

MAN'S ABILITY TO CO-OPERATE: A CONTRIBUTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY TO THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

by William G. Mather

There is a fundamental inconsistency in the Christian religion, one which even Christians do not care to talk much about. In very brief it is this: it takes its name from a man who gave his life for others, and it has as its symbol a cross, the instrument of torture upon which he gave his life, and yet the principles of non-violence, mutual understanding, co-operation, and self-sacrifice which he taught and exemplified are not only not practiced or taught but not even believed by the majority of his followers.

They stoutly believe and strongly teach that he turned water into wine, controlled the wind, healed the sick, exorcized demons, was born of a virgin mother, raised the dead, and was raised from the dead—but hardly one of the major creeds of Christendom mentions turning the other cheek, blessing those that curse one, walking the second mile, feeding the hungry, loving one's enemies, bearing one another's burdens, forgiving men their trespasses, or taking up one's own cross in imitation of him. Yet these are among the most primary of his teachings regarding the way of life of his true disciples and, indeed, of those who, in his phrase, would "inherit the kingdom."

The feeling among his followers seems to be that such actions are extreme, dangerous to man's survival, subversive to national welfare, impossible of accomplishment, and a sign of unmanly weakness when attempted. The real man, they seem to say, looks out for himself, takes no insults, gives as good as he gets, and wins his highest and most publicly approved honors in battle—witness the memorial stones raised in public places. This, we are told, is "human nature." It is the *real* nature of man, and a miracle must indeed take place before a human being can even attempt to come close to the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount—one must be "born again," out of the "physical" life and into

William G. Mather is research professor of sociology at Pennsylvania State University.

ZYGON

what is called the "spiritual" life. The common phrase is "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit."

This doctrine cleaves a deep gulf into the nature of every man. It assumes that his body is evil, in whole and in all its parts. Within this mass of evil has been introduced from outside, rootless, strange, alien, and weak, that which is called "spirit" and is good. These two struggle for the mastery of men. The outcome is always uncertain, always chancy, temporary, with evil playing on its home field and good disadvantaged by a strange stadium.

We have been learning lately that the situation is not so simple and the odds are not so great as this. There is no gulf between the good and the evil in man—or, better, between the flesh and the spirit, in the broadest meaning of the words. To the contrary, understanding, mutual aid, self-sacrifice, are all as firmly rooted in the biological nature of man as are selfishness, conflict, and vengeance. To put it another way, it is as much the nature of man to do good as to do evil. In fact, if there is an edge of advantage either way, it is on the side of the angels.

MAN'S ORIGINS

This is the lesson which anthropology can teach us, and which, if we can learn it, will help us meet the problems of our troubled day.

Man seems to be very old, for he goes back long before writing was developed—in fact, he invented it. But "natural" history, the record of the rocks that form the surface layers of the earth, indicate that man is very young, a child of around a million years or so whose identifiable ancestors are counted up by teeth, jawbones, brain cases, and a few extremities left here and there in nature's boneyard. It is largely a matter of judgment as to just which of these are enough like us to deserve to bear the burden of being our progenitors, for many, many species of living creatures have from time to time made their bid for survival, come close, and lost.

It is easier to find the bones of dinosaurs than those of man, for they were huge beasts, and their bones were great and strong. They resisted the constant efforts of the elements to eliminate their traces. The still more ancient shellfish, similar to the oyster and the clam, have been found in abundance; their hard shells, buried in the bottom mud of vanished seas, being replaced bit by bit with minerals from the water until an enduring cast was formed. But man is a comparatively fragile animal, weak-boned, thin-skinned, sprawled out with his vital organs exposed. His head is about his most durable part, and it can, in fact, tell us much about him.

Carnivorous animals have long, powerful jaws—they can take a good bite on an enemy and hold on. They are meat eaters. They have long, sharp canine teeth that can tear flesh, and these generally project well in front of the face, so they can see and breathe while fighting. Carnivora are likely to have large claws for holding, ripping, and tearing. To back this all up are, usually, a short alimentary canal and gut; meat digests more rapidly than cereal and salad.

But no man—except very superficially—resembles the true carnivore. Man's face is—relative to carnivorous animals and even to the great apes or primates who are his close relatives—rather flat. His tender nose sticks out in front of everything and gets in the way of good biting. His teeth are short and dull, poor for biting, and the jaws are weak but fair for chewing. His finger and toenails are worse than useless—they break off in a good fight. His gut is neither short like a tiger's nor long like a cow's—he is neither carnivorous nor herbivorous; he is omnivorous (like a pig) and eats almost anything, which puts him at an advantage in some environments, nutritionally speaking. He is not restricted to living in a small area where certain rare foods are found, but is a roamer on the earth.

In the zoological jungles of thousand millennia of prehistory, how could such a mismatch for the tyrannosaurs and saber-toothed tigers ever have risen to the top of the heap?

The story is a fascinating one. It is almost a Horatio Alger type of story, for it is the story of how the weakness, the mismatch, was capitalized upon and developed into strength. In a way, it is the story of how the meek are inheriting the earth.

Who the original Adam, Dowb, or Alley-Oop was, we do not know. But somewhere some long, long time ago, perhaps in China, more likely in East Africa, early man's ape-like ancestors began walking on their hind feet. We do not know why. But they were set upon their feet—a dangerous thing for animals as poorly equipped as they for self-defense. Their four-legged enemies could outrun them.

There were two distinct advantages to this risky state of affairs: their heads were lifted up on the top of their long, vertical spines, and their horizon was moved back so that they could see their enemies and measure the distance afar off; and their front legs were freed from carrying the leading half of their bodies, and thus made available for carrying other things. Most large primates can walk upright for a time and after an awkward fashion. Man, however, has a certain splayed-out hip bone with a certain angle to the socket that makes the upright stance quite comfortable, especially as it is combined with a marked

backward curve of the lower spine. His front legs have shortened through the generations, and their "toes" have become individually mobile so that, as fingers, they can lift, carry, and manipulate all manner of weapons, tools, and instruments with ease. Most of this the other primates can do but not with such accuracy and ease, not to such varied and practical purpose, as man.

Practical purpose—this is what sets man apart from most of his biological kin, as "the tool maker and user." The great apes may tear off a tree limb and wave it in the air. They may break a stick and use it, temporarily, as a club. They may strip the leaves from a twig and thrust it gently into the passageway of a colony of termites to draw them out and lick them off the twig, as a child might lick a lollipop. But man alone constructs and uses the more complex tools—the specialized, elaborate tools from bulldozers to surgeon's scalpels to space-probing rockets—so constantly for almost every activity of his existence. We have but to look at the clutter of things (tools) around us at any moment to see their importance in our lives. The abundance or the lack of them distinguishes the "developed" from the "undeveloped" nations and peoples.

Man can do this because of his large brain. He has the most brain, in proportion to the rest of his body, of any large animal. It is big where it counts—where thought, purpose, plan, take place. The great apes have brains, large brains, but they are given over mainly to the operation of the body—eating, digesting, breathing, pumping the blood around, building-maintenance, as it were. Man's brain does all that, too, but it has a large office space—or frontal cerebral hemisphere—for research and development. A man will have a brain of 1,350 grams; a gorilla of the same weight, 430 grams. It is this that makes possible thought—involved, complex, and, we fancy, logical thought—considerably above the level of reflexes and instincts which seem to be the common "mental processes" of the "animals," clever and adequate for limited situations though some of them may be. It is this part of the brain that conceives the purpose, and devises the tools and their manner of use, which the facile hands can then achieve. If man has any specialized biological feature, it is this large brain.

Evidence of tool making and evidence of a large brain—these are among the most important clues anthropology looks for as signs of man. They are very old in his life. When, in 1959, Mrs. L. S. B. Leakey, working in the Olduvai Gorge of the Great Rift Valley in East Africa, found three teeth projecting from a rock face—smooth and shining teeth, nearly twice the size of modern man's but very human in shape—

and nearby a skull—lower-browed than ours but with cheek, mastoid processes, and jaw-muscle attachments approaching ours—obviously held erect, and considerable numbers of sharpened pebbles nearby, she knew she was meeting a very possibly ancient ancestor. The Leakeys called him *Zinjanthropus*, or East African man, and from the fossil animal remains about him—*Afrochoerus*, the rhinoceros-sized pig, and *Pelorovis*, the giant sheep—they put him at a period of the lower Pleistocene, roughly 1,750,000 years ago. His broad molars indicated he was a vegetable eater, an herbivore; but the animal bones found with him, and the sharpened stones, suggest that he was also a flesh eater, a carnivore—quite like us, in those respects.

What we have seen is that man, by virtue of his generalized biological structure, can, of all animals, do many things. Most animals are, by biological structure, quite specialized. Their bag of tricks is small. What trick they shall use at a given time is usually bound so closely to their reflexes that their behavior can be readily predicted. Man, by conditioning their reflexes, has taught them to serve and amuse him. But man's brain can think so many thoughts, and his hands can do so many things, that he can choose from a variety of responses to any stimulus, and the understatement of science is that human behavior is largely unpredictable.

Man is built for freedom of choice. This could be stated, more simply, that man is built for freedom.

There is another biological characteristic of man that must be considered. He has a certain construction of the inside of the lower jaw and the high arch of the palate that happily gives him the ability to make a great variety of sounds. To some extent the other primates have this, but an awkwardly high bit of the frontal floor, called the "simian shelf," gives them trouble in free movement of the tongue. They might do more with what they have, but perhaps the smaller brain restrains them. Man, however, with no such handicaps, has proceeded to give definite meanings to a great number of sounds, and has strung the sounds together to make words and sentences of infinite variety. By these he can exchange his thoughts with his fellows, so that he need not solve all his problems alone. Several brains, so to speak, can be brought together to work jointly in analysis and planning. When, later, he added to speech the invention of writing, he made it possible to exchange views with absent contemporaries and to leave his thoughts behind him for succeeding generations.

Thus, no human child ever needs to "start from scratch" like the

ZYGON

child of the chimpanzee, but each human child stands on the pile of culture accumulated by the generations before.

Consequently, the tools and the thoughts and the ways of life—in sum, the culture—of each succeeding human generation is different from the preceding generation, and man has brought deliberate change, perhaps progress, to the world.

The unspecialized, facile hand; the large brain; the organs of speech; these biological events, fortunately occurring together in one species, have given that species the ability, as the Scriptures put it, to “have dominion over” the earth.

THE CULTURAL EVOLUTION OF SOCIALIZATION

But now we must go back to other biological features to explain, not how, but *why*, in what manner, to what purpose, this dominion is used.

We have been speaking of man as if he were but one, a single specimen in an isolated cage. Man really does not occur that way. One of his characteristics is that he appears in groups. This, too, he shares with the great apes. But here, again, there is a cluster of biological differences that gives man the advantage, especially with the features we have just been discussing.

Oddly, one of these is the existence of continuous oestrous. The human male and female are sexually attracted to each other the year around, not just seasonally, as is the case with most other two-sexed animals, who are more likely to run most of the year in packs or herds of one sex.

This means that some sort of adjustment, some sort of social arrangement, must of necessity be worked out between the two sexes. They must be together fairly constantly, and ways of living together must be developed. As it happens, solution of this problem is facilitated by the fact of female pregnancy and motherhood. Pregnancy is a nine-month process, during which the female becomes increasingly less mobile. She cannot go so far or so fast—either in the hunt or in the gathering of vegetables or in the flight from danger—as can the unhampered male. When the child is born, she is further restricted by its need to be fed and carried and protected for a period of several years before he can set out on his own. The duration of human dependency is longer than is required for the young of any similar animal. This long dependency of the child is another important and valuable weakness of man. It has led directly to the working out of a division of labor between the parents, with great social consequences, far beyond the immediate physical needs of the offspring.

Woman carried the child before birth and cared for it after birth—both the consequence of her femaleness—at a period in the history of the species long before canned milk and baby specialists. To her there fell, therefore, the labor around the cave or shelter where the child was; the care of the fire when fire became controlled and useful; the cooking of food; the making and repairing of clothing; the planting and tending of grain and vegetables when their cultivation was learned; and the care of domesticated animals. To the man went the hunting of large animals, the attack and defense against the enemies, the ranging afar for food, the maintenance of territorial boundaries, the exploring of new land.

The cultural divisions of labor did not come all at once, but over the years, the hundreds and thousands of years, until within any large group they seemed to have always been, and to have always been right.

The process involves co-operation, whether working together or working singly and trading or sharing the fruits of one another's work. Either method implies a recognition of the value of the other person's work and, hence, of the value of the other person. Who started this?

We come back again to the female—she who enjoyed the physical presence of the male and was enjoyed by him; she who conceived and carried the child, who gave birth to the child, who protected the child. She had to work out a way of living simultaneously with an adult male and an infant because she had a heavy emotional investment in each. Probably in the earliest years the male did not have much invested in the infant, but he did in the mother, and this gave him a motive for at least tolerating the child to keep her favor.

Of course, the two adults were trapped. For, because of its long infancy, before the first child had been reared to a state where it could shift for itself, and permit the parents to part, another child arrived. And another. Continuous oestrous, long pregnancy, extended infancy, overlapping progeny—these forced upon the members of the family group (now of mixed sexes and ages and states of health and conditions of dependency) the necessity of understanding, working with, and “putting up with” people different from each other. They had to work for each other, help each other, protect each other. Under the rigors of primitive life, with its constant hazards and dangers, family members had to live with each other or perish. Solitary people, like solitary animals, were short-lived. Even with all of the modern niceties of civilization, they still are.

To put it boldly, those who were cantankerous or selfish or harmful were thrust out of the group and died of starvation or illness, or were

ZYGON

killed by their enemies, animal or human, when injured, exhausted, or asleep. It was "one for all and all for one." Those who mastered the art of living in groups survived and propagated their kind and passed their way of living on—the others disappeared.

We are not ready to say that the passing on of ways of life from one generation to another was done by the genes. The evidence so far is that it was largely done by teaching, one generation learning from the former and from its own experience, as now. This places a premium upon the ability and the willingness to learn, which may favor the survival of individuals with those capacities and with skill in their use. There is evidence that the size of the cranium has developed with the evolution of the species and with man's progressively elaborate regulation of his biological and cultural environments.

This is not to say that man changed the ice and cold of the Arctic into the sand and heat of the Sahara. Not yet, at least. But he did learn to use the snow of the Arctic to build a house warm enough, and the sand of the desert to build a house cool enough, for a family to survive in. And he learned to bring water to dry land by irrigation, and to take water from wet land by drainage. He learned to live by wandering with herds of goats or sheep or camels or reindeer; he learned to live by settling down with fields of rice or maize or beans about his door. He learned to use as power his own muscles or those of other men, or other animals, or to use falling water, moving air, expanding steam, splitting nuclei, tamed lightning and magnetism, and solar radiation. He learned to live in large masses of his kind crowded together, or in small groups widely scattered. He learned to organize his social units on the basis of kinship or of residence in a territory. He learned to control the units by authoritarian or democratic processes, or any combination of the two. He learned to have one god or many gods. His divinities could ask of him the blood of animals killed in sacrifice and enemies killed in war; or they could ask of him justice to his fellows and peace for children playing in the streets. The forms of human living are infinite in their variety. They are limited only by the resources native to the area or that can be brought into it, and by human ingenuity and will.

Perhaps the one great characteristic common to all members of the human species is the freedom of choice. To each problem of mankind there is never one answer that is identical wherever the species is found, as is so likely to be the case with other animals whose responses seem to be more directly and specifically linked to genetically inherited processes. That is to say, man's biological nature, while it is the foundation

of his culture, is only the foundation; it does not determine the precise pathways through his culture which the response to a stimulus may take. By definition, all members of the human species have substantially the same basic physiological characteristics; but they may develop very different, although highly interchangeable, cultures.

The classic popular example of the extent to which this may go is provided by Margaret Mead's description of sex and temperament in three primitive New Guinea societies. The common assumption, in our own society, is that there is a "masculine" temperament and a "feminine" temperament, sex-linked, and with corresponding patterns of behavior; and being sex-linked, it appears in the separate sexes in all societies. Dr. Mead's findings were to the contrary. Among the Arapesh, both men and women were co-operative, unaggressive, and responsive to the needs of others, both as parents and as marital partners—qualities we might call "feminine." With the Mundugumor, both men and women were insecure, competitive, and violently aggressive, both as parents and as marital partners—qualities we might call "masculine." The Tchambuli presented a reversal of our sex roles, with the women dominant and aggressive and the men responsive and submissive, both as parents and as marital partners.

The point is that, while it could rightly be said that in all three of these New Guinea societies sex drives brought the men and women together, the manner of their coming together and the meaning of their roles as spouses and parents were defined and regulated by their cultures. And this, in spite of (or because of?) the fact that sex is indeed a very strong physical drive upon which the perpetuation of the species depends.

SELECTION IN CULTURAL EVOLUTION

Our discussion so far should not give the impression that almost any cultural response is sufficient for almost any biological need, or that any cultural response is as good as any other, for this is not so. People of innately dark skin color can more safely go with little clothing in the tropics than can people of innately light color, even if the skin temporarily darkens in the sun; and neither of them can go with little clothing in the Arctic. The cultural response must fit the environment, it must pass through the environmental screen. The use of nuclear weapons in warfare is militarily tempting, but if it creates a degree of environmental radioactivity that is lethal to man, or even to a considerable proportion of men, it will be a seriously harmful cultural response. The ultimate test, in every case, is whether the behavior in-

ZYGON

creases the chances, not of individual, but of human species survival. This is a very real test.

One great handicap of modern man is that he takes himself—and his present apparent success in the competition among the life forms on this planet—too much for granted. Actually, man is quite a Johnny-come-lately, still to prove his right to survive. One of the best illustrations of his lateness has been made by John R. Platt, of the Mental Health Research Institute at the University of Michigan. He asks us to imagine the two billion years that there has been, by present reckoning, life on earth, as a tower 200 feet high. The one million years that some form of man has existed is a 1-inch layer on top of the tower. It has been about twenty thousand years since man has learned to control his food supply by agriculture, and this is represented by a postage stamp, flat, on the top of the layer. Science, as we know it, will be the ink on the postage stamp. We ourselves are living, now, in the very thin film of moisture on the ink on the stamp on the 1-inch layer on the 200-foot tower.

Lest it seem that one million years of man should be time enough to demonstrate the permanence of the species, remember that the dinosaurs lived on earth one hundred million years before they lost their precarious hold on life and became eligible for our museums.

But in their time, they too looked good.

If we knew just why they failed to survive, we might learn from them. We do know some things: They were egg-layers, and egg-layers in general are short and sketchy in their care for their young; and their physical evolution went to extremes of specialization, with *Brontosaurus* reaching 80 feet of bone and blubber from his small head to the end of his tail, and *Tyrannus Rex* standing 20 feet high in his native armor of bone and ivory. Against these characteristics, man belongs to the mammals, a class that does care for its young, and to the primates, an order of generalized mammals, and to the species *Homo sapiens*, a primate unusually well equipped, as we have seen, for what we call thinking and the exchange of thoughts by oral and written speech, for cultural evolution.

It would appear that our rise in dominance over other forms of life to our present position is closely related to these physical characteristics and that our future survival will depend upon our further exploitation of them. We are in no position to kick aside the ladder upon which we are climbing.

Man's successful journey has taken the following most probable course.

Because it is impossible for the infant human to survive alone, there has always been some kind of human group, even if no more than mother and child.

Because of continuous oestrous, an adult male has been related to this group, whether loosely or tightly.

Because of overlapping progeny, additional children arriving before the preceding child is independent, a two-generation kinship grouping of some stability developed, strongly reinforced by the habitual nature of the contacts among the members.

Because of the satisfying nature of the contacts, adult children tended to remain within the group and with the older parents even after their own mating, multigeneration families resulting, the group size increasing, the patterns of contacts multiplying, and individual habits becoming group customs. (The reverse might also have occurred: family groups becoming identified within a "band" or "herd.")

These groups were generally small, limited to the number of people who could, operating from a common center, sustain each other by those most ancient and inefficient methods of gathering wild plants and catching small animals. Groups in contemporary societies on that level of culture rarely exceed twenty-five to thirty individuals, with little specialization of labor, little social structure, kinship the main bond, and custom the main regulator of behavior.

RELIGION AND THE PROBLEM OF SOCIALIZATION BEYOND BLOOD KIN

With the development of hunting the larger animals, specialized tools were made, specialized jobs identified (the game drivers and the game slayers), principles for division of the meat agreed upon, leadership positions established, and the mutual responsibilities of the group members more formally recognized than before. About then, too, because of the wider range of movement both necessitated and made possible by the more efficient method of food supply, the problem of what to do with non-kin who were encountered probably arose. The logical early answer was the pseudo-kin process of adoption, perhaps by the blood-brother ceremony.

When hunting became herding, and when plant gathering became agriculture, all of these developments were greatly accelerated. Man was beginning to control nature, and by careful breeding and skilled care his food resources became more secure and plentiful. But because of this came a closer settlement of the human groups, with more contact between them, and more relationships with "strangers," or at least non-kin.

ZYGON

The very fact of the division into hunting, fishing, herding, fruit growing, grain growing, and other types of groups, led to a still different type, the merchant or exchange type, the "market town." And by now all kinds of customs were needed, some in the form of "laws," well defined, that passing strangers could quickly learn, or that, in large groups, the group member himself could be threatened with when personal disapproval by his fellows did not suffice.

At some point in this development of man's culture, there came a time when the value of kinship began to wane. Probably the rise of commerce, where one mingled more with strangers than with those of one's own blood in the market places; or the rise of industry, where one learned and lived by a skill one's father did not know; or the rise of the importance of territory that contained needed resources, fruitful in the hands of anyone who possessed it—all of these, and others, would have been sufficient. But at some point, or many points, no blood-related group was large enough, or possessed enough resources, to provide what was needed by its members, and then came the expansion of feelings of loyalty and responsibility from the blood group to the community, to the "nigh-gebur," the near-dweller, the neighbor.

This was not lightly and easily done. The biblical books of Judges, Kings, and Chronicles give accounts of the terrible struggles of the Hebrew people, originally kinship-based on family, clan, and tribe, to establish a nation, territorially based. The old blood bonds were too strong, and within the span of the biblical records they were never able to make the national concept endure for any considerable length of time. Sooner or later the old tribal cry would rise, "What portion have we in David? To your tents, O Israel!"

The transition of loyalties from family and tribe to town and state has by no means been complete. This is partly due to the recency of the town and the state and the antiquity of the family and tribe. We see the conflict now in those lands, formerly colonial in government, where each tribe seeks to be a nation regardless of its size, fails, but refuses to join with other tribes in a more successful try together. And we still have the old saw, "Blood is thicker than water." Blood ties are still useful, recognized in the most modern law, and employed in social control in modern societies. It is still the custom for children to be reared by families, for mutual obligations of support between parents and children to be specified in law, and for property rights to be transferred down blood lines, just as in the day of Ruth and Boaz.

Facing the modern reality of small family size and inadequate or uncertain family economic resources, as we move away from a sub-

sistent-agricultural economy, we tend toward direct aid to the aged, the widowed, the orphaned, and the sick by public assistance or by public-sponsored insurance. The opposition raises the point that this is a *family* responsibility and no field for a non-kin group to enter. In somewhat similar but less rational fashion, unrelated people form voluntary associations, either religious or recreational (including "service"), in which the members address each other as "brother" or "sister," or require the use of first names. The desperateness of the effort is revealed when this must be done under penalty of fines.

Such things, humorous though they seem on the surface, actually indicate the great longings of the human individual for the personal recognition, love, and care found in the old, small, true kinship group. The grim fact is that man has not as yet been, and likely never will be, able to devise a perfect substitute.

Yet the true security of modern man lies in the largest possible group that he can create.

At the same time this is the most difficult group in which to be an active member because it generally follows that the larger the membership, the more diverse the membership. This is particularly apparent in groups selected on a basis of residence alone, as are members of communities, states, and nations. With the high mobility of modern men, any territorially based population holds at any one time a wide variety of occupations, political views, religious faiths, castes, customs, morals, and ethics; and its people will readily divide on any issue. Even threat from without, as in the case of war, is no longer sufficient for unity; sounding the trumpet or sending out the fiery cross or the dismembered body of the enemy's victim is not enough—there must also be a personal letter bearing the greetings of the chief executive to the potential soldier.

In spite of the difficulties it imposes, this situation is yet necessary for the individual member if he is to keep his individuality, his identification as a person. In union there is strength, but in disagreement there lie the seeds of progress, provided there can be a resolution of the differences and a preservation of the recognition that there is indeed a common lot, a shared destiny. States and communities that refuse full participation in discussion and decision and administration in public affairs to any category of resident thus risk their survival through revolt or conquest or decay.

There is nothing to be alarmed about.

What modern man faces is simply the problems of transition from the culture of the small kinship group to the culture of the large terri-

ZYGON

torial group, a transition which he must work out successfully or perish. The bomb shelter has little to recommend it over the paleolithic cave.

But in that cave lived a group with a variety of sexes, ages, and states of ability and health. Ancient man, as well as modern man, lived in diversity. He moved out of the cave for more opportunities and broader horizons. It is on the edge of these horizons, broader than he ever imagined, that modern man stands now.

It is trite to say, but it must be said, that modern man's ability is well proven by his conquests of hunger, disease, and ignorance, and by his ventures into space.

His greatest enemy now is himself, and his greatest weakness is his difficulty in living with his fellows.

But, as we have repeated, he was built for this, in the structure and functioning of his body. As an animal, man is as well fitted for tolerance as for intolerance, for understanding as for misunderstanding, for co-operation as for competition or conflict, for self-sacrifice as for self-preservation.

His problem is definitely not the suppressing or the battling with his physical nature, but the extension to his larger relationships of the behavior he has already developed upon that physical foundation in his smaller relationships.

The Hebrew people, to whom the great prophets spoke, were a people just coming out of tribalism and into nationalism. Somewhere in their past they had acquired the common belief, fanatically held, that the blood descendants of Abraham were the chosen of God, and all other blood lines were inferior. When the great prophets used the figure of speech of Israel as a "wayward child," or as a "faithless wife," or as a "suffering family servant," some of the highest levels of religion were reached. But when Nehemiah cursed and beat and pulled the hair of Canaanite women who had married Hebrew husbands, it reached a contemptible level; and when Hebrew armies killed captured men, women, and children in bloody slaughter "before the Lord," it reached a most horrible level. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, Hosea, and others fought the idea at every point except that, if it were true, then from these chosen ones great obedience to the Most High was demanded, not license and self-indulgence.

In his turn, Jesus of Nazareth, if we accept Luke's account on its face value, aroused his first opposition in his home town when he read from the scroll of Isaiah and went on to point out that, as Elijah was sent in a time of famine not to Israel but to a widow in Sidon, and as Elisha cured Naaman the Syrian of leprosy but was not reported to

have healed any Hebrews of that disease, so he himself had been appointed to minister to more than his own home town. The hero of his story of the man robbed on the Jericho road was not a Jew but a despised foreigner, a Samaritan; he told the crowds that God could raise up the sons of Abraham from the stones. He claimed that he had not come to contradict the prophets but to complete them.

In turn, the early Christian church did not begin its real success until it had broken down the barrier of breed and included the Gentiles in its ministry.

When Jesus spoke of mutual understanding, non-violence, co-operation and sacrifice, he was not merely supporting the prophets. He was being supported by the very physical nature of all men, and he was pointing the continuing direction of human survival.

He was no dreamer. He was expressing the very practical wisdom of the species.