VOLUME XII, NO. 20
MAY 20, 1959

THE EMPTY FORUM

IT is customary to speak ponderously of the "issues" before the modern world and of the differences of opinion which keep the various opposing sections of the world apart, in separate camps. It is also customary to speak of the great achievement of modern communications and how it has begun a new epoch in human affairs—the epoch of "one world," in which people everywhere are at once informed of what is happening everywhere else.

These customs give a false portrait of our times. It is true that the world is divided, but it is not divided upon the issues which are vital to the future of the world. It is true that the press and radio and television penetrate to the far places of the earth, but they do not bring to the people the facts they need, if they are to be intelligently informed. The channels of world communication are choked with the partisan, the superficial, the misleading and the false, while the issues set before the people are a musty compost of bad propaganda, ignorance, and moral timidity.

It is time for the birth of a new publishing idea, addressed to the intelligent people of the world, in terms of their common interests and understanding.

A brief review of material recently appearing in various magazines and newspapers will make this plain. A new publishing idea is needed, not because such material cannot be found, but because you have to *search* to find it.

An item to begin with is a review by Herbert Mitgang (New York *Times,* March 22) of *The Face of War* by Martha Gelhorn (Simon & Schuster). The book is made up of articles contributed by Miss Gelhorn to *Collier's,* over a period of years, producing, the reviewer says, "a brilliant anti-war book that is as fresh as if written for this morning." This is the passage which attracted Mr. Mitgang's attention:

> The world's leaders seem strangely engaged in private feuds. . . . Their talk sounds as if they believed nuclear war to be a thing that can be won or lost, and probable. . . . [They] appear to have lost touch with the life down here on the ground, to have forgotten the human beings they lead. . . . But we need not follow in silence. . . . As one of the billions of the led, I will not be herded any farther along this imbecile road to nothingness without raising my voice in protest. . . . I believe that memory and imagination, not nuclear weapons, are the great deterrents.

"The world's leaders"—who are they? No one can be singled out as a real *leader,* these days. Instead, the world is being led around by a collection of bad habits which seem to be taken on automatically by anyone so unfortunate as to be elevated to a position of authority. In a recent television discussion between Clifton Daniel, an editor of the New York *Times,* and James P. Warburg, banker and foreign policy analyst, with Louis M. Lyons moderating, Mr. Daniel identified one of these bad habits. He said:

> There is a mistaken belief on the part of newspapermen that for some patriotic reason or other—maybe it is simply loyalty to a given political party or given political creed or loyalty to our country—that we mustn't print certain facts that might embarrass our government. It may be that those facts are the very ones that our people need to know most about in order to come to a clear decision about our policy.

Mr. Warburg took up the theme, saying that the government has "indoctrinated people, rather than informed them, for the past five or six years." This was in relation to the idea that the United States has outrun the Communists. "When you have the highest officials of our Government saying this sort of thing," he continued, "it is rather difficult for the press to do anything but report them. . . . the fact is that the highest

officials of our Government have deliberately overstated our strength, overstated the weakness of the adversary, and understated the critical time in which we live."

Earlier in the discussion, note had been taken of the report in the New York *Times* of an important speech by Senator Mansfield concerning the Berlin crisis. Mr. Warburg praised the *Times* for noting editorially the importance of the Senator's demand for an "imaginative" solution, but added:

> On the other hand, I disagree with the *Times* editorial in that it pointed out with some misgivings, that in several instances Mansfield's constructive proposals were identical with or very similar to those of Mr. Khrushchev. Now, this is part of the cold-war fear psychosis, which all of our newspapers have indulged in. It doesn't follow that because the Russians want something we would be crazy to want it too. It is quite possible, in my judgment, that common sense might lead both of us to want the same thing. (New York *Times*, March 13.)

The point, here, is the matter of the "habit." Even the New York *Times* has it, and feels obliged to hedge its praise of an excellent speech with a warning of the danger of agreeing with the Communists.

Other phases of our leading bad habits are reported by Sybil Morrison in a recent *Peace News* column:

> The Second World War was responsible for introducing a phraseology designed to cover up and play down unpalatable and alarming facts. Statements officially issued in regard to air-raids were worded to give the impression that nothing very disastrous had happened.
>
> "Loss of life was negligible," became a common phrase, and the fact that those "negligible lives" were men, women and children buried under the rubble of their homes or offices, blasted or burned to death in the streets or underground railways was thereby lightly glossed over. . . .
>
> It also became necessary to disguise the number of lives lost at sea, and therefore, casualty lists, such as appeared in the newspapers every day during the First World War, were discontinued and human lives were transformed into tonnage; so many thousand tons were sunk, not so many men and boys drowned in icy waters or shark-infested seas, or blown to pieces on decks swept by high explosive.
>
> Men, women and children homeless, and perhaps wounded, burned, and blinded, became "the bombed-out" who, of course, were going to be looked after, and consciences could be assuaged by putting a piece of silver into a box for a Lord Mayor's Fund. Everywhere the official policy was to "play down," and not let the full effect of the holocaust be known.
>
> Now that the H-bomb, nuclear warhead rockets, and other monstrous missiles designed to destroy millions instead of thousands at a time, have come to be known, not as the immoral and appalling weapons that they are, but as THE DETERRENT, it is possible to see exactly the same pattern emerging.

Further evidence of the pattern of "playing down" the facts about nuclear weapons came to light last March when the first reports on the Argus test explosions were made public. At this time, Senator Clinton P. Anderson (New Mexico) accused the Defense Department of withholding vital information concerning fall-out. According to a report in the New York *Times* (March 20):

> He [Sen. Anderson] suggested to a reporter that the department was trying "to hush up" the information because it was contrary to what the A.E.C. [Atomic Energy Commission] had previously said, and would "upset some of those running around saying fall-out is no more dangerous than the luminescent dial on a watch."

The *Times* dispatch states:

> Preliminary information from last summer's atomic tests indicates that radioactive strontium is falling from the stratosphere much faster than had been supposed. The information, which has not been published, may force a major revision in theories about the nature of fall-out and how quickly it enters the food chain. . . . Strontium, which is chemically like calcium, tends to concentrate in human bones, where it can cause cancer and leukemia.

Dr. Willard C. Libby, the only member of the AEC who is a scientist, had estimated that the strontium-90 created by nuclear explosions would remain in the stratosphere for ten years before falling to earth. His later judgment was six years. The present estimate, however, is that it may

come down in about two years. This would make it more radioactive upon reaching the earth, since it would not have had so much time to decay in the upper atmosphere. According to a current report, Dr. Libby now urges that all future nuclear explosion tests be conducted underground, because of the likelihood of damage from "additional radioactive contamination."

While the concentration of strontium-90 is greater in the United States than anywhere else in the world, European figures on radiation are up 400 per cent. The Russian atomic tests of last fall are said to have doubled the amount of radioactive material in the atmosphere. According to *Peace News* for March 27:

> Within weeks of the Russian tests a Swedish radiation expert complained to the United Nations. He said that so much radioactive debris was falling in Sweden that elk grazing on the northern—and most contaminated—pastures were showing 200 per cent increases in the amount of radiation in their bones.
>
> In Holland recently, Mr. Erb, closely connected with the Dutch atomic energy program, confirmed measurements by the Royal Meteorological Institute, local water boards and the Royal Institute of Public Health. These all showed an increase of between 400 and 450 per cent in the general level of radioactivity.

Meanwhile, in the United States, some Minnesota scientists reported that the average strontium-90 content of thirty wheat crop samplings taken in 1958 was one and a half times the "safe limit" set by the AEC.

A *Nation* (April 25) article by Walter Schneir, "Strontium-90 in Children," declares that an unpublished report in the hands of the AEC (the third Kulp report, the first two of which have appeared in *Science)* estimates that "the quantity of strontium-90 concentrated in the bones of American children up to age four doubled in the one-year period ending December, 1957." This writer points out that since the bone analyses supplying the data for the report were made before last summer's nuclear tests, its figures are now seriously out of date. Mr. Schneir thinks the situation is much worse today. (The growing organisms of children take on strontium-90 much more rapidly than is the case with adults.)

Following is the *Nation* writer's general conclusion:

> How many additional cases of leukemia, bone cancer and other diseases will be caused by the increased absorption of strontium-90 as shown in the third Kulp report, no scientist can say with certainty. Out of a welter of conflicting statements and opinions, however, one irrefutable fact emerges: people throughout the world will suffer death and illness from the nuclear tests conducted to date—and the effects of these tests will still be felt by mankind 10,000 years from now. The only debatable point is whether the victims of bomb-testing should be counted in hundreds of thousands, or millions.

It seems likely that the scientists who in the past have spoken in justification of the policies and attitudes of the Atomic Energy Commission will now express their opinions in very low voices, and for quite a while.

For concluding "items" in this discouraging round-up on what the world's "leaders" are doing and saying, we have reports on two discussions of space travel—one conducted on March 16 by high school students under the austere auspices of the New York *Times* Youth Forum Telecast, the other a meeting of the nation's top "space scientists" at the California Institute of Technology on March 20.

The youngsters, ranging from fifteen to seventeen years in age, thought that the "conquest of space" would strengthen religious belief and bring people closer together. Going far into space and seeing "the perfect arrangement out there," said a 16-year-old girl, will increase man's "confidence in ideas of a supreme being." A 15-year-old boy felt that "man perhaps will be able to understand God more," but doubted that he would learn more about himself. Another boy thought that some people "will see the marvels of space as evidence of the power of God," but added that atheism might also gain for the same reason. The conference ended on this note of moderate piety.

The scientists busy with actual space projects took a different view. When, during their meeting, some of them began to question the value of the missile program, Dr. A. L. Grosch, manager of space programs for the IBM Corporation, shouted from the floor:

> "Our missile program is the swan song of a dying civilization.
>
> "We don't need better missiles to destroy each other—the ones we have now will do the job adequately.
>
> "And there isn't any point in zooming off into outer space. We could spend the money better solving problems at home taking care of our over-crowded, underfed millions. If we did that, we wouldn't need to find new worlds to colonize."

Dr. Grosch's outburst followed a speech by Dr. Louis J. Ridenour, Jr., assistant manager of research and development for Lockheed's missile systems division, who said that the missile program was following America's "traditional economy of waste." Dr. Ridenour continued:

> "We turn in our cars before they are worn out, and our nation would go broke if we didn't. Our missile program fits into the system very well. We send up missiles that never come back, and so we have to make more missiles.
>
> "This is fine. It creates jobs and keeps money in circulation. In the not too distant future, man will be boarding the other fellow's satellites and destroying them. This means more satellites must be built, and the economy is kept functioning at top speed."

It was at this point that Dr. Grosch started the uproar which broke up the meeting. Dr. Grosch also said:

> "We are planning to spend millions of dollars a year on new missiles and space probes. And I ask why?
>
> "Why must we continue to shovel these millions into companies that are interested primarily not in new scientific knowledge but in their 7 per cent profit? That 7 per cent alone would go a long way toward solving the social problems that create war and make space exploration and colonization a necessity.
>
> "We are in a bad way, I'm afraid, when we try to solve our problem by mass killing—or by paddling off to a bigger island in space."

And now, as a final footnote, there is the story (AP, April 11)—pure coincidence, of course—of Claude R. Eatherly, "tall, pleasant, former Air Force Major," who led the atomic bombers over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Mr. Eatherly was given a 90-day commitment to a Dallas, Tex., mental clinic last month. He claims he killed 100,000 Japanese. Apparently this delusion has taken him into mental clinics several times since the end of the war. His odd feeling of responsibility was discovered several years ago when he was tried for burglarizing some Texas post offices and was freed on grounds of insanity. His present trouble arose from an unsuccessful attempt to rob a drive-in grocery.

Letter from **BELGRADE**

BELGRADE.—I have observed, over the years, that MANAS writers can take off from almost any point, and come up with something worth thinking about. How about humor? Ever tried that as a start?

I think that perhaps every diplomat or public servant going overseas (including senators), and missionaries or private-agency representatives, should have a course in the analysis of humor. First of all, of course, and perhaps most difficult of all, he should know why he and his own countrymen laugh. But in these piping days of peace, he should understand what makes Ivan laugh.

Ivan laughs a lot, I have noticed. All the Ivans. I used to think, for instance, that I could tell what was going to happen next in Egypt by the quality of the humor of the moment. The Arabs have a good sense of humor, based soundly in the ridiculous. Their humor comes through the difficulties of translation extraordinarily well. In Cairo it varied from the norm, as unrest grew and tension mounted, through various stages of ribaldry to the positively lewd. Then something was bound to happen. Nothing much, however, has gone right in Egypt, including my predictions, so I'm no longer counting on my barometer.

But Eastern Europe is in this respect fascinating. It is, of course, a rumor-mill of stupefying proportions. Scratch a Pole and a rumor gushes out. And all over the area the normal response to a question, or termination of a discussion on politics, is a funny story. It is the change in the quality of these stories that fascinates me. There seems to be a sharp growth in bitterness in them; the hook is sharper and the barb nearer the surface.

In 1956 a Russian diplomat told the following story, obviously enjoying himself. He assured us it concerned only the weather, not politics. Its time was set just after World War II, when the border was being drawn between Poland and Russia. At one point it went right through a peasant's house, and the Russian officers in charge said to him: "This is too bad, so we have decided that you shall choose which country you want to live in. We'll return tomorrow for your decision."

The next day they asked the peasant what he wanted. He replied, "I want to live in Poland." This of course disappointed the officers, but they arranged the boundary to suit his wish, and then asked, "Now, tell us! Why did you choose Poland?"

"Well," replied the peasant, "I'll tell you: I just don't like the Russian winters!"

In Moscow, in 1959, I was told two stories by Russians.

One concerns a primary school inspector who, visiting a rural school, asked the Principal whether he had any really outstanding students. "Yes," responded the Principal, "I have one. He is a year ahead of all the others."

The lad was brought before the inspector, who said, "Now, young man, I have a very difficult question for you. Can you name the three worst enemies of the People?"

"Yes, sir. The first is Stalin." "Right!" responded the inspector. "Who is the second?" "Malenkov," said the boy. "Right again; and who is the third?"

"Khrushchev!" said the lad, bravely.

"Well," said the inspector to the Principal, "you were right. He is just about a year ahead of everybody."

The other story concerns justice. It seems two men were arrested, one day. The first had been shouting in Red Square: "Down with Communism!" He was sentenced to two years. The second, however, had been going about saying that Khrushchev was crazy. He was

sentenced to twenty years on a charge of revealing State secrets.

In Belgrade these same stories, identical in every detail except one, have reappeared. Here they are directed at Tito instead of Khrushchev. I have not been in Prague, Bucharest or Budapest, lately, but I will wager that they are appearing there, too, in their local forms.

Well, what's in a sense of humor? I wish I knew. The only thing I have heard in Belgrade at which there is no laughter is the report of the resignation of Mr. Dulles, which I heard last night (April 16), from a suddenly sober Polish diplomat. This is serious.

ROVING CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW
HUXLEY FOR DISCUSSION

IN *Brave New World Revisited* (Harper, 1958), Aldous Huxley derives some satisfaction from noting his success as a prophet in 1932, when his novel, *Brave New World,* appeared. *Brave New World* discussed a kind of Utopia and a kind of dictatorship which in those days was hardly regarded as possible. The distinguishing characteristics of this utopia-in-reverse were the multitudinous but insidious sensuous gratifications which science had provided by the year 639 a.f. (after Ford).

Mr. Huxley is not, of course, pleased with the later trends which follow the psychological pattern he outlined. In the present work, he points out that the age of brutal dictatorship has come and is largely gone—and that the dictatorship of the future, if it comes, will never be recognized as such. After an appreciation of George Orwell's projection of the Stalinist approach to world dominance, in his novel, *1984,* Huxley indicates why this type of human manipulation will rapidly become obsolete:

> In the light of what we have recently learned about animal behavior in general, and human behavior in particular, it has become clear that control through the punishment of undesirable behavior is less effective, in the long run, than control through the reinforcement of desirable behavior by rewards, and that government through terror works on the whole less well than government through the non-violent manipulation of the environment and of the thoughts and feelings of individual men, women and children. Punishment temporarily puts a stop to undesirable behavior, but does not permanently reduce the victim's tendency to indulge in it. Moreover, the psychophysical by-products of punishment may be just as undesirable as the behavior for which an individual has been punished. Psychotherapy is largely concerned with the debilitating or anti-social consequences of past punishments.
>
> The society described in *1984* is a society controlled almost exclusively by punishment and the fear of punishment. In the imaginary world of my own fable punishment is infrequent and generally mild. The nearly perfect control exercised by the government is achieved by systematic reinforcement of desirable behavior, by many kinds of nearly nonviolent manipulation, both physical and psychological, and by genetic standardization.

Like Erich Fromm—and especially like Joseph Wood Krutch—Mr. Huxley is affronted by the "social engineers." Despite all the talk about the need for "individuality" and for becoming "autonomous," Huxley feels that the scientific orientation of most higher education is ominous, for the following reasons:

> Alas, higher education is not necessarily a guarantee of higher virtue, or higher political wisdom. And to these misgivings on ethical and psychological grounds must be added misgivings of a purely scientific character. Can we accept the theories on which the social engineers base their practice, and in terms of which they justify their manipulations of human beings? For example, Professor Elton Mayo tells us categorically that "man's desire to be continuously associated in work with his fellows is a strong, if not the strongest human characteristic." This, I would say, is manifestly untrue. Some people have the kind of desire described by Mayo; others do not.
>
> It is a matter of temperament and inherited constitution. Any social organization based upon the assumption that "man" (whoever "man" may be) desires to be continuously associated with his fellows would be, for many individual men and women, a bed of Procrustes. Only by being amputated or stretched upon the rack could they be adjusted to it.

Aldous Huxley seems to know a great deal about pharmacology, biochemistry and neurology. After talking about the various "hidden persuaders" employed in modern selling—which often tend to render individual judgment ineffectual—Huxley reviews in some detail the subject of "Chemical Persuasion." In *Brave New World,* he delved into mystic lore, coming up with the ancient "Soma"—a potion which, in his version, had a hypnotic effect on the recipients of the state's "beneficent" propaganda. Thus affected, a person would become almost fanatical in his defense of the sometimes obscure beliefs with which he was indoctrinated. In the chapter

on "Chemical Persuasion" in the present book, Huxley shows that it is scientifically possible for combinations of drugs now known to function in this way. And then there is "hypnopædia," a method of indoctrinating criminals—or any one else—while they sleep.

With a touch of dramatic flavor, Huxley pools all this information to show how easily a government, acting as a benevolent dictatorship, could eradicate deviant beliefs or political opposition. Under the guise of "training for democracy," children of kindergarten age could be treated with hypnopædic suggestion during their afternoon naps. Nightly "sleep-teaching" could easily be used to propagandize students and adults on the ground that their "wisdom" would increase much more rapidly than would otherwise be possible. In the society where such techniques became prevalent, there would be no need for "brain washing"—nothing there to wash away, so far as unorthodox ideas are concerned.

But as Granville Hicks pointed out, reviewing *Brave New World Revisited* in the Nov. 15 *Saturday Review*, all this seems a little fantastic if regarded as prediction. Hardly anyone worries seriously about a dictatorship in America. But it is worth-while to worry about the close connection between the techniques now available for making people "happy" and the loss of individual incentive. There can be a "dictatorship" of process and attitude, and it wouldn't matter in the least who directed its activities.

Another reviewer, C. P. Snow, in the *New Republic* for Jan. 12, sums up by saying: "In both of Huxley's anti-Utopias there is one basic fact. It is that in organized societies men can be deprived of their free minds: the power-bosses in Communist countries, the concealed power-bosses in capitalist societies, can use various kinds of technique, sheer force, propaganda, subliminal advertising, drugs, and so on, to make the masses go contentedly, unresistantly, and even happily to whatever actions the power-bosses decide on for them."

Mr. Huxley states briefly the values he feels we need to make in order to maintain human dignity:

> The value, first of all, of individual freedom, based upon the facts of human diversity and genetic uniqueness; the value of charity and compassion, based upon the old familiar fact, lately rediscovered by modern psychiatry—the fact that, whatever their mental and physical diversity, love is as necessary to human beings as food and shelter; and finally the value of intelligence, without which love is impotent and freedom unattainable.

COMMENTARY
IF YOU LIVE IN CALIFORNIA

THERE are some features of California life which local chambers of commerce never mention. How bad the newspapers are, for instance.

On March 31, the New York *Times* printed a story of more than half a column about the Aldermaston March of British pacifists. We don't know what page the *Times* put the story on (our clipping doesn't show it), but there is a photograph of the marchers resting at the roadside along the 53-mile way from Aldermaston, site of Britain's Atomic Weapons Establishment, to London. Several days later the *Timaes* printed another picture, this time showing fifteen thousand people massed in Trafalgar Square, many of them holding anti-war posters, and listening to speakers.

Having quit reading the local papers, we didn't know what they did about the Aldermaston March and didn't think about it. But one citizen of Los Angeles wondered. He tells the story in a letter to a local news commentator:

> My interest in this matter started on Sunday morning, April 5, while listening to a news report from London by Charles Collingwood, the CBS news analyst. Collingwood stated that on the previous Monday, March 30, a pacifist-led peace parade that had begun at Aldermaston, the British Atomic Weapons center, reached London's Trafalgar Square, after a fifty-three-mile march, swelling to fifteen thousand marchers from the original three thousand that had started at Aldermaston.
>
> Normally given to playing down [that phrase, it keeps popping up!] British pacifist objections to atomic arming in his broadcasts, Collingwood this time said that the Aldermaston march was the biggest demonstration against war since the end of World War II. He also hazarded the opinion, based upon conversations with British people, that about one third of the English are opposed to the presence of nuclear weapons in the British Isles.
>
> I didn't recall seeing anything in the local press about this huge manifestation of feeling against war and so my curiosity and latent moral indignation were sufficiently aroused to make me go to the library and check all the West Coast newspapers (in the major cities) from Seattle to San Diego. Carefully scanning the papers from March 27 through March 31, I found that the only exceptions to a total news blackout on the Aldermaston March were two small stories in the San Francisco *Chronicle*, one on page 2 (March 27) and one on page 10 (March 31) .
>
> I then called the Associated Press and the United Press and asked if they had received any stories on the March. Both services said that the news about the demonstration had come over the international wire. An Associated Press man graciously invited me to visit his office to see the wire. I went and read the story. It is dated March 30, London, and written by Peter Grose. Incidentally, the AP report is marked as a "Class A" wire, which means that it was supposed to be important news.
>
> The *Manchester Guardian* on April 2 spoke of the Aldermaston March as possibly the biggest demonstration that has occurred in twentieth-century England.

Writing in London for the New York *Times*, Drew Middleton told in his March 31 story how the leaders of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, at the end of the march, called for unilateral abandonment of nuclear weapons by the British and demanded elimination of United States air bases in England. He reported:

> At 3 o'clock this afternoon the head of the column marched wearily but gamely up Whitehall into the square. About half the 6,000 marchers had covered the entire fifty-three miles from Aldermaston.
>
> In London they had deposited copies of their charter for nuclear disarmament at 10 Downing Street, office of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, at Lambeth Palace, seat of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and at the headquarters of the various political parties.
>
> The charter pleads for renunciation of manufacture of nuclear weapons as Britain's share in disarmament.

Benn Levy, a former Labor Member of Parliament and a leader of the campaign, said that Britain must give notice to the world that she sets peace above alliances. Mr. Middleton's account of the dramatic ending of the campaign is an

interesting portrait of the people massed in the heart of London:

> The crowd in Trafalgar Square was a cross-section of modern Britain.
>
> It included hundreds of families up from the Provinces or "up West" from London's proletarian East End for an outing. Almost by instinct these huddled together, leaving the cheering and the singing to girls in tight jeans and tartan trews and bearded and duffel-coated young men.
>
> Yet visitors who had come to London for a good time over the Easter weekend—today was a holiday here—applauded most of the speakers. . . .
>
> The marchers themselves included representatives of almost every political and religious group in Britain. There were Communists who chanted slogans like "Ban the Bomb." There were Quakers marching in dedicated silence. There was a Conservative borough councilor. There was a group of art students marching under a banner that bore the slogan, "Universities and Left Wing Review.
>
> Included among the marchers were groups from Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield and Peterborough. Other groups carried banners labeled Germany, Australia, South Africa and Tanganyika.
>
> Some used the march as a means of advertising particular points of view. Patrick Farrer of London had marched all the way with a kitten named Shandy on his shoulder. This was a protest, he said, on behalf of animals who cannot speak for themselves against an H-bomb war.
>
> Still, many of them had tramped fifty-three miles and crowds on the sidewalk clapped as they passed.

The reaction of one couple was perhaps typical of the attitudes of many Britishers. A man from Nottingham, relates Mr. Middleton, said that he was applauding "these kids who really believe in what they're doing," rather than their sentiments. His wife objected to this. She, she said, was applauding "anyone who wants to get rid of that awful bomb."

In any event, Drew Middleton did a story that showed the rich news value and human interest—if not the larger issues—of the Aldermaston March. The California papers—the West Coast papers—ignored the whole affair almost entirely.

Why not boycott the mass media? What are they good for?

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

LAST week we offered all the information space allowed on the venture in higher education called "New College"—sponsored by Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith and the University of Massachusetts. It is apparent that the basic educational thinking that is expected to focus in this projected school is already finding impressive application. An editorial in *School and Society* for Feb. 28 indicates that at least one of the sponsoring schools has put into operation some of the features of the "new" plan:

> Freshmen and Sophomores at Mount Holyoke College from now on will have an opportunity to do independent work in connection with one of their regular courses. A vote of the faculty in December, 1958, had made it possible for an underclassman, after the first semester of her freshman year, to carry on an independent project for an extra hour of credit in one of the basic courses taken to fulfill the general education requirements.
>
> This change, according to Academic Dean Meribeth Cameron, Chairman, Academic Committee, which initiated the proposal, is intended to give students in the first two years some experience of the kind of independent study and research which has long been available to able juniors and seniors.

The *School and Society* report says that these innovations grew out of extended studies by a Mount Holyoke faculty committee and prolonged discussions among the students, who were encouraged to form their own undergraduate curriculum committee. Already, ninety-five junior and senior students are carrying independent work for credit. President Richard Glenn Gettell sees a need for more independent work on the part of younger students, saying that "at the best colleges, the faculty does not so much teach, as help students to learn. This requires increasing independence over the four year span of college life. It means the progressive freeing of the student from rigid assignments, required course materials, and the encouragement of all who want to explore on their own the intellectual treasures of the world."

An AP dispatch from New Hampshire suggests that the ideas embodied in plans for "New College" are being effectively championed by some Liberal Arts educators not connected with New College's sponsoring institutions. According to this report (Los Angeles *Times*, April 11):

> Here among the quiet hills of Hanover, Dartmouth College has embarked on an academic adventure designed to produce a fundamental shift in higher education—from teaching to learning.
>
> If the switch in emphasis is successful—and the college says the evidence thus far is encouraging—the college library may replace the lecture hall. The student will become intellectually self-reliant. He'll stop leaning on his teachers and textbooks. He'll start learning without being taught.
>
> The heart of the new system is a compulsory independent reading program which is not related to any particular course. During each of his first two years at Dartmouth, the student is required to read six books of general interest from a list "with which a well-educated man should be familiar." (Examples: The Iliad, by Homer; Dialogues, by Plato; The Canterbury Tales, by Chaucer, and The Peloponnesian War, by Thucydides)

At Dartmouth, since the institution of the new program, the college library reports a better than thirty per cent increase in book circulation, a student bookstore reports a fifty per cent skyrocketing in sales of "non-course paperback books," and the student newspaper reviews a survey of upper classmen in which fifty-eight per cent affirm that they are spending more time studying now than under the more rigid system of the past.

* * *

An essay on education by a Canadian MANAS subscriber develops some considerations which suggest why young people, when they reach college age, are so badly in need of encouragement to undertake independent lines of study. The thesis of the essay is that "children

today are well schooled but badly educated," because the public school system impresses upon them a stylized pattern of learning. It is this subscriber's opinion that the outwardly impressive deviations from traditional instruction are only superficially effective, since the child usually finds himself pushed into a role that fits some educator's theory of education. Further:

> The child is from the very start denied his individuality; he is told of "democracy" and its virtues, although not how limited are those virtues, and yet is denied his democratic rights, for surely the first democratic right is the right to think for himself. In school and out he finds the same influences: the press, the radio, the church, and the numberless "fraternal" and similar orders all are designed to impress the same things upon his mind, and the everlastingness and sanctity of the status quo; if he challenges, or even questions, any part of it, he is a rebel, a social misfit, a "queer kid," probably subversive, and he pays the due penalty of his attempted independence. So the twig is already bent, and only the few are strong enough to resist that bending.

Another paragraph indicates what might be called the "metaphysical assumptions" of this critic. His quarrel with the goal of "social integration" stems from his belief that meaningful integration can be achieved only *after* a child has been encouraged to find his own individuality:

> The child, whether bright or dull, is a human entity, a potential thinker, an individual differing from all other individuals. He has latent talents which, developed, may be very high, even to the point of genius; he also has that within him called by a name which is almost a dirty word—spirituality with a possible destiny that would place him among gods. Moreover, he is not born with a mind as an empty slate, to be written on as may suit the aims of the day; to the contrary, he brings his own capacities with him, and it is this fact that makes individual differences.

The implication here is that uniqueness of individuality may involve a great deal more than differences of aptitude. The child *does* seem to be born "with something"—a character and a "genius" of his own. This, apparently, was the religio-philosophical view of certain high cultures of the past, and would explain why some old Indian universities embodying Buddhist influence achieved a far more inspiring practice of "liberalism" than has obtained in our own "liberal-arts" schools.

There is nothing original about noting that "individuality" survives with difficulty among people who are entrenched in an orthodox faith—during medieval times in the West, men of independent mind often found their way to a dungeon or the stake. But there has been a measure of scientific orthodoxy, too—during the past century especially—with partisanship on *both* sides of the struggle for influence between religion and science. One reason why the idea of "metaphysics" appears so frequently in these pages is that, quite evidently, even the non-metaphysical orthodoxies have *their* metaphysics. What needs clarification, therefore, is the nature and role of metaphysics, since everyone is a metaphysician of some sort. Sustained defense of "individuality," in all the meanings of this term, requires a consciously adopted metaphysical position.

FRONTIERS

The Work Is Not Easy

A READER in Puerto Rico has this to say:

> Since you are still going strong concerning the metaphysical or philosophical creed versus the scientific creed—which, as you know, sometimes worries me a bit relative to your negative presentation of the scientific creed—I thought I would communicate to you the outcome of a conversation on similar lines between my wife and myself.
>
> Spurred by topics covered in the courses in philosophy which my wife attends at the University of Puerto Rico, the conversation considered the alleged or real crisis which humanity faces in our time.
>
> We batted the merits of science and metaphysics back and forth at great length into the night, reaching the following conclusion:
>
> *During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, man was looking forward to the quick arrival of the millennium, because he believed that science would make him master of his fate.*
>
> *Result: He faces today a greater crisis than ever, since now that he is master of his fate, he mast decide what to do with it.*
>
> It seems that we have here a very strong case for both scientific and philosophical orientation as major guides or tools for shaping human destiny.
>
> Thus a tremendous challenge is presented, and for those who are ready and willing to accept it, there could be no more opportune time to offer more spiritual substance and profundity to the existence of a human being.
>
> I let you take off from here!

About all that can be done "here," in the space allowed (and we are thankful, considering the dimensions of the "challenge," that the space is very little), is to look briefly at the respective roles of science and religion.

Quite possibly, the constructive contribution of the scientific spirit and outlook to our age has been so great that we have taken it for granted. What, actually, do we owe to science? Apart from the almost incredible achievements of modern technology, which may be good or bad for us, depending upon how we use them, two notable and revolutionary stages of progress have been arrived at through science. First, we have convinced ourselves beyond doubt that the physical universe is an orderly place. We are sure that, within imperfectly defined limits, the universe is *knowable.* Science has set us on a road from which there is no turning back—the road to verifiable knowledge about our external environment, its laws, forces, and phenomena.

Second, science has created a new kind of self-respect for human beings. Through science men gain knowledge and power. This tells us something about ourselves. Whatever else we are, we are beings who can augment our knowledge and our power through our own efforts, by the exercise of our own intelligence. From this capacity springs a dignifying self-reliance and also a sense of responsibility. It is no accident that many if not most of the expressions of high responsibility, these days, come from practicing scientists.

At this point, let us stop and turn to philosophy. We must begin, however, by noting that we have already been speaking in philosophic terms, in the discussion of science. We have said that science has enriched mankind in moral terms. Self-reliance, responsibility, the determination to know for oneself—these qualities have an obvious moral aspect, hence a philosophical aspect. Since men practice science, and since human motives have their roots in moral attitudes, it is impossible to separate the activity of science from the activity of philosophy. It is only in the narrow region of the *scientific theory of knowledge* that the separation takes place. Here, in this area, moral neutrality takes over. And, curiously, it is the "morality" in the scientific devotion to accuracy and to the sort of certainty on which scientists feel competent to make declarations, which insists upon the moral neutrality of the scientific method. With scientists, it is a moral principle not to make moral judgments!

Why should scientists, as such, refuse to make judgments about right and wrong, good and evil?

Because right and wrong and good and evil have to do with two worlds—both the objective world and the subjective world—whereas science deals only with the objective world, the world of public truths and of the truths which, if not immediately public, can be properly stated in public terms, as, for example, statistically.

Philosophy must concern itself with the question of who or what is the self that may, among many other things, practice science.

A vast range of life remains untouched by the scientific collector of "data." The mysteries of creative work, the strange inspiration of lifelong altruistic commitment, the endless, ever-changing nuances of our higher as well as lower emotional life—all these and many more wonders of human sensibility belong essentially to the inner world explored by philosophy—philosophy in company with philosophical psychology (the two can hardly be separated).

But how are we to find our way in this subjective wilderness, uncharted by any save visionaries, poets, and mystics? That is indeed a question to be considered.

If we are mere beginners at such questions, suffering embarrassment and even fright at having to deal with them, there are perhaps two reasons for our reluctance to go any further. The first is our inexperience. The scientific theory of knowledge was until recently a quite imperialistic undertaking. It permitted no other view of human knowledge to be regarded with seriousness. The historical explanation for this claim to monopoly refers us to the long competition of science with religion. We are inclined to recognize, now that the struggle is practically ended, that a polemical arena is no place to find the truth or even to search for it. The limitation of "reliable knowledge" to the physical world and its objective contents was a clever stroke in the combat between science and religion. Religion was on the whole a bad thing and we—or the scientists, in our behalf—got rid of it in this way. But now we are beginning to wonder how we shall fill the abyss in our lives which has been left.

We have no foundation for high motives—no durable foundation, that is, in our scientific philosophy or theory of knowledge. We have no disciplined method of examining and criticizing our own intentions. Our science—it must be faced—is almost wholly at the disposal of politicians, who have about the worst historical record of all in the matter of motives, among the groups outside the acknowledged criminal classes.

We have, then, to carry the scientific spirit of self-reliance and responsibility, but not the scientific theory of knowledge, into the world of philosophy and our inner life of meanings and intentions. What else is there to do?

We said that there might be two reasons for our reluctance to do this, but spoke of only one. The other reason may be a fear of the absolute loneliness of the philosophic enterprise, once it is undertaken in earnest. A philosopher may spend time with others, and with the thoughts of others, but his ultimate realizations come only when he is alone with himself. That, for the sage, the Self becomes an all-inclusive reality, may be, for the philosopher, only a speculative hope or an intuitive longing.

We know of no philosopher who ever said his work was easy. Nor any scientist, for that matter. Only the technologists promise us easy work, and this after they have perfected the arrangements.