

REALITY

or less taken
relationships.
mmunication
rofoundly in-
of this term,
telegraphy,
are technical
cation. But
n itself as it
beliefs, and
es that have
ition of new
anges made
Meanings
ields. This
prevails in
authorities
endous cap-
wards truth

This changing terminology is highly significant in our culture. It is familiar to us in the term "lingo", yet the general public remains insufficiently aware of how language and symbols may be manipulated to control thinking. In analyzing the various properties of language, social scientists tell us that man has a highly conditioned reaction to the stimulus of words. This accounts for the great disproportion of meaning which many words assume under the disposition of those indulging in the "self-expressive" modern usage. We see evidences of this abounding in our very midst, even when we sit down in the evening to enjoy our meal or are walking down town through the shopping area. Politically we are idealists under the pretence of being broad-minded, and describe such and such an alien nation as being a "Socialist Democracy", thus effacing what was once a highly valid and esteemed term, "democracy". Socially we are "graciously exuberant," after an evening of light entertainment one does not merely "have a good time", but now "has a ball". This makes the use of superlatives appear utterly incongruous.

How many of us are able to keep our eyes clear in these verbal dust storms? What are the lasting words of humanity? They are those that surmount the differences of individual disposition and time because they come from men who have a charitable and genuine interest for their fellowmen. Communication is more than a matter of command of words, it is a sincere desire to communicate in an unbiased and sympathetic disposition with the ideas and emotions of others. Communication today, however, is different in certain ways and affects us differently now than at any time in the past. The difference is most likely to be in our increasing psychological knowledge of how communication may be made to function constructively or destructively. So it is for us to decide in what ways and with what proximity will the tool of communication bring man toward reality.

—EDITORIAL—

IN QUEST OF A CULTURE

With the advent of Greek philosophers, culture began to take on its true meaning. Its uniqueness and fructifying power arose from the fact that it pursued a great and constantly developing ideal, the humanist ideal. It is due to this very ideal that the best in European civilization and consequently our own, has come to be firmly established. For the Greeks, culture meant the over-all educating of the individual. By making use of this form of education, culture on the whole was set up to develop all the potentialities of man.

To refer here to the individual, is to do so with the awareness of the needed establishment of the cultured group or class and of society as a whole. This is so from the fact that the cultivation of all the potentialities of the individual is at best tantamount to a cultivation of a group and a society whereby the individual is able to be guided and protected by these. A study of Plato's *The Republic* will make this quite clear. In his work, Plato had in mind the formation of a group of philosophers capable of instructing and guiding the individual and of the creation of a state having the objectives of maintaining such a degree of harmony and peaceful co-existence with other nations as to bring about the desired cultivation of the individual. Thus if all the potentialities of man are to be developed it is expected that there be a class and a society so constituted as to guide and protect him. The Greeks were consequently in little doubt as to what they considered to be the essence of culture. Jaeger Werner, in his book *Paideia; The Ideals of Greek Culture*, states that "Culture was for the Greeks the original creation and original experience of a process of deliberate guidance and formation of human character." This stipulation lends further credence to the fact that by the term "culture" they bore in mind the pursuance of a deliberate and conscious ideal. In my opinion, the Greek idea of culture was one that would achieve the best that could be expected from a culture. This statement is unquestionably true, for through philosophical disputations they first of all achieved a clear realization of the natural principles which govern the individual and the laws by which man is capable of exercising his physical and intellectual powers. Conscious of these facts, it was the Greek aim then to set up the required machinery to make use of all these factors in the development of their ideal. The Greeks had a clear notion of what man was and what he was capable of accomplishing for civilization. Only after having discovered man's potentialities did they consider the formation of a culture which would be to his greatest advantage. Now, it is precisely here where we in our present day have fallen short of achieving such a logical type of culture. When we speak of culture, it is evident that we do not intend to pursue or are even aware of pursuing an ideal. The result has been conflict and confusion with regard to our notion of what culture actually is.

It is due partly to a general lack of purposefulness that we have failed to achieve the ideals of culture. Man today has generally been denied the opportunities of pursuing such a culture, or because of materialistic influences has remained in a state of complacency and ignorance as to its meaning and purpose. Moreover, it is to be noted, that we have come to use the term to express so diverse a compilation of matters as to attenuate its value and to render its meaning still more vague. Again we make reference to a statement by Jaeger Werner in his book, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, "We are accustomed to use the word culture, not to describe the ideal which the Hellenocentric

world possesses, but in a much more trivial and general sense, to denote something inherent in every nation of the world, even the most primitive. We use it for the entire complex of all the ways and expressions of life which characterize any one nation. Thus the word has sunk to mean a simple anthropological concept, not a concept of value, a consciously pursued ideal."

In addition, we find that there are a noticeable number of people who, in their attempt to safeguard their own private opinions, have brought about still greater confusion.

We have not exercised sufficient honesty in our use of the word "culture", using it in contexts where it does not belong. Some very well intentioned authorities have defended the view and labeled as culture, the cultivation of the individual, or the group, or the society as a whole, as distinct and separate entities. In other words, it is the opinion of such as these to hold that culture really exists separately when it consists in developing the potentialities of man alone, of a group alone, or of a society alone. But, the value of having a cultured society and a group must be recognized before the potentialities of the individual are capable of achieving any auspicious end.

In T. S. Eliot's book **Notes Towards the Definition of Culture**, we have come across a salient point in defence of the term. It has reference to man's aims in our present day in relation to the individual, the group, and the society. Some confusion could be lessened if we but tried to correct our aims in this regard. This is what T. S. Eliot has to say on this particular point: "A good deal of confusion could be avoided, if we refrained from setting before the group, what can be the aim only of the individual; and before society as a whole, what can be the aim only of the group."

Through further research in this matter, it has been found that such distinguished authors as E. B. Taylor and Matthew Arnold have defended a type of culture independent of the other senses of culture: In his book **Primitive Culture**, Taylor has developed a theme on culture in different distinct stages. He does not attempt to show the relation and dependency of one stage to another. Matthew Arnold on the other hand in his book entitled **Culture and Anarchy**, has branded as culture the cultivation of the individual alone. No doubt, the views of such noted writers have merited a considerable following. Their views however are untenable for they do not render justice to the ideal meaning of "culture." It is their aim principally to defend certain attainments which play only a part in culture. Many people today shelter similar opinions. We often hear people commenting on the cultural refinements of an individual musician, artist, sculptor architect, or what have you. They do not stop to consider the fact that there was need of a cultured group or society to offer guidance and to present him with the culture of past ages. In a

case such as this, culture for them means essentially the product of a culture. There seems to exist little understanding of the factors which were responsible for bringing to the fore the developed talents of the artist in question.

Moreover, it is to be pointed out that many well intentioned people display vagueness with regard to how culture should be achieved. Culture is one thing that we cannot deliberately aim at. And yet, there are many people who claim that we should aim at it deliberately. Truly, such a point of view is to be discouraged. We can aim at achieving a culture indirectly in so far as we shall have nurtured stimuli in order to pursue a certain direction in its attainment. But, it will be indeed more beneficial if we will have let matters follow their own course. Each activity in a culture must be pursued for its own sake. Culture will then be the net result of all activities working harmoniously in the embellishment of the system. In other words, we might add that logic should be its guiding principle. Let us begin where we should. Culture may be said to be somewhat analogous to a work of art. This is so, for we must take into consideration each move, and work as best we can, thereby assuring for ourselves the satisfaction of accomplishing a great work. If people were to correct their logic in this respect, the term "culture" will have survived another of its great obstacles.

It seems, in fact, that because of these varied notions, culture of the present day cannot impart any value to the original Greek ideal, but rather it needs illumination by that ideal, in order to establish its true meaning and direction.

Modern achievements, remarkable as they have been both as regards scientific and technical development, will most assuredly give man a more extensive mastery over the forces of nature, the beginning and end of human life. It is however quite certain that such a mastery will not transform the earth into a paradise of assured enjoyment. Herein lies the crux of the problem. For it seems, that because of an overemphasis on the material aspect of culture, the wholesome development of all of man's potentialities has been placed in jeopardy.

Many of us will agree that man is going through a period of transformation. We are succeeding fabulously in this respect provided only that we accept the machine and all its attendant effects upon our way of life as the final goal and sole beneficiary of the transformation. Because of what modern machinery has been capable of accomplishing in the way of comfort, far too much stress has been placed upon it, and not far enough stress is being placed upon the development of the soul of man. Consequently, we find man defeating his very purpose and losing in the struggle.

It is evident that there are far too few among us who have come to realize the problems that are at stake, despite the fact that the ranks in the minority are gaining in numbers. Those who truly realize what man is and what he is capable of doing, feel that unless man restores his own confidence in the forces of life, unless he loves himself more than the machine and the material comforts of the present, the papers for his abdication, perhaps for his annihilation, have been signed.

The reader may ask himself and with justifiable reason, why so much stress has been placed on this particular point. Well, it is just this. Although we appreciate what modern advances have made, we firmly contend that such advances should definitely not be considered as ends in themselves. Yet, that is what has taken place in our modern world. Such a situation is unhealthy, for if man today considers such advances as practically the only end and purpose of life, society and the individual himself will be subjected to a deadening regime that could stifle his intangible aspirations. Indeed, the process has gone far beyond its embryological stage, if we may use the expression.

Man has made stupendous material advances, but the question is, has he advanced intellectually in due proportion? I answer quite bluntly that he has not. Now, the problem is, which is more important, intellectual advancement or material advancement? If we would but ponder for a moment on the question as to the reason why we were created, to know and to love God, I feel that we would or at least should arrive at a convincing appreciation and understanding of the great importance with regard to the need of intellectual advancement. For it is principally by way of intellectual advancement that we arrive at the Ultimate. Science and the material advances which it has afforded us can lead us to a stable realization of this fact, but the all too prevalent practice of either stating outright that science and its advances are more important, or of living our lives as though this was all there was to live for must be condemned.

This material culture in which we find ourselves wrapped, is still generally acclaimed as the ultimate hope of man. It however does not stand up under critical examination.

It seems then that according as our scientific means become more perfect, our human ends too often become more trivial, irrational, life-frustrating and life-defeating. The more science progresses, the less does it seem to offer us in theoretically arriving at the ultimate nature of the universe, still less of the meaning of life.

The culture of the present has been one of degeneration from the fact that instead of building up a firm center upon the essence of man, it has systematically ignored this central function, thereby losing the human criteria needed for guiding technical develop-

ment into the channels of human purpose. Relevant to these factors, such a system cannot fit into the pattern of an idealistic culture. Matters have not been permitted to follow their own course. The purpose of nature itself has been disturbed and consequently such a total materialistic and technological approach to human life cannot but inevitably result in chaos and self-defeatism. It is likewise self-defeating from the fact that an adherence to such cultural principles is an adherence to the development of only a part of man's almost infinite potentialities.

Because of these seemingly limitless potentialities, man is of necessity destined to explore all the avenues of his creative possibilities which well forth spontaneously out of the deepest levels of his being. If man does not subject himself to such an exploration, it follows that he will not live a truly normal life. To be normal implies a subjection of oneself to the laws and purposes of nature. The overall study of philosophy gives us a clear insight into the relationships between man and these forces. Man is a rational animal. Because he is thus constituted he is expected to act and direct his pursuits according to the requirements of such a constitution. We are brought into the world intellectually naked, but by no means incapable of doing anything about it. The faculties of man's soul were given him for a definite purpose, the purpose of clothing his intellect with the garments of truth and creativeness. And to meet this purpose it is his obligation to make use of all his potentialities, not just a part of them. The fact that man has these potentialities is sufficient proof of this.

Today however, the scale is unbalanced. Man's material development has tipped it and it would seem that the intellectual weights have either corroded or been shelved. There can be no doubt but that because of a general belief in the machine as man's ultimate destiny, creativeness and freedom have been sadly impaired. Many of us are unaware of this and are complacent enough to conform and to adjust ourselves according to such a regime. It seems that the only factors which prevent us from realizing how deeply we have sunk in this respect are the residual traditions which were established prior to our modern age. Why for example do we have today such a meagre and seemingly uncreative abundance of great works of music, art and literature? Has it been due to a lack of the true sense of creativeness in modern man which has been brought about by placing far too great emphasis upon the material aspect of culture as we have it?

These factors, at least, must be fully considered by those who are fostering the movement toward a distinctive Canadian culture. Once the notion of culture has been given some sort of a reasonable definition, and this definition has been accepted by those who will have most occasion to use it; once the end and means of a culture have been clearly discerned and sincerely acted upon; once it has been determined whether a culture is a material fabrication

or a spiritual evolution, then, and only then can those who are advocating a distinctive culture for the Canadian nation hope to meet with even a token success.

—HENRY GAUDET '57—

YOUTH'S PURPOSE

Sad is our youth, for it is ever going,
Crumbling away beneath our very feet;
Sad are our hopes, for they were sweet in sowing,
But tares, self-sown, have overtopped the wheat.

Joys which, to us, in youthful years of pleasure
Are not confined to mortal's surly bonds,
Grow sad and die, when subject to life's measure
Of time, wherein all but the soul responds.

But sweet is youth when we have learned to prize it
And bear each trouble whether light or grave;
Not for its sake, for courtesy denies it,
But for the One whose excellence we crave.

—MARTY—

N. F. C. U. S.

In this article it is not the aim of the author to display his literary talents or the obvious lack of them, but merely to make N.F.C.U.S. better known to those who read **Red and White**. The organization is officially known as the National Federation of Canadian University Students, and, as the title implies, is the official voice of students from Newfoundland to British Columbia. It is composed of 23 member Universities representing over 45,000 students. The official organization consists of a salaried National President, who is a student, a Secretariat, four regional Vice Presidents, and the Committees on the local Campi.

The Federation was founded in 1926, ceased its activities during the Second World War, and resumed them again in 1946. Since that time it has met with varying degrees of success. The objects of the Federation as officially set down are very noble and are as follows:

1. To promote a better understanding among all Canadian University Students.
2. To promote a greater degree of co-operation and correlation among all Canadian Universities.