

Since the publication in 1959 of his celebrated Rede Lecture called *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*, the work of Sir Charles Percy Snow has enjoyed wide currency in England and America. The thesis of *The Two Cultures*, which was that a lack of communication between science and what Snow described as the "traditional" (literary) culture has created a dangerous deficiency in the West's understanding of social change and "the scientific revolution," has come under scathing attack, together with the whole of its author's reputation as scientist, novelist and lecturer. The attacker, one of Snow's fellow-countrymen, is the literary critic and Cambridge don F. R. Leavis. Dr. Leavis's views, which have already become a landmark in polemics, are printed in the March 9 issue of the British weekly *The Spectator*. At considerable length, Dr. Leavis dismisses Snow as "portentously ignorant" and the *Two Cultures* thesis as an "intellectual nullity." "He doesn't know what he means," Dr. Leavis asserts, "and doesn't know he doesn't know. That is what his intoxicating sense of a message and a public function, his inspiration, amounts to. It is not any challenge he thinks of himself as uttering, but the challenge he is, that demands our attention."

In subsequent issues of *The Spectator* (March 16, March 23) a number of correspondents rise to the challenge and most of them come down on Sir Charles's side. The controversy continues to rage, but to date there has been no response from C. P. Snow himself, although he has been offered the use of a London theatre should he wish to make one.

In the first of two articles on nuclear strategy ("The War That Can Be," *America*, March 17), Stefan T. Possony makes the following comments on the nature of the Cold War:

"The Cold War usually is interpreted as a propaganda contest, as economic competition, or as a series of small conflicts for the control of underdeveloped countries. This is just one 'axis' of the multi-dimensional Cold War and by no means the most important. The Cold War, as waged by the Communists, is the sum total of all lesser conflict operations designed to make nuclear aggression feasible and profitable, or unnecessary. Its main purpose is to achieve technological superiority in all major weapon systems, and, at the same time, to delay and perhaps eliminate technological progress in American weapon systems. Efforts to keep America's allies nuclearly unarmed are another dimension of the Cold War, and so is the demoralization of the free world, which, by means of various Cold War techniques and military demonstrations and threats, is to be conditioned to prefer Communism to extermination.

"The Cold War, or 'struggle for peace' as the Communists call it, is designed to make the United States and the free world acquiesce in Soviet undertakings aimed at establishing clear-cut arms superiority. The United States, of course, can prevent Communist Cold War victory. If the Cold War fails, the Soviets might take their chances by relying on marginal superiority plus strategic, tactical and timing surprise. They hardly will desist so long as they have hopes that they can move into a position of decisive strategic superiority."

"It is a melancholy fact that the Administration is aggressively driving only toward the limited goal of token integration," writes the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. in the March 3 issue of *The Nation*. In registering his disappointment with the Administration's first year of effort in the civil rights field, Dr. King calls upon the Executive authority to initiate a program of "massive social mobilization uniting the strength of individuals, organizations, government, press and schools."

"When the nation feels threatened by war," Dr. King continues, "a military budget of some \$50 billion is freely spent each year to achieve security. Not even \$1 billion a year is spent by government on behalf of 20,000,000 Negroes seeking to defend themselves from the persistent attack on their rights... An Alliance for Progress for South America, to cost \$20 billion, is forward-looking and necessary. An Alliance for Progress for the turbulent South is equally necessary."

The February issue of *Current* includes a proposal for the raising of independent revenue for the UN, as outlined by Eugene Staley, research director of the International Industrial Development Center, Stanford Research Institute. Mr. Staley suggests that member nations grant the UN exclusive tax rights to space traffic and communication, ocean resources, and polar resources.

"This would not solve the UN's immediate financial problems," writes Mr. Staley, "... but as science and technology progress further these potential sources of wealth could become very important, and within a decade or two the UN might have very substantial revenues from them."

Jewish Frontier, the monthly published by the Labor Zionist Movement, dedicates its March issue to David Ben-Gurion on his seventy-fifth birthday. Tributes from Eleanor Roosevelt, Felix Frankfurter, Arthur J. Goldberg, James G. McDonald, Hubert H. Humphrey, Jacob K. Javits, and Victor G. Reuther are among those published.

PAMPHILUS