arrangement is not arbitrary. The first section is the shortened form of the notorious modern statement by C. P. Snow, who has been at the center of the controversy for at least a decade. This is followed by a careful definition of science by a humanist scientifically inclined, and this, in turn, by three pieces from past centuries which raise many of the modern problems. At the heart of the book are set—in essays by Matthew Arnold and T. H. Huxley—the classic nineteenth-century formulations of the problem as it relates to education. These are followed by Lionel Trilling's examination both of the nineteenth-century debate and of the contemporary, acrimonious debate between F. R. Leavis and Snow. Next, there are biographical sketches of a scientist, Charles Darwin, and of a humanist, William Butler Yeats, two men whose very lives suggest the nature of the conflict. These follow, after Whitman's famous poem dramatizing the romantic reaction to science, several recent works—one an extremely intelligent and amusing science-fiction story—which suggest how various writers and scientists have attempted to work out the problems to their personal satisfaction. The essays by Robert Oppenheimer and Howard Mumford Jones indicate the difficulty of making intelligible to the layman the problems of their divergent disciplines. At the conclusion is a forceful and complex statement of the possibilities of reconciliation between the two modes of knowledge. The bibliography, though necessarily very incomplete, offers a relatively wide variety of material for further reading.

Our thanks go to Nancy Dillingham, Valerie Gottesman, and especially Kay Dinesmoor who provided outstanding secretarial help, some of it beyond the call of duty; to Michael Wolff, who suggested some provocative questions; and, of course, to our wives, who contributed the understanding and encouragement necessary to the completion of the manuscript.

G. L.
O. T.

Bloomington, Indiana
February 29, 1965

"It's rather odd," said G. H. Hardy, one afternoon in the early Thirties, "but when we hear about "intellectuals" nowadays, it doesn't include people like me and J. J. Thomson and Rutherford." Hardy was the first mathematician of his generation. J. J. Thomson the first physicist of his; as for Rutherford, he was one of the greatest scientists who have ever lived. Some bright young literary person (I forget the exact context) put them outside the enclosure reserved for intellectuals seemed to Hardy the best joke for some time. It does not seem quite such a good joke now. The separation between the two cultures has been getting deeper under our eyes; there is now precious little communication between them, little but different kinds of incomprehension and dislike.

The traditional culture, which is, of course, mainly literary, is behaving like a state whose power is rapidly declining—standing on its precarious dignity, spending far too much energy on Alexandrian intricacies, occasionally letting fly in fits of aggressive pique quite beyond its means, too much on the defensive to show any generous imagination to the forces which must inevitably reshape it. Whereas the scientific culture is expansive, not restrictive, confident at the roots, the more confident after its bout of Oppenheimerian self-criticism, certain that history is on its side, impatient, intolerant, creative rather than critical, good-natured and brash. Neither culture knows the virtues of the other; often it seems they deliberately do not want to know. The resentment which the traditional culture feels for the scientific is shaded with fear; from the
emphasis. They also support the notion of the end result being a product of both the physical and metaphysical realms. The phrase "end game" is a metaphor for the ultimate goal of the game, which is to achieve victory. This metaphor is used to illustrate the idea that life is a game with its own set of rules and objectives. The phrase "end game" is also used to describe a situation where the outcome is predetermined. In the context of the game, this means that the winner is determined before the game even begins. The phrase is also used to describe a situation where the outcome is predetermined. In the context of the game, this means that the winner is determined before the game even begins.
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What science is, and why it is important to us...

...though it does not originate with that—a moral one...

...knowledge acquired through experience and study...