

SYNANON—ITS BEST MAY COME LAST

[The good stories are unquestionably those which can never be told in entirety—because they are still in the process of unfolding. This is certainly true of the saga of Synanon House, that unprecedented "tunnel back into the human race" for former narcotics addicts, which is now proliferating in so many directions from its central location in Santa Monica, California. MANAS has been privileged to print some of the most perceptive writing on Synanon that has appeared anywhere—in articles by Walker Winslow (see "Ex-Addicts, Incorporated," MANAS, Sept. 14, 1960, and Synanon Revisited, Feb. 8, 1961). But even Mr. Winslow cannot compress into articles—or in a forthcoming book—all that may be said about Synanon. From any one of a thousand perspectives, the Synanon Story goes on. Two weeks ago we reprinted from the Congressional Record Senator Dodd's report on Synanon, a milestone of success soon followed by another tribute—President Kennedy's invitation to Synanon's founder, Charles E. Dederich, to attend the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse held last September. The discussion now presented grew out of some first-hand experience within the Synanon community.]

THE story of the Synanon Foundation is indeed, as Senator Dodd (see MANAS, Oct. 31) both dramatically and truly put it, "a study in heroism," so far as its pioneers are concerned. Charles E. ("Chuck") Dederich and a few staunch associates have piloted what appeared a fantastic dream of self-cure for drug addicts into successful reality. There are now few if any sceptics concerning Synanon's success. The Synanon method seems destined for large-scale application—in prisons, in public hospitals, and, independently, in a growing number of communities. Federal subsidy for such community undertakings may and should be forthcoming.

Literature on Synanon is rapidly accumulating, making ample information available for sociologists, prison authorities—and addicts—to study. But even descriptions of *how* the Synanon method works are, in one sense, merely

introductions to the most interesting and important question—*why* it works so well. The view presented here is that the Synanon method works so well because it cooperates with some of the hidden processes which underlie all significant transformations of human nature. The essential principles involved, if this is true, are applicable in every direction—in education, government, psychology, and throughout the field of interpersonal relationships.

Few who visit Synanon fail to be struck by its atmosphere of directness, honesty, and calmness. The former addicts are impressive so much so that visiting dignitaries and research men usually come to feel that they are going to school to Synanon, rather than observing or researching. Why? Because the inhabitants of Synanon are, for the most part, "pared down" people. Like the rest of us, they long toted around configurations of personality which were immature, inadequate, and phony. But unlike the majority of the rest of us, the addict has had his former personality "smashed." The futility of his brand of immaturity has been thoroughly demonstrated to him. He may then begin anew as a truly rare specimen—a man who has faced himself, a man who has been compelled to shuck off stances and attitudes which were obviously self-destructive.

No wonder Synanon people are impressive. They have taken at least a few sips from that fountain of self-knowledge which every philosopher and psychologist seeks, and which cannot be found unless the seeker is willing to relinquish his version of the prevailing concept of self. The Synanon people have been driven, by both circumstances and the nature of the synanon process, to such relinquishment. They have had, in effect, a fortuitous head start.

In his *Christ and Freud* (Collier, 1962), Arthur Guirdham treats of the constructive aspects of this sort of psychological death as a necessary introduction to his central themes. He speaks of "a truth which can only be attained by a process of self-annihilation," and continues:

It is only when man has shed his egotistical self and with it his needs that he is open to a truth not specially moulded by himself nor determined by his needs. If the truth which comes to us when we are detached from ourselves is the same as is perceived by others vastly different from us in race and creed and separated from us in time, then we are as near as we can ever be to absolute truth, even considered by the most rigid standards of science.

In this book I talk of self-annihilation and, at the same time of how a higher self, of which the individual is acutely aware, is realized in the course of religious experience. There is nothing contradictory in this though at first sight it may appear slightly confusing. The self to be annihilated is that formed from the social and dynamic personalities. It is only when this is achieved that the higher Self can be realized.

In Synanon there occurs an interaction between the hitherto dimmed, distorted personality of an addict and an extraordinarily effective process of education. For Synanon is a process rather than an institution—not so much a "cure" as a series of discoveries. In the space of a few short months former addicts have passed through two stages of transformation corresponding approximately to Riesman's change from "outer-direction" to "inner-direction." At the beginning directionless, such men and women accepted more than "cold turkey" deprivation of chemicals; they also accepted the "outer-direction" which a tough-minded supervision of daily life imposes. Previously incapable of establishing continuity of personal growth in their own lives or any adequate self-discipline, they have been force-fed in Synanon by situations which are designed to expose the nature of nearly fatal immaturities.

The exposure is accomplished by the hand of the Synanon community. And Synanon, in this

context, is a tribe rather than a philosophy. The individual, of course, must decide whether the initiatory rites of the tribe are worth the price of admission. He is not regarded, nor can he function, as a responsible citizen of a small democracy, for at the outset participation is cribbed and cabined, when not arbitrarily proscribed. He cannot pretend to establish the conditions under which he will progress, because conditions will be imposed by fiat rather than by argument. But if the initiation proceeds, if he survives his trials—the "rites of passage" of the tribe—those "rites" begin to be converted into some fairly definite articles of personal faith. He now begins to be "inner-directed"—a man who increasingly seeks to manage the processes which have been managing him—learning how, first, by identifying with the process.

The "ex-addict" has taken unprecedented steps; he has subjected himself to control and has come to believe in the validity of the control—a control which has mercilessly compelled him to exchange compulsive self-interest for a self-interest considerably more enlightened. Such a person has come a long way. He is "clean," so far as hiding himself behind a chemical fog is concerned. He is not, however, "autonomous" in the Riesman sense, for it has by no means been established that he can function without fear of relapse in the outside community. He may be still, in many crucial respects, a dependent personality—though strongly aware of the demonstrable distinction that his dependence upon drugs did not work well for him, while dependence on Synanon does. He is exposed to elements of new views on life, and the question becomes, what will he do with them?

So, of course, Synanon is not in all ways and at all times a "new society." Once the "smashed" person comes out of his chemical and psychological stupor he is likely to regain a measure of his old, immature egotism. His trivial fears and ambitions seek rebirth in the new context. But the Synanon society *is* new in one

crucial respect; it doesn't cater to petty fears and ambitions. These are mercilessly exposed, either at once, or, if cleverly concealed, in due time. This exposure does not take place merely by a chance striking of sparks between the rough edges of personality in a discussion group. Those who have discovered something of the difficulties involved in healing themselves—who have learned, so to speak, that "the kingdom of heaven must be taken by violence"—are in some measure able to become agents for the healing for others. In 1958 Chuck Dederich explained the function of such "Synanists":

The synanon can be defined broadly as a kind or type of group psychotherapy. *Synanon*, which is a coined word, is used to describe a more or less informal meeting, which ideally consists of three male patients and three female patients, plus one Synanist who is himself an addictive personality, but who has managed to arrest the symptoms of his addiction for some considerable length of time, or seems to be progressing at a rate somewhat faster than his colleagues in the meeting. The Synanist acts as moderator and, by virtue of an empathy which seems to exist between addictive personalities, is able to detect the patient's conscious or unconscious attempts to evade the truth about himself. The methods employed by a Synanist in a Synanon meeting may include devices or weapons which appear to be unorthodox, but such surprisingly beneficial results have occurred in an encouraging number of cases that we feel we must further explore the method.

The Synanist leans heavily on his own insight into his own problems of personality in trying to help the patients to find themselves, and will use the weapons of ridicule, cross-examination, hostile attack, as it becomes necessary.

While it is conceivable that the "Synanist," in undertaking what may become a rather heady responsibility, will over-reach himself and subtly glamourize his role, these tendencies are bound to be mitigated by a significant discovery—made in person. It is that human development to maturity requires not one but a series of "psychological deaths." In a recent interview published by the *Paris Review* (Summer-Fall), Henry Miller gives this point an interesting and even a transcendent

direction. He explains his use of the title, *The Rosy Crucifixion*, for one of his books with this remark:

I discovered that . . . suffering was good for men, that it opened the way to a joyous life, through acceptance of the suffering. When a man is crucified, when he dies to himself the heart opens up like a flower. Of course you don't die, nobody dies, death doesn't exist, you only reach a new level of vision, a new realm of consciousness, a new unknown world. Just as you don't know where you came from, so you don't know where you're going. But that there is something there, before and after, I firmly believe.

Synanon welcomes the person who has passed through one big psychological death—the death of his acceptance of himself as a drug addict. He comes through the doors as a kind of incubator baby. The new member receives much of "tender loving care," but if he then imagines that tolerance and empathy toward his former glaring failings can be parlayed into tolerance for their reappearance, he will soon be disabused of that notion.

While serving as Chancellor of the University of Chicago, Robert Hutchins remarked that the only way to run a really good University would be to burn the place down every few years. Dederich practices this idea by "pulling the rug out" from under embryonic status-seekers in his care. A man engaged in administrative work may find himself back in the sub-basement of Synanon House cleaning toilets and shower traps. A man without evident status may suddenly find himself occupying a position of responsibility. You can rise and fall, and rise again—or fall and rise and fall again; and, finally, perhaps, you begin to realize that these little up-and-down motions have no real significance except as they pare you down to where you can begin to be a man—"autonomous," because neither fears nor status-ambitions are reference points of motivation.

But no one becomes "autonomous" all at once, and Synanon still houses a ferment of personality problems. How else could the processes of growth be continued? One

"problem" is an almost mystical dependence on Dederich—a man who is himself about as "autonomous" as you can get. If, as he immodestly asserts, he is presently indispensable to the Synanon community, this is nothing more than actual fact. Suspected by some, not without reason, as a candidate for megalomania, Dederich is himself nonetheless the touchstone of the addict's success in rehabilitation. And if he did not invent the "synanon process," he has the greatest genius for applying it in the context of addiction. Because he is *sui generis*, those who have been "saved" by the Synanon experience are apt to regard him as someone more than a cut or two beyond themselves, a conclusion which is usually correct. But of course, when Dederich is regarded as some kind of special property or resource of those his works have saved, almost as Christ was regarded by the monks of the Middle Ages, repetition of "the way, the truth, and the light" of his utterances and decisions becomes sectarian—sometimes wildly so. Further, the multiplying crop of young administrators within the Synanon community—"co-ordinators," as they are called—is exposed to all the temptations of status-seeking. One way of achieving temporary status in Synanon may be by imitating Dederich more convincingly than the next man. But Dederich's own formulation of Synanon philosophy flatly states that "imitation is suicide," and those who try the imitation route to a pre-eminently self-seeking "career" in Synanon are simply building a personality which will have to be "smashed" like the one which fell apart before they came to Synanon in the first place.

For a man to consider himself thrice-blest in encountering Dederich and Synanon when he did, is one thing; to discover that no better environ presently exists for the addict who is ready to stop being an addict—that is the same thing. But to assume, as the "hot-gospelers" often do, that there have never been such truths as those unfolded in Synanon, to be utterly and blatantly confident that no other community than the community of Synanon has ever worked or can work to similar

ends—this is something different. It is sectarianism.

Imitators of Dederich seek self-preferment more than a deepening of understanding, even though, in Synanon, the ultimate value is declared to be the latter, and must become such, before the therapeutic and self-educational process is fulfilled. Viktor Frankl speaks well to this point:

I dare say, man *never*, or at least not normally and primarily *sees in the partners whom he encounters and in the causes to which he commits himself merely a means to an end*; for then he actually would have destroyed any authentic relationship to them. Then, they would have become mere tools, being of use for him, but by the same token, would have ceased to have any value, that is to say, value in itself.

A crucial element of the Synanon experience lies in the fact that the newcomer is *immediately* compelled to shed all aspects of his former status—whatever he possessed. There is a status-shedding bit in prison, also, to be sure, but it cannot be as complete. For in Synanon the process is not satisfied simply by obliging former professional men or other elites from the outside community to perform with alacrity the same tasks given to those who were pimps, dope-peddlers, hoodlums, and thieves; on top of this the "group-therapy" synanon sessions carve away at many of the remaining ego façades. This "paring down" is a salutary experience and anyone, addict or not, could undoubtedly benefit greatly from its application to himself. It is of course possible that after an individual has gone through such reduction and come to terms with the toughness of the Synanon philosophy and its practice, he will begin to construct another façade—based on the belief that now, since he lives in the world's most enlightened place, he is not only hip, but more hip than all the others. As façades go, this ego-mask may be rated a stratosphere above the one it displaced, but the demon of status-seeking is still involved. So the "paring down" process simply goes to work again. Here is ground for the

current Synanon dogma that the longer you stay the better off you are.

Synanon seems so basically healthy in both concept and practice that it can withstand the upthrusts of self-seeking ambition' better than most other societies, large or small. If an ambitious man within Synanon reaches administrative status and proves to have nothing significant to contribute to the community life, he and the community will probably part company—because they will begin to dislike one another. But what of men who may be somewhere in between self-seeking and dedication? Again, Synanon is a wonderful place to work out the ratios in this problem. There will always be breaks in empathy between those who are "status-seekers" and others who, for whatever reason, are not. At times, enough of the "elite" attitude manifests in administrators to make it seem that there is not *one* Synanon community, but *two*. And it is almost certain that the newly arrived addict often receives far more help from the lowly and unpretentious who have nothing to do with administration than from the current crop of "professionals." "Power corrupts . . .," etc. It seems that the most understanding help comes from those who *know* they are just getting over being "sick"—not from ones who are hot-shotting along under the delusion that their manipulative astuteness has made them somehow superior.

So newcomers to Synanon may feel undercurrents of tension between *groups*, which is always more potentially destructive than tensions between individuals. Perhaps the synanon process of searching analysis needs to be inverted once in a while—with those currently regarded by the administrative group as most "sick" acting as chief synanists and the administrators themselves as special subjects. There is nothing to prevent such king-for-a-day switches, as Synanon now stands. The mechanism is there, but its use on the part of lower echelon personnel as against the "elite" does not seem to be actively encouraged.

What this type of criticism involves, of course, is the whole problem of keeping and maintaining empathy between the governing and the governed. No one has yet worked out a "system" in any society which will guarantee that constructive empathy be furthered, rather than lessened, in government, and it would be ridiculous to expect Synanon to solve all the problems of the world. These comments are intended, however, to focus attention upon areas of maturity which will never be reached by men who adopt the "status-seeking" posture, however understandable and, from one standpoint, forward-looking, the new ambition of the "let-me-further-myself" person may be.

To find and utilize a "tunnel back into the human race" is a remarkable accomplishment, especially when the beginning-point is from the sinister combination of drugs and crime. But precisely because so many men and women of Synanon have shown themselves to be remarkable—because they are pioneers, and not just drug addicts—they bear some responsibility for continuing their discoveries. Their best may, indeed, come last.

REVIEW

THE IRONIST AS CONVERT

PROBABLY no translator-interpreter of Asian literature and philosophy is better known to American readers than Lin Yutang. Even those whom Lin Yutang might consider more worthy of this distinction—say, Arthur Waley, D. T. Suzuki, Alan W. Watts—apparently do not reach and hold a readership comparable to his. Dr. Lin is, moreover, not only popular but prolific. To date he has nearly thirty books to his credit. In perhaps the least known of all his books, *The Importance of Living* (1937), he explained why he was a pagan. Here are the highlights of that explanation

I am a pagan. The statement may be taken to imply a revolt against Christianity; and yet revolt seems a harsh word and does not correctly describe the state of mind of a man who has passed through a very gradual evolution, step by step, away from Christianity, during which he clung desperately, with love and piety, to a series of tenets which against his will were slipping away from him. Because there was never any hatred, therefore, it is impossible to speak of a rebellion. . . .

"To be a pagan" is no more than a phrase, like "to be a Christian." It is no more than a negative statement, for to the average reader, to be a pagan means only that one is not a Christian; and, since "being a Christian" is a very broad and ambiguous term, the meaning of "not being a Christian" is equally ill-defined. It is all the worse when one defines a pagan as one who does not believe in religion or in God, for we have yet to define what is meant by "God" or by the "religious attitude toward life." Great pagans have always had a deeply reverent attitude toward nature. We shall therefore have to take the word in its conventional sense and mean by it simply a man who does not go to church (except for an aesthetic inspiration, of which I am still capable), does not belong to the Christian fold, and does not accept its usual, orthodox tenets.

On the positive side, a Chinese pagan, the only kind of which I can speak with any feeling of intimacy, is one who starts out with this earthly life as all we can or need to bother about, wishes to live intently and happily as long as his life lasts, often has a sense of the poignant sadness of this life and faces it cheerily, has a keen appreciation of the beautiful and

the good in human life wherever he finds them, and regards doing good as its own satisfactory reward. I admit, however, he feels a slight pity or contempt for the "religious" man who does good in order to get to heaven and who, by implication, would not do good if he were not lured by heaven or threatened with hell. I believe there are a great many more pagans in this country than are themselves aware of it. The modern liberal Christian and the pagan are really close, differing only when they start out to *talk* about God. . . .

As I look at it at present, the difference in spiritual life between a Christian believer and a pagan is simply this: the Christian believer lives in a world governed and watched over by God, to whom he has a constant personal relationship, and therefore in a world presided over by a kindly father, his conduct is also often uplifted to a level consonant with this consciousness of being a child of God, no doubt a level which is difficult for a human mortal to maintain consistently at all periods of his life or of the week or even of the day, his actual life varies between living on the human and the truly religious levels.

On the other hand, the pagan lives in this world like an orphan, without the benefit of that consoling feeling that there is always someone in heaven who cares and who will, when that spiritual relationship called prayer is established, attend to his private personal welfare. It is no doubt a less cheery world; but there is the benefit and dignity of being an orphan who by necessity has learned to be independent, to take care of himself, and to be more mature, as all orphans are. It was this feeling rather than any intellectual belief—this feeling of dropping into a world without the love of God—that really scared me till the very last moment of my conversion to paganism; I felt, like many born Christians, that if a personal God did not exist the bottom would be knocked out of this universe. . . .

I feel, like all modern Americans, no consciousness of sin and simply do not believe in it. All I know is that if God loves me only half as much as my mother does, he will not send me to hell. That is a final fact of my inner consciousness, and for no religion could I deny its truth. . . .

It is all so clear to me now. The world of pagan belief is a simpler belief. It postulates nothing, and is obliged to postulate nothing. It seems to make the good life more immediately appealing by appealing to the good life alone. It better justifies doing good by making it unnecessary for doing good to justify itself. It does not encourage men to do, for instance, a

simple act of charity by dragging in a series of hypothetical postulates—sin, redemption, the cross, laying up treasure in heaven, mutual obligation among men on account of a third-party relationship in heaven—all so unnecessarily complicated and roundabout, and none capable of direct proof. If one accepts the statement that doing good is its own justification, one cannot help regarding all theological baits to right living as redundant and tending to cloud the luster of a moral truth. Love among men should be a final, absolute fact. . . .

It is wrong therefore to speak of a pagan as an irreligious man: irreligious he is only as one who refuses to believe in any special variety of revelation. A pagan always believes in God but would not like to say so, for fear of being misunderstood. . . .

We've quoted at length from *The Importance of Living* for two reasons. First, Dr. Lin's explanation of his paganism became widely acclaimed and accepted as a representative humanist view during the late '30's. As James D. Hart points out in *The Popular Book*, "Lin Yutang's graceful but simple exposition *The Importance of Living* . . . found enough readers skeptical about machine-age culture and the philosophy of go-getting to make this the most popular work of nonfiction published during 1938." Secondly, unless we keep in mind the fact that from the '30's till now these and similar views have been identified with Dr. Lin, we will not grasp the full import of his most recent book, *From Pagan to Christian* (World, \$3.50).

Dr. Lin begins by giving us an account of his childhood and youth. He was born in 1895 in Changchow, an inland village on the southeast coast of Fukien. His father was a Presbyterian minister. Dr. Lin characterizes him as "a pioneer progressive of those days . . . a dreamer, keen, imaginative, humorous, and eternally restless." His father, however, apparently had little trouble in combining his Confucianist upbringing with his Christian calling. In 1911 Lin Yutang entered St. John's College, Shanghai. He graduated in 1916, went on to study at Harvard and Jena, and received his doctorate from the University of Leipzig in 1923. During this period he made three

major decisions. He concluded that he was not fitted for the ministry—any ministry. He came to believe that being a Christian in China was almost meaningless and admitted to himself his ignorance of his own cultural roots. With these decisions began, as he puts it, "the grand detour of my spiritual voyage":

As long as we lived and moved and had our being in the Christian world, we were sufficient, too, as sufficient as the pagans of Peking. But being a Christian Chinese moving into what I call an authentic Chinese world, with one's eyes and mind open, one was stung with a sense of shame, blushing up to the tips of one's ears. Of what had I not been deprived? Things were not so simple as I had pictured them to be. Even the questions of foot binding and concubinage were not so simple and clear-cut as I had imagined.

In this period he became impressed with that formidable royalist, Ku Hung-ming. (Readers of Somerset Maugham's *On a Chinese Screen* will recall his vivid account of an interview with the Philosopher of Szechuen. The Philosopher was Ku.) At this time Ku Hung-ming was a walking arsenal of anti-Christian, anti-Western sentiments. For him, the Boxer Rebellion was a popular outcry, not a piece of political engineering. He heard the Rebellion as "the voice of the people." He wanted others to hear it as such and to make it prevail over what he called "the bastard British imperialism." With this conviction feeding and being fed by his caustic temperament, Ku Hung-ming became a pitchpot advocate of nationalism. His forthrightness, his insouciance, and his defiance of Western authorities all fascinated Lin Yutang during this period. And not only during this period; for throughout *From Pagan to Christian* Dr. Lin both admits and shows Ku's influence. "Ku Hung-ming," he tells us, "helped to cast off my moorings and put me out to a sea of doubts":

Perhaps without Ku Hung-ming I would have returned to the national stream of thought anyway; no Chinese could, if he was of a searching mind, remain long satisfied with a half-knowledge of the Chinese intellectual landscape. The call to discover one's own history and national heritage was a call from the

deep. There was something in the character of the Chinese language which invisibly but most emphatically changed one's mode of thought. The modes of thinking, the concepts, the images, the very sounds of words are so different between the English language and the Chinese. Speaking English, one thinks in English, and speaking in Chinese one thinks in Chinese. . . . Hence, studying Chinese, I began to think as a Chinese, and thinking as a Chinese I understood and accepted certain truths and imagery almost instinctively. The leap between the two languages so different as the Chinese and the English was somewhat bizarre. The English in me laughed at the smooth, shining pebbles of Chinese monosyllabism, and the Chinese in me recognized the greater definition and exactness of English thought but also ridiculed its jumble of incredible abstractions.

This statement can serve as well as any other to elucidate not only the content but the organization of *From Pagan to Christian*. For what it means in terms of the book Dr. Lin has written—a book publicized as "The Personal Account of a Distinguished Philosopher's Spiritual Pilgrimage Back to Christianity"—may be explained in this way. Though it is true that Dr. Lin began as a Christian, became a pagan, and is now a "reconverted Christian"; though it is also true that this pilgrimage was at no time easy for him and that he has earned his way to the position he now takes and to the views he now holds; and though it is true, furthermore, that he declares himself content to live by the light of Jesus' teachings and by that light alone, his pilgrimage is not over. It is this sincere tentativeness, this commitment to pilgrimage as such, which gives the book much of its interest.

RALPH S. POMEROY

Davis, California

COMMENTARY

PATHS TO MATURITY

THERE are many paths to maturity, but none of them, so far as we know, can be traversed without the experience of pain. The question now before us is how much pain may be involved for the world before the mature relationships of peace can be established.

The best comment we have seen on the Cuban situation is in a statement formulated at the height of the tensions by the American Friends Service Committee, which begins:

In these past days, fear has spread rapidly throughout our land. This is not a fear born of cowardice but rather of a sense that we are all caught up in a series of actions and reactions which are relentlessly moving us toward what we dread most—war. For many years now all men have lived in a world in which weapons of one sort or another have in many directions been mounted and pointed at the hearts of other men. We ourselves have expected the people of the Soviet Union to accommodate themselves to nearby weapons aimed at their cities. Now we know how it feels to be in this situation. Now we are learning the lesson of the absolute folly of reliance upon weapons of absolute destruction. War itself is the real enemy.

Shock is an instrument in both education and therapy. It is not the best or most desirable instrument, but it sometimes works. The shock implicit in the Cuban situation is a further recognition that the nations of the modern world are now competing in a framework which offers no "last resort" with a human meaning.

Until the development of nuclear weapons, war was a "last resort" which had meaning. You could think about such a war, make predictions about its course, and even offer judgments concerning its outcome. Men were often wrong about the meaning of such wars, but they had sufficient confidence in their anticipations to plan and execute them.

No one in his right mind has any such confidence about the course and outcome of a

nuclear war. The prospect of nuclear war is *out of all relation* to our past experience. We know it is a "last resort" which would destroy any semblance of human meaning.

This is knowledge which the men of our time possess in rational terms. The role of shock in education and therapy is to convert rational perception into emotional perception. When there is enough emotional perception, men act. Too much shock, however, blots out rational perception.

These are some of the precious elements of human function that have been reduced to psychological pawns in the "game" of the Cold War.

CHILDREN

. . . and Ourselves

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN

THE idea of "an international school for global understanding" was given popular support by Gen. Dwight Eisenhower during his recent visit to Sweden. The principal aim of such a school would be to provide a curriculum—presumably at both pre-university and up-to-graduate levels—which would be free from "national bias" and of which "the problems of world peace would be the central core." William Heard Kilpatrick comments in a letter to the *New York Times* (Aug.28):

The precedents for such a university have already been set by educational and research projects like the International Geophysical Year, the meetings of the Council on Science and World Affairs, where Soviet and American scientists join together to consider problems of disarmament, the CERN project in Geneva where the scientists of thirteen countries share physics laboratories for joint research, the recent establishment of a world journal for scientific publications and, of course, the United States itself, with UNESCO as an already existing center for world education.

The possibilities of benefit to humanity from such an institution are inexhaustible. They range from the education of international civil servants for the various agencies of the U.N. to the organization of a world culture center where the artists and scholars of the world could pool their cultural resources both in the performance of their theatre, dance and music and in the translation of all the major works of world literature into the world's languages.

One per cent of the world's military budget would guarantee a first-rate world university devoted to peace and international order.

A special report to the *New York Times* (Oct. 4) gives the plans for activities at Atlantic College in Wales, designed to further similar objectives:

An experiment in international education is beginning near here {Llantwit Major, Wales} in a

centrally heated castle overlooking the rugged south coast of Wales.

St. Conat's Castle, a medieval structure with an imposing view of Bristol Channel, will officially become Atlantic College, the first of a number of pre-university schools in various countries open to boys of different nationalities.

The first group of 60 students from 10 countries, including eight youths from the United States, arrived recently. They have already started their two-year course. The enrollment will climb to 450 by 1964.

This and other Atlantic colleges, with faculties from many nations, will provide starting points for the social integration of the Western community.

In the *Ladies Home Journal* for September, in an article titled "Do Your Children Worry About War?", Dr. Benjamin Spock suggests the need for "internationalist" education for parents. Many children are indeed worried about war, but this seems to be more of a problem of parental attitudes than a political question. In Dr. Spock's opinion, the most insidious fears come from feelings of helplessness in the face of influences which seem beyond control. Parents who have sincere convictions concerning national policy do not feel helpless; they try to *act* significantly, and thereby convey healthy feelings to their children. So the problem becomes not what one "teaches" the child about the dangers of a nuclear attack, but rather how this possibility is regarded. "Anxious helplessness" on the part of a parent is not only dangerous to the child, but in Dr. Spock's opinion cowardly and unnecessary, even if understandable. He writes:

What causes a sense of anxious helplessness in many people who do have a real concern and an opinion is the assumption that there is nothing effective they can do. What influence does one citizen among 180,000,000 have, they say—not as a question but as a gloomy answer. This attitude expresses a fundamental skepticism about democracy. Worse still, it expresses a sickness of the spirit, a resignation to pessimism. Actually it's quite unrealistic too. The course of action in any nation—even in a democracy—is influenced tremendously by the small minority of the population who have the gumption to express their convictions and to join in

groups to arouse others with similar views. If only one in a hundred of the readers of one magazine such as this were to write a note to the President on any issue, it would add up to an overwhelming torrent of mail that could not fail to impress him and the country generally. Think of that small band of dedicated mothers who recently traveled to Washington and paraded in the rain in favor of continued suspension of nuclear testing. The President saw them and most of the newspaper readers of the United States saw a picture of the demonstration.

Dr. Spock also asks for more frequent international communication:

Our partially open channels of communication with the Russian people, our cultural and scientific exchanges, have helped to keep them basically friendly toward us, admiring of our technical skills and material advantages, despite their government's efforts to instill fear of our intentions and scorn for our system. Our Administration appears cautious about visits between high-level officials until agreements are in sight, presumably for fear of giving the impression—to the Russian government, to some of our allies, to certain of our own citizens and politicians—of possible appeasement. To me it would seem there was every advantage to regular visits back and forth—even of the President and the Premier—not with any obligation to find a quick agreement but to become better acquainted with members of the opposing government and people, their views, fears, hopes. The good will and sincerity of our President would make a profound impression on the Russian people and he would find opportunities to say at least some things to them directly.

Khrushchev himself admitted recently, in so many words, that his nation has inferiority feelings and wants to be treated as an equal. I think it would greatly impress all Russians if we could honor their astronauts, scientists, musicians, dancers who have made contributions we respect, with such recognition as official receptions, awards. In ways like these hearts are warmed, even in high officials.

You may think I have gone all around the lot in answer to a mother's question. I've been saying that parents can't reassure their children about the cold war as long as they themselves feel uncertain and helpless. They need to inform themselves on the issues, test alternative views against their own conclusions. Then they should put their convictions into action in the ways available in a democracy—

voting, writing to the President, senators and representatives as often as they feel concern over any issue, joining groups to advance their cause. I've discussed some of my own convictions because that's the only way I can feel I'm doing my part.

We protect our children best, Dr. Spock says, when we "refrain from talking in a pessimistic or alarmist manner, and from exaggerating the ferociousness of our enemies." All the dreams of world government, in the last analysis, depend upon this sort of basic psychological understanding.

FRONTIERS "Community of Fear"

INTERESTING confirmation of W. H. Ferry's charge that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, has exaggerated the threat of "Communist subversion" within the boundaries of the United States appears in an article in the *Nation* for Oct. 20. Writing under the title, "Hoover and the Red Scare," Jack Levine, a former special agent of the FBI, outlines the work of the Bureau in keeping track of known American Communist Party members. While in the 1930's and early '40's, Mr. Levine says, the Party claimed a membership of 80,000 persons and sometimes was able to elect a candidate to public office, the present membership is only some 8,500, according to FBI estimates. Of this total, slightly more than one in six is an FBI informant! It follows, Mr. Levine points out, that the nearly 1,500 dues-paying members of the Party who work for the FBI are now "the largest single financial contributor to the coffers of the Communist Party." Some of the time, one FBI informant is found to be making reports on the activities of another informant, not knowing his real identity, since persons working at this level have no "who's who" of their colleagues.

In 1960, Mr. Levine says, Mr. Hoover decided that no more "informants" were needed to watch the membership of the party, except at the highest policy-making levels. The coverage is practically perfect, according to Levine. "The FBI believes it has completed its documentation of all current members of the party, and since recruitment has dwindled to almost nothing, there is little difficulty in keeping abreast of new members." With the help of local police, they could all be arrested in a few hours. There is even a likelihood, he says, that the numerous FBI informants, "who are rising rapidly to the top, will capture complete control of the party." Mr. Levine continues:

The supervisor in charge of the Communist Party Desk at bureau headquarters in Washington, D.C., during a briefing of agent personnel on recent

party developments, summed up the current situation: "The Communist Party, U.S.A.," he said, "has long ago become a paper tiger. The hard-core members have been reduced in size to a manageable bunch of harmless crackpots. We here at the bureau are starting to feel sorry for them."

Elsewhere Mr. Levine points out that actual Soviet spies have orders to shun American Communist Party members as both useless to them and "the surest way to invite detection by the FBI."

Why, then, the continual emphasis on the "Communist threat from within"? The desire for plenty of support for the bureau's activities is given as one explanation. "Belittle the dragon," says Mr. Levine, "and you belittle St. George." He offers this conclusion:

. . . it is now generally recognized that, by exaggerating the "threat from within," Hoover has helped to create a "Frankenstein monster" in the form of a right-wing hysteria intent upon destroying anything that smacks of liberalism or social progress. . . . Established myths, of course, die slowly, and the prognosis for the "Red scare" is that it will be with us for a long time to come. Professional anti-communism has become so important a part of the American scene that it is likely to outlast the American Communists.

It is easy enough to illustrate what Mr. Levine calls the intent of "right-wing hysteria." All you have to do is read the papers. But there are some strange instances of this influence which may have escaped the general reader. A few years ago a Midwestern Congressman inserted in the *Congressional Record* an "extension of remarks" in which he listed by name modern artists whom he branded as "international art thugs," "art vermin," and "subversives of art." Museum directors and others interested in "modern art" were included in a general charge that such art forms are a plot to undermine American morals and to corrupt our "glorious American art." In his book, *The Shape of Content* (Vintage), the American artist, Ben Shahn, relates some of the responses to this sort of "Red Alert"

Civic groups or veterans' groups—all sorts of organizations and their committees and their auxiliaries have assumed the solemn duties of judging and screening of art. . . . A mural in the process of execution just barely survived a campaign to have it removed because it contained a portrait of Roosevelt. Another just barely survived because someone thought it failed to express American ideals. On a sail in a painting of a regatta a city councilman professed to have discovered a Communist symbol, and he sought to close the exhibition of which the painting was a part. (The symbol turned out to be that of a Los Angeles yachting club.) Another large painting was vetoed because it contained nudes.

The most recent of the civic crusades—to my knowledge [Mr. Shahn wrote in 1957]—was directed against a very large exhibition of sports themes, paintings, drawings, and prints which had been laboriously assembled by *Sports Illustrated* with the assistance of the American Federation of Arts and was to have been displayed in Australia at the time of last summer's Olympic meet. The exhibition was circulated in a number of American cities before it was to be shipped abroad. It came to grief in Dallas, Texas. There a local patriotic group discovered among the exhibitors some names which had appeared under "The Extension of Remarks by Congressman Dondero." So great was the Texas commotion (and probably so delicate the political balance there), that the exhibition was not sent on to Australia.

In such a climate all art becomes suspect.

Mr. Shahn is right. Just recently, in Pasadena (Calif.), a sculptor-designer who constructs figures of Christ, using masonry and a mosaic technique, to adorn modern churches, was charged by six members of a Lutheran congregation with subverting American morals and artistic standards. The sculptor, Clifford Nelson, who has done Christs to suit the architecture of dozens of churches in this area, was completely bewildered. The Pasadena Lutherans were also confused by this charge and for a time it looked as though Mr. Nelson's Christ might be torn down and ceremoniously destroyed by these defenders of the faith. However, Mr. Nelson stood firm, refusing to alter his work and offering to address the entire congregation on the development of the art forms called into question.

It now appears that sanity will prevail, among the Pasadena Lutherans.

[Another aspect of the paralysis produced by the fear and suspicion Mr. Ferry condemned is illustrated by a recent letter from a reader, printed below.]

Your discussion of the "State of the Nation," (MANAS, Sept. 5) struck a sympathetic response from me.

As an employee, for sixteen years, of one of the nation's largest industrial corporations, I would like to relate my experience, by way of expanding on Justice Douglas' statement:

Big corporations, like big government and big unions, breed non-controversial men and women. At the managerial engineering, or administrative level there may be debate and controversy. But on the larger public issues of the day, the voices of employees are largely mute.

In the 1948 presidential campaign period, thousands of dollars were spent on company literature that poured over the desks of secretaries and supervisors, all of it hammering out one viewpoint alone and attempting, in various psychologically subtle means, to influence the vote of employees. All this expense was wasted because the candidate the company was seeking to defeat won the presidential election.

This company, also, when recruiting college graduates on the campus to train for future supervisory openings in engineering and business administration, while unable—due to F.E.P.C. regulations—to show the political preference of the student on the appraisal sheet that goes eventually to the personnel men in all the plants around the country, will write "Has fine attitudes," or "Has correct attitude for business." This indicates to the personnel men that the student is of the same political persuasion as the company's top management . . . As you see, it is often not so much a matter of not breeding controversial men and women as of not selecting controversial men and women as candidates for white collar employment.

Two years ago, a fellow-secretary and I fell into a friendly discussion of some of the major national and international issues. While our conversation was largely non-political, it could not help but have political overtones. Evidently we were overheard by a supervisor in the next office, behind the thin, makeshift wall separating my office from his; for, a week later, my supervisor, in a cold but clever way, severely reprimanded me—not for having discussed economic and other such issues with another employee, but for the nonconformist views, "socialistic," he called them, which I had expressed. As I had told the secretary-acquaintance, I am an Independent, voting, to the best of my judgment, for the best man for the office in question. My supervisor gave me to understand that he considered me to be an unthinking and unperceptive woman, just talking to hear herself talk.

Dayton, Ohio

BEATRICE Q. RICHARDSON

Controversy is not encouraged among the employees of big corporations. During the work day, one never dares express his views on major issues of the day if they differ from those of the top executives. If one desires, for economic security, to remain with the company, one does not even have the freedom to express one's views outside. One can be ostracized by management for expressing his viewpoint in the "Letters to the Editor" column of the local newspaper, especially if the local papers rule that the true name of the writer must appear with the Letter.

It seems to me that the decline of public controversy in the U.S. is due to the tyranny of such groups as are several of the big corporations which, by intimidation, deny their employees the right of free and honest discussion, and have no respect for differing views. This is truly a tragic state of affairs for a nation like ours today, priding itself—as it does loudly—on its pursuit of freedom. Moreover, this is "private enterprise" at its worst.

What the U.S. needs most—and in all fields of communications—is the redefining of the significance of "freedom."