

# Saturday Review

Editor: NORMAN COUSINS  
Publisher: J. R. COMINSKY

Associate Editors: HARRISON SMITH, IRVING KOLODIN, HORACE SUTTON

Associate Publisher  
W. D. PATTERSON

Managing Editor  
RICHARD L. TOBIN

Science Editor  
JOHN LEAR

Poetry Editor  
JOHN CIARDI

Education Editor  
PAUL WOODRING

Production Manager  
PEARL M. STEINHAUS

Book Review Editor  
ROCHELLE GIBSON

General Editor  
HALLOWELL BOWSER

Feature Editor  
JAMES F. FIXX

Editors-at-Large  
CLEVELAND AMORY  
HARRISON BROWN  
JOHN MASON BROWN  
FRANK G. JENNINGS  
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH  
T. S. MATTHEWS  
WALTER MILLIS  
ELMO ROPER  
JOHN STEINBECK



Contributing Editors  
HOLLIS ALPERT  
HENRY HEWES  
GRANVILLE HICKS  
ARTHUR KNIGHT  
KATHARINE KUH  
ROBERT LEWIS SHAYON  
JOHN T. WINTERICH

## Two Levels of Logic

**T**HERE are two levels of logic on which the decision to resume atmospheric nuclear testing can be considered.

The first level is national and traditional. It derives its basic energy and vocabulary from the long and punishing record of international conflict. Weak nations were gobbled up by predatory nations. Aggression occurred when aggression was possible. Force could only be countered by greater force. Any military advantage had to be recognized and offset.

On this level of logic, the decision to resume atmospheric nuclear tests seems natural enough. The Soviet Union unilaterally broke the informal moratorium on atomic explosions. In so doing, it made substantial gains in its nuclear weaponry. It is possible that the Soviet was able to reduce the weight and package size of megaton explosives, thus making for increased efficiency of the delivery system. This in turn may have led to important advances in the development of missiles that could knock out other missiles before they reached their target. The United States suddenly found itself struggling to catch up. Hence the decision to open up another round.

Even on this traditional level of action and reaction, however, it would be a mistake to suppose that the resumption of nuclear tests will give the American people military security. We are attempting, for example, to devise a missile-destroying missile, but a counter-device already exists. Relatively inexpensive missile decoys can

be used to flood radar screens and clear the sky for the lethal messengers.

There is no point at which either side will feel militarily comfortable. If one side is behind, it will want to catch up. If it is ahead it will want to stay ahead. Up and up the competition in killing power will continue. Finally and inevitably, the strategical importance of hitting first will preoccupy the thoughts and fears of both sides.

Thus the self-defeating nature of the logic on the national and traditional level. For it compels each side to keep churning away on the military level, with a dead end for the mutual and ultimate destination. In the competition with the Russians, we are like two sprinters, each desperately determined to win. But the finish line is the edge of a steep cliff. Victory, such as it is, can only be observed on the way down.

Not only is there no way of freezing any military advantage on this level of logic. There is no way of keeping the danger from magnifying in all directions. The failure to achieve an effective ban on nuclear experimentation means that a dozen or so other nations, including Communist China, will be involved in the calculus of atomic power. If the American people have been nervous about the Soviet possession of nuclear weapons, they must prepare themselves for some sustained jitters when the atomic force becomes generally dispersed.

What to do? So long as our thinking is confined to the old level of the national and the traditional, we will discover that the only thing greater

than our power is our insecurity. We will find ourselves caught in the hideous dilemma of either standing still, giving a clear field to the other side, or trying to stay in front, with nothing but disaster as the final destination. But if we can emancipate ourselves from the old and unworkable logic, then important new prospects emerge.

**T**HIS brings us to the second level of logic on which important decisions governing our lives and our values can be made. Logic on this level is transcendent. It involves total perspective on the human situation. It requires a sense of ultimate responsibility to the condition of man on earth. It doesn't regard the individual nation as the highest good. The highest good is the preservation of those conditions that make life worth living for the generality of mankind.

If this level of logic could serve as the framework for our philosophy and our decisions, we would not allow ourselves to be exasperated or stymied by military thrusts of the Russians. We would recognize that our security depends not on the pursuit of force but on the control of force. We would mount a world campaign, putting the full communications skills of this country behind the effort to obtain maximum popular support and pressure for a structured and enforceable peace. We would make it clear that we would undertake no measure in our own interests that would run contrary to the human interest. We would seek to have atmospheric testing branded as a crime against the human community, which it is. We would recognize the right of other peoples to keep the air above their lands free of the radioactive poisons that could ultimately despoil their crops and rob their people of their health.

In short, we would accept the fact that something greater than military force must be created if this nation and its freedoms are to survive. This calls for specific ideas and knowledge about what a workable peace under law requires. It also calls for recognition of moral power and the reality of the power of moral response. But moral power requires moral stature. And this is where the problem really resides.

President Kennedy, responding to the Soviet offer for cooperation in the exploration of space, declared that when men venture beyond the earth they should leave their national differences behind. Right here on earth is the place to do something about national differences. Otherwise we may find that the astronauts will roam outer space in heavenly splendor with nothing but an atomic crematorium to look down upon and come back to. —N.C.

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## COMMON SENSE AND THE U.N.

I HAVE JUST had an opportunity to read Arthur Larson's article "Common Sense and the United Nations" [SR, Feb. 24].

While I do not entirely agree with all of his conclusions, I feel that it is the best summary for continued support of the United Nations which I have read anywhere.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

Washington, D.C.

I HAPPEN TO be one of those individuals who have not been too enthusiastic about foreign entanglements, et al. However, I want to congratulate SR for publishing the article by Arthur Larson. . . . I have just finished reading Mr. Larson's article, and I am going to go over it again. It may soften my opinion on some of the goings-on at the U.N.

ALVIN C. BOHM.

Edwardsville, Ill.

## INVESTMENT IN PEACE

THE CASE FOR purchasing U.N. bonds which was presented in the editorial "Success Costs Less Than Failure" [SR, Feb. 10] seems nearly irrefutable to me. I can only conclude that Congressional opponents either haven't considered these details or feel that \$100,000,000 for non-domestic purposes may be hard to sell the home folks—especially when it's not a gift or "our share" as reckoned by a head count.

It's tragic in the age of space shots and doomsday machines that our old nostalgia for isolation and rugged individualism makes even the most basic requirements for membership in a world family of nations so unpalatable to so many. Thank you for your courageous insistence that we devote our fortunes and energies to the best way we know of peacefully regulating a divided world. May such ideas prevail—before it's too late.

WALKER B. LOWMAN.

Columbus, O.

## FALSE STEP?

IN YOUR LANDMARKS OF MODERN ART [SR, Feb. 24] critic Katharine Kuh calls Alberto Giacometti's sculptured "Leg" an "unexpected member of the human body." What is unexpected about a leg? Almost everybody has two of them. This leg is unexpected in shape, I admit; only a mummy or a man dying of starvation could display such a leg. This "slender monument to loneliness" does not touch my heart. Would not one poor little isolated toe be a more impressive monument to loneliness?

L. F. HAWKINS.

New York, N.Y.

Mrs. KUH's critique of Giacometti's "Leg" is a pure parody of the pretentious bombast that has militated against the wider



"If three high school boys doing odd jobs after school earn twice as much as one high school teacher, how long will it be . . .?"

acceptance of good modern art. But Mrs. Kuh clearly does not intend it as parody; it is a solemn, windy tribute to her own sense of appreciation—and as phony as the "Leg" itself is pointless. A "monument to loneliness"? It is a monument to one critic's foolishness.

WILL GLICKMAN.

New York, N.Y.

THE SCULPTURE is a leg, but is the review a rib?

VIRGINIA KENNAN.

Charlottesville, Va.

BY TAKING MY words out of context L. F. Hawkins has distorted their meaning. I mentioned that as a rule Giacometti depends on the entire figure in his work, but that in this case he "allowed one unexpected member of a human body to act for the whole." If isolated hands by Dürer and Rodin can be expressive, why not a leg by Giacometti?

No, I did not intend to "rib" or "parody" this sculpture, which I find the antithesis of "pointless." History is full of jocular art comments that have boomeranged. Here are a few:

"Degas is nothing but a peeping Tom . . ."—*The Churchman*, 1886.

"Let us leave it to others to admire the monkeys à la Cezanne, painted with mud, not to say worse."—*La République Française*, 1905.

"Just try to explain to M. Renoir that the torso of a woman is not a mass of decomposing flesh. . . ."—Albert Wolff, 1874.

About Corot: "This black and mangled mass, would that be a tree?"—*Revue Nouvelle*, 1847.

About Rouault: "Behind the epileptic, one detects the fake."—Camille Maclair, 1930.

Perhaps, after all, it is better to err with "solemn, windy tributes."

KATHARINE KUH.

New York, N.Y.

## LIBERTY AND LICENSES

HERETOFORE, I HAD consistently regarded John Ciardi and his writings as completely stuffed shirt. Now, however, with his "Confessions of a Crackpot" [SR, Feb. 24], I am compelled to revise my opinion and say "excellent writing." I thank SR and John Ciardi.

EVERETT HOWELL.

Brownsville, Tex.

I HATE TO THINK what would happen to the country if everybody had John Ciardi's lack of respect for law and order. Licenses—such as for fishing, driving, and operating a ham radio—are necessary in a well-regulated society. We can all be thankful for what Mr. Ciardi sneeringly calls the Man of Reason.

E. C. ELLSWORTH.

Los Angeles, Calif.

WHAT THIS COUNTRY needs is a few more "crackpots" like John Ciardi.

ARTHUR P. MOODIE.

Seattle, Wash.