

## THE TIDE OF PEACE

IT would be a great thing if a man could add to the common longing for peace a deep conviction that it is going to come about. Vast changes have overtaken the human race, without our being very much aware of them as they were going on. A scholar of history, perhaps, or a sociologist concerned with the translation of moral vision into the historical process, could enrich our hopes with facts. He might be able to document an interpretation of the present with parallels from the past—with studies of how once powerful institutions die out and are replaced with new ways among men.

Is it conceivable that men will one day abandon war and violence? If you read only the daily newspapers and the large-circulation magazines, any such possibility may seem the remotest of dreams. The concentration of modern leaders on the plans and projects of war has never been as intense as it is right now. Never have the intellectuals of a civilization given so much of their ability and resources to the military requirements of State as highly trained and skillful minds of the United States are today devoting to the strategy and armaments of war. By what miraculous process could this intensification of the military means of meeting international issues be suspended, and a comparable intelligence be turned to labors for peace?

There is a comment to be made on this question, even if no answer is available. The men who are devoting their intellectual abilities to preparations for war are using only their professional resources and a kind of "technical" imagination in this work. They are not functioning as complete human beings, but as specialists whose ends are marked off and determined by other men. They are hired hands, and we must not think of them as *representatives* of the age, but only as its symbols, and symptoms, perhaps, of some of its gravest defects.

We spoke, earlier, of a need for scholars to concern themselves with such problems. This century has been fortunate in producing at least one

man who combined humanist ardor with a knowledge of history, and who, some years ago, undertook a series of studies not unrelated to our question. *The Processes of History* was first published by Frederick J. Teggart in 1918, at the close of the first world war, and it is apparent from this book that its writer felt an extraordinary compulsion to bring his knowledge to bear on the problem of war. He wrote:

It is obvious that war has played a most significant part in the advancement of mankind, but the benefits it has conferred have been confined to the break-up of crystallized systems of organization and of thought. Since man has not become sufficiently self-conscious of the natural processes which dominate his life, he continues to submit to the fixative influences of group discipline, and throws all his weight in favor of maintaining the *status quo*. It follows that, in the past, the gateway of human advance has been the violent conflict of the representatives of old and new ways of thought and action, whether old and new be embodied, for the occasion, in states, in groups within a given state, or in single individuals. It must, therefore, be regarded as a shortsighted view which imagines the conflict thus precipitated as in itself a desirable thing, though, heretofore, man's ignorance of himself has made such conflicts inevitable. . . . War has been, times without number, the antecedent of advance, but in other cases, such as the introduction of Buddhism into China, the same result has followed upon the acceptance of new ideas without the introductory formality of bitter strife. As long, indeed, as we continue to hold tenaciously to customary ideas and ways of doing things, so long must we live in anticipation of the conflict which this persistence must inevitably induce. (*Theory and Processes of History*, pp. 292, 313, University of California Press, 1941 edition.)

Dr. Teggart never stopped thinking about this problem. Years later, during World War II, he published a paper entitled, "Causation in Historical Events," in the *Journal of the History of Ideas* for January, 1942, in which he said:

Civilization is menaced by war, but because it is dominated by theories of violence and by preachments

of strife as the means to the establishment of a millennium—such as Nietzsche imagined. Strife, war, and revolution are openly advocated as the procedure necessary for the settlement of difficulties, not only in the external relations of states, but within every nation.

But the ideas which play an all-important part in modern existence were formulated by individuals—whose names and works are known to us—for the purpose of exciting populations, classes, and individuals to acts of destructiveness. Onward from 1808 the mind of the German people has been obsessed by the glory and necessity of war. For the forty years from 1860 to 1900 the intellectuals of France, England, and America accepted the domination of the doctrine of struggle and violence inherent in Darwinism. With the coming of the twentieth century, the fashion of thought underwent a change, and the new generation of intellectuals submitted to what they conceived to be a new type of thought by exchanging Darwinism for the teachings of Marx.

The essential difficulties of the modern world are difficulties in thought. Are we to admit a permanent intellectual bondage to views put forward in the nineteenth century by Fichte, Darwin, and Marx? The future of civilization turns on our ability to face the difficulties in thought which confront us. Preparation for the future is the obligation of scholarship, just as the prosecution of the struggle of today is the responsibility of government. We may look forward confidently to the ruin of our civilization if we cannot bring ourselves to face the burden of intellectual leadership. All great periods in history have been times when men were found willing to face difficulties in accepted ideas. The opportunity lies open.

Dr. Teggart might have put these paragraphs a little differently, were he writing today, but his major point would hardly change.

Are uses being made, today, of the opportunity "to face difficulties in accepted ideas"? If you read only the conventional press, as we before suggested, you will know practically nothing of the extent of what is happening along these lines, but if you should happen to be a subscriber to the *London Peace News*, or of *Liberation*, published in New York, or are on the mailing list of the Committee for Nonviolent Action (CNVA), or the Fellowship of

Reconciliation, or the War Resisters League, you may have reason to be encouraged.

But who, someone may ask, ever heard of the handful of people who are making this protest? There is an answer to this minimizing objection in a sentence quoted above from Dr. Teggart. He wrote: ". . . the ideas which play an all-important part in modern existence were formulated by *individuals*—whose names and works are known to us—for the purpose of exciting populations, classes, and individuals to acts of destructiveness." Their names and works were known to us, that is, years after they formulated the ideas which became the keynote of our historical epoch.

The people who are now seizing the opportunity spoken of by Teggart may indeed be unknown to us, but will they remain so? What if we stand on the threshold of a new epoch of history? And what if these people are among the architects of that future?

Last month John Beecher, a professor of English at Arizona State University, in Tempe, Ariz., gave up his teaching career to join the San Francisco-to-Moscow Peace Walk. Mr. Beecher is a poet (see *MANAS*, April 25 and Aug. 22, 1956, for examples of his verse), and a former teacher of social science at San Francisco State College. His wife Barbara, an editor and artist, and his associate in the Rampart Press, has also joined the peace walk. "I believe," said Mr. Beecher, "my example in joining the walk will be more effective teaching than anything I might be able to do in the classroom."

So, Prof. Beecher joined the motley band of a dozen or so peace walkers, with their knapsacks and brogans, their tired feet and posters against war. What good will that do? Perhaps one needs to jog along a few miles with the peace walkers to find out. Perhaps one needs to get the feel of how people are thinking in the United States, without benefit of the newspapers. Yet it is fairly obvious that, so far, there are only faint suspicions that a way can be found for the world to get along without war. Some of the encouragements people along the road offer the peace walkers are sentimental and superficial; many of the friendly bystanders don't realize that outright rejection of war means a major revolution in

human affairs, and probably civil disobedience for many of the pioneers of the movement. The walkers themselves explain regretfully that a lot of the verbal support they get comes from people who don't understand very much of what the demonstration means. But not all the encouragements to the walkers are of shallow depth.

The Peace Walk to Moscow is one of the projects of the Committee for Nonviolent Action—a group with headquarters in New York—to which many of the younger pacifists in the United States have gravitated in recent years.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation, an organization of Christian pacifists, initiated the still continuing vigil at Fort Detrick, at Frederick, Maryland, where pickets stand outside a Government center for research in biological techniques for destruction of human life. The Vigil is called "An Appeal to Stop Preparation for Germ Warfare." There biologists working for the Army Chemical Corps are building an inventory of insects infected with deadly diseases, and developing means to spread plant diseases capable of destroying the basic food plants of the world. Teachers in four of the country's leading divinity schools (Andover Newton, Boston University, Yale University, and Wesley) signed an appeal for support of the Vigil at Fort Detrick, saying:

In his disturbing article, "The Morals of Extermination," *Atlantic*, October, 1959, Lewis Mumford states that, "Many of our professed religious and moral leaders have steadily shrunk from touching this subject (the moral breakdown permitting the justification of total war); or, if they have done so, they have naively equated mass extermination with war and have too often given their blessing to it, for reasons just as specious as those our government has used." These are strong words, but can their aptness be denied?

What shall we do to recover a responsible approach to "the morals of extermination"? We know that there are many ways to work for peace, but we also know that the time has come for men to stand up and to be counted. Nothing short of a mighty upsurge of individual conscience can turn the accustomed habits of men and governments from war to peace. . .

At missile bases and at germ and chemical warfare research centers across the continent the symbolic action of mass annihilation is daily rehearsed. Should we not join with our fellows in a symbolic action to affirm personal responsibility for national policies carried on in our names? And should we not do this willingly—even at the cost of some personal inconvenience and discomfort? You hold the answers to these questions. . . .

This letter was addressed to the faculty and students of the four seminaries named.

Polaris Action is a project of the Committee for Nonviolent Action which was begun last June, in New London, Connecticut, and still goes on. The Polaris submarine, armed with intermediate range ballistic missiles, is said by Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, to be "purely a weapon for massive retaliation." According to a Polaris Action bulletin, there is to be a fleet of at least fifty such nuclear-armed submarines, each "able to launch within fifteen minutes several times the explosive power of all the bombs dropped by American planes in World War II; and the fleet of fifty an attack *six times greater* than one which the Rand Corporation estimated would kill 160 million Americans in 36 hours."

Polaris Action has involved picketing, leaflet distribution, poster walks, and acts of civil disobedience, gaining numerous reports in the local and national press concerning the protest. Since June an office of the CNVA has been maintained in New London, where inquiries are invited and explanations are made of the reasons for the project. As of February this year, Polaris Action began activities at Charleston, South Carolina, point of departure to England of the Polaris submarine, *Proteus*. A bulletin recites:

English pacifists are preparing two forms of reception. A "Committee of 100," including Bertrand Russell, is organizing 2,000 people to gather outside an official building in London and remain there, perhaps illegally, for a time. Another group plans to await the arrival of the *Proteus* with binoculars. When the *Proteus* is sighted, bonfires will be started on hill-tops and church bells rung as during invasions in ancient times. Some will go in kayaks to obstruct the arrival of the *Proteus* where the base for Polaris submarines is to be established.

The Charleston, S.C., demonstration will include an attempt nonviolently to board the *Proteus*, or to obstruct its departure.

Other phases of Polaris Action will include civil disobedience at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, on March 11, by an attempt to board the Polaris craft *Abraham Lincoln* (*sic!*), followed by a walk to New York to reach the United Nations headquarters on Easter Day (symbolic of the plea that "any or all nations should disarm unilaterally").

Eight members of Polaris Action are now under indictment on charge of entering a restricted area, which carries a possible penalty of ten years' imprisonment plus a fine. This prosecution is the result of civilly disobedient action in a demonstration against the *Ethan Allen*, another Polaris submarine. Two of the eight face a second count and additional penalties for "touching" a Polaris submarine. (Financial aid, in the form of checks made out to Polaris Action, and sent to CNVA at 13 North Bank Street, New London, Conn., will be welcomed.)

One of CNVA's early undertakings was the demonstration at the Camp Mercury nuclear bomb testing grounds in Nevada in 1957. There on Aug. 8, anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, pacifists joined hands across the road leading into the restricted area. Several protesters were arrested and given jail sentences. The later picketing and acts of civil disobedience in 1959 at the government missile base near Omaha, Nebraska, brought convictions to a number of demonstrators, including Marjorie Swann, mother of four. (Robert Swann, Marjorie's husband, is now under indictment for counselling civil disobedience in connection with Polaris Action.) An annual activity sponsored by CNVA is the group refusal to seek shelter during New York's civil defense drill. Last spring, similar protests were carried out in two other cities. These "offenses" brought jail sentences and fines to the participants. The 1958 voyage of *The Golden Rule* into the Eniwetok testing region of the Pacific was another CNVA-sponsored project.

Last summer a *Nation* writer, Barbara Deming, attended a sixteen-day training program conducted by the Peacemakers, a group whose efforts closely

parallel if they are not identical with the work of CNVA. Miss Deming's report in the *Nation* (Dec. 17, 1960) was quoted last week in *Frontiers*. Here we add her brief comment concerning the reactions to CNVA activity of those who were shocked by its occasional civil disobedience. "But why," they would ask, "break the law?" Miss Deming remarks:

The depth of many Americans' awe of authority astonished me. "Would you have broken the law if you had lived in Germany under Hitler?" I heard one workman questioned. He answered stoutly: "No. I believe in obeying the law." Those who viewed with the greatest alarm the prospect of challenging authority (and who invariably assumed that individual action must be ineffectual: "What can you or I do? It's up to our leaders") were the same people who professed that they would rather die—would rather see mankind exterminated—than live "as slaves" under "authoritarian" Communist rule.

The longer I listened to the advocates of nonviolence in conversation with the townspeople, the more I was struck by the difference that marked them off from the majority—a difference, I think, directly resulting from those "foolish" acts in which they are engaging.

That the *Nation* is giving increasing attention to the thinking and acts of people of the sort associated with CNVA is itself a sign of a change in the outlook of the serious intellectual community. Further evidence of this comes in the form of a new announcement by the several sociologists, psychologists, historians, and others who have united under the name, Committees of Correspondence, spurring investigation of a humane solution for the world's conflict situations. The first announcement, signed by such men as Erich Fromm, David Riesman, Mulford Sibley, and Sidney Lens, said: "We want to see new groups come into existence and to promote the search for strategies which can end the Cold War, replace 'deterrence,' reduce the virulence of nationalism, and alter the quality of life in industrial society, not merely in detail but radically." (Quoted in *MANAS* for April 27, 1960.)

From the January *Liberation* we take the following extract from a more recent announcement by the Committee of Correspondence:

We reject reliance upon weapons of mass destruction and the logic of deterrence. . . . The question before the United States today is whether to abandon all initiative in the international situation and continue to be guided by the logic of deterrence and the arms race; or to take up the initiative once again and experiment imaginatively and courageously with ways to slow down and end the arms race. . . . We call for unilateral steps toward disarmament both on principle and as a practical strategy, which represents neither surrender to Communism nor wishful fantasy since no country courageous enough to thus disarm would be an easy victory for any form of dictatorship.

Among those signing the statement including the above are Dr. Jerome D. Frank, Johns Hopkins psychiatrist; Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College; Robert Heilbroner, historian, of Harvard; Robert M. Hutchins, of the Fund for the Republic; S. I. Hayakawa, editor of *ETC*, journal of general semantics; Walter Millis, Dallas Smythe, Lewis Mumford, Kenneth Rexroth, and Paul Goodman. (A copy of the complete statement may be obtained by writing the Committee of Correspondence, P.O. Box 536, Cooper Union Station, New York 3, N.Y.)

Well, we have over-run our space, and have provided only the merest sampling, in brief outline, of a new spirit abroad in the land. Careful and full reporting of the thinking and acting against war as a means of national policy, during the past ten years, would fill several books. Ordinarily the reader encounters only an occasional reference to these undertakings in a fleeting newspaper report, or never hears of them at all, remaining almost completely ignorant of the groundswell of opinion that is slowly making itself felt throughout the land. Its progress is slow. A person here, a person there, moves from his place as an anxious onlooker to add his drop of personal energy and commitment to the main stream of war resistance.

The thing that is impressive about this growing movement is that it claims the full moral and imaginative powers of human beings. Here you find no technical experts, no hired hands. These people are working with both their minds and hearts "for the

purpose of exciting populations, classes, and individuals" to acts of *constructiveness*.

It is a patent historical fact that there is no longer any authentic moral energy in the preparations for war and the kind of thinking that leads to war. All that supports the program for war is fear, habit, and technical ingenuity. The creative qualities of human beings are uniformly against the plans and projects of the military apparatus. The best men among us are no longer nourishing the State and its dreadful designs. It is even conceivable that, given one or two fortunate accidents to expose to shame and ridicule the present managers of the national destiny, a great wave of popular indignation may break out and swing the direction of interest toward fresh alternatives. We do not mean that a large population like the American public is in any sense ready to adopt the disciplined stance of nonviolent action, but only that a kind of revulsion may set in, bringing bewildering confusion and demanding a sort of imaginative leadership away from the paths of war which the "power elite," to use a phrase, is wholly unable to supply and does not understand at all.

In short, the serious ideological and scientific thinking which produced the present historical circumstances, of which Prof. Teggart speaks, is nowhere being done today. Another kind of thinking, equally intense, but oriented for peace, and not for war, is now going on. And this thinking is getting increasingly frequent translation into at least symbolic demonstration and action, before the public eye. People generally would know of these things, were it not for the choked-up mediocrity of the mass media, with not merely a lag, but an almost complete stoppage, in the communication of matters of importance to mankind. But the breakdown of communications can only slow down historical change, it cannot prevent the change from taking place. "All great periods in history have been times when men were found willing to face difficulties in accepted ideas." These willing men are now being found.

## *REVIEW*

### LITERATURE IN TRANSITION

JOHN DUDEK'S *Literature and the Press*, a new book issued by Ryerson and Contact, of Toronto, makes fascinating reading for anyone connected with printing and publishing, and will doubtless engage the attention of the general reader as well. Its chief concern is the impact of technology on literature, and should be examined, therefore, by all those who found J. B. Priestley's *Literature and Western Man* of interest, and by admirers of Lewis Mumford's studies of the history of technology. *Literature and the Press* surveys the course of the printed word since the time of Gutenberg, showing the progressive effects of mechanization upon reading matter for the general public. In a chapter headed "The New Periodicals: An Age of Popularization," Mr. Dudek writes:

Most disturbing of all, the literary periodical as such has in recent times become a specialized type devoted to a specialized audience. Subjects which are in their nature universal—literature and philosophy—are narrowed and excluded from the center of culture in the specializing process. Interests which for centuries held their place at the center of life, now are relegated to the sphere of specialized interests of particular groups, while the focus of attention is held by generalized periodicals appealing to the less-than-average intelligence, providing the most superficial treatment of the news subjects of the hour. The valuable periodicals, in every field, are by now specialized, so that when we review the history of the better periodicals since the mid-nineteenth century we are dealing with what belongs increasingly to a retreating minority, although we continue to think of this minority as having a key importance in the shaping of culture.

Here we get into puzzling problems of cause and effect. This driving of general quality magazines to the periphery of culture is no doubt related to the growing dominance of mass production, but is the resulting degradation of taste a simple effect of the coming of the machine? We might argue, instead, that the machines have simply put on display a condition which existed before, but had no voice. We could say that one of the problems of human beings, considered collectively, has been made

explicit by the skills of mass production. Vulgarization of literature comes when the controls of the traditional hierarchical society are removed and the publishing industry, considered as a division; of profit-taking business enterprise, and not as an organ of culture, becomes responsive to mass impulses.

It could be rejoined, of course, that the masses are "exploited" by the publishers of second-rate books and magazines, as no doubt they are, but then the ugly question of *control* arises. If a wise paternalism is to govern the output of the presses, then whose ideal of "good literature" is to be adopted? Is the State a more reliable censor than the taste of the masses?

Lyman Bryson, in *The Next America*, has a paragraph: on this issue which may be introduced here:

The control of our general flow of mass communication by the profit motive needs examination from the standpoint of both art and politics. It is not managed by a cold and inhuman love of money, any more than any other business is so managed. The human beings who succeed in getting ownership or management of newspapers and magazines, and broadcasting or cinema companies, as well as the artists and journalists they hire, are ordinary human beings in their self-respect as well as in their self-seeking interests. In fact, if it were our purpose here to discuss the best method of developing high principles and sound consciences in the managers of mass communications, the best case could be made out for trusting freedom as we have trusted it in most other aspects of our lives. Men respond in the long run best to best motives.

Mr. Bryson sounds right in principle, but there seem to be large holes in his analysis. The legitimacy of profit-taking for the goods of the mind is what ought to be called into issue, and Mr. Bryson neglects this question. The net of his comment, so far as we can see, is that the publishers are victims of their own devices, along with their readers. Men may, as he says, "respond in the long run best to best motives," but someone some man or men—will have to undertake the crucial task of clarifying what the "best motives" are. Free men, in order to remain

free, must adopt of their own will standards of behavior which are consistent with freedom.

Meanwhile, Mr. Dudek provides us with the facts of the contemporary situation:

At the start of the last century, the most influential periodicals were also the best, and the most widely circulated among the cultivated middle class; after the 1830's this correlation was gradually disturbed, and even reversed. In the bustling new society of the cities, with the advance of cheap printing, popularity with the majority was easily won by periodicals that were amusing and entertaining, but without real value. The best periodicals in England today—to take extremes, the *London Magazine*, *Encounter*, or the *Manchester Guardian*—have the smallest circulation, while inferior periodicals sell in the millions of copies; a fact which produces confusion in standards and leaves a society standing on its head—the subnormal head of its mass audience.

We are now perhaps at a point where criticism and education must face the practical issues involved in the division of literature into popular and unpopular: that is, clarify what has happened, and establish a program of reclamation, or witness the disappearance of rational standards before the rule of the mass market in matters of taste. It will not be possible for a complex tradition to hang on for very long on the fringe of a commercial entertainment culture. If the present drift continues, even in the universities, literature will lose status—or be infiltrated, as it is in Freshman courses, with journalism and popular substitutes for the old difficult books. There is already alarming evidence that this is happening.

Mr. Dudek says that "the vast increase in recent years of paper-backed books—many of them excellent—seems to represent an important new stage in the economics and technology of book printing," but this, he adds, "is still too new to be measured." The good paperbacks, however, do add an encouraging qualification to his pessimism.

A problem of this sort comes into focus with the attempt to fix responsibility. The easy solution of "blaming the machines" will not do, since it places us in the dilemma of choosing some controlling authority to decide what the machines are to print—which means, in our present situation, leaving it to

commercial publishers or turning the decision over to the State. Why not ask the writers who are denied a mass audience what they think about the question?

This means going to the intellectuals. But the intellectuals are today very much involved in the problem of their own identity. Who are they? What is their role? C. Wright Mills asked some searching questions of this sort in his recent paper in *Contact*, "The Decline of the Left" (see *MANAS*, Oct. 28, 1959). The *Nation* has had two excellent articles on the subject in recent weeks. Michael Novak (*Nation*, Dec. 10, 1960) tends to blame the intellectuals themselves for their lack of an audience. They have, he says, luxuriated in self-esteem and ignored the responsibilities of self-criticism. Loren Baritz (*Nation*, Jan. 21) believes that American intellectuals have been beguiled into participating too uncritically in the processes of the mass society. Mills, in the *Evergreen Review* (January-February), promises a book on this general subject, to be called *The Cultural Apparatus*, in which "the ascendancy of a commercial ethic in cultural production and distribution" will be examined for its consequences.

The question of the identity of the intellectual elite is a very real problem. The intellectual has powerful social reasons for not thinking of himself as an "aristocrat"—even an aristocrat of the mind—and yet he finds himself set apart from the mass culture by his own inclinations. Why is he different? What is his responsibility? The articles named above are good beginnings of an investigation of these questions. The problems of the mass society can hardly find intelligible solution until some acceptable answers are supplied.

The price of *Literature and the Press* is \$5. Copies may be ordered from Contact Press, 781 Beatty Ave., Montreal 19, Canada.

## *COMMENTARY*

### THE BEAT CONTRIBUTION

DAVID McREYNOLDS, whose *Peace News* series on the Beat Generation is quoted in *Frontiers*, has more material of this subject in the January-February issue of the *WRI News*. Here he examines the causes of the Beat rejection of conventional values and takes a critical look at the anger Beat attitudes have provoked:

These youth turned their backs on Madison Avenue, on success, and on money as being unworthy goals of human endeavor. While personally gentle, their writing consisted of scathing attacks on the law, on government, on religion. Despite their rejection of the church, the Beat Generation was perhaps more fundamentally a religious movement than anything else, but its religion was, to a major extent, the kind of "personal religion" which applies to individual relations but is not a driving force for social change.

The Beat Generation came under severe and steady attack. Beat characters when they appear in comic strips are almost invariably portrayed as sinister (the fact that the Beat Generation has made the comic strips at all testifies to how widespread this movement is). They were charged with being "immoral, irresponsible and perverted." But the real reason for the attack was not the "immorality" of the Beats—which was never actually very great—but the horror of the middle class at a group of young people who had turned their backs on a material set of values. For underneath a thin layer of hypocritical religion—symbolized by Norman Vincent Peale—the United States today is not at all a religious nation, at least on the level of its "official culture." Even more than the Soviet Union we are a nation committed to materialism, and it is a materialism all the more crude and vulgar because it is coated over with a distorted and (if I may use the term) "bourgeois" version of the Christian gospel. Clearly any group of young people who openly repudiate crude materialism as a basis for organizing society are a threat to social stability. And how provocative of these degenerate youngsters to question the current American theory that a Christian God can be defended by Hydrogen Bombs and poison gas!

However, American culture is basically too optimistic to accept a nihilistic position. The Beat Generation did not indicate the first stage in a permanent breakdown of law and order, but on the

contrary its effect was to expose and destroy false values in order that something positive, honest and decent might be constructed.

As field secretary of the WRL (War Resisters League), David McReynolds will be in the Los Angeles area during the first week in March, when he will be available, until his time is filled up, for speaking engagements. McReynolds was a leader of the student group which opposed ROTC on the campus of UCLA early in the 1950's. He is a pacifist, a socialist, and former editorial secretary of *Liberation* magazine, and a contributor to *MANAS*. He was active in organizing the protest against civil defense drill in New York City and last summer participated in the program of Polaris Action at New London, Conn. He is particularly interested in speaking to audiences of young people. He may be addressed care of *MANAS*.



## CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

### INSIGHTS FROM PSYCHOTHERAPY

PARENTS and teachers who appreciate the work of Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, and the Shankman Orthopedic School in Chicago, will find interesting developments of Bettelheim's theories in a pamphlet by Dr. Robert C. Murphy, Jr., entitled, *Psychotherapy based on Human Longing*. A Menninger-trained psychiatrist, Dr. Murphy wrote this piece nearly two years ago, following a series of teaching engagements at Pendle Hill, and it now appears in print for the first time as a Pendle Hill Pamphlet (35 cents).

Dr. Murphy feels that every human being, young or old, psychotic or "normal," is possessed of a transcendent longing for meaning and purpose. When a parent attempts to assist the emotional development of a child or when a therapist undertakes to assist a patient, the true success of the enterprise depends upon the awakening of this metaphysical motive:

Buried in the deepest stratum of his unconscious, at the wellspring of man's existence, lies an immense psychological force. In pure form, it is experienced as a longing, the object of which is constantly receding from him, as the horizons of his world widen throughout his growth. Any experience of this longing, either in oneself or others, is cause for delight. This is because it brings with it its own insight, and therefore the seeds of its own fulfillment.

The psychotherapist needs only to be aware of this force, in his patient, and to keep it within his vision. Then he may enjoy his work, and need never bog down in boredom. His task is simply to watch, as the person in front of him wrestles with well-nigh paralyzing conflict for the emergence of what he knows is there: man's inherent longing for relatedness and for meaning.

Dr. Murphy continues the analogy between the inarticulateness and confusion so often evident in children and similar states of mind in neurotics and psychotics—the difference being, of course, that the ordinary childish confusions do not

represent the end-result of years of frustration, but are clearly organic to processes of emotional and mental growth. Yet when the child encounters a new teacher, just as when a patient encounters a therapist, the basic question is the same: "What is it you want of me?" And the teacher, if he is a good teacher, or the therapist if a good therapist, shows by attentiveness that what he "wants" is to come to terms with the innermost nature of pupil or patient. The following paragraphs suggest numerous correlations between psychotherapy and basic education, for in both instances the pupil or patient must himself become active in order to reveal himself:

"What is your innermost nature?"

The patient sets out to answer this question as a child might start to climb a mountain, mistaking the first line of foothills for the summit. Nor is it possible ahead of time to show him what lies beyond his vision. First he answers with what he knows, or believes, about himself. This has been enough to date for establishing himself in relation to other egos. But not with the therapist, who always waits for more.

This being waited on is bewildering to the patient, and fascinating. Authority, throughout his life, has meant a force that molds one to its own command. It is that to which, since it is too strong to be attacked, one must simply conform. And now here is "authority" so strong that it seems altogether unshakable, which gives no hint of anything to which one may conform at all. What, then, is one to do? Is there no satisfying this person? And the patient responds to this query by gradually marshalling in the treatment relationship all the forces in his life through which he has sought to influence other persons. Dependent cravings, accumulated resentment and feelings of violence, sexual strivings, and the most timid of his aspirations are all brought into the effort to come to grips with this person who steadfastly eludes him. The therapist, to the extent that his insight does not fail him, acknowledges with appreciative courtesy the strength which the patient is mustering. But he himself shrinks steadily out of the picture. He becomes, as it were, "invisible" and "undiscoverable," showing less and less of his own needs as they are replaced by his growing interest in the unfolding of the patient.

Further parallels between the processes of education and those of psychotherapy appear

when Dr. Murphy says: The therapist "does not want to 'stamp out' that which appears destructive, because when the whole is seen, nothing is destructive. Every communication is a plea from the patient that the therapist see his basic striving." Particularly provocative are the following observations and speculations regarding precocious sexual activity:

Psychotherapy is designed to lead—or drive—the patient to see that about life which is self-evident. This is why it is so difficult and sometimes takes so long. The patient has spent his life believing about himself, his god and his world what he is told to believe. This leaves him dissatisfied, because something inside whispers to him that the authority to which he is clinging is not final. So he sets out to find one more adequate. He rebels and turns to destroy his old certainties, so as to be free to look beyond them.

In healthy relationships, he simply withdraws from them by mutual consent. The parent not only loves the child but respects his developing independence. It is on this growing respect, in fact, that his love feeds and without which it would dry up and die. In less healthy relationships more force may be called into service of the rebellion. An adolescent girl is driven toward getting pregnant not so much by sex as by a desperate need to declare that she is a separate person capable of functioning for herself. This is, in any case, what brings her to the brink of pregnancy. Once in that position, she may then be toppled over it by a sex drive which is in itself still very feebly developed. During all of this, she acts the part of one driven by genital lust and may persuade herself, her age mates and the juvenile court judge that she is more interested in sexual experience than in growing into independent adulthood. Actually, the meaning of her behavior is precisely the opposite of that; the sexual avenue is chosen simply because all other means of self expression have been closed off to her by the clamor of authoritarian voices telling her what is right, what wrong, and what the "truths" of her world are. Her movement in the direction of pregnancy may threaten to set in motion a complex tragedy. But it may well contain the only striving toward health which could be unearthed in a therapeutic setting: the longing for a more reliable authority in which to place her trust. Blindly, it is true, but resolutely, she is turning from outside allegiances to something within herself. However undesirable a pregnancy may be, this shift in loyalties

is the absolute prerequisite to her getting well. The therapist's work is to discover this shy longing hidden behind the screen of symptoms, and let himself be won by it. The statement is redundant, for the discovery, once made, evokes its own warm smile of pleasure. When this happens the instinctual threat begins to vanish. The youngster begins to catch sight of what she really wants, because she sees it reflected in the therapist's face. She is quite happy to let sex wait until she is bidden to it by something more convincing than the claims of mere defiance. She has moved a little closer to that which is self-evident, which in this case is: that freedom of choice is the very essence of her life, and she doesn't really have to make such a fuss to demonstrate it.

While Dr. Murphy's views may seem extravagant to some, this is a sort of extravagance which every teacher and parent will want to afford. After all, the belief and the faith involved are placed in what might be called the "higher self" of the pupil or patient.

## *FRONTIERS* Off-Beat and Beat

WHEN David Riesman defined the mature man as the "autonomous" man, he was saying that the less you know what you really think, the more you don't know who you really are—and that if your life is directed by tradition or by desire to conform, you can't find out *what* you think. David McReynolds, in the last of a three-piece series on "The Beat Generation" for the London *Peace News* (Oct. 28, 1960), contributes some thoughtful paragraphs bearing on this question. An effective writer and an active pacifist, McReynolds has certainly discovered for himself that to get on the "beat" of one's own integrity, one must be "off beat" so far as traditional conceptions and habits are concerned. Now, when off-beat people seek a measure of genuine autonomy, they are bound to have imitators among the restless and disillusioned. Or perhaps we could say that the constructive liberals of the present are intelligent enough to know that they have not really found what they are looking for and are therefore still searching, while the less determined will settle for some way-station of opinion. Here is "The Beat Generation" as McReynolds sees it:

An age of unrest is an age of questions and of the anxiety which questions produce in us. The individual finds himself standing alone, uncertain of anything except his own existence and at times doubtful even of that. Sweep away the authority of the Church and the State and each of us must confront existence on its own terms—without the usual "buffer" of religion and custom which cushion us from reality.

The result of this confrontation of existence is sometimes devastating and sometimes transfiguring. It is not easy for me to put into words the sense of shock which this confrontation has had and continues to have on myself and which I know it is having on others my age or younger.

The Beat Generation is essentially a generation in search of the meaning of existence and reality. How widespread is this search—how many Beats do we really have in our society?

Tens of thousands of young people, seeking desperately for some meaning in life, have adopted the "Beat pose." Women wear long black stockings, and let their hair cascade down to their waist. Men are bearded and it is bad form to wash. In the United States one really hasn't "made the scene" if one does not experiment with narcotics. A walk through Greenwich Village (and I suspect this is true also in parts of London) will reveal a great many young people, often still in their teens, ambitiously pursuing their vocation as "Beats."

There is something both humorous and tragic about this but very little that is really Beat. These youth, instead of conducting a personal search, have tried hard to follow in the path of Ginsberg. And, of course, to follow in this way is to negate the real meaning of Beatness.

The fascinating thing is that, in all the time I have watched the beat scene, the only people—without exception—that I ever met who called themselves "Beat" were people who were terribly square and didn't know it. I have *never* heard a Beat voluntarily pin that label on himself (unless he was doing a commercial bit in a coffee shop, reading poetry for money).

We have lost sight of the thousands and thousands of young people who would be puzzled if you called them "Beat" but who are essentially alien to this society and, in the broadest sense, must be considered part of a Beat Generation. Precisely because the alienation of youth results in a private and personal search for reality, there will be a multitude of different ways in which this search is conducted and its results expressed.

We might turn from these considerations to a passage concerned with both "play" and "art" by a Danish writer, Paul Henningsen. Henningsen's definition of an artist, together with his feelings about the sort of debilitating conformity which directs most human lives today, can certainly allow one to conclude that McReynolds' people are at least *trying* to become artists. Henningsen writes:

When is a person an artist? In every situation where he manages to differentiate between what is essential and what is not; every time he bases his evaluation and judgment upon his own observation.

Active play is the door to art. Where play and work embrace and become one, the artist is born. A

good poet is playing while he writes his verse. However, art may be broader or narrower, and perhaps it emerges most richly when the spirit and the hand are united.

When is a person *not* an artist? When what is unessential—what others feel about him—becomes more important than the essential: What *he* feels about himself; when he lets mass media predict, meet and satisfy ahead of time every one of his feelings and set the limits of his horizon; when repetition and recognition become his only joy; recreation and entertainment his narcotics; when his activity is acquiesced and his private life submerged because of his need to conform to his class.

Today few of us think of playing with anything, a thought or a problem. Our "teeth" are not used for chewing. Our spiritual nutriment is pre-chewed.

One gets to wonder how much difference there actually is between Communist culture and American culture. Both are moving toward more conformity and bourgeois standards of living with increasing contempt for the truly artistic—the truly essential. History repeats: Before World War II the press and the public feared Communism while the bourgeois secretly admired Hitler. Today we are again wasting our time fighting Communism—which is not wrong—merely unessential.

Not all autonomists who are constructively off-beat persons belong to the generation with which McReynolds is concerned. For example, a New York *Post* story by Richard Kluger features a "close-up" of a 61-year-old industrialist, Louis Schweitzer. We habitually associate certain attitudes with a position of considerable wealth—attitudes revolving around the means to safeguard wealth and preserve the status quo. But Schweitzer turned out to be a kind of "radical," and the more money he makes, the more radical he becomes. Kluger's *Post* story has something to say on three subjects of considerable interest to the best of the Beats—training for disarmament, voluntary taxation, and the support of communication media which allow controversial ideas full scope. Mr. Kluger writes:

Disarmament should begin with the kids. Take the arsenal of toy guns and rockets away from the children of the world to blunt their warring instincts,

and man's hope for an end to self-slaughter will have been advanced several leagues.

That's what Louis Schweitzer thinks, and he couldn't be more serious. He'd like to see juvenile disarmament ordered by a UN resolution, banning the further manufacture of kiddie weapons. The real ones would then be outlawed in good time, he believes.

Schweitzer, a top industrialist in the paper industry, concedes that his proposal is naive. But in such little things, he sees hope for the world. With only a hint of whimsy in his voice, he says, "The naive should inherit the earth because the realists have done such a lousy job."

Schweitzer has a habit of translating his naivete into meaningful acts. This year, for example, he'll contribute 1 per cent of his income to the UN. He took a full-page newspaper ad recently to call attention to similar self-tax movements throughout the country.

Schweitzer attracted national attention last January when he gave away a radio station. A radio ham since his schoolboy days in Brooklyn's Bay Ridge section, Schweitzer was operating New York's WBAI-FM in hopes of putting fine music and the broadest spectrum of political and social thought on the air. As the station began to succeed commercially, the quality of its programming deteriorated from the ideal Schweitzer had envisioned.

As a result, he handed the \$200,000 property over to the Pacifica Foundation, a non-profit group that runs two West Coast stations on a listener-subscription basis and offers an avant-garde variety of programs that have won widespread applause.

Schweitzer remains the station's No. 1 booster and sternly defends it against those who object to its free-wheeling fare including the airing of Socialist and Marxist speakers—and including orthodox Communists.

Says WBAI's ex-owner, who was born in a little village on the Dnieper River in Russia, "I don't just admire the First Amendment—I love it."