

The Saturday Review

Editor: NORMAN COUSINS

Publisher: J. R. COMINSKY

Chairman, Board of Directors: E. DEGOLYER

Associate Editors: HARRISON SMITH, IRVING KOLODIN

Assistant Editor Feature Editor Book Review Editor Poetry Editor Science Editor
ELOISE PERRY HAZARD PETER RITNER RAYMOND WALTERS, JR. JOHN CIARDI JOHN LEAR

Editors-at-Large
CLEVELAND AMORY
HARRISON BROWN
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
WALTER MILLIS
ELMO ROPER
JOHN STEINBECK
FRANCIS HENRY TAYLOR



Chairman, Editorial Board
HENRY SEIDEL CANBY

Contributing Editors
JOHN MASON BROWN
BENNETT CERF
HENRY HEWES
JAMES THRALL SOBY
HORACE SUTTON
JOHN T. WINTERICH

Associate Publisher
W. D. PATTERSON

Contents Copyrighted, 1956, by Saturday Review, Inc.

Business: Our Newest Profession

THE classical disciplines of law, medicine, and theology have had to move over since the turn of the century to make room for the newer professions of teaching, engineering, and journalism. A modern complex society demands not only men of talent, but men of talent with a sound education.

In the United States today a college degree is increasingly essential to a successful career. This is true not only of the established professions but more and more in business itself, where top leaders are recruited for their positions of power, prestige, and preference from the highly educated executives to be found throughout the ranks of present-day industry.

The fact is that business is rapidly becoming, if indeed it has not already become, our newest profession, with all the accoutrements of learning, curricula, standards, and degrees that a graduate school can bestow. Columbia University's Graduate School of Business, Harvard's School of Business Administration, and the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Finance and Commerce are outstanding examples of an accelerating development, paced by the social and technological complexities of twentieth-century industry.

This issue of *The Saturday Review* takes note of this welcome change in the general relationship between business and education, referring to them as "new partners." They have been old antagonists, and a skeptical caution still remains in certain quarters where old-time executives scoff at "eggheads" and campus intellectuals breathe scorn upon the tycoons. But this heckling is disappearing, and

fortunately so for American society as well as education and industry.

In a democracy the two great foci of power are politics and government on one hand, and economics and business on the other. Not only must they be in able hands, but they should be wielded by separate groups within the society. The totalitarian state tyrannically fuses political and economic power entirely into the monolithic state. To safeguard democracy these functions must be kept quite separate, but they must also be administered with a sense of social responsibility. In a modern democracy of advanced industrial techniques and intricate economic relationships this is more critical than ever.

The ramifications of modern business at all levels of U.S. society demand that the contemporary executive be concerned not entirely with profits and the marketplace, but also the larger social structure of which business is a part.

The great common ingredient in this new pattern is education. That is why college-trained men are more important than ever in government. That is why more and more universities are giving graduate and professional training in business. The central and significant centers of power in our society must be administered by highly educated men.

What is transpiring is that the old vocational training for business in many colleges, useful as it was at the time, is being succeeded by professional training in which the subject is related in meaningful terms to the basic liberal tradition of learning.

Business has found that the exec-

utive with a broad, general grounding in the humanities and liberal arts, reinforced by professional training in the special problems of management, holds greatest promise for becoming the creative, sensitively oriented man required to conduct affairs today at the top level of U.S. industry.

ON THE technical side of industry the vast strides in science and research have also served to bring the educated man to the fore. One in every sixty employes today is a scientist, engineer, or technician, compared to one in 1,100 before the turn of the century. The result is today's intensive recruiting drive by industry for science graduates of our colleges and universities to carry on the nation's mammoth \$5 billion a year research program.

This is not a temporary, boom-born phenomenon. Our society, our democracy, our economy all demand educated talent, and will continue to as the complexity of our industrial, economic, and political units increases.

Business has recognized this by rallying with steadily expanding financial aid to our hard-pressed institutions of higher learning. Our colleges and universities, after all, are the only sources of educated material for business and for the dynamic democratic society business needs in order to function. As a result, major corporations last year contributed approximately \$100 million to the operating funds of U.S. colleges and universities, to enable them to better meet the tasks our modern society is imposing upon them in the swelling need for educated men and women.

Thus, the new partnership between U.S. business and education takes shape and grows stronger in a time of unparalleled challenge to the American way of doing things. Undoubtedly, both Karl Marx and our own early buccaneers of business, and the social critics they spawned, would be astonished at this evidence of the creative adaptability of U.S. society.

SR believes the new professionalizing of business leadership and the new partnership of Campus and Executive Suite are to be welcomed and encouraged. We and the world are troubled by many fundamental social and political problems. We can finally apply our leadership effectively only if our society and its leaders are united around standards of excellence and are prepared to give power, prestige, and preference to men and women of learning.

And learned not only in the science of survival, but in the art of living. There lies the great hope for the future. —W. D. P.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DR. WERTHAM OBJECTS

IN THE REVIEW of my book "The Circle Of Guilt" (SR Oct. 20) the one passage singled out for comment is taken out of context, which distorts its meaning. The full paragraph reads like this:

In recent writings, speeches, and reports there is endless repetition of the cliché that "delinquency has multiple causes." Over and over the facile statement is made that "no single factor" should be accused. What that really means is that these writers are afraid to attribute delinquency to *any* factor—and to anything at all; the children are just delinquent. You can always say that there are so many factors that you omit positive and persistent action on any of them. To emphasize above everything else that there are "multiple causes" is just as dogmatic as to single out one factor alone. It is not feasible to determine once and for all "what value to attach to each factor." What may be a powerful and even decisive factor in one case may be relatively insignificant in another. Clinical judgment has to decide in the individual case which of the various factors working upon one another is more significant. From intensive study of significant cases we do know the potential dangers and can guard against them. "The chain of psychopathology," as Dr. Francis Braceland (president of the American Psychiatric Association) expresses it, "is sometimes no stronger than its weakest link."

That is not "arrant nonsense"; it is elementary scientific medicine.

FREDRIC WERTHAM, M.D.

New York, N.Y.

MR. DEUTSCH REPLIES

THE FULL PARAGRAPH quoted by Dr. Wertham merely reinforces my original point. I quoted the first three sentences in my review; the rest of the paragraph consists mainly in further distortions of the "multiple cause" viewpoint and in non-sequiturs. I said it was "arrant nonsense" to imply that writers who hold there are multiple causes in delinquency "are afraid to attribute delinquency to *any* factor—and to anything at all; the children are just delinquent." Adherence to the multiple cause principle, of course, does not preclude discrimination between significant and insignificant factors—nor does it inactivate the will to work toward their elimination or reduction. It is astonishing that a man who presumes to speak in the name of "elementary medical science" should permit himself such a statement as: "To 'emphasize causes' is just as dogmatic as to single out one factor alone." This is saying that to support with certainty an established scientific truth is just as dogmatic as to support a demonstrated error. This is not



"I'd ask you in but my wife isn't here and she's the one who does the talking."

"elementary scientific medicine"; it is more arrant nonsense.

ALBERT DEUTSCH.

Washington, D.C.

LONG LIVE LONGJUJU!

IN THIS BRIGHT, BRIGHT world it seems that only those brave enough to wear dark glasses are still able to see spots on the sun's face. May I shake the hand (all four fingers and a thumb) of Longjuju's decapitator (SR Dec. 22). If I could draw, *his* portrait would be dominated by an equally immense star in the middle of the breast area. Let us have more from this glow.

B. J. McLAUGHLIN.

Trenton, N.J.

A DUNSANY ADMIRER?

FOR A NUMBER OF seasons now I have admired the courage and tenacity (though not the understanding or sensitivity) of Lord Dunsany in the field of literary and poetic criticism. But little did I realize that His Lordship would turn artist (and art critic). However, why not?

Anyone who knows nothing about art can become an artist. All one needs is a good prejudice and a little ability to fan

an old controversy. All that's needed to get your work into print is to make it thoroughly reactionary. With this in mind I look forward to Lord Dunsany's early appearance in the Metropolitan.

WILLIAM STIPE.

Evanston, Ill.

DOWN WITH LONGJUJU

HURRAH FOR LORD DUNSANY! Down with Longjuju! This is unquestionably the most accurate and the most devastating commentary on contemporary art criticism to be published in many a year. I hope it may be read by some literary critics, too, among whom John Ciardi can be mentioned.

ROSS STAGNER.

Champaign, Ill.

WHERE'S ALEXANDER?

I'D LIKE to put Horace Sutton straight on some local landmarks (BOOKED FOR TRAVEL, SR Nov. 3). If he goes back downtown he'll find that the churchyard across from the New York County Lawyer's Association on Vesey Street is St. Paul's, not Trinity's.

ERWIN W. SMITH.

New York, N.Y.