VOLUME XVII, NO. 9
FEBRUARY 26, 1964

THE CRISIS IN MEDICINE

FOR many years, as a general practitioner I have been troubled by the apparent inadequacy of the medical profession in meeting many of the problems that people bring to the office. Not that we should be able to solve all of them, but it is a fact that today about half of the GP's practice revolves around the difficulties people have because of their behavior, rather than because of overt physical disease, and because of psychosomatic disorders that are also a result of anxiety, guilt and stress reactions, or just a matter of the way we now live our lives.

Much or most of the emphasis in medical education is on physical disease, and therefore the general practitioner is left without the skills he needs to cope with problems in this area (the big share of his practice), so that he learns by trial and error, if he learns at all. And even then the skills acquired may be wasted because they are not yet adapted to the field of family practice. The doctor who thinks nonetheless spends many hours in soul-searching to find answers for these inadequacies, which he sorely needs to correct. This is true, of course, if his primary purpose in life is to help people. Many able physicians are not satisfied to remain GP's even though their incomes are more than adequate, and are leaving general practice for other fields. It follows that they are not recruiting younger physicians into this base of sound medicine; therefore, the family physician is declining in numbers at a time when he is needed more than ever. And those who remain end up too busy to fulfill their responsibility as medical counselors for the family; they are spread too thin.

I had some inadequate reasons for this trend, never fully explaining it to my own satisfaction or anyone else's, until I happened on a book that has changed my way of thinking about family medicine and the path (s) it must take to survive. The book is *Doctor, Patient, and Illness* by Michael Balint (International Universities Press, New York, 1957). I recommend it to anyone interested in the *continuing care* concept of medical practice via the family physician.

Dr. Balint's main thesis is that in order to fulfill his role as the family's medical adviser and confidant, the general practitioner must not only be well versed in the physical disease entities, but must also be aware of all the factors that cause dis-*ease* in people—whatever puts them at odds with their environment. He must also be true to his title of "doctor," which means *teacher;* he then becomes not merely an administrator and interpreter of tests, or a "traffic cop" routing patients to the proper specialist for the proper test, but a man skilled in his own right in the interpersonal relationships between humans and the effects these have on the individual. He becomes as well a medical philosopher who understands that "dis-ease" in humans has a many and varied etiology, not purely physical or biochemical. He is also aware of the power that he has as a physician, and he learns to use it wisely.

The readers of MANAS will clearly understand that this multiple etiological approach falls into the philosophical-psychological realm, for when is a disease or any human condition—purely physical or biochemical? Dr. Balint notes that because medical education emphasizes physical diseases and the learning of erudite techniques and skills for handling them, the doctor is prepared for only a part of what he meets in his practice—the preponderance of patients may be ill at ease but have no physical disease, yet consult doctors thinking they do. Then there are those with manifestations of psychosomatic disorders (or other diseases whose etiologies are vague and unexplained), where the causes most likely are

psychic; and those who consult because they need counsel in interpersonal relationships.

In spite of the psychiatrists' attempts to make the medical profession aware of this problem (Dr. Balint is a psychoanalyst), they have been confined by the real limitation of their working milieu—the protected environment of the hospital or the consultation room couch, where they develop a close personal relationship with the patient, which is quite intimate but has a *beginning and ending.* In contrast, the GP's relationship with the patient is at various levels of intensity, depending on the problem he faces. Also, because of the relative "youth" of psychiatry, and its less tangible value and results, it has been very slow to be accepted by our profession, especially in an ultra-materialistic-scientific society. Dr. Balint felt that as an analyst he knew little of the problems psychic disease presents to the family physician, and, rejecting the perennial teacher-pupil relationship between specialists and GP's, he began to hold seminars with family doctors, working with them on their problem patients, assuming that he knew no more than the GP but that together they would learn of this problem and develop skills that would be useful to both. Many questions were answered and useful things learned, but mostly they found that far more exploration of the subject was needed.

There is certainly a need for training in the physical disease entities, but with so many specialties and specialists abounding today, and with so much of the research money going into the study of these problems, the neophyte generalist learns a lot that he doesn't require or will not use. He needs only to be familiar with the scope of the specialties, to know what help they can be to him, so that he can spend more time learning the skills that will enable him to give his families good continuing care skills to aid his patients in understanding their irrational behavior and unconscious motivations, and the many causes of their disease with their lot. This could help to solve our biggest health problem today—mental illness. Progress has been made, but there is much yet to be done.

Dr. Balint also names a problem created by over-specialization in medicine—"the collusion of anonymity," he calls it—whereby the patient has no one doctor responsible for his "case" after he has made the rounds of all the specialists. Each specialist assumes only the responsibility pertaining to his specialty. Then, the general practitioner resents the perpetuation of the "teacher-pupil" relationship that continues in his contacts with his specialist-colleagues far beyond the medical school environment. He wishes to be respected for the unique contribution that he makes to the team, not disparaged for not having degrees in some specialty. As a result, the GP does little to create a more friendly atmosphere, and I can't blame him, for too many specialists obstruct the general physician on hospital staff appointments, offices, and so on. The relationship should be that of mutual aid and respect, the one helping the other for the benefit of the patient, rather than assuming he knows more than the other and having constantly to direct and teach. After all, the family doctor has the final, hard job of the continuing care of the patient, the ultimate responsibility for his health and welfare, and he is usually willing to assume this responsibility as long as his decisions are respected. This is what he wanted when he chose medicine as a career. He undertakes to take care of patients who live, die, have problems of all kinds, have babies, sickness, get into trouble, or just exist, bringing together the best of science, philosophy and his desire to practice his art well, for the benefit of his patient.

We must learn that over-emphasis on physical disease, in medical education, in the lay press, and in research can *make* many people ill, especially if the physician is willing to give every symptom encountered a physical-disease classification rather than investigating other causes which are

just as real. Doctors *do* cause disease; we have a name for it——iatrogenic disease.

Dr. Balint has a prescription for what he calls the "utopian general practitioner," which I will paraphrase under a few headings:

1. The ideal GP will not be subordinate to the hospital specialist. The medical student, therefore—
   (a) will have a good share of his training outside the hospital, if he is to do general practice. (This is a good argument for preceptorships.)
   (b) He will not defer or default to the specialists in many areas that coincide with his own knowledge and ability.
2. He must alter his standard approach from that used in hospital practice.
   (a) He will not automatically comply with the concept of "elimination by proper exam and tests, invoking only selectively the prevalent maxim of "rule out."
   (b) He will make the center of his work the office rather than the hospital.
   (c) His interviewing will be entirely different—more free-wheeling than the standard forms.
3. He will realize that the clinical illnesses classified and studied by hospital medicine are only brief episodes in the long history of a patient.
4. He will regard the specialist as one who is to help the GP, as do the pathologist and the radiologist, from whom a diagnosis is all that is asked and all that is given. Since the specialist is not experienced in working in the GP setting, it would be presumptuous of him to suggest treatment for patients that the GP has known for a long time, at least in some areas.
5. He will not fall into the trap of the "collusion of anonymity" where the patient ends up with no one physician really responsible for him. "The GP will not be able to disappear behind a facade of a bored, overworked, but not very responsible dispenser of drugs and writer of innumerable letters and requests for exams; instead, he will have to shoulder the whole responsibility for peoples' health and well-being and partly for their future happiness."

To sum up, this approach would give the family physician a *raison d'être,* which otherwise is fast being taken away from him by the specialist. He needs his dignity and usefulness restored, to be made equal in the eyes of his colleagues and the public. What he has to offer is unique and can be offered by *no one else.* There is certainly a crying need for his services. If the general practitioner and his concept of continuing medical care is lost to the specialty-oriented, scientific, impersonal approach prevalent today, medicine as an art, a philosophy and a profession will be dead. The humanity of it will disappear. It will be a technique to be mastered by those adept at learning technical skills rather than a philosophy understood, loved, and practiced by wise men. Nobody wants the return of the horse and buggy doctor; he had little more than his compassion to offer. But this *he gave.* Besides the wonderful advances in scientific medicine which are already available, he must learn the newer techniques of studying and comprehending human behavior that are available from psychiatry, sociology and psychology that we need to help people live in a complex modern society; given this impetus in basic education and medical practice more general practitioners will be recruited automatically.

I think an aspect of economics in medicine must be briefly mentioned. All specialty training is done in the hospital setting. Therefore, the specialists feel uncomfortable doing anything the least bit complicated outside the hospital. As a result, they admit many people to the hospital who really do not need to be there, and who could have been cared for adequately in office practice. And since their orientation is gained largely by interpreting tests, they order many expensive, unnecessary tests, often running a whole gamut of tests and exams for the sake of completeness, instead of choosing wisely those few tests suggested as pertinent by the condition presented to them. As a result of this emphasis in hospital tests, and because of inner anxiety, many patients demand the tests as a matter of course, since they are available.

I wonder if it is wise to comply in this. Patients should be able to consult someone they have faith in, who can determine whether they need these procedures or not. I think it has been quite harmful for the American people to be as health-conscious (regarding physical disease, particularly) as they seem to be, because many of them go about looking for illness as an escape-mechanism, or in mortal fear that they have not taken a test that may show some horrible disease. All this does is to prevent them from finding a suitable philosophy of life to relieve their anxiety and to live more comfortably in a world that presents enough anxieties of its own, without adding anxiety from within in the form of an unrealistic concern for physical health and well-being. People need this time to devote to developing their spiritual lives rather than looking for some external panacea from the medical profession—a "pill" that will solve all their problems.

There are already the beginnings of a practice of this sort in this country. While preparing this paper, I ran across an article in *Medical Economics* (Jan. 13, 1964) by a family doctor who is putting these ideas in effect with a group association in the Northwest. It can be done just as easily by a solo practitioner, because the time he spends with his patients can be compensated for if the money spent on unnecessary hospitalization and tests can be diverted to this area. Fewer specialists would be needed, and there would be more family practitioners. I have always felt that there are enough doctors in this country to care for everyone, but that they are poorly distributed, in both geography and the types of work they do. I think the English idea of large medical centers for the highly specialized type of medicine and surgery is sound; in this country, the best specialty treatment available is in the large clinic or university hospitals. But even if you live in a medical center, it is difficult, perhaps more difficult, to get good continuing medical care from a family doctor.

Spirituality is necessary in medicine today, as it is in all areas of our lives. Attempting to understand our relations with each other and with the world we live in, and the force or forces that guide it, *is* spirituality. Understanding illness is a part of this. We need not discount the great scientific advances made, but only put them in their proper perspective, knowing that the scientific approach will never answer fully the problems in human life. So much of our illness and dis-*ease* comes from irrational behavior and unconscious motivation and poorly understood interpersonal relationships, factors certainly in the spiritual realm. What we do for people, the ideas and impressions we convey to them, makes medicine an art, and I find it hard to analyze this, except to say that an art has to be practiced under good tutelage. What comes out sometimes cannot be rationalized intellectually, which seems to involve it in the spiritual realm.

The thing that plagues me most is whether the medical profession, in assuming any of this responsibility, is stepping into the area of religion and religious institutions. Do patients consult the doctors because they cannot find answers or solace in their present religious or spiritual institutions? It would be far easier for us to limit ourselves to what we can explain, such as physical and biochemical disease, but many of us feel that then we would be burying our heads in the sand, refusing to use the greatest gift we have—the unique ability to study human behavior in time of stress, at first-hand in a close relationship, through a profession that does have much to offer in this area, because of the kind of men who have chosen it and make it up.

RAYMOND J. PY, M.D.

Vermilion, Ohio

REVIEW
MR. WILSON'S PROTEST

WHILE Edmund Wilson's *The Cold War and the Income Tax: a Protest* (Farrar, Straus & Co., 1963) has been subjected to considerable criticism, this book should not be dismissed as only a display of irascibility on the part of a writer who is incensed because his private affairs are first investigated and then managed by the U.S. Treasury Department. Whatever the provocation, part of Mr. Wilson's indictment is a charge that we must apply to our present national culture, and critical reactions to Wilson's personal situation and outcry are comparatively unimportant. It is necessary to recognize that the mechanisms designed to enforce the regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue constitute a kind of Frankenstein monster in many persons' lives, and that resulting fears of income tax difficulties have a paralyzing effect. As a writer relatively unconcerned with the business of making or keeping money, Mr. Wilson is in this respect similar to thousands of teachers, authors and artists, and while it is impractical to argue that their records of financial disbursements be regarded with privileged leniency, one wonders why the Treasury Department could not provide a sympathetic advisory service to men whose incomes are never predictable, and who are apt to forget about the problem of Money for years at a time. Wilson now faces lifetime impoverishment, the attachment of any future earnings, largely because of penalties incurred for failure to file tax returns when he had barely enough money to carry on his projects.

Now almost seventy years old, Edmund Wilson is the author of two works of unparalleled importance, *To the Finland Station* and *The Dead Sea Scrolls,* and it is impossible to appreciate them without feeling sympathy for the situation in which he now finds himself, harassed by a plethora of hearings and no real end in sight. Mr. Wilson is not the first man to take a long look at a social problem because of something that happened to him personally, nor are the reflections so evoked safely dismissed because of the origin.

Here is his summation of the current situation in respect to taxes:

> The collection of taxes and the avoidance of taxes have now become national industries. There has grown up as opposite numbers of these 60,000 tax officials a corps of 80,000 lawyers who are occupied exclusively with taxes, and there are also the accountants who work with them, and the thousands of other lawyers whose practice is also more or less in tax matters. A professor at Chicago Law School tells me that he has estimated that half of the top 10 per cent of the school's graduating class has been, during the last ten years, devoting at least half its working time to taxes. The government lays upon us the obligation not merely to hand over to it, above a very moderate bracket, a third or more of what we make, but also, in addition, if we have not the time or the aptitude to attend to such matters ourselves, to pay out considerable sums to experts in law and accounting, who try to circumvent its unmanageable statutes and to save for us, by pleas and excuses, as large a share as possible of that income of which our national propaganda assumes that we are freely disposing in our enjoyment of "the American way of life." The atmosphere of the tax-ridden United States is reminiscent of the Prohibition era, except that it is a good deal grimmer. Among the population in general, these tax laws are felt, at the least, as a constraining and menacing embarrassment which our legislators have got on the books we do not know exactly how and with which we are less and less able to contend at the same time that we are less and less prepared to conform. The day I was haled into court, the judge was knocking off the cases of a series of income tax culprits as if they were so many bootleggers. The *New York Times* of August 12 announces that "the fiscal year 1963 saw an increase of more than 105 in convictions of income tax violators."

Fears of the threat of Russia during "the cold war" parallel and supplement the fear of income tax trouble, and, in Mr. Wilson's opinion, the two are intricately interwoven. How is it possible, he asks, for "citizens of this free world to resign from the gigantic and demented undertakings to which our government has got us committed?" He continues:

> The truth is that the people of the United States are at the present time dominated and driven by two kinds of officially propagated fear: fear of the Soviet Union and fear of the income tax. These two terrors have been adjusted so as to complement one another and thus to keep the citizen of our free society under the strain of a double pressure from which he finds himself unable to escape. . . . The bulk of the nation's funds is being spent, as the new budget shows, on the exploration of space, the arrears from previous wars and the preparation, in prospect of future wars, of the instruments of wholesale destruction and deliberate contamination—the fact that what we do and what we make goes mostly not for life and enlightenment on this planet on which we have not yet found out how to get along decently with one another but for the propagation of darkness and death, for ourselves as well as for the enemy, has been poisoning American society to an extent of which most of us are not fully aware.

Edmund Wilson, of course, has encountered an intensification of effects of this alliance between taxation and war preparation because his political opinions were once very much suspect. Under the heading, "The Point of View of a Former Socialist," he relates the history of his thought in the fateful 1930's:

> It may perhaps be wondered why a former Leftist, who in 1932, at the time of the great depression, when the Communist Party was legal, voted for the Communist candidates in the presidential election and who voted for Norman Thomas thereafter up to the time when he ceased to run, should be making so much fuss about state control. Had I not, in voting for socialism, been voting for the state control of industry? Had I not at that time been in favor of expropriating the profits of the rich and expending them for the welfare of the many? Well, I must confess with compunction that I was naive enough at thirty-one to take seriously Lenin's prediction in his pamphlet *State and Revolution,* written in 1917 on the eve of his return to Russia, that the clerical work of a socialist government could easily be attended to in the spare time of ordinary citizens who were otherwise occupied with higher things, and that the State, under the new regime, no longer needed by a governing class, would inevitably "wither away" and cease to harass the individual, who would be eager by that time to cooperate in promoting the general harmony of a frictionless because classless society—though critics of Saint-Simon and the other early nineteenth-century communists had predicted the opposite result: the growth of a huge bureaucracy and the eventual omnipotence of the State.

It was precisely from this background, though, that the most valuable general book we know on the Communist revolution and its antecedents was produced—*To the Finland Station,* a book circulated abroad by the State Department with considerable gratitude for its educational value. And how does this former socialist look at the present? Mr. Wilson writes:

> We and the Soviet Union, in spite of our competitive boasts and our nasty recriminations are both at this point well advanced in what used to be called invidiously "State Socialism" in order to distinguish it from a socialism which was intended to be more beneficent, which would somehow free everyone from bondage and give everyone enough to eat. The "State" in both cases consists of a kind of mechanical organism of interlocking official departments, with a nominal leader at the nominal top who is taxed one would think almost beyond endurance by the effort to keep his hand on the complicated ill-coordinated and often refractory controls.

One of Mr. Wilson's advisers suggested that perhaps he should live abroad, since his affairs had become so hopelessly complicated. At the time, the suggestion seemed absurd, for Wilson's natural home seemed to be the land of his birth and of his work. That it was not completely absurd occurred to him later:

> I have always thought myself patriotic and have been in the habit in the past of favorably contrasting the United States with Europe and the Soviet Union; but our country has become today a huge blundering power unit controlled more and more by bureaucracies whose rule is making it more and more difficult to carry on the tradition of American individualism; and since I can accept neither this power unit's aims nor the methods it employs to finance them, I have finally come to feel that this country, whether or not I continue to live in it, is no longer any place for me.
>
> To one who was born in the nineteenth century, and so still retains some remnants of the belief in human progress of a moral as well as a mechanical

> kind, it is especially repugnant to be forced to accept preparations for the demise of our society or of a damage to it so appalling that it is impossible to see beyond it. The confident reformer of the past always saw himself confronted by an enemy, the defeat of whom would represent for him a release of the forces of life, the "dawn of a new day," the beginning of "a better world." But who today is the reformer's adversary? Not the trusts, the "malefactors of great wealth." Not "capitalism," not "communism." Simply human limitations so general as sometimes to seem insurmountable, an impulse to internecine destruction which one comes more and more to feel irrepressible. These elements plus our runaway technology, have produced our Defense Department, with its host of secret agents and diligent bureaucrats of the Pentagon and the CIA, who have got themselves into a position where they have not merely been able to formulate policy without the approval of Congress itself but even to carry it out. . . .

A Protest is also informative on what has happened to men who have objected either to preparations for war or to the collection of large amounts in taxes on private income to support it. The cases of Maurice McCracken and Claude Eatherly are given interesting dimensions, and in this context one is compelled to note that Henry David Thoreau would be in a lot of trouble today. The conclusion of *A Protest* should be sufficient indication that this book is not a mere harangue, but a pithy and provocative tract for the times. It closes with these paragraphs:

> I should not make the mistake I have mentioned above of isolating a human institution and regarding it as the enemy of humanity. It is admitted that, in the phenomenon of hypnotism, the victim must have the will to be hypnotized, and we have now been hypnotizing ourselves. We have created the war branches of our government in one of our own images. But now that things have gone so far, is there any chance short of catastrophe, of dismembering and disassembling this image and constructing a nobler one that answers better to what we pretend to?
>
> All such images, to be sure, are myths, national idealizations. But there has been enough good will behind ours to make the rest of the world put some faith in it. The present image of the United States—homicidal and menacing—is having the contrary effect. And for all our boasts of wealth and freedom we are submitting to deprivation and coercion in order to feed and increase it.

COMMENTARY
CONTEMPORARY MAGAZINE

FROM time to time MANAS has requests from other publications for use of its mailing list. The reply is always the same: we regard the MANAS mailing list as a trust from our subscribers and do not release it to anyone. Recently, after making this explanation to one of the editors of *Contemporary Issues* (a magazine published for some fifteen years in England, and brought to the United States last year), we received a letter asking some questions:

> Am I correct in assuming that your rule of not releasing your live mailing list was adopted to prevent commercial exploitation of the names? Yet I wonder whether your rule does not have as well the effect of shielding your subscribers from material that would be likely to be of interest to them?
>
> Many of your readers might be interested in our publication, but have little chance to see it. We are not a commercial venture. . . .

P.O. Box 2357
Church Street Station
New York 8, N.Y.

JACK BEARD
for *Contemporary Issues*

This magazine (50 cents an issue, $3.00 a year) is published by a group calling itself Organization for Rational Society. A portion of the statement of its purposes was quoted in the lead article in MANAS for July 24 of last year. In one place this statement said:

> A challenging examination and critique of the very bases of modern society—its underlying economic relations, its patterns of urban and cultural life, its laws of development—have become urgent matters not only of social responsibility but of personal integrity.

There may be MANAS readers who would like to see a copy of C*ontemporary Issues.* Requests should be directed to the editors at the above address.

MANAS has some subscribers in India, but might have many more if Indian readers could afford to subscribe. Commenting on this difficulty, one Indian subscriber has noted that the three-year rate of four dollars a year would take about one third of the monthly salary of a primary school teacher in that country! He thinks a rate of $2.00 a year—amounting to twenty rupees—would be welcomed by many Indians.

Since MANAS operates at a considerable loss, we cannot reduce the subscription rate, but if there are readers in the United States or elsewhere who would like to help with this problem, a contribution of three dollars could be put with two dollars from an Indian reader, to make up the necessary amount for a one-year subscription.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
DIALOGUE ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

ON the evening of Jan. 22, a MANAS editor was present during the taping of a three-way discussion conducted by Kimmis Hendrick, Chief of the Western News Bureau of the *Christian Science Monitor,* Robert M. Hutchins, President of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and Frederick Mayer, Professor of the Humanities at Redlands University. The aim of the discussion was to point up the need to replace the notion that "learning" can be segmented into two- or four- or eight-year spans, with the idea of lifelong education.

In Mr. Hutchins' opinion, the only optimistic way to look at education in the United States derives from the fact that the facilities are excellent; Americans not only believe that education is a Good Thing, but they have been willing to finance its impressive physical plant. We have, in other words, the skeleton of universal education, but in Dr. Hutchins' opinion, the skeleton has no flesh. The ends and aims of learning are in confusion, and while university presidents can prove with statistics that the earning power of a college graduate is substantially more than that of non-graduates, they are not apt to be sure why this is so. We tend to agree vaguely with Socrates that there is no human being who cannot be taught, but we are not sure *what* should be taught.

Dr. Hutchins heartily recommends the abolition of departments of education and teachers' colleges, since none of the courses which presume to tell the teacher how to teach tells why instruction is important or what sorts of learning are basic. One problem of the future should not be a problem at all—the matter of figuring out how to use increasing leisure time to personal and social advantage. But how do you shift from an emphasis on making money and securing status, to stressing the goal of enriching one's capacity for thought as the most natural and beneficial of human aims?

Dr. Mayer felt compelled to characterize most of what now passes for education as a series of exercises in insignificance. Training for proficiency in any one of the thousands of technical specialties does not give significance to living. Beyond specialization is the task of becoming a human being. And this is possible only when the life of the mind is seen as a continuing dialogue with oneself and the community. We cannot have a "great" dialogue in education unless we are willing to discuss every manner of controversial issue, unless the teacher learns something of the philosophical attitude which sees in controversy an incitement to further learning, and is able to evoke this attitude in his students. For some reason or other, it sounds practically "corrupt" to praise the Athenian practice of paying citizens to attend important lectures, but perhaps this was evidence of complete faith in the continuing process of education as the only means by which human life can be fulfilled.

Meanwhile, the enormous field of adult education has scarcely been touched. The extension and improvement of adult education programs from community to community may demonstrate something which theoretical criticism and discussion cannot—that education has no time-limit, that the study of philosophy may be more important at the age of sixty than as a course in the sophomore year at a university, that both learning and teaching capacities may flower at any point of time and regardless of formal academic background. The support of adult education should be one of the greatest if not the greatest of national concerns, for a democracy depends for its success upon the continually improving understanding of its electorate. Further, people who appreciate the significance of more opportunity for adult education are precisely those who will demand vital content in the education to

which their children and grandchildren are exposed.

From a practical standpoint, automation-caused reduction of the work week and the inevitable increase of unemployment without impoverishment points to more education as the only means by which the energies of individuals can be helped to flow into creative channels. Many of us have learned as individuals, and we all have learned as a culture, that the pursuit of pleasure is self-defeating, that the pursuit of money is degrading, and that only education directed to encourage constant transformations of the self can preserve vitality. As Prof. Mayer put it, any sort of education can acquaint us with our limitations, but only a great teacher can show us the open road ahead. This is the tradition of teaching, and it still needs to be established.

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is now fighting for its life financially, and this is something of a commentary on our culture. Unfortunately, those who appreciate the nature of the endeavor which focuses under Dr. Hutchins are not in the "mainstream" of any sort of official thought, and can only assist by explaining the value of the undertaking. But explanation is certainly a part of education. Brooks Atkinson, in the New York *Times* (Jan. 21), has just done a useful thumbnail sketch of the Center, a portion of which follows:

> Dr. Hutchins cannot believe that the United States will not support the center, which he regards as of real value to the future security of our national life. "If you are headed towards a new political and economic situation, it would seem wise to think about it," he says. Dr. Hutchins believes that the aim of living is education, that a genuine democracy is a community in which everyone is learning, and that our basic problem today is how to create opportunities for learning. Long ago he accepted as his major premise Aristotle's assertion that men of all kinds want to know. Having always acted on that premise, Dr. Hutchins expects that the center will continue to act on it because it is not only sound but essential. Disinterested thought seems to him the highest form of civilized life, and he is right.

Since the center has no political program, it cannot be easily described in a society that is always looking for the angle. A Roman Catholic scholar, Simon Scanlon, a Franciscan, has described it most graphically in a miniature magazine called Way. He compares the center to the medieval studium—an organization of scholars that stood between the people and the centers of power and interpreted the universe to both. The medieval studium was subsidized so that it could enjoy freedom from economic pressure. It also enjoyed political exemption.

What the center busily interprets lies in six basic fields: corporations, labor unions, religious institutions, defense, the mass media and the political process. Every working day Dr. Hutchins rings a bell at 11 o'clock. And for the next two hours, scholars on the staff and visiting consultants discuss analyze and criticize papers written on these subjects. When a paper has survived criticism and discussion, it is printed as a pamphlet and sent—for the most part free—to institutions organizations and individuals who may need such counsel.

About 140 pamphlets have been written and printed in editions of 25,000. Some of them, notably A. A. Berle Jr.'s "Economic Power and the Free Society," have been reprinted in editions of 100,000, because public response has been so great. The pamphlets have also grown into a long shelf of books that have been expanded out of the original material and are issued by commercial publishers. The center has led the study of the effects of automation on society. Dr. Hutchins believes that the center can take a large share of the credit for alerting the United States to the problems that automation creates.

FRONTIERS

The Human Spirit at Bay

SOME time after World War II, a man who had been a radical socialist during the 30's, and a pacifist during the war, returned from a season of teaching at one of the large universities in the United States in a somewhat depressed state of mind. "They don't know anything about the past," he explained, meaning the students. "They have no sense of history, no sense of continuity, no memory—not even one obtained from books—of the social struggle."

This comment was made back in the days of the "silent generation," and American students can no longer be labeled in this way. Today the campuses of the country are kept in ferment by workers for peace and for racial equality, and you might say that this activity is even better than expressions of radicalism which are a continuation of the revolutionary movement of the past. You could argue that the issues of the second half of the twentieth century are not the same as the issues of the first fifty years, and that the response of students to the challenges of the present comes spontaneously, through direct awareness, without the stimulus of radical tradition. These young people, it may be, are creating the radical traditions of the future, rather than following old ones.

Yet the past of the struggle for freedom and justice is something that no young person anywhere in the world should remain ignorant of. If you had a sixteen- or eighteen-year-old you wanted to help to an understanding of this past, from which he might find his own sense of continuity, what would you do? Where would you start him reading? Book lists prompted by such a question might soon grow too long.

An easy solution at the moment would be to give him a copy of the new edition (Lyle Stuart) of Upton Sinclair's *The Cry for Justice,* an anthology of the literature of social protest first published in 1915. The present edition has 638 pages, has been brought up to date by the addition of extracts from such writers as James Baldwin, Albert Camus, Milovan Djilas, Danilo Dolci, Erich Fromm, Michael Harrington, C. Wright Mills, Harvey Swados, and Yevgeny Yevtushenko. There are twenty-nine reproductions of works of art representing the spirit of protest. The book opens with a note by the publisher, followed by Jack London's introduction to the first edition. The price is $10.00.

There are many things to be grateful for in this book. One is that it includes the entirety of Thoreau's essay on civil disobedience. Extracts from this classic are always frustrating; you want to know what came before and after. But most of all you are grateful for a fresh hearing of the ringing voices of the great humanitarians of the past. There is the statement of Eugene V. Debs to the court in September, 1918, before being sentenced for opposing World War I. There is Thomas Hood's "The Song of the Shirt," and that one-sentence classic by Anatole France: "The law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."

The anthology begins with "The Man with the Hoe" by Edwin Markham and reaches an early crescendo in an extract from Jack London's *The People of the Abyss.* In a section called "The Chasm," which contrasts poverty with riches, Blake, Bellamy, Zola, Heine, and Freud are heard from. Book II, "The Outcast," is devoted to the life of those thrown on the scrap heap by the modern industrial machine. Here are Emma Goldman, Maxim Gorky, and Oscar Wilde, with David Rousset on the Nazi concentration camps. "Out of the Depths," another section, has passages from Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Victor Hugo, Bernard Shaw, Leonid Andreyev, Dorothy Day, Theodore Dreiser, and Langston Hughes.

Some extracts are bitter against organized religion, others repeat Jesus and Buddha. Ancient and modern philosophers are represented. There is a quotation from John D. Rockefeller, added

for dead-pan irony, and one from Karl Marx. Mao Tse-Tung has a passage, and Khrushchev has his say on the Stalinist terror. Vachel Lindsay is all through the book, along with some others of Mr. Sinclair's favorites. One of Joe Hill's "hymns" is in the section on "Humor." Most of the Utopians are present, from Plato to Campanella, and Thomas More to H. G. Wells. A passage from Orwell's *1984* stands for the anti-Utopians.

Quite possibly, a better book for this purpose, one more organically conceived and put together, can be imagined; or you could compile a short reading list starting, say, with Edmund Wilson's *To the Finland Station,* and ending with Dwight Macdonald's *The Root Is Man,* as a way of getting your young reader interested in the radical past; but the material in *The Cry for Justice* is rich enough in itself to overcome all minor objections, and no reading list can possibly touch all the bases Mr. Sinclair tags from century to century.

One thing more: the Proem by the publisher, Lyle Stuart, deserves attention. Publishers hardly exist for most readers. The differences among them are not thought of by the general reader, and are known, when important, only in the trade. But when a publisher is proud of a book, and makes a fine edition of it, he ought to say something about it, and Lyle Stuart does this in the front of *Cry for Justice.* First, he tells what happened in connection with his earlier anthology, *The Great Quotations.* This volume, a kind of nonconservative Bartlett, has things in it you can find nowhere else. No serious editor can afford to be without it. *The Great Quotations,* edited by George Seldes, went well. It has been through three large printings, Mr. Stuart tells us, and has been chosen as a selection by a major book club. But he also has this to relate:

> Although J. Donald Adams of the *New York Times* wrote the introduction to *The Great Quotations,* the book wasn't reviewed in the *Times.* In fact, the book was scarcely reviewed anywhere. Copies were purchased by more than sixty of the major editors and publishers in America today. But they didn't review it.
>
> Was it because Seldes had been a crusading critic of the press? Or was it because the bulk of the book contained radical and revolutionary quotations—words that have moved men over the centuries? I didn't know. I did know that I felt I'd made my contribution to society with *The Great Quotations.*

Then someone showed Mr. Stuart a copy of Upton Sinclair's *The Cry for Justice,* and he soon found himself involved in publishing another anthology.

In the MANAS review (Jan. 8) of *Instead of Violence,* also an anthology, the writer spoke of social thinking which is emerging in the peace movement, growing out of the conviction that peace is not possible without justice. Some paragraphs by Dimitrios Roussopoulos in the December 1963 issue of *Our Generation Against Nuclear War,* an international quarterly published in Canada, illustrate this trend. Mr. Roussopoulos, who is editor in chief of *Our Generation,* says in a section of this journal called "Dialogue":

> I cannot see how world peace will be achieved without a fundamental change in world politics, altering the nation-state orientation of these politics and replacing the international war system by world community government.
>
> The time has come to forge a radical analysis that will lay the fundamentals for a peace philosophy or ideology. This development will have to deal with two basic phenomena, first the nature of the nation-state system, and second the nature of conflict and the historical relevance of revolutionary non-violence.
>
> The single-issue organization is on the way out because it stands for the refusal to work out an explicit philosophy. There is no point in organizing for world peace when you are not armed with a relevant social analysis, upon which you can structure organizational tactics and movement strategy. The analysis is growing every day, but I don't think any of us are nearly ready enough. That will come with further advance on the two fronts where we are weakest: theories of society, history and human nature; and the major problem—ideas about the historical agencies of social change. . . .

> The historical agencies of change for liberals of our type of society have been an array of voluntary associations, coming to a political climax in a parliamentary or congressional system. For socialists of almost all varieties, the historic agency has been the working class—and later the peasantry.
>
> We cannot avoid the view that in both cases, the historic agency (in capitalist countries to begin with) has either collapsed or become ambiguous: so far as structural change is concerned, these don't seem to be at once available and effective as *our* (the peace movement's) agency any longer. We want fruitful research and dialogue and this begins with the recognition of the revolutionary job that has to be done and then to carry it out.

Our Generation Against Nuclear War is published four times a year by the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. The annual subscription is $3.00 (students, $2.00). The address is 3510 rue Ste-Famille, Montreal 18, Quebec, Canada.

The first issue of a new quarterly, *Disarmament and Arms Control,* published in England, with offices in the United States at 122 East 55th St., New York 22, gives a revealing slant on the Pugwash Conferences. One writer, C. F. Powell, an English physicist, in the course of an appreciation of A. V. Topchiev, a Soviet scientist who died recently, has this to say:

> At the early meetings, there was inevitably an undercurrent of reserve between people meeting mostly for the first time and with all the prejudices and suspicions which can arise and be fostered in societies which have for a long time been isolated from one another. But from the very beginning it was remarkable that in spite of very sharp exchanges and without any sacrifice of principle, the meetings always ended in a measure of positive agreement; remarkable because such discussions are exceeding vulnerable to cynicism or innuendo, and meetings can be wrecked by a very few people of ill will. That on many occasions a positive agreement was reached was largely due, on the Russian side, to Topchiev's patience and determination to make progress.
>
> In the early days of the Pugwash meetings, I believe many of us in the West had an entirely false impression of the position of Topchiev and our Soviet colleagues. We knew that in our own countries, policy results from sharp debates and sharp struggle between factions, that great circumspection must be shown by those seeking to contribute to its development; and that more consequences flow from mistakes than the loss of an immediate issue alone. But we tended to think that the position of our Soviet colleagues was much easier, much simpler.
>
> It was one of the fruits of our discussions that we gradually appreciated the fact that their position was rather like our own, that the formation of policy takes place in much the same way in all great states, that our Soviet colleagues were also the advocates of policies which were on trial and which needed some success if they were to be maintained. We learned a great deal, for example, when one of them once said, "We too, have our generals." Or when, at the second Pugwash Conference at Lac Beauport in 1958, they were deeply anxious that the initiative of the Russian government in unilaterally abandoning test explosions should be internationally recognized and should lead to an early and positive response by the Western powers.

Disarmament and Arms Control is published by Robert Maxsvell at Pergamon Press, Oxford, England. The executive editor is Wayland Young. The editorial board is made up of Donald Brennan, president of the Hudson Institute; Alastair Buchan, director of the London Institute of Strategic Studies; Bernard Feld of M.I.T.; Henry Kissinger, of the Harvard Center for International Affairs; and Nevill Mott of the Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge University. Subscription is $6.00 a year for private individuals.