



## THE HUMAN SITUATION IN A TECHNOLOGICAL WORLD\*

SUAT SINANOĞLU

The technological world and Man who has created it are situated in the European-Atlantic region of the earth. Consequently, speaking about the human situation in a technological world means speaking about Western Man. We can therefore state that neither fatalistic and irrational Man, nor mystical Man, whose instants of ecstasy are his flashes of knowledge, are of any interest for us. The primitive man who creates his view of the world through direct contact with nature, and the yogi who is able to regulate his blood pressure are also outside our concern. The inhabitant of the technological world is Western Man, a specimen of the human race who is evidently a creation of nature, but also the creation of long human experience - experience which Man has consciously lived and rationally evaluated.

It is Western Man who has been able through thirty centuries of history to find out and analyse his own psycho-somatic characteristics, to identify and classify his different inclinations, his different talents, to develop them to the highest degree, and, dominating Nature, to create a world which is both natural and human. Western Man is a harmonious organism, who has succeeded in coupling and blending freedom and respect for the rights of others, physical well-being and spiritual enjoyment, a taste for nature and adaptation to the urban environment; for nothing or almost nothing produced by Man contradicts his nature, and, therefore, Nature itself. That is why the plastic arts, painting, poetry, music (as created by him) are the translation in forms and volumes, in colours, in rhythms of words, in musical notes (and, as far as they express human desires, hopes, sufferings, and dreams, they are the human interpretation) of volumes, forms, colours, rhythms and the sound harmonies of Nature. The transmutation of natural beauty and artistic beauty into spiritual enjoyment weaves instants of happiness into the life of Man.

The humanists were the depositaries of this culture. The institution where human and rational education (the kind most in keeping with human nature)

---

\* Paper read at the International Conference organized by Mr. John Sewell, chairman of The European-Atlantic Movement: St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, July 1973.

was given, was the classical school. The classical education was so efficient in moulding the mentality of Western Man, that, despite living in the XXth century, he felt himself closer to the Greeks of 2.500 years ago than to his contemporaries in the Middle East or North Africa. This unity of intellectual education permits us to consider the western civilisations, which have succeeded each other down the centuries, as a unique complex of civilisations, whose successive phases have shaped the spiritual development of mankind.

But the weak point in this most civilised world was social inequality: the happiness and the well-being we have referred to were the privilege of a minority. Scientific discoveries and technological progress have enabled society to enjoy to the full a life which is more and more worthy of man; on the other hand, the fact that industrial society has an increasing need for skilled workers, technicians and specialists has raised the average level of education to a point never reached before. So that the masses today, intellectually more elevated (being rich in notions and well informed, although not cultured in a humanistic way) are conscious of their own rights and, because of this consciousness, are the most powerful force affecting a nation's social and political life.

A number of concomitant causes (and not only industrialisation, as even the most eminent sociologists think) have profoundly changed the way of living of western societies; and this has affected the mental habitus of Man as well as the institutions in which people are educated. Present-day Man is no longer "sapiens", nor "faber", but (if I may say so) "technologicus".

Humanist philosophy, having ignored the scientific, technological, and industrial development of western societies, is no longer able to dominate, analyse, and lead the natural course of events, the natural evolution of things. Its obstinate refusal to concern itself with modern social life has provoked its present crisis. Its crisis is the crisis of the humanist school of education and, consequently (which is much more serious), the crisis of western civilisation.

Today the classical school (providing young people with a humanist education) is criticised from several points of view. It is accused of being dogmatic (Russell); it is regarded as useless except for country gentlemen's education (Ferrarotti); it is attacked as giving aristocratic education and being antidemocratic, not complying with the principle of equality in education; it is said to be anachronistic, to be a kind of escapism, to be encyclopedic, to be incapable of preparing young men for life by giving them professional instruction or specialisation as needed by society. But what is neglected is the evaluation of the classical school in terms of its main function, i.e. the

education of man according to an ideal which has been elaborated in the course of thirty centuries of western experience - the education of man who, where necessary, must not accommodate himself to life, but fight it and mould it in conformity with his own principles.

The crisis of humanist thought, which carries with it the failure of the classical school and is one of the principal factors exacerbating the problem of the human situation in the modern technological world, is due to a complicated interlocking pattern of causes and effects.

The humanists have not been able to keep pace with the scientific-technological development of modern times. The unity of arts and sciences, so natural to the Greek mind, has been broken in modern times. The split between sciences and arts, due partly to the negative influence of Christian thinking, and partly to scientific discoveries, has resulted, following the growth of industrial society, in the rejection of the humanists from social life. Humanist education has refused to give the sciences the place they deserved because of their development in recent decades. The humanists know that everything that seems inexplicable and super-human to the non-specialist can be rationally explained by science, but they think they are not supposed to know its principles.

The humanists are not even aware of the fact that technological-industrial development requires of the masses, and at the same time, gives them the opportunity to acquire a lot of notions and a degree of information which earlier generations never had. This phenomenon has raised the level of information of the masses and has made them more clearly aware of their rights to a more dignified life.

The consequence has been that the humanists have never thought it necessary to make society the object of their inquiry. They have believed that its best specimens could represent it in all its changing aspects and its material as well as cultural interests. In their absence of concern for society, the humanists have remained aloof from the active research of sociologists, and have not accepted that sociology, whether it is an independent science or not, is certainly a scientific approach to the society.

Confident in the soundness of their own minds, trained in logic and dialectics, and capable of dominating passions, they did not care to study the psychological state of the average man in his different reactions to the environment, to the particular conditions of work and life. Consequently, they have not appreciated the results of psychological research.

Trusting to their common sense, they are devoted to traditional teaching; they have never felt any interest in the new methods which pedagogy proposes and they are not aware of the fact that pedagogy, incompetent when pretending to replace the philosophy of education, is often efficient where techniques and methods of teaching are concerned.

They have no inkling of the wide possibilities which the techniques of audio-visual teaching offer today. In short, the humanists seem not to realise that the size of the problems alters their nature and that a scientific approach is needed.

Being alienated from the sciences, it would be useless to expect contemporary humanism to be interested in technology. Already the concept of liberal arts in Antiquity rejected as unworthy of free man the artisan's technology, where (in spite of the Turkish dictum, according to which "the tool creates and the hand claims the prize") it is the hand that, managing the tool, creates the object. The artisan's production is still an artistic creation, even if the functional has priority over free creation. It is an art which, although it cannot be defined as free creation, nevertheless is, if I may say so, an art of variation; for, every object has its own particular birth and shows the mark of the artisan's momentary, capricious inspiration. Industrial technology, on the other hand, has rendered Man's ability and the inspiration useless, the one being allotted to the machine, the other to the artist or artisan entrusted with the creation of models. The products of mass production have no individuality, they endlessly repeat the master, on which no variation is possible. We cannot expect the humanist who (although knowing the terracottas of Myrina and the vase painting) is not interested in the artisan's craft, to feel any interest in industrial technology.

As a result, the humanists, who have deliberately held themselves aloof from modern sciences and techniques, and from the problems of man and the phenomenon of his growing awareness of his rights, have been excluded from co-operating in the solution of problems which once constituted their field of studies, i.e. the field of education, culture, and civilisation. Cultural relations between the western and the non-western world are the most prominent example. Here the humanists are ignored, they have no say in the matter; nor, I think, would their advice carry any weight.

Concluding we may say that the humanists once used their knowledge of their own society for a better understanding of classical antiquity and knowing it better they were capable of better evaluating and orienting their

society. But at present the humanists are not aware of the problems which industrial society has to face; thus, they can neither see the classical world from a new point of view, nor make an authoritative contribution to the solution of the cultural and social problems of today. The best scholars of antiquity among the younger generations seem to recognise that the charges levelled against them by the modernists are somehow true, and, on the other hand, wanting to compete with the scientists in original findings and sensational discoveries (a thing which is impossible in the field of classical studies) they prefer to transfer to neighbouring fields (particularly attractive are the civilisations of the Middle East, where there is much to be done) or they exercise their perspicacity and erudition in criticising and interpreting Greek and Latin authors of little or no importance.

The humanists having given up the field; the study of Man and problems relating to his education, his professional training, his family and social relations, his material and spiritual needs, have become the monopoly of the social scientists. The social scientists think that, if they want to impose their views on society, they have to fight the humanists. To be non-humanist is their specific characteristic: the older generations out of repudiation, the new generations because of the education they have received.

The social scientists have devoted themselves to their own field of studies with the zeal of pioneers, impatient for discoveries; they have set themselves intensive work programmes, they have often gone beyond the limits of their area breaking into the neighbouring ones, they have undertaken innumerable research projects of wide range and general character (macrosociology) or they have pursued studies of strictly circumscribed extent, studies on small details (microsociology); they have amassed vast quantities of documents of all kinds, statistics and surveys, so that they have been obliged to ask themselves: "Knowledge for what?" So much was research pursued for its own sake, without any real purpose.

Problems are now tackled systematically: but what this category of scholars and intellectuals seem to lack is a sound philosophical and historical background. The modern scientist works from actual reality, from scientific data, but he is ignorant of the most genuine part of himself. He does not know that contemporary Man, the subject of his research, is a product of thirty centuries of conscious evolution, that this man owes his frame of mind to thirty centuries of history, of a history which he has not undergone, but created. And since he fails to realize that his mind is a product of historical processes,

he finds it hard to penetrate the human condition. Sometimes we have the impression that he forgets that the human condition has two sources: nature and culture.

The modern scientist, lacking knowledge of man as such and, hence unable to see the particular problem in its more general context, is very often misled in his conclusions. The sociologists who often work not from the methodological exigences of sociological science, but from real situations, even ones which are coincidental but require a prompt solution, in their effort to examine the problems of workers, have for a long time analysed and judged the worker only as such, without taking into account that in reality the worker does not exist; what exists is Man; work is only one of his functions, he has so many other functions and so many different aspects, as a family member, a citizen, an individual having an inner world, and so on.

A significant example of this incomplete knowledge of Man is provided by the United States. The American Government, in the years following the second world war, believed that for helping the developing countries the provision of funds would be sufficient. But later it realised that a profitable use of funds was possible only provided that skilful economists and good administrators looked after their investment and therefore proceeded to create institutions to train the necessary specialists. But it seems to me that the American leaders never realised that it is impossible to train modern administrators and economists without revolutionising the traditional education of their society and giving them an intellectual, moral and aesthetic education based on humanist values. For it is evident that the economic development of a country needs first of all a secular vision of life and the assimilation of the human and rational values of the western world.

This lack of knowledge about the cultural history of the west sometimes induces sociologists to carry out research, the results of which turn out to be truths which modern humanists or thinkers of classical times pointed out years or centuries ago. So William H. White Jr., in his "Organization man", referring to the incompatibility of humanist thought, not indeed with science, but with technology, is pointing out a truth that an eminent Oxford University Hellenist, Professor Reginald Dodds, strongly affirmed many years ago. Recently a German scholar, Professor von Fritz, in his report to a seminar held in Paris in August 1972, demonstrated that Konrad Lorenz, fighting against Watsonian behaviourism, according to which individuals are equal at birth and differences of character and particular abilities are due to the

environment in which they grow up, discovers a truth which Aristotle discovered 23 centuries ago, namely that men are born with different and marked talents and inclinations to specific activities. Differences between individuals are most pronounced in Man, and no other creature can compete with him. Environment and education can only promote or not promote their discovery and development.

On the other hand, ignorance of the history of human thought breaks the continuity of history and confines the scholar in the present world, so that his conclusions are very often vitiated by a partial, and hence erroneous, view of problems.

But the rediscovery, as it were, of truths acquired in antiquity does not constitute the major harm. The major harm is that ignorance of the historical development of the human mind, the statistics which reduce the human being to a mere numerical datum, the analysis of the human body, of Man's brain, his nervous system, his physiological functions, the study of man as an element in the social fabric, the evaluation of his role in society - all combine to induce the social scientists to consider Man from the point of view of his anatomic-physiological structure, from that of the society of which he is a member, from that of technology (which is his creation!), and finally from the point of view of the needs of industrial growth and mass production, so that, as Raymond Aron says, he becomes a medium of productive organisation.

It is a fault on the humanists part to have considered classical antiquity for centuries as an eternal model to be imitated (in so doing they have, among other things, delayed the evolution of several concepts, such as that of art) and it is a fault to have remained aloof from the dynamic life of contemporary society. But it is a fault on the part of modern scholars to want to study a phenomenon in itself without studying the history of its origin and development; so that, being incapable of imagining a reality different from what they have before their eyes, they can only tinker with reality, believing they have revolutionised it.

In conclusion, we may say that what is happening now is not a conscious evolution, but rather a simple natural process of events.

The alienation of the humanists from contemporary life and the alienation of sociologists from the concept of the continuity of western culture, have left modern man at the mercy of the conditions created by scientific discoveries, by its technical applications and, above all, by industrial growth which seems to follow its own inner logic.

The impression is that the concern of Man, transferred from the external world to Man himself at the time of the Sophists, is now averted from him and concentrated on technology.

Western Man finds as many hours of employment as he can endure. He is charmed by all kinds of objects (whether useful or useless, pleasant or repellent, but all pretending to be original and, in any case, being different from preceding models); industry offers them in abundance and at prices which are more and more accessible. Western Man works more and earns more: his aim is to spend more and acquire more. The progressive growth of consumption is a peremptory demand of great industrial complexes, the aim of which is their own perpetuation, regardless of the real needs of society. Industry, by rationalising work, accelerating its rhythm, by using automation, favouring the creation of models which are more and more attractive, does its best to increase demand. It does this, not only for the sake of profit, but also because the growth of production reduces the cost price, and, hence enables the masses to satisfy their needs.

But the sacrifice required of Man is a big one. In return he has to adapt himself to the machine. His physiological characteristics have been studied to ascertain what his highest efficiency can be as an element of the machinery (Taylorism).

Specialisation requires a long period of teaching and training; and that means that in the schools the educative disciplines (those which educate Man as man) are more and more reduced, giving rise to marked intellectual poverty.

The average level of technical and professional instruction and of specialisation is very high. The learning and the assimilation of so much knowledge cultivate Man's intellectual faculties. This has produced a new, broad class of intellectuals, who are anything but humanists. It cannot be said that the intellectuals of our times have a remarkable general culture, but they are very well informed, they have a wide horizon and they are able to analyse every situation from the particular point of view of their specialisation.

The American way of life has spread to Europe; it dominates all the European-Atlantic community. The rhythm of life is so intense and values are undergoing such rapid transformation that the older generations find it hard to accommodate themselves to a restlessly changing society. But young people are angry: they think that this accommodation is slow, equivocal, irresolute, and delayed. The crisis and the contestation of youth have serious motives. Young people feel that the new possibilities provided by modern

technology impose the necessity of a new evaluation of the essential factors of contemporary civilization, a new conception of the purpose of human life, of society and of the State; a new conception which will free man from slavery to the machine, as once he freed himself from slavery to nature.

The intensive life of modern Man (not consciously directed to any pre-determined aim) is a succession of hours of working and hours of amusement: he has no time to listen to his inner voice, to retire into himself, to ponder; because life in industrial society is timed in minutes and seconds.

The life which is lived, but not meditated, the life which Man does not dominate, but undergoes, has shaken, in my opinion, some pillars of the system of traditional values.

First of all comes entertainment. The greater the strain placed on the nervous system by work and the more easily and pleasantly the need can be satisfied by modern broadcasting techniques, the greater is the demand for entertainment.

But what is entertainment? I think (and I am referring particularly to the cinema, to TV and radio, to magazines) that entertainment, to a large extent, is "to witness the vicissitudes of others, the creation and activity of others". Then, is entertainment true spiritual enjoyment or simply relaxation, treatment of the nerves? Aristotle says that to live is to create or to act. Today Man devotes much part of his time to "spectating". To what extent is "spectating" a need which has its origin in the psycho-somatic characteristics of Man? Is it a means of true happiness for man, or is it a source of fallacious happiness, as drugs are? I do not think that the problem has been put in humanist terms. Man has no time to ask himself if he is happy "spectating" or if he has to create and act in order to be happy.

What is sure is that physical fatigue, intellectual work, and joy in creating are native and inalienable characteristics of Man.

Now another traditional value which seems to me to have fallen by the wayside is the conception of work as a source of enjoyment, as acting and creating, and as the earning of daily bread.

Nowadays work demands much more an effort of the nervous system than physical fatigue; on the other hand, social assistance and social security have deprived the struggle for life of all meaning. There is only emulation for a better life. But that too is not a general feeling.

Work (and not only productive work) has, then, in large measure lost

its function of dominating activity which gives meaning and orientation to the life of man, has lost its character of a main occupation for man.

This is, in my opinion, one of the most important effects of industrial society on human life. As work was enjoyment, purpose in life, source of morality, we may venture to say that the need for acting and creating must be transferred from the field of "negotium" to that of "otium". "Otium" has, then, to be endowed with a new content and a new aim. We must remember that technology and industrialisation allow a considerable saving of time. Developed countries have already reduced the working week to five days and will reduce it still further. In future, man will have more time for free creation and activity.

Modern Man lives in a totally artificial environment where there is no horizon and no landscape, nor even natural light and natural air. For he lives surrounded by the insipid forest of reinforced concrete, and he works in modern blind caves breathing the filtered air which is let in and by the light of fluorescent lamps. Man is alienated not only from his work, but also from nature. Natural phenomena do not exert any influence on his life; he does not live at the rhythm of nature, but at that of the machinery to which he has given movement. Under such conditions man cannot feel cosmogonic feelings and ask himself what the mystery and purpose of life is. The result is increasing impoverishment of his inner world.

His thirst for knowledge is exploited by an avalanche of information, propaganda and advertising. World events are presented to him in such an artistic way and by such advanced technology that people confuse more and more the concept of information and that of a rooted general culture.

The impoverishment of the inner world of man is the cause and, at the same time, the effect of the slackening of family bonds and of the weakening, among other things, of the sense of human solidarity.

The self-sufficiency which begins before a young man or girl has completed his or her studies, the parents' desire to live their own life until their old age (while once to a certain age they felt that they had to devote themselves to their children), the independence acquired in early youth; the economic sufficiency as a result of which the most humble employee does not depend on the generosity of his employer, have overthrown the affective life of the individual (remember Aristotle's fine analysis of the relations between benefactor and beneficiary).

Man lives in groups (when working, when amusing himself, when at home) but he feels and is isolated. It has been a hasty and fallacious conclusion to

welcome TV as a strengthener of bonds between family members: I do not think that to sit in front of the same set and watch the same programme can bring people closer together. On the contrary, the TV programme is often an obstacle to dialogue between relatives who generally have the opportunity of meeting only at supper time.

Man has a diminishing need for others' support and assistance; and that makes him less cordial, less generous, less kind towards his fellows. Social relations, based on mutual interest, make him less sensitive, less inclined to human solidarity, less sympathetic with man's sufferings; man grows more and more selfish, unscrupulous, inaccessible and alien to the sense of gratitude. What is being lost is the consciousness of human ultimate purposes. A new kind of *homo*, namely, *homini lupus* is born.

Urban, industrialised society has, then, shaken some of the basic conceptions of the western world: the conception of work, that of spare-time, family ties, the affective life of individuals are deeply altered. A new education (which is no more humanist, but adapted to the needs of industrial society) concurs to mould a new type of human being, who, removed and detached as he is from nature and from his traditional values, is forced to change his most intimate nature.

I consider it useless to discuss whether or not some fixed elements exist in man, whether or not there is such a thing as hereditary human nature; for it is certain that Western Man (the hero of thirty centuries of evolution) has been able to create - cultivating his talents and inclination - his own nature.

Recapitulating, we may say that the growth of industry, due to the progress of science and of technology, is the principle underlying the social change which has taken place in the western world over the last decades. This has promoted a rapid and deep transformation of the way of life of western societies, and that transformation of the way of life has had an impact on the feelings and thoughts of Western Man, whose philosophy of life and frame of mind are altered. Concomitant causes of this alteration are the new conception of education, the abdication of the humanists, and the advent of scholars with a non-humanist and non-historical education. Since experience shows that nothing can change the development of a society, if a change does not occur in its essential components, the first thing to be considered is the rapid development of industrialisation.

I have already shown the negative side, from the humanist point of view,

of industrialisation. Now we must point out that the same techniques which have brought the industrialisation of society to its peak, are, from other points of view, a source of prosperity and welfare for mankind. Industrialised society has overwhelmed them with all sorts of good things, has rendered life very easy, has sheltered man from epidemics, from malaria, has eliminated malnutrition, and so on; it has almost doubled the average length of human life, contributing considerably to human happiness, which premature deaths and natural calamities once destroyed so often and so easily. It has enlarged his regional or national horizon so to include the globe and, recently, even the moon.

But there is more to it. Technology does not meet only the material needs of society; spiritual needs too are met by it. A single example may suffice: fifty years ago only a happy coincidence of numerous circumstances would allow a man to listen to a musical work of which he would be fond, while today man is able at any moment to listen to whatever composition he wants. This possibility may by itself counterbalance the sacrifice of Man who has accepted the order and the rhythm of industrial society. We cannot, then, think that he is willing to reject what is, at bottom, the source of his new opportunities and new hopes.

Now, before tackling the problem of how to safeguard the human condition without changing the technological basis of present-day life, I must complete the series of causes which have contributed to the present situation. I have already pointed out that the established order invests all sides of human life and it is so complex that we cannot see its source only in economic factors. Thus I have mentioned, besides the consumer economy, the abdication of the humanists and the inadequacy of modern thought. I have yet to discuss a cause which, although of a psychological nature, has affected trends in education more than any other factor.

Since nothing must be done to restrain the evolution of industrial society, it is the task of conscious thinking to proceed (re-examining the problem of Western Man from his origins) to a new evaluation of the human situation in our technological world. One factor contributing to the present false evaluation was the particular psychosis which spread in the United States as a consequence of the success attained by the Soviets in launching their first sputnik. This psychosis, even before being recognised as such, has given rise to drastic, radical measures, which have completely changed the orientation of American society's educational and cultural interests. The Americans who, after the

second world war, seemed to be willing, after a blooming period of creativeness, to pause for a period of reflection on what had been done, seeing that they had been overtaken by the Soviets in the field of space research, have given up their purposes of innovation; they have forgotten their need for a new education based on philosophical-historical grounds and aiming to better orientate their leadership in international politics, and they have proclaimed the general mobilisation of the minds best endowed by nature in mathematics and the natural sciences. The provision of large numbers of scholarships has incited the most talented youth of post-war generations to study physics and chemistry. In addition, the natural inclination to be attracted to fields on which the attention of public opinion is concentrated and an inborn ambition to excel have once again pushed emergent humanist studies into the background.

The fascination of scientific discoveries, the admiration aroused by the first space adventure have conquered the humanists themselves. With an increasing frequency they ask themselves if it is worthwhile spending years of study for a better understanding of Aeschylean tragedy or Platonic philosophy while scientists undertake the conquest of universe.

But the sputnik psychosis not only arrested, at its beginning, the humanist current in America, it provoked a recrudescence of the aspiration to material prosperity as the most valuable blessing of mankind.

Today there is much talk of alienation from work, from the environment, the family, society. But reality is worse: man is alienated from himself - from his natural inclinations, his psycho-somatic characteristics. Material prosperity is going to kill happiness.

The attitude of Europe has been surprising. Complexes, apprehensions concerning the future have urged post-war Europe to leave suddenly the historic role it played as a centre of intellectual influence. It has not lingered in following the example of America. The admiration provoked by the space enterprise, by the consumer economy, the admiration for the organising genius and capacity of the Americans, have introduced into Europe the American way of life. As I have said elsewhere, *America docet*.

The renunciation of Europe's capacity to be itself has had its most serious repercussions in the educational field: classical studies and, in consequence, humanist education, are declining rapidly. Greek has disappeared almost everywhere in Europe; Latin is on the retreat: already vanished in the secondary schools of the socialist countries, it is vanishing in the Scandinavian

countries; the other nations keep it vegetating in one or two of the sections into which the classical school has been broken down. Everywhere the teaching of classical languages is losing in efficiency. For admission to Oxford University, Latin is no longer required. In France, the re-arrangement of studies has made it possible, in principle, to be professor of Roman law or even professor of French literature with only a superficial knowledge of Latin as given in university courses. In Italy the problem of Latin has not yet been solved.

The scholars of classical antiquity themselves sometimes confuse philological research with the teaching of Greek and Latin, and these two with a classical education. What is more, the humanists are not aware that this time the problem does not concern this or that aspect of humanist education, but its very existence. And they are far from understanding that the weakening of the humanist spirit involves the future of western civilisation, that is the further evolution of mankind.

The school has been revolutionised: curricula, methods, aims, all have changed. Everything is considered from the point of view of fitting young people for modern life, but social scientists do not perceive that they are inducing man to adapt himself to the self-development of industry and to create a world which was once anthropocentric but is growing more and more technocentric.

As I have already said, school is considered from many points of view: professional, technical, pseudo-democratic and so on, but what has been overlooked is its principal function, which is to bring up Man as a man.

To analyse what have been the effects of the modernist school on the education of the individual would take too long. I can only offer a list of the results of the new education:

1. Less control of the passions, and hence less objectivity.
2. Less sense of the functional and inconsiderate claim for originality (as can be observed in architecture, furniture, etc.).
3. A diminished sense of aesthetics.
4. A diminished sense of responsibility.
5. Less idealism, less faith, fewer hopes.
6. A vanishing sense of human decorum.
7. And (being cause and effect of all that) less sense of the value of human being, who is more and more reduced to a cipher, to a guinea pig, to a machine for consuming the goods produced by industry.

The sputnik psychosis causing the said general mobilisation in America and affecting Europe, has exacerbated the long lasting crisis in the field of education, and, by its deliberate impact on the education of the new generations, has changed the general orientation of mankind.

From this point of view, we may say that really the Soviet success of the first sputnik has been a sensational event influencing, by means of the psychosis provoked in America, the roots of modern civilisation.

The sputnik psychosis, favoured by the abdication of the humanists, by modernist scholars' lack of historical perspective, and also by self-developing industry (which calls for more technical instruction and specialisation), has contributed in considerable measure to a non-humanist orientation, which can be defined as a *process of dehumanisation of the western world*.

Dehumanisation is synonymous with decivilisation - with betrayal of the human and rational principles which constitute the basis on which western civilisation is built. At present, western civilisation is in danger.

To my mind, we cannot deceive ourselves into thinking that civilisations are born, grow and disappear by natural law, and that if the present civilisation disappears, a new (and better) one may take its place. For western civilisation is not one of many civilisations on the earth, as Toynbee thinks, nor can it be considered as a "prima inter pares". Western civilisation is the only civilisation which does not believe in eternal divine models, but entrusts its destiny to mobile human intelligence and to its capacity of evolving forever. What is commonly termed "western civilisation" is in reality a complex of civilisations all founded on freedom of thought and constituting with their history the history of human evolution. This complex has its origin in the Homeric poems; different peoples in different historical ages have been incorporated in it. Its immutable basis is the mental habitus of free man, educated in the cult of beauty and jealous custodian of his own rights. The best specimen of *homo sapiens* derives his substance from nature, but his form is impressed on him by thirty centuries of history.

Now, what can be done to safeguard the creative energy of Western Man and his happiness?

Since the natural and historical qualities of Western Man are threatened by industrialisation and since the process of industrialisation cannot and must not be arrested, the problem is to find out how they can be reconciled. An effort of conscious human will is required to divert the natural course of events.

But diversion cannot occur while the forces at work in this natural process remain unchanged.

Thus, it is the task of the humanists to identify its components and try to reduce or eliminate those of them which are harmful or useless.

1. First of all, the humanists must again take their place in society. Less waste of time in pursuing studies already done over and over again, and more interest in the results of sociological research as well as in the principles on which new scientific findings are based, may render back to them the role they played until recently.

2. I am not sure that the sputnik psychosis will last. But all the measures taken under its influence must be re-examined.

3. The phenomenon of industrialisation has to be considered in a historical framework and evaluated from a humanist point of view. The phenomenon must not be allowed to grow by inner necessity, independently of human conscious will; Man must not be allowed to turn into an element of industrial machinery; Man has to reconsider his needs, to distinguish between them in Aristotelian fashion, classifying them as essential, useful, and superfluous. Only in this way can the consumer economy be brought to a halt and man freed from overwork. Mass production must be contained within the limits of an activity capable of providing all members of society with what is necessary and useful. Society ought not to be subjected to the pressure exerted by excessive production.

4. Being aware that the aim of mankind is happiness, industrial society must develop to its extreme limits but under control. For it is quite evident that cybernetics and automation, if well directed, can help free man from slavery to the machines and allow him to devote himself to occupations which are worthy of his intellectual capacities.

5. Indeed, automation and cybernetics offer two great possibilities; one is the increasing reduction of working days; the other is Man's liberation from long technical and vocational instruction; for recent sociological research has shown that in the most modern industrial complexes the number of specialised workers and technicians is decreasing owing to the fact that automation has no need of specialists, but of simple machine-minders and supervisors.

It is not fanciful to think that in future the monotony of supervising machines will be alleviated by means of some kind of rota system. An "industrial service" will be introduced, not dissimilar from the military service of today.

6. As has already been said, work as the individual's principal activity is condemned to come to an end. Man will be obliged to search the source of his own satisfaction and the aim of his life no more in labour, but in leisure. Man should have a steady and rich intellectual education in order to be capable of aesthetic enjoyment and of creating for himself a hobby which will be no more his favourite amusement, but the true mission of his life.

7. But here, as happens whenever the concern is with the solution of basic problems of society, we come up against the problem of education.

First of all, the humanists must energetically protest against every direct or indirect measure aimed at restricting higher education, as our present rulers feel themselves obliged to do because of the impossibility of finding for all people an employment worthy of their degree of instruction. For, as said before, Man's main occupation will not be work, but leisure.

But planning leisure in such a way as to give life meaning requires a rooted humanist education. This is the only one which can enable Man to find a purpose for his own life and, at the same time, help him to recover his endowment of generosity, his sense of human solidarity and sympathy. Humanist education should re-establish its old prestige and, contrary to what is happening now, should be extended in varying degrees to all kinds of schools.

The conception of school and out-of-school education must be revised. The school years, in spite of the claims of industrial society, should be devoted, to large extent, to the intellectual, moral and aesthetic education of young people, for the mental "habitus" are moulded in these years.

School education and out-of-school education must be considered as two complementary phases of a single systematic education. A young man, at a certain age, should be able to take up employment in society, but that should not mean the end of his regular studies. The young man must be given the possibility of continuing his post-school studies with the same regularity and assiduity as at school. His employment should not depend on the degree of instruction already received, but on his capacity to adapt himself to the work and to specialise.

Briefly, the school years should aim to give a fundamental humanist education, which further will constitute the common ground on which to start effective dialogue between technologists, social scientists and humanists. The first is the active and creative element in industrial society; the second is the specialist who studies problems as they arise; the third is the man who evaluates situations, events, and problems within the framework of human

evolution and is aware that the problem of the human situation in the present-day technological world is the problem of the survival of western civilisation.

I would like to end by saying that (a) a basic humanist education, (b) the spread of higher education and (c) the collaboration of technologists, social scientists and humanists are essential for Man's happiness and for the further evolution of western civilisation.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The concept of Western Man and that of western world considered as a complex of civilisations based on a common system of values, as far as the point of view of Arnold Toynbee on this subject have been discussed in a book which I published in 1960: *L'Humanisme à Venir*, Université d'Ankara, Faculté des Lettres (2nd edition: 1973).

Two papers, which I read in Aix-en-Provence (1963) and in Rio de Janeiro (1970), analyse the crisis of the humanist thought: *Humanisme actuel et Occidentalisation*, Actes du VII<sup>e</sup> Congrès de l'Assoc. G. Budé, pp. 579-588, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1964 (republished: *Humanisme Contemporain*, pp. 69-76, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1964); and *Les Etudes Classiques à l'Age Technologique* in "Anatolia" XV, pp. 41-54, Ankara 1973.

*Knowledge for what* (Princeton, 1939) is the well-known book of Robert S. Lynd.

Franco Ferrarotti's book, referred to on page 2, is *Idee per la nuova società*, Vallecchi editore, Florence 1966.

Discussing the rediscovery of truths pointed out long time ago by humanists or thinkers of classical time three scholars have been mentioned: William H. White jr.'s book *The Organization Man* was published in 1957, New York. E. R. Dodds' inaugural lecture quoted is *Humanism and technique in Greek Studies*, London 1936. Kurt von Fritz read his report at the symposium organized on the occasion of the 14th General Assembly of FIEC (Paris, August 1972): *The Position of Classical Studies in Our Time*.

On timing in industrial society see L. Mumford, *Technics and Civilization*, London 1946, and G. Friedmann, *Où va le travail humain?* The writings of Taylor have been brought together in a book entitled *Scientific Management*, New York 1946. On the evaluation of history and sociology see B. Croce, *Terze pagine sparse*, Bari 1955, and M. Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, Tubingen, Mohr 1951, 2nd edition, pp. 105 s q.

On the new intellectual class and the function of the humanists in the society see C.P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*, Cambridge Univ. Press, New York 1962, and P. Jaccard, *Sociologie de l'éducation*, Paris 1962.

## TEKNOLOJİ DÜNYASINDA İNSANIN DURUMU

SUAT SİNANOĞLU

Batılı insan psiko-somatik özelliklerini zorlamayan, aksine bunları en elverişli şekilde geliştiren ve değerlendiren bir uygarlığın yaratıcısıdır. Batılı insan özgürlükle başkalarının haklarına saygıyı, bedensel sağlıkla iç huzuru, doğa sevgisi ile çevreye uyumu bağdaştırmasını bilmiş bir insandır. Mutluluğu güzelde, iyide, estetik zevkte bulmuş bir insandır.

Bu kültürün emanetçisi ve temsilcisi humanistlerdi. Klâsik okullar insanı ve akılcı değerler sistemini kuşaktan kuşağa aktarırlardı. Ama yakın zamanlarda, bir yandan mutlulukla refahın bir azınlığın ayrıcalığı olması, öbür yandan bilimle teknolojinin süratle gelişerek kitlelere bir çok kolaylıklar ve imkânlar sağlaması sonucunda insanların yaşadığı dünya temelli bir değişikliğe uğramıştır. Çevre şartlarını değiştiren insanın kendisi de değişmiştir. Bunda, meslekî formasyona ve uzmanlaşmaya büyük yer veren yeni tip okulların rolü önemli olmuştur. Okumuş insanlar çoğunluktadır. Bu çoğunluk bugün haklarının bilinçli savunucusudur; sadece insan olmanın kendisine bir çok haklar kazandırdığını bilmektedir; ama humanist kültürden yana zayıftır. Bugünkü insan ne "sapiens", ne de hattâ "faber"dir; "technologicus" olmuştur.

Humanist düşünce modern bilimin, teknolojinin, endüstri gelişmesinin dışında kalmakta inat etmiştir. Toplum hayatına eğilmekten kaçındığı için de önemini, arkadan da itibarını kaybetmiştir. Bu bunalım humanist eğitimi de sarmış, batı uygarlığının bunalımı şeklini almıştır.

Bugün klâsik okul dogmatik, pratik erekten yoksun, antidemokratik olmakla suçlanmaktadır. Çağ dışı olduğu, hayattan kaçtığı, ansiklopedik nitelikte olduğu söylenmektedir. Fakat klâsik okulun asıl fonksiyonu unutulmaktadır: klâsik okulun fonksiyonu, insanı otuz yüzyıllık bir tecrübenin geliştirdiği bir ideale göre yetiştirmektir. Bu okulda yetişen insan, gerektiğinde hayata uymayı reddedip, hayata kendi ilkelerine uygun bir biçim vermeyi bilen insandır.

İşte bu okul humanist düşüncenin gerilemesi ile gerilemiştir. Humanistlerin yol göstericiliğinden yoksun kalan bir dünyada insanların durumu çok güçleşmiştir.