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RECOMBINANT DNA RESEARCH AND THE PUBLIC

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF RECOMBINANT DNA technology over the past two years has ranged from quiet exchange of information to inflammatory debate, from informed exposition to vacuous rhetoric. It now appears, however, that the most polemical exchanges are over. With the appearance of a variety of books on the subject discussion will probably be more useful than before, but substantially less newsworthy. If this also means that fewer non-scientists participate, it will, in this writer's opinion, be for the worse rather than for the better. A shifting kaleidoscope of issues will confront the public for the foreseeable future; hopefully the kaleidoscopic figures can be seen against a ground of common information shared by both the public and scientists.

As some will remember, public discussion of recombinant DNA technology began with a letter to the editor of Science magazine in July, 1974. Written by professional scientists involved in genetic and biochemical research, who as a result of earlier discussions had thought deeply about the risks of DNA recombination, the letter called for a voluntary moratorium on certain kinds of recombinant DNA research until potential risks from such research could be assessed. The letter catalyzed a milestone conference in February, 1975, at Asilomar, California. At the conference scientists of widely different backgrounds and opinions attempted to reach a consensus on how research was to be conducted. Attending the conference also were some non-scientists, including reporters. Resulting news stories made the issue no longer a matter of professional self-regulation by the scientific community, but an issue that raised political and ethical issues for a broad spectrum of the public. Debate over the propriety of conducting research with recombinant DNA technology agitated several university communities in 1976. Last year it was the subject of numerous newspaper and magazine articles, as well as the subject for discussion in professional scientific magazines and legislative hearings. Meanwhile, the scientific community, under the leadership of the National Institutes of Health, had produced a set of guidelines satisfactory to most scientists involved, and recombinant DNA research controlled by the NIH guidelines was underway. Now it appears that scientific developments and the refinement of political and ethical questions have advanced sufficiently that a cautiously optimistic assessment of the technology can be offered to the public and the remaining public issues can be set out for further reflection.

First, let us offer a quick description of the technology and its history for those who need refreshing. It arises from the powerful and elegant theory of the hereditary stuff of life first propounded by Crick and Watson. Genetic information is encoded in a system composed of complementary strands of DNA wound together, each of which can reproduce its complementary pair. The sequence of nucleic acids along the strands codes information which can be read by cell mechanisms and ultimately used to control all of the cellular processes. Thus DNA contains the information necessary for an organism to reproduce itself, and faithful reproduction depends on precise conservation of the encoded information. Changes in the DNA sequences produce changed organisms.

Recombinant DNA technology is, in the words of one writer on the subject, the new technology "that enables a scientist to take DNA from one organism and splice it into DNA from another to create something absolutely new: new living molecules, new genes, and therefore new life." 1 In most organisms the DNA occurs in strands within the cell nucleus, but in bacteria there is no nucleus. Some bacterial DNA is found in double stranded rings within cell structures called plasmids. In organisms such as Esterichia coli the bacterium commonly inhabiting the human intestinal tract, the DNA has been extensively studied with a variety of complex techniques. A key technical breakthrough was the identification of enzymes that break open the plasmid DNA ring at particular sites, leaving some unpaired DNA at each end. When the loose-ended DNA is mixed in solution with various snippets of DNA from other sources, together with another appropriate enzyme, the snippets can sometimes be attached to the plasmid and the ends of the ring brought together again. If this plasmid is placed back in a

functioning cell, it may resume functioning as before, but with an additional capability conferred by the gene or genes encoded on the newly incorporated section of DNA.

The power made available by the ability to manipulate genetic material is such that it can only be compared with one other technology in the history of mankind: the splitting of the atom and its associated technologies. Like atomic technologies, DNA technologies carry great promise but also great risk. Robert Sinsheimer has listed several possible applications of knowledge gained by recombination experiments:

It is very probable that in time the appropriate genes can be introduced into bacteria to convert them into biochemical factories for producing complex substances of medical importance: for example, insulin (for which a shortage seems imminent), growth hormone, specific antibodies, and clotting factor VIII which is defective in hemophiliacs. Even if these specific genes cannot be isolated from the appropriate organisms, the chances of synthesizing them from scratch are now significant.

Other more grandiose applications of microbial genetic engineering can be envisaged. The transfer of genes for nitrogen fixation into presently inept species might have very significant agricultural applications. Appropriate design might permit appreciable modifications of the normal bacterial flora of the human mouth with a significant impact upon the incidence of dental caries. Even major industrial processes might be carried out by appropriately planned microorganisms.  

The hazards which have so far been imagined include genetic changes in bacteria that would spread and increase resistance to antibiotics; E. coli, the commonly used experimental organism, might become able to cause new diseases or transfer pathogenic genes to still another organism; tumor-causing viruses might be spread by bacteria; deliberate attempts at making biologic agents for war or terrorism might be undertaken. The introduction of new genes might inadvertently harm an economically important plant or animal; bacteria or other organisms might cause ecological changes with unpredictable consequences.

This short list of benefits and risks is hardly enough to introduce the intelligent non-scientist to DNA recombination, nor to the scientific factors to be taken into account in thinking about the major public questions outlined below. Interested readers may wish to enlarge their stock of knowledge. Fortunately, excellent resources are available. For those willing to turn to a book, there are three good sustained treatments of DNA recombination. Nicholas Wade, writer for Science magazine, has produced the most straightforward account of DNA recombination and the surrounding discussion.  

The book describes the discoveries and techniques that make DNA recombination possible and assesses the significance of the scientific breakthrough by comparing it to the domestication of plants and animals. Wade then traces the controversy over the regulation of DNA experiments through its various phases in the United States to about March, 1977. One reviewer compares Wade’s book to a superhighway and a book on the same subject by Michael Roger to a scenic tour.

An associate editor for Rolling Stone magazine, Roger was not credentialed to attend the Asilomar conference until he won the prestigious AAAS-Westinghouse Science Writing Award. His report of the conference in Rolling Stone was generally praised as a journalistic tour de force, resulting apparently in his decision to write Biohazard. The book develops the human side of science and scientists more strongly than Wade’s book. Perhaps a reader may get a better feel for the scientific developments leading up to DNA recombination.

The reviewer who described the previous books with a highway metaphor also applied that metaphor to the third book, June Goodfield’s Playing God.  

Goodfield’s book is described as “a complicated rotary intersection, a book spinning with ideas.” The book deals with Goodfield’s personal experience as a researcher, but it also reaches much farther than the other two books. She raises difficult questions about the meaning of the DNA controversy in relation to the scientific profession as a whole and the profession’s problematic and changing relationship with the society which supports it. She says:  

... the current state between science and society is like that of a supersaturated solution. A crystal of contention, recombinant DNA has been dropped into the solution, and then as happens in a supersaturated solution, crystallization has occurred, and a whole conglomeration of issues, concern, arguments, and debates have rapidly appeared.

The book is complex in its exposition and tentative in its conclusions but should not necessarily be avoided on that account.

Further sources of information for the reader are the results of conferences held on the recombination issue.

---

1 As quoted in F.A.S. Public Interest Report XXIX, No. 4 (April, 1976).


7 The reader can try out some of Goodfield’s ideas in a widely accessible article, “Humanity in Science: A Perspective and a Plea,” Science, 198 (11 November, 1977), 580-585.
A volume from the New York Academy of Sciences is significant for its articles analyzing social and ethical concerns in the conduct of scientific research generally. Another volume that has articles on many of the same concerns, but also is stronger on the DNA issue specifically has been published by the National Academy of Sciences. Readers who have access to the F.A.S. Public Interest Report can find a balanced discussion of the scientific issues in the April, 1976, issue. A short but very good article by Clifford Grobstein is recommended for those who want less than book length knowledge about the issue.

RISKS

THE FIRST ISSUE ON WHICH PUBLIC DISCUSSION needs to continue is the issue of the risks posed by recombinant DNA experiments. It is to the credit of the scientific community that these risks were quickly recognized and brought to the attention of the public. However, public discussion soon took an angry and strident tone that alarmed the scientists, who for the most part wished key decisions regarding scientific research to remain within the hands of the scientific community itself. The discussion up to now has revealed several problems. First of all, there is technical uncertainty in assessing the risks of recombinant DNA research. What risk should be assigned to various types of experiments? Is the risk of using E. coli substantially greater than that of using other less well-known organisms as hosts? What are the risks of the host organism exchanging plasmids or other vectors with species outside the laboratory? Secondly, even were the risks known, different value judgments lead to different positions on how the risks should be treated. For instance, one investigator has argued for the value of free investigation:

As a working microbiologist for almost 40 years, I find it inconceivable that fear of factors inadequately known or understood should be the basis for inhibiting free investigation.

A non-scientist put a value on the safety of the public:

Since it is the scientists who want to do the work, let them persuade us that the experiments are safe before we permit them to continue.

Another scientist put a value on preventing ecological damage:

There should be a complete stop on all forms of experimentation with artificially produced DNA recombinants that could in any way represent a potential danger to animal or plant life.

Finally, there has been disagreement over who should make decisions about risks connected with DNA experiments.

Fortunately, some of the immediate concerns about the risks of the recombinant DNA research are now alleviated. The problems which seemed extremely perplexing several years ago have sorted themselves out somewhat. Further refinement of the technologies for doing recombinant DNA research have provided mechanisms for reducing some of the risks. For instance, a biologically attenuated strain of E. coli, having little chance of surviving outside of the laboratory, has been developed. Modified vectors have also been developed so that the chance of passing recombinated genes to new organisms outside of the laboratory is significantly reduced. Finally, regulations published in mid-1976 by the National Institute of Health now govern research funded by NIH and NSF. Most universities seem to be on the way to making such guidelines mandatory for all their research. Admittedly, the guidelines were prepared in relative haste with little input from the general public, but for the moment they seem to provide a means of reducing the immediate risk from recombinant DNA experiments to a small (although unknown) magnitude. In this writer’s opinion immediate risks from experiments conducted under the NIH guidelines are probably no larger than risks (also unknown) of a serious nuclear catastrophe. However, the possibilities of harmful effects in the more distant future remain controversial. The public may be prepared to accept risks such as this to allow research to go on that may (or may not!) produce significant knowledge and lead to useful applications. But the discussion is still very preliminary. Popular impressions of the risks or recombinant DNA research so far seem to be greatly exaggerated. And hard knowledge about what the risks really are is extremely scarce. The direction that discussion of risks might profitably take is for the public to begin to assess what kinds of risks it is willing to assume, to push for the conduct of research designed to define the risks, especially the longer term ones, more clearly and, if possible, to reduce them.

REGULATION

CONNECTED TO THE ISSUE OF RISK IS THE question of regulation. Scientists who originally brought the issue to the attention of the public for the most part felt that recombinant DNA research should be a matter for professional self-regulation rather than public control, especially not public control by legislative statute. The public response to the entire matter now has many scientists strongly concerned that ill-considered regulation
based on “knee-jerk anti-scientism” on the art of the public will seriously impede, if not completely halt, the most important kinds of recombinant DNA research. Thus, many scientists, of whom Nobel laureate James D. Watson is one of the most outspoken, claim that the dangers have been grossly exaggerated and the regulations of NIH needless and arbitrary. The public can hardly be assured by this kind of talk, however, when it comes from a professional scientist like Watson who, at least in his auto-biography, places the highest priority on winning at the game of science.

The fundamental question is whether recombinant DNA research should be regulated solely by the profession or by some other mechanism. If society is asked to bear risks or unfortunate consequences, then it seems to many that some principle analogous to that of informed consent ought to be given, so that society has the opportunity to understand and to acquiesce. If this principle is to be followed, some agency legally and politically accountable to the public will have to regulate and supervise research.

This I believe to be a question for further serious public discussion. If regulations such as the NIH guidelines now in effect are adequate, how can these be extended to cover private industry and agencies to which the guidelines do not now apply? Should there be local, state, or federal statutes? What should they be like? If the public believes scientific research to be worthwhile, can ways be found to regulate it without losing the creative vigor that now characterizes it? How should compliance with whatever regulations are in force be monitored. The history of federal monitoring is certainly not a history to inspire confidence; yet what are the alternatives? How can regulations be kept flexible, so that they are adequate to continually changing circumstances and reassessments of risks? Is common law with respect to liability sufficient, or does society need specifically drawn liability statutes? These questions remain to be fully discussed. Few sustained discussions of policy alternatives exist, although one that I know of seems headed in a useful direction.12

SCIENCE AND SOCIAL CONTROL

Perhaps the most important question for public discussion raised in connection with recombinant DNA research is the general question of society’s role in the direction of scientific research. As June Goodfield has documented, the scientists emerged as a recognized professional class during the nineteenth century when nearly all of society viewed the advance of science as an unqualified good. As a result, scientists today are the profession least accountable to the society that supports their work. Many people no longer consider this situation appropriate at a time when scientific progress appears much more ambiguous than it did a century ago, or when, in the words of one famous scientist, scientists have “known sin.” The call for restrictions on scientific activity has naturally made many scientists uneasy. One response has been to assert that scientists have a right to nearly absolute freedom of inquiry, and society has a moral obligation to support research. Others insist that science is a profoundly meaningful part of culture, but, like the arts, other scholarly endeavors, and religion, it cannot claim that society must support some particular form or amount, or even support it at all. Science must justify its claims on society’s resources.

Because of the way science has developed, we do not now have any experience in the social regulation or direction of basic scientific research or its applications. What effects would such regulation have? What criteria ought to be employed by society in directing future research? For this, the specific case of the control of recombinant DNA research becomes a test. What social and ethical criteria should the public use in deciding on the future of such research?

As Daniel Callahan suggests, discussion at the public level has hardly gotten underway. General discussion has so far been “boringly repetitive in substance and tediously hysterical in tone.” He asks:

What ought to be the content of that discussion? By what criteria ought the public to judge the competing scientific and ethical cases that have been made by now? For the public should not only be heard. The public ought also to think. But what is it supposed to think about?13

Callahan makes several suggestions about what that content ought to be. The most pertinent here are these: First, how do we feel about scientific progress? As a general rule do we favor boldness and risk taking or do we favor caution and low risk? Secondly, after due reflection, do we think that society has a moral obligation to pursue lines of research which may benefit future generations or not? The questions, of course, are not trivial. Discussing them requires separate treatment. Yet, how they are answered will affect one’s stance toward the specific issue of DNA research.

Callahan suggests that not only scientists, but also the public has a moral obligation to act responsibly regarding recombinant DNA research. Such action for the public certainly includes informed participation, especially where public decisions are the best means we have for making choices. The process of decision-making with respect to recombinant DNA research so far, while not perfect, allows cautious optimism about the future. Probably, the public can be protected without stifling the quest for new knowledge. Continued public awareness and involvement may help to maintain such optimism.


RALPH W. EMERSON WAS WELL AWARE THAT the world of Nature was not, by and large, the world of men, but as both poet and humanist he reveals to us what the world beyond trade, books, and industry could and should mean. Reading through the poetry in toto, we see that much of it focuses on movement from one world to another. For Emerson himself Nature, as we would expect, becomes the shrine and he, as poet, becomes the pilgrim. If in Emerson’s prose we find his statements on the importance of knowing the world of Nature, we find in his poetry his descriptions of going there. Our logical conclusion for both Emerson as a pilgrim to the shrine of Nature and ourselves as potential pilgrims is that, as he says in Nature, “In the woods we return to reason and faith.” Emerson’s sojourns were personal ones, but his poetry makes clear that we all should feel compelled to make our own pilgrimages from the workaday world and create our own retreat in Nature away from what Wordsworth in “Tintern Abbey” calls “the fretful stir/Unprofitable, and the fever of the world.” Emerson’s vision in this regard is unequivocally democratic, and my paper attempts to focus on Emerson, not so much as poet per se but as a humanist who, in the midst of nineteenth century industrial expansion and scientific thought, was fearful that his fellow men were losing sight of a world of solace that lay beyond the secular one with all its disconcerting demands.

Before commenting on the poetry itself, I will point out here that almost the exact sense of Emerson’s pilgrimages expressed in the poems can be found in Thoreau’s essay “Walking.” Thoreau points out that he knew few people who understood the art of “sauntering,” a word which, as he says, can be traced to describe the action of those who in the Middle Ages went “à la Saint Terre” and who were, then, saunterers.1 There were those, Thoreau says, who only pretended to go to the Holy Land, but the others who really did were “saunterers in the good sense, such as I mean” (p. 252).2 Emerson, as Thoreau well knew, was a saunterer “in the good sense,” one who on their excursions together and at other times strolled in the countryside around Concord to land that was holy to them. If, as Thoreau says, the true art of walking “comes only by the grace of God” and “requires a direct dispensation from Heaven” (p. 253), Emerson receives his dispensation not only as a walker but also as a poet who, for the benefit of others, expresses the joy of the pilgrimage. Both Thoreau in his essay and Emerson in his poetry are pleased that the sauntering takes them away from man and his affairs in town (p. 260). Thoreau prefers the swamps in outlying districts to the cultivated gardens of the town (p. 278). He mentions a “subtle magnetism in Nature, which, if we unconsciously yield to it, will direct us aright” (p. 265),3 as one would expect, Emerson’s pilgrimages to the shrine of Nature as expressed in the poems are made with this belief as the primary underlying basis both for himself and for us. The poems clearly indicate that these excursions for Emerson were a necessity, not an option. He knew, as Thoreau puts it, that all “good things are wild and free” (p. 287) and that one must move abroad to encounter them, not stay indoors all day as the mechanics and the shopkeepers did “as if the legs were made to sit upon, and not to stand or walk upon.” Thoreau is surprised they had not committed suicide long before (pp. 254-255). And, finally, at the close of the essay he says: “So we saunter toward the Holy Land, till one day the sun shall shine more brightly than ever he has done, shall perchance shine into our minds and hearts, and light up our whole lives with a great awakening light, as warm and serene and golden as on a bankside in Autumn” (pp. 303-304). Emerson’s poetry reveals to us an inveterate saunterer who knew in which direction this Holy Land lay, who made continual pilgrimages to it, and who shares the experiences with us.

1 The Writings of Henry David Thoreau, Riverside Edition (Boston, 1893), IX, 251. Throughout the remaining paragraph, references to this volume are given in the text.

2 Thoreau mentions in the same passage that the pretenders were “idlers or vagabonds.” Emerson’s strolling idleness, mentioned later in my paper, is what Emerson calls in “Waldeinsamkeit” “a proud idleness,” an activity far beyond Thoreau’s “idlers.”

3 Certainly such a power draws Emerson to the rhodora in the well-known poem by that name.
EMERSON MADE HIS SOJOURNS IN “PROUD idleness” (see note 2). One is reminded here of Robert Louis Stevenson’s essay “An Apology for Idlers” and of what is said there about the idler’s acquisition of wisdom: “His way takes him along a by-road, not much frequented, but very even and pleasant which is called Commonplace Lane, and leads to the Belvedere of Commonsense.” Stevenson also points out that so-called idleness, “which does not consist of doing nothing,” has as much right to state its position as industry does.5

Emerson would have agreed. He says in “Musketaquid”: “I bathe in the morn’s soft and silvered air, / And loiter willing by yon loitering stream.”6 Willing sojourners are Nature’s only true pilgrims. In “The Miracle” he writes: “I have trod his path a hundred times/With idle footsteps crooning rhymes” (p. 368). Here we see him quite literally as a poet-pilgrim. When he says in the same poem, “I know not why I came again/Unless to learn it ten times ten (ibid.), we see his return to that particular spot as a visit to renew his faith in all that Nature held for him. Emerson realized as Stevenson the essayist did that the idler is often chastised for loitering quite literally as a poet-pilgrim. When he says in the poem, “When man in the bush with God may meet?/For what are they all, in their high conceit/Leave authors’ eyes, and fetch your own,” (p. 366). The dedicated saunterer realizes that the wilderness is unmoved by the presence of “polished gentlemen”; they, after all, must bow to “stalwart churls in overall,” the “doctors of the wilderness” (“The Adirondacs,” p. 185). As one experienced at Nature’s shrine, the poet has words of advice:

See thou bring not to field or stone
The fancies found in books;
Leave authors’ eyes, and fetch your own,
To brave the landscape’s looks

Nature’s pilgrim should take with him on his sojourn an open mind, a receptive heart, a discerning eye, and a sensitive spirit. Emerson could hardly define a broader humanistic base than this. We are all potential pilgrims.

Emerson’s walks through Nature, as described in the poems, strongly suggest the Christian motif of “Seek and ye shall find.” He is drawn on his pilgrimages by what Thoreau called Nature’s “subtle magnetism.” The shrine is identified by Emerson as “a spot that is sacred to thought and God” (“Good-Bye,” p. 4). His route there is as clear-cut to him as the road followed by Chaucer’s

Later, there is the word of welcome to the faithful: “Welcome!’ the wood god murmured through the leaves” (p. 184). The gods murmur in his ear in “Musketaquid,” and in the poem “The Poet” Emerson’s poet says, “I have supped to-night with Gods’” (p. 314), a line amplified by a portion of “The Apology”: “I go to the god of the wood/To fetch his word to men” (p. 119). Bringing back this word, of course, would be one primary object of the poet-pilgrim’s jaunts.

Since these saunterings abroad are prompted and sustained by the heart, not the intellect, we, as well as the poet, can make our way to the god of the wood. True pilgrimages, after all, are made simply and sincerely in and for love. The lore of books and the teachings of scholars should surely be left behind in the study by one who will listen to and interpret the murmurings of wood-gods; therefore Emerson tells us that when he is beneath the pines he laughs at

. . . the lore and pride of man,
At the sophist schools and the learned clan;
For what are they all, in their high conceit
When man in the bush with God may meet?
(“Good-Bye,” p. 4)

One wood walk will provide more lessons than “learned men/ Can find with glass in ten times ten” (“The Walk,” p. 366). The dedicated saunterer realizes that the wilderness is unmoved by the presence of “polished gentlemen”; they, after all, must bow to “stalwart churls in overall,” the “doctors of the wilderness” (“The Adirondacs,” p. 185). As one experienced at Nature’s shrine, the poet has words of advice:

See thou bring not to field or stone
The fancies found in books;
Leave authors’ eyes, and fetch your own,
To brave the landscape’s looks

One wood walk will provide more lessons than “learned men/ Can find with glass in ten times ten” (“The Walk,” p. 366). The dedicated saunterer realizes that the wilderness is unmoved by the presence of “polished gentlemen”; they, after all, must bow to “stalwart churls in overall,” the “doctors of the wilderness” (“The Adirondacs,” p. 185). As one experienced at Nature’s shrine, the poet has words of advice:

See thou bring not to field or stone
The fancies found in books;
Leave authors’ eyes, and fetch your own,
To brave the landscape’s looks

Nature’s pilgrim should take with him on his sojourn an open mind, a receptive heart, a discerning eye, and a sensitive spirit. Emerson could hardly define a broader humanistic base than this. We are all potential pilgrims.

Emerson’s walks through Nature, as described in the poems, strongly suggest the Christian motif of “Seek and ye shall find.” He is drawn on his pilgrimages by what Thoreau called Nature’s “subtle magnetism.” The shrine is identified by Emerson as “a spot that is sacred to thought and God” (“Good-Bye,” p. 4). His route there is as clear-cut to him as the road followed by Chaucer’s

---

5 Ibid., p. 76.
6 The Complete Works, Centenary Edition (Boston, 1904), IX, 142, Hereafter references to this volume are given in the text.
pilgrims to Canterbury: “The watercourses were my guide;/I travelled grateful by their side” (“Woodnotes I,” p. 47). They lead him through the “thicket damp” and the “foodful waters fed him” (ibid.). He is led by the humble-bee, the “sailor of the atmosphere” and “rover of the underwoods” (“The Humble-Bee,” p. 38). May Day prompts the poet-pilgrim to be “Up and away! where haughty woods/Front the liberated floods” (May-Day,” p. 171). What is to be celebrated cannot receive proper commemoration unless one quits his cottage and saunters abroad: “We will climb the broad-backed hills,/Hear the uproar of their joy” (ibid.).

NO TRUE PILGRIMAGE WOULD BE COMPLETE if a fruitful edification did not result for the sojourner. Emerson makes his visit in “The Waterfall” to gather strength (p. 369), and Nature’s beauties salve his worst wounds in “The Musketaud” (p. 144). So Emerson finds what his fellow New Englander Bryant had earlier found and expressed in “Inscription for the Entrance to a Wood” and, of course, in other poems, and what fellow New Englander Robert Frost later found and expressed most succinctly in “Directive”: “Here are your waters and your watering place./ Drink and be whole again beyond confusion.” Emerson himself realized that his jaunts were pilgrimages of a sort. In “Seashore” he says, “I heard or seemed to hear the chiding Sea/ Say, Pilgrim, why so late and slow to come?” (p. 242) On this occasion it is here near the sea-gods that he can be made whole again. On one winter excursion Emerson's spirits are lifted by the titmouse. The bird had hurled “defiance at vast death” and fronted “the north-wind in waistcoat gray” (“The Titmouse,” p. 234). The poet ultimately surmises in his typically democratic stance:

The reason of all cowardice
Is, that men are overgrown,
And, to be valiant, must come down
To the titmouse dimension (p. 235).

He further catches the sense of the song which includes the admonition:

“For well the soul, if stout within,
Can arm impregnably the skin;
And polar frost my frame defied,
Made of the air that blows outside” (pp. 235-236).

Grateful for the lesson, the poet turns homeward, strengthened and edified: “When here again pilgrim comes./ He shall bring store of seeds and crumbs” (p. 236). Just as Keats thought of Ruth's hearing the song of the nightingale so does Emerson suggest the eternal note of the chickadee:

I think old Caesar must have heard
In northern Gaul my dauntless bird,
And, echoed in some frosty wold,
Borrowed thy battle-numbers bold (ibid.).

Emerson's observations in this poem are a complement to Thoreau's statement in “A Winter Walk” that the “chickadee and the nuthatch are more inspiring society than statesmen and philosophers, and we shall return to these last as to more vulgar companions.”

There could be no defiling of the pilgrimage, of Emerson's total immersion in Nature and of the ultimate edification. He says in a fragmented portion of “The Poet” quoted in the Household Edition:

Let me go where'er I will
I hear a sky born music still:

It is not only in the rose,
It is not only in the bird,

But in the darkest, meanest things
There alway, alway something sings.

The above lines suggest a passage from Emerson's well-known essay “The Poet”:

Wherever snow fall or water flows or birds fly,
wherever day and night meet in the twilight,
wherever the blue heaven is hung by clouds or sown with stars, wherever are forms with transparent boundaries, wherever are outlets into celestial space, wheresoever is danger, and awe, and love—there is Beauty, plenteous as rain, shed for thee...

As a poet-pilgrim Emerson found all this and more. What his poetry suggests to us is that as a concerned humanist he wanted his contemporaries and those who came after them to experience in Nature what he did, and, of course, we can if we are dedicated saunterers “à la Saint Terre,” to the shrine of Nature.
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OPENING CONVERSATIONS

on their own
now they rise
in the hot
silence wanting
this dance yet
they hesitate
turning to look
toward the past
limp, bleeding
for whole minutes
gathering themselves things
they prize artifacts carried everywhere like Duchamp's portable museums
broken, calling,
wrapped up like loaves under arms
in expressions
opinions that tear
at their seams
when you start
flake into onion
skin words
in a life of their own walk, drop, splinter
one by one
step into voices,
introduce themselves.

WILDGLOVE AND FOXFIRE WALKING OUT OF LIBRARIES

given a ticket
from home
given all things
necessary to arrive
on a stack of tides.
you have been in the books for years,
turning pages and
gasping, you looked
in and i looked
out. there was no way to say hello
in the air, lost to every sound,
wandering everywhere,
lip reading, probably no way to open pearls and talk,
testing all my wings on your roof
finishing the slip,
checking out volumes

PETER BRETT
GOD IN MAN'S IMAGE?

WALTER E. KELLER

Matthew 11:2-11

Voltaire once wrote: "God made man in his image and likeness—and man has paid him back." Like Caiaphas before him, the cynical French deist spoke more truly and more wisely than he knew. A quick survey of the character of the gods of many religions can confirm Voltaire's suspicion that most gods are patterned after their own worshippers.

Take, for example, the gods of the ancient Greeks, gods later adopted also by the Romans. They were a rather promiscuous lot. The stories of those gods display family quarreling, incest, fratricide, which doubtless explains how it was possible for such gods to slip virtually unnoticed into the battles of the men and the beds of the ladies.

Another example comes from that soldier's soldier, General George S. Patton. When the winter rains of 1944 immobilized his armored units, he ordered all his chaplains to pray for dry weather. He summoned his Third Army Chaplain just before Christmas and said, "Chaplain, I want you to publish a prayer for good weather. I'm tired of these soldiers having to fight mud and flood as well as Germans. See if we can't get God to work on our side." Replied Father O'Neill, "May I say, General, that it is not a customary thing among men of my profession to pray for clear weather to kill fellow men." To which Patton, visibly irritated, responded: "Chaplain, are you teaching me theology or are you the Chaplain of the Third Army? I want a prayer." "Yes, sir." The prayer was printed, distributed with Patton's Christmas greeting, and read: "Almighty and most merciful Father, we humbly beseech Thee, of Thy great goodness, to restrain these immoderate rains with which we have had to contend. Grant us fair weather for battle. Graciously hearken to us as soldiers who call upon Thee, that armed with Thy power, we may advance from victory to victory, and crush the oppression and wickedness of our enemies, and establish Thy justice among men and nations. Amen." God, so it would seem, responded promptly with the Battle of the Bulge.

And then there was John the Baptist, the fiery preacher of repentance, the wild wilderness holy man, who attracted
great crowds by his flaming oratory, whose sermons denounced the sins of kings and soldiers, partisans and peasants, great and small. He spoke of wrath to come and the axe being laid to the root of the tree. He pointed to one yet to come, who would separate the wheat from the chaff, and who would gather the wheat into his granary, and who would burn the chaff in fire unquenchable. Then the truly righteous and the truly pious would be vindicated and God's coming One would expose all phoniness and fraud, all those hypocrites and holier-than-thous, and they would get a glorious come-uppance.

WELL, JESUS CAME. AND JESUS BEGAN TO DO his thing. And John waited. And Jesus preached. And John was arrested and imprisoned. and Jesus performed mighty works. And John began to wonder. Events did not seem to bear out John's expectations. Indeed, Jesus called them seriously into question. And John began to doubt, but he just could not help it. His image of God was being contradicted by the image of God in Jesus. And so when John heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ, he sent word by his disciples and said to him: "Are you he who is to come or shall we look for another?" That is precisely THE question. If Jesus is the one, then John's earlier expectations will have to go. But if John's expectations are to be fulfilled, he will have to look for another, for Jesus is then a disappointment. Indeed, more than a disappointment. He's a shock, he's an offense. But John has asked of Jesus a question, and Jesus answers by inviting the Baptist to consider just those activities that caused him to stumble in the first place: "The blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them." He is the help of the helpless, the hope of the hopeless. He restores shalom to the defective and broken, and life to the dead. He bothers with the poor and the insignificant, and he includes in his fellowship even the outcast lepers. "Blessed is he who takes no offense at Me," says he. The image and likeness of God that are reflected in Jesus are so different—so offensively, so incredibly, so blessedly different—from anything a Voltaire or a Patton or the Baptist customarily expect. What is so striking about THIS image of God, the image of God embodied in THIS man, is that he has a single relentless stance toward us: he loves us. And nothing in all the world is an effective barrier against this love.

CONSIDER HOW WE LOVE. I love the mountains of the west. I love asparagus and I cannot stand spinach. I love Bach and Beethoven and Brahms, and I have difficulty with some other kinds of music. I am attracted to certain people and others turn me off. In every case our likes and loves and preferences are called forth by something, some quality in the other thing or person. And if we let our thoughts turn to religion, we just naturally imagine that, like us human beings, God likes some people for whatever desirable qualities He finds in them, while He dislikes others for whatever undesirable qualities He sees in them. God knows who is righteous and who is evil, who is lovely and who is unlovely, who is intelligent and who is stupid. If human beings know how to discriminate, surely God discriminates perfectly.

But the God who is imaged in Jesus is just not like that. And that is so unsettling, so blessed. Jesus' Father loves us, not for what He finds in us, but because of who He is. It is not because we are good that He loves us, but because He is so unspeakably good, He loves all, good and evil, those with 20-20 vision and those who are blind, those who are perfectly healthy and those who are lepers. He loves even the loveless, even the unloving, even the unlovable, even the lovely. When he finds people who are congenial, appealing, attractive—please, for Christ's sake, don't be offended—He loves them anyway. Jesus lives for those who are dead and he has died so that his killers might live. He thereby reveals his Father's grace, who is gracious to us prior to and quite apart from anything that we do or fail to do. The God who is imaged in Jesus loves so indiscriminately, and He loves us absolutely.

Advent looks forward to Christmas and anticipates the coming of Jesus. Is he the one whom you expect, or shall we look for another? One who loves so absolutely as Jesus, and one who thereby reveals a God whose name is Love, is hard to take. He calls into such radical question our conventional deities, like, for instance, the little tin god who so readily excuses us for not contributing anything to the hunger campaign because he understands all our mounting expenses with Christmas coming up. Or like the little godlette who pats us on the head and tells us what a fine reward he will give us for making an effort on behalf of the hungry. The God incarnate in Jesus loves us anyway. He loves us absolutely. He loves us all the way by giving Himself for us. He feeds the hungry. And he pleads with us. "Blessed are they who are not offended at Me."
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BERLIN AGAIN, 1976

You must have had a thousand facelifts.
Each pockmarked patch of skin, each flowered park’s restored.
Now, rouged and gloriously flagged, you strut
like an old whore in crepe-de-chine.
A temporary disarrangement has now become a way of life.
I don’t know any feature of your rebuilt face.

RUDOLF WITTENBERG

FICTION AND POLITICS:
Problems of the American Electorate

Fiction and politics are at times close kin. Evidence of this kinship appears in Robert Penn Warren’s All the King’s Men, a novel that reveals many of the methods and dangers of image-making in American political life. Indeed, the image-making techniques of Willie Stark, a central character in Warren’s story, are so similar to those used by modern politicians that we should begin to question the “realities” of our politics and means by which candidates seek and hold office.

STARK AND MODERN POLITICS

LIKE MANY OFFICE-SEEKERS, Stark grows in his mastery of image-projection. In his first gubernatorial race, he campaigns as if reason were the essence of political persuasion. He writes speeches that are “a weird mixture of facts and figures.” Speaking and shaking hands “with the gravity of a bishop,” he cuts an image utterly inappropriate for his rural constituency.

Willie eventually abandons this image when he learns that he is being used by big city politicians to split his state’s rural vote. He no longer makes rational, programmatic appeals. As Len Garment advised in Richard Nixon’s 1968 campaign, “People distrust most programs, don’t comprehend the details, and are generally
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exasperated with the political motivation of most proposals" (quoted from Joe McGinniss' *The Selling of the President*, 1968). Instead of talking about the technicalities of highway systems and tax reform, Willie begins to blast away about crops rotting in fields because of washed-out roads, about empty bellies, patched clothes, and windy schoolhouses. He identifies with his constituency and pleads for unity and the American Dream that the "plainest, poorest fellow can be governor." His appeals sound the depths of his voters' most basic needs. Like many Louisianans prior to the rise of Huey Long, Stark's constituency has been under the thumb of a corrupt, do-nothing aristocracy. His voters do not participate in the American Dream either politically or economically. And just as the people of Long's time hoped for someone to translate their needs into accomplishments, so Stark's voters come to envision in him the achievement of their desires.

To enhance his image as an understanding, effective politician, Willie tries to associate with the most respected leaders in his state. Their endorsements are important. According to Harry Treleaven, political advertiser in the 1968 presidential campaign, "a good endorsement encourages voters to . . . participate in what appears to be the accepted choice" (*The Selling of the President*).

Realizing that his image is important, Stark chooses, after his election as governor, an attorney general with "clean hands" and a "pure heart." The Boss also tries (but fails) to associate his political machine with the well-known and well-respected Judge Irwin.

Willie's image-consciousness includes his family. He has numerous family pictures taken and later used in his state's newspapers. As trivial as this may seem, political scientists like Nelson Polsby and Aaron Wildavsky indicate the importance of a politician's family image and background (*Presidential Elections*, 3rd ed.). Just as portraits of the Kennedys with their children melted the hearts of so many Americans, so too are Stark's pictures "an asset . . . they . . . gave the voters a warm glow, it made them feel solid, substantial, and virtuous."

The Boss's physical appearance is also integral to his image. His lightweight Palm Beach suits with sweat stains under the arms suggest that he is an energetic, hard-working leader. Such an image is imitated by recent politicians. When George Bush ran for a congressional seat from Texas and John Tunney for a senatorial post from California, both presented themselves in television ads with their coats slung over their shoulders, their sleeves rolled up, ready for any task and any challenge. Similarly, a number of Jimmy Carter's television ads pictured him in work shirt, jeans, and boots, walking through hot, sunny fields—upright, vigorous, and indomitable.

When Stark is threatened with impeachment as governor, he is careful to look calm, almost nonchalant. According to Murray Edelman's *Symbolic Uses of Politics*, such an image is important for a politician to project if he is to give the impression that everything is all right, that everything is under control. During the Watergate hearings, Richard Nixon tried to maintain such an image until the weight of public opinion and the truth crushed him. Not only does Willie appear calm under pressure but also strong. Projecting the image of an active, productive leader, his favorite technique is to pit his lone self against the bureaucratic mass of overpaid, irresponsible legislators in his state's capitol.

When impeachment proceedings against Willie fail, he masterfully turns his victory into a public one. He promises a new state hospital, tax reform, better public education, in short, "hope." As he says to an audience on the steps of the capitol, "Your will is my strength . . . Your need is my justice." The Boss's rhetoric reinforces both his image as a dedicated leader and the vague, beneficent appeal of political language. As Edelman says, "Accuracy is not the important characteristic of political language, but instead the appraisals . . . of an audience."

**PROBLEMS OF IMAGE-MAKING: OLD AND NEW**

**WITH THE IMAGE-MAKING practiced by politicians, we as citizens face some serious problems. First, there is the age-old problem of deception. Although he has an honest attorney general, Stark himself is corrupt—so corrupt that his good attorney general resigns (albeit quietly). Although Willie projects the image of a populist, he is in fact an autocrat who gets his way by arm-twisting and blackmail. Although he is solicitous of his family image, he is in fact an adulterer who will divorce his wife only after he has won a seat in the U. S. Senate.**

**Like Stark, politicians in the "real" world deceive the public. The instances are too numerous to even begin enumerating them.**

Another problem with image-making, particularly in recent years, is its costliness. According to Ira Katznelson and Mark Kesselman's *The Politics of Power*, Richard Nixon and George McGovern alone spent $110 million in 1972, "most of the money going for media and advertising costs." Such staggering expenses have had a profound effect on American politics. Fortunately, we now have a system of public financing for presidential elections; and in the recent campaign it seemed to work fairly well. But to run for Congress (as Willie Stark planned to do), a candidate must either be wealthy or become indebted to those who can fund expensive image-making campaigns. (Before his assassination Stark made considerable use of radio to enhance

---
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his image on the national level—a use provided by money whose origin remained a mystery.) According to a recent study by Common Cause, a national public interest organization, the amount of money spent by special interest groups on congressional candidates nearly doubled from 1974 to 1976 (FrontLine, III, No. 1). And according to the New York Times (5 Feb. 1977), special interest groups provided nearly two-thirds of the funds spent by fifteen major House committee chairmen in their 1976 re-election campaigns. Such evidence suggests that the money of a few outweighs in influence the votes of many.

THE SUPREME COURT AND CAMPAIGN FINANCING

A MOVE TO AVOID THIS kind of problem appeared to have occurred in the Supreme Court's decision on the Federal Election Campaign Act, upholding official campaign contribution limits and a system of finance disclosure. But the decision to eliminate ceilings for personal expenditures made without consulting candidates (or their representatives) and ceilings for campaigns run without federal financing continues to encourage government by the rich. A person can spend any amount of money on another's candidacy or his own, providing that money is not discharged in consultation with the candidate or his representatives or is not spent in a campaign run with federal financing. That such loopholes in the Supreme Court's decision foster government by the wealthy was the dissenting opinion of Justice Marshall. Justice White based his dissent on the fear of corruption: "... expenditure ceilings reinforce the contribution limits and help eradicate the hazard of corruption. ... One would be blind to history to deny that unlimited money tempts people to spend it on whatever money can buy to influence an election" (New York Times, 31 Jan. 1976).

The Court's majority view on expenditure ceilings is that they are a violation of the freedom of speech. It follows then that presidential candidates who accept public financing (with its ceilings for primary and general campaigns) are limited de jure in their freedom of speech. Was this the case in the 1976 election? Were the candidates restricted in presenting themselves and their messages to the American people? Should we return completely to the old system of campaign fund raising, special interests, and monied power? Or should we have public financing for all federal elections—senatorial and congressional as well as presidential? If we have such financing, we can at least have candidates with the same financial advantages for their campaigns. This does not solve the problem of incumbency advantage. Nor does it solve the problem of achieving fairer eligibility advantage. Nor should we have public financing for all federal elections—senatorial and congressional as well as presidential? If we have such financing, we can at least have candidates with the same financial advantages for their campaigns. This does not solve the problem of incumbency advantage. Nor does it solve the problem of achieving fairer eligibility advantage. For grants to new party candidates.

Proponents of federal financing note that it would not cost much more than one dollar annually for every eligible voter to support presidential primary races with ten million dollar ceilings and general election campaigns with twenty million dollar ceilings (see David Adams-Katznelson, Ira, and Mark Kesselman. "Election Campaign Financing," Political Science Quarterly, XC). Although the twenty million dollar ceiling is a bit low, public financing is feasible. Moreover, with adequate sums determined for presidential, senatorial, and congressional campaigns, and with an efficient commission to disburse those sums, we will probably not experience any limitations to freedom of speech in the political arena. Finally, the benefits of public funding in terms of diminishing big money interests and the influence of extravagant as well as deceptive image campaigns would be great.

EDUCATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL

EVEN WITH PUBLIC FINANCING, however, politicians will still try to manipulate us through surface images and shallow rhetoric. The only other way to minimize this manipulation is to educate ourselves. Attending debates and public forums, studying the resource materials offered by organizations like the League of Women Voters and Common Cause, reading the news, and, above all, investigating the candidates (especially their voting records)—such efforts are far better than relying on political advertisements and campaign rhetoric. No one says that these efforts are easy. The responsibilities of the ballot are great. Even though a story like All the King's Men can suggest the ills of political image-making, the answers to those ills are up to us. In Warren's novel, the narrator says that "History is blind, but man is not." We may or may not agree with the first half of the narrator's assertion, but the second half requires some modification: people are not blind—or at least they shouldn't be.

BOOKS MENTIONED

WHEN I RECALL THAT SOME of my friends have gone all around the world, then I think of my routes—Zurich-London-Toronto-New York-Zurich, as local trips. Has the jet age really made the world smaller? Our imagination has become slave to advertisement slogans; without ever becoming aware of it, our thinking has lost its independence from a world at odds with itself. But there are—or were not so long ago—some minds unmoved by the torrents of fallacies. Simone Wei!, for instance, said that it is immoral to reach a destination without having made the journey. One can go all the way—slowly, I would suggest—to reach the opposite point. It was Emerson, I believe, who said that one can see the whole world while looking out of one's window. A whole world as if in a nutshell or rather in the playfulness of the child in a great artist is the world of Alexander Calder. It is not so long ago that he died. I saw a short film in which he played with his own figures made of wire and metal, and he played with his toy-like circus with total oblivion of the world around him. The Kunsthau in Zurich not so long ago had a representative show of his mobiles, sculptures that move with the mood of their own balance. I remember vaguely that one afternoon a few modern dancers used part of the exhibition and danced around Calder's mobiles and stabiles. My recollection tells me that his work as a stage set did little to enhance the dance, nor did the dancing bodies give Calder's witty and playful sculptures more weight or more airiness in space.

I was reminded of it when I witnessed a tribute to Calder on Broadway. The “Orchestra of Our Time,” conducted by its director Joel Thome, presented Satie's Socrate and used a reconstructed mobile set which Calder did for the 1936 production at the Wadsworth Athenaeum in Hartford. Satie and Calder are kindred souls. If there ever has been a musical expression of highly polished sophistication in the guise of childlike and sometimes primitive naivete, then it can be found in Erik Satie's work. When Socrate was first heard in Paris in 1918 it was described as “variations on monotony.” Its rhythmic repetition conveys the feeling of white music and reminded me again of Satie's reverie on a plate: “How white it is! No painting ornaments it; it is all of a piece.” At certain points I had images of one of those white paintings which are just white-on-white, but there were other moments in which I felt the monotony radiating a deeply felt sensation.

While the orchestra played and the singers voiced Plato's words, Calder's mobiles were seen in the background. For some time they did not move, but then when they were set in motion, beautiful in themselves, their beauty paled, their wit seemed stale. There was not even that eccentric incongruity between mobiles and music, that incongruity Satie
loved so much; he could not even have said about it what he once voiced about one of his scores, "this work is absolutely incomprehensible, even to me."

* * * * *

I ARRIVED IN NEW YORK IN time to see the dancer Twyla Tharp on the National Educational TV. She has become something of a star within a relatively short time, filling a ready-made vacuum. She came in riding the crest of that nostalgic wave which started to hit us during our ill-fated adventure in Vietnam and which the world was not yet able to stop. Twyla Tharp wiggled herself to prominence, using a great deal of jazzy movements of the 1930s which she works into a wide educational network. The saddest thing about it was that some people of whom I thought highly did not find anything revolting about it.

* * * * *

APROPOS NOSTALGIA. People want to escape, and they do more of it than they can really afford, financially and mentally. The theater, more than we think, is the mirror of our everyday life. While I was in London The National Theatre prepared a beautiful magic carpet on which it took us back to 1910, to those good old—and, indeed, very bad—days before World War I when destiny began to shake man out of his Victorian dream with a cataclysmic fury. In the English theater two of the dominant figures were, at that time, Bernard Shaw and Granville Barker.

Barker had done a great deal for the experimental theater. He was also an impressive director supplying, as Shaw said of him, "the actors with a wealth of psychological background," which some actors "found fascinating but alarming." Barker, no doubt inspired by Shaw, wrote a few plays. Between 1908 and 1910 Shaw had hit a low with his-plays. After his The Doctor's Dilemma which came out in 1906 we had to wait until 1912 for his next brilliant plays, Pygmalion and Androcles and the Lion. What he produced in between were such minor efforts as Getting Married, a one-act-play idea turned into a full-length play, and Misalliance, more talk than play. And even the talk seemed diffuse, spiced sometimes with Shawian wit: "Common people do not pray, my lord; they only beg," or "Nothing is worth doing unless the consequences may be serious." But the stories remained inconsequential.

Barker's production of his play, The Madras House, fell into this period and, in its epic sweep, also helped to make such a deep impression because Shaw had disappointed his public. On another level, the play attacked a human or rather inhuman condition, just as Beaumarchais' Marriage of Figaro once did when it bared and attacked the aristocrat's right of primogeniture. Barker cleverly satirized a well-do and respectable draper's household and attacked the drapery establishment which made the lie of the people's lives economically possible. The employees of this industrial seraglio had sold soul and body to be able to make a meek living. These workers were "living in" and had to abstain from marriage since this would have been detrimental to the business and the supremacy of the barons of industrialism.

The piquantness of the plot lies in the juxtaposition of the young Philip Madras and his father, Constantine. Philip, the idealist, is sincerely concerned with human misery and expresses his fears that "we good and clever people are costing the world too much." His father had left his wife and family and was living somewhere in the Orient. He became a Mohammedan, not only to be able to defy the double standard of Victorian mores, but also to negate what he considered unchristian because unethical, the exploitation of other people for the whimsies of a small minority. He thought little of a household ruled by a queen mother and of women in general: "How's he to keep a clear brain for the larger issues of life . . . all politics, all religion, all economy is being brought down to the level of women's emotions." Constantine is a typical Britisher of that era, escaping his world, like the colorful, quirisíc Lawrence. We have only to listen to Philip who wants an "art and a culture that shan't be just a veneer on savagery," something that must come "from the happiness of a whole people." And thus Philip decides to become a politician. Poor Philip; he did not know what it meant to be a Fabian-type of politician or any politician for that matter!

The production of the play at the National Theatre in London was as meticulously done as most everything one can see there. From a dramatic viewpoint, the play indulges in too big a cast, and too many scenes are too loosely tied together. The parts were well done, if only to prove again the advantage of a long-standing ensemble. But ensembles also have their stars, and the only thing one can say against that remarkable actor Paul Scofield is that, in all his roles and however brilliant he appears to be, he is a bit too much himself all the time. It particularly disturbed me the way he played Constantine.

Leaving the theater I could not help feeling that it was a long, almost a strenuous, evening. Perhaps the play was put on at this time because it is fashionable to kowtow to the "lib" movement. Also, it was not a wholly satisfying experience because (as a period piece) it was not well enough written. Moreover, the central issue is no longer of interest. The Industrial Revolution progressed rapidly. Industry is no longer interested in man per se, only in the buying power of the masses whose job is or may be done by automota. Man's body and soul are about to be reduced to a consumer's body. His soul be damed! The play dealing with this problem is now being partially enacted all over the world—but it has not yet been written.

This is an account of India’s economy since independence (1947), with special emphasis on development. As an economics layman interested in India, I found it highly intelligible, informative, and stimulating. The author, who served in India from 1969 to 1972 as the U. S. Treasury Department representative, makes good use of first-hand information and practical experience in addition to a wide and well-selected variety of other sources. Veit presents masses of data in a coherent, meaningful way, often with the help of tables. The economics information is all the more useful because it is presented in its natural political, social, and cultural environment—no mean achievement. He regards India’s economic goals as growth, equity, and self-reliance, and analyzes its achievements in terms of those goals, which he regards as attainable with India’s natural resources and expertise.

Sad to say, the attainable was not in fact achieved because of poor planning, cultural barriers, and political vested interests, among other reasons. While respecting Mrs. Gandhi, Veit gives her higher marks for rhetoric, at which she is no doubt most skillful, than for actual accomplishments, at least in the area of development. Her political base, consisting largely of the landed farmers and urban bourgeoisie, and the combination of often loosely-drafted laws and clever lawyers, really made it almost impossible for her to translate her sometimes radical sounds into practical reality.

It is the measure of this book that, although it was largely completed by early in 1975 and contains only a brief Epilogue mentioning the Emergency declared by Mrs. Gandhi in June 1975 and discontinued only when she was voted out of office by the Janata (Popular) Party last year, it remains largely valid today and should be useful reading for all Indian officials and foreigners interested in India and especially its economy—if only to attempt to refute it, which would take the same sort of solid thinking and extensive data utilized in preparing it.

There will certainly be differences of opinion about Veit’s repeated and extensively-developed judgment that India’s giving priority to import substitution over export promotion was ill advised. At the time he wrote, India’s foreign-exchange position was very unfavorable. Subsequently, the situation improved greatly, and Mr. Desai inherited a substantial reserve of foreign resources when he took office. This was partly the result of increased indigenous production of petroleum, something Veit feels was unnecessarily delayed. The foreign exchange situation and anticipated self-sufficiency in oil are two bright spots in an otherwise rather gloomy economic picture.

A discouraging and recurring note in this book is strong evidence that most development programs, even those designed to bring about a greater degree of equity in the distribution of economic resources, have only served to make the rich richer (and one should never forget that there are millions upon millions of rich people in India) and the poor poorer, at least relatively. Whether the poor are better off in general today than they were thirty years ago is a subject for valid debate.
One thing is certain—there are more of them now! As education and economic resources increase, prolificacy generally decreases; thus, India’s monthly production of one million additional citizens comes disproportionately from the poor, which tends to make their status permanent.

India’s burgeoning population has tended to nullify the benefits of its significant and impressive achievements in increasing industrial and agricultural production. Really effective external means for controlling population growth are yet to be found, and internal means have not been forthcoming either among those who are contributing most to the growth. Many factors play in; let us consider only two. In a one-person-one-vote democracy, many minority groups feel that only in increased numbers can they find any security. The proportion of Muslims in India is roughly the same as the proportion of blacks in America. The attitude of American blacks toward controlling black population growth is well known! Religion also enters in: a rather subtle case for population control based on curbing the selfish arrogance of ego duplication/multiplication can hardly stand before the bludgeon blows on behalf of the “will of God” and man’s natural purpose, which usually means more babies. And when political and religious factors combine, as is so often the case in Indiana...

Some people (especially those opposed to population control) point out (validly, I believe) that India could produce food for a billion and more people (at the present rate, India will reach one billion about the year 2,000), but food “ain’t where it’s at.” Education, the cinema, and the democratic political process, always involving promises, have combined to raise people’s expectations greatly without at the same time producing the means for the fulfillment thereof. India’s economic growth rate (3%+) has managed to keep ahead of its population growth rate (2%) but not ahead of its people’s rising expectations. India’s labor force numbers about 200 million; un- and underemployed people number probably more than 30 million! Even with the best planning and programs it would be almost impossible to provide good education, gainful employment, and meaningful lives in terms of their own expectations for even the present population, to say nothing of a constantly-growing one.

THE SCRAMBLE FOR AVAILABLE JOBS is unbelievable. One easy way to reduce the number of valid applicants is to raise the qualifications for a post. Attaining the necessary qualifications may be quite expensive, and actually getting a job often involves a bribe (sometimes in excess of one year’s pay from the concerned job, in advance). Generating the necessary resources to provide the required education and/or the bribe for the job is just not possible for most poor people. (Put yourself into the position of one being approached for a loan or a gift to pay the bribe which may be the only way to enable a gifted poor youth who has somehow been able to obtain education/training to make use of the same in a remunerative way. At that point pious moralisms may not be appropriate!) In a poor, large family perhaps at great sacrifice one of the sons may be educated beyond high school. Higher education will often not practically equip the student for a job (except perhaps as a teacher, for which the job market may be exceptionally poor), but it is likely to make it virtually impossible for him to make a living as most of the poor must, by means of manual labor. Even when education or some sort of training are possible, the poor rarely have the influence or means to get a job, and the result is a gifted, educated, discontented, frustrated, non-productive member of the family. This cruel cycle is all too prevalent in India today. Of course, it is not unknown in America either! Meanwhile, in the absence of social security or adequate welfare benefits, the poor continue to regard a large family as their only source of security, with enough offspring to beat the diminishing but still very high infant mortality rate. India’s working force is greatly in excess of available work. This has resulted in mass emigration to wherever work might be found. The Persian Gulf area presents great opportunities at the moment, but how long will it last? The Indian people have a high level of intelligence and skill. Proof of this may be found in every American institution of higher learning of any size, in every American hospital of any size. India may be exporting the skills it needs most itself, but there is very little that can be done about that. “Enlightened” countries like Canada and the United States require such skills of immigrants. India continues to train and export some of its greatest and most essential, productive people, those who would have (and in other countries usually do have) the smallest families. Meanwhile, on the home front the population, and the work force, and the unemployment, keep growing, growing.

Under the Emergency some progress in population control was made, but it was no doubt the over-zealous implementation of some basically-good “family planning” programs (and not, as some “liberals” might like to think, political oppression, censorship, etc.) which toppled Mrs. Gandhi. The four southern states, in
which the zeal was kept within bounds, all voted for Mrs. Gandhi! Population control is not politically profitable or advisable in India, and the acceptance of that fact as political reality may yet be the most abiding result of last year's "return to democracy."

VEIT MOVINGLY RECALLS India's former President Giri's reminding an audience of the Mahatma's seven social evils: politics without principles, wealth without work, pleasure without conscience, knowledge without character, commerce without morality, science without humanity, and worship without sacrifice. He warned his fellow citizens that those evils are even more prevalent today than they were in Gandhi's day. He could be speaking to us too. Those evils have infected the entire "free" world, in effect making an irony of the adjective. Pres. Carter in India remembered the relationship between M. K. Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. Beyond that there has been a traditional warm and deep feeling of friendship between the peoples of India and America, although this has hardly always or even often been reflected in the "official" relations between the two countries. Yet, one is compelled to conclude that for most Americans India doesn't really count—it's not important. With all its art and philosophy and culture in general, with more people than the entire populations of Africa and South America combined, with its democratic form of government, it remains distant, peripheral for all but a few Americans. Pausing in mid flight to the toilet, an American newsmen with "Delhi belly" opines that a country which can't provide a pure glass of drinking water shouldn't be fooling around with nuclear explosions, and 200 million Americans piously, and vigorously, assent, with perhaps the most feeling many of them have ever had about India! Well, he was wrong: wrong in what he said and in the way he said it, without thought and without love.

And perhaps I am wrong to worry about it! However, I do feel that India and America need each other and can help each other attain what are often common goals and ideals. Veit is not your usual prophet of gloom and doom, but he does conclude that the future outlook for India is rather bleak—and one finds his reasoning compelling if not inevitable. Veit would very much like India to keep its present form of government, although it has so far not proved greatly effective in responding to its needs. I personally feel that a turn to the left from Mrs. Gandhi's policies is what India really needed, while with Morarji Desai and the Janata Party it really took a turn to the right. The Janata Party had a strong plank on rural development, which Veit and most others would support. But, as far as I know, little practical effect has resulted from that plank and probably little can be hoped for, since Mr. Desai's political base is very much like Mrs. Gandhi's. Meanwhile, somewhere in the wings, the Indian military forces are waiting—well trained, well organized, probably capable of honest and efficient administration, and so far remarkably, and scrupulously, uninvolved in politics for the most part. Perhaps that might be the way that India will go if the Janata Party can't put it all together, something that does remain within the realm of possibility. That might not be too bad, all things considered (how sad!), since elsewhere in the wings others are waiting too. Only God knows, but it wouldn't hurt to say an occasional prayer for India!

Perhaps it would be in order for a reviewer to note somewhere the distressingly-frequent typographical errors in this book. Some superseded place names also crept in, in part only because of the lapse of time between writing and printing (e.g., Ceylon/Sri Lanka, East Bengal/Bangladesh, Mysore/Karnataka). Mr. Mehra may not be pleased to find his name spelled three different ways (Ashok, Ashoka, Asoka). But these are minor problems in what finally must be regarded as a superb achievement by an author who to a remarkable degree combines intelligence and affection, professional skill and genuine concern.

LUTHER ENGELBRECHT

THE IMPROBABLE ERA: The South Since World War II.

EVERY COUNTRY, the saying goes, has a South. That "different" region of our country has been a source of continual fascination for the rest of the United States. It has occupied the attention and has been on the conscience of the nation almost since its beginning. The place of the South in the nation has been, and continues to be, a key feature of our ongoing political history. The awesome solidarity showed a "native son"—Jimmy Carter—in the 1976 election reminded us once again of the salience of a persistent regional identification and pride. The national fascination was "born again" with Carter. The South is in: good old boys, pickup trucks, country ham and
grits, the quaint traditions of violence and folk music and good manners.

The identity of and interest in the South continued through the wake of great change—change that brought the “New South,” the race revolution, political reaction, and then accommodation. It is this period—roughly since World War II—that Charles P. Roland, Alumni Professor of History at the University of Kentucky and author of several books on the South, treats in a survey of that turbulent period. Not as insightful as W. J. Cash’s famous The Mind of the South nor as probing of the Southern psyche as William Faulkner’s murky novels, Roland’s work nevertheless constitutes a valuable, if somewhat cursory, overview of recent Southern history and society.

The book is a straight narrative, and thus is most valuable for the introductory student—or Yankee—trying to understand the recent South. It is especially good in recounting the awesome political struggle over the central issue of the era, the status of black people in Southern society. Roland understands that the South is not “coping” with race relations any better than the rest of the country. The South dealt with the issue in its own peculiar style. Roland understands also that eventually the issue became national. Indeed, it is astonishing to think the extent to which the South has gone “national,” not only in sentiment about racial cover issues such as “busing,” but also in religious fundamentalism, conservative values, even in lifestyle such as music. Perhaps the moment the South won the War Between the States was when WMAS in Chicago went to a full-time country and western music format. In any case, one might even say that in the last decade, the South has not rejoined the Union, the Union has joined the South.

The book is weakest in the few efforts that are made to get behind the peculiar regional experience, going to the “roots” of the question, the paradox of southern continuity in the wake of great change. The author does understand, but does not explore in depth, the importance of myth of the South (or rather the myths) as Defensive, Benighted, Redemptive, Abundant, Tragic, Romantic, and Fundamentalist. It would help us to understand Carter and his region if these persistent myths had been explored in more detail. Carter, for instance, may belong to the Redemptive tradition, seeing himself as bringing moral force and reconciliation to the entire nation. Roland’s book may be recommended as a “way into” the main road South, but not as a way to understand the back roads and bayous of the Southern mind. Nevertheless, it is a contribution to the “reconstruction” of the progress and reaction, the turbulence and serenity, the simplicities and paradoxes, the agony and pride of the dearly loved and hated South.

JAMES E. COMBS

POWER SHIFT

POWER SHIFT ARGUES A PROPOSITION which few would dispute. Since World War II, economic and political power in the U.S. has shifted, so that the South and Southwest have gained more influence while the relative power of the Northeast has declined. Sale’s work, written when Jimmy Carter was still a little-known former Georgia governor, promises to explain and document this important change. Unfortunately, although Sale makes some provocative points, his definitions are so peculiarly drawn, his arguments so poorly made, and his documentation so sloppily presented, that the reader finishes the book doubting the validity of the almost self-evident thesis.

Sale begins by noting Richard Nixon’s remarks about this rearrangement of political strength. While discussing the Watergate scandal with John Dean, Nixon grumbled that the investigation was being encouraged by his political enemies. “They’ve just got to have something to squeal about”, Nixon said, “… because the Establishment is dying.” Sale notes that Nixon considered himself outside the “Establishment” which traditionally dominated American politics and that Nixon’s election represented the “power shift” which had occurred. With more support from the South and West than from cities in the East, Nixon reshaped the voting patterns which had kept Republicans (except for war hero Eisenhower) out of the White House for thirty-six years.

Here Sale makes the political definitions on which he bases the rest of his argument. Nixon represents the “Southern Rim,” that area of the U.S. which lies south of the thirty-seventh parallel. This is the area which has gained power from the “Northeast,” the center of the “Establishment” which Nixon saw as his enemy. Midwestern readers may be surprised that Sale has classified Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin as part of the Northeastern bloc, especially since Nixon won all four states in his close race against Hubert Humphrey in 1968. Anyone familiar with the long-standing influence of southerners in congressional leadership positions may also question a
classification which places politicians like Richard Russell and Sam Rayburn outside the political “Establishment.”

From this introductory look at Nixon’s view of politics, Sale moves to analyze the financial influence of the South and Southwest. This chapter is the strongest in the book, for Sale convincingly shows that the “Southern Rim” has indeed become an economic power, with a gross product greater than any nation except the Soviet Union. Agriculture, defense, scientific technology, oil, real estate, and the leisure industry make up the strength of the region. Perhaps the argument is somewhat overstated; auto making, steel manufacturing, and banking are still centered in the “Northeast.” But without doubt business growth in the “Southern Rim” has been impressive.

Sale follows this section, however, with a weak attempt to describe the nature of this development. He uses San Diego to show that economic growth in the region has been characterized by “more than its share of business scandals and illegalities.” But although he lists the many unscrupulous activities associated with “Southern Rim” business and politics, he never shows that the region has been any more corrupt than other areas experiencing rapid economic growth.

THE AUTHOR’S TREATMENT of political ideology on the basis of regional differences is especially difficult to accept. He sees the South and Southwest as the center of “rightism, racism, and repression,” where politicians make their biggest gains by playing on the prejudices of the citizens. The analysis ignores northern racism as well as the efforts by southern politicians to unite whites and blacks in liberal coalitions of the sort which enabled Jimmy Carter to win the Democratic nomination and the presidency. Such a superficial theory of American politics enables Sale to explain the Kennedy assassination as a plot by the CIA, organized crime, and defense contractors—all “Southern Rim” centered—to stop eastern policies designed to hamper their activities. To argue this, Sale claims that Kennedy was planning Vietnam withdrawals, a major crackdown on the CIA, and a broad attack on organized crime, even though little evidence exists that he had any such intentions.

Besides such strained and undocumented interpretations of political events, the book is also marred with errors of fact. Kennedy is supposed to have shifted the “traditionally Republican black vote” to the Democrats, when, in fact, a majority of black voters had not supported a Republican presidential candidate since Herbert Hoover. The author’s characterization of Houston as a vast suburban area of single family homes would amuse anyone familiar with either the city’s poorer areas or the large number of apartment complexes which have been a recent feature of the city’s growth. In addition, some of Sale’s figures on the southern vote in the 1960 election (statistics on which he builds his case of political shift) are in substantial error. Readers seeking the sources of the author’s information will have difficulties, however, for many of the facts are so poorly footnoted that they are impossible to corroborate.

Yet Sale’s premise remains correct. The South and Southwest have experienced tremendous economic growth and have become more influential in national politics. But a well-documented and intelligently argued book about this important change remains to be written.

RONALD SCHLUNDT

CORRESPONDENCE OF JAMES K. POLK. Volume V, 1837-1838.
Edited by Herbert Weaver; Wayne Cutler, Associate Editor. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1977. Pages: xxxvi + 692. $25.00.

EDITOR HERBERT WEAVER and his staff have continued the excellent work done on previous volumes in this series, a project sponsored by Vanderbilt University, The National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Tennessee Historical Commission, and the Polk Memorial Association.

Over 600 pieces of correspondence are included in this volume covering the years during which Polk was elected to a second term as Speaker of the House of Representatives. Much of the correspondence is from his family, political associates, and friends; there are nine letters to Andrew Jackson, two from him, and five to President Van Buren.

This material reflects several important phenomena in the life of the country and in the experience of the man who was soon to be elected Governor of Tennessee and President of the United States. Intense political rivalry between Democrats and Whigs, the fury caused by the economic Panic of 1837, and the fragile nature of the Democratic coalition in Polk’s home state are particularly evident.

Researchers will find this volume, like the others, very easy to use because it contains a preface which provides historical background, organizes letters chronologically, and places notes after individual letters. It is another superbly edited work bearing the mark of Herbert Weaver — his farewell volume. He has given his successor, associate editor Wayne Cutler, standards worthy of emulation.

DEAN KOHLHOFF
RASCALS AT LARGE.

IMAGINE A WORLD WITH NO television, but plenty of romanticism; a world in which people are breathless traveling at thirty or forty miles per hour and the practicality of heavier-than-air flight is hotly disputed; a world where the telephone is a new and exciting invention and horizons are broad for everyone; a world in which young lads and lassies don't drink, never swear, blush at the mention of the opposite sex (although they have a healthy interest), exercise freely, believe in God, and obey their parents; and a world where those parents are themselves always aware of their children's whereabouts, apply firm discipline when necessary, but by and large trust their children, giving them freedom and responsibility. Imagine a world where heroes abound, right always triumphs (and usually has might besides), where evil is readily identifiable and sure to be defeated by the heroes. Imagine all this, and you have imagined the world of Tom Swift, the Hardy Boys, Nancy Drew, Tarzan, the Rover Boys, the Motorcycle Chums, and dozens of other characters created in the pre-and post-World War I era. If you're in your fifties or so, you grew up with them and remember them fondly. Some of us younger folks with access to a parent's library grew up thrilling with Tom Swift in darkest Africa or Don Sturdy at the North Pole, too; but even youngsters are familiar with the Hardy Boys and Nancy Drew books today—or if not the books, have yet the dubious privilege of receiving them spoon-fed from television.

These old books, published from the late 1890s to around 1930 or so, happen to be this reviewer's hobby, a hobby he thought peculiar to himself until the discovery of Rascals at Large by Arthur Prager. Prager captures all of the humor and excitement we felt when we read these books for the first time as kids. He pokes gentle fun at himself and us at the same time.

Rascals is a wistful, whimsical, loving adult look backward at all we held dear in the old, magical days before war and depression—and even during war and depression, when children had enough to dream on. Prager opens up to us the books and their styles, quoting liberally and appropriately, showing us again their strengths and their foibles, laughing at them and loving them at the same time. Bless him, he's even found out something of the authors themselves—their own successes and failures in life, their struggles with publishers, the competition and mimicry of each other, and tied it all neatly in with the books and characters themselves without confusing them in the least.

Did you know that your favorite author is a Syndicate? It was begun by a fellow named Edward Stratemeyer who wrote, or at least edited, "Tom Swift," "The Hardy Boys," "Nancy Drew," "The Motor Boys," "The Bobsey Twins," and literally dozens of other series, some of which are still continuing. His daughter is now head of the Syndicate.

Do you know the real name of Fu Manchu's creator? Or how many cities are named after Tarzan of the Apes? Or that there are no such Great Apes in Africa—or anywhere else?

Prager reviews all of this in nine chapters, among them: "The Victory Cry of the Bull Ape"; "The Secret of Nancy Drew: Pushing Forty and Going Strong"; "Peril: The Mother of Invention"; "Just Kids Like You and Me"; and "The Superboys". The literary quality of these old children's stories may be pretty low, but modern writers should be so lucky as to capture the art of story telling that really was in the midst of all that rotten writing.

If you've never read any of these beautiful old potboilers, you have simply wasted your childhood. Assuming you have, and if you haven't had a good, nostalgic break from reality lately, find Rascals at Large and recover your youth. Golly, you'll feel a new man! Bless my shoe buttons, and a new woman, too!

W. R. RIEDEL

ALCOHOLICS AND BUSINESS. Problems, Costs, Solutions.

THE PREFACE TO THE BOOK states that it is not a diatribe against the use of alcoholic beverages, but that the author will view alcoholism and its problems from the standpoint of their effects on the business community. This is done by looking at the scope of the problem of the alcoholic, the cost to society with emphasis on the cost borne by business, and at a solution that will minimize both the problem and the cost. In the discussion of these three points the following concepts emerge:

a. Alcoholism is a disease and the alcoholic is a sick person.
b. The alcoholic can be helped and is worth helping.
c. Alcoholism is a public health problem and therefore a public responsibility.
d. As the business community bears a greater portion of the cost, it therefore is to the advantage of business to deal with the problem on an individual basis.

Although the business community has frequently been chided that it is insensitive to its social responsibility, almost immediately upon the close of World War II it recognized that alcoholism was a costly problem and quietly began seeking a solution. Since alcoholism is no respecter of persons, the problem drinker is found throughout the organizational hierarchy. Firing the employee is a very expensive solution. Personality deterioration of an alcoholic is a slow process and so the business is dealing with a problem drinker found through the early stages of the problem. As many companies have health insurance as part of the fringe benefit packet, the health insurance should cover the cost of treating alcoholism by health institutions. This eliminates the inhibiting cost factor and encourages the alcoholic employee and his family to seek assistance in the early stages of the disease.

The author makes the point that a business organization is in the best position to assist the alcoholic. The immediate supervisor has a personal relationship with employees, and, if properly trained, can easily recognize their problems, frankly discuss the situation with the employees and refer them to agencies where they can obtain help. If the fellow workers know that it is the company's policy that the worker's job is not in jeopardy (while under treatment), the supervisor will have no difficulty in enlisting their help to encourage the alcoholic to seek assistance.

That the immediate supervisor plays an important role in making any program of aiding the alcoholic a success was recognized by the companies that co-operated with the Yale University program as early as 1947. The reviewer, as manager of supervisory training for a large corporation at that time, was involved in such a program, both in preparing training material and conducting seminars with supervisors. Just a few weeks ago, an in-house publication of this company described the work the supervisor and the alcoholic counselor are doing today.

As this book was written primarily for the business community, it describes the programs of a number of companies and the success experienced. It is a testimony to what management can do in its own immediate environment, the company. Many companies employing over 1100 workers have some type of program to aid the problem drinker. If the reader is impressed by a recovery rate of 60 to 80 per cent experienced by the companies, he can find additional sources in the 40-page appendix.

Much that is written for the business community today is directed toward large corporations. This is also a weakness of this book. Some three million companies employing under 50 people, which is approximately 40 per cent of the work force, will find little information of direct benefit for the small businesses. They encounter many of the same problems, but due to limited resources and lack of time, they do not have the trained personnel to assist the alcoholic employees.

By devoting some space outlining the aid small businesses can obtain from local agencies, both public and private, the author could have rendered a valuable service to the business community. Due to the high visibility of employees through close contact with the owners, early assistance can be given if the owner is knowledgeable to whom to refer the alcoholic employee.

Alcoholics and Business is full of valuable information for the casual reader interested in the problem, but most helpful to the individual in the business community who is brought face to face with the problem drinker.

PAUL BIERWAGEN

Perspectives in Education (concluded from page 28)

The Church, which is often perceived as constrictive, worships the Creator and should give considerable attention to creativity. Here, too, we can see creativity, not as a denial of, but as in the expression of, conviction. Or haven't we heard of Christ and Paul and Luther and Teilhard de Chardin? There will continue to be a tension between the need for a body of doctrine and the essential freedom to differ, but that can be a creative tension.

In fact, the tension between structure and freedom is essential. Structure is not the antithesis of creativity, but its prerequisite. The creativity-in-education movement and the back-to-basics movement aren't at war; they need each other.
PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION

I. Creativity in Education

IN OUR SOCIETY GENERALLY, "creativity" has become a glamorous but overworked term. One can find books on "Creative Macrame", "Creative Rubbings", and even "Creative Divorce"! What are we to make of such a slippery term? George F. Kneller says, "Any definition of creativity ... must include the essential element of novelty."

This ability of human beings to be creative has been given considerable attention in education during recent years. The creativity-in-education movement began in 1950—a generation ago—in the literature of psychological and educational research. In the 1960s the movement surfaced in many ways, from the unconventional experiments at Esalen to the institutional legitimacy of the Creative Education Foundation in New York. In spite of the resistance of inertia and the corruption of faddism, the movement has prospered, as indicated by a number of items: the explosion of research on the topic; the publication of a number of helpful works, including Arthur Koester's The Act of Creation (1964); the establishing of The Journal of Creative Behavior in 1967; the refinement of tests of creativity; and, of course, the support of projects by the United States Office of Education and by private foundations.

After all the attention lavished on the topic, what is the role of creativity in education?

We understand better than before that the dimension of creativity should be present in all fields of study and work, mathematics as well as music, chemistry as well as art. There are creative persons in diverse fields in our schools. While the "creative" arts often give dramatic expression to human creativity, mere association with one of the creative arts does not assure that a person is creative. A musician, for example, may be an accomplished craftsman and a talented performer without displaying much creativity. The most creative person on a faculty may well be in sociology, biology, or computer programming.

Educators are concerned that creativity be nurtured as a dimension of all human beings. Creativity, like I.Q., body height, and other attributes, is distributed to persons in varying amounts. Each individual should be aided in realizing the creative potential within him.

Educators also hope that those individuals who are endowed with unusually high creativity will be identified early and aided in expressing their creativity for the benefit of all. In some states "gifted" is narrowly defined as "having an I.Q. of 130 or higher." Such definitions should give way to a broader concept of giftedness which would include superior endowment in any area of achievement, including I.Q., of course, but also encompassing various talents and creativity.

Acknowledging the importance of creativity as a dimension in all education, we must admit that creativity cannot be taught directly. Since it is not a subject to be communicated but is rather a dimension of every subject area, creativity can be stifled—or it can be released—in the study of any discipline.

TO BEGIN WITH, CREATIVITY can be encouraged by a climate of freedom which is conducive to exploration, inquiry, questioning, forming hypotheses, taking risks, venturing opinions. Settings which are strictly authoritarian, overly programmed, and intolerant of error constrict creativity. There also is some evidence that creativity is helped by breaking down rigid walls between subject areas; it flourishes in the interaction of disciplines—for instance, at the interfaces of biology and chemistry, of art and geometry, of anthropology and theology.

Furthermore, creativity is encouraged by emphasis on divergent rather than convergent thinking, the search for many solutions rather than the one prescribed answer. Ashley Montagu cynically claims that American schools never have been serious about encouraging such creativity. As an anthropologist, he is convinced that if schools did encourage divergent thinking about God and government, incest and economics, there would be more "creativity" than we could handle. He asks us to recognize that schools are meant to pass on our cultural consensus rather than to encourage any creative thinking. Montagu seems to set up an artificial dichotomy. Certainly we have had creative responses within the context of established conviction. Or haven't we heard of Jefferson and the Marshall Plan and the Sadat initiative?

Universities have some real problems with creativity. The emphasis in higher education can easily fall on conformity and correctness. Graduate study is particularly vulnerable. Bernard Elevitch of Boston University states it bluntly: "There's something about the whole graduate process that stifles creativity. An intellectual constipation sets in."

(continued on page 27)