THE PSYCHIATRY OF ENDURING PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

THE WILLIAM ALANSON WHITE MEMORIAL LECTURES BY

G. B. CHISHOLM

C.B.E., M.D.

WITH A FOREWORD BY

ABE FORTAS

AND DISCUSSION BY

HENRY A. WALLACE
WATSON B. MILLER
SAMUEL W. HAMILTON
ROSS McC. CHAPMAN
HARRY STACK SULLIVAN

FORTY CENTS; 44c IN CANADA

RC
602
.C45

WILLIAM ALANSON WHITE

AND THE SPONSORS OF THESE LECTURES

IT WAS to carry on the work of their beloved teacher and friend that, with his consent, the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation came into being in 1933 and was incorporated in the District of Columbia. Its program crystallized under his direction. Dr. White became a Trustee and its Honorary President for life on the 19th of February, 1934.

No one did more than William Alanson White to withdraw psychiatry from its cell and influence its integration with general medicine. He was a great interpreter and his lucidity of thought and expression, his capacity for the wisely spoken, as well as written, word carried far. Medicine owes him much as a distinguished teacher and editor. He was, moreover, a great hospital administrator.

The Board of Trustees of the Foundation undertook to support research and to establish facilities for training research and treatment personnel as far as possible to a new level of competence.

The Washington School of Psychiatry (1936) was a project of mature deliberation as to the existing facilities for postgraduate training. Dr. White was to have participated in its program as Clinical Professor of Psychiatry. The School has stood for a growing integration of the biological and social sciences.

The second project of the Foundation, its journal, *PSYCHIATRY*, with the same aims in view, has lived up to its purposes and has gained a warm reception.

The William Alanson White Memorial Lectures, as an occasional activity of the Foundation, are to have, I believe, a not inconsiderable place in the history of psychiatry.

Dr. Harry Stack Sullivan, first President of the Foundation, the Editor of our journal and President of the Washington School of Psychiatry, was the first Memorial Lecturer.

General Chisholm was until recently Director-General of Medical Services, Canadian Army and is Deputy Minister of Health in the Dominion Department of National Health and Welfare, as well as President of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, Canada. I need scarcely add that he is a psychiatrist of world-wide distinction.

Ross McClure Chapman,
President

The William Alanson White
Psychiatric Foundation.

The William Alanson White Memorial Lectures

Second Series

Major-General G. B. Chisholm, C.B.E., M.D.

DEPUTY MINISTER OF HEALTH
DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, CANADA

OFFPRINTED FOR DISTRIBUTION IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST FROM

PSYCHIATRY

JOURNAL OF THE BIOLOGY AND THE PATHOLOGY OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

VOLUME NINE **FEBRUARY, 1946** **NUMBER ONE**

Published Quarterly by The William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, Inc. Entered as second class matter, April 26, 1938, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Office of Publication, 1500 Greenmount Ave., Baltimore 2, Md. Address all editorial communications to The Editor of Psychiatry, 1711 Rhode Island Ave., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Copyright, 1947, by The William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, Inc.

An Appreciation

Honorable Abe Fortas

The Under Secretary of the Interior

GENERAL CHISHOLM'S REMARKABLE LECTURES on The Reëstablishment of Peacetime Society will undoubtedly startle many people. This is not the first time that wisdom has mercilessly illuminated the nature and consequences of the fantastic fabric of man's training and behavior. But I dare say that it is one of the few occasions in which pitiless disclosure has been accompanied by the drawing of a clear, cleanly-defined alternative which may inspire our efforts. General Chisholm is paradoxical. He not only pleads for mature men and women, but the nature of his plea discloses that he himself is that extraordinary creature: a man of maturity.

Dr. Sullivan says that "*the* mental disorder of modern man" is the attempt "to protect a peace of mind that at best is the peace and quiet of fresh thistledown on a windy day." But the prescription of General Chisholm for this disorder is not the patent formula in the medicine book. He does not suggest a renewed effort to anchor the mind and personality. He does not even propose that the trouble be solved by anchorage to different and better foundations. He says that the difficulty is with the very idea of anchoring at all.

Man has sought through the ages to define and classify behavior: this is good, that is evil; this is religion, that is taboo. It matters not that different groups of men at different times and in different places have arrived at conflicting results. The results have always been as unimpeachable as a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. The inducements to the results, although more complex, have been similarly basically intelligible: to define a code, to compel a course of conduct which would apparently permit man to live with man in the given society, and, as a presumably necessary part of this, to bind each new individual to his elders, his rulers, and their past.

But the human past is no longer suitable to the material present. It hasn't been for some time, but we have now reached the point where drastic readjustment of human personality and conduct appears necessary for survival.

As General Chisholm points out, the problem of society in a world trembling with the power of self-destruction is essentially the problem of society's individuals. Unless we can remake ourselves—unless in every country there are "large numbers of mature, reasonable people, free of guilts and inferiorities," there may soon be "none of us left, not even to bury the dead."

So it is that General Chisholm proposes that we put aside the "mistaken old ways of our elders," and that we take charge of our own destiny. On his agenda, no one is without a part to play in this challenging undertaking; the church, the home, schools, and government should set themselves to the task of examining and understanding and treating the ills that beset society—and the individual. And the rôle of the psychiatrist in this venture is not merely that of a healer; it is the greater task of him who seeks the causes of fear, anxiety, prejudice, and vicious passion, and works to eradicate those causes.

We must make it possible, General Chisholm advocates, for human beings to think, and thereby to act rationally. If we are to do this, we must first free them of the terrible burden of blind authoritarianism, of the slavish acceptance of the doctrines which each generation is supposed to accept from its predecessors like a burial urn, and to pass on untouched and unexamined to its successors.

There are some, no doubt, who will take alarm at this precept. But the rejection of authoritarianism which it implies is neither an adjuration to repudiate authority nor a mandate to cast aside reasonable standards of behavior. It is merely an invitation to seek fact and reason, which cannot be found in the blocked tunnel of prescribed formula.

Indeed, most of the essential principles which we teach as religious or moral imperatives are solidly founded in sensible social necessity. "Thou shalt not kill" is a reasonable multilateral arrangement among the members of society. But "Thou shalt not kill," advanced merely as the *ipse dixit* of a thunderous War-God, is a bewildering contradiction which spawns with equal facility avengers, aggressors, Quakers, and Jehovah's Witnesses; the GI's of Bill Mauldin's cartoons and the GI's of the neuropsychiatric wards.

General Chisholm's proposal is practical pedagogy. We are interested, after all, not in the mere learning of good and evil, but in the practice of reasonably mature individual and community living. This comes about not through the acquisition of doctrinal information, but through the application of reason and humanity, maturely, to the complex facts of life. "Thou shalt not kill" has not yet stopped a war. "Thou shall not commit adultery" has not yet solved all of the emotional and social problems of fancy which has gone astray. But careful analysis of the problems of human life, killing, love, sex, and family, might give us a start towards reasonable attitudes, and an approach to workable solutions. At any rate, from it will not result the frustrations and agonies of undebatable principle in sharp conflict with undeniable fact.

Teaching should not be a substitute provided for thinking—and it too often is, from nursery through Ph.D. and beyond. Instead of precepts, it should offer for discussion and analysis the relationships of people and events, factors and things. General Chisholm says, "Freedom from moralities means freedom to think and behave sensibly." Freedom from authoritarian imperatives, divorced from reason and life, means freedom to acquire, in useable form, understanding and comprehension of behavior and relationships, which may equip us to deal with the urgent problems of a desperate time. We have smashed the atom and unleashed the terrible power of nature. We must smash the housing of preconception and prejudice which encases the mind and spirit of man, and set them free to cope with the forces of dissolution and disintegration which are loose in the world.

The Reëstablishment of Peacetime Society†

G. B. Chisholm*

The Responsibility of Psychiatry

WILLIAM ALANSON WHITE'S teachings and writings from his *Outlines* in 1907 to the last days of his life provided much of the impetus in the development of psychiatry which occurred during those years. His vision and humanity, honest thinking and devotion would have been of great value to the world in the troublous times ahead of us now. It would not however be a fitting memorial to William Alanson White to spend our time on this occasion looking backward at his work and bemoaning his absence and the loss to psychiatry. He would not have us at any memorial of his, talk about William Alanson White. The most sincere way we can honor him is to try to look forward, in the spirit of honesty, devotion and service which characterized his whole life, to face and deal with the vast problems which lie ahead.

He would recognize that there is much for psychiatry to do and we should be getting on with the job as he would be doing if he were here. He would recognize, as we must, that this is a sick world, with an old chronic but ever more extensive and serious sickness. Its sickness has recently become acutely dangerous and the future is uncertain indeed.

Man, again, and on a wider and more highly organized scale than ever before, has been indulging in one of his most consistent behavior patterns, war. Though it seems that, among the people of the world, relatively few want or enjoy wars, and very many suffer in many ways during wars, man persists in this senseless behavior century after century. Until recent years wars could take place locally without necessarily affecting or causing concern on the part of peoples in other parts of the world, but that time is past. Every war is now a threat to all the people in the world, either directly or through deprivation of materials or loss of trade.

This situation is widely recognized and no nation will ever again be able to formulate its policies on the basis of isolationism. The interdependence of all the people in this shrunken world is obvious. Fast air transport and the atomic bomb are only the latest steps in that process, which has been going on for a long time, of breaking down the geographical barriers between groups of peoples. We are all now, perforce, citizens of the world, whether we are sufficiently mature adequately to carry that responsibility or not.

* M.D. University of Toronto 24; post-graduate work Middlesex and All Saints' Hospitals London England 24-25; general practice Oakville Ontario 25-31; lecturer psychiatry Yale Med. School 31-33; National Hospital Queens Square and Maudsley Hospital London England 33-34; practice psychological Medicine Toronto 35-40. Canadian Army infantry for 4½ years through ranks to Captain in first World War; Battalion and Brigade Commander in the Militia; in present World War served as Commandant Northern Area M.D. 2, was chairman Canadian Medical Procurement and Assignment Board, Deputy Adjutant-General and Director Personnel Selection 41-42, Director General Medical Services 42-44, Deputy Minister of National Health Dept. National Health and Welfare November 44-. Chairman Dominion Council of Health; President National Comm. Mental Hygiene Canada; Chairman Health Comm. Canadian Youth Commission.

† This is the second series of William Alanson White Memorial Lectures. The first of these two lectures was given in Washington, D. C., at the Auditorium of the New Interior Department Building, 23 October. The Honorables, the Secretary of Commerce, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Deputy Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, participated in panel discussion with Drs. Chisholm, Ross McClure Chapman, Samuel W. Hamilton, and Daniel Blain, at the same place the succeeding evening. The second lecture was given in New York City at the Academy of Medicine, 29 October 1945. Honorable Jerome N. Frank, U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals Judge, spoke in discussion.

In the face of this new status as world citizens we must accept the uncomfortable fact that we are the kind of people who fight wars every fifteen or twenty years. We always have, for as far back as we know anything of the race, and if we go on being the same kinds of people it is to be supposed that we will continue to fight each other.

Now that the latest war has just finished we must take one of several possible courses. First we can return to the kind of life and society we had before the war, go back to our peaceful pursuit of a living, or local social betterment, or political importance, or psychotherapy as the case may be. We could probably count with luck on fifteen years, or even twenty, of peace if we do that, but those occupations would be completely futile as we would be taken over and enslaved, literally, and our comfortable social developments thrown into the discard by a "Master Race" to whom we would appear weak and unrealistic and not fit to run our own lives. Every present indication is that the next time any self-styled master race is allowed to prepare and make such an attempt it will succeed. If our future concern is just the reëstablishment of the pre-war society, slavery is absolutely inevitable. We were before the war the kind of people who allowed the Germans, Italians and Japanese to prepare openly for war for years and to pick their own time and place to attack us. If we go on being that same kind of people we are indeed not fit to survive. We will have proven clearly our lack of ability to learn from even the most painful experience—a biologically intolerable condition.

The second possible course is to prepare earnestly for the next war, recognizing its inevitability, training our children from infancy to live dangerously, to be able to fight effectively with ever more efficient, ruthless and terrible weapons. They must be trained to strike first because there may be no second blow in the wars of the future. Constant alertness and ruthless killing of all potential enemies will be the price of survival if we go on as we always have.

The third possible course is to find and take sure steps to prevent wars in the future. While this possibility seems obviously preferable it is something that has never yet been undertaken successfully. Perhaps it can be said that such a course has never been undertaken at all. Perhaps there is no way of preventing wars; if so we must decide whether to be slaves or ruthless killers, but before accepting either of those uncomfortable alternatives let us at least explore possible ways of preventing war.

Before exploring such possibilities however, we should first consider war in relation to the human race so that we may be assured that it would indeed be good for the race to prevent future wars. It would seem to be true that, whatever the destiny of the race, the killing off of large numbers of its physically fit, intelligent and socially minded younger men can hardly be advantageous. A case might be made for wars if they could be fought by the old men and the mental defectives but that does not seem to be even a remote possibility as wars become ever more technical and demanding of all the fittest men. While the atomic bomb has been a dramatic weapon in the closing phases of the recent war, other possible weapons may be still more terrible. What of the introduction into major water supplies of a chemical which will prevent pregnancy in all females? What of the infinite capacity for killing in the hands of biologists and chemists all over the world? Any country could be paralyzed and destroyed at leisure by a well organized attack of any one of various new types—and without any development of heavy industries. In fact then the tendency is to involve not only fit young men, but every sign points to the killing in any future wars of large numbers of unselected whole populations, including women and children. This can hardly possibly be a useful procedure from a racial point of view unless conceivably it could serve to reduce population pressures in some parts of the world. This end could surely be attained, however, in less painful ways and with better selec-

tion, if such reduction of population should become necessary to the human race.

Some aspects of war are undoubtedly attractive to many people, but these advantages are clearly so far outweighed by the sufferings of others that no case can be made for continuing to wage wars on that score. Wars affect the economic status of millions of people, many of them for the better. Business booms, money flows freely, prosperity is widespread, but only where the war is not actually being fought. In the future, war may well be fought everywhere throughout the world without immediately compensating prosperity for anybody. Furthermore it ought to be possible for us to produce the same prosperity without killing, starving or enslaving millions of people.

Look as we may we cannot find a sensible reason, from the point of view of the welfare of the human race, for continuing to fight wars or for not preventing them. Then why do we go on doing it? Let me repeat—we are the kind of people who fight wars every fifteen or twenty years. Why? Shall we only throw up our hands in resignation and reply "human nature"? Surely other expressions of human nature are subject to extensive changes. Why not this one? We may not change nature but surely its expression in behavior patterns can be modified very extensively.

The responsibility for charting the necessary changes in human behavior rests clearly on the sciences working in that field. Psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, economists and politicians must face this responsibility. It cannot be avoided. Even a decision not to interfere is still a decision and carries no less responsibility. We must earnestly consider what can be done to save the race from itself, from its insatiable desire for its own blood. Can this old habitual pattern of the race be eradicated by strong combinations of powerful nations, or by legislation, or by pretending that now everyone will love everyone else and there will be no more wars, or by prayer and fasting, or by control of enemy industries? These have all been tried repeatedly and uniformly unsuccessfully. There is nothing to suggest that any of them can be successful though they are all seriously being recommended again by many interested people. We are even being told we can prevent wars by controlling our potential enemies' heavy industries. I am reminded that when the Romans were concerned to keep the Britons from fighting them they cut down all the yew trees in England so the Britons could not make long bows. The Britons took to cross bows instead, which were much better weapons. Surely we have learned something in 2000 years! Or have we? We might as well forbid the Germans to make spears or breed horses for cavalry as control their heavy industries. Every lesson of history and of common sense would suggest the futility of these methods. It is clear that something new is needed—but what?

Can we identify the reasons why we fight wars or even enough of them to perceive a pattern? Many of them are easy to list—prejudice, isolationism, the ability emotionally and uncritically to believe unreasonable things, excessive desire for material or power, excessive fear of others, belief in a destiny to control others, vengeance, ability to avoid seeing and facing unpleasant facts and taking appropriate action. These are probably the main reasons we find ourselves involved in wars. They are all well known and recognized neurotic symptoms. The only normal motive is self defence, to protect ourselves from aggression, but surely we should be able to see the aggression coming long before it breaks out in warfare and take appropriate action to satisfy or suppress it. Even self defence may involve a neurotic reaction when it means defending one's own excessive material wealth from others who are in great need. This type of defense is short sighted, ineffective and inevitably leads to more wars.

When we see neurotic patients showing these same reactions in their private affairs we may also throw up our hands and say "human nature" or "psychopathic

personality of this or that type" or we may go to work to try to help the person in trouble to grow up over again more successfully than his parents were able to do. This can be done frequently but it would have been still better if his parents had been able to help him to grow up successfully in the first place.

It would appear that at least three requirements are basic to any hope of permanent world peace.

First—security, elimination of the occasion for valid fear of aggression. This is attainable, at least temporarily and as a stopgap until something better can be arranged, by legislation backed by immediately available combined force prepared to suppress ruthlessly any appeal to force by any peoples in the world. The administration and command of such a force is a delicate problem but can be devised if and when the great powers really want it. A less effective substitute for this method but one which may work well enough for long enough is for the great powers to assume this function themselves. To work even well enough it will be necessary that all disputes between nations be submitted to arbitration by a world court of the highest integrity.

Second—opportunity to live reasonably comfortably for all the people in the world on economic levels which do not vary too widely either geographically or by groups within a population. This is a simple matter of redistribution of material, of which there is plenty in the world for everybody, or of which plenty can easily be made. This can easily be attained whenever enough people see its necessity for their own and their children's safety if for no more mature reason.

It is probable that these first two requirements would make wars unnecessary for mature normal people without neurotic necessities, but their attainment depends on the ability of enough people in the right places to want to implement them, and few people are mature and without neurotic necessities. So far in the history of the world there have never been enough mature people in the right places. We have never had enough people anywhere who have been able to see and accept these facts and who are sufficiently well developed and responsible to tackle these problems.

It follows inevitably then that the third requirement, on which the attainment and the effectiveness of the others depend, is that there should be enough people in the world, in all countries, who are not as we are and always have been, and will not show the neurotic necessities which we and every generation of our ancestors have shown. We have never had enough people anywhere who are sufficiently free of these neurotic symptoms which make wars inevitable.

All psychiatrists know where these symptoms come from. The burden of inferiority, guilt, and fear we have all carried lies at the root of this failure to mature successfully. Psychotherapy is predominantly, by any of a variety of methods, the reduction of the weight of this load. Therefore the question we must ask ourselves is why the human race is so loaded down with these incubi and what can be done about it.

Strecker and Appel have recently defined maturity in terms of abilities which, if attained by enough people, could ensure the continuity and continued development of the race along the lines of its inherent destiny without wars. To quote, "Maturity is a quality of personality that is made up of a number of elements. It is stick-to-it-iveness, the ability to stick to a job, to work on it, and to struggle through until it is finished, or until one has given all one has in the endeavor. It is the quality or capacity of giving more than is asked or required in a given situation. It is this characteristic that enables others to count on one; thus it is reliability. Persistence is an aspect of maturity: persistence to carry out a goal in the face of difficulties. Endurance of difficulties, unpleasantness, discomfort, frustration, hardship. The ability to size things up, make one's own decision, is a characteristic of maturity. This implies a considerable amount of independence. A mature person is not dependent unless ill. Maturity includes determination, a will to achieve

and succeed, a will to life. Of course, maturity represents the capacity to cooperate: to work with others, to work in an organization and under authority. The mature person is flexible, can defer to time, persons, circumstances. He can show tolerance, he can be patient, and *above all he has the qualities of adaptability and compromise*. Basically, maturity represents a wholesome amalgamation of two things: 1—dissatisfaction with the status quo, which calls forth aggressive, constructive effort, and 2—social concern and devotion. It is morale in the individual."

Let me repeat parts of this "The ability to size things up, make one's own decisions, is a characteristic of maturity," "A mature person . . . above all he has the qualities of adaptability and compromise." Can anyone doubt that enough people reaching maturity in these terms would not want to start wars themselves and would prevent other people starting them. It would appear that this quality of maturity, this growing up successfully, is what is lacking in the human race generally, in ourselves and in our legislators and governments, which can only represent the people.

This fact puts the problem squarely up to psychiatry. The necessity to fight wars, whether as aggressor or as a defender who could have, but has not, taken steps to prevent war occurring, is as much a pathological psychiatric symptom as is a phobia or the antisocial behavior of a criminal who has been dominated by a stern and unreasonable father. They are alike irrational behavior patterns resulting from unsuccessful development and failure to reach emotional maturity. It is evident that this failure is usual in the whole human race and has been so throughout historical time.

For a cause we must seek some consistent thread running through the weave of all civilizations we have known and preventing the development of all or almost all the people to a state of true maturity. What basic psychological distortion can be found in every civilization of which we know anything? It must be a force which discourages the ability to see and acknowledge patent facts, which prevents the rational use of intelligence, which teaches or encourages the ability to dissociate and to believe contrary to and in spite of clear evidence, which produces inferiority, guilt and fear, which makes controlling other people's personal behavior emotionally necessary, which encourages prejudice and the inability to see, understand and sympathize with other people's points of view. Is there any force so potent and so pervasive that it can do all these things in all civilizations? There is—just one. The only lowest common denominator of all civilizations and the only psychological force capable of producing these perversions is morality, the concept of right and wrong, the poison long ago described and warned against as "the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."

In the old Hebrew story God warns the first man and woman to have nothing to do with good and evil. It is interesting to note that as long ago as that, "good" is recognized as just as great a menace as "evil." They are the fruit of the one tree and are different aspects of the same thing.

We have been very slow to rediscover this truth and to recognize the unnecessary and artificially imposed inferiority, guilt and fear, commonly known as sin, under which we have almost all labored and which produces so much of the social maladjustment and unhappiness in the world. For many generations we have bowed our necks to the yoke of the conviction of sin. We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers and others with a vested interest in controlling us. "Thou shalt become as gods, knowing good and evil," good and evil with which to keep children under control, with which to prevent free thinking, with which to impose local and familial and national loyalties and with which to blind children to their glorious intellectual heritage. Misguided by authoritarian dogma, bound by exclusive

faith, stunted by inculcated loyalty, torn by frantic heresy, bedevilled by insistent schism, drugged by ecstatic experience, confused by conflicting certainty, bewildered by invented mystery, and loaded down by the weight of guilt and fear engendered by its own original promises, the unfortunate human race, deprived by these incubi of its only defences and its only reasons for striving, its reasoning power and its natural capacity to enjoy the satisfaction of its natural urges, struggles along under its ghastly self-imposed burden. The results, the inevitable results, are frustration, inferiority, neurosis and inability to enjoy living, to reason clearly or to make a world fit to live in.

The crippling of intelligence by these bandages of belief, in the name of virtue and security for the soul, is as recognizable as that of the feet of the Chinese girl who was sacrificed to the local concept of beauty. The result is, in both cases, not beauty of character or of feet, but distortion and crippling and loss of natural function. Intelligence, ability to observe and to reason clearly and to reach and implement decisions appropriate to the real situation in which he finds himself, are man's only specific methods of survival. His unique equipment is entirely in the superior lobes of his brain. His destiny must lie in the direction indicated by his equipment. Whatever hampers or distorts man's clear true thinking works against man's manifest destiny and tends to destroy him.

Man's freedom to observe and to think freely is as essential to his survival as are the specific methods of survival of the other species to them. Birds must fly, fish must swim, herbivorous animals must eat grasses and cereals, and man must observe and think freely. That freedom, present in all children and known as innocence, has been destroyed or crippled by local certainties, by gods of local moralities, of local loyalty, of personal salvation, of prejudice and hate and intolerance—frequently masquerading as love—gods of everything that would destroy freedom to observe and to think and would keep each generation under the control of the old people, the elders, the shamans, and the priests.

Let us go back to Strecker and Appel's definition of maturity. "The ability to size things up, make one's own decisions is a characteristic of maturity." "A mature person . . . has the qualities of adaptability and compromise." Were you and I brought up in that direction? No; we were taught to be absolutely loyal and obedient to the local concept of virtue whatever that happened to be. We were taught that Moslems or Hindus or Jews, or Democrats or Republicans (with us in Canada, Grits or Tories) or capitalists or trade unionists, or socialists or communists, or Roman Catholics or Methodists or any of all other human groups are wrong or even wicked. It almost always happened that among all the people in the world only our own parents, and perhaps a few people they selected, were right about everything. We could refuse to accept their rightness only at the price of a load of guilt and fear, and peril to our immortal souls. This training has been practically universal in the human race. Variations in content have had almost no importance. The fruit is poisonous no matter how it is prepared or disguised.

"The mature person is flexible, can defer to time, persons and circumstances. He can show tolerance, he can be patient, and above all he has the qualities of adaptability and compromise" say Strecker and Appel. Is family or school or church teaching in that direction? Almost never, and yet it is surely true that helping their children to reach this state of maturity successfully is the first responsibility of each generation. Only when this has been done successfully can we hope to have enough people able to see and think clearly and freely enough to be able to prevent the race going on as we have gone, from slaughter to bigger and better slaughter.

Psychiatrists everywhere have spent their lives trying, more and more successfully with a variety of methods, to help individuals who are in trouble to approach

near enough to this state of maturity to be able to live comfortably for themselves and for the group; but surely it would be more advantageous to the world for psychiatrists to go into the preventive field where the big job needs to be done. The training of children is making a thousand neurotics for every one that psychiatrists can hope to help with psychotherapy. To produce a generation of mature citizens is the biggest and most necessary job any country could undertake, and the reward in saving of misery and suffering would be colossal.

The re-interpretation and eventually eradication of the concept of right and wrong which has been the basis of child training, the substitution of intelligent and rational thinking for faith in the certainties of the old people, these are the belated objectives of practically all effective psychotherapy. Would they not be legitimate objectives of original education? Would it not be sensible to stop imposing our local prejudices and faiths on children and give them all sides of every question so that in their own good time they may have the ability to size things up, and make their own decisions.

The suggestion that we should stop teaching children moralities and rights and wrongs and instead protect their original intellectual integrity has of course to be met by an outcry of heretic or iconoclast, such as was raised against Galileo for finding another planet, and against those who claimed the world was round, and against the truths of evolution, and against Christ's re-interpretation of the Hebrew God, and against any attempt to change the mistaken old ways or ideas. The pretense is made, as it has been made in relation to the finding of any extension of truth, that to do away with right and wrong would produce uncivilized people, immorality, lawlessness and social chaos. The fact is that most psychiatrists and psychologists and many other respectable people have escaped from these moral chains and are able to observe and think freely. Most of the patients they have treated successfully have done the same and yet they show no signs of social or personal degeneration, no lack of social responsibility, no tendency toward social anarchy. This bugbear has no basis in fact whatever. We all recognize these reactions as those of the immature, the inferior, the guilty, which are not found in the mature, integrated personality. Freedom from moralities means freedom to observe, to think and behave sensibly, to the advantage of the person and of the group, free from outmoded types of loyalties and from the magic fears of our ancestors.

If the race is to be freed from its crippling burden of good and evil it must be psychiatrists who take the original responsibility. This is a challenge which must be met. If psychiatrists decide to do nothing about it but continue in the futility of psychotherapy only, that too is a decision and the responsibility for the results is still theirs. What the world needs from psychiatry is honest, simple and clear thinking, talking and writing. It needs the same from psychology, sociology, economics and politics. Clear and honest thinking can almost always be expressed in simple words which are understandable by the people who matter in a democracy. The people who matter are the teachers, the young mothers and fathers, the parent-teacher associations, youth groups, service clubs, schools and colleges, the churches and Sunday schools —everyone who can be reached and given help toward intellectual freedom and honesty for themselves and for the children whose future depends on them. Can we psychiatrists give up our protective device of hiding behind a specific, difficult and variable vocabulary to avoid our obvious responsibility?

The battle, if it is to be undertaken, will be long and difficult but truth will prevail—whenever enough people want it to. With luck we have perhaps fifteen or even twenty years before the outbreak of the next world war if we remain as we are, twenty years in which to change the dearest certainties of enough of the human race, twenty years in which to root out and destroy the oldest and most flourishing parasitical growth in the

world, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, so that man may learn to preserve his most precious heritage, his innocence and intellectual freedom, twenty years in which to remove the necessity for the perverse satisfactions to be found in warfare, and to ensure that enough people everywhere do not close their eyes to the awful threats facing them as we did from 1910 to 1914 and 1917, and from 1933 to 1939 and 1941.

We are the horrible example. We are the people who fight wars every fifteen or twenty years. We must at whatever cost prevent our children and their children from being as we have been, but freedom from the tyranny of these faiths and fears is not to be gained in one generation.

It is therefore necessary that, for so long as it may take to change the bringing up of children in enough of the world, our close watch on each other and everyone in the world should not be relaxed for a moment. Let us all be prepared, not for another like the last war with navies and armies and airforces, but for the *next* war with rockets and atomic bombs and all the mobilized power of our laboratories. These are the weapons of the future and with them the whole world can be reached from any place on the earth in some minutes. The people who definitely do not want to fight any more wars must promise annihilation to any nation which starts to fight and must be prepared immediately and ruthlessly to carry out that promise without parley or negotiation. This involves the continual upkeep of widely dispersed atomic rocket stations covering the whole world and a continual high pressure research program to discover ever more efficient methods of killing to keep ahead of any possible competition. This must go on until we, all the people, are re-educated to be able to live in peace together, until we are free to observe clearly and to think and behave sensibly.

The most important thing in the world today is the bringing up of children. It is not a job for economic or emotional misfits, for frightened, inferiority-ridden men and women seeking a safe, respectable and quickly attainable social and emotional status, nor for girls filling in their time before marriage. Fortunately there are recent signs of intellectual stirrings amongst teachers which give some hope. To be allowed to teach children should be the sign of the final approval of society. The present scale of values is clearly illustrated by the disparity between teachers' salaries and those of movie actresses or football coaches. I am reminded of a group whose responsibility was the reclamation, training and rehabilitation of all the unmarried mothers in a certain community. The procedure was to have an "I.Q." done and then to train the girl according to a simple chart. The upper levels rated various types of useful training. Those at the bottom, not fit for anything else, were trained as nursemaids, to bring up children. Thus, hundreds of defenceless children in that large community have been brought up by moronic unmarried mothers. Because these are psychopathological matters, psychiatrists simply have to take the responsibility of interpretation and initiative.

Can such a program of re-education or of a new kind of education be charted? I would not presume to go so far, except to suggest that psychology and sociology and simple psychopathology, the sciences of living, should be made available to all the people by being taught to all children in primary and secondary schools, while the study of such things as trigonometry, Latin, religions and others of specialist concern should be left to universities.

Only so, I think, can we help our children to carry their responsibilities as world citizens as we have not been able to do. Only so can we prevent their having to live in a world of fear and chaos and cruelty and death, far more horrible than we can know.

We have never had a really peaceful society in the world, but only short interludes of forgetting and then frantic preparation between wars. Can the world

learn to live at peace? I think so, but only if individual psychiatrists and psychologists can live up to Strecker and Appel's definition,—"Basically maturity represents a wholesome amalgamation of two things, one, dissatisfaction with the status quo, which calls forth aggressive, constructive effort, and two, social concern and devotion." If we cannot, the job will be left to what survivors there may be after the next war, or to intellectually more honest and braver people who may get a chance some generations later. With the other human sciences, psychiatry must now decide what is to be the immediate future of the human race. No one else can. And this is the prime responsibility of psychiatry.

The Responsibility of Psychiatrists

The object of the William Alanson White Memorial Lectures is stated as the perpetuation of "the tradition of Dr. White in disseminating significant developments in psychiatry to the profession and in encouraging the critical utilization of psychiatric principles by those responsible people on whom largely depends the functional effectiveness of our democratic social order." Any value there may be in such periodic lectures as these should be found in the opportunity to step outside the field of our usual preoccupations and routines in order to see more clearly the larger picture, within which we all function, but in relation to which personal contacts may be few and limited. It would seem desirable, in any changing situation, to undertake a periodic reëvaluation and reorientation of our relationships. We may reasonably ask ourselves what our objectives are, what our methods and what our plans. We may further reasonably ask ourselves whether, in relation to the total situation, recognizing our status and responsibilities as world citizens, we are satisfied with these as they are, or now perceive clearly that they are in need of revision.

We have in the past commonly shown a certain complacency about our progress. Many of us have been thinking, in relation to social developments, in terms of two or three or more generations. It has been taken for granted widely that the trends of recent years, though interrupted by reaction and wars and depressions, would continue. These expectations have received many rude jolts in the last ten years, and many people are beginning to wonder whether time is, in fact, on the side of orderly progress along the road of man's increasing humanity to man. Other interruptions in the near future may prove to be much more serious threats to this progress than have the reactions, wars and depressions of the past. The potential of man's efforts has been stepped up greatly, but the increase has so far been of a kind that increases the power of reaction, rather than promotes social progress.

Man clearly has been developing more and more concern about his comfort and security in his local environment, and has done much in this field. His environment, however, is no longer local. Relatively suddenly, over a period of only a few hundred years, more recognizably in the last ten years only, and finally quite unmistakably in the last few months, everyone has become a world citizen. I think it was Schiller who said, "The most virtuous man cannot live in peace unless his wicked neighbor wants him to." All the people in the world, at least with respect to their power to destroy each other, have recently become neighbors. No lack of understanding between ourselves and other peoples is any longer unimportant. Every such rift becomes a potential source of great danger to all of us. Man's destructive power has become so manifestly great that there are but three alternatives for any peoples in the future—one, passively to accept any fate arranged by any group which puts itself in a position of sufficient power; two, to watch carefully for signs that any individuals or groups are becoming potential enemies and to kill them all ruthlessly before they can become strong; or, three, to learn to live peaceably with the other peoples of the world.

But what has this to do with psychiatry and psychiatrists? Possible objectives for psychiatry can be seen only in the light, and within the framework, of the realities of its environment. The world in which we live is not the same world that we were living in a few years ago. There is much reason to fear that time has gone over to the side of reaction. We are in mortal danger of reverting to something resembling the social development of the world hundreds or even thousands of years ago.

Einstein stated recently that he thinks it possible that the next war may leave alive as many as one-third of the human race. He is clearly among the optimists, not particularly because he believes that a third of the people in the world may survive, but because, as he goes on to say, he believes that after the next war progressive men may have an opportunity to build a better world. This is optimism, indeed. There would seem to be little chance that men of good will and clear thinking will be a significant factor among those who survive the next war. There are many reasons for expecting a long period of authoritarian control by the strongest of the survivors—the people who were best prepared in advance, who chose the time and method of attack. If we remain as we have been, we certainly will not be among these people.

Again, what has all this to do with psychiatry? Is it any of the psychiatrists' business? The answer depends on both professional and on lay appreciation of the function and capacity of psychiatrists. Some have thought that our only responsibility is therapy, treatment of the casualties produced by man's struggles against himself. This attitude reflects a stage of development through which many other branches of medicine have passed. At one time doctors concerned with tuberculosis were content just to treat infected patients. Little headway in controlling tuberculosis was made until pasteurization of milk was undertaken and attack made on living conditions, poverty and ignorance. It was not until the attack on malaria had shifted from the patient to the mosquito vector that control of these diseases really began to be effective. Typhus flourished until the louse which propagates it was attacked. The treatment of patients in these and many other instances has proven inadequate or even futile, until informed prevention was undertaken. Psychiatry, thus far, has remained almost exclusively in the treatment field, and it is clear that its present resources are grossly inadequate for any attack on the problem of prevention.

It may be profitable briefly to consider the status of psychiatry in relation to the field of treatment. Dr. George Stevenson has stated that the U.S.A. now needs some nineteen or twenty thousand psychiatrists. Of this number some three thousand are available, many of them still being with the armed forces. Available training facilities may produce as many as two hundred new psychiatrists a year. If the population could remain constant both in numbers and in needs, and if it could be arranged that no psychiatrists would retire or die, there could be enough psychiatrists to meet the treatment needs in about eighty years. Facts being as they are, it is obvious that if we go on as we have been going, we shall never catch up to the requirements. A similar situation has been reported in the case of psychiatric social workers and clinical psychologists.

Shall we then resign ourselves to the prospect of just not providing the help which many suffering people want, shall we face the problems of enormously increasing the numbers of psychiatrists being trained, or shall we attempt treatment by less well trained workers? Is there some combination of measures which will offer some hope of meeting the responsibilities which surely lie on psychiatry?

There are indeed areas of hope. Some help may well be found in possible developments of shorter, more effective techniques of treatment. Shock, chemotherapy, group therapy, hypno- and narco-analysis, psycho-drama, even surgery, can all be used, and some of these methods may be employed by other than trained psychiatrists. There is no indication, however, that any developments in these fields will be able to meet the volume of needs previously suggested. Can it be made possible for the general practitioner to carry a large share of this burden of psychotherapy? This apparently reasonable suggestion would require for its realization much more teaching of psychopathology and psychotherapy in the medical schools, as well as an increase in the proportion of practitioners to population. Many more general practitioners would be

needed, because whatever real therapy the general practitioner undertakes will certainly require much more time than does now the prescription of a sea voyage, a bottle of medicine, or vitamin pills, or the passing out to the patient of a drug traveler's sample, perhaps the commonest treatment of the neuroses.

The hope that at some time in the future much of the present load of psychotherapy may be borne by the general practitioner is hard to evaluate. Some medical schools are moving at least a little in this direction, but any such movement is slow, and the general picture will hardly be affected appreciably for a number of years, perhaps twenty or more. One can scarcely find reason to hope that any large number of doctors now in practice will develop an interest in psychotherapy so strong that it will induce them to undertake the necessary study and training which would equip them to help their patients in this way.

There is some encouragement in the possibility of developing clinics which, under psychiatric direction, would use clinical psychologists, group therapists, psychiatric social workers, psycho-dramatists, hypnotists and others; and, given sufficient experiment, other types of therapy aides may be developed.

However we view it, the picture of the whole situation would seem to indicate that present immediate needs for psychotherapy are not going to be met adequately. The developments possible in several fields may contribute some help, but these will take time, large numbers of personnel, and much money. We must accept the fact that very many people in serious need of treatment are not going to get it, and that this situation will continue for at least some years into the future.

If large numbers, additional thousands, of psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, psychiatric social workers, hypnotists, group therapists and general practitioners are to be produced within any reasonable number of years, a very extensive overhauling of the educational system will be necessary. Existing therapeutic services will have to be modified or curtailed to provide the teachers and teacher-hours which will be required for work in the training schools for teachers that will have to be set up to staff the medical and other professional schools concerned. Novel methods of financing will have to be devised to make all this enormous growth possible.

It is clearly desirable at this stage of things that any advantages for suffering people to be found in psychotherapy of any type should not be advertised; the recognized need is already far greater than can possibly be met within the next ten or twenty years. It is, therefore, perhaps fortunate that many thousands of people who could benefit from psychiatric treatment do not now realize either their need or the direction from which help should come. If all the people showing neurotic symptoms, inferiorities, irrational fears, personality disabilities affecting their relations with other people, unreasoning prejudices and hates, over-suggestibility which makes them the victims of spellbinders and demagogues, attachments to ridiculous cults and magics, weird superstitions and faiths, were suddenly to identify the source of these symptoms within their own personalities and to demand help from psychiatrists, then many times the previously suggested number of psychiatrists and other professional workers would be needed. If, however, we are to accept the rôle of psychiatry as one only of further development in the field of therapy, and do in fact go about training vast numbers of therapists, we surely must recognize in our planning, even though they do not, that all these kinds of people, millions of them—or of us—need treatment, and might in ever increasing numbers seek it, if it were known to be available.

When now we also have to recognize that neuroses propagate themselves and affect whole families, we may well begin to speculate on the advisability that psychiatrists, once the necessary one or two or three millions of them are available, should be trained as salesmen and taught all the techniques of breaking down sales

resistance. Should not the prospective groups of psychotherapists employ advertising and sales organizations in order to drag in customers? Should discounts be offered for treatment of whole families? Should attempts be made by the profession to induce governments to institute compulsory treatment for the neuroses as for other infectious diseases?

If we believe in our wares, if more and more psychotherapy is what is needed, then surely it is legitimate and sound to do everything possible to educate the public to an appreciation of the need, and to use all the modern inducements which are getting results for soap or toothpaste. True, we might suffer some embarrassment from our failures, but we might in time be able to advertise, or even to guarantee, seventy-five percent or so of cures in the treatment of personality disorders, which is probably as high an efficiency as soap or toothpaste has been able to show. In brief, these projections of a possible development in psychiatry as a curative art might at least go far toward solution of national unemployment problems.

This is indeed a dismal and ridiculous picture, but if we are content to go on just as we have been going I do not see where we can stop short of these absurdities. We may well feel impelled to search earnestly for alternatives. Are there answers possible other than more and more extensive psychotherapy? I think we must grant that for the immediately presenting problem there can be no adequate answer. Thousands of people, including our veterans, will not get the help they need within the next few years. Can we use the analogies provided by the methods which have led to more or less adequate control of such other human disabilities as I have previously suggested: tuberculosis, typhoid, diphtheria, smallpox, typhus and others? The problem of neuroses, warped personality, and behavior disorders is much more widespread and much more serious than has been that of any of these other diseases, but is there not something to be learned from the successes of prevention? The first necessity in effective control of any of these other afflictions has been understanding the cause, the ways that infection spreads, the early signs and symptoms, and the physical, climatic, economic and social conditions which contribute to propagating the infecting organism. Is enough known of the etiology, methods of spread, early signs and symptoms, and conditions under which the neuroses and behavior disorders flourish, to warrant a campaign along the lines which have been so effective in these other fields? I think that I have shown in the first of this series of lectures that I believe there is an affirmative answer, and that there are the best of all possible reasons for undertaking just such a campaign.

This campaign cannot but be a very serious undertaking. When the other disabilities were attacked at the preventive level, some martyrs had to be sacrificed to the cause of humanity, because reactionary forces fought back. Ignorance, superstition, moral certainties, prejudice, and interests vested in exploiting the people resisted through anti-reform organizations, religious and political pressure groups, even political parties; and this is by no means wholly a thing of the past. It is not yet possible to lay a manslaughter charge against parents who allow their untoxoided or unvaccinated child to die quite unnecessarily of diphtheria or of smallpox. Children still die because their parents say, "I do not believe in toxoid or vaccines," or, "I believe it is sinful to introduce these things into the human body," or even, "There is no longer any diphtheria or smallpox around our town, so why bother?" The problem is no longer the germ of diphtheria, or of smallpox, but rather the attitudes of parents who are incapable of accepting and using proven knowledge for the protection of their children. Were enough people to adopt these attitudes, founded on their neurotic disabilities, the great epidemics which decimated Europe and other parts of the world in the past would soon reappear. It is apparent that in the field of prevention of other diseases, the behavior disorders and neuroses

have important adverse effects; that if present knowledge could be applied in relation to many diseases, countless lives could be saved and much misery prevented. That which stands in the way is ignorance and moral certainty, superstition and vested interest. Against these handicaps headway is being made in at least some directions. Cults and reactions repeatedly arise which temporarily and locally block rational progress with new faiths or retranslations or disinterments or reaffirmations of old ones, but in spite of all these retreats to, and reanchorings in, our mistaken past, there seems to be perceptible movement toward intellectual honesty and truth.

In principle, there seems to be no great difference between the control of the other diseases and that of the neuroses. The main problems which have to be overcome are the same—the ignorance, moral certainties, prejudice, and so on. Just as it so commonly has been taken for granted that parents have a perfect right to leave their children exposed to death, by neglecting to protect them from diphtheria or smallpox; so it has long been generally accepted that parents have a perfect right to impose any points of view, any lies or fears, superstitions, prejudices, hates, or faiths on their defenseless children. It is, however, only relatively recently that it has become a matter of certain knowledge that these things cause neuroses, behavior disorders, emotional disabilities, and failure to develop to a state of emotional maturity which fits one to be a citizen of a democracy, able to take one's part in making a world fit to live in. "I believe" or "I do not believe" have been acceptable as valid reasons for arbitrary limitations or distortion of a child's experience, for imposing any kind of guilt and fear on the child, for perverting the child's capacity to observe and to think clearly, without thought about the effect on the life of the child and on the society in which he will live.

Surely the training of children in homes and schools should be of at least as great public concern as are their vaccination or toxoiding, for their own protection and that of other people. Emotional and social health is at least as important as physical health; neither type of health can be held to be exclusively the concern of the parents, for it has much importance for the community. The states of emotional health of the individuals determine the internal organization and consistency and the external relations of the community. The vastly increased importance of the external relations of the community in terms of actual survival has become obvious to every thinking person. Events in recent months have made this clear. The psychiatrist knows that individuals who have emotional disabilities of their own, guilts, fears, inferiorities, are certain to project their hates on others, on groups, communities, or nations, and thus to jeopardize seriously the external relations of those who are associated with them, in the view of their "enemy." They are the people who must believe the worst of all foreigners and who then react emotionally and irrationally to these beliefs. They are a very real menace. The government of a country cannot organize and impose any social developments or external relations which are too far ahead of the state of maturity of its citizens. There would otherwise result internal conflict and dissension, producing a reactionary government and a retreat to a less mature stage of social development. We must realize that such a retreat will never again be a matter for merely local concern in the particular country, as it has often been in the past. Any such reaction now becomes a dangerous threat to the whole world. Any such retreat from maturity may presently lead to the horrible death of a great many people, perhaps the extermination of whole nations, or the decimation of continents. For the very survival of large parts of the human race, world understanding, tolerance, and forbearance have become absolutely essential. We must be prepared to sacrifice much if we would hope to have opportunity to go on with our development. At whatever cost, we must learn to live in friendliness and peace with our neighbors, who are all the people

in the world. In time, if we prove worthy of their trust and confidence, we shall obtain it.

Here, perhaps, is the trouble, or much of it. The need for psychiatric treatment in at least some other countries is as great, relatively, as in the U.S.A.; perhaps greater. Can any country showing these vast amounts of emotional disability reasonably hope to develop and maintain rational, tolerant, and consistent external relations? Recognizing the absolute necessity of such relations, we must recognize also that our hope of maintaining them is not well-founded, and will not be until we can depend more on the people in our countries to take rational, tolerant and mature attitudes about themselves and other peoples. In a democracy, only mature people can maintain the mature social organization and stability in which alone lies hope of avoiding world chaos and slaughter.

In whatever direction we explore, and I realize the discursiveness of this attempt, we come back inevitably to the necessity of having in every country large numbers of mature, reasonable people, free of guilts and inferiorities. We can only hope that it may be possible for the race to survive through the troubled period which is inevitable while we are learning to grow up successfully. It must be clear to every person who is able to think in terms of evident reality that we cannot any longer afford to shelter and protect the old mistaken ways of our forebears. The new world is too sensitive; it can explode, literally, too easily. We are walking on dynamite, or perhaps I should say on atomic bombs, and we must learn to tread lightly and with great discretion. We cannot afford the certainties of the past; everything which may affect our ability to live at peace must be reëvaluated—and that means everything in our lives. We know that we have been misguided and mistaken. The fact of our enormous incidence of emotional disability is proof that our past methods have been in some way mistaken. We have not been growing up successfully. Emotional maturity is anything but the common lot of our peoples. The fact that we allowed the Second World War to happen is a clinching proof, if proof were necessary.

It is easy to find excuses for the bewilderment of this generation. The past fifty years have embraced violent upheavals in the social order and in interpersonal relations. At the beginning of this century many values and certainties which have since come adrift were well anchored in community sanctions. In the typical town fifty years ago every individual was clearly labelled as good or bad, respectable or not. Good girls were at home by nine or ten at night as might be the local custom. There were no excuses for tardiness. The old grey mare brought young people home from the allowed buggy- or cutter-ride on time. Everyone in the village knew almost exactly what everyone else was doing at any time of day or night. The town drunkard was drunk as he was supposed to be, and would no more be expected to step out of character than would the minister or the choir leader. Then came the automobile, and the impact of its arrival had far reaching consequences. Those of you who are old enough will remember the delightful unreliability of the early attempts at tires, not to mention lights, carburetors, distributors and other aids to seduction. When the boy and girl returned at 3 A.M. or next morning from a ride in the old man's car, no one knew, or at least no one could prove, whether they were bad or not. Perhaps they had had four punctures. And so the clear cut moral classifications of people and behavior began to break down. No longer could one be sure who was bad and who was good, a very disturbing state of mind in a world of competitive personal salvation. At about this time was added the movies, through instrumentality of which previously respectable people began to see illustrated types of behavior they had always been taught to believe would lead straight to damnation. Some of these kinds of behavior looked rather attractive and no one seemed to be struck dead by an angry God—so yet more certainties

slipped a little. Then came the first world war, for no good reason that anyone could find, and accomplishing nothing that appeared to be of any particular value. It contributed to the confusion of mind and clarified nothing. When it was ended, all the idealism which had been mobilized seemed to sink without a ripple in the struggle for power and personal aggrandizement.

Then came a period of ununderstandable prosperity when the stock markets boomed and fortunes were made overnight. Again there was nothing for reason to lay hold on. Wealth, power and prestige seemed to have no relationship to personal integrity, intellectual or educational equipment, hard work or social value. To know the right people and to be lucky were the requirements for success. The following world depression again did not make sense. Why should people be hungry when the world was glutted with food? Why should the prairie farmer be unable to sell his wheat when people elsewhere were desperately hungry? Why should people not have many things they wanted while the people who had been making those things were out of work? Here was more food for bewilderment and confusion. No sensible reasons were found; attempting to understand the mess that man had gotten himself into became futile and unproductive. Then came the final insult to intelligence, World War Two. Again why; and there was no sensible answer. Why didn't we stop the Japs in the early thirties, why didn't we stop Mussolini in Ethiopia, why didn't we stop Hitler not later than 1936? The only conclusion could be that there was no sense to anything; causes and effects were apparently beyond effective identification.

At the same time, throughout these bewildering years, people were being taught the same old faiths and rules that their ancestors had been taught. There was no apparent relationship between the virtues and vices that had been, and real events. Virtue was *not* rewarded, except in the movies and pulp magazines.

It is easy to build up and to accept reasons for the world of the present being as lost and bewildered as it is. It is also obvious that we should not go on like that. We should not tamely submit to the unpredictable and ununderstood cycles of wars, and prosperity and depression, and wars again. There is something to be said for taking charge of our own destiny, for gently putting aside the mistaken old ways of our elders if that is possible. If it cannot be done gently, it may have to be done roughly or even violently—that has happened before.

And what of the training of psychiatrists, which I may appear to have forgotten? Programs as projected by various groups typically deal with training for psychotherapy, though sometimes with earlier stages of disability than previously. One program, remarkable in that it is a joint memorandum of the Royal College of Physicians, the British Medical Association and the Royal Medico-Psychological Association, makes these recommendations: [1] "1. Psychiatry is not a limited specialty. It permeates and influences general medicine, surgery, obstetrics and gynecology. Psychiatrists should be appointed to the staffs of general hospitals with status equal to that of other physicians and surgeons. 2. The mental health department of the health service of the future should be responsible for the organization of all medical work which is essentially psychiatric. 3. The psychiatrist is not concerned merely with fully developed mental disorders. The mental health service should include provisions for prophylaxis of mental disorders over the widest field. 4. In the educational sphere psychiatric advice is essential for children showing neurosis, behavior disorder or mental defect. 5. In industry a full and efficient consultative psychiatric service should be available, which should work in close cooperation with the patient's doctor and the industrial medical officer. Psychiatrists should cooperate with industrial psychologists in the investigation of industrial fatigue and ill health, working hours and conditions,

[1] Foreign Letters, London, The Journal of the American Medical Association. July 28, 1945.

incentives, personnel management and the like. 6. Psychiatrists should cooperate in the work of vocational guidance and selection, an essential part of which is the assessment of personality and temperament. 7. Psychiatrists should take part in the rehabilitation of patients after accident or illness. This work should be carried out in close liaison with employers, workers' representatives and patients' doctors."

Of these recommendations the only real hope for the future seems to lie in No. 3: "The psychiatrist is not concerned merely with fully developed mental disorders. The mental health service should include provision for prophylaxis of mental disorders over the widest field." But No. 4 reverts to the old defeatist therapeutic attitude: "In the educational sphere psychiatric advice is essential for children showing neurosis, behavior disorder or mental defect." Surely we should project psychiatry into actively preventing at least some of these conditions from arising. It is clear that psychotherapy must be continued but it is also clear that there will need to be selection of cases. The greatest importance of psychotherapy is, I think, in the training of psychiatrists, not with view to their doing psychotherapy but to prepare them to undertake preventive work. We cannot afford to squander our best brains on psychotherapy, except as a teaching procedure, and for the benefit of certain people who are of manifest potential or proven value to the social organism.

In cooperation with leaders in all fields, social psychology, sociology, law, politics, labor, the churches and others, psychiatrists should do their utmost to examine, compare, study, understand and treat the ills of our society. Everything we think and do and believe should be looked at. All should be suspect because they are all part of us and we are not living successfully. We need fear no sacrednesses. Truth has nothing to fear from the earnest and sincere research for truth. Anything that should survive will certainly survive the most searching light of intellectual examination. We, not just psychiatrists, should look at our laws and our courts for instance. We would find that despite all modern understanding of the human being, judicial procedure still applies the "McNaughton Rules," though the right and wrong to which they refer have changed greatly in the hundred years since those rules were formulated. Sincere people should examine our schools and our churches. Are their methods of teaching consistent with present day knowledge of the developing human personality? Is the intellectual heritage of children kept intact through these experiences? Most of you will agree with me that it generally is not.

These are only illustrations of the work there is to do. These are desperate times and the time for remedy may be exceedingly short. Let us deal in plain words, let us talk in simple factual terms and let us try to begin to be honest with ourselves. Of course, any planning for the future which would discard any burden of the past is almost always reproached as disloyalty to tradition, to ancient faiths, or to the authority of our forefathers. But what would we think of a father, who, his house on fire and his children burning, stopped to rescue his ikon, his prayer wheel, his beads, or the picture of his first school teacher?

Let us be our own authority. We know far more than any of our ancestors. Scientists of this generation have no obligation to admit superiority of knowledge or of wisdom in any body of traditional belief or authority. There is no room for authoritarian dogma in the field of human relations. Let us discard the bromides which have kept us drugged, obedient to the old people and afraid of their displeasure. Let us accept our own responsibility to remodel the world in bolder, clearer, more honest lines. Let us stop prostituting man's noblest and highest development, his intellect, to the service of guilt and fear and shame.

We have learned to raise pigs and cows and horses, even to grow flowers and vegetables, in ways that make them of greater service to mankind. If your son

is going to raise pigs for a living he goes to a college for three or four years to study under experienced teachers. But if he is merely raising children he commonly learns nothing; nor appreciates, even dimly, that there is anything that he has to learn. Surely the rearing of children is greatly more important, and more complicated, than the raising of pigs. Within the possible expressions of human nature are the personalities of a Caligula or a Franklin Roosevelt, a female guard at Belsen Camp or a Florence Nightingale, a Hitler, or, almost, a Christ. Is it not important to us which we produce? Is not this the great problem facing our generation? Is there any greater field for earnest, devoted work? Whatever will help our children to grow up to be mature, compassionate, tolerant and worthy of being citizens in the world they must make, must be of interest to psychiatrists—but not to psychiatrists, alone—and part of their training in the future. Psychiatrists must, with all the help they can get from every source, become specialists in living. We have our chance now. If now we all revert to our little private concerns, if we all tell ourselves "it is someone else's responsibility," there will one day be none of us left, not even any to bury the dead.

Panel Discussion of the First Lecture†

The following statements are mostly verbatim from the proceedings of the Panel. Moderator's remarks and some of the interchange have been omitted.

Honorable Henry A. Wallace

The Secretary of Commerce

My Presbyterian conscience, which I inherited from my father who was an elder in the United Presbyterian Church and my grandfather who was a minister in the United Presbyterian Church, caused me to awake at four o'clock this morning to read the lecture in order to be prepared tonight, and on reading the lecture, I had no difficulty whatsoever in discovering the psychiatric explanation of our distinguished visitor. I recognized in him at once what you might call a second generation derivative from a Presbyterian background, a fact which I verified a little later on. It is a marvelous background against which to work, although a slightly difficult background in which to find yourself.

There is a passionate search for security among the Presbyterians and a belief that security is attained with very, very great difficulty. By the skin of your teeth at the last moment you are saved by the grace of God from utter damnation. Those who are raised in that atmosphere or those who are only once removed from that atmosphere are caused to become great philosophers, as a matter of escape. Dr. Chisholm has definitely escaped. He has risen above the realm of "morality" in a Presbyterian sense, and yet it is only a superficial release—it could not be otherwise, being raised as he was.

I do want to congratulate him and all psychiatrists, however, on the protective coloration with which they have managed to surround themselves. I have found when I attempted to deal with thoughts of this sort that I have tended to speak my mind without that protective coloration, and the results have not always been best for everyone.

Seriously, the talk, the lecture of General Chisholm last night is one of the most thought-provoking which has ever been given in Washington. It goes to the very roots of future peace. It recognizes the supremely important fact that security is not attained merely by radar, by V-2 rockets, by atom bombs, by the other devices which were on the point of perfection but which have not yet been tried, which may be even more devastating than any which were brought out during the war. General Chisholm recognizes that beyond all of these devices of force, there is still something mightier, and I am tempted at this moment to read a quotation from Pavlov, the great Russian who dealt, as you know, with conditioned

† Held in the Auditorium of the New Interior Department Building on the evening of Wednesday, 24 October 1945. The comment of Dr. Samuel W. Hamilton, President-Elect of the American Psychiatric Association, has been expanded into a statement pertaining to the two Lectures, which follows this digest of discussion. The statement and comment of Dr. Daniel Blain, Acting Director of the Neuropsychiatric Division, U. S. Veterans Administration, and the immediately related remarks of Dr. Chisholm, are omitted from this digest, as hereinafter explained.

reflexes—who I found out tonight has a varied standing among psychiatrists—but with regard to this quotation I think there will be no difference of opinion. This is a quotation which I have used repeatedly during recent weeks because it made such a profound impression on me.

Said Pavlov in 1928: "Let the mind rise from victory to victory over surrounding nature. Let it conquer for human life and activity not only the surface of the earth but all that lies between the depth of the seas and the outer limits of the atmosphere. Let it command for its service prodigious energy to flow from one part of the universe to the other. Let it annihilate space for the transference of its thoughts, yet the same creature, led by dark powers to wars and revolutions and their horrors produces for itself incalculable material losses and inexpressible pain and reverts to bestial conditions. Only science, exact science about human nature itself, and the most sincere approach to it by the aid of the omnipotent scientific method will deliver man from his present gloom and will purge him from his contemporary shame in the sphere of inter-human relations."

I congratulate General Chisholm for grappling with the fundamental issue raised by Pavlov in this statement.

I had not been aware that it was accepted universally by psychiatrists that the sad state of the recent generations of mankind was due to a sense of inferiority and guilt and fear. That to me was a most challenging statement. I will not, in order to maintain the protective coloration, indicate where General Chisholm thinks this feeling originated. I am sure we should not betray that secret. Suffice it to say, however, that I would that this address were mailed to all of the ministers and priests in the United States. The thought created in the minds of all those who have to do with religion would be very helpful, I am sure. There might be a very deep disagreement in certain quarters, but the final result, I am sure, would be constructive because, after all, those who are profoundly concerned with religious matters are also concerned with the objective stated by Pavlov. Pavlov wanted to reach that objective by what he called the omnipotent scientific method. Why shouldn't those who are concerned with religious matters use the omnipotent scientific method? It is precisely the purpose of psychiatry to discover in a scientific way the wellsprings of human nature even as those who are working in the religious field have endeavored to find those wellsprings in an authoritarian way from the Book, from the Bible, from tradition.

But as I read the Bible, there was among the prophets a continuous change to meet changing circumstances. Undeniably the New Testament is different from the Old; undeniably Jesus Christ was preaching a message to slaves, essentially—slaves of the Roman Empire in Palestine; undeniably He was conditioned by that fact. He had to use words that recognized it. Otherwise, why did He proclaim rendering unto Caesar that which was Caesar's?

Why shouldn't we, in the spirit of Christ, continue to grow? Did the insight of humanity end 2000 years ago? I feel that there is room for a uniting of the scientific method of psychiatry with the intense longing of genuinely religious souls to bring about an abiding peace. I was struck by Dr. Chisholm's posing of the question that either we had to find a sure way to peace or else we had to become either slaves or ruthless killers. I know that General Chisholm selects the first path, the path toward an abiding peace.

Those people who proclaim that wars are inevitable, if they really followed their conclusions, could only preach one of two courses today. If they had the courage of their convictions, and were genuine Christians, they would take the course of slavery. If they were not Christians, they would proceed at once towards the dominance of the United States over the whole world. I know that Dr. Chisholm is not advocating that course, but are we "softies," we who do not believe in the inevitability of war, that we don't embark wholeheartedly on the course that leads

to abiding peace? Or are those who believe in the inevitability of war "softies" that they don't embark at once on the course of the "United States über alles?"

The logic of Dr. Chisholm's presentation is extraordinarily compelling. It suggests to all right-thinking people, to my mind, that we haven't gone out with full faith, with full vigor, towards reaching a genuine mechanism for abiding peace.

* * * *

[About the returned veteran and the displaced war worker;] I suppose the problem is to try to distinguish between the field of the psychiatrist and the field of the economist. I think it is good psychiatry so far as possible to treat the returned veteran and the displaced war worker just like anybody else. That doesn't necessarily take care of all cases. Dr. Chisholm was telling me earlier in the evening that they found as a result of observation of men overseas that some of them, without being aware of it, developed stomach ulcers and ulcers of the intestinal tract, ulcers which healed up rapidly when they came back to this hemisphere—men who eagerly wanted to get into combat again. This suggests, of course, a peculiar type of nervous tension which might have to be dealt with by psychiatric methods from time to time. Nevertheless, I am convinced that we would reduce enormously the number of psychiatric cases among the returned veterans and the displaced war workers if, by means of cooperation between government, business and labor, we were able to promote that necessary flow of private funds—and in case of need, of government funds—which would make possible full employment. I don't care if you do call work the curse of humanity. I have the feeling that it is a lesser curse than the sense of not being needed.

I think one of the supreme psychiatric or psychic needs of humanity at the present stage of evolution is the sense of being wanted, being needed, being useful. It may be that the Presbyterian capitalists have given us this complex, but it is very definitely with us. We do want a job and until atomic energy has freed humanity from the curse that was placed on Adam and Eve, I think full employment is a pretty good intermediate goal.

At the same time, I realize very well that it is proper one of these days to raise the question: Beyond sixty million jobs, what? I wish somebody would write, say five or ten years from now, a book along that line. I think it is important, but I think the immediate goal is full employment for the veterans and for the displaced workers. In order to realize the immediate goal, it is important also to have a more distant goal. I think that is good psychology; whether it is good psychiatry or not, I don't know.

That more distant goal, one on which I think we could all agree, is the sense of well-being and happiness which comes from service of the general welfare as the concept of the general welfare changes year by year. I will admit that just working for work's sake can eventually prove to be an ugly thing. What we want is beauty and joy in life, but in order to realize that beauty and joy in life it seems to me that there has been imposed upon man the discipline first of discovering some method by means of which all of us can work together, possibly for incomplete goals in the first instance. Atomic energy has undoubtedly placed a great responsibility and strain upon mankind. It places upon mankind the absolute necessity, in my opinion, of finding the road to an abiding peace; and second, it has placed upon mankind the absolute necessity of learning how to live joyously with abundance. The whole religious training that has come to us out of the past has worked in the direction of teaching mankind how to live grimly with scarcity. I think it is a much greater moral challenge to learn to live joyously with abundance than to learn to live grimly with scarcity.

As I understand the psychiatrists as a result of my brief contact with them this evening, one of their purposes is to teach mankind to live joyously with abundance on behalf of the general welfare. Ap-

parently they believe that if we learned that, perhaps ulcers of the stomach would tend to disappear. We have seen many people around Washington who have suffered in this way—I mean that the soldiers on the peace front suffer this way as well as do soldiers on the battle-front. There are good soldiers on the peace front. They apparently are fighting a good fight with all that is in them, but nevertheless their nervous system does give way. Their stress comes from the fact that they have questioned whether all of us here in Washington have been working determinedly on behalf of joyous living with abundance on behalf of the general welfare. There has been a sense of frustration and strain from time to time. If psychiatry can help clear that up, so much the better.

I trust you will let us, General, go through this intermediate period of striving for sixty million jobs, provided we give you a promise that later on we will try to solve the more ultimate problems of joy and beauty.

* * * *

[As a concluding comment] I would like to put in a plea for the place of people who are not fully mature. It seems to me that it is generally agreed that our friends the Russians are not fully mature; I am speaking now in the population sense. Russia has a very large proportion of young people to old people, whereas Western Europe has a very high proportion of old people to young people. We here in the U. S. are more like Western Europe than we are like Russia with regard to having a high proportion of old people.

A young population is a dynamic population, of necessity. Growth is not necessarily a sin. Growth characterizes young people. Mature people tend to be static. The psychiatric ideal might be taken to be a people who are completely mature, therefore not growing.

Honorable Watson B. Miller

The Federal Security Administrator

I am afraid that my rather sketchy observations set down quite recently because, like the Secretary, I was not able to attend the presentation of the paper, may be rather inadequate. I made some marginal notes here which I think may be regarded more in the nature of questions so as to clarify my own thinking on what without doubt is, at least from an economic and social sense, the most important question that faces us.

I suppose what we are dealing with here in an international sense is something like the internal and external emotional and intellectual manifestations of people in their relationships one to the other, and that, I think, might be regarded as the regular regularity of nature, or the irregular irregularity of it, depending upon the mood in which you are, and the circumstances in which you find yourself.

General Chisholm has spoken about atomic energy and that we all become perhaps more concrete citizens of the world, and I just wondered in using Dr. Chisholm's thesis if that fact might draw us as individuals and communities closer together, perhaps occasionally lead us to trust one another, and finally to cultivate mutual protection; and I am wondering whether the physical and mental propinquity finally might get us into an atmosphere where we might trust each other more than we sometimes do now.

General Chisholm says, "Every present indication is that the next time any self-styled master race is allowed to prepare and make such an attempt, it will succeed"—meaning, of course, in the matter of conquest. Well, I don't know whether this is essential or whether it is important, but I don't know what master race means. It might mean one thing today and another thing tomorrow. Certainly it did as to the Attilas, the Genghis Khans, and the Tamerlanes, and the Athenians in the days of Pericles, to the Spartans, to the Romans, and finally to the Germans; so maybe a master race, looking at it in any sense you like to consider the term, master race one day, may through many, many varieties of reasons fail to be the master race the next day.

I think probably one of the principal reasons why the civilization we love doesn't always prevail, and has not prevailed through such ages where intellectual and religious advances have been made, is because in the face of power, success, affluence, even if they be accompanied by the development of the arts and the sciences, history has shown us that at times a strange somnolence comes over the active and aspiring mind of man and then we begin to lose ground in every way and finally our national existence, with all that it means to us and all that we have or fail to have, is blotted out.

I agree with the General in the proposition, expressed colloquially, that one of the things we have to do in the age in which we live, certainly, and probably through the many generations which will follow us, is to keep the powder dry. I have read the paper only twice, hurriedly, and that after I left the office this evening. Perhaps at first I construed the conclusions of General Chisholm in too insular a manner and internally revolted at the proposition of leaving our entire future and every segment of the mosaic in which we live to the psychiatrist—not that I undervalue them and I take no part in what I sometimes discern as very light and thoughtless poking of fun at them. Anything that is embraced by a consider-

able number of intelligent and thoughtful and earnest and honest and tenderhearted people, I don't think should rightly be susceptible to poking fun, even if it isn't very seriously meant.

I would like to think of the future combining the sort of training and the inculcation of what methods there may be of self-development and self-control with what I have written on the margin here. I have reverently but very broadly said, "The spirit of Jesus Christ." If people love each other—and many people around us do love each other for many reasons, some difficult to describe and some perfectly well understood—it seems to me if we can eliminate the prejudices and the selfishnesses and think less maybe of who has access to this or that other waterway, or this or that other political advantage; that we may at length, through the generations to come, learn to trust each other in a world-wide political sense.

The Doctor says that we can identify the reasons why we fight wars, and he lists them as being prejudice, isolationism, the ability emotionally and uncritically to believe unreasonable things, excessive desire for material power—and that is what I was trying to say, General, in a rather abstract and clumsy way, are some of the things that we have got to learn if we develop some kind of brotherhood, and those elements may be composed and not be made to predominate the whole world and all parts of it.

I have often wondered, when we are considering here what amounts to an international police force, where you would locate its persuasive elements, Mr. Secretary. It seems to me that a quick moving fire in Baltimore can't very well be quelled by the Washington Fire Department, to take a homely illustration. I don't think that is important to what the discussion is here. This paper is a remarkable thing and one to which we all ought to give much thought, and if possible add to the channels and extensions by which a formula for exploratory purposes, at any rate, should be formed.

I like the combination of these things, General Chisholm. I know of a certain religious creed in the Christian atmosphere where there is a reasonable combination of faith and good medicine, and that is what I would like to see as we address our long-range international future. A great man lived in Georgia, born in 1812 near a little town called Crawfordville. His name was Alexander Stephens, and he was not a psychiatrist. There was a great man who was born in Kentucky, I think in 1809, and his name was Abraham Lincoln. I think he was not a psychiatrist, although I am sure his internal reactions were those that psychiatrists would have. But it is perfectly safe to say, I am sure, Mr. Secretary, that no war between the states, no great fratricidal war, would have occurred if it had been left to those two men.

So, can't we cultivate some of the things they had and some of the understanding things that rise spontaneously in all of us, because truly if we don't pause sometimes in the drudgery of our daily A, B, C, D work and consult the good emotions that lie deeply in all of us, we do not truly live. What I am trying to say to myself and am forced to say aloud is that what you suggest and what I am thinking of might be a good combination in the things to which the Secretary has referred.

* * * *

[About the returned veteran and the displaced war worker] in a large sense I quite agree with General Chisholm. I have seen documents recently contrived by one or two of the best-meaning personnel officers of the Government, rather voluminous things, calculated to ease the returned veteran back into the association that he left before he put on the uniform, which amazed me, as a matter of fact. I approached the subject just 180 degrees away. They certainly don't want any patronizing and they don't want anybody to give them the notion that they have no volition, that they have been a serial number and their volition has gone since they have been under somebody else's command. It was rather laughable to me. I won't go into that, but I just wouldn't have handled it that way at all.

I wonder if maybe the General doesn't

mean by the last line of his paper that it is the responsibility, really, of the psychic; and then I wonder whether the psychiatrist is in command of the psychic and the understandings, the revulsions and attractions, that go with it. It won't do us any good if you gentlemen propose to exercise your psychotherapy by remote control.

* * * *

[A final question;] General Chisholm gave us some intimations of localities and organizations and individuals who talk about a lot of things, tending to elevate the morale and morals and to fit us better for the social and business climate in which we have to live as we grow up; but taking quite seriously the suggestion that now is the time to do something, is there a formula to be developed by you that we could use for going into meetings, or are you pleading for just a continuation and perhaps an accentuation of what millions of us are doing in this country and in your own country and in other countries so far as I know, to develop honest, God-fearing people with honest judgment and compassion and humanity and tenderness and things that go in those broad categories? You want to begin on something; have we a program to read from, a series of subjects to discuss?

Honorable Anthony Hyde

Deputy Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion

I shall confine myself to asking a couple of questions and wait respectfully for the answers in due time. First, I wonder whether it was our neurotic tendencies that got us into this war. I think we can make a pretty good case for the fact that the German nation had paranoid tendencies, feelings of inferiority, and I think that perhaps had a great deal to do with the comparative ease with which Hitler got the Germans into war. But my recollection of the facts is that we had a heck of a time getting the democracies to go to war and there was a lot of talk about appeasement, and I think that a great deal of that talk of appeasement was a basic loathness and unpreparedness from a psychological point of view of the democracies to go to war.

Second, I am delighted that the question of saving the world is now safely in the hands of the psychiatrists so that a lot of us can relax. Certainly, I think we all agree that there is a great need for a program of psychotherapy. We see that on every hand, but I am wondering whether hand in hand along with that psychological program we don't need an economic program leading to full employment. I think it is pretty difficult for an unemployed man to be a happy and well adjusted man.

The statement by Dr. Daniel Blain, Senior Surgeon (R) U. S. Public Health Service, Acting Director of the Neuropsychiatric Division, U. S. Veterans Administration, who spoke for and in the absence of Major General Paul R. Hawley, M.C., U. S. Army, Acting Surgeon General of the Medical Service of the Veterans Administration, and Dr. Chisholm's reply thereto, have been omitted from this digest, for inclusion in the report of the Round-table Conference on Technical Training of Personnel, held 27 October 1945. The Conference appointed two committees, to investigate curricula, and to consider standards, respectively, and adjourned to a later date. Publication of the Proceedings is not contemplated at this time.

G. B. Chisholm

The William Alanson White Memorial Lecturer

It is greatly essential that every once in a while—in fact, continuously—attempts should be made to reinterpret, to reunderstand the philosophy of living which fits with our current observations, to keep our thinking, our attitudes, our feelings, our beliefs, up to date. Believe me that this effort I have made is an effort in that direction, not by any means in hope of giving anybody any of the answers but only in the hope of stimulating some people to do their own thinking in an effort to see whether or not their thinking, their beliefs, their attitudes, their points of view, are actually up to date with current knowledge, knowledge which is reasonably sure.

I like the reference of the Honorable, the Secretary of Commerce to our mutual Presbyterian ancestors. I think Presbyterian ancestors are a great asset. They are something like Scotland; they are excellent places to come away from, and there is undoubtedly a great urge for people who live in places like Scotland, or the Maritime Provinces in Canada, or some of the New England States, to go elsewhere, which, I think, can be seen as a distinct advantage. But it is perhaps not sound to send our children back to Scotland and make them do it all over again, because they will only leave Scotland or the Maritimes with great searching of spirit and soul, great difficulty, great internal conflict, and commonly and usually with a great nostalgia to be back there where everything is quite certain and one doesn't have to use one's head to think with, which is often difficult.

This is only one attempt to do a little catching up. I hope it will stimulate people, everybody that it can reach, in their own attempts not to do the same thing but to do their own catching up; and most particularly I hope it may help people to avoid sending their children back to start all over again for themselves.

The Honorable Mr. Miller, I think, was more optimistic than I can be about propinquity helping people to love each other. We have so many notable examples. There are, just for example, the Mohammedans and the Hindus in India; there are the well known Irish and English who don't live very far apart. The Poles haven't got along very well with their more immediate neighbors. They get along much better with people who are much farther away from them. I doubt if propinquity is actually a reliable basis for hope.

I agree that if it could be arranged that we all love each other and trust each other, everything would be fine, but I wonder how we are to do that. One way, of course, is to eliminate those that we don't love and trust, and that has been tried repeatedly by many people, sometimes with reasonable local success for a time, but it has never been successful for very long and probably isn't a sound method for us to undertake at the moment, although it might be better than lots of other methods that we could think of.

The master race idea to which I alluded in the address last night was an attempt to move forward into a projected future the type of thing that has happened in the past. There have been master races before but they didn't have atomic bombs; they didn't have lots of the things that we have or will have available within a few years. The master races were limited in the past by their transportation, by their weapons, by the undeveloped state of their science. In the future it would seem to be probable that if a master race arises, is given a few years of freedom to develop

as it pleases and to prepare itself, that its earnest endeavor to take over and control the whole world may well succeed.

It is possible to reach every part of the world within at least a few hours from any place on the earth's surface now. Within ten years it will probably be possible to reach perhaps not personally, but with quite enough destructive material, any part of the world from any other part of the world within some minutes. That does undoubtedly tremendously increase the potential for control of any master race once it had occupied the productive capacity of the world and had it firmly in its hands.

It is quite to be supposed that after a time, three, four, ten generations, sometime or other, they might break down. They would be subject inevitably to internal stresses and strains. Their own controls would weaken and break as they have in the past whenever that has happened, even locally, but it would probably take at least a few generations. Hitler's objective was only 10 centuries of control of the whole world. Even he seemed to realize that his type of "civilization" would break down inevitably and the human race would struggle up again. It would have been a long, slow, painful and difficult process.

I am sorry that some little misunderstanding may have crept into the discussion of what psychiatrists are going to do. Please believe that I scarcely expect that psychiatrists will do much of anything themselves. I only had some hope that psychiatrists might sit back and tell other people what should be done—a much more pleasant occupation and much rather to be expected from psychiatrists.

The Honorable, the Secretary of Commerce alluded to protective coloration, and that, of course, psychiatrists have developed superbly. Their vocabulary is an excellent defense. It is gifted with all the things that obscure meanings, words now mean one thing and now something else, and in the hands of different people mean entirely different things, so that as a method of obscuring thought, of saying things without appearing to say them, or saying things which will be understood by some people and not by others, it is an excellent instrument. I believe that psychiatrists can be of no great service to the human race until they shall have given up this protective coloration.

The Honorable Mr. Hyde spoke of the neurotic tendencies which got us into war—or questioned whether our neurotic tendencies got us into war. I would like to quote a German to you, a German officer, a Prussian, a doctor, an intelligent person, well educated and keen, whom I knew quite well about 1934. At that time he told me quite clearly what the Germans were going to do, how they were going to do it, what their organization was developing towards at that time, and what it would look like when they finished. The picture, to him, was perfectly clear. There would be a Prussian governor under orders from Berlin in every city and province in the world, with absolute power of life and death over all the people. The German people, servants of the Prussians, would garrison the world.

I asked him what this meant to him personally, and he said that this was a permanent dedication of his race; if not this time or the next time, then the time after that or the time after that because it was destiny—destiny for the human race to be controlled by the superior Prussian *kultur*. I asked him if it bothered him at all that he was talking freely about this intention and he said, "Oh, no, not at all. You people don't want to believe and so you won't until it is too late."

He was dangerously nearly right. A long time ago someone said, "If a man has a garden in which there are poisonous serpents and beautiful flowers, he must first deal with the serpents before he may enjoy the flowers." The neurotic person goes about his garden admiring the flowers and pretending that there are no serpents, or if there are, they are not poisonous but pleasant little playthings. That is reminiscent to me of ourselves during the periods of 1908 to 1914 and '17, and again during the period of 1933 to 1939

and 1941. We were pretending that everything in the garden was lovely, that everyone loved everybody else, there wasn't going to be any more war, and while the dear Germans were naturally slightly misguided, as we ourselves come to be sometimes, they would recover from this and become the nice people they have always really been at heart.

I think no one but a well developed neurotic could believe anything of that kind in the face of the overt, obvious, clear-cut, advertised evidence during those years.

We are the people who allowed this World War to arise, and the one before it. We even sat back and let them take the first bite at us. We allowed them to choose the time and place because we went right on pretending to ourselves, more or less successfully, that there weren't going to be any wars.

We may call the German reaction neurotic, but certainly we are no less entitled to call our own reaction neurotic. We allowed it to happen, and in my own mind there is no doubt whatever that if the English-speaking people of the world had faced the facts as the facts were advertised during those years, they could have prevented war.

I quite agree, too, that full employment is necessary for happiness, but the variety of definitions of employment is infinite. I have seen people busily employed lying on their backs in the sunshine enjoying themselves. Sometimes I feel that I would be glad to enjoy that mode of employment for some considerable part of my future.

You know we were all brought up on one of these moralities of which I have been talking—perhaps some of you weren't, but I am sure that all good Presbyterians were: "Satan finds some evil still for idle hands to do." Of all things, hard work has become a virtue instead of the curse it was always advertised to be by our remote ancestors. Even the most authoritarian statement of the case is to the effect that Adam and Eve were condemned to work as the result of their sin. They weren't supposed to work before that.

And so I think the time is going to come, if it hasn't come already, when we shall have to redefine a little our idea of employment. It may well be that within a few years, as atomic energy is made releasable and usable in industry, there won't be enough productive employment available for anything like all the people in the world. It may well be that this time can come within twenty years. What is education doing about that? Are we preparing our children to spend large parts of their lives denied the "privilege" of working? Our children should be prepared to bring their children up so they won't have to work as a neurotic necessity. The necessity to work is a neurotic symptom. It is a crutch. It is an attempt to make oneself feel valuable even though there is no particular need for one's working. There are people who dig holes and fill them in just to "busify" themselves. I think we need to look at this whole problem of employment in relation to man's enjoyment of living, not just with regard to his "busification" which is something quite different.

* * * *

[Concerning the returning veteran;] The problem of men and women coming back from the services needing help, and how to get them to accept it and how to get it to them, is a vastly difficult problem, indeed, because many of the men who most need help cannot admit it to themselves, and insist on struggling along when they could be given effective help reasonably easily.

There are very many men and women coming out of the services who have needs that the normal civilian community will not normally supply unless it is done purposefully, intentionally, by people who know what they are doing. These people who come out of the services have specific needs. They are not the same people they were when they joined the service. They have developed and grown enormously. They are far more developed people. They are far more civilized people than they were as so-called civilians.

They have developed an ability to count on people around them. It is impossible for a fighting soldier to question the reliability of his comrades or the other arms. He must for his very security learn to accept absolutely the responsible people about him. He must know that the tanks will be in the right place at the right time; he must know certainly that the air will not let him down; he must have learned through the process of military training to count completely on the people who are about him. For soldiers it is all very simple, and I mean soldiers who have been good soldiers for a long time, and particularly those who have been a fighting kind of soldiers. All people are divided clearly into two kinds: our friends and our enemies. You kill off the enemies whenever you get a chance. You make as many of these chances as possible. You count completely and absolutely on your friends to be on your side on every occasion.

When the returned soldier comes home from overseas, he typically starts with the belief that we at home are his friends; therefore, we are all right, we are on his side, he can count on us. He knows that we won't let him down. The painful process of awakening to facts in that relationship has been the precipitating factor in the developing neurosis of many a good soldier who has given everything required of him and done all he could. It has commonly happened that the failure of the civilian to live up to his standards of civilization has been the precipitating factor in the trouble in which he finds himself.

The returned soldier may be precipitated into neurosis or he may feel an utter lack of sympathy and understanding around him from civilians and find that his only spiritual home is with other soldiers. If that happens, he tends to segregate himself from civilians, with other soldiers, and to set himself apart as a particular kind of person. I don't need to suggest to you the damage that this type of reaction can do to a community and to very large communities. It is essential to the integrity of any country that its returned service people shall stop being veterans as soon as possible and become full-out citizens and civilians and leaders in their communities.

If the soldier in this war has learned anything, he has learned to do his own thinking, to take charge of situations, to do what needs to be done. He has developed the need of a standard of service which is rarely found in civilian life. It is to be hoped that soldiers coming out of the services will recognize their own needs in this connection and invest their emotions in service to the community in order to produce some continuity of feeling of being needed and important. It is devoutly to be hoped that civilian communities will make it possible for soldiers to meet these needs, have them fulfilled. It is vastly important that there should be places—and I mean emotionally significant places, valuable places—in every community for every soldier who is coming out of service to fill.

I believe earnestly that the biggest therapeutic problem and the whole course of treatment are in the hands of the people of this and other countries, not in the hands of psychiatrists. Psychiatrists can touch only the fringes, treat only a few, and those not by any means always successfully unless the community is able to do its part—which certainly does not mean seeing the soldier as a pathological specimen or in any way peculiar or unusual, but rather as a grown-up man, not "our boys" coming home. These are not boys. They are men, if there ever were men; and they don't like being called boys. They may take it, even with a smile, but it hurts inside. It is an indication to the returned soldier of the patronizing attitude of the civilian who expects him to come back and resume his place as the little boy again and do what is expected of him.

The returning soldier from this war is not that kind of man. He is the kind of man who, if he knows what is good for his emotional health, will take charge of situations when he comes home. It will be well for him and for this and other countries if he is given the opportunity.

The question of cost in relation to treatment of the neuroses in veterans is utterly irrelevant, as I see it. There is no way of evaluating the comfort, the peace of mind, the ability to live, of a man and a family. There is no way of evaluating in monetary returns the effect on children of the peculiarities of their parents. Any amount of money that it is necessary to spend to stabilize returned veterans, to make it possible for them to live peacefully in their community, to be good citizens, to help to bring up their children to be contributing citizens of the community, can hardly be too great, and whatever requirements there are will be a good investment. It is perfectly true that adequate psychiatric care is an expensive business, but it will be much more expensive not to give that care.

* * * *

[Concerning Dr. Hamilton's comment;] I could talk about original sin for quite a long time. Of course we have original sin. It can be called human nature or anything else you like, but it is the same thing. The way people are when they are born is not civilized. Therefore, it is sinful, because that is what sin is—not conforming to what is expected of one when one is grown up—and so of course we will have sin in that sense always with us.

The thing that I object to is everybody having to feel guilty all their lives for having been born the way they were born. That is what makes trouble; it is the learning that they weren't supposed to be that way, despite the fact that everyone who has been born is that way and will probably go on being that way for quite a while yet. It is the guilt that is foisted on people, on children while they are still defenseless, for being natural products, for not having been born civilized, that makes the trouble.

I am not optimistic about our having a world full of well matured people within twenty years. It just doesn't add up to that. Arithmetic makes it impossible. But maybe we can go quite a distance. There are soft spots. There are groups of people who are earnest, intelligent, concerned people, who do not know all the answers, and who are anxious to find out what some other people do know. I think one of the hopeful spots in our kind of civilization is the parent-teacher association, where young parents meet together with teachers to discuss what is best for their children. If every psychiatrist and social psychologist and everyone else who feels himself capable—and whether he is capable or not is relatively unimportant as long as he stirs up people's thinking—will take even as little as one evening, say, every two weeks to talk about these things with groups of people, service clubs, youth groups, schools, parent-teacher associations, anyone else who will listen to him, I think a very great deal can be done in the span of twenty years.

Such a program will doubtless increase to some considerable degree the insecurity and anxiety of quite a number of people who will be jolted and made somewhat uncomfortable. But after all, this is a major illness. If a patient has an appendix ready to burst and is going to die if nothing is done about him, even if there is no anesthetic handy it is still sound humanitarian practice to cut a hole in him and take his appendix out anyway, even if it hurts. I think that this is a sound analogy for the situation in which we find ourselves. Of course it will hurt, but that does not argue against the necessity for doing something about it, and we won't get around to it any sooner than now. The longer we put it off, the longer it will take to do it and the more difficult it will be to do. I would hate to have to prove that but I think it is true.

Now is the time when people are at the stage of reëvaluating very many things. The fact is that a lot of things have come loose in the last thirty years, and now is the time, perhaps the crucial time—again a crossroads—a time for reëvaluating things with some hope of being able to see them more clearly than we or our ancestors have previously. Because of all these factors and because of these considerations, I believe that we should go to work at it now, even though there is relatively little hope, if any, of actually producing very large numbers of

mature people within twenty years. If we start now, we might do it in forty years. If we don't start it for ten years it may be several generations before another chance is found.

* * * *

[In reply to Mr. Miller's question;] I would not suggest any program. I would not dare to draw up a statement of what people should think about themselves, nor tell them where to go to hear good advice. I would suggest only, and most earnestly, that everyone should regard as suspect everything that we have believed up to now.

I am suggesting a most earnest searching for the reasons we are the way we are, with a willingness to change anything that we believe and any way that we think if we find that any of the things we believe or ways that we think are in fact liabilities rather than assets.

Ross McClure Chapman

President of the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation

You, General Chisholm, have given me much to think about, but not for a sufficient time. I have not yet been able to think through to an adequate discussion of your splendid address of last night, which I then remarked was one of the most healthily provocative presentations I had heard.

I should choose for special attention the last third of the lecture which challenges not only psychiatrists but all other individuals and groups in the community and the world who have to do with education. Particularly you referred to the teachers of children as well as psychologists, sociologists and politicians.

Because a great many people will be reading and thinking about this address I want to add to the contribution of Mr. Fortas in which he spoke of freedom from moralities. Quoting, he, as I recall, said, "Freedom from moralities means freedom to think and behave sensibly," to which should be added, "to the advantage of the person and the group." Emphasis on the group is an important thought in that connection.

General Chisholm has defined maturity to his own liking as the sizing up of difficulties and making one's own decisions, which maturity carries with it flexibility, adaptability, *tolerance.*

The essential part of his address is his courageous approach to the development of a more mature citizenry through the education of children. This deserves, and I have no doubt will receive, careful reading and much thought. I hope it leads to constructive effort.

An Appreciation and Critique

Samuel W. Hamilton

Mental Hospital Adviser to the United States Public Health Service

IN THESE ADDRESSES General Chisholm, like a prophet of old, has presented a picture of the New Jerusalem in which life will be better lived because better leadership will dominate. This leadership will be in the hands of persons who have been brought up to make their own decisions, not worry about precedents and not reproach themselves for what goes wrong. They will be clearheaded, suitably deliberate, strong in action. Perhaps this makes one think of the Swiss, or the Swedes. There will still be room in the world for people with fears and foolish ideas, but they will no longer run it. There will be fewer of them than now, because more people will be of the kind that are calm, confident, free from prejudice, and capable.

This is an inspiriting picture. But to the ordinary psychiatrist the concomitant challenge is disturbing. General Chisholm argues with close-knit reasoning that psychiatry must turn more strongly than ever to prevention; that we should not allow unhealthy attitudes to develop. This he rightly calls a challenge to psychiatry.

Of course it is also a challenge to the individual psychiatrist, who may have no children to educate, no opportunity to sit on a school board, only limited influence on the character development of the little folks of the neighborhood. He is quite busy with his adult patients, seems to be useful and enjoys his professional work. Perhaps there is need of interpretation of the thesis. The psychiatrist being a physician can seldom compel people to do as they should about rearing their children. Only at times is the physician backed up by the law so that he can call on the policeman and the judge to enforce his decisions. That is when he can make a very strong case to the effect that something that a person is doing endangers the health of his neighbors.

One may point out two matters, perhaps small, that will impede this advance:

1. Preventive medicine may not free many physicians for activities they would like to engage in, for unexpected results develop. When epidemic disease ceases to be fatal, we have more cardiacs to care for, so preventive medicine is far from abolishing therapeutic medicine. Probably many psychiatrists will be needed even when wars shall cease.

2. It takes intelligence to carry on an advanced program of training in any field. A vast number of parents over the world are of modest intelligence, or less. Children inevitably imitate their parents in many attitudes. Perhaps we cannot harness them to our better scheme within any short period.

When a man has a vision it is right for him to proclaim it, though he trouble his colleagues. If a thing needs to be done, it is the duty of every one of us to figure out his part, and do it. Whatever each of us can contribute toward control of affairs by persons of mature attitude of mind, should be willingly contributed.

The Cultural Revolution to End War

Harry Stack Sullivan

President of the Washington School of Psychiatry

IN HIS WILLIAM ALANSON WHITE Memorial Lectures, Major-General G. B. Chisholm in an argument characterized by pertinacity of consideration, lucidity of analysis, and rigor of its reasoning, has put squarely before psychiatrists a clear statement of the all but overwhelming responsibility that lies on them at the present juncture of national and international affairs.

The task which he delineates is stupendous. The personnel to whom primarily he addresses himself is numerically small and spiritually impoverished.

A call to assume significant leadership in what Albert Deutsch well designates a cultural revolution may seem to most psychiatrists too fantastic to be heard clearly; much less, to evoke responsible effort.

It would not be strange if psychiatrists, by and large, were among the last to be moved to action by Dr. Chisholm, himself a psychiatrist. It has already been said that he is crusading. One is asked why psychiatry should feel called upon to take up such a program.

It is easy to close the mind to a disturbing prospect. Compared to man, the ostrich's burying its head is uningenious.

Dr. Chisholm is anything but a visionary living out a myth tolerated by his particular culture. He is a rarely wise man, a man of great foresight. His career documents this; it is shown by his established works.

Those who close their minds to his words are chiefly of two classes: the people demoralized by the defeats of life and those whose prestige and income are imperiled by his views; these and the stupid.

The stupid and the demoralized have in common a sad necessity to protect a peace of mind which at best is the peace and quiet of fresh thistledown on a windy day.

Where they can, they seek to avoid anxiety and the feeling of helpless unworthiness by demands that 'if I am a molehill, then let there be no mountains.'

Perhaps this is by no means the prerogative solely of the demoralized and the stupid. Perhaps this protecting a dubious peace of mind by disparaging anyone and everything which is disturbing is *the* mental disorder of modern man.

Broadly speaking, we are all—and I speak not by any means for psychiatrists only—like angry children. We are like children because we have failed to develop our human potentialities. We are angry for two reasons. It is more pleasant to be angry than to feel anxious, frustrated and humiliated; and everyone at least occasionally realizes, however dimly, that the world *need* not be so hopelessly confused and demoralized.

Some psychiatrists, in fact, have been most fortunate. I think of William Alanson White, and of those who came to know him. Psychiatry itself, as it has developed in a union of Canada and the United States, owes in singularly large measure a world preeminence to the judicious and synthetic qualities of mind of Dr. White, the teacher.

It was William Alanson White who fused into a vital unity the relatively sterile nosological interest of Emil Kraepelin, the precise scientific approach of Adolf Meyer, and the vivifying dynamic conceptions of Sigmund Freud.

He was among the first to encourage rapprochement of all the sciences concerned with human life. He was immensely enthusiastic in his support of preventive psychiatry, the program of mental hygiene, and the use of psychiatric principles in humanizing the practice of medicine.

Dr. White was quick to see that psychiatry, as it grew in importance as a body of insights into living, was coming to have greater significance *outside* than inside the mental hospital; that psychiatry was becoming far too important to society at large to be restricted in use to the monastic world in which it was nurtured.

Psychiatry was forging tools indispensable to all those who strive to facilitate human living.

Dr. White labored mightily to encourage the critical utilization of psychiatric principles by those responsible people on whom always largely depends the enduring good of a democratic society.

As I understand it, the William Alanson White Memorial Lectures were instituted at a time when it seemed imperative to carry forward this one of Dr. White's great interests.

The first series of these lectures sought to outline to a diversified audience the conceptual structure and practical position that psychiatry had reached at a time when the world was almost certainly moving toward disaster. It was hoped that something useful might be given to those who would soon be husbanding human resources and social values in the pandemonium of war.

The first series of William Alanson White Memorial Lectures was not particularly distinguished from many another effort of that time. They were too little, far too late.

By wonders of wartime organization, by the miracle of solidarity and morale in a people belatedly alive to its peril, but even more by the fortune of redoubtable allies who earned us time by their sweat, blood and tears, at cost of unutterable devastation of all human values, we are still intact—even if seriously impoverished.

The second series of the Memorial Lectures comes at a time when the perils of the world are greater, more imminently dreadful, than has ever before been the case in historic time.

It is exceedingly to the credit of our Western world that at this awful juncture there is a greatly distinguished man among us who speaks unequivocally, with calm determination that at whatever cost he shall make clear what psychiatry has to offer as an at best forlorn, but also the only, hope.

What does this man, this most practical psychiatrist, say to us?

He says, as does many another, that we are choosing now, perhaps passively, but inevitably, *whether* we shall be slaves of the next "master race," *or* members of a world-unity so alert and so powerful that potential aggressors will be destroyed before they can strike the first horribly destructive blow in a future war. These are the only alternatives.

He says that the second alternative, to be chosen quickly if we would insure ourselves and our children a continued progress in civilization, is but a way to gain time in which to find and take sure steps to prevent wars of the future.

He reviews past efforts in this direction and notes their repeated and uniformly unsuccessful outcome. "Every lesson of history and of common sense would suggest the futility of these methods. It is clear that something new is needed. . . ."

He seeks to identify the human factors which have repeatedly eventuated in wars. He recognizes political factors operating in national and larger aggregations. He recognizes causative factors inhering in the no longer necessary economies of scarcity, with their exploitation of backward peoples. He observes that remedial modification of these two elements in human society would probably make wars unnecessary for *mature* people.

"So far in the history of the world there have never been enough mature people in the right places. We have never had enough people anywhere who have been able to see and accept these facts and who

are sufficiently well developed and responsible to tackle these problems."

Some influences which show consistently in every civilization of which we have knowledge must be responsible for arresting personality development in all or almost all its people, so that they failed of true maturity—could not come to perceive and utilize patent facts; could continue to believe contrary to and in spite of clear evidence; were burdened by irrational inferiority, guilt, and fear; and had urgent necessity to control others' behavior because of prejudice and an incapacity for sympathetic understanding.

Dr. Chisholm concludes that the only factor common to all civilizations which acts as a psychological force capable of producing these ubiquitous arrests and perversions of personality development is morality, the structure of man's beliefs concerned with "right and wrong," anciently warned against in the Jewish creation-myth as fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Some voices are heard denouncing this conclusion.

Among the five hundred people who heard General Chisholm's Washington lecture there were few or none of those who since then have lifted their voices in denunciation and antagonistic exhortation. "Intelligence," says the General, "ability to observe and to reason clearly and to reach and implement decisions appropriate to the real situation in which he finds himself are man's only specific methods of survival. His unique equipment is entirely in the superior lobes of his brain. His destiny must lie in the direction indicated by his equipment. . . . Man's freedom to observe and to think freely is as essential to his survival as are the specific methods of survival of the other species to them. . . . That freedom, present in all children and known as innocence, has been destroyed or crippled by local certainties, by gods of local moralities, of local loyalty, of personal salvation, of prejudice and hate and intolerance—frequently masquerading as love—gods of everything that would destroy freedom to observe and to think and would keep every generation under the control of the old people, the elders, the shamans and the priests."

What psychiatrist entitled to respect himself as a therapist would find fault in this statement?

What educator free from the domination of a group with vested interest in controlling his charges would question it?

What social scientist secure in his academic freedom and his income would change a word?

Is not this the central finding of every serious student of personality or of culture, everywhere in the world?

If humanity is to be freed from this crippling burden, "it must be psychiatrists who take the original responsibility. . . . What the world needs from psychiatry is honest, simple, and clear thinking, talking and writing. It needs the same from psychology, sociology, economics and politics. Clear and honest thinking can almost always be expressed in simple words which are understandable by the people who matter in a democracy."

In the second lecture, given in New York City, Dr. Chisholm reviews the status of psychiatric personnel and practice with regard to meeting in a somewhat practical fashion the needs which now confront psychiatrists.

"Possible objectives for psychiatry can be seen only in the light, and within the framework, of the realities of the environment. This world in which we live is not the same world we were living in a few years ago."

Commenting on those who believe that the only responsibility of the psychiatrist is custodial care and therapy, the lecturer shows that a vast increase in the number of practitioners is needed to meet the self-recognized needs of the population, in turn but a small part of manifest mental illness.

There are several ways of ameliorating this situation, including the evolution of shorter and more effective techniques of treatment and the use of less well trained workers.

If this is to continue to be the major concern of psychiatrists, and if current and prospective needs are to be met in

the reasonably near future, training facilities must be increased enormously, and those now engaged in effective therapy must be withdrawn from that field and put to teaching in training schools for psychiatric teachers.

Also, "If we believe in our wares, if more and more psychotherapy is what is needed, then surely it is legitimate and sound to do everything possible to educate the public to an appreciation of the need . . . [in which case] possible developments in psychiatry might at least go far toward solving national unemployment problems."

In seeking alternatives to this program of ever bigger and better mental hospitals and more and more extensive psychotherapy, Dr. Chisholm draws a telling parallel with the treatment of infectious and deficiency diseases as compared with prevention in these fields.

Clearly, if psychiatry hopes to make sense in the world of today, some of its practitioners must raise their eyes from a goal of passing in moderate respectability from their professional birth to the obituary notice.

The petit bourgeois ideal is all right for the psychiatrists who are correctly defined as doctors who have failed in the practice of medicine. They have found for themselves a useful function in sheltering society from those whom it has destroyed.

The upper middle class ideal is all right for the psychiatrists who are content to be variants of Wagner-Jauregg's bitter aphorism about "a way to live on one patient," or as mass-production experts in shock 'therapy,' modified decortications, or distributing drug-house detailmen's wares.

I surmise that at least the psychiatrists who, as members of the war effort, have caught a glimpse of living as collaboration will not be content to return to these modest respectabilities—even as I fear that the sequels of demobilization will discourage all too many of them.

Dr. Chisholm is calling to psychiatrists to live in reasonable conformity with the implications of their knowledge of personality and interpersonal processes.

He is calling not to a crusade, but to an honest, diligent and demanding public service the quiet nobility of which was well reflected in the profound comment of Secretary Wallace when he once remarked that all great religious leaders, the prophets, even Jesus Christ, had actually *brought religion up to date.*

As Abe Fortas says, Chisholm is a mature man who realizes that the human past is no longer suitable to the material present, that we have now reached the point where drastic readjustment of human personality and conduct appears necessary for survival, and that the rôle of the psychiatrist in the work of man's taking charge of his destiny is not merely that of a healer, but that of one who seeks the causes of fear, anxiety, prejudice, and vicious passion, and works to eradicate those causes.

Less than a thousand people heard Dr. Chisholm. By now, many thousands know that he has spoken, have some idea of what he said. I venture it will not be long before millions will have rumor of his message. The fact that he has spoken and has spoken clearly and unequivocally what he had to say is bound to affect psychiatrists everywhere. It makes it much less easy for them to go on with their little private concerns, saying, "This is someone else's responsibility."

However awkward it may be to have people expect them to make public sense instead of private marvel, however miserably some of them may fail to measure up to the unwonted task, psychiatrists will be finding that communities are awaking from the trance imposed throughout historic times by the mythmakers.

The bomb that fell on Hiroshima punctuated history. The man whose wisdom and foresight in large measure made that bomb had dealt with human destiny with fully human competence.

The gods of local certainties, of local moralities, of local loyalty, of personal salvation, of hate and prejudice and the intolerance of others passed into history.

As mundane distance shriveled into insignificance in the eddies of radioactive matter which swept space around the earth, so also did the swathings of im-

material fictions and habitual evasions with which everyone had been methodically enwrapped.

The peoples of the world, wherever language reaches, caught a glimpse of Reality, felt with whatever terror a moment of insight into alike the minuscule and the magnificent in Human Being. As their apathy and stupefaction yield to the dynamic of life within them, they will hear and understand Chisholm: if we go on as we have, there will one day be none of us left, not even any to bury the dead.

As a psychiatrist, it has been my privilege to see in the difficult treatment of persons suffering obsessional distortions convincing evidence that *people strive however blindly towards improved mental health.* No contrary hypothesis could account for the brute fact that severe obsessional conditions actually change, with appropriate help, in the direction of relatively simply gratifying and successful living.

This tells me that there is immanent in human personality a striving towards a way of life that is not destructive to others. It tells me that man *would* live at peace had he ever had a chance to be free of that "slavish acceptance of the doctrines which each generation," to quote Abe Fortas, "is supposed to accept from its predecessors like a burial urn, and to pass on untouched and unexamined to its successors."

As reactionary trends are swamping every government, as every possible cleavage in every people is being encouraged, as every issue is being confounded by irresponsible if not indeed unscrupulous expressions of prejudice, interpretation and rumor; at such a time is it not apparent to every serious student of any aspect of human living that events call upon him to manifest his particular kind of functional activity in an effort to preserve that very human society which has culminated in his peculiar privilege to pursue the truth?

Even the lowest form of caution would support this; this can scarcely be a time for just playing safe. Decision lies in indecision quite as certainly as in observation and foresight. One will be with the forces of reaction and human exploitation; or one will be *actively* against them.

A distinguished company of publicly very quiet people, the physicists, have read the omens. They have left their laboratories and classrooms. Their voices are heard. The public understands them. This is not because physics has been popularized; not because the physicists are talking down to the masses. It is because they are reporting their clear and honest thinking in simple words which are understandable by the people who matter in a democracy.

Will the physicists outdo the people in the study of personality, in the study of culture, in sociology, in economics, in the science of politics, in the vast field of pedagogy, in responsible religion, in administration, in practical politics? Shall we offer nothing from our special capabilities towards implementing that utterly indispensable and wholly inconspicuous responsible leadership which is exerted in every community by men who respect the rightness of their facts and the care and correctness of deduction reflected in their expressed opinion?

I think that the peoples of the world would be less hesitant to become subjects of a world government eternally vigilant to maintain overwhelming destructive force, ready instantly to use every sanction and to destroy any who would again provoke war, *if it were evident to the thoughtful among them* that things otherwise were not going to go on much the same way that they have gone on up to now; if, in other words, it were certain that this mighty garrison state which would exercise sovereignty over every person in the world was to be but a temporary precaution to protect the helpless while men of good will would be working out a fully civilized way of life for the peoples of the earth.

It is from the custodians of knowledge and those skilled in human techniques that the evidence of this benevolent probability must come.

This is a challenge to each of us, and a challenge which each of us must meet. A decision to do nothing about it identifies one with the destructive principle which the great mass of humanity has not yet found a way to escape: one shows by inaction that one is of those who irresponsibly exploit their less fortunate fellows. Possible for how much longer? Can one be sure?

Chisholm calls on us to proceed responsibly with a cultural revolution. The first step is to uncover the archaic control ideas that make of every extant culture anything but the ideal medium in which the human animal becomes the human being. Along with this investigation, there must go the teaching to every parent—bright or stupid, rich or poor—the fact that children do not grow like green plants on chemicals activated by solar energy, or in any other way that may be taken for granted, but rather by assimilating ideas and example given them by significant elders. Parents must be made to see that children are in no sense their chattels but instead their wards, held in trust as future members of the community.

The good of every community requires that children shall be much better prepared for social life than were their parents when they reached legal maturity. The survival of human society on anything like a civilized plane depends absolutely on this.

When these conjoint first steps are in progress, there will begin the second great step, the practical realization of dynamic, evolving, principles of living initially suited to particular culture-areas and ethnic groups but progressively uniting all the peoples of the world in a great, benevolent community singly devoted to human progress everywhere.