VOLUME XXVI, NO. 46
NOVEMBER 14, 1973

THE FABRIC OF SOCIAL LIFE

IF YOU soak for a while in accounts of the lives and works of William Morris and Eric Gill—two men who longed for the transformation of culture, and who lived what they preached—the pointlessness of elaborate planning becomes increasingly evident. Logical demonstrations of what "ought to be" are easy enough to put together; and as Ferdinand Mount suggests in *The Theatre of Politics,* the more sweepingly comprehensive an ideology, the more satisfactory it may seem to those who are eager for one great solution to all problems. Yet the wisest of planners are the most cautious in preparing final blueprints, knowing that each step of human development creates new ranges of possibility, opening the way to alternatives that had not even been thought of until then.

A symposium on "Democracy, Socialism—and Gandhi" in *Gandhi Marg* for last July is of interest in this connection. One contributor, J. B. Kripalani, maintains that the basic economic and social problems of India—the poverty and unemployment of the masses—were not changed or even much diminished by the transfer of power to Indian hands in 1947. The policies and programs of the Indian National Congress Party to meet these conditions had been laid down by Gandhi, but after independence had been achieved, they were not applied. Mr. Kripalani gives this explanation:

> It was because Congress politicians in general did not understand Gandhi's comprehensive plans and programs. The socialists of those days described Gandhi as a reactionary, a friend of the capitalists and, therefore, of the imperialists. The more charitable among them afterwards described him as a revivalist. Leaving aside the socialists, the Swarajists could not understand him either. Even leading Congressmen failed in this respect. Jawaharlal [Nehru] ridiculed spinning as an "old dame's work."

Mr. Kripalani quotes a letter by Nehru to Gandhi, written in 1928 in which he expressed disagreement with what Gandhi had said in *Indian Home Rule (Hind Swaraj,* 1908) and he showed little faith in the khadi program. Nehru wrote:

> . . . you gave some newspaper cuttings from America about crime and immorality and contrasted American civilization with India. I felt it was something like Catherine Mayo's drawing conclusions from some unsavoury hospital statistics. . . . You have stated somewhere that India has nothing to learn from the West and that she reached a pinnacle of wisdom in the past. I entirely disagree with this viewpoint and I neither think that the so-called Rama Raj was very good in the past nor do I want it back. . . . You do not say a word against the semi-feudal zamindari system . . . or against capitalist exploitation of both the workers and consumers.

While Nehru admired and respected Gandhi, perhaps loved him, that was his view of Gandhi's opinions, Kripalani says, and other Indian intellectuals felt the same way. Interested almost exclusively in putting an end to the foreign rule of India, the Congressmen supported Gandhi, one could say, in order to hold his "dynamic political leadership in the freedom fight." But they did not share his views on the longterm task of Indian regeneration. Gandhi probably knew this—even that he was "used"—but he worked, as Kripalani says, "with the material he had."

What, then, were Gandhi's ideas about reconstruction after independence? Mr. Kripalani writes:

> In order to understand this it is necessary to study the method of Gandhi's work. He was not an academician. He was not a theoretician. He did not work out his plans and programs in a library. He did not write learned theses about them. He tackled factual problems confronting the country and its people, in a practical and pragmatic manner. Theory was arrived at as a consequence of results obtained. It did not precede practice and experiment.

> For instance, 80 per cent of the Indian masses live in villages on agriculture, with the land divided into small holdings. Mills and factories could not be established under foreign rule. Even if they could, they would not have provided work for the millions of unemployed and the semi-employed. They had to be provided with work in the villages, to supplement their meagre earnings from their tiny plots of land. What could be a more convenient instrument of production for them than the charkha [spinning wheel]? It has no preconceived theory to support it!

Yet Gandhi was nonetheless a deep thinker, by no means devoid of theory or ignorant of the dynamics of social process and the laws of human growth. He was not understood because his thinking had transcendental rather than sociological roots. His vision was essentially moral, looking to what natural social consequences would result, instead of a social vision with, hopefully, some moral consequences. (Some years ago MANAS printed a series of four articles [Aug. 15-Sept. 5, 1962] titled "Gandhi's View of Man and History," by Raghavan H. Iyer, showing the profound moral philosophy that underlies his thought and writing, and it happens that this material is now available as a portion of Dr. Iyer's book, *The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, published last month by Oxford University Press in the United States [200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016] There will also be an Indian O.U.P. edition.)

Mr. Kripalani continues:

> Political problems too were to be tackled factually. The old panchayat system had provided effective local self-government to the villagers. It had almost been destroyed by the centralized foreign government; yet its traditions were alive. The ignorant masses, knowing their own needs, could work it. On this Panchayat Raj as the base was to be built the all-India structure of democracy. Gandhi wanted to build from below upwards not from the top to the base. In social matters, too, Gandhi was pragmatic. Unless there was Hindu-Muslim unity, he prophetically said that rivers of blood would flow, as they have been flowing even after independence. Untouchability is a great and festering wound in the body politic. Its removal would also remove the caste-system among the Hindus.
>
> So also, other problems in India were tackled by Gandhi on practical and pragmatic bases. Every scheme of reform was based on the existing condition. There was no preconceived theory of socialism or any other issue behind any of his schemes.
>
> The only basic principles he pointed to were truth and nonviolence. And it is on these that democracy is based. These virtues are also necessary for international peace.

In Gandhi's view a truly democratic society meant the achievement of social discipline by individuals, since "rights flow from duties fulfilled."

Mr. Kripalani concludes:

> From the above it will be seen that Gandhi in working for the removal of poverty did not think in terms of an undefined and undefinable "socialism." His ideas about democracy implied the social individual. We call him the Father of the Nation. Why? Because he knew the pulse of the nation and its requirements more than any other past or present leader. In the reforms he advocated, he had indicated pioneer work under the handicaps of foreign rule. He expected his pioneer efforts to be pushed forward and to cover the country after Swaraj. To the extent that we have failed in this, we have been unable to solve the national problems a quarter of a century after independence.

Why, one wonders, did Gandhi continue to work with the Congress Party after it became evident that few of even its leaders shared the vision later recorded in *India of my Dreams?* Speculating, we might say that now and then there come great moments in history when the outer struggle of men to obtain freedom and justice has natural correspondences with the inner struggle for moral freedom and to know the truth—and that, when these correspondences become evident, a devoted and highly intuitive man may work for a portion of mankind *at both levels*, serving both in common cause for as long as the synthesis of objectives can be made to prevail. All people feel the preternatural strength in such a leader; they feel uplifted by participation in his vision, and may even rise to heroism from his example, if only for a time. Thus images of greatness are imprinted on

the national or cultural memory. No matter how denatured by ritualization or dimmed by clamoring self-interest, something of this past greatness remains, engraved on the collective *psyche* of the people. There are sleeping resonances in their inner lives which may be made to sound again, in some future confrontation. And there are those who, better remembering the splendors once made manifest in ordinary men, and knowing that they are timeless, work together in small nuclei, keeping alive a spirit which has become more than a memory. As human efforts are presently evaluated, their work may seem slight in effect, their achievements marred by limitation. But there are authenticities and a faithfulness in what they do that count for more than the showings of any external measure.

Writing in MANAS for July 6, 1966, Anadi Naik gave an account of Gandhi's way of "planning" and what happened to the enterprise he began:

> In the thirties Gandhi had chalked out a specific plan for the development of rural India. In those days he demanded a group of 700,000 young people—one for each village—who would devote their time and energy to the uplift of the village people, keeping themselves aloof from power politics. Many young men came forward, but not enough. Gandhi, no doubt, had a great hope for the National Congress, but the Congress was a political front. Most of the leaders of the political parties which mushroomed in free India had been in the National Congress. These vocal people, who once had inspired the lethargic masses with the vision of freedom, now had different objects in view. Except for a few, they had been power-seekers who recognized in Gandhi the man to serve their purpose—in other words, to give them freedom; so they followed him. But when the goal was achieved, they deserted him in a very subtle way. Gandhi had anticipated this, and while disappointed, was not surprised. In the early thirties, when the constructive workers united to form the Gandhi Seva Sangha within the National Congress, some party leaders objected; the Sangha, they said, was distracting the minds of the people from the main objective of independence. The Sangha was concentrating on spinning, village sanitation, community prayer, basic education, eradication of untouchability, treatment of lepers, and development of cattle, etc. At that time it was impossible to convince those leaders that the constructive program was the program that would enable them to achieve their political goal in reality—since political freedom might turn out to be comparatively less important than overcoming the apathy of the people.
>
> So, the Sangha was dissolved. But in his address to its last meeting, Gandhi instructed its members to remain active, he said that although the Sangha as a group was dissolved, each worker committed to its cause should stand erect and consider himself a Sangha. Gandhi exhorted them to stay out of power politics and they did so. They carried on their activities in their ashrams (shrines). The masses of India could not see the meaning of this occurrence, in those days. For the villagers, those who wore handspun and hand-woven clothes were workers in the "Congress party." But after Gandhi's death, the difference between the people in power and the people who lived in ashrams became obvious. It was realized that the National Congress, in spite of its historic background, no longer had revolutionary zeal and no longer represented the true voice of the nation. It had become "the organization of a power-loving group," i.e., a party.

For a time the constructive workers lacked orientation, but in a few years Vinoba Bhave's Land Gift movement gave fresh focus to the energies of the Gandhians, and this movement now continues, still having Vinoba's inspiration and the leadership of Jayaprakash Narayan. Its work is accomplished with a minimum of organization, since organization has never been an important part of any of the enterprises which originated with Gandhi.

We started out in this discussion by speaking of William Morris and Eric Gill. Both were "constructive workers." Morris seems more contemporary every day, in terms of his decentralist conceptions and craftsman's social ideals, while the intensity of Gill's life, even in his early years, became evident in Herbert Read's brief appreciation of him. It gains little to read such men, or about them, with the intention of classifying them in some way or other. You could say, agreeing with one of his biographers, that Gill had little historical sense; or, as others have observed, that his Catholicism was in curious

contrast to his deep social convictions. And you could say that Morris imagined that all men could live as country gentlemen, practicing the crafts and "expressing themselves," when any such notion, as a remedy for the massive social problems of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, was romantic in the extreme. But such comments, conventionally obvious enough, don't have much relevance if you turn to the incommensurable aspects of either one of these men. Take for example the seriousness of Eric Gill in his late teens. His first job was a low-paying apprenticeship in the architectural office of W. H. Caroe, who served the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in London. This was in the 1890s. There he readily absorbed from a fellow apprentice the idea that architecture was more a matter of building than of style, and that good architecture depended upon what you really thought about ultimate questions, and how you lived, rather than skill in drawing plans. In those days, Gill "was fascinated by H. G. Wells and hypnotized by *Omar Khayyam."* In his *Life of Eric Gill* (P. J. Kenedy, 1966), Robert Speaight relates:

> For several months on end he read *Sartor Resartus* at breakfast. He devoured the sixpenny tracts of the Rationalist Press Association and the rather more respectable brochures of the Fabian Society. He discovered *Unto This Last* (by Ruskin, which Gandhi later translated into Gujarati, titling it *Sarvodaya* (Welfare of All)], and *The Seven Lamps of Architecture,* which he possessed in a first edition. He called himself a Socialist and sported a flowing red tie and red socks. He had seen the ugliness of capitalist-industrialism and, although he had little experience of factory-hands, he deduced their degradation from the objects they were compelled to produce. He was less concerned with the indifference of the rich and the unhappiness of the poor than with the status of the workers; less concerned with how much money they got, or ought to get, than with the work they did or ought to do. . . . He had immediately to decide whether the profession of architect was one that he could honestly pursue—and he concluded that it was not. . . . Rather than be a designer at his desk he would prefer to be a workman at his bench. He would dignify his own status even if he could not dignify other people's.

So, he took a course in lettering and learned how to cut letters in stone, which became his trade or calling. This, eventually, led to stone carving, and by the time he died Gill was accounted a distinguished sculptor who worked directly in stone. He also became a typographic designer, beginning, in 1904, with drawing the titles and headings for a twenty-one volume edition of the German Classics. His perfectionist habits fitted him to teach monumental masonry and lettering for stonemasons by 1905. He married in that year, and was very busy teaching, carving, lettering, and designing typographic treatments. He also became a versatile calligrapher. Robert Speaight opens a window into Gill's life in the early days:

> He went to the meetings of the Art Workers Guild, listening to J. W. Mackail talk on William Morris, or Rothenstein on Hogarth. He lectured to their junior branch himself on inscriptions. At the same time he was feeling his hand at wood engraving. It was a period of intense and varied activity, during which his Fabian associations grew closer. He heard Shaw speak on Socialism and Art, and was a member of the special committee set up to report on this subject. "I am heart and soul for the Special Committee," he wrote in his diary. He also wrote a pamphlet in support of the Labour candidates at the Borough elections. There was a second visit to *Captain Brassbound;* he saw *You Never Can Tell* with Johnson, and *Man and Superman* with his sister Gladys, and heard Harley Granville-Barker read Gilbert Murray's translation of *Trojan Women* at Kensington Town Hall. In the evenings, when he was not otherwise occupied, he amused himself with photography; and sometimes, during the day, Edward Johnson read Plato to him and Ethel in the workshop.

Not yet a convert to Catholicism, his views (in 1911) of the Church of England were those of a radically religious man:

> We live in the middle of a chaos and at present the only forces making for order are purely materialistic—therefore doomed. England will never obtain salvation by Act of Parliament. What are the churches doing? may be asked. So far as I can see they are confining themselves to district visiting and such like. Otherwise they take their cue from the politicians. You will find parsons who are Tariff Reformers and those who are the other thing. There

> are Socialist parsons and Tory and Radical ditto. There are parsons who support the House of Lords and there are those who don't—but so far as I can make out, there is not a parson in the land who realizes it is the parson's business to take his cue from the Church and not vice versa. You will agree that this is the inevitable result of the Reformation—whereat the Church became subordinate to the State and hence these tears—but what's to be done now?

Eric Gill seems to have needed "rules" and an established spiritual authority, hence his conversion to the Roman Church. Yet he remained a thorn in the side of every orthodoxy, especially his own, and if one pauses in rational criticism of his beliefs, or of his inconsistencies, there is a certain magnificence in the way he practiced what he believed. The book we have been using here—by a co-religionist of Gill's—is heavy on the side of Gill's religious associations, and for relief the reader may turn to the free air of Read's essay, in *A Coat of Many Colors*. But the point of considering him lies in the integrities that emerged in his youth and grew to maturity in him without faltering, given the limitations that are plain enough. Throughout his life Gill made interesting moral distinctions, as in the one between commerce, which he saw as necessary, and commercial*ism*, which is not. Toward the end of his life, he reluctantly resigned himself to a balance between industrialism and the craft productions of which he was the master:

> Eric had now ceased to expect the conversion, or the collapse of industrialism. He accepted the two worlds—the world of machines and machine-minders, and the world of men—living side by side; all he expected—though even here his expectations did not run very high—was that each would produce works which were proper to them—"industrialism becoming more strictly and nobly utilitarian as it recognizes its inherent limitations, and the world of human labour, ceasing any longer to compete with it, becoming more strictly and soberly humane."

All through his life of hard work and immense productiveness, Eric Gill gave out opinions, judgments, justifications, grounded in the intensity that was characteristic of the man. The world was a messy, ugly place, and he did what he could to improve it, in both form and moral quality, by living a life that seemed best to him. He had great difficulty with the doctrine of Original Sin, and embarrassed cardinals and bishops by his seldom restrained candor. He left objects of surpassing beauty, not the least of which is the typeface Perpetua, known to everyone who has had to do with fine book-making or good printing. Perhaps the tribute of a sculptor who learned from him best conveys what he accomplished. David Jones—

> pointed out that in a world devoid of culture Eric worked "as though a culture of some sort existed or, at all events . . . as though one should, and could, make such a culture exist." Because of the man he was, his carvings sometimes look like the products of a culture that was living and authentic.

Such men exert a transforming influence on their times, extending invitation to deeper influences from perhaps better or wiser, or more universal men, by reason of the fundamental decencies they add to the world.

REVIEW
THE POSSIBILITIES OF HUMAN NATURE

IT is almost a certainty that more use of the work of A. H. Maslow has been made in these pages than that of any other thinker. A MANAS reviewer first came across Maslow in 1956 through a reference to his idea of the self-actualizing individual in an article by S. I. Hayakawa in *Etc.* In 1957 *Motivation and Personality* was reviewed in March, and later in the year note was taken of his contribution to the Conference on New Knowledge in Human Values, sponsored by Pitirim Sorokin's Research Society for Creative Altruism. In this paper, Maslow spoke of the climax of self-actualization as a peak experience, calling such occasions "transient states of absolute being." Rejecting the theological notion that heaven lies at the end of the path of life, he said: "Heaven, so to speak, lies waiting for us throughout life, ready to step into for a time and to enjoy before we have to come back to our ordinary life of striving." Then, in 1958, the editors began seeking out Maslow's work and obtained permission to reprint (in two parts) "The Mission of the Psychologist," his contribution to a volume on psychological frontiers. This paper made it completely evident that here was something entirely new in the world of modern psychology. It contained the statement and elaboration of fourteen fundamental points or theses concerning what psychology ought to become and do. We quote two of these requirements:

> 10. Psychology should study the human being not just as passive clay, helplessly acted upon by outside forces, and determined by them alone. He is (or should be) an active, autonomous, self-governing mover, chooser and center of his own life.
>
> 14. Finally, as we get to know more about what the person legitimately wants and needs for his growth and self-fulfillment, i.e., for psychological health, then we should set ourselves the task of creating the health-fostering culture.

From then on MANAS continued to find in Maslow's work a consistent and growing inspiration, and in some respects an ideal embodiment of the objectives of MANAS. The editors got to know his writings rather well, although no systematic study of them was attempted. They kept close track of his papers and books, as they came out, making repeated use of them in various places in the magazine.

We have given this brief account of the part played by Dr. Maslow in the development of MANAS as a means of explaining why we find so much to enjoy and appreciate in Richard J. Lowry's *A. H. Maslow: An Intellectual Portrait*, published this year at $5.95 by Brooks/Cole, Monterey, Calif. Mr. Lowry, who knew Maslow at Brandeis, as his student, has managed to isolate and select from the entirety of this prolific psychologist's writings the ideas which are a key to his development, showing in Maslow's words the themes which animated his thought at the beginning of his career, then tracing their refinement and increasingly explicit articulation through the years, to what may be regarded as final expressions and conclusions. While all readers who are acquainted with Maslow's general conceptions will value this book, those who have read in him extensively will take particular pleasure in Mr. Lowry's perceptive study of the course of what may fairly be called a one-man revolution in the science of psychology. Since he is also editor of other works relating to Maslow, Lowry is familiar enough with the material to provide the readers with a distillation of his thinking. He does this in eighty pages, adding, as a long appendix, Maslow's "Good Human Beings Notebook" (to which attention was given in MANAS for Sept. 19).

The first focus for Maslow's boundless intellectual energy and enthusiasm for knowledge came with a reading of Sumner's *Folkways*, which early established for him the fact of cultural differences and planted seeds of anthropological interest that served him well throughout his life.

What seemed to him the simple clarity of Behaviorism had at first a similar impact, although the rich humanness of his own children, then babies, soon made him see the limitations of Watson's theories—strictly for the laboratory, he said, and "useless at home with your kids and wife and friends." Pressing him on to his destiny as an innovating and reforming *philosophical* psychologist was a driving "passion for ethics, utopianism, Messianism, the prophetic thundering," as he said of himself years later. What were intuitive insights in his early years became the postulates of more developed psychological theories and doctrines later on. We owe Mr. Lowry much for finding these pithy utterances, which seem to have come to Maslow out of the blue, and for which he sought scientific foundations, working to relate them to Being dynamics through experiment and close observation of the best human specimens he could find.

He said in an undergraduate paper written in 1929 or 1930:

> The most superficial observation of facts serves to impress upon me overwhelmingly that we are not at home here (in the world). . . . We are strangers, we are guests . . . (some persons believe) that the world was made for us. I should rather say that we were made for the world. . . . To consider only mankind is fallacious. Mankind, it must be clearly borne in mind, is a result of the existence of the world and not its cause.

Men, he believed, have a work to do in the world, and he applied this idea most of all to himself.

His misconceived attack on Emerson, also an undergraduate production, was an important clue, since it revealed his deep opposition to any "outside" deity or heavenly manipulator, or even source of the excellences of life. Yet Maslow's attack on externalizing religious ideas, his confirmed "atheism," and his restive impatience with any doctrine that denigrated human potentiality, is only one side of his thinking, since he became absolutely convinced that there were profound truths behind religion, and a "naturalistic spirituality" might identify his fully expressed point of view, although a science that did not disdain the reality of the sacred, but could recognize it everywhere, would be fundamental to Maslow's ideal naturalism. It should be added that Maslow would have none of a God-idea which had a reductive effect on the idea of man. He never willingly used the word "God" to represent elements in his own thought, but might be thought of as an unlabeled pantheist who saw the greatest promise of the deific essence in the possibilities of man. He wrote in his journal in 1960:

> Just finished C. S. Lewis' *The Four Loves*, and it's still true that I get more out of the theologians than I do out of most psychologists. . . . Hard struggle to translate it naturalistically, but when I do it makes sense. . . . Of course, he winds up with God—but what of the god within the person who serves the same function?

This idea of the promise of "wonderful possibilities and inscrutable depths" in mankind was a part, the essential part, of Maslow's thinking when he was twenty years old. He couldn't stomach the idea of original sin (it seems likely that no one rich in human health and creativity can). In 1938 he was like the ideal Socratic disciple of the Theætetus, swelling with a great pregnancy of ideas: "the picture I have now is such a vague one, but with such intimations of immortality, with such great flashes of hope playing around it, that I have the feeling we're on the edge of a great human revolution."

It is necessary to read this book and some of those by Maslow—say, *Toward a Psychology of Being* and *Motivation and Personality*—to avoid supposing that he was only dreamy about these things. They *are* visionary conceptions, but Maslow made strenuous efforts to verify their reality by the continuous study of people, especially "good human beings," since he felt that the normative for man could and should be discovered in the thinking and behavior of the best people that can be found. Such studies, begun with eminent persons he knew, and continued with

students who were accessible to him at Brandeis, led to the formulation of the hierarchy of motives, which he divided into Deficiency needs—the requirements for staying alive and keeping the body in good health—and Being needs, which are ethical and moral requirements, recognized as paramount for those who think of their lives as essentially enterprises in value fulfillment. The self-actualizing people are humans who make manifest the best values which are potentially in them. These values are potential, Maslow was sure, in all human beings, but not all human beings give them expression. Failure to actualize in this way was Maslow's conception of psychological or human sickness. A note in his journal shows the kind of thought which was running through his mind when working on the development of the idea of self-actualization:

> I meant to write and publish a self-actualization critique, but somehow never did. Now I think I know why. I think I had a hidden, unconscious criterion of selection *beyond* health. Why did I get so excited over Arthur Morgan, just from reading his book—so sure he was a self-actualizing person? It's because he was using the B-language! What I've done was to pick B-people! In addition to all the overt and conscious criteria. People in the B-realm using B-language, the awakened, the illuminated, the "high plateau" people who normally B-cognize and who have the B-values very firmly and actively in hand.

Maslow was able to understand why he "got" so much from certain theologians when he came to the conclusion that there were those who, in the past, when they used the term "God," didn't mean a Big Person but a metaphysical principle. This made them worth "translating" into Maslow's way of using the B-language.

Rare psychological aperçus are scattered throughout Lowry's book, such as the observation that sick people almost always have a distorted view of health, so that non-actualizers tend to caricature the idea of the self-actualizing person, an unreal projection of an unreal ideal. Again, seeing things whole requires health, even "caring," since alienating feelings close off holistic perception. Maslow found that the self-actualizers were as a rule very reticent about their inner life—so much so that he began to suspect anyone who easily cooperated with his inquiries! He felt the same need for privacy in respect to his own inner life. "I *still* find myself somewhat embarrassed to talk about my own experiences, and rarely do," he said in 1964.

A statement about religion which applies pre-eminently to Maslow himself appears in *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences.* The scientist must learn to learn that the religious questions are real, even though he disagrees with the answers given by organized religions. Religious yearnings and needs are rooted deep in human nature and "they can be studied, described, and examined in a scientific way." This may have been said before, but what is fresh and new is Maslow's way of studying them. Lowry says:

> Basic to Maslow's understanding of religion was the idea that "the very beginning, the intrinsic core, the essence, the universal nucleus of every known high religion . . . has been the private, lonely, personal illumination, revelation, or ecstasy of some acutely sensitive prophet or seer." Thus did all religions begin, he thought, and thus too did they all begin with approximately the same content, the same message about the nature of reality. It is, however, "very likely, indeed, almost certain, that these older reports, phrased in terms of supernatural revelation, were, in fact, perfectly natural, human peak-experiences of the kind that can easily be examined today which, however, were phrased in terms of whatever conceptual cultural, and linguistic framework the particular seer had available in his time." It is also the case that these initial revelations became, in the course of time, institutionalized, codified, and therefore even further corrupted (that is, supernaturalized).

Maslow contended that a low opinion of human beings required an outside god for balance. "The worse man is, . . . the more necessary becomes a god." From this it follows that decline in belief in the supernatural ought to lead to "increasing faith in the higher possibilities of human nature." Maslow made it the business of his life to present evidence in support of that faith.

COMMENTARY
"WE ARE TOO POOR"

THE integrity of Eric Gill as man and artist showed itself in the grain of his life. After the first world war, for example, he was given a commission to do some war memorials. But when he learned that architects were to "design" the memorials, Gill objected. Such decisions, he maintained, belonged to the sculptor or stonemason. Architects might advise, but the design of either memorials or headstones should reflect the individual and regional taste of the artisans who do the work. "Eric thought it appalling hypocrisy to erect crosses and altars to the dead," under the pretense that "we are a Christian empire," and then, under the cloak of culture, "to deny to the mourners even the unfettered choice of words." Inscriptions should express the feelings of the people, and anything else was "worthy of 'the Prussian or the Ptolemy'." Gill attacked the factory system because it "robbed the workman of responsibility," and because it "specified and subdivided his work." Even profit-sharing and combined management would not remedy loss of responsibility and destruction of the personal relationship between him who buys and him who sells.

Usually, when the same man is mentioned in two articles in the same issue of MANAS, it is a coincidence, but not this week. Our "Children" article on Morris was deliberately planned because Eric Gill claimed the lion's share of attention in the lead. To what is said in "Children," we add an outcry by Morris toward the end of his life:

> We are too poor to have pleasant green fields and breezy moorland instead of these dreadful deserts that surround us: too poor to have rational, properly planned cities, and beautiful houses fit for honest men to live in. . . . too poor to pull down our prisons and workhouses and to build fair halls and public buildings on their sites for the pleasure of the citizens: too poor above all things to give opportunity to everyone to do the work which he can do best and therefore with pleasure in the doing of it. . . .
>
> Shall man go on generation after generation gaining fresh command over the powers of nature, gaining more and more luxurious appliances for the comfort of the body, yet generation after generation losing some portion of his natural senses: that is, of his life and soul? . . . Consider what it means; loss of the sense of beauty. . . think of a race of men whose eyes are only of use to serve them to carry food to their mouths without spilling it!

What sort of education makes it possible for people to see, feel, think, and speak in this way; that will not shut out such feelings and perceptions with preoccupations that either sentimentalize or brutalize life?

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
A USEFUL LIFE

IT is desirable to have frequent reminders of the irrelevance of schooling (as we understand and practice it) to the awakenings and fiery processes in which authentic education consists. The reading of biography soon makes this plain. Again and again, you come across revealing statements. In Paul Thompson's *The Work of William Morris* (Viking, 1967), Morris is quoted as saying: "As far as my school instruction went, I think I may fairly say I learned next to nothing there, for indeed next to nothing was taught." His years at Marlborough College did set him on the path toward becoming a High Church clergyman (the music was lovely), but he soon gave this up for architecture. As Thompson says:

> For the rest, he continued to teach himself. In the school library he found a good collection of books on archaeology and gothic architecture. He spent ample free time on long walks, muttering romantic stories of knights and magic to himself, in the beautiful surrounding countryside.

He needed a tutor to get himself ready for Oxford, but there, in Exeter College, he was bitterly disappointed. The tutors seemed bored and indifferent and teaching was by lecturing to classes. Yet he found new life at Oxford in the close and lasting friendship he formed with Edward Burne-Jones. A small nucleus was established, and while mainly religious in the beginning, these ardent young men turned toward Christian Socialism as time went on. Morris read Carlyle and Ruskin and began to discover the good side of the social life of the middle ages—it was "a coherent way of life with a sound understanding of social duties, and their art was the expression of the free and happy life of their craftsmen." Recognizing that monastic life would be pure escapism, Morris joined with other members of the group to take up secular writing, poetry, social problems, Factory Acts and sanitation. Morris had an income which lasted for a while and after leaving Oxford he used it to support a magazine which survived for about a year. Through Burne-Jones, who was studying with him, Morris met Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and under his influence Morris became a painter of some ability. But Morris felt that his real talent lay in decoration and design.

By now other painters had joined the group of friends, and Swinburne, too, who admired Morris's early poetry. His first published collection of poems, *The Defence of Guenevere*, won no praise from the critics, except for Robert Browning, who said that they were "the only new poems to my mind since there's no telling when." He had been working as an apprentice architect for George Street, a Gothic revivalist, but other arts absorbed much of his time: he took up wood engraving, clay modelling, carving and illuminating. In 1861, with Burne-Jones and others, he established a company to produce decorative work which included "wall paintings and decoration, stained glass, metal-work and jewellery, sculpture, embroidery and furniture of all kinds for either houses or churches." The company had its ups and downs, but finally achieved success with Morris at the helm and the help of a business manager. Textiles and wallpapers were especially the products of Morris & Co. His life was one of incredible activity. For example, he went to Iceland to supervise printing production of an Icelandic New Testament, and there met an enthusiast of the old Northern folk songs and sagas, Magnusson, who so excited Morris with their beauty that he began translating them. He said to Magnusson, who chanted them in Icelandic, "You be my grammar as we translate. I want the literature. I must have the story." There were various publications, reaching a climax in 1876 with *Sigurd the Volsung*, called a poetic masterpiece. The agnosticism he had adopted was somehow tempered by this "religion of the Northmen," as he called it.

One could call Morris a practical and practicing medievalist, yet a man who dreamed of

a better future for all, as did so many of the distinguished men of his time, the last quarter of the nineteenth century. His poetry was good enough to get him an invitation to "stand for the Professorship of Poetry at Oxford in 1877," but he refused on the ground that he did not regard himself as "a man of letters." He added: "It seems to me that the *practice* of any art rather narrows the artist in regard to the *theory* of it." His strong social sense came out in the conviction that artists and designers should be craftsmen who would themselves execute what they conceived. He worked in his factory alongside the men. This idea of everybody working usefully with his hands as well as his head was Morris's remedy for the ugliness of the industrial age, of which he was the bitter enemy. When Bellamy's *Looking Backward* came out, he wrote *News from Nowhere*, a utopia which would, he felt, correct Bellamy's failure to give attention to this side of life—shaped by the values of craftsmanship developed by working artists.

Morris died in 1896. The summation of his life, given by Thompson, is this:

> Morris in 1895 was thus a happy man, happy in his pattern designing and presswork, happy in the belief that socialism in the end must come, happy in the love of his old friends and his two daughters and the fellowship of artists and socialists who shared his outlook and for whom he was a chief inspiration. As he had written, "Fellowship is heaven, and lack of fellowship is death." He could feel that his own life had realized those words of John Ball [in Morris's utopian story, *The Dream of John Ball*]. A little over sixty, he could look back on extraordinary achievement. He had published seven volumes of important original poetry, four of prose romances, six of prose and verse translation and two of lectures. His designs for patterns for repeated production in wallpapers, textiles, carpets and tapestry numbered over five hundred. In addition there were many individual designs for embroidery, tapestry, carpets and stained glass. He had started a private press [Kelmscott Press] which in eight years issued fifty-three books, requiring over six hundred separate designs for initials, borders, title pages and other ornaments. He had supervised the production for more than five hundred stained glass windows, for which he had supplied another two hundred or more figure and pattern designs. He had mastered and revived the largely forgotten techniques of dyeing and tapestry, as well as other less neglected processes. He had made a financial success of a difficult manufacturing business. He had made a lasting impact on English politics and become one of the few major political thinkers. In the six years before 1890 he had delivered over two hundred and fifty public lectures. To both art and socialism he had in his prolific years contributed more than any other living man.

What about Morris, the socialist, operating as a capitalist? Well, he divided the shares in the business in what seemed to all a fair way among some six of those who worked with or for him, paid generous wages, provided a garden-like setting, and established a circulating library for the employees. "There is no sign that his reputation as an employer ever reduced his standing as with the socialists," according to Paul Thompson.

What has all this to do with education? Perhaps nothing, perhaps everything. What helped Morris most, as a person growing up, was the fertility of the environment he found or sought out, the rare friends he acquired, the men he learned from. Since Morris did so many things well, there is no point in classifying him. Underneath it all, he was moved by longings which a great many more people share today, although few realize them as broadly as he did, or even make much of a beginning at it.

FRONTIERS

Trends in the Man-made Structure

IN Frontiers for Oct. 10 Harry M. Caudill was quoted on strip mining. We now learn from the *Nation* for Sept. 3 that Caudill is a "backwoods Kentucky lawyer" who has called strip mining "the world's supreme act of greed." As the wooded cover of the hills in eastern Kentucky is ripped away, "we are destroying a forest 60 million years old—the richest on the planet—so a few men can become millionaires."

In this *Nation* article, Peter Bernstein lists some of the compulsions behind the trend to strip mining:

> Strip-mine production has soared in the last few years, from about one-third of the annual coal tonnage in 1968 to more than half now. According to the United States Bureau of Mines, the cost savings over deep-mined coal is on the order of one-third in Appalachia and even more in the West. Productivity per worker runs as high as five to one in favor of stripping, and is going higher under the Federal Coal Mine and Safety Act of 1969, which requires deep mines to take expensive steps to curb the high rate of death and injury underground. There are reports the safety law has made strippers out of a number of mine owners who couldn't or wouldn't pay the increased costs of underground safety.

Strip mining brings quick returns and requires fewer if more skilled men. Bernstein writes:

> Strip mining is safer and cheaper than the conventional underground mining. But it has left a trail of scarred mountains, mutilated land, and polluted and silted streams and rivers. Countless poor families—mostly retired and disabled underground miners—are being driven from their homes by strip operations using giant drag lines whose mechanized claws are devouring the land at the rate of 4,000 to 5,000 acres every week. Today, the government estimates that orphan lands left unrepaired by more than a 100 years of virtually unregulated strip mining total 2 million acres—the equivalent of a mile-wide slash stretching across the country from New York to San Francisco.

Who are these strip-mining operators? Bernstein says they are increasingly part of big conglomerate corporations or oil companies:

> Two of the three largest coal producers are oil companies . . .; five of the largest ten also are oil companies. Looked at another way, only three are independent. This means the coal industry is run by huge energy trusts that manipulate markets, create their own energy crises, and have the power to open and close mines to suit their needs. Whether or not the energy trusts are involved in some concerted strategy, it is interesting to note that while the demand for coal has greatly increased, actual production of coal this year is running behind last year's output.

It is an easy transition from this article to a review by Robert Kirsch of Anthony Sampson's *The Sovereign State of ITT* (in the *Los Angeles Times* for Aug. 19). For those who want to understand what is happening to the world at the socio-economic level, this book is apparently essential reading. Kirsch ends his review with a quotation from Woodrow Wilson: "Big business is not dangerous because it is big, but because its bigness is an unwholesome inflation created by privileges and exemptions which it ought not to enjoy." Much of the book, Kirsch says, is "counterpoint to the Watergate affair," and even the characters are sometimes the same. Yet he also says that quite obviously "the people involved in these activities do not consider them immoral or illegal." They are, one could say, dramatically successful practitioners of what has been called "the Frontier ethic," and regard themselves as carrying out the mandate of the prophets of Manifest Destiny. When attacked or criticized, it is perhaps natural for them to think of themselves as misunderstood benefactors. "ITT employs 400,000 people in go countries." Summarizing, Kirsch writes of the multinationals:

> They create jobs, they can serve peace and prosperity. But by virtue of their size and their global connections they may act as though they had a sovereignty of their own. ITT is now the biggest American corporation in Europe, the ninth biggest in the United States, with greater revenue than the gross

> national product of Portugal, or even, ironically, Chile.

Starting as a tiny Puerto Rican telephone company, ITT grew in fifty-three years to its present dimensions, "above controls and above morality." How many businesses is ITT in, besides communications?

> ITT acquired mutual funds, insurance companies, business schools, pump companies, car park companies, book publishing companies, bakeries. The Conglomerate Report for 1972 says: "ITT's expansion into multinational, multiproduct operations through acquisitions has created a virtually self-contained corporate structure that exists and acts outside the scope of any of the countries in which it provides services."

An SS general looked after its German interests during World War II, and afterward the company received $27 million in reparation for wartime damage to its German plants, one of which made bombers. The company was really "above the battle"! A well-paid ITT executive has on the wall of his office a "sampler" from John Maynard Keynes, which reads:

> For at least another hundred years we must pretend to ourselves and to everyone that fair is foul and foul is fair; for foul is useful and fair is not. Avarice and usury and precaution must be our gods for a little longer still. For only they can lead us out of the tunnel of economic necessity into daylight.

Very progressive, those Keynesians. Tough-minded and able to face facts.

Yet curiously, when John McHale needs illustrations of the necessity and inevitability of international cooperation, the multinationals, exemplars of know-how and managerial efficiency, are ready to hand as at least technical examples of what he means:

> We may well reflect that, even at this stage, if all access to such internationally sustained services as telephones, airlines, and health information were shut off, no developed nation today could survive for more than a few days. This is amply illustrated by even local power failures, airline strikes, etc. This web of international services and interlocked enterprises represents a trend and commitment whose real power is as yet unrealized.

And Kirsch, reporting on Sampson's book, says that "Despite the tight centralization of ITT, individuals in the organization have acted on conscience and there are indications . . . that many are sensitive to questions of ends and means." It is the tendency of the *structure* to avoid accountability, and to corrupt political processes. What made the structure? That is what men like Roszak, Mumford, and Lynn White have been writing to explain.