

necessity of national planning to cope with them. He forecasts a budget for 1980, with the GNP (gross national product) at \$1.3 trillion and Federal R & D at \$35 billion. (It is now about \$15 billion.) After deducting \$10 billion for R & D in arms control, he sets up targets for R & D in medicine, conservation, oceanography, space, atmospheric programs, etc. He would have a Continental Water Authority, a kind of super TVA "in which the run-off of precipitation is redirected by a system of engineered watersheds and waterways." It could be tied in with a system of national weather control.

But, says Dr. Lapp, never allow the scientists to run the show exclusively. He does not mention "Technocracy," but that ghost of the 1930s is what he fears.

The country is fortunate in having two such able scientists profoundly concerned with the impact of technology on the human condition. Both shy away from a government controlled by technocrats. Both see thermonuclear war as the outstanding threat, but with a formidable list of other problems raised by science close behind.

OUR authors have started the dialogue on a subject second to none in importance for the future of the race. They have started it not as theoreticians, but as active participants in Washington's corridors of power. Dr. Lapp gives an absorbing account of the Manhattan Project, beginning with Einstein's letter to President Roosevelt. He describes the Oppenheimer case, the great fall out controversy, and the shifting power plays that led to the test ban treaty. It might be mentioned that his regard for Admiral Lewis Strauss is not excessive.

My only reservation is that the dialogue should be expanded to include intensive R & D in the behavioral sciences, especially cultural anthropology and social psychology. How are we to plan for a great society without knowing more about human nature, as well as about the hydrologic cycle? The dialogue should also be expanded to include more about control of the population explosion, which, to my mind, is a danger second only to the thermonuclear explosion—and perhaps for the long run even more ominous.

Finally, I take a middle course in respect to scientists in politics. It is not important that many Congressmen should be Ph.D.'s, but I think it very important that every Congressman, and every political leader for that matter, should have a clear understanding of the scientific method. He should know how a scientist orders his thoughts, what is a demonstrated fact and what is a hypothesis, and how a scientist is always prepared to say, when the evidence comes in, "I was wrong."

SR/ July 17, 1965

Man and Dominion

Power and Human Destiny, by Herbert Rosinski (Praeger. 206 pp. \$5.95), deals with the effort to control environment, both natural and manmade. The most recent book by Michael Curtis, professor of political science at Rutgers University, is "Western European Integration."

By MICHAEL CURTIS

THE ELUSIVE concept of power has intrigued students of politics since the days of Aristotle. In recent years it has been explored from a variety of perspectives: sociological, philosophical, analytical, linguistic, military, by writers such as Harold Lasswell, George Catlin, Franz Neumann, C. Wright Mills, and Bertrand de Jouvenal. To the rapidly growing literature on the subject has now been added a troubled posthumous work by Herbert Rosinski, which has been edited and completed for publication by Richard Stebbins.

The thesis of Rosinski seems to have an improbable pedigree, by Teilhard de Chardin out of Hegel and Marx. Man is defined and differentiated from all other beings by virtue of his capacity to establish himself as an individual. History is a continual process of man's self-transformation and progressive self-liberation from the bondage of nature. Man's

search for freedom and for his own way of life is inevitably one for power over his environment. Power is not a limited phenomenon but an objective quality of all reality.

This universality of power was clearly recognized in earlier historical periods, which embodied it in natural phenomena, a multiplicity of gods, or a single god. In post-medieval times, discussion of power in mythico-religious terms was replaced by a naturalistic analysis largely limited to political and military institutions. This allowed the development of a view of a private sphere, devoid of power, in which the individual could act autonomously. The problem with which Rosinski is concerned is that modern man has forgotten that purely private activities, outside of political or military affairs, have also become a source of power that needs responsible recognition and control.

Rosinski paints with broad, sweeping strokes a portrait of history divided into three main eras during the last 10,000 years: the agricultural civilizations, the four post-medieval centuries, and the industrial civilizations. During the first era the four High Civilizations of Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, and India all left a distinctive mark. But while the two Eastern civilizations reduced man to a mere member of the universal order and prevented him from achieving a con-



"I'm amazed at how relaxed you can be, knowing the future and all that."

sciousness of his uniqueness, the Western civilizations, through the Judaeo-Christian tradition and Greco-Roman experience, provided the basis for his liberation. In the second period—characterized by secularism, the modern state, the separation of state and society, modern science, and the industrial revolution—the idea developed of the individual as a private person, but at the same time man became increasingly enmeshed in a world whose structure and relationships he no longer controlled. The sketch of modern industrial civilization is perfunctory, concentrating on the unprecedented degree of organization that extends throughout the intricate network of human activities, and the lack of coordination and harmonizing activities in the interests of society as a whole.

This is the Western European perspective of world history, permeated by a kind of historical inevitability from which the contingent and the unforeseen are absent. The difficulty with Rosinski's analysis is that it is cast in such broad categories, unrelated to concrete phenomena, events, or persons, that at any moment it might be controverted by an inconvenient fact.

Rosinski's work is sober and existential in substance, but without the despair of those who lovingly embrace the absurd. There is an urgency in the pleading for control over power and for the growth of a spirit of awareness and responsibility. Rosinski is concerned that man today is too little interested in mastery of his fate and too inclined to drift without any comprehensive understanding and control of his situation. This intellectual disorganization is best illustrated by contemporary views on war and peace and by the acquiescent acceptance of the precarious and uncertain current state of mutual deterrence or balance of terror. All nations, democratic, Communist, and newly independent alike, are, for different reasons, reluctant to deal with the problem of power.

The fact that Rosinski's analysis is not original, and that Walter Lippmann wrote in almost identical vein fifty years ago, does not diminish the cogency or significance of the argument, though it is not always as clearly expounded as one might wish. But unfortunately Rosinski's prescription for the correct way ahead is vague and inconclusive. We may agree that it is vital to perceive the unity of mankind amid the multiplicity and variety of civilizations; but the final hortatory plea that we reorient our education toward "the inculcation of a spirit of dynamic responsibility," resynthesize our knowledge, and recognize tension as the structural basis of all future existence, is singularly inadequate in its lack of precision and baffling by its lack of relationship to the major theme of control over power.

Descendants of Eve



Robert Graves—"the original champion of matriarchy."

***Mammon and the Black Goddess*, by Robert Graves (Doubleday. 165 pp. \$3.95), and *The Flight from Woman*, by Karl Stern (Farrar, Straus & Giroux. 310 pp. \$4.95), discuss the kind of femininity that is "Muse incarnate" and "nourishing and destroying divinity." Emile Capouya's essays and reviews appear regularly in SR.**

By EMILE CAPOUYA

LET US take a trivial instance. Thoreau says, "I had three pieces of limestone on my desk, but I was terrified to find that they required to be dusted daily, when the furniture of my mind was all undusted still, and I threw them out the window in disgust." That little episode presents a paradigm of a certain kind of male temperament. Thoreau felt that he had important work to perform, and for his purposes it was essential to travel light, to strip down to his fighting weight, even abandoning homely comforts and offending against the household pieties.

At the opposite pole is another familiar paradigm—that of the variety of female temperament whose important work requires the very objects that Thoreau rejects as superfluous, and for

whom the household is not merely a means but an end. Thoreau never married; he built a great book. If all were minded so, "threescore years would make the world away." By contrast, the femininity we are talking about is concerned with the survival of the race. Robert Graves and Karl Stern devote their very different books to that kind of femininity, one that takes the household mysteries as its point of departure but ends, theoretically at least, in a demi-godhead or more, a nourishing and destroying divinity, like the sea or the skull-festooned Kali.

Mark Twain speaks of the calm confidence of a Christian holding four aces. Mr. Graves shows a like certitude, that of a pagan worshipper of the Muse who has an excellent volume of poems to show anyone who might be tempted to doubt that he has enjoyed her favor. Mr. Graves tells us that the Muse is incarnated, from time to time, in this or that woman of flesh and blood, and that she is fickle by nature but still constrained to observe some of the decencies because of her dependence on the poet for worship. Now, here is a question of great theoretical interest. Is Mr. Graves right? Does the Muse ever *have* to care about her poet? Ronsard's famous sonnet predicts that she will marvel, in time to come, how *Ronsard me celebrait du*