VOLUME XXII, NO. 5
JANUARY 29, 1969

THE HEROIC CONCEPTION OF MAN

THE alternations in intellectual inquiry which shape the attitudes of culture seem to be partly functions of optimism and pessimism. No sophisticated modern, for example, can share in the visionary enthusiasm which animated, say, Bellamy, a century ago. No one any longer writes a Hegelian sort of essay. Such old-style "organic" theories of the social or historical development of human societies attract no attention. They issue, we say, in totalitarian monstrosities. Even if one senses some truth in Hegel's philosophy, it is not a truth we can use just now. We are far more interested in learning how to liberate ourselves from the confinements resulting from its coercive applications.

Hegel's philosophy was a philosophy of State. Yet it didn't start out that way. It began with a big intuition concerning life as a process through which spirit comes into knowledge of itself by contact with and experience of limitation. The meaning of life lies in self-conscious growth. The general truth of this conception seems evident enough, but we are surrounded by the infamous consequences of Western man's attempt to give it compulsive political interpretation.

Ernest Becker, in *Beyond Alienation* (Braziller, 1967), has put the dilemma clearly:

> The State does not willingly change, but uses instead the lives of its own youth to perpetuate its form. Perhaps this is truly the great lesson of the twentieth century, and the very one we will not heed. No State has trained its youth to be the responsible critics of their own society, and so we have revolution or war, and repression and more war. Revolution, war, repression: these are synonyms for the failure to educate youth in the capacity peacefully and freely to remake the world. Its cost, as we know, has been terrible. In World War I, the graduating rolls of the English public (private) schools—the true elite—were almost exactly balanced by the rolls of the war dead. France lost a full million of the cream of her youth and Germany—and Russia—how many? The numbers of the dead from World War II are still too dose to us to need counting; and for some years we have been preparing for World War III. No particular ideology is involved: neither capitalism nor communism nor socialism nor Nazism: the State is to blame, the structure will not submit itself to free and peaceful transformation; the everyday habits institutionalized over the whole society, that bind men like chains and make them fearful as rabbits. The youth of these societies, having been denied a "liberal education," can only serve the State like the true slaves that they are: in the uncritical pursuit of the rewards that their elders taught them to prize; in the foreign wars where they try to show that they are worthy sons; or in violent revolutions within the State itself, where they try to show that their elders are unworthy.
>
> Why is it that *all* these ideologies cause the same catastrophe to their youth . . .? The historical problem is no longer a problem of the "right ideology" for modern man; the problem is to convert the *socially* liberated masses in every modern State into *educationally* liberated ones. The problem is to give them the freedom in ideas and criticism that turn them against those who tyrannically control the State, whether it be the commercial mass media, the demagogues, or the commissars. In this sense, no people on earth is today free, no matter what its ideology.

So, for at least a generation, we have had no important books, except devastatingly critical ones, on ideology. The original thinkers of our time see no promise or challenge in political formulas. The Utopias, if they are political, are all *anti*-utopias. The 1930's saw the last serious writing which found hope in political solutions. Only captive intellectuals or hacks could work on the development of themes which led to the imprisonments of which Mr. Becker speaks.

Good men, in short, now refuse to think like "managers." What then do they think about? Well, they think about individuals, about people who become the victims of managers. They let the problems of organization go, because these are

apparently insoluble, turning to the inward promise of human life. How to be a man became a much neglected subject during the long epoch when men argued interminably about how to organize the State. The State, it was assumed, would shape the man, and solving the problem of human excellence would be some sort of incidental by-product of the main drive of "social" development.

This return to the idea of the individual as the matter of central importance has had other preparations. So long as the "objectivism" of the scientific theory of knowledge ruled intellectual life, there was little occasion for study of individual psychology. There is simply no room in the conventional scientific world-view for the idea of men as independent centers of causation, so that it was natural for planners and managers to assume that if they were able to devise the right system or environment, good things would result as a matter of course. But by the 1930's, modern thought had gone a long way toward wearing out the mechanistic assumption of science as applied to man. The transformation recorded by Ira Progoff in *The Death and Rebirth of Psychology*—from the view of man as some kind of psycho-physical object to the humanistic conception of him as a being of immeasurable subjective potentialities—a being whose primary need is not for better "social organization," but for deepened self-understanding—was well on the way. A man extraordinarily sensitive to such changes, Charles G. Jung, wrote in 1939:

> The rapid and world-wide growth of a "psychological" interest over the last two decades shows unmistakably that modern man has to some extent turned his attention from material things to his own subjective processes. Should we call this mere curiosity? . . . This psychological interest of the present time shows that man expects something from psychic life which he has not received from the outer world: something which our religions, doubtless, ought to contain, but no longer do contain—at least for the modern man. The various forms of religion no longer appear to modern man to come from within—to be expressions of his own psychic life, for him they are to be classed with the things of the outer world. He is vouchsafed no revelation of a spirit which is not of this world; but he tries on a number of religions and convictions as if they were Sunday attire, only to lay them aside again like worn-out clothes. (*Modern Man in Search of a Soul.*)

In another ten years, this "psychological" interest would begin to turn into a flood. The novel was now a "quest for identity." Psychology was already becoming a secular form of religion. The leaders of the new psychological movement—mainly humanistic psychologists—did not set out to start religions, but when a great vacuum exists in the lives of human beings, it is filled either by authentic growth or by the frantic borrowings which give sectarian religion its characteristics.

Then, there is a sense in which the various kinds of expression we sum up under the term "modern" began to take on the dimensions of a mass movement in the 1950's. But since any mass movement soon exhibits only a vulgar face, it is now very difficult to separate the authentic trends from their packaged and commercialized imitations.

What was the "modern" in literature and art? We think of it as an authentic revolt against tradition, an emergence of the irresistible need of the writer or artist to speak for himself, to declare his personal reality. The "modern" is a man who feels insecure while living under the protection of any borrowed security. He is, almost inevitably, a tortured man. He knows what he has given up, but he can no more go back to it than Prometheus could negotiate a pact with Zeus. To look for oneself is the modern enterprise. It is daring to believe with Blake that all the gods are within.

The peculiarly "modern" problem—the feeling of extreme disorientation, of being terrifyingly alone—arises because men have had no preparation for recognizing the gods within themselves. They have little or no practice in reflection and self-questioning. The passage from the age of organizing to the age of self-discovery has been too swift, more angrily rejecting of the old than warmly accepting of the new. Men

resentful of past betrayals forget how to open their hearts to trust. Their discoveries are now etched with acids. Their love can find no worthy object.

The universal longing is for self-knowledge, but no self-knowledge is ever gained in a nervous, anxious atmosphere. No one makes progress in this direction if he worries about it. He must somehow forget himself. Yet to discover the necessity of self-knowledge brings a sense of crisis to a man, and how can he stop worrying? He must also discover that the psychology of crisis is not a means he can use in his search. Patience, love, and tenderness are the qualities which attend human growth; the uncompromising toughness that will also be needed is a later development. New love is always a fragile thing.

Meanwhile, we might ask ourselves: Why these incredibly costly oscillations of human thought and hope? Why must we be Hegelians, filled with faith in social organization for a century or two, and then be compelled by omni-present failure to look desperately "within"?

How could human thought be corrected for these im balances? Why, for one thing, did Hegel neglect the role of individuals? What possessed him to leave out the dynamics of true human growth? There is no *human* progress at all without the development of individuals, as Tolstoy was able to point out only fifty years later. John MacTaggart, one of the few modern thinkers who did not make the same mistake, maintained (in *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*) that Hegel was simply not *interested* in individuals. He liked to work *big*. This put his thinking out of phase with human reality. *Nations,* according to Hegel, are the ultimate embodiments of spirit—they are "steps in the development of the one universal Spirit, which through them elevates and completes itself to a self-comprehending *totality."*

Hegel was a great thinker and we are going to have to go back to him, one way or another. But we need not revive this delusive apotheosis of nations. *Individuals* are the units in which the spirit becomes conscious of itself, and no institutional surrogates can replace the necessity of private awakening. When organizational substitutes are introduced, the symptoms of failure soon show themselves, and then the only resort of authority is to coercion and camouflage. Organized phoniness is the result. Education, in the hands of the sovereign nation, becomes institutionalized self-defeat. This was quite clear even twenty years ago to men who had devoted their lives to teaching. In *Philosophical Issues in Adult Education* (1949), Horace Kallen wrote that education has four aims. The first, he said, is to teach people how to labor in order to earn. The second is to provide each generation with an opportunity to assimilate the wisdom accumulated by mankind through the ages. The third is to train a select group of men "to help their less perceptive brethren toward a clearer understanding of the truth . . . *in brief,* to minister to the common need." But the fourth aim is self-serving and tends to render all but the first empty of content:

> This fourth job is to keep the general public quiet and tractable while it is being used for the profit and aggrandisement of whatever dominant class happens to be in control of the State. . . . The pressure brought to bear on administrators and teachers to see to it that as few people as possible oppose or even seriously examine the principles or lack of principles of the economic-industrial-financial-political powers that happen to be, is serious. . . . It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that education's chief enemy . . . is a conspiracy which demands silence about the competency of the social and political order to secure justice and thus to free men and women to attain their true end.

For a great many people, taking what Horace Kallen says seriously would involve them in intolerable dilemma. The State, as they understand its functions, has been their salvation. Moreover, the transfer of education from private agencies to a branch of government, accomplished mainly by Horace Mann, was one of the great reforms in American history. Can we now turn away from such magnificent achievements?

We can, and we must, if all our talk of "self-knowledge" is to have meaning. The delegation of responsibility to the State is also the delegation of power, and no great and fundamental reforms in human attitude and practice have ever been realized with the consent or collaboration of the status quo.

Actually, we may now be only at the very beginning of a great swing toward inquiry into the nature of man. Except for ancient philosophies, or revivals of them, the good books on the subject have practically all been published within the past twenty years. See, for example, the dates of the volumes named in the bibliography of A. H. Maslow's *Toward a Psychology of Being.* Most of them appeared in the 1950's. There is reason to think that we are now in the initial throes of a transition even greater than that of the Renaissance, during which surging new assumptions of responsibility will be required of individuals. The revolutionary implications of the new psychology are clear enough—although it is difficult to imagine how they will be spelled out in actual changes of practice in daily life and in the almost total loosening up and redesign of institutions. The institutions which came into being for the needs of a *managed* society can have little constructive function in a society of people who are learning how to discover and be themselves.

Dr. Maslow makes this clear in his chapter, "Health as Transcendence of Environment":

> The danger that I see is the resurgence, in new and more sophisticated forms, of the old identification of psychological health with adjustment, adjustment to reality, adjustment to society, adjustment to other people. That is, the authentic or healthy person may be defined not in his own right, not in his autonomy, not by his own intra-psychic and non-environmental laws, not as *different* from the environment, independent of it or opposed to it, but rather in environment-centered terms *e.g.*, of ability to master the environment, to be capable, adequate, effective, competent in relation to it. . . . An extra-psychic centering point cannot be used for the theoretical task of defining the healthy psyche. We must not fall into the trap of defining the good organism in terms of what he is "good for" as if he were an instrument rather than something in himself, as if he were only a means to some extrinsic purpose.

This represents a *clean break* with the past. There is no compromise here with the habit of defining the human being in terms of some external or institutional end. Man defines himself, defines his good himself, and his failures and mistakes in doing it, no matter how awful, can *never* be as bad as the failures and mistakes which result when his identity and ends are conceived by someone else. Speaking of recent psychological works which espouse sophisticated forms of adjustment theory, Dr. Maslow adds:

> I feel we must leap beyond these statements, admirable though they may be, to the clear recognition of transcendence of the environment, independence of it, ability to stand against it, to fight it, to neglect it, or to turn one's back on it, to refuse it or adapt to it.

To understand what is meant, here, we need to study the autonomous quality of distinguished human beings. Transcendence, in this context, cannot have objective definition, but it can have a great deal of *meaning.* As Dr. Maslow explains in a note:

> Examples of this kind of transcendence are Walt Whitman or William dames who were profoundly American, most *purely* American, and yet were also very purely super-cultural, internationalist members of the whole human species. They were universal men not in *spite* of their being Americans, but just because they were such good Americans. So, too, Martin Buber, a Jewish philosopher, was also *more* than Jewish. Hokusai, profoundly Japanese, was a universal artist. Probably any universal art cannot be rootless. *Merely* regional art is different from the regionally rooted art that becomes broadly general—human.

The norms of a self-defined mankind are *of necessity* philosophical. The kind of awakening to the self that seems to be going on, these days, represents a great jump in history—an elimination, in psychological terms, of the entire burden of theology-defined man, and scientifically or environmentally-defined man. This is a

psychology which consults only man for an understanding of man, and its norms are based upon the performance of the most excellent of men. With so much diversity in human behavior, on what else could the norms be based? The links with the distant philosophic past are clear in the following:

> For cognition to be complete, I have shown that it must be detached, disinterested, desireless, unmotivated. Only thus are we able to perceive the object in its own nature with its own objective, intrinsic characteristics rather than abstracting it down to "what is useful," "what is threatening," etc.
>
> To the extent that we try to master the environment or be effective with it, to that extent do we cut the possibility of full, objective, detached, non-interfering cognition. Only if we let it be can we perceive fully. Again, to cite psychotherapeutic experience, the more eager we are to make a diagnosis and a plan of action, the *less* helpful do we become. The more eager we are to cure, the longer it takes. Every psychiatric researcher has to learn not to try to cure, not to be impatient. In this and in many other situations, to give in is to overcome, to be humble is to succeed. The Taoists and Zen Buddhists taking this path were able a thousand years ago to see what we psychologists are only beginning to be aware of.

Well, we can see the direction in which the search for self-knowledge is going. In time it will restore a heroic conception of man. It will almost certainly enrich itself with drafts of ancient pantheism, and probably become overtly metaphysical before the century is out.

REVIEW
THE SAKHAROV MANIFESTO

IN a novel (*The Living Reed*) concerned with the "growing up" of Korea to modern ways—a process we may some day decide to equate with cultural suicide—Pearl Buck describes the reaction of an old Korean patriot to the speeches of Woodrow Wilson at the end of the first great war. Wilson's declaration of principles moved the Korean to tears. Here, he told his friends, was a Western leader who *understood* the pain of the world, and whose nation happily had the strength to establish conditions of justice and self-determination for all peoples. He would need only to be told about the plight of Korea—a small but ancient country continuously threatened and interfered with by powerful neighbors—for the might of the United States to be exerted in the right direction. So the old Korean noblemen set out for Paris to acquaint President Wilson with the urgent facts.

Such innocence! The reaction of the American reader is automatic. How could this patrician Korean gentleman be so naïve? Just like a child! Unfortunately, this reflection seldom continues to the quite reasonable conclusion that the reaction of the Korean was also that of an unspoiled, habitually honest man—a man whose faith in the word of other human beings had not yet been destroyed by continual betrayal. That we think of such a man as "backward" may be more of a comment on the quality of "modern progress" than evidence of Korean immaturity.

What happens, actually, when people lose this sort of innocence? Well, they become "realistic," we say. But we ought also to say that they reduce their capacity to respond to vision to the level of nervous twitches. From repeated experience of unfulfilled promises they come to regard all expressions of idealism as hypocritical pretension. High-sounding pronouncements have no face value, and their ulterior meaning can be grasped only by men with cynical minds—men half-dead as human beings.

What is the price of this sagacious "realism"? The price is a world in which distrust of other men has been made a law of nature. It is a world in which the decent qualities of human beings are declared foolish, unnatural, *subversive*. Finally, it is a world ruled by the emotion of fear, in which men try to free themselves from the shame of their fear by foolhardy violence and noisy aggression. It is actually the case, today, that the more successful nations think they maintain their eminence as "great powers" by exceeding all others in anti-human excesses. That is what the common loss of faith in the word of other human beings has cost the modern world.

This is not, of course, the whole picture. Beneath the tiresome monotone of what the commercial press deems "newsworthy," and independent of "official" communications, there flows a continuous expression of individuals who try to speak to other individuals as human beings. Unallied to power, this expression is publicly regarded as having little or no reality, although it is very nearly the only remaining evidence that human beings with human qualities still exist in the world. On rare occasions, one of these expressions may find its way into the mass media. Usually, there is a special explanation. A man must have considerable personal eminence to get a purely human idea published far and wide. He needs to be an Einstein, a Schweitzer, or a Gandhi—someone who towers above the façades of power and conventionality—before his simple sanity can gain a hearing. This is one of the two ways, these days, that *Man* can noticeably enter history. The other is by conscientious objection to war.

A rather impressive breakthrough of this sort occurred recently in Soviet Russia. The occasion was made by the fact that a brilliant Russian theoretical physicist—the man who had a leading role in the development of the Soviet thermonuclear bomb—wanted to be *heard*, and

evidently the Soviets felt that it would not be a good idea to try to make him keep still. His name is Andrei Sakharov. During 1968 he wrote and circulated among Soviet scientists and intellectuals a manifesto entitled *Progress, Peaceful Coexistence, and Academic Freedom.* Sakharov's statement appeared in full (twelve thousand words) in the *New York Times* for July 29, 1968, and it is carefully reviewed by Eugene Rabinowitch in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* for last November. (It also had notice in the *Saturday Review* for Nov. 23, 1968.) It is a document which should command the attention and gratitude of all the world. We need to read it as though we were all "old Koreans." In his introductory section, Mr. Rabinowitch summarizes its content:

> The Sakharov pamphlet exposes the familiar ideas of liberalism—the rights of fret speech and free publication. It even suggests, at least as a possibility, if not as a general necessity, free elections and several political parties. These were the ideas of the Petetfi Club before the Hungarian revolution, and of the "Literaturny Listy" in Czechoslovakia this spring. They are also those of Solzhenytzin, Lydia Chukovskaya, and many other Moscow writers.
>
> Naturally, this aspect of the pamphlet has attracted the greatest interest among the liberal intellectuals in the West. But its most significant aspect is for Western scientists the assertion that the scientific revolution has made old ideological divisions not only obsolete, but deadly dangerous for mankind; that technological progress has made capitalism, as well as communism, capable of providing acceptable economic security for all; and that the advantages of the socialist system must now be sought in its moral values, rather than in its alleged economic security and consequent historical inevitability.

Mr. Rabinowitch says that Sakharov "became the youngest member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR," and that his statement embodies the views of the Russian intelligentsia. Paramount is the idea that there is no future for anyone in further "ideological confrontation." The significance of the Sakharov statement, according to the editor of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, is this:

> Sakharov's pamphlet is the first fully spelled out presentation of this view. It is a document clearly free of any official influence. We have good reasons to believe that it represents the convictions of a significant group of Soviet scientists, who are loyal to their society and share its belief in the moral justice of socialism, but are committed to scientific honesty and objectivity, and concerned with the common salvation of mankind.

The candor of the pamphlet is virtually epoch-making. Following is an early passage:

> Civilization is threatened by a general nuclear war; by catastrophic hunger among the larger part of mankind; by mental degradation caused by the narcotic of "mass culture" or imposed by the pressures of bureaucratic dogmatism; by mass myths delivering whole nations and continents into the power of cruel and wily demagogues [he mentions racism, Stalinism, and Maoism as three such myths], and by death or degeneration caused by unforeseen alterations of the human habitat on earth. In the face of such dangers any action increasing the disunity of mankind, any preaching of incompatibility of ideologies, or irreconcilability of nations is madness, is a crime.

To overcome the forces of disunity, intellectual freedom is required—"freedom to obtain and disseminate information, freedom of unbiased and fearless discussion, freedom from the pressure of authority and prejudice." The freedom needed by mankind is now suffocated by the "opium of mass culture," and suppressed by the "cowardly and egotistic authority of small bourgeoisie" or by that of "ossified dogmatism of bureaucratic oligarchy with its favorite instrument—ideological censorship."

It cannot be said that Sakharov distributes his favors unevenly!

The *New York Times* version of the pamphlet asserts that in the Middle East, direct responsibility for war rests "not with the United States but with the Soviet Union." Of Vietnam, Sakharov says that "forces of reaction sacrifice a whole nation to the alleged need of stopping the

communist flood." Concerning racial strife in America, the manifesto states:

> The white people of the United States, who now refuse to make the minimal sacrifice needed to end the economic plight of the blacks must be induced to change voluntarily their attitudes, and selflessly support their government s and the world's efforts to change the economics, technology, and the standard of life of people all over the world. . . . A similar change in popular psychology must be achieved also in the USSR.

Mr. Rabinowitch summarizes another passage:

> Sakharov is particularly concerned with the crimes of the Stalin era, with its "chain reaction of torture, executions, and denunciations." According to Sakharov, it has caused the death of 10 to 15 millions of Soviet citizens. It has involved "machine-gunning of thousands of camp inmates, deportations of whole peoples—German Tartars, Volga Germans Kalmyks, and many Caucasian peoples," and imposition of "almost serfdom" on peasants.
>
> Sakharov praises Khrushchev for the beginning of de-Stalinization, "although he was one of the accomplices of Stalin's crimes"; but calls for a much more thorough extirpation of the remnants of Stalinism. "After 50 years of unrestricted domination over minds of the whole country, our leadership," he says, "is afraid of a mere hint of free discussion." . . . The key to the rebuilding of the Soviet state system, he argues, is in intellectual freedom. In this connection he praises the Czechoslovak experiment and calls for its support.

This "review of a review" touches only a few highlights of the Sakharov statement. The Soviet physicist speaks of the moral promise of socialism, but also of the folly of claiming that capitalism leads to pauperization of the working class. The termination of ideological conflict will "permit both systems to undergo long-range developments, borrowing from each other their best traits, and actually becoming more similar in many important aspects." Mr. Rabinowitch ends his comment by recognizing "in Academician Sakharov a new and powerful voice for reason and hope." Wouldn't it be a fine thing if this recognition could be echoed everywhere in the West, by all those who try also, in their own way, to be voices of "reason and hope"? The time has surely come when men must begin to risk being regarded as "childlike" or "naïve." And Sakharov, after all, speaks as a man. His statement serves no State.

COMMENTARY
PRACTICAL WISDOM

THE Greeks distinguished between theoretical wisdom and practical wisdom. Skill in theory, they said, is possible for young men, but practical wisdom comes only with experience. It might also be said that theoretical understanding has the sort of logical structure that submits to intellectual analysis. With mental effort you can figure out how its conclusions are reached.

Practical wisdom is less accessible to intellectual skill. There is a sense in which it simply affirms. Its validity has a kind of self-evidence. It calls attention to what is, but has not been seen by most men. It speaks from a stance instead of an argument. Our response to it is intuitive rather than "rational," yet it violates no canon of reason.

Theoretical constructions of thought reach eminences of clarity by the use of abstractions. These conclusions may have elegance and symmetry, but they neglect alternatives of which practical wisdom remains intensely aware.

No doubt there are correspondences between theoretical and practical wisdom, but attempts to establish them remain inconclusive. In any event, men who give evidence of having practical wisdom are characteristically cautious when it comes to extending theory beyond the area of verification. Verification means use,(and ideas which can persuade without being used have the dangers of sharp tools: in the hands of children.

All men have a measure of practical wisdom, but for most of us it is rather low grade. High-level practical wisdom seems to be the fruit of the union of acute intelligence with spontaneous and determined devotion to general human good. The combination is rare, but it occurs, resulting in the recognizable but unanalyzable wisdom of men like Socrates, Epictetus, and, in modern times, say, Martin Buber. The difficulties of the pursuit of this sort of wisdom is the subject of Plato's *Theatetus.* The closest that Plato comes, anywhere, to "explaining" it, is in the *Meno,* where he really regresses the problem instead of explaining it away.

There is a quality of practical wisdom running through this week's "Children . . . and Ourselves." This discussion of education is both large-hearted and tough-minded. It allots the same importance to feeling that Plato gives the nobler sort of love, and makes the same recognition of the necessity of critical intelligence. It stresses the requirement of high vision, if education is to serve the true development of the young. These great and ennobling ideas are expressed in ordinary language, without piety or pretense. Analogies, when given, are deft and provocative.

Yet abstractions are present throughout these paragraphs on education. Expressions such as "the influence of the universal" need to be filled in by the reader. There is reference to "the significant experiences of the human race" and to the "age-old quest." This is the language of human aspiration, which speaks to the heart. Men of practical wisdom always use this language, but they never sloganize it. Nor will they permit its abstractions to be displaced by merely intellectual constructions. They know, somehow, that the abstractions of practical wisdom can only be filled in by indefinable acts of growth.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
ARTHUR E. MORGAN ON EDUCATION

[These paragraphs have been selected from the section "On Education" in the book, *Observations*, compiled from the writings of Arthur E. Morgan, just published by the Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio. The material presented here renders comment on the quality and importance of Dr. Morgan's book unnecessary.]

THE eagle, pushing its young out of the nest to compel the large freedom of flight, is a type of the proper compulsion of education.

However original a man may be, in most of his life he will be a follower. Since follow I must, whom shall I follow? If I can discover greatness and follow it, I am fortunate. Ability to recognize, to enjoy, and to follow greatness is not quickly acquired. It must be practiced steadily and long and be come by gradually. Education should have as one of its chief aims introduction of students to greatness; development, recognition, and appreciation, and an appetite for greatness. Otherwise we shall not escape commonplaceness.

It should be the business of the college to free the student from the hold of the transitory, and to bring him under the influence of the universal.

Education is not an institution discovered and adopted by men and kept alive by ceaseless vigil. It is an integral element of human life, and as definitely included in the scheme of things as is physical development from infancy to maturity.

I believe that not twenty per cent, perhaps not ten per cent, of the young people entering American colleges have any native bent so pronounced that it alone ought to determine the calling to be prepared for . . . Many young people drift about seeking genius when their real job should be to correct their characters so they can sustain interest in some field where they have capacity. For most college students accomplishments will best follow upon intense and interested application to a field well chosen in view of many considerations, rather than upon a search for highly specialized aptitude.

Desire and expectation have much to do with human possibilities, and these can be aroused by great education.

Appetite for difficult achievement should be aroused. A passion for excellence—which requires an appetite for difficulties—is an essential to civilization.

Every child has a right to look at the world for himself as he reaches maturity. To take away that right, as it is taken away in much religious and economic teaching, is to deny a fundamental human value. No sect or party has a right to control the mind of childhood.

In higher education it has been good form to know, but bad form to care. Higher education has neglected the education of the emotions. Knowing and caring are co-ordinate virtues. Neither is fully effective without the other. Caring will not mature without teaching any more than will knowing.

Inclination will actually determine the course of students' lives. It does not commonly arise spontaneously, but is acquired by contagion, and if the universal contagion of the commonplace incentives of society is to be surmounted and sublimated, it will be because of conscious, definite commitment and effort to that end. It will not necessarily follow from critical inquiry in any field, but has a continuity and cultural heredity of its own. That contagion can best be transmitted quietly and not with any dramatic pretensions. In my opinion, the American university has underestimated the element of incentive, just as the old liberal college underestimated that of critical inquiry.

Intellectual study is greatly important to clarify, discipline and inform purpose as aspiration, but unless the spark is there, intellectual education alone will not supply it. Some of the least desirable men who have lived have been intelligent and educated.

As the conditions of life change, the deficiencies of human environment change, and so the content and method of education must change—always to make up the deficiency in human environment, and in men's equipment for getting the significance of life.

Aims of education can be clear only as the purposes of life are clear.

It was my hope for Antioch College in its reorganization, as it was the hope of Horace Mann at its beginning, that it should not shrink from disturbing the prevailing and traditional patterns where their validity was no longer sustained by critical, objective inquiry. My hope was by the help of such inquiry and disciplined imagination, to encourage the use of elements of both general and special education for the emergence and achievements of a total way of life. By the expression "a total way of life" was meant, not conformity to a set of rules, but rather motivation by attitudes which survive free, critical inquiry, and which give promise of contributing to the overall significance and value of life. All elements of living—college courses, occupations, programs and activities—would be judged by the extent they contributed to or tended to defeat such overall purposes.

A person without history of knowledge of the past must see the world as commonplace because, except at extreme times, he is going to live among commonplace people who have come to that conclusion. . . . The only way to get the sum and substance of human experience is to reach out beyond the years we have into the years of the past, into the significant experiences of the human race.

Education should protect the individual from the limitations of the group mind. The group mind tends to the uncritical acceptance of whatever is dominantly presented.

Just as the uneducated man goes through life unaware of the interest and significance of much of what he sees, so the person of narrowly specialized training is blind to important areas of significance and interest, and often is unnecessarily ill-equipped to meet problems and opportunities.

College students may come to have sympathy and understanding with men in all fields, and may share those common interests which transcend all special boundaries. Professional training alone is not enough. Before one becomes a lawyer, architect, or merchant, he needs to know his deeper roots and more controlling loyalties in the all-inclusive profession of man.

Higher education furnishes the student with fragments of wisdom, fragments of culture, fragments of purpose, but often fails to help him to develop sufficient architectural skills to give unity and design to the structure. The result may be a jerry-built life, no more attractive or sound than a jerry-built house.

The liberal college is recognition of the fact that specialized environment is necessary to transmit culture, knowledge, clear thinking. The technical school organizes another field of environment. The aim is skill.

If a boy were planning to be a wrestler, we should not expect him to succeed very well if he should decide to spend the first ten years in reading about wrestling before he began to practice wrestling. If a person should wish to play a musical instrument, we should not expect him to spend the first ten years in reading about that instrument and about music, before beginning to practice. These cases are clear enough. Through long custom we have come to imagine that the situation is different in other fields. In fact, however, the same principles apply to a large extent in nearly the whole of education. Failure to recognize this is one of the reasons for the poor results of the educational system.

My major hope for Antioch College has been that our academic courses, campus experience, and practical work would be the means of clarifying life purposes and design. I have hoped

that there would develop here the aspiration, the stamina, and the commitment to make life a major adventure and not a habit of acceptance of incongruities.

The danger today is not that no opportunity will occur to give expression to a great and fine design for social and economic life, but that when such opportunity arrives there will be no fine design permeating the spirit of the people, and so, in the future as in the past, the great moment will be lost to mediocrity.

Education should develop the habit of examining usage and of judging it, not by the manner in which it is intrenched in custom and habit, but by its essential value to society. The prime business of education is to change our social inheritance from what it is to the best it might be. This includes the preservation of its highest values.

ARTHUR E. MORGAN

Yellow Springs, Ohio

FRONTIERS

Friends with the World?

IT is increasingly evident that the most urgent problems of the modern world have been created by very bright men. This is an ominous realization, since these bright men are the ones in whom the highest confidence has been placed, as qualified by their intelligence to get us out of trouble. Yet what they have done by their solutions of recognizable problems is to generate the causes of much greater ones—problems which prove inaccessible to ordinary remedies.

Put in another way, our worst problems are the result of brilliance in manipulative techniques devoted to the service of mediocre and sometimes morally despicable intentions. Who would deny that the greatest immediate threat to human survival has resulted from arming partisan political motives with the deadly instrumentation provided by scientific invention? Or that the spreading degradation of the natural environment has been caused by the applications of science to the acquisitive drives of industry?

A sharply critical article on the famous "think-tanks" of modern times, by Leonard C. Lewin, who was responsible for *Report from Iron Mountain*, illustrates how these high-level intellectual institutions are dominated by the motives of their clients. These very bright men are not asked by their customers how to make peace, but how to win war. They are not asked how to establish justice, but how to make money with as little disturbance as possible. They are not asked to devise wise laws, but how to maintain control and "order." If, informally, you ask some of these very bright people questions which require them to go behind the motives of their clients, they simply stop thinking. They are not about to abolish their jobs.

Mr. Lewin sets out to demonstrate the element of intellectual fraud in the learned productions of the think-tanks. He writes:

> A typical think-tank production can make ordinary guesswork sound awesomely quantitative. It will start, normally with broad, unproved working assumptions (usually about anticipated economic or political trends). These will be programmed into a computer, together with available statistics that seem relevant. . . . The seemingly scientific conclusions are usually so elaborate and detailed that the reader tends to lose sight of the fact that they have been developed from premises that often amount to no more than off-the-cuff opinions.

An example of client-dominated thinking is the secret project Mr. Lewin says the Army commissioned as a research program in 1965. Originally called *Pax Americana*, the project was later identified as seeking "a basis for the U.S. to maintain world hegemony in the future." "World hegemony" was of course the client's idea. It might have been a very bad idea, but that was not inquired into. One supposes that the excitement of figuring out how to dominate the world soon disposes of nagging questions of "morality." Moral issues, in fact, being loaded with ambiguity, have no scientific standing and need not be consulted. As Mr. Lewin says:

> Another characteristic of this thinking is its claim to some kind of godlike objectivity, that it is possible to make plans for the future of humanity without regard for any human values. The usual phrase used by the think-tankers is that their work is value-free."
>
> One noted think-tanker, whose descriptions of nuclear escalation and annihilation are the best known examples of such coldly "objective" thinking, defends such studies as hardheaded realism. But the implications of this brand of "scientific" objectivity are, in fact, monstrous.
>
> We have, for example, the spectacle of a respected scholar proposing the mass starvation of the Chinese people (by cornering international grain supplies) as a "practical" political lever against their government.
>
> This thinking quite predictably reaches its zenith when it turns to warfare. Your friendly neighbor, a gentle man who will risk injury to himself to avoid hitting a dog with his car, will talk quite casually five minutes later about the desirability of

ending the war in Vietnam by dropping an H-bomb in Vietnam simply to "get it over with."

So far as he is concerned, he isn't talking about mass murder; he is being "realistic." He is reflecting a barbaric point of view that has been made respectable by the "value free" strategic studies emanating from the think tanks.

This article by Mr. Lewin appeared in a little paper called *Family Weekly* (for last Dec. 29). It looks like the sort of thing you get free in supermarkets. Perhaps even chain-store merchants are getting worried about where all this "advanced thinking" is taking us. As Mr. Lewin says: "It is frightening to realize that the men who personify the think-tank mentality have had access to the highest Government levels since World War II."

A report of a recent conference of ecologists (*Christian Science Monitor*, Dec. 31, 1968) held in Warrenton, Virginia, fills out the picture of client-dominated science and technology. The account begins:

For three days more than 70 ecologists, economists, and social and political scientists heard one case study after another reported and discussed. The experts gave resumes of their on-the-spot research, mostly in tropical and subtropical developing countries. The reports disclosed a varied list of harmful effects that the introduction of new technologies had wrought on the environment.

It became evident that the motives of even the clients who claim to be interested in "conservation" are simply not adequate for what needs to be done. Some nations, Lynton K. Caldwell (University of Indiana) declared, are already "ecologically bankrupt." They can no longer help themselves. The *Monitor* reports his observations:

"Ways must be found to alter the priorities to which national political leaders and administrators feel compelled to respond," said Dr. Caldwell. "For them, occupational survival in their political milieu is a first order priority. The popularity and short-terse feasibility of the project tend to be the determining factors. The 'practical' attitude toward ecological consequences, if they are even considered, is to meet them if and when they arise. At this stage the ecological damage has already occurred."

Barry Commoner, of Washington University's Center for the Biology of Natural Systems, believes that the time has come to "go to the people" for help in meeting such problems. Reliance on experts has led to technological mutilations of the natural environment which are now more or less evident to all—most obviously in radiation fallout, smog, and soil and water contamination from industrial sources. The *Monitor* quotes his summarizing observations:

We who call ourselves advanced claim to have escaped from that dependence on the environment still existing among primitive peoples. In the eager search for the benefits of modern science and technology we have become enticed into a nearly fatal illusion: that we have at last escaped from the dependence of man on the balance of nature.

The truth is tragically different. . . . As the population of the world continues to increase and the already tragic need for food intensifies, the many stresses on the ecology of the earth may reach the breaking point.

We are still in a period of grace. In that time, let us hope, we can learn the proper use of science is not to conquer the world, but to live in it.

These remarks are not addressed to men in power, but to the people who put them there. The powerful are too busy preserving their power to hear such common sense, but the people, alas, are out of practice, having expected the powerful and their very bright hired men to look after such matters. Yet anyone can understand what Dr. Commoner is saying. He is saying, in effect, that the *world* is unconquerable, but that people can still learn to make friends with it, if they will.