

## THE RELIGION OF MAN

WE might have named this discussion "The Frightful Interlude," because that is the sort of period modern man is now going through, and it will be necessary, in order to fortify the proposal of a religion of man with urgency, to speak of the present with horror and loathing. But since nothing good ever comes out of horror and loathing alone, we chose a title which, so far as we can see, represents the larger necessity and the sole hope of the age.

The present is an interlude because it is a time of waiting. It is frightful because it is a time in which we are recognizing the breakdown of all familiar remedies.

There are two ways to look at what is going on. One is the poetic or prophetic way, the other the practical way. For the first, we might have said "religious," but this, in our vocabulary, amounts to equivocation. Effective religious thinking, in the present, is secular in origin. That is, it does not arise in the matrix of any of the great religious movements of the times, but in the thought of individuals who are better described as humanists than anything else.

Choosing at random, you might say that of the men of the nineteenth century, Amiel, Heine, and Tolstoy did better at anticipating the ethical and human bankruptcy of the present than any of the conventional moralists. They saw the decay of human intentions and the warping of religious ideas to accommodate the coarse acquisitive drives of the nineteenth century, and they told what would happen in the twentieth. It has happened. You could say that the guiding morality of Western civilization has had the sole virtue of being one hundred per cent wrong, and by being so wholeheartedly anti-human has brought us to the condition of being absolutely stopped in the direction of our "progress." We

are not really stopped, of course; we can go on, and we may not destroy ourselves all at once; but we cannot go on as we have and continue to be human, or even, for long, pretend that we have remained human.

What is moral bankruptcy? It is apathy, indifference, and blindness in relation to essential decisions between good and evil. The Nazis were a type of this bankruptcy in the last generation. A more impersonal example in the present is the bland reconciliation of the leaders of the great powers, and of a large portion of the people who follow them, to the prospect and necessities of nuclear war. "We will not," the President of the United States said recently, "prematurely or unnecessarily risk the costs of worldwide nuclear war . . . but neither will we shrink from that risk at any time it must be faced." This is an echo of outworn boldness that should sicken the hearts of all human beings. Mr. Kennedy, of course, is not alone in such pronouncements, which voice the endlessly repeated cliché of a morality which has no difficulty in finding sound, democratic reasons for risking the destruction of the human race, or so large a part of it that we cannot even imagine what life would be like for the survivors.

Our leaders, in short, are able to speak casually, and without provoking protest, of the possibility of undertaking immeasurable destruction. What, as a *Liberation* editorialist asks, will make it "mature" to risk a worldwide nuclear war? The answer comes—we shall not loose these weapons unless we *have* to! Is it cruel so to examine the words of a harassed man who bears the weight of all this responsibility and is inevitably yoked to the emotional forces of a successful military tradition and an anxiety-ridden public? It would be crueler not to look at the meaning of this declaration since, in our society,

his voice is ours. No man should be left alone in such decisions.

Years ago a university professor, Harold C. Brown, of Stanford, wrote in decisive terms of the prevailing morality of this century, which speaks "only of petty things, of lying, stealing, and murdering in their retail forms, of barren desires, of ugly manners." He asked:

How can such shrunken moralists build in the tortured and propagandized world of today the moral stamina to hold fast to the freedom and standards of living that are requisite to the realization of moral progress, and guide us amongst conflicting programs of action to espouse those that make for a society more capable than this of integrating the practical problems of living with the conditions for the improvement of human character? . . .

The problem for us is not so much to discover virtues as to justify those known to us as making for a better life. If they do not appear to do so, then either we are mistaken in taking them for virtues or else we are living in a world so badly organized that the virtuous life is impossible in it. . . .

Now here, exactly, is the statement of our situation. And the question to be answered is why we have done nothing about it.

The question is no longer either a social or a national question. It is a human question. A point is reached, in the extremity of the individual's plight, when he can act only for himself. Is he a man? Are there some things which, as a man, he must do, and some things he cannot do and remain human?

Now we shall be told, by some with patience, by others with irritation, and by still others with angry contempt, that "no man is an island," that no man can act for himself alone; and that the good, for man, is a social creation, in which he, as a man, must participate. There is a truth in this, but we submit that it is a lesser truth that can make cowards of us all, and in the present instance *has* made cowards of us all.

We should not submit to the winds of doctrine in this matter, but turn to the facts, or what, in a fair estimate, may be presumed to be

the facts. Let us look at the milieu of our social creation. Writing of the generation of American youth which was attending evening college in 1941—the youth that shortly went to war and is no doubt at the helm of national affairs today—an English instructor observed in Harper's for August, 1941:

These students [he wrote] cannot advance beyond the limits set by their own mental habits. Their rallying cry is, "What good will this do me?" And they expect the answer in an itemized reckoning. . . . These young Americans are confirmed realists, and they practice their rationalistic creed in every thought and act of lives dominated by their methodical habits of thinking. They will not look beyond the limits of their own interests. . . . They lack depths of feeling to support personal ideals or sentiments, and they water down their enthusiasm for any important ideals with the thought that no tangible gain may be expected where only ideals are at stake. With their joy in realism and good balance they are proud of their ability to see both sides of a question, but in their desperate avoidance of bigotry they sacrifice the convictions of character.

The reason why these students, like most Americans, have not built upon their foundations of realistic honesty is that, far from having experienced and understood life, they have actually retreated from it. Not in the sense of having retired from a world of hard truth to a dream cottage, but in a larger sense. They do not know man; they know only their neighbors in business. Their judgment and vision are only as wide as their experience, and their experience is only as wide as their jobs.

The social doctrine, the political dogma, the ideological thesis has here been manifestly insufficient. There may be better, more fruitful social doctrines, but we do not know them, are not about to adopt them, and it is not for such alien messages about the good that we are prepared to "risk the costs of world-wide nuclear war." But whatever others may say—whether enemies, rivals, or friends—it does not seem credible that any *social* doctrine can help to repair the failure to understand life or to reverse the retreat from its meanings. If a man has to look to some collectivist contention for the explanation of his being, then his end and his good lie outside

himself, and the entire and sacred meaning of individuality is thrust aside. On this view the man who resolves to stand alone for right and principles has no existence. His being, his vision, his dignity and salvation must await the devices of some political philosopher. His will must gain its animation from some political bureaucrat, who gives him his *raison d'être*. There need be no mistake about this. In our imperfect world, the political metaphysicians may compose the rhetoric of social dignity, but it is the bureaucrat who puts it into practice for us all. It is not the semi-divine ghost of Jean Jacques Rousseau who calls you to the colors to serve the General Will, but some retired veteran of a lesser "world-wide war" who pulls your number out of a bowl and tells you where to go and whom to kill.

This is not to deny or to ignore the great half-truths of social philosophy. A man does become more of a man in the service of his fellows. The goods of being human are the only goods which are not diminished, but vastly increased, by being shared with one's fellows. But that is not the issue, here. The issue, now, is utterly and finally simple: It is whether we shall have some human good to share. It is a question of what we are, in and of ourselves, before we join in the fellowship of the social community. Have we anything to give? If we stipulate, either by accepted dogma or by abdication of dissent, that our being is created by the social entity and has scope and promise only in political relations, we have nothing to give: we can only take or obey. And what can such a man do about the kind of a world he lives in? Nothing.

In this *impasse* we find ourselves. We do nothing about the world: and we believe we can do nothing about the world. It is as though we thought we were wired into the life of the military state and its objects and would collapse into formless amoebae if anyone were to turn off the juice or if the wheels just stopped turning.

It is a question of course of faith. All final questions, all acts of ultimate decision, turn on the quality of man's faith.

Suppose, for example, that there were a great faith in the world that it is better to act in behalf of man than in behalf of particular organizations of men. This is a way of asking what would happen if men believed in and practiced the religion of man instead of the religion of social organization. The answer is quite simple. The Frightful Interlude would come to an end.

But the question is *too* simple, so that we get our fine answer too easily. The question ought rather to concern how you get the religion of man to replace the religion of social organization. And the answer to that is not simple at all. Yet this is the question to which we must address ourselves.

What needs to be considered for the purposes of pursuing this question? First of all, we doubt if there has ever been a viable religion which grew out of the rational determination that one was "needed" in order to make things work better for mankind. Viable religion is always an end in itself. It accomplishes great things of benefit to society, but never in fulfillment of "social" motives. The good things come as by-products developed by men intent upon and laboring for higher ends. "Survival," as we understand the term and set store by its meaning, is one of those by-products. The man who glorifies his god is likely to survive, but the man who tries to glorify his god *in order* to survive and to obtain the Three Important Things he requires to Preserve his Identity, is a blasphemer before the Lord. And he will not survive. Who needs him?

What *is* religion? The difficulty here comes from the fact that all abstract definitions of religion are circular and devoid of the rich meaning they ought to contain. Religion is the ringing wonder which fills the human heart when it is set upon its appointed tasks. Religion is the resonance called out by one octave of life from all the others. Religion is the magic of meaning at the moment of its disclosure. Religion is the sense

of discovery a man feels when he sees the One in the Many and the Many in the One. Religion is the exquisite moment of truth which moves continuously through the fabric of all its corruptions. It is the endlessly active definer which has a Corsican feud with every one of its definitions.

What is the religion of Man? It is, we submit, the religion that may be founded, not upon rock, which is frangible, but upon the human essence, which is continually reborn. Whatever wonders our dreams encompass, man has the only promise that they may come true. The gods in the heavens and the fiends in the underworld are all the creations of man. He makes and unmakes them.

We are not composing a sober humanist treatise to be followed with agnostic caution and scientific discipline. There may be gods. There may be devils. We do not propose the immeasurable vanity of supposing that in this generation we can offer the Last Word of faith, belief, and possibility. Wiser men than we have believed in the gods, but no wise men ever believed in a god who could take away from men the prerogatives of making their own decisions and shaping their own destiny.

Ours is an age which need bow to no other in respect to the magnitude of its follies, so let us be humble in our claims to discovery of final truth. But there is nonetheless a certain wisdom that has been forged from the pain of our time, and from the accumulated woes of the past. It is that every system that has been devised to turn man into some kind of "creature"—whether of God or the reverberating atoms of Lucretius—has ended in angry rejection and death. The one thing that we cannot successfully deny is the creative potentialities of human beings—and when you say "creative potentialities" you add to man the coefficient of infinity.

It comes to this, that in a period of very nearly maximum disaster, we are overtaken by realizations of self-knowledge which will make us turn away forever from a number of familiar

falsifications about ourselves. And this, it well may be, is a sort of psychological experience which is the prelude to the Religion of Man.

And now a question will be heard. How extensive are these discoveries? Count the new men, catalogue their realizations, make a census of the Blakes, Whitmans, and Thoreaus: will you have enough people to hold a New England Town Meeting?

And where does the question come from? From the damned, the double-damned statisticians. They are the people who, if you tell them to breathe, will want to make a survey to see if it's being done in this part of the country.

The whole point of the religion of man is that each individual makes a beginning for himself, and follows his heart in those matters which he knows are unmistakably good. He leaves the surveys to the historians, who have their place, and resolves to follow, not usage, but a conception of life which may in time create a usage that is worth following.

For this to happen requires that men have faith in themselves; and it is here that we suffer from extreme impoverishment. The only thing that can be done about this is to accumulate a body of thought and a diversity of practice founded on self-reliance and direct moral judgments of good and evil. We may take some encouragement in this task from the manifest ruin which has sprung from other sorts of behavior.

It is no use saying the System will not let us. The system is not Jupiter or Jehovah. The system is an old, laggard mechanism filled with booby traps and soft morasses created by human indecision. But the system is not as formidable as the Great Plains or the Rocky Mountains or the Passage around the Horn. It is seamed with cracks and habitable interstices. A great number of ingenious people use the System instead of becoming its victims. The little magazines and the journals of opinion are bubbling over with the life and promise of self-reliant thought and action.

There is a lot of room in Free America. There is a lot of room everywhere, for the people who know how to find it and are willing to learn how to use it. Look what Danilo Dolci did with an old Sicilian road to the sea!

We said that there are two ways to look at what is going on, and have spent nearly all our space upon one of them. There is still the practical way to be considered. In our attempt to be practical, we ask the reader's patience with a certain confusion. Having found in the *Nation* (Dec. 1, 1962) a review of Ralph E. Lapp's latest book, *Kill and Overkill*, we thought it might be a good example of the practical way to see what is going on. Dr. Lapp is a scientist, a frequent contributor to the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, and has been closely involved in the development of nuclear weapons "from its quiet university beginnings some twenty-five years ago." It is Dr. Lapp's view that "we are trapped in an arms economy and a weapons culture," having placed our defense in the hands of groups whose "dominating policy has been an unlimited build-up of arms—the hardware came first, the philosophy could come later." The reviewer comments:

That hardware has eventually dictated a philosophy couched in terms of a delicate balance of terror, but increasing weight of evidence indicates that "the strategy of enforcing peace through terror is shot through with fallacies and contradictions." In such terms Ralph Lapp condemns a strategy that he fears is soon to bring our uneasy peace to such a degree of instability that the weapons themselves will begin to rule our destinies by forcing our leaders to change from abhorrence to dread acceptance of a first-strike policy. And, we learn, our nuclear stockpile now holds enough megatonnage to overkill the Soviet Union twenty-five times.

We meant by "practical," a way of looking at developments in the Cold War which would make it plain that we must find some other way of dealing with the Soviet Union—or, since "enemies" change, with any opponent who earns our distrust. But this brief summary of Dr. Lapp's findings is disconcerting. One is obliged to

wonder whether "practical" considerations can have any effect in a matter that has gone this far.

If the brainiest men in the country—and we are frequently assured that these are the men who plan the national defense—can find no alternative to a program that is "shot through with fallacies and contradictions," how will "practical" arguments help us?

But the point must be made anyhow. It is that, in any rational frame of reference, resolution of the differences between nations by the might of arms has become wholly absurd. And since nations are nothing without their armaments, "nations," as the units of social organization, are also absurd. But this is horrifying. What principle of organization shall we adopt? What will hold us together? Who will protect the weak from the strong? Or the strong from the weak? Who would be the strong, in a weaponless world?

Such curious dilemmas suggest the extremity of the times. In any event, any familiar meaning of the word "practical" returns us to essential questions about the nature of man and the manner of true human fulfillment—as questions which can no longer be neglected unless we refuse to think at all.

## REVIEW

### GET YOUR PERSONALITY READY

THE BRAIN WATCHERS (Random House, 1962) by Martin Gross is a documentary on the nearly incredible increase of "personality measurement" examinations for prospective employees in business, school children, teachers and minor executives. This is now a fifty-million-dollar-a-year business, and for fifty million Americans, according to Mr. Gross, a matter of intimate concern. Reason: Psychologists operating in this field are rapidly becoming so influential that a man's career and his place in society may be determined by a test he is required to take.

In the first chapter, "The Personality Colossus," Mr. Gross touches upon the awesome claims and the dubious power of "the brain watchers":

Brain watching is a vital twentieth-century sociological phenomenon that has made your mind, inner thoughts, political opinions, frustrations (including the sexual), aspirations—what we commonly call *personality*—the raw material of a humming, seemingly insatiable American industry.

The growth is accelerating, especially in "human inventory," the testing of men already on the payroll and in the so-called creative industries once considered off limits to overzealous brain watchers. It is becoming increasingly common for newspaper reporters and editors, writers, radio or TV network personnel, public relations executives or advertising agency account men and copywriters to have their already delicate future hinge on a tester's swift evaluation.

Unless the trend is sharply reversed by some now unknown immutable business law, by the end of the decade anyone who punches a time clock or inhabits an executive suite from San Diego to Penobscot will have to get the nod from the personality tester before exercising the atrophying privilege of working.

Modern man in the sixties is seated indecorously on the prongs of a dilemma. Words such as "motivational research," "human relations," and other psychological jargon titillate his upcoming twenty-

first-century consciousness and he applauds any probes into the mind, or soul, of man. Yet with vestigial pride of the declining Protestant ethic, he nourishes his own little-remaining privacy. The brain watcher, who views suspiciously anyone who is not publicly voluble about himself, has no such anxiety. Individual man, he says, was meant to be probed, for the corporation, society, and profit.

In a chapter headed "Science or Cult?" Mr. Gross makes plain his opinion that the claims of the personality-adjustment psychologists are excessive and irresponsible. Even though "to some sensitive psychologists, the din of testers is a revolting cacophony," Mr. Gross continues, "they feel relatively helpless against the slickly organized onslaught." This seems to be another case of the public demanding a questionable product after a campaign of misleading advertising. Thoughtful psychologists who are extremely critical of the trend and its outrageous oversimplifications of "human personality" are not consulted for *their* opinions. So we have, in Mr. Gross's words, "a formidable cult." There are some indications, however, that the fundamental weaknesses of the testing devices, which openly seek conformism, are appearing. Mr. Gross's concluding essay, "Morality and the Mean," cites two executives who have had their fill:

De-emphasizing of the individual is foremost among the brain watchers' many sins. The necessity for a "safe" hiring policy that will not agitate the management who pays, has made the tester suspicious of the true individual. Using his averages as a guide, the tester rationalizes that the individual is more apt to rock than guide the boat. He knows that although evenness and constancy in men may not move civilizations, or corporations, forward, it is difficult to trace any slow, imperceptible backward movement when things appear so steady.

The tester's fight for "adjustment" has plainly been a fight for the status quo, and a fight against genius and its unpredictability. The dull business leader is usually willing to make this compromise in return for the tester's guarantees that his work force will be stable and tranquil. Slowly—although increasingly—leaders of the business community are grasping the fatal implication of such policies. Reed O. Hunt, president of the giant Crown Zellerbach

Corporation, for example, recently asked for the complete elimination of personality tests as inconsistent with our desperate need for "individuals" who can create the "new products, processes, and technological improvement" needed for growth.

The testing blight has had another negative effect on corporate morality—namely, the disintegration of human values in the relationship between employer and employee, between supervisor and those he supervises. It has heightened the dehumanization that has always been latent in the corporate atmosphere. George Odiorne, director of the University of Michigan Bureau of Industrial Relations, for one, warned in a recent speech that the use of "forms and techniques adopted from those used by psychiatrists on emotionally disturbed patients" is helping to destroy the "human element" in industry.

A superficially conceived "psychological test" can be bluffed through by any reasonably intelligent person. If, then, the corporation which wants nothing but seeming extroverts occasionally gets an introvert who is smart enough to cope with the testing situation, one can say that no harm has been done—since the same intelligence will make him efficient at his job as long as he wishes to be. But think of the mood in which one might take a job under such circumstances! Here we have a kind of internal espionage and counter-espionage game being played for purposes of advancement. And the man who has to falsify his spontaneous inclinations will certainly have a harder time defining his individual opinions or convictions on any subject. This is a far cry from the words of Emerson on self-reliance. "Let each man speak the utmost syllable of his convictions" may become a literal invitation to career disaster, whether the career is in government, teaching, or private enterprise.

It is of interest that a similar concern currently occupies a novelist's attention. Roderick Thorp's *Into the Forest* contains an "evaluation" of personnel tests:

"Look at it this way," Charlie said to Torrenson, "some of these tests are built to find out if you're the kind of man to put the company or your wife first. That's the most severe criterion, I know, but it's still one of them. Now when you want to know that, you

infringe on a man's freedom. Suppose you have two men, one a fink and the other willing to do a just day's work for a just day's pay. But you've discovered the fink through the test. How do you decide who gets the job?"

"Well, whose interests are at stake?"

"Exactly. At the heart of it, the public's interests." He could see Elaine looking at him proudly. "And no less important," he said, feeling better about the time this was taking, "the interests of the individual. You see, when a company hires someone who'll give his all for the company, it's exploiting a cripple. No one has the right to expect more than a full day's work for a full day's pay. By forcing people to do more than they want—or should—you endanger the society. Take a person who's neither a cripple nor a well man, but someone who is just ignorant of what is being done to him. With this deep testing and so forth, a door is being opened in him so that he can be taken advantage of. Do-or-die can be slowly established as the standard among the ignorant. You could compare the result to labor conditions in the last century, except that everyone would have a smile on his face."

Mr. Gross's warnings respecting the "brain watching" trend seem entirely justified. He concludes:

How easily we have seemingly relinquished our constitutional rights of protection against search and seizure when it applies to our minds instead of our properties. Apparently there is something more sacrosanct in the inviolability of our split-level castles than in the private nobility of our brains.

Brain watching today cannot be successfully minimized or dismissed. Man's curiosity to know more and more about his neighbor increases regularly, as does the volume, if not the quality, of the techniques for such study. Rather than wait and work patiently toward a better understanding of the problem, the brain watcher has decided to use the opportunity to earn rather than learn. If his powers continue to grow, we may find ourselves totally overwhelmed by this aggressive non-science in this most scientific of ages. To surrender now to a twentieth-century mystique which many have confused with an inevitable touch of progress would indeed be a harsh irony.

## *COMMENTARY* **THE FEAR OF PEACE**

ALL men, said Thomas à Kempis, desire peace, but few men desire those things that make for peace. This situation has not changed. Men still desire peace, but they still withdraw from the things that make for peace. And today, it must be added, the withdrawal is very nearly conscious and overt. For today most men regard the means to peace with a fear that is comparable to a quite normal horror of the unknown.

The path to peace is the path of universal disarmament. There can hardly be a compromise in this, since partial disarmament is objectively the same as partial armament, and a nation which disarms a little bit can always reverse itself and arm a little bit more—until, once again, the threat of nuclear destruction is held to be the principle of survival.

So, disarmament is the only realistic policy for a nation seriously bent upon peace. But a disarmed nation would be a nation living in a power vacuum. And where is the nation so pure in heart that it could maintain a normal social life without the means of armed defense against those whom it has wronged? To render a nation without arms would be like turning a child out into a forest in the middle of the night. Who knows what dark horrors will come to devour us?

It follows that the capacity to make peace is an aspect of the capacity to live without fear. And with only a little reflection we realize that the capacity to live without fear belongs only to those who are ruled in their behavior by the principle of justice.

Here, basically, is the logic of the proposition that only "the people" can make peace. The managers of the modern nation-state are far too sophisticated to believe in the practice of justice or in the moral law which this discussion implies. They know that self-interest is the principle of survival for nations, and they are psychologically unable to abandon this principle as the basis of

national policy. All the tangible reference-points of the national being are entries made by self-interest. To change, now, in the midst of crisis, to another principle is for them a virtual impossibility.

This is a time, therefore, when the people, with the strength of their innocence—of their lack of awareness of the amorality of international affairs—will have to take the initiative away from the political managers of the modern nation-states. If there is to be peace, it will have to be made by those who are psychologically capable of believing in justice, and morally capable, therefore, of living without fear.

What can we anticipate about social life in a power vacuum? Very little, except for the common-sense conclusion that the people who have put their faith in justice and a willingness to live without the "security" of immeasurably destructive armaments will have to go through some disillusioning awakenings concerning their own national past. Far-reaching debts will have to be paid to long-exploited peoples during the process of changing peace, freedom, and justice from political abstractions into practical facts. The prospect is not engaging, but the maturity we long for can hardly be gained in any other way. And you could say that the choice now before us is between perishing and growing up.

# CHILDREN

## . . . and Ourselves

### INTERNATIONAL YOUTH FESTIVAL

AN encouraging indication of the value of organized efforts to lower the barriers between peoples of opposed ideological traditions was provided by the World Youth Festival held at Helsinki, Finland from July 28 to Aug. 6, 1962. Eighth in a series of such festivals, this gathering was planned and prepared for by an international committee in 1961. A total of 150 persons from fifty countries participated in the constitutive assembly, including representatives from the USSR, India, England, Italy and Australia. The basic point of view is given:

The Assembly reaffirms that the Eighth Festival, a meeting place for Peace and Friendship, is open to all those who wish to participate in it, irrespective of their political opinions, religious beliefs, race or nationality; no political, ideological, or religious beliefs will prevail. Support for the Festival in no way signifies the renunciation of one's own convictions, of one's adherence to any given tendency. Everyone may express his own convictions while showing respect for the opinions of others.

Among statements supporting the festival from those occupying important positions is the following:

The Festival of Youth and Students, which has developed into a regular and fine tradition, links together under a noble banner "For Peace and Friendship" young people of different nationalities and races, different convictions and religions. Peace and friendship that is the first cry—that is what mankind needs at this juncture.

The Peoples of all countries need Peace. Only with enduring peace can the young generation create, study, increase human wealth and build up their own happiness. And precisely on that account the place of youth is among the front ranks of those fighting for general and complete disarmament.

May the Eighth World Festival add greater strength to their unity in the fight for peace, national independence and social progress.

The writer of the above was Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, Premier of the Soviet Union. India's Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, also sent his greetings:

It is becoming increasingly clear that if this world is to continue, the relationship of nations and individuals should be based on peace and friendship as well as tolerance of each other's ways. It is particularly important that the youth of the world should increasingly believe in this approach. I hope the Helsinki Festival will lay stress on our tolerance of each other even when we differ.

From the United States came a laudatory statement signed by fifty prominent educators, clergymen and community leaders—revealing a determination to express their convictions for peace, even though many of their countrymen disapproved of "mingling with the Communists." The statement included these paragraphs:

We are aware of differences of opinion in our country concerning participation in such a festival; but this year, we note a considerable reluctance to oppose this exchange forthwith as had been the case with past festivals.

We pray that nothing will prevent American youth from joining together to engage in frank exchanges in their own names with other young people living under conditions and philosophies quite different from our own.

Let us hope that the lessons learned from the contact with the youth of other countries and fervor engendered will help change the climate in our beloved land. May these young people lend their lusty voices to the growing clamor for international amity in place of Cold War.

In the best traditions of our democratic way of life, we seek to encourage the exchange of ideas as the only avenue to achieve the fullest maturity of our own young people as to the best contribution we can make towards the elimination of strained relations and the ultimate achievement of a permanent world peace.

The Rev. Martin Niemoller, President of the World Council of Churches, gave the opening address before the festival group of the Federal Republic of Germany. He came directly to the

issue on which criticism of the festival quite predictably developed. Dr. Niemoller said:

Some people reproach me, saying, "You, as a man of the Church deal with the Communists!" To this I can only answer, Yes, I really do—and I negotiate with them consciously because we want peace; and especially, because we as Christians are responsible for the peace in the world. If we want peace, we must first have peace between the west and the so-called communists. In this connection we have an enormous task and an enormous responsibility.

Yesterday evening, when the Festival was opened, it became clear that the Festival really wants peace and friendship, and I believe in this intention as I think the Festival is a most important and significant international event, in which participation is possible for all young people all over the world and for our youth in the Federal Republic too. I cannot imagine that the spirit of peace and friendship can be successful in your generation without the Festival's work and eagerness. Otherwise, peace in our time would be an uncertain thing. The politicians did not leave us much hope, but I found yesterday evening a fountain of joyful hope, promising progress along man's political path.

We must show others that we want peace. We must offer friendship, we must offer peace, even if people will stone us for it. I appeal to you, my young friends, not to lose your way, and not to allow doubt to cloud your convictions.

Inasmuch as *Time* magazine called the Festival "red-run" and further slanted its coverage with the comment that "a terrible time was had by all," we suggest that readers endeavor to have a look at the Festival report—forty-nine pages of the Festival program and preliminary results. (United States Festival Committee, Inc., 460 Park Avenue South, Room 807, New York City 76, N.Y.) So far as we have been able to determine, the unwillingness of U.S. political leaders to underwrite the program provides the only explanation for the fact that the Soviets were much better represented than the United States.

The following from the Report should be of general interest:

Nine hundred and forty-seven participants from 106 countries, representing nearly 400 national and

11 international organizations, took part in the "Colloquium on Problems of Peace and National Independence." There were 327 participants from 111 organizations (327/111) from the Western countries; (49/25) from the USA); 95/28 from the Eastern countries; 525/241 from the neutral and colonial nations of Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America. A further breakdown reveals 179/63 from Africa, 103/50 from Asia, 129/84 from Latin America, and 88/44 from Europe. Furthermore the 12 largest numbers of participants were from France (83), Finland (56), USA (49), Italy (39), Argentina (36), the German Federal Republic (32), Great Britain (28), Algeria (28), Ceylon (25), Denmark (22), Belgium (20), and Iraq (19).

Two full days were devoted to four main topics; Peaceful Coexistence, Disarmament, National Independence, International Cooperation. The topics under discussion were introduced respectively by Mr. Tehnesniacivitchous of the Soviet Committee of Youth Organizations, David Laws, Secretary of the Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), Kent, England, Mr. Bangoura, Secretary-General of the Pan-African Youth Movement, and Mr. Francois, of UNESCO. The four man presidium consisted of representatives of four continents—the head of the Mali delegation, Mr. Hibrahim Guindo, member of the Administrative Committee of the Argentine University Alliance, Mr. Antonio Sofia; the Vice-President of the Indonesian delegation, Mr. Subabhi; and the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Union of Young Socialists of Poland, Marian Remke.

Fifty-three speakers were heard; 14 from the West, 9 from the East, and 30 from the neutral and colonial nations (11 from Africa). The four American speakers represented the most from any one country. Among the speakers heard were: the Danish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, National Union of Students of Brazil, Algerian FLN youth, the progressive Youth of British Guiana, Syrian Union of Democratic Youth and Students, the Peoples' Youth of Yugoslavia the Tunisian Youth Council, the Student Union of U.A.R., the National Festival Committee of Japan, the Indian Congress Party Youth, the World Federation of Christian Democratic Youth of the German Federal Republic. The Finnish organizations—Union of Agrarian Youth, Union of Social-Democratic (Opposition) Youth, Union of Democratic Youth, and the Foreign Policy Association of the Young Generation of Finland—each participated in the Colloquium. Other participants were Mr. William Jones of the Institute of Youth (UNESCO) of Gaunting, Mr. Kalervo

Siikala, secretary of the Finnish UNESCO Committee, and Mr. Hugh Williams observer for the United Nations. Seventy participants who had signed up to speak weren't able to because time ran out.

The representative of the Ceylon Youth League said: "Isms are for man and not man for isms—that is why we are able to discuss our problems calmly. We want peace, not peace at any price, but an honest peace. We want to act as a neutral bridge. Nowadays there are weapons in existence with which people can not only destroy each other, but destroy the whole of Humanity as well. The arms race increases the Cold war, and we have got to find means of solving this problem. Peace is one and indivisible.

## *FRONTIERS* Strange Currents

A DISCUSSION by Theodore Roszak (professor of history at Stanford University) of "The Historian as Psychiatrist," in the *Nation* for Nov. 24, 1962, examines a rarely considered aspect of the thought of Sigmund Freud. Noting the neglect of Freud's interest in "the psychic foundations of civilization, and of the historical process as a whole," Mr. Roszak comments:

The omission is remarkable because this is exactly the historical problem that most fascinated Freud (and Jung and Ferenczi and Rank and Roheim). Far from believing that psychoanalysis was relevant only to mankind's outbursts of obvious individual and collective madness, Freud was convinced that the new science also had much to say about our conditions of normalcy. Or to put it another way, he became progressively more aware that "normalcy" may actually be the socially acceptable form of psychic sickness. Man, Freud concluded, is the neurotic animal; the disease is the disease of his nature.

If what Freud had to say about man is correct, then psychoanalysis has much more to do with the study of history than simply shedding new light upon Luther's *Turmerlebnis* or the population decline of the fifteenth century. For what historians may really be studying, not occasionally but at all times, is diseased matter. Human history becomes a *case* history of the greatest of all neuroses: that of civilized man.

What this amounts to, when you think about it, is a secularist theory of Original Sin. Such an idea is oppressive, especially to those who remain persuaded of the nineteenth-century doctrine of Progress, and since such people are still in command of the affairs of mankind, it is not remarkable that this side of Freud's general diagnosis is noticed hardly at all. In fact, it is a part of the neurosis of the age to have denatured Freud and assimilated his "influence" in innocuous dilutions:

What remains of Freud . . . is the feeble realization that dreams have some kind of psychological meaning and that sex is—well, important, too, but it isn't everything. (For which

read: it's almost nothing.) Which places us back in the pre-Freudian nineteenth century without even an adequate appreciation of Blake or Nietzsche. C. P. Snow is typical of the pre-Freudian intellectual whose good, solid, constructivist common sense is enjoying a renaissance in our day. Snow's hyperconscious scientists with their personalities pasted tightly to the backs of their foreheads inhabit a world where Dostoevsky (let alone Kraft-Ebing) is a dirty word.

Freud saw through the high-sounding pretensions of the men who throw the world into long and costly wars, and he found their actions pathological. Mr. Roszak agrees: "I cannot see any other way of describing behavior, deliberately undertaken, which seriously endangers the survival of the entire human species than to call it insane." Then, turning to the fact that modern technology is now "capable of making the lives of men clean, healthy and comfortable for the first time in history," he comments:

Happiness would seem to have become an objective possibility for the human race. And yet the angry elites of the world and those who support them want us to turn our back upon it. In their hands, real and urgent options become hopeless Utopias. Instead of setting about the business of giving all men the physical well-being and sense of independence it is well within our power to give them, they exhort us at the least opportunity to fight and intrigue against our fellows, stifle their aspirations, and kill them by the millions, with time off only to waste our resources by shooting expensive rockets to the moon. Instead of seeking to give our minds and bodies peace, they bid us grimly to steel ourselves to another fifty years, or another hundred years, of cold-war tensions. The struggle must go on. But why? Nobody knows. The answers offered dissolve into anachronistic rhetoric.

This is madness. It is madness even when it is undertaken by history professors from Harvard or members of the Soviet Academy. It becomes no less mad when "we" claim only to be responding in kind to what "they" do. It remains the activity of ascetic and essentially suicidal men who cooperate marvelously in confirming their psychotic conception of reality. This is a trans-ideological account of historical human behavior. It proposes that there is manifest sickness in the drives of history.

We might find our condition easier to understand if we could read history in the context

of ancient myth—if, for example, the tortures of Prometheus could be understood as a part of the human agony, typifying what man does to himself. But we have no such framework of transcendent meaning; we lack a text for explaining our own self-betrayal, and the same presumed "healthy-mindedness" which encourages us to reject theological Original Sin permits us to ignore the generalizations of Freud.

A similar diagnosis comes, however, from a vastly different source. Roger Bray, writing in *Anarchy* 19 (September, 1962), brings Taoist wisdom to bear on the contemporary scene. Lao Tse saw in the ambitions and contentions of civilization the marks of alienation from Tao. "Almost all Taoist writing," Mr. Bray notes, "is in some sense an explanation of how a man may become a vehicle of the Way, 'who remains calm and quiet and thus becomes the guide for the universe'."

This anarchist writer finds parallels between Lao Tse's teaching and contemporary needs:

After Tao was lost came "power," then human kindness then morality, then ritual. "Now ritual is the mere husk of loyalty and promise-keeping and is indeed the first step towards brawling." "It is because everyone under Heaven recognizes beauty as beauty, that the idea of ugliness exists. And equally if everyone recognized virtue as virtue, this would merely create fresh conceptions of wickedness." "He who knows the always-so has room in him for everything, he who has room in him for everything is without prejudice." None should judge, not ever. Not judge, as Sonia in *Crime and Punishment*. Only accept.

And speech should be at a minimum. "To be always talking is against nature." Even about disarmament. "It was when the family was no longer at peace, that there was talk of 'dutiful sons'." To love the people is the beginning of hurting them. To plan disarmament in the cause of righteousness is the beginning of rearmament." It follows, as Lin Yutang asserts, "When it becomes necessary to talk of disarmament, all plans of disarmament must fail, as man has learned today." This Taoist concept is similar to that of present libertarian thinking. Disarmament under social conditions in which rearmament is possible is meaningless. Without

replacement of national states by a cosmopolitan libertarian socialist society, war is almost certain. The idea of national states may be too ingrained to be changed before disaster. These states are now more powerful than ever, and there is apparently less feeling of international solidarity among workers and scholars than there was before World War I.

Then a withdrawal should occur, out of the state, science, and industrial society into self-inquiry and self-subsistence, into poverty (by modern standards), into silence and joy in small things. Having heard what is outside, we listen with our hearts to what is inside. "Without leaving his door, he knows everything under heaven. Without looking out of his window, he knows all the ways to heaven."

Of such withdrawal there will be the usual critics, from political right to left, because of belief in the upwards and onwards theory, the bright face of tomorrow.

We have put these quotations together because, basically, they speak to the same condition. Freud called it neurosis, Lao Tse departure from the Tao. And we, until recently, have called it "progress." Freud was pessimistic, Lao Tse paradoxical, yet there is a deep perception in their thinking which the modern world has passed by, at immeasurable cost. Fortunately, a genuine revival of this kind of thinking is now going on.