A RESPONSIBILITY OF PEOPLE

> Those who would have others know "the truth" must take into account what "the truth"' would mean to them and how they would respond to it. The truth is relative in interpersonal affairs; it has meaning only in relation to people, and this meaning is often difficult to anticipate. The messenger of "truth" bears part of the responsibility for the results of his effort.
>
> LESTER GREENSPOON, M.D.

WE have for this week's lead article a collection of what seem probable "truths," gathered from fairly diverse sources, which, taken together, point to a "larger" conclusion that may be far more important. In the course of making the collection, we came across Dr. Greenspoon's caution, and, lacking any clear idea of how to apply his idea to the project at hand, we adopted it as a kind of over-seeing text.

The first item for report is from an article by Bill Ward in the *Nation* for Jan. 25, titled "Why the Students Revolt." Last December students at Syracuse University joined in a mass meeting to protest an administration decision concerning the Christmas holidays. They wanted to go home on Dec. 18 instead of Dec. 23. Thousands attended the meeting; many of them jeered the chancellor, who came to stand his ground; then, not getting what they asked for, they did a little picketing, boycotted some classes, and went home on Dec. 23. There was no big issue of "principle," here, but Mr. Ward makes the protest into an occasion for some observations in depth concerning student attitudes of alienation and rejection. He begins with undergraduate feelings about John F. Kennedy:

> To the other generations, Kennedy was a good President, but he was not as warmly held as FDR or Eisenhower. But to the college generation, Kennedy was more than political leader; he was physically, intellectually, ideologically and ethically the perfect symbol of all their dreams. A professor friend of mine inadvertently pointed this out recently. He was

uncertain whether to show a movie based on a Kennedy press conference. "They will all start crying again," he said.

> . . . The students pin the assassination mercilessly to the older generations. The act was fully characteristic of the genius for destruction.

The prosecution sums up: "You set off the atom bomb. You were complacent until Dachau. Your Depression wasn't so Great. You got trapped in Korea. Now, you want to threaten my life in some place like Viet Nam. You assassinated Kennedy and gave me in his place a professional politician from Texas. Your generation has failed us and yourselves utterly." . . . The older generation represents to them dogmatism and self-righteousness that have produced two world wars, a depression, a political inquisition, a rising crime rate and a dehumanization of city ethics.

> Mississippi is still another symbol of the perfidy of their elders. Many students spent the summer there and have returned to Northern campuses to exert greater pressures against any society that tolerates a Mississippi in its midst. The attitude toward rights has led to consistent interracial dating on campuses, to great enthusiasm for civil rights groups, for pickets and sit-ins and parades. These students consider themselves the true warriors of the times, fighters in new, nonviolent terms.

> Another thing that angers the college student is the feeling that he has been belittled by his elders. He is misunderstood for instance, when he confronts established authority and is accused of falling in, blindly or otherwise, with Communists or other demagogues. He is misunderstood when he demonstrates against the House Un-American Activities Committee not because that group is anti-Communist but because many times it has been anti-student. . . .

> Even in college, he feels patronized. He is in search of enriched intellect and too often finds himself treated like a youngster. He is fobbed off with graduate students as teachers. He is governed by a bourgeois ethic that is fundamentally caste and many times alien to his own background. . . . He is lectured at and rarely reasoned with. He feels his creativity blunted and stunted at every turn. His health and morality are fretted over, but rarely his

intellect. He feels like his teenage hero-victim, Holden Caulfield, arrested in his years, seeking the ideal and hating to accept the real.

A British lecturer on education at Leeds University has this to say (in *Peace News* for Dec. 25):

> We can be proud of our progress, of our greater humanity in our treatment of the young. And yet there are dangers in the very measures of protection which we have devised. "Protection" is a two-edged device: it can help, and it can humiliate. By "protecting" young people we can push them aside into a world of trivialities, a no-man's land of unimportant concerns. We may do this in their own best interests, but our very benevolence may be an insult. . . . In every sphere of life we are postponing the time when the young can stand beside the adult members of the community. Today sociologists (like Mark Abrams) are even describing men and women in their mid-twenties as "adolescents." This is preposterous. It is even dangerous. Of course if we exclude them from any responsibility and possibility of self-respect from their mid-teens to their mid-twenties, we can *make* them into "adolescents." . . .

> We do too many things at the wrong time in life. It is probable that too much of our formal education is offered at the wrong age, when young people have other pressing, distracting and in many ways more important demands upon their "life-space." (And many of our most worthwhile young people are often those who at 16, 17 or 18 refuse any longer to submit to it.) Whatever educational arrangements we devise, we must make sure that steps which are taken ostensibly to protect the young are not, in reality, steps taken to protect ourselves.

Mario Savio, the straight-A philosophy student who became a leader of the Free Speech Movement on the University of California Berkeley campus, made this analysis of the revolt:

> The students are frustrated; they can find no place in society where alienation doesn't exist, where they can do meaningful work. Despair sets in, a volatile political agent. The students revolt against the apparatus of the university.

> This is the motive power of the student movement. I thought about it and my own involvement when I went to Mississippi where I could be killed. My life, my middle-class life, had no place in society, nor it in me. It was not really a matter of

fighting for constitutional rights. I needed some way to pinch myself, to assure myself that I was alive. Now we will have to break down the fiction of the separation of student and citizen. We are breaking down barriers set up in a lot of people's personalities. That is what drives the student movement on.

Lewis Feuer's Dec. 21 *New Leader* article seems to capture much of the spirit of the Berkeley sit-in demonstration. He quotes a student orator: "Clark Kerr has written that the university is a factory. He deals with us as numbers. Well, that's the language he understands, so we are here as numbers— hundreds and thousands. . . ." Prof. Feuer makes this comment:

> In physics, the law holds that to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction, and this is often true in social reality. To the trend toward the Impersonal Managerial Multiversity, there corresponds the uprising of the alienated, seeking a sense of their personality in the impersonal setting which emasculates their idealism at manhood's beginning. . . . it cannot be gainsaid that when students speak of the impersonal and depersonalizing modern university, they are speaking of a genuine phenomenon.

> The students feel themselves propelled about by IBM machines from one big line to another. Long lines in the library to get a book, long lines outside a professor's study. "Nobody knows my name," they all say. "Nobody knows me after four years to write me a letter of recommendation." "We are like electrons in a mass-accelerator, to be speeded up and measured. . . . .

> What economy or educational purpose is served by gathering together on one campus 27,000 students and 1,700 professors? The bureaucratic channels are multiplied, the structures of committees become top-heavy and their functioning inefficient; the committee captains tend to be professors with little interest in their research or teaching who are making a full-time career of bureaucratizing on committees. Anonymous functionaries become influential because the very multiplicity of committees and their changing personnel favors their strategic role. . . .

> We are finally faced with the "contradiction" of the Modern University. Every bureaucrat will have his corresponding beatnik, every IBM machine will have its corresponding neo-Luidite rebel,

organization will have its counterpart in alienation, the Multiversity will evolve into a Nulliversity. Shall we allow these "contradictions" to deepen until they breed a directionless generational uprising, or shall we intervene against the so-called inevitabilities and do what we can to revive the idea of universities as centers of human wisdom?

Not enough people, alas, read the *Nation* and the *New Leader.* The students are right. They are not understood. It may be true, as some say, that they are exhibiting their "immaturity," but what is wrong with the people who will make no effort to see behind this superficial wrapper into the issues that are involved?

The fact is that we have a new-model world, very nearly *all* man-made, and the change from the recent past, when Nature still afforded checks and balances, has been too sudden. Our institutions are ruthlessly out of phase with human need. They have multiplied without regard for the human qualities of human beings. They have grown according to abstractions about progress, not in response to life-processes. They didn't mean to do it, but the specialists have run amok, and carried all the rest of us along into the antihuman barrens of a gleaming technological desert. They don't *feel* what they have done because, in their specialists' terms, nothing bad has happened. But other people are feeling it. The problem is to understand their cries.

In a recent Pacifica broadcast, Hallock Hoffman said:

> It is commonplace now for people to talk about what is going on in terms that express the violence of our daily experiences. . . . We call them population "explosions," knowledge "explosions," and "revolutions" in technology. We human beings find ourselves, wherever we are, in new situations. We are obliged to adapt ourselves to environments that are changing more rapidly than we can change ourselves to fit them. . . . The new times call for new men, but, as Erich Fromm once remarked, we are biologically cavemen psychologically organized for the tribal culture of the stone age, embarked on a technically sophisticated race toward extinction.

How, actually, do older people feel about the monstrous problems that keep erupting all over the place? Mainly, it must be admitted, they feel *interrupted* by intrusions upon their well-being. As Anatol Rapoport put it recently:

> The American is far from anti-social. He would like to think of others as his Brothers. But he does believe that he becomes a person to be reckoned with by his own efforts and that this is his primary duty. And then, after this duty is taken care of, *then* he may graciously give of himself to others or to society at large. In the American conception, this giving is a virtue, not a duty.

Not many people take kindly to the idea that this "virtue" is now *inescapable* duty. It comes hard to realize that *they—we,* all of us—have changed the world into a place where the relationships of close interdependence have become social-natural laws of life. Hallock Hoffman continues:

> We need look no further for example than to Mississippi. There men and women cling frantically to the remnants of a former era, driven to terror and violence to preserve their sense of identity and significance. No white resident in Mississippi can, in his heart of hearts, really believe he is arresting the change in the status of Negroes of his own state, though he may think he is delaying it a bit, and few can be blind to the fearful cost of the rear-guard action upon which they are engaged. The white southern passion to sustain white superiority brings down the architecture of society itself—when courts and lawyers and doctors and decent men and women are forced to lie and cheat and harm others for the sake of a principle that even now does them no service. Enough of the southern white mentality lives in all of us to make us sanction the same sort of backward battle in the United Nations against the rising societies of colored men and women elsewhere in the world. It shows in Mississippi when the murder of three civil rights workers, two of whom were white, becomes a national event, although murder and torture of Negroes goes on before and after without stirring national interest, it shows in the United Nations when Adlai Stevenson makes an oratorical defense of the rescue in the Congo of a few hundred white missionaries, technicians and their families, but makes no equal protest against the murder and torture of black men and women on the same battleground.

Writing in *Pacific Discovery,* Bruce Finson develops an argument which moves on to show the need for new attitudes toward nature. We shall borrow his argument to point to the need for a changed attitude toward man (the two needs are not really dissimilar):

> At one time civilization was an island in the jungle. Man's struggle to survive was then a struggle against nature, a struggle to make natural forces and resources serve man's needs. This exploitationist attitude was necessary for survival. To build civilization, resources had to be developed, forests transformed into cities, large families produced. For thousands of years it was man's nature and virtue to behave in this manner toward his planet.

> But the battle has been won. Man has largely conquered nature. Within the past century the relationship has been reversed: now the jungle is an island in civilization. The ecology of the earth has become a human ecology. . . . It is man's planet now; and he must decide what to do with it.

We turn to an article in *Landscape* (Winter, 1964) for a discussion by A. E. Parr, a senior scientist at the American Museum of Natural History, who has become concerned with the ecological relationships of the entire environment. Considering the psychological effects of architecture, he says:

> At the rate at which we are changing our surroundings the task of examining whether or not perceptual diversity fills a real and significant psychological need is long overdue. There is evidence to indicate that the mind has an appetite and a requirement for sensory intake of a quantity of appreciably varied impressions, which in some ways is quite comparable with our bodily demands for physical nourishment. Extreme sensory deprivation—that is, extreme lack of external stimulation—quickly deranges the mind and will soon destroy it if the condition is allowed to persist. But little or nothing is known about the mental effects of such minor sensory boons as may be experienced in normal surroundings. . . .

> The adventurous spirit so characteristic of the young may be described as a diffuse but nonetheless strong craving for experiences that cannot be entirely foreseen. In a not too distant past the urge could, and did, find one of its main outlets in exploring the changing aspect of the environment, from house to house, block to block, and street to street.

> As the pattern of the cityscape becomes more and more uniform by architectural design and public regulation, the rewards of exploring the neighborhood milieu dwindle to insignificance. With the increasing predictability of the perceptual environment, unpredictable behavior becomes a natural way to seek the challenges that the adventurous spirit demands and the evolving environment tries to deny. The loud delinquency of the juvenile and the quiet or restless boredom of the adult are probably in a large measure only different responses to the sensory famine.

> Any experienced traveler knows that there are cities or districts where he can walk for hours and miles before feeling any fatigue, while the prospects of other towns make him feel tired almost before he gets on his way. . . . It might be well to remember that the city is a stage on which the lives of most of us are acted out, and it should not be designed as though it were a columbarium for our ashes.

There is probably a more than tenuous connection between the logic of this analysis and the fact that Martin Luther King, winner last year of the Nobel Peace Prize, has made little headway with his philosophy of non-violent action for civil rights in the Negro ghettos of the large cities of the North. Theodore Roszak writes in *Peace News:*

> In Harlem last summer [Dr. King] was booed by many because he courageously condemned the violence which had broken out against the police. Of course, he also condemned the "environmental violence" of the ghetto: the social injustices which breed hatred and vengefulness. But his words were not well received, for he would not give voice to the very real personal bitterness many Harlem Negroes feel toward white society. One wonders how long non-violent leadership can maintain itself without greater progress being made at a faster pace toward the equality of life and opportunity Negroes are demanding *now.*

> The non-violence of Negro leaders like Martin Luther King is a great gift to American society. When one considers the generations of oppression and cruelty Negroes have endured in white America and the explosive backlog of frustration and fury that exists among them, it is almost incredible that the struggle for racial justice should be taking place with so much civilized restraint on their part. This is one

of the great historical acts of human generosity—and it is better than white society deserves by anything but the loftiest moral standards.

In another *Peace News* article, Mr. Roszak describes what passes for "urban renewal" in the United States:

1. Negroes and other underprivileged social elements are "removed"—often driven haphazardly—to other slums (preferably in other cities) or, where there has been better planning, they are walled up into some form of hive-like public housing. The typical housing project is over-sized, slapdash, characterless, ponderously utilitarian, often prison-like, densely and noisily populated, depressing in almost every respect—*and* clearly marked out as public housing, so that its residents cannot escape the stigma of their poverty. Thus, in one way or another, the original ghetto is reconstituted. The gross injustice of some of these practices has become so clear that, under pressure from federal housing authorities, some cities have begun taking more care to relocate their "renewal DPs"—in some cases by subsidizing their rents in ordinary neighborhood housing.

2. The slum landlords are then bought out by the city, state, or federal governments, and their land is sold to private developers at criminally low prices—in order to provide "incentive."

3. The private developers then slap up hive-like "middle-income" housing which is over-sized, characterless, depressing in almost every respect—but possessing electric garbage disposals and wall-to-wall carpeting.

What is fundamentally wrong with such urban renewal is the refusal of those in charge to recognize that the renewing of cities involves the renewing of people. A slum is not simply ramshackle buildings and filthy streets; it is rather depressed and socially useless people who cannot afford (often cannot clearly comprehend) the social respectability they want sorely to enjoy.

Mr. Roszak has an alternative program to offer. It is to undertake systematic *restoration* of many of the buildings in the slum areas, and help the people who live there to learn how to do the restoring and renovating themselves. This would give them work, teach them trades, and the buildings so reclaimed would include some of the most interesting structures in our cities, in many cases providing housing of character and charm. Mr. Roszak has this program worked out in some detail (see *Peace News,* Oct. 9, 1964) . He says in conclusion:

It is too much to expect that the ideas presented here will be adopted by housing authorities under present conditions. There are too many vested interests and too much bureaucratic inertia behind the going system. Proposals like this can find no sympathy at the top. But perhaps they can develop a following at the bottom. What may be required is a widespread effort to mount non-violent resistance against those urban renewal projects which ignore the real problems of the slum dwellers.

If residents dug in their heels and refused to be judged, if they loudly and troublesomely demanded the right to renew their own neighborhoods, I daresay their success could be astonishing. Few northern cities want to be placed in the position of driving impoverished mothers and their children from their ghetto with bulldozers. When the poor and deprived ask the opportunity to rehabilitate themselves and back up the demand with organized non-violent resistance, they are apt to be in a strong bargaining position in most northern cities.

In a review in the *Nation* for Jan. 25, Scott Greer concludes the discussion of a recent book with some observations on urban renewal as presently pursued:

To create a more orderly and pleasing city, to see that all American families do have "a decent home and a suitable environment," to create and maintain exciting public space—these are values for which there is widespread support. It will increase as the nation as a whole becomes better educated, better paid, more highly skilled in symbolic manipulation. But this urge moves within the political culture which prescribes so much autonomy that the true urban renewal effort results from a tug of war between local politicians and the federal agency. It moves within a culture which insists that nothing which can earn a buck should be left for the government—throwing the program to the mercy of real estate speculators and leaving the agency to deal with the local real estate market as best it can.

Urban renewal as it exists dramatizes the schizoid character of our public purpose. Is government only to maintain the minimal order within which aggregated wealth determines direction? Or is it to take responsibility for the public

purpose, moving the earthly city toward the heavenly city?

Further, at what level should this purpose be generated? Among the higher civil servants in Washington, estimable men but perhaps a little removed from the neighborhoods? Or should it be generated among the citizens of this particular city, by the elite of the city or the *vox populi?* These are some major questions that must be considered when we try to understand urban renewal.

It happens that Mr. Greer is a poet *(Via Urbana and Other Poems,* Alan Swallow), which perhaps explains his willingness to leave these questions without easy answers. In our society, it takes a special intelligence to show technical indecision in matters both moral and complex, although, earlier in this review, he has sufficiently revealed his own opinion: "Free enterprise in the use of land is the precise reason for the unsightly horrors of the central cities; free enterprise in government, which allows any piddling enclave of residents to incorporate themselves and use police power to segregate Negroes, is a major reason for the slums.

Well, we are now ready to state the "larger" conclusion to which this rambling jaunt through the pages of various magazines has led. It is that the worst thing which we, the people, have done, in all these depressing relationships, has been to allow the pretense that *we know what we are doing.* It would take a great deal of the pain out of all these situations if we—and here the "we" emphatically includes our elected representatives—would admit, openly and repeatedly, that the complicated problems faced by the present generation are apparently without solution in any familiar terms. More than their frustrations and identity difficulties, college students hate the stupidity and vanity which pretend that these problems are not real. More than they are discouraged by the mess the world is in, they despise an adult generation which refuses to admit its responsibility for *making* the mess.

There needs to be recognition that collective conceit is *not* a patriotic duty, but an unforgivable abuse of power. The obligation to admit failure does not dissolve because so many millions are involved. We can't even begin to cut our losses and make a new start without exposing all the plain uncertainties we feel inside.

From another point of view, there isn't so much, after all, to be ashamed of, when you think of what we have been attempting. As Bruce Finson says. "It is man's planet now; and he must decide what to do with it." How could we have known everything would get so hard? Simply to tell the truth about our ignorance in the present situation would straighten out many of our psychological problems, and this would make the practical problems much easier to solve. We really have nothing, to lose nothing, that is, except an intolerable burden of infallibility. It is time to recognize that no one dare shoulder that burden except the incurably sick in mind.

REVIEW
LINKING SOCIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY

AN informal presidential address before the New England Psychological Association, delivered by Abraham Maslow in November, 1963, revolves around the speaker's development of a conception in the thought of Ruth Benedict, with emphasis on what she calls "synergy." It becomes evident that lines of Dr. Benedict's work enter the field of what has been called "third force" psychology. In particular, the anthropologist's familiarity with many cultures leads to transcendence of typically "Western" frames of reference. (Dr. Maslow reports that Dr. Benedict often chided members of his profession by saying, "You psychologists are too Western—you should be more Eastern.")

In distinguishing between confining cultures and those which engage the qualities of the "self-actualizing person," Dr. Benedict felt the need to reject the simplistic categories of "insecure" and "secure"—substituting "low synergy" and "high synergy" as reflecting the capacity of a group to value non-acquisitive and non-aggressive motivations. In Maslow's words:

> To say briefly: those societies have high synergy in which the social institutions are set up in such a fashion as to transcend the polarity between selfishness and unselfishness, between self-interest and altruism, and in which the person who is simply being selfish necessarily by the social arrangements benefits other people, and which the person who tries to be beneficial to other people, altruistic and so on, necessarily reaps rewards for himself. One too-easy way to put this is to say that the society with high synergy is one in which virtue pays.

A passage from Dr. Benedict's paper (apparently unpublished) is quoted by Dr. Maslow:

> Non-aggression occurs, not because people are unselfish and put social obligations above personal desires, but when social arrangements make these two identical. Considered just logically, production— whether raising yams or catching fish—is a general benefit and if no man-made institution distorts the fact that every catch adds to the village food supply, a man can be a good gardener and be also a social benefactor. He is advantaged and his fellows are advantaged.

> I shall speak of cultures with low synergy where the social structure provides for acts which are mutually opposed and counter-active and of cultures with high synergy where it provides for acts which are mutually reinforcing.

Dr. Maslow is persuaded that every aspect of psychology can and should be seen as holistically penetrating anthropology, sociology, philosophy, and finally religion. Some twenty-five years ago, as Ruth Benedict's student, Dr. Maslow observed some unusual features of cultural ethos among the Blackfoot Indians. At the time of their yearly sun ceremony, respect was paid to two kinds of eminent members of the tribe. There were of course those who, in the Plains Indian tradition, were distinguished by material achievements and possessions. But the greatest respect was shown to the man who, having heaped his possessions in front of him, gave them away to others who were needy and had less ability to hunt and trade. Maslow suggests that here the conflict between "selfishness and unselfishness" was transcended— not simply by the individual as a kind of initiation into a new realm of empathy, but also by all those in the tribe who honored and understood the "total" dispossession. This man, in a sense, was Joseph Campbell's "hero of self-achieved submission"—a subtle sort of heroism which evokes a deep response. In this way, then, as Maslow puts it, the Blackfoot tribe showed its development of "high synergy." He describes his own "initiation" into this view by recording differences of tribal response to two men. One of them was "wealthy" in the goods of the Indian world, but the other was known to have a different kind of wealth:

> I remember my confusion as I came into the society and tried to find out who was the rich man and found that the rich men had nothing; and when I asked the white secretary of the reserve who was the richest man, he mentioned a man whom none of the Indians had mentioned—that is, the man who had on

the books the most stock, the most cattle and most horses. When I came back to my Indian informants and asked them about Jimmy McHugh, how about all his horses, they shrugged with contempt. He keeps it. And they hadn't even thought to regard him as a wealthy man. White Head Chief was wealthy even though he owned nothing. What were the rewards for this? In what way did this virtue pay? The men who did this, who were formally generous in this way were the most admired, the most respected, and also the most loved men in the tribe. I think if we can get ourselves into this position, if we can feel ourselves into this, I think we can understand it, get the feel for it. These were the men who benefited the tribe. These were the men whom they could be proud of. These were the men whom it warmed their hearts to see working, to see walking around.

The contrast with our own culture is clear. As Dr. Maslow observes, "our institutions practically guarantee jealousy, envy, resentment, distance and finally the great likelihood of enmity." The net of this discussion is that the self-actualizing person *tends* to create elements in a culture which honor a leadership not based on aggressive or defensive capacities. Dr. Benedict's "synergy" represents a transcending of the dichotomizing factors in culture, a transcending of the polarity—"a fusion of the opposites into a singularity, melting into a single concept." And it may be seen that "this kind of concept is most useful for the understanding of intra-personal psychodynamics; sometimes in a very obvious way as in the distinction between integration with the person and disassociation. The disassociations of the ordinary pathological sort can be very obvious—even simple conflict can be very obvious as a person torn against himself."

The efforts of the new psychologists to transcend familiar barriers may often seem "a bit jumbled"—to quote from a paper on "The Scientific Study of Experiences Called Religious," by Phillip W. Warren of Minnesota State College. Yet as Dr. Warren says: "A certain amount of this is to be expected in any attempt to cut across old and established realms of thought (this is especially true in an attempt to combine religion and science where there is a very strong belief that

the two will never meet)." A subsequent comment will be of interest to MANAS readers:

It may help if one reads some other literature in the area of the integration of Eastern and Western approaches to man (e.g., Watts' *Psychotherapy: East and West,* Fingarette's *The Self in Transformation* which relates psychoanalysis and the "language of many selves" to the karma doctrine and cycle of rebirth and also relates the idea of satori to a complete analysis, the journal *Manas* is devoted to this problem at a social-psychological level; there are many other works in this area—it seems to be in the *Zeitgeist).* In lieu of reading in one field or the other it will help if one rises above this East-West dichotomy in some way using whatever technique the reader has to open his mind to new combinations of approaches. At least it will be of some assistance to be willing to assume the viewpoint of the approach which is most unfamiliar.

COMMENTARY
REPORT FROM A HOSPITAL

THE discussion by Robert Sommers (in Frontiers) of the treatment of schizophrenics in mental hospitals makes an occasion for calling attention to *The White Shirts,* a paperback on this subject by a former patient, Ellen Field. Miss Field writes as one who endured the horrors of electric shock treatment in a large state hospital twice a week for two years—some two hundred times in all. The value of this book is in its graphic communication of how it *feels* to be a mental patient—the helplessness and hopelessness of it all. One passage describes the ordeal of waiting on "treatment" days—the acute physiological *fear* of what was to come. Eighty or a hundred people, scheduled for shock, queue to go to the bathroom every fifteen minutes or so:

> During the two-hour waiting period in the dorm, there was this constant bladder emptying in varying degrees of severity. I was waiting in the line most of the time. A most terrible loss of body fluids, hormones, etc., under this terrible stress. I mention this because people tend to underrate the physical damage of anticipating shock. At any rate, they think of it as a purely mental fear. This is so false. The truth is that electric shock is physical torture of an extreme type. How to describe this sensation . . . especially when most people don't want it described. They want to change the subject. The word "physical" is where people don't follow you. They think you mean some kind of abstract psychological fear and pain. This fear is intensely physical. It proves the case against mind-pain. The heart and solar plexus churn and give off waves of . . . I don't know the word for it. It hasn't the remotest resemblance to anything I've ever felt before or since. Soldiers just before battle probably experience the same abdominal sensation. It is the instinct of a living organism to fear annihilation, which is what this means to these instincts; regardless of their trying to call it by the rational name of treatment. Our instinct says "no."

Other portions of *The White Shirts* deal with the problems of the civil rights of mental patients. In a report on a Congressional subcommittee hearing on constitutional rights (1961), there is extensive quotation from Dr. Thomas S. Szasz, author of *The Myth of Mental Illness* and *Law, Liberty and Psychiatry,* who proposes that involuntary hospitalization of the mentally ill is "disguised punishment" and a violation of the rights of the patient, and argues at length for far-reaching changes in the law in behalf of the personal liberty of those presumed to be mentally ill. "A person," he said, "ought to have the right to be ill and the right not to seek treatment."

This is an angry and bitter book. From the evidence presented, its writer has had cause.

CHILDREN
. . . and Ourselves
CHALLENGES OF GUIDANCE

THE role of the teacher as "student counselor" has had serious attention ever since the implications of John Dewey's educational theories began to penetrate the training programs of teachers' colleges. Whatever the strength of "progressivism" during its various manifestations, it became impossible for the twentieth-century elementary or high school teacher to think of his job as a simple matter of transmitting the data of prescribed courses. Advanced training for teachers today includes courses in "counseling," accompanied by a plethora of manuals and texts, variously concerned with such matters as the differing I.Q.'s of students, their home background and general situation. And during the past ten years, studies in "creativity" have been appearing at a great rate. However, the relationship between teacher-guidance and a student's creativity potential—certainly a fundamental concern of Dr. Dewey—still requires a great deal of clarification.

We have at hand a paper titled "Guidance and Creativity," by Dr. Paul Torrance, of the University of Minnesota's Bureau of Educational Research, which points to some of the subtler dimensions of creativity. The counselor must first of all be aware of some facts which research has definitely established:

> For the past 70 years, investigators have consistently found little or no correlation between measures of creativity and measures of I.Q. In the upper range of intelligence, there is practically *no* relationship between these two kinds of measures. Within a group varying widely in intelligence, there will be *low but statistically significant* correlations. Within a group low in intelligence, there will be relatively high correlations. The abilities measured by tests of intelligence and scholastic aptitude emphasize logical reasoning, memory, and convergence. Tests of creative thinking emphasize divergent kinds of thinking (ideational fluency, flexibility, originality and elaboration), sensitivity to defects and missing elements and ability to redefine

and restructure. Traditional measures of intelligence emphasize conformity and getting the "correct" answer. Measures of creative thinking abilities call for the unconventional response, breaking away from the beaten, safe pathway.

We now learn that the I.Q. is not "fixed," but can be raised—often in a quite startling fashion—once a dormant or stultified imagination begins to activate mental processes. Mental ability, it appears, is a quality rather than a quantity, and it cannot be measured by any conventional methods of testing. Dr. Torrance continues:

> Information from many sources indicates that much creative talent goes unrecognized. In our own studies at all educational levels (Torrance, 1962), over 70 per cent of those in the upper 20 per cent on tests of creative thinking would be eliminated, if only an intelligence or scholastic aptitude test had been used.

> Of all Elizabeth Drews' (1961) three gifted groups (social leaders, creative intellectuals, and studious achievers), the lowest teacher grades were achieved by the creative intellectuals. When the others were studying for examinations, the creative intellectuals would be reading a book on philosophy or a college textbook with almost no pay-off in the teachers' grade book. Thus, on standardized achievement tests, the creative intellectuals surpassed the other groups as a result of their wide reading and uncredited, self-initiated learning.

But "society in general is downright savage towards creative thinkers, especially when they are young." Not intentionally, of course; and the teacher who finds the behavior of a highly creative child annoying may in theory value highly-developed individualism, yet fail to recognize its presence behind intellectually upsetting behavior. Dr. Torrance continues:

> To some extent, the educational system must be coercive and emphasize the establishment of behavioral norms. Teachers, peers, and administrators can rarely escape the coercive role. Guidance workers are in a position to free themselves of it, if they wish.

> From the studies of Getzels and Jackson (1958), we know that highly creative adolescents are estranged from their teachers and peers. Our Minnesota studies indicate that the same holds true

for children in the elementary school. The reasons are easy to understand. Who can blame teachers for being irritated when a pupil presents an original answer which differs from what is expected? It does not fit in with the rest of the grading scheme. They do not know how the unusual answer should be treated. Peers have the same difficulty and label the creative child's unusual questions and answers as "crazy" or "silly."

Thus, the highly creative child, adolescent, or adult needs encouragement, support, and understanding.

A sensitive, potentially creative child is apt to present difficulties in the home, and the guidance worker or counselor must realize that some parents need a great deal of help in order to help their children:

One of the most tragic plights I have witnessed among highly creative children stems from the failure of their parents to understand them. Frequently destructive or incapacitating hostility is the result of this failure. When teachers fail to understand highly creative children, refusal to learn, delinquency, or withdrawal may be a consequence. There are good reasons why parents and teachers have difficulty in understanding such children.

Many parents attempt too early to eliminate fantasy from the thinking of the child. Fantasy is regarded as something unhealthy and to be eliminated. Fantasies such as imaginative role playing, telling fantastic stories, making unusual drawings, and the like are normal aspects of a child's thinking. Many parents are greatly relieved to learn this and out of this understanding grows a better parent-child relationship. Certainly we are interested in developing a sound type of creativity, but this type of fantasy, it seems to me, must be kept alive until the child's intellectual development is such that he can engage in sound creative thinking.

A high degree of sensitivity, often associated with the capacity to be easily disturbed and with divergent thinking, is regarded by Dr. Torrance as an "essential of the creative personality." It is also necessary to realize that creative children are apt to be enormously puzzled by aspects of their own behavior, and need help in understanding their "divergence." "Guidance and Creativity" includes a story written by a fourth-grader which illustrates the unusual child's search for someone who will understand him:

. . . Charlie had just one great wish. It was to be able to roar. You see when Charlie was born he quickly turned hoarse. As soon as he was nine years old, he went to ask Polly the parrot. But she said, "Go ask Blacky the crow."

So off went poor Charlie to see Blacky. When he got there he asked, "Blacky, why, oh why can't I roar?"

But Blacky only replied, "Don't you see, Charlie, I'm busy? Go see Jumper, the kangaroo. She can help you."

Jumper didn't understand Charlie's problem. But she did give him some advice. Jumper said, "Go ask the wise old owl."

The wise old owl understood everything. He told Charlie, "I hate to say this, but if you really want to know, you're scared of everything."

Charlie thanked him and hurried home. To this day Charlie can't roar, but how happy he is to know why he can't.

Dr. Torrance's paper concludes:

There are crucial times in the careers of creative individuals when being understood is all that is needed to help them cope with the crisis and maintain their creativity.

Regardless of the methods we use in identifying creative talent and in assessing creative growth, the important thing is that we learn how to reward more appropriately this kind of talent. Plato's famous statement is still true—"what is honored in a country will be cultivated there."

FRONTIERS
Schizophrenia and Utopia

MORE than thirty years of intensive research has shown that schizophrenic people are in bad shape. Their interpersonal relations are faulty, their perception is awry, their thinking lacks purpose, etc. This remarkable conclusion describes in plain language the findings of 90 per cent of the studies of schizophrenics. The remaining 10 per cent are concerned with helping the patient adjust to normal society and includes studies of psychotherapy as well as psychotropic drugs. These studies begin with the assumption that mental patients need help while the former had the same point as a conclusion. In both instances we are told that the solution lies in some form of remedial action, some operations to be performed by, on, or with (if you are a third force psychologist) the patient in order to help him fit the mold of society. Most of this work implicitly assumes the notion of a monolithic societal structure which only accommodates a limited number of quasi-middle class behavior patterns. Hence the mental hospital patient's frequent complaints that the psychiatrists expect him to be "super-normal" before they'll discharge him. It is probably in our mental hospitals that the middle-class model of normality is most elucidated.

However it is only fair to see what happens if one looks at the schizophrenic's special quirks and proclivities as legitimate *modi vivendi* and see what kind of world he needs to make him happy. Certainly we don't provide this in large dilapidated custodial mental institutions. There are many groups in society for which special provisions are made. This became very apparent some years ago when I took my children to Storyland Park in the Pocono Mountains of Pennsylvania. According to the owners, Storyland is a "childhood imagination come true." Besides the junior fire engine for adults and children alike, there is a western town with a real jail where each child can be sheriff. There are places to crawl through, things to take apart, an absence of "no-nos," in short everything to delight and interest a child. The buildings were child-size, with little doors and windows, tiny tables and chairs. It is a world designed with the nature of children in mind and things are done on the child's scale. How different it is for a man or woman who is unfortunate enough to get committed to a state hospital. At this moment there are 800,000 men and women living in these places in North America. New York State alone has some 70,000 individuals so incarcerated. Is this a world designed with the patients' interests, happiness, and needs in mind? Hardly; the poorest institutions are designed with security, custody, and economy in mind, the best designed for something nebulously designated as therapy or rehabilitation. In no sense can a therapeutic milieu be equated with one which is designed to give happiness and pleasure to the inmates. Therapy implies society's goals and interests rather than the patient's. It is acknowledged that patients should be treated humanely and kindly while they are changed but the concept of changing the individual is implicit in the notion of therapy.

On the one hand society could do more than it is presently doing to give these 800,000 unfortunate individuals a more pleasant and satisfying environment. However this would require some admission by society that the patient's way of life is legitimate. For the person who happens to be labeled schizophrenic, this means admitting that withdrawal from social intercourse is a recognized and legitimate mode of existence. Some people find no place to hide in society and turn within themselves for solace. The practical man might admit the legitimacy of retreat but still balk at the prospect of feeding and maintaining people who voluntarily choose to leave his world. In this sense, it is an economic question that lies at the heart of the matter. Anyone is entitled to be a rich eccentric as long as he follows the laws of the land. Schizophrenics who have had the good fortune to be wealthy have used their money to protect themselves against the world. The problem is the individual who does not want to participate in society but

lacks the resources to maintain himself at a level society deems necessary. It is he who is no longer incarcerated for punishment but instead is committed for therapy. In neither case is any attempt made to find out what the schizophrenic is good for. It is as if we assume, not only that everything bad is expressed in mental illness, but also that mental illness indicated only bad. Even on the basis of the most superficial examination of schizophrenia, this is patently false. It is not that the patient does poorer in every task he undertakes, but rather that he behaves differently than normal people. Unfortunately the yardstick used to assess the patient's performance equated customary with satisfactory performance, the patient turns out to be poorer on all the tasks. Nonetheless most of the accepted psychological and phenomenological accounts of schizophrenia emphasize that it is the form rather than the excellence or creativity of the patient's behavior that suffers the most.

If this is true, there should be tasks at which a schizophrenic will do *better* than his normal counterpart. Let me give a recent example. The many investigations of sensory deprivation indicate that schizoid individuals are better able to bear extended isolation from a normal environment than are other individuals. There are even some suggestions in the newspapers that slightly neurotic individuals would make the best space travelers. No one went so far as to recruit astronauts from Pilgrim State Hospital but it is not far fetched to suggest that the vast majority of Pilgrims could endure lengthy isolation far better than any of the ten motel owners who are presently in line for the honor. Autobiographies of manics typically mention a quickening of associative powers and verbal fluency far in excess of that of the normal state. Frieda Fromm-Reichman described how the creative powers of many writers and artists develop in conjunction with, or in response to, a mental disorder. Van Gogh, Nijinsky, and Schuman are a few of the well known psychotics who were able to turn their energies into productive channels. In view of this

it is amazing that not one article by a psychologist or psychiatrist has ever shown that schizophrenics do anything better than normals. For the reason of sheer redundancy alone, it seems time for researchers to stop trying to prove that schizophrenics are crazy people. Enough studies have been done to establish this point beyond any question. What is needed now is an attempt to find ways in which the schizophrenic's present liabilities can be assets to him either in society or in some special world that society lets him create for himself or builds for him with his needs in mind.

ROBERT SOMMER

Davis, California