VOLUME XI, NO. 33
AUGUST 13, 1958

THY MEN ARE BORN!

SOMETHING more than a hundred years ago, Alfred de Musset reproached Voltaire for his iconoclasm. "Sleepest thou content, Voltaire?" he asked. "Thy dread smile, hovers it still above thy fleshless bones?" He addressed the great skeptic of the previous century:

> Thine age they called too young to understand thee;
> This one should suit thee better—
> Thy men are born!
> And the huge edifice that, day and night, thy great hands undermined,
> Is fallen upon us. . . .

It was, no doubt, the Age of Faith which de Musset saw crumbling before his eyes. The question, however, is whether he should have reproached Voltaire, or called to account the authors of the Faith which was giving way. Why had they built so poorly? Why was their work so vulnerable? A great deal of the criticism directed at the skeptics, and at the more outspoken materialists, seems to have been misplaced. What good is a faith which dissolves when confronted with the laws of Nature? Even if the arguments of the materialists were defective, men like Voltaire showed that the faith which suffered from scientific attack had been based upon "miracle, mystery, and authority." Voltaire, whatever his shortcomings, wrote as a philosopher. So did the other great iconoclasts. The men of unbelief, even if they disbelieved too much, wrote in behalf of man. They wrote to restore him to a position of honor in the cosmos. What they could not communicate, apparently, was the ground of their own inspiration, their own faith, in the dignity of man. As the dogmas of religion lost their force, there was nothing left to uphold standards of human behavior. A kind of freedom had been achieved, but men were using it like vandals instead of liberated spirits. Instead of the Stoic philosophers, whom the great skeptical thinkers of the eighteenth century themselves resembled, the men of the nineteenth century chose other models. Diderot was prophetic of the coming mood which would prevail when he defined the will as "the last impulse of desire and aversion." Indeed, it may be Diderot's men who are born today, or have been born for the past half century or so.

Is this too sordid a view of the present? For those who think so, we invite attention to a series of articles by Aldous Huxley which were printed earlier this year in the Long Island newspaper, *Newsday,* and which have been issued in a single newsprint edition by the paper. This longish essay by Mr. Huxley is titled *Tyranny Over the Mind.* It endeavors to show quite successfully, we think—that the men of *Brave New World* (Huxley's Utopia-in-Reverse which appeared in 1931) are already among us, and are more or less in control. (For copies of *Tyranny Over the Mind,* send ten cents to *Newsday,* 550 Stewart Ave., Garden City, N.Y.)

If Alfred de Musset could be called upon to write another reproach—a reproach pertinent to the present—how would he phrase it, and to whom should it be addressed? Whose men are these, who exercise "tyranny over the mind"? To whose "inspiration" shall we trace the exploits of our technologists of manipulation, the ignoble practitioners of the arts of desire and aversion, and the all-too-willing submissiveness of their victims? These things cannot be laid to any great man's mistakes. Rather the manipulators are the vulgar offspring of a thousand scriveners and petty theorists who have slowly filled the vacuum left by the iconoclasts and skeptics of the past two hundred years. *Our* men can claim no better parentage than a composite union between prudent conformity and unimaginative timidity, and the skills of the counting house and the market place. Great free-thinkers and skeptics

had respect for the truth, whether or not they found it, but these men who are the masters of our time, who set its pace and call its turns—they respect only their own desires and aversions. The rest is talk.

Mr. Huxley's essay is important to read because it constitutes a bill of particulars. You may say that we are not "like that." But it will be difficult for you to say it again after reading Mr. Huxley. There is a bare possibility that a *Life* or a *U.S. News &World Report* editorial writer might have a go at refuting Mr. Huxley, but we doubt it. He has too many facts and arrays them too well.

Briefly, Huxley describes the present scene in the terms of eight categories of tyranny over the mind. We are subject, he shows, to Over-Organization, to the Propaganda typical in Democracies, the Propaganda typical in Dictatorships, Selling Techniques, Brainwashing, Chemical Persuasion, Subconscious Persuasion, and to something called "Hypnopaedia" (suggestion during sleep). Not all, of course, of these methods of tyranny are equally applied, and some of them have been pursued more in one country than in another, but they all represent clear tendencies of our period, in various stages of development. The way these techniques of tyranny work is described in sufficient detail to leave little hope that Mr. Huxley is unduly alarmed.

This is the first time, so far as we know, that so many facts of this character have been gathered together within the compass of a few thousand words. Mr. Huxley has produced a fairly accurate inventory of the works of men who have a low opinion of mankind, including themselves. This is the common denominator of all forms of tyranny.

Mr. Huxley does not himself sound very hopeful. This is his closing paragraph:

> Meanwhile there is still some freedom left in the world. Many young people, it is true, do not seem to value freedom. But some of us still believe that, without freedom human beings cannot become fully human and that freedom is therefore supremely valuable. Perhaps the forces that now menace freedom are too strong to be resisted for very long. It is still our duty to do whatever we can to resist them.

Why have we not been more successful in resisting them? This is not much of a question unless the "we" is identified. "We" is the same as the "some of us" in Mr. Huxley's conclusion, and it does not include very many people. Having admitted this, it is necessary to add that the memorable achievements of the human race are almost always the work of relatively small minorities. The few articulate their vision so that it can be understood, respected and honored by the many, and put into practice, more or less, by the many. That is what happened with democracy or self-government. The few set high standards of public behavior which could be admired and imitated by the many. But the standard set, today, is contempt for man.

As a result, widening disasters are afflicting free and unfree alike. Some infectious malady more far-reaching, more penetrating, than political failure, is overtaking the human race. How shall we generalize to diagnose this ill which eats away our freedom?

The customary and familiar approach to what is wrong with the world involves the judgment of ethical failure. We do not, we are told, know how to apply morality to the new sort of civilization we have evolved. This point of view is well expressed by Ludwig von Bertalanffy, a leading biologist with philosophical inclinations. In a Conference on Science and Religion (held at the California Institute of Technology last May), Dr. von Bertalanffy said:

> The traditional ethical code gives rules for individual behavior, but none for those complicated social systems which have arisen in our civilization and where the *dramatis personae* to a large extent are not human beings, but abstract entities which by way of a legal or political fiction act as if they were individuals. Operating the colossal social structures of our time—from businesses to states to humanity as a whole—with the ethical concepts of a nomadic society of 2,500 years ago is like operating an atomic reactor with the technology of a bushman. At the

> same time, it becomes clear why this problem—notwithstanding its long history—has become acute in our period. The reason is simply that never before was the individual so entangled, controlled and governed in his most private affairs by impersonal and hence often inhuman social forces. . . .
>
> One of the main problems of our time is to complement the traditional code of values and behavior as expressed in the decalogue or the Golden Rule, with a broadened code applicable to our times, that is, to the various systems in the hierarchy of society and humanity and at the same time, to safeguard the individual from being devoured by the social leviathan.

Let us pause for a closer look at this analysis. The offenders, or, at any rate, the causes of our trouble, according to this writer, are "abstract entities which by way of a legal or political fiction act as if they were individuals." It is easy to fill this in. The "abstract entities" are nations, corporations, trade unions, armies, navies—any kind of institution which has been organized to serve some common interest of its members. The purposes of these institutions are partisan. They are not essentially human purposes, but the purposes of some limited objective. They intend, for example, to further a man's interest as an employer or as an employee, or as the citizen of one country and not of another. These organizations are responsible, not to any human conscience or individual perception of value, but to the rules of their charters. They are like machines set moving in a certain direction, or along a particular track. They are robot affairs, instruments to gain given ends. They are not empowered to evaluate their ends. The commander of an army, for example, is not supposed to wonder whether he is fighting a good or a bad war. He may privately wonder, of course, but if he intrudes his wondering upon his behavior, he is soon retired from the field, and perhaps court-martialled. He must not deviate from the military charter. So with a corporation. The man who heads a corporation is supposed to serve the interests of the stockholders, which means, he is supposed to make money for them. A president of a corporation or a chairman of its board can be discharged if it is shown that he has wilfully neglected the interests of the stockholders. He doesn't have charge of their morality, he has charge of their money. As a result, the corporation has charge of *his* morality. If the head of a company financed by other people's money begins to wonder if the product the company makes is not good for people as, for example, white bread is believed by some to be not good for people—he had better get out of that company. The charter representing the people who put up the money, and who want more, defines the "ethics" of the situation.

"Never before," says Dr. von Bertalanffy, "was the individual so entangled, controlled and governed in his most private affairs by impersonal and hence often inhuman social forces." That seems to sum it up.

The trouble is, we have come to *accept* this situation as inevitable and even "natural." Only when the moral disorder reaches an intolerable extreme as, say, in the conformity of a large number of Germans to the dictates of the charter and "ethical" conceptions of the Nazi Party—do we express disapproval and try to do something about it. The Nuremberg Trials developed the principle that no man should be permitted to act criminally because of an order from his military superior. It took the death camps and Hitler's madness to get this principle an expression in the twentieth century.

In general, we don't disapprove the partisan motives of institutions governed by self-interest. We just don't want them to be obviously organized for murder and genocide.

The man whose energies are largely directed by the charters of corporate institutions is relieved of many moral or ethical responsibilities. He can always say, "I have to do it to keep my job"; or he can say, "I am responsible to four hundred and sixty-eight investors," to settle any criticisms. He can do all sorts of disreputable things for the institutions with which he is allied—his company, his club, his fraternity, his party, his country, his

church—and have almost no moral decisions left to make for himself. He can totally "organize" his life in this way and win the respect, even the admiration, of his friends and his community. He becomes some sort of "model" man. Look at all the things he belongs to, all the fine organizations he serves!

No one denies, of course, that the partisan concerns of institutions have to be watched and "controlled." The statute books are filled with laws intended to control the excesses of institutional interest. Here the professions of law and accounting find their role in the service of partisan institutions. Their role is to make the law and its administration as "flexible" as possible. They are seldom interested in ethical impartiality, in fundamental human questions, in connection with their work as lawyers or accountants. Their professional ethics concerns only their personal behavior during the work of serving these partisan interests.

What about law-makers? Well, the law-makers regard themselves as watch-dogs of the public good. When partisan institutions secure some unusual advantage over other institutions, or are found to be noticeably misusing the public, the law-makers devise some kind of "controls." The fact of the partisanship is never questioned. The mere thought of challenging partisanship and aggressive self-interest is unholy. It is against "free enterprise."

This is where the desperate issues of our time are joined. The men of the West have identified freedom with self-interest and partisan enterprise with the Good, the True, and the Beautiful. Even to call attention to this fact, as we are doing, is widely regarded as dark, suspicious, and under-handed, a species of unforgivable irreverence. If a man will say *that*, what *else* is he likely to say, when we are not watching him so closely?

The reason why the Communists can so easily anger conventional Westerners is that the Communists have taken the logic of organizational ethics and carried it to a final conclusion. Why get your ethics from a score of organizations, when you can have One Big Organization to say what is Right?

The irony of the Communist "Reform" or "Revolution" is that it took a relative delusion of Western civilization and made it *absolute!* In the name of mankind, it gave *all* human prerogatives to an organization, leaving the individual exactly nothing to decide for himself.

The Communists have the same notion of power as the democratic nations. Power resides, both they and we believe, in the best military and technological organizations. Ideologies apart, both have the same idea of the good life, a high material standard of living, industrial progress, evidence of supremacy in the mechanical arts. These are the things for which the One Big Organization labors unceasingly, and for which it has been willing to sacrifice practically all the humanistic values.

The Western nations, if they could but realize it, have reason for immeasurable gratitude to the Communists—gratitude for proving the complete impossibility of gaining the Good Life through organization. It is no longer necessary for the West to pursue its reliance on organization to the bitter end of *total* organization. We of the West can look at the milder organizational techniques of control—described, for instance, by William H. Whyte in *The Organizational Man*—and then turn to the Russian "experiment" in total organization for the real McCoy! We can read Vance Packard's *The Hidden Persuaders* and Dr. William Sargant's *Battle for the Mind,* and then turn to accounts of the Moscow Trials and more recent "confessions" sponsored by the Communists, including what happened to young American soldiers held by the Communists in North Korea, to see how the topflight specialists in organizational ends use these methods.

The argument between Capitalism and Communism pitiably misses the point. Of course Communism is a bad thing. It is a bad thing because it sets out to correct the excesses of

Capitalism by developing the partisan ethic of Capitalism into a total doctrine. The ethic of Capitalism is partisan because it has to do with property and acquisition. Now property and acquisition may have their place in life; property may be a fine thing to have, for some purposes, and in certain relationships; and acquisition may be a necessary process, just as eating and sleeping are hardly avoidable. But you can have private property and any amount of acquisition of it and still miss entirely the essences of the good life. Capitalism is not a philosophy of life. It is a partisan doctrine invented to justify and to further the ends of certain human activities and to safeguard their pursuit from interference. Yet the atmosphere of pseudo-morality which dominates the American scene is intended to discredit anyone who is unable to regard Capitalism and its odd collection of partisan apologetics and ethical justifications as representative of the highest truth. It is intended to make him ashamed, as though he had forgotten to put on his pants that morning. If you can make people feel that way, you don't ever have to argue with them. They slink around corners and hide in Bohemian dives and write for the Little Magazines, working off their neuroticism as best they can.

These are not really political questions. They have to do with the human tendency to evade responsibility, to find some easy way of making up one's mind. If a man is lazy in mind, he'll manage to find some organization which will take a large part of his load of moral responsibility. It will also give him arguments to repeat to others, explaining that he has done the right thing. This is no exaggeration. The worst crimes known to man are the crimes committed in the name of somebody's version of the "most high." That is, they were done with the blessing of some "system" or other, some organization. In past centuries, the organizations of this sort were usually religious. Today, they are political.

There is only one real answer to this situation. It is to reject absolutely any organizational justification for human behavior. We don't have to abolish organizations We *can't* abolish organizations. All we have to do is stop allowing organizational aims and objectives to justify what we do.

There is no morality in organizations. There is no truth in organizations. A tool has no ethics and it doesn't "know" anything. An organization is only a tool. It was never anything more than a tool and neither flags nor hymns, neither uniforms nor vestments, can make it into anything else.

We must establish a rule: Never combine to make something sacred. There is no sacredness in numbers. There is no truth in the consensus. The consensus is valuable as evidence that a number of people have agreed to do something together in a certain way. Their agreement does not make what they do holy or even admirable. What they do by agreement may be a common disgrace. If, by agreement, they are able to do fine things, the good is in the men, not in the agreement. We can reasonably combine to *do* something, but never to *believe* something.

Ethics is not disclosed in a huddle. You don't find out what is the right thing to do by getting a lot of people together to "decide" about the right thing to do.

There are a lot of arguments against the restoration of ethical responsibility to the individual. Every one of them is based on a low estimate of man, and a low estimate of man is the origin of tyranny.

The problem is not to expand our "traditional ethical code" to include all the entangling organizations and institutions which have pre-empted the power and right of moral decision. The problem is not to "control" and limit or modify the acts of all these organizations. That way lies an endless frittering away of our energy in politics and "reform." Instead, we have to recover the authority of moral decision for individuals, and this means regaining our independence and self-respect as human beings—a

slow process of organic growth, based upon a renewal of our faith in human beings. The "traditional ethical code"—whatever that is—needs reinforcement with a high estimate of man.

How shall we get a high estimate of man? Well, we can throw out the categorically low estimates, if only to see what improvement that will accomplish. For several centuries we have been subject to a continual flow of propaganda filled with low estimates of man. You can't really tell what man is like until the effects of all this low-rating begin to die away. And we can look with some seriousness at the multiple evidences of man's greatness. We can begin to work for the day when Gandhi's and Schweitzer's men are born. No organization ever made a man good or great. No church ever created a Savior. No corporation ever set free a mind. We don't need organizations to be free, and if we think we do, we shall be forever enslaved.

REVIEW
THE TRIAL OF LUCULLUS

THE CONDEMNATION OF LUCULLUS is the first opera I ever attended where I did not listen very much to the music (by Paul Dessau), because Bertolt Brecht's text captured my whole attention.

Lucullus, commander of the Roman armies in Asia, had been always victorious. He had conquered seven kingdoms, he had subjugated fifty-three cities, he had filled Rome with fantastic riches, bringing home an army of new slaves—but now he was dead. He had to appear before the Court in the "Realm of the Shadows," which would determine whether he was worthy of being admitted into the community of the "Blessed."

Lucullus is arrogant. He boasts of his triumphs, of his personal eminence. He asks that a witness be called—he will have an expert, Alexander the Great, to say what it means to conquer seven kingdoms.

Alexander is called, but in vain. Among the "Blessed" are only those who have done something to benefit mankind. Alexander's activities are unknown in the Elysian Fields. He had not been admitted.

One of the seven vanquished kings is called as a witness. He answers the appeal. Asked if Lucullus has told the truth, he says, "They came over us like a hurricane. We tried to defend ourselves, but it was all in vain. They were stronger. It is all true."

Lucullus protests. That king had been a harsh ruler, himself, before the Romans came. He has no complaint.

But the king, the evidence showed, had built several cities during his reign. And the judge tells the jury: "He built up! Remember: He built up!"

The queen is also summoned before the Court. She, too, corroborates what Lucullus had said. She was bathing at the beach when the foreign soldiers appeared. Her maids tried to protect her, but they were too strong. She had to yield. One woman of the jury, who had been a prostitute in Rome, says she can comprehend this. How often she had to yield to the violence of men! "Consider the testimony of the queen!" says the judge.

Seeing that his defense is of so little effect, Lucullus offers a new argument. All he did was done upon order, for Rome, he says. But one of the jury, who had been a teacher and later a slave, replies:

> Rome, Rome, Rome!
> Who is Rome?
> Were you sent by the masons who built it?
> Were you sent by the bakers, the fishermen, the farmers, the oxen-drivers, the gardeners who nourish it?
> Or by the tailors, the furriers, the weavers, the sheep shearers, who clothe it?
> By the column-polishers, the wool-dyers, who bedeck it?
> Or was it the tax-collectors, the silver-gamblers, the slave-dealers, the Forum-bankers who loot it?

But the strongest argument is brought forth by the other of the two women on the jury who had been a fish-monger in a market place in Rome. When she starts to speak about the war, Lucullus protests:

> How can war be judged by those
> Who do not understand it?

She replies:

> I understand it. My son
> Was killed in the war.
> I was a fish wife in the market near the Forum.
> One day they said that the ships
> With those returning from the War in Asia
> Were in. I hurried from the market
> And was at the Tiber for many hours,
> Where they disembarked; and in the evening
> All ships were empty. My son
> had not come across the gangway.
> Faber, my son Faber,
> Whom I bore and nursed.
> My son Faber.
> It was cold at the harbour
> In the night; a fever took me
> And during the fever I sought my son.

Groping darkly, I felt more chilly
And, dying, came into the realm of shadows,
Seeking further. Faber, I called, as that was his name.
I ran and ran through the shadows,
Passing shadows, facing shadows,
Calling Faber, till a guardsman
In the camps of those slain in the war
Caught me by the sleeve and said:
"Old one, here are many Fabers, many
Sons of mothers, many, dearly missed,
But the names are forgotten
Names which only served to register them in the Army
And are of no avail here.
They don't want to meet their mothers,
Since these let them go to the bloody war."
Faber, my son Faber,
Whom I bore and nursed,
My son Faber!
And there I stood, caught by my sleeve.
My calling died on my lips.
Silent I went back. No longer I yearned to
Look my son in his face.

The Court decides: "The mother of the victim understands the war."

The judge admonishes Lucullus:

"The time passes by. You do not use it. You had better not gall us any longer with your 'triumphs.' Have you, man, no witness for any human weakness in your nature? Your cause looks bad. Perhaps your weaknesses would show an interruption in the chain of your violent deeds. Remember your weaknesses, shadow, take my advice!"

Indeed, there is some good in every man. Lucullus once brought home, from Asia, a cherry tree. It was planted on the mountains in Italy. One of the Jury, a former farmer, praises this act. When all the riches of the Asian booty will be gone, eaten by the moths, by the rot and the rust, the cherry tree will live and give its sweet fruits to future generations. And Lucullus is the man who brought it to Italy. There is some good in him! But the teacher retorts:

"One cherry tree! He could have got it with one man. But he sent eighty thousands into the shadows where there are already so many half-lived lives!"

The Jury is unanimous. "Away with him!" they say, one by one. The last is the farmer who had praised him for the cherry tree: "Eighty thousands for one cherry tree? Ah no, away with him!" The choir of the slaves sums up:

Away with him! How long
Will they be there, he and his like,
The inhuman set above of the human,
To lift their rotten hands and throw
Whole nations against each other in bloody wars?
How long shall we, shall those of our kin, suffer this?

I saw this opera performed at Leipzig, in East Germany, a country under Communist rule. My neighbour whispered to me that he had seen it several times. It is often performed, especially when there is an important congress.

Most people in the Western World believe that the Communists long for an opportunity to hurl the world into the abyss of aggressive war. But some mental preparation is required for an aggressive war, and it would be strange for anyone to think that it is possible to prepare the people for an aggressive war of conquest with a play like *The Condemnation of Lucullus*, in which the value of human lives is placed high above all glory, all conquest, all political expediency.

HEINZ KRASCHUTZKI

Berlin

COMMENTARY
UNCOMMON SENSE

IN the July issue of *Western Advertising,* a West Coast advertising man, Henry Rich, reverses the field on his colleagues who insist that the way for the United States to get along in the world is a problem in "sales promotion." This idea, according to Rich, is dangerous nonsense. He says:

> I humbly submit that our foreign policy should be purged of all traces of professional advertising and public relations influence. We must, in order to make friends and influence uncommitted people, keep our big mouths shut about the so-called "American Way," our pure intentions, our love of peace and freedom. We talk too damn much.
>
> We are already doing our country a grave disservice by attempting to export "the American way of life" like so much packaged cereal. We disconcert our friends and delight our enemies by our slogans, preachments, and ballyhoo.

The rest of the world, Mr. Rich points out, is not "conditioned to American advertising." We can laugh at the commercials, he intimates, even while they influence us! "The techniques of advertising," he says, "become insulting when applied to international policy and offered to nations which live under vastly different circumstances, and nurtured in traditions wholly unlike ours." The "sales" approach, he suggests, makes these people "resent our free advice, which they cannot accept," and they "angrily reject the implications that they are morally wanting because they must choose alternate paths."

American advertising men, Mr. Rich proposes, in concentrating on selling a bill of goods, have become "unfitted for diplomacy." Selling methods, he says, when applied to diplomacy, become "infuriating to the citizens of other lands who are proud of their traditions and, because of their traditions, must inevitably live out their own destiny." He concludes:

> I maintain that to regain the respect of the free world, and to win the uncommitted peoples, we must stop chasing all over the globe in a vain attempt to make the world into our own image. The world is not our captive audience, and even if it were, advertising becomes brain washing when applied to the realm of ideas.

It is doubtful that Mr. Rich's article will be widely reprinted abroad, as an illustration of American "self-criticism." Such admissions would mar the bland unity of America's official PR. But it is heartening to learn that dozens of readers of *Western Advertising* called the editor of this magazine on the phone to congratulate him for printing Mr. Rich. If this sort of self-examination continues, a saving remnant of American advertising men may be willing to consider the possibility that a lot of the people at home also have reason to be insulted by the "packaged cereal" approach.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves

LOVE AND ADOLESCENCE

IN an article, "How We're Failing our Adolescents," in the June *Parents'* magazine, Edgar Friedenberg points out that young people today "do not fare too well . . . in a society which an essayist recently characterized as increasingly middle-aged and middle-class." Dr. Friedenberg is a professor of education at Brooklyn College. In this discussion he endeavors to show why parents must help their young to discover that "love" is more than an emotion. The transition from childhood to adulthood is an extended period of discovery, during which realization of the meaning of individuality by the young person is a crucial experience. Dr. Friedenberg writes:

> Adolescence is marked by the beginning of a genuine capacity to love; that is its distinction. Children cannot give love, though it is vital that they receive it abundantly and consistently. Not that children are unemotional or coldly selfish; they give themselves very freely to others and have much to give. But this is not complete love, because children do not clearly perceive the individuality of the people who care for them. They do not see clearly who or what it is they are loving. As long as love is forthcoming and its source is familiar, they are unlikely to raise much of an issue about the personal characteristics of those who give it, although they are profoundly and permanently influenced by them.
>
> But adolescence is the period in life when other people begin to make a difference as individuals and are loved for themselves. Shortly before puberty one begins to be discriminating—very sharply and passionately so. For the first time one loves somebody else. One loves somebody in particular and is particular about whom one loves. Adolescence concludes, if events have gone well, in being able to love someone *different* from oneself—as different as man is from woman.
>
> The importance of this to the adolescent lies in the help that persons who love one another can give and accept, in defining the individual identity of each.

Unless an adolescent is given patient understanding in his attempts to define his own individuality, it is easy for him to feel that, as Robert Paul Smith puts it, "adults are the natural enemies of children." For the adolescent is not usually modest, unless inhibited—and inhibition and modesty are only superficially alike in any case. As Dr. Friedenberg puts it, "they must exaggerate to others for what they are, for the purpose of making sure of it themselves." And there is not much patience in our society, at least at the parental level. Adults who live routinized and carefully budgeted lives tend either to worry or to be affronted by behavior which departs from accepted norms.

The emergence of psychology as an aid to the guidance of interpersonal relations at least helps many to realize that the passage from childhood through adolescence is very complicated. First, as Dr. Fromm shows in his *Art of Loving*, there is complete dependence upon the mother—the one who ideally accepts, without question, whatever is manifest in the embryonic personality. At the outset, there are no distinctions in being "loved." But sooner or later it has to be discovered by the child that he himself has something to do with fullness of the love response, and this awakening, traditionally, results from the father's influence in terms of required discipline. The child learns that he is expected to manifest his best potentialities in growth, and his failure to do so lessens, in some manner, the degree of affection. But, finally, the adolescent on the border of maturity must establish his own means of defining "self-hood." As Dr. Fromm puts it:

> Eventually, the mature person has come to the point where he is his own mother and his own father. He has, as it were, a motherly and fatherly conscience. Motherly conscience says: "There is no misdeed, no crime which could deprive you of my love, of my wish for your life and happiness." Fatherly conscience says: "You did wrong, you cannot avoid accepting certain consequences of your wrongdoing, and most of all you must change your ways if I am to like you." The mature person has become free from the outside mother and father figures, and has built them up inside. In contrast to Freud's concept of the super-ego, however, he has built them inside not by *incorporating* mother and father, but by building a motherly conscience on his own capacity for love, and a fatherly conscience on his reason and judgment. Furthermore, the mature person loves with both the motherly and the fatherly conscience, in spite of the fact that they seem to contradict each other. If he would only retain his

> fatherly conscience, he would become harsh and inhuman. If he would only retain his motherly conscience, he would be apt to lose judgment and to hinder himself and others in their development.

This paragraph illustrates the great drafts of psychological energy and comprehension taken by the process of attaining maturity. The break with dependence on the mother, and ultimately with reliance on the father, can seldom be accomplished without some protest and rebellion. And it is here that the teachers in our schools, no matter how enlightened or concerned, can hardly supply what is needed. An adolescent's defiant self-assertions cry for a measure of respect in his own home. A young person, unless already in hopeless rebellion, does not always expect to gain assent to his vigorous expressions. Often he wants little more than "recognition" as an individual person. It is a wise mother or father who recognizes the need for contention or debate with the young as if among equals.

Most considerations of "love and adolescence" quite naturally concern themselves with the dangerous fascination of untutored passion. Parents traditionally warn, not wisely but too well, of the pitfalls which threaten the young who involve themselves with the opposite sex without comprehending the complications and heartaches which may ensue. But just as over-anxious concern plays a dominant role in the relationships between parents and children, so, also, are we forced to admit that the negative, or "viewing with alarm" approach usually produces only negative results. The concerned parent, rather than dreading the disasters which may follow precocious sex experience, might better turn to the great philosopher-teachers. Krishna, in the *Bhagavad-Gita,* points out to his still moralistic pupil Arjuna that "all beings act according to their natures; what, then, will restraint effect?" Buddha suggests that the fulfillment of one's individual destiny is closely related to the quality of the companionship sought. Close alliance, of any kind, with those who are insensitive to the language of one's heart, is deceptively confusing, and ultimately productive of pain rather than pleasure. The Buddha's verses on this point, in the *Dhammapada,* read:

> If a wayfarer does not meet his better or his equal, let him resolutely proceed alone on his journey. There is no companionship with a fool.
>
> He who consorts with fools experiences great grief. The company of fools is like company of enemies—productive of pain Company of the wise is like meeting of real kinsfolk—it brings happiness.

In one of his essays, Emerson describes Plato's approach to the relationship of truth and beauty, involving in the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus,* love between the sexes. The aim of life, as Plato sees it, says Emerson, is to perceive that "all things mount and mount" toward a higher synthesis. Emerson continues:

> All his thought has this ascension; in *Phaedrns,* teaching that "beauty is the most lovely of all things, exciting hilarity, and shedding desire and confidence through the universe, wherever it enters; and it enters, in some degree, into all things: but that there is another, which is as much more beautiful than beauty, as beauty is than chaos, namely, wisdom which our wonderful organ of sight cannot reach unto, but which, could it be seen, would ravish us with its perfect reality. "When an artificer, in the fabrication of any work, looks to that which always subsists according *to the same;* and, employing a model of this kind, expresses its idea and power in his work it must follow, that his production should be beautiful. But when he beholds that which is born and dies, it will be far from beautiful.
>
> Thus, ever: the *Banquet* is a teaching in the same spirit familiar now to all the poetry, and to all the sermons of the world, that the love of the sexes is initial, and symbolizes, at a distance, the passion of the soul for that immense lake of beauty it exists to seek.

All this may seem remote from the practical counsel which parents so much wish to offer to their adolescent sons and daughters. Yet it is not the avoidance of the painful or inadequate which inspires imagination and determination. It is, instead, a recognition that fulfillment of one's potential requires that he strive for the best and the most beautiful, and have some conception of what this sort of striving entails. Detours along the way become less appealing, as time passes and understanding grows.

FRONTIERS

It-Ain't-So-Good Department

IT is not difficult, these days, to fill a page with view-with-alarm items on the woeful shortsightedness in public affairs—nor to editorialize anxiously about them. We shall content ourselves with notice of some recent clippings.

A Washington UP dispatch reports that the Defense Department hopes to come up with something which will make the hydrogen bomb obsolete. The Department's space-agency director remarked that the "ultimate" weapon might be a death-ray. According to the dispatch:

> Roy W. Johnson, head of Advanced Research Projects Agency, told the House Space Committee it is ridiculous to put a man in a satellite to drop a bomb because a bomb wouldn't drop.
>
> "But our new work might lead to a death ray. That would be the weapon of tomorrow and obviously a man up above in a satellite would be in the position to use it.
>
> "The bomb today is considered the ultimate weapon. I suspect that twenty years from now the bomb will be passé."

The uncompromising and indefatigable Dr. Linus Pauling has dug up some new trouble for the AEC to explain. The New York *Times* summarizes:

> Dr. Linus C. Pauling, leading biochemist, introduced today a new threat in atomic fall-out—a long-lived radioactive atom known as carbon 14.
>
> The Nobel Prize winner, who has taken the lead in arguing the dangers of fallout, said carbon 14 represented a far more serious, long-term menace than all the other radioactive byproducts of an atomic explosion, including the much-publicized strontium 90.
>
> While strontium 90 is a more immediate threat, he warned, over a period of five to 10,000 years the danger to the human race from carbon 14 is 200 times greater.
>
> The carbon 14 created in atomic bombs already exploded will cause 5,000,000 genetically defective children in the next 300 generations and millions of cases of bone cancer, leukemia and other bodily damage, he predicted.
>
> Atomic Energy Commission officials conceded that carbon 14 presented an appreciable genetic hazard over a period of several thousand years. They questioned, however, that the danger was as great as portrayed by Dr. Pauling.

Another embarrassment to the AEC comes by way of the New York *Post:*

> Two U.S. Weather Bureau scientists estimate that twice as much radioactive strontium from hydrogen bomb tests falls on the earth from the stratosphere as the amount calculated by the Atomic Energy Commission.
>
> The AEC has estimated that only 10 per cent of dangerous Strontium 90 descends from the stratosphere each year.
>
> But R. J. List and Lester Machta estimated it at 20 per cent in a paper presented at a symposium on radiation sponsored last night by the Federation of American Scientists.

Cyrus Eaton, an outspoken Cleveland industrialist, blasted several current government practices over television, then welcomed a subpoena to appear before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Mr. Eaton may have been swinging a little wild with some of the things he said, but "little" seems to be ample qualification. The New York *Times* for May 5 summarizes the punch lines:

> Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland industrialist, said last night that freedom in the United States was in jeopardy because "scores of agencies" were engaged "in investigating, in snooping, in informing, in creeping up on people."
>
> Mr. Eaton, sponsor of an annual international scientific meeting in Pugwash, N.S., was interviewed on WABC-TV.
>
> He said he thought scientific development in the United States had been "enormously retarded" because "the scientist is conscious that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is breathing down the back of his neck all the time, scaring him."
>
> Mr. Eaton said there were no Communists in the United States "to speak of, except in the mind of those on the payroll of the F.B.I."
>
> The industrialist said the F.B.I. had "sold itself in a marvelous way." "But I always worry," he went on, "when I see a nation feel that it is coming to greatness through the activities of its policemen."

He said the importance of the F.B.I. was enormously exaggerated. "They make no contribution to the upbuilding of this country and its respect abroad," he said.

Mr. Eaton contended in the filmed interview that the F.B.I. was just one of scores of agencies in the United States investigating citizens.

"If you were to take the police forces of the cities and of the counties and of the state and governmental agencies and add them up, Hitler in his prime, through the Gestapo, never had any such spy organization as we have in this country today," he said.

The industrialist said that he thought that the United States had less confidence in its own people "maybe than any nation that I know of on earth."

"We're certainly worse in that respect than the Russians," he added.

When the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Rep. Francis Walter of Pennsylvania, decided to interrogate Eaton, one newspaper observed:

It is rather comical to learn that Mr. Eaton has now been subpoenaed before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Its chairman, Rep. Francis Walter, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, apparently took umbrage at some recent comments of Eaton's which (1) urged an accommodation with the Soviets, (2) criticized the public adulation of the F.B.I. as a dangerous tendency, in a free society, to glorify the police. Both points of view are defensible, and even if they were not, he has a perfect right to utter them.

We haven't agreed with many of Eaton's positions, but we think it is a very healthy thing, and a heartening affirmation of the pluralistic nature of our society, to have so wealthy a man taking such unorthodox and non-conformist positions. Go right on speaking your mind, Cyrus. Walter is making a fool out of nobody but himself.

The New York *Times* gives further indication that a large section of the public is fed up with Loyalty Committees. The *Times* editorial concludes:

Mr. Eaton, who sometimes goes off the deep end, did so again, we think, in this particular program. Some of his comments on the F.B.I., and his declaration that Adolf Hitler never had a spy organization equal to the "snooping" systems current in this country, seem to us more than a little silly. But it is not silly—it is a preposterous and dangerous arrogation of unconstitutional power—when a committee of Congress dares to summon a free American citizen to appear before it to account for the expression of opinions which it happens not to like.

One doesn't need to consult Buddha or Plato, today, to become convinced that men who devote all their energies to preserving personal security, end by participation in either offensive or defensive violence. Similarly, the motivation of personal enjoyment, if placed at the pinnacle of human emotions, destroys the capacity for joy. In the United States alone there are 7,719,000 "problem drinkers," and the statistical prognosis is that one out of every thirteen of them will become an alcoholic.

In a conference on "Labor in the Free Society," sponsored by the Fund for the Republic, Dr. Erich Fromm warned that the present adult psyche is not ready for the forty-hour work week. Dr. Fromm said that a thousand new psychiatrists would first have to be developed to deal with nervous breakdowns among workers who do not know what to do with their spare time.

On the plus side of the ledger, we note a mounting wave of protest against atomic weapons testing. Dr. Albert Schweitzer, in calling for a Summit Conference with the sole purpose of renouncing nuclear weapons, has given focus to the concerns of troubled scientists all over the world.