VOLUME XXVI, NO. 49
DECEMBER 5, 1973

WHAT SOCIETY NEEDS

IN *Saturday Review/World* for October 9, E. Grey Dimond, a medical doctor and provost for the health sciences at the University of Missouri, begins an article on education for a career in medicine by saying:

> There is good evidence in medical education literature to suggest that the actual selection process that decides who gets into medical school has been weighted too heavily toward scientific ability to the detriment of humanistic qualities. The simple truth is that one cannot get into medical school, cannot prosper in medical school, or cannot achieve academic recognition on the basis of his or her compassion, devotion to people, desire to serve, stability, ethics, honesty, or commitment.
>
> But society *needs* individuals who will accept the label "physician" and will commit themselves to a life of "support" of their fellow man through medical, surgical, and psychological measures. This goal has not been fully met, and in part the reason is that we have not used the full range of values in selecting who should be given the privilege of becoming a physician. To a great extent the error has been in the fact that the medical faculty was science- and technology-oriented. The neophyte allowed in the system was selected by scales that were weighted excessively toward non-humanistic attitudes.

Well, asks Dr. Dimond, if we need more socially aware and people-oriented doctors, why don't we test for these qualities in candidates for medical education? He at once points out that no one has developed testing methods for identifying such students: "How does one quantify the qualities of compassion, integrity, and stability?)' Moreover—

> How does one do this at the *beginning* of a career, with essentially no track record to go by? The truth is that such testing is indeed elusive and variable in performance. However, the situation will improve if the selection committees will but admit that such values should be analyzed and encouraged.

But goodheartedness is not enough; it must be joined with scientific aptitude: "tomorrow's doctors must have a balanced, multivalued approach if they are to meet society's medical needs." Dr. Dimond continues, pointing out that the doctors now need not only a humane spirit and sound medical knowledge, but must also cope with the strains produced by psycho-social disorders. The doctor should be guide, philosopher and friend, as well as medical practitioner. Dr. Dimond says:

> Think of the decreasing influence of organized religion and the recognized faults of the penal and parole concepts of law. Whether or not the physician seeks the task, he will in the years ahead be forced into a larger role—that of science and morals counselor to society.

It is true enough that many family doctors—a diminishing tribe—find this role thrust upon them by their patients, so that Dr. Dimond's account of the "challenge" to medical education is far from rhetorical.

Eight years ago, in a paper titled "Science and Self-Actualization," which appeared in MANAS (for July 28, 1965, and was reprinted in *The Manas Reader*), A. H. Maslow related some of his experiences as a medical student—experiences which in fact caused him to switch from medicine to psychology. In this paper Maslow observed that while science can be a path to great human fulfillment, "it can also serve as a retreat from life and from humanness." His time spent in medical school made him feel that "science and everything scientific can be and often is used as a tool in the service of a distorted, narrowed, and de-emotionalized *Weltanschauung."* He found his teachers attempting to "desacralize" the attitudes of their students toward the phenomena of life and death. They seemed to want to stamp out "the emotions of humility, wonder and awe." After this general statement, he added details:

> I think I can best make this clear by an example from my experiences in medical school (3o years ago). I didn't consciously realize it then, but in retrospect it seems quite dear that our professors were almost deliberately trying to harden us, to "blood" us, to teach us to confront death, pain, and disease in a cool, objective, unemotional manner. The first operation I ever saw was almost paradigmatic in its attempt to desacralize, *i.e.*, to remove the sense of awe, of privacy, of fear, of shyness before the sacred, and of humility before the tremendous. A woman's breast was to be amputated with an electrical scalpel which cut by burning through. As a delicious aroma of grilling steak filled the air, the surgeon made carelessly cool and casual remarks about the pattern of his cutting, paying no attention to the freshmen students rushing out in distress, and finally tossing this object through the air onto the counter where it landed with plop. It had changed from a sacred object to a lump of fat. There were of course no prayers rituals or ceremonies of any kind as there would certainly have been in most preliterate societies (Eliade). This was handled in a purely technological fashion, emotionless, cool, calm, even with a slight tinge of swagger.
>
> The atmosphere was about the same when I was introduced—or rather *not* introduced—to the dead man I was to dissect. I had to find out for myself what his name was, and that he had been a lumberman and was killed in a fight. And I had to learn to treat him as everyone else did, not as a dead person, but as a "cadaver."

There is more of this evidence "for the record" in Maslow's explanation of what he means by the desacralizing effect of the way science is sometimes taught, but we need not quote it here, since the point seems made. And we know from the religious and intellectual history of Europe where this disdain for and indifference to the "holy" came from—it is an aggressive strategy adopted by rank-and-fire scientists in the later years of the great war between oppressive theological bigotry and the rising spirit of experimental science—a war which began back in the days of Copernicus and Galileo and lasted well into the twentieth century, and may not be entirely over even today, judging from recent controversies over whether the Bible account of "Creation" should be included in the science courses in Evolution in California public schools. But when practicing medical scientists or surgeons exploit the victory of the experimental method over dogmatic religious beliefs, turning their recently won authority into an attack on spontaneous decencies and the reverence felt by many for the human body, and for other wonders of nature, what was once the freedom of inquiring minds has become the arrogance of a shallow materialism. This attitude gave so much offense to Maslow that he could not continue with the study of medicine, and he was no believer in orthodox religion. His reaction to this studied contempt for the qualities of reverence and wonder was the expression of a spontaneous naturalism, a response that would be felt by any normal person whose sensibilities have not been worn down or deadened by long exposure to dehumanizing indoctrination. Conventional religious belief has little to do with such feelings. It was a man of completely independent mind, Thomas Carlyle, who wrote:

> There is but one temple in the universe, and that is the body of man. Nothing is holier than that holy form. . . . We touch heaven when we lay our hand on a human body! . . . This sounds like a mere flourish of rhetoric, but it is not so. If well meditated it will turn out to be a scientific fact; the expression . . . of the actual truth of the thing. We are the miracle of miracles,—the great inscrutable mystery.

Quite possibly, instead of wondering how to "test" candidates for medical education to identify those in whom "compassion, integrity, and stability" are strong, the schools should make an effort to hold and encourage students of Maslow's sort, and stop giving them reason to think that training to be a doctor involves systematic coarsening. "This," Maslow said in his paper, "is why so many brilliant students drop out of science. They are asked to give up too much of their human nature, too many of the rewards of living, and even some of the main values that led them to think of science in the first place." This is strong language, now perhaps less deserved than it was when Maslow wrote, by reason of recent campaigning by medical students for education

that recognizes the value of human warmth and social concern.

But this relates to what not to do in medical education. There is still the problem of how to support and increase the strength of the humanistic qualities in medical students. Tomorrow's doctors, says Dr. Dimond, "must have a balanced, multivalued approach if they are to meet society's medical needs." Does this call for a curriculum designed to produce "multivalued" people? Hardly. No one can write a formula for "balanced" human beings. For at least a generation, the better engineering schools have responded to criticism of their mechanism and "materialism" by adding a few innocuous courses with humanistic labels, producing no more effect on the students than church-on-Sunday religion has on the rest of the population. What Dr. Dimond is talking about is the spirit and attitude which affect a man's life at its roots. As applied to doctors, we might think of it as Buber's I-Thou relationship, taking the place of the I-It habit of mind of the man who deals with disease entities and organic functions instead of patients. These are qualities which can perhaps be courted, but not really "taught." Possibly a small library filled with the biographies of great healers would make a good beginning.

One thinks, for example, of the inspiration which comes from reading the life story of Semmelweiss—discoverer of the cause of puerperal fever, and its remedy—movingly told by Morton Thompson in *The Cry and the Covenant* (Doubleday, 1949). Then there was the Canadian surgeon, Norman Bethune, who discovered the collapsed lung treatment for tuberculosis, and who died on a Chinese battlefield in 1939. (See *The Scalpel, The Sword* by Allan and Gordon, Prometheus.) Both these men were benefactors of mankind; both lived lives which were personal ordeals, filled with sacrifice and suffering. Both are fine examples of men who were devoted to the welfare of others, who had strong convictions, were stubborn, idiosyncratic, who bucked establishments of one sort or another all their lives, who never gave up, and never stopped working. These two books are random recollections and there must be scores of others about great doctors. The lives of such men are almost never neat or conventional. What they learned in medical school had little to do with their greatness. Semmelweiss was a Hungarian Jew who paid a high price for his ancestry to stuffy, conceited, medical men in Vienna during his long struggle to get them to *wash their hands* before delivering babies. Bethune became a communist, mostly out of anger and desperation when he saw that the poor people he saved from death with surgery went on getting sick from malnutrition. He was an impulsive man and hoped for a simple political solution. But if great men are to be honored, then the nonconformists, rebels, and eccentrics will often deserve the most recognition. Today, the situation is probably pretty much as Maslow characterized it, writing more generally:

> To a certain extent, science education is a training in the obsessional *Weltanschannng.* The young man is rewarded *only* for being patient, cautious, stubborn, controlled, meticulous, suspicious, orderly, neat, and the like. Some effort is made to train *out* of him his wildness his unconventionality, his rebelliousness against his elders, his poetic and esthetic qualities, his gaiety, his Being-humor, his craziness, his impulsiveness, his "feminine" qualities, his mystical impulses, and much more besides.

No one can say how to put these qualities into a human being, but it is at least possible to leave them alone when they are there. They may be the background effects of a strong creativity.

As Dr. Dimond says, even if they don't know how to test for the humanistic virtues, the selection committees of medical schools can help by admitting that they should be encouraged. One way people can encourage the virtues is by creating a climate of opinion which welcomes their presence. What is wanted, in this case, are virtues informed by the spirit of science, but this, if we are to take Maslow's criticism seriously; will mean a new understanding of the meaning of

science—a reformed scientific epistemology. First would come the stipulation that science does not require mechanistic assumptions about human behavior or the nature of man. A new theory of scientific knowledge might well be grounded on the views of Michael Polanyi, made explicit in his book, *Personal Knowledge,* which is a modern classic. Maslow's books, *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences* and *The Psychology of Science,* would help to develop a scientific attitude which does not reduce man to a mere "object." As Maslow said in one of his papers: "Psychology should study the human being not just as passive clay, helplessly acted upon by outside forces, and determined by them alone. He is (or should be) an active, autonomous, self-governing mover, chooser and center of his own life."

If the qualities of devotion to others, desire to serve, stability, ethics, honesty, and commitment are what is wanted in the physicians of tomorrow, along with scientific and medical knowledge, and if we admittedly know more about teaching science and medicine than we do about the origin and development of these qualities, then why not examine more closely *any* individuals who have these qualities? This, again, is a quest parallel to Maslow's search for self-actualizing people, during the last thirty years of his life. We might take, for example, one of the persons whom Maslow studied, and refers to in his journal—a man who, in addition to making a successful career in civil engineering, gave a great deal of time to education and the study of the formation of human character. We are speaking of Arthur Morgan, who was born in 1878, and who today, at ninety-five, still goes to work every morning at the office of Community Service, Inc., in Yellow Springs, Ohio, and will soon publish a book he has written about his years as Chairman of TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority).

Arthur Morgan was born and grew up in St. Cloud, Minnesota. His childhood was sickly, and the after-effects of cerebral meningitis—over-sensitive nerves—afflicted him for the rest of his life. Interest in natural history emerged in his boyhood. With other youngsters he formed a Geologists Club, learning enough to pass a college entrance exam in geology when he was sixteen. He was a good gardener, raising and peddling enough vegetables to buy his own clothes. During high school he worked afternoons on neighboring farms. After graduating from high school he secured a teaching credential and earned $22 a month teaching the lower grades. Meanwhile he did such things as collect plant specimens, which he was sometimes able to sell to botanical institutions. His health continued poor, so at nineteen he took to the road for Colorado, equipped with a change of socks, paper and pencil, a diary, Gray's *Elegy* and the New Testament. In Colorado he had a rough time, but gained much experience. He was troubled by boils and unimproved health. He kept attending school when he could. In 1898, in Denver, in the Preparatory School of the State University, he took Caesar, German Grammar, Psychology of Art, Drawing, Solid Geometry. His eyes gave out, forcing him to quit school for a while, so he bought and peddled vegetables in the hills where no peddlers ever went. A musing entry made in his diary in 1899, two months before his twenty-first birthday, indicates the quality and direction of his thinking in those formative years:

> Have been reading the introduction to Butler's Analogy. I have heard of it for years and have half dreamed that when I should read it my doubts would all vanish, and that my theology would rest on a sure foundation. I never knew what was meant by analogical reasoning, and so did not know what course was taken in Butler's book. But I have for years been making analogies for myself and I have received all the analogical assurance I feel the need of.
>
> But I was disappointed in finding that the book I had so long been preparing myself to read, makes no pretense at demonstration.
>
> It is the possibility of there being no foundation for my faith and of my then being a dreamer; it is this possibility I want removed. The possibility at times seems small, but at other times seems to become equal to the other. That is, it sometimes seems

equally possible that the universe is purposeful and that it is purposeless.

For about three years I have lived on the supposition that there is a divine purpose, and it seems to me that is the only way to live. If we don't live consciously on that supposition, we live unconsciously on it, because the laws of the universe seem to govern us whether we will or no. It is only a choice of acting willingly or by compulsion. To bemoan the possibility of the universe being purposeless would demand an infinite intelligence.

Another entry, two days later, reveals the meticulous self-examination Morgan practiced, apparently as a matter of course. Such notes appear throughout his diary. You might think this tendency would make him a prickly sort of man, but he seemed to gain maturity rapidly and was able to carry heavy responsibilities all his life, becoming a teacher of the young as well as distinguished in his engineering profession, and also a rural sociologist of wide influence. He revived Antioch College in 1921, developed the Antioch plan of alternate work and study, then headed TVA, and after that gave all his time to rural community development.

This was the man who at the beginning of his adult life had confided to his diary:

I dislike to write with an unbroken spirit because in looking at this afterward it is possible that I may read it from the standpoint of one whose life is settled down to the commonplace and my present assurance would seem embarrassing.

But I don't intend to be commonplace. I intend to make a great person of myself. Not, perhaps, great in conspicuousness among men, but great in harmony with God, great in having fulfilled my possibilities; great in having seen which of my possibilities is greatest.

It makes me impatient to see myself using my powers in ways not the most effective. I haven't energy enough to waste it in resisting evil, pleasing my lower nature, seeking the approval of men, or making myself have the appearance of success.

Mrs. Morgan put together from Morgan's diaries the passages we have been quoting, in a book, *Finding His Way,* published by Kahoe & Co. in Yellow Springs in 1928. She wrote this about the early influences in Morgan's life:

From his mother he gained indomitable perseverance, a very exacting conscience, a fear of hell, and an almost equal fear of public opinion. In him the first two finally overthrew the latter in a fight that developed moral fibre and straight, dear philosophic thinking which has been an asset all his life. His mother, who during his boyhood kept students as boarders and roomers and gave them moral purpose, seems to have been a wonderful influence in the lives of young people she met; while his father, commonly known as "Uncle John," was considered a joyous friend and a kind adviser among the scattered families where he stayed overnight in the course of his surveying work. Spending an evening at a farmer's home, he would inquire of all friends and relatives as though they were his own, and he seemed never to forget any, though his last visit might have been fifteen years before.

About all we can deduce from this example of the shaping of a man who was indeed guide, philosopher, and friend to countless young people, and a public servant as well, is that such fruitful developments in a human life can hardly be planned. The *entire community* needs to involve itself in such responsibilities, for that is the only way a climate hospitable to the desired qualities can come into being. Yet community action is always begun by one or two, then strengthened by a few, and is finally understood, appreciated, and supported by many. So also with schools undertaking the deliberate sort of change envisioned by Dr. Dimond. Men such as Morgan and Maslow are now lonely individuals, all too few, but if their vision can be spread around, some more of them might be able to emerge, benefitting the medical schools along with other institutions.

REVIEW
MODERN CITIES ARE NOT CITIES

WITH all the talk about the ugliness, inhumanity, and impoverishment of life in modern cities, it is natural to wonder if there is *any* excuse at all for a city. Socrates, some may recall, preferred urban life to living in the country, by reason of the pleasure he took in conversing with other men. But to be persuasive, this reason needs expansion, and the view we have adopted is that the only justification for cities is that they gather and focus in one place certain rarities and high privileges of human experience which must be sought out because they are not common anywhere. The best reason for the city—perhaps the only reason—is its unique value as a school.

Even in their declining state, universities tend to make the towns where they are located good places to live. At least something of the now mythical community of scholars remains to enrich the cultural atmosphere. One thinks, in California, of Palo Alto and Santa Barbara, where some wholesomeness and decencies seem to persist more noticeably than in larger cities which are overwhelmed by numbers, leaving even a dozen or more colleges or universities without much effect.

In an article, "The Myth of City Planning," in the September/October *Liberation*, Murray Bookchin (who wrote *Our Synthetic Environment* under the name of Lewis Herber), suggests an ideal conception of the city which would include this idea. He says: "In theory, at least, the city is revered as the authentic domain of culture, the strictly man-made social substance from which humanity fashions the essential achievements of sociation." One could also say that the city, thought of in this way, provides opportunity for the full development of individuality. It is a place where humans may find themselves "freed from the deadening grip of custom, irrationality, the vicissitudes of natural contingency," and Bookchin quotes Max Horkheimer's contention that "the fortunes of the individual have always been bound up with the development of urban society."

But these conceptions now have hardly any application. Bookchin rises to eloquence in a denunciation of modern urban centers:

> The city in our time is the secular altar on which propinquity and community are sacrificed to a lonely anonymity and privatized atomization; its culture is the debased creature of commodity production and the advertising agency, not the gathered wisdom of the mind, and its claims to freedom and individuality are mocked by the institutionalized manipulation of unknowing masses among whom crass egotism is the last residue of the selfhood that once formed the city's most precious human goals. Even the city's form—or lack of form—bespeaks the dissolution of its civic integrity. To say with Marx that the modern city urbanizes the land is testimony not so much to its dominance as to its loss of identity. For the city, by the very nature of the case, disappears when it becomes the whole, when it lacks the specificity provided by differentiation and delineability of form.

In short, modern cities don't desene to be called cities, and Bookchin thinks that megalopolis is now the right word. His critique of city planning, as commonly practiced, is intended to show that the planners now accept the fundamental debasements of function and purpose which have destroyed the only acceptable role of the city, claiming that any other approach to urban problems is fuzzy-minded and romantic.

> The city, once the refuge of the stranger from archaic parochialism, is now the primary source of estrangement. Ghetto boundaries comprise the unseen internal walls within the city that once, as real walls, secured the city and distinguished it from the countryside. The bourgeois city assimilates archaic parochialism as a permanent and festering urban condition. No longer are the elements of the city cemented by mutual aid, a shared culture, and a sense of community; rather, they are cemented by a social dynamite that threatens to explode the urban tradition into its very antithesis.
>
> To these historical contradictions and tendencies, urban planning and its disciplinary cousin, urban sociology, oppose the platitudes of analytical and technical accommodation. Leonard Reissman does not speak for himself alone when he affirms that, while "there have been recurrent crises" in urban history, "there is little chance for a perfect solution. . . ." The thrust of this thinking is strictly ideological: the megalopolis is here to stay, and the

> sooner we learn to live with it, the better. A dysutopian mentality increasingly pervades contemporary city planning and urban sociology, an outlook misleadingly formulated in terms of regression to rural parochialism or adjustment to an "urbanized world." Radical critique tends to be denigrated. Typically, Reissman belabors "rural sociologists" for seeking "a rural idyll or an urban utopia." Such thinking, he scornfully adds, is "super-critical," with the result that "we continue to criticize the city more often than we praise it, to magnify its faults more often than we stress its advantages." These remarks conclude with the pragmatically triumphant note that "In any case, such discussions have hardly slowed the pace of urban growth."

But Reissman, Bookchin suggests, has at least the virtue of being aware of his own assumptions and is willing to discuss and defend them. Yet like others in this field, he attributes the problems of megalopolis to the moral defects of the people in general, ignoring the fact that these defects are not only allowed to develop, but are enormously encouraged, by the anti-human urban environment. "The economics of avarice, the politics of ignorance" are referred to without indication that these practices are typical preeminently of the groups which dominate and shape city life—"land speculators, construction barons, government bureaucrats, landlords and banking interests."

Looking to the past for a model of the city with at least some ideal elements, Murray Bookchin chooses the Hellenic *polis* as a form of society which "promotes individuality without denying its base in an integrated community." While the Greeks depended upon slave labor and restricted women to the domestic sphere, their *polis* nevertheless achieved balances difficult to find elsewhere. People rather than place determined its quality. Especially pertinent for the criticism of modern cities is the Greek sense of *limit*. Bookchin quotes from Aristotle's *Politics* the view that the polls should house "the largest number which suffices for the purposes of life and can be taken in at a single view." E. A. Gutkind observes that Greek town planning followed this rule, with the result that when Syracuse was at its greatest expansion, it consisted of five different towns, each with its own wall. Strabo called it Pentapolis.

Modern capitalism and the bourgeois city are evolutions from the devotion to trade of the medieval towns, not from Greek ways. Bookchin stresses the contrast:

> Trade is the reduction and quantification of the world to commodity equivalents, the leveller of quality, skill, and concrete labor to numerical units that can be measured by time and money, by clocks and gold. What sets this abstract quantified world in motion is competition—the struggle for self-preservation on the market place. Capitalism, the domain of competition *par excellence*, has its fair share of violence, plunder, piracy, and enslavement; but in the normal course of events its mode of self-preservation is a quiet process of economic cannibalization—the devouring of one capitalist by another and the ever-greater centralization of capital in fewer hands. This takes place as a ritual peculiar to the capitalist mode of production—notably, as production for the sake of production, as growth for the sake of growth. The bourgeois maxim, "grow or die," becomes capitalism's very law of life. The inevitable impact of this unceasing expansion on the city can only be appreciated fully in our own time by the limitless expansion of the modern megalopolis, as the arena both for the endless production of commodities and their sale. If the Greeks subordinated the market place to the city, the emerging bourgeoisie subordinated the city to the market place—indeed, it eventually turned the city itself into a market place. This development marked not only the end of the small, sharply contoured medieval town, but the emergence of the sprawling capitalist megalopolis, a maw which devours every viable element of urbanity.

What ought to be done? Among existing ideas and proposals, the best that Bookchin can find is *Blueprint for a Communal Environment*, a radically counter-cultural program developed by a coalition of several groups in Berkeley, California, who take their inspiration from the "People's Park" episode in May, 1969. (This *Blueprint* was included by Theodore Roszak in his book, *Sources*, Harper Colophon, 1979.) Bookchin's *Liberation* article is a portion of his book, *The Limits of the City*, to be published this month by Harper & Row, also a Colophon paperback.

COMMENTARY
"ADMINISTRATIVE OMNIPOTENCE"

WHAT amounts to explanation of the hardly concealed contempt for Indians evident in the report on Indian Bureau schools in "Children" may be found in a few words by John Collier, a past Commissioner of Indian Affairs, taken from his Foreword to *The Hopi Way* (University of Chicago Press, 1947) by Laura Thompson and Alice Joseph. Speaking as a determined reformer, he said:

> Indian Service in the United States deals in total ways with whole societies. It does this for ill or good. Through generations that look gray and cold now in retrospect, Indian Service pursued one and another special and decreed aim: to Christianize Indians, to substitute the individual Indian for the societal Indian, to make Indians into land individualists, to obliterate Indian superstition, to make go-getters of Indians. And policy was dominated by preconceptions as to the nature of Indian society. . . .
>
> The presumption was one of administrative omnipotence. What was willed by authority, and put into action by authority—that was the thing which would be. The obscure complexes of personality and of group influence and ancient, present physical environment were ignored. . . .

Collier did what he could to change all this, but past attitudes still seem dominant in the Bureau schools.

Certain findings of the authors of *The Hopi Way* bear on this subject. Some four thousand Hopis, the westernmost of the Pueblo peoples, living in the highlands of northern Arizona, are said to "have probably preserved more of their ancestral heritage than any other Indian tribe in the United States." The Hopi attitude toward the American schools is of particular interest:

> The children are sent to school by their parents usually not out of any genuine admiration for the values of reading, writing and American history, or because our system of moral education is thought to be truly desirable and superior to their own but as they openly voice it, because school may provide them with necessary tools for defense—first of all, the knowledge of English—in the fight for survival with a physically stronger force.

Apparently, the children "cooperate," since the Hopi youngster "who has gone through the grade school does not show less, but frequently more, resistance to measures taken by the administration than the unschooled Hopi." Incidentally, both tests and simple observation show that the Hopi children "are very intelligent, highly observant, and- are apparently very capable of complex and abstract thinking."

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
WHERE DESTRUCTION BEGINS

A DEVASTATING account of the education of American Indian children provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is contributed to the Fall issue of *Contemporary Education* (Indiana State University School of Education, Terre Haute) by Pat Porter. According to this writer, 177,463 children are sent to these Bureau schools, which include seventy-seven boarding schools and a number of consolidated day schools. Most Indians resent these schools, which tear the children away from their home environments, and the children fear and despise them. Mr. Porter says:

> Suicides among teen-age Indians are four times the national average. In fact, in a 1972 government hearing it was stated that the "teen-age male American Indian has had the highest suicide rate of any species on the face of the earth." Especially shocking is a report of Indian children between the ages of 10 and 13 playing a "school-yard game of suicide." On the Fort Hall Reservation, children as young as 8 have committed suicide.

The cruelty and indifference in the treatment of these children, reported at length in this article, is apparently well known and even commonly admitted, causing a witness testifying in a Senate Hearing on Indian Education (in 1968) to say: "The American Indian reservations are communities in crisis and there is evidence that our present educational program contributes to the disintegration of many of the children." The large boarding school at Tuba City, Arizona, has been characterized by Senator Mondale as "cold, really inhumane." Of the younger children (ages 5-9) in boarding schools, more than ninety per cent are Navajo. In most cases the homes of the children are within twenty-five miles of the school, but the children may go nine months in school without seeing their parents, since the families cannot afford transportation. However, the Bureau may also send the children to boarding schools hundreds of miles from their homes, an example being Alaskan students who are sent to a boarding school in Oregon. Pat Porter says:

> Destruction of the Indian personality begins in schools controlled by non-Indians showing little concern for the desires of Indian parents and students. In addition, these schools lack Indian teachers and school personnel who understand Indian life and history; there are actually fewer Indian teachers now than 20 years ago. Discrimination against Indian people is often perpetuated in educational materials such as an eleventh-grade textbook used in New Mexico describing Indians as "savages who beat out the brains of white babies."

While it has been declared Bureau policy to "phase out" boarding schools for the past thirty-five years, more boarding schools and consolidated day schools continue to be built. Lack of roads reaching to the isolated areas where the Indians live is a reason given. On the subject of day schools, Porter says:

> If the BIA chose to, it could build cottage day schools in most Indian communities more cheaply than consolidated day schools. A 1968 study reported that 15 decentralized day schools with live-in facilities for teacher-aide couples who would teach 20 pupils each would have been cheaper by $600,000 to build than the consolidated BIA school then being planned for Porcupine, S.D., for 300 students. This school was to cost $l,140,000 and would be quite far from the homes of many children.

While in 1970 President Nixon directed that "every community wishing to do so, should be able to control its own Indian schools," and funds can be made available for this purpose directly from the U.S. Office of Education, the 1974 budget requests no money for this program. So far, only twelve of the two hundred schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs are Indian-controlled.

We have said little about the racism, handcuffing, and other brutalities practiced on Indian children, and almost nothing of the prison-like atmosphere of places which, as Senator Mondale put it, masquerade as schools but function as detention centers. Pat Porter gives his

authorities in scores of footnotes. One important source is the report, "An Even Chance," prepared in 1970 by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

What may be one of the twelve exceptions—schools funded by the Bureau but operated by Indians—is the high school in Ramah, New Mexico, which has a seven-person, all-Navajo board and a staff three-fourths of whom are Navajos. This high school is a comparatively new experiment. In 1970 a delegation of Navajo Indians from Ramah went to Washington for help in starting their own school. Their spokesman, Mrs. Bertha Lorenzo, told the Indian Bureau: "Our children run away from your boarding school; they cry themselves to sleep. We want to bring them home where we can give them love and education." According to an account in the *New York Times* for last July 15, the Ramah delegation secured grants from the Bureau and HEW and started with an enrollment of 155 children. In addition to the standard academic curriculum, there were courses in Navajo history, Navajo culture, and practical instruction in shopping, which a teacher described as "how not to get ripped off at the trading post." While the Indian dropout rate is ordinarily about 50 percent, and reaches 95 per cent with Indian college students, dropouts are negligible at the Ramah high school, and the community is now hoping to establish an elementary school, starting with a kindergarten. Progress in academic studies is slow, since the high school students are handicapped by past years of poor teaching and failures, while for most of the children English is spoken only as a second language. But enthusiasm for the school runs high. Allied with the school is a local FM station which broadcasts in Navajo.

Florence Howe begins a review of eight feminist books for the Autumn *American Scholar* by saying:

> In the spring of 1970 I went to see a number of people in publishing with an idea. Why not begin to produce a series of biographical pamphlets on women in literature and other arts in history, science, medicine, law and politics? For format I had in mind the Minnesota series on American writers. For audience, I envisioned the slow but studied growth of women's studies courses like the fifty I knew about then. There were no biographies at all for such significant women as Antoinette Brown, Maria Mitchell and Rebecca Harding Davis, a trio of nineteenth-century Americans in the fields of religion, science and literature respectively. Given a burgeoning women's movement, I added, the prospective audience might be very much broader than high school and college students.

Publishers couldn't see any possibilities in the idea. One said that they were "losing their shirts" from over-estimating the demand for black studies books, and didn't propose to do the same thing with books about women. Fortunately, Mrs. Howe was not discouraged and she—or perhaps her friends—started the Feminist Press, a non-profit publishing company that has so far produced a series of biographies titled: *Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Constance Markievicz,* and one on Simone Weil called *Approaching Simone.*

This seems like a splendid idea, and maybe the popularity of such studies will be able to overcome the skepticism of book dealers toward pamphlets, which haven't sold well for years. (Actually, a great many books could be improved by being held to pamphlet size.) It is often difficult to find material on distinguished women. Madame Roland, for one, was an extraordinary person of whom more ought to be known, and there are others of her time who are seldom mentioned except by scholars—Madame de Stael, for example. Mention of Mrs. Browning recalls the rare insight of Ronald Sampson in portraying her character in *The Psychology of Power* (Pantheon, 1966). It is especially good news that Simone Weil has a place in the Feminist series, since this extraordinary woman, who died at the age of thirty-four in 1943, was surely among the most brilliant thinkers and essayists of the first half of the twentieth century. Happily one of her books, *Oppression and Liberty*, has just been

brought out by the University of Massachusetts Press, and is reviewed in the Autumn *American Scholar* by Robert Coles. Coles, the psychiatrist who wrote *Children of Crisis*, was just the man to review Simone Weil, for he has felt the same necessities that drove her to work in a Renault factory and on farms, doing hard manual labor for which she was hardly fitted, in order to taste at first hand the experiences of working people. Coles muses on the things which come to mind while reading her book:

> Dignity, she knew, was the issue, and the small community of farmers and artisans was the dream she nourished as the means for that dignity to be at least substantially achieved. Again, one thinks of Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin, of Proudhon, whom Simone Weil mentions, and Kropotkin and Eric Gill and Tolstoy: dreamers, perhaps—impractical and overly idealistic and thoroughly idiosyncratic. Still, if the kind of Christian community, or series of communities, that she envisioned cannot be considered a likelihood but rather the product of a utopian imagination, we certainly need such an imagination, not only because it provides a standard, a means by which we can measure the distance we have to travel, but also because the ideas and ideals of Simone Weil and others in her tradition have provided many others—less pure of heart less self-sacrificing, perhaps it can be said less blessed—with a kind of necessary tension. With a voice like Simone Weil's in our ears, we are less inclined to be satisfied with the more transparent and absurd justifications that this century has seen intelligent people find for fascism, Stalinism, and too, the rampant destructiveness (of air, land, water, not to mention human beings) that has been carried out in the name of one or another "democracy."
>
> I hope many young Americans will find their way to this extraordinary philosopher.

Dr. Coles, we think, is right on all counts.

FRONTIERS

The Urbane Farmer

WE have another book on how to live happily and constructively on the land. If the present trend continues, before long we'll have a good library on the subject, made up of review copies! This one is *Farming for Self-Sufficiency* by an English couple, John and Sally Seymour, published this yea, in England by Faber and Faber and in the United States by Schocken ($7.50). There is a chapter on land, seven chapters on animal husbandry, one on bread and wheat, another on barley and beer; other field crops are discussed, and there is attention to growing fruit and nuts. Garden crops get ample space, also vegetable storage. Fish have a chapter, and odd matters such as beekeeping, seaweed, wood, and a smokehouse are also covered. There is a good introduction by Mildred Loomis, veteran communitarian, decentralist, and friend of Ralph Borsodi, who with her husband farmed for many years at Lane's End Homestead in Ohio, and is now at the School of Living in Maryland. An excellent bibliography lists many of the classics of organic gardening and related studies of nutrition.

Unlike Scott and Helen Nearing, the Seymours raise animals and eat meat, but like Scott, John Seymour devotes half a day to writing, the rest to working the farm. A book like this needs careful reading, so that an attempt to summarize its contents would be profitless. But the reasons for choosing to live this kind of life invite discussion. Little by little, the ideas in this book are gaining currency and acceptance.

"What," the Seymours ask in their opening chapter, "does being self-supporting mean?" The question is answered with examples of pre-industrial cultures—in India and Africa. Life is indeed "primitive" in these communities, but the authors are interested in certain prevailing qualities. In the Indian village, the only "useless" man is the *zamindar* or landowner, who produces nothing but usually consumes more wealth than any of his fellow villagers. The African village is still more "primitive"—

> The Central African village has no *zamindar*, in fact it has no landowners at all. The concept of land-ownership is completely alien to the African tribesman. The *village* owns or at least controls, such of the surrounding forest as it can hold from others, and the villagers till the land in common, each man tilling what seems to the Headman of the village a reasonable amount, and paying nobody any rent for it. The Headman tills (or at least his wives do) the same amount as anybody else, and everybody has enough, and could have more if he wanted it. Here, unless there is a famine (and in twelve years in Africa I never saw one), everybody gets enough to eat, and people who do not hanker after the flesh-pots of the white man live a very good life indeed.

These matters may seem arguable, but objectionable features of the African village don't have much bearing on the issue of land ownership, which is here the point. It is of course very difficult for the Westerner even to imagine a secure life without ownership of land, and it can be said that people who manage without it live in ways we should not find attractive at all. Yet an exercise worth attempting would be to see if what intelligent modern man wants of life is really dependent on ownership rights, or on what might be termed *use*-rights. But doing away with private ownership is a proposal that immediately conjures up the spectre of the all-power-state as ruler and manager of practically every aspect of existence. For this reason the best way to get rid of the abuses of landownership is by *outmoding* it, as Gandhi proposed, as Vinoba has applied the idea in the Gramdan movement, and as the land trust program of Robert Swann illustrates. The state has no part in these changes, which are community-inspired. By such means land-ownership might first be made irrelevant, and then an old and backward idea, and finally unthinkable, as it was to the American Indians before they learned, to their sorrow, that the white men really meant to make the land inaccessible to them.

Maybe individualism and private ownership are phases of experience that people have to go

through, and then recover from, in order to combine sociality and fellowship with distinctive individuality. It seems obvious that Western civilization will be forced to learn wholehearted cooperation and sharing if it is to survive. Meanwhile, it is certainly the case that when Western literacy, Western individualism, and a money economy are forced on people who have no knowledge or experience of these ways, they find it almost impossible to adapt and are destroyed by the customs of civilization. Thinking about such things becomes important if supposedly civilized peoples must now find their way to a simpler kind of life. This, in fact, is what the Seymours have been doing. John Seymour says:

> Now, the sort of self-sufficiency which I wish to treat of in this book is not the old, pre-industrial self-sufficiency: that of the illiterate peasant or hunter who has never heard of anything else. That kind of self-sufficiency is, for better or worse, on the way out. What I am interested in is post-industrial self-sufficiency: that of the person who has gone through the big-city industrial way of life and who has advanced beyond it and wants to go on to something better.

Total self-sufficiency, Seymour thinks, is probably not possible or even desirable. He believes in the self-sufficiency of communities and individuals. His book is a case for a lot more self-sufficiency for individuals—more than they have now; for craftsmen who farm, farmers who want to become craftsmen, and for sensible exchanges and cooperation between them. He finds that more and more people are thinking in this way and wanting to make a practical start.

> These people are not anachronistic, or ignorant or stupid, but are in fact drawn from the most intelligent and self-aware part of the population. The list of "intentional communities" in the United States of America is long and getting longer with an increasing momentum. In this country there are several hundred communities, and the army of "hippies" and "drop-outs" wandering about the roads like pilgrims of old contains many individuals who would like to be self-supporting, but haven't the faintest idea how to set about it.

John and Sally Seymour have been working at this project for eighteen years, and their book is the record of what they have learned. However, they don't think anybody can be completely self-supporting—

> We have never been self-supporting—but we have been very *nearly* self-supporting. We have lived extremely well on a very small money income, and the tax-eaters have not done very well out of us. We have not contributed much to the development of the atom bomb, nor to the building of *Concorde.* When the latter breaks the sound barrier over our heads, and scares the wits out of our cows, we have to endure it, but at least we have the satisfaction of knowing that we haven't *paid* for it.

Even people who plan to stay in the city may find enjoyment in this book, and something of value.