bryce, 121-24; Etherington, 106, Table 6.1; 112-128; Daniel Gilbert, “Wind Battle Blows Over Canyon,” *Wall Street Journal*, December 9, 2010.

14. Bjorn Lomborg, *The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 134; Etherington, 63-68; David Ropeik, “How the Grid Powers a Continent,” *Mysteries of the Universe*, NBC.com, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/3077316/ns/technology_and_science-science/t/how-grid-powers-continent [accessed November 30, 2012]; Bryce, 97-98.

15. Julio Friedmann, quoted in Fallows, 73.

16. Holman W. Jenkins Jr., *Wall Street Journal*, April 13, 2011.

17. Etherington, 98.

18. Guy Chazon, *Wall Street Journal*, December 23, 2010.

19. Mike Ramsey, *Wall Street Journal*, January 14, 2011.

20. Bjorn Lomborg, *Cool It: The Skeptical Environmentalist’s Guide*

to Global Warming (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007). The author challenges whether “hysteria and headlong spending on extravagant CO₂—cutting programs at an unprecedented price is the proper response, where billions of people live in poverty, where millions die of curable diseases, and where these lives could be saved, societies strengthened, and environments improved at a fraction of the cost.”

21. Robert L. Bradley, Jr., “Climate Alarmism Reconsidered,” posted November 17, 2004, Institute of Economic Affairs, London, <http://www.iea.org.uk/publications/research/climate-alarmism-reconsidered> [accessed November 30, 2012].

22. Fallows, 66, 73 (quoting Friedmann), 72 (quoting Ming Sung).

23. Report of Deutsche Bank, November, 2010, quoted in Steven Mufson, “Coal’s Burnout,” *Washington Post*, January 2, 2011.

24. Robert A. Guth, “A Window into the Nuclear Future,” *Wall Street Journal*, February 28, 2011. See also George F. Will, “This Nuclear Option is Nuclear,” *Newsweek*, April 9, 2010, 25: “Meanwhile, America, which pioneered nuclear power, is squandering money on wind power, which provides 1.3 percent of the nation’s electricity: it is slurping up \$30 billion of tax breaks and other subsidies amounting to \$18.82 per megawatt-hour, 25 times as much per megawatt-hour as the combined subsidies for all other forms of electricity production.”

25. Nathan Myhrvold, “The Next Smart Thing,” interview, *Wall Street Journal*, March 7, 2011.

26. See, generally, Lomborg, *Cool It*; Paul Driessen, *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power, Black Death* (Bellevue, WA: Free Enterprise Press, 2003).

27. Daniel Yergin, *The Quest:*

Energy, Security and the Remaking of the Modern World (New York: Penguin Press, 2011), 8: “The world’s appetite for energy in the years ahead will grow enormously. The absolute numbers are astounding.”

Bibliography

Broecker, Wallace S., and Robert Kunzig. *Fixing Climate: What Post Climate Changes Reveal About the Current Threat—and How to Counter It*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2008.

Bryce, Robert. *Power Hungry: The Myths of “Green” Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future*. New York: Perseus Books Group, 2010.

———. *Gusher of Lies: The Dangerous Delusions of “Energy Independence*. New York: Perseus Books Group, 2008

Driessen, Paul. *Eco-Imperialism:*

Green Power, Black Death. Bellevue, WA: Free Enterprise Press, 2003.

Etherington, John. *The Wind Farm Scam: An Ecologist’s Evaluation*. London, Stacey International, 2009.

Flenner, Tim. *Now or Never: Why We Must Act Now to End Climate Change and Create a Sustainable Future*. New York, Atlantic Monthly Press, 2009.

Friedman, Thomas L. *Hot Flat and Crowded: Why We Need a Green Revolution and How It Can Renew America*. New York, Farrar, Strans & Giroux, 2008.

Gore, Al. *An Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Rodale, 2006.

Hertsgaard, Mark. *Hot: Living*

Through the Next Fifty Years on Earth. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2011.

Lomborg, Bjorn. *Cool It: The Skeptical Environmentalist’s Guide to Global Warming*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.

———. *The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Simon, Julian. *The Ultimate Resource 2*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Stager, Curt. *Deep Future: The Next 100,000 Years of Life on Earth*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2011.

Yergin, Daniel. *The Quest: Energy, Security and the Remaking of the Modern World*. New York: Penguin, 2011.

2013 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 *Torch*, is given to the author of an outstanding paper presented by a Torch member at a Torch meeting. The winning author for the 2013 Award will receive an appropriate trophy, a \$250 honorarium, and paid registration to the 2012 IATC convention in Portsmouth, VA. The winner will be introduced at the convention banquet where he or she (or a designated representative) will deliver the paper on June 29, 2013.

Eligibility: The author must be a member of a Torch club. The paper must have been delivered to a Torch club meeting or a regional Torch meeting between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012 (inclusive), and be submitted to the IATC Office by February 15, 2013. Current officers and directors of IATC are ineligible for this award during their terms of office.

Procedure: All papers to be published in *Torch* should be sent to the IATC Office, Attn. Editor, 11712C Jefferson Ave., Newport News, VA 23606, along with the current Manuscript Submission Form (available from the club secretary or IATC Office), duly signed by the author and a club officer. Paxton candidates will be selected by the Editorial Advisory Committee from all papers submitted for publication in *Torch*. The Paxton Award Committee will consider the EAC-recommended 2012 papers in the spring of 2013 to determine the 2013 award winner.

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,” available from the IATC Office, and the “Manuscript Submission Suggestions” at the Publications link of the IATC website www.torch.org. The winner of the Paxton Award and other contestants will be notified early in May 2013.

Additional Information:

- A publishable Torch paper should be approximately 3,000 words in length.
- Local clubs are not allowed to submit papers directly for Paxton consideration.
- The Paxton Award paper will be published in the Fall 2013 issue of *Torch*.

Call to Annual Business Meeting and Torch Convention—Columbia, SC—June 27-30, 2013

Thursday, June 27: 3:00pm Officers' Exchange; 4:00pm Business Session I; 5:30pm Dinner & Torch Paper #1

Friday, June 28: 8:00am Membership Development; 8:45am Business Session II; 10:00am Torch Paper #2;
11:15am lunch & Tours; 5:00pm Purple Martin Lake Cruise with dinner and Silver Awards

Saturday, June 29: 8:15am Meet the *Torch* Editor; 9:00am Torch Foundation Membership Meeting; 10:00am Torch Paper #3; 11:15am lunch & Tours; 6:00pm Banquet, Gold Awards, Paxton Paper (black tie optional)

Sunday, June 30: 7:30am Breakfast; 8:00am Interfaith Session; 9:00am Torch Paper #4; 10:30am Business Session III

2013 Convention Speakers

Torch Paper #1

Thursday, June 27

Early SC Rocks!

***A Lawyer's View of
Pre-Civil War
South Carolina***

Ed Latimer, past president
of IATC, retired attorney

Torch Paper #2

Friday, June 28

***The Development of
Thinking Machines***

Eric Davis, technology expert
and life-long conservative who
stands just to the right of
Attila the Hun

Torch Paper #3

Saturday, June 29

Duro Europos:

On the Edge of Empires
Fr. Thomas Moore,
Archpriest of Holy Apostles
Orthodox Church

Torch Paper #4

Sunday, June 30

Save Your

Confederate Money

Jack Meyer, Curator, South
Carolina State Museum

**“Famously Hot—
Historically Cool”**

**2013 IATC Torch Convention
Columbia, SC, June 27-30, 2013**

Registration Fee

Paid by February 1, 2013 \$320/person

Paid by May 15, 2013 \$330/person

Paid **After** May 15, 2013 \$350/person

Make check payable to:

Columbia Torch Club

Mail check to:

Dick Clark

7442 Coachmaker Road

Columbia, SC 29209

Registration Form

Please use one form per person

Name _____

Name on badge _____

Street (orPOB) Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Telephone _____

Email _____

Torch Club _____

Special Needs _____

**Note: Hotel Reservations are not
included in the registration fee.**

Make reservations directly with

The Columbia Marriott

1200 Hampton Street

Columbia, SC 29201

(800) 593-6465 (toll free)

Room rate is \$119/night plus tax

Tours

(Tentative)

Torch Tour #1 (& lunch)

Historic Plantations

or

Civil War Battle Sites

or

Historic Columbia

Torch Tour #2 (& dinner)

Purple Martin Lake Cruise

or

SC Train Adventure Party

Torch Tour #3 (& lunch)

City Hall to Capitol Walk

or

Historic Homes/Gardens

or

Congaree National Park

On Your Own

w/ directions

USC Campus

Riverbanks Zoo

Columbia Art Museum

Fort Jackson

SC Archives & History

SC State Museum

SC Military Museum

Confederate Relic Room

The International Association of Torch Clubs, Inc.
11712C Jefferson Ave #246
Newport News VA 23606
www.torch.org

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

Reflections

*Knowledge is proud that
he has learned so much;
Wisdom is humble that
he knows no more.*

—William Cowper,
“The Task” (1785)
