

seems inappropriate: an innocent child dies as a consequence of a parent's sin. So it is with Watergate and its consequences. Those proven guilty will pay the fines and serve the jail sentences. But there are innocent people caught in this vortex — jobs lost, reputations ruined, political structures damaged, and enormous pain to the families of those involved. It is a sad day for the Republican party, and a lot of Democrats are gleeful. They had better listen to John Wesley's dictum: "There but for the grace of God go I." And if Sen. Goldwater is right, future disclosures might well reveal similar chicanery among the Democrats. If so, let judgment fall and justice be vindicated!

Is there any word of hope in this mess?

Of course. The biblical understanding of judgment is not punishment alone, but also redemption. There is joy in judgment. There is joy in the coming of the Lord. There is joy when the thief repents and paradise is immediately opened to him. After David came Solomon, and a large part of Solomon's wisdom came about because David had been unwise.

We have been shown that a free press is not to be feared (e.g., for instant interpretations of political speeches) — far from it; the press merits honor and protection for its devotion to truth during a time when a lot of us were swallowing the lies that were being fed to us as the truth. We have seen for ourselves that a balance of power between the executive

and the legislative branches of government is needed to provide a safeguard against irresponsible power, and that it is time for Congress to clean its own house, strengthen its own moral and intellectual fiber, and then to reassume its rightful place in this balancing of interests.

And we have learned that power can be used either for good or for evil; but if those on the side of good lack vigilance, then evil will masquerade as good, and the destruction of high values, truth and genuine goodness is upon us. Let us, therefore — Republicans and Democrats alike — comfort one another in love, and perhaps there shall arise among us new political Solomons who will do what is right in the sight of the Lord.

J. CLAUDE EVANS.

Reader's Response

A Little Debate About Technology

Replying to Thomas G. Donnelly

SIR: When I heard that a technologist, a computer specialist, had attacked my book *The Technological Society*, I was quite pleased, for it is always a good idea to pay attention to criticism; it may lead one to revise his positions and sharpen his analyses. At the same time, I was surprised too, because generally — at least in France — it is the philosophers who object to my work and the scientists who agree with it.

But when I read Thomas G. Donnelly's article ("In Defense of Technology," Jan. 17) I was deeply disappointed and taken aback. Disappointed, because there is a great deal of anger in it, a great deal of fulmination and anathematizing, but no evidence at all, no serious analysis, no *fact* (despite Donnelly's claim to the contrary). If I were to adopt his attitude, I would merely say that his article is superficial, a tissue of false accusations; that it reveals complete ignorance of sociology and complete incomprehension of my writings; and, finally, that it utterly distorts my thought. But let me try to do better than that.

I shall not take it upon myself to answer those of Donnelly's strictures that are not directed at me. He charges, for example, that certain people insist that automation will result in massive unemployment. Well, I've never said anything of the sort anywhere. But I want to point out that on this question sociologists and economists are very much divided. There are two opposing views of it, both supported by equally strong evidence. Yet Donnelly, totally

ignoring the complexity of the case, settles it by asserting without proof that automation will *not* result in massive unemployment.

I

But as to what concerns me: Donnelly invariably distorts my statements. For example — for I adduce evidence — he says (p. 66) that in my book on the subject I define technology very broadly but deal only with industrial technology and do not consider such techniques as "political double-talk . . . public relations trickery . . . Machiavellian deceit." In fact, however, that book of mine has a chapter on political techniques and one on the technique of the humanistic sciences in which these questions are treated. Either Donnelly hasn't read the book or else he deliberately distorts it. Moreover, as the natural sequel to my *Technological Society*, I wrote a book on propaganda, where he could have found a detailed discussion of these matters. He would have done better to read it before talking.

Another example (p. 67): he accuses me of writing that "the machine" cannot be "checked or guided." I defy him to find such a statement anywhere in my writings. What I wrote is that the *growth* of technology as a system cannot be "checked or guided." (But perhaps Donnelly doesn't know that there is a system in sociology also.) On page 68 he says that I caricature those parts of the technological reality of which he has firsthand knowledge — "computers, mathematics, stochastics," etc. Well, I say

practically nothing about computers in my *Technological Society*, because it was written between 1948 and 1950, and Donnelly must know that at that time the sociological problem of computers did not exist. About mathematical techniques I say not a word in that book. And its passages on stochastics (application of the calculus of probabilities to economic phenomena) I submitted for revision to Prof. Rouquet, the outstanding French economist who does stochastics. But this too was in 1950. Now, these are virtually the only factual elements Donnelly advances, and they are all inexact. I hope that in his own field he is a little more exact in the observation of facts.

I could do without another element in Donnelly's critique. He undertakes a psychological analysis, and declares several times that in face of technology "philosophers and humanists" react with fear, hatred and a feeling of impotence. It is these emotions, he says, that account for their anti-technological stance. This is rather amusing (and, by the way, I am not a philosopher; I aim to be a sociologist). But here too Donnelly simply makes assertions; he does not adduce a single fact in evidence. In return I could assert that he is so passionately devoted to technology, and so disconcerted over his inability to come up with a scientific rebuttal of sociological criticism of technology, that he gives way to anger and blindly piles up accusations. That's an argument as good as his.

Elsewhere in his piece he says — again without proof — that I am "conservative and reactionary." The truth is, I have always said that it's not a question either of returning to the Middle Ages or of doing without the benefits we might gain from technology. I said as much in the preface of the very book Donnelly attacks. Maybe he hasn't read it?

Finally, Donnelly thinks he is doing a subtle bit of analysis when he suggests

(p. 67) that my view of technology is merely a projection of a kind of arbitrarily constructed interior world of my own. I suppose then that the little problems of pollution and the destruction of natural resources, for example, are but a projection of my personal imagination. If such were the case I would be very happy for humanity. Now I don't overestimate these problems and I don't use them as an argument against technology, because I believe that technology can solve them (I disagree with the MIT report). But I discussed them in 1950, and it would have been well if, instead of embracing technology so enthusiastically, people had listened to me *at that time*; then we would not have the problems that beset us today.

II

I close with an observation. Donnelly contrasts the scientific method, which consists in "generalization," with humanism, which proceeds by abstraction (p. 69). This seems a false juxtaposition to me, because science also proceeds by abstraction (surely the passage from the physical phenomenon to mathematical interpretation of it is an abstraction). Moreover, Donnelly obviously doesn't know that the sociological work I do likewise has its scientific methodology—a very rigorous methodology, though different from that of physics. As to generalization, evidently the problem is: generalization of *what*? For in these fields it is impossible to know all the facts. In his admirable *Technological Man*, Victor Ferkiss generalizes on the basis of facts different from mine, but his work is not more scientific than mine. It is only the future evolution of the technological society that can determine which of us is right. And I am not much worried. The technological developments of the past 20 years have accorded at all points with my predictions.

I say nothing about the political views which underlie Donnelly's defense of technology and in part dictate it, for these are matters of opinion. The rest of his article bespeaks the "offended technician" and illustrates exactly what I have written about the personality of the technician who has become a "believer" and can't stand criticism. But what Donnelly fails to grasp is precisely that I have never *attacked* technology. On the one hand, I have attempted to describe the whole sociological problem of technology, with emphasis on my conviction that the benefits accruing from technology are well worthwhile. On the other hand, I have attacked the *ideology* of technology and *idolatrous* beliefs about technology. And it is here that Donnelly has felt himself wounded.

JACQUES ELLUL.

University of Bourdeaux,
Bourdeaux, France.

CRITICISM: Books and the Arts

The Jungian Approach

BOUNDARIES OF THE SOUL. By June Singer.
Doubleday, \$10.00.

† IT IS one thing to read the works of Jung as either literature or philosophy and quite another to see how his psychology is put into practice. June Singer, an analyst who studied at the C. G. Jung Institute in Zurich, reveals the secrets of Jungian analysis through her use of the Jungian approach with patients. The subtle distinctions between Freud's and Jung's approaches are at some points clarified and at others somewhat blurred. For example, Dr. Singer states that "one distinctive feature of the Jungian approach is the analyst's openness about himself and his reactions." From my own experience, I do not regard Jungian analysts as unique in this respect.

The archetypal patterns, as they emerge in the patient, are delineated in some detail in the book. The process of individuation is described—not as Dr. Singer has learned it or read about it, but as it unfolds through the drama of analysis. The chapter on "Psychological

Types: Key to Communications" is extremely valuable. Jung was responsible for the terms extrovert and introvert, and to his credit he attached equal importance to the two types. There are four functional types of "thinking, feeling, intuition and sensation" existing both at the conscious and at the unconscious level—16 "types" in all. These are illustrated by means of case histories of patients.

The book is an excellent contribution to the understanding of Jung, especially as applied to analytic practice. Dr. Singer has written with candor and understanding.

PAUL G. DIMMITT

Reviewers

Paul G. Dimmitt works for a publishing company in Highland Park, Ill. Dennis C. Benson edits *Recycle* and is a freelance media consultant in Pittsburgh. Lycurgus M. Starkey, Jr., is senior pastor at Kirkwood United Methodist Church, St. Louis.



Not all Christian ministers begin as ministers . . .

They have begun as salesmen, bankers, nurses, tailors, soldiers, engineers, and teachers, to name a few of the starting points. HERBERT BROWN began his career as a millworker. He had also been a mechanic, TV repairman, and accountant. He was a mill foreman when he decided to answer the call to ministry. His age and lack of college training were major concerns for him. But through the unique "Bangor Plan" he enrolled in a two-year program in liberal arts and sciences. A sophomore now, he will begin studies in the theological department in September. Two years of college remain at a school of his choice after this five-year period of intensive study has been completed. He will then be eligible for the Seminary's Master of Divinity degree.

Herb's accounting and management skills are proving valuable in his position as book store manager at Bangor. Recently, he was called as a student pastor to a United Church of Christ parish in Maine. He moved his wife and daughter to the community in which he serves. This rural church is providing first-hand experiences in ministering.

Like Herb, other men and women—many in their thirties and forties—are literally changing the direction of their lives—beginning "late" a vocation in church-related work. Write us today to find out how this 159-year-old interdenominational Seminary may make it possible for you to answer God's call to ministry.

Bangor Theological Seminary

For further information write
President Frederick W. Whittaker
300 Union Street, Bangor, Maine 04401



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.