When the ten 1973-74 Visiting Scholars traveled to 87 colleges and universities throughout the U.S. this past academic year, they carried detailed schedules of their two-day visits planned to make the best use of the Scholar's time and talent on a particular campus. Such a program is not easily put together and requires months of advance preparation on the part of the local Phi Beta Kappa chapters and cosponsoring departments; but a carefully planned visit will lead to a rewarding occasion where the Scholar is brought into the mainstream of the campus, especially the lives of the undergraduates, and meets with students and faculty on many levels.

A reading of chapter reports indicates that participation in the Visiting Scholar's activities is not always limited to the host institution and, in fact, is very often open to interested persons from neighboring, and even somewhat distant, schools. When James L. Gibbs, Jr., professor of anthropology and dean of undergraduate studies at Stanford, went to the University of Arkansas, he was joined in his two days of class appearances, student conferences, colloquia, and public lectures, by not only those people on the main campus, but by students and faculty from other branches of the University who had come to hear him from some 200 miles away. Another instance of this long distance cooperation occurred in the visit to DePauw University by Renée C. Fox, chairman of the sociology department at the University of Pennsylvania. Because of her special interests in sociology of medical research and medical education, she stimulated a great deal of cross disciplinary discussion, and, says the chapter correspondent, "...the visit aroused enough interest to entice several carloads of nurses to come from Greensville to Indianapolis to hear her speak." On additional campuses an unusually large number of radio and taped TV interviews served to widen the audiences of other Scholars. It is hoped that this widening of impact will be felt on even more campuses as future panels are expanded with the help of the Phi Beta Kappa Associates, who have generously agreed to support the Visiting Scholar Program.

The ten men and women who have accepted appointment for the 1974-75 academic year are:

HAZEL E. BARNES, professor of classics and integrated studies at the University of Colorado since 1953, is visiting professor in the department of philosophy at Yale University during the 1974 spring term. She is author of An Existentialist Ethics, Humanistic Existentialism, and Sartre.

JEAN SUTHERLAND BOGGS has been director of the National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa since 1966. During 1962-64 she was curator of The Art Gallery of Toronto, and in 1964-66 was Steinberg Professor of History of Art at Washington University.

RENÉE C. FOX is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and recipient of the E. Harris Harbison Gifted Teaching Award. Chairman of the department of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, she was a Phi Beta Kappa Visiting Scholar during 1973-74.

MARTIN KILSON is author of Political Change in a West African State and Political Dilemma of Black Mayors. Professor of government at Harvard, he is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Black Academy of Arts and Letters.

RAY D. OWEN, professor of biology at Caltech, was appointed in 1973 to the President's Cancer Panel. Former president of the Genetics Society of America, he is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences.

EUGENE M. SHOEMAKER, a geologist with the U.S. Geological Survey since 1948, is professor of geology at Caltech and was chairman of the Division of Geological and Planetary Sciences there from 1969-72. In 1961 he organized the Branch of Astrogeology of the U.S. Geological Survey.

(continued on back cover)
Every thinking person is familiar with the old debate — it has been unremitting since industrialization began — about whether our growing technological power is a boon or a menace. Are steam engines a good thing? Yes, said the party of hope, they surely will give us more power over nature, reduce the need for menial labor, and provide more creature comforts for more people. No, said the party of gloom, they will poison the air with filthy smoke, undermine a harmonious rural way of life, and breed immorality. Since the expectations of both parties proved correct, it seems unlikely that such an argument ever can be resolved — even in retrospect.

Of course it is tempting to think that we now conduct the debate on a much higher level of sophistication. Today we not only enjoy the services of computers, but of comparably objective modes of thought — systems analysis, game theory, cost benefit programming — and a reassuring lexicon of neutral terms like feedback, spin-off, and trade-off. My impression is, however, that while the method of computation and the vocabulary have changed, the basic form of the debate remains very much what it was in the steam age. Consider the current controversy about nuclear power plants and you will find that one party talks about the necessary increase in electrical power whereas the other points to the deterioration of the less tangible qualities of life. No doubt some of the pessimistic testimony of intellectuals like myself is the expression of particular vocational, aesthetic, or class interests. But after making every reasonable allowance for special bias, the remaining reasons for pessimism — at least for the immediate future in the United States — strike me as compelling.

I specify the United States as the prototypical advanced industrial society — "advanced" in the sense, especially, that services and mental labor, now occupy a larger portion of the work force than productive labor. It is a capitalist society committed to continuing economic growth and technological innovation and marked by a hierarchical structure of power, wealth, and status.

The chief reason for pessimism about technological change in the United States is political. A number of technical innovations since World War II have imparted new credence to the widely held assumption that advancing technology is conducive, somehow, to the growth and centralization of state power. For example, the introduction of nuclear armaments has weakened the constitutional constraints upon the President's arbitrary use of military power. Given the possibility of swift surprise attack, the President must be allowed the right to initiate hostilities at a moment's notice.

But the centralization of power over the use of military technology is only the most dramatic of many analogous developments. If and when biologists achieve the power to regulate human reproduction by means of genetic engineering, or if, as there is every reason to assume, the deterioration of the environment will continue, these developments will provide even more plausible sanctions than any now available for the urgent imposition of governmental control. Such control will of course be facilitated by the new electronic methods of gathering, storing, and disseminating information — a technology that raised the Orwellian spectre of governmentally dominated thought and expression. Quite apart from the miraculous hardware it has produced, the electronic revolution has enlarged the technical and scientific elite, further widening the gulf between the beneficiaries of higher education and the rest of the populace, and thereby weakening — or so it would seem — the democratic ethos.

The main point is a familiar one: advancing technology seems to be a major force impelling us toward some kind of totalitarianism. To be sure, there are important distinctions to be made between a totalitarian society and a society marked by centralized governmental power. But the technical developments mentioned make it almost certain that the authoritarianism of the future will be far more profound, far more inclusive, than old-fashioned Caesarism. They portend a nation state dominated by a web of interdependent, hierarchical bureaucracies — a totality so intricately organized, so vulnerable in the sense that a failure in any part could jeopardize the whole, that it will require a highly disciplined, controlled, and pacified populace.

In sketching this lurid picture I do not mean to imply a necessary relation between these sophisticated new technologies and the emergence of a totalitarian polity. Whether they are so used will of course depend on other, political conditions. For this reason I propose to use the threat of what might be called "technological totalitarianism" as a hypothetical context in which to consider a narrower subject: the relationship between certain technological developments and higher education. Supposing that we do face such a threat, how might we adapt our work in the colleges and universities to meet it? To be more specific, in what ways might the humanities, or what I would prefer to call "the study of man," contribute to the resistance to totalitarianism? But first, let me explain how I use the terms "study of man" and "technology."

One advantage of a term like "the human sciences" or the "study of man" as against the "humanities," is that it may help to overcome the unfortunate cleavage between the "humanities" and the "social sciences." Instead of emphasizing the differences between the disciplines which take as their subject matter various aspects of human behavior, "the study of man" would emphasize what they have in common. The truly urgent problems posed by the accelerating rate of technological innovation and, more specifically, by the threat of totalitarianism, demand for their solution the active collaboration of "humanists" and social scientists.

As for the concept of technology, a useful definition ought to take into account the expanding range of meaning we now give the term. Let me suggest three meanings related to each other as if arranged in concentric circles. In the smallest circle, at the center, we locate technology in the most limited sense: it refers to the knowledge, skill, and equipment that men use for practical purposes. For the present discussion we shall make no distinction between pure and applied science.

In the second circle the idea of technology is expanded to include the forms of bureaucratic organization through which the practical knowledge, the apparatus, and the skills are administered. A discussion of automotive technology in the United States therefore would embrace the organization and the goals of the industry as well as the machinery of the assembly line. Similarly, the subject of medical technology in the United States would be incomplete without a consideration of the system of private practice for profit. The second sense of the word, then, is technology bureaucratized. Speaking of technology in this way, incidentally, with qualifying adjectives like automotive, medical, agricultural, architectural,

This is an abridged version of a paper first delivered to the A.C.I.S. Conference on Technology and the Humanities at Drovoland Castle, Ireland, in June, 1972. The complete essay will appear in The Sciences, the Humanities and the Technological Threat, edited by W. R. Niblett, London University Press, 1974.
tural, etc., calls attention to one misleading feature of current usage: the tendency to make statements about the beneficial or deleterious effects of "technology," as if, indeed, a judgment could apply with equal cogency across the board to the whole gamut of modern technologies. As a result, many discussions of the presumed good or evil of "technology" are virtually meaningless. They help to obscure the real problem, which is not to adopt a single attitude toward all the available and often competing technologies, but rather to find an effective way to assign priorities among them.

Next we come to the outer circle, the third and most inclusive definition of technology. Used in this sense, the word is roughly synonymous nowadays with "the system" or "The Machine." This third, virtually all-encompassing sense of the word, might be called metatechnology. It refers to a hypothetical situation: the virtual domination of the life of an entire society by the mode of thought most conducive to, and therefore seemingly inherent in, the advancement of technology in the narrow sense. It is a way of thinking which features impersonal, piecemeal analysis, standardized procedures, and the adaptation of all things — except of course the controlling goals of society — to those forms of knowledge susceptible to precise quantification. In other words, metatechnology interpenetrates and becomes one with the national ideology. It is connected with technology in the second sense (the bureaucratic organization of practical knowledge, skill, and apparatus) by means of the institutions of mass indoctrination, particularly the advertising industry as it dominates the national system of communications. It might create a technologized nation state, an almost supra-human force, like Frankenstein's monster, which we no longer would control — a kind of technological totalitarianism. However skeptical we may be about the validity of this extravagant futuristic idea, there can be little doubt that it has a powerful hold upon the collective imagination these days. It expresses a pervasive anxiety, one which can hardly be said to lack a basis in political reality.

Coming back now to higher education, I want to consider certain ways in which our universities are now being adapted to the needs of technology in the second, or bureaucratized, sense defined above. One of the first educators to call attention to this development was Clark Kerr. In his important Godkin Lectures of 1963, Kerr argued that a distinctive characteristic of the multiversity is the increasingly close coordination of its activities with those of the great industrial corporations. The two institutions, he observed, are in fact "merging physically and psychologically." In describing the multiversity, Kerr refers to it as a "big mechanism" and as part of the "knowledge industry," and on the whole his language supports the idea that a primary shaping influence upon education should be the technological requirements of a corporate economy. One of the chief aims of the multiversity, therefore, is to supply expert technicians and managers to the dominant bureaucracies — governmental (including the military), industrial, financial, and educational. To borrow the language used by another theorist of the new order, Zbigniew Brzezinski, in "America in the Technontronic Age," the university having been since medieval times "an aloof ivory tower, the repository of the irrelevant," is now making "a grand re-entry into the world of action." Today, he says, it is becoming "the creative eye of the massive communications complex, the source of much strategic planning, domestic and international." In addition to this way the new technocratic style has helped to integrate the multiversity with the other great national bureaucracies on a horizontal plane, as it were, so it also has been extended downward within the vertical structure of education from graduate training to the primary levels of schooling. Requirements for admission to various professional, graduate, and advanced technical schools thus help to define the undergraduate curriculum. By the same token, criteria for admission to undergraduate status shape the aims of education for students in the top "tracks" of the high school system. The end of the "track," of course, is a job or profession — a slot in the system — and "getting off the track," as the "little engine" discovers in the children's fable, is a dangerous thing to do.

This idea of contemporary American education dominated by technological needs may be something of a caricature, but it is one that many disaffected students of the Sixties found compelling. Beginning at Berkeley in 1964, when Mario Savio called upon his followers to stop "The Machine," a chief target seemed to be technology. Those who chided the radical students and teachers for being the "new Luddites," reminding them that their electronic music and even their drugs were products of technology, missed the point. The rebellion was not directed against tools, gadgetry, or power machinery per se, not technology in the narrow sense, but rather against technology in a wider sense — as a mode of consciousness and a form of social organization — technology in the third, most inclusive sense defined above. Remember the famous placard a student carried in one of the early demonstrations at Berkeley: "I AM A HUMAN BEING — PLEASE DO NOT FOLD, SPINDLE OR MUTILATE." This student's outrage is provoked not by the computer itself, but rather by a university designed and operated on a machine model — the interchangeable parts being minds and bodies.

If we strip away the animus from this radical student view of contemporary education, the conception that remains is strikingly like the one held by Kerr, Brzezinski and its other ardent advocates. They agree that the multiversity is becoming more closely integrated into the national structure of economic and political power, and that it is less concerned with nurturing critical minds than in producing experts and specialists.

If this conception is accurate, it may help to explain the loss of confidence and purpose within higher education since World War II. The utilitarian idea of the multiversity, and the fragmented, scientific conception of knowledge which it favors, are at odds with our presumed commitment to democratic and libertarian values. Whereas the student population of our universities has grown immensely, so that a smaller percentage than ever is destined for academic careers, teaching continues to be dominated by the tacit aims of the graduate and professional schools. Even at the undergraduate level many teachers continue to present their subjects as if their highest purpose is to replicate themselves. In the context of this sterile professionalism, the academic equivalent of bureaucratic technology, the student demand for relevance makes a good deal of sense. It presupposed that relevant knowledge, in a democracy, is knowledge that meets the needs of non-specialists, which is to say, the needs of "the people." But the multiversity seldom meets these needs. Within it teaching is divided among dozens of academic fiefdoms — departments, schools, institutes. Given the tremendous expansion of knowledge in modern times, a degree of specialization of the intellectual life is of course unavoidable. What lends a marked technological quality to the teaching and research done within many of the subdivisions of the modern academy, however, is that it so seldom is informed by any purpose larger, or more responsible socially, than the advancement of that particular discipline or vocation.

To return to the issues raised at the outset: what can be done to counteract the further technologizing of higher education? Are there any practical alternatives to the fragmented curriculum of the modern university? Until recently, it should be admitted, most attempts to recover some part of the lost unity of knowledge by means of interdisciplinary programs have been unimpressive. Too often they have had a half-
serious, nostalgic cosmetic air about them, the sort we associate with efforts to inject a little genteeel "humanizing" culture into the training of technicians.

But the recent civil crises invested the idea of interdisciplinary education with a new significance. They brought into focus as never before the political consequences of the standard multiversity style of education. It may be an effective way to train students for particular jobs or professions, but it does very little to prepare them for winning the struggle for liberty, for achieving decency, or for stopping the growth of poverty, disease, and strife down of city life. Accordingly, a number of new and more radical programs in non-specialized education have been initiated in American universities: black studies, urban studies, women's studies, environmental studies, etc. Like their predecessors, however, these programs tend to exist on the fringes of the university. They are widely regarded, perhaps not without justice, as second-rate in quality and peripheral in importance. This will continue to be the case until we devise a more effective format for interdisciplinary studies: one that embraces significant research as well as elementary learning, and is a force capable of engaging the attention of our ablest serious scholars. The trouble is, however, that a "serious" scholar, according to currently received definition, is one who works at the "highest" (read: most technically advanced) levels of inquiry. One test of the new mode of interdisciplinary studies, according, will be their capacity to transform our conception of what constitutes scholarly seriousness. How, then, can we encourage serious interdisciplinary education at the university level? As a basis for discussion, let me suggest an organizing procedure and a format. Needless to say, what follows is intended (at least for the moment) to be a supplement to, not a substitute for, the conventional system of education.

The first step is to assemble a group of people—teachers, students, laymen—who are interested in a problem of current significance. Although the central significance of the problem would be the catalyst, it is inconceivable that any topic deserving the necessary degree of attention would lack an historical dimension. One thinks of the kind of problems which came to the fore in recent years, problems of environment, poverty, racial, sexual, and social injustice, the impact of change on the family and on the young, and the influence of popular culture, not to mention the problems of war and imperialism. The group would begin by canvassing the essential issues and setting provisional goals for a colloquium of limited duration (perhaps three to five years). (It is important that the entire group agree beforehand on the term of this, and that it not become another vested academic interest like many special "institutes" in continental universities. A major goal here, after all, is to increase the flexibility and adaptability of the university.) The group would then be able to relieve faculty participants of many of the departmental obligations for a period long enough to produce some scholarly results in the forms of papers, books, plans of action, and so on. A further aim would be to teach at least one academic generation of undergraduates and graduate students.

Here is an example of the way the system might work. An invitation to a planning session is issued to all of those within the university and the adjacent community who are interested in the problems of aging. Representatives of many academic disciplines attend, among them medicine, psychology, anthropology, history, art, literature, economics, etc., as well as representatives of the city government, a nursing home, a hospital, the housing authority, the social security agency, and the city planning board. A plan is drawn up for a combined program in teaching, research, field work, and (in the final stages) an advocacy campaign, to begin two years hence. The agreed upon objective is to publish a collection of papers on the problems as seen from the perspective of the several disciplines, and along with those papers a specific plan for improving the situation of the aged in the local community. An executive committee is established and the following year it announces an undergraduate and graduate curriculum plan to be taught by participants. (A teacher of comparative literature, for example, offers a course on the treatment of old age in the work of major writers including Shakespeare, Tolstoi, Yeats, and Mann.) Students who enroll in the colloquium will be expected to devote a specified fraction of their time to work in the colloquium. In addition to the obvious approaches to be taken, the group will supervise field work leading to a cross-cultural study of the problem; the city planner and the political scientist will work with a group preparing to win support for a new city program, including a housing project with special facilities for the aged, etc. A number of students concerned with social change plans to be participant observers in that campaign. Several graduate students in a variety of disciplines join the colloquium with plans to do their research for advanced degrees under its auspices.

Another program could focus on prospects for a new system of mass transit in a particular region. Ecologists and engineers might be involved in studies of the fuel resources and the bio-physical environment. Historians and sociologists would examine the changes in community structures and family life caused by the automobile. A comparison with the impact of earlier technological innovations might be undertaken. Perhaps the most challenging problem would be to understand the strong attachment of the public to the automobile in all its aspects—psychological, economic, sociological, mythological, etc. This would also entail studies of city planning, architecture, popular culture, advertising, and the relative value of various kinds of advocacy.

A third example would be a colloquium focused upon one of the central issues raised in this discussion itself: to what extent does the apparent affinity between technology and the centralization of power derive from the organizational structure, and perhaps even the method, of science itself?

The idea that the erosion of other values follows from the root assumptions of science deserves serious evaluation. Alfred North Whitehead found this intuition at the heart of romantic poetry, which he characterized as "a protest on behalf of the organic view of nature, and against the exclusion of value from the essence of matter of fact." In recent years this criticism of scientific empiricism has elicited the support of many natural scientists, particularly those who have been attempting to define a perspective adequate for coping with the problems of population, and resource depletion.

Central to the shared insights of romantic poets and present-day ecologists is the idea that the specialized knowledge acquired by scientific inquiry tends to screen out essential kinds of evidence. It may provide accurate data about all of the subordinate aspects of an ecosystem without providing any knowledge of their complex interactions and overall significance. To what extent do present-day ecologists attach science for this narrow focus. But whether the flaw resides in the method itself, or whether it derives chiefly from the closely related organizational structure of science and technology, or from a combination of the two, is not at all clear. It does seem evident that in our present scientific inquiry the subdivisions of knowledge tend to become coterminous with the kinds of administrative subdivisions of the academic and corporate establishment.

As an historical corollary, the work of Lewis Mumford might also be invoked. In The City in History (to which, of course, he refers), he argues that all the basic features of modern technology were present in the system used by the Egyptians in building the great pyramid 5,000 years ago. By tracing the prototypical machine, or "megamachine" to this ancient system of power in which the interchangeable "parts" were human beings, Mumford, in his view, revives the generally received notion of the potentially oppressive aspect of technology. What threatens us, he contends, is a perspective—a mode of thought and action—as it manifests itself in our interaction with nature. If we ask what this perspective leaves out of account, we are likely to get a fairly complete inventory of the kinds of data no computer can handle—of knowledge which clashes with "the humanities." A colloquium organized to test this hypothesis could lead in many directions. Among the advantages of the colloquium format, as I envisage it, are the following:

1. It would be conducive to both teaching and research, and thus enable scholars to share their professionally oppressive aspect of technology.
2. It would help to break down the barriers between the academy and the world, and between academic specialties;
3. It would combine the study of man in his highly individual expressive behavior (as in) of the arts) with the study of man in his collective, often anonymous, social, political or institutional behavior;
4. It would provide useful points of intersection between the study of the past, the present, and the future;
5. It could form a bridge between conceptual knowledge that we generally get in the classroom and from books, with practical programs of action in the world;
6. It would enable scholars to address the kind of broad problems which tend to fall into the interstices between vertically structured academic disciplines;
7. It would help to provide the experience and
This new handbook ably covers the years 1918 to 1965 and provides concise historical and statistical information on the Communist movements of 106 different countries. It serves as invaluable background for the equally useful annual Hoover Institution Yearbook on International Communist Affairs. In addition to the country chapters, there are relevant brief summaries on such items as the Balkan Communist Federation, the Communist and major Communist front organizations.


An informative work on 90 years of Austrian intellectual development. While not surprising in its over-all conclusions, the rich details and biographical studies on major Austrian thinkers in the fields of philosophy, social theory, and psychoanalysis are well worth reading. Specialists of Central European history will appreciate the analysis of Austro-Hungarian ideological conflicts.


Arthur J. May of Rochester has carefully reconstructed the last four decades of the Hapsburg monarchy culminating in the collapse and dissolution of the Empire as a result of World War I. Presenting considerable material never before published, this book is especially useful on pre-World War I Balkan and Danubian diplomacy.


This timely study covers a multitude of contemporary aspects of American foreign policy. Most impressive is the clever and provocative writing in the chapters entitled: "Nice Guys Finish Last" and "The Sound of Money." The book's emphasis is on America's diverse propaganda practices, the feedback effects, and their general impact on the minds of men and women abroad.

FREDERICK J. CROSSON


A comprehensive biography of the most influential thinker in America during the first half of this century, by a friend of his retirement years. Ample access to family papers and other original sources make the rendering of Dewey's life concrete and detailed, if unabashedly admiring. It is impressive to see the extent to which he instantiated his own theory of concepts emerging from practical inquiry through his involvement in political and social movements and their impact on his ideas.


The "Indianization" of China through the pervasive spread of Buddhism eclipsed the ancient Chinese worship of ancestors and natural forces, pitting individual salvation against the strong family and social ties of Confucianism. But like Judaism in Canaan and Christianity in the Greco-Roman culture, the host society exercised an influence of its own, and Chinese Buddhism emerged as a quite distinct form. Ch'en documents and analyzes the metamorphosis, tracing its stages in ethics, politics, literature and economics. The student of Western history will
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find numerous fascinating parallels to the first millennium of the Christian era.


After a quarter of a century, Marjorie Grene returns to a study of Sartre, of whom she was one of the first American interpreters. She has added to his phenomenology more seriously, his drama view of life, the Critique as reducible to Being and Nothingness deductive and Sartre himself as the last of the great Cartesians. His last work, on Flaubert, resists a final assessment, but on the whole her own better-defined position allows her to make some insightful criticisms of his analyses.


This half-autobiographical book is at once a repudiation of its author's recent religious views and a cogent reassertion of the value of his early ones, indeed of his childhood religious experiences. Theologians, he argues with verve and dash, have too much read other theologians, and not enough examined and shared the people's religions. Books are inherently elitist and the religions founded on a scripture have a "shattering impact" waiting to be released. Once the religious sense emerges. Through Esalen, Cox rediscovered the experiential roots of religion, and he celebrates with fervor their ubiquitous presence. Agree or not, it's a well-written and intriguing work.


At the opposite pole of approach to the phenomena of religion from Cox, Smart's is a sober, carefully reasoned analysis aimed at establishing the autonomy of a scientific study of religion, which is not reductive. Lying between theology and the psychology and sociology of religion, independent of the faith or non-faith of the investigator, the claim mapped out relies on phenomenology to validate the self-contained meaning of ritual and belief. Explanatory hypotheses based on descriptions are checked by cross-cultural comparisons. Programmatic but very good.


The thesis is that Nietzsche's theory of value is not a coherent, but rather than volitional. The method is to group the pro and con texts and to elaborate a cognitive interpretation based on "the more fundamental themes" in his thought which can account for the apparently non-cognitive texts. Knowledgable and coherent, if not compelling, and instructive in any case.

Judaism and Tragic Theology. Frederick S. Plotkin. Schocken. $7.95.

A tragic view of history is part of the Judaic inheritance, in Plotkin's view, an inevitable consequence of their trans-political God. In this honest and searching book, he tries to articulate the fundamental challenges raised for Judaism by the modern secular worldview, and he does not tolerate easy answers or the reduction of religion to praxis. Sharpened questions for "secular Judaism" are the culmination.

LEONARD W. DOOB

Poems from Africa. Samuel Allen. Crowell. $4.50.

An intriguing, attractive collection of traditional "poems" and modern poems provocatively illustrated by the black-and-white drawings of Romare Bearden. The traditional verses are not poems in the modern sense: they have not been composed and communicated in detached isolation the way our own poets write but, having been embedded in the context of songs, dances, religion, and rituals, they reflect the life and values of their unknown creators and audiences. The modern poets, who usually use English, French, or Afrikanas, express African problems and protests; for example, Hago gives an amazing background is working class/I my foreground is working class/I am myself my slogan/Eat, booz, and be married/For tomorrow we vote."

Social Sciences as Sorcery. Stanislav Andreski. St. Martin's. $7.95.

A truly challenging, sufficiently sophisticated, very angry, largely justifiable attack upon political science, psychology, and sociology for their use of jargon, their abuse of quantification, their penchant to demonstrate the obvious, and their hidden values. Talcott Parsons is the favorite butt of the作者. The author is less severe, when he semi-diagnoses a few personages, such as Freud, Marx, and Weber; he heaps unjusting praise upon Herbert Spencer and — above all — upon himself to whom he makes copious references. Is it true that "the wealthiest American universities contain an unusually large proportion of phonies who have as the collective glory deservedly won by their colleagues in the exact disciplines"?


A calm, delicate, perspicacious description of conflict as it recurs within each person as well as between persons and groups. The analysis in the first and last parts stems from a wide assortment of sages such as Gandhi and Kurt Lewin, from existing studies and opinions in social science, and more often than not from the author's own experiences as a social philosopher. It culminates in a series of challenging, cogent, wordy propositions, very few of which are as self-evident as they might appear at a quick glance. Part Two is a potpourri of ingeniously designed experiments by the author and his students. One's admiration for their quantity and quality is tempered only by the fact that the subjects have generally been college students or otherwise adults living in New York City, not typical samples of mankind.


A compact, adequate summary of what we know, or guess we know, about the content and particularly the effects of TV programs to which virtually every American child is addicted. The text is limited to 30,000 words a week per week. Emphasis is placed upon laboratory and field studies, rather than wild, ignominious. The theoretical question is intriguing: does the violence on TV serve as a model and induce young viewers to commit violent acts, or does it provide a vicarious or cathartic outlet so that they are less prone to be violent in real life? The answer of course depends on the relevant data — and methodologically clean, conclusive data are not easy to come by.


A collection of papers describing in fascinating detail runaway slaves in North, Central, and South America established their own communities; protected themselves from planters and militia; survived by utilizing the resources of usually inhospitable environments and often by trading with Indians, pirates, or dissident whites; and both perpetuated and drastically altered their own significant African cultures. Clearly these slaves as well as those who temporarily visited relatives or lovers in neighboring plantations (petit maronnage) did not docilely accept their lot.


A swiftly written, pleasantly journalistic sufficiently scholarly retelling of the conquest of most of Africa by European powers. With a keen eye to the role of individual Europeans and not to the basic social and economic contexts.

RICHARD BEALE DAVIS

The Political Status of the Negro in the Age of FDR. Ralph J. Bunche. Edited by Dewey W. Grantham. Chicago. $17.50.


Bunche's is our first comprehensive study of the black man's lot earlier in this century, a manuscript going back to the period discussed and now published. Lynch's volume is the first to present a well- rounded documentary history of blacks in American cities from 1866. Both stimulating books.


This greatest of colonial New England journals, now re-edited with new insertions of text, footnotes containing new information about people and events, and appendices valuable as genealogy and bibliography, is the latest of the works of our earliest writers to appear with unhampered commentary. In handsome format, it is a most valuable book.


The first two volumes designed to provide one-volume histories of the thirteen original colonies in a series under the general editorship of Milton M. Klein and Jacob E. Cooke. In the case of these two we have the first-ever inclusive colonial histories of two of the colonies.


Calhoun examines the motivation and the
character of individual loyalists in the context of society and economy. Main gives us a swinging survey of economic problems, political forms, loyalist elements, and the related places of all these in the evolving thirteen states. Schwartz’s book, though concerned with a later time-period, offers a continuation in many respects of the story of the formative and dissident elements in the shaping federal republic, of course from a considerably differing stance.


Two quite different but equally valuable books on an ever-fresh subject. Larzer Ziff considers Puritanism as a culture, defines his terms, and offers provocative discussions and conclusions. He seems to agree with Perry Miller only in the assumption, implicit and explicit, that the American way of life has the one great advantage in the colonial era. The Roger Williams book, a beautifully annotated edition of his first published work, is charming, informative, sensitive. Fascinating reading for the laity, a necessity for the colonialist and American linguist.


Three studies of provincial or state history of considerable significance. The new edition of the history of North Carolina brings many things up-to-date and modifies some previous conclusions. The Maryland book, though hardly well-written, presents a clearcut and apparently well-rounded study reaching moderate conclusions. Sarah Lemmon delves into a little-studied subject, the attitude of the individual states (outside New England) toward the War of 1812.


A beautiful book presenting a real contribution to American Indian materials, though the account itself is rather sketchy. There is also a valuable picture of life among the whites in the back-country.

J. T. BALDWIN, JR.

*The Wind Birds,* Peter Matthiessen. Viking. $9.95.

The text of this book is an impressionable essay originally written for *The Shorebirds of North America,* edited by Gardner D. Stout (Viking) and illustrated with opaque water colors by Robert V. Clem. Omitted from the present volume are the colored plates and much of the technical and scientific information of the earlier publication; included are twenty-five new drawings by Robert Gilmore, a fine wildlife artist. The essayist is a good naturalist with a delightful style of writing. To read him is a pleasure. For him to call his subjects wind birds is imagination at its felicitous best. For those not familiar with shorebirds the common names are often confusing.


Scientist and popularizer of science Profesor Borek writes with such clarity and authority that he makes biological experiments seem simple—as many of them are, and interprets them in a way that anyone who can truly read may understand. Here with discriminating judgment and common sense he weaves occasional glimpses of wit he summarizes what is known and not known about normal regulation and its derangement which result in the monstrous growths known collectively as cancer.” Collective is a key word: a crash program to cure cancer is senseless stupidity with a guaranteed route to waste of time and money.


To know the wild parts of Mexico and to be friends with the kind people who live there you must have an eye for the beauty and graciousness in their daily lives. Roger Williams, assisted by sundry sensitive souls, makes this evident. We are in his debt for his frequent ornithological visits to Mexico to study and illustrate birds and for his perception sensitivity that makes us feel a party to the recording of his experiences. Of course, his paintings and drawings are superb, here admirably supplemented by photographs by Olin Sewall Pettigill, Jr., and others.


An encomium to John Steinbeck, to the part of America that nurtured him, to the land and its people whom he loved and about whom he movingly wrote. The author has lived in that land and knows its people, and its attachments to both are strong. In a most appreciative way he writes about the natural and human history, and his wonder photographs supplement his words. Not omitted is recognition of the luscious side of the life of the time and place. At appropriate intervals are quotations from Steinbeck.


Long considered wastelands, the realization is now upon us that estuaries are essential in great measure to our survival. Meeting and mingling of salt and fresh waters make them some of the most productive places on earth; rich with trapped solar energy and life-nurtured nutrients, they teem with plants and animals, which are there during all or parts of their lives to become links in the complex chains of other organisms— as for example, migrating fishes and migrating birds. An amateur inspired by a gifted teacher (Al Molina), the author began a serious study of ecology and marine biology and “lived” with estuaries, particularly Bolinas Lagoon near her home.

Drugs and Foods from Little-Known Plants. Siri won Reis Altschul. Harvard. $10.

Data taken from about 5,000 specimens in Harvard herbaria and recorded here in taxonomic sequence. With the thought that certain notes of folk uses of plants as chronicled by the collector and filed with his specimens might afford productive leads for research, Doctor Altschul pursued her idea with diligence and meticulousness and examined an estimated 2,500,000 specimens.
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TECHNOLOGY AND MAN (continued from page four)

the knowledge most needed to meet the threat of technological totalitarianism in a post-industrial society; and, not least important, (8) it might help our institutions of higher education recover that sense of confidence and purpose they recently seem to have lost.

This model of university education may be called radical in the sense that it stresses the interaction between learning and decisive issues of contemporary life. It differs from both the multivarsity model and the liberal model. The dominant goals of the multiversity are determined by the needs of the corporate system for managers and technicians; the goals of traditional “liberal education” are set by ostensibly neutral intellectual needs, that is, by the quasi-autonomous advancement of learning within the established academic disciplines. The radical program described here differs from both in its effort to meet those wider social needs which do not coincide with the functioning of any particular social class or bureaucratic segment of the organized system.

I have put so little emphasis upon the contribution to this educational program that could be made by the study of imaginative literature (my own special interest) and by aesthetic experience generally, because that case has been made so often, and the facts seem so obvious, that they do not seem to require repetition. Study of the arts provides an exercise of the senses, the imagination, and the experiencing powers not available elsewhere in the curriculum. Knowledge of this kind, particularly because it reaches down below the level of abstract ideas into the life of feeling, is an invaluable defense against the moral nihilism that seems to accompany technologized thinking. At the same time, however, I must disagree with those who would have us rely upon aesthetic education as our chief defense against what is, in essence, a political danger. The faith of Matthew Arnold and his latterday disciples is an overblown faith in the power of literature. So far as education in the arts can engender resistance to technological totalitarianism, it will be most effective when most available to collaboration with the other branches of the study of man.

For all of these reasons, I believe, we need to create somewhere in the university a new format for interdisciplinary education. It must be a format that enables us to bring any of the human sciences (including technology itself) to bear on problems arising in contemporary life. If we can expose academic disciplines to the pressures of first-hand-experience, if we can place them in the “real life” context where politics, the struggle to gain and use power, intersects with our prized definitions of ultimate concern, we may be able to retain control of the ways in which knowledge is used — and of our own lives.