

Continued from page 18

right so that the divine meaning would become clear. Interpretation was almost unnecessary: Almanacs, histories, and collections of "providences" often contained only lists of occurrences, and even many published sermons contained long recitations of "the facts."

Of course, it was not long before varying interpretations of events did begin to appear, and by the time the first real newspa-

pers were started in Boston during the early 18th century, the teleological import of the news had all but vanished. Even so, Nord argues, journalism continued to feel the Puritan influence. "The news would remain event-oriented, devoted to unusual (but conventional) occurrences, and dependent on reportorial empiricism." The chief difference is that, today, "no one knows what the stories mean."

RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY

Locke's Lapses

"Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade" by Wayne Glausser, in *Journal of the History of Ideas* (April-June 1990), Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y. 14627.

It is one of the more unsettling puzzles of political philosophy that John Locke (1632-1704), the premier theorist of liberalism, was an active participant in the slave trade. Among other things, he invested the substantial sum of 600 pounds in the Royal African Company, a slave-trading venture.

Over the years, notes Glausser, of DePauw University, scholars who have tried to explain Locke's lapse have fallen into three distinct camps. One group dismisses it as "embarrassing but insignificant." Scrutinizing *Two Treatises on Government* (1690) and other writings, these scholars find a virtually airtight case against slavery. Everyone is naturally free "from any Superior Power on Earth," Locke wrote, and anyone who attempts to enslave a person "puts himself into a State of War" with that person. Locke seemed to admit only one exception: captives taken in a just war can be held as slaves.

A second group of scholars, led by M. Seliger, detects signs of tortured logic justifying slavery in Locke's writings. From Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), Locke borrowed the theory of "waste land," the notion that idle land may sometimes be seized by people prepared to put it to good use. Thus Locke wrote that victors in war may not seize the land of the vanquished, except that "where there being more

Land, than the Inhabitants possess, and make use of, any one has liberty to make use of the waste." By this logic, Africans resisting use of their "waste land" by whites could be considered aggressors in war—and thus candidates for slavery.

The third group of scholars sees slavery as part and parcel of Lockean theory. A conservative critic, Leo Strauss, maintains



Locke probably coauthored colonial Carolina's constitution; granting "every freeman . . . absolute power and authority over his negro slave."

that an acceptance of slavery was a natural outgrowth of Locke's defense of capitalism: "To say that public happiness requires the emancipation and the protection of the acquisitive faculties amounts to saying that to accumulate as much money and other wealth as one pleases is right or just." Leon Poliakov and H. M. Bracken are among those who argue that Lockean theory is fundamentally racist. Locke, they argue, did not consider blacks and Indians

to be fully human, and thus entitled to human rights. In *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), for example, he denied that nature had drawn the boundaries of the human species: "*The boundaries of the Species, whereby Men sort them, are made by Men.*"

Where does Glausser stand? He thinks that slavery is integral to Locke's thought, but only as part of an ambiguous "destabilizing competition of values."

The Muslim Mind

"The Roots of Muslim Rage" by Bernard Lewis, in *The Atlantic Monthly* (Sept. 1990), 745 Boylston St., Boston, Mass. 02116.

The Cold War may be over but the clash of civilizations is not. Even if the inhabitants of what was once called Christendom still cannot quite believe it, they are locked in a holy war with much of the Muslim world.

Some of the "roots of Muslim rage," writes Lewis, a Princeton historian, grow in certain profound differences between the two faiths. Christians always recognized a distinction between Church and State, and since the great religious wars of the 17th century they have come to accept the separation of the two. Muslims never made such distinctions, Lewis observes. "Muhammad, it will be recalled, was not only a prophet and a teacher, like the founders of other religions; he was also the head of a polity and of a community, a ruler and a soldier." Thus, "the struggle of good and evil very soon acquired political and even military dimensions."

Many Muslims feel that Islam has been locked for 14 centuries in a struggle with Christendom; only since the Turks were repulsed at the second siege of Vienna in 1683 have the infidels enjoyed the upper hand. The Muslims were pushed out of Europe. Then came European and Russian colonialism, followed during the 20th century by the invasion even of the Muslim household by alien ideas about the roles of women and children.

Why has the United States become the focus of Muslim rage?

American "imperialism" and support for Israel are the answers most often

given, but Lewis does not find them credible. The Ayatollah Khomeini, for example, clearly loathed the United States even more than he did Israel; he was not, after all, above secret dealings with Jerusalem. Indeed, Muslims never seemed to hold it against the Soviet Union that it was responsible, through its satellite Czechoslovakia, for keeping Israel alive during its first weeks of existence in 1948. As for imperialism, Lewis says, the United States was never a power in the Muslim world, and it even forced the French, British, and Israelis to withdraw from Egypt in 1956. Meanwhile, Muslims are virtually silent about the fact that some 50 million of their fellow believers live under Soviet rule.

There are several reasons for this selective hatred, Lewis speculates, but none so powerful as the fact that the Soviet way of life poses no challenge to Islam. "After all, the great social and intellectual and economic changes that have transformed most of the Islamic world, and given rise to such commonly denounced Western evils as consumerism and secularism, emerged from the West, not from the Soviet Union."

Unfortunately, Lewis continues, the West can do nothing to remove the source of conflict with the Islamic world; nor can it do much to mollify Muslim fundamentalists. At best, it can step aside and wait for this cycle of Muslim fury to end and for the more tolerant forces that have always existed within Islam to reemerge.