

in the magazines

The *New Republic* for March 16 carries an excerpt from Charles Burton Marshall's recent testimony before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee. Mr. Marshall spoke on our China policy and put forward some suggestions for effectively altering our official attitudes without surrendering any of our legitimate commitments. It is vain, he argues, to expect the Chinese Communists to comply with Washington's conditions for recognition, and our insistence in this regard is patently ineffectual: the "pro-forma bombardment of the offshore islands [is] a continuing display of snapping their fingers at the conditions we invoke." As to Formosa, Mr. Marshall agrees that we cannot honorably yield our protective position, but he believes it would be improved by abandoning our "exclusive proprietorship on one side of that issue" and getting other nations to pledge their support in our defense of Formosa.

The Chinese Nationalists, he believes, hold an untenable position in their occupation of Quemoy and Matsu—"it was an act of folly ever to get prestige committed to the offshore islands—folly on the part of the Nationalists and on our part as well"—and, similarly, we should clarify our recognition of the Formosa regime in accordance with the true facts of the situation, however difficult these may be for the Nationalists to accept.

Mr. Marshall is persuaded that the seating of Red China in the UN is an inevitability, and that the Chinese Communists' possession of the veto in the Security Council is not of first importance: ". . . because the fact of the matter is, whatever the juridic situation, the Peking regime *does* exercise a veto on accommodations in the Pacific area anyway. Moreover, the fact is that in the Korean armistice bargaining the UN did come to terms with the Communist Chinese . . . This seems to me to be vastly more important in its implications than the suggested shifts in the UN franchise."

•

The *Journal of International Affairs* (No. 1, 1959) contains a number of articles devoted to various aspects of science and world politics. Included are discussions by leading experts of such subjects as inspection for disarmament, the International Geophysical Year, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and military control and government of outer space. In "Science, Technology, and Foreign Policy," Warner R. Schilling seeks the relations between international political progress and technological development, both as they are manifest in the recent past and as they illumine the destiny of nations. There is a study by Mark G. Field of "Soviet Science and Some Implications for Ameri-

can Science and Society," which compares the position of the Russian scientist with that of his American counterpart.

Both these articles make the point that our "science potential" vis-à-vis the Russian threat is the dominant issue of our time. But Dr. Fields believes that, even if we are able to match the Soviet Union in the number of scientists placed at the service of the state and furnished with corresponding material rewards, we will still not have solved the problem. For, as he points out, "science and scientific work is a vocation which carries its own built-in rewards, and which provides its own self-sustaining and self-rewarding motivation. . . . As a vocation it must be sustained by deep emotional commitments and motivation that can be imbued to the future scientist by those who mold his personality in the formative years: his parents. This molding cannot take place unless there is in the culture, in the values of our society, in the means of mass communications, in the thought patterns of the average individual, not necessarily an *understanding* of what scientific and intellectual works are, but an *appreciation* of their importance . . ."

•

Archibald MacLeish, writing in the March *Atlantic*, finds that the prevailing apathy of our times has its roots in a profound divorcement of knowledge from feeling or, as he puts it, of "poetry" from "journalism." "Why . . . should poetry and journalism be the two poles of the world of words in our time? . . . Poetry and journalism—to put it in more inclusive terms, poetry and history—are not opposites and cannot be opposites, and the notion that they are is a delusion." Both depend for their validity on events in the actual world, Mr. MacLeish believes. "It is only when the scattered and illegible fragments in which we pick up our experience of the world are recomposed in such a way that they make sense as human experience that great journalism can result. And the same thing is true in the same words of poetry."

But the "increasing inwardness" of poetry and the reduction of journalism to a mechanically transmitted deluge of facts have produced the indifference with which the public greets the facts of foreign policy and international life; for "knowledge without feeling is not knowledge and can lead only to public irresponsibility and indifference, and conceivably to ruin. Nothing could more clearly prove that when the fact is disassociated from the feel of the fact in the minds of an entire people—in the common mind of a civilization—that people, that civilization, is in danger."

PAMPHILUS