VOLUME XVII, NO. 12
MARCH 18, 1964

HUNGERS OF THE HEART

THIS article can be little more than an invitation to the reader to share some uncertainties and bewilderments. The general subject to be inquired into is the good of man, and the particular area claiming attention is the role of the modern business corporation. Why should we look at the corporation? This makes the first uncertainty and bewilderment.

To answer the question straight off would probably result in a cavalier dismissal of the subject, and since men of manifest good will and notable intelligence have been addressing themselves for years to the study of corporate enterprise, a serious response can hardly be avoided. One substantial fruit of this inquiry comes to us in the form of a book, *The Corporation Take-Over*, edited by Andrew Hacker, and published by Harper & Row (1964; $6.00). Its contents are made up of material gathered at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, comprising the thinking of ten men on the corporation and the economic order. The book is representative of the general purposes of the Center, which are described by W. H. Ferry, staff director of the Center's Studies on the Economic Order, in his Preface:

> Its [the Center's] inquiries are mainly directed at discovering whether and how a free society may be maintained under the strikingly new political, economic, social, and technological conditions of the second half of the twentieth century.
>
> Thus the Center has examined the effects on freedom and justice of such powerful institutions as corporations, labor unions, mass media, and political parties. All of these are institutions that were not in sight or only mildly imagined at the time that the Constitution of the United States was adopted.
>
> The object of the Center's studies has not been specialized research or academic contemplations. The aim has been to get the issues clear, to make general statements about general questions, to bring practical wisdom to bear on these questions, and to widen the circles of discussion through publication of books and pamphlets, circulation of radio tapes of conferences and discussions, and participation in many programs of classroom and adult education.

We have been reading this book and finding the practical wisdom. The central problem seems to be that the corporation is an agency for the exercise of power, yet there does not exist any coherent rationale for the use of this power, mainly because the power has come, not by revolutionary fiat or constitutional decision, but by the slow spread of function, invading and modifying every vital organ of the economic body of contemporary society. *The Corporation Take-Over* charts these developments and takes note of the endless improvisations in law and economic practice intended to accommodate society to corporate growth.

The basic question raised, as we understand it, is how to relate corporations to the general concepts of democratic self-government, such that they will be contributors to its strength and well-being instead of makers of frustration and impasse. In his chapter, "The Corporation and the Republic," Scott Buchanan writes:

> The main weight of the considerations in this short essay has been put on the questions whether the political nature of the corporation has been recognized and whether it would not be a good thing for our whole political life if the recognition were formalized in the body of corporation law. These questions are hidden in the phrase "private or invisible governments." The answers to these questions have been negative for more than a generation. The evidence has not been clear enough, and when parts of it have been clear, they have pointed in too many different directions, often enough indicating restriction and regulation of corporation activities rather than giving them measures of self-government. But the evidence is rapidly accumulating and demanding understanding not only by lawyers and economists, as in the past, but also by

> sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, and journalists. New evidence raises new questions, and, finally, directors, managers, trustees, administrators, and various categories of members are asking themselves questions about the corporations they work with.
>
> Many of the new questions concern the kind of human beings that are being formed by the corporations they belong to. These are difficult questions to answer, but they should be asked, and they can be answered if they are kept in order. This essay leads to one of these new questions: How do the political habits formed by members of corporations fit with the habits that republican forms of government have developed in their citizens heretofore?

If you are a layman, and not a professional or semi-professional student of corporations, the best way to consider a question of this sort is to remember what you can of personal experience. Accordingly, we have this to relate. Back in 1948—the first year of publication for MANAS—one of the largest corporate agricultural ventures in California's Central Valley was struck by its stoop labor hands, some eleven hundred men and women who harvested the crops. Armed with background gained from three of John Steinbeck's books, *In Dubious Battle* (the best, perhaps, of anything Steinbeck wrote), *Grapes of Wrath*, and *Of Mice and Men*, and from Carey McWilliams' *Factories in the Field*, a MANAS writer visited the region of the strike, in the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley.

Joseph Di Giorgio came from Italy and he knew something about raising grapes. Looking at the arid land near Arvin, he said, "Fruit is nothing but water and labor." He bought some land, hired some wells dug, and began growing fruit. By 1947, when his farm was struck by members of the Farm Labor Union, he was head of the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation, said to represent assets of $80 million. The Corporation's land in California amounted to some 25,000 acres, and the farm where the strike took place encompassed eighteen square miles. By his neighbors, Mr. Di Giorgio was regarded as a good citizen. The people of Arvin placed a bust of him in the town's Community Center. He put up $150,000 to pay for a public school within the Corporation's lands. His farming methods were progressive; he worked out a crop rotation scheme which eliminated the "migratory" aspect of his labor. Most of the Di Giorgio workers were busy the year round and Di Giorgio let himself be quoted as believing in an "annual wage" in agriculture. It was said—and it was probably true—that Di Giorgio would have settled with the strikers if he had been free to act as an individual, but that, like the other big operators in the Valley, he was a member of the grower-shipper organization, the Associated Farmers, which has never been willing to deal with a farm labor union. After nearly two years, the strike failed. Thereafter the labor problem of the big California farms was largely solved by Mexican Nationals, brought into the Valley by labor contractors for the duration of the harvest season.

You could feel both admiration and regret for Di Giorgio—admiration for his monumental achievement in agriculture, regret for the strait jacket made for his labor policy by his financial alliances—while believing that if ever striking workers had a just cause, this struggle for union recognition in the San Joaquin Valley was it. The field laborers had to report every morning, with no assurance they would get work. If they failed to report, they might be blacklisted. The pay was 80 cents an hour or a little more. At Di Giorgio, the workers were mostly native Americans, men and women who had migrated from the dust-bowls of Oklahoma, Arkansas and Texas, and many of them had worked for Di Giorgio for years. Of the strike, MANAS said in 1948 (May 12)

> The long-term union objective, quite obviously, is the stabilization of farm labor in California, and the ultimate release of half a million human beings from a rootless, wandering existence at the mercy of the requirements of the most highly organized and powerful farming interests in the world. Farms like Di Giorgio's are not farms in the familiar sense at all, but vast industrial empires operated like any other big

business, except that there is virtually no check on the abuses of their labor policy.

It would be difficult to find a more helpless, defenseless and resourceless body of laborers in the whole of the United States. . . . The struggle of these people for the right of collective bargaining in no way resembles the power-hungry activities of some long-established unions of skilled workers. These people are farmers, and they are farmers without land. Even if some day they obtain guarantees of an annual wage, gain seniority rights, protection from arbitrary discharge, and special compensation for exceptionally long hours of work which the harvest sometimes requires—even if, after years of struggle, they become able to own or rent decent homes and send their children to school regularly, and establish residence in one community long enough to vote like other American citizens they will still have little enough to show for their arduous toiling on the sun-baked plains of California.

But these objectives are precisely the objectives which the powerful land-owning interests of California agriculture oppose. The advantage of the industrialized farm lies in large measure in its ability to obtain a lot of cheap labor for a brief period of time. Not all the big farms can use year-round labor to the extent that Di Giorgio can. Di Giorgio, if he recognizes the Farm Labor Union, will do himself little harm—he could easily pay the wage demands of the strikers, and considerably more. But he is bound by his alliance with the other big farmers to maintain the anti-union position.

There was a lot of romance in this strike, even though it lost. A sympathetic small land-owner gave the union a piece of ground and the strikers built a union hall. There was even an incident of anonymous violence to recall the ruthless conflicts of the '30's, when more than one labor organizer was murdered. The Los Angeles Labor Council sent caravans of food and supplies to the strikers. Meanwhile, Di Giorgio brought in Mexican Nationals to do the work, and hard-faced men in boots and whipcord pants (looking for all the world like characters out of the movie version of Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men*) herded them from job to job. The struggle was at once bitter, heroic, and tragic. It failed completely.

Other aspects of corporate farming in California require attention. At the time of the Di Giorgio strike, the vast irrigation program of the Central Valley Project of the Bureau of Soil Reclamation was well under way and controversy raged over the 160-acre limitation of the Reclamation Act of 1902. The basic idea of this law was that if the Government uses tax money to supply water for agriculture, this service should be of uniform benefit to farmers, and not become an enormous water-subsidy to the big landowners. The explicit threat of Reclamation law to California's "factories in the field" was that these great holdings would have to be divided up into ownership units of 160 acres (or 320, held by a man and his wife), in order to receive any water from the Central Valley Project. Application of this law in California did not mean only support of the family-size farm, as was its original intent, but expropriation and destruction of the manifold efficiencies of large-scale corporate enterprise. "Okay," laughed Di Giorgio. "Divide me up," he said. "Divide up R. H. Macy. Divide up General Motors and Western Electric, too." They didn't, of course. Instead, the then Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau's regional director in California lost their jobs.

A bit starry-eyed about rural life in those days, the MANAS staff writer who worked on this assignment kept wondering why some plan of diversified production couldn't solve the socio-economic confusion of the Central Valley. He spent some time with the Farm Labor Union organizer, talking about the problem. Why not make an effort to develop smaller farms for the migrant workers, and then help to establish something like "cottage industry" products for off-season activity? Well, the organizer didn't want to see small farms in California. He was there to organize farm labor, and in his experience you had better luck organizing the workers on big farms like Di Giorgio's. He wanted a strong labor movement, not a pastoral scene of happy communitarians.

So, from the ramparts of the social struggle and the Di Giorgio picket lines we went to the sociologists and the historians of social movements. We read some books. One was Walter Goldschmidt's *As You Sow* (Harcourt, Brace, 1947), a study of three California towns in the Central Valley—Wasco, Dinuba, and Arvin. (Arvin, incidentally, was Mr. Di Giorgio's town.) Wasco originally came into being (around 1905) from the efforts of a group of families who wanted to cooperate in various ways. However, they finally bought their water individually from a large utility company, which wiped out "one of the focal points of community effort," as Goldschmidt remarked. His recital of what happened to this undertaking continues:

> So the course of Wasco's star was set by the nature of her physical and social environment. Long before the community existed, the agricultural enterprises were established against which her farmers had to compete, and the pattern was set. The very plan of establishing a colony on irrigated lands inevitably called for the production of cash crops at a high cost with abundant cheap labor. Though the hardships were to be great and many farms were to be lost in the struggle to bring Wasco into the pattern, it was inevitable from the outset that she should be set up on an industrialized basis. That is, inevitable in an economic sense. For the cash outlay for expensive equipment necessary to pump water meant producing high-value cash crops. And in order to cover these costs the new farmers had to compete with established enterprises. Thus they were immediately caught in the established pattern of farming.

Dr. Goldschmidt makes this further comment:

> It is not merely that crops are sold for cash and sold on the market, but it is that cash returns dominate the behavior of the farmers in every facet of their activity. The value of production for household use, when weighed in the scales of cash returns, is found wanting. Sharing of implements and trading labor are so rare as to appear unique in California's fields. A cash settlement is the solution, and practically all share arrangements are handled on a rental basis.

This seemed a poor situation to settle for, so we read about the Kaweah Cooperative Colony, established near Visalia in the 1880's by some 500 people who were inspired by the thinking of Edward Bellamy and Lawrence Gronlund, and how, some twenty years later, lobbyists for private enterprise got Congress to pass an act which destroyed the Colony, which had already shown extraordinary promise in both economic and social achievements. Then there was the Salvation Army venture begun in the Salinas Valley in 1898, in which indigent San Francisco families were helped to become owners of 10- and 20-acre farms on which they raised beets for the Claus Spreckles factory to turn into sugar. It worked, and the Salvation Army made a profit of $12,000 on its investment! On the whole, however, California cooperative communities are the ephemera of social history. We visited a couple of small ones in 1948—Tuolumne Cooperative Farms in Modesto, and a more loosely-knit group in Three Rivers. They were admirable and interesting, but their pattern did not spread.

After pursuing these few field trips and moderate research in 1948, the MANAS writer reached the following conclusions:

> . . . three time-honored articles of faith come into head-on opposition: first, the Jeffersonian principle that the small landowner and farmer shall have equality of economic opportunity; second, that property rights shall not be interfered with by "radical" schemes of socialization and third, that every American has the right to become as rich as he possibly can, and that acquisition of wealth is the best obtainable evidence that the American Dream is being fulfilled.
>
> . . . with the proletarianization of the small farmer and the increasingly intimate relationship between government and all forms of industrial enterprise, the old libertarian conceptions of American democracy seem depressingly rhetorical. *How*, within this emerging pattern, can the principles of human freedom and equality be applied? We see no immediate solution at all—certainly no easy one—and in the long run the objective, we think, will have to involve the voluntary and gradual elimination of the characteristic motive of unlimited acquisition, and the substitution of cooperative enterprise for the "rugged individualism" which has so largely created the present dilemma.

It is at this point that you quit writing about politics, economics, law, and even "social justice." It is at this point that you determine to concentrate on the web of basic human attitudes which shapes the motives and dictates the actions which, in turn, create insoluble social dilemmas.

Apart from the Mother Earth mysticism of the rural life, why does the picture of Man on the Land exert so much fascination? One factor of attraction, it seems to us, is the impersonal constancy of the natural environment. There it is—the earth, the sun, and the weather, and you test your metal against these natural forces. The weather plays no favorites; Congress can't mess with it; if you are a good farmer, your crops will grow.

The real moral of *The Corporation Take-Over*, it seems to us, lies in the need to recognize the big switch in our environment accomplished by technology and its institutional superstructure of corporate enterprise. It isn't the sun, the land, and the weather that we cope with, now, but a kind of secondary "nature" which has moved in on the land and raised its canopy of man-made conditions over us all. Can we—dare we—draft new plans for the canopy? Are the experts in nostalgic recollection right when they say no one is smart enough to "plan" so enormous a scheme of arrangements, and that "Nature"—now the untutored nature of capital enterprise—must be left to its muddling and improvised solutions for the problems it absolutely refuses to define except in terms of managerial irritation and disturbing peripheral effects? The common-sense background for this sort of decision-making is well put by Andrew Hacker in his Introduction:

> Are there alternatives to corporate capitalism? Few voices are heard nowadays suggesting the public ownership of major industries, and it is just as well; for the odds are that nationalization would end in disillusion. The problem is that there is no real middle ground. This was well known to both Adam Smith and Karl Marx, but it is a fact hard to swallow in an age that seeks reason along the course of moderation. Suppose that America followed the British pattern and nationalized a few industries such as railroads, electricity, and the coal mines. Instead of becoming agencies of the public interest these industries would soon enter service as handmaidens of the private sector of the economy. For the preponderance of economic power would remain in corporate hands, and effective efforts would be made to ensure that the industries in the public sector were suitably docile and did not serve as vehicles for serious planning that might jeopardize corporate interests. In short, partial nationalization would not make economic decisions accountable to the public but would instead create yet another set of official agencies to be captured by corporate enterprise.
>
> On the other hand there is the extreme proposal that the state nationalize all industry, thus once and for all destroying private economic power. This was and is the Marxian prescription, offered with the full understanding that the old order must be felled with one stroke if the new is to rise from its ashes. But the problems of irresponsibility in corporate America are minor compared with those of totalitarianism and the Marxist alternative to capitalism is hardly one that those who have known a free society can be expected to embrace with enthusiasm.
>
> Hence the frustrations that mark any search for a middle ground. We hear much of regulation, of intervention, of planning on the part of the government. But, to take only the last, who are to be the planners? What is to be their source of power, as against their legal authority, and who will give force to their decisions? And is it possible to prevent corporate institutions from seducing, capturing, and otherwise infiltrating those who are mandated to plan the economy in the public interest? Until questions such as these are answered, the power of corporate America will continue to grow, and in directions of its own choosing.

We cannot improve on this summary, and we doubt if anyone can. Actually, this book is a polite way of saying to the business community: "Why don't you wake up and get busy figuring out who you are, what you want, what you are really doing, and *why?"*

Fifty years ago the writers of this book might well have been in the revolutionary movement. But today they have seen enough of history to know that the Big Stick of revolutionary violence does not work. By process of historical elimination, social change has become a project in

rational intelligence. Yet the rational intelligence of too many people is concerned with other things. The problem is how to engage it where it ought to be engaged. But first, this problem must be properly set. At what level do you start working with the rational intelligence of people? At the level of decision-making in the ranks of corporate enterprise? Before that, in the schools? Before that, in the homes?

These are days when social and intellectual leadership is languishing in an uncharted limbo. The old fronts of the social struggle are either meaningless or have dissolved, and the new ones have not emerged with any clarity. What are the hungers of the heart, the deep human concerns that will define the frontiers to come? This is the question, it seems to us, for which we ought to find at least tentative answers. . . .

REVIEW
MISCELLANY

A DESK piled too high with miscellaneous pamphlets and periodicals, all of them containing material that should be noticed, calls for some kind of action. The easy solution, which we adopt, is to quote selected passages from them. The following *is* from an old copy of the Council for Correspondence *Newsletter* (last May), the last paragraph of an installment of David Riesman's Cold War Diary:

> . . . everybody in America is supposed to be a good guy and be able to "take it." I am often asked questions about my views on the cold war by people who have no sense of responsibility as to whether man lives or dies, and where I feel I am either being baited or that rather bored and indifferent people are making conversation of vital concern to me and no concern at all to them. When I am very exhausted and feel not in the least like an argument, I have sometimes tried to sidestep it, and, if pressed, to say that at this point I would rather not discuss it with them, though I would be glad to have them read things I have written and then to take the matter up again. Usually the response is that I must be insufferably arrogant or self-righteous not to be willing to debate at all times—even with people who are in no way serious and only want to put me down. At such times, weeping is beyond me, but anger is not—only "proving" to my interlocutor that people who hold such views as mine are not capable of being reasonable and make judgments *ad hominem* rather than on the merits.

This recalls a story told of Albert Schweitzer years ago when he was a guest for some doings at Aspen, Colorado. Reporters were buzzing around him, looking for a new "angle" for a story on the tired old man. "Reverence for Life" naturally came up, and Schweitzer, turning away, remarked, "Well, you see, reverence for life includes me, too."

Next is an extract from *Anarchy 31* (September, 1963), taken from an article, "The Spontaneous University," by Alexander Trocchi. For his text on this subject, the writer quotes from Raymond Williams: "The question is not who will patronise the arts, but what forms are possible in which artists will have control of their own means of expression, in such ways that they will have relation to a community rather than to a market or a patron." Mr. Trocchi then says:

> Of course it would be dangerous to pretend to understand Mr. Williams on the basis of such a brief statement. I shall say simply that for myself and my associates in Europe and America the key phrase in the above sentence is: *"artists will have control of their own means of expression."* When they achieve that control, their "relation to a community" will become a meaningful problem, that is, a problem amenable to formulation and solution at a creative and intelligent level. Thus we must concern ourselves forthwith with the question of how to seize and within the social fabric exercise that control. Our first move must be *to eliminate the brokers.*
>
> How to begin? At a chosen moment in a vacant country house (mill, abbey, church or castle), we shall foment a kind of cultural "jam session": out of this will evolve the prototype of our *spontaneous university.*
>
> The Jewish settlements in Israel turned a desert into a garden and astounded all the world. In a flowering garden already wholly sustained by automation, a fraction of such purposiveness applied to the cultivation of men would bring what results?
>
> Then there was the experimental college at Black Mountain, North Carolina. This is of immediate interest for two reasons. In the first place, the whole concept is almost identical to our own in its educational aspect, in the second, some individual members of the staff of Black Mountain, certain key members of wide experience, are actually associated with us in the present venture. Their collaboration is invaluable.
>
> Black Mountain College was widely known throughout the United States. In spite of the fact that no degrees were awarded, graduates and non-graduates from all over America thought it worth-while to take up residence. As it turns out, an amazing number of the best artists and writers of America seem to have been there at one time or another, to teach and learn, and their cumulative influence on American art in the last fifteen years has been immense. One has only to mention Franz Kline in reference to painting and Robert Creeley in reference to poetry to give an idea of Black Mountain's significance. They are key figures in the

> American vanguard, their influence everywhere. Black Mountain could be described as an "action university" in the sense in which the term is applied to the paintings of Kline *et alii.* There were no examinations. There was no learning from ulterior motives. Students and teachers participated informally in the creative arts; every teacher was himself a practitioner—poetry, music, painting, sculpture, dance, pure mathematics, pure physics, etc.—of a very high order. In short, it was a situation constructed to inspire the free play of creativity in the individual and the group.
>
> Unfortunately, it no longer exists. It closed in the early Fifties for economic reasons. It was a corporation (actually owned by the staff) which depended entirely upon fees and charitable donations. In the highly competitive background of the United States of America, such a gratuitous and flagrantly non-utilitarian institution was only kept alive for so long as it was by the sustained effort of the staff. In the end it proved too ill-adapted to its habitat to survive.
>
> In considering ways and means to establish our pilot project we have never lost sight of the fact that in a capitalist society any successful organization must be able to sustain itself in capitalist terms. The venture must pay. Thus we have conceived the idea of setting up a general agency to handle, as far as possible, all the work of the individuals associated with the university.

This sounds like a great idea, although the problems which are present in any sort of "selling" may give the sponsors trouble. But artists have those problems anyhow, and they might find new ways to solve them through the *esprit de corps* the venture generates. There are a few more details in the article and interested readers can probably buy this back number of *Anarchy* by sending 30 cents to Freedom Press, 17a Maxwell Road, London SW6, England. [Alexander Trocchi is a graduate in philosophy of Glasgow University and the author of *Young Adam* and *Cain's Book.* The above is a portion of material extracted by the editors *of Anarchy* from Trocchi's *Invisible Insurrection of a Million Minds*, and in a footnote they note its similarity to ideas in earlier issues—*Anarchy 24* (The Community of Scholars) and *Anarchy 30* (The Community Workshop).]

COMMENTARY
WHERE DO YOU BEGIN?

THE question at the conclusion of this week's lead article—"At what level do you start working with the rational intelligence of people?"—would be presumptuous if it meant simply looking at people as "objects" and deciding where to begin. But as every teacher knows, the help one can give to others is almost always an overflow of one's own enthusiasm and sense of discovery. Usually, the last thing that people want or need is some kind of didactic instruction.

What, then, seems to be the chief ailment of the time? One answer would be to say that there is a breakdown in understanding of cause and effect in a wide range of social and human relationships. By the book noticed in the lead article, the corporation is taken to typify the complexity which has been added to the economic and political processes of our society, such that only the most sophisticated minds can hold valid general conceptions of how these processes work. Even if you read *The Corporation Take-Over* carefully, you still won't really know, unless you have that kind of a mind and are willing to give a significant portion of your life to study of the subject. And then, there you will be, with all that knowledge, and not enough people to understand you. A contemporary novelist, George P. Elliot, put the basic situation very well:

> Nothing is harder than to have a clear, steady and sound idea of what society is and what it should be. I must speak for myself: I realize that I could not define the word to anyone's satisfaction; like many, I sometimes in desperation identify society with the state—whence horrors ensue. The word "democratic" has ceased to have any more independent meaning than the word "united" in United States. We have no good analogy by which to comprehend our society. *(Nation,* Nov. 14, 1959-)

Another *Nation* (April 21, 1962) contributor, Frederick R. Karl, finds this anomy reflected in literature:

> . . . novelists—American as well as English and continental—reflect a reality that balks resolution. The pressures are too great, man's separation from others and from himself too immense, the important issues too distant. The power of the human will to overcome problems, even to create happiness—what every nineteenth-century novelist took for granted—is now in serious doubt, and only popular minor novelists like Wouk, Sloan Wilson and Ruark seriously believe in it.

The problem, as we see it, is not to worry too much about management of big institutions. They have already gotten away from us; they are out of scale; they fund their human resources and transform this energy into such formidable impersonal reactions that you might as well try to change the weather as corporation practice from the outside.

Scott Buchanan's question about what kind of men are being formed by the corporations they belong to, leads to another: What kind of men would not allow themselves to be formed by corporations? The answer is obvious: Those who believe more in the dignity of man than in the ends of corporations.

Why are such men so rare? Why is it that most of the men who ask the questions raised in *The Corporation Take-Over* are now managing to live without working for corporations—the commercial ones, at any rate?

Are we getting around to a vain and fanciful approach, such as proposing that we turn our backs on the only institutional form that can claim to have good health and a great future in our society? Well, people are here to stay, too, and all that we ask, to borrow the words of Mr. Hacker, is recognition of their need to grow, and in directions of their own choosing.

It is the damnable bigness of our institutions that makes them into ruthlessly controlling influences. Today, when we see and know this very well, we are confronted by the fact that a truly decentralized society cannot successfully make war. So we keep our big institutions and our anti-human scale of doing things, and *still* we

are unable to make things work for us very well. Here we are, with our great big tax bill, and our incredible military power, our ridiculous capacity for overkill (obscene expression), and we still don't know what to do about Cuba, about Panama, or about South Viet Nam.

What we need is a conception of ends or meanings in human life that will return to us the power to shape institutions more to our liking. There have been people who refused to be creatures of institutions, and there are people like that today, but not enough of them. Until now, we have only punished them for being the kind of people we all ought to be. We need to begin giving them at least small rewards and helping their number to grow.

This is a way of claiming, we suppose, that we live in a lawful universe; of proposing that our institutions cannot be anything more than ourselves writ large, depersonalized, and made to embody, besides the good in them, our collective lack of serious purpose and sense of human destiny.

Of course we have to work with and use our corporations; just now, they're all we've got. But the idea is to use them for our purposes, not in furtherance of their own mindless, robot ideologies. If we change, they'll change. They'll have to.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
TOWARD NONVIOLENCE

THE Fellowship of Reconciliation is one of the largest and most effective organizations concerned with education in non-violent thinking and action. While of Christian origin, its scope continually broadens in response to the obvious need of the world for alternatives to violence. A recent communication from Dorothy Hassler, Membership Secretary, informs us of the latest among many new FOR projects. Mrs. Hassler's letter reads in part:

> Recently we've been involved in an attempt to translate such ideas over into the intelligent high school student area, through the publishing of the little "paper" of which a sample is enclosed. If at times you come upon literature or material which would be suitable for quoting in this, we'd be happy to have you think of us.

The "little paper" is named *High Issues* and contains quotations offered as material for discussion, chosen for use by the intelligent teen-ager but often of value for adult groups. One copy of *High Issues* asks:

> Your education has included a variety of the best scientific ideas that the new formulas can produce. How will you use this knowledge? When the time comes to put your knowledge to work, where will you choose to put it:
>
> Will your life work help to feed the world, or will it help to starve it?
>
> Will its end be to kill, or will it help cure?
>
> Will it create for humanity, or help to destroy?
>
> Will it benefit the privileged few, or all people?

Among quotations drawn from a variety of sources, we choose as especially provocative a letter (printed by *Science* in 1950) by Albert Einstein, who shows himself to be a sensitive educator and an intelligent pacifist. He wrote:

> External compulsion can, to a certain extent, reduce but never cancel the responsibility of the individual. . . . Whatever is morally important in our institutions, laws, and mores can be traced back to interpretation of the sense of justice of countless individuals. An effort to arouse and strengthen this sense of responsibility of the individual is an important service to mankind.

Since the FOR seeks understanding of the causes that make for war, it is natural that the shattering experience of President Kennedy's assassination should be considered in its obvious relationship to the partisan hate and violence in contemporary civilization. The editors of *High Issues* comment:

> It will be many months—years, we hope—before we outgrow the mood of soberness and shock brought to us through the assassination of our President. For many, this mood precipitated hours of reflection about the purposes and pitfalls of life as we know it. One fifteen-year-old said: "I suddenly realized how quickly life really can end, and what a waste of time there is in negative action." Another said, "It made me suddenly conscious of all human beings whose lives were blown out from under them." If you had thoughts like these, you will be interested in learning about what was said by those who have worked in the field of alternatives to violence for many years. Some are contained in this HIGH ISSUE.
>
> From the kids who knock one another around in the school washroom to the assassination of the head of a great government to the wiping out of cities with atomic power—is there any connection? We think there is. "Perhaps," said the statement of the FOR staff, "this tragedy will move many of us to reexamine the whole place of violence in the equation of ends and means. Barbaric the assassination was, yet presumably the assassin was able somehow to rationalize his deed to himself. If we concentrate on his act alone, as the aberration of a tormented and twisted human being, we shall miss the most urgent point of the tragedy. That point is the effect on all of us of our society's widespread acceptance of violence, including murder, as a valid instrument for achieving ends believed to be important.

Following the above, a short verse, "Elegy for the World of J.F.K.," is reprinted from the magazine, *Liberation:*

> Let us cease now the frantic cementing
> of a shattered myth
> and confront for once

reality through this gap
in the heavens;
the dark forms of unmourned millions
who need not tears but hope,
not orations but bread;
for this is the vision, magnified
through that death, that should wound us
into love.

On the same subject, it is natural to recall the attitude and approach of Martin Luther King, whose influence clearly extends beyond any racial partisanship to the ethical problems of the entire human family. *High Issues* quotes from King's "Epitaph and Challenge":

> While the question "who killed President Kennedy?" is important, the question "what killed him" is more important. Our late President was assassinated by a morally inclement climate. . . .
>
> It is a climate where men cannot disagree without being disagreeable, and where they express dissent through violence and murder. It is the same climate that murdered Medgar Evers in Mississippi and six innocent children in Birmingham, Alabama. So in a sense we are all participants in that horrible act that tarnished the image of our nation. By our silence, by our willingness to compromise principle . . . by allowing all of these developments we have created an atmosphere in which violence and hatred have become popular pastimes.

Students interested in the thought and discussions contained in *High Issues* are asked to fill in the following form:

HIGH ISSUES
Box 271, Nyack, N.Y.
Send me information on alternatives
to violence between individuals •
in the social struggle •
between all nations •

- ☐ I am planning to do a paper or speech in this field, and would like suggestions for resource materials. (Give details below.)
- ☐ I am working with a Youth Group which will be dealing with this subject at a future meeting. Please suggest resources. (Give details below of nature of group and subject of meeting, etc.)
- ☐ I have been thinking for some time along these lines, and would like to do some more intensive reading to clarify my thoughts. Please suggest some books and articles that will be helpful. (Give details, special areas, etc.)
- ☐ I have some definite questions I'd like to raise with you about this subject, and would appreciate an answer when you can manage it. (Indicate below.)
- ☐ Send me the Statement of Purpose of the Fellowship of Reconciliation: THAT MEN MAY LIVE IN PEACE TOGETHER.

FRONTIERS

Art and Civilization

ART gives a central meaning to culture and links the realm of the intellect with that of the senses. Art is the bond between the past and the future, between the world of our dreams and the realm which we actually experience.

The artist is a subtle moralist. He teaches a lesson by direct experience and vivid awareness. His sermons need no translation; they can be understood by all. He does not superimpose ideas upon life but allows the rhythm of existence to develop freely. By liberating himself, the artist contributes to the emancipation of humanity.

Progress in civilization means more than technological improvement. The machine can enslave us or it can be a bringer of freedom. Nor does progress imply more comforts for the individual; our luxuries may simply alienate us from nature. Nor is mere knowledge an unqualified blessing; knowledge may paralyze us for action and create unending dilemmas. Progress can be measured best by the expansion of sensitivity—moral and aesthetic—so that beauty invades our soul and dominates all our relationships.

Art represents genuine universality. Whether we are young or old, poor or rich, whether we have much formal education or are self-educated, we need the stimulation of art. This does not imply that we should all paint or compose or become designers or poets, rather that we should learn to become aware of the stimulation of art, its infinite variety and its impact on human development.

There is a nexus between science and art. Both fields depend on imagination and intuition; they substitute a new universe for the one which the ordinary man experiences; they construct patterns from the multitude of phenomena; both contribute to man's need for self-expression; they necessitate a discipline which heightens our senses; both are forms of profound awareness. The difference is that science is interested in prediction and control, while art represents both order and chaos, both integration and deliberate disequilibrium.

The tragedy of many individuals is that they feel separated from life. Many students merely endure education, which they view as a mechanical process. They listen to lectures, but the words of the instructor become monotonous phrases. They cram for tests and a week later they have forgotten most of the material covered in the book. They give answers in class which they feel will please their instructor and improve their grade. They study not to become educated, but only to obtain a better job after graduation.

Many instructors likewise are not at all interested in reaching the individual student; rather they are concerned about their own economic and professional advancement. In college this means the publication of books and articles and unending research. They strive for respectability rather than for understanding. They are not emotionally involved with the process of learning. In fact, they studiously cultivate an attitude of neutrality toward the great issues of our time.

Art demands emotional involvement. Through art our emotions are stirred, we become conscious of parts of our personality which were ignored amidst everyday experience. The greyness of existence is replaced by new contrasts and climaxes.

Art is a protest against inhumanity. When we look at the paintings of Goya and Orozco we become aware of the inhumanity of man and his ability to compartmentalize his conscience. When we view the productions of Kirchner and Munch we feel the threat of mass society which tends to enslave the individual. But art is more than an expression of social reform. It points to a new universe, to new possibilities, to ideal vistas. It transforms experience so that uniqueness and genuine individuality are achieved.

When Sinclair Lewis wrote *Babbitt* and *Main Street* he did not want to expose merely the drabness of middle class life and the ugliness of the small town; he wanted to point to new realms of experience in which generosity was treasured and beauty valued, in which art had an autonomous function. When Sherwood Anderson wrote *Winesburg, Ohio,* he exposed the inner life of the pillars of small-town society, showing how far their actual lives differed from their social masks. Yet all the time Anderson stressed man's need for authentic communication which overcomes loneliness. Art, according to Anderson, presents us with a paradox. On the one hand, it reminds us of the mortality of all occasions, that we will become a part of the stream of time, that our hopes and ideals and desires do not have a cosmic status. On the other hand, art gives us an awareness which transcends the moment. It is our link with infinity.

The modern artist shows the fragmentation of society, its profound sense of alienation and its sharp division between the realms of value and fact. Modern life encourages physical and spiritual ghettos. Education illustrates the paradox of modern man who seeks peace and yet creates the conditions for war.

Art faces life in its nakedness and creates an order which has a transcendental value. Art makes education vital and emotional. The individual, through artistic experience, is reminded that it is not enough to know and to verbalize, he must learn to express himself and become a participant in the drama of life.

Art demands allegiance to a cause which illuminates and intensifies all feelings and all occasions. The artist becomes so absorbed in his work that its expression becomes more real than his own existence. Carl Jung maintained that in a sense Goethe did not create Faust, rather Faust created Goethe.

The child who truly values art achieves a uniqueness which adults often lose. His curiosity is not stifled; he does not become a slave to convention. He retains the capacity to feel deeply and to appreciate with fervor. To him, life is a process of relatedness in which the larger self is discovered. His values are less dependent on materialism and social approval; rather they center on warmth and creativity. He does not live an other-directed life, for he finds society within himself and he discovers new vistas and new areas of the self. Solitude is not a burden, but an invitation to renewal and to more deliberate inwardness.

As Emerson said in "The Poet": "How cheap even the liberty then seems; how mean to study, when an emotion communicates to the intellect the power to sap and upheave nature; how great the perspective! Nations, times, systems, enter and disappear like threads in tapestry of large figure and many colors; dream delivers us to dream, and while the drunkenness lasts we will sell our bed, our philosophy, our religion, in our opulence. . . .

"This emancipation is dear to all men, and the power to impart it, as it must come from greater depth and scope of thought, is a measure of intellect. Therefore all books of the imagination endure, all which ascend to that truth that the writer sees nature beneath him, and uses it as his exponent. Every verse or sentence possessing this virtue will take care of its own immortality. The religions of the world are the ejaculations of a few imaginative men."

To live in the realm of imagination is to transcend mortality. This is the feeling of the artist, whether he is young or old in whatever civilization he may live. External barriers do not matter. We can admire the art of the paleolithic age as well as of today. We can be partisans of the realism of the Renaissance as well as non-objective art. We can appreciate Picasso in advanced age as well as the tentative attempts toward self-expression of a school boy. Art thus develops genuine generosity and charity. It indicates that complexity is to be welcomed, that

an idea should be judged more by its fertility and impact than by its accuracy.

Art reminds us that man is not a statistic. He cannot be subordinated to a method in education, politics or religion. *Art is defiant individuality in action.* In education art indicates that standards and evaluations are secondary; in politics it shows that man cannot fulfill himself by abdicating his individuality and by conformity to mass standards; in religion art points to the inner experience rather than to the outer ritual.

Art is a protest against waste: In *Our Town*, Thornton Wilder shows that the real tragedy of man is not death; it is deliberate unawareness; it is our inability to see the preciousness of the moment; it is our proclivity toward triviality and our failure to explore the full dimensions of life. There are infinite reservoirs of beauty, and yet we tolerate incredible ugliness. The life of the spirit creates unending adventure, and yet we neglect it for the pedestrian pursuits of materialism. Novelty is a constant element in life, and yet we succumb to the patterns of sameness. We are reminded by Thoreau that "life is sweetest at its core," and yet we are pilgrims on the surface.

To see beyond the surface, to become involved in life, to heighten its significance, to express our individuality without fear and without anxiety, to make beauty part of everyday existence, to overcome drabness in all dimensions—this is the challenge of art in contemporary civilization.

FREDERICK MAYER

Redlands, Calif.