

BALANCE AND POWER

WHILE the Congress of the United States was still delaying the shipment of grain to famine-stricken India—apparently on the ground that the Indian government has not shown the proper spirit in opposing the Communist menace—*Time* Magazine did its bit to help the American people to ignore and write off Prime Minister Nehru as a rather inconsistent and fuzzy-minded "idealist" whose inability to see the *real* issues before the modern world brings him very close to being a "dangerous" man. As *Time* sums up:

Nehru's privileged balancing act cannot go on for ever. The American way of life is not to be confused with God's way—granted; but it is evident that the world is going either in America's direction or in Russia's. Nehru will not admit that hard historic choice, as far as Asia is concerned: Asia, he cries, must go her own way. (*Time*, May 7.)

There is quite an argument, here, which could be developed through several volumes. What, for example, is "America's direction"? A lot of Americans would like to know. That is, a lot of Americans who want to do something more than merely "slogan thinking" about the present crisis would like to know. Of Russia's direction, we may admit the worst, and there is still the question of whether Russia can be successful in taking the world with her. It is even arguable whether or not Russia is really taking China with her. As Sir Benegal Narsing Rau, author of India's Constitution and her representative to the United Nations, said, a few months ago:

Whatever social system emerges in China, it will be very different from that of the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, we know these things about the Peiping Government: it has effected land reforms; it has got rid of corruption and is a very honest government; it includes non-Communist advisers.

Certainly its external policy is today influenced by the Government of the Soviet Union. But the Indian view is that opportunity must be given to it to learn by contacts with other governments, such as

membership in the United Nations can provide. At present it is isolated and ostracized. Its leaders think that the United States and the United Kingdom are hostile to them. If they feel that the United States is hostile, they are apt to be hostile in return.

Thus the immediate Indian point of view, which remembers that the Cairo and Potsdam Declarations promised to restore Formosa to China, suggests that if the Chinese want to have a communist revolution, that is their business. And Indians believe that the Chinese revolutionary government is a representative government. As Prime Minister Nehru recently told Norman Cousins:

. . . the present Chinese Government came into power with the largest possible backing of the Chinese people. At the present moment that more or less continues. In fact, they came into power with the greatest ease and only because they had that large backing. Otherwise it would have been almost impossible for them to do it.

. . . We have no desire to interfere with China and don't want China to interfere with us. I believe China's people and India's people, quite apart from recent developments, have had for a long period of time very friendly feelings toward each other. I think, despite changes, we want that to continue and we do not want to take any steps to raise hostilities between these two countries, which have a tremendous frontier and which have had at least 2,000 years or more of relations with each other.

Mr. Cousins asks Mr. Nehru all the pertinent questions that would occur to any American bothered by the threat of a Soviet-dominated China, and the Indian leader answers them as well as he can. The entire interview (published in the *Saturday Review of Literature* for April 14 and 21) is worth careful reading. Here we are concerned with the longer-term view of India's place in world history, for it is this view which is ignored in discussions such as that in *Time* for May 7, and in most of the contemporary comment

on the presently somewhat strained relations between India and the United States. With India's failure to show belligerence toward Soviet Russia and Red China, there has been a marked tendency among Americans to become impatient and even a bit contemptuous of this new member of the family of nations. Mr. Nehru is charged with inconsistencies—with being "firm" in attitude toward Pakistan in the Kashmir controversy, while speaking in Gandhian accents with regard to the Korean war. India is indeed in a difficult position. It is necessary to remember that India has been an independent republic for barely more than a year; that she entered upon her career of untrammelled self-government at a time when the world seemed perilously poised on the brink of another world war; and that the Indian people themselves have lately suffered two extraordinary shocks—the death by assassination of their beloved teacher and leader, M. K. Gandhi, and the turbulent partition of their country into the two states of India and Pakistan. There is the further difficulty of widespread hunger and poverty in India, and a literacy rate of only 18 per cent of the total population.

Despite these enormous problems, India's voice is heard in the councils of great nations. Her long and finally successful struggle for freedom has created an inalienable dignity for India's spokesmen. And, for the most part, those spokesmen have been worthy of respect. For example, *Facts on India*, a publication issued by the Indian Embassy in Washington on January 26—the anniversary of Indian Statehood—has the following to say in its Foreword:

. . . the world in which India emerged as a sovereign state was already saddled with an heritage of passions and conflicts, and the tradition of power politics which seemed to persist in the midst of the universal standards of justice propounded in the U. N. Charter.

An outstanding characteristic of "power politics" is the conduct of international relations by force or threat of force without consideration of right and justice. In the United Nations Organization it manifested itself in the formation of rival power

blocs. In such cases there is a tendency for a member to vote on the side of his group irrespective of the merits of the case.

Independent India found it difficult to become an automatic adherent of one or another bloc without giving up the basic ideals on which her revolutionary movement had been founded. Instead she considered the principles and purposes of the U. N. Charter a much better framework within which to build her foreign policy. Outside or inside the U. N. she has avoided involvement in power blocs, and her voting in the U. N. bodies has proceeded on the lines, so far as possible, of judging each issue on its merits and irrespective of power considerations.

A disregard of power considerations has two consequences. First, it enables a country, whose military strength is comparatively negligible, to say to a great power: "I disagree with you on such and such matters and I am not afraid of your overwhelming might because I do not rely on power to convince you. My strength lies in my attachment to right and justice to which you are equally committed." That is the Gandhian technique projected on the plane of international relations.

It is easy to say, as *Time* remarks, that "Since Gandhi's death Nehru has indeed tried to speak Gandhi's language but he has not acted by Gandhi's faith." True, Nehru is not a pacifist. But non-pacifists as well as pacifists can guide their decisions by principle. Pacifism was not even Gandhi's greatest contribution to the modern world: his truth-telling and his spirit of absolute integrity were even more important.

A man with a gun as well as a pacifist can refuse to fear "overwhelming might," and can speak his mind honestly, without fear. Gandhi, it may be said, taught the leaders of India to be fearless. When Norman Cousins asked how we are to deal with the threat of nations who menace the peace of the world, Nehru answered:

I should have said that the basic threat today in the world was fear. And fear is the most dangerous companion for any individual or for any country to possess. Fear clogs the mind, and fear leads often to impassioned action. As you have said, we must not give in to evil, but we must also remember that evil is not surmounted by wrong methods which themselves produce more evil. Therefore, the method becomes

very important. It may sound—well, shall I say—like preaching a sermon. I have felt more and more that the basic lesson that Gandhi taught was right, and that was that means should never be subordinate to ends. I know that these sayings cannot easily be translated into life. A politician or statesman cannot function like a prophet, whether it is in a democracy or any other type of government. He has to limit himself to people's understanding of him and people's appreciation of what he says, otherwise he cannot function at all. Nevertheless, this basic idea seems to be most important: that the right means should be employed and firmness should be allied always to a spirit of friendliness and conciliation, not of appeasement.

We are not trying to suggest that Prime Minister Nehru is an *avatar* of statesmanship or that India alone among the nations behaves as a great nation should. The point is simply that India, despite her manifest weakness, her terrible domestic problems, and even her occasional "inconsistencies," is at least declaring and avowedly *trying* to behave according to profoundly important principles of morality. The modern world has become so cynical as to almost forget that these principles exist—"The American way of life is not to be confused with God's way," remarks *Time*, almost adding a practical "Thank Heaven!" as an afterthought.

The German people succumbed to the Nazi tyranny because of their fear of naked power. The satellite countries of the Soviet sphere and doubtless many of the Russians themselves are held faithful to the Communist line and policies through fear of power. We say, again and again—and Mr. Cousins says it in his conversations with Nehru—that power-mad governments are harnessing whole populations "to purposes which threaten the peace"; and then, when India displays a courageous policy of independence, undeterred by fear, we respond by refusing or delaying shipments of food for millions of hungry Indian people.

Mr. Nehru is unique among modern statesmen as a cosmopolitan citizen of the world. His mind is free of theological entanglements. He

is agnostic toward religious dogmas—both Western and Eastern—and in politics he inclines to socialism. *Time* is just in remarking that while no Communist, Nehru "objects more to Communist methods than to Communist ideas." Like other revolutionaries of Asia, Nehru brought the vigor of progressive Western thinking to bear on the problems of his own country, and has been more of a European than an Indian in many of his ideas. Even his knowledge of the prevailing religion of India, Hinduism, began with the influence of an Irish Theosophist who was the tutor of his boyhood. (Here, in its accustomed manner of sneering at heterodox minorities, *Time* calls Theosophy "a watered-down Western copy of Hinduism," which means, simply, that *Time* knows little of either Hinduism or Theosophy, but has simply echoed the prejudices of its "authorities.") But Nehru has gained a fresh grasp of the wisdom of the East, through his teacher Gandhi, and through what may be some form of intuitive perception of great functional truths behind the ancestral religions of India. Gandhi once said of Nehru, "When I am gone he will begin speaking my language." The prophecy is in some measure correct, for Nehru has been trying to apply the greatest of Gandhi's principles.

History is moving very rapidly during the twentieth century. In fifty years, Europe has sunk to being an impoverished and blood-soaked battlefield. So tragically complete has been Europe's downfall that the famous scholar, George Santayana, secluded in his old age in Rome, has advised the United States to waste none of the lives of its young men in a fruitless attempt to defend a land which is "already a wreck." Meanwhile, out of the turmoil of destructive wars and revolutions, a new Asia is being born. Perhaps the next fifty years will see a reversal of the balance of world power—and not alone of military power, but of *human* power, the power of honesty, of fearlessness, and integrity. If this be the case, then, surely, Prime Minister Nehru will go down in history as one of those who sounded the keynote of the great change.

Letter from **CENTRAL EUROPE**

INNSBRUCK.—Public opinion in Central Europe regards the writers of memoirs concerning the period between 1922 and 1945 with certain reservations. They generally belong to one of two classes—those who have suffered personally on account of diverging political views, and others who pretend to have "always been ready to take part in a rebellion against the regime," but—at the time—accepted all the promotions and decorations offered them. Among the latter are persons of diplomatic reputation and high standing. The man in the street calls them white-washers.

In spite of large sums promised by eager publishers, two eminent men of our time—so the newspapers report—have decided not to write their memoirs, or at least not to have them printed in the near future. And it is interesting that both these men, the U. S. General Marshall, and the German General Guderian, quite independently of each other, have given the same reasons for their decision. Although they had occupied important ranks and positions, so they say, it easily could happen that in consequence of insufficient knowledge, injustice would be done to persons still alive, and history in general would be provided with inaccurate material. That this danger exists is proved, incidentally, by the Memoirs which the present Duke of Windsor permitted the papers to publish; he judges, if only in a casual way, persons whom he met only once, or briefly, and who will, probably as long as they live, carry this judgment on their shoulders, be it a good or an unfavourable one. Here it seems that some of the monarchs of Austria found the best way to handle memoirs. They commissioned a confidant to seal at the time of their death the box selected to contain their papers, with orders that it was not to be opened for fifty years. Obviously, they neither wanted to influence history straightway by their testimony and opinions, nor did they deem it right to conceal forever valuable historical details.

Only a part of the articles about Hitler, Mussolini, Göring, Göbbels, Ciano, etc., which lately have been appearing practically several times a week in the Austrian and German and Italian press, deserve to be called memoirs, as a lot of them are written and

presented in a sensational manner, merely to increase circulation. As these articles, in fact, attract scores of buyers, and as publishers of esteemed periodicals bluntly declare that they must print such articles in order to meet their competitors, a number of foreign correspondents have drawn the conclusion that the people in Central Europe still cling to these political ideologies. But this seems to be a judgment based on appearances. Actually, the average Central European knows that National Socialism and Fascism are matters of the past. Nevertheless, he wants to know whether the leaders he worshipped before 1945 really duped him, or whether they were trustworthy, in spite of the assertions of their opponents.

More recently, however, a new type of literature has come to light, and the remarkable thing about these books is that they are welcomed by practically all readers. The outstanding production of this sort in Austria is *Heimfahrt*, by Franz Tumlér (Pilgram-Verlag, Salzburg). It isn't the story of some "big boss" of the past, but simply that of an ordinary man who took part in World War II as a soldier of the German army; who found himself, when the Germans received their last blow by the Allies, in the extreme northwest of the Reich, and who begs and battles his way home . . . to his native town in Austria. There is really nothing exciting about the book. But that is just the point. The reader who, in nine cases out of ten, has gone through similar experiences, feels the truth speaking to him, whenever he turns a page. He gets acquainted with the misery again and, at the same time, with the many joyful hours, which were somehow included. He sees the events not judged from any political point of view, but through human eyes. And he is satisfied to learn that—despite all ideologies—decent men behave alike whether they are German, American, or of any other birth, and that a brute remains a brute, regardless of nationality.

A book like this should not be classified among the memoirs. From an ethical standpoint, it has even a higher value than some of the others possess. The fact that *Heimfahrt* is a success seems to indicate that the times of anxiety, in consequence of a lost war, are fading and that absolute values are regaining their old importance—much to the good of all, and particularly of the Central Europeans themselves.

CENTRAL EUROPEAN CORRESPONDENT

REVIEW

CAPSULE CULTURE

JOHN BROOKS' *The Big Wheel* (Harper's), inside-information novel revolving around life on a big weekly news magazine, has now reached its fifth printing and finally become a Pocket Book. As the advertisements claim, John Brooks is excellently qualified to "know what he is writing about. He has served on the editorial staffs of several large magazines including *Time* and *The New Yorker*."

There are two ways to look at this behind-the-curtain novel. First, most of us find that the big weeklies are a definite part of our lives, if only because nearly everyone reads what appears in *Time*, *Life*, etc., and discusses current affairs or news tidbits from the perspectives of these papers. Wanting to know more about such weeklies may be a little like displaying intelligent curiosity in regard to the process of automobile designing and manufacturing—we all ride along, with both news magazines and cars, whether or not we are subscribers or owners.

Under this heading, at a somewhat more critical level, comes the opportunity to familiarize ourselves with the psychology of typically American propaganda. No one can read *The Big Wheel* without being convinced that the large weekly magazines are actually dispensers of propaganda on nearly every subject under the sun; we are given slants on religious, political, educational, and social news which we unthinkingly accept because of plausibly written stories and because of the peculiar authority that any financially successful institution seems to enjoy.

It is hard for the average reader to know what to make of the conversion of *Life's* editors to Christianity, for instance, because he is not actually told that the conversion has taken place. Instead, an "informative" article on recent religious developments is presented. The implication is that all "intelligent" Americans now

realize that the scientific world made a mistake in leaving God out of contemporary events. Staff writers are adept in making such pieces sound as if merely "history," or "common sense," or "majority opinion" is speaking.

All this is a matter of elementary psychology, but with the prevailing habit of magazine reading in America, it also reveals a social phenomenon—as one of the representatives of the fabulous Ford Foundation remarked not long ago in Pasadena. For the agencies able to control mass communication media are the agencies which control the country: we can never have "a government of laws" alone, interpretation and emphasis being nine points of any law. If we ever grow ourselves a dictator, or a national "Religious Leader," he will undoubtedly come to us by way of television, radio, and the successful weekly magazines.

The second and perhaps most important view of *The Big Wheel* is occasioned by Brooks' insight into the fact that the problems focussed in such a magazine office are really the problems of our entire culture. The editorial floor of *Present Day* is a hothouse for quickening attitudes which are typical of America. We find there the one-time intellectual liberals who, tiring after years of youthful enthusiasm, try to rationalize their compromises with an editorial position assuring them social status. At the top of the structure, we find that "the big wheel," the editor, is run by "faith," and the subordinates represent the "little wheels run by the grace of God," as the song has it—or in other words by chance selection of some young writers over other young writers. Nearly anyone with mechanical capacity for writing can serve on the "editorial staff" of a magazine headed by a few true believers in conventional opinion. The little wheels may squeak in protest at the over-simplified pap they are required to produce, but however much they assert their loftier intelligence in cynical inter-office conversations, they will probably stay where they are. Once in a great while the Individual stands out, either as the

man in Brooks' novel who quit a top-flight job to work for the CIO, or as the irreligious religious editor of liberal background who poises himself for a suicide leap from the thirty-ninth floor. The latter, however, finally settled for a nervous breakdown.

Then there was the man who threw his Remington-Rand out the window after producing a bunch of copy he didn't believe in writing. But, even so, the over-all pattern is one of inexorable smoothness, with success and prestige holding the whip-hand over individual convictions.

What is behind all this is really something very simple—something which social psychologists call a "cultural contradiction." Karen Horney's *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* is addressed almost entirely to the thesis that from infancy we are invited to believe in the ideal abstract qualities of truth, goodness and beauty and the ideal of conscientious service of our fellow men, and are at the same time inoculated with a drive for financial success at any cost. One aspect of this huge "cultural contradiction" is described by the leading character of *The Big Wheel*, who is finally jolted into self-examination by an unprecedented rebellion of a few of his best writers:

"I see it all now; too well I see it. We get out an intellectual magazine that has to make money. We sell ideas. The two, you see, are mortal enemies, selling and ideas. You cannot sell the truth for money; when you try, it changes before your eyes into a monster.

"And me? The trouble is, Dick, I was born half-salesman and half-thinker. The blending of two fine American strains—but put them together and you've got a man trying to impersonate God. You see, I'm the man who has the ideas for sale, and unfortunately I'm made in such a way that I have to believe in them. Oh, your psychologists would have a pat way of saying it: they'd say that the more deeply he realizes his dishonesty, the less he can afford to admit it to himself. But right now, I have a vision of the truth: I don't quite believe the ideas I sell, either."

Ed Masterson, the editor of *Present Day*, is in no sense a villain. He even manages to be a mild

sort of hero at times, in his striving for honesty. But his lucid moments, as above, are too easily followed by the lulling security of habitual, unconscious compromise. After this brilliant self-revealing speech to his cousin, someone enters the editor's private office; the narrator indicates how difficult it is to really climb out of the pink miasma of believing that all is sufficiently well with the respectable world. Even our occasional self-searching, it seems, can be fitted conveniently into "the American way" and absorbed without much of a trace:

Masterson glanced at me. Our common Anglo-Saxon insipidity stood before us, relaxing us in the midst of our solemn soul-searching. He was more secure now; I could see that at once. He sat behind the big desk with the old flair, in the way which suggested that he was at home there if he was at home nowhere else. There had been a bad moment, and then the shoeshine boy Sam had appeared, fortuitously; the heavy tread of routine had taken hold.

Finally, Masterson's integrity wins something of a victory, but life has no longer any place to go for the Great Man. A glimpse into the latest revised edition of Masterson's mind comes when the narrator receives a friendly note from California. Masterson had resigned, at last admitting something he must always have known—that the men who worked for him never wrote, nor could write, what they really believed as individual thinkers:

Out here one exists without necessarily thinking, the sun helps with that. One lives in the company of those who have come here because they've given up. And to one's surprise, despair turns out to be not nearly so bad as one always supposed it would be.

Masterson's resignation is precipitated by his decision to fire a man who openly let it be known that a book he had proposed for *Present Day* review was, in his own opinion, utterly worthless. Since *Present Day* did not devote any time to destructive criticism—not sufficiently "American"—this meant that he knew the book might make a good splash of copy, and he was willing to write that copy.

Masterson had always proceeded on the grandiose assumption that his editorial policies were genuinely shared by the men who served under him. With fatherly kindness he rubbed at the "rough spots" of individual dissension in his writers, which he excused as "immaturity." His juniors learned that only one thing could succeed—acquiescence to conservative optimism. Yet a latent spark of principle flickered among other writers at the dismissal of the offending junior editor: they knew that they were all guilty of the same crime. Perhaps they realized that they were more guilty, since they had never openly admitted being parties to the required policy of verbal prostitution.

What was plainly worse than the prostitution itself was the calm, actually *believed-in* insistence by Masterson that insincerity never existed on the *Present Day* staff. The stand taken by the twelve writers who protested the dismissal was on a fabulous ground—the right of the writer to disbelieve in what he produced for public consumption—and his right to keep quiet about his disagreement in order to hold his job. Nothing very noble here, certainly, but at least the wiggling of a kind of tired integrity. Play dead, wiggle, or go mad—these are the alternatives for one's convictions. And when one grasps these subtleties of editorial policy it is easy to understand the following telling comment, made when the religious editor's threatened suicide jump is discussed by the staff:

"The worst of it was—the thing that really got me was—nobody could think of a very good reason why he shouldn't have jumped."

From this sketchy review the reader might conclude that Brooks is an arch-enemy of conservatism, a rampaging liberal, but this is not the case. Brooks finds more heroism in Ed Masterson and some of his easily compromised associates than he does in the smugly assured generalities of a popular university liberal—another character. We are encouraged to dislike

Professor Horton Wilson, who grandly abhors everything *Present Day* stands for.

Brooks apparently feels that the "problem of cultural contradiction," which he presents with vapid mouthings coming from both the liberal and conservative founts of wisdom, is so extensive that it cannot be escaped by the average writer. He seems to sum things up, in effect, in this manner: "Here is the way human beings are. It is interesting that only a very few are devoid of what we call 'conscience' or what we call 'moral principles,' but it is necessary to note that these qualities hardly ever get anyone anywhere." But Brooks so obviously wants to believe moral principles are worth more than money that we shall count him a believer despite his protestations.

COMMENTARY DAYS OF DISSENT

THE reader of *The Big Wheel*—an excellent novel, as novels go (see Review)—is likely to reflect that this book belongs to a growing family of devastatingly critical stories which embody a kind of iconoclastic genius. They are brilliant if somewhat contemptuous revelations of the working of the minds back of national advertising and publicity campaigns.

Books like *The Hucksters*, like Charles Yale Harrison's *Nobody's Fool*, Jerome Weidman's *The Price Is Right*, and *The Big Wheel* seem able to put intellectual and moral revulsion on an almost symphonic basis—they show what intelligent modern man ought to be against, and why. They oppose the systematized duplicity of our culture with the same insight into human nature which, in other hands, accomplishes the deceptions they expose. But after we have admired the clinical penetration of these books—what then? Novelists, we may admit, are good critics, but they seem unable to suggest what intelligent modern man ought to be *for*, and this, after all, is what we need most.

The usual procedure, when such questions are raised, is to condemn the writers as "negative." Give us stories with positive content, we say—books that are capable of creating a yearning for better things. We want a Tolstoy to uplift us, and all we get are Zolas and Sinclair Lewises. We forget that the novelist has to have material; even Tolstoy felt himself hopeless and impotent until he discovered the qualities he sought in the Russian peasant of his time. Writers are not magicians. If the novelist is to write stories with positive content, his culture must provide him with positive themes, and where, today, are such themes to be found?

It is a curious fact that most of the stories which attempt to embody an affirmative "message," these days, are usually only dressed-up orthodoxy, such as *The Robe*, or propaganda

novels like *And Quiet Flows the Don*, or are warped in some way by the moral impoverishment of the times, like the somewhat notorious *Fountainhead*.

Conceivably, the reader, in this transaction, is more than the writer. The reader belongs to that vast anonymity known as "the public," to whom the writer can only hold up a mirror. If we want better books, more affirmative stories, we shall have to live them, first—and give, in short, our writers something better to write about.

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

Your column seems to find fairly regular fault with the child-training experts. Yet you must realize that many of the points made in "Children . . . and Ourselves" are often found in the child-psychology books, such as Gesell's. Why is it thought necessary to "warn" parents against paying too much attention to such books?

THE bias is acknowledged, and we may also acknowledge the need for direct explanation: We believe that too much reliance upon professional experts is a typical and insidious fault in modern culture. It is not, however, so much a fault of the experts as of the general public. What Gesell or any other competent specialist actually does or says may be excellent, yet an unimaginative reliance upon someone else's psychological classifications and categories of children's personalities and problems can make a failure out of a parent.

The business of education is to start children thinking, and the best preparation of parents for this work is for them to be sure *they* think for themselves. This they cannot do if they believe that someone else, whether priest, psychoanalyst, or sociologist, should be entrusted with the task. Perhaps, in this age, we need to keep complicating the problems of education instead of oversimplifying them by too much routine. The *attitudes* of truly effective educators can and must be both simple and profound; the bases of communication between teachers or parents and children should spring from intuitive sympathy; but the methods to be used for attaining a particular objective can never be decided by rote or formula. Here we have the whole vast world of human experience to select from, and no single theory, however carefully reasoned, can qualify as an invariable "open sesame."

The best way for one teacher to reach a child's mind may not be the best way for another, and each will reach his highest usefulness when he finds whatever approach is most natural to his

temperament and the temperament of the child. It is so easy for fairly well-informed and well-intentioned parents and teachers to divide themselves into factional groups, as for instance the "progressives" and "anti-progressives." The trouble, here, is that the child himself is left out, or rather, becomes a sort of pawn, while devotees of a sort of educational party-platform strain mightily to prove the superior efficacy of their chosen ideologies.

The following anecdote is provocative of further thought on this subject, though it comes to us in the form of another question:

I have lately been forced to make a peculiar comparison of educational environments. Some good friends of mine have brought their children up with what appears to be conscientious and meticulous care. Books on child psychology are neatly stacked, ready for instant use, and have, I think, been intelligently studied. These parents often discuss the needs of their children and want to be able to take pride in doing a workmanlike job. But the kids are hell on wheels, not so much in the sense of having a lot of spirit, but more in the sense that they do not seem to have any particular respect for or enjoyment of their parents. On the other hand, I know a family fathered by an often drunk, apparently never conscientious man, who slams his youngsters around when they misbehave, yet they completely adore him. When he comes home, their faces light up with love and admiration. Not wishing to believe that the best way to be a good parent is to become a periodic drunk, I am appealing for enlightenment.

First of all, this type of question can hardly be answered, for it involves that mysterious X-factor in human relationships which is of necessity eliminated in "scientific" treatment of child-parent relationships. One thing we can do, though, besides admitting that such an X-factor exists, is to surmise that children are more apt to have affection for adults who are not trying to follow woodenly a formally established pattern of either living or instruction of the young. It must be that a level of direct communication between human beings is often easily cut off by too much theory. The theorist, too, may actually become a split

personality, his originality submerged under the routines he feels he "should" adopt.

The intensely moral minister will sometimes hold a lower status in his own children's affections than the village half-wit—the half-wit is probably at least not prideful nor trying to be something other than what he actually is. Among other things, children want *color* in human personality, honest and direct emotions, and people who embody these with greatest ease speak a language they best understand.

We are not generally disposed to praise corporal punishment, yet a constructive revolution may sometimes be in the making with the proverbial parent who finally applies a nicely shaped child psychology volume to a susceptible area of the child's anatomy. While not suggesting much of a creative action, this idea might possibly symbolize the recognition that parents have to break out of the bonds of regimented advice if they are to do something better than frustrate both themselves and their children. It is at this point that we can appreciate the observations of those psychologists who argue that it is better for a parent to show normal annoyance or anger than to suppress it. *The child does need to know that the parent is a human being like himself*, if for no other reason than that part of growing up in the world is learning how not to unnecessarily provoke our associates.

However, if we establish a dogma on the basis of this single proposition, calling ourselves "the we-let-our-children-see-freely-expressed-emotions-club," we may become oblivious to something else which they need to learn—namely, that control of emotions is also necessary. Parents can well set an example by remaining calm and judicious. So, perhaps each good educational point may best be regarded as only a half-truth, in need of supplement.

It is for all these reasons, in any case, that our program for the guidance of abstract parenthood would be formulated something like this: "Wake up and realize that *your own* solutions, even when

they are woefully imperfect from many standpoints, will have a special value if they are *truly your own*. Don't be afraid of doing 'the wrong thing,' but seek instead to guard yourself against the prideful tendency to refuse to admit your mistake when it can be seen."

FRONTIERS Strategy For Victory

STRATEGY is the intelligent direction of available energies for overcoming a crisis or winning a struggle. Since human intelligence itself is the most important energy—and since it is of paramount value to every one of us—the primary task of our situation is responsible self-direction by those individuals who are really aware of it, and its primary requirement is logical as well as moral consistency. Universal standards and principles are therefore not only the essence of any worth-while objective but also the indispensable means for attaining it.

These considerations are sufficient to condemn the policies of practically all ruling powers of both the East and the West. No political oratory can obscure the fact that these powers represent predatory interests rather than constructive energies, brute force rather than intelligence. Their so-called mobilization is a fraud: it is designed for confiscating and immobilizing all material and human values within their reach. They can deal only with masses and must ignore all those individual qualities on which civilization is built. It is only natural that their struggles now verge upon universal war.

Once we realize that we can expect neither reason nor responsibility from power politicians and their allies, we should not waste our time denouncing or trying to reform them. It is folly to assume that they could ever be interested in liberty or democracy, either at home or abroad. Aware of their weakness, they will always find reasons for being isolationists where the real needs of honest people are concerned, and interventionists where fellow exploiters are in trouble or where their own puppets get out of hand. They are constantly evoking spirits which they can not shake off, and creating monsters which they can not control.

There is an unbroken line of causation from our unthinking routine activities to our social

chaos and the threatening world disaster. It is by permitting our resources and constructive talents to lie idle that we are surrendering them to the forces of destruction. To disentangle ourselves, by systematic efforts, from the disastrous course of power interests is today a matter of life and death for all of us.

Sound strategy does not waste time with the uncontrollable. It is concerned only with what is accessible to direct and individual action. It consists in the very things which the ruling powers of the world are trying to prevent: general self-improvement and self-organization. Our only hope is therefore an alliance with those who refuse to accept domination and dictatorship, who are determined to develop their individual abilities for an intelligent approach to their own life task, thereby assuming their full share in meeting the problems of mankind.

It is by neglecting opportunities of cooperation with those fellow men who are trying to master their destiny that we are jeopardizing not only the control of our national affairs, but also the good will of those millions in foreign lands whose voice and attitudes may decide our future—and that of civilization. An adequate strategy demands a cause which is capable of inspiring people of every type to a maximum of spontaneous efforts. It demands positive goals which will constitute, in effect, the substance of man's individual aspirations. It is evident that there can be nothing more powerful from a long-range perspective than a nation or a movement which obtains its grand strategy by the voluntary coordination of the most constructive faculties of its members. Only a practical demonstration of this principle can furnish the impulse of a world-wide crusade for peace and freedom and, by reviving hope among the oppressed, eventually penetrate even the most fortified realms of dictators.

A sound strategy is simple. It demands only that we stop activities which mean systematic self-destruction, that we rid our own life of force and

fraud, and that we start a process of conscious self-organization of all vital resources within our control. It refuses to be engaged in confused and shifting issues and will insist, first of all, on creating a definite front, determined by the central motives and life aims of free individuals. If dictators can be shaken and eventually eliminated by measures for establishing genuine solidarity at home, it is folly to remain idle or to be tricked into costly adventures on "foreign ground." It may be unnecessary to invade their territory with anything but a message of encouragement for their victims—who will constitute the shock troops of world liberation provided they have proof that we are on their side and can not be bribed into deserting them.

Each individual can enlighten himself about possible activities which are closest to his interests and his best abilities and by which he will therefore find his way out of the present hopelessness. Although his first efforts may be confined to spare-time work and the use of idle resources, his realm of action will gradually expand as he helps others to widen their own field of creative manifestation. It is mainly a matter of becoming fully aware of our predicament and exploring the entire range of individual opportunities for overcoming it and for effecting a gradual transition to the community of free men.

Every literate person knows of some ventures—by groups or individuals—in socially relevant action which have a direct bearing on the problems of our crisis and may serve as examples for solving them. Their attainments demonstrate that the measures involved do not demand the impossible and that they have room for the most modest and the most heroic individual contributions. It is the essence of voluntary association that it permits the widest range of action and all degrees of cooperation. Some independent managers or owners of enterprises will be in a position to convert parts or all of them into profit-sharing or community-serving projects, to encourage measures of self-employment for

various occupations, or to assist others in working out logical and nonexploiting trade and exchange arrangements. Some leaders in education and other cultural fields will find increasing opportunities for developing human resources ignored by existing institutions and for realizing some of the highest concepts of a free community and culture. And people of all economic levels who are determined to have true solidarity will join in exploring realms of common interest.

Free men determined to make their own strategy will proceed systematically and in accordance with the principle of organic growth in which each stage is the preparation of a higher stage. While ready to assume the maximum burden, true pioneers will not lose sight of what people in different circumstances are able to do, realizing that the fate of others is inseparable from their own. It is a political misconception to assume that a sound program demands organizing experts or at least a certain percentage of members representing both overall and detailed knowledge of all of its features. In a strategy of freedom, highest wisdom is obtained by letting every one select his own type of active contribution and develop, to the limit of his talents, the potentialities of voluntarism in his own field which will then automatically find contacts with related efforts of others. Under these conditions, experts in such matters as cooperation and mutual aid, or education, or publicity, will work as equals and preclude the danger of abridging the self-reliant initiative of any one.

The greatest kingdoms have been conquered by men with principles. These men, however, did not try to serve two masters and did not reserve their principles for a few Sunday hours or for some cheap gestures of charity while clinging to privileges and useless possessions. We have to choose between total devotion to freedom and totalitarian terror. There is no reason for despair even in the face of the foulest despotism if we begin to meet our emergency with radical decisions and sacrifices, the first result of which

will be that we are establishing, for ourselves and others, a new human environment, discovering trustworthy people who mean what they say and will demonstrate it by deeds.

The task before us consists not in converting any one to the ideal of a nonexploiting social order, but in uniting with those in whom this ideal has already become the dominating vital force. Ultimate victory will go to people who are determined to remain free and who will therefore investigate and use all available ways and means for enabling one another to realize their highest potentialities and to attain their full human stature and their real strength. The less selfishness and vanity there are in our motives, the wider will be our orientation and the greater our ability to attract others of similar motives until every one of us will find his true place in the growing brotherhood of man.

San Francisco

EDMUND HERMANN