

The Seventh Annual William E. Drake Lecture

WAS BILL DRAKE A RELIGIOUS PERSON?

William H. Fisher
The University of Montana

I have been honored to be invited to present the Seventh Annual William E. Drake Lecture. Those who have had this honor before me have been, without exception, excellent scholars and speakers who no doubt made a greater contribution than I will make today. However, in light of my tremendous respect for Bill Drake and his memory, I have frankly hoped that I would somehow "measure up"--and not only that, but that my remarks might contribute in some small way to a better understanding of who Bill was, and how his philosophy as expressed orally and in his writings, might come under the rubric of "that which is religious." If I succeed in my endeavors along this line, I will be thankful for (as everyone knows who knew Bill Drake) if indeed he had a religion, it surely was not of the orthodox kind. Thus I admit that I have ventured onto territory which is a bit shaky. In passing, I want to mainly thank two people for my part on this occasion: (1) Martha Tevis who invited me on behalf of the Texas Educational Foundations Society; (2) Jack C. Willers who, following prolonged conversations (mostly by telephone) urged me to go ahead with the topic I was toying with, and thus Jack stiffened my backbone and made me feel that maybe I could handle it.

A certain amount of analyzing terms seems to be in order at the start. I could have chosen such a topic as: "Did Bill Drake have a religion?" However, I consciously stayed clear of that topic inasmuch as the word religion seems somehow more definitive than the word religious. And in the interest of just plain honesty, one must admit that it is not a simple matter to pin down the nature of William E. Drake's religious orientation--although I do emphatically believe (at least in terms of my interpretation) that Bill was profoundly religious in his orientation to life and its problems¹ In regard to this first footnote, I am a bit ambivalent regarding any kind of "categorizing" when it comes to our friend. So, if this problem bothers you (as it has me), then possibly the term metaphysics is one which may be properly used at this point inasmuch as such a term frequently impinges upon both religion and philosophy.²

Fervor. Webster, as per the same edition cited in footnote #1 above, in definition #2, p. 516: "great warmth of emotion." Great warmth of emotion surely was characteristic of Bill Drake's support of various causes, or opposition to the same! And under "religious" (ibid., p. 1200) we find words such as "conscientiously exact; careful; scrupulous." Such words and terms as the foregoing bear emphasis and indeed, they are emphatic in their own right. My opinion is that they are commensurate with the character of William E. Drake: When he believed something that he thought was important to the world of education (and thus to the world at large), he did so strongly and emphatically. At the risk of overly emphasizing my point, I will add the obvious: I have

chosen these dictionary quotes as further evidence that William E. Drake was indeed "a religious person." In the possibility that those who have not known the late Bill Drake in terms of a close relationship and understanding--if indeed such persons should want to follow-up on my perception that he was a person of strong feelings--then you should peruse his limited-edition autobiography A Voice From Mount Parnassus. As just one example read the portion (pp. 230-231) wherein he explains how he was eased-out as secretary of the Philosophy of Education Society after many years in that capacity. He named names of those who were instrumental in this move and characterizes them as a "coterie of villains." Frankly, reading this kind of shocked me, as the names were familiar to me and without exception, they were leaders in philosophy of education and were individuals who philosophically maintained much the same pattern-of-thought as did Bill Drake.

As I am writing this, I have at hand a letter from William E. Drake dated June the 15th, 1982. Bill was responding to a letter which I had written him, but since I did not keep a copy of my letter I am unaware of its specific content. However, judging from the contents of the message from Bill, it is evident that I had written to him on some subject closely related to religion.³ It is indeed fortuitous that I unearthed this statement of Bill's--sufficiently so that I will take the liberty of quoting from it at some length:

As for the matter of religion, I would say, each man to his faith, whatever it may be. My position in this respect is not a matter of being negative to the churchman's purpose, but is solidly based upon the way in which social thought has developed through the evolution of the human mind. The fact that our ministers of God continue to preach a doctrine suitable to the knowledge of cultures of more than two thousand years past is, to me, the present chief means of blinding our people to the growth of the free scientific and creative mind. I would be a willing participant in discussing the matter at one of our annual meetings if enough of our members would be so interested. Why not use some literature such as Parrington's Main Currents in American Thought as a substitute for the Old Testament? (A few "typos" were in this letter, and I will keep it on hand in case any interested party should care to check-it-out.)

Those who have been familiar with William E. Drake's conversations on the subject of religion, will surely recognize some major themes that Bill Drake above dwelled upon. Firstly, I think we should recognize that he was sincere in his admonition--each man to his

(own) faith--for surely Professor Drake was a strong supporter of The Bill of Rights. When he castigated "our ministers" for preaching a doctrine more suitable to a culture of two thousand years ago than today, in my opinion he was thinking of the typical fundamentalists, rather than the liberal pastors to be found serving some congregations today. We would have to admit that the latter are in the minority. Then, when Bill mentioned Parrington's Main Currents in American Thought, it frankly "rang a bell with me."⁴

One test of whether an individual is a religious person surely is rooted in the problem of whether he/she believes in personal immortality.⁵ Since I have stated elsewhere that belief in personal immortality is not the major test of religiosity,⁶ I won't labor the point other than to reemphasize that support for the hypothesis of individual survival is a significant indication of a person's attitudes toward religion. Since any certitude was lacking (on my part) regarding this aspect of Bill Drake's belief system, I did the obvious--I phoned Jack Willers in Nashville and received a response that was very helpful.⁷ A kind of synopsis of what Jack told me follows, especially as regards the possibility of personal survival following physical death. These are not direct quotes; however, they are statements as interpreted by me as the two of us conversed: Bill Drake would have liked to support "a yes answer" to the question of whether there is personal survival after death. But in the interests of just plain honesty, he could not--or more accurately it may be said that William E. Drake had his doubts regarding this problem. Dr. Willers said that when Bill's mother died and also with the passing of his wife, Zelma, this wanting to believe came on quite strongly.⁸

Bill Drake has stated: "Since childhood I have had a deep religious outlook...Who is God?...The important question is not whether one believes in God, but in what kind of God one believes in."⁹(sic.) The foregoing quote from Drake's autobiography should lay at rest the problem of whether Dr. Drake was a religious person!

On June the 14th, 1993, I phoned Jack Willers again with my principal purpose being to question him as to whether Drake's beliefs regarding religion were much the same as John Dewey's, especially as expressed in the latter's A Common Faith. In answering me, Professor Willers specifically used the word "parallel." Well, parallel is not the same, obviously, as identical. Possibly a viable explanation of Drake's philosophy of religion as contrasted with Dewey's is to say that they were quite similar.¹⁰

In further explication of Dewey vis-a-vis Drake on this subject, we may cite a statement from my friend Bob Roth at Fordham University. As a kind of "prologue" we will remind you that Dewey through much of his career, sought ways to bring people together and to eliminate as far as possible the alienation which is part-and-parcel of human conflict.¹¹ In his John Dewey and Self-Realization Roth stated: "It would seem ...plausible to accept Dewey's own reason for adhering to the term (i.e. God). He wanted to dissociate himself from militant atheism which shares with supernaturalism the separation of man from nature."¹² The foregoing statement underlines the fact that those critics of Dewey's philosophy on the ground that he was some kind of an "atheist," were way off base! And by the same token, those who may have had the mistaken belief that because Bill Drake was at

times a vigorous critic of organized religion, this made him an atheist--such critics of Dr. Drake are also way off base.

Perhaps we are prone to dwell too long on this problem of institutionalized religion. At the same time, it is a problem and one which through the ages has helped raise the question: Just who is a religious person! Furthermore, what part has the organized church had in holding back the march of human progress? The latter question is an extremely complex one. Although it is unfair to criticize one social institution unmercifully, at the same time and if we are to view organized religion in an historic context, a student of the subject will have to admit that such institutions as The Inquisition proved itself to be a bulwark to the progress of humankind. By the use of physical and mental torture--in many cases the end result literally being murder--The Inquisition manifested itself in ways which were clearly unconscionable.¹³

While I was in the midst of working on this manuscript, I was reading a biography of Galileo.¹⁴ Not only was this "exercise" a very interesting one, but possibly in some fortuitous sense I was prompted to read it at this time because it so well fitted some problems about which I had been thinking. Living at the close of the Renaissance (his dates were 1564-1642) when an element of empirical thinking was beginning to appear upon the scene, in his challenge to the Aristotlean way of viewing the universe and his support of the new Copernican way, he was able to garner some substantial agreement among men of vision and honor. This was true both within and without the church.¹⁵ But there was never quite enough support to render him free of the potent threats of official church circles, these under-girded by the decrees of The Inquisition. And while we may say that he was not forced to pay the supreme penalty, nonetheless there may be no doubt that the persecutions that came his way would have destroyed persons of lesser stamina. All this lends itself to a further reaffirmation that when the church--yesterday or today--attempts to influence its affiliates and its various adherents with what is correct and what is incorrect in the realm of scientific truth, it is on very shaky ground, to put it mildly!

My previous statement indicates that--if any reaffirmation were needed--that the basic principles for which Galileo stood in the sense of the search for truth irrespective of where that search may lead; in short, said principles have been threatened from Galileo's day until today. True, we have possibly come a-ways in advancing the cause of liberty since those days. That is, a person who takes a firm stand on behalf of some tenable hypothesis or some tentative truth--said individual has a better chance today at least in the United States of America, of coming out of the situation with his physical body intact. However, his/her emotional status may be very much affected, and the individual could suffer the loss of his/her professional position. Surely the latter eventuality is not much different than an actual death sentence.

I am sure there are persons who are listening to and/or reading this paper who have suffered at least emotional damage as a result of interference with their basic academic freedom. Other cases, perhaps better known to the public, are extant. Before I bring this portion of my presentation to closure, I want to mention the famous Bertrand Russell case involving The City College of New York in the early forties. This dramatic imbroglio

perhaps was not the cause-celebre of first import in the history of academic freedom, but certainly the notoriety which it involved and the fundamental principles which were at stake, must impel us to use the illustration as a most significant one.

Russell's chronological years were 1872-1970. He was beyond a shadow of a doubt one of the greatest philosophers of the present century. Not only were his publications exemplary, but his educational backgrounds were equally so, and his teaching credentials read like something which could with credence be said, "He was a teacher of world renown." It is true that because of his stands on a number of controversial issues, he was frequently in trouble with the authorities--both at the institutions where he taught and with the higher governmental authorities.¹⁶

At the time of his appointment to the faculty of CCNY, Russell had been teaching at UCLA, and the new position was to include a stint of a little better than a year--from February 1941 to June 1942. "Russell was pleased to be going to City College as it had a liberal reputation, and a record of fostering the education of the lower classes..." (see p. 136). But alas, this was by no means the end of the story. Bishop William T. Manning of the Episcopal Church diocese of New York, an old adversary of Russell's and an arch-conservative in both religion and politics, jumped into the brewing controversy with both feet. (ibid.) Stimulated by Manning's leadership, other ultra-conservative forces and individuals got into the fray, including the Hearst Press, many a Tammany Hall politician--yes, Tammany was the Democratic Party in NYC at the time as it was influenced by Irish-Catholic ward heelers galore--and Manning's campaign in opposition to Russell was ardently supported by Catholic lay organizations including the State Council of the Knights of Columbus, the latter issuing a statement describing Russell as "an articulate spearhead of the radical, atheistic and anti-religious elements of our time." (ibid., p. 137).

Liberals from across the USA also jumped into what had become a question of national import: Is Bertrand Russell "a fit person" to teach at CCNY? The philosophy department at City College held its ground and said that Russell's appointment would remain intact. John Dewey, Albert Einstein and many another prominent intellectual rallied to Russell's defense. Einstein being the always perceptive observer of events and having a guesstimate as to how the controversy would end, penned the following poem: "It keeps repeating itself--In this world, so fine and honest; The Parson alarms the populace, The genius is executed." (see ibid., p. 144).

It certainly needs to be interpolated at this point, that, especially for the times in which he lived, Russell's views of Marriage and Morals were "advanced." He had written a book some years before the CCNY episode on this very subject. In the opus, he had taken much the same stand as had the well known Denver jurist Ben Lindsey who advocated "trial marriage" as a kind of antidote--a treatment for the endless stream of divorce and broken marriages with which he had to deal when he was on the bench. Needless to say, Judge Lindsey in general terms paid a price for his stand, but one not so dramatic as what happened to the Russell appointment: You guessed it, he was never permitted to teach at CCNY.

When the Manning forces could not get their way

with the administration of the college, they turned to the courts. A Mrs. Jean Kay, a citizen of Brooklyn who had no connection with CCNY, received the ardent support of attorney Joseph Goldstein. Goldstein, according to authors Feinberg and Kasrils, had been a magistrate under a previous Tammany administration, "...and) was a masterpiece of character assassination." (see ibid., p. 152.) Justice John E. McGeehan of the New York Supreme Court heard the testimonies of both sides to the dispute and--in the light of the emotionally charged atmosphere pervading this whole affair--ruled in favor of Mrs. Kay and her attorney Goldstein, and against CCNY's appointment of Bertrand Russell. It is possibly worth mentioning that it was characteristic and circumstantial that in 1950, less than ten years after this messy affair, the Nobel Prize Committee, although at the time not warranted to award the accolade in Philosophy, did award Russell a Nobel Prize in Literature.

Have I spent too much time and space, relatively speaking, on the foregoing case? I think not. I fully believe that if Bill Drake were still around in this world and teaching as he once did at the University of Texas (and elsewhere), he would approve of my having illustrated a point with this particular, unfortunate event in American history. The case represent a graphic instance of what can happen when the forces of organized, right-wing religion run rampant. And even though fifty odd years have transpired since the CCNY episode, you and I as the students of Bill Drake, realize that these forces of bigotry still are active in American life; and if they are beneath the surface, they are not far beneath, and we as the followers of a kind of philosophy that Bill supported, owe it to his memory to combat these dark forces, just as he did!

The topic which I assigned myself on this occasion is much like other topics I have assigned myself in the past--just too much territory to cover. But leastwise, I hope that my discussions will lead some of you to check further into Bill Drake's life and his contributions to the uplift of humanity.¹⁷ The fact that he wrote a rather comprehensive autobiography should not dissuade Bill's friends (and others) from writing articles or even books regarding this-or-that phase of his notable career.

One quality in Bill which influenced me very much was his insistence that intellectual content in the work which we as teachers do, must be always uppermost as we engage in our various endeavors. Not only by direction but also by in-direction this is implicit in one of his better known books.¹⁸ In his historical writings, as a further example of this point, he makes plain his preference for Jefferson rather than Jackson as a political leader.¹⁹ While many religious persons prefer the quality of intuition over that of cognition, this was not true of Professor Drake. My own leanings are frankly toward intuition--at least in those situations where we have great difficulty in making a final decision as to a course of action, or as to some philosophical problem.²⁰ I hasten to add, however, that even though I never had the pleasure of an actual, formal course with Bill Drake, in more ways than one, he influenced me, and the foregoing is one of those ways. Thus, I find myself saying on occasion when I believe that I am leaning too-too much toward a subjective approach as I ruminate regarding some problem: "Bill, slow down--Bill Drake would say that you are letting your emotions get the better of you!"

Previous reference has been made to Drake's admi-

ration and respect for John Dewey, and how their thinking along the lines of religion was somehow parallel, or similar.²¹ In this discussion, it is pertinent to draw upon Dewey's psychology. While he was not all the way into gestalt psychology, he surely was leaning in that direction as illustrated by his oft-quoted quip regarding E.L. Thorndike's behaviorism: When asked in some public discussion while on the faculty at Columbia University what he thought of Thorndike's statistical (or quantitative) approach to psychological problems, Dewey answered to the effect that it reminded him of the way the farmers in his native Vermont determined what price to expect on their pigs as they prepared to ship the latter to the urban markets. The big question was, of course, how much the hogs weighed. And the way they determined that, was to find a lengthy board and with the help of a proper fulcrum, they would balance this lever precisely then place the hog on one end of the lever (holding it gently so that it wouldn't fall off) and then pile rocks on the other end until everything balanced. Then they would estimate the weight of the rocks! This actual (or apocryphal) story from Dewey was gleaned from the years before gestalt psychology became a major challenge to Thorndikian Behaviorism--but it constitutes ample evidence that Dewey wasn't enamored of a strictly quantitative methodology in his search for a viable philosophy (or psychology) of education. And I will postulate that like Dewey, Bill Drake never was wedded to statistics--bless his great soul!

Although Dewey died in 1952, 't isn't surprising that his influence to this day is muchly felt. And if we consider the following quote, 't isn't surprising that Drake found so much in Dewey's writings that he could (and did!) support. Robert J. Roth, S.J., writing but a few years ago, had this to say: "...during a teaching career of more than fifty years he (JD) was no ivory-tower intellectual. He believed that the philosopher should be engaged in the human clash of social purposes and aspirations. Problems of poverty and disease, social justice and the underprivileged, the dignity of the human person and the possibilities for the development of human potentialities--all these were important to him. Consequently, he was anxious to assist in the improvement of the institutions which concerned themselves with these issues."²²

We have previously indicated how--insofar as it was an issue in those days--Dewey leaned toward gestalt psychology and away from crass behaviorism. Consistent with his stance on this issue was his attempt to search for a holistic perspective when viewing any problem which seemingly invited an analysis which implicitly might lead to fragmentation. In fact, it has been widely stated that even though Dewey drifted away from his earlier orientation toward Hegel's philosophy, he never drifted all the way to a complete departure from Hegel.²³ Even in his later years, Dewey stated: "There is greater richness and greater variety of insight in Hegel than in any other systematic philosopher except Plato."²⁴ Apropos the foregoing quote, it is reasonable to conclude that one reason Dewey never completely departed from Hegel's philosophy was because of the latter's insistence that fragmentation as a tendency among philosophical thinkers was a tendency to be avoided like the plague, and that wholeness, or a holistic approach, was the way to go. Surely this "way to go" fits a well balanced attitude toward religion. It explains also why

Dewey (and Drake!) tended to avoid super-naturalisms of all kinds because: (1) They fly in the face of logic and solid intellectualism; and (2) Supernaturalistic religions tend to fragment groups and lead to conflict; and also within the individual, this ultra-conservative stance leads frequently to confusion and a high degree of emotionalism.

I reemphasize at this point three aspects of why a person may be profoundly religious and yet he/she refuses to be a conformist: (1) Critique of an institution doesn't necessarily mean opposition to the original purpose for which the institution was founded. "That Dewey's own strictures bore on existing religious beliefs, organizations and institutions, rather than upon religion itself is a tenable inference..."²⁵ (2) Gestalt. Wholeness: "See the whole picture"--or in short, seek a holistic way out of confusion and fragmentation. (3) Reject a super-naturalistic approach to basic religions. It is worth mentioning that while the previous point may not satisfy some persons, nonetheless and as nearly as this writer can ascertain in the spirit of a Bill Drake and one of his philosophical heroes, John Dewey, my "guess-timate" is that neither of them would have been sympathetic toward a religion which rejected humanism--a humanism based in naturalism.²⁶

As I wound up the rough draft of this ms. (end June, 1993), I was attempting to think of some piece from literature which might occupy a fitting closure.²⁷ Such a closing statement should be consistent with the personality and the spirit of the individual involved. It was then that I perused William Cullen Bryant's well known poem Thanatopsis. And it seems to me that the final lines are consistent with Bill Drake's philosophy of religion:

So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, that moves
To that mysterious realm where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go, not like the quarry slave at night
Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and
soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Notes

¹We cannot completely escape "categorizing" in this paper, so I will venture to state that Professor Drake's ruminations (and actions) in those affairs of life which impinge upon that which is religious, had a close relationship to modern humanism. One definition of humanism is to the effect that it is a movement which is "...monotheistic, rationalistic (and) that holds that man is capable of self-fulfillment, ethical conduct, etc. without recourse to supernaturalism." (See Webster's New World Dictionary, second college edition, latest copyright 1980, p. 683).

²I will illustrate this point by citing an example from a biography of the late Robert M. Hutchins, Unseasonable Truths--The Life of Robert Maynard Hutchins, by Harry S. Ashmore (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1989). I clearly am not saying that Bill Drake and Robert

Hutchins had the same philosophy of education, for surely they differed in said philosophy. What I am stating simply by way of illustrating one meaning of metaphysics is that Hutchins used the term so frequently because he had attempted during much of his adult life to find a substitute for the religion which he had lost. Not wanting to completely disavow certain religious loyalties, he searched for a word that was, in meaning, approximately “halfway” between religion on the one hand, and pure philosophy on the other. (See Chapter 15 of the Hutchins Biography: “Facts vs. Ideas.”)

³At least a little analysis seems in order regarding Drake’s statement to me: The vigor with which, especially in private conversations (“private” in this instance meaning not in the classroom setting, but more likely in an informal give-and-take setting), Bill laid down some rather potent blasts at the church; this no doubt influenced some to believe that he really was anti-religious. But I don’t think so. William Earle Drake certainly was not the first thoughtful critic of organized religion to attack the church. Various kinds of liberals have attacked the church, while these same attackers were at heart believers and even devout individuals. Baruch Spinoza was a typical example among well known philosophers. He was Jewish and a believer if ever there was one, but his own synagogue officially booted him out. Bertrand Russell refers to him as “...the noblest and most lovable of the great philosophers.” (See BR’s A History of Western Philosophy, 1945 copyright, p. 569.) It is also well known that among our own Founding Fathers, the greatest of the great such as Franklin and Jefferson, were deists. In short, they had a religion although one admittedly unorthodox. And that’s the point, unorthodox; and through the centuries the know-nothings have persecuted and killed all sorts and kinds of unorthodox thinkers.

⁴Tis not stretching the point to state that in Parrington’s three volume classic there is much about religion. There had to be, since many of the great classic works of American literature were written by those who were themselves profoundly religious, or were writing about persons and events related to religion. True, Parrington’s social philosophy was left-of-center, although it clearly was not Marxist. When I attended the University of Washington during the thirties, Parrington’s influence there “was all over the place”--and the main building in which English and Literature are taught, was named for that truly great teacher and writer. I had courses with a few of his students, but more to the point in ways informal as well as formal, the long stint he put in at that university manifested itself in ways which I do not hesitate to say were eternal. Whatever liberal tendencies I have reflected from those days until these, are in part (although perhaps indirectly) the result of the impact of the teachings of Vernon Louis Parrington. And I can tell you that he and his students did not worship at the shrine of organized religion.

⁵Corliss Lamont’s The Illusion of Immortality (NY: Ungar, 1965 last c.) is in my opinion clearly the strongest, most logical statement I have read in opposition to those who support immortality. I disagree with it, but I think it is definitely worth reading--in part because it forces the individual believer to think acutely in order to

find answers to this particular humanist’s well reasoned arguments.

⁶See my “Agnostics vis-a-vis Atheists” in the Proceedings of the S.W. Philosophy of Education Society, 1984, Dalton B. Curtis, Jr., Editor.

⁷Anyone who knows Professor Willers and his grounding in religion--as well as his close and ongoing professional association with Bill Drake across many years--will appreciate the fact that Jack is very well qualified to give a viable analysis of what Professor Drake believed regarding various aspects of the broad problems related to Bill’s approach to religion. (I kept notes as I was talking with Jack, and I know this took place during May, 1993, but I don’t have the exact date.)

⁸Bill Drake surely was not alone in wanting to believe in immortality! This is a common phenomenon--and it seems to be a phenomenon among those of liberal persuasion, including a number of agnostics. My own “prejudices” may be apparent when I state it as my opinion that the attitude of wanting something could possibly indicate a quality in the individual of a strong leaning-in-that-direction. In his Will To Believe, William James identified himself quite strongly with the postulate if we want something enough--very much, that is--this quality of ardent hopefulness might actually bring that which we want into existence. Needless to say, such a one as Corliss Lamont strongly opposes “the will to believe” thesis.

⁹William E. Drake, A Voice From Mount Parnassus, The Autobiography and Poems, edited by Jack Conrad Willers, Vanderbilt University, 1992. (Drake b. 1903, d. 1989). Chapter 3: “Who Is God?” Quote is from p. 23.

¹⁰A person didn’t have to know Bill Drake “all that well” in order to realize that John Dewey was one of his great heroes. (In passing, it is worth noting that Dewey’s statement on religion in A Common Faith, is his main one, but surely he touched on religion in a number of his other writings.)

¹¹While Dewey surely wasn’t some “Norman Vincent Peale” kind of thinker, nonetheless and if it could be done honestly, he was looking for those philosophical points-of-agreement which could prevent fragmentation.

¹²Roth, John Dewey and Self-Realization (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962), footnote #27, p. 108.

¹³In fairness we must state that the Counter Reformation developed some policies which caused the church to give up certain stances and practices for which it had been oft-criticized. At the same time the actual physical abuses (torture, etc.) which were institutionalized by The Inquisition, justify the use of the word unconscionable.

¹⁴Colin A. Ronan, Galileo (NY: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1974).

¹⁵Had Aristotle been alive at the time of “the big

fuss" over Galileo's experimental work and his conclusions, it is highly likely that he would not have joined in the proceedings of condemnation that characterized Galileo's opponents. But the historic fact was that philosophers and teachers of that epoch had attained such a frozen-in interpretation of Aristotle that it was virtually hopeless for Galileo's defenders to postulate what I have postulated in the first sentence of this footnote.

¹⁶The material herein contained has been mostly gleaned from Barry Feinberg and Ronald Kasrils, Bertrand Russell's America (NY: The Viking Press, 1974), Chapters 11 and 12 respectively titled: "A New York Appointment" and "The Chair of Indecency." Needless to say, this famous case has had treatment in numerous other publications.

¹⁷It is to be hoped that the still extant family of Dr. Drake will give its approval to a further production of Bill's autobiography. I know that Jack Willers has been working on this off-and-on, to bring to fruition something more than the very limited number of volumes so far published.

¹⁸Drake, The Intellectual Foundations of Modern Education (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967).

¹⁹Actually, Professor Drake had great respect for both these leaders, but it is plain that he reserved greater respect for Jefferson, the latter obviously being one of the greatest intellectuals that this or any nation has produced.

²⁰It would seem to the present writer (WHF) that no matter which direction the thoughtful individual leans--toward intuitive factors in decision-making or toward strict reliance upon cold-blooded intellect--the latter must have some say-so in this process. The late, great

British philosopher Bertrand Russell, surely would agree with this perspective, as reflected in his many published writings.

²¹See footnote #10, above.

²²Roth, Person and Community (NY: Fordham University Press, 1975), p. 88.

²³Jo Ann Boydston, Guide to the Works of John Dewey (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), p. 22.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Paul Arthur Schilpp (editor), The Philosophy of John Dewey (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1939), p. 398. This chapter, #13, was written by Edward L. Schaub.

²⁶Assuming that one interpretation of "supernaturalism" is to the effect that Jesus was the Christ--and that He and God were of the same substance--there probably are individuals in SWPES and related organizations who subscribe to this kind of "supernaturalism" while at the same time they are social-political liberals. Okay and okay! However, the assignment I gave myself has been to have a look at Bill Drake as a religious person--and my assumption is that he would have been with Dewey in rejecting supernaturalism.

²⁷I include in this note a reference to what I have previously implied: That this paper is really introductory in nature. Whether a biography of Bill is needed inasmuch as Jack Willers has edited a full-fledged autobiography, is debatable. More to the point, I believe that it isn't debatable as to whether the final lines of a statement of this kind should be consistent with Drake's approach to religion--for they should be.