PANORAMA

THE PHILIPPINE MAGAZINE OF GOOD READING

FILIPINO GOLF CHAMPION 1966

FEBRUARY, 1966
75 Centavos

PANORAMA

THE PHILIPPINE MAGAZINE OF GOOD READING

Vol. XVIII MANILA, PHILIPPINES No. 2

OF STUDIES

Studies serve for delight, for ornament, and for ability. Their chief use for delight, is in privateness and retiring; for ornament, is in discourse; and for ability, is in the judgment and disposition of business. For expert men can execute, and perhaps judge of particulars, one by one; but the general counsels, and the plots and marshalling of affairs, come best from those that are learned. To spend too much time in studies is sloth; to use them too much for ornament, is affectation; to make judgment wholly by their rules, is the humour of a scholar. They perfect nature, and are perfected by experience: for natural abilities are like natural plants, that need proyning by study; and studies themselves do give forth directions too much at large, except they be bounded in by experience. Crafty men contemn studies, simple men admire them, and wise men use them; for they teach not their own use, but that is a wisdom without them, and above them, won by observation. Read not to contradict and confute; nor to believe and take for granted; nor to find talk and discourse; but to weigh and consider. Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested; that is, some books are to be read only in part; others to be read, but not curiously; and some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention. x x x Reading maketh a full man; conference a ready man; and writing an exact man. And therefore, if a man write little, he had need have a great memory; if he confer little, he had need have a present wit: and if he read little, he had need have much cunning, to seem to know that he doth not. — *Francis Bacon.*

■ Our privileged citizens — the Senators and representatives.

CONGRESS: AN ANALYSIS

The sad story of the nation's political, and consequently social and economic evolution is laid bare in unexpurgated form in the legislature. After all, here indeed are the representatives of the people. If the public has become the victim of oppressive legislation it is because the citizenry has not cast a discerning eye on the legislature. By this we mean an intelligent scrutiny of the Upper and Lower House, the temperament and character of the two bodies, the quality and motivation of legislation, and the shape and moral integrity of this branch of government. For one thing it is apparent that in the Senate a large number are multi-millionaires; no crime in itself we hasten to add, but this is indicative of the relation between wealth and office. For another it becomes quite obvious that while legislation has been presumably for the whole nation without discrimination, there has been extensive and clear discriminatory shadings in the amendments and final shape of bills passed. Moreover, the legislators have generally fallen into a privileged class, usually exempted from the effects of the law in question, as in the case for example of persons who run for public office having to give up the current post, which does not apply to congressmen and senators.

* * *

The more one looks into various problems of the nation, the more one finds himself looking at the legislature. Here, much more than the executive and the judiciary, pulses the root-cause of much of our national problems. Legislators are the first not to respect the law so that they either exempt themselves, ignore the law, or amend and circumvent it. The bureaucracy in the government is overloaded and inefficient

largely because of the legislators. Senators are not above fighting with cabinetmen over filling up a position for janitor. Legislators have been involved in much of the graft and corruption, from reparations to smuggling.

• • •

This is not a brief against Congressmen and Senators. We wish to point out the need for an academic, non-punitive, objective analysis of the legislature, with a view towards assessing the present situation and possible directions. To our mind, it is the legislature that is bringing about the rise of a two class society, with the politicians as a ruling class. The quality of legislation is in dire need of study too, because not only are bills being smuggled and towns cut up and created, not only are franchises, land, and concessions treated like spoils to be apportioned, but the character and spirit of legislation all betray a "citizens be damned" attitude. Thus we citizens have to fill-up census forms which can be used to harass us, all in the name of catching tax evaders, when we all know who the biggest evaders are. Thus also, we have to buy an extra stamp during anti-TB months while the legislators enjoy a franking privilege. Our democracy is being reshaped in the legislature. Since national political leadership, (including the president) emerges, from the legislature, we should stop, look, and think about the shape and character of the legislature. — *By Alfredo R. Roces in Manila Times.*

THE RACE QUESTIONS

There is literally a multitude of myths and dogmas which purport to explain racial differences. They range from biblical explanations to zoological classifications. As one explanation loses its novelty or its power to convince, another emerges. The persistence of race theorists is astonishing. Why do they go to such lengths to find proof for what they obviously take for granted? The concept of race resists precise definition. All the same, the layman knows perfectly well that there are certain major human groups that differ noticeably from each other — even though there are also noticeable differences between members of any one of these groups.

Racism begins with the attempt to attach values to real or imaginary differences, and the attempt plumbs the depth of absurdity when it produces statements like these: 'Races which are hairy are inferior to and less human than those which are free from body hair; thick lips are more human than thin lips because apes have thin lips; straight, lank, or wavy hair is more simian than woolly hair'. Where does this kind of analysis take us — if it can be honour with the name? Exactly nowhere. Simian features appear to have been distributed among the races with a fine impartiality.

What race theorists fail to establish on the basis of measurable physical differences, they try to explain in terms of inherent psychological differences. But this is tricky ground too, for people's reactions to psychological tests are very much affected by socio-economic conditions, and by acquired habits and skills which are hard to associate from innate ability. For instance, it has been established that there are no completely culture-free or language-free psychological tests.

In everyday terms we speak of people as being of 'English blood', 'German blood', 'Negro blood'. We speak of one as 'pure-blooded', of another we say that he is 'half-breed' or 'half-caste', or one-eighth this or one-sixteenth that. It sounds very precise to say that if one of the sixteen direct ancestors of a person — that is, a great-great-grandparent — belongs to a particular race, then he is one-sixteenth a member of that race. In Brazil there are special names for different racial mixtures — white-African mixture is a 'mulato'; an Indian-Portuguesse mixture is a 'caboclo'; an Indian-African mixture is a 'cafuso'. But genetically a man cannot be described as if he were a cocktail or an omelette! Anyway, if these 'recipes' have any value as descriptions of people's physical types they are useless in cases where members of the same family — brothers and sisters, even — have totally different complexions and physical characteristics, to the point where some are regarded and treated as Negros and others pass for whites.

Race relations are rooted in accumulated experiences and memories of the past, in frustrations and grievances of the present; these are the things which determine the mood in which peoples meet, that give birth to preconceptions and attitudes which get in the way of mutual understanding. Dr. Albert Schweitzer surprised us when he said: 'My general rule is never to trust a black'. A Gold Coast statesman, Nana Sir Ofori Atta, said in the Legislative Council in 1939: 'Whiteman is a whiteman, he will not leave his brother whiteman and support you. Do you think the Government will support you, black man?' A former Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia is reported to have said: 'Africans, until they are very much advanced, are all liars'.

And then there are the dogmas. A Governor of Mississippi is reported to have said: 'The Negro is singularly tractable and amenable to control by his well-recognized superior. For this reason the Egyptian, the Roman, and the Turk paid higher prices for them than for other slaves'. Needless to say, this seemingly scholarly

pronouncement has no basis in fact. But the Governor is not alone in his illusion. The late Field-Marshal Smuts, addressing an audience in New York, once remarked: 'Apart from the donkey, the Negro is the most patient of God's creatures'. Questioned about this, the Field-Marshal answered that he was praising the virtues of Negros, and that his remark had not been intended to be an insult!

It is not generally realized that Negro resistance to slavery never ceased. Independent and purposeful slaves on American plantations were usually 'sold down the river', as the expression was, to harsher and more ruthless masters. Captured runaway slaves and insurrectionists were quartered or broken on the wheel. Haiti became independent as a result of a rebellion of its slaves. Fugitives from slavery formed independent settlements in Guiana, where they became the 'Bush Negroes', and in Jamaica, where they were named the 'Maroons'. Among the early settlers in Freetown, Sierra Leone, were rebellious Negroes who had been specially selected for repatriation. There is no shortage of evidence to show that the Negro worked relentlessly to emancipate himself and to regain his status as a man.

Apart from resisting slavery, Negroes developed a group consciousness which provided a basis for a kind of black nationalism. The white man's religion and civilization – everything white – was regarded as part of an arrangement to enslave and humiliate the black man. There have been two trends in black nationalism, represented by two anti-slavery agitators, Delany and Frederick Douglass. Douglass's school of thought sought to secure the rights of the Negro in a multi-racial society, and it is carried on in the policy of the present-day Civil Rights movement. Delany's attitude finds expression in the Black Zionist movement of the 'twenties, which was led by Marcus Garvey, and in the Black Muslim movement of Elijah Muhammed and Malcolm X, whose aim is to build a Negro society in isolation.

In his study of the race question, *An American Di-*

lemma, the Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdal established what he termed a 'rank order of discrimination'. This is a set of topics about which upholders and victims of racial discrimination feel most strongly. Myrdal lists them from the point of view of white Americans in descending order of intensity. Marriage and sexual relations rank the highest, followed by conventions intended to deny social equality; then there is segregation in the use of public facilities; next comes political disenfranchisement; then comes discrimination in law courts and by law-enforcement officers; and at the bottom of the list are restrictions on the ability to purchase land, secure credit, and obtain employment.

Myrdal notes that 'the Negro's rank order is just about parallel, but inverse, to that of the white man'. In other words, the complaints which were at the bottom of the white man's list — jobs, education, housing, political rights and just treatment by the courts and law-enforcing authorities — are at the top of the Negro's list. The same pattern appeared in what were called 'the African Claims' which were adopted in 1945 by the National Congress of South Africa, some of whose activities I have mentioned. In short, the most pressing disabilities are economic. Poverty, social debasement, and lack of political influence expose the deprived sections of a community to abuse, exploitation, and injustice. An improvement in economic status could lead to fuller public acceptance and to equality before law; but the lack of these social rights makes economic improvement impossible.

To return to my categories of fear: the intensity of feeling about inter-marriage, which came first on the white man's list, is closely linked with the fear of miscegenation. It is an aspect of most caste and class systems. The rule has been for the male members of the dominant races to take women of the subject or conquered peoples, and where there has been ethnic domination most persons of mixed ancestry have for their fathers or grandfathers members not of the sub-

ject group but of the ruling group. The contemporary male member of what used to be the ruling races has inherited a sense of guilt which grossly exaggerates his fear of the reverse process — of the formerly subordinate group becoming sexually dominant. And unscrupulous politicians and racial psychopaths exploit this fear.

Richard Wright once made the defenders of 'racial purity' an offer: he suggested that an inter-racial covenant should be signed which would guarantee that: 'The white man's eyes shall remain forever blue, his skin forever white, and his hair forever blond, provided that he does not continue to presume that the natural resources of the world belong to him and that all other peoples are means placed at his disposal merely because his eyes are blue'.

The peoples of the world are trapped in a vicious circle composed of notions of superiority and inferiority, of suspicion, misconceptions, preconceptions, frustrations, and insecurity. Above all there is fear. It is fear that sets the racial moods, and if we are to break the vicious circle we must concentrate our assault upon these racial fears in all their forms. Hatred and intolerance are not innate in peoples; they are the children of fear, as fear is the child of ignorance.

Ultimately, what racial minorities seek is not anybody's to give. The dominant races will not be any poorer by recognizing the rights that are now denied to much of the world. When this fact is appreciated in all its significance, our moods will change. And change they must, because the solution to our problem is to be found in a society of free men. There is all the difference in the world between 'free' and 'freed' men. Nobody is being required to free anybody. A world of peoples will consist of societies in which men are free.

No one can give equality; all that can be shared is respect. — *Robert Gardiner, Home Service of the BBC.*

■ **A famous historian points out an analogy or similarity between the Vietnam and the Filipino revolution on the subject of criticism and dissent.**

THE PROBLEM OF DISSENT

In 1899 we fought a war that has interesting parallels with that which we are fighting today — war which we now have almost wholly forgotten, perhaps for reasons that psychologists can understand better than politicians. That was the war to put down the Filipino "insurrection." For the Filipinos — like the Cubans — thought that they were to be liberated, but Admiral Dewey cabled that the Filipino Republic represented only a fraction of the Filipino people and that independence was not to be thought of and the United States threw her military might into the task of defeating what they called an insurrection. Soon the presses were filled with stories of concentration camps and tortures; soon American soldiers were singing.

Damn, damn, damn, the Filipinos
Slant-eye'd Kakiak Ladrones
And beneath the starry flag
Civilize them with a Krag
And return us to our own beloved Homes!

The Filipino war excited a wave of outrage and protest among intellectuals, reformers, and idealists as vociferous as that which we now witness. Mark Twain addressed a powerful letter, "To a Person Sitting in Darkness," which asserted that the Stars and Stripes should have the white stripes painted black and the stars replaced by skull and crossbones. The philosopher William James charged that "we are now engaged in crushing out the sacredest thing in this great human world. . . . Why do we go on? First, the war fever, and then the pride which always refuses to back down when under fire." And from the poet William Vaughn Moody came a memorable "Ode in Time of Hesitation":

Alas. what sounds are these that come
Sullenly over the Pacific seas, . . .

Sounds of ignoble battle, striking dumb
The season's half awakened ecstacies. . . .
Was it for this our fathers kept the law?
Are we the eagle nation Milton saw
Mewing its mighty youth,
Soon to possess the mountain winds of truth
And be a swift familiar of the sun. . . .
Or have we but the talons and the maw?

And "To a Soldier Fallen in the Philippines" he wrote just such an ode as might be written for a soldier fallen in Vietnam:

A flag for the soldier's bier
Who dies that his land may live;
O banners, banners, here
That he doubt not, nor misgive. . . .
Let him never dream that his bullet's scream'
Went wide of its island mark
Home to the heart of his darling land
Where she stumbled and sinned in the dark.

Nor were these men of letters alone in their passionate outery against what they thought an unjust war. They had the support of a brilliant galaxy of public leaders: Carl Schurz and *Samuel* Gompers, El L. Godkin of the Nation and Felix Adler of the Ethical Culture Society, Jane Addams of Hull House and President Jordan of Standford University, and Andrew Carnegie and scores of others. And when the defenders of the war raised the cry "Don't haul down the flag," it was no other than William Jennings Bryan, titular head of the Democratic party, who asked, "Who will haul down the President?"

We need not decide now whether those who protested this war were right or wrong. It is sufficient to remember that we honor Mark Twain and William James, regard Jane Addams as one of the greatest of American women, and still read Godkin, and that Bryan is somewhat better remembered than William McKinley. Those infatuates patriots who now assert that it is somehow treasonable to criticize any policy that involves Americans in fighting overseas would do well to ponder the lessons of the Philippine War.

But, it will be said, as it is always said, this war is different. Whether history will judge this war to be different or not, we cannot say. But this we can say with certainty: a government and a society that silences those who dissent is one that has lost its way. This we can say: that what is essential in a free society is that there should be an atmosphere where those who wish to dissent and even to demonstrate can do so without fear of recrimination or vilification.

What is the alternative? What is implicit in the demand, now, that agitation be silenced, that demonstrators be punished? What is implicit in the insistence that we "pull up by the roots and rend to pieces" the protests from students — it is Senator Stennis we are quoting here. What is implicit in the charge that those who demonstrate against the war are somehow guilty of treason?

It is, of course, this: that once our government has embarked upon a policy there is to be no more criticism, protest, or dissent. All must close ranks and unite behind the government.

Now we have had a good deal of experience, first and last, with this view of the duty of the citizen to his government and it behooves us to recall that experience before we go too far astray.

We ourselves had experience with this philosophy in the ante-bellium South. The dominant forces of Southern life were, by the 1840s, convinced that slavery was a positive good, a blessing alike for slaves and for masters; they were just as sure of the righteousness of the "peculiar institution" as is Senator Dodd of the righteousness of the war in Vietnam. And they adopted a policy that is many Senators now want to impose upon us: that of silencing criticism and intimidating critics. Teachers who attacked slavery were deprived of their posts — just what Mr. Nixon now advises as the sovereign cure for what ails our universities! Editors who raised their voices in criticism of slavery lost their papers. Clergymen who did not realized that slavery was enjoined by the Bible were forced out of their pulpits. Books that criticized slavery

were burned. In the end the dominant forces of the South got their way: critics were silenced. The South closed its ranks against critics, and closed its mind; it closed, too, every avenue of solution to the slavery problem except that of violence.

Nazi Germany provides us with an even more sobering spectacle. There, too, under Hitler, opposition to government was equated with treason. Those who dared question the inferiority of Jews, or the justice of the conquest of inferior people like the Poles, were effectually silenced, by exile or by the gas chamber. With criticism and dissent eliminated, Hitler and his followers were able to lead their nation, and the world, down the path to destruction.

There is, alas, a tragic example of this attitude toward criticism before our eyes, and in a people who inherit, if they do not cherish, our traditions of law and liberty. Like the slaveocracy of the Old South, the dominant leaders of South Africa today are convinced that whites are superior to Negroes, and that Negroes must not be allowed to enjoy the freedoms available to whites. To maintain this policy and to silence criticism — criticism coming from the academic community and from the press — they have dispensed with the traditions of due process and of fair trial, violated academic freedom, and are in process of destroying centuries of constitutional guarantees. And with criticism silenced, they are able to delude themselves that what they do is just and right.

Now, it would be absurd and iniquitous to equate our current policies toward Vietnam with the defence of slavery, or with Nazi or Afrikaner policies. But the point is not whether these policies have anything in common. The point is that when a nation silences criticism and dissent, it deprives itself of the power to correct its errors. The process of silencing need not be as savage as in Nazi Germany or in South Africa today; it is enough that an atmosphere be created where men prefer silence to protest. As has been observed of book-burning, it is not necessary to

burn books, it is not enough to discourage men from writing them.

It cannot be too often repeated that the justification and the purpose of freedom of speech is not to indulge those who want to speak their minds. It is to prevent error and discover truth. There may be other ways of detecting error and discovering truth than that of free discussion, but so far we have not found them. — *By Henry Steele Commager, extracted in part from SR.*

RESEARCH AND PLAGIARISM

Nicholas Murray Butler and Professor Brander Matthews of Columbia University were having a conversation, and Prof. Matthews was giving his ideas as to plagiarism, from an article of his own on that subject.

"In the case of the first man to use an anecdote," he said, there is originality; in the case of the second there is plagiarism; with the third, it is lack of originality; and with the fourth it is drawing from a common stock."

"Yes," broke in President Butler, "and in the case of the fifth, it is research."

■ **The qualifications and ability of a competent dictionary writer.**

NOAH WEBSTER, SCHOOLMASTER TO AMERICA

Harry Warfel's biography of Noah Webster, the great American lexicographer and journalist, is a well-balanced and important contribution to America's cultural and educational history.

Noah Webster (1758-1843) was the son of a Connecticut farmer who mortgaged his farm to send Noah to Yale. After graduation he taught school, studied law and was admitted to the bar. In 1783-85 he published a *Grammatical Institute of the English Language* in three parts — a spelling book, a grammar, and a reader. This was the first American work of its kind, and it soon found a place in the schools of the United States. While Webster worked on his dictionary, the famous spelling book was the principal source of income for his family. Before 1861 the sale of the spelling book had reached more than a million copies a year.

The American Dictionary, which came out in 1828, over a quarter of a century after it was first announced, contained 12,000 words and from 30,000 to 40,000 definitions that had not appeared in any previous dictionary.

Harry Warfel writes the following in his biography of Webster:

On his seventieth birthday, October 16, 1828, Noah Webster lifted his eyes from the last proof sheet of the scholarly Introduction to his Dictionary. Slowly he wiped the ink from the quill, laid it down, and methodically capped the inkwell. His moist eyes blinked. He turned to his wife and colleague, caught her hands. Together they knelt by the desk and prayed tremblingly in giving thanks to God for His providence in sustaining them through their long labor. Since June 4, 1800, when the project was first publicly announced, Webster had dan-

dled his book on his knee to the tune of a public lullaby of jeers, insults, and misrepresentation. Every opprobrious epithet in the vocabularies of calumny and abuse had been showered upon him. Undeterred by it, he had completed single-handed America's first monumental work of scholarship. *An American Dictionary of the English Language* was immediately acclaimed, in England and Germany as well as in America, the best work of its kind ever prepared.

Today, *Webster* and *dictionary* are synonymous terms in our language. No tribute can surpass this one.

Yet, curiously enough, although the name *Webster* is on the tip of every person's tongue who wants to consult that indispensable reference book, the dictionary, few can give the lexicographer's first name. When asked the question, the average informed person looks blank a moment, then hesitantly ventures 'Daniel I guess.' Thus Noah Webster, who eminently deserves a niche in the Hall of Fame, not only is not memorialized in that pantheon, but has suffered an even worse fate: his name has coalesced with that of the famous orator and statesman who was not even his kinsman.

Like Dr. Samuel Johnson, whose dictionary lost ground as Webster's gained, Noah Webster was more than a 'harmless drudge,' a writer of definitions. Before announcing his dictionary at the age of forty-two, Noah Webster had become the pivotal figure in American education and literature. As the author of a series of primary school textbooks and as the expounder of a nationalistic theory of education, he had become the young nation's first schoolmaster. As an itinerant propagandist for a Constitution, he had done more than any other single individual to prepare a climate of opinion in which a Constitutional Convention could be successful. As a clear-visioned economist, a humanitarian, a magazine and newspaper editor, a historical scholar, and a moralist, he ceaselessly drove his pen in furthering the best interests of his country. Although he completed the

Dictionary in 1828, he never surrendered work until death called him in his eighty-fifth year, May 28, 1843.

Something of the many-sided intellectual quality of Benjamin Franklin reappeared in Webster. Both possessed astonishing versatility and delved into every area of knowledge, leaving marks of influence in almost every field of activity developed in their times. It was fitting that Franklin, in his old age, befriended the young schoolmaster and tutored him in simplified spelling. But Webster, unlike Franklin, did not permanently slough off the iron mantle of New England Calvinism. And Webster never sought or obtained high political position. Essentially a scholar and publicist, Webster wielded his pen as a weapon in the perennial warfare against social injustice, scientific error, mental torpor, and national instability. Early in life he called himself The Prompter, the man who sits behind the scenes to correct errors or assist the memory.

Webster became our greatest schoolmaster. He passed successively from the desk of a Connecticut log schoolhouse to the lecture platform, to the editorial chair, and finally, to the home library table as the arbiter of every English-speaking reader's and writer's diction. His schoolbooks were carried from the hills of New England across the Alleghenies; his were among the first books printed in every new settlement. Across the prairies and over the Rocky Mountains his carefully marshaled columns of words marched like warriors against the ignorance that tended to disrupt the primitive society of thinly spread and localized culture of America. Dialect variation disappeared from our writing and spelling, and to his blue-backed Speller, of which nearly one hundred million copies were sold before it went out of general use, America owes its remarkable uniformity of language. No other book, the Bible excepted, has strained so many heads, or done so much good. It taught millions to read, and not one to sin. And today the monolithic 'Webster' on every schoolteacher's desk, on the reference tables

of libraries, at the elbow of the justice, and on the study table of the scholar, bears silent testimony to Noah Webster's enduring labors and superb genius.

Patient, indefatigable laborer for American cultural advancement that Webster was, he yet never won the warm personal sympathy of his countrymen. A pugnaciousness in propagating his own strongly phrased ideas, a gesture many people considered egotistic, rendered Webster socially unattractive. His tall, spare, Yankee form stiffened under opposition. His massive head grew rigidly upright in an inflexible ambition to do good. The mountainous forehead, crowned with a forest of autumn-tinted hair, sloped to beetling crags of eyebrows. Deep set, as in a cave, small gray eyes flashed lightning warnings of intense mental operations. A massive square jaw and a jutting nose persuaded opponents that here was one endowed by nature to hold his own against any and all opposition. The narrow, thin line of lips held taut a tongue ever ready to castigate error. 'If my name is a terror to evildoers,' Webster once wrote, 'mention it.' In this respect, too, Webster was the typical schoolmaster, the man who is more concerned to have lessons well learned than to secure the adulation of shirking, fawning ignorance. — *By Harry R. Warfel.*

NOT SIN BUT ERROR

A young girl came to the late Father Healey of Dublin and confessed that she feared she had incurred the sin of vanity. "What makes you think that?" asked her father confessor. "Because every morning when I look into the mirror I think how beautiful I am."

"Never fear, my girl," was the reassuring reply. "That isn't a sin, it's only a mistake."

■ Heretics is the usual name given to non-conformists.

SCREWBALLS AND FIREBRANDS

Barrows Dunham was head of the Philosophy Department at Temple University, Pennsylvania, when the Committee on Un-American Activities haled him before it for questioning. "When I fell silent before these gentlemen," Mr. Dunham tells us, "my employers dismissed me, alleging 'intellectual arrogance' on my part."

To fall silent in court before one's accusers may be judicious, but is it sensible, 12 years later, to remain silent before one's readers? Prof. Dunham doesn't say what crime the Committee accused him of: we suppose it was membership of the Communist party. He doesn't tell us whether he was guilty of the crime: we suppose he was. But it would be nice to know, because where a reader's sympathies are concerned there is a great difference between a man who is an underdog and a man who is just lying doggo.

Impressed by his persecution, Prof. Dunham withdrew into reflecting upon similar occurrences in history. *The Heretics* is the fruits of his brooding. It is a fairly long, interesting and informative examination of selected heretics from Socrates to Marx, with close looks at the forms their "intellectual arrogance" took and the characters of their accusers.

As is inevitable with such records, one is left with the impression that history's endless repeating of its own injustices is about the most mournful and tedious element in the whole story of mankind. But this impression is strengthened rather too much by the fact that Prof. Dunham is a strongly opinionated radical, to whom all persecutions look suspiciously alike. Such an attitude does not allow either history or human nature a sporting chance to express its diversity.

Heresy, however, as we can nearly all agree, is usually

what Prof. Dunham says it is — the screwball's refusal to play ball with the team. The fact that the former (at least in the more famous cases) is often acknowledged later to be the hero of the game should not blind us to the fact that he has not had hemlock poured down him in the first place just because all heretics are good and all authorities are bad.

To grasp the real drama of heresy and get a clear idea of why heretics are burnt with such monotonous regularity one must at least make an effort to see that something beside the heretic is at stake.

Pharisees, elders of the people, Calvinists, inquisitors and police-chiefs all believe that a few personal bonfires are preferable to a general conflagration. Religions whose whole foundations rest upon unquestioning faith in revealed truth believe inevitably that the stake is the best place for those who want to open their religion to dispute. If Marxism was the science that Prof. Dunham believes it to be, and not just another ideology, its leaders would long since have made a policy of cosseting the best brains instead of blowing them out.

What Prof. Dunham has no difficulty in showing is the heretic's repeated advantage over the organisation-man in the matter of intelligence and good sense. He also touches on, but does not stress broadly enough, how much extra pugnacity, wit and nous the heretic develops as a result of being badgered by hostile mossbacks.

Socrates' defence before his accusers is such a model in this respect that his capital punishment for it comes as no surprise, while Voltaire's "English Letters" are still living evidence of the folly of releasing such a tartar from the Bastille and allowing him to visit a free country:

> "Go into the London Stock Exchange, a place respectable than many courts. There you see representatives of all nations, gathered on behalf of usefulness to mankind. There the Jew, the Mohammedan, the Christian deal with one another as if they belong to the same reli-

gion, and call a man infidel only when he is bankrupt."

That was written in the good old days, of course, before the heretical Marx spoilt the fun by insisting that businessmen did just as much evil as clergymen. But one doesn't blush to read it, as one does whenever one reads the words of an organisation-man struggling, as always, to deny to others the privileges he enjoys himself:

"In every constituent body throughout the empire the working class will, if we grant the prayer of this petition, be an irresistible majority. In every constituent body capital will be placed at the feet of labour; knowledge will be borne down by ignorance: and is it possible to doubt what the result must be?"

This is Macaulay, begging the House of Commons not to grant the Chartist petition for universal suffrage and a secret ballot. But it might well have been spoken only yesterday, in Rhodesia. Heretics are often wrong, but they are usually original. But the spokesman for organisations are in a much worse fix, because the horse they elect to flog is usually dead and the cause for which they would die has usually gone bad.

Prof. Dunham records all this in a low, rather sorrowful tone. That is not a style that readily does justice to the numerous springy, lively heretics who sizzle through his pages. Wilful, headstrong and as much of a nuisance to the sleeping as breadcrumbs in a bed, their legacy is more of high spirits than of invalid port. — *By Nigel Dennis in The Listener.*

■ **This is an intelligent explanation of the nature and effect of a philosophy of life which appeals to highly educated men.**

HUMANISM IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Lord Francis Williams, a Humanist, answers questions from Kenneth Harris

May I begin by asking you what humanism means to you?

I suppose humanism means to me personally a philosophy of life, a philosophy which rejects or finds no need for any supernatural explanation of the universe, but which has as its basis what I perhaps could best describe as a sort of limited certainty, the belief that over the ages we have developed a knowledge that gives us a certain amount of certainty about a certain number of things. This certainty, while providing a guide for present action, may be altered by a new knowledge, therefore the essential thing is to be open-minded, not to believe in a system of absolutes, of blacks and whites, in which one has a closed mind.

Does this philosophy of yours have the same inspirational effect on your life as, for instance, the Christian philosophy does — or should — have on the Christian?

I am never quite clear what, in this sense, is meant by inspiration. Perhaps I am not a very inspirational character, in that I get my sense of inspiration, my sense of uplift, which is what I suppose you mean, from great poetry, from art, from the movement of nature, from a beautiful scene, and so on, and also from my sense, of the infinite variety and wonder of ordinary human beings. I do not need anything more than that.

How did you become a humanist?

I suppose I might be described as one of those odd creatures, a second-generation humanist, in the sense that although I come from a family of a rather strong puritanical chapel background, both my father and my mother had broken away from it. The family had been

Shropshire farmers for 500 years or so. My parents had broken away from it, perhaps because it was too rigid and puritanical a doctrine for either of them — for they were both, I think, generous-minded people — to accept. Therefore I had — except when my grandfather was around — no particular compulsions of religion in my youth, and I did not suffer, as many people have suffered, any great sort of traumatic experience in trying to break away from a doctrine which had been put before me as the absolute necessity of life.

Do you think that humanism ever can be the thing in international affairs, international relations, that Christianity, for instance, has been and is today?

I would say that it is in a sense the inevitable and natural approach in international affairs. Christianity has a substantial force, but one has to realize that Christianity is only one among many great religions in the world, and in terms of the clashes of great power blocs, only one among many mythologies. It seems to me that one of the significant facts in the world today — many people find it surprising — is the immense passionate desire on the part of peoples of all nations to believe themselves to be democratic. They do not always act, in our view, democratically, but there is no new country that comes into existence, even if it immediately puts its opposition into prison, which does not declare that it is doing so in the name of democracy, in pursuit of the democratic ideal. Humanism can help here because it is essentially a democratic concept, because it believes, as democracy believes, in a continuing dialogue, in an open-minded examination of each new issue as it comes along, to try to determine what is best and most practical in the circumstances of the time as a guide to a common meeting-ground, without the inevitable restrictions of a rigid doctrine, religious or political.

Can humanism ever be the basis of understanding between two peoples that Christianity could be and has been?

Christianity has been the basis of a great deal of misunderstanding between peoples as well, hasn't it? I mean, let us not get all confused by the myth that Christianity throughout its history has been a great common binding force in the world. There has been nothing so severe as the great religious wars and conflicts. I would say humanism can be that link between peoples, simply because what the humanist in fact is saying is: 'We must work in the belief that, so far as we can see, Man is the chief agent, and the highest expression so far of the evolutionary principle. In so far as he has a dedication it is to help forward that force of evolution. He can only do so by being constantly ready to explore new ideas, to look at new political or economic principles as they come up, not as challenges to a prepared, established position which he holds, but as possibly a new system, a new idea, a new conception which is worth examination, some of which may be no good, parts of which may be capable of being absorbed into other systems, so that you have this constantly moving, fluid aproach'.

One of the things that struck me about humanism, as a result of these inquiries I have been making is that to be a humanist, a man has to be a pretty mature personality and also a man educated — even if self-educated — considerably above the average. Doesn't this make it difficult for humanism to become acceptable to, for instance, primitive people?

I do not know that I would accept your premise. To be a theologian, to be a philosopher of any kind in the higher ranges of that philosophy, one has to be a fairly sophisticated and educated person. But I would have thought that humanism, for example, was very close to the approach of the ordinary English person with his concept of tolerance, of looking at the other chap's point of view, and so on. When you get to very primitive communities, either Christianity or humanism has a problem in breaking away from concrete, conceptions of physical gods, of physical totems and so on, which have come to be important; but I would

not have thought that the break from that kind of primitive conception to humanism was more difficult than the break to Christianity — in fact in many ways I would have thought it less difficult.

I wonder too, whether humanism can be effective in international affairs in the way that Christianity certainly has been, and sometimes is today — Christianity's effect on the slave trade, for instance? Is humanism sufficiently specific to apply to international problems?

I would think so; and when you say 'Christianity's effect on the slave trade', this was only true of a particular group of Christians. What I think appals one, as one goes back historically, is the way in which people who were in many ways very genuine Christians were able to accept either the slave trade or the idea that children of seven or eight should work in the mines, and the fact that this did not conflict with their idea of Christianity. They were strong church-goers, strong Christians, but they had persuaded themselves that they were of a different race, or a different group of people. I think the humanist could never do that, because the humanist sees the whole human race as one, at various stages of evolutionary development, and his concern is to help on that evolutionary development by exploring with an open mind every possible means of so doing.

A couple of weeks ago the Archbishop of Canterbury made a statement about the use of force in Southern Rhodesia. As far as he was concerned, he said, he was making a statement of Christian principles. Could a leading humanist say anything about some international problem in the same way as the Archbishop did?

Yes; I do not think he would say that he was making a statement of humanist principles; I think he would say that he was making a statement of what seemed to him to be intelligent and human principles. He would not try to claim the authority of a great organized body behind him — and indeed the Archbishop got into a deal of trouble by doing just that. It has struck me very much recently on various occasions

when I have been marching in the same lobby with the Archbishop of Canterbury — on various issues like the Bill to end hanging, and so on — the virulence with which he has been attacked by other Christians for behaving as they thought in an un-Christianlike way.

Turning now to general international affairs, take the permanent East-West conflict, for instance. What can the humanists contribute to that?

I believe to the humanist the East-West conflict represents movements by human groups to find solutions of human problems: solutions which at the moment differ, but each of which may contain something from which the other could borrow, and from which one can learn — unless one gets oneself into the sort of position that that great Secretary of State in America, Mr. Dulles, once got himself into: the belief that there is an absolute black and an absolute white in international affairs. One's attitude must be that each approach to a solution of political affairs is worth examining, and perhaps worth borrowing from.

You have lived a very busy life; you have been engaged in a great many causes; you have worked for social reform. But now you are moving towards the period in life when you have to sit down and take things rather more easily. Do you think that humanism as a faith will be as attractive to you in your old age as it was when you were a busy man? Do you think you might perhaps long for the consolation of a religion like Christianity, for instance?

I do not think so. In a way this problem — if it is a problem — came to me about three years ago, when I had a coronary and was laid on my back, and it seemed to me to be quite possible that this might be the end. I found no sense at all of anxiety about the end, but a great deal of interest in considering what would be happening to mankind when I was gone from it. — *From The Listener, Dec. 2, 1965.*

MARCONI: THE MAN AND HIS WIRELESS[1]

Guglielmo Marconi (1874-1937), inventor, electrical engineer, and winner of the Nobel prize for physics, was the first to perfect the devices used in space telegraphy. To his genius is due the great scientific triumph of wireless telegraphy.

Orrin Dunlap states that he gives us the exciting story of how the first wireless signal was flashed across the Atlantic sky, because "it is not only unforgettable, but one of the great climaxes in the history of wireless, and in Marconi's life." From his book comes the following story about Marconi's invention.

Marconi at the dawn of a new century caught the vision of a dream. He saw men sitting on the edge of the North American continent listening to what a lambent spark was sputtering across 2,000 miles of broad, curving ocean.

New Year's Day, 1900, ushered in an electrical age of speed and scientific wonders — a Century of Progress.

The question in 1900 was, how can 20 kilowatts spread out to every point of the compass provide sufficient energy to traverse 2,000 miles in one direction? Would America and England be brought in touch with each other without the aid of the submerged cable costing from $4,500,000 to $9,000,000 or up to $2,500 a mile?

Marconi thought so, and was working feverishly toward that conclusion.

The cable secluded in the bed of the sea could carry dots and dashes, but the idea that thoughts might pass through the ocean air in less than a second was something to balk human credulity.

[1] Orrin E. Dunlap, *Marconi: The Man and His Wireless*, by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York, 1937, p. 87-90, 93-99, 100-101.

How less tedious, less expensive it would be to utilize a free right-of-way in the heavens instead of laying a cable in Neptune's dreary sanctum? The idea had possibilities calling for a miracle man. The skeptics, of course, were countless. It was true, this man Marconi had convinced the doubting world that wirelesss lifted messages for short distances, but the Atlantic — well, it was much wider than the English Channel.

It was not so difficult to comprehend, in view of Marconi's achievements, that a boat 250 miles off the English coast picked up a wireless signal from the shore. But that must have been a freak of nature aided by extraordinary atmospheric conditions. So argued the diehards. It was eight times that distance from England to America!

Marconi, a conservative scientist, knew the Atlantic project was fraught with daring — a little too much for the public mind to grasp. He realized the significance of premature announcements.

Wireless across the sea meant the very shrinkage of the earth. It meant new and revolutionary communication between every nation on the face of the globe. Wisdom called for secrecy. If the dream turned out to be a bubble it would be a matter of disappointment only to the dreamer. If successful it would be a signal of progress for mankind. So he would work quietly, unassumingly, with plans unpublicized.

He was looked upon as a modern wizard whose human traits outwardly failed to betray any eccentricities of genius. Londoners who saw him in Piccadilly or Pall Mall observed a rather sad, keen-eyed, thin-lipped young man with unlimited capacity for work and a firm faith in his own ability. His brown hair was neatly trimmed and carefully brushed; sometimes he shaved twice a day. His attire, if anything, was a little too neat for a scientist. He was fond of a fur coat and was not above afternoon tea. One who passed him in the street would class him with the average club or city man, fond of the good things in life, yet his manner and step revealed he was by no means

an idler. He looked like a man faithful to friendship but the type who would give it rarely.

Divested of the fur coat he looked frail. His movements were slow and direct, yet there was an odd air of diffidence very apparent when he was in the company of strangers. This shyness was emphasized if wireless telegraphy was the topic. He appeared much younger than his twenty-six years, and more than one great scientist eyed him incredulously when seeing him for the first time.

Superficially, Marconi had little to distinguish him from the average man, but closer acquaintance invariably impressed one with his tremendous energy. The doctrine of strenuous life never had a more faithful follower. He labored under high pressure and expected his subordinates to feel the same intense enthusiasm that gripped him during experimental periods. He worked by night and day when a problem presented itself.

Such was the calibre of the man intent upon transatlantic wireless; the man who was preparing for what he termed, "the big thing" — wireless between the Old and New Worlds.

Marconi, accompanied by Major Flood Page, managing director of the Marconi Wireless Company, and R. N. Vyvyan, engineer, in July 1900, went to the barren southwest tip of England and selected Poldhu, near Mullion in Cornwall, as the site for a pioneer transmitter, 100 times more powerful than any station ever built. Construction began in October.

There history would be etched electrically on the blue canopy of the globe. Professor James Ambrose Fleming of University College, London, appointed Scientific Adviser of the Marconi Wireless Company in 1899, was entrusted to design the installation. He was a specialist in high tension alternating currents. Mr. Vyvyan was selected to supervise construction. Newspapers printed meagre reports that an Italian inventor hoped to link two far-distant points without the aid of visible wires.

The word "visible" appearing in the accounts of 1896-99 indicated the incredulity of the general public. The

Gay Nineties were conservative in regard to electrical miracles; people shook their heads in doubt and wonderment . . . .

A queer-looking structure, never before seen on the English landscape or anywhere else for that matter, was attracting attention on the forbidding rocks that jut out into the Atlantic at Poldhu. It was Marconi's latest idea of what an aerial system should comprise. There was to be a ring of twenty wooden masts, each about 200 feet high, arranged in a semicircle 200 feet in diameter, covering about an acre. It was designed as the "frame" of a conical aerial consisting of 400 wires.

By the end of August, 1901, the masts were nearly completed, but a cyclone swept the English coast on September 17; the big masts blew down like so many toothpicks after it had taken eleven months to erect them. Disappointment swept through the Marconi ranks. The engineers said it meant postponement of three months or more to remove the wreckage and build anew.

The "sister" towers on Cape Cod suffered a similar disaster a few weeks later.

Marconi was too anxious, too unconquerable a soul to permit fallen masts to get the best of him. He decided it might be possible to utilize a simpler aerial. So two poles, instead of twenty, each 150 feet high, were erected. A triangular stay was stretched between the masts and from it were suspended fifty-five copper wires. They were about a yard apart at the top and conveyed at the bottom, forming a fan-shaped aerial.

Everything was ready for a preliminary test.

The fiery spark crashed across the gap electrifying the makeshift web of wire and the bleak November air.

A wirelesss outpost at Crookhaven, Ireland, 225 miles away, heard the signals with such intensity that the engineers felt certain the power was sufficient to drive a message across the Atlantic — ten times as far as Poldhu to Crookhaven!

Marconi was sure it would. He decided to conduct the first test in Newfoundland — the nearest point in America to the Old World.

Bound on a historic jour-

ney, he sailed on November 26 from Liverpool on the liner *Sardinian,* accompanied by two assistants, G. S. Kemp[2] and P. W. Paget.

They had odd baggage for three men. Small captive balloons and a number of large kites were in the luggage. They knew the inclement weather in Canada at this season of the year and the shortness of the time at their disposal made impossible to erect high masts to hold aloft antenna wires. But the kites and balloons might do the trick, thereby saving time and expense and possibly make history.

Undramatically, in fact, unnoticed, the trio of pioneers landed at St. John's on Friday, December 6, and the following day, before beginning operations they visited the Governor, Sir Cavendish Boyle, Premier Sir Robert Bond, and other members of the Ministry, who promised heartiest cooperation. They cheerfully placed the resources of every department of the government at Marconi's disposal to facilitate his work.

"After taking a look at various sites," said Marconi, "which might prove suitable, I considered the best one was on Signal Hill, a lofty eminence overlooking the port and forming a natural bulwark which protects it from the fury of the Atlantic winds. On top of this hill is a small plateau some two acres in area, which seemed very suitable for manipulation of the balloons and kites. On a crag on this plateau rose the new Cabot Memorial Tower, erected in commemoration of the famous Italian explorer John Cabot, and designed as a signal station. Close to it there was the old military barracks, then used as a hospital. It was in the forum of this building that we set up the apparatus and made preparations for the great experiment.

"On Monday, December 9, we began work. On Tuesday we flew a kite with 600 feet of aerial as a preliminary test, and on Wednesday we inflated one of the balloons, which made its first ascent during the morning. It was

[2] Mr. Kemp was one of Marconi's most valued electricians and his diary of wireless was a great asset to Marconi when in court fighting patent litigation and infringements.

about fourteen feet in diameter and contained about 1,000 cubic feet of hydrogen gas, quite sufficient to hold up the aerial, which consisted of wire weighing about ten pounds. After a short while, however, the blustery wind ripped the balloon away from the wire. The balloon sailed out over the sea. We concluded, perhaps the kites would be better, and on Thursday morning, in spite of a gusty gale we managed to fly a kite up 400 feet.

"The critical moment had come, for which the way had been prepared by six years of hard and unremitting work, despite the usual criticism directed at anything new. I was about to test the truth of my belief.

"In view of the importance of all that was at stake, I had decided not to trust entirely to the usual arrangement of having the coherer signals record automatically on a paper tape through a relay and Morse instrument, but to use instead a telephone connected to a self-restoring coherer. The human ear bearing much more sensitive than the recorder it would be more likely to hear the signal.

"Before leaving England I had given detailed instructions for transmission of a certain signal, the Morse telegraphic 'S' — three dots — at a fixed time each day beginning as soon as word was received that everything at St. John's was in readiness. If the invention could receive on the kitewire in Newfoundland some of the the electric waves produced, I knew the solution of the problem of transoceanic wireless telegraphy was at hand.

"I cabled Poldhu to begin sending at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, English time, continuing until 6 o'clock; that is from 11:30 to 2:30 o'clock in St. John's."

As the hands of the clock moved toward noon on Thursday (December 12, 1901), Marconi sat waiting with the telephone receiver held to his ear. It was an intense hour of expectation. Arranged on the table were the delicate instruments ready for a decisive test. There was no calibrated dial tuner to facilitate adjusting the circuit to a specific wave length. In fact, the wave of Poldhu was not measured.

There was no device to measure it. Professor Fleming thought there should be some method of measuring wave length but he had yet to invent his cymometer or wavemeter.

The length of Poldhu's wave was a guess. There was nothing precise or scientific about tuning. But based on the fact that the aerial was 200 feet high and that it was linked with a series coil or "jigger," Professor Fleming estimated the wave length was not less than about 3,000 feet or 960 meters.

Marconi had to hunt for the wave.

A wire ran out through the window of Cabot Tower, thence to a pole and upward to the kite which could be seen swaying overhead. It was a raw day. A cold sea thundered at the base of the 300-feet cliff. Oceanward through the mist rose dimly the rude outlines of Cape Spear, the easternmost point of the North American continent.

Beyond rolled the unbroken ocean, nearly 2,000 miles to the coast of the British Isles; wireless might leap that in one ninety-third of a second! Across the harbor the city of St. John's lay on the hillside. No one had taken enough interest in the experiment to go up through the snow to Signal Hill. Even the ubiquitous reporter was absent.

In Cabot Tower, the veteran signalman stood in the lookout's nest scanning the horizon for ships, little dreaming that mysterious waves might be coming out of the sky from England.

Wireless was ready for the crucial test. Its destiny was at stake. So was Marconi's. Everything that could be done had been done. The receiving outfit was as sensitive as Marconi could make it; he had faith that these instruments would pick up the faintest trace of a signal.

Marconi listened and listened. Not a sound was heard for half an hour. He inspected the instruments. They looked perfect. Had something gone wrong at Poldhu? Had some mysterious force led the signals astray? Was the curvature of the globe a barrier? All these things flashed through his mind, coupled with the

fact that it was almost fantastic to believe an unseen wave of intelligence could cross through the ocean air and strike such a slender target as a copper wire. It seemed incredible. It would be so easy for the message to travel off in some undesired direction.

Marconi knew, however, if the signal went east, north or south it would also go west and to that wire antenna dangling from the kite.

Without warning there was a sharp click in the earphones. What caused it? Was some stray static playing a prank? Indeed not! Marconi had at last found the right tuning adjustment to put him in touch with Poldhu!

"Suddenly, at about 12:30 o'clock, unmistakably three scant little clicks sounded several times in my ear as I listened intently," said Marconi, in recounting the day. "But I would not be satisfied without corroboration.

" 'Can you hear anything, Kemp?' I said, handing the receiver to him.

"Kemp heard the same thing I did, and right in my anticipation," recalled Marconi. "Electric waves which were being sent out from Poldhu had traversed the Atlantic serenely ignoring the curvature of the earth, which so many doubters considered would be a fatal obstacle. I knew then that the day on which I should be able to send full messages without wires or cables across the Atlantic was not very far away. Distance had been overcome, and further development of the sending and receiving instruments was all that was required."

Wireless had flashed across the Atlantic's sky like "some meteor that the sun exhales."

Again and again Marconi and Kemp listened to be sure there was no mistake. Padget was called in. He listened but heard nothing; he was slightly deaf. What Marconi and Kemp heard must have been Poldhu. There was no other wireless station in the world to send that prearranged signal. And a marvel was that it was noon time; it would have been so much easier to perform the feat at night when darkness aids the flight of long-wave wireless. Marconi was not aware of that.

It was mid-afternoon. The kite gyrated wildly in the gale that swept in from the sea. The antenna failed to maintain the maximum altitude and the fluctuating height naturally influenced reception. The wind tugged and tugged at the kite, finally at 2:20 o'clock the antenna was lifted within range of the repetitious dots. And that gave further verification.

At dusk the inventor and his companions went down the hill toward the city sparkling with lights. He made no statement to the press. In fact, he felt rather depressed because he had not intercepted a continuous stream of signals. Possibly the stress of the preceding days had something to do with his dishearted feeling.

It is said that a secret is no longer a secret if more than one person holds it, but that night three men kept a secret from the world. And what they harbored was front-page news — news that would find a place in history books.

They went to sleep dreaming of what they had heard and in hope that a new day would put the stamp of success on their work by further verification. It almost seemed too true for them to believe their own ears. They would listen again for the three elusive dots.

They were up on the hill early the next morning, anxious to lend an ear to space at noon, for that was the appointed time for Poldhu to broadcast.

The signals came on schedule but were not quite as distinct as the day before. The changing weather on a 2,000 mile front could make a radical difference in behavior of the waves. There was no doubt, however, that wireless had spanned the Atlantic. Nevertheless, the modest inventor hesitated to make his achievement public, lest it seem too extraordinary for belief.

Finally, after withholding the news for two days, certainly evidence of his conversatism and self-restraint, Marconi issued a statement to the press, and that Sabbath morning the world knew but doubted. . . .

The scientific world was mindful that Marconi had never released a statement in public until absolutely

certain of the facts. He never had to withdraw a notice as to his progress. As soon as the significance of the event was realized star reporters and special magazine writers rushed northward from New York to get the story from the lips of the inventor.

He told them it cost $200,000 to get the three dots across the Atlantic! To Marconi there was nothing problematical about the future; he had spanned the Atlantic. He had upset the calculation of mathematicians. — *By Orrin E. Dunlap.*

SELF ANARCHY

Harold Laski has this story to tell: I discussed recently with a Hindu I knew — a man of great culture — the question of Indian Independence. "If England were to withdraw from India," I said, "wouldn't the country relapse into a state of anarchy — much like what it was in the 18th Century when Clive and Hastings laid the foundations of the British Raj?"

My friend assented sadly, "Yes, I suppose you are right."

"And that would be followed by a tyranny, or several tyrannies, would it not?"

"Yes, probably."

"And then the pendulum would swing back to anarchy again?"

"Yes," he said, "yes, I am afraid it would!" Then, after a long pause, he added, "but it will be our tyranny and our anarchy!"

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Preparations for the establishment of an Asian Development Bank are approaching their final stage. The Charter of the $1,000m. Bank has been examined, discussed, and revised, paragraph by paragraph, by senior government officials from 31 Asian and non-Asian countries. Manila is chosen for its principal office.

Operations of the Bank are expected to begin about the middle of 1966.

Main functions are:

To promote investment in the region of public and private capital for development purposes;

To utilize the resources at its disposal for financing development of the developing member countries in the region, giving priority to those regional, sub-regional, as well as national projects and programmes which will contribute most effectively to the harmonious economic growth of the region as a whole, and having special regard to the needs of the smaller or less-developed member countries in the region;

To meet requests from member countries in the region for assistance in the co-ordination of their development policies and plans with a view to achieving better utilization of their resources;

To provide technical assistance for the preparation, financing, and execution of development projects and programmes, including the formulation of specific project proposals.

Initial capital is $1,000m. Asian member countries will subscribe 60 per cent.; the other 40 per cent. is expected to come from non-Asian developed countries.

Lack of investment capital has hampered economic development. It is one of the main reasons why the gap between the poor and rich countries has widened rather than narrowed. The A.D.B. is yet another attempt to solve the problem.

AN AMERICAN ZEN BUDDHIST

"The unearthly silence of the monastery's tremendous pine and cedar trees took hold of me," says the thin, gray-haired monk, explaining one reason he returned to Japan to live Zen.

The monk is Philip Kapleau, a balding ex-businessman of 53, who probably knows more about the actual practice of Zen Buddhism than any other living westerner.

Twelve years ago, Kapleau, ridden with ulcers and allergies and haunted by dark and uncertain fears, gave up his New York business, his apartment, his art collection and his automobile and came here to enter a Zen monastery.

Today Americans and Europeans from all walks of life, including a few artists, psychiatrists and physicians, seek him out and consult with him on how to practice the Zen discipline.

After years of rigorous training in two leading Zen monasteries as a lay monk, under three of Japan's outstanding Zen masters, Kapleau considers himself a much happier man because of the experience.

Connecticut-born, Kapleau studied law and became a court reporter. He was chief reporter for the international military tribunal at Nuremburg at the end of world war II and also a staff-member at crime trials in Tokyo.

While in Tokyo, he visited the 13th century Engakuji Zen monastery in nearby Kamakura, and it was there he experienced the unearthly silence of the pines.

After returning to the U.S., Kapleau organized his own court reporting company and at the same time began his search for the meaning of Zen under the Japanese scholar Daisetsu Suzuki at Columbia university in New York.

But after two years of Suzuki's lectures, Kapleau felt that Zen "philosophy" was not ridding him of frustration. He described it as "a nagging feeling of nothingness."

The clue that changed his life came from a Japanese acquaintance, a psychiatrist familiar with Zen, who told him:

"Zen's not a philosophy. It's a healthy way to live. If you go to Japan to practice Buddhism and not just talk about it, your whole life will be transformed."

A few months later, Kapleau found himself cross-legged in a Zen monastery, tortured by pain in his legs and back from hours of "sitting Zen." Shivering in the December air of an open, unheated hall, he began wondering if he had made a mistake.

But he stuck it out for three years as a lay monk, first at a well known monastery perched among cedars, pines and bamboo overlooking a valley near Tokyo, later at another monastery near the Japan sea.

His day began at 4 a.m. with meditation for an hour and a half, then chanting of "sutras" for half an hour. There was a breakfast of rice and vegetables, manual labor, and trudging through snow in straw sandals with fellow apprentice monks to beg for rice. But mostly he was "sitting, sitting" on a flat cushion on the straw-matted floor.

In the heat of summer, Kapleau was there with the monks felling trees, planting rice, cultivating the monastery gardens and working in the kitchen. He still suffered searing pain in his knees and back from the sitting.

All through this discipline, he was hoping to achieve "Satori", a state of "spiritual awakening" marked by great joy and inner peace which has been the aim of Zen monks for centuries.

His stomach condition improved and every one of his allergies disappeared. "The dark fears which formerly haunted me as well as my dreams and hopes, all these have withered away leaving me with a clearer sense of the real," he wrote. But satori did not come.

Kapleau moved on to Kamakura to become a disciple of one of Japan's most highly reputed Zen masters, Hakuun Yasutani.

He began the study of "koans" — baffling spiritual problems presented by the Zen master, or "roshi." One

of the best known of these is "what is the sound of one hand clapping?"

But it wasn't until five years later, in 1958, at one of his periodic meetings or "Zen interviews," with Yasutani that Kapleau experienced satori.

As Kapleau describes it, "every single thing disappeared in a dazzling stream of illumination, and I felt myself bathed in a delicious unspeakable delight. . ."

This all sounds more than a little mysterious to one who hasn't experienced it. But Kapleau has now written a book — "The Three Pillars of Zen" — which he hopes will reveal Zen as "an eminently straightforward and practical teaching."

It is, he says, a "unique system of body-mind training whose aim is spiritual enlightenment."

Despite his association with Suzuki, who has done much to popularize Zen through scores of publications and translations, Kapleau feels that the venerated scholar has misled many into believing that Zen is a philosophy to be studied, rather than a living religion to be practised.

In Kapleau's opinion, one of the key aspects of Zen discipline which Suzuki and other commentators on Zen have almost neglected to mention is "Zazen," an exercise in concentration whereby the mind is both tranquilized and sharpened. One aspect of Zazen is the art of sitting in the difficult, cross-legged "lotus" position.

On the lowest level, he believes that Zen discipline can overcome the tensions of modern life and help a man to think more clearly and live a healthier life. On the highest level, he believes that Zen can bring inner peace and moral certainty by teaching "The unity of all existence."

Kapleau's old master, Yasutani, who at 80 has more energy than most men half his age, has set out for the United States, where he has been invited by various groups to teach Zen "more or less permanently."

Kapleau believes that the "Zen fad" that has arisen in many parts of the United States has been "little more than a mind-tickling diversion of high-brows and a plaything of beatniks."

WHAT IS THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

In a long professional life I have tackled the job of writing about a good many nations, cities, and institutions, and I have always sought to ask a number of questions:

What does this place look like?

Where did it come from?

What are its prevailing qualities and characteristics?

Who runs it?

Is the population satisfied?

Where is it going?

In this survey I will try to do the same thing for the University of Chicago.

This is what I found,

Quality at an academic institution cannot be built merely upon individual brilliance. First rate work and first rate people need support both broad and deep. At Chicago, the faculty is supported by a staff of 7,300 (including 1,200 part-time student workers).

The main campus has changed little since I first saw it. It has, so to speak, been filled in, but the central design, the basic structure and pattern as laid down by the first builders, remains intact. It is still a handsomely self-contained community of lawns and quadrangles, the battlements of which are built of grey Indiana limestone in the Gothic manner. The gargoyles, ivy, spires, apertures, red slate, scrolled designs, look mildly anachronistic, but are pleasing.

South Campus has architecture quite different from the main campus. The works of three major modern architects stand in order along a "cultural mile," arrayed like specimens to be savored at leisure by the architectural connoisseur.

Looking at the University after many years' absence, I wanted first of all to find out something about the rockbottom citizenry of this principality, the undergraduates. Of course the Uni-

versity of Chicago is, and always has been since its foundation in 1891, primarily a graduate school. In fact students working for advanced degrees and those in the graduate professional schools outnumber undergraduates today by a ratio of two to one.

The University acquires as undergraduates the scholastic cream of the cream. It has appeal for all sorts of bright youngsters, and especially favors vigorous "achievers" with serious motives and imaginative, independent turns of mind. Chicago students come from farms and hamlets, from slums and suburbia. Although they study in the lee of a great graduate school, the College students are not repelled by their more mature and more extensively educated colleagues — instead, they are attracted. Chicago is not an obvious place for the average student, but gifted youngsters find it supremely challenging, and some others discover abilities they never knew they had .

No quota system of any kind governs entrance to the University. No questions are asked on application forms about race or religion, and a photograph is optional. Tuition comes high — in the $1,700-range for three quarters — and an additional $1,500, at a bare minimum, is necessary for living expenses. About half the undergraduate body has helped in the form of scholarships, and nearly two-thirds have part-time jobs of one sort or another. The average scholarship for an entering freshman in the Class of '68 was $1,225, and the University is spending about $10 million this year on various forms of aid to College and graduate students.

Of course University of Chicago graduates were bright in my day too, but not as terrifyingly bright as today's leaders seem to be.

I spent one afternoon with four bright, knowledgeable undergraduates. One was a vice president of the Student Government; another was editor of the "Maroon" (the campus newspaper, circulation 10,000). These youngsters, one of whom was a blonde, pretty girl who seemed to be appallingly young, but who was specializing in

Russian Civilization and had already had her first extensive trip in the Soviet Union, impressed and puzzled me. They were very guarded — perhaps shy. I asked them what they like most about the University. Well, it was one hell of a good school. They did not feel at all that they, as undergraduates, were overshadowed by the prevailing emphasis on graduate study. Quite the contrary — they were being amply prepared for graduate work. Complaints? First, tuition charges were too high. They wanted to get at the bottom of the accounting system used by the University and see why costs could not be reduced. Second, the general education courses were sometimes "badly" taught and did not reach fully enough into the present. They wanted more emphasis on the contemporary, particularly in history and the humanities. Third, the University was behind the times in its approach to the racial problem. Fourth, although they freely conceded that the University was thorougly liberal, youngsters could get into trouble by being vociferous on civil rights, censorship, and so on. Fifth, intelligent youngish teachers might, my informants said, be in danger of being fired just before they got tenure if they did not "conform."

I doubt that a professor ever has been fired at Chicago for "non-conformity" despite what students may say. In my interviews with them, faculty members were generous in their praise for the freedom and independence they are granted by the administration of the University. If there is a pressure on them, it probably is the social pressure of the academic community to work hard, teach well and contribute in positive terms to mankind's storehouse of usable knowledge.

The next day I climbed the old iron stairway of Cobb Hall and sat in on a sophomore humanities course. No rostrum, no desks. Eleven young men, ten young women sat informally with an instructor round a large oval table. Classes are commendably small — averaging 18 — at Chicago. The class was reading Plato's "Gorgias," and instruction took the form of question, elucidation, and

discussion. The mood was nicely — but not exaggeratedly — spirited. There are all manners of innovations at Chicago. Formal lectures usually do not take place more than once a week, and only original texts are used. At examinations the identity of the student is unknown to the examiner who goes over his papers.

Advocates of general education are listened to with respect. This, indeed, next to the quarter system (The school operates the year around and is divided into four quarters) which has been widely copied (and will surely be introduced in many more universities), is one of Chicago's distinguishing marks in the undergraduate realm to day. The alert, bright-eyed early careerists receive an excellent pre-professional education and often move rapidly toward their chosen goals. But the University makes it clear that it values the well-rounded person, with a solid underpinning of general knowledge, before specialization begins.

What the University wants to stress is the "interrelation of disciplines," and thus arose the now celebrated broad-beam courses which every student is obliged to take and which totally occupy two of his four years unless he can prove by "placement tests" that he does not need them.

The eight obligatory courses are:

1. Humanities (including philosophy, art and music.)
2. English composition
3. A foreign language (not compulsory if a student passes a satisfactory examination.)
4. Mathematics
5. History of Western Civilization
6. Biological Sciences
7. Physical Sciences
8. Social Sciences

One should also mention that instruction in the fourth year may be tutorial, and that "specialization" does not mean vocational education. Chicago is certainly not the place to go if one wants to study ice cream manufacture or hotel management.

About 230 members of the faculty specifically serve the undergraduate body but practically all professors, no matter how elevated, may teach in the College. Many, including the President of

the College, like to do so, because it gives them the chance to associate with fresh, youthful minds.

The graduate divisions are the Humanities (roughly 565 students), Biological Sciences excluding medicine (260), Physical Sciences (505) and Social Sciences (1,150). Here are enticing realms of the recondite; courses exist from Balkan Linguistics to Neuropharmacology. Here too, in spite of close emphasis on the refinements of particularized scholarship, we find that some of the frontiers between disciplines have already broken down — particularly in the sciences. The University encourages this. There are professors who scarcely know whether they belong to one department or another. Nobody knows these days where biology stops and physics starts. Here too, the relations of professor to student can attain an exquisite level of intellectual intimacy. The Department of Music, one of the strongest on the campus and one of the most stimulating in the country, has a staff of 15 to 50 music majors. Astronomy presently has ten teachers, including several men of formidable renown, for 15 graduate students.

Many universities today have a tendency to be choosy about students who apply for graduate work. Chicago takes a more liberal attitude and prides itself for its hospitality to "risk" admissions; it will take a chance on a bright boy, no matter how spotty or unconventional his previous education has been. Some of these have paid off well. And, of course, undergraduates progressed to earn a doctorate between 1936 and 1956 than in any other institution in the country.

Needless to say, the graduate and professional schools spawn an enormous amount of talent. Chicago ranks as the nation's largest per capita producer of college and university teachers elsewhere in the nation. It is an incubator, a teacher of teachers. No fewer than 167 presidents of other American colleges or universities — one out of 10 — either are Chicago alumni, or have been faculty members — an almost unbelievable statistic.

The Graduate School of Education, established in 1958, is the newest of Chicago's professional schools. But the University from the beginning has won renown for its research in education. Research is translated into direct service through a number of Centers in the education school — the Reading Research Center, the Urban Child Center, and the Comparative Education Center which investigates the differences in teaching and learning the world over. Since 1957 the University has been providing educational training and guidance in Pakistan, and for Pakistanis on the Chicago campus.

The Laboratory Schools, as the name implies, serve both as a demonstration center for effective teaching — from nursery school through 12 years of pre-college education — and as a research tool for testing and validating educational theory. Incidentally, the average I.Q. of the 1,200 students in the Laboratory Schools is higher than 130 — not surprising, I suppose, since about half of them are children of University faculty members.

What makes the University of Chicago great is neither endowment nor equipment, but men — the faculty. Twenty-four Nobel Prize winners have been associated with the University in one way or another so far. Twenty-eight members of the faculty are members of the National Academy of Sciences, 31 are fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and 17 are members of the American Philosophic Society, the oldest learned society in the country.

Seventy per cent of the faculty live close enough to the University to be able to walk to their classrooms, an important factor in maintaining the community spirit, and their children by and large go to the same schools and play together. Nobody pulls rank; everybody from the President down is plain "Mr.," except Doctors of Medicine.

To summarize, it is the faculty which gives the University much of its unique quality, its special temper, based on a devout belief in research for its own sake and relentlessly acute and inces-

sant speculation and experiments. The dominant principle is solid scholarship, and it demands the best. Small principalities as well as large ones have their founding fathers, their historical *raison d'etre*. The University of Chicago was founded in 1890 by the curious impingement of three forces — a Baptist organization (the American Baptist Education Society) which contributed the idea; John D. Rockefeller who contributed most of the money; and the first President, William Rainey Harper, who contributed almost everything else. It opened its doors on October 1, 1892 as a full-fledged university, not a college. This was something unusual at the time, when a university normally grew out of a previously existing college. The original faculty of 103 included eight college presidents, whom Harper enticed from other institutions, as well as other eminent scholars. The student body numbered 594.

Harper, assuming charge of the creation of a new University, was enthralled by its possibilities; after being assured of getting a free hand, he issued an extraordinary manifesto of policy — a policy so revolutionary that it provoked the amusement or scorn of almost all the orthodox pedagogues of the time.

Soon this remarkable innovator and energizer evolved a novel idea which is still one of the most distinctive marks of the University — the four quarter system. He scrapped the old September-to-June schedule, and established in its place the first all-year-round university in the history of the world. The year was divided into four quarters which were made as nearly as possible identical in the work offered and the professors in attendance; the University was to keep its doors open the whole year, in full blast all the time. By this scheme University education was made more flexible than it had ever been before. A student — even today — may come when his finances permit, leave again, come back, and graduate at any season when his work is complete; on the other hand, he may work all four quarters for three years without interruption and thus get out a year ahead of

time. Another advantage is that a student at Chicago takes no more than three or four courses during each quarter, and the curriculum is widened.

Harper died, worn out, in 1906, aged 49. The University has never changed much from the pattern stamped on it by this extraordinary and indomitable man.

In 1929 came Robert Maynard Hutchins, aged 30, from Yale, where he had become the "boy wonder" Dean of the Law School at 28. The University will never forget Robert Hutchins, and discussion of his regime still provokes lively controversy. Hutchins was a brilliantly inspired innovator, lucid, packed with principle, and possessed of enormous charm.

Hutchins' central belief was that "Every student should obtain a liberal education before being permitted to specialize." At the same time he wanted to speed up education so that work in the professions could get under way more quickly. What he sought was "more educated A.B.'s and fewer uneducated Ph.D.'s." He even looked forward, as somebody put it, to the time "when Ph.D.'s would really be Doctors of Philosophy." What interested him was ideas, and he stood for culture and the human tradition.

The two men who have followed Hutchins as heads of state at Chicago came from quite different molds and have shown quite different styles.

Lawrence A. Kimpton, an energetic professor of philosophy and a practical man as well who had become vice president of the University, took over when Hutchins resigned in 1951 and served as chief executive until 1960.

George Beadle, who succeeded Kimpton in 1961 to become the seventh president of the Chicago principality, is a biologist, a specialist in genetics, which is a field that could well turn out to mean to this generation what atomic physics meant to the last.

Who does run the University of Chicago?

From trustees, faculty, students and outsiders, I got the same answer: "Under Beadle, Levi." Edward Hirsch Levi, formerly Dean of the Law School is Provost

of the University and Beadle's right arm.

The faculty has considerable autonomous power at Chicago, probably more than in any comparable American university. Beadle is faculty-minded, and so is Levi. Harper laid it down back in the 1890's that educational jurisdiction is the exclusive domain of the faculty, and this tradition has been pretty well kept up to this day. The trustees do not supervise on the academic level. Money follows policy not the reverse. The faculty is unshakeable.

Perhaps the single element that best characterizes the University is its incessant search for quality, which goes back all the way to Harper. It does not have to kowtow to any legislature or city council. It has unlimited reserves of energy and creative talent for dealing with the true business of a university, the pursuit and communication of knowledge, and it has risen again to become newly typical of what a university should be, an unfrightened and pertinacious community of scholars. — *John Gunther, condensed from Exchange, No.* 36, 1965.

THE WRONG MAN

Pauline Bonaparte was in love with Freron, a commissioner of the Convention. She wrote him:

"I love you always and most passionately. I love you forever, my beautiful idol, my heart, my appealing lover. I love you, love you, love you, the most loved of lovers, and I swear never to love any one else"

Soon after she fell in love with Junot who became a field marshal.

■ Today international law must be adjusted to contemporary interests and conditions to make it acceptable and useful.

INTERNATIONAL LAW IN ACTION

The problem of settling disputes is as old as man himself, and it is a matter in which the international lawyer has long had a keen interest. International law provides the rules which should govern any particular inter-state controversy, and international lawyers can try to provide the techniques whereby these rules stand the best chance of being obeyed. The degree to which they will be successful in any given situation will depend partly upon whether they have established suitable machinery, and partly upon how far the rules laid down by international law appear to support or conflict with the vital interests of the countries involved. It is frequently said that, when the chips are down, governments do not obey international law. The answer to this is that as they do obey it when it supports their interests, the task of the contemporary lawyer must therefore be a continual search for common interests, and a continual willingness to erect legal principles upon those common interests. This in turn involves admitting that certain old, traditional rules may havé served their usefulness and no longer represent the needs of the international community.

It should also be said that, unless their very existence is threatened, nations do often obey international law even when it runs against their short-term interests, because the sanction of reciprocity is here effective. For example, when the spy in the suitcase, destined for Egypt, was discovered at Rome airport last November, the Italian police did not keep the Arab diplomats concerned under arrest. No doubt it would have been to their advantage to retain them for prolonged questioning, but the law of diplomatic immunity prevented it, and the Italian Government was wise enough to know that there

might come the time when it, too, would wish to rely on the rules of diplomatic immunity.

The international community is comprised of powerful, sovereign states, and I have said that I believe that international law, to be effective, must be based as far as possible upon common interests. For the newer nations this presents an immediate difficulty. Many of them feel that the present system of international law is purely European and Christian in origin, developed without their participation, and protecting the interests only of the older, white states. There is, of course, something in this; modern international law is largely European in origin, and to some extent it reflects a distribution of power which no longer exists. On the other hand, legal historians can now show that in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, even though not later, Europe — and especially England, Holland, France, and Spain — treated the countries with which they traded in the East as equals, and that international customs about how countries in dispute dealt with each other owed at least something to this experience.

Moreover the substance of international law does not have to be static. New legal arrangements may be made by treaties, and the new states are now in a position to negotiate these as equals; again, law is developed through time by the diplomatic practice of states, to which the Afro-Asian world will make a substantial contribution; and these countries are also represented on the International Law Commission, a body specifically set up by the U.N. General Assembly to promote the development of international law.

So much for the rules themselves. But what about the techniques and methods of settling disputes? Some people want to draw a line here between 'political' and 'legal' disputes, but I do not think that this is possible. Virtually all disputes are both political and legal in nature, and in theory, at least, the International Court of Justice could be used to settle many of them. But the newer Afro-Asian nations have

shown a marked reluctance to adopt this procedure, for reasons completely apart from the delay that the legal process involves. The jurisdiction of the court is based upon consent, which may be given *ad hoc* in a specific case; or in advance in a particular treaty providing for reference to the Court if its terms become disputed; or by accepting the so-called 'optional clause'.

This clause — Article 36 of the Court's statute — provides that states may declare that they recognize the jurisdiction of the Court, in relation to any other state which also accepts the Court's jurisdiction. All the Efta countries, all the Common Market countries, Scandinavia, and the United States, have accepted the Court's jurisdiction, with or without reservations. Yet in the Middle East only Israel — and, since Suez, the United Arab Republic — have accepted the Court's jurisdiction. In non-white Africa the list only extends to Liberia, Ethiopia, Sudan, Somalia, Uganda, Ghana, and Tunisia: a list which includes not one of the French-speaking African states. Of the Asian countries, only Cambodia, India, Japan, Turkey, Pakistan, and the Philippines agree to the Court's jurisdiction.

The reason is not hard to find: the newer nations fear that the Court might apply rules of law which do not fully take account of their aspirations. While by and large the rules of traditional international law — for example, airspace, diplomatic immunities, state sovereignty — are acceptable, there remains a range of questions, including the regime of the territorial sea, the validity of treaty obligations formerly assumed on their behalf by colonial powers, and the nationalization of property, upon which they are unwilling to accept the traditional law. In this last, for example, the old states point to the traditional rule of law by which a state expropriating the property of aliens is bound to pay compensation which is 'adequate, prompt, and effective'; while some newly independent nations assert that they must have a truly independent economic policy, which would not in

their present poverty be possible if their freedom to nationalize were fettered by these legal requirements.

On occasion one hears it said that the newer nations are not interested in going to the World Court, because the judges there will be biased against them. I do not believe the accusation is justified, and nor do I believe that the new nations really believe it. The fifteen judges on the Court are by no means limited to western Europe or white Commonwealth: at the present time the only ones who could be so classified are the judges from Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States, Greece, France, and Italy. The other nine judges come from Pakistan, Senegal, Mexico, Peru, Japan, the United Arab Republic, Russia, Poland, and China.

All the evidence, it seems to me, goes towards the belief that the reluctance of the newer nations to use the Court to settle disputes has nothing to do with impartiality of the judges, but rather reflects a fear that the rules the Court would apply are not in their interests. The only long-term solution lies in the new nations and older nations collaborating in developing the law and making it as fair as possible to all parties, using the means I suggested before — treaty-making, diplomatic practice, and the International Law Commission. The important point is this: the non-aligned nations have no doctrinal objection to recourse to the judicial process as a means of settling disputes. Indeed, in a limited number of cases they have done so — Cameroon recently brought a case against the United Kingdom concerning the conduct of the plebiscite in the former Northern Cameroons; and at this moment Ethiopia and Liberia are engaged in litigation against South Africa over South-West Africa. Even more important, the non-aligned nations have no objection in principle to third-party settlements of disputes whether that third party be an international court, or an arbitrator, or a mediator, or a United Nations fact-finding mission.

It is here that we notice a great contrast with the position of the communist nations. The dislike of the So-

viet Union for the International Court of Justice and for all third-party settlement is rooted in dogma and in ideology, and runs very deep indeed. How this has come about is a complex question, and one worth looking at more closely.

According to Leninist theory, the world is now in a transitional period, during which revolution will transform capitalism into communism. During this period international law is acceptable —but only in so far as it is not 'reactionary', and will not impede progress towards the classless society. Unhappily, it hardly needs adding that what is or is not 'reactionary' international law is a matter solely for determination by the Marxists themselves.

In addition to this selective attitude towards international law, the communists have been urging recognition of what they term 'legal principles of peaceful coexistence'. The principles of coexistence, we are told are, to use their phrase, 'qualitatively higher' than the existing rules of international law. These principles, promoted actively by the communists since they received approval in Moscow in 1956, have a curious origin. They are based on the five principles of Panch Shila, originally set out in a treaty between India and China in 1954, and later copied in treaties throughout the Far East. They make interesting reading: the first principle is 'mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty'; the second is 'mutual non-aggression'; the third, 'mutual non-interference in internal affairs'; and the fourth, 'equality and mutual benefits'. None of these is new or revolutionary — indeed, all are to be found in the United Nations Charter. All that is new about them is that they are being promoted as something special, something not thought of before. The fifth principle of peaceful coexistence *is* something of a surprise, however, because it is 'peaceful coexistence'. Thus 'peaceful coexistence' is both a principle and the concept embracing all the principles.

Added to these five principles are some others which have emerged in detailed discussions held at the United

Nations. They include general and complete disarmament (a noble aspiration, but hardly a rule of international law), and significantly, the duty of states to settle disputes by direct negotiation.

Principles of peaceful coexistence

What are these 'principles of peaceful coexistence' all about, and why are they being promoted? The nuclear stalemate, the fears caused by the prospect of an enlarged nuclear club, the efforts of both East and West to woo the non-aligned nations, and above all the growing preeminence of China in Asia, provide cogent reasons for urging 'peaceful coexistence'. If world events dictate this coexistence, then one might as well try to extract the most favourable conditions possible. The Russians have thus included the old United Nations Charter rules of non-aggression, sovereign equality, and non-interference in the list of 'new principles of coexistence', in the hope of rewriting them and interpreting them in such a way as to advance their interests. The U.N. discussions on these topics have made it clear, for example, that, in the Russian view, 'non-intervention' need not necessarily exclude support for so-called 'wars of national liberation'. Some principles — such as general and complete disarmament — have been thrown in for political effect; while others, such as the duty to negotiate bilaterally, go to the whole heart of the legal techniques for settling disputes.

The U.N. Charter provides a variety of methods for settling disputes: mediation, or conciliation, or the use of good offices, or arbitration; and of course resort to the International Court. The Russians are making it clear that they reject all of these methods, and that a 'higher rule of law', which they must obey — namely, the principles of peaceful coexistence — requires that they only engage in direct negotiation. Third-party settlement is out.

Communist opposition

There has long been communist opposition to using the International Court of Justice: no communist nation has ever appeared in litigation before the Court, even though both a Russian

and Polish judge of great distinction sit upon the bench. The Soviet Union and her allies have felt outnumbered in the international community, and consider that their interests may be protected by not subjecting themselves to majority decision. For them, law should be made by treaties resulting from bilateral negotiation, and not from the decisions of judges. Equally unacceptable are the attempts of majority of nations at the United Nations to impose their views, and it is this which lies behind the Russian opposition to U.N. forces as a means of settling disputes. The U.N. force in Gaza – UNEF – is regarded as undesirable because it was set up by the Assembly, where the majority vote obtains. The U.N. force in the Congo, although set up by the Security Council with the approval of Russia, was paid for through assessments made by majority vote in the Assembly. Russia has refused to regard herself as bound to contribute.

The indication now is that the Russian view is hardening on all forms of third-party, impartial settlement of disputes. Independent mediators or arbitrators are unacceptable because, as Mr. Khrushchev put it, 'while there may be neutral nations there are no neutral men'. This discouraging attitude has now been extended further by communist opposition to suggestions that the United Nations should set up a fact-finding body to investigate particular disputes. Russia has indicated that fact-finding by the U.N. is almost as bad as third-party settlement of a quarrel.

What does all this mean in practical terms? It does not necessarily mean that Russia is against disputes being resolved: in Kashmir, for example, she voted with the United States and Britain in calling for a cease-fire to be supervised by the United Nations. But where her own interests are directly involved – and Berlin and Vietnam come immediately to mind – there is every indication that she will agree only to direct negotiation. Furthermore, even on Kashmir she has recently shown herself reluctant to give the

Secretary General any real authority. All of this, it must be admitted, makes it look as though the role of international law in settling East-West disputes will be small.

I am more optimistic that international law can play a useful part in settling quarrels that involve the developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. With a little give and take on both sides, progress is possible. The recent decision by the United Kingdom Government to accept the jurisdiction of the European Court is most welcome; though America's acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court is subject to conditions which make it almost meaningless. — *Rosalyn Higgins in The Listener, Dec.* 1965.

QUICK THINKING

When Paderewski was visiting Boston some years ago he was approached by a bootblack who called, "Shine?"

The great pianist looked down at the youth whose face was streaked with grime and said, "No, my lad, but if you will wash your face I will give you a quarter."

"All right!" exclaimed the boy looking sharply at him. He ran to a nearby fountain where he made his ablutions.

When he returned, Paderewski held out the quarter. The boy took it and then returned it gravely, saying, "Here, Mister, you take it yourself and get your hair cut."

■ Man's power to control nature is ever growing and to the advantage of mankind.

BIOLOGY AND OUR FUTURE WORLD

The balance of nature is a very elaborate and very delicate system of checks and counterchecks. It is continually being altered as climates change and new organisms evolve. But in the past the alterations have been slow, whereas with the arrival of man their speed has been multiplied many fold.

Agriculture is the chief of man's efforts at the biological remodeling of nature. If we reflect that agriculture is less than a paltry 10,000 years old out of 300,000,000 years that green plants have been on earth, we begin to grasp something of the revolution brought by this biological discovery.

But agriculture is, if you like, unnatural; it concentrates innumerable individuals as a single species — and always of course, a particularly nutritious one — into serried ranks, while nature's method is to divide up the space among numerous competing or complementary kinds. Thus it constitutes not merely an opportunity but a veritable invitation to vegetable-feeding animals, of which the most difficult to control are the small, insinuating, and rapidly multiplying insects. And the better and more intensive the agriculture, the more obvious the invitation. Mile upon square mile of tender, well-weeded wheat or tea or cotton offers the optimum possibilities for the rapid multiplication of any species of insect which can take advantage of man's good nature toward his kind.

Finally, man's insatiable desire for rapid and easy transit has capped the trouble. By accident or intention, animals and plant species find their way along the trade routes to new countries. They are in a new environment, and in such circumstances the majority fail to gain a foothold at all; but a few find in the new circumstances a release instead

of a hindrance, and multiply beyond measure.

Then it is up to the biologist to see what he can do. Sometimes, by studying the pest in its original home, he can discover what are the species that normally act as checks on its overmultiplication. Thus in Fiji, when the valuable coconut industry was threatened by a little moth — very beautiful, with violet wings — those grubs devoured the leaves of the palm trees, biologists searched the remote corners of the Pacific for a parasitic fly. This fly quickly reduced the menace to the status of a minor nuisance. And in Australia, when prickly pear — first introduced into the country as pot cacti for lonely settlers' wives — increased so prodigiously that it was covering the land with impenetrable scrub at the rate of an acre a minute, biologists sent out a mixed team to fight it: a caterpillar to tunnel through the "leaves," a plant bug and a cochineal insect to suck its juices, and a mite to scarify its surface. There were the Four Anthropods of the prickly pear's Apocalypse; and the thickets are melting away under the combined attack.

One could multiply instances. How the sugar cane of Hawaii was saved from its weevil destroyers; how an attack is being launched upon the mealy-bugs that are such a pest to Kenya coffee by massed battalions of lady-birds. To cope with all the demands for anti-pest organisms a veritable industry has sprung up.

The difficulties of such work are far more severe when the pest is an old-established inhabitant of the country. Problems of this type are set for us by malaria, spread by indigenous mosquitoes; human sleeping sickness and nagana disease of cattle, transmitted by tsetse-flies; plague, dependent for its spread upon the ubiquitous rat. In some parts of Africa the issue is whether man or the fly shall dominate the country. Here the remedy seems to be to alter the whole environment. Most tsetse-flies live in bush country. They cannot exist either in quite open country or in cultivated land or in dense woodland or forest. So that wholesale clearing

or afforestation may get rid of them.

That pests of this nature can cease to be serious is shown by the history of malaria and of plague. In various parts of Europe and America, these diseases, once serious, have wholly or virtually died out. And this has happened through a change in human environment and human habits. Take plague. Modern man builds better houses, clears away more garbage, segregates cases of infectious diseases, is less tolerant of dirt and parasites and, in fine, lives in such a way that his life is not in such close contact with that of rats. The result has been that rats have fewer chances of transmitting plague to man, and that the disease, if once transmitted, has less chance of spreading. With regard to malaria, agricultural drainage, cleanliness, and better general resistance have in many cases done as much or more than deliberate anti-mosquito campaigns.

There is still another angle from which we can attack our problems. For instance, instead of trying to attack a pest by means of introducing enemies, or altering the environment, we can often deliberately breed stocks which shall be resistant to the attacks of the pest. Thus we can now produce relatively rust-proof wheat; and the Dutch have given us spectacular examples of what can be accomplished by crossing a high-yielding but disease-susceptible sugar cane with a related wild species which is disease-resistant and, in spite of the fact that the wild parent contains no trace of sugar, extracting from the cross after a few generations a disease-resistant plant with an exceptionally high yield of sugar.

Thus science offers the prospect of the most radical transformation of our environment. Cows or sheep, rubber-plants or beets represent from one aspect just so many living machines, designed to transform raw material into finished products available for man's use. And their machinery can be improved. Modern wheats yield several times as much per acre as unimproved varieties. Modern cows grow about twice as fast as the cat-

tle kept by semi-savage tribes, and when they are grown produce two or three times as much milk in a year. This has thrown a new strain on the pastures; for if the cow eventually draws its nourishment out of the soil, and if the animal machine for utilizing grass is improved, the plant machine which is responsible for the first stage of the process, of working up raw materials out of earth and air, must be improved correspondingly. Accordingly research is trying to manufacture new breeds of grass which shall be as much more efficient than ordinary grass as a modern dairy beast is than the aboriginal cow.

These few examples must suffice to show the kind of control which man is just realizing he could exert over his environment. But they are enough to give us a new picture — the picture of a world controlled by man. It will never be fully controlled, but the future control of man will enormously exceed his present powers. The world will be parceled out into what is needed for crops, what for forests, what for gardens and parks and games, what for the preservation of wild nature; what grows on any part of the land's surface will grow there because of the conscious decision of man; and many kinds of animals and plants will owe not merely the fact that they are allowed to grow and exist, but their characteristics and their very nature, to human control. — *Condensed from Harper's Magazine,* (1932) *by Julian Huxley, British biologist.*

■ Confesor's patriotism was of the kind which defied the nation's enemy fearlessly and openly.

THE HEROIC RECORD OF TOMAS CONFESOR

The days when the Japanese soldiers' dragnet was closing in on Governor Tomas Confesor and he was about to be captured alive, his separation from his wife and the capture by the enemy forces of his niece, were the darkest in his life. He was like Jesus Christ agonizing in the Garden of Gethsemane. The enemy did not only put a price on his head, but when he defied Dr. Fermin Caram, occupation governor of Iloilo, by writing that he would not surrender to the enemy as long as he could stand on his feet, the enemy swore to get him "dead or alive."

Fortunato Padilla, Iloilo provincial board member whom former President Macapagal had appointed as judge of the court of first instance of Leyte del Sur, said that one who did not draw spiritual sustenance as Confesor did would have succumbed easily to the enemy. Padilla should know. He was with Confesor all the time in the mountain hideout of the civil resistance government of Free Panay and Romblon.

According to Padilla, Confesor was still too weak after having recovered from a severe illness when the Japanese, under Captain Watanabe, known in Panay as "Patyando" or murderer for having plunged the island into a bloodbath in which more than 10,000 civilians, mostly old men, women and helpless children were killed, stepped up the liquidation campaign beginning July of 1943.

Padilla said that he was with Confesor in barrio Igtuble, Tubungan, Iloilo, when the Japanese, in a four-pronged attack, penetrated their mountain hideout. Confesor had retreated and moved his hideout to the barrio from Bucari in Leon, Iloilo, since the Japanese had succeeded in piercing the Bucari hideout. After ten days, the Japanese succeeded in closing in on the five evacuation huts used by Confesor in Igtuble, and the Japanese, mistaking Lt. Blanco, a signal officer of the 63rd battalion, for Confesor, took him alive to the lowlands. Blanco looked like Confesor, and this mistake enabled Confesor to escape.

Upon reaching the lowland and realizing their mistake, the Japanese tortured Blanco to death.

Confesor, taking another path from that of his wife and Padilla, succeeded in reaching barrio Santiago in Pandan, Antique, by criss-crossing deep ravines and stiff cliffs. Confesor sustained himself during this time by eating corn. Mrs. Confesor, accompanied by Padilla and Vicente Elefan, reached barrio Lag-it in Valderrama, Antique, while Confesor's niece, Teresa, daughter of former Rep. Patricio V. Confessor and now wife of Cabatuan Mayor Francisco Tobias, was captured by the Japanese along with Leticia Lorin, Mansueta Patrimonio and one Juanita. The Japanese took the women prisoners to San Jose, Antique. Teresa was sick of pneumonia at the time of her capture.

It was not until December of 1943 that Confesor was united with his wife in Bato Puti, Ma-asin, Iloilo. Here, Confesor learned for the first time of the fate that had befallen his niece. But Confesor and his wife were to be separated again when the Japanese raided the civil resistance government printing press under Provincial Treasurer

Juan Griño in barrio Quipot, Janiuay, Iloilo, in the vicinity of Bato Puti..

Writing about this chapter of his life in "Via Crusis," Confesor said that while he was not afraid to die, he was tormented by the fact that his niece, Teresa, got captured by the Japanese and he did not know what her fate was. Confesor said that this dispersion of members of his family and of those whom he loved, was more than he could bear.

In another letter smuggled by submarine to President Osmeña in Washington D.C., after the death of President Quezon, Confesor said he was in the fight to the bitter end because he believed that the United States was fighting for the righteous cause of democracy and that for him to give himself up to the enemy for a life of ease and comfort, was to betray the Filipino people.

Confesor told President Osmeña that the Japanese almost got him alive and that he had been sick all the time. But Confesor said that he wanted President Osmeña to return to the Philippines and the Commonwealth government with Osmeña.

Confesor said: "Long before the war broke out, I have searched my conscience for the purpose of discovering where my duty lies should this country become involved in the maelstrom of this colossal world chaos. The quest was soon ended and ever since the storm broke loose with all its fury upon us, the way has all been clear as crystal to me. It lies on the rough and rugged road of the Calvary of resistance but it is the way of honor and victory." — *By Loreto Angayen, Manila Bulletin.*

STEVENSON'S IDEAS

My friends, more important than winning the election is governing the nation. That is the test of a political party — the acid, final test. When the tumult and the shouting die, when the bands are gone and the lights are dimmed, there is the stark reality of responsibility in an hour of history haunted with those gaunt, grim specters of strife, dissension and materialism at home, and ruthless, inscrutable and hostile power abroad.

The ordeal of the 20th century — the bloodiest, most turbulent era of the Christian age — is far from over. Sacrifice, patience, understanding and implacable purpose may be our lot for years to come. Let's face it. Let's talk sense to the American people. Let's tell them the truth, that there are no gains without pains, that we are now on the eve of great decisions, not easy decision. — *Adlai Stevenson, part of his Acceptance Speech in* 1952.

It has become clear that what happens in research laboratories and in the minds of men can multiply the potentialities of physical factors.

Hours worked, land utilized and capital employed are the elements which, by classical formulas, determine the growth of output. But both the quality and quantity of output have been progressively expanding far beyond what the mere physical combination of these factors would indicate. This we must attribute to intelligence, imagination, inventions, entrepreneurship. Brains have become a real growth industry.

The power of intelligence can manifest itself in every aspect of our lives and in every phase of the development process. We need a concept of social "capital" which goes beyond bricks and mortar and includes investment in education, training and the stock of useful knowledge. *Before the U.N.*

Attention: All organization heads and members!

Help your club raise funds painlessly . . .

Join the *Panorama* "Fund-Raising by Subscriptions" plan today!

The PANORAMA FUND-RAISING BY SUBSCRIPTIONS PLAN will get you, your friends, and your relatives a year's subscription to *Panorama*.

The *Panorama* is easy to sell. It practically sells itself, which means more money for your organization.

The terms of the PANORAMA FUND-RAISING BY SUBSCRIPTIONS PLAN are as follows:

(1) Any accredited organization in the Philippines can take advantage of the PLAN.

(2) The organization will use its facilities to sell subscriptions to *Panorama*.

(3) For every subscription sold the organization will get ₱1.00. The more subscriptions the organization sells, the more money it gets.

Contents

Of Studies 1

Congress: An Analysis 2

The Race Questions 4

The Problem of Dissent 9

Noah Webster, Schoolmaster to America 14

Screwballs and Firebrands 18

Humanism in World Affairs 21

Marconi: The Man and His Wireless 26

Asian Development Bank 36

An American Zen Buddhist 37

What is the University of Chicago 40

International Law in Action 49

Biology and Our Future World 57

The Heroic Record of Tomas Confessor 61