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Clausewitz' dictum should be constantly borne in mind: "War is nothing but a continuation of political activities with other means intermingled...Political activities are not stopped by the war...but are substantially continuous." The soldier does not fulfill his whole function unless he is conscious of that fact and fully competent for its realization.

The day of fighting for glory is long gone, the day of struggle for empire is surely over. Indeed, the day of battle for anything except the right to live our own life is past. If that is the sole legitimate occasion for war, we must know precisely what our own life is, what it should and can be, how its goals can be attained. At the same time we must discover how our ideals square with the aims and practices of the rest of the world.

That is a large order, particularly for the United States. Understanding is difficult because, prior to modern transportation and communication, this nation had an isolated situation between two oceans with secure boundaries to the north and south. Long history established a mental pattern to fit the geographical, political, commercial, and technological realities; changing habits of mind to meet swiftly altered conditions is harder by far than digging an interoceanic canal to create a new relationship between the Atlantic and Pacific.

Among the consequences of isolation was neglect to master foreign languages. In crowded Europe it is not at all unusual for men to speak three or four languages fluently. When we became a world power, it seemed
simpler to us for others to learn English than for us to master their strange tongues. The linguistic barrier to understanding is serious. It not only makes current dealings tediously slow and difficult, it limits appreciation of cultures older than ours, fully as rich, and surely as prideful.

Comprehending others is made harder because we have become stronger while other nations have weakened either actually or relatively. Any alteration in traditional balances is irritating to the nation suffering disadvantage. Under the best of circumstances mutual trust between great and small nations has never been easy to attain. What a strong nation regards as a suggestion may seem more like an ultimatum to a weaker one.

Moreover, the United States is unique in many respects. Uniqueness means, explicitly, that our differences from others are more significant than our similarities to them. That makes full confidence between us and others even harder. It requires more patience, more learning, more imagination, more wisdom.

To see how distinctive is our aim, examine a dollar bill: one side shows the great seal of the United States bearing the words "Novus Ordo Seclorum"--a new order of the world--or, translated more freely, "a brave new world." That motto was not chosen by over-modest men. Its adoption reflected a deep inner conviction about the destiny of our nation. We consciously set about promoting revolutionary ideas, upsetting the old order so that a new and, as we believed, a better one could be substituted.

The old world--East as well as West--had orders of nobility, caste systems, privileged classes of one kind or another. America made the startling assertion that all men are created equal; no man is born into any status; he is in no fixed position relative to other men. In the fulle.
sense of the word that claim was "revolutionary." Thomas Jefferson's last letter before his death, written half a century after he had drafted the Declaration of Independence, translated its majestic phrase into everyday language: "The mass of mankind was not born with saddles on their backs, nor a favoured few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God."

Another great democratic statesman, Abraham Lincoln, summed up the relationship of this revolution to the establishment of the Union under the Constitution. "It has a philosophical cause. Without the Constitution and the Union, we could not have attained the result; but even these are not the primary cause of our great prosperity. There is something back of these entwining itself more closely about the human heart. That something is the principle of 'Liberty to all'--the principle that clears the path for all--gives hope to all--and, by consequence, enterprize and industry to all. The expression of that principle, in our Declaration of Independence, was most happy and fortunate. Without this, as well as with it, we could have declared our independence of Great Britain; but without it, we could not, I think, have secured our free government and consequent prosperity. No oppressed people will fight, and endure, as our fathers did, without the promise of something better than a mere change of masters. The assertion of that principle, at that time, was the word 'fitly spoken' which has proved an 'apple of gold' to us."

It is hard to realize that never before in history had men been born free of class, caste, social status; complete absence of such fixity was indeed a New Order in the world. It was an idea so radical, so revolutionary that after nearly two centuries we can still hardly comprehend it. Our difficulties over so-called civil rights legislation are a current
reminder. Nevertheless the principle so infected the minds of men that kings by divine right have disappeared; orders of nobility are vanishing; slavery has been abolished the world around; even the ancient caste system of India is crumbling. An acute critic well said, "The Declaration of Independence blew Europe off its moral base." We set out to supply a new and better one.

The fruit of our egalitarian philosophy was universal suffrage and democracy. In no other land mass with such contrasts in terrain, range of climate, variety of racial stocks, and diversification in occupations is the policy of government controlled by democratic processes. That also is, in sober truth, a New Order in the world. Never before in history and at no other place in the world has a government of continental size, actively controlled by public opinion, faced issues so great in scale and scope or so complex as those that confront the United States today.

Even in foreign relations public opinion is dominant, for there is no American tradition that excludes international affairs from popular control. Professional diplomacy has a relatively short history in the United States; important as it has become, it has never escaped the trammels of citizen judgment. This accounts for the phrase so often employed to describe our international tactics, "shirt-sleeve diplomacy." Our foreign policy is not the product or the possession of an elite; it is an instrument of public opinion.

The leadership of the president, greater in this area than in most others, is nonetheless curbed by the necessity to be sure he is not too far ahead of "the man in the street." That was brilliantly demonstrated when Franklin Roosevelt bowed to the sharply unfavorable reaction to his
"Quarantine Speech" of 1937. The evidence was clear that the president's leadership had outrun the mind of the people, and he swiftly modified his position to accord more fully with the popular will.

Effective democracy requires a citizenry who will cling to and promote our distinctive way of life. Our key ideals are valid not for ourselves alone, but for all men. We should not hesitate to preach what we practice, as we are in honor bound to practice what we preach. Yet we must not seek to impose all our lesser standards of value upon other nations. It is essential to remember that the validity of their institutions is conditioned by many factors quite different from those which govern our lives.

Any naive transposition of values from our situation to theirs can make our generous impulses seem not merely futile, but dangerous. In such circumstances our actions are misinterpreted. Gifts appear to be instrumentalities of imperialism; cooperative measures for mutual defense seem seriously to impair their sovereignty.

We have a vast interest in the integration of Europe and view with enthusiasm such projects as the Schuman Plan and the European army. In fact, anything that tends to curb sovereignty in Europe and to create a larger unit, sometimes referred to as the "United States of Europe," evokes great enthusiasm. It is evident that Congress is impatient at the failure of the British to join and at the hesitancy of the French and Germans to enter into a firm and sweeping union. On the other hand we do not want to join closely with others. We are more interested in integrating others than in integration with them. From our standpoint we are maintaining our independence, while their behavior seems to us stubbornness. Too great pressure on our part may make them balky. Patience is a virtue to cultivate.
The old saying that "he who pays the piper calls the tune" is not a safe aphorism for international relations. In voting for military and economic aid under the Mutual Security Act, Congress put what it regarded as reasonable restrictions upon the grants. In particular, the recipients must make as full a contribution as possible, not only to their own defensive strength, but to "the defensive strength of the free world." This requirement has resulted in the suspicion that we want them to put their armed forces at our disposal in any contest with the Communists. What seemed to us a prudent condition appears to some of the weaker among them an effort to make them into "neo-colonials" or satellites. Such an intention is far from our minds, but we must take account of their suspicions and prejudices when we shape our proposals if we are to work with them in harmony. It is necessary merely to scan the dispatches of reporters the world around to be convinced that misunderstandings are dangerously widespread.

When the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was established only the Algerian departments of France were included in its defense area. Apparently the African territory has now been unilaterally expanded to cover Morocco and Tunisia without consulting the population involved. Some persons feel that in our concern about defense we have given too little consideration to the feelings of peoples eager to escape from colonialism. Nor is government alone in perpetuating unintentionally an obsolete colonialism. Many businessmen seem not to realize that colonialists assumptions underlie traditional modes of managing rubber plantations, oil installations, manganese and other mining operations. Some tend to cling to these, even while they denounce European nations for adherence to outworn concepts.
We are engaged in a vitally important effort to win men's minds to our point of view. For their own sakes, as well as for ours, it is essential to induce them to participate in a program of mutual security, or at the very least to defend their own integrity against aggression—military, political, or economic. It is elementary that in order to win men's minds we must appreciate their standards of value, must comprehend the order of priority they have established among the good things of life; both may be different from our own. Only disciplined effort will enable us to comprehend what people of different races, languages, religions, traditions, and interests hold dear.

The necessity for this was stated impressively by Charles Malik, minister from Lebanon to the United States and delegate to the United Nations: "Point Four for the most part aims at redressing economic and social injustice throughout the world. But, as thus conceived, it is directed only toward the means of human existence. Far more grievous than economic and social injustice is intellectual and spiritual injustice. There is the order of ends—what man should live for, what he should think, what he should believe, what he should be—about which the United States should have something to say, and for which it should have something significant to offer. It is for contributions of the heart, mind and spirit that the Near East Thirsts."

Those words may not be pleasing, but they are important. The naive assumption that dollars will cure "backwardness" is dangerous. Understanding is more difficult than subsidizing. It can never be achieved by appropriations alone; indeed the larger the appropriations the more difficult becomes the problem because the vaster the expenditure the more we appear to seek dominance. Subsidies, even to our European allies,
have well been called "a very tricky business"; by themselves they do "not make a solid foundation for international relations."

Our own history should have brought that truth home to us and prepared our minds for the seeming ingratitude occasionally displayed by weaker allies. Our war for independence was subsidized by the French. That act of the royal government was not motivated by love for us or any passion for freedom; it was merely one element in the strategy of a long struggle with Britain. However sincere may have been the volunteers who aided us, the policy of assistance was coldly calculated for the profit of France; our gains were incidental to that controlling principle.

We benefited greatly from French help and felt true gratitude toward the fighters. Americans were enthusiastic when our concept of liberty seemed to sweep over France and dominate its revolution. Nevertheless, neither the military, naval, and financial aid nor ideological enthusiasm prevented the deterioration of relations into a naval war between the United States and France before the century was out.

That historic episode should forever remind us that money may influence people, but does not necessarily win friends. The same fundamental truth is shown in personal experience with private gifts, given or received. Presents are not always the result of pure beneficence; recipients are often insulted by the size, the character, or the atmosphere surrounding the gifts. In such matters personal feelings are less tender than national feelings.

Quite apart from cultural and emotional strains, we need to grasp how and why other economic systems are basically different from our own. Again, too much money unwisely spent may be a curse rather than a blessing. In our zeal to advance "backward" countries, "we fail to realize
that foreign money can be used only in limited quantities by them without seriously inflating their own price levels and disturbing their economies. This reduces the degree to which foreign capital aid can be effective in moving a country forward."

Sometimes we do not even comprehend our own economic interests. We grumble at what seem like enormous expenditures for foreign aid and simultaneously erect tariff and other barriers against imports from those same nations. It should be patent that "in so far as we enable them to market their products here we lessen their need for dollar aid. In that sense, we will be getting our imports, or some of our imports, for nothing."

On the other hand, to the degree that we close our markets, we must expand our gifts; that is inherent in the broader obligations we have assumed. These elementary economic realities are seldom heeded.

In a number of recent instances the net effect of congressional or administrative action has been to express a preference for giving money to a foreign nation rather than accepting its products. The intention was to benefit small special-interest groups; there was no apparent appreciation of the adverse effects upon much larger interests—domestic and international. The penalties were higher taxes and higher prices for the American people, and a less healthy economy in the nation to which we gave "help." Such transactions do not make economic sense nor serve the national interest nor promote international harmony and progress.

Cordial international relations, it should be clear, depend upon something far more complicated than large appropriations, the passage of sound commercial legislation by Congress, the development of fair trade practices by business, the exercise of fiscal wisdom by the Treasury, courteous diplomacy on the part of the State Department, and the preparedne:
of the armed forces. All those are necessary, but in addition all must work in balanced harmony; public opinion must be alert to each of these elements all the time.

Coordination of these various kinds of policy has been lacking in Korea, and the present imbroglio may well serve as a symbol of frustration in international relations. We are involved in a war we did not want, in a land outside our defensive perimeter, on a continent to which we never intended to commit our troops, against people other than our real enemy, with allies who cannot or do not shoulder their full share of the burden. For want of adequate exposition the public has come to feel that the sacrifices exceed what is to be gained. Relative to known goals, the expenditure of blood and treasure seems extravagant. There is no clear and well understood program for exploiting victory, if mastery is achieved, or for resolving the diplomatic stalemate, if we are condemned to a military one.

American opinion has become disunited; friendship between nations has been strained; "neutralism" has gained ground in Asia; enemies have been multiplied and embittered; the likelihood of effective United Nations action in other comparable emergencies has been lessened. Instead of serving as a model demonstration of desirable method, the Korean campaign has raised doubts of the workability of collective security.

To the current demoralization of public opinion through frustration must be added its confusion and partial paralysis through fear. The most superficial knowledge of psychology--individual or social--reveals that fear in its acute form induces paralysis. It leads not to rational and wise action, not to action, not to courageous performance of the acts necessary to meet the situation, but to inaction or to irrational outbursts.
Foreigners insist we show signs of hysteria. It cannot be denied that we are kept in a continuous state of alarm--over the atomic bomb, over the growth of inconvenient nationalisms, over the obsolescence of our weapons compared with those of our potential enemies, over Communist infiltration, over inflation, and many other things.

Unless we substitute prudence for terror as the spur to action, we shall have assaulted the inner core of our being and the source of our wisdom. The first step should be a reawakening of confidence. For example, life insurance figures offer evidence of progress. Despite two world wars in one generation, medical science (by hygiene, surgery, antibiotics, and ten thousand times ten thousand techniques) has extended the span of life. In the last fifty years life expectancy in the United States has been increased by twenty years; this is a gain of nearly fifty per cent over the average length of life a century ago. Viewed in absolute terms, it is an impressive performance. Even with wars of unexampled ferocity, scope, and duration, gains have much more than offset losses so far as human life is concerned.

The public should be given some measure of awareness that the things which terrify us today are no worse, relative to our capacity to deal with them, than the dilemmas of the past. Even dominance of fear is not a new experience. Following the Bolshevik revolution America was swept with hysteria over the Reds. Their menace seemed to many a clear and present danger to this nation.

After the First World War, also, memories of poison gas and the emergence of the airplane led to predictions that the striking power of an aggressor nation would be so formidable that it would be victorious in a very brief time; yet we all know the Second World War was longer than 11.
the first. Current prophets of doom who assert that civilization will be wiped out in the next war are propagators of fear based upon relatively superficial causes for terror; they neglect the more profound dynamics of human history. Knowledge of the past would show that the same predictions have followed every great advance in destructive weapons.

Did those earlier fears lead us to wise and vigorous action in order to prevent the Second World War? On the contrary they caused the abandonment of victory and a search for an unattainable isolation. They resulted in wholly unrealistic economics about the war debts and reparations. They led us to underestimate the dangers in the rise of fascism and Nazism. The negative consequences of fear have never been better illustrated.

Excessive fear fosters retreat from responsibility. For instance, it is frequently claimed that the next war will not require many soldiers because it will be a "push-button war." In this place I do not need to argue that it takes more men and more brains to manage the button than for hand-to-hand combat. Before the button is ready to push, there are enormous technical, scientific, and other problems to be solved; and before you decide to push the button, there are even greater moral issues to be faced.

To minds in the escapist mood the possession of the atomic bomb seemed for a time the answer to every foreign danger. If anybody got out of line, drop an atomic bomb. But to anyone aware of what goes on in the minds of men, it is as clear as daylight that most people have an opinion about the atomic bomb (whether justified or not) which makes the decision to use it much more than a technological, or even a strategical problem, great as those are; it has become a moral and political question of first importance.
Unless one is aware of all these factors simultaneously and keeps them in proper balance, the use of the bomb might result in a momentary victory, but ultimate defeat. It could easily become a classic illustration of winning the battle and losing the campaign. As General Eisenhower said recently, upon the occasion of his induction into the French Academy of Moral and Political Sciences: "There is hardly a political decision in the international field that does not have some security aspects. And, similarly, there are very few high-level military decisions which do not necessarily have profound moral, political and economic implications."

Those things being so, what can higher education do to further the security of the nation? How does one set about designing a program to educate for the kind of world in which we must live out our lives? It must be admitted that there is confusion on this point. So much energy has been spent in perfecting specific techniques that inadequate attention has been paid to a coherent design for the whole.

A philosopher offers a key to the puzzle. In "The Aims of Education and Other Essays," Alfred North Whitehead gave a hint so basic that it is almost never mentioned; nevertheless it furnishes the text for all I have to say. He used four short words: "The students are alive."

Before impatience with so obvious a comment closes your minds to the full implication of the phrase, give it enough analysis to see why one of the intellectual geniuses of our time thought it worth while to set down a patent truism in a book on education.

What is the meaning of "alive"? To begin with, I should not include the chicken heart that Alexis Carrel and his associates kept "alive" for a number of years after it had been removed from the chicken. Presumably
that was an experiment of great scientific importance, but it involved a
definition of the difference between "life" and "not life" far too tenuous
to be applicable to a discussion of education. Life, surely, means growth,
change, response to pressures--atmospheric and many others. Such a de-
scription, however, might apply to a tree; something more vital must be
inherent in the assertion that students are alive.

Fundamental is the capacity, not alone to grow physically, but to
gain appreciation and understanding of one's environment. More important
is a constantly enlarging ability to reshape the environment--imaginatively,
purposefully, and skillfully. Man alone can do these things; that gift
sets him apart from all other creatures; it is that which clothes him with
human dignity. In attaining these goals he reaches his highest potential,
manifesting not alone power but wisdom. That word should not be slurred
over; wisdom. No wonder it is exalted in the Book of Proverbs: "Wisdom
is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom." Its possession is essential
to the fulfillment of life's promise.

This quality of being alive varies greatly in intensity. For a
newborn child the zone of awareness is extremely limited. He has no ex-
perience with hearing; therefore sounds give him only a minimum of infor-
mation. His power of communication is severely limited. His eyes do not
focus, his sight is dim; he sees little and what he sees does not signify
much. As the area of awareness widens and deepens, life takes on new
dimensions. During the first year or two the change is so swift and
dramatic that it seems like a miracle. If education performs its mission,
growth is continuous throughout life. Failure steadily to broaden and
sensitize consciousness may fairly be described as an assault upon the
life principle itself.
Of what does awareness consist? In one sense, we all see the same things, but some pay no more heed than as if they were blind; others give them full attention. If we break "attention" into two words, its meaning becomes clearer: "at tension" a person feels the pull of the object at which he is looking.

"Feels the pull of the object" surely signifies something more than mere awareness of its presence; it means to enter fully into the observer's knowledge and to become an integral part of his life. If the object is not physical, but intangible--an idea--the sensitivity which feels its pull requires more rigorous discipline for its attainment than mere awareness of a pretty girl, let us say. The idea may be even more beautiful, if not so obvious in its power to attract.

Life's great adventure lies in steadily extending the range of observation, deepening the sense of awareness, filling in the pattern of meaning, not alone during the period of youth, but throughout the whole of life. That provides ever fresh experiences of mind and body; one becomes more and more alive--more sensitive to what occurs in the world, more alert to beauty, more perceptive of significance, more sympathetic--more wise.

The first obligation of the educator, therefore, is so to teach, both through the choice of materials and by his method, that every student is stimulated to full aliveness and habituated to reflection, by which observation takes on meaning and enters into mature experience. Teaching has never been subjected to such scientific analysis as might make it possible to set a standard pattern for every teacher. Indeed it is doubtful that such a goal is desirable, for teaching is in truth an art. It requires freshness of insight and individuality of approach. Standardiza
destroys both. Both can be improved by rigorous self-discipline. As in other arts, there are great practitioners; there should be many more.

As yet we have no idea how far, by the efficient management of time and energy, teachers could expand the quality of the student's life, as doctors have expanded its length. That is not an indictment, for the secrets of the wonder drugs are relatively simple compared to solving the riddles of student motivation. Difficulty should spur us on, because anything less than great teaching impairs the life of a student. Stated in physical rather than mental terms, it cripples him—an effect which would be considered barbarous, if we were not so accustomed to it. It disregards the faith and promise of the Declaration of Independence, which asserted that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights," among which "Life" is put first—even before "Liberty."

Every study of the adult learning habits of the alumni of American institutions of higher education offers clear evidence that after graduation many of them cease to widen their interests or intensify their understanding outside the narrow range of their professional and business life—some of them, alas, even within such a confined space. In plain terms, this means that teaching has failed to evoke adequate zest for complete living.

In the light of this unquestioned fact we ought to scrutinize assumptions that deny students the quality of being fully alive. Most are subtle, but nonetheless extremely important. For example, in an extraordinarily real sense any deterministic doctrine is a limitation upon the quality of life. That remains true whether it be economic or geopolitical determinism or philosophical positivism or religious predestination or any other concept which has the effect of diminishing man's freedom to
master and alter his environment, which reduces his range of choice among an infinite variety, which deprecates the idea that he can make up his own mind and establish his own pattern of values. In its early and crude forms, then in its later misunderstanding and misapplication, behavioristic psychology has often tended to reduce man to a mere mechanism which responds to stimuli as a motor to electric impulses.

Certain social philosophies accentuate the tendency to narrow the outlook upon life. Though Aristotle long ago described man as a social being, much current educational discussion would lead to the belief that the discovery was made in our own generation. In a reaction from what appeared as excessive individualism, the pendulum has swung so far in the other direction that students are sometimes thought of as "social units."

For example, the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education said, "The development of social technology is an imperative today." Another contemporary favorite is "social engineering." Reflection will reveal grave connotations in those words. Free will cannot be "engineered"; it is unpredictable and incalculable. It is not possible to "engineer" freedom, which is precisely the right to follow your own bent. Mechanistic concepts deal with individuals, not as persons of infinite worth, but as social units--a very different matter indeed. Social engineering measures success coldly in operating efficiency rather than in an increase in freedom, happiness, and dignity. The concept of social technology is hostile to the true aims of higher education, for technology is adapted to machines, not to humans. Contrast these doctrines with Jefferson's statement that the University of Virginia was to be "based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind."
All limiting and negative ideas have marked effects upon educational philosophy and practice; all contravene the basic doctrine that the student is alive. Far too much of what passes for "education" assumes that his reflexes must be conditioned, his responses determined, and his patterns set. It is hoped that after he leaves school he will follow along in the fixations which have been predetermined by "specialists" whose own perspective, in many cases, stands in need of correction.

Fixation is the opposite of freedom; it offers no thrilling "new order of the world." Conditioned response is the negation of lively imagination and curbs the creative power of the mind. We have no right to denounce the Communists for their dialectic materialism and their totalitarianism if we do not continually expand the aliveness of students and thus enlarge both their true liberty and their capacity for the pursuit of happiness.

Tests and measurements may be extremely valuable, but faulty construction to some extent and inept interpretation to a larger extent have led to a tragic underestimation of what students can or will do. For some reason educators have been more impressed by the lower end of the scale than the upper; as a consequence they expect too little of students. Higher education, whose direct obligation does not extend to the lower brackets, should never have fallen into such an egregious error.

Nothing else, however, can explain the prevalent custom of stuffing students with inert information. Such a practice is clear evidence of doubt of the fundamental truth that students are alive. In the process too many inert ideas are "merely received into the mind without being utilized, or tested, or thrown into fresh combinations." A Scotch philosopher well defined such inert materials of instruction: "They are things that don't give you the feeling of aliveness and interest, that
don't pull you together and brace you up and make you feel that here is something worth while, something that makes life good and vivid."

It is lack of faith in the aliveness of students, also, that leads to overaccent on vocation, to excessive emphasis upon mere training, to an everlasting routine which desensitizes young people instead of making them more alert.

To have laid so much emphasis upon preparation for unchanging vocations under the realities of our time passes all comprehension. Training for a specific job is better adapted to an age long gone, when a man was born into an established pattern and had to follow that rigid design until death. He lived under authoritarian religion, and under the tabus of tradition, inhibited in a thousand ways from which modern man may escape. Under those older circumstances masses of men descended to the plane of automatons, incapable of controlling the politics of their nation; each was a mere unit in society who could not become dominant in its structure or its alteration.

There is something positively absurd about the ultravocationalism which neglects the new potentialities of life. In many senses, man is capable of being an individual today as never before in history. Because of the swift miracles of science, communication, and transportation, his capacity for experience is infinitely broadened. The slaves of the lamp and the motor vastly extend his powers. Telegraph, telephone, radio and greatly improved communication put him in instant touch with all the earth. When the sailing ship gave way to the steamboat and, again, when the airplane came, life took on a new dimension. Now it is simple for a man to travel around the world--an expansion of life in space which was inconceivable even a few years ago.
Contrast the position of an American student today with youth in most of Asia. Human life in the Orient means very little for the reason that it holds very little. Born to abject poverty with no prospect of rising above the margin of subsistence, tied to the land with no hope of escape, equipped with no ideas except those which were inherited, a person has, as we say, "little to live for." Such a man does not cling to life with the tenacity of those who are privileged to see its potentiality in the struggle for survival others wipe out his life with callousness. In America, however, we may find life zestful and rich; we may deal with it in broader and more significant terms than those who have not had the opportunities for intellectual development, social mobility, and spiritual growth, and all the other advantages which have been opened to us.

For these reasons it is especially tragic that our education should be dominated by techniques, that students should be indoctrinated, that skills alone should be trained, that men should be dealt with substantially as if they were machines. When these things are done, is it any wonder that devotees of cybernetics sometimes ascribe to servomechanisms purposeful behavior and other qualities which heretofore have been regarded as the possession of living creatures alone? Should we be surprised that so much stress is laid upon how much more accurate, how much more dependable, how much better than human are the "memories" of electronic monsters? The emphasis should be reversed in order to point out how clever are the men who create them, and build into them such extraordinarily lifelike qualities that the machines seem more alive than many products of an education which fails to remember at every step of the way that "the students are alive."

Even more extraordinary than the failure of teachers to realize that students are alive is the failure of undergraduates fully to appreciate what it means to be alive. Anyone who has helped with their course election
knows how frequently negative factors are dominant. The time of day at which the class meets, the question whether it has a Saturday session, the "personality" of the professor, superficially observed—these trivial straws easily divert a sluggish intellectual stream. Many choices which are made with more serious consideration are primarily defensive in character. Children of a generation awed by depression seek a false vocational security. Their questions are all too economically oriented: What good is it? What will it get me? To what use can I put it?

We speak of an analgesic for relief of pain as "deadening"; the medication is intended to limit sensibility. Vocational overconcentration deadens many aspects of life and has the effect of cutting down awareness of other values. In an effort to become "expert" in one field many students restrict their zones of sensitivity to such an extent as not to participate in the rest of life to the limit of their potentialities. The man who gains vast technical proficiency at the cost of spiritual dullness, esthetic blindness, or ethical insensitivity is not fully alive. In a calculated way he is reducing himself toward the level of a mechanism.

Suicide can be defined as war within one's self to the death. It occurs when a person's life has become so disorganized that, instead of tensions being compensated, they mount to an unbearable point. We all recognize that as a supreme human tragedy. But we do not recognize how tragic is the fact of partial suicide, which occurs when a person limits the variety that gives meaning to his life and impairs its innate characteri capacity for growth. Anyone who does not strive to develop all his powers—physical, mental, spiritual, and esthetic—has, to the extent that he neglects so to do, failed to remember that he is alive.

21.
On the other hand, as a person broadens his field of attention and alerts his mind in various ways, he widens the frame of reference of a favorite word of those who oppose breadth: relevance. When a new subject, outside a narrow specialty, is suggested, they ask, "What is its relevance?" To a man who sees no reason to study history, the life of people in a far-off country and in a time long past seems dull and unimportant. One whose interests have expanded beyond the narrow range of his own experience finds deep significance in what has happened elsewhere and at earlier times. He comes to see how like our times other eras have been in many respects and how men behaved in comparable circumstances.

We would pity a man with no memory. He would daily be discovering what ought to be obvious; he would puzzle his wits over things which should be done from mere habit without, as we say, "giving it a thought." In modern society he would be helpless. Similarly, a man with no memory but of his own experiences has a very limited basis for action. Unfamiliar with the forces that shaped the problems with which he has to deal, his approach is naive. Only through supplementing memory by vicariously entering upon the experiences of others can a person reduce the number of baffling situations in which he finds himself.

Memory, lengthened sufficiently by knowledge of earlier experience, supplies at least an analogue to almost every intellectual, moral, social, and political dilemma which confronts us. Life's potential has been infinitely extended by the resources of historical scholarship. It reveals the experiences of ancient times; it clarifies the ways in which earlier people dealt with problems still insistent today, especially those of the ethical and moral life and the relationship of the citizen to politics. In convenient form we have readily at hand not only our own accumulated
knowledge, but that of many who have preceded us. We do not have to grope our way blindly through unfamiliar circumstances, but can chart a course by what we know others did, whether rightly or wrongly, in comparable circumstances.

Failure to use memory so expanded as an intellectual tool needlessly hampers our work. There would be no sense whatever in insisting upon using a bent stick, which we might fashion for ourselves as a plow, when we can take advantage of modern gang plows drawn by tractors. There would be no sense in harvesting with a sickle, when there are available reapers and binders to do the work of many men--faster, better, and cheaper.

Why, then, should we not utilize to the full the tools of the intellect which are put in our hands through the experience of others? Yet a great deal of education spurns them. It treats as novel what is really shopworn; it misunderstands issues that are before us; it leads to false expectations with regard to peace and war.

Everyone who is fully alive--intellectually, emotionally, spiritually--finds the world so entrancing, life's adventure so thrilling that his curiosity is insatiable. To him nothing seems wholly foreign; practically everything gains "relevance." Instead of constantly rejecting subjects on the ground that they do not hold any personal appeal, charm is found in more and more ideas. By reflection they are formed into a coherent pattern within the mind. Such comprehensive knowledge helps to banish fear. The wider one makes his area of informed interest, the more competent he is to meet what must be faced with courage and clarity of mind.

There is no reason to restrict the concept that students are alive to the physical and intellectual life; indeed, to do so would be a tragic mistake. The emotions are as capable of cultivation as are mind and body.
The necessity for vigorous discipline of the emotions has been explained by the same Scotch philosopher whom I quoted earlier: "Unless the emotions and the intellect are in harmony, rational action will be paralysed" because "a merely intellectual force is powerless against an emotional resistance." He points out that, whereas in the modern world there has been an enormous growth of knowledge, there has "been no corresponding emotional development. As a result we are intellectually civilized and emotionally primitive; and we have reached the point at which the development of knowledge threatens to destroy us. Knowledge is power, but emotion is the master of our values and of the uses, therefore, to which we put our power."

Emotion brings us news as significant, truth as valid, and experience as real as any revealed by the intellect. Indeed the highest emotion of all, love, is the foundation for the religion to which most of us adhere. All the forces which drive us are emotional in character even though the intellect supplies the light and power.

Harmony of intellect, emotion, and physical well-being makes life a great adventure. Disharmony results in undue tension, and our time has been called, not so much the atomic era, as the age of the barbiturates. American hustle, the competitive spirit, the pressure of the hucksters and others have induced restlessness that has added to emotional ill-discipline. Neuroses do not arise so much from excessive work as from disharmony and disorganization.

Conscious of unhealthy tension, men seek avenues of escape. Escape from what? Escape from reality—that is, escape from living. So men bore themselves with the incredible inanities of radio, and television, or turn to adventure stories, or murder mysteries. Others take to alcohol or narcotics seeking oblivion.
There are available compensatory activities which are not escapist. They serve to expand life instead of encouraging us to run away from it. There is room--indeed, there is need--for the constant refreshment of one's sense of humor. It is essential to proper perspective; and it is not only legitimate, it is wise, to take time for its cultivation.

There are many forms of recreation--physical and mental--which promote sound health and which help in the attainment of that reasonable sense of proportion which the Greeks established as the ultimate good. Among these is literature, through which it is possible to enter into the imaginatively created experience of others and thus broaden perceptions of the meaning of life and savor its great adventure. Joseph Conrad set down his purpose; it was "by the power of the written word to make you hear, to make you feel...before all to make you see...If I succeed, you shall find there according to your deserts: encouragement, consolation, fear, charm--all you demand--and, perhaps, also that glimpse of truth for which you have forgotten to ask."

Poetry has charm all its own; as it becomes a familiar companion its deepest values emerge. Then its capacity to unite thought and feeling with cadence and rhythm gives it a distinctive place. The greatest poets seem "to annihilate both time and distance" so that the absorbed reader may enter into other people's stream of life and inhabit far away places as naturally as one goes home.

Another form of enrichment is music. The first time one hears a great composition it may seem a mere jumble of sounds. After the ear has been trained and the mind has been schooled to appreciate what is heard, when one has become emotionally sophisticated as well as perceptive, music brings profound satisfaction. Or, looking at the fine arts may so stir one
to esthetic awareness that thereafter all beauty has more significance. For art, like music, speaks an international language and has a timeless quality.

None of these things needs to be passively received; one may undertake, as an amateur, to write, to paint, to play or to compose. Such efforts sharpen the outlook upon the work of others and add richness to appreciation. Any fresh and diverting physical, intellectual, or emotional activity can withdraw a person's attention from his labors and cares; he can relax without deadening his experience, but by deepening and enriching it.

For human beings creative opportunities are almost infinite in variety. Every idea is an invention, if it is really an idea, and not a mere parroting of someone else's thought. Each time the imagination evokes an image capable of realization by whatever skill, it is an act of creation, a manifestation of life. Creative power does not stem from skill; its origin is in imagination, which itself is capable if disciplined development. Of course, it requires skill to translate what the mind has conceived, but skill without imagination is sterile.

In an electronic calculator an idea is only a datum—cold, hard, non-malleable—to be "stored" in an appropriate tube against the time when it is summoned. But if the student and the idea are both alive, their interaction one upon the other is a unique occurrence in the history of the world. For no two living people were ever alike and no two ever responded to the same idea in precisely the same way; the possibilities therefore are, in the most literal sense of the word, infinite.

To what conclusion does this reasoning lead? America proclaimed a revolutionary doctrine: all men have an equal right to life, liberty, and
the pursuit of happiness. That faith shaped the course of our history and fired the imagination of the oppressed abroad. It gave us moral leadership in the struggle for freedom.

After the First World War disillusionment and economic depression combined to drain away the passionate confidence which had marked our faith. The initiative passed to the totalitarians; and during the last quarter century the rights of men were curbed rather than expanded. After the defeat of fascism and nazism, communism alone challenged democracy. That challenge has not yet been met.

Industrial energy revived before moral and political confidence returned. The United States led the world in a technological revolution of amazing proportions. The productivity of our economy upset the historic balance of the world. It furnished support for war-weakened nations and inspired them with fresh hope. At the same time its dominant size awakened fears lest instability here carry all the free world down in another crash like that of two decades ago. The situation illustrated the paradox incisively defined by Ortega y Gasset: "superior to other times, (but) inferior to itself;" "strong, indeed, and at the same time uncertain of its destiny; proud of its strength and at the same time fearing it."

From those doubts and fears we must escape. The United States must recapture the intellectual and moral initiative in the struggle for "a new order of the world." Without that mere "situations of strength" will prove sterile. In that recovery Higher Education, in the true meaning of the term, has a vital role.
We must make available to every competent American not only training in skills and a growing mastery over nature. In addition to those essentials, we must cultivate far more intensively the disciplines of the humanities and the social studies. By their help we may attain our fullest potentialities as men. That is the only path to leadership in the world's quest for peace and freedom. The future security of the nation rests with students who are alive.