

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 GIRON

General Editor
HALLOWELL BOWSER

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

A Challenge to Our Assumptions

EDITOR'S NOTE: *The author of this week's guest editorial is chairman of the Council on World Tensions, Inc., and former chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc.*

MAN'S problem of survival today is not a case of "we or they." Neither is the issue one of "win" or "not win." It is, rather, to realize that every system, every ideology, is going through turbulent, revolutionary change; that *they* as well as *we* are changing.

Once this realization is made, the fanatical states of mind induced by the cold war, and inflamed by suspicious contempt, mistrust, and even outright hatred, can be safely abandoned. For many of the things we feared about each other yesterday, and perhaps with some justification, simply are not true today.

Take, for example, the nineteenth-century picture of capitalism which Communists continue to project. This picture is of farmers and factory labor being exploited in order that capitalists might accumulate savings for investment in increased technological growth and production of more goods for more people. But modern capitalism has changed. Now the capitalist ideal is to make every man an owner. The free world is not bent on burying Communism; rather it would work for a condition wherein every government rests on the consent of the governed. Democracy in economic life is developing fast.

On the other hand, consider the picture of Communism that the free world continues to project. Farmers and factory labor are exploited in order that Communist states might accumulate savings for investment in increased technological growth and the production of more goods for more people. But modern Communism is also changing. The principle of government by consent of the governed is edging into the minds of Communist peoples.

All humanity, capitalist and Communist, white and colored, West and East, North and South, more developed and less developed, is moving forward into some new stage.

A billion Europeans, Middle Easterners, and North Americans have left behind old Scrooge's tyrannical kind of capitalism.

A billion Communists are moving away from tyrannical, totalitarian dictatorship toward a politics and economics consistent with the demands of the new science and engineering and of moral teachings.

Hundreds of millions of Indians have stepped out beyond colonialism.

Hundreds of millions of Chinese are striving to go beyond feudalism.

Hundreds of millions of Latin Americans are breaking the bonds of peonage.

The colored peoples, three-quarters of the human race, are climbing toward the goal of equality of opportunity.

Minds which busy themselves with "burying capitalism" or "destroying Communism" are blinded by precon-

ceptions. Much of the anticapitalist fanaticism in Communist lands, like the anti-Communist crusades in the open societies, is meaningless. The great concerns of our time now lie far deeper than the cold war. The changes which science and technology are bringing into all older systems, and the advanced positions toward which peoples are marching, make the cold war not only out of date, but dangerously deceptive. For the money, manpower, and energy demanded by negative efforts in a cold war could keep us from developing initiative and creative action, and from asserting leadership on the main streams of human change.

This change presents a real challenge to our past assumptions. As an American businessman, a former head of a major industrial corporation, I have held that business success depends on management's willingness to recognize change, to accept the principle of early obsolescence, and to embrace improved techniques. I have tried to think how this verified business philosophy applies to the West's political attitudes.

One thing is certain. It is hogwash when Khrushchev talks of conquering mankind. We must not let such boasts drive us to bankruptcy through armaments, nor immobilize our Department of State, making it incapable of new ideas. We are well aware of Khrushchev's reasoning. He made three points clear, writing in *Foreign Affairs* as long ago as October, 1959:

- (1) We are required to coexist. The alternative is mutual destruction, which neither system wants.
- (2) Peaceful coexistence should develop into peaceful competition for the purpose of satisfying man's needs in the best possible ways.
- (3) We must keep the positions of ideological struggle clear, but not by resorting to arms in order to prove that one is right.

We need not fear the implications of the third proposition. Lenin taught that Communism would make headway not by arms but by the force of example. *Pravda* repeats the confident prophecy that peaceful coexistence will afford opportunity to strengthen the Communist camp and lead to the simultaneous dissolution of the capitalist societies. They will try to penetrate by means of their ideas, as we are pushing our ideas. So what?

Are the West Germans embracing Communism when the Hammer and Sickle exhibits the example of building a wall to keep East Germans in the Communist paradise? Were the Asian and African participants in the United Nations's investigation of the Kremlin's example in Hungary convinced that

Communism is what they want in their nations? African leaders and students we for years been witnessing the Communist example as guests in Communist cities: why is there not a single really successful Communist party in Africa? Latin Americans have watched the confused Castro and seen the example of Communism in Cuba. Unless the privileged religious forces, the powerful military, and the wealthy élite in South America resist reasonable social changes, Communism will not be the wave of the future there. Canadians and Americans have watched the example of Communist countries for forty years; Communist gains in North America are as rare as cases of cholera. Communists will bury capitalism? Nonsense!

Indeed, there is no substantial evidence at all that the whole world will ever go Communist. The Communists have had no more success in converting mankind to their creed than the Jews experienced in getting the whole world to accept their presentation of a Universal Jehovah. Or than the Buddhists have had in persuading everybody to follow the Way of Buddha. Or, again, than the Christians have had in 2,000 years of proselytizing for their Savior. Or the Muslims, in their wish to conquer the whole world for Mohammed.

The nature of man is designed for cultural pluralism. We are becoming increasingly uniform in our science and morals, but increasingly diverse in experience, taste, intellectual opinions, artistic forms, and general ways of living.

Communism itself is in transition on this point. As science and technology revolutionize Communist societies, party commissars are being replaced by scientists, engineers, and factory managers. Politicians cannot run modern industrial plants, and politics is forced into second place as Communist societies become highly technological. Communist societies are to be with us for as far into the future as we can see, but Communist scientists are now asking metaphysical questions; Russian poets and writers are moving beyond Communist dialectical materialism; business men in Communist states are more interested in economic production and merchandising than in party theories; and youth in Russia and its satellites is exhibiting more interest in American jazz and the twist than in the fanatical cell-thinking of Lenin's era or the single-mindedness of Stalin's limited persuasions.

What would a modern businessman do about competition in a situation such as this?

First, he would concentrate on strengthening his own enterprise, main-

taining sound economic policies of expenditure relative to income, and improving his product. This means an affirmative, constructive program on America's part.

Second, he would be concerned with the living conditions of his market. Are the consumers faring well? The potential consumers of the ideas and goods this country is selling are largely the underdeveloped peoples of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. How can their purchasing power be raised? How can they be assured by the rich and the powerful of their countries that there is no truth in the statement, "the masses have nothing to lose but their chains"? If America, co-operating with the United Nations, fails to attend to the well-being of its logical customers, then Castros will crop up throughout the new non-aligned nations.

Third, the American businessman would keep in touch with his competitors through trade associations. If a competitor indulged in methods that were against the law of the land or the rules of the industry, he would see that the offender's behavior was arrested. On the international level this means that business sense dictates a need for world law, an effective World Court System, a United Nations safety police force, and regional Common Markets. Meanwhile, this country must be reasonably protected with a national defense force, while avoiding the disintegration of our society by overly burdensome taxes for the military.

Fourth, along with continuing research, training programs, development departments, and merchandising, a progressive business would woo the public interest, tactfully cultivate good will, and educate the people. Advertising is only one form making an impact on the public. Public service programs are another. Support of undertakings for the public good, and for the benefit of competitive enterprise, is still another. Cultivating all possible customers is a business rule that has vast implications for international relations.

In past ages nations sent out soldiers or marauders, peddlers or traders, missionaries or teachers. The peoples to whom they went knew little about them. There were no standards and few guarantees. But now the Telstar satellite, electronic voices, jet travel, modern merchandising, and everyland's tourism have created a science of people-without-people communication. Everybody tends to know about everybody else—what they eat, how they dress, things they make, money they earn, ways they play, ways they work, ways they pray, what they think, what they experience.

The American image is vivid in the minds of the whole world. And for the most part it is not ugly. The picture of America is Lincoln and emancipation, Jefferson and human rights, Henry Ford and inexpensive transport, workers earning wages that buy plenty, schools for every child, doctors for every sickness, food for every meal. America is government by consent of the governed, honest tax-paying, incorruptible political officers. America is music, poetry, and Wild-West sagas. America is the Statue of Liberty, the Declaration of Independence, the real Peoples' Revolution, the home of The United Nations. America is the best-known show-window for science and technology, bringing a high standard of living to everybody and fulfilling the dreams of man's spirit.

PEOPLE abroad know our faults and limitations, of course. They know that some of our values are cheap, some of our citizens phony. But we know what America can do to counterbalance this knowledge, and prove that human beings of every nation, race, and religion can live in one union of states, with liberty and justice for all. We know what America can say about the necessity to keep the range between the rich and the poor within reasonable limits, about the worth of every soul, endowed by the Creator with rights to think, speak, publish, and act in accord with one's interpretation of the facts. Let's say these things to the world.

These four business rules cannot result from negative, defense, "shelter" psychology. They flow from confidence, from thinking big, from having a positive mental attitude and a drive-straight-ahead operating dynamism. They justify optimism with regard to our present confusions and man's future needs.

That this is a time of dangerous, turbulent change we all know. That this is a fantastic, wonderfully promising era we all may believe. That world tensions will continue to challenge us, long after the present encounters are solved, we all may assume. Taking the dangers, the promises, and the tensions all together, should everybody get ready for nuclear war? On the contrary. The business outlook for moral growth, national development, human productivity, economic profits, freedom for leisure, and intellectual maturity were never as general as they are at this moment in history. We have the conditions for peace. Our dream now is for a new age of mankind, a new breed of interdependent nations. Let us work to make this dream a reality.

—HARRY A. BULLIS.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

JUSTICE UNDER LAW

A COMMON MISUNDERSTANDING of the difference to human freedom between rule of law and rule of men was expressed in the letter by Alexis C. Fern [SR, July 21]. Mr. Fern insists that since laws are not self-implementing and must be interpreted by men who disagree, there never has been "any other rule except of men."

It is true, as Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes once said, that the Constitution of the United States is what the Justices say it is. But this is an essential to rule of law, where men interpret and enforce laws that are made only by consent of the governed.

An important basic characteristic of rule of law is that, although there may be bad interpretations of laws and bad laws, there are the peaceful remedies of judicial appeal and legislative repeal or reformation that produce "justice under law" without cruel human conflict. In free societies under rule of law, wrong decisions generate peaceful corrective action. Under rule of men, wrong decisions lead only to whatever justice, if any, may reside in a tyrant's heart and mind, except, of course, as accumulated injustices inspire a people to overthrow the rule of tions of this grand country.

BYRL A. WHITNEY.

Kensington, Md.

TRAVEL AND HISTORY

HORACE SUTTON's "July People" [SR, Sept. 8] is the kind of article I keep on hand to give to a guest to keep her out of my kitchen while I prepare a luncheon or dinner. And it always works, as the saying goes.

Especially interesting are the historical notes. The trips he is making in our country now are to my way of thinking the very best thing to inform those who have never been taught about the early years in the Northeast and Atlantic sections of this grand country.

MRS. J. W. KESSLER.

Oakland, Calif.

DAMNATIONS

JOHN CIARDI's DIATRIBE against the young, "Prejudices and Damnations" [SR, Sept. 15], amused me, for ever since he started sounding off in *Saturday Review*, I have excused him on the grounds of his youth.

Give yourself a little time, Mr. Ciardi, and you will mellow as the rest of us have done.

DORIS M. COLE.

Syracuse, N.Y.

MR. CIARDI WOULD PERHAPS do well before entertaining us with another mindless discourse on the youth of today to consider the fact that Television, Transistor Radios, Sports Cars, the Mass Media, and



THROUGH HISTORY WITH J. WESLEY SMITH

"And in preparing for these seven lean years, your majesty, it just so happens that I have ample grain storage facilities now available for a modest consideration."

most of the other senseless machinery supposedly belonging to this "gold-plated" generation are the result of the perfidious tamperings of *his* generation.

DAVID M. HUBBARD.

Charlottesville, Va.

JOHN CIARDI has bewildered me and made me very angry at numerous times, and he is totally inconsistent. But, when he speaks truth, it is with no forked tongue. In the fewest words I have ever seen, he describes the moral values of the so-called modern generation: "They have no values but their silly group."

REV. THEODORE POPP.

Grafton, Mass.

... HE APPARENTLY THINKS there is nothing he or any parent can do about the situation but accept it with a sickly grin. But don't parents really have the upper hand if they *dare* to use it?

MRS. A. A. SINCLAIR.

Highland Park, Mich.

JOHN CIARDI, with whom I am at odds much more often than not, has brought me into his tent, at least momentarily. What he says about our effete youth seems to strike exactly where it hurts, even though I am compelled to remember that anyone past twenty takes a dim view of those younger than he. Cicero found the youth of his day a shambles, too.

ROBERT LABOUR.

Sand Lake, Mich.

... IF MR. CIARDI really believes that "youth is muscle and age is thought," he

should beware of expressing himself in such a juvenile and unthinking tirade. . . .

DAVID E. JOHNSON.

Annandale-on-Hudson, N.Y.

MR. CIARDI IS FORGETTING that an awful lot of these sick and puny products of progressive education are honest, hard-working, and respectful of their elders.

The percentage of those who are not is a figure obviously unavailable either to Mr. Ciardi or to anyone else. Perhaps closest to the truth is the fact that among the sit-ins and freedom riders there is a far larger segment of youth than of persons from any other age group.

EUGENE G. EPSTEIN.

Philadelphia, Pa.

EX POST FACTO

MAY I CALL YOUR ATTENTION to three small mistakes in price, title, and publication date in the splendid review by Granville Hicks of "Mark Twain," by Henry Nash Smith [SR, Sept. 29]. The price of the book is actually \$4.75, not \$5.50 as listed. The subtitle is "The Development of a Writer," rather than "The Making of a Writer," and the actual publication date is October 15.

Working from proof instead of finished books, Mr. Hicks would have had no way of making these corrections, but I know they will be of importance to your readers whom he has interested.

MARK SAXTON,

Promotion Manager,

Harvard University Press.

Cambridge, Mass.