VOLUME XVI, NO. 8
FEBRUARY 20, 1963

CORRESPONDENCE

[In recent months there has been a noticeable growth in the number of mimeographed publications that come in the MANAS mail. Some of these are well worth reading—far more important, in some instances, than the beautifully printed material brought by the postman. Eventually, we should provide readers with a fair sampling of a number of these papers, in evidence of the sort of intelligence that is finding expression by this means. Right now, however, a more direct claim on our space is made by the correspondence from readers. We present below several letters or short articles which discuss recent MANAS material. Some brief comment follows each of these contributions, which are interesting, not only for their individual content, but also for the diverse viewpoints represented.—Editors, MANAS.]

I HAVE read and studied the article in the Nov. 28 MANAS, titled "The Irrelevance of the Cold War." While I appreciate this instructive dissection of the U.S. policy that goes under the label "Cold War," I am impelled to question the accuracy of the suggestion that the chief ideological issue of the Cold War is "whether property and the instruments of production should be owned by the State or by individuals." (MANAS, Dec. 5.) Instead, I suggest that on this issue the rulers in the Kremlin and those in Washington are basically in agreement, in deeds if not in words. I make this charge despite the fact that a wide gulf still separates the two nations in the area of economism. This difference exists because Russia was socialized almost overnight by revolution, while in the U.S. the method employed, that of Fabian socialism, is still some distance from fulfillment.

The United States began the socializing process early this century with the Federal income tax and the Federal Reserve system. Since 1932 socialism here has been fueled by (1) printing press currency inflation, (2) a politically-inspired bogus humanitarianism largely replacing religion, and (3) two costly and senseless overseas wars. While we retain many of the outward trappings of a free people, steadily and quietly we are being herded into the goose-step of a conscript society.

Does this sound far-fetched? Then consider some of the signs about us.

Our rulers spend abroad each year billions of dollars. Every dollar spent this way nourishes socialism in the United States and in the recipient countries. At home the expenditures expand political control over private enterprises, and sap the taxpayers' ability to resist regimentation.

The Cold War posture enables our rulers to expropriate over 50 per cent of American business profits without effective resistance. As these tens of billions are expended by the military and other facets of the ruling group, the automatic result is subservience by the big corporations and their employees to the will of the Washington rulers. What is this, if not a sure route to socialism?

Individual initiative and responsibility are still a factor, but their significance is being steadily devitalized by federal intervention. The results are clearly apparent in agriculture, housing, transportation, education, medicine, and now, by far-fetched reasoning, political meddling reaches into such areas of personal choice as sports and recreation.

Temporarily this massive socializing process goes on, largely unnoticed and unresisted because of the distractions of the cold war and the enervating effects of socialism's most powerful weapon—the narcotic of printing-press money.

There may be significant ideological differences between the rulers in the Kremlin and the rulers in Washington, but if there are, what are they?

The chief ostensible difference is in the area of religion. In the U.S. the ruling group affects

deep respect and obeisance to religion. In deeds, such episodes as "Unconditional Surrender," the dropping of atomic bombs on a beaten foe, and the relentless spoliation of the dollar savings of the masses by inflation tell another story.

The harshness of the Russians toward religion and toward the masses of people excites both our anger and our pity. But what will we have in America when and if repeated dollar devaluations take place? Shutting our eyes to this question does not dispose of it and others equally serious.

Granted, the ruling group in Washington still relies more on the carrot than the stick, while Moscow relies almost solely on the stick. Our Washington rulers usually gain their ends by skillful use of silk gloves and indirect methods (except for an occasional episode like terrorism on U.S. Steel), while their Russian counterparts have long since discarded soothing syrup tactics. But, judging from performance thus far, is it not more likely that each of the two giants is trying to establish a global totalitarian state, in which its own power clique would rule the world? If this is so, then each must portray the other as evil incarnate, in order to justify actions taken at home.

Of course, it could be that each must encourage the vigorous enmity of the other, simply to justify the severity of its own regime, and that neither actually has ambitions beyond their own borders. But it would be hard to validate this last theory, in view of the persistent meddling everywhere by both Russia and the U.S.

HOWARD BUFFETT

Omaha, Nebraska

There is manifest truth in these observations. The progressive socialization of the political economy of the United States is no doubt a fact, already carefully described in a non-ideological study published by the University of Kansas Press in 1943, *Development of Collective Enterprise* by Seba Eldridge and associates. This work should be studied by anyone who has doubts about the reality of this process. Whether or how it can be avoided, and whether or how it should be resisted are questions that cannot be settled here. A knowledge of the major facts is a prerequisite for any intelligible debate on such a subject, and, so far as we are concerned, there are more important matters to discuss in these pages.

Two things, however, might be noted. First is the question of how the political principles upon which freedom depends can be made to operate in the complex technological framework of an advanced industrial society. This is an absorbing problem for economists and political scientists to consider. The claim of centralized control in behalf of technological efficiency is difficult to resist, and as this control spreads, not by any Machiavellian design, but by the slow evolution of structures which narrow the range of human decision, we find ourselves in the grip of "necessities" we can do very little to change. It is our impression that the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is pursuing a cultural-technical examination of this problem.

Second, we are on every hand confronted by the effects of the *ethos* of doctrinaire self-interest. Our people bear the marks of a barbarous acquisitive philosophy which trains them in indifference to others, except at the institutional level of "public welfare" and "charity." One result of this abominable propaganda is that we get an identity value-scale which depends upon property and money, which is corrupting and morally impoverishing to both young and old. These attitudes are repulsive to normal human sensibility and create obvious justification for the socialist critique of the free enterprise, capitalist society, if not for the socialist alternative, which deals with the effects, not the causes, of our ugly civilization.

Finally, these moral issues surround and enclose all the technical problems brought into being by expanding technology, so that the student of the general situation finds it almost impossible to isolate the constants from the variables, or vice versa, supposing, in the first

instance, he is wise enough to distinguish between them. Naive (unexamined) philosophical assumptions continually confuse the analysis. For example: Self-interest is the spring of human action and motivation, especially at the mass level; People can or will change, given an environment which influences them in the "right" direction; the "masses" have always been a passive instrument needing manipulation for their own good by the elite, and always will be; the masses are long-suffering innocents who need only to be taught their own power and aroused to revolt, for justice to be done; what we need is *total* revolution and an entirely fresh start; we have instruction from "Nature" concerning the principles of a proper social order, and if we reduce bureaucracy to a point where the operations of natural law can be seen, its beneficial authority will be recognized by all; what we need is more (less) religion in public affairs; nothing less than complete world government can solve our problems; the best government is the least government, statism and all political sovereignty must go.

Such slogans make noise out of the public dialogue concerning the public good, and the tense atmosphere of the Cold War, with its emotional charges of fear and partisan interest, exacerbates the confusion. It is for these reasons, among others, that MANAS chooses not to argue in this arena.

One more point: the living processes of economic, political, and moral life are continuous, not discrete. Life is an organic flow, not calibrated by nature, but only by human analysis. We impose the calibrations in order to measure, compute, and *handle* what we believe to be the "real" elements of our existence. Hence our theories never work out in practice as we hope they will. The matrix of life with its ceaseless metabolism imposes its own rules on whatever we do to alter our condition. This is as true of our technical, physical environment as it is of our moral impulses. The *counted* value is never the same as the living value. Henri Bergson pressed this truth upon us in modern times, but the present tendency is to recognize it in the puzzling paradoxes of Lao Tse. Lao Tse was an "extremist" in demanding recognition of the inviolable flow of life, of the indivisible nature of being, and our pains are such, today, that the extremist critics have become more appealing. Lao Tse would tell us that the very instruments of our progress now threaten our existence, and we hunger to know exactly how he might be right.

I WAS surprised and pleased to see the *Evangelical Agnostic* quoted in MANAS for Dec. 19. I especially liked your discussion of some of the implications of an "uncertain" approach to governmental processes regarding crime and punishment and the problem of war. You ask four questions, to which I shall attempt some answers. The questions are:

> Would not the agnostic view, which has no certain moral authority, take away from the good people their spiritual mandate to defend the Right?
>
> Shouldn't racist doctrines be combatted?
>
> Should we not have hated the Nazis for their crimes?
>
> How are you going to get anything done without the resource of a high moral authority by means of which to *engage* people in the struggle for the Good?

1. It seems to me that we have to take our chances that `'good people" will still find motivation to defend "the Right" without appealing to dogmatic or absolute authority.

2. I hope that my article did not imply that we should stop trying to eliminate racist doctrines. My own activities in this area include, among other things, being a member of the NAACP and having served formerly as a student pastor in an interracial church in San Francisco.

3. I have stood outside the gas chambers at Dachau and feel strongly the horror and tragedy connected with them. However, I feel that a humble, agnostic view on the part of the Nazis, and incidentally on the part of many Christians

who have aided in laying the foundation for anti-Semitism down through the ages, would have eliminated the possibility of these atrocities. But hate is unnecessary and only wastes our energies. We should keep trying in our own way to minimize any arrogant or absolute action of one individual or group of individuals regarding another, when and wherever we are able to do so.

4. We shall get things done when we realize that we do not have to wait for absolutely conclusive evidence, because we are free to act immediately in a creative and experimental way. Whether we do actually act may have as much to do with our metabolism, with what our fifth-grade teacher happened to say to us, with whether we are getting enough sleep at night, or with how we have learned to satisfy and sublimate our basic drives, as with anything else. Also, it seems to me that we need to be able to accept apathy as frequently preferable to arrogant activity.

Well, these are four quick responses. I will try to reply less subjectively in a later issue of the *Evangelical Agnostic.*

3644 East Platt Avenue WILLIAM HENRY YOUNG
Fresno, California

The only point, here, that seems to need attention is the one which suggests the advantage of "a humble, agnostic view on the part of the Nazis." A natural reaction to this would be to say that if the Nazis had been either one, they wouldn't have been Nazis, which is of course true. It is a normal human impatience which argues that, given people like the Nazis, you don't have much choice except to try to stamp them out. There is, we often say, no other way to deal with such people.

But when we talk about "dealing" with such people, we mean that we insist upon having a "sure thing" in the method that we decide to use. In the isolated framework of the time from Hitler's rise to the fall of the third Reich, the war we used to stamp out Nazism seems like a "sure thing." Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and the other Nazi leaders are dead. The tangible intolerables have been eliminated. However, the question now arises as to whether our "sure thing" methods in eliminating the tangible evil of the Nazis may have produced intangible evils every bit as horrible, but which our "sure thing" methods can not touch at all.

If this is the case, then our "sure thing" methods are not sure, but only seem so temporarily. You can evade this argument by refusing to admit that the intangible evils exist. You can deny that all mankind has been coarsened and brutalized by World War II. You can insist that nuclear weapons, which issued out of that conflict, would have come anyhow, in the course of the development of military technology. You can say that it doesn't matter that the dialogue concerning political philosophy and political economy has been reduced to beachheads of angry dogmatism and self-righteousness, in which the thoughtful and just mind cannot participate.

In short, you can still maintain that "sure thing" methods must be used against the evil in the world, and refuse to try, however tentatively, any other policy. But if you take this position, you risk the dehumanization of mankind.

I WOULD like to comment on Joseph Wood Krutch's article, "The Humanist Case. " (MANAS, Jan. 2, 1963.) It seems to me that, not only is there no cold war between Science and the Humanities, but that *the war no longer exists.* Most scientists no longer delude themselves into thinking that unmeasurable matters are not important, or that important humanistic questions are not measurable. At the same time, humanists are willing to consider the scientific method in the spirit of Humanism; that it is *one* way of man's attempt to deal with important dilemmas, with relevant questions.

There are many individuals today who rightfully consider themselves to be "humanistic scientists" or, if you will, "scientific humanists."

This is especially true of many psychologists and other social scientists. Here are examples of individuals who do not think that science and the humanities are mutually exclusive in purpose or in subject-matter: A. H. Maslow, Clark Moustakas, Carl Rogers, S. M. Jourard, Rollo May. These individuals are not embarrassed to ask questions like:

"How can human beings grow and actualize themselves?"

"What is love and striving?"

"What is the meaning of death in human existence?"

"Are men alienated from their own potentialities and from each other?" and, "What can we do about it?"

"How can man transcend the concrete aspects of his daily existence?"

In addition, these individuals (and many others) are not embarrassed by numbers, the fools of science, and make use of them in their attempt to answer such questions.

The monkey trials are over and only those who have been hibernating for the past twenty-five years can still argue hypothetical wars between science and the humanities.

JOSEPH C. ZINKER, Psychologist
Cleveland, Ohio

We ought first, perhaps, to rid Mr. Krutch of the charge of naïveté which some readers might find in this letter. On the question of those who work in the sciences, yet practice the kind of humanistic inquiry Dr. Zinker (with us) admires, Mr. Krutch wrote:

> Freud offers a . . . striking case in point. He was so far from establishing a science that there are by now almost as many incompatible schools of psychoanalysis as there are Christian sects. Competent physicists could not possibly disagree among themselves on fundamentals as psychoanalysts disagree. But Freud had as much effect upon our mental climate as many men who lived during his time, because when we read what he had to say, we experienced "the shock of recognition." What he had not actually demonstrated was recognized. We believed because our past experience had prepared us to do so.
>
> *The Lonely Crowd* is, I suppose, the most widely read sociological work written in the United States during the past twenty years. Yet, as sociologists with a narrower conception of their quasi-science are quick to point out, it didn't actually prove anything. There were no measurements and no experiments weighty enough to be taken seriously. The examples of "inner directed" and "other-directed" personalities were not selected by any controlled process of sampling but were treated merely as illustrations, much as a literary essayist might have treated them. Yet, most readers did experience the shock of recognition. *The Lonely Crowd* is a contribution to "the humanities."

So, if you wanted to make an argument with Dr. Zinker you could say that the war between the sciences and the humanities was partially ended by the men he lists coming over to the side of the humanities. This is of interest, but it is not precisely the point of Mr. Krutch's article, except in this place.

Actually, such questions are only resolved by deciding what definitions you will use and by sticking to them. Mr. Krutch means by science what it has meant for the past couple of hundred years. Dr. Zinker is redefining science to include the daring of the new Self psychologists. Zinker's science will of course be a far more humanly useful kind of science, once it gets established—or should we say, until it gets "established"?—and we do what we can in these pages to help it along.

But what ought to be recognized is the fact that the insights of this new psychology gain their sanction and verification, for the most part, from the intuitions of its practitioners and from "the shock of recognition" in the rest of us. Experiments may be worked out to put some of these conclusions on a "public truth" basis, as time goes on, but it is obvious that, today, the insights are way ahead of the experiments. We hope that they will always be far ahead of the statistical sort

of confirmation that tends to destroy the fire of individual creative thinking. Meanwhile, the consensus of the new psychology seems to us to be obtained in a manner which reminds us of a story repeated by John Toland about Lord Shaftesbury, one of the founders of seventeenth-century Deism. Shaftesbury and a friend were conferring about the many sects of religion in the world, and finally concluded, as Toland puts it:

> . . . that notwithstanding those infinite divisions caused by the interest of the priests and the ignorance of the people, ALL WISE MEN ARE OF THE SAME RELIGION; whereupon a Lady in the room, who seemed to mind her needle more than their discourse, demanded with some concern what that Religion was? To whom the Lord Shaftesbury strait replied, MADAM, WISE MEN NEVER TELL.

The new psychologists are doing what they can to tell that they find out, and to make their truth as "public" as possible, but they begin, most plainly, with wisdom, find their companions by wisdom, and gain strength from one another in common intuitive insights while endeavoring to create a new *zeitgeist* for the age.

REVIEW
"THE HIDDEN REMNANT"

THIS book by Gerald Sykes (Harper, 1962) may be discussed in a great number of ways, as current reviews demonstrate. In the case of Mr. Sykes, one may also expect various expressions of annoyance on the ground that he, a layman, carries around a sort of portable pinnacle from which to look down on the schools of psychotherapy providing rudiments of the education he holds to be necessary for personal or societal salvation. Then, too, many will find the notion of salvation by a "remnant" of initiated *philosophes* vaguely irritating, perhaps because of an intimation that *retaining* wisdom in the face of disaster is the answer, rather than acquiring wisdom we do not yet possess. But what Mr. Sykes seems to be trying to promote is not so much a gathering of an elite clan to survive catastrophe as a recognition that only those who have felt catastrophe all around them will be able to survive our time in a full human sense.

In any case, we prefer to leave evaluation of Mr. Sykes' style and personal élan to the reader and simply present his concept of a "remnant" for its undeniable value. In his closing chapter, he writes:

> The Remnant might be described as those people, necessarily few, who retain a sure sense of "the best that is in them." They outwit the subtlest efforts to miseducate them. They acquire *mana*, or a personal power that is more than equal to external pressures. They are *not* crushed by their environment. Their victory is symbolic, however, and can only be appreciated by a few. They are the "saving" Remnant in the sense that, if they become conscious and numerous enough, they save others from being overwhelmed by brute nature. They are rarely thanked for it. But no one else, finally, wins as much respect or wields as much influence.
>
> The Remnant itself is a myth, but the kind of myth that meets the pragmatic test. Its power is real. . . .
>
> In this sense, a durable myth is simply another name for a tested, empiric truth that enables you to cope with reality, instead of leaving you defenseless before it. Science no longer blocks you, but ignites your mythopoeic spontaneity. The sterner its discoveries, the more intense your aesthetic satisfactions. You detest illusions, except as stage sets, children's games. Existence grows none the less hard, but it has varifiable meaning in mental fertility and bodily health. However painful, your yoke feels mild. Death becomes a constant friendly companion, and you demand nothing after it. Experience will still surprise, terrify, brutalize you—but not for long. Your anxieties provide your fuel, and your humiliations your light.

During his discussion of the most fruitfully influential of schools of psychotherapy, Sykes suggests, again, that the man of insight today must have removed himself from the "lonely crowd," existed for a time in the difficult climate of the bare mountain top, and returned to involvement with the problems of his age. Here we come to a theme beautifully presented by Joseph Campbell in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces.* Sykes writes:

> We must acquire an intimate understanding of internal forces that are remarkably similar in everyone. We must wrest power from these internal forces and confer it, not upon a self-inflated ego, but upon our portion of the impersonal. Does it seem simple? It is the most difficult achievement of all. A Remnant will not be produced by "conditions" but by precise self-study and ancient religious methods of self-reliance brought up to date.
>
> Vulnerability is a predominant trait of the Remnant. It is indeed the beginning of wisdom and of knowledge with grace. A member of the Remnant *listens.* He is ready to see with "the innocent eye." He is open to new experience. If he is a man of action, he is ready for thought. If he is a man of thought, he is ready for action. All this means that he is willing to be wounded, or to be temporarily ineffective and insecure. He faces his own evil. He is willing to kill off an old portion of himself, the instant he notices his attachment to it. He accepts the pain of continual self-transcendence. He accepts his own skin, his own mind, his own place in a historic order. (This does not mean that his social position may not change; almost invariably, because of his talents, it does, bringing a greater need for self-conquest.) He hunts out obscure ancestral legacies of mind, as prime obstacles to consciousness. And he realizes that his vulnerability means estrangement

> from his group, a harder struggle for recognizable self-fulfillment, considerably delayed recognition, and, sometimes, no recognition at all.
>
> I see the Remnant as made up chiefly of former outcasts who now form the innermost core of their society, Ishmaels no longer in flight. Unless a man is born at variance with his society, he will never understand it. Unless he later consents to serve it, in his own best way, he will never take root. To survive, therefore, he must become *bilingual;* that is, master the language of his people, and also master the new international language of the mind, which can at last make him feel at home with his people—and himself.

Mr. Sykes seems to have no heroes, for, though he continually uses Freud, Adler, Jung, Frank, Horney, Sullivan and Fromm as reference points, he finds each one suspect of deficiencies. And here we may miss the dynamic suggested by Campbell—the dynamic which moves men when they are touched by the vision of genuine gods and heroes. Sykes has little to say directly about philosophy, religion and metaphysics, save by side comments such as that "psychology is a necessary bridge to that personal metaphysics that each individual, even if he has a traditional faith, must continuously reforge for himself."

It is perhaps true enough that we can no longer take refuge behind a standard "to which the wise and honest can repair." Perhaps it is also true that, as Sykes says: "The tragic sense is the beginning of enjoyment. The eyes of 'the shipwrecked' are eyes that light up. When a few people find a way—*after* catastrophe the others will find a way too." But we may also feel that the shipwreck of our era can be psychologically counter-balanced only by the emergence of what Howard Fast called a "new man." What really causes the eyes to light up, traditionally—and contemporaneously as well—is the dream of a better future so vivid as to make survival a creative endeavor.

In our view, however, Mr. Sykes deserves considerable appreciation. He has attempted something that needs to be attempted again and again. Though his own "position" remains somewhat obscure, his book can be discussed for a very long while.

COMMENTARY
AGAINST THE GRAIN

HERE is a letter that came in after this week's lead article was put together, which we are obliged to take quite seriously:

> I, for one, am sick of the cold war and articles about the cold war. The MANAS of yesteryear used to headline articles on Zen Buddhism, Existentialism, Capital Punishment, etc. What has happened recently in these fields? What about racial integration? How about a little variety? The problems abroad are interesting, but there are also problems at home!
>
> READER

It would be easy enough to argue that the Cold War is very much of a problem at home, but there are times when we feel the viewpoint of this reader very strongly, and wonder what we can do about it. (We do save up material on Capital Punishment and at regular intervals print "surveys" of developments in the campaign to end this barbarous practice; and only last week Frontiers gave what seemed an especially valuable review of the issue of the *Progressive* which was entirely devoted to the struggle for racial justice.) The difficulty is that whenever there is any broad discussion of human welfare and human search with no mention of the Cold War, the discussion takes on an otherworldly quality. It seems vital for all of us to accept our responsibility for the tensions which have produced the Cold War, and to recognize the full horror of what may happen to the world if its peoples do not rise up and *reject* both the means and the ends of the nuclear weapons competition. So it is hard to leave this subject alone.

There is a sense, of course, in which all discussions of the means to maturity, or practical wisdom, are concerned with how to put an end to the Cold War. But to be passive about this issue, when we ought to be active—and "active" may mean no more than having thought-out convictions and giving them appropriate expression—would be to accept the brutalizing, inhumane patterns of national behavior so clearly characterized recently in W. H. Ferry's article, "What Price for Peace?" (MANAS, Jan. 30, 1963.)

Perhaps we don't relate these matters very well. Perhaps on occasion the attention given to the Cold War seems to become strident or too insistent. This is a temptation which often overcomes those who express minority opinions. Further, the pages of MANAS cannot help but represent the feelings of engagement and concern of those who write for the paper, and no doubt its changing themes reflect the changing currents of interest in the editors, who are, so to speak, pursuing their education "in public" by reporting from week to week on matters which claim their attention. This makes for highly individual editing, but it may also give the paper what authentic life it has.

There is a sense in which Gerald Sykes makes a serviceable definition of the MANAS editorial policy, in one of its aspects:

> Unless a man is born at variance with his society, he will never understand it. Unless he later consents to serve it, in his own best way, he will never take root. To survive, therefore, he must become *bilingual;* that is, master the language of his people, and also master the new international language of the mind, which can at last make him feel at home with his people—and himself.

To be "at variance" with one's society, yet to conduct one's life and make one's expressions with measure, balance, and taste, while refusing compromise and weakness—this calls for talents which belong only to rare individuals. The conscious attempt to pursue this course cannot help but create a strong feeling of humility. This is not false modesty, but an inescapable psychological fact. To have a concern for others, yet to dissent, strongly and frequently, makes any undertaking difficult.

The obstacles of the course are compounded by the imposing institutional structures which absorb so much of the energy of our age. In a

truly free society, the institutions would be "loose," allowing and even encouraging great latitude in individual behavior and decision. But in our society, the deviant seems to go about in rags. He preserves his dignity only by internal balance, with none of the aids that conventionality supplies. So it is that the "rebel" often seems obstreperous or odd, when the fact may be that his peculiarity lies only in the contrast he presents to the conformities of the rest. His judgment, manners, wisdom, are always on the block for critics to see and measure. And if he is any good at all, he accepts this situation without complaint.

Since he may not feel himself to be especially wise or qualified for this role, but accepts it only because he must, he is, as Mr. Sykes says, "vulnerable." And this also he accepts. "Your anxieties provide your fuel, and your humiliations your light."

Fortunately, there is a fellowship of those involved in such undertakings, and enough humor to deflate the egotisms which sometimes develop. And there is also the rare example of those who have done well at these tasks.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

TOWARDS A SCHOOL FOR MANKIND

AN article in the UNESCO *Courier* (June, 1962) by Henry Cassirer describes the attitude of true educational reformers by way of a short history of the work of Paul Geheeb. Presently head of the radio and television section, Mass Communication Techniques Division, at UNESCO, Cassirer received all his schooling from Geheeb's *Odenwaldschale*—begun in Germany and later transferred to Switzerland, following the advent of National Socialism. The flavor of Geheeb's influence is given by Mr. Cassirer:

> Paul Geheeb turned his back upon Germany, not in a spirit of defeatism but in one of defiance. His School of Mankind, which he founded under difficult conditions in Switzerland in 1934, was as yet more an ideal and a challenge for the future than a reality.
>
> In his inaugural speech he stressed that this might not appear to be the appropriate time to speak of a school of mankind, but while the concept of *humanity* had lived as an abstraction in the minds of Kant, Herder or Schiller, history had since demonstrated that humanity did not yet exist.
>
> "But precisely because the idea of a school of mankind may easily be considered untimely," he said, "our age probably needs it most of all."
>
> "The ideal which firmly stands before my eyes is the economic and cultural co-operation of mankind with each bound closely to the other. The microcosm of a living community in a school should correspond in its essential characteristics to this."

The philosophy of the *Odenwaldschule* is implicit in some of Geheeb's maxims and sayings:

> "To be only *governed* is completely unknown in our school," Paul Geheeb said, "for it is a community without superiors, a *school without a director* . . . We have never quarrelled about *rights*, no one was interested in *equal rights* for old and young. The central idea of our community is *responsibility*, responsibility of everyone, for himself and for the community."
>
> As one of the teachers in the Odenwaldschule put it: "The authority of the teacher is replaced by the authority of those who together represent the idea of the school; this authority is heeded by adults as much as by children."
>
> This approach was not only in stark contrast to the authoritarian tradition of German education but also to the opposite extreme where undue "freedom" is granted to children in the name of progressive education.
>
> "The teenage child of 12 to 14," Geheeb wrote, "often completely lacks a sense of humility, and his unchildlike sophistication is actually encouraged by contemporary thinking, which is based on a confused notion of the 'right of the child,' and a well-meaning reaction against the inhuman relationship between teacher and pupil which was so prevalent in the past. As a result, teenagers frequently have no understanding of the reserve required in one's conduct with other people: they have lost the feeling of respect for greater maturity, and are unable to establish a fruitful relationship with adult friends, that is, a relationship from which they can profit and develop."
>
> These words, written by Geheeb more than forty years ago, go to the root not only of the problem of teenagers but also of the harmful impact of a misunderstood "progressive" or "child-centered" education.

There are, of course, many attempts to establish "ideal" educational centers such as Geheeb's "School for Mankind." Many languish after a few years, while a few flourish. But whatever the attempt, and however long it survives, each such effort serves in some degree the object of universal brotherhood. Discussion of Geheeb's school makes a natural occasion for a note on a school near La Paz, Mexico, in Baja California. Brief mention was made of "Shimber Beris" a year or so ago and, since that time, the work pioneered by Dr. and Virginia Burden has persevered. A News Letter dated November, 1962 gives Mrs. Burden's reflections on the second phase in the life of Shimber Beris:

> Using such means as were available to me, I began my puny promotional activities. I turned out articles and pamphlets on an obsolete mimeograph machine, and these finally metamorphosed into a respectable little bulletin called "Essays on Learning and Practical Philosophy." Some of my articles were printed in little "thinker's magazines." I began to get

invitations to lecture to small groups in people's homes, and I carried with me slides of the life and work in Mexico. I hired myself out for short-term periods to private schools and children's workshops to demonstrate philosophical methods in teaching. During this time, I "straddled" the border, spending part of my time in Mexico and part in the United States. I became a veritable commuter on the airlines flight to La Paz.

Finally, parents began to send their children by way of the peninsular adventure in our sturdy, four-wheel drive converted army ambulance. Dr. Burden, with his keen, pioneer's sensitivity, accompanied the students, and they were driven by Mexican chauffeurs who knew the road well. Sometimes they would fly with me, or travel down the mainland of Mexico and ferry across the gulf. They enjoyed it enormously. Then, for a summer, a semester, or longer, they took their studies in our thatched, bamboo-enclosed classroom, and the lessons were interspersed with such duties as milling grain and making bread, milking the goats and caring for them, as well-as the horses, cats and chipmunks. Some would help Juan with the building and gardening; others would act as "nurses" and hold the instruments while Doctor pulled teeth and tended the ailments of the natives. Sometimes, they would visit the homes of the sick, and they saw firsthand—as no tourist could ever see it—the poverty and suffering, the stoic courage and stubborn resistance to all which threatens the dignity and liberty of these people. It is seldom that any of our students complain about the plain, wholesome food we serve, or wish to over-eat. The presence of so much need, coupled with so much endurance, takes the greed and selfishness out of them. The old attractions take on a different countenance; the values change.

Under the incessant demand to find harmonious answers to group problems, and to meet the challenge of relationships in a fundamental way, as we work in intense psychological proximity to one another, perspective *must* alter. As one adolescent girl said, while watching some tourists, some months after arriving in Shimber Beris, "Is *that* what we Americans look like to other people?" When these children return to their old lives, parents and friends are amazed at the maturity and insight that has suddenly blossomed forth in their natures. One parent said wistfully "They seem to have found something that most children, *and* adults, don't seem to find."

Recently Shimber Beris has been authorized to establish a free medical clinic near the school to help people in the fishing villages who have no medical care. The school also has accreditation for older students, through the cooperation of Wolsey Hall, Oxford, England.

FRONTIERS

Some Unanswered Charges

WHEN MANAS is reproached, as sometimes happens, for what seems to a reader to be "hostility" to free enterprise, and when that reader goes on to say, as happened recently, that he has had personal experience in commercial undertakings in which human individuality, creativity, and the basic decencies of human relations were given full scope—far more, presumably, than would be possible under the political control of a collectivist system—we find it difficult to know just what to say in reply. In any argument which sets the values of the individual against the values of an institution, it is natural to want to choose the side of the individual, but when the values of the individual are made the basis of an argument for a particular kind of institutional arrangement, the issue becomes cloudy. This is of course inevitable. No argument of this sort can be "pure."

Our correspondent is no doubt right, as far as he goes. But how would he react to a pamphlet which recently came our way—*Modern Industry in the Light of the Gospel*, by E. F. Schumacher, published by the Society for Democratic Integration in Industry (Houseman's Bookshop, London)?

Mr. Schumacher is no collectivist. He is not an ideological foe of "free enterprise." However, the content of his pamphlet makes its sponsors say:

> This is a pamphlet that should be read by every Christian. The domination of economics throughout life is the outstanding characteristic of modern society. Every concept of economics in industry today is rooted in materialism, destroying our spiritual life.

Mr. Schumacher puts together a closely argued indictment. While his language is that of a Christian moralist, this does not reduce one whit the force of what he says, even for free-thinking humanists or other non-Christians. The following will show the temper and scope of his analysis:

Modern industrial society is immensely complicated, immensely involved, making immense claims on man's time and attention. This, I think, must be accounted its greatest evil. Paradoxical as it may seem, modern industrial society, in spite of an incredible proliferation of labour-saving devices, has not given people more time to devote to their all-important spiritual tasks; it has made it exceedingly difficult for anyone, except the most determined, to find any time whatever for those tasks. In fact, I think I should not go far wrong if I asserted that the amount of genuine leisure available in a society is generally in inverse proportion to the amount of labour-saving machinery it employs. If you would travel, as I have done, from England to the United States and on to a country like Burma, you would not fail to see the truth of this assertion. What is the explanation of the paradox? It is simply that, *unless there are conscious efforts to the contrary,* wants will always rise faster than the ability to meet them.

The widespread substitution of mental strain for physical strain is no advantage from our point of view. Proper physical work, even if strenuous, does not absorb a great deal of the power of attention; but mental work does; so that there is no attention left over for the spiritual things that really matter. It is obviously much easier for a hard-working peasant to keep his mind attuned to the Divine than for a strained office worker.

I say, therefore, that it is a great evil—perhaps the greatest evil—of modern industrial society that, through its immensely involved nature, it imposes an undue nervous strain and absorbs an undue proportion of man's attention. Of course, it might be otherwise. It is still conceivable, for instance, that hitherto undeveloped countries might pick and choose what they wish to take over from Western industrialism, adopting only those things which really facilitate and enrich human life while rejecting all the frills and harmful elaborations. But there is no sign of this happening anywhere in the world. On the contrary, it is cinemas, television, transistor sets, aeroplanes and such like that catch on much more quickly than anything worthwhile.

Whether the tendency to raise wants faster than the ability to meet them is inherent in industrialism as such, or in the social form it has taken in the West, may be a debatable question. It is certain that it exists and that the social forms exacerbate it. In this country, expenditure on advertising falls only a little short of expenditure on all types of education. Industry declares that advertising is absolutely

necessary to create a mass market, to permit efficient mass production. But what is the great bulk of advertising other than the stimulation of greed, envy, and avarice? It cannot be denied that industrialism, certainly in its capitalist form, openly employs these human failings—at least three of the seven deadly sins—as its very motive force. From the viewpoint of the Gospels this must be accounted the very work of the devil. Communism, which rejects and derides the Gospels, does not appear to be bringing forth anything better; its main claim is that it will shortly "overtake" (as they say) Britain or even America. British Socialism once upon a time showed an awareness of this evil, which it attributed solely to the peculiar working of the private enterprise-and-profit system. But today, I am afraid, British Socialism has lost its bearings and presents itself merely as a device to raise the standard of living of the less affluent classes faster than could be done by private enterprise. However that may be, present-day industrial society everywhere shows this evil characteristic of incessantly stimulating greed, envy and avarice. It has produced a folklore of incentives which magnifies individual egotism in direct opposition to the teachings of the Gospel.

The first thing that ought to be said about this writer—if it needs to be said—is that he is neither partisan thinker nor doctrinaire moralist. His use of the Gospel categories of good and evil does not reduce the pertinence of his criticism. What he says has power because he measures the operation of the system he is examining in precisely the terms of value that ought to be used: *he tells us what it is doing to individual man.*

There is no answer to criticism of this sort, which is just, measured, and accurate. It speaks to the facts—not in behalf of some competing ideology, but in behalf of human beings.

We should like to quote the entirety of this pamphlet (which may be purchased for a shilling, about thirteen cents, but add for postage, from Houseman's Bookshop, 5 Caledonian Road, London, N.I), but must be content with one more passage:

> Mechanical, artificial, divorced from Nature, utilising only the smallest part of man's potential capabilities, it [the industrial system] sentences the great majority of workers to spending their working days in a way which contains no worthy challenge, no stimulus to self-perfection, no chance of development, no element of Beauty, Truth or Goodness. "Every man," it has been said, "should be a special kind of artist." How many men can be artists of any kind in their daily work? The basic aim of modern industrialism is not to make work satisfying but to raise productivity; its proudest achievement is labour saving whereby labour is stamped with the mark of undesirability. But what is undesirable cannot confer dignity so the working life of a labourer is a Life without dignity. The result, not surprisingly, is a spirit of sullen irresponsibility which refuses to be mollified by higher wage awards but is often only stimulated by them.
>
> In addition, industrial society, no matter how democratic in its political institutions, is autocratic in its methods of management. If the workers themselves were given more say in the organization of their work, they might be able to restore some interest and dignity to their daily tasks—but I doubt that they would. After all, they too, like everybody else, are members of modern industrial society and conditioned by the distorted scheme of values that pervades it. How should they know how to do things differently? It is a frequent experience that as soon as a working man finds himself saddled with managerial responsibility he begins to develop an almost uncanny understanding for and sympathy with the current preoccupations of management. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? Modern industrialism has produced its own coherent system of values, criteria, measurements, etc.; it all hangs together and cannot be tampered with except at the risk of breakdown. If anyone said "I reject the idolatry of productivity; I am going to ensure that every job is worthy of a Man," he would have reason to fear that he might be unable to pay the expected wages or, if he did, that it landed him straight in the bankruptcy court. All the same, autocratic management which treats men as "factors of production" instead of responsible human persons, is a grave evil leading to innumerable stunted or even wasted lives.
>
> Maybe a type of industrial society could be developed which was organized in much smaller units, with an almost infinite decentralization of authority and responsibility. From the point of view of the Gospels, a hierarchical structure, i.e., authority as such, is not an evil. But it must be of a size compatible, so to say, with the size of the human being. Structures made up of, say, a hundred people can still be fully democratic without falling into disorder. But structures employing many hundreds or

even thousands of people cannot possibly preserve order without authoritarianism, no matter how great the wish for democracy might be.

I have listed and discussed four main characteristics of modern industrial society which, in the light of the Gospels, must be accounted four great and grievous evils:

its vastly complicated nature;

its continuous stimulation of, and reliance on, the deadly sins of greed, envy, and avarice;

its destruction of the content and dignity of most forms of work; and

its authoritarian character owing to organization in excessively large units.

Since the champions of Free Enterprise commonly stress the importance of human freedom and the preservation of individuality, they have a serious obligation to consider the force of these judgments, which are almost identical in some respects to the charges directed against the collectivist forms of society.