

POWER AND INNOCENCE by Rollo May

I. MADNESS & POWERLESSNESS

1

A great deal of human life can be seen as the conflict between power on one side (i.e. effective ways of influencing others, achieving the sense in interpersonal relations of the significance of one's self) and powerlessness on the other. In this conflict our efforts are made much more difficult by the fact that we block out both sides, the former because of the evil connotation of "power drives," and the latter because our powerlessness is too painful to confront. Indeed, the chief reason people refuse to confront the whole issue of power is that if they did, they would have to face their own powerlessness.

Hans Morgenthau gives the political comment: "Majority rule, for which men have struggled for centuries, has produced a situation in which men are more important, more powerless to influence their government than 150 years ago."

For violence has its breeding ground in impotence and apathy. True, aggression has been so often and so regularly escalated into violence that anyone's discouragement and fear of it can be understood. But what is not seen is that the state of powerlessness, which leads to apathy and which can be produced by the above plans

2

for the uprooting of aggression, is the source of violence. As we make people powerless, we promote their violence rather than its control. Deeds of violence in our society are performed largely by those trying to establish their self-esteem, to defend their self-image, and to demonstrate that they, too, are significant. Regardless of how derailed or wrongly used these motivations may be or how destructive their expression, they are still the manifestations of positive interpersonal needs. We cannot ignore the facts that, no matter how difficult their redirection may be, these needs themselves are potentially constructive. Violence arises not out of superfluity of power but out of powerlessness. As Hannah Arendt has so well said, violence is the expression of impotence.

Powerlessness Corrupts

When she was exploited, as she often was, sexually and financially, she had no defenses, no way of drawing a line beyond which we could firmly say "no," no anger to support her. (One gets a feeling that some such persons almost invite exploitation – it at least gives them some relationship and significance.) Along with her inability to get angry, there went, as a necessary corollary, a deep experience of powerlessness and an almost complete lack of capacity to influence or affect other people in interpersonal relations.

But such a person has another side which, as I have confirmed in working with many borderline patients since, is completely different.

Priscilla's dreams were of cut-up bodies put in bags, of blood and battles – in short, as violent as her conscious life was docile.

Madness & Society

Prisons don't deter criminals, according to Toch's data, for "violence feeds on low self-doubt, and prison unmans and dehumanizes; violence rests on exploitation and exploitativeness, and prison is a power-centered jungle."

Powerlessness & Drugs

The basis of addiction is a "lot of weakness" and a "Blocked anger." The weakness takes the form of "I can't meet the demands of my family"; "I can't get a job"; "I am sexually impotent"; "I am a 'no person.'" The anger takes the form of the addict's revenge upon his family and the world for forcing him into this painful position of powerlessness. Sexual impotence is present before taking the drugs; a large majority of addicts report that they had suffered from premature or quick ejaculations or had great difficulty in getting an erection at all. Their fear is that they are "not man enough" to satisfy a woman.

The Cry for Significance

Sullivan believed that the feeling of power in the sense of having influence in interpersonal relations with significant others is crucial for the maintenance of self-esteem and for the process of majority. When the sense of significance is lost, the

Individual shifts his attention to different, and often perverted or neurotic, forms of power to get some substitute for significance.

What all too often is tiresomely ignored is that these two approaches are not mutually exclusive. Aggression is part of the basic equipment of man, but it is also culturally formed, exacerbated, and can be, at least in part, redirected. Our culture is not simply a given, but is also us. We "homo called sapiens," as Edna St. Vincent Millay put it in her sonnet, are the kind of creatures who create a vast TV and other forms of mass communication and, using these means, covertly teach aggression to our children. At the same time we endlessly sermonize against aggression. The contradiction this creates adds to the importance everyone feels and to the hypocrisy with which we surround the issue of power in our culture.

The Argument of this Book

With human beings, mere physical survival is now no longer the main issue, but survival WITH some esteem.

When self-affirmation meets resistance we make greater effort, we give power to our stance, making clear what we are and what we believe; we state it now against opposition. This is self-assertion, the third phase. It is a stronger form of behavior,

more overt than self-affirmation. It is a potentiality in all of us that we react to attack. We make it unavoidable that the others see us as we cry: "Here I am; I demand that you notice me!"

The fourth phase is AGGRESSION. When self-assertion is blocked over a period of time – as it was for the Jews for many years, and as it is for every minority people – this stronger form of reaction tends to develop.

Finally, when all efforts toward aggression are ineffective, there occurs the ultimate explosion known as VIOLENCE. Violence is largely physical because the other phases, which can involve reasoning or persuasion, have been ipso facto blocked off. In typical cases, the stimulus transmitted from the environment to the individual is translated directly into the violent impulse to strike, with the cerebrum being bypassed. This is why when a man erupts in a violent temper, he often does not fully realize what he had done until afterward.

II INNOCENCE AND THE END OF AN ERA

It is always and forever the struggle: to perceive somehow our own complicity with evil is a horror not to be borne. (it is) much more reassuring to see the world in terms of totally innocent victims and totally evil instigators of the monstrous violence we sell all about. At all costs, never disturb our innocence. But what is the most innocent place in any country? It is not the insane asylum?...The perfection of innocence, indeed, is madness.

Arthur Miller, from "WITH RESPECT FOR
HER AGONY – BUT WITH LOVE"

Recall those towering individuals of the Renaissance, explorers of the earth like Columbus and Magellan, and explorers of the heavens like Copernicus. Our comparable exploration is the recent trips to the moon. But practically no one remembers the names of the astronauts who walked on the moon. What we do remember is the machinery; the hero of the moon trip was not an individual but a projectile, and the men were tenders of this projectile.

To start with, we must distinguish between two kinds of innocence. One is innocence as a quality of imagination, the innocence of the poet or artist. It is the preservation of childlike clarity in adulthood. Everything has a freshness, a purity,

newness, and color. From this innocence spring awe and wonder. It leads towards spirituality; it is the innocence of Saint Francis in his sermon to the Birds. Assumedly it is what Jesus had in mind when He said: "Only as ye become like little children shall ye enter the kingdom of heaven." It is the preservation of childlike attitudes into maturity without sacrificing the realism of one's perception of evil, or as Arthur Miller puts it, one's "complicity with evil." This is authentic innocence.

There is another kind of innocence, already hinted at in Melville's novella *BILLY BUDD, FORETOPMAN*. Billy's type of innocence is that which does not lead to spirituality but rather consists of blinders – PSEUDONNOCENCE, in other words. Capitalizing on naiveté, it consists of a childhood that is never outgrown, a kind of fixation on the past. It is childishness rather than childlikeness. When we face questions too big and too horrendous to contemplate, such as the dropping of the atomic bomb, we tend to shrink into this kind of innocence and make a virtue of powerlessness, weakness, and helplessness. This pseudoinnocence leads to utopianism; we do not then need to see the real dangers. With unconscious purpose we close our eyes to reality and persuade ourselves that we have escaped it. This kind of innocence does not make things bright and clear, as does the first kind; it only makes them seem simple and easy. It wilts before our complicity with evil. It is this innocence that cannot come to terms with the destructiveness in one's self or others; and hence, as with Billy Budd, it actually becomes self-destructive. Innocence that cannot include the daimonic becomes evil.

The Greening and the Parching of America

We cannot escape the conclusion that some special conflicts must be present in the consciousness of Americans to account for the simultaneous existence of violence and tenderness.

I propose that, primarily, the violence and, second, the tenderness are connected with our conscious denial of power and the pseudoinnocence that accompanies this denial. Violence comes from powerlessness, as I have said; it is the explosion of impotence. The denial of our desires for power, when it occurs in the endeavor to cover up an actually high degree of power, sets up an inner contradiction; power then does not allay our feelings of powerlessness. It does not lead to the sense of responsibility that actual power ought to entail. We cannot develop responsibility for what we don't admit we have. We cannot develop responsibility for what we don't admit we have. We cannot act upon our power directly, for we always carry an element of guilt at having it. If we were to admit it, we would have to confront our guilt. That is why power is customarily translated into money in America. At least money is external. "Cold cash" we can give to other people and nations; we share it profusely with charities, indicating our guilt in possessing it. So we behave like a nation of wolves in rabbits' skins.

Are there really no enemies? Can we call to mind the Berrigan brothers and think that? Or the Soledad brothers? Or Angela Davis? Or the convicts at Attica, who, after the slaughter, were forced to run the gantlet naked? Or Vietnam – yes, the defoliation and the dehumanized cruelty of Vietnam? Reich has no understanding of the creeping fascism already discernible in our country: the turning of youth against their fathers, the anti-intellectualism, the growth of violence coupled with the sense of powerlessness of the mass of people, the tendencies of bureaucracies to make decisions on the basis of what works mechanically with all human sense drowned in opportunism.

Other Forms of Innocence

One feels that the younger generation gets particular gratification out of simply attacking the establishment as such. It is a reaction-information to their own unease at the affluence of their parents and to their own guilt at their dependency on their parents for sustenance? But this is an unnecessary battle, if for no other reason than that the establishment is dying anyway. The present college generation was born in an era when practically all mooring poses-i.e., in sex, marriage, and the role of women. No one can doubt that a new electronic technology is fast revolutionizing our economic and communication systems. Religious practices are also involved in profound change, what with ersatz Buddhists, Yogis, and Hindus springing up on all

sides. One age is dead and the other not yet born – ours, which includes both youth and age, is in limbo.

To what extent, we must finally ask, is technology used as the scapegoat for our present situation and, therefore, an escape from responsibility? A student who participated in the protests at the time of the Cambodian invasion told, in his therapy sessions, of milling around the park at his university at the moment when the protest hovered on the edge of riot. One of his fellows had shouted: “Let’s get the computer!” The student then remarked to me: “all my life I’ve wanted to smash a computer.” Now, on my college tours, when I tell that story, the students unfailingly burst into laughter, and it is the kind of laughter that indicates that some unconscious urge in them has been released.

But “high purpose” is not enough. One observer of a number of communes says that those doomed to failure are the ones with no other purpose than the self-improvement of the group, whereas those that succeed have some goal or value – a special religious commitment, for example-that transcends the members themselves. This saves them from the innocence of believing that what they want will come out of their wanting it, that nature will renounce its age-old neutrality and fit their morality (as it was in the Garden of Eden), and that somehow one escapes the tragedies and complexities of life simply by being simple.

Innocence as a perpetuation of earlier attitudes – the innocence of the flower children, of the too easy program of love everyone, of nakedness without anxiety or guilt, of oversimplification of honesty and sincerity as though one were still a child – all our contemporary world. It is an innocence that shows itself in the clear, open, pure visage of a Larry, an innocence that expects nature to hear our need and forsake her ancient condition of neutrality in order to protect us from harm. It is an innocence without responsibility.

The fact that innocence is used for such extra-innocent purposes is what makes it suspect. Innocence as a shield from responsibility is also a shield from growth. It protects us from new awareness and from identifying with the sufferings of mankind as well as with the joys, both for which are shut off from the pseudoinnocent person.

III LANGUAGE: The First Casualty

When a person feels violent toward another – in a surge of rage, says, or a hurt pride that demands immediate revenge – the capacity to talk is automatically blocked by neurological mechanisms that release adrenalin and shift the energy to the muscles in primitive preparation for fighting. If the person is of the middle class, he may rapidly pace back and forth until he can control his violence enough to put in into words; if he is of the proletariat, he may simply strike out.

When the bond between human beings is destroyed – i.e., when the possibilities for communication breakdown – aggression and violence occur. Thus distrust of language on one side and aggression and violence on the other arise out of the same situation.

The Distrust of Words

Thus the great trend toward action therapies in our day in contrast to talking, and the conviction that truth will emerge – if it ever will – when we are able to live out our muscular impulses and experience rather than get lost in dead concepts. Hence encounter groups, marathons, nude therapy, the used of LSD and other drugs. This is, in short, the bringing of the body into a relationship when THERE IS NO RELATIONSHIP. Whatever relatedness there is ephemeral: it springs up multicolored and bright today, and often will be but a damp place where sea foam has evaporated on our land tomorrow.

The distrust of language is bred into us by experiencing the “medium is the message” phenomenon. Most of the worlds coming over TV are lies not in the sense of outright falsehood (that would imply a still remaining respect for the word< but in the sense that the words are used in the service of selling” the personality of the speaker rather than in communicating some meaning. This is the more subtle form of emphasizing not the MEANING of the word but the PUBLIC-RELATIONS value of it. Words are not used for authentic, humanistic goals; to share something of originality or personal warmth. The medium is then the message with a vengeance; as long as the medium works, there is no message.

Now no one could say that Secretary Laird spoke an untruth: obviously, everything he said was factual. The only point is that his language denies the whole structure of communication. There is no relationship in his answers to the question asked. In extreme and persistent form, this is one species of schizophrenia; but in our day it simply is called politics.

Obscenity and Violence

This amounts to using violence to defeat violence – which never works, whether it is done by police and administration or by young people themselves.

All this, of course, is exactly contrary to what we have been taught. We are taught that the more specific and limited a word is, the more accurately we talk. More accurately, yes, but not more truthfully. For we tend, with this point of view, to make our language more and more technical, impersonal, objective, until we are talking in purely scientific terms. This is one legitimate way of communicating, and certainly the way that thrives in a technological age. But it ends up with computer language; and what I really want to know about my friend as he walks beside me in the country is as absent as though we were in two vacuum tubes.

Words and Experience

It is arbitrary and confusing to say that reflection is also part of experience; we must keep the thinking function in its own right. The error is in using experience as a way

to shut out thinking or in using “immediate” experience to evade the implications of history. The younger generation is right in its attack on “mere” thought, “mere” words, and so on; but it makes the same error when, under the guise of “experiencing life,” it seizes on “mere” feelings, “mere” actions, or any other partial function of man. The “experience” then becomes intellectual laziness, an excuse for sloppiness of execution.

BLACK AND IMPOTENT: The Life of Mercedes

The Rites of Rebirth

This account indicates that, far from toning down aggression, it is on the very nature of psychotherapy to help people assert it. Most people who come for therapy are like Mercedes, though less pronounced – they not too much aggression, but too little. We encourage their aggressiveness provisionally, confident in the hope that, once they have found their own right-to-be and affirm themselves, they will actually live MORE constructively interpersonally as well as intrapersonally. This, of course, means a different kind of aggression from that which is usually implied by the term.

Violence as Life-“Destroying and Life-Giving

This is common defense of people overwhelmed by feelings of powerlessness. Some other force must have the power to change things since obviously these people don't; THEIR actions don't really matter. To fill the vacuum left by their failure to act the

powerless frequently rely on the practice of magic rites. Worried about her increasing weight, for example, Mercedes asked me to hypnotize her to cause her to eat less. I refused, saying it would take away her own responsibility; and why did she not learn to be her own hypnotist? The next session she told me that she had been enraged at me by my refusal. She recognized her reliance on magic.

Thus magic – a covert, occult force – is an absolute necessity for the powerless. The spread of magic and the reliance on the occult is one symptom of the widespread impotence in our transitional age.

If, as is our tendency in this country, we condemn all violence out of hand and try to eradicate even the possibility of violence from a human being, we take away from him and element that is being, violence is always an ultimate possibility – and it will be resorted to less if admitted than if suppressed. For the free man it remains in imagination an ultimate exit when all other avenues are denied by unbearable tyranny or dictatorship over the spirit as well as the body.

V THE MEANING OF POWER

Kinds of Power

A. EXPLOITATIVE This is the simplest and, humanly speaking, most destructive kind of power. It is subjecting persons to whatever use they may have to the one who holds the power.

16

B. MANIPULATIVE This is power OVER another person. Manipulative power may have originally been invited by the person's own desperation or anxiety.

C.

The shift of exploitative to manipulating power is seen on our own frontier in the superseding of the gunman by the "con" man. In all of his dishonestly and misuse of Protestant ethics, as David Bazelon points out, the con man represents a less destructive power than the brute force of the gunman, if for no other reason than that he left his victim living.

The proposal of operant conditioning, put forth by BF. Skinner, is another example of manipulative power. Based on research with animals, it works gratifying with those who are already mentally limited, such as retarded children, some backward psychotics, prisoners, and with neurotics in limited spheres. And it certainly works with pigeons. These are groups in whom spontaneity has already been largely handicapped or rendered ineffective and for whom the principle of manipulative

power is necessary. Recognizing that much of human life is manipulative, Skinner proposes that the manipulation be used for socially justifiable aims. No one, to my knowledge, would disagree with the above points.

The error lies, from the scientific viewpoint, in trying to apply a system developed from limited work with animals to human society and, indeed, to the whole realm of human experience. Everything must be made to fit this system of manipulation; and if it, like Dostoevsky novels, does not fit, it is summarily thrown out of the Skinnerian world. "In the future no one will read them: remarks Skinner. But Skinner's arbitrary choice to use rats and pigeons to obtain his data necessarily rules out human freedom and dignity. If, like the behaviorist, you recognize the smile but not the smiler – that is, you omit the person performing the act – how can you expect to encompass a society of beings who smile and frown and weep and kill and love – indeed, being who are HUMAN?

D. COMPETITIVE This third kind of power is power AGAINST another. It is worthwhile to remind ourselves that the great dramas of Aeschylus, such as the Oresteida, or Sophocles' Oedipus trilogy and many of the works of Eurpides were produced in competitions. The implication is that it is not only the KIND of competitive power.

The competition between nations, as Anthony Storr points out, in the race to the moon or to produce cheaper and better forms of technology (mousetraps), drains off a great deal of tension that would otherwise go into warfare. Konrad Lorenz also makes a great deal of this kind of competition in sports as a counteraction to the competitive power that might otherwise lead the nations to tear at each other's throats. Even if such assertions presuppose a too simplistic view of international aggression, they nevertheless do illustrate a positive form of competitive power. To have someone AGAINST you is not necessarily a bad thing; at least he is not OVER you or UNDER you, and accepting his rivalry may bring out dormant capacities in you.

E. NUTRIENT This is power for the other.

F. INTEGRATIVE This fifth kind is power WITH the other person.

Man is the curious being who is afflicted with memory. If he cannot integrate his memories into his self-image, he must pay for his failure by neurosis or psychosis; and he tries, generally in vain, to shake himself loose from the tormenting memories.

Power and Love

This endeavor to love with the renunciation of power is a product of the tendency toward pseudoinnocence. It underestimates the difficulty of loving, overlooks the fact that love is always, no matter how profound and lasting, afflicted by its moments of dishonesty. Such love is based upon our unawareness of our complicity, to paraphrase Arthur Miller, in the inescapable ambivalence of human life.

A person must have something to give in order not to be completely taken over or absorbed as a nonentity.

The relationship between power and love is shown in myth. Recall that Eros, god of Love, is the offspring of Aphrodite and Ares, god of war or strife. In what better way could the ancient Greeks have told us that there is no love without aggression? But even more surprising is the name of another child which blessed this union, Harmonia. The word means that which is fitting, in proportion, in concord – and it seems paradoxical in the extreme. But it is not appropriate that harmony should be a dynamic proportion between strife and beauty?

In marriage and in relations between couples we see a similar relationship between love and power. I have elsewhere written of the necessity of combining self-assertion (power) with tenderness (love) in the sex act. Without tenderness, the caring and the sensitivity for the feelings and delight of the other is absent; and without self-assertion the capacity to put one's self fully into the act is missing.

When love and power are seen as opposites, "love" tends to be the abject surrender of one partner and the subtle (or not so subtle) domination by the other. These are often the sadomasochistic marriages. When the aim is to be guided only by love, assertion and aggression are obviously ruled out as being too tainted with power. There results a clinging to one another, an absorption in each other. Missing are the firmness of assertion, the structure and the sense of dignity that guard the rights of each of the partners.

But what is generally called "jealousy" surely goes far beyond that normal care. It is a possessiveness which arises in direct proportion to the impotence of the individual. That is, the degree of threat he experiences at the loss of the other is the degree to which he feels jealous. He can do nothing; he has not power in himself to win the loved one back; and he experiences himself as left out completely in the cold. In such situations jealousy can become a form of violence.

Our problem is now different; we stand in a world dominated by giant technology, and men and women must be able to assert the power of their consciousness if they are to survive at all.

VI THE POWER TO BE

Origins of Power in Childhood

We noted in chapter One that the word POWER comes from the root meaning “to be able.” In this sense, it is interesting that Harry Stack Sullivan generally uses the term “ability and power” together, and also speaks of nature and nurture together. “We seem to be born with something of this power motivation in us, he remarks. But this does not at all cast the die in favor of the “nature” side of the dichotomy in Sullivan’s eyes any more than my own, for he speaks of this power motivation being formed in terms of security, status, and prestige. These characteristics are certainly social and are learned by the developing infant from and in his culture.

In origin the infant shows his power and aggressiveness always in conjunction with its opposite – i.e., with his need to be dependent and to be nourished. The whole process of growing up can be seen as beginning with the severing of the biological tie to the mother (when he is born from the womb, where everything was done for him automatically). After the cutting of the umbilical cord, he has to learn to form relationships on a psychological basis. Each venturing forth represents a use of his individual power and ability, and he then comes back to his mother.

The Life of Oliver

He must, at all costs, not let his power come out into the open or let himself be SEEN as powerful; he must forever remain the innocent little boy. To make me RESPONSIBLE BUT POWERLESS – this was the bind he tried to put me in. It must also be the bind he himself had been in all his life.

Oliver’s life illustrates how power is bound to come out if all constructive ways are blocked, sadism being one alternative. More than that, it illustrates again the positive as well as negative aspects of rage. “Depression,” he had remarked, is like starting a small fire to stop a big forest fire. I got depressed to avoid my rage toward my sister. I wanted to kill her, yell at her, ‘You ruined my life. Stay in the sanatorium!’” But he later saw the constructive use of rage. “rage is the dynamic which makes me autonomous, independent of my parents. If I don’t have my rage, I don’t have my strength.

We recall that the rehabilitation of drug addicts depends on their “angry energy.” And also that Mercedes’s violence, which is an expression of rage, had both life-giving as well as life-denying aspects. Oliver is here making the same discovery in his own experience and own insights.

Self-Affirmation

The error many persons make, illustrated by Oliver, is that of bypassing self-affirmation and humping straight from powerlessness into aggression and violence. When one has always been powerless, the heady feeling one gets when he first realizes he does have power seems to be intoxicating. It is as though he had to summon up adrenalin in order to experience the fact that he has "power to be," and once the adrenalin is present, he moves on the strength of it into aggressive behavior.

Many in our culture tend to deny self-affirmation on moral grounds. They have been taught that this urge is "selfish" or "egocentric" in the pejorative sense, and that the way to "love" others is to "hate" yourself. This is one of the most thoroughly anachronistic aspects of our deteriorated puritanism: Sullivan's theses, that our attitudes towards others parallel our attitudes toward ourselves and that a basic love for ourselves is necessary if we are to love others, has now been proved beyond any doubt. The Biblical precept means what it says: Love your neighbor has you hate yourself but as you love yourself. Therapeutically, it often helps to cast the patient's behavior into perspective by reminding him, "You wouldn't treat another person as badly as you treat yourself."

Consciousness is the intervening variable between nature and being. It vastly enlarges the human being's dimensions; it makes possible in him a sense of awareness, responsibility, and a margin of freedom proportionate to this responsibility. The reflective nature of human consciousness accounts for the fact that studies of animal behavior cast only peripheral light on human aggression. The human being can be infinitely more cruel and can destroy for the sadistic pleasure of it – a "privilege" that is denied animals. All of this follows from the fact that in the human being nature and being are not identical.

And this is why man is infinitely more educable than animals and the rest of nature; being less instinctually guided, he can, through his own awareness, influence to some extent his own evolution. Therein lies the collective shame and bewilderment of being a man, and therein also lies the greatness of being one.

Self-Assertion

Unless there is an actual encounter or the potentiality for an actual encounter, as Paul Tillich brings out, an individual's power of being remains hidden. The power to be becomes evident in the continual struggles of being against nonbeing, in Tillich's words, Tillich seeing nonbeing as all aspects that negate and destroy being. These include conformism, which destroys uniqueness and originality; hospitality, which shrinks courage, generosity, and capacity to understand the other; destructives; and, eventually, death itself. We have being to the extent that we can absorb nonbeing

into ourselves. “A life process is the more powerful, the more non-being it can include in its self-affirmation, without being destroyed by it.” The aim is not to overlook or repress expressions of nonbeing, but to confront them directly, accept them as necessity, endeavor to absorb them – all of which reduces their destructive power. Out of this struggle comes creativity.

That is why power cannot, strictly speaking, be given to another, for then the recipient still owes it to the giver. It must in some sense be assumed, taken, asserted. For unless it can be held against opposition, it is not power and will never be experienced as real on the part of the recipient.

VII AGGRESSION

The Meaning of Aggression

In contrast to self-assertion, which may be simply a holding fast – “Here I stand; you can come this far and no farther: - aggression is a moving out, a thrust toward the person or thing seen as the adversary. Its aim is to cause a shift in power for the interests of one’s self or what one is devoted to. Aggression is the action that moves into another’s territory to accomplish a restructuring of power. This fourth level in our spectrum occurs because of the individual’s or group’s conviction that the restricting cannot come by self-affirmation or self-assertion.

As so often happens in psychotherapy, when the patient expresses some negation – “I feel you are attacking me. I can’t stand that....” - or when the therapist says: “What you’re saying makes me angry; let’s see why,” both together can explore what sensitive spot was hit. When these aspects of aggression are worked through, there is not only a clearing of the air but both arrive at a new and deeper understanding of the other and, generally – since we love people for their faults as well as their virtues – a greater affection for the other too.

The truth is that practically everything we do is a mixture of positive and negative forms of aggression. Before I give a lecture, I find myself getting in the mood of “If anyone goes to sleep, my voice and ideas will be so importunate that I’ll wake him up” (which is positive aggression). Sometimes I defiantly feel: “If anyone tries to far as it can be summoned. If I were describing it mythologically interrupt me by heckling, I’ll shut him up by making him look silly” (which is negative aggression).

Varieties of Aggression

Most aggression is indirect, masked, taking the form of subtle put-downs of the other person.

There is another kind of aggression – that WITHIN the self or, as it is generally experienced by the person, AGAINST the self. I sit down early in the morning to

Work on this book. Up till now I have been relaxed, relatively happy, even a bit placid. But as I sit here thinking of the subject of aggression, I summon up my rambling thoughts, I open my mind to whatever insights may come, I contemplate the topic. I summon the rebellious parts of myself; inwardly I look for a "fight," aware that creative power and vision come out of such a struggle. I summon the daimonic – so far as it can be summoned. If I were describing it mythologically, I would say that a swarm of dwarfs, elves, and trolls become embroiled in my mind and refuse to do my bidding. The melee that results until some clear ideas and insights emerge is actually my own self, tearing down conventional ideas and ways of seeing in order to grasp anew man's life and problems. It is the daimonic in full force.

All art must be aggressive in some sense. Artists are not necessarily belligerent people as a group; they are generally the ones who fight their most important battles within themselves and on canvases, typewriters, or some other medium of art.

The Psychology of Aggression

Taking off from Freud's second theory, a group of talented young men in the graduate school at Yale published a famous monograph on FRUSTRATION AND AGGRESSION in 1937. Their theory, which started a great train of researchers both pro and con, holds that aggression is always the result of frustration, and where-ever

there is frustration there will be aggression. The Theoretical flaw is that it tacitly assumes, like practically all American theories, that all aggression is negative, and implies that when we someday construct a society without frustration in it, there will be no aggression. But most important of all, the theory fails to take seriously the cruel realities of life, such as in Negro ghettos or in slavery. How can aggression in the prisons, where men are fighting for their lives as human beings, be encompassed in the term frustration?

Man creates symbols and bases his culture upon them; the flag and patriotism are examples, as are status, religion, and language. The capacity to create and deal with symbols, actually a superb achievement, also accounts for the fact that we are the cruelest species on the planet. We kill not out of necessity but out of allegiance to such symbols as the flag and fatherland; we kill on principle. Thus our aggression occurs on a different level from that of animals, and not much can be learned from animals about this distinctively human form of aggression.

Destructive Aggression

This audience seemed alert and fresh but, try as I would, I just could not communicate my main ideas. At a recess I discovered that, for this part of their training, these young executives (being judged for possible promotion to the few top positions in the corporation) were being trained to be “aggressive,” and that AT&T had retained a couple of professors from the college to grad the men on how efficiently they could “shoot holes” in the arguments presented. What I was really facing was not an audience that wanted to learn or even a group present for the pleasure of intellectual stimulation. Its aim was entirely different; the audience was listening not to what I said, but for the errors, the weakness in the argument. This was, in short, a sophisticated form of listening geared toward “putting down” the speaker. The aggression had a weighty competitive reward, namely promotion to high office.

This is an example of non-communication. Such an attitude will successfully inhibit any speaker; you cannot bring forth your ideas unless you feel that they will at least be HEARD. This does not mean that they will be agreed with; but it does mean that they will be listened to for their own intrinsic merit. If I had known about the purpose of this audience at the outset I could have simply changed the whole theme of my talk to aggression and its purposes and effect; then we would at least have been communicating.

VIII ECTASY AND VIOLENCE

Most Americans are opposed by the sense of individual responsibility, not only for general humanitarian reasons (as described by Dostoevsky) but for reasons specific to our own nation. An American receives very little aid from his culture in carrying this responsibility. Americans have no sacraments like Penance, no rituals like confession (except in psychoanalysis for the few) to help free them from the burden of the past. The whole weight rests on the shoulders of the individual, and we have already seen that he feels powerless. Perhaps this accounts for the moralistic and picayune forms that responsibility tends to take: in the past it centered on insects and not throwing away anything made of plastic. In any case a person cannot carry the burden of responsibility for his own moral salvation without a corresponding depth of culture to give him structure. Otherwise he will end up feeling isolated, lonely, and separated from others.

Ecstasy in War

What are the sources of war's allure"? One is the attraction of the EXTREME situation – that is, the RISKING ALL in battle. This is the same element, although to a different degree, that Oliver cited when he said the protest march caught him up “beyond human desires.”

The declaration of war is thus important as a moral statement, as a moral justification, and enables the soldier to give over his moral responsibility to his outfit. This point is generally cited in criticism of the war machine; and no one can have the slightest doubt that war does erode individual responsibility and the autonomy of conscience. Mylai and the Calley case prove this in a horrible way. But what is generally overlooked is that man has a desire to avoid freedom as well as to seek it; that freedom and choice are also a burden – as Dostoevsky and countless others have known throughout history; and that to give one's conscience over to the group, as one does in wartime, is also a source of great comfort. This is why the great determinisms of history – such as Calvinism and Marxism – have also demonstrated great power not only to form people into ranks but to inspire in them a degree of active devotion that other movements may not find available.

For the first time in my life I can now, for example, understand the American Legion. That organization has always been, for me, a negative conscience – whatever it was for, I was against, and whatever I was for, it was against. This worked quite well as a PRO TEMPORE device when I didn't have time to figure out on which side justice was. But I never could understand the motives of the legionnaires or other veterans; organizations in their saber-rattling and their stretching the hunting-under-every-bed-for-Communists to absurd lengths. Now, however, I see that these groups had originally been, by and large, young men who had held insignificant jobs pouring gasoline into Buicks, Fords, and Chevrolets when

they were called to war. In France they became heroes, the pride of the women; flowers were strewn in their paths, every honor thrust upon them. They were SIGNIFICANT, possibly for the first times in their lives. Returning to this country, some could find only the same jobs pouring gasoline into Buicks, Chevrolets, and Fords, and those would find better jobs may have experience a similar despair in the empty life of peacetime. No wonder they band together, out of their ennui, to create the CLOSEST EXPERIENCE TO THAT OF THE WAR, such as the “search and destroy” anti-Communist missions. They hark back in their yearning to find something that will give their lives a significance it intrinsically lacks.

The Search for Recognition

We are going to have upheavals of violence for as long as experiences of significance are denied people. Everyone has a need for some sense of significance; and if we can't make that possible, or even probably, in our society, then it will be obtained in destructive ways. The challenge before us is to find ways that people can achieve significance and recognition so that destructive violence will not be necessary.

IX THE ANATOMY OF VIOLENCE

The Psychoneurological Aspects of Violence

Aggression and violence are rightly linked in the public mind – one speaks of aggression AND violence. Aggression is to violence, remarks Gerald Chrzahowski, as anxiety is to panic. When aggression builds up in us, it feels, at a certain point, as though a switch has been thrown, and we become violent. The aggression is object-related – that is, we know at whom and what we are angry. But in violence, the object-relation disintegrates, and we swing wildly, hitting whoever is within range. One's mind becomes foggy, and perception of the enemy becomes unclear; one loses awareness of the environment and wants only to act out this inner compulsion to do violence, come what may. Man, Kurt Goldstein reminds us, is the creature who can think in abstraction and who can transcend the concrete situation. The violent man's capacity to abstract has disintegrated, and this accounts for his crazy behavior.

The third possibility is that I can delay my response. This is what most people actually do. The lower down the scale of education and status a person is, the more apt he is to react directly; the higher on the scale, the more apt he is to delay reaction until he had had a chance to think and assess the prospects of fighting or fleeing. The capacity for delayed response is a gift – or burden – of civilization: we wait to absorb the event into consciousness and then decide what is the best response. This gives us

34

Culture, but it also gives us neurosis. The typical neurotic may spend his whole life trying to fight with new acquaintances the old battles that never got worked out in his childhood.

Varieties of Violence

There are at least five recognizable kinds of violence. There is, first, SIMPLE VIOLENCE. Second, CALCULATED VIOLENCE. The third type I call FOMENTED VIOLENCE. Fourth, there is ABSENTEE VIOLENCE, (or instrumental violence).

There is a fifth category of violence, different from those above, which occurs when the part in power, threatened with encroachment on its power, strikes out with violence to stave off these threats. This we may call VIOLENCE FROM ABOVE. Its motive is generally to protect or re-establish the status quo.

Destructive Violence

The important element in this bloody story is his early symbolic interpretation that the world is a place of derision. His ultimate violence achieved a double response: it answered his cry for recognition and it also mocked the world in revenge. (Again, we see the macabre logic in such outbursts of violence.) From his complete lack of feeling when he was later questioned about the persons he had murdered, we cannot conclude that he was always so unfeeling, so unfeeling, so typically schizoid. It is obvious that the person on a binge of violence must BECOME unfeeling and detached, like a soldier mowing down the enemy with a machine gun, or else he could never do what he feels he has to do.

We are haunted above all by his childhood obligato: "I love guns. They give me a feeling of power." The symbol of the gun as a phallus and its relation to six is well known. Both are long and slim, both eject a substance that can radically change the person into whom it is directed. Hence the gun has become, especially with simple people, a symbol par excellence of masculine power.

Constructive Violence

The violence Fannon recommends does not consist of sticking needles in dolls or pounding on pillows but is aimed at the real evils of social oppression. In his rage the black man not only gives himself vicariously for his brother black but affirms himself as well, even if in the process he sacrifices his own life.

X INNOCENCE AND MURDER

When we push the question of innocence and murder to the furthest reaches of human consciousness, we may find it to be one of those perdurable problems that we cannot answer satisfactorily via intellect alone but must, in Rilke's advice to the young poet, "LIVE the questions now. Perhaps you will then....life along some distant day into the answer." But in our endeavor to think it through, we can expect new light to be thrown on the mainsprings of violence. Most important of all, an analysis of the problem of innocence and murder foreshadows the emergence of a new ethics for the coming age.

The Guardsman

But our society, our country, has this power because we as individuals capitulate to it; we give over our own power, as I have tried to point out earlier, and we then are offended because we are powerless. To that extent, we victimize ourselves. Our survival depends on whether human consciousness can be asserted, and with sufficient strength, to stand against the stultifying pressures of technological progress. If the country has evolved into a state of "massive unreality and fear, it must be you and I who experience this unreality and fear.

Billy Budd's Tragic Flaw

The symbolic action of Allison Krause, the day before she was killed, dropping a flower down the barrel of the guardsman's gun defies all of the accepted beliefs about the power of guns. Thus innocence threatens to upset the world as we know it.

Virgins and Dragons

It is obvious that the establishment is ENVIIOUS of youth, envious of the innocent, whose lives are ahead of them. This is exacerbated, particularly in America, by the worship of youth; it is always better to be young. The older people, those who have lost their innocence long since, declare wars that these virginal youths are required to fight; and we go through the complex ritual of uniforms and bands and songs and disseminating an enormous amount of propaganda which is largely a projection of our own aggression and violence on the Japanese or the North Vietnamese.

The established people who represent established ways, are also afraid of the youth. This is particularly obvious in our own day and society. Envy and fear – these are two motives for the sacrifice, and while they do not go very deep, they may help us for the moment.

What did he do? He went up into New England and took the next few weeks to meditate. One had the feeling that this was the purpose of it all: he had wanted to be caught. He was calling for a structureless world to give him some structure; a young

man with a steady stream of successes behind him, son of a famous father, never anything against which he could test his strength, nothing yet that would stand in his path and require him to try his mettle. In such students, this is a cry for experience equivalent to their previous innocence. Young people have already lost their innocence in one sense: concentration camps and atom bombs have rendered their world structureless, but they are without the equivalent experience to go with it. They cry for experience to match their precociously lost innocence.

“The dragon and the Sphinx are within you.” If that is where the dragon and the Sphinx are really located, we must first become aware of them. Our error is not in our myth-making; this is a healthy, necessary function of the human imagination, a help toward mental health; our denial of it on the basis of rationalistic doctrines only make the evil in ourselves and our world hard to get at. No, the dragon and the Sphinx are not in themselves the problem. The problem is only whether you project them or confront and integrate them. To admit them in ourselves means admitting that evil increase in proportion to our capacity for good. The good we seek is an increased sensitivity, a sharpened awareness, a heightened consciousness of both good and evil.

Pollux, one of the characters in Bronowski's play *THE FACE OF VIOLENCE*, says near the end of the drama: "Violence has the face of the fallen angels." But what are fallen angels except human beings, and what are human beings except fallen angels? Surely enough, in the next speech at the very end of the play, Castara answers: "Forgive the man his violence...for violence has a human face."

XI THE HUMANITY OF THE REBEL

What is this element? It is the capacity to sense injustice and take a stand against it in the form of I-will-be-destroyed-rather-than-submit. It is a rudimentary anger, a capacity to muster all one's power and assert it against what one experiences as unfair. However it may be confounded or covered up or counterfeited, this elemental capacity to fight against injustice remains the distinguishing characteristic of human beings. It is, in short, the capacity to rebel.

Civilization Needs the Rebel

Consider also the tale of Orestes. This is a representation of man assuming responsibility for his own life, likewise a prerequisite of civilization. It is similar to the story of Prometheus and that of Adam and Eve in the sense that it depicts the taking of a giant step forward in the humanization of man; and the fact that Orestes identifies with his father should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the myth emphasizes even more profoundly that an individual's existence must start with a

rebellion against his mother, to whom he is tied at birth by the umbilical cord. After Orestes' murder of his mother, and his cutting himself loose from Mycenae, he endures persecution by the Erinyes, who drive him to virtual insanity. Likewise many persons in psychotherapy struggle, on the brink of psychosis, toward autonomy. The stages of the dramas are Orestes' act, his guilt and atonement, his assuming responsibility for his deed, and his ultimate forgiveness in the *EUMENIDES*, the final play of Aeschylus' trilogy, by a court composed of MEN, not gods. It is a portrayal of the importance of rebellion for the capacity to assume responsibility for one's own and one's fellow's lives.

But that is to misunderstand the function of the gods. Gods are, culturally speaking, symbols of our ideal yearnings and visions. (Symbol encompasses diverse strands of reality and participates in the reality itself.) God is the symbol of the power human beings yearn for but do not have. We are always enlarging our insights and visions. To simply deny the god function in human life is to impoverish our lives, specifically our ideals and our visions. But as we enlarge and purify our insights (say about justice) and our visions (say of a better world), we also enlarge our symbols of the gods. This is why one reads in the Old Testament of the curious phenomenon of Abraham arguing with God not to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah, saying: "Far be that from thee! Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Genesis 18:25). He TAKES God to task for not living up to his own principles. Time and again in the Old

Testament a figure will rebel against God in terms of his new vision of what God ought to be and stand for.

Rebel and Society: A Dialectic

The rebel is continually struggling to make the society into a community. “I rebel – therefore we exist,” as Camus puts it. In our particular day, the rebel fights the mechanizing bureaucratic trends not because these in themselves are evil, but because they are the paramount modern channels for the dehumanizing of man, the stultifying loss of integrity, and the indignity of man. He fights affluence for a similar reason, for he knows that “an abundance of wealth may erode power, and riches are particularly dangerous for the....well-being of republics.”

The recognition of the value of the rebel would go a long way in channeling such daimonic forces in constructive directions.

For the rebel does what the rest of us would like to do but don't dare. Note that Christ willingly takes on Himself the sins and the scorn of men; He acts, lives and dies, vicariously for the rest of us. This is what makes Him a rebel. The rebel and the savior then turn out to be the same figure. Through his rebellion the rebel saves us. We see here another demonstration of my previous thesis – that civilization needs the rebel.

The Artist as Rebel

I mean rather that his whole work is a rebellion against the status quo of society – that which would make the society banal, conformists, stagnant. Often this takes the form of rebellion against the academic tradition in art itself – vide van Gogh, Cezanne, Picasso. But the essence of the rebellion is in the new way of seeing nature and life. The art consists of the discovery and expression of this new way of seeing, which in turn is related to the artist's originality, his sense of newness and freshness, his criticism of the past and present in the light of future possibilities.

The skyline of New York, once one of the wonders of the modern world, has been progressively ruined by the conglomerate, haphazard erection of skyscrapers thrown together with no reference at all to an over-all form of vision. Yes, they are built with glass and glistening aluminum and all sorts of other interesting materials. One can build a cesspool out of interesting materials.

The Limits of the Rebel

True, the rebel is sometimes so absorbed in the universal application of his ideal that he neglects his own family. Well, like us all, he remains a human being of both good and bad traits. His capacity for empathy makes him more compassionate for peoples-if not always for the members of his family – and enables him to form his vision.

The rebel is he who can grasp this meaning with a clarity that reaches beyond that of the masses of people. "An act of rebellion on (the rebel's) part seems like a demand for clarity and unity," writes Camus. "The most elementary form of rebellion, paradoxically, expresses an aspiration to order." Those who hold political power may not trust the rebel's vision and may hang on to their power to oppose. But in this new vision, this very pattern and order, there are present the restraining factors on the rebel himself. When one writes a sonnet or any other kind of poetry, the chosen form exercises a restraint upon the poet just as the banks restrain a river. Otherwise creativity flows off absurdly in every direction and the river is lost in the sand.

Especially in the understanding of violence is it necessary to be aware of the good and evil in each of us. As Camus again puts it:

Whatever we may do, excess will always keep its place in the heart of man, in the place where solitude is found. We all carry within us our places of exile, our crimes and our ravages. But our task is not to unleash them on the world; it is to fight them in ourselves and in others. Rebellion, the secular will not to surrender...is still today at the basis of the struggle. Origin of form, source of real life, it keeps us always erect in the savage, formless movement of history.

The fact that good and evil are present in all of us prohibits anyone from moral arrogance. No one can insist on his own moral supremacy. It is out of this sense of restraint that the possibility of forgiveness arises.

XII TOWARD NEW COMMUNITY

We cannot avoid
Using power,
Cannot escape the compulsion
To afflict the world,
So let us, cautious in diction
And mighty in contradiction,
Love powerfully.

Martin Buber, from "POWER AND LOVE"

Farewell to Innocence

But this argument assumes that violence is a relatively recent arrival on the American scene, born fifty years ago with mass media, which is far from the truth. The problem of violence has been present in America all along: ask one of the few remaining Indians or any of the frontiersmen who took the law into their own hands and lived by brute force. Would Dr. Wertham prefer that the Vietnam War no longer be covered on TV? The evil is surely not TV, but the war itself. Mass

communication holds a mirror up to ourselves, and would those who argue, like Dr. Wertham, break the mirror so that we can remain blissfully innocent of our own destructiveness? “The whole idea is that of ‘original innocence,’” writes Hedy Bookin, in criticizing Dr. Wertham’s view. “Man would never be so evil if the serpent of the mass media hadn’t tempted him with the forbidden fruit of violence.

Wertham’s argument would be stronger if it were made against the passive character of television, for a steady diet of TV cultivates not the participation but the spectator role of the viewer. In this way it may cultivate a real feeling of impotence, and this impotence may well contribute to violence.

To strike the disease at its core requires that we deal with the impotence. Ideally, we must find ways of sharing and distributing power so that every person, in whatever realm of our bureaucratic society, can feel that he too counts, that he too makes a difference to his fellows and is not cast out on the dunghill of indifference as a nonperson.

When riots swept over the colleges and universities at the time of the Kent State shooting, Oklahoma had its uproar but no violence. Those in the best position to know at Oklahoma stated that it was this giving the students an integral part of the

reconstruction that was responsible for their freedom from violence. It Was POWER DISTRIBUTED – not paternalistically, but authentically. The students’ judgment was valued, desired, and utilized – as, indeed, it would have to be if such a reconstruction was to be effective. It was power WITH RESPONSIBILITY in accord with the level of development of the persons (i.e., students) involved. Responsibility was commensurate with the power. When the threats did come, they did not escalate into violence. Why should the students become violent? They were not impotent, it had already been demonstrated that they had their voice in the direction of the university.

If I Could Have Found My Tongue

Frantz Fanon points out that there is something more important for the powerful nations to send to the weaker ones than food and arms. This is the POETS. For the poets (and writers in general) are the ones skilled in communication. They can speak in universal forms which will be understood by people of whatever color or nationality. They speak the language of consciousness, of dignity, regardless of race or color; they can cultivate the integrity of the blacks and the other characteristics that are essential to being human. For they know that communication makes community, and community is the possibility of human beings living together for their mutual psychological, physical, and spiritual nourishment.

Community can be defined simply as a group in which free conversation can take place. Community is where I can share my innermost thoughts, bring out the depths of my own feelings, and know they will be understood. These days there is a great

search for community, partly because our human experience of community has largely evaporated and we are lonely. The term community gives birth to a rich cluster of words, all of which have powerful connotations. There is commune, a relatively new word with a positive ring; and communion, an old word with new meaning that has for many of us a still more positive tone. But we come then to a cognate which is taken negatively by many people – namely COMMUNISM. All of these words have the same root.

Community is where I can accept my own loneliness, distinguishing between that part of it which can be overcome and that part of it which is inescapable. Community is the group in which I can depend upon my fellows to support me; it is partially the source of my physical courage in that, knowing I can depend on others, I guarantee that they also can depend on me. It is where my moral courage, consisting of standing against members of my own community, is supported even by those I stand against.

Love and Power

When Priscilla remarked to me that a man in her home town would not have committed suicide if “one person had known him,” what was she saying? I believe she was saying that this man had no person to whom he could open himself up, no

one who was interested enough in him to listen, to pay attention to him. She was saying that he lacked someone who had compassion for him, a compassion which would be the basis of his self-esteem. If he had had such a person, he would have counted himself too valuable to wipe out.

If we are to “honor reality,” we must be aware that power and love can have a dialectical relationship, each feeding and nourishing the other. We must turn our attention to the interplay between love and power, and the fact that love needs power if it is to be more than sentimentality and that power needs love if it is not to slide into manipulation. Power without charity ends up in cruelty. The destructive kind of power generally comes from persons who have suffered radical deprivation, like when Oliver, despairing over the lack of effect his protests had in Washington, fantasied shooting all the old ladies in the supermarket. The constructive forms of power, such as nutrient power and integrative power, come only when there has already been built up within the individual some self-esteem and self-affirmation.

Compassion is the acceptance of the conviction that nothing human is foreign to me. I can then understand that if my enemy is killed, humanity is reduced that much. Even if the sum total of cruelty has not greatly diminished in the last twenty centuries – children still suffer for things for which they have not the slightest responsibility – we shall not require cruelty without regard for tangible success – that man discovers what he is in the depth of his personality.

But, even as we continue all efforts to end the war as soon as is humanly possible, it may be that Vietnam will be, in the long run, of service – if one may speak that way without blasphemy –to America. With all its evil Vietnam may, daimonically indeed, represent an occasion in which America could achieve an insight into life that will be essential to its future. This could come about by our gaining a tragic sense, an awareness of our own complicity in evil, or own participation in automatized, dehumanized destructiveness. What two world wars failed to do may be accomplished by the little country so decisively inferior to our power but able to continue its self-assertion despite all the sufferings we inflict. The guilt we feel is surely a normal guilt and may be the beginning of America's transformation from an adolescent posturing to the maturity of a responsible nation. So far we have kept our innocence, despite all lessons to the contrary. Let us hope that this sad event will constitute a farewell to innocence.

Toward a New Ethic

We can, in a splurge of individualism, live by our own integrity; or we can, in a splurge of solidarity, identify ourselves with a group or party that takes over our decisions for us and decides by its own rules. Either way leads us into error if it neglects the other. Held in balance, however, they constitute the two sources of ethical choice. From the first should be preserved the element of the consciousness of the individual, necessary to all ethics; and from the second, the element of interpersonal responsibility, also a necessary source of all ethics.

Woodrow Wilson called this “the character that makes one intolerable to other men.” Ethics and religion became largely a matter of Sunday, the weekdays being relegated to making money – which one always did by ways that kept one's own character impeccable. We had then the curious situation of the man of impeccable character directing a factory that unconscionably exploited its thousands of employees. It is interesting that fundamentalism, that form of Protestantism which puts most emphasis on the individualistic habits of character, tends to be also the most nationalistic and war-minded of the sects, and the most rabid against any form of international understanding with China or Russia.

To admit frankly, our capacity for evil hinges on our breaking through our pseudoinnocence. So long as we preserve our one-dimensional thinking, we can cover up our deeds by pleading innocent. This anti-diluvian escape from conscience is no longer possible. We are responsible for the effect of our actions, and we are also responsible for becoming as aware as we can of these effects.

It is a considerable boon for a person to realize that he has his negative side like everyone else, that the daimonic works in potentiality for both good and evil, and that he can neither disown it nor live without it. It is similarly beneficial when he also comes to see that much of his achievement is bound up with the very conflicts this daimonic impulse engenders. This is the seat of the experience that life is a mixture of good and evil; that there is no such thing as PURE good; and that if the

evil weren't there as a potentiality, the good would not be either. Life consists of achieving good not apart from evil but IN SPITE of it.

...end of book