VOLUME X, NO. 37
SEPTEMBER 11, 1957

# SUSPENDED IN AIR

A CORRESPONDENT intrigued by "The Age of Climax" (MANAS, July 3) invites a return to the question: "Does history exhibit an intelligible order?" The discussion in the article named, he says, "was tantalizing but inconclusive."

This question, our correspondent proposes, "appears to be engaging the attention of the West more than ever before: the meaning of its history and the meaning of all human history."

Our earlier discussion may have been tantalizing, and we certainly hope it was inconclusive, since conclusive judgments about the meaning of history have brought more bloodshed during the past two thousand years than any other cause. They brought religious persecutions and wars; they raised the dragon's-teeth spawn of the Nazis, nurtured the Communists, and have armed with righteousness every man and party which have sought to club other human beings into behaving as they "ought."

Yet men are bound to think about the meaning of history and to try to discover what it is. This is the problem which tortured Tolstoy, as Isaiah Berlin shows so brilliantly in *The Hedgehog and the Fox.* "What is truth?", asked Pilate; in our time, we phrase the question differently: "What is history?" It is the same question, with the added burden of seeking the truth for all mankind, instead of only for the questioning individual. This is perhaps the "sense" of our time, what uniqueness it has, as a period of history. We cannot think privately, for ourselves alone. It is certain that the strength of "collectivist" thinking, whatever its fallacies and mistakes, derives from a deep instinct for human brotherhood which may be misled but will not be denied.

The alternation of human thought between belief that history has a great transcendent meaning, and that it has not, is a little like the youth who pulls off the petals of a daisy, saying to himself, "She loves me, she loves me not."

The splendor of Hegel's great "organic" truths about history wanes into the tyranny of the State and the compulsions of the Commissars to prove that Marx was "right." With the reaction against imposing doctrines of historical "truth" come the lesser truths of the empiricists and the pluralists—the truths which leave you elbow-room, which cannot be blue-printed into a "way of life" and made to support a social system that is straight out of God or the "laws of Nature."

After the second world war, one of the popular magazines, probably the *New Yorker,* printed an article called "The Great American Fish Fry." It was about the state of mind of the returning G.I.'s. They weren't coming home to make the world go right again. They just wanted to go fishing. They knew about Crusades. They'd been on one. Philosophers are not so very different from G.I.'s. There are times when only the little truths seem worth pursuing. "The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing." The day of the foxes follows a time of crusades and promotion of the "big" truths which turned out to be not so, or not what we thought.

Yet the "little truths" of the fox philosophy create a kind of vacuum which eventually fills with the tyranny of aimless lives. Eventually, men begin to long for some great idea to give themselves to, to lift themselves out of the trivialities which have slowly occupied the territory cleared by the free spirit of skepticism. Then, as today, Hedgehoggism becomes popular again.

But do we dare become hedgehogs? Is it possible to believe that some larger meaning hides behind the confusions and duplicities of history, without getting carried away?

This question is artificial unless the matter of how "truth" is determined is considered. If, for example, you believe that the slow process of accumulating facts about the world and the people in

it will some day flower into a genuine certainty about life and its meaning, then the question can have no real meaning for you. If you think that science has replaced philosophy, that discovery by some men can solve ultimate problems for others, then reading such discussions as this is a waste of time.

But if, on the other hand, you are puzzled by the fact that knowledge does not seem to bring wisdom; if, looking about you, it appears that technology has failed to create the good life—is, indeed, irrelevant to the good life; and if you are willing to embrace the uncertainty of a man who prefers an honest insecurity to confidence in the generally accepted "truths" of his time, then the question has a very great meaning.

Well, for a practical answer, we would say that the "larger meaning," if it exists, must be conceived of as having absolutely no relation to or dependence upon armies or navies; and no relation or dependence upon preachers or propagandists. The only man who can help us at all in the quest for the larger meaning of history is the man who holds a dialogue with himself, and permits you to listen. If he wants to "convert" you, he is the Enemy. Only if he encourages you to independent discovery can he be called a friend.

Why bother? Can't we get along without "larger meanings"? The fact seems to be that we can't. At least, it seems only a petty conceit of a rather bad hundred years or so of history that we can do without larger meanings.

The word "organon" has a use here. An "organon" is a tool for the acquisition and organization of knowledge. The scientific method is an organon. But what about the capacity for living with wisdom and serenity? We have no organon for that. We have a lot of talk about it, but no organon. We seem to fear an actual test of our wisdom. That is, we want to be tested by conventional criteria, since we have given some attention to getting ready to be judged by conventional criteria.

An organon of wisdom would not have to be overtly metaphysical. Lao-tse's *Tao Te Ching* is a most remarkable book in this respect. Some passages from *The Parting of the Way*, a valuable commentary on Lao-tse by Holmes Welch, just published by the Beacon Press, will illustrate. In a summary of the idea of *wu wei*, or inaction, Mr. Welch writes:

> *Wu wei* does not mean to avoid all action, but rather all hostile, aggressive action. Many kinds of action are innocent. Eating and drinking, making love, ploughing a wheat-field, running a lathe—these *may* be aggressive acts, but generally they are not. Conversely, acts which are generally aggressive, like the use of military force, may be committed with such an attitude that they perfectly exemplify *wu wei.* The Taoist understands the Law of Aggression and the indirect ways that it can operate. He knows that virtuousness or non-conformity can be as aggressive as insults or silence. He knows that even to be non-aggressive can be aggression, if by one's nonaggressiveness one makes others feel inferior. It is to make another person feel inferior that is the essence of aggression.
>
> It is because of this Law that the Taoist practices *wu wei.* He sees spreading all about him the vicious circles of lying, hatred, and violence. His aim is not merely to avoid starting new circles, but to interrupt those that have been already started. Through his peculiar behavior he hopes to save the world.
>
> The Taoist well understands that *wu wei* is ineffectual if his compassion and humility are worn like a hat. These attitudes, to have their effect, must come from the roots of his nature. It is not easy for him to find these roots. . . .

The astonishing thing about the *Tao Te Ching* is that it is addressed to the rulers of States, rather than to the ordinary man. Lao-tse is the original advocate of *laissez faire:*

> Government controls defeat themselves, for "they may allay the main discontent, but only in a manner which produces further discontents." Therefore, "rule a big country as you would fry small fish," *i.e.,* do not keep stirring them or they will turn into a paste.
>
> Government controls—and these include laws—defeat themselves for another reason. They are a form of aggression on the nature of man. . . . "The more laws you make, the more thieves there will be." This is like the American Indian dictum: "In the old days there were no fights about hunting grounds and fishing territories. There were no laws then so everyone did what was right." Lao-tse believes that

> man's original nature was kind and mild, and that it has become aggressive as a reaction to the force of legal and moral codes. This is the basis of some. . . surprising statements . . . "Banish human kindness, discard morality, and the people will become dutiful and compassionate", "It was when the great Tao declined that human kindness and morality arose. . . . It was after the six family relationships disintegrated, there was 'filial piety' and 'parental love.' Not until the country fell into chaos and misrule did we hear of 'loyal ministers'." Thus Lao Tzu reverses the causal relationship which most of us would read into such events. It was not that people began preaching about "loyal ministers" because ministers were no longer loyal: rather, ministers were no longer loyal because of the preaching, *i.e.*, because society was trying to *make* them loyal.
>
> The wise ruler does not try to *make* his people anything. He "carries on a wordless teaching" because he knows that "he who proves by argument is not good."

The *Tao Te Ching* is a book of hints and moods, yet it is an organon of wisdom, and one which contains in amazing maturity verities which the best men of our time seem to be vaguely groping for. Lao-tse has no "up-and-doing" philosophy; he is not "progressive," yet he seems to know more about human beings than both law-makers and educators. His fundamental position is that he opposes the imposition of *doctrine* in the name of truth lest it displace what truth men have come by naturally. Yet throughout the *Tao Te Ching* is an implicit metaphysic, a pervading majesty which, while verbally slight, has greater power of appeal than precise philosophy because it is an almost "wordless teaching."

Ideas such as these, it seems to us, are starting points for a fresh study of the meaning of history. We have no business returning to the serious study of history without being on our guard against the attitudes which can so easily turn history into a nightmare of self-righteous rivalries. History begins with the roots of life itself. It begins with the nature of man. There can be no real knowledge of history, therefore, without wisdom about man and the practice of wisdom about man. The men who understand history—and we assume that such men have existed—are men of infinite patience with the slow unfoldment of the human spirit. They are men like Lao-tse, and like some others. We can still say, with Hegel, that history is the spirit, trying to comprehend itself, but we have no business announcing the score until the game is over. The true score is more likely to be the eternal and unending process itself than any climactic issue of human events, however grand in aspect.

If we are going to have a metaphysic, and we doubtless will, since no culture has lasted without one, we can at least design a metaphysic which distinguishes between what we believe and what we know; between what we dream of doing and what we can do.

So far as we can see, the secret of the human situation lies in the necessity of certain tensions in human life. It is man's weakness that he seeks to eliminate those tensions by illicit means. He tries to turn what he believes into knowledge by passing "an act of God." He invents an "infallible formula" called the scientific method and turns the whole catalog of his difficulties over to a corps of experts. He tries to buy security for something less than the absolute determination to know for himself. For these mistakes, history periodically punishes him by producing terrible dilemmas—dilemmas of his own making. Today, confronted by one of those dilemmas, we feel as though we have been catapulted by history into mid-air, and don't know where to light. What can we rely on? This search for something "solid" to rely upon is a search for something which does not exist in heaven or earth. Yet it has a reality. Lao-tse called it *Tao.*

# *Letter from* INDIA

[While the following interchange deals in considerable detail with a domestic problem of India, there is always a value in insight into the difficulties which attend the correction of and compensation for past injustices. In his article on India's second Five Year Plan (MANAS, May 8), C.V.G. expressed the view that the Madras Government (an Indian state) is making a serious mistake in lowering educational standards to permit the graduation of technical students from communities which once had suffered injustice and persecution at the hands of the higher castes. This statement brought objection from an Indian, a former resident of Madras, now living in the United States. Following is his letter, together with C.V.G.'s reply.—Editors.]

EDITORS, MANAS: I am surprised by the article on "India's Second Five Year Plan" in your issue of May 8, 1957. I am afraid it contains some unfair criticism of the government of Madras about a discriminatory attitude in admissions to the university. Having myself lived in Madras for twenty-one years, I feel that I am qualified to explain the exact situation to your readers.

Most of your readers know that India suffers from a very serious social problem—caste. During the past few centuries, *some* members of the highest caste, who controlled the educational system, denied the lower castes opportunities for education and gradually adjusted them to mediocrity. The practice of communal recruitment (minority protection) was introduced in Madras by the British government to help the lower castes.

In some respects one may compare this communal problem in India to the "racial problem" in the United States. In many cases the American Negro finds it difficult to compete with his white fellow citizen. All intellectuals agree that educational heritage at home is an important factor in the development of any individual.

The culture of a nation should not be evaluated by the number of strong men it produces, but *only* by how the strong treat the weak. If only man realized this, the world would be a far happier place to live in. While competition is desirable for a successful economy, it should not be forgotten that distribution of opportunity to help the weak is a sign of great human character—Sacrifice.

I have discussed this problem of "communal representation" with many distinguished persons in the Western world. During my four years abroad, both in England and the U.S.A., I have not met anyone who criticised the basic principle behind it—sacrifice of the immediate present for the ultimate benefit of all.

The Madras government needs to be congratulated for its careful handling of a difficult problem.

D. V. REDDY

Evanston, Ill.

---

Editors, MANAS: While Mr. Reddy may be "qualified to explain the exact situation to your readers," I am afraid that the "situation" as explained by him is not "exact." We are all agreed that caste is evil, and the governments in India committed to its destruction have our whole-hearted support. But I do not believe that the Government of Madras is going about the caste problem in the right way and therefore I totally disagree with Mr. Reddy who writes that "The Madras Government needs to be congratulated for its careful handling of a difficult problem."

Mr. Reddy writes that "during the past few centuries some members of the higher caste which controlled the educational system denied the lower castes opportunities for education and gradually adjusted them to mediocrity." This was no longer possible for the higher castes under British rule. The British organised elementary, secondary, and higher education in India on a non-communal basis. Nevertheless, the lower castes fared badly even under this system, which could not assure them a fair deal. When educational

opportunities were open to all communities on considerations of merit, not all of them benefited in an adequate measure. It was noticed that the opportunities were best utilised generally by members of the higher castes, while the lower castes did not respond satisfactorily. Since seats in educational institutions were severely limited, open competition virtually shut out the lower castes. However unfortunate this may be, is it right to describe such a situation as higher caste "control" of educational opportunities? I do not deny that the lower castes suffered much persecution from the higher castes in the past; their present relative backwardness in education is perhaps due to past incapacities resulting from persecution by privileged castes. It is therefore right that the State should help them to rise to a par with members of the higher castes and, in the interests of fair play, should extend preferential treatment in the initial stages. The communal recruitment introduced in Madras by the British Government, to which Mr. Reddy refers, was therefore a humanitarian step from the point of view of the lower castes.

I would be happy if the communal situation in Madras were so simple as to make it unnecessary for me to bandy words with Mr. Reddy. Unfortunately many extraneous considerations complicate the caste problem in South India and it will not be possible for me to discuss all of them in a letter which threatens to become very long. By all means, help the lower castes and backward communities; we shall not grudge such help, even if it results in incidental hardships to the higher castes. But has the State a right to proceed on the assumption that ameliorative action in behalf of one section of the people implies or sanctions deliberate persecution of other sections? And, in India, such misguided action is fraught with serious harm for the interests of the entire country. I shall explain both these aspects of the communal policy of the Madras Government.

I have already written that admission to educational institutions, particularly professional colleges such as engineering and medical, has become extremely difficult for members of the advanced communities, despite brilliant performances by their members in qualifying examinations; whereas students belonging to backward communities just walk in, however poor their qualifications may be. Mr. Reddy will argue that this is as it should be, and that the interests of some sections *should* be sacrificed. I shall accept his contention. I do not question the state's right to reserve a percentage of seats in educational institutions for backward communities. The Madras Government has gone much farther than this, but certainly not in the right direction. In recent years, after independence, there has been an alarming fall in educational standards in India. I am in a position to say that, so far as the Madras State is concerned, this deterioration in standards has been planned and designed. Standards in examinations have been greatly relaxed. Students who were formerly expected to achieve a mastery of their subjects are now excused with a poor smattering of them, with the result that university graduates here are often the most ignorant persons one comes across. This has been done in the mistaken belief that large numbers of students of backward communities may get easily and quickly "educated."

Now that leads me to my second point—the resulting effects of such an educational policy on the State itself and its activities. When the universities turn out large numbers of ill-equipped graduates on whom the State has to rely, particularly for technical jobs, confusion is sure to ensue. Already the evil effects of such an educational policy are discernible. The scandalous fall in standards of efficiency among the younger, junior staff in our Government departments is there for all to see. I doubt whether Mr. Reddy or any Indian can be proud of the manner in which the Madras Government runs its departments. Deterioration in efficiency has proved fatal in many cases. In British India, railway accidents were few and far between. But in recent years after independence, major accidents have become

distressingly frequent—and investigating committees have attributed them to the poor quality of men in responsible positions. Mr. Reddy believes in "sacrifice of the immediate present for the ultimate benefit of all." I doubt whether he can be so complacent if he knows that one of the requirements of the "sacrifice of the immediate present" is the entrusting of an innocent public to the care of inefficient engineers and doctors.

I repeat that I am not grudging the provision of educational opportunities to the lower castes even at the expense of the higher. But that does not necessitate the misguided policies adopted by the Madras Government. The uplift of backward communities is certainly possible without recourse to the deliberate lowering of educational standards, which is a positive disservice to the intended beneficiaries themselves. Reservations of seats in colleges and generous offer of scholarships—these are the measures that responsible and imaginative policy-makers institute. In the present context of all-round lowering of standards by the Madras Government, I do not see the "ultimate benefit" around the corner, in which Mr. Reddy fondly believes.

Mr. Reddy writes of "minority protection." I may point out—though he must be well aware of it already—that the principle of minority protection would ensure a much needed safeguard to a sorely persecuted minority in India—the Brahmin community. The Brahmin community is one of the advanced communities which is now very much persecuted educationally and otherwise. The present generation of Brahmins now suffers for the wrongs of its ancestors who ill-treated the lower castes. But the Brahmin community constitutes only three per cent of the entire population of India and is entitled to "minority protection" which it is not getting!

C.V.G.

Madras, India

# *REVIEW*
## A FORTUNATE FEW

FOR the man who wants to know what psychoanalysis is about, but has only vague impressions, *The Invisible Curtain* (Rinehart, 1957) by Joseph Anthony is a good book to read. Mr. Anthony is not an analyst, but a writer who attended a seminar conducted by Dr. Louis Montgomery and became interested in the subject. He persuaded Dr. Montgomery to help him write a book for laymen—"a book giving play-by-play descriptions, in nontechnical terms, of typical analyses."

The seven cases reported by Mr. Anthony all concern patients who would by ordinary standards be called "successful" people. They are all intelligent, some of them having exceptional ability. They were not "psychotic," but suffered either from some psychosomatic illness or from some delusion which made them seek treatment. They are supposed to represent "typical" cases, neither the easiest to help, nor the most difficult. These cases are doubtless representative of common psychological ills, but it would have been interesting if Mr. Anthony had included some "failures," since the total effect of the book—certainly unintentional—is to make analysis seem an almost conventional success story in the practice of medicine.

Dr. Montgomery is unquestionably a skillful practitioner who believes in non-directive therapy. In each case, he brings his patient to recognition of motives which he has been hiding from himself, and from this point the adjustment proceeds with the patient taking the lead. At the outset, in each case, guilt, hostility, or aggression is hidden behind a glaze of superficial attitudes and even slogans. The role of parents in producing these attitudes is manifestly crucial; intelligent parents ought to read books like *The Invisible Curtain* to see what can happen to their children when they express shock, anger, or any gross emotional reaction to what their children do.

Sex, of course, plays a large part in the stories of these unhappy people—from the attractive girl who became a prostitute to spite her ex-husband, to the brilliant but miserable architect who always had to have two girls on his string, lest he become "involved" with one of them—but sex is only one of the means by which these seven people tried to misrepresent themselves to themselves. Their self-deceptions are always in terms of the conventions—the "nice" conventions and the not-so-nice conventions. The hackneyed, superficial attitudes of men in condemning women and of women condemning men, appear, also the "I am no good" view and the "I am an iron woman" conceit. The neurotic always seems to take refuge in some kind of stereotype in self-justification, hoping for acceptance on this basis. People are only external factors in the predicament of the neurotic—they are not there as human beings at all.

Mr. Anthony has a passage which sharply illuminates such situations. It concerns a woman of thirty-nine who thought she had deliberately run down a jay-walker and insisted that she had committed murder. The incident which precipitated her desperation—the accident, that is—was really of small importance. Her trouble was that, because of incidents in her childhood with her father, she hated men. The war she started with her father had dominated her entire life. Her recovery began when she stopped hiding this from herself and when she was able to disentangle her feelings from these childhood memories. Mr. Anthony relates:

> Once Mavis had started to recover these bits of her emotional life, she developed an awareness of the fact that she had been shying away from them, and a great determination to be cooperative. Sometimes this created tougher problems than her earlier resistance; she had taken to reading technical books on analysis, and began producing material that fitted into textbook theories instead of spontaneous thoughts and feelings. However, this is a common phase of the analytic process. Outgrowing it, she made new strides to emotional maturity.

When she was able to accept the fact that she had been in love with Paul Wycoff (in love according to her own definition of love) Mavis realized that his basic attraction for her had been the very quality she resented—his aloofness. "I can see now that I was unfair to that guy," she commented. "I was sore at him because he didn't give me a chance to drop him in the ash can, the way I did all the others."

The hardest of all truths for Mavis to grasp was that, in spite of her lifelong resentment against males, her own behavior had been masculine. This clashed violently with her ideal picture of herself. "If there's one thing I've always prided myself on, it was being a really feminine woman," she said repeatedly.

One day, in a flash of insight no analyst could have excelled, Mavis said, "All my life I've been angry at the world. Now I know I had to be angry to avoid loving anyone but myself."

This represented progress much more significant than the disappearance of her insomnia and the rest of her selfinflicted symptoms, all of which had gradually faded out of the picture.

Another interchange, earlier in the treatment, shows that analysis is not necessarily dull:

"Doc, won't you please, for once, answer a straight question?

"It's your thoughts and feelings that are important, not mine."

"Well, logically, I know I couldn't have stopped that car a split second sooner than I did. But psychologically. . .

"Oh, what's the use! Here I am, wondering whether I'm a potential killer, and you sit back asking questions like a streamlined Socrates. Now I know why they gave that old bastard the hemlock."

The mention of Socrates makes an occasion for noting what seems wrong with all this. There isn't even the breath of an impersonal interest in the lives of any of these people. All seven were completely wrapped up in themselves. We wonder if, in a culture which nurtures higher conceptions of the good life,—which sets ideals for the young to strive after,—these people might not have gotten so mixed up as to need analysis. "Ideals," of course, become part of the problem when they are defined by conventional "morality," but it has been well said that when there is no vision, the people perish. Without Dr. Montgomery's help, these people would have perished rather rapidly. We wonder whether, now that they are living more or less balanced lives, they feel any responsibility to the millions who can't afford "analysis."

# *COMMENTARY*
## THE GENIUS OF LAO-TSE

ACCORDING to Holmes Welch, author of *The Parting of the Way* (see lead article), only the Bible exceeds the *Tao Te Ching* in the number of times it has been translated into English. Why should this small book—of 5,000 characters—be so fascinating to scholars and students of religious philosophy?

The answer, we think, is that it combines the promise of profound meaning with puzzling obscurity, yet in such a way that the reader is able to feel that a precise understanding will eventually reward his reflections on *wu wei* and the *Tao.*

Beacon's publication of this book ($6.00) is a great service, since Mr. Welch has been able, better than any other commentator, we think, to show how a student of the Chinese sage may enrich his own thinking by reaching after the meaning hidden in Lao-tse's utterance.

The *Tao Te Ching* is not a book for followers of any philosophical or mystical tradition. Its magic is in its capacity to release and stimulate the philosophical imagination. The very lack of mystical enthusiasm, the almost dull neutrality of Lao-tse regarding matters which bring flights of rhetoric from others, is the provocative in the *Tao Te Ching.*

> My words have an ancestry,
> My deeds have a lord.

Thus cryptically, Lao-tse indicates a background of metaphysical assumption for what he says. Mr. Welch explores this background, just as he compares possible meanings of *Tao* with the accounts of the highest reality found in Western sources, but the reader can preserve his sense of freedom to choose what meanings he will adopt, regardless of what Mr. Welch or anyone else thinks. You feel, somehow, that this is what Lao-tse wants, and the book's greatness lies in its power to convey this feeling successfully. Mr. Welch's virtue is that he seems to have amplified this power.

The last half of *The Parting of the Way,* which tells what the various Taoist "churches" made of Lao-tse's teaching, can be ignored almost profitably. This section does little more than demonstrate the folly and even crime of sectarianism and organization in relation to the search for transcendental reality. A mind blunted to the claims and counterclaims of organized religion is a mind ready to take delight in Lao-tse.

# CHILDREN
## . . . and Ourselves

Editor, "Children . . . and Ourselves": I refer to the July 17 letter and your comments about neglected children. Both writers seem to take it for granted that children may be born whether they are wanted or not, and that a certain degree of neglect is therefore to be expected.

Why must there be more children in the family than the father can provide for without assistance, or than the mother can care for at home without hired help? Why must there be any children at all in the home, if the adults are not really interested in children? Why must *any* child *ever* be neglected, so long as the parents are alive and in good health?

The trouble seems to be that too many parents never *wanted* children in the sense that they craved the sight and the feel of them. All they really wanted was to be "parents." They didn't know what to do with themselves and they imagined that the state of parenthood would magically endow them with maturity and solid citizenship; they thought that having babies would solve their problems. So they made parents of themselves. And they got what they wanted: the good feeling of being "responsible" adults with "a family to worry about."

In such families, the children themselves, as individuals, are not important. They feel unwanted because they *are* unwanted. They are nothing but trouble—trouble and expense and a great responsibility—which is precisely what their parents want them to be. The whole silly business is meant to be therapeutic, after all. Nobody is *supposed* to have any fun.

I believe there would be fewer neglected children if there were fewer children. Also, the schools wouldn't be so crowded.

DESPITE the well-meaning efforts of birth-control crusaders and some sociologists, the vast majority of children who enter the world are not "planned" by their parents. Aside from a feeling of uncertainty that this state of affairs should be deplored—perhaps because of a suspicion that "Nature" often knows what's what more fittingly than intellectualizing adults—we think that the sort of parent our correspondent describes is clearly a member of a small minority. We can agree that the thought of "having" a child to buttress one's status as an "adult," just as the idea of "having" a wife or husband, creates a poor psychological basis for family responsibility. Children born to parents who want them because other people have them are "wanted" children, all right, but wanted for the wrong reasons. There is only one good reason for deliberately bringing children into the world, and that is the desire to provide them with the opportunity for learning and living. On all other points, the *ideal* parent should be disinterested in the outcome of his child's upbringing, for if he is determined that his son or daughter should "become" this or that sort of person, or proficient in a certain field, he fails to accept that child as a being of sufficient worth to merit the privilege of making his own decisions. Bored wives who would like to have a child as an extra-special toy or playmate, are similarly obtuse regarding the inherent integrity of human beings.

There is little doubt that our schools are filled up by the children of large families from lower income groups, but we see no remedy for this thoughtless increase of population save by the improvement of our philosophical and psychological education in general. Contraceptive information is no substitute for dawning realization on the part of adults that each child needs a vast amount of intelligent attention, and that, save in exceptional rural circumstances, the sort of attention required cannot be provided adequately for a great number at once.

The question of neglect is a complicated one, for its terms can never be defined except in relationship to the particular qualities of the child and adult concerned. Some youngsters do not seem to require a great amount of time or overt attention. They are competent explorers of a world of their own, and, already living in the atmosphere of their parents' attitude and knowledge, naturally turn to their parents as their "home base." Other children, those who lack this integration with their parents' lives, need to be provided with conscious assistance much of the time. We should say, however, that a child is really neglected only when the parents fail to recognize that the child is a genuine human being who, of necessity, has a tie of affection or love for them. The thoughtless person neglects psychological

needs in almost all relationships and, unfortunately, it seems easier to be neglectful of children, who need attention the most, than of anything else. This for the obvious reason that the child, being so much less articulate than an adult, can often make his needs known only by demands which are symbolically expressed.

A MANAS reader who serves as Headmaster of a "Ranch School" at Jenner, Calif., has provided us with an attractive brochure depicting the advantages of an ideal physical location for the training and healthful pleasures of boys. The Stillwater Cove Ranch School seems to be a bit of paradise for children whose parents can afford the sixteen hundred dollars per school year tuition, and on the off-chance that some readers may be interested, we note that literature about Stillwater can be had for the asking.

At this school, children of grades one to ten live in daily contact with forest, stream, and Pacific Ocean. Located on the Sonoma County coastline, above San Francisco, the ranch properties are extensive. Saddle stock is available as well as facilities for boating and ocean fishing.

Of greatest interest to us is the evident determination of Headmaster Paul Rudy to see that the boys of the richest parents learn how to do useful work. The ranch maintains its own dairy herd, produces all of its beef, pork and lamb, and supplies the table from a large garden. On this aspect of Stillwater, the brochure remarks:

> Some twenty years ago, for our own boys, we felt the need of a place where they could develop sturdy bodies and well-rounded personalities in the performance of simple, useful tasks. In addition to regular academic subjects, we wished that they might learn some of the interesting lessons of plant and animal life; that their inquiring minds might contemplate the mystery of seed germination; and that they might experience the dignity of skill in the use of their own hands.
>
> We have a particularly rich background for the study of biology. Beautiful marine gardens lie along our rocky shores, and on land are hundreds of specimens of rare wild flowers, ferns and animal life.
>
> In an environment of natural beauty, our boys find the opportunity for useful, responsible work and pleasant recreation. Boys seriously interested in shop work will find encouragement as well as facilities. As the school maintains its own generating units, pumps, refrigeration, and other mechanical devices, ample opportunity is afforded for their study, repair, and maintenance.
>
> Our seacoast location provides us with an invigorating climate; it is never hot and it is never cold. Winters are very mild and snow is unknown to our coast. In addition to regular academic work, all boys are assigned some duty or chore for which they are held responsible. The caring for our horses and live stock and the cutting and preparation of fire wood are some of the duties assigned to the boys. Chores are changed from time to time through the school year. A grade is given each week for *work* just as one is given for any academic subject. Boys are taught the importance of a job well done and the self-satisfaction of being a part of a producing social group.
>
> As the ranch maintains its own dairy herd, produces all of its beef, pork and lamb and has continuous produce from a large garden, meals are varied and appetizing. A large walk-in freezing unit enables us to hold hundreds of pounds of fish (caught during the salmon runs of our summer season) and keep on hand an abundance of fresh meat.

Well, this *sounds* as though one could hardly have it so good anywhere else. For those of us whose finances do not make possible a sojourn at Stillwater, there is still much to be derived from dwelling upon the wondrous ingredients provided. Perhaps we *can* manage one or two of them, even if in less spectacular or less well-rounded forms. And, reverting to our first correspondent's remarks about neglected children, we should say that for the young teenager who falls into this category, the instruction of Nature herself—in a locale like Stillwater—may provide an excellent substitute for what was not available at home.

# *FRONTIERS*

## "The Dust Hasn't Settled"

IN borrowing this title from a *Reporter* (June 13) editorial by Max Ascoli, we wish to call attention to that magazine's distinguished contribution to national education on the subject of nuclear fall-out from bomb tests. Anyone who follows the liberal press at all is aware of the efforts of the *Saturday Review* and its editor, Norman Cousins, in this direction. It was Cousins who secured the famous open-letter appeal from Albert Schweitzer, and who subsequently opened *SR's* pages to pro-and-con rejoinders. But the most informative and complete article on fall-out was written by Paul Jacobs for the *Reporter of* May 16. In the June 13 issue, the effects of the article were reviewed by Mr. Ascoli:

> The ever-mounting repercussions to our May 16 issue on the atomic tests in Nevada could already provide material for a story as significant and disturbing as the one Paul Jacobs wrote. Of this second story, we give here a sketchy outline.
>
> The three wire services carried summaries of the Jacobs piece and 148 newspapers in at least thirty-eight states found it newsworthy enough to give an account of it. When the AEC issued its blanket disclaimer, there were more dispatches by the wire services and more news items in the press. Some major newspapers published vigorous editorials, stressing the points we have raised: that the AEC "is far from infallible," as the *Christian Science Monitor* put it, and that, as the Washington *Post & Times Herald* wrote, "Fallout is not good for you, nor is it to be treated with the insouciance reserved for a cold, as too many of the official statements virtually imply."
>
> Among the atomic scientists and geneticists whom we had occasion to approach or who approached us the reaction was, if anything, even more significant. The letters of two outstanding scientists Linus Pauling and Harrison Brown, are to be found in this issue and are indicative of opinion among some of the people who know these appallingly complex matters best. Similar reactions from eminently qualified men are coming to our attention with increasing frequency.
>
> Other scientists share the feelings of Harrison Brown, Linus Pauling, and John Heslep, but for various reasons don't feel free to have their opinions published. They don't want to be counted among those who are against the AEC, partly because they are just as unwilling as we are to make a blanket indictment of all the AEC activities, partly because, as someone put it, they don't want to get on the black list of the AEC. Most research on the atom is subsidized by AEC funds. Don't you see, they ask? We do see.

As tangible evidence that Mr. Jacobs' research reached people in influential positions, we reprint a communication to the *Reporter* from Sen. Clinton P. Andersen, Vice-Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy:

> *The Reporter* is to be commended for a valuable public service in publishing "Clouds from Nevada" by Paul Jacobs in the May 16 issue. I have read with care both the article and Max Ascoli's editorial.
>
> The service they perform lies in filling the void created by the Atomic Energy Commission's information policy on the fallout problem. *The Reporter* tells the other side of the story. Of necessity, it is one-sided. Until the AEC makes a fuller disclosure of its information, the article "Clouds from Nevada" may stand unchallenged.
>
> Mr. Jacobs has handled well such facts as were available to him, and the conclusions he draws from them are restrained. It is difficult for me to distinguish between my reaction to the article and my personal opinion, based on information from other sources. However, I think Mr. Jacobs demonstrates that the AEC has been less than absolutely honest in its dealings with the public as to fallout hazards, accompanying the Nevada tests. This, according to Mr. Jacobs, is because the AEC wishes to avoid saying anything which, in their opinion, would be "psychologically bad."
>
> I wonder who is practicing bad psychology? It seems to me that it is bad psychology for the AEC to withhold faith in the public's willingness to deal with danger. It seems to me that the public's wishes and the physical well-being of every citizen are considerations equally important to the scientific convenience upon which the AEC seemingly places so much emphasis.
>
> If you accept Mr. Jacob's conclusions, it appears that the AEC is circumventing a possible public objection. The public quickly senses the circumvention. The result certainly cannot be psychologically good.

An article by Chet Holifield in the *Saturday Review* for Aug. 3 indicated that the AEC will have to change its tune and tactics even more in the future. Rep. Holifield, who is chairman of the Special Radiation Subcommittee for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, said:

> It has been my experience that a Congressional investigation is often the only way to make the Atomic Energy Commission come out into the open. We literally squeeze the information out of the agency. Except for the Congressional hearings, the AEC would withhold some important information that the public should have. Then, too, when the commission releases information on its own initiative it comes in forbidding technical form or in driblets through speeches of commission members or other high-ranking personnel. Even skilful newspaper reporters, not to mention the layman on the outside, have difficulty piecing together the information or understanding its significance.
>
> I believe from our hearings that the Atomic Energy Commission approach to the hazards from bomb test fall-out seems to add up to a party line—"play it down." As custodian of official information, the AEC has an urgent responsibility to communicate the facts to the public. Yet time after time there has been a long delay in issuance of the facts, and oftentimes the facts have to be dragged out of the agency by the Congress. Certainly it took our investigation to enable some of the Commission's own experts to break through the party line on fall-out.
>
> Tardy release of information is bad enough in itself. But there is something worse. That is the selective use and release of information to favor a political position. The atomic Energy Commission is supposed to be an independent agency. By direction of the Congress it commands vast resources and decides what the public shall know and what shall be withheld from the public. This is a great burden of responsibility.
>
> The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, by virtue of his dual role as Atomic Energy adviser to the President and head of an independent agency, has at times blurred and confused the situation. The prestige and resources of the Atomic Energy Commission have been lent to the fulfillment of partisan purposes in at least two instances—the Dixon-Yates involvement and the 1956 Presidential campaign.
>
> Whether detection of all large bomb tests is feasible or not could make an enormous difference in possible international control arrangements. But the Atomic Energy Commission does not deign to enlighten the public and its scientists are muzzled.

Since Mr. Jacobs' piece was a target for general criticism in the press as well as from various members of the Atomic Energy Commission, we let Mr. Jacobs' defense rest on the foregoing quotations. Meanwhile, having read everything that comes to hand on the subject of the AEC's continuing "crime against nature," we are convinced that every MANAS reader should buy a copy of the May 16 *Reporter* and read his article. In the context of his thorough coverage of the facts and issues involved in fall-out, numerous scattered news items take on a significance which might otherwise be overlooked. For example, from the Los Angeles *Times* (July 25) we learn that both air and water in California are subject to contamination from fall-out produced in Nevada. The floating clouds of radioactive particles are likely to make even the most remote areas of the globe vulnerable to poisonous precipitation. Headed "Radioactivity Rises in Sierra Snow Waters," the AP story relates:

> The California State Health Department today reported spot checks have disclosed "radioactivity higher than the safe limit for continuous ingestion" in Sierra snow runoff water in three northern counties.
>
> The radioactivity reported is nothing to get alarmed about said Dr. Malcolm H. Merrill, State Health Director.
>
> Three points where snow runoff showed "a level of radioactivity higher than standard" were at Lassen Park in Lassen County, Donner Summit in Nevada County, and Gold Lake in Sierra County.
>
> Dr. Merrill said the "continuous ingestion" phrase meant that "some danger might be involved if a person were to drink the runoff waters over a period of months."
>
> He said a follow-up check will be made when the current tests are complete.