

CONCERNING HUMAN GROWTH

TRUTH is said to reside in paradox, and perhaps only in paradox. At any rate, the single-voiced, unambiguous truths—concerned with matters that can be settled, once and for all—do not make the claim on either our minds or our longings that truth in paradox exerts. Nor do these flat certainties, once they are known, generate wondering inquiry. Only the truths on which the last word can never be said do this.

What we can affirm about the nature of man may be the best possible illustration of both the dilemmas and the resources of paradox. We say, for example, that all men are made of the same indefinable stuff, that all have the same potentialities, the same unpredictable promise and essential moral worth, leading us to declare, with what seems sufficient reason, that all men are *equal*. This is the foundation of our socio-political life, the source of common human dignity, the explanation we give for insisting that our free institutions are precious beyond any material value.

And yet, inseparably linked with the conception of equality is the enigmatic notion of *individuality*. Men, we say, are nonetheless different, and have the right to be different. To be equal, in the sense that one ball bearing in a set is exactly like every other—has the same weight, the same diameter, and the same hardness—is not what we mean by the equality of man. A man is equal in that his individuality is his own, not to be explained away by an emasculating determinism or rendered ineffectual by Procrustean laws. His development and flowering are processes to be guarded and cherished, not subjected to an excess of external management. He is equal to other men in his right to pursue his own ends.

These are some of the truths included in our knowledge of man, and at the level of theory they

satisfy us well enough. Only in practice do the truths at one end of the paradox constantly wear away at the meanings of the other end. There is no need to go into the resulting difficulties and contradictions, which are all about. To honor both ends of the paradox is to be wise, yet the men who attempt to translate wisdom into practical social systems have not been notably successful in achieving a balance between the claims of equality and individuality, and they fail especially when their principal means for gaining assent is the wrathful emotion solely concerned with redressing wrongs.

It is probably—almost certainly—the case that these two ideas, which are plainly moral ideas, the ideas of equality and individuality, are not enough knowledge to deal practically with human affairs. What can we add to them? Well, it is obvious that both man's equality and his individuality, while unmistakably real and present in principle, have imperfect development. What may be said about this? Various things have been said. The opinion long prevailed that man is constitutionally a sinner, deserving mainly constraint and punishment. Another opinion, often voiced today, is that he has but lately shaken off the habits of a jungle existence—that ferocity and hostility are barely hidden beneath the surface of the veneer of civilization. Neither of these views is of much use except to autocrats and tyrants and their literary case-makers.

Another view is that man has some *growing* to do. The idea of further growth for human beings does not sit well in company with the conception of him as basically a sinner. People who assist growth processes cannot be censorious. Nor is the person convinced that human life is by nature nasty, brutish, and short able to concern himself much with fostering learning. He is too busy guarding against the

ominous implications of his assumptions—too occupied in finding confirmation of his dark expectations and in matching them with preparations for control.

The service of growth does in fact involve some risks. In its favor it can be argued that while the alternatives may seem to involve fewer risks, they doom the dignity and ideal promise of the human enterprise to certain failure. Probably, in the long run, they doom it to material failure, too.

How, then, do men grow? We wish we knew! There is no area of human life of which we are more ignorant. There is of course some excuse for this. Not only is growth a subject to which we have given practically no attention, but it is also very difficult to understand. The most subtle treatises known to man deal with it only obscurely—in paradox. More easily comprehensible is the simple fact that growth does take place, that some men are better, wiser, more useful human beings than others. This is a fact, however, that has suffered systematic cultural suppression in our time, as a by-product if not a direct result of the energetic efforts of the reformers of the eighteenth century and after. It is clear, for example, that to speak of a man as "better, wiser, more useful" comes very close to calling him an aristocrat. We put an end to aristocracy in the eighteenth century, having ample historical reason for doing so. And if aristocrats claimed to be wise and superior, when in fact they were not, we shall not tolerate any praise of these objectives or attainments. This is something like the position of those who take pride in being against "peace," today, since the Communists, whether hypocritically or honestly, say they are for it. We take no risks with any of the virtues claimed by people we have learned to despise. *Those* virtues are by definition tools of deception. A man's a good man, enough of a man, just *the way he is*. This is the popular way of applying the idea of equality. It has its moral point at the political level—a vote for every man—but in other areas it becomes a denial of the

need or importance of growth. As John Schaar says of the birth of American society:

At the time of the founding, the doctrine and sentiment were already widespread that each individual comes into this world morally complete and self-sufficient, clothed with natural rights which are his by birth, and not in need of fellowship for moral growth and fulfillment. The human material of this new republic consisted of a gathering of men each of whom sought self-sufficiency and the satisfaction of his own desires.

Growth of a sort, of course, was involved. The people wanted to get rich, which was not after all surprising, since they had been poor and undernourished for so long. The Old World had almost vengeful scarcity economies. But *human* growth was not an idea that got much attention. Getting to heaven, after all, meant becoming a sort of angel, and the narrow rules connected with this achievement were not of much interest to men redressing balances and proudly proving themselves in a great variety of ways on earth. So growth, for our civilization, has been almost entirely an economic affair. Those who compile "goals for America" seem still persuaded of this objective, even though a surfeit of plenty and the misapplication of power seem at the root of most of our problems, today.

Other men, living in other times, have found other measures of human development more appropriate. There are schemes of human growth based upon intrinsic human qualities which once were the foundation of past civilizations. There was for example the ancient Indian caste system which, before it became simply a matter of heredity, had functioned as a kind of eschatological meritocracy. The dynamics of this system were Karma and Reincarnation, by means of which the individual soul moved through many different roles, gaining experience, learning the laws of life, finding out how to fulfill responsibility, until, at last, he became truly wise and could devote himself entirely to teaching others. We almost always judge this system by its attributes after it had fallen into evil ways and

hereditary stratification—overlooking, for example, when we say that Buddha rejected caste, that he did not reject the idea of individually earned human excellence. "Him," he said, "I call a Brahamana who is free from anger, devoted to duties, practices divine virtues, who is without craving and controlled. He wears his last body." For the Buddha the true badge of quality and human degree was always inner, hidden, though ineffaceable.

The same basic structure is provided for human development by Plato, as in the Myth of Er in the *Republic* and in the *Phaedrus* myth, as well as in the *Phaedo*. Only the philosopher, Socrates says in the *Phaedo* (83), frees himself of the delusion "that whatever causes the most violent emotion is the plainest and truest reality," whether the emotion be of pleasure or pain, and overcoming in this way the bonds of earthly existence he is ultimately "rid forever of human ills." This is another way of suggesting that "he wears his last body." In the *Phaedrus* (248) Plato makes an almost playful classification of the degrees of human growth. At the top of the scale he places the philosopher and seeker after the godlike. Next comes the king or ruler who abides by law. Third is the businessman, statesman, or trader; then comes the athlete, his trainer, and the physician. Fifth are "prophets" or priests, followed by poets and other imitative artists. The artisan or farmer is seventh, the Sophist or demagogue eighth, and last and lowest is the tyrant.

The fact that it is so easy to quarrel with these priorities might be taken as evidence of the general unreliability of any attempt to fix the degree of human development in terms of earthly occupation, although few will object to his placing demagogues and tyrants at the bottom, or deny philosophers room at the top.

Systems less culturally comprehensive were simpler. Religious views affected by Gnostic teachings of human development generally included two broad classifications, variously

named, such as *Credentes* and the *Perfecti*—the former being ordinary men who longed to learn the truth, the latter those who had attained some degree of initiation and could be thought of as teachers and wise men. The last European representatives of these ideas were the Cathari, known as the Albigensians in Southern France, and, a little earlier, the Bogomiles of what is now Bulgaria. One might add that Masonry, with its various degrees, bears internal evidence of being derived from such beliefs in antique religion.

Actually, without the conception of inner growth, admission of human differences becomes morally very difficult. Inevitably, any social theory which takes them into account must either embrace some of the old ideas of soul evolution, or their equivalent, or protect itself from abuses by adopting corresponding ethical ideas such as Gandhi held, including rejection of political power, non-violence, and a life of service to others. The better the man, Gandhi said in effect, the more he gives up, starting with coercive power. It should be added as a matter of course that Gandhi was a wholly convinced believer in the old Indian idea of soul-evolution.

It is notable, in this connection, that when Western thought turned to the general problem of the classification of differences, the mode chosen was always historical or collective. Auguste Comte (1798-1857) was the originator of a progressive scheme of cultural evolution. He declared the Law of the Three States, under which three different sorts of explanation are offered for the phenomena of experience. First men make a religious or supernatural explanation. Then come the explanations provided by metaphysical theory. The last and final explanation is the scientific or positive explanation. Comte hoped to bring to the problems of social order, through social science, the same certainty that he thought had been achieved in chemistry and physiology. A pyramid of scientific knowledge, with mathematics and the physical disciplines at the base, would finally

displace the illusions of theology and the speculations of metaphysics.

The importance of Comte in shaping the form and direction of modern sociology can hardly be measured, even though his almost fanatical ardor placed limits upon his direct influence. Except for Charles Jung's doctrine of individuation, there has been little significant thinking about *individual* development or growth until late in the twentieth century, with the publication of Maslow's psychology of self-actualization. There has, however, long been a hunger for some kind of transcendental thinking, and concern for the meaning of individual life, which openly surfaced in the nineteen forties in the "quest for identity" literature, and in the appearance of various "growth" psychologies which were in some ways a revision of psychoanalysis. The symptoms of this hunger have been various. The incredibly large circulation of popular astrology magazines is related to it. The cult of "art" and the obsessive preoccupation with "creativity" are evidence of unsatisfied being-needs, along with less admirable drives. Actually, the entire movement of Humanistic psychology is both herald of and response to this hunger. The conquests of Zen Buddhism among Western intellectuals doubtless marked a watershed in serious opinion, representing a vast swing away from exclusively historical or cultural dynamics and an open break with the deterministic habits of thinking about the individual which collectivist premises inevitably produce.

We are still, of course, "empirical" in our approach to the basic questions—to the mystery of individuality and the unanswered questions about human development—but the background atmosphere, the side-influences, the illustrations used by lecturers, and the analogies suggested are increasingly unconfined. It is no longer necessary, for example, to apologize for using an expression like "self-knowledge." There is wide intuitive acceptance of "insightful" old ideas.

There are also direct discussions of individual human development, with reasoned comparison of research findings with what is known about social development and discussion of the tensions between the two forms of growth. A particularly good example of this is found in a paper by Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Child as Moral Philosopher," published in *Psychology Today* for September, 1968. Dr. Kohlberg found in children three distinct levels of moral thinking, which he felt able to identify as separate moral philosophies or views of the socio-moral world. He followed the subjects of this research—seventy-five boys—into maturity, the term of study encompassing about twelve years. These are his conclusions:

We can speak of the child as having his own morality or series of moralities. . . .

The *preconventional* level is the first of the three levels of moral thinking; the second level is *conventional*, and the third *postconventional* or autonomous. While the preconventional child (the level of most children from four to ten) is often "well-behaved" and is responsive to cultural labels of good and bad, he interprets these labels in terms of their physical consequences (punishment, reward, exchange of favors) or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules and labels of good and bad. . . .

The second or *conventional* level also can be described as conformist, but that is perhaps too smug a term. Maintaining the expectations and rules of the individual's family, group or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right. There is concern not only with *conforming* to the individual's social order but in *maintaining*, supporting and justifying this order.

The *postconventional* level is characterized by a major thrust toward autonomous principles which have validity and application apart from authority of the group of persons who hold them and apart from the individual's identification with those persons or groups.

The levels of course overlap and particular steps of movement from one level to the next are unpredictable, save that, in general, they do take place. Dr. Kohlberg says:

All movement is forward in sequence, and does not skip steps. Children may move through these

stages at varying speeds, of course, and may be found half in and half out of a particular stage. An individual may stop at any given stage and at any age, but if he continues to move, he must move in accordance with these steps. . . . In a general and culturally universal sense, these steps lead toward an increased *morality* of value judgment. . . . Each step of development then is a better cognitive organization than the one before it, one which takes account of everything present in the previous stage, but making new distinctions and organizing them into a more comprehensive or more equilibrated structure. The fact that this is the case has been demonstrated by a series of studies indicating that children and adolescents comprehend all stages up to their own, but not more than one stage beyond their own. And importantly, *they prefer this next stage*.

Who might represent the postconventional stage? Dr. Kohlberg suggests Socrates, Lincoln, and Thoreau as examples—as men who speak in tongues which are not culture-bound, who make reference to ideal principles and offer lucid applications of them.

It is of interest that in the Fall 1970 *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* Clare W. Graves presents a more complex study of this sort, using eight instead of three levels, the six lower ones being expressive of Maslow's deficiency-needs, the two highest representing being-needs.

What can we learn from such investigations? Some important lessons are obvious. It is clear for example, that a mass society will have many people in it who, for whatever reason, stopped moving at the pre-conventional level. The majority, almost certainly, will be at the conventional level, while those who reach the postconventional elevation are rare indeed. Anyone who acknowledges the reality of these differences will see the folly of a socio-legal system which, in the name of democracy or "equality," attempts to rule and contain all the people at a single level. He may also see that harmonious interchange between the various levels—that is, relationships encouraging persons on the higher levels to help and serve those on the lower ones—is best achieved in *small* social aggregations. The control necessities of

enormous populations—like the control necessities of enormous schools—make poor growth environments.

When growth opportunities are withheld, or space for them is denied, a process of frustration and reversal must surely take place. Failure to recognize the differences among men, inability through rigid structure to adapt to the vital needs of these differences, and ideological suppression of their reality—these are undoubtedly basic contributing causes to the moral disorder and social breakdowns in our society. People who are freely growing manage somehow to minimize the effects of their weaknesses and faults, which still exist but don't do so much harm because of the positive development going on. Frustrate growth, transition, human unfoldment, and *everything* that we are, the good along with the bad, appears in its worst light. There should be foundation for basic social principles in such studies.

REVIEW

VOICE OF AMERICA

THERE is reason to think that we should make an effort to get young Southerners to do more writing about the condition and prospects of the country in general, and invite the Eastern intellectuals to occupy themselves in other ways for a while. This is an impression which grows from reading the long extract in the December *Harper's* from Bill Moyers' book, to be published in February. Moyers is only one man, and not a sufficient sample, but the present editor of *Harper's*, who doubtless had something to do with choosing Moyers as a contributor, is Willie Morris, who was born and brought up in Yazoo City, Mississippi. *North Toward Home*, Morris' life story, was published in 1967 (revised in *MANAS* for April 3, 1968), about the time that he joined *Harper's*. He was then thirty-two years old. Bill Moyers grew up in Louisiana. He came to Washington, D.C., as a student intern in 1954. Early in the sixties he became Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, and was later special assistant and close adviser to President Johnson (1964-65). Later, while he was publisher of *Newsday*, a Long Island daily, the paper won two Pulitzer Prizes. He is now thirty-six.

Listening to America is the account of what he saw and the people he talked to during a 13,000-mile tour of the country by bus, in the fall of 1970. He took a tape recorder and interviewed hundreds of people. An introductory comment by *Harper's* seems accurate. "Moyers knows, more than most young political activists of our day, just how taut and thin is the thread of civilization which holds together our disparate nation, and his report is free of the rancor and dogma which have muddied too many of the contemporary descriptions of our troubles."

You sense the broad humanism of Moyers' outlook by what he chooses to write about. The value in this kind of reporting is its direct and simple quest for the human qualities of people in

relation to their lives and their problems. The conclusion—or a passage placed at the conclusion of the extract appearing in *Harper's* (some 45,000 words)—brings this meditative comment:

People are more anxious and bewildered than alarmed. They don't know what to make of it all: of long hair and endless war, of their children deserting their country, of congestion on their highways and overflowing crowds in their national parks; of art that does not uplift and movies that do not reach conclusions; of intransigence in government and violence; of politicians who come and go while problems plague and persist; of being lonely surrounded by people, and bored with so many possessions; of the failure of organizations to keep the air breathable, the water drinkable, and man peaceable; of being poor. I left Houston convinced that liberals and conservatives there shared three basic apprehensions: they want the war to stop, they do not want to lose their children, and they want to be proud of their country. But it was the same everywhere.

There is a myth that the decent thing has almost always prevailed in America when the issues were clearly put to the people. It may not always happen. I found among people an impatience, an intemperance, an isolation which invites opportunists who promise too much and castigate too many. And I came back with questions. Can the country be wise if it hears no wisdom? Can it be tolerant if it sees no tolerance? Can the people I met escape their isolation if no one listens?

These seem at least some of the right questions. It isn't exactly "leadership" in the old sense that is wanted, but rather a lot of good examples of the right thing to do. When things start to go the wrong way, the ugliness in human nature comes to the surface. Sometimes a handful of people in a small town can keep things going right. Bill Moyers visited some places where this was happening. He found that the good men were often pretty quiet men. After they gained respect, they exerted a great deal of influence. The worst situations developed in areas where nobody cared and nobody bothered.

The last pages of the extract are devoted to the nation's capital. Moyers rode around with two Washington policemen—one white, the other

black—and watched them do their job. It was answering calls to scenes of violence, crime, and other disturbances—a monotonous and discouraging evening. Then he talked to the public-affairs officer for the Metropolitan Police Department:

"I am not a hysterical man," he said, "and I think I know as much about the statistics of crime in this town as anyone, but, yes, I have to say that I would not want my wife to shop after dark downtown. That's a helluva thing to say about the nation's capital. I do not like saying it. But it is true. Our crime rate has been falling in the past few months but it's still bad. There are a lot of reasons for it. One is that we have a lot of criminals. Period. Human nature does have a dark side; some men will kill, steal, beat, and rape simply because that side of their nature runs them. But that isn't all. The man who says that crime is not aggravated in this town because of conditions social and political is a fool or a bigot. Jerry Wilson [Chief of Police in Washington] has an almost totally black constituency and a power structure that is dominated by Southern whites. The same Congressmen who get up and say we have to send another hundred million dollars to South Vietnam to help their fight for self-determination oppose every dime spent on self-determination right here in the nation's capital. Why, the General Hospital here ran out of penicillin, did you know that? Our court system is an abysmal failure, especially the juvenile courts. They're bad as they are and there aren't enough of them. Our corrections program would do justice to the Stone Age. School children are being taught in low-grade slums. Most of the best teachers have fled to the suburbs in Maryland and Virginia. Until three years ago we didn't even have a city college. But what do we do? We do things like tearing down the slums in the southwest part of town, which was a good thing, and then turning that area into luxury living, which wasn't a good thing. When you and I shave in the morning, we're looking at the cause of crime, because we support a political system that keeps a city of close to a million living on scraps thrown at it by people up there"—and he motioned toward Capitol Hill—"who deep in their hearts hate the place. We've got lots of households with two color television sets but Washington doesn't have a good rehabilitation center for kids. We've got lots of country clubs and Cadillacs but no narcotics-addiction program worth a damn in the capital. We've spent \$356 billion in four years for national defense and more than \$20 billion

for highways and yet if you will look out there"—and he pointed across the dining room of the Hilton Hotel through large windows overlooking part of the city—"you will see the roofs of some of the worst slums in the country. Right on over those rooftops you are in one of the worst crime districts anywhere. I couldn't even tell you how bad it is because I am sure we don't get more than 25 per cent of all crimes actually reported to us. And those statistics don't touch white collar crime. One officer of the Riggs National Bank told me that his bank's losses to robbery are only about 10 per cent of what they lose through internal dishonesty. But that doesn't make the papers. . . . We should be a model for the country. We're a model all right. We're a model of what has gone wrong in this country. With all the problems we have, everything's breaking down and we can't even govern ourselves right here in the capital."

After that, you need to turn back the pages to where Moyers tells about what is happening in Johnsonville, South Carolina, partly because of a modest community planner brought in by the head of a textile mill so large that people call Johnsonville a company town. After one of his achievements, the planner remarked: "The important thing is *they* decided," a statement of which Moyer said: "I wrote it down verbatim because at the moment I thought it might be the only sentence he would utter all day."

Particularly poignant are the accounts of runaway children—teen-agers, that is, mostly girls, who turn up in San Francisco and Los Angeles, or more often are not located because of the difficulty of finding anyone in suburbs which stretch on and on. This subject came up again in Moyers' meetings with business executives who are disturbed about their own miscalculations and mistakes. In Seattle, one man said to him:

"Where is the country going? Where is each one of us going? I think this is what is bothering the young although I don't think they have the practical experience to know what to do about it. I feel that I have betrayed myself. I've done a lot of looking at myself. What in the hell, I've asked myself, have you done with all those things you were thinking about in college? I know this sounds schmaltzy, but truthfully I haven't done very much. . . .

"A month ago my own daughter just disappeared. She left—no note, no word, nothing. Just disappeared. I've been lying awake nights asking, Where did I go wrong? What happened? How come she didn't come in and say, 'I've got to go, Daddy. I'm going to pull out.' . . . She called last Friday night. She wouldn't leave a phone number or an address. She just said she was in New York, working as a typist for \$100 a week. When her mother got on the phone she said, 'It's okay, mother, I'm being a good girl.' I guess she thinks we are more concerned about her chastity than we are about her as a person. Maybe that's the problem. She's a sensitive child. We thought she had a suitcase full of clothes but it turned out to be full of books—Tolstoi, Dostoevsky, introspective writers. . . . I wanted a phone number, an address, some way to get in touch with her if anything happened. But she said not to worry and wouldn't give them to me. What happened? . . ."

This same man had said earlier:

"I think rushing into that fantastic progress caused more heartache and suffering than it was worth. The people were saying, 'More, more, more,' so the airlines said, 'More, more, more, and Boeing said, 'More, more, more.' We scrounged and grabbed and fought for dominance, and when we got it, we lost it. All this running and shoving to build a structure that suddenly we don't need. And look at all the people who got hurt. Business has got to change. I think it will because the children of so many businessmen are becoming hippies."

Finding encouragement in what Moyers writes does not seem vain or misleading.

COMMENTARY

"COTTAGE INDUSTRY TECHNOLOGY"

NOT long ago MANAS received a letter from a young man in prison—a conscientious objector. He had asked for some back numbers containing material by E. F. Schumacher, and we had sent them to him. A chance reading of Schumacher's "Buddhist Economics" had aroused his interest.

He enjoyed reading the other articles, he said, but he was also disappointed. What about some "intermediate technology" for the industrially *advanced* countries? he asked. The point is a good one, although it shouldn't be made to Schumacher as any sort of reproach, since there is a limit to the number of problems a man can work on. And one could say, as Schumacher does, that the primary need lies in the underdeveloped countries, although it is a need for education as much as a need for overcoming poverty through appropriate economic assistance.

Meanwhile, there is plenty of technical education available in the United States. Devising small production units to help with the decentralization of industry in countries like the United States is a job for imaginative young engineers. (A lot of them, incidentally, are now out of jobs, but they needn't be out of work.) Years ago Borsodi pointed out that only the American obsession with "bigness" caused the designers of production equipment to think in terms of enormous installations. This is exactly the wrong direction to go in, today. Why couldn't there be some sort of "cottage industry technology" to provide livelihood for those who are mechanically inclined and want to get away from congested urban areas? Combining modest production with subsistence agriculture might make a balanced way of life for a lot of people, and a balanced family economy, too.

We might develop a wide variety of ways to make a living if we could recover some of our famous "Yankee ingenuity" and ally it with an "intentional community" spirit. A few people have

thought and written about this. Arthur Morgan is one of them. He realized years ago that the small community is the seed-bed of society, and his book, *Industries for Small Communities*, tells how a college can be a catalyst in the healthful development of small-town economics. Morgan is now ninety-two years old. He may not write any more books. It is time for some younger men to get busy along these lines.

CHILDREN

. . . and Ourselves

INDIAN SCHOOL

[An Indian reader, Dwarko Sundrani, who has been active for years in the Sarvodaya Movement, and lately in rural education, has sent us an account of a school in Bihar, Samonwaya Vidyapith, which should be of general interest. American readers may be particularly impressed by the fact that a self-supporting school becomes an actual possibility in an "under-developed," agricultural country—an achievement difficult to imagine in lands where advanced industrialization and the artificialities of convenience- and gadget-dominated standards of living have created barriers to self-reliant life on the land.]

OUR Sarvodaya movement undertakes development work among the weakest section of society, so I have had a chance to work amongst this class. The Sarvodaya approach is to educate the masses and involve them in their own development. I found the progress very slow, due to old habits, customs, and traditions. Therefore I came to the conclusion that we should teach the children an art of living from an early age. . . . So the idea of the school emerged.

The main problems of our country are poverty and ignorance, both of which are interdependent. If we try to get rid of poverty, ignorance stands in the way. If we work against ignorance, poverty is the obstacle. Thus we need a project that can solve both problems at the same time. Mahatma Gandhi suggested basic education, which he envisaged as education through craft. The basic craft of this country is agriculture, and so we have started this school to teach agricultural and connected subjects such as dairy farming and food processing.

Of India's population, 82 per cent live in the villages, so naturally our work is there. Yet it is difficult to find persons willing to work in the villages. Even the few people in the village who are educated want to go to the towns and cities in search of work and money, making a constant "brain drain." In this school we intend to take two children from each village in the nearby area. We want to train the boys in agriculture, dairy work, and food processing, and the girls as nurses, and then train them all as

organizers. They will earn their livelihood on their farms and organize development work for the village.

At present the government runs the schools, so that the politicians are able to influence education and mould the boys in their own pattern. It is almost a kind of brainwashing. Education, therefore, must be outside government control. So we have decided to run this school without government support or recognition.

In this school we shall keep the children for eight years. For the first five, scholarships will be provided, but during the remaining three years the child will be expected to both earn and learn. This will give him the capacity to earn his livelihood when he leaves school. We have seventy acres of wasteland for the school which we have reclaimed and are developing. The plan for the future is that with the sale of agricultural and dairy produce the school will no longer need financial help from the outside. This adds the dimension of self-sufficiency to education.

Periodically, we have joint meetings of parents, teachers and children. The parents come to see the school, the agricultural projects and the dairy, etc., and stay for a day. There are discussions of the development, which help to integrate the people with the project.

At present many kind-hearted people from different countries are helping us. All the eighty-eight children have been "adopted" by individuals, groups, or schools, bringing new contacts for the children. We send these friends reports, photographs, and information, leading to exchange of ideas and more mutual understanding. The name we have given our school means "The School of Harmony."

[The foregoing is from a paper on the purposes of the school. What follows is taken from school news bulletins.]

With the assistance of Oxfam we have purchased fifteen head of cattle from Rajasthan at a great distance from the State of Bihar, because they are superior in breed to any we have here. Not only do the cows produce more milk than Bihar cows, but

the bullocks are strong and hard-working for use at the school. Our dairy has great importance because all the food at the school is vegetarian. So we seek high-protein foods for the children's meals. Milk is excellent, and we are producing soybean and groundnut (peanuts) on our farm, both being rich in protein.

We have made much progress with our land, having reclaimed many acres which only a year ago were dense forest. There is much work in clearing and leveling the land, and preparing it for crops. But people from the villages near the school help us in our work. Our first crop was small because our irrigation system needs further development and new land takes several years of cultivation to be highly productive. Our yields, however, are said to be impressive.

While we farm and teach, we also build. We recently completed a kitchen and dairy building and are now working on our third well, which is to be twenty-five feet in diameter. Some young French and British volunteers called "Brothers to All Men" are assisting us with the well.

Many of the children have made remarkable progress since their arrival. In our school we give no degrees or examinations. Our method is not competitive. We wish only to give them a sound academic education and to teach good farming techniques to the boys and nursing to the girls. It is our hope that when they are adults they will return to the villages from which they came and act as a wedge between their people and the poverty of their past.

[From a later bulletin:]

In the last eight months we have completed the construction of our third well. This is thirty-four feet in diameter.

The water source is inadequate. We are planning to deepen the well after the monsoons. . . . There is electricity in the school now. We are running four electric pumping sets for irrigation, one milling wheel for flour, and one chaff-cutter.

We had a good crop of wheat—about 4000 kgs. We cultivated summer paddy, sugar cane, vegetables, and bananas. But we could not irrigate

these crops in summer due to inadequate water. The crops were damaged. We now have 50 acres of cultivable land. If we want to make our school self-sufficient, independent of outside financial help, which is our ambition, we must double our water supply. There is rock underground, so we need a rock-drilling machine to make one or two tube wells for increased irrigation. While this year's rain is below normal, our maize, rice, vegetables, sugar cane, and fodder for cows are progressing well. From our dairy we have organic fertilizer, so we are using 50 per cent less inorganic fertilizer than last year. We have started to improve seed for vegetables and soybeans for distribution among the villages. Last month we added 115 fruit trees to our orchard. On a day devoted to the visit of a hundred farmers, mostly parents of our children, we demonstrated rice transplantation and provided two talks on the subject in the school.

The children are developing and growing, but we have a problem of sickness—mainly fever, cough, and eye and ear trouble. We need a small medical service unit at the school and are accumulating funds for a hospital building.

Education goes well. The children are taught only two and a half hours a day, yet the whole daily life is teaching. They do wonderful work on the farm, in the dairy and the kitchen. They have prepared four folk dances and know many folk songs, and are energetic in sports and swimming. They have decided with the teachers that there should be absolutely no punishment. A group of twenty children has taken the responsibility of looking after all the children, so far as discipline and work are concerned.

We have had many visitors, both official and non-official, from all over the country and from abroad. In this age of science, man has achieved the means of living, but he has yet to achieve relationships which have no label of caste, class, colour, creed, or nation. One can see this in our school—a universal family!

DWARKO SUNDRANI

FRONTIERS

How Ho Became a Communist

IN the Communications section of the *Saturday Review* for Dec. 12, both the editor of the section, Richard L. Tobin, and Walter Cronkite, television newscaster, argue for freedom of the news media, pointing to attacks and restrictive practices by the Vice President and the President, and high officials of the judiciary. Mr. Cronkite stresses the importance to a democratic society of a press free to present all viewpoints, and able to function without intimidation or threat. For contrast, he speaks of the controlled Soviet press in Russia, where, as a result, there is "no dissent over national policy, no argument about the latest weapons system." Yet as a member of the working press in America he suggests that the voluntary censorship which may be practiced here "profiting from the news by pandering to public taste—is almost as frightening." Other articles in this section deal with the decline of the syndicated "Sunday supplements"—only two of them are left—and the "joint operating agreements" by which the economically threatened daily newspapers are often able to survive.

A reading of this section supplies ample evidence of the mess the newspapers and other news media are in. The reports, however, suffer the defect of nearly all news stories. They tell what has happened, but do little to suggest why. Yet one clue is provided by Mr. Tobin—in a summary of an address by Mrs. Katherine Graham, president of the Washington Post Company, at a recent meeting of a national journalistic fraternity. She spoke of the findings of two pollsters:

The first was Lou Harris's discovery that 72 per cent of the best-educated Americans are among those most distrustful of the press; the second, George Gallup's personal observation that "never in my time has journalism of all types—book publishing, television, radio, newspapers, magazines—been held in such low esteem. . . . We have raised up a new kind of person in the United States during the last three decades. He's much better educated, more enlightened, and he's no longer satisfied with obsolete practices, the tired formulas that we have handed down in journalism, all designed for a different kind

of person brought up in an entirely different kind of age."

While Gallup's comment is somewhat ambiguous, the general distrust of the press is surely justified. And the judgment of John Tebbel, who writes on the economic problems of the big dailies, is to the point:

The primary fact to be remembered is that, whatever the philosophical rights and wrongs may be, newspapers are a *business*, and they have been since the turn of the century, when advertising began to be the dominant factor instead of circulation, and when the era of personal journalism began its slow demise. Once advertising became the lifeblood of the newspaper, the character of the industry began to change. True, circulation and advertising were still interdependent and interrelated—the publisher had to deliver the one to get the other—but now it was a competition principally for dollars, not people. This development, coinciding with the gradual disappearance of the great entrepreneurs (Hearst and McCormack were the last of them), also changed the role of newspapers in society. They were no longer the personal organs of powerful men who could play the role of kingmaker in politics, but devices to sell goods, and secondarily to provide news and entertainment in proportions varying with each newspaper. The editorial page, with some rare exceptions, remains what it has always been, a luxuriant garden of ego outlets, but not even many publishers pretend that it any longer has a profound effect on political or social developments.

Television and radio, of course, are another sort of device to sell goods, and the news is secondary.

Mr. Cronkite tells what he does:

A major problem is imposed by the clock. In an entire half-hour news broadcast we speak only as many words as there are on two-thirds of one page of a standard newspaper. . . . There are twenty items in an average broadcast—some but a paragraph long, true, but all with the essential information to provide at least a guide to our world that day. . . . The transient, evanescent quality of our medium—the appearance and disappearance of our words and pictures at almost the same instant—imposes another of our severe problems.

He suggests that film clips and brief documentaries that "expose weakness in our democratic fabric" and "graphics that in a few

seconds communicate a great deal of information" compensate for such limitations.

Well, perhaps Mr. Cronkite is a good defender, but much more important, one might think, would be to contribute a more sagacious analysis of what any press—even the best—can do, and what is really beyond its power. Such intelligent candor might lay a foundation for generating new respect for journalism. Usually, its role and service in a democratic society are exaggerated beyond all reason. Walter Lippmann, for example, certainly the dean of journalists in the United States, pointed out in 1922 that all that the press can do is move the beam of a searchlight "restlessly about, bringing one episode and then another out of darkness into vision." He added:

Men cannot do the work of the world by this light alone. They cannot govern society by episodes, incidents, and eruptions. It is only when they work by a steady light of their own, that the press, when it is turned upon them, reveals a situation intelligible enough for a popular decision. The trouble lies deeper than the press, and so does the remedy.

Add to this rare common sense what was said, at about the same time, by G. K. Chesterton:

After the Great War our public began to be told of all sorts of nations being emancipated. It had never been told a word about their being enslaved. We were called upon to judge of the justice of the settlements, when we had never been allowed to hear of the very existence of the quarrels. People would think it pedantic to talk about the Serbian epics and they prefer to speak in plain every-day language about the Yugo-Slavonic international new diplomacy; and they are quite excited about something they call Czecho-Slovakia without apparently having ever heard of Bohemia. Things that are as old as Europe are regarded as more recent than the very latest claims pegged out on the prairies of America. It is very exciting; like the last act of a play to people who have only come into the theatre just before the curtain falls. But it does not conduce to knowing what it is all about.

What, for instance, do the American people know of Ho Chih Minh? There is no secrecy about this man's career, only silence in the press. Wonderful story material is in the Congressional Record—in, for example, the report of a hearing of

the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 13, 1970. The witness whom we shall quote here was David Schoenbrun, now a journalist, who in 1944 was an intelligence officer on the staff of General Eisenhower. In that capacity he came to know Ho Chih Minh well, since Ho was an ally of the United States in the war with Japan. Mr. Schoenbrun told the Senate Committee many of the things he learned from and about Ho:

He also said, and I think it is interesting to note, that when he was a youngster—let us see, he was born in 1890, so in 1918 he would have been 28 years old, a young man in Paris, he said he was one of hundreds of thousands who stood on the Champs Elysee and cheered the great man of the world, Woodrow Wilson, who came to propose self-determination and he went out to Versailles with a memorandum from his people thanking the great American President for his offer of self-determination and was deeply disappointed when he never got an answer from the State Department delegation and that Woodrow Wilson did nothing about self-determination for the Vietnamese in 1918 at the Versailles Conference.

He explained to me that one of his friends said there had been a revolution in Russia and why did he not write to the Russians. There was a man named "Lenin" who offered the same things to people and so he wrote Lenin and it is interesting that Lenin did write back and offered him a scholarship to the University of Moscow and he said to me, "That is how I became a Communist." He said, "Maybe if Woodrow Wilson had answered me I would have gone to Princeton University" [laughter] "and been a leader of a student protest movement."

It is funny, but it is very sad, it is very sad, distinguished Senators, to think that our country has meant so much to so many people for 50 years and that our rhetoric for self-determination has excited so many peoples, but that in practice we have not followed through, and I think that Vietnam is a particular case of the tragic gap between American reality, between American promises and American performances

There ought to have been the making of a good news story here, even for Mr. Cronkite.