VOLUME XVIII, NO. 13
MARCH 31, 1965

TOUGH-MINDED MEN IN FLIGHT

THE proposition to be defended here is that the tough-minded men of the present are working on a largely irrelevant project. They are trying to prove something that doesn't really need proving and ignoring something which ought to be axiomatically affirmed as the basis for all subsequent "proving" activities.

This is not to suggest that the project engrossing the attention of the tough-minded men ought not to be worked on at all. In our present condition, we may need to work on the wrong project for a while, simply to learn from experience that this project will not take us where we want to go.

What is this "wrong project"? It is the attempt of hardheaded, fact-facing observers of the human situation to persuade their contemporaries that the physical, institutional, economic, cultural and psychological circumstances of life are being so rapidly altered by the progress in technology that all other considerations are dwarfed by this massive change. Are they right about the *fact* of the change? If you look at the evidence, it becomes exceedingly difficult to dispute their claim. What may be disputed, however, is the way in which they are setting the problems which, they say, are being precipitated by technology upon the human race.

Credit for forcing this discussion goes to the Ad Hoc Committee for the Triple Revolution. While the Memorandum of the Triple Revolution had three prongs—Racial Justice, Abolition of the Arms Race, and Cybernation—as W. H. Ferry says in a recent article (*Fellowship*, January), the Triple Revolution was really misnamed: "It purports to take up three significant developments but in fact deals at length with only one—cybernation." What is the practical meaning of cybernation? It means the progressive displacement of men from vital economic processes by the computer-controlled automation of industry. As Robert Theobald has put it:

> In the relatively near future the machine systems will take over all repetitive physical and mental production tasks and huge numbers of people will be thrown out of work. It has been estimated by some authorities that as little as 10% or even 2% of the labor force will be required for conventiona1 work in the future.

To resolve the resulting contradiction—vastly increased production confronted by vastly diminished buying power—the Triple Revolution Memorandum proposed the solution of a guaranteed income for all the people. This radical idea brought consternation in many quarters. As Mr. Ferry says in his *Fellowship* article ("Further Reflections on the Triple Revolution"):

> Although the redefinition of work was said by the Committee to be of the greatest importance, it did little redefining itself. This shortcoming led in turn to the impression among many if not most readers that we were in effect advocating the indolent society, a cushioned technological epiphany in which cashing government income checks, beer-drinking, television watching, and general lollygagging would be the main activities of the majority of people. Equally unfortunately, we left the impression that we were not disturbed about such unwholesome side effects and social costs.

Elsewhere, Mr. Ferry observes:

> The Ad Hoc Committee did not aspire to describe the society of the future but only certain relentless tendencies in the community today. Just how relentless these tendencies are and how imminent the need for fundamental change, are of course the crucial issues. I confess the evidence seems mixed. The statistics about unemployment and underemployment can be read to come to many different conclusions about their scope and points of impact. I confess I am also deeply impressed by the almost universal anguish aroused by the proposal for

a guaranteed income. This anguish I at first interpreted as the normal abhorrence of an unusual idea, but I now see it as genuine fear of demoralization of the community.

He says further:

. . . you will have noticed that I have not got to the spiritual connotations of The Triple Revolution. . . . the idea should come in, but I am not easy about it. Every day I feel less capable of grasping the spiritual outlook. I have been bewildered by the fact, sometimes referred to by those among this [*Fellowship's* pacifist] readership, that the nation's spiritual leaders have in the main endorsed the genocidal policies of the thermonuclear era. I cannot distinguish in this regard between Christian and un-Christian nations. I have listened often and carefully to the explanations of our spiritual mentors, but always come away more confused than ever. If there is a difference between worldliness and other-worldliness in these men, I am not bright enough to discern it.

In a conclusion which muses on the impact and lack of impact of the Triple Revolution Memorandum, Mr. Ferry says:

By now we sadly realize that it is ingenuous to expect progress in our economic organization and cultural and political life commensurate with the achievements of the machines we so adroitly hitch together. Some will think depraved is too strong a word for the current situation, and they may be right yet the emergence of material poverty and evidences of moral poverty, North and South, from Birmingham to Chicago to Dallas to the Cow Palace indicate that we Americans are in a more brutalized condition than we have been willing to admit. At any rate, there is no doubt about wholesale apathy hatred, boredom, anomie, and other psychic ailments in the community.

Mr. Ferry now moves into an area of criticism which virtually sets up the proposition we want to defend. In the closing section of his article, "A World Founded on a False Doctrine of Man," he says:

I think that man's only chance of escaping the iron maiden he is fashioning for himself is through a self-conscious and sedulous attack on the enclosing walls. Mumford remarks that "we seem to be paying for an excess of physical power by our spiritual impotence, and for an excess of automatism by our inability to control the process once it is started." The central issue is whether we can bring our technical achievements under political control, in the interests of compassion and rationality, and put them to the service of man rather than the other way around. This control has never been achieved, nor even tried. Technical advance has seemed a self-evident good, and encouraged to go according to its own imperatives. The results are all around us, from the slums and dirty air of Megalopolis to the thermonuclear and neutron bombs. . . .

The Triple Revolution aimed to startle readers into an appreciation of the increasing dominance of technology in respect to war, prejudice, and economic machinery. In retrospect I fear it barely merits passing marks. On its central and fateful implication, that our virtuosity in megadeath weaponry is carrying us into calamity, The Triple Revolution produced only a twitter of comment. The memorandum asserted cybernation was daily compounding the difficulties in coping with the race situation; but this too was drowned almost at once in clamor about discrimination against white workers, the uneducability of Negroes, and similar claptrap. Even the central emphasis on the inevitable effects of cybernation on employment and the entire structure of political economic theory was diminished into a temporal and trivial contention about "paying people to do no work." We sought to delineate the closing of one era and the opening of another, full of promise and novelty and hazard. It is a majestic theme, but if we did not elicit a majestic response, the fault must be just as much ours as that of our critics. . . . In view of the radical alterations in every circumstance of the common life, the need for a radically new theory and practice of political science seems to be inescapable.

Now the project of the tough-minded men has been to prove the case for technological doom—in terms of a coming wor1d of immeasurable, technologically-produced plenty which remains inaccessible to an impoverished world of men without jobs—and *then* to demand a Big Switch in conventional attitudes toward Work and Free Enterprise and Socialism. Objective Social Science is supposed to bludgeon the laggard intelligence of modern man, regardless of ideology, into Facing the Facts. And then, persuaded against the drive of his past and the momentum of his present, modern man will usher in the Millennium.

This seems to us a wholly ungrounded expectation. It won't work. The temple may come tumbling down, whether from the unsettling disturbance made by these Sampsons of dire prediction, or from the seismic intervention of the technological gods they worship, but nothing will be proved by such disasters except that confusion follows upon confusion.

What is wrong? These tough-minded social technicians offer us only the hair of the dog. They talk about the good of man without saying a word about man. They accept the definitions of the good which produced the status quo, as though they ought not to be seriously questioned. In socio-economic terms, they are like the big bakeries which refine all the vitamins and other basic nutrients out of flour to make it pure, white—and *dead*—and then "fortify" their loaves with elaborate synthetic compounds to placate nutritionist critics who are getting the ear of the housewives. They say, in effect, you can have all this "material abundance" and be "creative," too! Just *do* it, that's all.

They are like old-fashioned moralists. Arise, they say. Be a *Man!* For exhortation, they use the after-glow images of conventional Humanist ideals, of tired, ancient moralities which have never had the strength to reverse any human passion or appetite. They point to massive symptoms of aimlessness and frustration in all the "advanced" societies and tell us we suffer from a mindless invasion by the machines. Our innocence is stolen away by these monsters. Our good intentions are perverted by the unintended wickedness of Techniques. They cast man as victim, and they prove that he is a victim, or will soon become one, with facts and figures. They pin his trembling, doped, and anxious psyche to their boards, and then tell him to wriggle free and change the whole system of butterfly collection to their utopian plan for butterfly resurrection.

If you want to talk about the good of man, you have first to talk about man. Jacques Ellul, for example, lets you glance briefly at the paling face of man through the heavy plate glass window of his technological dungeon, and then tells you that in his sociological analysis of the effects of technology he will not notice human beings as such. Specifically, he says: ". . . in describing sociological currents, I obviously cannot take into account the contingent decisions of this or that individual, even if these decisions could modify the course of social development. For these decisions are not visible, and if they are truly personal, they cannot be foreseen."

Admittedly, Ellul is not writing a book about man, but about technology as man's enemy. Our point, here, is that books must be written about man.

What, then, is man, for the purposes of this discussion—or, for the purposes of any discussion about human good? He is the being who makes what Ellul calls "invisible" decisions. He is a decision-maker. If he makes no decisions he is not a man. Survival, for man, means making decisions.

Is this a historical, that is to say, a sociological, problem, or is it a human, that is to say, timeless problem?

It is first a timeless and human problem. Historical or sociological approaches to this problem have absolutely no meaning unless they follow and build upon the individual and human approach.

This is our proposition: Man is man thinking and deciding. Not tomorrow and tomorrow. Now.

Our Western civilization has accepted this proposition only occasionally and in revolutionary fits and starts. We live, instead, by the proposition: Get the things you need and want, and then do some thinking and deciding, if you still want to, or if there is time.

Our proposition is that this reversal of the order of authentic priorities in human life is responsible for the ills of our civilization. It is that

present belief in the reality of man as a thinker and chooser is a half-hearted belief which is seldom taken seriously, and then only weakly in moments of pain and bad conscience. This reversal, we hold, has had the effect of producing, first, alienating attitudes in daily thought and action, and, second, alienating circumstances in the external environment—in both cases to such an extent that men's ideas of both themselves and the world are correspondingly inverted and falsified.

Some further general observations support this diagnosis. First, what we commonly call the highest human values are spoken of in terms of the example of certain distinguished human beings. We pick out characters in history who did what they believed to be right, *regardless of their circumstances.* It was not some calculated compromise with circumstances, or redesign of the circumstances themselves, which generated the values, but the *irrelevance* of the circumstances in relation to the judgments that make us remember and honor those human beings.

A man's fulfillment, we come to realize, is not a matter of circumstances, but in spite of them. There's no harm in better circumstances, we may argue sheepishly. Of course not. Yet there is endless harm in relying on them for the good. How can it be made more obvious that there is neither good nor evil in circumstances, but only in the way we think of circumstances and the circumstantial relationships which, in consequence, we allow to pervade and control our lives?

This is pretty pure doctrine. But what if it should also be true?

One of the notable facts about the present is the ease with which perceptive critics find so many things wrong with our society. Listen to Mr. Ferry. We are possibly "depraved," more "brutalized" than we are willing to admit, sufferers of wholesale "apathy, hatred, boredom, anomie, and other psychic ailments." The bill of particulars could be endless. Read Rogers and Maslow, Seidenberg and Kahler, Mumford and Krutch. Note that these people are only incidentally talking about "circumstances." Their concern is really with the state of mind of modern man. A person afflicted with such generalized anxieties about the human condition has only to inspect his own life to see the point. He is not hungry. He probably has a fairly good automobile. He works *hard* only because he wants to. He can say (in the "Free World") practically anything he pleases. He can travel almost at will. It is fair to say that, in the United States at least, while a disgraceful number of people are without these material advantages, never before have there been so many people *with* them.

Well, then, why so grim an outlook? The answer is not a matter of building a case by adding up a lot of bad things. The grim outlook comes from feeling the emptiness and aimlessness in people's lives. The grim condition is psychological, not physical. It is subjective, not environmental. The people are not *using* their freedom. They are sick of an inner disease. They are not making choices worth talking about or thinking about. While some of them exclaim about their loss of freedom, condemn the "rat-race," deplore the loss of "identity," indict phase after phase of the mechanistic system under which they live, they are really victims by choice, if you look at the record.

Not that their pain is not real, or their charges ill-founded. The symptoms they feel have an irresistible presence, but they are not yet physical, although they may soon become so.

The point is that no human situation is without its circumstantial limitations, its adverse conditioning influences. No human situation fails to produce pain in some human beings, or in most or all human beings. The point is that the morale of any culture in relation to its circumstances depends, not upon the circumstances, but upon what men do in them or in spite of them. The changing of them is only a by-product.

There are a lot of people living in our present circumstances who are doing no doom-saying. They are using these circumstances to the full to enlarge the scope of their decision-making. They are bringing up their children as "outsiders." They are treating the circumstantial environment the way much of it ought to be treated—as antihuman, as alien, as the creation of men who did not think like human beings. What else is there to do?

These people are breeding morale. They are proving their freedom and their humanity. They are starting schools, some of them in Mississippi. They are making their "invisible" decisions plain to all who are willing to look at what they do. They are rejecting the mold of the technological absolutes. Such people are constitutionally incapable of feeling like victims or writing about themselves as victims. They are doing what Socrates did, what Thoreau did, what countless sung and unsung heroes have done. They are living their own lives. When the system speaks its demands, they don't hear. They know the human spirit wasn't meant to listen to those demands, and that it doesn't have to.

Suppose all the men who specialize in telling us how we are doomed by technological necessity were to concentrate, instead, upon telling the people the other side of the truth—that their psychological troubles in the present and their cybernetic troubles of the future are due to their mistaking the props for the action, the scenery for the play. To have a human society, the members of the society have to play a human role. They have to behave like human beings for at least some of the time. History is filled with the remains of well- or ill-advised devices invented to help men to act like human beings. The devices may have been bad ones, or become bad in time, but their original intent is usually plain. Taboos, rituals, formulas, purification rites, affirmations of purpose, mystery plays, myths of heroic undertakings, planting and harvesting symbolisms relating man and nature, hymns celebrating human meanings in identification with cosmic meanings, role-and-duty-defining institutions, psyche-ordering customs, individuation secrets embedded in scriptures and epics, poems of longing and transcendence, and the counsels of perfection of ancient religion and philosophy—these are all evidences of a lost wisdom concerning the importance of being human. These devices served the interests of man with varying effectiveness until, by the eighteenth century, coincident with a quickening of the human spirit from within, they showed that, as traditional forms, they were irredeemably corrupt.

Then, during the great revolutionary break with the past, threads of ancient doctrine about the dignity of man were turned into popular intuitions of independence and self-determination. What had been mystical—hidden within the hardening matrix of orthodoxies—became explicit and even political. The old forms of social control were fuel for the fires of rebellion and self-affirmation. The idea of freedom created a new plateau of synthesis high above the old dialectical struggle between the sacred and the profane, releasing vast human energies that flowed into new lands like a great evolutionary tide—which indeed it was. And then of course, as men have done in the past, they covered up the truth of their inspiration with monuments to themselves, as though the capacity to think and make decisions as individuals was some kind of private possession, a resource to exploit instead of a vision to increase. And now, by appropriate and inevitable Nemesis, we have an Ugly America, caught fast in the worship of the Bitch Goddess Success, fascinated by the Ikons of Acquisition, the very air continually resounding with Her corrupting liturgies. Our children know no other airs but these tinny jingles. Meanwhile the grownups talk learnedly of salvation by science and technology, which stand ready, as a modern version of the secular arm, to incinerate any portion of the world requiring righteous reproof.

What must we do? We have, once again, to learn to be men. We have to turn our backs on all in our society that is unworthy of human beings. We have to stop compromising with the things for which we are able to feel only contempt. We have to stop echoing the claim that the good life for human beings has become dependent upon perpetuation of the suffocating imagery of Acquisitive Man. We have to stop dropping our pinch of incense on the altars of Mammon. Our sophisticated hearts must learn the full shame earned by every external conformity to social and moral lies.

Is this to advocate no more than a beatnik riot of rejection? The proposal is nothing of the sort. It means rather to make every act a discriminated act, to take no sides, except the few that are plain enough to leave no decent alternative, and to make our deliberations felt in every human relationship. It means to walk a straight and narrow path in behalf of Man Thinking, to plan, devise, improvise and create new, manageable institutions scaled to the needs of children and young people who will thereby gain an opportunity to grow up like human beings, devoted to human ends. It means to work night and day at the task of creating space for free minds. Only by such means can we learn to recognize behind the masks of the fellaheen of technology the small boys and little girls who long to disclose their secret humanity. It means to boycott, ignore, discourage and disparage the propaganda of anti-human ends, the commerce in brazen images of an acquisitive elite. It means to risk the plain living that goes with high thinking. It means to support the decentralized, independent, ingenious, humanly-scaled projects of other men. It means full recognition that the revolution in which individuals must participate, which only they can accomplish, will never take place in the mirrors of scientific sociology. Those mirrors, as Ellul warns, cannot catch the glint of individual decision. The project is to make visible the reality of statistically invisible man.

REVIEW
RANDOM NOTES ON "SELF-TRANSCENDENCE"

A PAPER by Abraham Maslow, to be published this year in a Braziller volume titled *Sign, Image, Symbol*, raises a number of questions concerning the meanings of such words as "autonomy" and "self-actualization." For example:

> The autonomy and strength which is found in emotionally secure people is different from the autonomy and strength of insecure people. Very broadly, and without too much inaccuracy, we can say that insecure autonomy and strength is a strengthening of the personality as *over against* the world, in an either-or dichotomy in which they are not only quite separate but also are mutually exclusive, as if they were *enemies*. We might also call this selfish autonomy and strength. In a world in which one is either hammer or anvil, these are the hammers. In the monkeys in which I first studied the different qualities of strength, this was called autocratic or Fascistic dominance. In the college students who were later studied it was called insecure high-dominance.
>
> Secure high-dominance was another matter altogether. Here there was affection for the world and for others, a type of big-brotherly responsibility, and a feeling of trust in an identification with the world rather than of antagonism and fear towards it. The superior strength of these individuals was therefore used for enjoyment, for love and for helping others.
>
> On various grounds we can now find it possible to speak of these differentiations as between psychologically healthy and unhealthy autonomy, and between psychologically healthy and unhealthy homonomy. And we find that this differentiation enables us to see that they are interrelated rather than opposed to each other; for as the person grows healthier and more authentic, we find that the high autonomy and the high homonomy grow together, appear together and tend finally to fuse and to become structured into a higher unity which includes them both. The dichotomy between autonomy and homonomy, between selfishness and unselfishness, between the Self and the Non-Self, between the pure psyche and outer reality, now tends to disappear, and can be seen as a by-product of immaturity and of incomplete development.

Here, certainly, is a meeting-ground between "high philosophy" and the emerging insights of psychologists who are now attempting to define the nature of a man who is reaching into the resources of his beinghood. George Santayana, in *The Realm of Spirit*, describes the "self-transcending" potency by saying that "the imprisoned spirit escapes from its cage as no physical fact can escape." He continues:

> Without quitting its accidental station it can look about; it can *imagine* all sorts of things unlike itself; it can take long views over the times and spaces surrounding its temporary home, it can even view itself quizzically from the outside, as in a mirror, and laugh at the odd figure it cuts. Intelligence is in a humorous position: confinement galls it, it rebels against contingency; yet it sees that without some accidental centre and some specific interests and specific organs, it could neither exist nor have the means of surveying anything. It had better be reconciled to incarnation, if it is at all attached to existence or even to knowledge.
>
> This is the force of intelligence, marvellous if we try to conceive it on the analogy of material being, but perfectly natural and obvious if we look at it congruously and from within. Spirit assumes a transcendental station, and looks out from there on all the world. Wherever it is, is here, whenever it is, is now. Yet *here* and *now*, for intelligence, are not what they are for physical being, or for external indication, a particular, accidental, dead position. For intelligence *here* and *now* are movable essences, to be found wherever spirit may wander. . . .

The book in which Dr. Maslow's essay will appear is part of a series titled "Vision and Value." It is one of Maslow's chief points that the possibility of self-transcendence is not to be simply categorized as "mystical experience," but has to do with the need for overcoming the dichotomies in one's own nature. In *Psychoanalysis and Religion*, Dr. Fromm describes the attitude which both accepts full responsibility for unique individuality and sees the very root of individuality in a oneness which "comprises both the sharp and even painful awareness of one's self as a separate and unique entity and the longing to break through the confines of this individual organization and to be

one with the All." Dr. Fromm continues: "This sense is simultaneously the fullest experience of individuality and of its opposite; it is not so much a blending of the two as a polarity from whose tension religious experience springs. It is an attitude of pride and integrity and at the same time of a humility which stems from experiencing oneself as but a thread in the texture of the universe."

In his discussion of a common human participation in "peak-experiences," Dr. Maslow speaks of the commonalty of the *capacity* for seeing beyond the merely egocentric image of one's self:

> While this transcendence of dichotomy can be seen as a usual thing in self-actualizing persons, it can also be seen in most of the rest of us in our most acute moments of integration within the self, and between self and the world. In the highest love between man and woman, or parent and child, as the person reaches the ultimates of strength, of self-esteem, of individuality, so also does he simultaneously merge with the other, lose self-consciousness and more or less transcend the self and selfishness. The same can happen in the creative moment, in the profound esthetic experience, in the insight experience, in giving birth to a child, in dancing, in athletic experiences and others which I have generalized as peak-experiences. In all of these peak experiences, it becomes impossible to differentiate sharply between the self and the not-self. As the person becomes integrated so does his world also and simultaneously grow integrated. As he feels good, so does the world look good. And so on.

COMMENTARY
MORE GRIST FOR THE TOUGH-MINDED

IN evidence that automation is a topic of increasing concern, we note that Pasadena City College chose the subject, "Automation—Its Impact on Education," for the theme of its second annual convocation, held earlier this month. In the opening address, Dr. Walter Buckingham, Director of the School of Industrial Management, Georgia Institute of Technology, presented figures showing that the unemployment level in the United States is already higher by between two and five times than that of all other industrialized nations except Canada. Speaking to a packed audience, he said:

> Mixed with the so-called "affluent society" and the "economy of opportunity" in which we live is an enormous economy of frustration of millions of Americans. We who live in the United States, with only six per cent of the world's population, have almost half its wealth. Yet . . . one fifth of all American families are unemployed or earn under $3,000 a year. Another fifth live on the verge of poverty.... These add up to nearly 80 million Americans who live in, or on the edge of poverty.

Only for a few weeks during the past ten years, he said, has the unemployment level in the United States gone below five per cent. That it seldom goes above six per cent indicates, he added, that we have a permanent rate of unemployment. The formula for poverty and deprivation, he told his audience, may include any of the following factors:

> Be non-white. Belong to a family with no earners. Belong to a family whose head is a female. Be a male aged 14 to 25, or over 65. Have less than eight years of education. Live in a rural farm area. Belong to a family with more than six children. Live in the South.

For many of these people, Dr. Buckingham said, survival depends on help from either relatives or social agencies. "They have little hope for the future, little hope for the satisfaction that work gives, not just what it may bring in leisure." And many of them, he added, are unable to qualify for welfare aid. In a summary of Dr. Buckingham's general contentions, the Pasadena *Independent* for March 12 repeated his warning that

> "poor" and "rich" classes of society are developing in the United States and they threaten to wipe out the "middle class," which has been the backbone of the nation.

This is the dilemma—already well along to a *fait accompli*—with which our lead article is concerned in terms of the attitudes and behavior which brought it about.

We should incidentally take note of the fact that the economist, Robert Thebbald, one of the original signers of the Triple Revolution Memorandum, goes further in his analysis than most of the hard-headed men who present us with terrifying facts. He strongly condemns the irresponsible distribution techniques of the acquisitive society, arguing for the right of every individual "to receive information undistorted by desires to mislead for the purposes of private gain." He continues:

> What type of distortions am I condemning? I condemn the advertisers who play on the weaknesses of the individual in order to increase their sales. I condemn the propagandists of any country who unhesitatingly distort the unfavorable and bury the undesirable news. I condemn the academics who distort the truth as they see it in order to gain reputations for power.

Actually, it is probable that all the serious men who insist upon reckoning with the ominous threat of automation are warm-hearted citizens as well as hard-headed prophets. It takes courage to recite facts which a great many people do not want to hear, and it takes human concern to explain the meaning of those facts. Our point is simply that the findings of experts always come in a form that requires response by professional, if public-spirited, manipulators. *This is not what we need most.* Most of all we need activities generated by individuals and small groups to set counter currents going in the lives of the people. We doubtless need public action, too, but without the other kind of free, autonomous action, the solution, whatever it turns out to be, will be something done to people, not by them. The facts may be facts, but the focus of the hard-headed diagnosis seldom points to the qualitative change that will have to take place.

CHILDREN

. . . and Ourselves

FRANCONIA COLLEGE—PROGRESS TOWARD AN IDEAL

OUR previous report on this pioneering venture in the higher learning (MANAS, June 17, 1964) can now be supplemented by informing and encouraging material from the second volume of *Franconia College Proceedings.* As at Black Mountain College, which thrived from 1933 to World War II, the students at Franconia fulfill an active role in the maintenance and development of their rather extensive facilities. Franconia, in other words, is a "community of work," though a better word might be "endeavor," since the distinction between the assumption of responsibility for thinking and the assumption of responsibility for care and improvement of the physical environment tends to be obliterated. The work program (also reminiscent of the educational centers in India established by Gandhi) is described in the 1965 brochure:

> Each student at Franconia is expected to contribute an average of seven work hours each week to the general welfare of the community. Planned and supervised by an elected committee of community members, the Work Program is seen as part of our curriculum, and every student's permanent record carries comments reviewing his performance in it.
>
> Work jobs change each term. At the time when jobs change there is an immense statistical difficulty for the Committee; there is also great speculation and anxiety for the students waiting for assignments to be posted. Some jobs are exciting and creative; remodeling the facilities, . . . operating the ski slope the College shares with the town, staffing the nursery school, working in the print shop which produced this issue of the *Proceedings,* maintaining the College wood lot. Other jobs may appear less glamorous, but are equally necessary to support the community: manning the switchboard, waiting on table, washing dishes, assisting the cooks, staffing the library, or running the coffee shop.
>
> Like other aspects of the College, the Work Program combines practicality and idealism. Some jobs teach skills which students find valuable to their preparation for a specific career others offer no reward except the feeling of getting a necessary job done as efficiently as possible. A sense of humor is often a help in some jobs, but in every job the student is expected to show adult responsibility in organizing the work and getting it done. This involves cooperation and good will, for inevitably a certain amount of inconvenience is necessary from time to time. Sometimes, however, legitimate differences of opinion arise. Shortly before this issue went to press, for instance, the Work Program Committee spent most of an evening negotiating a strike called by the Pot Washers to protest what they felt to be inequalities in work distribution among several other work crews. An agreement was finally reached, the kitchen was reopened late in the evening, the striking crew went back to work and breakfast was served on schedule the next day. This was a valid argument, and made a good point: the community as a whole profits from the contribution of each member, and by the same token, a breakdown in any individual or crew often inconveniences many community members.
>
> The benefits of the Work Program are not limited to these educational ends alone, however. Several work areas, such as the coffee shop, school store, and print shop, operate at a substantial profit. The money is turned back into a general fund which is at the disposal of the community. Beyond this, the presence of so many workers, whether dishwashers or cooks, carpenters, woodsmen, or printers, eliminates the need of any additional staff members whose salaries would have to be met by raising the cost of attending Franconia College.
>
> So the Work Program serves many ends—some plainly idealistic, others frankly practical. As such, it is close to the heart of the College.

The most distinctive feature of Franconia is the "Core Program." Daily time is given to interdisciplinary study-research and discussion of "moments of significant decision-making." The first of such "moments" was the decision of Athenian democracy to put Socrates to death. In this context students read and discussed Plato's *The Euthyphro, The Apology, The Crito, The Phaedo, The Meno, The Symposium,* and selections from *The Republic;* also Thucydides' *The Peloponnesian War,* and Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex.* The second year began with more recent decision-making moments: Roger Williams' determination to leave the Massachusetts Bay Colony; the ratification by the state of New York of the United States Constitution. Four more

core starting-points will be selected from among the historical changes represented by Darwin, Marx, Freud, Camus, Eichmann, Malraux, Truman.

Under the heading, "The Core and Educational Process," is the following paragraph:

> We place upon the Core a special burden: the teaching of reading, speaking, writing, and thinking. We pursue these goals in the following ways: *First,* we read. Together we study original sources and secondary texts of merit, reading them in detail and trying to understand their meaning. *Second,* we meet. The heart of our meetings is the small, informal Core discussion group, consisting of a teacher and no more than thirteen students. In these groups we constantly test and improve our ability to speak in a reasoned and persuasive manner. Frequently, however, we meet in large groups, for the purpose of hearing lectures and debates by Core faculty members. Altogether, we have eight hours of meeting time each week. *Third,* we write. Since writing is one of the best ways of plumbing thoughts and feelings well enough to understand, test, and communicate them, students are asked to write a Core essay each week. For this reason, we consider the two years of Core the equivalent of at least one year of college English.

So much, for the moment, for the way in which these Franconian idealists, now numbering about two hundred, inclusive of faculty, regard their own work. A significant addition to the public image of Franconia has now been supplied by the New Hampshire legislature. In 1964 Franconia became the first college in the state to be recommended for professional accreditation. The New Hampshire Coordinating Board of Advanced Education and Accreditation said in its report:

> The Committee regards the "Core" area as one of Franconia College's chief assets, and a proper justification for the school's belief that it is not simply another liberal arts college. With its emphasis on an integration of disciplines, small classes, and independent study, the Core program seems to be consistent with the best contemporary educational thought. Of particular appeal is the fact that the entire student body, regardless of the degree or course program being pursued, studies each Core topic together. This common experience, together with the Core's emphasis upon individual involvement and "dialogue," should do much to advance the community ideal of the college.
>
> The curriculum outside the Core seems to be imaginative and original in design, and of a remarkable breadth. Of particular note are a number of courses whose contents are rarely offered short of a graduate seminar.
>
> The Committee was much impressed by the quality of the teaching staff, and felt it the most considerable single asset of the College. The members of the faculty have been selected with great care, show excellent preparation for their assignments, are attentive to the needs and special problems of their students, and appear to be utterly absorbed in their work.
>
> The grading system is indicative of an admirable awareness of the significant and bedeviling problem of evaluating student work. Here, as in so many areas of its examination of Franconia College, the Committee was impressed by the College's willingness to reassess in a fresh and exciting way all the basic components of higher education.

Of particular interest to some MANAS readers will be the approach of the Philosophy of Religion course:

> This course is designed to: (1) explore the nature of "religious experience"; (2) determine the kinds of language, syntax, and methods which have been employed to describe and communicate this experience; and (3) read original sources in the religions of India (Hinduism, Buddhism), the Far East (Taoism, Confucianism), and the Near East (Judaism, Christianity, Islam). Before a student can be accepted for enrollment he must read Mircea Eliade: *The Sacred and the Profane* (Harper) and Joachim Wach: *The Comparative Study of Religions* (Columbia).
>
> *For students in Religious Thought III:* In addition to meeting for a seminar once each week, students will be expected to share in the teaching responsibilities of the course by holding regular tutorials with students in *Religious Thought I,* helping in the preparation of book renews and seminar papers, and leading discussions.

This pamphlet provides excellent material for teacher-training courses and for upper division or graduate seminars. Copies may be obtained by writing to Franconia College, Franconia, New Hampshire.

FRONTIERS

Signs of Health

THE art of making good generalizations—of gathering into one basket of meaning considerations which are not distorted by being grouped, but are mutually illuminated—is exceedingly rare. Only men who have thought a good deal about large questions can practice it. Robert M. Hutchins, of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, who now contributes a column to the Los Angeles *Times*, is one of the most skillful generalizers in the country, as the following remarks concerning American foreign policy will illustrate *(Times*, March 1):

> Everybody in the world is supposed to be interested primarily in "containing" communism. The people of Vietnam and the Congo are not permitted to say whether they would rather die than see communism rear its head in their country. It is assumed that every Asian or African peasant knows that communism is worse than death and that he should be delighted to have his country destroyed in the effort to repel it.
>
> Of course, we do not really care about the Asians and Africans. If we did, we would ask them what they wanted. We have not let the South Vietnamese vote on joining North Vietnam or on any related subject, because we have suspected that the vote would not go our way. The foreign policy of the United States has not been built on justice; it has been built on the supposed self-interest of this country.
>
> But "containment" is not in the interest of this country. It puts us into every situation anywhere in the world in which there are alleged to be any Communist elements. There is no situation in which this cannot be alleged.

And, Mr. Hutchins points out, even if no communists are there, they will sooner or later show up, to help the people we have been opposing. It follows that wherever there is a quarrel, we can find a "policy-of-containment" reason for getting in on it—usually, on the wrong side. "The reason," he says, "we are likely to be on the wrong side is that we are allied with the status quo all over the world, and the status quo, in the underdeveloped countries, at least, is usually wrong." He continues:

> We are opposed to those who want to change it [the status quo] unless we can be sure they have the same ideas as the people they want to displace.
>
> For example, we have no difficulty in adjusting ourselves to the game of musical chairs as played by military dictators in Latin America. But we find it almost impossible to accept a social revolution there or anywhere else.

The policy of "containment," Mr. Hutchins points out, can only make us unpopular the world over. And it gets us into fights that we can never really win. The substitute for the "containment" policy is support of the United Nations. This international agency is at least potentially capable of "maintaining order during revolution," so that "during revolution we may obtain peace with justice."

These are very simple statements. They move from both principles and facts to self-evident conclusions. Mr. Hutchins has the capacity for putting unpleasant truths so lucidly that it is hard to see how anybody can get mad at him. But of course, people do.

Mr. Hutchins incidentally illustrates what a single individual of aroused moral intelligence can do for a self-governing, democratic society, simply by saying what he thinks. His thinking is so effective, his record so unblemished, his devotion to principle so manifest, that people who disagree with him nevertheless value his presence among us and acknowledge his contribution to the democratic process. They even give him space in the mass media to say what he thinks.

The appearance of this material in the Los Angeles *Times* is impressive evidence of the fact that we have a free press in the United States. The press, for all its faults, would doubtless get a lot better if more people would use it for good purposes. For example, in the same issue of the *Times*, a professor of history at the University of Southern California, Dr. Thomas W. Africa, writes a letter to the editor arguing for the kind of

education Mr. Hutchins has defended, supported, and instituted for more than a quarter of a century. Too often, Dr. Africa says, the humanities are neglected in American education, while the sciences in which we excel, "cannot provide moral values or a full grasp of man's non-material existence." The professor draws a comparison:

> It is the humanities which most clearly differentiate education in a free society from education in a totalitarian community. No one can dispute the scientific achievements of the Soviet Union, but the condition of the humanities in Soviet education is a standing rebuke of its closed system.
>
> In the United States, we do not stifle free expression or persecute dissent, but we may allow the humanities to wither and perish through indifference and neglect. . . .
>
> As a result of an imbalance in educational emphasis, our college-bred Americans are notoriously ignorant of foreign languages and know little of the history of this nation or any other. In politics, their views are often uncritical and sometimes naïve, and their taste in literature and the arts reflects little concern for excellence or human dignity.
>
> In our universities, a man can acquire an excellent training in science and never come to grips with the problems which tormented Socrates or Lincoln, or realize the compassion of Jesus and the Buddha. Books which deal with men and not with things remain closed to many students because the colleges cannot support the humanities as generously as the sciences.

On the ground that education in the sciences gained government support when it was realized that "technology was needed to protect us from external dangers," Dr. Africa asks for a government-established National Humanities Foundation to guard against the "internal disasters which can overtake a society when it delights only in gadgets and ignores the humanities." Well, maybe. It is fair to ask whether Mr. Hutchins, who certainly stands for the humanities, could work for the Government in its present mood. The humanities ought to be the independent judge of government, not its mild-mannered beneficiary.

We hear a lot about private enterprise these days. We are not sure about the issues of this argument, and seldom enter it. But of one thing we are certain: Being human, or practicing the humanities, is the most important of all private enterprises. If a man can't do that without a government subsidy, he has no real interest in doing it. What is true of individuals is true of societies.

Of course, a government which places human excellence on a higher plane than political power could do a lot for education in the humanities. But you can't just arrange for a government like that. You have to earn it, grow it, deserve it.

When this country has dozens of institutions, privately supported, eagerly used, such as the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, the humanities will blossom all over the place, simply for the reason that understanding democratic institutions requires an understanding of man. Recently, there have been signs of hope in this direction. When these signs grow into a movement—spontaneous, free, subsisting on self-generated resources—the health of the people will be manifest and there can be reasonable expectation that their government will then contribute what it can to the increase of that health.