Northeastern Illinois University

NEIU Digital Commons

The Innovator: Newsletter for the Center for Program Development

Publications

1979

The Innovator- Mar/Apr. 1979

Reynold Feldman

Follow this and additional works at: https://neiudc.neiu.edu/innovator

Recommended Citation

Feldman, Reynold, "The Innovator- Mar/Apr. 1979" (1979). *The Innovator: Newsletter for the Center for Program Development*. 33.
https://neiudc.neiu.edu/innovator/33

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Publications at NEIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Innovator: Newsletter for the Center for Program Development by an authorized administrator of NEIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact neiudc@neiu.edu.

H7/55

THE INNOVATOR

NEWSLETTER OF THE CENTER FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

VOLUME VI NUMBER 2 | NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY Chicago, Illinois 60625 | MARCH/APRIL 1979

REPORTS ON KELLOGG CONFERENCES IV AND V

(Kellogg Issue III/4)

In 1978, two types of curriculum development received considerable attention at UNI. Two task forces appointed by the Provost were working to explore the merits of (1) instructional uses of internships, cooperative education, etc., in the undergraduate curriculum, and (2) implementing international/intercultural education through curricular options, co-curricular activities, and immersion experiences in the city or other countries.

Each task force, as a part of its investigation, sponsored a regional conference, partially funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, to bring together theorists and practitioners who could share information and ideas. Thus, in June, 1978, the Task Force on Field Experience Education sponsored a one-day conference, "The Role of Experiential Learning in Urban Higher Education," which was keynoted by Dr. Arthur Chickering of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Memphis State University. Noted for his scholarly works on student development in higher education, Chickering has recently published Experience and Learning: An Introduction to Experiential Learning.*

Also featured at the conference were scholars from UNI and other Chicago-area universities together with representatives of both public and private enterprises, who participated in workshops to describe effective approaches to experiential education. The workshops and presenters were as follows:

Panel Presentation #1:
Insuring a Quality Field Experience: Contracts, Establishing Roles and Responsibilities (Faculty, Field Supervisor, Student Institution, Agency)

Presenters: Anna Marie Buchmann, Associate Professor of Psychology, Northeastern Illinois University (Moderator)**; Edward Fosco, Northeastern Psychology Major**; Carol LaChapelle, Staff Coordinator, Undergraduate Field Experience Program in Northeastern's Psychology Department**; Donna Schiller, Northeastern Psychology and Sociology Major; Betsy Schwartz, Assistant Director of Volunteer Services, Children's Memorial Hospital; Robert Zapata, Counselor and Consultant, Director of Alternatives Intervention Service, Inc.

*Change Magazine Press (New Rochelle, New York, 1977).
**at the time of the Conference.

Panel Presentation #2:
The Academic Component of Experiential Learning: The Use of Preparatory, Concurrent and Post Group Seminars

Presenters: Reynold Feldman, Director of Program Development, Northeastern (Moderator); Lenore Borzak, Associate Master, College of Community Studies, Northwestern University; Robert Chrismer, Coordinator, Cooperative Education Program, Truman College; Daniel Kielson, Vice President for Student Affairs, Northeastern; H. Marijean Suelzle, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Center for Urban Affairs, Northwestern

Working Session #1:
The Evaluation Process: Students, Field Centers, Faculty, Field Supervisors and Program in General

Facilitators: Margaret Condon, Associate Professor of Psychology, and Barbara A. Hursh, Assistant to the President/Affirmative Action Officer, both from Northeastern

Working Session #2:
Performance Requirements that Aid the Integration of Theory and Practice, e.g., journals, readings, library research

Facilitators: Anthony Kopera, Associate Professor of Psychology, and Robert Walker, Professor of Speech and Performing Arts, both from Northeastern.

The Task Force on International/Intercultural Education organized a one-and-one-half-day conference in September, 1978. Entitled "Global Perspectives for the Urban University," this event was keynoted by Dr. Chadwick Alger (Ohio State University), who has been active in curriculum development to advance global perspectives. Dr. Alger is currently President of the International Studies Association. Also featured were Dr. Lee Anderson, Northwestern University, Dr. Donald Iodice of Oakland University, and Mr. Varindra Tarzie Vittachi of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. Workshops were organized around the international dimensions of four areas, with presenters as follows:

A. Business

Herbert Lachner, Public Relations and Information Manager, Robert Bosch Corporation
Alex J. Pollock, Vice President, International Banking, Continental Bank
M. Esat Kadaster, Consultant, Lockwood-Greene Engineers, Inc.
Daniel Kielson (Moderator)

B. Environment and Health

Swailem Hennein, Professor, Specialist in Population and Hunger, University of Illinois Medical School
Bernard Jaroslow, Specialist in Immunology and Parasitology, Argonne National Laboratory
Judith Stockdale, Executive Director, Conservation Specialist, Open Lands Project
Frank Dobbs, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Northeastern (Moderator)

C. Education, Arts, Media

Joel Henning, Director, Illinois Arts Council
Michael McGuire, Foreign Editor, Chicago Tribune
Vera Teixeira, Specialist in Education in Latin America,
Lecturer, Northwestern University
Phyllis Goldblatt, Associate Professor, Educational Foundations,
Northeastern (Moderator)

D. Citizens' Groups

Karen Minnice, Co-Director, World Without War Council
Linwood Fredericksen, Head of Programs, Rotary International
Gladys Scott, Education Director, Hyde Park Cooperative Society
William Howenstine, Professor, Geography and Environmental Studies,
Northeastern (Moderator).

Both conferences generated a rich variety of ideas and thus informed the work of the two task forces. Tapes of most of the presentations, as well as books and articles by the featured speakers, are available on loan from the Center for Program Development. Persons interested in either of these curricular directions are encouraged to utilize these materials at their convenience.

Meanwhile, we have selected the comments of Varindra Tarzie Vittachi, Director of Information at the UN Fund for Population Activities, for publication in this issue of the Innovator. A Sri Lanka-born journalist by profession, Mr. Vittachi has authored numerous books and articles, mostly on national and international politics. A citizen of the globe, he is uniquely qualified to apply his perspectives to questions of international education in the U.S. His comments reveal a sensitive questioning stance relative to political, social and educational institutions and as such provide a useful backdrop for conceptualizing international education at the postsecondary level.

Space constraints prevent the publication of his comments in toto; however, the following edited version of his address will give the reader a sampling of a thoughtful Easterner's views on the importance of transcending the traditional walls of the university and using a variety of arenas and methods for educational development.

Barbara A. Hursh
Assistant to the President/
Affirmative Action Officer,
Guest Editor

* * *

Many years ago when I was a little boy, my grandmother, a village lady, was supposedly uneducated in those Imperial times because she knew no English. When my educated mother was reading Edgar Wallace for her bedtime reading, my uneducated grandmother was reading the Baghavad-Gita and the Buddha Sutras in Pali. She would collect my little brother and me and tell us bedtime stories. Everytime she began a story, it was like this: "Brahma (meaning God) breathes out and Brahma breathes in. Once upon a time there was a king who had a daughter" and so on. The next time, "Brahma breathes out and Brahma breathes in. Once upon a time there was a millionaire who had a son" and so on. Now

my brother and I never understood what she was meaning by this, but it didn't seem to matter to us. It sounded marvelous.

I never understood the meaning of this until quite recently--like ten years ago--when I realized that what she was talking about was this whole process of evolution and involution, of multiplicities returning to unities. I have, through that kind of early imparting, seen the world in cyclical terms like that. It becomes easier to understand events as part of that perspective.

Cycles I have seen, for instance, the growth of nationalism. We know that 400 years ago there was no such thing as a nation state. There were little petty principalities, which gradually began to be forged into nation states. There was no such thing as India until the British umbrella, the imperial umbrella, was put on top of it. So, that whole era of 400 years saw nation states that acquired the power over the technology of the land. The physical technology of the world went out and created in this process of unification of petty principalities, entities called empires. And then these broke up into nationalisms again, and then the next phase comes, and now those nationalisms are again trying to build up into a different kind of cohesion. You can remember, for instance, that no one would have said in 1945-46 that Europe would be unified in seven years. But the treaty of Rome was concluded in 1953, among countries who had just fought the bloodiest nationalist wars in history. Seven years later, they were working toward a unification; not successful yet, but certainly a movement toward it.

In Asia, with all our distinct histories, we have formed a thing called ASEAN, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Imagine those countries who are party to this: Thailand, never colonized and with a Buddhist cultural history; Malaysia, with two large ethnic groups, the Malays and the Chinese, Buddhist and Moslem, with a British imperial background; Singapore, 80% Chinese, with a Buddhist background and British imperial history; Indonesia, with a Dutch imperial history, Moslem; and the Philippines, with a Spanish and American imperial history, largely Catholic. That these incredibly disparate nations could come together to form ASEAN is a phenomenal event. So I see this whole process as being one of flowing in and flowing out.

That is why I was so interested in 1973 in what you have all been taught to call the great "energy crisis." When the word was used in the newspapers, I giggled to myself constantly, because here am I, having lived with an energy crisis for 2,000 years. Suddenly there were people who had no gasoline to go on their Sunday picnics, and this became a big problem. There was no energy crisis for the Arabs that produced the oil. It was a big opportunity to get the prices that obtained in the world market, that the market was willing to pay. And that was bad when the Arabs did it, and the fault was that they didn't leave the Seven Sisters--big energy corporations--to handle this.

At that time I began to understand my American friends for the first time. They are very concerned about the state of the world, where the world is going, and so on, and they decided, "Why do we have these monster cars? These block-long cars? We don't need them. People were getting sensible for the first time, it seemed to me. They made all kinds of marvelous resolutions that when this energy crisis was over they would have smaller cars. But I, as an old skeptic--my whole philosophy has been a kind of sympathetic skepticism--I reminded myself that the human memory is about six weeks long, and that when the immediate impact of all this had passed, things would return to normal. And so I got the cartoonist on my staff to draw this cartoon of a motor manufacturer in Detroit calling his design staff together and saying, "Gentlemen, let's make the biggest goddamn small car in the business." And that is what has happened.

It's very interesting that the first time these ideas came about, Henry Kissinger in Washington, talking to the European foreign ministers, used the word "interdependence." He said, "The world has become interdependent." And I thought that Daniel had to come to judgment: "How marvelous. Here is a man who speaks at last of the truth." And I observed him, because he's an observable man, and a very wise man in many ways, because he communicated very easily and interestingly. I watched him over several other conferences of the UN Food Conference in Rome and various other places, and wherever he went he talked of interdependence. So I tried to find out what he meant by this, and all he meant, I found eventually, was, "Look, you Arabs, you have oil. We have tanks. Give us your oil at reasonable prices." In other words, fill-er-up.

That is all that was meant by interdependence. Nothing to do with simple things like brotherhood or sisterhood of man and woman, or humankind. Nothing to do with elementary stuff like love. I mean, the idea of "love thy neighbor" would be horrifying to Henry Kissinger. Because the only way you could love your neighbor was to have a balance of terror; you've got to have balance-of-power politics. This is the only thing he knows, because he is the spiritual successor of people like Metternich. I realized also that you cannot, in this world as it is structured, now give any substance to this idea of interdependence because of the profound dependency that exists in the world. In other words, all you can have in the foreseeable future is a kind of mutual dependency. But unfortunately, more than two-thirds of the world are dependent on somebody else, on great power machines of all kinds, the military power machines, the multi-national power machines, and so on. People who are dependent on others, therefore, cannot be interdependent. You cannot have an elephant and a mouse being interdependent.

But, having seen this, and not to be cynical, I realized that many of us don't realize that when we talk of the future, we're not talking of a very remote future. We're talking of the time in which our children are growing up and the time in which their children will be born and growing up. Let me give you some idea of the kind of world, the physical world I see. Working in the Population Fund, this becomes quite, quite evident to me every day. Just consider the magnitudes that we are going to deal with in the next ten, twenty years.

<u>Magnitude of the Problems</u> Two countries, before the year 2,000, will have populations of over one billion, China and India, assuming there's no major catastrophe. Now if catastrophe is going to be the answer, then we can all sit back, relax, and wait for catastrophe. But assuming catastrophe is not the answer, let's consider these magnitudes: nearly 2 billion in China and 1.5 billion in India. There will be something like 11 or 12 countries with populations of over 100 million, and 26 countries with populations of more than 50 million. This is very different from the world in which we were raised as children, certainly in which I was raised as a child. Let's consider the magnitudes of cities, because you're concerned with urban communities and urban universities. Tokyo-Yokohama, 17 million by 1990 or 1995; Mexico City, 32 million; and Cairo, 12 million, just to give three examples from three different places. And those magnitudes are proportionately followed in many other parts of the world.

For the first time I find myself agreeing with Pope Paul in a funny kind of way. Although I don't buy his line of thinking, the conclusions seem to be right. He said at the United Nations some things that are very memorable in my ears. He said that it is not a question of reducing the number of guests at the banquet of life, but of increasing the size of the banquet. I go one step further and say, not only increasing the size of the banquet, but seeing

that it is properly distributed. Now, why is this not understood? Why are all the self-evident things not easily seen? This is not a very complicated statistical exercise. You can see the meaning of this magnitude, and these guests are coming, whether we like it or not. They are on the way, so why don't we realize that it is time that we adjusted our houses to receive them? We have to receive them.

The question then becomes, "Can you conceive of a world in which the economies are so distorted (distortions of poverty and affluence already afflict billions of people) receiving these magnitudes which must be regarded as inevitable? That is what we should be talking about, and that is what is worth teaching. How are we going to survive? How do you make the plans now to receive those guests?

I think that this is not understood, largely because the media have not done their job. I speak as a journalist of 30 years experience, and I know that we were all raised on certain formulae. For instance, I was taught in Fleet Street where I was sent for my sins to learn my journalism. As a good imperial (not colonial) boy, I was sent to Fleet Street, the kind of Mecca of journalism, where I was sent to the London Times for six months to be trained. There I learned no journalism, but I learned how to be a British gentleman. And then to the Daily Express, where I learned all my journalism and forgot how to be a British gentleman. But this experience was very useful. I found that what we were taught was another rudimentary story that only the exceptional is news. That is, "dog bites man" is not news, but "man bites dog" is news. That is the sort of first commandment of journalism. And we, as good students, followed this thing in our countries also. My journalism, my early journalism, was certainly like that. It was always "man bites dog" journalism. Now I think the time is past for that--long past. Those values of the Penny Press that Lord Harmsworth and Lord Montcliffe started in England are no longer applicable, but we continue to pursue them every day.

Now I ask my colleagues all the time, and some are beginning to listen, "What happens when the exceptional becomes normal?" When Henry La Bouis, who directs the United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF, makes an announcement that 400 million children go to bed hungry every night, it is an extraordinary statement! An extraordinary fact! Four hundred million children going to bed hungry every night. We can see the extraordinary nature of it if we just relate to it ourselves! If one of our children doesn't have the glass of milk he needs before he goes to bed, how would we feel?

But 400 million other people's children are going to bed hungry every night. So, what do we do with this? I asked my friend, editor of the New York Times, "How did you handle this thing?" "Oh, we published it." And, of course, on one of the inside pages, the statement was made. And it was properly recorded; it's a good newspaper of record. So I asked him, "What did you do about it the day after that? Those kids are still going to bed hungry." That is our problem as journalists, as media people. We don't know how to keep such an event on the front burner of public attention. We don't have the techniques, I'm sad to say, and neither do we have the motivations. We have lost sight of the true function of the communicator, and I include not only journalists as communicators--all of you are communicators. In my definition of media, teachers play the first role because they are in the business of communicating ideas and values. Teachers, professional associations, women's groups--all these should be regarded now as media, because they are the people who are in the business of communicating values and ideas. But we don't have the techniques.

Television is always reporting events: who said what to whom last night, and who did what to whom last night. One day in 1974, the New York Daily News said,"Hell in the Sahara." A hundred thousand people have died; it will be going up to half a million people; the cattle have died; an event has taken place. When a hundred thousand people die, an event has taken place. But they were dying for over six years; and nobody gave a damn, because it was not yet an event to report. Perhaps if we become aware of these things early enough, and do perform the function of communicators and bring these things to public attention and keep them on the front burner, then we might have even contributed something toward preventing such an event from taking place.

But that is not what is happening now, because the conventional media reject the function of education. They even reject the function of advocacy. Advocacy journalism is anathema in the best journalistic circles--except when it comes to advocating their own cause. When the freedom of the press, so-called, is threatened, suddenly they become advocates.

Connections Now, I think that one of the things that we have to do as communicators--I speak to you now as fellow communicators--is work on these problems: how do you make the invisible visible? I mean by that something very simple. I have seen your President, President Carter, desperately trying to go over the heads of the media to the people, trying to make people realize that they must act now if we are going to cope with our energy problems in ten years time in this country. But the media, which should be in the business of making that invisible event visible now, are not cooperating because it is not an event yet. It is not a sexy event.

I once gave a seminar in Delhi to 40 journalists. Numerous people spoke eloquently about the population problems of India. And this man came to the rostrum and didn't speak. He remained silent, and because he remained silent, people stopped shuffling their papers and looked at him: this strange man at the rostrum who didn't speak. And when he really had their attention, he went like this (snaps fingers three times). Still he didn't speak. Finally he said, "Ladies and Gentlemen: three babies have just been born in India." Then he went on to say something like this: "Babies are not visible. So many babies around. In most of the places where the adults work and think, there are no babies. But when the babies born yesterday grow up, and in 17 or 18 years enter into the age of active fertility and have a child (even if they are persuaded to have only two children, just to replace the parents), then to give those children who will be born in 17 or 18 years the elementary needs, like education, health, and so on, you would need to build a thousand new hospital wards every day for the next twenty years; a thousand new classrooms every day for the next twenty years, and so on. Impossible to conceive of." He left on this note. And then I asked my colleagues, "What do we do about this?" And they said, "No story."

No story. Because this is happening in twenty years. That is where our problem is--how do you make the invisible visible? This is the function, I think, of all of us--the primary function.

I also want to suggest that process, this idea of process, is really one of looking for connections, revealing the connections. I as a journalist, as a writer, have followed a little the two-word slogan that E. M. Forster, one of my great literary heroes, gave us a long time ago. He said, "Only connect." This process of connecting becomes very important when you see it in practice.

For instance, at a journalists' meeting recently, I asked the foreign editor of the New York Times, the foreign editor of the Washington Post, the foreign editor of the Times Group of London, and some others, "Why did Mrs. Gandhi lose her election? She and her son lost the election; her party lost the election. Why was this?" And they looked at me as though I was stupid. They said, "Everybody knows. She lost the election because her son imposed on the people these compulsory vasectomies and sterilizations, and there was a backlash and she lost the election." And they said, "Isn't that so? Isn't that what happened?" I said, "Yes, that is what you reported. That is certainly the impression that your reports gave the world." And they said, "Is this not true?" I said, "It's a fact, but it may not be the truth."

I have always learned that facts and truth are very different monsters. Fact can often obscure the truth, because you select facts. In the selecting of facts that suit your purposes to give a kind of clear, black/white picture of any situation, you can distort the truth.

So I said to my colleagues, "Look, this is what happened. Since it is a fact that the vasectomy campaign produced a backlash, then you also must explain how this came about. You can take India and bisect it horizontally, say north of Bombay. Mrs. Gandhi and her party lost every seat north of that line except for four parliamentary seats, and south of that line she and her allies won every seat except six. Then we find that what you printed now connects, when we study places like Kerala. The maharaja who ruled it when the British were there was a socialist. Now this state had introduced free primary education and established a clinic within five kilometers of any household. Many important social reforms took place in the last two decades, with one result: infant mortality, which was 180 in a thousand, had fallen to 50 in a thousand. The result of that--the people who felt that they had to go on having children because their infants were going to die--became more assured that their babies would survive. So they didn't need to have as many children as they had thought was necessary before. They sought family planning information voluntarily.

One other important reason: free primary education made it possible for an entire generation of girls to be educated, with the result that women now became employable. They were an equal part of society. Their status changed completely in the south. Now, parents who once sought boys for employment to support them in their old age and help them in their work no longer pursued having children to have boys, because girls were also employable. So an entire social scene was transformed by those interactions of social reforms, with the result that the number of accepters of family planning in the south was very high.

In the north it was very different. These social reforms, for other historical reasons, had not been introduced, so that infant mortality still was at 160 or 170 in a thousand in states like Bihar and Orissa. Mrs. Gandhi pushed birth control in the north, and the backlash came in the north. Now I think it is necessary, therefore, to understand such situations. The world should understand that elections, the parliamentary process, education, the status of women--these things are not disconnected. What we should be really teaching, I say, is humanology. This kind of total understanding of the human process that is taking place. If we regard it as disparate events, as disparate concerns, we will not be making the connections necessary for us to understand the situation or for the people we connect with, as communicators, to understand what is going on in the world. I would like to suggest, therefore,

that what is necessary now, with this prospect of magnitudes in front of us, is that change of our own minds has to take place; change in our own values has to take place; change in the measurements that we use to see the world has to take place.

Let's consider what has happened to fertility: you could take it on a curve, the familiar sigmoid curve, the S-curve of the statistician. For 10,000 years what has happened to us? We came through an agricultural society, an agrarian society in which the most important virtue must essentially be fertility. I suspect that even the idiom of our religions was agrarian: the shepherd and the flock; the fisherman; Ruth amidst the alien corn; Mohammad and his nomadic flocks, and Buddha's peasantry. All those images were agrarian. Even the architectural idiom of minarets and spires and domes were fertility imagery.

Now there is a difference. Now the curve is bent the other way. So now infertility or regulated low fertility is the value. So what has happened? A value change is taking place, and we don't notice it.

I remember being sent by the Economist to report rural poverty in Asia. I lived in a little cottage in a village near Djakarta, and one afternoon I walked over and talked to my buddy, the paddy farmer next door. Actually I didn't talk to him so much as to his wife, because she was the spokesperson of the family; she was the most formidable member of the family. I was talking to them about how they managed with this tiny little plot of land which they sharecropped. As we were talking, a car came down the lane--a scarlet Mercedes-Benz, which is cachet in Indonesia. This car stopped outside this little hut, and out popped an Indonesian Ibu, a lady, very bejeweled, clanking away, a society dame. She started lecturing these people, saying, "I'm from the Djakarta Family Planning Association." And this woman said, "What the hell is that?" They are very polite people. She sounded "What the hell is that?," but what she said was, "Apa, Ibu?"--what is that, ma'am?" And the bejeweled woman began to explain that she had come to tell them that they should stop having any more children because they already had seven. The local woman said, "But why, Ibu?" "Because you'll become poorer," she said. And the man, who was not talking all this time, giggled behind his hand. The Indonesians are so polite that even when they giggle, it is done very politely. She noticed and said, "This is not a laughing matter." And_he said, "No, ma'am, I wasn't trying to offend you at all; I just think it's not possible." And she said, "I can tell you how to stop having babies." And he said, "No, ma'am. I didn't mean not to have babies. I mean it's not possible to become poorer." She looked at me for sort of educated sympathy, because I look like an Indian and all Indians look educated. So she looked at me for educated sympathy but didn't find any, because I was totally on this man's side, because I understand living in a feudal, agrarian economy. You are asking them overnight to adopt new values. How do you do this?

Trends I think that this is the kind of thing that we will move towards: a change in the value order that directs our perceptions. For instance, I think that we will move--and more and more I see it even in this country--toward a concentration in health education and health practices, from anti-sickness. In other words, dealing with a human being at the healthy end to prevent ill health, rather than dealing with ill health once it has come about.

The other day I was talking with Russell Peterson, who runs Congress's Office for Technology Assessment, which is a very interesting exercise. They are conducting an exercise in which they have studied what health care would cost if they changed the American health system around to pro-health methods. It would cost something like one-fiftieth of what it costs now. And that report will come out soon, I suppose, and will be widely discussed. I think the trend is towards that.

Then I think there will be a change from competition to cooperation. Now, the entire society in this part of the world is apparently built upon competition; you've been told this every day. And it goes back to father Adam Smith, who legislated the marvelous process of laissez-faire economics, in which he said that supply and demand will be balanced by the Invisible Hand. But we have never read Adam Smith. I go around the United Nations, where everybody is talking about Marx and Adam Smith, and so on, but nobody has read these people, certainly not recently. They don't realize that the Invisible Hand was spelled with capital "I" and capital "H." Adam Smith was not talking about that faceless financier on Wall Street or those gnomes in Zurich. He was talking of God as the one who would balance these supply-and-demand forces. I think that what will happen is that competition will give way, by necessity, to cooperative attitudes, and this is happening, certainly among the young people in these countries, and it will happen everywhere else by necessity.

I think there will be a change from the value of aggression to consideration. I would like, if you have not read it yet, to ask you all to read Richard Leakey's Origins. About a year and a half ago I met him in Nairobi, and we got into a very strange situation. I was at a friend's house, and we had done a lot of work and were very tired. We had dinner and a few drinks and were very merry because the work was finished. Then this young couple walked in and introduced themselves to us as Richard Leakey and Meave Leakey. They said, "We heard the laughter and thought we'd come and join." So we had this incredible conversation. At one point I said, "Richard, thank you so much. I want to thank you and your parents for having given me a longer heritage than was allowed me when I was a boy. Because when I was a boy the human race was only 20,000 years old. Later on it became possible for us to accept this Dutchman who found the Java man and to go up to about 337,000 years or something. And then your father pushed it back to about a million years; then your mother pushed it back to 2 million years; then you yourself pushed it back to 3 million years; then your mother pushed it back another half a million, and now we have pushed it back to 4 million years." And he said, "It's probably much longer."

I said, "I suspect that at some stage of our evolution we had a much finer civilization than this." He looked at me very quizzically and said, "Do you call this civilization?" And I said, "Of a sort, of a sort." He said, "With so much cruelty?" I said, "Well, there's also a lot of kindness." Well, he looked at me and said, "You're quite right; there must have been a civilization better than this. In fact, I know it and can't prove it."

But how do you prove anything having to do with considerateness? What are the tools of considerateness? What are the fossils of considerateness? Nevertheless all the logic points to the fact that human beings survive not because they're aggressive, as Conrad Lorenz and Desmond Morris and Robert Ogden are saying, but because they cooperate. We have had a cooperative society which has enabled human beings to survive through the process

of evolution. And now we have reached the point, it seems once again, in which those old ideas have to come about again, have to be refurbished in our minds again, from competition and aggression to cooperation and consideration.

In fact, we journalists are terrified of using these words, the simple words. I think the answer finally is that these new values we are talking about are, in fact, the oldest values in the world. Simply said, I use W. H. Auden's words which reverberate in my mind all the time: "We must love one another or die."

You ask me for my perspective on the future of our world? The way I see it, it is something like this: that we will have to share, we will have to cooperate, we will have to be considerate, out of sheer need to survive. And I think that we will have to give up some of the appurtenances of our modern societies, of our global societies, like you see here in Chicago or in New York City or in London. The idea that we cannot survive without all those appurtenances, all the supermarkets, is not true.

As a very young journalist I had the great and glorious opportunity of meeting Mahatma Gandhi once. Since I was going to meet him, I was dressed to kill. He was seated on a rattan settee. Looking at me, he said rather caustically, "Ah, one of our smart southern neighbors." A real dig in my ribs. He couldn't stand these brown sahibs. He had a real kind of contempt for these people, because he had been one himself, in London, when he was a barrister--a real brown sahib. So he knew what all that meant. And then he saw my face blush at this public chastisement in front of 40 people. So he took compassion on me and, sort of patting the seat beside him, asked me to sit down. So I sat down gingerly and was thinking desperately, like the intelligent boy in a class who had just been given a rapping. What do you do? You ask an intelligent question to recover your face. So I tried to think of an intelligent question. It came out nicely. I said, "Gandhiji, because of your work all of us in Asia are going to be free very soon. If you had one piece of advice to give us, what would this be?"

I remember how he looked down, kind of sadly. Then he looked up again, grinning that marvelous toothless grin of his. And he said, "Reduce your wants and supply your needs." And he had it. Our needs make us vulnerable enough. Why increase our vulnerability?

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I look back, thirty years now, on that incredible remark, and I realize that in the whole of Asia, very ironically, it seems that only China has followed Gandhi's example. And look at where the rest of us are because we did not follow that advice. We did not reduce our wants and supply our needs. The result: We cannot now supply our needs.

Varindra Tarzie Vittachi
Director of Information
United Nations Fund for
Population Activities

* * *

NEXT...

May/June: Professor Mitchell Vogel writes on Educational Experiments in the Peoples Republic of China.