

but pretends to be sane. Marcuse advocates no particular solution to the social problem; his position can well be described as essentially that of philosophical anarchism, characterized more by what it rejects than by what it proposes to do. He talks vaguely in terms of socialist solidarity, but gives no clear definition of what socialist solidarity means. The quotation at the head of this section states the essential of Marcuse and his anarchism, saying "we shall be free to think about what we are going to do". This, for Marcuse, is liberation — without a definition of what we are going to be free to do. We are simply to be free to *think about what we are going to do*. This is a long way from traditional Marxism, is it not?

The next suggested choice brings us back to the Mexican Antonio Caso, and is from his book, *El Problema de México y la Ideología Nacional*, written almost fifty years ago, in the midst of the Mexican revolution. The English version of this quotation is by this author: "Let us organize our specific conscience, the national conscience now torn to pieces, hoping that other happier days will see Mexicans closer to one another in the mysterious and royal realm of the soul. After all, love is easier and less disturbing than hatred." It is interesting that fifty years ago Caso should have used the word "love" much as the alienated youth of today uses the term in his arguments and in his discussions. This is not to say that today's youth gives the word the same meaning Caso gave it. But it is significant how often this theme recurs in confronting the choices that we have in dealing with the alienation of today.

In *Mater et Magistra*, the encyclical of Pope John XXIII, one finds the two paragraphs quoted above. The version used is the one available to me, the English language version. Paragraph 217 says: "No folly seems more characteristic of our time than the desire to establish a firm and meaningful temporal order, but without God, its necessary foundation." The following paragraph (218) adds: "What the Catholic church teaches and declares regarding social life and relationships of men is, beyond question, for all time valid."

Pope John here repeated the essential social teaching of Christianity, but with a special social sense that runs through the Encyclical. One also finds, incidentally, that the World Council of Protestant Churches, meeting in Geneva during the days of Pope John, produced a social statement which differs little ideologically from the *Mater et Magistra*. Thus we see evidence of a rather wide-spread reaction of the established churches to the problem of alienation in the world today.

For the final suggested choice we turn to another revisionist Marxist, Professor Leoncio Basbaum of Brazil. The quotation presented above is from his book, *O Processo Evolutivo da Historia*. This book is essentially a treatment of the theory or philosophy of history. But throughout, one finds a current of

criticism of the orthodox Marxist theory of history. Professor Basbaum gives a new definition of economic determinism, historical materialism, and the class struggle more consonant in terms with the existentialist and relativist views of the present day. The dialectic is one in which the thesis is *liberdade* and the antithesis is *escravidão*. Liberty, he is saying, has become slavery. This is an expression of alienation, but it is also an expression of an alternative approach to the problem alienation presents. Liberty, operating as the thesis in Hegelian terms, has produced industrial slavery as its antithesis, and a new liberty is being produced as a synthesis. The new synthesis as in all dialectical process, is different from the two forces that produced it. It is a new liberty, based on human progress and scientific knowledge and on the unification of the world. This is the process currently going on and creating freedom in what is a counter culture. What one has here, then, is a more refined, a revisionist concept of the Marxist revolution, one to be carried out within this dialectical process by the rise of the working class.

The Basbaum theory is scarcely recognizable in terms of the original Marxism from which it comes, but it is a point of view widely held concerning the course of social action that is possible today. Out of this dialectical process, Professor Basbaum tells us, we are achieving a new form of liberty based on human progress within a historical process that is in a sense inescapable. We are confronted with an imperative to structure and to build the new human culture which the process of evolution has presented to us in the form of a new synthesis. This point of view is important in two respects. The Basbaum view is important because it is reasserting the significance of the historical; it is also important because in recognizing the historical it attempts to reconcile the historical with the general revolutionary movement going on in the world today.

SOME FUNDAMENTALS

1. ACCEPTANCE OF ALL THE MEANING OF RELATIVIST AND EXISTENTIALIST THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY, INCLUDING ITS RADICAL SKEPTICISM.
2. ASSERTION OF *BELIEF* IN GOD AND IN VALUE NORMS FOR PERSONAL CONDUCT AND FOR SOCIAL POLICY.
3. BELIEF IN HUMAN VALUES REQUIRES LOVE AND RESPECT FOR FELLOW MEN (LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF).
4. A SENSE OF COMMUNITY RESOLVES THE DILEMMA OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY. MAN MUST ACCEPT THE DISCIPLINE OF COMMUNITY. RECONCILIATION.

5. ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS MUST CONFORM TO THE DEMOCRATIC AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF IN THE LOVE OF FELLOWMAN, PROBABLY WITH LESS EMPHASIS ON THE NATION AND MORE EMPHASIS ON THE COMMUNITY AND ON THE UNIVERSAL FELLOWSHIP OF MAN.

If, out of the thoughts we have been sharing, we can draw some conclusions helpful in looking at the problem of man in society today, some of them might be summarized as above. These "Fundamentals" are assumptions which the thoughtful person must make today as a basis for thinking about the perplexing present day problems of social policy. Each reader might well add others, and not all will agree with all those set down here.

First, we have no alternative but to accept the meaning of relativist and existentialist theory and philosophy, including its radical skepticism. We must, because this is the essence of our science of physics today; without the Einstein contribution to theoretical physics we might not have put a man on the moon. This is also the essence of our psychology, of what we know about how man's mind and emotions work. So, to reject this relativism and existentialism is to reject much of what is fundamental in our knowledge today. But the danger in accepting this rational and scientific basis of the contemporary mind is that we may not recognize its limits. We may not see that its validity rests upon a concept of human reason which our skepticism and psychology lead us to question. The danger becomes particularly obvious when social scientists begin to talk of modifying human behavior on a social scale.

The second essential assumption, therefore, is the assertion of belief in God, and so in value norms for personal conduct and for social policy derived from this belief. We must do so because, if we accept the first assumption as the final word we admit that we can no longer say that belief in God is based on logic and reason. One of the great things about the thought of Miguel Unamuno was his recognition of this intellectual fact. "Filosofía y religión son enemigas entre sí, y por ser enemigas se necesitan una a otra," he wrote in his controversial book, *The Tragic Sense of Life*.¹⁰ William James, with whom Unamuno agreed on many things, wrote something similar: "This inferiority of the rationalistic level in founding belief is just as manifest when rationalism argues for religion as when it argues against it."¹¹ But Unamuno was led by his view of man as man, as well as by his doubting of the skepticism of Descartes'

¹⁰ Quoted from Miguel Unamuno, *Antología*. Prólogo de José Luis Aranguren. (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1964), p. 307.

¹¹ *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: The New American Library, 1958) p. 72.

rationalism, to one of the most passionate appeals for religious belief based on man's humanism, not just on his reason, expressed in modern thought.

The third essential assumption follows naturally from that of Unamuno. Belief in human values, in any pattern of religious belief, requires love and respect for fellow men. This is the Christian principle stated here as "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

The fourth essential, a sense of community, resolves pragmatically the dilemma of the individual and society. Man must accept the discipline of the community if he is to escape alienation and anomie sufficiently to find reconciliation to the world in which he lives. He need not take the route of the countercultures upon which our hippie communities are based, thought he may do so. He does need to recognize, a point appropriately emphasized in Pope John's *Encyclical*, the essential role of the community in the reconciliation of man to society. In Erich Fromm's terminology, this is the way to make society sane. In more Christian terms it is the reconciliation of man with God through reconciliation to society.

A fifth and final fundamental in considering man in contemporary society is that economic and political institutions must conform to this democratic and religious belief that love of fellow man is a commandment of God. What is required today is less exclusive emphasis on the nation than in the past and more emphasis on the immediate community, as well as upon the universal fellowship of man. This last fundamental seems abstract, abstruse, utopian, no doubt; and so it is. But it is a principle inescapable in our thinking about society one that is neglected at our peril. Without this ingredient, the society that we create in the future will not be a society of men, but a society of robots and machines.

