VOLUME XIII, NO. 13
MARCH 30, 1960

FOR A THINKABLE PEACE

A REVIEW article last month (Feb. 17) provided such effective quotation on the problem of war from Dr. Jerome D. Frank, a psychiatrist at Johns Hopkins, that we made an effort to secure more of Dr. Frank's thinking. A friend who had heard recently a broadcast of one of his radio talks wrote to the station and provided us with a copy of "The Nuclear Arms Race—Sanity and Survival." (Free copies of this talk are available from the Preferred Risk Mutual Co., 6000 Grand Ave., Des Moines, Iowa, and we strongly recommend that it be read in full, since it deals as searchingly with the obstacles to peace as any discussion that we have seen.)

It is extremely difficult, these days, to avoid brooding about the problem of war. So much is at stake, yet so little is being done by the peoples of the world to prevent war from coming. There are various ways to break the problem up into segments, but basically it seems to have two divisions. There is the practical question of what to do—what steps to take in terms of international agreements, measures, revisions of policy, etc., in order to remove as many as possible of the provocations to war, or at least to make war unlikely; and there is the moral question of how people in general are to become ready to *take* the practical steps.

Our interest is in the moral question, since the great powers have seldom lacked for experts in practical affairs, and the best possible plans for peace do not founder because they are without skill in design or sagacity of conception; they fail, instead, because people do not recognize their importance and are unwilling to do the kind of thinking that will make them acceptable.

Dr. Frank's talk is about this failure. Before quoting from his paper, however, it should be useful to have some illustrations of the difficulties that are encountered. This may be obtained by reprinting a letter by W. H. Ferry to the Santa Barbara (Calif.) *News-Press* (Jan. 13), and then looking at the comments by other readers, together with Mr. Ferry's rejoinder. Mr. Ferry has a "radical" proposal in behalf of world peace, and some readers may feel inclined to say that he "asked" for the indignant reactions his letter stirred up. Another view would be that so forthright an expression had the virtue of bringing the real issues out into the open; at any rate, the further correspondence provides ample documentary material to illustrate what Dr. Frank has to say.

Here, then, is Mr. Ferry's letter:

> Editor, *News-Press:* When one says that war is unthinkable, it must be taken as a literal statement, *i.e.*, nuclear war cannot be thought about. We have no vocabulary, no recourse to imagination sufficient to deal in logical terms with the prospect of 60 or 70 million American corpses, to say nothing about the carnage accompanying a nuclear attack, and to say nothing of the effects of radiation lingering over generations.
>
> Perhaps this is one reason why all current assessments of the impasse between Russia and the United States end up in the same sterile and hopeless formula: Arms and yet more arms.
>
> In commenting on the reports of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Stanford and Johns Hopkins research groups your editorial (Jan. 8) comes to the same fruitless conclusion, that since we cannot think of anything else to do, let us continue with all speed to make bombs, gas, germs, rockets, missiles and submarines.
>
> Suppose we were to go in the other direction? Suppose we were to junk all of our weapons of whatever kind? Suppose we were to tell the world that we are doing so because we are convinced that it is the only practical way out of the fateful dilemma in which all are caught?

The best possible result of such a decision is that it would give us the unquestioned moral leadership of an apprehensive world, that Russia would follow our example because of its declared eagerness to compete and surpass on grounds other than armed might, and that all could turn to the solution of humanity's pressing problems.

The worst possible result is that Russia would instantly take advantage of our defenselessness to bomb the U.S. into radioactive rubble. In this case we would not be worse off than if we had engaged in a two-way war. All that would be lacking would be a regret among survivors that we had not had vengeance on our attackers. But this result seems wholly unlikely. It may better be supposed that Russia does not desire the extinction of the U.S. but its submission as a nation and great production center to Communism.

Another and more possible result then is that this country would be taken over by the Reds, commissars replacing our managers and mayors, legislators and union officials, broadcasters and publishers. (We may also presume similar action in those countries of Western Europe and elsewhere for which our arms are said to provide a shield.) This is a desperate and repellent vision; and while I do not believe that this would be the outcome, it is necessary to accept it as a possibility if one is willing to argue that unilateral disarmament is the only practical policy for this country to adopt. Red domination of this and other free nations is at least "thinkable." We can at least imagine it in all its hateful and dismal aspects, while we find the consequences of a nuclear, germ, and gas war unthinkable and unimaginable. We would survive as a nation with the greatest of traditions and with the unquenchable intention of demonstrating by argument and peaceable resistance the power of freedom and justice as man's best and only proper organizing principles.

It might well take years or decades to regenerate freedom and justice. But we would have the chance to do so, a chance that by common agreement would not be vouchsafed us in the case of an all-out war which no nation could win. Should war come the task would not be resisting or throwing off the hand of an oppressor by reasonable means; it would be the task of rebuilding civilization from barbarism and chaos.

It is said that we are now following the only feasible road in seeking disarmament with ironclad agreements on inspection. This is not the "middle road" it is claimed to be, for the preparations for war continue without let-up. This argument contains, moreover, fatal fallacies. Inspection cannot be devised that will give absolute assurance against manufacture or stockpiling of lethal weapons. Highly productive countries like the U.S. and Russia will always be able to maintain facilities for making such arms, convertible almost overnight from peacetime industry. An inspection system is institutionalized distrust, and as fragile as any understanding so based.

The alternatives are drastic and repugnant in the highest degree. But the important point is that there is an alternative to our present policy.

W. H. FERRY

The question of whether or not an idea is "thinkable" has at least two meanings. There is, first, the matter of whether the idea contains elements which are literally immeasurable to the mind. This is the meaning used by Mr. Ferry. He says that the prospect of a third world war involves the anticipation of happenings men cannot really imagine. The scale of the horror, the death, and the destruction goes out of our intellectual sight. The mind cannot contain this prospect and cannot, therefore, deal with it on a rational basis. Such a war, he says, is therefore "unthinkable."

The other meaning of "unthinkable" has to do with the repugnance of an idea. There are ideas and proposals which people—some people, that is—are unable to contemplate in a rational mood because they seem to be *intolerable* ideas. Mr. Ferry's letter smoked out the fact that unilateral disarmament may be in some cases as unthinkable on an emotional basis as he finds war to be on an intellectual basis. (Of course, a future war is probably also unthinkable, emotionally, in the sense that we cannot possibly "feel" what such a war would be like, but Mr. Ferry's point was that the mind cannot really contain, even though the emotions may accept, the prospect of another war.)

There is not space to quote in full the letters critical of Mr. Ferry's communication; fortunately, extracts will serve. A woman writes:

> . . . I have felt for a long time that there is in our country a certain faction of people who advocate policies and trends of thought that lead toward total surrender. . . . However, I have never seen this defeatist attitude put into such blunt words as those of Mr. W. H. Ferry's letter. . . . I was so shocked by his admission of utter defeat and despair, it took me a few minutes to recover from its stunning impact. . . . Please, Mr. Ferry, read the Communist Manifesto . . . and see what their aims and creeds really are. . . .

Another letter:

> Does Mr. Ferry really think we are ready for the type of brain-washing he attempts in his letter of Jan. 13? I see the crux of his thesis in two of the later paragraphs of his letter in which he almost pleadingly advocates a course of submission to the Soviet remarkably similar to that pursued in France by the Vichy regime, in Norway by Quisling and up to last year by Mr. Nehru. . . . How close to blackmail do we have to be before we recognize it? How long would Red China let Japan, the Philippines, Formosa, even India, be free nations had there been no Seventh Fleet to back up the faith these nations have in our pledged word? . . . Because the Soviet was successful in having us believe that intervention would have led to "the holocaust," they got away with murder. They will continue so to do as long as there are those of little faith in the strength of the Western world. . . .

A more sophisticated communication alleges the "unthinkable" nature of Mr. Ferry's proposal:

> The policy Mr. Ferry asks us to consider would have a shattering effect upon the American people. The act of self-immolation would require a unity of purpose that could not be attained. In the absence of such unity, such readiness for martyrdom, the lives of people would lose all meaning.

(The point of this correspondent is that disarmament and its presumed result of invasion of the U.S. by Russia would not be followed by years and decades during which Americans would labor to regenerate freedom and justice.)

> In his anxiety to secure our country's physical survival, he would risk the destruction of the spiritual values we live by. Such a policy would lead us to a disaster as terrible as the one he is seeking to avoid.
>
> We would all like to escape from the nightmare threat of nuclear war. But the only hope of escape lies in conducting firm and steady negotiations with the Soviets—not in plunging down a path of desperation.

(We might note, in passing, that this letter represents the voice of traditional "sober judgment," and "realistic" common sense, with "due regard" for moral questions. The writer does not attack Mr. Ferry as a "defeatist" or a "coward," but calls his proposal "bold," and in analysis suggests that Ferry's account of what would result from disarmament is a mistaken anticipation.)

What is of interest here is that of the three letters quoted, only one reflects comprehension of Mr. Ferry's meaning. The other two move in entirely different networks of assumptions. They are not a rational response to what he says, but an angry rejection of an *unexamined* idea. The writers found the idea "unthinkable."

It is of course impossible to prove Mr. Ferry either "right" or "wrong." Nor is it possible to prove any of his critics right or wrong. The arguments and proposals of all the letter-writers have elements of speculation in them. But it is important to distinguish the least speculative elements from the most speculative elements in these arguments, proposals, and predictions. Mr. Ferry, it seems to us, wins hands down in this sort of comparison. He said in his concluding letter:

> I set forth the worst results of unilateral disarmament of which I can conceive and said that I would prefer them to thermonuclear war. They [his critics] would meet my argument by specifically accepting the worst conceivable results of thermonuclear war; this would make the real choices open to us much more clear. Neither, to be sure, is a pleasant alternative; mine is merely more practical.

What is this argument really about? There is no argument about the horror of nuclear war. Mr. Ferry affirmed the nature of this horror and nobody contradicted him. The argument is really about human behavior. Mr. Ferry thinks human beings will behave one way, and his opponents think they will behave in some other way. Mr. Ferry thinks that the moral effect of unilateral disarmament will be constructive; that other

peoples will respond to this sort of leadership. His opponents predict only cowering, betrayal, and disaster from such a course. Mr. Ferry thinks that if the United States should be occupied by a conqueror, the American people might be able to regain their lost freedom by means other than military action. His opponents refuse to consider this possibility, as being inconceivable in the face of the unworthiness of "giving up."

Except for Mr. Ferry, the writers of these letters express almost absolute certainty about what can be expected of human beings, both Russian human beings and American human beings. One writer declares that Khrushchev "exterminated a quantity of his own people, to equal a good-sized atom bomb," and asks: "Would he have more mercy on us?" With revulsion she pictures her own children "grovelling at the feet of monsters, murderers, barbarians, and forsaking their God, their honor, and their country, merely to save their life." Another writer predicts that disarmament would make the lives of Americans "lose all meaning."

How can they be so sure of these things? And if they cannot be so sure, why do they pretend to have such certainty?

Why do they dwell so insistently on these uncertain "certainties" while ignoring the certainties which are not uncertain at all—the devastation and death, the universal destruction, of another war?

Manifestly, we are confronted, here, not by questions of fact, not by the actual issues of war and peace, but by a psychological situation that will have to be understood before we can hope for progress in identifying facts and assessing probabilities.

Jerome Frank addresses himself to this psychological situation in his paper, "Sanity and Survival," and we are now ready to see what he says.

After reviewing the "facts" which Mr. Ferry's critics pass over without notice—that is, the incredible danger to all the world from nuclear war—he turns to the parallel between mental illness and the prevailing attitude toward the nuclear arms race:

> A striking aspect of our response to the nuclear arms race is our indifference to it. We go about our accustomed affairs and make plans for the future, just as if atomic weapons were not aimed at our throats. This is analogous to what has been termed "denial" in psychiatric theory. One way of dealing with unpleasantness it not to notice it. This is a healthy way of coping with many of the minor ills of life, and it warrants a psychiatric epithet only when it is clearly inappropriate. . . . The difficulty with "denial" as a means of coping with a problem is that it prevents taking constructive action. If the problem does not exist psychologically there's no incentive to do anything about it. When death is threatened from sources beyond human control, denial is as good a way of handling it as any, since nothing can be done in any case. But when the death threat is of our own making and can be removed from us, then the tendency to deny its existence is tragic.

When "denial" is abandoned, a worse situation may ensue:

> To the extent that we are indifferent to the dangers facing us, we make no attempt to solve them and this is sufficiently serious. Even worse is the fact that when we do attempt to find solutions, we seem to be trapped in a course of action which steadily intensifies the danger. Why can we not change behavior which we know is only making matters worse? One reason may be that we are frightened and one of the theoretical assumptions which I think has a good deal of basis in psychiatry is that too much anxiety tends to fix one's perceptions and behavior, and a lot of the so-called "repetition compulsions" of neurotic patients can be explained on this basis.

Dr. Frank has case histories from which to illustrate the typical behavior patterns described in this analysis. He now continues, discussing the effects of anxiety:

> The more panicky and anxious an organism is, the more blandly rigid his behavior can become. I wonder if this may not have some faint analogy to what is going on with us. . . . There is nothing harder to stand than uncertainty. So when faced with a dangerous situation one tends to over-simplify it. Everything becomes black and white. To use a more

> technical term, thinking tends to become "stereotyped" and there's one stereotype from which we are all suffering again right now and which will probably be fatal to the whole world, and that's the stereotype of "the enemy." No matter who the enemy is or who we are, the enemy tends to be perceived as intellectually inferior but possessed of an animal cunning which enables him easily to outwit us. He is seen as cruel, treacherous, and bent on aggression. Our side is seen as intellectually superior but guileless and therefore easily victimized, peace-loving, honorable and fighting only in self-defense. . . . It is remarkable how rapidly this stereotype of the enemy can be shifted from one group to another. Scarcely more than a decade ago, Germany and Japan had this stereotype and Russia was our noble ally. Russia has now changed places with Germany and Japan, and we are not even embarrassed by the memory of our recent pictures of these three countries. The fact that the enemy, whoever he may be, is viewed as completely untrustworthy is perhaps the major source of tensions leading to war.

Dr. Frank gives current quotations from national leaders to illustrate the habit of distrust. His next parallel with psychiatric diagnosis seems frighteningly accurate:

> The terrible thing about the mutual distrust of enemies is that some enemies are untrustworthy to begin with, but all become so eventually. Enemies cannot trust each other because each is forced to act in such a way as to justify the other's distrust. This is an example of what psychiatrists and sociologists have called the "self-fulfilling prophecy." One sees this pattern also in mental patients. The classic example is the so-called paranoid person, who expects other people to be hostile toward him, to look down on him, to be contemptuous of him or to be his enemy. So when he meets a stranger, he expects this response and he acts surly and disgruntled and suspicious and stand-offish and, sure enough, the other person starts to dislike him, and his prophecy is confirmed. And I think you can see that there is an analogy in what we are doing today to this situation. Each country expects the other to attack it. So each behaves in such a way as to make it more and more likely that this attack will occur. First of all, because each fears the other will attack, neither side enters into negotiations with good faith. . . . As one man put it succinctly, each side brings to the disarmament negotiations the precise attitude which caused the armaments race in the first place. So the negotiations break off with distrust increased on both sides. . . .

Well, we are back where we started—wondering about the best means to persuade people to take seriously the threat of war and the project of peace, and how to help them to do the kind of thinking that will make the project of peace acceptable to them. No "ordinary" sort of education will be sufficient. No wonder pacifists go to "extremes" to get attention for their ideas! No wonder intelligent observers find it difficult not to be pessimistic.

There is an advantage, however, in recognizing the scope of the undertaking, and the sort of obstacles which will have to be overcome. Dr. Frank's paper is an invaluable contribution for this purpose. He makes it plain that moral ardor without psychological understanding is not only of little value, but may also be a barrier to the solution of the great problems which lie ahead.

REVIEW
"THE TRUTH ABOUT PSYCHOANALYSIS"

AN article with this title in the *Reader's Digest* for January contains a British psychiatrist's criticisms of the Freudian school of analysis. With much of what Prof. H. J. Eysenck has to say, the thoughtful reader is likely to agree: Psychoanalysis did become and still is a "fad" for a great many people, and for those who approach the analyst with this sort of prompting, very little benefit may result. Further, the ignorant use of analytic jargon among laymen has undoubtedly "resulted in endless confusion and much harm." He adds: "People talk about their 'inferiority complexes,' when they really mean their *feelings* of inferiority—quite a different matter, of course, because they are aware of their feelings, while complexes are supposed to be unconscious." Dr. Eysenck might also have pointed out that for many, psychoanalysis has been interpreted so as to justify pleasant feelings of irresponsibility: *we* are not accountable for distorted behavior—it is our complexes and "inhibitions."

Unfortunately, though, Prof. Eysenck's somewhat breezy discussion passes by the subtleties and complications which must be faced in a study of Freudian methods. The really useful evaluations of psychoanalysis are usually contributed by men who themselves have undergone analytic training and who have worked in the field. An excellent example of the latter sort of writing appears in *Psychiatry* for November, 1959. Dr. Stanley L. Olinick, discussing "The Analytic Paradox," gives some idea of why it is necessary to consider the relationship between analyst and analysand as in part simply another "human relation," and for this reason we can not expect analysis to result automatically in successful therapy. Dr. Olinick writes:

> The analyst, although he stands as the advocate of individual integrity, inviolability, and spontaneity, is at the same time the initiator and agent of a process that for painfully long periods of time must be traced through a maze of submissiveness and intrusiveness. The necessity to assist the patient to the point of his "ego's freedom to choose" along a route of dependence, via the psychoanalytic processes of dynamic and genetic regression, constitutes a paradox, upon the solution of which depends the outcome of the therapy. There is no lessening of its stress from the fact that this paradox confronts every parent and indeed every authority-figure in a society where the privileges and obligations of the individual are traditionally honored. . .
>
> The "matchmaking," or tacit prediction as to outcome, that is involved in the initial bringing together of prospective analyst and analysand is based on grounds which are largely unconscious and irrational, and rarely carefully formulated. At the same time, the degree of success or failure of an analysis is not infrequently settled in these earliest interviews, or even during the first telephone contacts. Even so early, a sub-threshold intertwining of needs may be initiated, taxing all subsequent efforts at their resolution.

The "psychoanalytic paradox" arises from another paradox in human nature. As described by Dr. Olinick:

> The human being requires the recurrent experience of being at one with his fellows. This may take different forms, variously admixed with combined and permuted metapsychological factors. . . . The human being also requires the recurrent experience of being separate or separable from his fellows. Examples would include the processes of individuation whereby the developing and maturing person gradually differentiates himself from mother and father, to become, more or less uniquely, the *Gestalt* of himself. The requirement for separability may appear as a striving for, or a groping toward, autonomy and identity.

Erich Fromm's *Saturday Review* article, "Man Is Not a Thing," is ostensibly a criticism of psychoanalysis and yet, in terms of the points raised by Dr. Olinick, Dr. Fromm is defending the analytic technique, as opposed to hypnotism, shock therapy, and other techniques apparently preferred by Prof. Eysenck. For the great virtue of the well-schooled analyst lies in the fact that he does not *consider his labors with the patient to have predictable results.* Some of Dr. Fromm's

passages are especially interesting when read in this light:

> Complete rational knowledge is possible only of *things*. Things can be dissected without being destroyed; they can be manipulated without damage to their nature; they can be reproduced. *Man is not a thing*. He cannot be dissected without being destroyed. He cannot be manipulated without being harmed. And he cannot be reproduced artificially. Life in its biological aspects is a miracle and a secret, and man in his human aspects is an unfathomable secret. We know our fellow man and ourselves in many ways, yet we do not know him or ourselves fully because we are not things. The further we reach into the depth of our being, or someone else's being, the more the goal of full knowledge eludes us. . . .
>
> Psychology can show us what man is *not*. It cannot tell us what man, each one of us, *is*. The soul of man, the unique core of each individual, can never be grasped and described adequately. It can be "known" only inasmuch as it is not misconceived. The legitimate aim of psychology, as far as ultimate knowledge is concerned, is the *negative*, the removal of distortions and illusions, *not the positive*, full, and complete knowledge of a human being.

It is therefore a very difficult matter to sum up psychoanalysis in some kind of final judgment, just as it is difficult to make a final accounting of religion. What Freud did teach was an infinite patience on the part of those who must deal with distortions of human personality, and he himself believed that only the mind of the individual patient could manage a "mental" cure. He also had numerous theories of dream and symbol interpretation, many of them now proved inadequate, and preoccupation with this unwieldy half-science of the personality probably accounts for much of the confused thinking on this subject. But the best criticism and the most forward-tending philosophical conclusions concerning psychoanalysis are commonly made by those who have first gained an appreciative knowledge of Freud's views.

The closing paragraph of Fromm's "Man Is Not a Thing" illustrates how the analyst may reach beyond the lower elements of the personality to the idea of a "spiritual" nature in man:

> The final understanding cannot be expressed fully in words. It is not an "interpretation" which describes the patient as an object with its various defects, and their genesis, but it is an overall intuitive grasp; it takes place first in the analyst and then, if the analysis is successful, in the patient. This grasp is sudden. It is an intuitive act which can be prepared by many cerebral insights but can never be replaced by them. If psychoanalysis is to develop in this direction it has still unexhausted possibilities for human transformation and spiritual change. If it remains enmeshed in the socially patterned defect of alienation it may remedy this or that defect, but it will become another tool for making man more automatized and adjusted to an alienated and basically "inhuman" society.

COMMENTARY
A DOCTOR FOR THE NATION?

THE idea of a doctor for the nation involves complications far beyond those which exist in the ordinary doctor-patient relation, even though, as our review article shows, in psychiatry or psychoanalysis this relation is itself difficult enough.

But the value of Dr. Frank's diagnosis is so apparent that the analogy ought to be pursued further, at least to wondering about the possibility of "treatment."

The first condition of any sort of treatment is that the patient must want to be helped. Can we say, then, that the nation, conceived of as a "patient," wants help? Just asking this question conjures up the prospect of angry critics of any such program, and charges, already heard in some quarters, that the psychotherapists would like to become dictators of the nation's destiny.

This reaction, however, should not be disheartening. It is expected by physicians in almost any human being who needs psychological help. If there were no resistance in him to this help, he would not need the help. The therapist knows that the resistance will come, and is ready for it. In fact, a major advance in the treatment is accomplished when the patient slowly reconciles himself to accepting help.

What is the nature of this advance? Basically, it means that the patient has recognized that the therapist does not want to do anything *to* him, or *take* anything from him, or even *give* him anything. The aim of the therapist is to bring the patient to a realization that his recovery will depend upon his own capacity to see more clearly what his illness is, and upon his willingness to look for and acknowledge its causes.

Well, how shall we continue the parallel? An individual, we might say, is a convention of motives. The well person is one in whom these motives have achieved a reasonably ordered unity, through intelligent selection and decision. The well individual, that is, functions as a hierarchy rather than as a mob.

Can a nation be conceived of in this way? It is easy to draw the parallel with a dictatorial society, but can it be done with a democracy?

In a democracy, the man who gains the authority of decision is placed in that position by the confidence and trust of the people. This trust has two facets. First, the people trust him because they believe that he will not commit them in a direction contrary to their wishes. Second, they trust his capacity to make good decisions in matters they do not understand very well, or which require immediate action.

So a nation is, in this sense, very like an individual, except that the authority of national decision is delegated to the executive branch of government by the deliberate action of the people. In this *conscious* delegation by the people of the power to make decisions in behalf of the entire community, lies the difference between the *Organic* State and a Democracy. A free society needs authorities as much as an unfree society, to perform the functions which cannot be fulfilled in any other way. But in a democracy the governed consent to this authority, define its powers, and by this means participate in its decisions.

How, then, could a therapist "treat" a nation?

The answer seems plain. By reason of the nature of his therapy, a doctor can treat a nation only by a general illumination of the meaning of psychotic or neurotic behavior. And this illumination must be carried to the public, to the people at large, who will then have opportunity to choose executives in government who display an understanding of the problem and who express a willingness to act in behalf of a national recovery.

Actually, the therapist accepts no responsibility for decision. He is never a threat to a free people, since it is always the patient, never the therapist, who must make the decision that

leads to recovery. A man is not a thing. A nation is not a thing.

But since it is evident from Dr. Frank's discussion that the psychotherapists enjoy astonishingly clear perceptions concerning what is wrong with our national behavior, there is no reason why we should not seek from them as much illumination as we can get. Why not invite them to write more papers of this sort? Why shouldn't psychiatrists and psychoanalysts form an association and get out a magazine comparable to the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*? Why shouldn't a man like Jerome Frank be asked to be its editor?

The entire world would profit from such an enterprise. A foundation with some money earmarked for service to the cause of peace could hardly find a worthier undertaking. There would be criticism, of course; but the threat of opposition in the patient does not prevent the practice of psychological medicine. Why should it be allowed to interfere with devoted labors in behalf of the national health?

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
SPORTS, ETC.

WHILE a society embodying ideals of high purpose would probably find better uses for the energies which presently pour into stylized sports, as matters stand, international events like the recent Olympic Games are a boon and a blessing. For example: On Feb. 28 the U.S. ice hockey team struggled through to a surprised championship, defeating Czechoslovakia in the finals after an unexpected victory over the apparently superior Russian team. But this victory was in part attributed to the captain of the Russian team, who offered a "friendly assist" when the U.S. was trailing against the Czechs. The Los Angeles *Times* story pictures Nikolai Sologubov, captain of the Russian team, congratulating the U.S. captain, John Kirrane, on the victory stand. Previously, the *Times* reports, Sologubov had "bridged the gulf of international rivalry with one of the most heart-warming gestures of these Olympic Games." Although the Russian captain spoke no English, he had sympathized with the worn warriors of the U.S. who had played themselves out against the Russians and Canadians and were now losing to the Czechs. Finding his way to the U.S. dressing-room, Sologubov suggested oxygen "pickups" such as the Russians had several times themselves used:

> Sologubov, known as "Solly" to the American players, accompanied the U.S. trainer to the nearby medical room, helped him to carry the oxygen equipment back. The players each took a whiff, stormed back with an overwhelming attack and concluded their Olympics campaign unbeaten and untied.

Russian sportsmanship was impressively in evidence during the surprise loss of the Soviets to the U.S. after having won every previous encounter. Even that true-blue, 100 per cent American, Braven Dyer, of the Los Angeles *Times,* was moved to admire the manner in which the Russians took their defeat. Dyer wrote (*Times,* March 1):

> The high moment for me was the two minutes after John Patrick Riley's hell-for-leather hockey players had beaten Russia—3-2. This was the first time the United States ever had whipped the Soviets on ice and the demonstration by players and fans alike threatened to last indefinitely.
>
> Tradition calls for the two teams to line up facing each other in mid-rink, then step forward for handshaking and back-slapping. The beaten Russians stood there on the ice, crushed, of course, and waited for their conquerors to calm down. Had I been on that losing team I'd have been long gone to the powder room. Finally one of the Cleary brothers realized that the Russians were waiting. Eventually he got his mates in line and the ritual was completed.
>
> "That was the greatest demonstration of international goodwill I ever saw," said Lee Frankovich, former UCLA football captain, who stood beside me. "All the politicians in the world couldn't achieve anything that fine."

Frankovich articulated a sentiment felt throughout the whole Olympic Village and carried home by U.S. athletes. "Those guys are really great sports," was the consensus. American athletes—and finally the spectators—responded in kind, so that each triumph scored by a member of a rival team was cheered with heart-warming sincerity. Another *Times* report (March 1) reveals something of the spontaneous change in feeling, for most American spectators, by force of childish habits, had come intending to boo the Russians and cheer when their own representatives excelled. Lev Kassil, a popular writer in the Soviet Union, told the story when he telephoned his impressions of the Olympics. The *Times* summarizes:

> The writer said he was "a little puzzled over the terrible roars from the throngs of spectators" when a contestant, no matter what nation he came from, happened to win over a Soviet entry. "However, when the results were in our favor people frankly cheered the winners and tried to be first in the rush to congratulate them," Kassil said.
>
> Kassil was gladdened by the fact that the Soviet team had marched off with the largest number of gold

> medals. However, he added that "undoubtedly there was one main result and that was the strengthening of friendship between the sportsmen of the five continents."

Topflight athletes, it appears, do very well for themselves in human relations when left alone. The only sour note in the Russian visit was occasioned by a March 2 newspaper report from Stockholm intimating that a member of the Soviet team had deserted to seek asylum in the United States. While other newspapers were readying themselves to pounce, an investigation disclosed that the missing Russian was in his hotel room asleep. Besieged by reporters, Nicolai Romanov, head of Russia's Olympic team, asked, "Why do you dig up dirt? Why are you spoiling the good impression we have of America?"

When sportsmanship is integrated with sports participation, some of the missing ingredients in American formal education are supplied—if there is proper training and discipline. Significantly, though, it is at the highest level of performance that the highest levels of sportsmanship also arise. Frenetic high school rivalries in athletics, sometimes leading to deliberately "dirty" playing, should be tempered by the example of the recent Olympiad, for the thorough dedication and commitment of the athlete is symbolic, now as it was to the Greeks, of a man's capacity to rise above himself. Our youngsters need this kind of dedication, but they can acquire it only when they see beyond rivalry to impersonal appreciation of excellence, no matter where manifested. Strange that the athletes should teach philosophy by example, but let us be eternally grateful that they so often do.

Another means for lifting the young above pettiness is by encouraging exploration of the world of natural wonders. Stories of primitive adventuring speak out to every child, for in human struggles with the elements it becomes apparent that one has no real enemies save his own weaknesses. Jean George's *My Side of the Mountain* (E. P. Dutton, 1959) is the imaginary account of a youngster who left New York in May with $40, a pen knife, a ball of cord, and an axe, to see whether he could learn to live off the land in a remote portion of the Catskills. His intention was to survive a winter without assistance. *My Side of the Mountain* is filled with simple pen-and-ink illustrations of the devices which "Sam" had seen in books he had read—devices for catching fish, trapping animals, building fires and a winter shelter. Our own experience indicates that even a six-year-old becomes intensely absorbed in the details of this story, however improbable the number of triumphs attributed to "Sam."

There is a kind of purity both in intense sports participation and in solitary explorations of Nature, which helps the confused psyche of our time to understand the meaning of persistence and integrity. For each youngster there comes a time when he must light this kind of a fire within himself, and "Sam's" first achievement in fire-making can easily suggest a universal symbolism:

> I must say this now about that first fire. It was magic. Out of dead tinder and grass and sticks came a live warm light. It cracked and snapped and smoked and filled the woods with brightness. It lighted the trees and made them warm and friendly. It stood tall and bright and held back the night.

FRONTIERS

Garthnewydd Community House

[The declared basis of those who join together in community life is always of interest. The statement printed below is self-explanatory, being a formulation of the common interests and intentions of a community venture in a city in Wales. The address of Garthnewydd Community House is, Merthyr Tydfil, Glam., U.K.—Editors.]

BACKGROUND: For many years some pacifists have sought a more fundamental approach to the problem of peace than that offered by war resistance alone. A few of these have wondered if such an approach might lie in the application to our industrial society of Sarvodaya, the social philosophy of M. K. Gandhi. In 1957, at the Bristol Conference of the Fellowship of Friends of Truth (an inter-religious fellowship whose origin was also in India), the proposal was made to start an F.F.T. centre based on such an approach.

The main problem of finding premises for the experiment was solved when John Dennithorne, a Quaker who had worked several decades in the Merthyr Tydfi1 area, offered a property in the town, of which he had become trustee. John Dennithorne was active in the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War, and was imprisoned for his part in the demonstration at Swaffham. Two of the members here participated in the Aldermaston picket, and there are several other contacts with the Direct Action Committee. There are thus special links with the F.F.T., and D.A.C., besides the conscious attempt to apply in this country the Sarvodaya principles that Vinoba Bhave and his coworkers are working out in the different context of India.

However, we early decided that we should not officially affiliate ourselves with any organisation, but should rather try to maintain personal links with several groups working along similar lines (*e.g.,* the International Voluntary Service, Plaid Cymru, Servas and Peacemakers, besides those mentioned above) .

Statement of Basis: We are united in the feeling that there is purpose in the universe, that all forms of existence are interdependent, that all life is one; and this we see as a fundamental scientific and spiritual truth. The civilization in which we live denies this unity, being largely built on self-seeking and violence.

The society that we envisage will provide a favourable environment for the spiritual growth of the whole personality. It will differ from our present society by embracing meaningful work, decentralization of economic and political power, a balance of industry and agriculture, communal ownership of land and other vital social wealth, and in fostering a sense of trusteeship in all its aspects.

To make an effective witness to this ideal and to live out its implications, we have established a community house. It will be based on service, primarily with the local community. We are prepared to accept the greater self-discipline that this living together implies, and will endeavour to make ourselves better instruments of service through individual and group study. Income will be pooled, and decisions taken on the basis of unanimity. We envisage the possibility of non-violent action in the face of social and other wrongs.

We will try to apply in our lives the principles of truth, love and non-violence, to practice simplicity, to realize our kinship with the least privileged, and to eliminate in ourselves all barriers that violate the unity of life.

(N.B. This statement is an attempt to clarify our aims. We are certainly very far from putting it into practice, especially the last paragraph; the basis of service is at present largely one of intention only.)

Some implications of this statement are:

(*a*) Self-discipline by the individual, and an attitude of trusteeship towards one's body and mind;

(*b*) the rejection of all discrimination based on race, colour, religion, sex, class or nation;

(*c*) the working for radical social and economic change;

(*d*) a complete commitment to non-violence

(*e*) as complete a withdrawal as possible from the whole war machine, including refusal of conscription, and considering the non-payment of taxes for war (either by a refusal to pay or by living below the tax level);

(*f*) non-violent resistance, in particular to the preparations for nuclear war, and non-violent direct action when necessary

(*g*) an attitude of trusteeship towards other species, and a rejection of unnecessary killing;

(*h*) an attitude of trusteeship towards the soil, and a realization of man's close dependence on it for physical and mental wholeness;

(*i*) simple living, and the cutting out of luxuries that do not contribute to the growth of the whole personality.

Service: We are not interested in social service from the point of view of "salvage work" or patching up the fabric of present society.

We see it as—

(*a*) Mutual aid, and the answering of an immediate human need;

(*b*) a means of forging links with ordinary people, and of ensuring that we do not cut ourselves off from society;

(*c*) an essential part of training for those who intend to engage in non-violent resistance;

(*d*) a means of being more effective in a critical situation or when suppressed by government, through the moral authority that only disinterested service can give.

Study: We consider this to be of equal importance with service. Books that have particularly influenced the thinking of the group so far have been

(*a*) *Ends and Means* by Aldous Huxley

(*b*) *The Power of Non-Violence* by Richard Gregg

(*c*) *From Socialism to Sarvodaya* by Jayaprakash Narayan

(*d*) *The Orchard Lea Papers* by Wilfred Wellock.

Economic Basis: We have started a small glass fibre industry, which is providing full-time employment for some members, and which it is hoped will later provide considerable financial support to Community House concerns. It is hoped that the industry will develop into a radical experiment in industrial democracy.

Membership: Of the dozen or so friends who launched this experiment, four have found it possible to become members. Anyone who accepts the Statement of Basis and its implications is welcome to join, after a trial period of approximately six months.

Delegation of Responsibility: There is no "Leader." Responsibility is divided between members, including prospective members (*e.g.*, one person for catering, another for finance, etc.) and all community questions are discussed and decided at periodic house meetings, in which all Garthnewydd residents whether members or not are welcome to participate. Important decisions are made with the unanimous agreement of all full members.

Finance: Members pool income completely, but not capital. There is also some income from other residents and visitors (although the latter are regarded as guests, and not expected to pay anything unless they are really able and want to give). From this common purse are met food and household expenses, rates, fuel costs and other bills, ten shillings a week allowance for each member, and all particular needs (such as clothing). Income from letting rooms to various groups is put into a separate House Fund, for which the Trustee is responsible, and which is intended for repairs and other expenses connected with the property. We are considering giving financial help to other groups and concerns other than the Community House when we are able.

Disposal of Assets: In the event of the Community House being dissolved, any assets will not be used for the benefit of remaining members, but will be given to a group or groups with similar deals.

Communal Meals: As most of us feel that meat-eating involves avoidable killing, the communal midday and evening meals are vegetarian. Apart from these communal meals, however, individuals decide this question for themselves.

December, 1959