Southern Illinois University Carbondale
OpenSIUC

The Dewey Newsletter

Center for Dewey Studies

7-1969

Volume 3, Number 3

Follow this and additional works at: https://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/cds\_dewey\_newsletter

# **Recommended Citation**

"Volume 3, Number 3." (Jul 1969).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Dewey Studies at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Dewey Newsletter by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

# **CO-OPERATIVE RESEARCH**

**ON DEWEY PUBLICATIONS** 

# The Dewey Newsletter

Volume III Number 3 July 1969

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901

DEWEY'S WRITINGS

IN TRANSLATION

The Southern Illinois University Press has announced that John Dewey: A Checklist of Translations, 1900-1967, compiled and edited by Jo Ann Boydston, with Robert L. Andresen, will be pub-

lished in August 1969. The book is priced at \$6.00 and will be available from the Press, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, 62901. To quote from the Spring-Summer Press catalogue, "Dewey's thought is best known abroad through the 327 separate translations of his works into 35 different languages. All translations from 1900 to 1967 are here listed alphabetically in one main section according to the English title of Dewey's work; under each entry the translations are arranged alphabetically by language and multiple translations into a language are arranged chronologically."

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*

VOLUME 3,

1882-1892.

AWARDED CENTER

SEAL

The third volume of THE EARLY WORKSOF JOHN DEWEY, 1881-1898, will be the third non-literary work to carry the "Approved Text" seal of the Center for Editions of American Authors. After a three-day inspection by the Center's representative in April, the Center's Director wrote that the seal had been granted, signifying observation of specific basic editorial principles and a high de-

gree of accuracy, as well as acceptance of safeguards to preserve that accuracy through subsequent reprintings.

Volume 3 has now gone into production and there seem to be no roadblocks in the way of its meeting the December 1969 publication date.

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

RELEVANCE OF

JOHN DEWEY TODAY

In July 1968, we reported in this *Newsletter* that George Geiger had been appointed for the first five-year period to the newly created post of "John Dewey Professorship in the Humanities." In

that role, Professor Geiger planned and directed a symposium at Antioch College, May 19-20, 1969, entitled "The Relevance of John Dewey Today." The three featured speakers were Bertram Morris, on "Dewey's Aesthetics"; Sidney Hook, "John Dewey: The Politics of Liberalism"; and Ernest Nagel, "Dewey's Logic of Inquiry: Trends in the Philosophy of Science." Responses to these addresses and opportunities for open discussion by the audience were also features of the conference. A similar conference is now being planned for next spring and if possible, we will announce it in the April, 1970 *Newsletter* so that you can plan to attend.

Sidney Hook's address, which evoked wide and warm discussion at the conference, is published in the current issue of the *Antioch Review*.

COPYRIGHT O by Co-operative Research on Dewey Publications

# Volume III, Number 3, p. 12

MANUSCRIPTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

GIFTS RECEIVED

Newsletter readers who have requested the catalogue of Dewey correspondence will have noticed last-minute listings of recent gifts and acquisitions. Once more we express our gratitude for the co-operation of persons who have sent such materials to be added to the Dewey collections.

From Professor Emeritus Herbert L. Searles of the University of Southern California came Dewey's letter of December 19, 1913, accepting the invitation of the Aristotelian Society of Great Britian to speak at an annual meeting. That he was not able to fulfill the date was very likely because of the war. Professor Victor Lowe of Johns Hopkins has presented a letter from Dewey to him May 4, 1949, commenting on Lowe's article "The Influence of Bergson, James and Alexander on Whitehead," in the Journal of the History of Ideas.

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*

# MORE GIFTS OF

#### MANUSCRIPTS AND

CORRESPONDENCE

The ever-industrious and thoughtful Horace M. Kallen unearthed and carefully corrected the typescript of a General Seminar of the University in Exile at the New School for Social Research on December 12, 1936. The Seminar started with Professor Kallen's paper on "What Pragmatism Means

for the Social Sciences," and proceeded to discussion of the paper by Armstrong, Ascoli, Heimann, Wertheimer, and John Dewey.

Southern Illinois University also recently acquired the nine-page manuscript for Dewey's review, "College Sons--and Parents," of Christian Gauss' *Life in College*, which was published in the *New Republic* in 1931, along with the letter of transmittal to "Wilson."

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### DISSERTATIONS

COMPLETED

Please add to your list of doctoral studies (*Dew-ey Newsletter I*, 4; *II*, 1) dealing with Dewey and his thought:

1. Shaw, Marvin Cabrera. "Naturalism and the Divine: The Possibility of a Naturalistic Theism Based on the Philosophies of Santayana and Dewey." Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1968, 387 pp.

2. Bordeau, Edward James. "The Practical Idealism of John Dewey's Political Philosophy: An Answer to Some Critics." Ph.D. Dissertation, Fordham University, 1969.

3. McDermott, John Donovan. "John Dewey: Ethical Inquiry and the Psychological Standpoint." Ph.D. Dissertation, Notre Dame University, 1969.

Professor McDermott worked assiduously with many Dewey materials at the Dewey Project here. We plan to include the abstract of his dissertation in the October issue of the *Newsletter*.

# Volume III, Number 3, p. 13

#### THE MYSTERIOUS

"MR. GATES"

In response to Gerard Deledalle's query about a "Mr. Gates" to whom Dewey had written in 1903, both Milton Halsey Thomas and William W. Brickman suggested that the person might be Frederick

Taylor Gates. Professor Donald H. Steward of Roosevelt University sent very carefully documented information about Mr. Errett Gates, who had been minister of the Hyde Park Church of the Disciples of Christ from 1897 to 1900, and who was abroad in 1902 but had returned to Chicago by Spring 1903 when Dewey met 'Mr. Gates.''

Evidence internal to the letter seems to prejudice the case in favor of Frederick Taylor Gates (1853-1929) who was, according to the *Dictionary of American Biography*, IV, the guiding force in many Rockefeller enterprises, among them the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research and the Rockefeller Foundation. He was President and trustee of the General Education Board, and, as Halsey Thomas succinctly says, "helped Rockefeller found the University of Chicago."

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*

## DEWEY'S ARTICLES

IN JAPANESE

To conclude the feature started in the April Newsletter, we are publishing here abstracts of the remaining three articles written by John Dewey for the Japanese periodical Kaizō. The abstracts

were prepared by Professor Shiro Amioka for inclusion in the Japanese book Essays Commemorating the 50th Anniversity of John Dewey's Visit to Japan, edited by Professor Masako Shoji and published this summer by the Tamagawa University Press. As we indicated in April, Professor Shoji and her colleagues in Japan graciously consented to an earlier publication of these abstracts in The Dewey Newsletter to make possible wider dissemination as soon as possible. We are grateful to both Professor Amioka and Professor Shoji for this permission. Professor Amioka's complete translations of the articles are to be included in later volumes of the Collected Works of John Dewey.

> "A Philosophical Interpretation of Racial Prejudice" [Kaizō, Volume III, No. 9 (August 1921), pp. 73-90]

Racial prejudice is commonly discussed from the moral viewpoint. That is, the purpose is to ascertain whether racial discrimination is good or bad. However, this problem should be first discussed scientifically. Before we handle this problem morally, we should analyze it and discover its causes.

Human prejudice is a disease extremely widespread and deeprooted, and it is not easy to make its causes clear. To take religious persecution, for example, it is not uncommon to find believers who were previously indignant because of the persecution they had received in turn now persecute other religious sects as soon as they get the chance. The same phenomenon can be observed in the case of racial discrimination. The Japanese complain about being discriminated against by the Westerners,

# Volume III, Number 3, p. 14.

but they themselves display discrimination against the Koreans and the Chinese. Thus it can be seen that the phenomenon of racial antagonism is extremely complicated and very widespread, and it is difficult to arrive at a scientific conclusion.

A fact which is so widespread must have at base a simple foundation. We must first examine the psychological characteristics of prejudice in general. Regarding prejudice, there are two different schools of thought in psychology setting forth two different types of explanation. The intellectual school believes that prejudice is one type of judgment; that is, it is nothing more than a defective and imperfect judgment which has been hastily made without thoroughly examining the facts. The term "prejudice" is related in form to the term "judgment." However, this term also suggests that prejudice is something that operates before judgment and not that it is a defective judgment. Thus, the second school explains that it is better to say that prejudice is one expression of instinct and emotion rather than to say that it is intellectual. Thus, prejudice is a natural dislike which appears before thinking and which changes the direction of thoughts that arise subsequently toward the same direction of the prejudice.

When we look for a general instinct which is capable of explaining the fact that human prejudice is widespread, a general antagonism against anything that is new, rare, and unusual catches the eye. Anything that is not customary, or is entirely different from what we are accustomed to, gives rise to fear and hatred and strong natural reactions. To an uneducated mind, those who ignore custom, or who set up standards or rules different from those generally prevalent, are considered unnatural or even supernatural. As a result, terms such as unfamiliar people, strangers, and outsiders are not geographic terms, but rather psychological terms. Therefore, a visitor, or a foreigner, does not differ simply in geographic influences, but also differs completely in style of living, way of thinking and manner of feeling.

Racial prejudice, like all prejudices, exists prior to the intellect, and, with respect to human instincts, there is no great difference between uncivilized and civilized people. Within the natural antagonisms toward difference in customs regarding language, dress, manners, religion, morals, and thought is found the primitive and fundamental foundation of the racial prejudice of today.

Race is an abstract idea. Since the origin of the most important races of the present world is mixed, if we were to follow science, the idea of race is generally speaking a mythical one. Against this conception, man seeks something concrete, tangible, and visible. Thus race, in its common meaning differing from its scientific signification, is the designation given to the accumulation of facts which draw our attention because they are different from our own customs. The important matter that needs to be considered is how the primitive antagonism toward something different overwhelmed the other factors and gave rise to the present day phenomenon of racial discord.

The first factor is the immutable physiological differences which to the vast bulk of mankind are reliable symbols of race. Differences in color, such as the black color of the Africans, the white of the Europeans, the brown and yellow of the Asians, and differences in facial features, such as the distinctively Jewish features, are constant. These physiological differences become distinctive symbols which express great cultural differences and serve as a clear reminder for the feeling of discrimination.

The next factor is the power which contains the intellectual element; that is, cultural differences which become the cause of antagonism. One of these differences is religion, particularly the case in which the external, visible differences, such as worship, ritual, temple, costume, and symbol, are added to differences in doctrine.

The second cultural factor is political. Nationalism is practically a political fact today. Political rule creates within the ruling class a feeling of superiority on the one hand and of inferiority on the other. When the ruler and the ruled are of different races, then the general prejudice is transformed to racial discrimination.

The next factor with respect to racial prejudice is the economic factor. From a certain point of view, this is the most rational factor in racial prejudice. To say this, however, is not to say that this factor always operates in a rational manner, but rather that, instead of being simply an instinctive element, it has more of the elements of conscious thought and purpose. For example, immigration of modern times generally is based on economic causes. In the United States, there is an intensive movement to limit all foreign immigrants. This movement has a political factor, but the main strength is the economic factor, and the labor unions are exerting maximum effort to limit the entry of new laborers. When differences in skin color, language, religion, and custom and style of living are added on top of the odious economic cause, racial discord can easily become very intense.

The conclusion essentially is that the foundation for racial prejudice is instinctive hatred and fear against the

# Volume III, Number 3, p. 16

unfamiliar. This antagonism is changed to permanent prejudice by cultural differences, such as language, custom, and religion, by accidental physiological differences, such as color of the skin, and by the accompanying political and economic competition. The result is the kind of present-day conception of race and of fixed racial differences vaguely held by the masses without any scientific evidence whatsoever. And its final result is the kind of racial discord that exists today.

The issue is how to resolve this problem. There is no one method which will solve this complicated problem. The method of increasing enlightenment or providing more humanistic education will no doubt have some effect by making possible a better understanding of different cultures. With the growth of social intercourse, the difference which we have especially called alienation may be alleviated. If the various civilizations establish close relationships, they would probably assimilate something from each other. However, without the economic and political changes which are fundamental, these factors would not produce the effect of completely eradicating racial discord. When strained nationalism gives way to some form of internationalism, then for the first time foreigners both within and without a country would not be looked upon with suspicious and hateful eyes. It may also be necessary to raise the standard of living of the countries which are treated with the greatest amount of prejudice today.

Racial prejudice is a bad thing. However, blind and hasty reaction against it is also bad because the problem is a complicated one. That is, it is not a problem of race at all, but a problem of mutually harmonizing the various cultures. Within the differences of these cultures are included differences in language, differences in tradition, differences in intellectual views, differences in ideals, differences in religion, and differences in customs in daily living. Each of these differences has implicit in it causes for misunderstanding. However, if this is all there is to these differences, they would probably give rise only to interpersonal misunderstanding and discord between one individual and another. Therefore, the important point is that, because of the political forces which are the result of the nationalistic organization of today's world, economic competition, and industrial designs, these differences consolidate and become collective differences and discords between one group and another. Racial prejudice is a symptom resulting from envy and enmity which arose from political and industrial forces, rather than the cause of present day discord.

The purpose of this discussion is not to attempt a solution of the problem of racial prejudice and discord, but rather to state what the problem is and the direction in which the solution is to be sought.

## "The Pacific Conference"

[Kaizō, Volume III, No. 10 (September 1921), pp. 235-240]

The problem concerning the Pacific Conference is very complicated and includes the problem of intense nationalistic interest. In addition, it is difficult to obtain the reports necessary for intelligent judgment, while, at the same time, elucidating the facts as they are leads to even greater difficulties. In spite of these difficulties, I am expressing my personal opinion because I have frequently heard the viewpoint of the Chinese intelligentsia on the Pacific Conference and I am in wholehearted agreement with it. This viewpoint is that the peace of the world in the future can be guaranteed only by substituting people-to-people diplomacy for governmentto-government diplomacy.

There are four leading actors in the Pacific problem. They are the Chinese, Japanese, Americans, and Russians (or Siberians). Of these four, I shall discuss the position of the Chinese only. Recently, a Japanese thinker, in rebuttal against my views on the China problem, has stated that the cause for my error lies in not recognizing the fact that "peace in the Orient can be guaranteed only by a cooperation between China and Japan which does not brook intervention by the United States." Of course, I wholeheartedly believe that the key to future peace and prosperity in the Pacific lies in Sino-Japanese cooperation. However, that cooperative steps must be taken for the benefit of both countries. The present Chinese views can be explained by enumerating several obstacles in Sino-Japanese cooperation as seen by the Chinese.

First, according to general belief, the Japanese have been encouraging and aiding the bandits of China, especially in the Manchurian and Shantung areas. Second, according to the claims of the Chinese, Japan is systematically importing into China morphine and other harmful drugs and assisting in their traffic. Third, until very recently, the Japanese authorities have actively fanned the internal strife of China and, on one occasion, have assisted radical revolutionaries like Sun Yat Sen, while, on other occasions, have aided in other places those who desire the restoration of the Imperial regime. Fourth, it is generally believed that Japan, in order to conquer China economically by gaining an economic foothold, is employing both the method of coercion and the method of corruption. Lastly, it is generally believed in China that the objective of Japan is to conquer China both politically and militarily.

Whether the views stated above are ture or not is not the point. The point is that they accurately reflect the attitude held by the Chinese today. The attitude held in common by the Chinese is fear of Japan. This fear is very intense and deep and it colors all of their opinions, beliefs. and suppositions. Fear is the cause that gives rise to suspicion and gross exaggeration.

It is necessary to say a word about the fact that there is a method available to resolve this problem. In Japan, it is frequently thought that the present attitude on the Chinese side is in some measure the result of the influence of foreign countries, particularly the United States. To try to make the influence of foreign countries responsible for the anti-Japanese thought and movement in China indicates a grave misunderstanding of the psychology of the Chinese. To gain a much better understanding of this psychology is the precondition to better relations between China and Japan and the way of securing the future peace of the Orient.

A question might be raised as to how the above discussion is applicable to the Pacific Conference. The key to complete disarmament and peace lies in the establishment of a truly friendly cooperative relationship between the two nations of Japan and China. This relationship can be established only by the power of Japan. Does Japan really have the preparation and the determination to take the necessary measures? The real effect of the Pacific Conference rest entirely on the answer to this question.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

Please direct correspondence to: Jo Ann Boydston, Editor The Dewey Newsletter Dewey Project Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois 62901