

## in the magazines

Perhaps the most arresting article of the summer is C. P. Snow's "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution," published in the June and July issues of *Encounter*. Sir Charles, long one of Britain's most eminent novelists, is also Scientific Adviser to the Civil Service Commission. In his dual capacity as man of letters and man of science, he has been able to observe the widening gulf between what he calls "the two cultures"—the scientific and the literary—and to observe it with dismay. It is his conviction that the almost total estrangement which has gradually developed between these two cultures in Western society leaves us ill-prepared to face the new realities of the scientific revolution. And Sir Charles warns that, unless some mutual re-education takes place (but chiefly among the "literary" intellectuals, whose disdainful ignorance of science has largely caused this polarization), we shall be unable to keep up with the rate of social change, and the near future will find us "an *enclave* in a different world."

"The main issue of the scientific revolution," writes Sir Charles, "is that the people in the industrialized countries are getting richer, and those in the non-industrialized countries are at best standing still: the gap is widening every day." In the inevitable industrialization of the poor countries the West must play a major role, "but the trouble is that the West, with its divided culture, finds it hard to grasp just how big and, above all, just how fast the transformation must be." Sir Charles believes that it is "technically possible" to achieve the scientific revolution in India, Africa, South East Asia, Latin America and the Middle East within fifty years. Whether the West will be able to muster the capital and the trained men such a task requires is, in Sir Charles' view, open to grave doubt. But we can begin by closing the gap between the two cultures. ". . . For the sake of Western society living precariously rich among the poor, for the sake of the poor who needn't be poor if there is intelligence in the world, it is obligatory for us and the Americans, for the whole West, to look with fresh eyes."

Two timely articles deal with the Supreme Court and its current position in the midst of controversy. One is by Alpheus Thomas Mason in the summer issue of *The Yale Review*, the other by Joseph O. Losos in the July *Review of Politics*. Both writers cite a principal issue which seems to have emerged from the spate of recent Court decisions. It is the question of whether, in Mr. Losos' words, "economic matters should be governed by one rule, and those affecting civil liberties by another, more stringent

rule." Asks Mr. Mason: "Can a rationale be fashioned justifying greater judicial alertness to infringements on civil liberties than to legislation regulating the economy?" Mr. Losos concludes that, "when one considers the much greater limitations imposed on speech in our time, the Court's actions take on a different appearance . . . Today the libertarian line of defense has been centered on the courts; tomorrow, as yesterday, the capitalist defenses may rest there too." Similarly, Mr. Mason writes: "Tomorrow's majority may have a different composition as well as different goals. Defense of the political rights of minorities thus becomes, not the antithesis of majority rule, but its very foundation."

The role of the Senate in foreign policy is reviewed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, in the July issue of *Foreign Affairs*. Senator Humphrey, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, notes that the era of "total diplomacy" and the advent of the United States to its present position of world power have brought about a tremendous expansion of the Senate's role in the framing of foreign policy. While the conduct of foreign relations is still the Constitutional prerogative of the Executive Branch, "the great increase in the Senate's work in the field of foreign policy is absolute rather than relative to that of the Executive Branch . . . In the twentieth century a Senator represents not only his state but also the nation, and under certain circumstances he operates directly in the international arena."

But Congressional foreign policy committees are overburdened and understaffed. If they are to fulfill their responsibilities, Senator Humphrey argues, they must have the resources which are available to the Executive Branch. "Adequate staffing will alone enable Congress to escape from uniformed acquiescence on the one hand and irresponsible obstruction on the other." Senator Humphrey also suggests a solution to the increasing structural fragmentation of government business. He proposes the creation within the Executive Branch of a "permanent research and policy-analyzing agency charged with the responsibility of thinking about comprehensive national strategy, embracing in that term all essential factors of domestic and foreign policy. This agency would relate the total capacities of the American people—military, economic, technical, intellectual and moral—to their responsibilities of international leadership." But the problem of conflict in government affairs, the Senator feels, is due primarily to a "lack of leadership at the top."

PAMPHILUS