



Barry Goldwater—bloopers.

disastrous television appearance of January 5, 1964, on *Meet the Press*, where he showed a frightening ignorance of the powers of the Constitution, the Senate, and the Chief Executive, led even a friendly columnist to write: "They [the bloopers] represent, to some of the Senator's friends, an inattention to detail and an impreciseness of utterance that could be troublesome to his Presidential campaign." This was a prophetic sentence; in the campaign that followed (Mr. Novak's book closes with the nomination) Goldwater violated most of the precepts of American politics.

THE Rovere book is flawed, first of all, by the sense one has of having read much of it before—and one is jolly well right, too, because it turns out that most of it appeared before Election Day in *The New Yorker* and elsewhere. From *The Goldwater Caper* one also gets the uneasy feeling that Mr. Rovere automatically detests all Republicans, though there are a few exceptions, like Thomas H. Kuchel of California and Jacob Javits of New York, and that for him a Democrat can do no wrong. This sort of reporting is always suspect, whether from Left or Right. Rovere, alas, has fallen into the pit that A. J. Liebling fell into when he wrote about newspapers. Liebling developed a psychopathic dislike for the press, until finally it could do nothing right however hard it tried or however perfectly it reflected the human scene. Although Mr. Rovere's reports may have seemed sound as they appeared serially in *The New Yorker* (he can write, no question at all about that), the sour aftertaste of the partisan and malcontent is unavoidable when the items are read in toto. Suffering, as they do, lost topicality, columns like these ought to be left to the bound volumes of the distinguished magazines in which they first appeared.

SR/March 13, 1965

On Seeing and Believing

Education of Vision, Structure in Art and in Science, and The Nature and Art of Motion, edited by Gyorgy Kepes (Braziller. 233, 189, and 195 pp. \$12.50 each), initiate a new series designed to explore the relationship between vision and behavior and between art and science. August Hecksher was Special Consultant on the Arts to President John F. Kennedy.

By AUGUST HECKSCHER

WHAT we have here are three large and handsomely produced volumes, part of a series called "Vision and Value," edited by Professor Gyorgy Kepes of MIT, and representing to some extent a distillation of seminars that extended over fifteen years. A number of the papers and illustrations included result directly from the seminars; others were specially prepared for the published volumes. The seminars apparently had two different but related aims: to explore the nature of vision and its effect upon our ways of acting, thinking, and believing, and to explore the relationship between art and science. The approach, therefore, is interdisciplinary. Among the contributors to the enterprise are psychologists, philosophers, physicists, artists, art historians, educators, architects, planners, and designers.

Professor Kepes begins with a concern for the "deformed and dishonest environment" in which modern man lives. We are surrounded by what he calls the "second nature of our man-made environment," cut off from the natural guides that instinct and traditional values have given us. We have built badly, and we see imperfectly. "The appearances of things in our man-made world," he says, "no longer reveal their character: images imitate forms; forms cheat functions; functions are robbed of their natural sources emanating from human needs." The world that modern man has constructed, he adds, "by and large lacks sincerity and scale."

The results of this deformation are twofold. The first is that the eye does not see—and neither, for that matter, does the ear hear. To penetrate the confusion of forms and images is to begin to live once more. It is also to begin to create a more sensible and human environment, an act heretofore inhibited by

dulled sensibilities and obscured vision.

The first volume, *Education of Vision*, deals with such subjects as art education, visual education for science students, design and play (a fascinating essay by Paul Rand), and other problems and examples linking the efforts of scientist and artist to comprehend the nature and essence of the world.

For *Structure in Art and in Science* Professor Kepes once again provides an introduction, giving as much coherence as possible to the necessarily scattered essays that follow. The world has attained a new complexity and subtlety as man has penetrated below the surface of his environment, seeing it made up less of uniform and solid substances than of complicated organizations. The sense of structure within the physical world leads to new concepts of form within the human community and to new theories of the relation of structure to art and art to structure.

The third volume is in some ways the most lucid and interesting, concerned as it is with the "nature and art" of motion. The perception that we live in a universe composed, not of solid objects fixed in space, but of entities in motion and masses of energy, is at the bottom of much of modern man's unique vision—and also of much contemporary confusion. Where everything moves, everything tends to become blurred. Experience loses its clear outlines and sharp edges. Yet somehow modern man must learn to master motion, both in his scientific concepts and in everyday experiences. He cannot stand still; he must find meanings in the flux.

I remember motoring across the American West with two French teenagers. In the good European way they wanted to stop periodically and look at fixed objects in the landscape. They were continually disappointed by the results. I found myself explaining that the whole point of travel in America is to keep moving. If you stop there is nothing to see. But in the midst of motion there are meanings and endless delights: the sense of the road passing like a ribbon beneath one, the shifting perspectives of far-off mountains, clouds gathering and dissolving, the unfolding of the immense scale of the American landscape.

The meanings sought by individuals when confronted by the fact of ceaseless motion have been illuminated by art. Indeed, twentieth-century art can

be largely interpreted as an attempt by various means to come to terms with a universe that does not stand still. Sometimes in the contemporary world art itself moves, like Calder's; sometimes we move through the art, as in the wire sculpture of Lippold in the Pan American Building. Architecture today can be understood only if you keep on the go. If you stop you are lost: there is no façade, no single point of view from which the reality can be observed.

IN Professor Kepes's third volume these phenomena are explored. To single out only two of the essays, George Ricket does a beautifully revealing piece on the varieties of "kinetic art"; Donald Appleyard takes us through the sequences of space in the contemporary city.

In these volumes the similarities between artistic and scientific insights are not rigidly stressed. It is easy to oversimplify in this area, suggesting that abstract art has predicted and foreshadowed later discoveries of the physicists—that its obscure patterns unconsciously reflect what is to be seen under the microscope. Professor Kepes avoids this approach, merely suggesting that there is an affinity between the two worlds, and that an atmosphere can be created within which fresh perceptions and new ways of communication may be encouraged. His seminars have evidently accomplished this, and his books extend to a wider audience the sense of mutual hospitality.

The Cannibals

By Jascha Kessler

AND when the box was opened it was a wedding present brought by barbarous uncles—don't you remember the words, the old music, the dancing, the wine and cakes and good food, and how everyone kissed us?

And afterwards, when they left, when we were alone at last, poking through the gay ruins, late towards our first morning, when we were too tired to laugh, we found it in a corner, trembling in terrible fright?

And how we waited awhile wondering what it could mean, until the sun filled the room, giving us no other choice—don't you remember it now? how we threw ourselves down then, and how we killed it, and ate?

The Lure of Power by Terror

Lambs of Fire, by Pierre Gascar, translated from the French by Merloyd Lawrence (Braziller. 330 pp. \$5), searches out the various motivations of a number of Secret Army Organization terrorists and their Left-wing counterparts. Thomas Bishop is professor of French at New York University and president of the Alliance Française.

By THOMAS BISHOP

MUCH has been written about the complex and tragic events that have plagued France during the past dozen years, beginning with the Algerian war, the revolt of the generals, the crisis of May 13, 1958, the Secret Army Organization, and leading, finally, to the negotiated settlement and the "emigration" of hundreds of thousands of *pièdes noirs* to metropolitan France. The literature has so far consisted mainly of nonfiction accounts of these episodes, plus a few novels and plays devoted principally to the tortures and brutalities perpetrated in North Africa.

In *Lambs of Fire* Pierre Gascar adds a new dimension by transmuting political controversy into art. The subject of his taut and almost constantly exciting novel is the ultra-Right-wing Secret Army Organization's reign of terror. More precisely, it deals with a band of *plastiqueurs*, bent upon awakening a nation they deem complacent, and upon seizing power by means of bombs, blackmail, and murder. But if the author clearly sides against their terrorism, his book is nevertheless only superficially concerned with the political aims of the O.A.S. Gascar, a novelist of considerable talent, searches the minds of his characters in an effort to determine what makes twentieth-century men commit themselves so drastically and so totally to a cause that is ruthless without even being revolutionary, and which strikes down uninvolved, innocent men, women, and children.

Each of the characters represents a different answer to this question. Letellier, the society intellectual and leader of the small group, yearns for an epoch that is gone forever. Major Frochot, an "old school" army man, succeeds in rationalizing his betrayal of the military by convincing himself that it is the army that has betrayed France—the "real"



Pierre Gascar—controversy transmuted.

France, which he probably could not define but for which he has a gnawing nostalgia. Alain, the protagonist, a young activist of shaky political convictions, is committed not so much to the cause as to action itself as a means of proving himself, of being needed and depended upon, and of paying the world back for the extreme poverty of his youth. There are lesser but equally well-drawn characters who round out the spectrum of possibilities and give the novel a meaningful human dimension. Moreover, Gascar underlines his intention of depicting, not merely the motives of Rightist terrorists, but a facet inherent in the human condition, by setting alongside the O.A.S. band a Left-wing group which, in its eagerness to combat the potent threat to democratic institutions, resorts to many of the strong-arm tactics of the very people it detests.

Clearly, for Gascar extreme political activism has its roots in individual human problems and, conversely, represents a desperate means of self-expression for a wide variety of men. The human aspect of the problem is admirably incarnated in the tormented, introspective Alain and in the strange, quasi-mystical attraction he and his Leftist counterpart, Dandrieu, have for

SR/March 13, 1965