
PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements

1-1-1953

Socialism versus communism: An ethical and psychological contrast

George Wilfried Hartmann

Roger Payne

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Hartmann, George Wilfried and Payne, Roger, "Socialism versus communism: An ethical and psychological contrast" (1953). *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*. 257.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/257>

SOCIALISM

versus

COMMUNISM

An Ethical and Psychological Contrast

by

GEORGE W. HARTMANN, Ph.D.

Chairman, Department of Psychology, Roosevelt College, Chicago
Sometime Fellow of the Social Research Council

and

ROGER PAYNE, B.A., LL.B.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, England
Former member of the Inner Temple, London, England

Copyright 1953

Cloth Binding \$1.00

Paper Covered 50¢

Three Arrows Press
Room 516 303 Fourth Avenue
New York 10, N. Y.

SOCIALISM

versus

COMMUNISM

An Ethical and Psychological Contrast

by

GEORGE W. HARTMANN, Ph.D.

Chairman, Department of Psychology, Roosevelt College, Chicago
Sometime Fellow of the Social Research Council

and

ROGER PAYNE, B.A., LL.B.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, England
Former member of the Inner Temple, London, England

Copyright 1953

Cloth Binding \$1.00

Paper Covered 50¢

Three Arrows Press
Room 516 303 Fourth Avenue
New York 10, N. Y.



Fotoset and Litho'd by Academy Photo Offset Inc., N. Y. C.

Introductory Note

ON THE very day (March 5, 1953) that the death of Stalin was announced, the authors of this pamphlet completed the final revision of the manuscript of a 400-page book bearing the tentative title, *The Coming Downfall of Stalinism*. The chapter headings of this project appear on the following page. As a result of this not wholly unanticipated coincidence, it seemed best to delay the appearance of this book until the significance of Stalin's passing could be suitably appraised and incorporated in our text.

On account of the special interest that Part III, *An Ethical Inquiry*, had aroused among some critical and appreciative readers of the manuscript, it was deemed expedient to issue immediately the three chapters comprising it in separate pamphlet form. This will give the authors time to make appropriate changes in the remainder of the work before publishing the complete volume. Such is the origin of the present pamphlet.

THE COMING DOWNFALL OF STALINISM

by

Roger Payne, B.A., LL.B. and George W. Hartmann, Ph.D.

Introduction

PART I THE ORIGIN OF MODERN COMMUNISM

Chapter I	The Gist of the World Problem
Chapter II	Some Historical Background
Chapter III	Marxism—The First Phase
Chapter IV	Communist Pseudo-science
Chapter V	Communist Philosophy

PART II THE RISE OF STALINISM

Chapter VI	Leninism—The Second Phase
Chapter VII	The Bolshevik Revolution
Chapter VIII	Stalinism—The Third Phase
Chapter IX	Tactics of World Communism

PART III AN ETHICAL INQUIRY

Chapter X	What is an Ethical Society?
Chapter XI	Socialist Psychology
Chapter XII	Communist Psychology

PART IV DICTATORSHIPS—PAST AND PRESENT

Chapter XIII	The Story of Dictators
Chapter XIV	The Dictatorial State
Chapter XV	The Maintenance of Dictatorships

PART V STALINISM—THE CURRENT CHALLENGE

Chapter XVI	The Resources of Russia and her Satellites
Chapter XVII	The "Cold War" with Soviet Imperialism
Chapter XVIII	The Point Four Program
Chapter XIX	Will Stalin Start Another World War?
Chapter XX	Winning the "Cold War"
Chapter XXI	Can Stalinism be Ended Without War?

Conclusion

Chapter I

WHAT IS AN ETHICAL SOCIETY?

IF EVERYTHING that we did were a matter of indifference, there could not be any ethical judgments. Because we are so constituted that *preferences* for certain forms of behaviour as well as *objections* to others exist, ethics may be said to be based upon the psychological reality of discriminating between various experiences of value.

The feeling that human conduct is measurable by some scale of goodness is a primitive one. We think it worth while to be accurate rather than incorrect in adding up a column of figures, because we know or believe that *in the long run and for most people more desirable results* flow from the former than from the latter action. Presumably, this is the basis for approving one response and disapproving the other. But an error in computation may be unintentional, in which case we may consider the person incompetent but blameless. On the other hand, we recognize an unethical quality or motive in a deliberate misrepresentation designed to deceive others to their hurt for the advantage of the deceiver.

When we examine a collection of cases or incidents to which the terms "ethical" or "unethical" are applied, we usually find that it is the presence or absence of some *principle* which underlies the use of the terms. This abstract feature appears to be conveyed by such ideas as "ought", "should", or "must", and similar concepts. Conduct motivated by a *sense of oughtness* is ethical conduct, especially when awareness of, and devotion to, the larger or higher values involved in an act of choice decisively determine the outcome. Thus, a man *ought* to be honest, even if he isn't; he *should* be friendly and helpful to his neighbors, even if he lacks such a disposition; he *should* conduct his affairs without injury to others, even though he may be more interested in benefiting himself than in avoiding harm to his fellow human beings; he *ought* to sup-

port in some way all intellectual efforts to improve the quality of group living, even though he may be indifferent or opposed to such activities.

At a severely practical level, it often seems that "applied" ethics is little more than a series of do's and don't's. There is no question but that somewhat detailed specifications as to *acts to be avoided or performed* constitute the core of common, habitual, or ordinary "morality". But when one comes to the question *why* it is better to do one thing rather than another, then one finds such choices are always traceable to some over-arching *system of values*. It is better (for oneself and others) to be healthy than to be sick, *more desirable* to be alive than to be dead, pleasanter to be happy than unhappy, *more satisfying* to be intelligent than stupid, strong than weak, beautiful than ugly, kind than brutal, and so forth.

The list could be extended indefinitely to cover all conditions, characteristics, and activities found in our lives. Sometimes the ethical component is prominent—as when one sends food or clothing to a destitute foreign family—or more in the background—as when one refuses to buy a certain company's products because of dislike for its current labor policy. But it is hard to find any form of action in which the ethical element is not prominently present, since almost everything that permits options or alternatives in doing or not doing, contributes in some way either toward a better or to a worse personality or social system.

Increased sensitivity to the relationship surrounding all behaviour, and especially to its *consequences* when appraised in terms of the highest possible standards or ideals, is a necessary part of ethical development for all people. The *good man* is one who is *growing in the right direction*, not necessarily one who has arrived there, since there is no truly final end to this process of *seeking the Highest*, wherever it may be found.

The Possibility of Moral Measurement

With this preliminary discussion of the nature of the ethical society we may now move to a consideration of the reciprocal effects of certain societies on their individual members, and the influence they in turn may exert upon the groups of which they are parts. From one point of view, what we call *cultures* are merely "other peoples". Since we are always interacting with each other, the effects of such cross-stimulation and response are mutual, that is, societies change as the individuals comprising them change and *vice versa*. Thus, there is little doubt that the moral fervor of such figures as Whittier, Garrison, and other Abolitionists so altered the total mood or situation in America between 1830 and 1860

that the sheer intellectual position of defenders of chattel slavery ultimately became untenable. Conversely, the "emancipation" of India from British rule in 1947 has already released strong native forces of initiative, resourcefulness, and independence of mind in countless numbers where formerly such individual attributes were much less in evidence.

It is an hazardous undertaking to describe the Moral Man or the Moral Society, for one is in grave danger of merely offering a revealing recital of one's current prejudices. Nevertheless, some effort to outline both is unavoidable—indeed, it would probably be unethical to refrain from the attempt. Certainly the endeavor to reach progressively higher levels of society is more likely to be helped than hindered by such attempts.

On the personal level, it seems clear that an acceptance of large, long-term responsibilities to promote the welfare of all people symptomizes a higher plane of ethical obligation than one which restricts itself to furthering the advantages of one's immediate group. One may call this the criterion of *universality*. This concept is implicit in (1) the ancient injunction to do unto others as you would have them do unto you, (2) the democratic postulate that the good of all takes precedence over the good of the few, and (3) the dim awareness that in some fundamental way all men are brothers. There are other formalized ear-marks of the ethical personality such as *consistency and persistency in working toward the maximum possible combination of values for everyone*.

The completely ethical social order, then, can only be produced by fully ethical personalities. But these ethical individuals themselves originated and grew to maturity in an imperfect ethical or even definitely unethical society. Is there perhaps some inherent tendency for the worse to be supplanted by the better? To say *yes* would be a comforting optimistic belief and distinctly more encouraging than to hold that the better naturally becomes the worse.

Without attempting an answer to this difficult question, we can at least recognize that no culture is so bad that some morally superior people do not emerge from it and rise above it—or so good that some ethically inferior personalities do not appear. The former phenomenon, at least, is a constantly recurring factor of hope, and may underlie the dynamics of all progress. Moreover, at any given time any society contains several parallel traditions within itself, and these undergo relative strengthening or weakening as man's experience with them deepens.

An ethical community can be characterized as one concerned with fostering the development of ethical personalities in all its members. To do this requires avoiding many things now done; and doing much now left undone. A nation that goes to war inevitably inflicts much harm, not only upon its avowed foes, but

also upon its own citizens. A nation that fails to supply the fullest possible health services for all its inhabitants is in effect condemning them to lead less useful lives than would otherwise be possible. Very simply, an ethical social order operates to advance the well-being of all, not some of its members, and is positively concerned to pursue such policies as will further the welfare of all humanity. Even a state, whose jurisdiction is in one sense limited territorially, should so operate that people everywhere gain rather than lose by what it does.

Not many years ago Edward L. Thorndike¹ sought to compare the General Goodness of various American cities in terms of certain statistical indices by which they could be ranked for the *quality* of life they apparently make possible for their inhabitants. For example, there are masses of census data which show (1) the infant death rate per thousand births for all towns with more than 30,000 inhabitants, (2) the homicide rate, (3) the *per capita* circulation of books in public libraries, (4) the average salary paid to school teachers, and (5) the ratio between the value of all public property and the total bonded debt of the community; and similar figures.

Records of this kind can be combined into a picture of the overall merit or desirability of an actual city, just as corresponding information about a person can give us a clue as to how good (for certain purposes) a human being he is, relative to others. Thus, few of us would have any trouble in deciding that, other things being equal, we would rather live in a community where (1) the chances that a new born child will survive are high, (2) murders are few or non-existent, (3) people read many books rather than few or none, (4) school teachers were adequately paid, and (5) the city was well managed instead of being in a semi-bankrupt condition. Perhaps these items taken singly are not conspicuously inspiring, but collectively they give a pretty clear indication of what a higher rather than a lower plane of social ethics implies. Obviously, no one feature makes the crucial difference between a moral and an immoral society, but the *total pattern* nonetheless can be as readily distinguished as a square from a circle.

Moral Condemnation of the Communist State

From the preceding discussion it must be clear that we have been concerned with laying a basis for determining the relative ethical stature of great sectors of the world's economy organized according to the principles of capitalism, Communism, and Dem-

¹*Your City*, Harcourt Brace & Co., New York, 1935.

ocratic Socialism. The temptation to deal with the problem in simple "all-or-none" terms must be avoided, because all contemporary cultures are complex combinations of good and evil elements. For example, in such predominantly capitalist areas as democratic Switzerland and the bureaucratic United States, there are also tendencies and positive attainments of a scientific, technological, democratic, and liberal nature.

The respective national achievements of these countries in these and other areas of human endeavor are too great to be slighted just because one happens to be an anti-capitalist. It is likely that even the formal Christianity professed by some modern states does make a beneficial difference in the character of elementary person-to-person relations, at least by contrast with cultures lacking such an influence. To this extent the complex structures of all modern societies must possess some definite ethical value or they would be more disorganized than is actually the case.

The fact that a system "works" is no proof that it is working satisfactorily. A situation may be acceptable without being agreeable. Moreover, there is a painfully wide gap between what the propagandists *say* their systems are designed to do, and what they *actually* accomplish. At the height of the second World War, two American writers, John L. Childs and George S. Counts, made this amazing declaration:¹

The United States and the Soviet Union are alike committed to the achievement of certain great moral ends: the improvement of the lot of the ordinary men; the attainment of equality of opportunity and the elimination of exploitation of man by man; the abolition of social discrimination, and the achievement of brotherhood among all races and nationalities.

It is true that the national archives of both countries contain great state papers proclaiming lofty purposes similar to those expressed in this quotation. What is more important, however, is *the degree to which concrete steps are taken to bring people closer to these avowed goals*. If what is quoted above is considered seriously, one wonders why the two countries could have been so antagonistic as they clearly were from 1918 to 1933, and as they have been in even sharper form since 1945. With regard to the alleged "moral ends" of the Soviet Union, let us examine the following quotation from an article by James Burnham:²

What is most dreadful about Soviet Communism is not that it is plainly wrong, false, evil. If it were that then the problem—intellectual, moral, and historical, would be so much

¹Childs, John L. and Counts, George S. *America, Russia, and the Communist Party in the Postwar World*. John Day Co., 1943. p. 90.

²New Leader. January 4, 1947.

easier. The simply bad, like the simply false, is a straightforward obstacle that dissolves when confronted by the good and the true. But Satan—he could not otherwise be Satan—began as the brightest angel, and is therefore still able to deceive eternally. *Soviet Communism is a perversion of the good*, or close to the best and that is why it is more horrifying and seductive than any other social movement of our time. That is why, also, it can never be definitely unmasked, why the task of refuting, exposing and combating it must be daily renewed.

The factual supports for such a judgment are extensive and undeniable. An examination of them and their significance converges upon these points:

1. *The Soviet Union was the world's first wholly totalitarian regime of the present century.* It has become progressively more evident from its methods and operations that neither human happiness nor economic equality are its goals. Under the existing regime, the individual has no rights whatsoever. Few persons reared in a culture possessing even the faintest traditions of individual liberty would elect to live under such a government were other options available to them.

2. *Communism, unlike democracy and Socialism, does not make people better.* On the contrary, it repudiates all ethics as so much “bourgeois twaddle”, forgetting that men who are unjustly treated have a keen and intense feeling of right and wrong. Man's integrity and freedom are vital to his development, as shown by the fact that some of the finest personalities have gone to the gallows rather than surrender their attachment to these values. But *all* people (and not just the “best”) need intellectual and moral room in which to grow.

3. *Organizational ethics cannot be different from personal ethics.* Lying, torturing, and killing are morally as bad when committed by states as by individuals, a fact often ignored by ardent nationalists. The retention of ethical values is indispensable for both individual and community well-being. Man is so constituted that moral considerations of some kind are necessities, rather than superfluous luxuries. Human beings are capable of attaining anything short of Utopia. *Democratic Socialism is the only really ethical form of society.* Dictatorial Communism, on the other hand, is the most unethical form of society that we have seen in modern times. It is a new form of slavery in which the great mass of the people are slaves to the controlling dictatorship—Stalinism or its equivalent successor.

An Example of the Right Way

In the interest of social control from above, people at all times

and in all places have been fed words, rhetoric, "purple prose" if one may so call it, and then denied in varying degrees the substance that these alluring phrases presumably symbolize. While the Soviet Union is probably the outstanding example of this debased practice, other countries are not unfamiliar with it—as appears in the long-established Conspiracy to Extol the American Standard of Living as though this were of itself a *sufficient* answer to every critic of our current institutions. Even this is accomplished by resorting to comparisons with less advantaged nations than the United States, and omitting the cases where we fall behind.

Most Americans are unaware, for instance, that the people of New Zealand have an *average* standard of living about twenty-five per cent higher than the people of the United States, but *such is the fact*. Statistics show that in the 1935-1938 period, the real income *per breadwinner* in New Zealand was represented by 1612 international units as compared with 1389 units in the United States. But in real income units *per capita* the people of New Zealand had 710 units while the people of the United States had only 545 similar units. Further it may surprise most Americans to know that the average real income of the people of Great Britain in that pre-war comparison slightly exceeded that of our *own* people, being 584 units per person.¹

The superiority of the New Zealander's standard of living over that of our own people appears to arise from the fact that there are proportionally fewer paupers and millionaires in that country and a greater concentration in the middle income brackets. When one considers that this has been accomplished with a far less favorable geographical position, less natural resources, and a lower degree of mechanization of industry than America possesses, New Zealand's social achievement becomes correspondingly more admirable.

We think it is demonstrated that New Zealand, in terms of conformity to any reasonable set of requirements for an ethical social system, comes nearest to meeting them, the United States distinctly less so, and the recently expanded Soviet Union definitely least of all. It is no accident that the prevailing spirit in the social arrangements of the first is found in Democratic Socialism, of the second in a late or weakened capitalism, and of the third in a totalitarian or dictatorial Communism—Stalinism and its aftermath.

Are Ethical Gains Possible?

Occasionally one encounters the mature attitude that acknowledges the superiority of Socialism as an ethical system, but ex-

¹Clark, Colin. *Conditions of Economic Progress*. Macmillan & Co., London, 1940, p. 148.

presses grave uncertainty about the ability of most people to become as bright or as good as the Socialist society requires them to be. This viewpoint is much impressed by the apparent lack of high enough biological quality in any contemporary nation, when the population is examined from a position stressing eugenics and heredity. When grounded in solid scientific data, such a reservation—even though it is clearly pessimistic—deserves a respectful hearing. Associated with it is the neo-Malthusian view that overpopulation, and the depletion of natural resources, dooms to defeat all efforts to create a Socialist society.

This mixed sophisticated or tired attitude commonly results whenever someone's faith in the power of the human mind to solve the pressing problems of group living is weakened or shattered. It practically declares that man cannot reach a much higher ethical plane than he has, because inner and outer limitations keep him on a lower level. If most persons *permanently* lack the brain power or the motivation to operate a community on a Socialist basis; if they multiply recklessly in defiance of the currently available food supply; and if there just isn't enough to go around because one can't distribute what hasn't been produced—then a somber outlook would be justified. We would simply have to resign ourselves to the fact that the eventual solidarity of the human race is an idle dream unwarranted by all we know of our powers to hate and injure each other.

But this pessimistic orientation overlooks precisely those features which make Democratic Socialism an optimistic creed. It may well take intelligence greater than the average man now possesses to grapple with some of these acute issues. But people of less than average mentality can recognize and support generally advantageous policies framed and administered by their more competent fellows. Birth control is at least in part a by-product of better education, but it is interesting to note that "overpopulation" is usually alleged to exist among groups we don't like rather than among those we do.

Apologists for private enterprise capitalism have long urged: "Don't sell America short!" It would seem to be at least equally warranted to meet certain gloomy prophets in *the field of social reconstruction* with an even more invigorating phrase: "Don't sell mankind short!" At worst it is clearly better to try to create an Age of Plenty, which by its very presence would eliminate many of the common barriers to mature ethical behaviour, than never to make the attempt because one is foolishly convinced of defeat in advance.

Perhaps the best way to end this discussion would be to ask the reader to score himself on the following set of *general attitude statements* and see with how many he agrees or disagrees.

1. The will and the capacity to work for the good of all can be developed, just as much as any other potentiality of men.

2. Most men really wish to be of service to their fellows, even if they occasionally fall short of that standard.

3. The existence of vicious personalities should not blind one to the undeniable reality of noble personalities.

4. The fact that there is much deception in the world does not diminish the value of truthfulness in human affairs.

5. Sacrificial love and friendship are authentic aspects of the average man's life.

6. One of the most encouraging things about man is that he knows that he is not right even in his own eyes.

7. Considering the forces arrayed against this result, it is remarkable that the average man is as good as he is.

8. Man's benevolent impulses are much stronger than his urges to do evil.

No group to whom these propositions have been given has ever considered more of the above statements false than true. Indeed the degree of agreement with each of these eight attitude-statements is usually well above 70%. To be sure, this may merely indicate (1) how common self-deception is, (2) that most people are kind rather than harsh in their opinions of their fellows, and (3) that since it would be a form of self-condemnation to disagree with such content, there is a tendency instead to express agreement. But it seems more reasonable to accept the fact of overwhelming majority support for these conclusions as evidence that the average man is honestly disposed to see in himself and others far more desirable than undesirable traits; and that, since this judgment is mutual, it is a symptom of faith and trust in human possibilities.

An ethical society depends for its achievement in part upon the conviction that it can be created by ethical means. *Capitalist morality, even at its best, is far below what thoughtful men consider the highest of which they are capable.* Communist morality, if it can be dignified as such, is the authoritarian morality of slaves who let others do their thinking for them, or of masters who have stifled and repudiated all conscientious scruples. Compared to these, *Democratic Socialism represents a vastly more defensible and consistent integration of the greatest and noblest of human aims with the ultimately most satisfying, effective, and appropriate methods for their attainment.*

Chapter II

SOCIALIST PSYCHOLOGY

ON NOVEMBER 14, 1947, Robert Addy Hopkinson, an English valve manufacturer, died at the age of eighty. In his will, signed a year previously, he bequeathed his entire fortune of about one million dollars to the British Labor Party for the education of the people of his country in Socialist principles. Thirty years earlier he had been a member of the Huddersfield (Yorkshire) Fabian Society—to which branch, at that time, belonged at least one future British Cabinet member.

Shortly after Mr. Hopkinson's death, a new Labor Member of Parliament, Sir Richard Acland, one of England's oldest baronets, was elected in a crucial by-election. He had previously donated his fortune to the Socialist movement and his land to the government. He had also founded the *Commonwealth Party*, at the time of the war, which had helped much to win middle-class British support for the cause of Labor and Socialism. Similarly, Sir Stafford Cripps, an earnest and brilliant Cabinet member who was for some time the most highly-paid barrister in Great Britain, earlier illustrated this trend by giving up his practice to devote the remainder of his life to the cause of Socialism.

A number of interesting questions arise, as one seeks to absorb the full implication of these simple but dramatic events. Why should anyone become a Socialist—particularly a wealthy business man such as Robert Owen, or an inheritor of a title or any form of social power or influence? What kind of people are Socialists, and why are they Socialists instead of capitalists or Communists? Why does a Socialist wish to convert other people to Socialism? Why should education and persuasion be chosen as the preferred way of doing this?

Questions of this nature show plainly that a full understanding of Socialism requires more than a mere familiarity with certain

economic, political and social demands conveniently grouped around this title. Such an understanding requires an insight into the complexities and varieties of motives which underlie the doing of unusual things by human beings. No one can successfully understand a Socialist, and no Socialist can grasp his own inner drives or those of others who are hostile or indifferent to what he believes, without some awareness of the psychological factors typically present in such cases.

Socialism and Psychology

Historically the Socialist movement is one of the many movements that men have developed to secure better and more satisfying lives for themselves. The science of psychology alone can explain why so many people, all over the world, believe that Socialism is the best method evolved for meeting the major unfilled wants of the individuals composing the human race.

Human beings have a multitude of *unmet* needs, resulting in many *frustrations*. Any suggested change in our social system that will aid in supplying some of the unfilled wants of men, and thus reduce to a minimum the frustrations affecting them, has value to humanity. It is only because men prefer plenty to poverty, health to sickness, freedom to slavery, and many other of the good things of life that the appeal of Socialism has strength.

The attraction of human beings to certain positive "goods" and their aversion to many other things that are evil is the basis, not only of Socialist behaviour, but of *all* behaviour. What then distinguishes Socialist behaviour from other forms of behaviour? The special kind of frustration which is the basis of the Socialist movement is that which occurs when a man sees another having unsupplied needs and is unable to do anything directly to help him although desiring to do so. Such a desire, however, may not lead to Socialism but to some kind of reform. What then, is the difference between Socialism and reform—which we usually call liberalism?

Socialism is distinctive in that its psychological essence is its espousal of an all-embracing plan of organization for meeting the needs of all. Its conscious aim, in contrast with non-Socialist systems, is to inventory the major wants of mankind and then to plan the structure and functions of the whole economic and social life around them. All people require a certain amount of food, clothing, and shelter; therefore, the collectivity under Socialism whether a "demonstration colony", a city, or a whole country assumes the responsibility to supply such a quantity of goods to all its citizens.

In principle, every need (no matter how elaborate, provided it

is common to a large number of the members of society) can be met most efficiently by the advanced pattern of cooperation which Socialism advocates. Socialism thus construed differs from earlier and existing types of society mainly in its being able to *satisfy better more needs of more people*.

The Socialist movement is today a protest against the existence of poverty for the majority of mankind in the midst of potential plenty for all. With this protest is combined a definite plan to remedy this unsatisfactory condition. Both sides of this combination are well expressed in the comprehensive definition of Socialism by Oscar Jaszi in his article under that heading in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*:

1. A condemnation of the existing political and social order as unjust.
2. An advocacy of a new order consistent with moral values.
3. A belief that this ideal is realizable.
4. A conviction that the immorality of the established order is traceable, not to a fixed world order or to the unchanging nature of man, but to corrupt institutions.
5. A program of action leading to this ideal through a fundamental remolding of human nature and of institutions, or both.
6. A revolutionary will to carry out this program.

Conversion to Socialism

Persons become Socialists mostly by a process of "conversion". It is unfortunate that this term has a purely religious connotation to most people. It may, however, be used correctly to mark a radical shift from approval to disapproval of capitalism, and the acceptance of Socialism. All cases of conversion involve "insight", meaning that the subject *comprehends the necessity* of the change. Although a man can ordinarily be "converted" to Socialism only after a prolonged and varied series of antecedent experiences which produce the requisite preliminary sensitization, the shift itself, when it finally occurs, is quite rapid and complete in nature.

The intellectual and emotional reconstruction involved in Socialist conversion is often brought to a head by an impressive speech, a persuasive book, a convincing friend, or more spontaneously by inner groping for an answer to such riddles as: Why is there poverty and misery in a scientific age? In any case, the important phenomenon is that the adoption of a Socialist standpoint comes typically when Socialism in its essential totality is perceived to be required for the common good.

The fact that a high degree of certainty and conviction parallels this process frequently puzzles the observer who does not share this assurance, and skeptically suspects a pseudo-solution. Yet this

inner sense of rightness accounts, in part, for the persistence and vitality of the belief. The "rightness" is not exclusively an ethical persuasion, but is reinforced by the same sort of technical or objective confidence which an engineer has in a double-checked calculation. To a Socialist it is equally certain that the social ownership and democratic management of the steel industry will *eventually* mean more and better steel products at less cost than private ownership involves. The Socialist thus seeks to reconstruct his world because the "facts" as he interprets them leave him no option. He is in a sense "coerced" by them.

The Socialist Mind

There are *four* main factors that distinguish the Socialist mind. They are (1) a sensitivity to social evils, (2) a motivation to eliminate them, (3) a superior intelligence, and (4) an ethical approach.

1. *Sensitivity.* The basic Socialist attitude is a mature response of the human being to the presence of preventable ills in the functioning of society. People who enjoy warfare, or who are not upset by the depressing spectacle of the chronic insecurity which prevails today among the masses of the people, and particularly among workers who are raising families, do not become Socialists. Neither do folks who just don't care what happens to others or to themselves.

The people who become Socialists are those who have the necessary emotional and intellectual predisposition to be aroused by such things as (1) the persistent challenge of needless poverty and disease, (2) the continuance of gross social inequality and injustice, (3) the existence of artificial ignorance and cultivated falsehood, (4) the ugliness and pathos of crime and vice, 5) the innumerable cases of extreme mental and physical suffering caused by various forms of tyranny, and many other social evils. In other words to become a Socialist it is essential to be something of an idealist or humanitarian.

2. *Motivation.* It is not, however, enough to be sensitive to these wrongs. Many people are aware of them but do nothing about removing them; they see a problem but lack the will to find a solution. They must (like the Quakers) not only be concerned to express their "hot and cold anger" at the starvation in the midst of plenty and other forms of tragedy visible in the modern world, but they must also be moved to take the necessary action to remedy these conditions. The second requirement of the Socialist mind is therefore that the forces at work within him are strong enough to "move" him literally in the direction of voicing, endorsing, or engaging in corrective or reformist activities.

3. *Intelligence.* Many people who repudiate the exploitation and misery caused by capitalism have been victimized by such inhuman alternatives as international Communism or nationalistic Fascism or Nazism (all sisters under the skin). This is a frying-pan-into-the-fire type of solution of the great problem of social life, because the remedy is worse than the disease to be cured. There must be (1) a correct analysis of the failure of our economic and social system, and (2) the intelligent formulation of appropriate and thorough-going changes in the social organization such as will eliminate the existing evils. This does not need exceptional talent or genius, but at least an I Q somewhat above the average.

Call it what one will—sagacity, discrimination, or simply intelligence—there must be sufficient thinking ability to reject pseudo-solutions, “blind-alley” suggestions, regressive policies masquerading as “progressive”, and similar attractive errors. This third prerequisite of the Socialist mind is *sufficient critical intelligence to choose the remedy that will lead ultimately to the maximum gains to humanity.*

4. *Ethical approach.* The Socialist mind has an ethical background. The Socialist approach to social problems is that the good of all must take precedence over the good of the few. Socialists favor the free and equal distribution of the work, the leisure, and the good things of life. This includes not only the free distribution of food, clothing, and shelter, but of all kinds of services such as transportation, medical and hospital services, and education. Under Socialism these will all be just as *free to everyone* as the public schools are to our children today.

While all acknowledge the ethical superiority of Socialism, many doubt the ability of mankind to maintain such a high ethical standard. Such people are unaware that the way in which human beings act, usually called “human nature”, is not a fixed thing but largely a product of the cultural environment in which our children are born and brought up. A Socialist environment will develop human beings so superior to those of today that they will be able to maintain a far higher standard of morality than anything we have today or have had in the past. The fourth factor of the Socialist mind then is a *superior ethical motivation.*

Four elements therefore, appear to be involved in the basic composition of the Socialist mind: (1) an above-average *sensitivity* to avoidable evils traceable to faulty social organization, (2) a sufficiently strong or compelling *motivation* to eliminate these defects, (3) the possession of insight or intelligence vigorous and courageous enough to make a scientific diagnosis of our social difficulties and to formulate such a change as will eliminate the existing evils, and (4) an *ethical approach* to social problems. If this seems like a formidable array of mental factors, one can only affirm that

the coming of Democratic Socialism is dependent upon the very best of right feeling, right thinking, and right doing that mankind can achieve. Time alone will tell whether mankind is capable of functioning at the high level demanded by such a solution.

Some Socialist Ideals

Having outlined what appear to be the basic psychological components of the Socialist position, we can enrich our understanding of related aspects by indicating some additional points usually associated with it. It is obvious that all Socialists share the assertion of the Declaration of Independence that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are the *minimum* advantages that every individual should obtain from membership in *any* social order. The Founding Fathers not only claimed these blessings for themselves, but by the strongest of implications accepted the obligation to attain and maintain them for all other people as well.

Where the Socialist differs from some other interpretations of this oft-quoted sentiment is in his stress on quantitative enrichment or a "going beyond" in each of these three vital concepts: (1) not merely "life" but the "more Abundant life" of which the prophets, both ancient and modern, have spoken; (2) not simply liberation from old bonds, but *liberty to do* more and finer things; and (3) not alone the *search* for happiness, but the positive establishment of those *supporting physical conditions* and the economic, political, and social relations which scientific inquiry has demonstrated are fundamental to the well-being of humanity. More people will be outwardly and inwardly *happier* under Socialism—bold as this claim appears to be—because "pleasant" mental states can be produced by a better control of physical and other conditions of which these agreeable moods are the result.

In the deepest sense, the Socialist is an *optimist about the long term possibilities of the human race*. Despite repeated frustrations, he normally retains his Faith, his Hope, and—with all-too-human lapses—his Charity. He is aware that immense disasters *may* come, yet they are not inevitable or irreparable. He acts on the assumption that man makes his history, and that there are promising alternatives that we may bring about if only enough of us desire such alternatives with sufficient intensity to expend the necessary energy required to attain them.

While not all Socialists are equally "realistic" (or equally "idealistic", for that matter), they generally recognize that their outlook is not for those who prefer to nurse petty prejudices and find a perverse comfort in them, nor for those who cultivate conventional or private illusions and withdraw into a dream world or seek solace or serenity in isolation from the real problems of men

and women. A temporary retreat to some Ivory Tower to regain perspective or to restore our depleted psychic energies, may be useful or even imperative on occasions; but a permanent abandonment of the struggle for a better life for all is an unmanly and self-defeating answer to the great questions of the age.

Socialism and the Development of Character

Generally, the Socialist is dissatisfied with the personal character of his fellow-citizens—and with his own as well. Many, but not all, of these deficiencies he traces to our uncritical acceptance or tolerance of the “scramble” technique for distributing wealth according to each individual’s cunning, meanness, selfishness, and other undesirable traits. These qualities are at a premium in a competitive economic system, whereas admittedly finer attributes such as generosity and sympathy would lead to bankruptcy in a capitalist or commercial world. It is a reasonable hypothesis that nobler and more magnanimous lives would be commoner if this constant corruption of the ordinary man’s efforts to behave decently were removed by a form of social surgery eliminating the moral cancer at the center of our economic system—the *profit motive*.

Certainly, most of the men affected rebel against the ill-effects which many occupations have upon their natures. They resent the necessity of becoming pushing and grasping creatures as the price of survival under the existing “rules of the game”, and yearn for a state of affairs which will enable them to develop the “better side” of their personalities. This normal and healthy effort *to grow in a more valued direction is a dimly-understood motive*, but its reality is undeniable and its presence one of the hidden and reserve sources of strength in all men. It is the basis of whatever mental and moral evolution the human race has so far achieved and of such incipient advances in behaviour (like mature Socialist conduct itself) which remain to be accomplished in the future.

Everyone knows the ways in which current industrial relations operate to lower the ethical behaviour of people caught in their grip. It is hard for an employee, especially one with family responsibilities, to stand up against an arbitrary employer who has his future entirely in his hands and can ruin him by an irresponsible act of will. In the presence of such an ever-present danger, the bravest may well be fearful. Small wonder that trickery, the natural defense of the fearful, is so widespread!

Further, who can measure the grave harm that is daily done to our young people as they assume their respective roles in a pecuniary culture, by their repeated observation that most people are

respected, not so much for what they actually are, but by what they own or by the scope of hiring and firing authority vested in them. The most severe damage is done to our sense of values when we see men receiving exaggerated deference from their fellows because they have property, wealth, or influence. Such a relation is neither beneficial to the one who plays the local "boss" nor to those who serve as courtiers, vassals, or retainers of such a Kinglet. What is needed is a penetrating—and inevitably embarrassing—inquiry addressed to those in authority as to the ultimate source and justification for such possessions and influence.

Socialist Personalities

It is a shallow opinion which holds that a Socialist is merely an inferior person who is jealous and envious of his betters. Such figures as are available indicate that the average income and education of Socialist workmen and teachers is somewhat *greater* than those of non-Socialists. There is also some evidence that among college students the Socialists tend to score a little higher than other political groups in intelligence tests and academic achievement.

Paradoxical as it may seem, a certain level of physical and mental well-being is a prerequisite to Socialist receptivity. Men who have lived long upon a low standard of living usually lack the vitality and power to engage in the kind of activity needed for the spread of Socialism. An increase in Socialist activity is therefore a sign of vigor among both the individuals and the community, instead of a mark of decay as some cultural reactionaries erroneously maintain.

Observation of the behaviour of many Socialists reveals them to share the familiar shortcomings of their non-Socialist opponents. In contemporary Socialist groups we find quarrelsomeness; a hypercritical approach; an obstinate and doctrinaire attachment to explanations rendered untenable by new evidence of altered conditions (a curious "conservative" defect in a "radical" movement); a disposition to mock either rational thinkers or honest and sincere blunderers; the exploitation of another's good will in the name of a hypocritical "comradeship"; and many other evidences of human imperfections.

The psychological warrant for the Socialist effort to abolish the private ownership of natural resources and productive equipment lies in the fact that this type of private "property"—as distinct from the harmless or beneficial private ownership of consumption goods—*creates undesirable patterns of personal interaction between the few who own and the many who do not.* In the case of land it produces

the one-sided disparity of influence in the typical landlord-tenant relation, where historically the State has often been forced to intervene in order to minimize the hardship of its landless inhabitants. In the case of the traditional relationships of master-servant and employer-employee, there exists an analogous discrepancy in effective political and economic power, which has similarly often required community "interference" to redress the balance in the interests of the workers.

It is a disconcerting experience for a youth about to earn his way in our society to discover that he can secure an income only if he has something of value to offer *those who can pay* for it, and that the first requirement of a livelihood for a so-called "free" man is to find a "boss"! Under such circumstances, it is a wonder that servility, slavishness, timidity, submissiveness, and general "inferiority feelings" are not more widespread than they are. It is remarkable that any person actually achieves individual moral responsibility where a system of this kind prevails.

Unfavorable Conditions to Personality Growth

The strongest argument in favor of a Socialist organization of life would-collapse unless all individuals would be aided by it to achieve higher levels of human excellence. Most people are weaker characters than they might be because various repressive or inhibiting forces have literally kept them "down" and prevented them from attaining excellence. Just as a good diet demonstrably increases the growth of children, so a good economic, political, and social system will inevitably evoke better personalities than does our present inadequate society.

For example, it is easier to be honest (even in the narrow sense of not stealing) when most of one's material wants are supplied with little personal effort than when chronic deprivation "softens" one up so that succumbing to temptation is easy. It is likewise easier to be kind and helpful to others when there is a dependable surplus to share. Finally, it is easier to be cheerful, pleasant, and agreeable if one's environment is free from subtle threats to one's welfare.

It is because Socialists discern and resent what both capitalism and Communism have done to the personalities of both the advocates and victims of these *character-injuring systems* that they repudiate them equally. Thus Dr. Kurt Schumacher, the late post-war head of the West German Social Democratic Party declared that he and his followers would not permit the brutal totalitarian lords of the Soviet or Eastern Zone of Occupation to forget that Social Democrats are fighting for *complete* democracy, nor allow some

obtuse representative of so-called "free enterprise" in the American or Western Zone to forget that Social Democrats are firm adherents of *true* democracy—economic and social as well as political.

Participation in the Socialist movement implies that one has enlisted in a fellowship to promote the knowledge, the love, and the practice of Right Living. This is why it is all the more disconcerting when Socialists occasionally fall from grace in these respects. There are, however, real psychological hazards to which every Socialist in a non-Socialist country is exposed. By virtue of his adoption of a temporary "minority" position, he may be more self-conscious about his attitudes, more under a strain to defend them under pressure, more intolerant of the "dumb oxen" who miss the point of his criticism, less sensitive to the specific values of opposing groups than absolute fairness requires, and oppressed to the point of despair by the magnitude of the changes which Socialism demands and the evident difficulty of effectuating them. Annoyed by the apparent inertia of the Conservative Mind, he may be deficient in veneration and respect for the wisdom of the Past, a little incautious in attempting to make over the present, and perhaps not as humble as he might be before the great institutions that have grown up through a long history of human achievement.

There are certain subtle and unique frustrations which arise whenever objectively-grounded convictions fail to win acceptance because the "audience" to which they are communicated is emotionally and conceptually unready to make them its own. In this regard the Socialist is like a teacher who "knows his stuff" but "cannot put it across" either because of his own deficient pedagogical powers, lack of classroom resources or "aids", or because of some deep or uncorrected limitations of the learners.

However, none of these difficulties are insurmountable. They are truly "challenging" problems; but *every one among them is eventually solvable*. Whatever the human mind—and this is equally applicable to the Socialist mind—can identify as a problem or question, it can likewise ultimately "answer", if not fully and correctly, at least partially and approximately.

Chapter III

COMMUNIST PSYCHOLOGY

WE ARE living in the declining period of capitalism. It is being supplanted in different parts of the world by two new but sharply contrasting social systems: (a) Socialism and (b) Communism. In the preceding chapter on *Socialist Psychology* we pointed out that to be a Socialist an individual must possess sufficient critical intelligence to choose a system to replace capitalism that *will lead ultimately to the maximum gains for humanity*. This means, among other things, the avoidance of any new system resembling capitalism in giving to the masses of the people little more than lives of meaningless work and misery and to the owners and rulers control of fabulous wealth and power.

Three such new social systems were developed in Europe during the first half of this century: Communism, Fascism, and Nazism. The latter two of these came to power in Italy and Germany respectively and were destroyed, mainly as a result of their leaders' misguided attempts to gain control over Europe and other parts of the world by warfare. Communism which came to power in Russia in 1917, and has been forcibly extending itself over Eastern Europe and Northern Asia, still survives and is obviously seeking eventual world domination.

Communism or state capitalism continues in the Soviet Union the familiar pattern of under-compensated work and poverty for the masses which exists under capitalism while replacing the capitalist owners by another set of owners—the Communist Dictators. The new ruling classes, having combined the ownership and control of *both* the economic and political systems, are *much more tyrannical than their predecessors under capitalism*. They have put to death millions of people who opposed their rule and have converted other millions into a new kind of slaves in forced labor

camps or into *compulsory* workers in factories or on collective farms. In the Soviet Union an individual must be tacitly at least a supporter of Communism if he wants to survive outside a forced labor camp. Knowing these stern background conditions, what motivates anyone outside the Soviet Union to become a Communist? To answer this often puzzling question we must have some understanding of what may be called the psychology of Communism, the way in which the minds of Communists work.

The intelligibility and persuasiveness of this volume would be markedly reduced if we failed to consider, even in a highly exploratory and preliminary way, what may be termed the "human" side of the Communist movement. Representative of the questions frequently raised by experienced observers of Communist behaviour, both within and outside the territorial confines of the Soviet Union, are such items as these:

1. What motivates individuals to become and remain Communists?

2. What learning—or unlearning—goes on as a Communist develops his faith?

3. How does the Communist typically view the course of human affairs; or, in more technical language, how does he "structure" or perceive the social world of the present generation?

4. What specific satisfactions flow from accepting the Communist Party position and discipline?

5. Why are certain character and personality consequences of engaging in or supporting Communist activities acceptable to the human beings in whom they occur?

6. How shall one account for the intensity of the conspicuous "power-violence-deception" features of standard Communist group conduct?

The answers we propose to sketch in this chapter are admittedly subject to revision as clinical insight into behaviour disorders and social pathology progressively deepens. Despite the acknowledged tentative and conceivably somewhat "unfair" character of judgments founded on imperfect or incomplete understanding of others, the widespread and persistent view that Communism is an inscrutable enigma should be reduced by this brief analysis. As part of our prefatory remarks on this subject, it may be well to introduce a few propositions to serve as correctives of certain misconceptions entertained by those who irritatedly and over-simplly dismiss Communism as a merely bizarre and repugnant form of life.

What Sort of People Are Communists?

Communists are human beings. This elementary statement may

seem unnecessary, but some non- or anti-Communists occasionally respond as though their adversaries were monstrous fiends from another planet rather than flesh-and-blood creatures with the same general assets and liabilities as the rest of mankind. Communists become hungry, thirsty, frightened, and angry under approximately the same inner and outer conditions that produce these states in everyone. Their sense organs, glands, and muscles operate just like those of other people. As a group they would constitute what statisticians term a rough random sample of humanity so far as the basic "common denominators" of conduct are concerned. In an era of acute antagonism, when *a sense of the biological kindship of the entire race is easily submerged by bitter feelings of mutual hostility*, there is some potential healing merit in reaffirming this plain concept, if world peace is to be preserved.

Even in a Communist society, where uniformity of opinion is at the highest possible premium, *individual differences continue to exist*. Stalinists vary over almost the whole range of human structural possibilities. Some are tall, others short; some blonde, some brunette; some bright, others dull; and so on for almost every recognizable attribute of form or function. One consequence of this phenomenon of variability is that for many significant purposes, such as re-education, it is erroneous to consider every Communist as identical with others or to deal with them on such an assumption.

A Communist military officer ordinarily has a different personality pattern from that of a Communist peasant, not only because everyone is unique, but also because the distinct occupational demands of different jobs attract persons of varying equipment and in time build altered response-habits in them. A Soviet locomotive engineer on the Leningrad-Moscow run *may* thus be more like a mid-Western American railway engineer than like a nearby Stalinist lawyer or office manager. While recognizing this possibility, it is equally true that a Communist school teacher may be more like a Communist textile worker in many respects than he is like foreign teachers. This "overlapping" among the many partial aspects of complicated organisms makes it inaccurate to lump all Communists together as a common tendency predisposes us to do.

Communism is a world-wide movement. Communists are not identical with Slavs or Russians. There is a real danger that nationalistic, economic, linguistic, or cultural differences may confuse and weaken the far more defensible objections to Communism. Intellectual laziness or downright ignorance may lead some to mix up Communism with the Greek orthodox church ritual, or with certain unfamiliar non-Latinized types of script or printing, or with "odd" folk customs in dress, diet, gesture, and speech, all of much older origin than the Bolshevik regime. Further, the terri-

torial concentration of Communist power in Eastern Europe and Northern Asia does not mean that all the population of these regions adhere to Stalinist doctrines.

Types of Communists

In the Soviet Union the Communist Party numbers only a few million out of a population of nearly two hundred million. Its members are the *main* support of the regime and receive in return a large share of the consumable wealth and complete control over the country. The Communists may be divided into three readily recognized groups according to their activity or position in the movement and their motive for joining it. These divisions are: (1) the *hard core of believers* or fanatics, (2) the *careerists*, and (3) the *enforced Communists*. The participation of a member in the activities of the movement is a matter of degree, depending largely upon his reasons for joining it.

Outside of the U.S.S.R., there exists another group known in the United States as "fellow travelers". No such group exists in the Soviet Union because the nature of the dictatorship either prevents or renders superfluous such a category of supporters. On account of this and other factors it is necessary to distinguish Communist behaviour *within* the "home" empire from that manifested outside.

It might be mentioned here that this "field" factor may be decisive for many individuals. Thus, Fred Beal, once an American Communist of the rank-and-file variety, became definitely an ex- or anti-Communist following his distressing Moscow experience. Similarly, Freda Utley, the well-known British writer, was one of the many to undergo the painful disillusionment poignantly described as "the dream we lost". The converse also occurs; Kravchenko is representative of those numerous Soviet citizens of higher or lower status who found it preferable to abandon the prospect of a comfortable future (or a liquidation) under Stalinism after a non-Soviet pattern of sharply contrasting experiences had been undergone "abroad".

The Hard Core of Believers

This highest group constitute an élite or key body of men and women who literally give "the whole of their lives" (to use the apt title of Benjamin Gitlow's work) to the cause in which they are engaged. Perhaps some social law of the division of labor brings them into existence. Most people who have political views to ad-

vance do not devote all of their time to such activity. The hard-core Communists, on the other hand, devote their *whole* lives to the movement.

These "true" Communists, as we may designate them outside the Soviet Union, often have substantial financial or other resources available to them and are experts at agitation, propaganda, planning, and carrying on campaigns for gaining control of the community. They are specialists who sacrifice almost everything the ordinary human being cherishes to advance the interests of the party. In return they acquire a prominent status within the world-wide Communist movement, and *the self-esteem that comes from wielding power over others*. They have a sense of success in achieving difficult manoeuvring tasks such as capturing a union or swinging a profitable ballot-box deal by arrangement with "rival" political leaders.

In the Soviet Union these hard-core believers are hated intensely by the masses of the people. Only very occasionally does any Russian show any sympathy toward their special form of activity. Although *some* of them might be active in a revolution to overthrow Communism, the general feeling among Soviet *émigrés* is that they will all have to be "dealt with drastically" in the event of the overthrow of the present regime. They are all linked together in the popular mind with the hated secret police, the M.V.D., the members of which most of the people believe will be literally torn to pieces by the enraged populace when Communism is overthrown.

The Careerists

The "careerists" mostly join the Communist Party within the U.S.S.R. and its satellites in order to get ahead faster than they could on their strict merits in their trade or profession. They have more personal ambition and fewer scruples than other people. They join the party often because they have reached some important administrative post or because they are promising workers in their speciality. It has been suggested that they reach the height of their career over the bodies of their comrades. Obviously, there is a wide gap between the group of trained, carefully selected "professional revolutionists" or party bureaucrats, the real hard-core Communists, and these careerists.

Among these latter are the large group of party workers who do the leg work and miscellaneous chores of endless party activity. *Outside* of the Soviet Union they often contribute largely of their money as well as their time to the movement, and get in return an exhilarating sense of being a part of the "wave of the future" or of being on the prospective winning side when the Old Order goes under.

The Enforced Communists

The greater part of the membership of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union is in this group. They are the men and women who were forced to join the party for various reasons. Some to hold their jobs or get better ones, others to protect their families or to keep out of trouble with the police. Many attractive jobs, particularly the highly paid ones, are open only to party members. All members of the armed forces above the lowest grades must be party members. The same thing applies, of course, to all members of the M.V.D., and all those in governmental positions of any kind.

None of the persons so motivated are active in teaching Communism sincerely or in perpetuating the regime. The result of this is that the Communist Party is becoming more and more a convenient channel for obtaining jobs instead of being a select body of militant revolutionaries. An occupational motive is a very poor drive upon which to build a political party. The young people join the *Komsomols* for somewhat similar "vocational" reasons. The majority join because it is a necessary step for any boy or girl who wants to get any kind of higher education and obtain a responsible job. They accept a mild form of careerism as an unavoidable necessity. Later they will join the Communist Party for similar reasons, although that step is a much more serious matter.

The Masses Under a Dictatorship

To a reasonably literate person in a community that generally respects the civil rights of the individual, the fate of the *average man* under a dictatorial regime is somewhat of a puzzle. From one standpoint, he seems to have been reduced to the status of a serf, becoming almost literally a pawn in the hands of those who have the power to push him around. To be controlled in all essential activities by others in authority can be galling to one accustomed to a large measure of self-direction. It is normally more satisfying to the ordinary adult to be treated as a person who is more mature than he actually is rather than to be treated as though he were a child.

Under a democracy the average man feels rightly that in some areas of his activities he is master of his destiny. Under a dictatorship these areas are eliminated or much reduced and give rise in the ordinary man to a sense of being confined or even choked in many of his activities. The superior or more gifted person, however, reacts to these deprivations much more strongly than his less endowed fellows. As a result of this reaction he may be led to take steps in opposition to the government which has deprived him of appropriate outlets for his activities. The tendency of such a per-

son is to become a *rebel* against the dictatorial government.

A cursory inspection of the history of recent centuries reveals repeated instances of the rule that high-grade rebels tend to appear under authoritarian governments. Revolt against oppressors, far from being a mark of bellicose incompetents is more often a sign of normal or superior intelligence. Because tyrannical institutions prevent the free expression of many legitimate personality needs, people thus thwarted find ways ultimately of attacking and removing the sources of their frustration. Group meetings and conferences for the exchange of common grievances help the participants to explore each others' position and to see how far they are ready to go in attacking the regime. Minor acts of defiance or insubordination may be initiated as a means of testing the limits within which they can operate with relative safety.

A conspiracy of rebellious personalities, especially under conditions of secrecy, is hardly the most favorable foundation for a healthy democratic movement inside a despotic state. Yet personalities like Luther, Hampden, Jefferson, Tom Paine, and many others found it possible to work constructively to undermine the established order of things, where that "order" was sick. The repeated imprisonment of Gandhi and Nehru weakened British rule in India rather than strengthening it. Similarly the jailing of several thousand conscientious objectors in the United States diminished rather than heightened the status and prestige of the military viewpoint. Admittedly, the thorough-going police supervision and repression identified with such societies as the late Nazi and current Soviet systems seem to leave the natives of such countries with no resource but an appeal to violence directed against hateful masters. Yet a non-violent disintegration of tyrannical controls should be possible if intellect and imagination as well as sheer determination were concentrated on the problem.

On the other hand, the average man caught in such a situation tends to adjust himself by adopting the attitude that one can get along if moderately careful. "Sure, things are bad; but they could be worse. After all, what does the average man get out of life? Yes, we have selfish tyrants, but they exist elsewhere also, and we'd rather take our chances with the familiar home-grown variety who speak our own language and know our ways than be subject to the only alternative, a similar despotism, but foreign in origin—a military occupation."

Pushed further, such an hypothetical person might add that he had a lot to lose and little to gain by resisting the authorities. After all, the daily routine, if not altogether comfortable, is at least bearable. Man is an amazingly plastic creature. If a small gang wants to run the whole show—well, let them. We'll wait and see what happens. The world is very old and this is just a tiny span of

history. The good in the system will last; what is wrong will eventually disappear, or if it doesn't, a certain amount of evil is the price one must pay for having any good. Who am I anyhow to think of going against the might of the State? David at least had a sling-shot and a pebble to hurl at Goliath, but I don't even command a grain of sand, my aim is poor, and a million Goliaths are arrayed against me.

I like my work and if I keep my mouth shut and don't become too conspicuous, I can have the satisfaction of doing the best I can under the circumstances. Conditions are what they are; I didn't make them; they are just here. This is my home neighborhood and I've grown used to a lot of things that others find strange. Much of it I dislike, but I swallow that in order not to lose the few values I really cherish and which are still available to me.

Reflections of this kind consoled the "little man" who accommodated himself to the Nazis, the skeptical peasant under Fascism, the housewife under military or clerical domination, and innumerable able learned men in Oriental autocracies of the past. The human race has had plenty of experience in adjusting itself to such difficulties as those presented by an all-encompassing regime of the Stalinist kind. The average individual, like the reluctant private in a conscript army, discovers compensations in an otherwise uninviting situation. Others are in the same predicament so one takes what pleasures remain since the closest supervision falls short of one hundred per cent regulation. Perhaps it is best to be non-political—politics is just a source of misery to anyone active in it as even the most fortunate in that game can testify. The sun still shines somewhere even if my vote is meaningless. I cannot talk freely on dangerous topics but I can still sing old songs lustily.

From the preceding illustrations of a variety of attitudes, it is clear that the effect of authoritarianism upon the "masses" is largely to turn their attention toward safe and allowed areas of action. Innocent recreations of the circus, carnival, or county fair type tend to develop. Mass parades, impressive dramatic spectacles, and similar demonstrations which one can either behold or participate in produce a sense of excitement and relief from drab daily living. Music, films, and books supply aesthetic and intellectual stimulation even though a sense of sameness limits one's explorations in this field.

Hannah Arendt argues that a prolonged dictatorship reduces most people to the level of unthinking beings—in extreme cases to something like inanimate "things." That a noticeable loss in individuality occurs is undeniable. Originality and independence of thought are penalized in most cultures; dictatorships are merely more severe in demanding and rewarding blind conformity in behavior. But we believe it is a mistake to assume that the average

man's critical capacity evaporates altogether in such an uncongenial atmosphere.

The drive toward autonomy is repressed rather than extinguished under a dictatorship. Prudence dictates that one keep in the background rather than the foreground, and if necessary seem to be duller than one really is. When one is expected to obey orders rather than to "co-determine" policies, a certain loss in initiative is bound to occur. As in an army, "do what you are told and keep your mouth shut" becomes a tacit motto. Even the heavy fog of propaganda paradoxically may keep the ordinary mind alert by suggesting: "What is really behind all this?" Under a despotism, the *majority* of the population manifests much of the insecurity and confusion which an unpopular *minority* exhibits in a freer culture. Such a majority will continue to betray by many little signs its repugnance to a dictatorship as opposed to a willing acceptance.

Perhaps the really damaging consequences of exposure or submission to rigorous authoritarianism is not so much a deterioration in the quality of mass thinking (since that has never been on any very high level) as the sharp drop in warm fellow feeling that ensues. Too many people become indifferent to the fate of their friends or associates who run afoul of the "apparatus." Kindly and benevolent acts to people in distress are sternly tabooed if these folks bear a political stigma. In this respect a despotism maintains throughout its life the *mentality of a nation at war*. A repression of ordinary social sympathies occurs. Instead of pity for the victims of a dictator, the common reaction is either "they got what they deserved" or bland unconcern as expressed by "this has happened many times before."

Human impulses of a helpful nature fortunately do not disappear altogether. Countless individual acts of decency and generosity mitigate the horrors occasioned by ruthless legislative, judicial, or executive measures. The disturbing feature is that such kindly gestures must be "bootlegged." A merciless administration, by punishing harshly simple acts of friendship, makes it impossible to behave like friendly human beings. *Life under a dictatorship approximates that under harsh and prolonged war conditions.* The moral objections to the one are almost indistinguishable from those made against the other.

The Communist Urge for Power

The basic drive among Communists is an urge to acquire and increase their dominion over other groups. There can be little doubt that the main aim of the world Communist movement today is the conquest and maintenance of power over people. To be sure, the possession of such control over the political system is

held to be a necessary preliminary to making such changes in the life of the nations as will result in concrete advantages for "the masses" in whose name the Communists profess to speak. In practice, however, Communism as a political process leads to an inclusive substitution of an interest among its adherents in *gratifying the power urge as such without intellectual or emotional regard for other values* or benefits presumed to flow from the purposeful exercise of public authority.

In this respect, Communist behaviour is rooted in the same crass disregard for personal freedom frequently displayed in earlier historical periods and still seen in various forms in non- and anti-Communist areas. Apparently, as a result of distorted growth, there are some energetic folks who are neither artists, scientists, nor creative workers in any field who concentrate on the art of "bossing" and obtaining obedience to orders as though this were the chief good in all human experience regardless of the consequences of such exercise of power.

The tyrant or despot, whether an imperial dictator or a petty functionary, is primarily concerned to force others to do his will as a means of securing ego-gratification regardless of the comparative worth of what is incidentally produced by such coercion. Some constructive things have been and can be done by this crude method, but they are bought at a needlessly terrific cost in human welfare.

Normally, the main result of sheer coercion is to enlarge the number of "slaves" compelled to submit to brute power and the development of such fierce resentment as can only set the stage for later more violent outbreaks wherever favorable opportunities arise. Internally, the Communist hierarchy is self-defeating, as far as real personal security is concerned, since the sole way for a *minor* Communist to cling to his authority is to remain in the good graces of a *major* Communist, and so on up the line. Boot-licking is bad enough in any culture as a condition of preferment, but when skill in this contemptible art and *suppression of all manly dissent is a prerequisite even to survival*, then human relations have fallen to a painfully low and sickly level. *

The Abuse of Power

Communism thus ends in a barren, impotent, and irrational monomania where the sole goal of the power-holder is to keep or enlarge his power. Its method of political organization is marvelously efficient save for one fatal flaw; by the time that social power has been achieved, the destructive methods used and the severe mental price paid usually mean that the capacity for real-

izing better objectives has disappeared. In this respect, the Communist is like the ambitious rich man who, subordinating every generous impulse to the accumulation of wealth, eventually finds himself in the empty state of being *able to hire* almost any kind of skill without being able to do anything distinctive himself except to add to his already adequate fortune.

As an inevitable outcome of making power their highest good, Communists become predisposed to an unusual degree of violence, deceptiveness, cruelty, and associated vices in their personal and collective behaviour. Human experience points clearly to the danger of placing power in the hands of those who are abnormally eager to exercise it. The right use of group power remains one of the great problems in all forms of social organization. There is a dawning recognition that such control is most safely entrusted to those who prefer to *subordinate* it to other far greater values such as truth or justice. Official Communist willingness to sacrifice everything precious in their own lives and to destroy all the hard-won democratic gains of recent centuries for the sake of gaining and holding the instruments of compulsion or "force" available to modern states is the most serious indictment that can be brought against that movement.

This blind and distorted over-estimate of the worth of power as such is primarily responsible for all the repulsive actions that follow from the acceptance of the view that in a relentless war "anything goes" against one's enemies. *When all one's psychic energies are centered in the will to domineer, ruthlessness naturally follows.* Stalinists are not the only folks victimized by this hideous illusion. The persistence during warfare of large-scale systematic lying, cheating, brutality, mechanized forms of torture, stupid retaliation, and countless harmful or wasteful deeds by all participants amply proves this.

What is deeply significant is Communism's unblushingly incessant and wholesale recourse to its use of power as distinct from its normally sporadic employment in most other political systems. All armies have been guilty of horrible rapine, pillage, and murder—but for sheer terrorism Communist behavior outdoes all competitors because of its comprehensive, intensive, and sustained nature even when civil authorities are supposed to rule. This behavior is seen in (1) the sudden arrests in the middle of the night; (2) the familiar dictatorial pattern of unexplained disappearance of potential critics; (3) the intentional spreading of distrust and suspicion; and (4) the existence of such deep-seated fear that people refrain from expressing even verbal or gestural dissent in the privacy of their own families.

Inevitably, this sullen popular mood of accepting and enduring what seemingly cannot be changed makes worse the position of the Communist rulers. As the fear they have aroused in their vic-

tims deepens it gives rise to a reciprocal fear even among the rulers themselves. A vicious emotional cycle is thus established which can be broken only by the slow restorative action of mutually helpful acts among all the members of the community involved. That *such constructive possibilities exist* among responsible (really, irresponsible) Communists themselves appears in the numerous instances of guards who look the other way while hapless prisoners flee. They are also shown in the warnings or hints given by officials to each other when they see advance signs that some person or group is about to be "liquidated." They also appear in the escape abroad of those relatively fortunate bureaucrats in the administrative machinery whose feelings could no longer stand the harshness of the system of which they were a part.

Are Communists Mentally Normal?

So far we have been making an elementary psychological examination of Communists. It is necessary now to extend this examination to include features normally emphasized by professional case studies of severely maladjusted personalities. It was one thing to have greeted, with varying degrees of benevolence and enthusiasm, the Bolshevik regime from 1917 to 1921 as an opportunity to see what a "worker-dominated" culture might become. It is quite another thing to cling to that gross illusion after the exiling (and eventual murder) of Trotsky and the earlier removal of Lovestone as head of the Communist Party in the United States on direct orders from the Kremlin in the Twenties.

This changed point of view was objectively required and emphasized by (1) the centrally-directed mass starvation of millions of families during the much publicized First Five-Year Plan, (2) the revolting "purges" and scientifically-extracted false confessions connected with the fantastic exhibition trials of the middle Thirties, and (3) the Hitler-Stalin Pact, an unprincipled attempt by the Soviet dictator to extend his dominion regardless of the cost in human welfare. The complete militarization of the Soviet Union during the last war and the locust-like savagery of Red Army occupational policies, together with the more recent relentless suppression of every vestige of critical and independent performance in art, science, and letters strengthened this changed point of view. A normal or even superior person could understandably have been sympathetic to the movement at its start; none but an obviously neurotic individual could remain "loyal" after the corrupt nature of the system has been repeatedly demonstrated.

Symptoms of Abnormality

Our thesis, therefore, is that *Communist conduct now* (whatever may have been the case decades ago) *is properly a part of abnormal psychology*. By affirming that it is basically a special kind of behavior disorder, often affecting otherwise high-quality human beings, we do not intend to stigmatize it with the convenient language of the psychiatrists. Mentally unhygienic phenomena occur with tragic frequency among non-Communists. Regardless of ideology, it is fortunate that most emotionally-disturbed individuals, whether severely psychotic or mildly neurotic, recover either partially or completely. The remarkably high turnover in Communist Party membership, all over the world where relatively free entrance and exit is possible, testifies to some extent to its incompatibility with the ordinary man's sense of what is healthy.

A therapist recognizes delusional symptoms in the chronic suspiciousness and feelings of hostility displayed by Communists in their speeches and writings. He senses too, the abnormal tendency in the *activist exaggeration* of party work done often for the sheer delight of being kept busy making trouble for others. And clearest of all, he discerns the rigid divergence between intellect and feeling by which an end is made holy if blessed by the party hierarchy no matter how vicious the means employed may be. This classic trinity of formal insanity: (1) delusional symptoms; (2) manic or hyperkinetic temperament; and (3) divergence between intellect and feeling, is so invariably present in orthodox Stalinist functioning that this close association of abnormal signs cannot be considered a pure accident.

The modern psychiatrist, just like the ordinary layman, has considerable difficulty in distinguishing the wide range of degrees of sanity from the almost equally broad spread of degrees of abnormality. Obviously, few Communists become institutional cases, since their responses in other areas than the political are pretty much like those of the rest of us. All persons, if pressed hard and long enough by severe mental strains, can succumb to some form of psychic illness. In our opinion, the available evidence strongly indicates that the ordinary Communist has started on that road. We might give a multitude of examples of Communists and the abnormal ways in which they act. Limitations of space prevent us citing more than one, a very remarkable example, however, of the way in which Communism prevents even a highly trained mind from thinking logically, that is, the atomic scientist and "super-spy"—

Dr. Klaus Fuchs—the Physicist

Here is a man gifted far beyond ordinary mortals, with the best cultural background a superior German family and education could provide combined with the most advanced technical training opportunities of the kind reserved for Nobel prize-winners in the laboratories of England and America. As a university student in depression-cursed Germany, he was drawn toward the Communist Party organization for much the same reasons that influenced thousands of other able intellectuals everywhere at that time. Loyalty to its all-compelling demands made him successively disloyal to the land of his birth, disloyal to the country that adopted him as a citizen, disloyal to the group of scientists with whom he worked and ironically, in the end, disloyal even to the ideals of Communism itself!

The moral question involved is not simple. It would be easy for others than Fuchs to get confused about their *ultimate* allegiance. Pure science normally has no secrets—its procedures and results have always been shared with any interested and competent scientist. Trade secrets of a scientific or technological nature have always been construed under capitalism as property rights protectable by patents or other temporary legalized monopolies. In the scientific and technological development of weapons, rival governments behave like jealous corporations because their very existence depends upon military advantages. Great precautions are taken to see that such new developments are kept secret. To preserve an advantage over a real or potential foe for even a few years is deemed to be a vital and decisive consideration.

Whether the British or American government should have had any secrets to withhold from Russia as a "wartime partner" is a nice point. Again one might challenge the right of *any* government to imprison a faithless public employee on the ground that nationalism is the supreme test of a person's merit. But these are not the real issues for our purpose in judging Dr. Fuchs' motivation. What is important is that he did not have to *deceive* others about his ulterior intentions in engaging in nuclear research. He was under no compulsion to do *that* kind of work. He could have carried on scholarly investigations in "neutral" scientific theory or in the application of his special science in some other area. He chose, however, to work on the development of the atom bomb possibly because an active scientific mind like his enjoyed exercising itself upon such a difficult enterprise. Further, he may have had a certain playful satisfaction in eluding the watchfulness of those entrusted to guard the secrecy of these colossal operations.

The real tragedy lies in Fuchs' initial assumption, apparently unshaken until his arrest and imprisonment, that he was doing

mankind a service by enabling the Stalinist regime to keep abreast of the armaments race with possible opponents! As though placing in the hands of a confirmed despot the most murderous device on record were a gesture of good-will to all men! Only a warped and twisted interpretation, as bad as anything ever attempted by a shyster lawyer, could make this seem plausible to a scientific brain. How could any man, particularly one with the cerebral equipment of a Fuchs, believe that social good would follow from such an action? The answer to this might be that Fuchs (as well as some other atomic spies) passed on secret information because they genuinely believed that with Russia as strongly equipped with such weapons as the Western Powers, the West would never dare use "the bomb". We do know that the use of poison gas did not occur in World War II because both sides felt that common possession meant that it had *cancelled* itself out as a weapon. In this sense, the British and American governments both evidently believe or think in Fuchs' terms—but in reverse!

The fact that such a betrayal took place shows something of the strength of the *delusion* or fixation from which Fuchs suffered. He had never been to Russia, yet he served the Politburo better than most of its highest functionaries. He was well treated by both Britain and America, yet he impaired their security as much as any hostile army. What strange resentment led a man who knew physical realities so well to distort *social* realities so fundamentally that he could cooperate with Kremlin agents as though they were emissaries of some benign deity? Is making retaliation possible, the way to insure peace? Much of the riddle still remains even after this analysis, but this much is clear—*none but an unhealthy personality deeply disorganized could have acted in this manner*. Not just Fuchs, but every Communist starts on the road back to mental health the moment he makes a clear break with the Communist myth which has disordered the minds of millions of otherwise sound individuals!

The Appeal of Communist Authoritarianism

That most Communists are comparatively sick persons in clear need of mental treatment of some sort is an important part of the behavioural picture, but not all of it. Another feature is that Communism, as a totalitarian belief which presumably supplies *all the answers* required by tormented minds in the twentieth century, satisfies a longing to submit to *infallible authority*. A number of observers have commented on the interesting affinities of Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic populations to Communist teachings, despite the strong official and personal opposition of many priests, particularly Catholic, to Communism. It may be significant that Italy and France in free post-war elections found almost a third

of the voters supporting Communist candidates. Undoubtedly other determining forces were at work in these countries, but the possibility that a patriarchal church pattern has predisposed many persons reared under such a system to the uncritical acceptance of *any* authoritarian position that gives an opportunity for the expression of strong dominance or submission urges (technically termed sadomasochism) cannot be denied.

A sample quotation from a French writer, Roger Garaudy, reveals the direction this can take when the party functions as father, mother, church, and state to the individual who allows it to structure all his activities and close all his perceptions.¹

I am a Communist without anxiety. . . . Since the days in which the analysis in Marx's *Kapital* taught me the dialectics of history, I have found myself facing a compelling truth. . . . When once I had understood what the world some day can become as a result of our efforts, I go toward that goal with all my strength and all my joy, with passionate attachment. . . . If my joining the Communist Party has been the beginning of my freedom, my betrayal would be the beginning of my agony, that agony which is always the price paid for a bad choice.

The pathetic sincerity of the admission that one finds relief in leaning on a stronger personality cannot be questioned any more than the rationalizations of some pious Protestants who profess to see the following "Christian" ideas in Communism:

1. The *equal* value of all individuals (save that some, like Stalin and his favorite Commissars, are far "more equal" than the rest!);
2. A *mystic* conception of human society (the Nazis had one just as mystic and conceivably more romantic);
3. The postulate of the *transformation* of the human soul (into something better or into something worse?); and
4. The *hope* in the coming of the Millennium (erected on a mountain of human skulls?).

If the fundamental motive force of contemporary Stalinism were really "fraternal love", the writers of this volume would gladly join hands with such a meritorious undertaking. Actually, it has degenerated into an incredibly mammoth manifestation of fear and hate and must receive treatment in accordance with the diseased entity it has become.

Communist Deceptiveness

Among the more articulate apologists for Communism, one

¹ Garaudy, Roger, *Literature of the Graveyard*, International Publishers, New York, 1948, p. 56.

encounters repeatedly the paradoxical phenomenon of the *intellectual who is free from the basic necessity of thinking* because all truth has been automatically bestowed upon him by his acceptance of the Communist faith! His membership in the party keeps him in touch with whatever ideas circulate within its limited framework, but like a hack lawyer, partisan journalist, or a narrow-minded sectarian missionary, he enjoys repeating or embellishing the stereotyped arguments handed down to him from on high. Throughout the world these crusading or hired retailers of Communistic opportunism usually offer *just one aspect* of the Kremlin "line" to whatever group or individual is being wooed. Semantic blackmail and all the tricks of the linguistic black market are exploited to the very hilt!

They emphasize, like any unscrupulous salesman or dogmatic pedagogue, that *single* feature of Communism which appeals to the interests or the temperament of the recipient while deceptively failing to tell the *whole* story. Thus, to the underprivileged laboring masses, "security" and "economic justice" are peddled (as *words* only!); to colonial peoples, emancipation from foreign imperialism is stressed; to peace groups, attacks on real or imaginary war-mongers and mass petitions with a grim joker in the text; to the victim of prejudice and discrimination, the natural lure of race equality; and so on with whatever seems significant for every "audience". Because *errors in part-whole response* are so widespread, many are led to believe that these *fragments* of propaganda constitute the *essence* of Communism.

David and Elizabeth Rodnick spent 1948 in Czechoslovakia analyzing five interesting types of Communists among the roughly ten per cent of the adult population then included in that group. They were:²

1. "Fanatics" or the ultra-loyal core;
2. "Idealists" who remained loyal despite any qualms;
3. "Pan-Slavs" who considered party policy subordinate to an inclusive solidarity of the Slavic peoples;
4. "Economists" or individuals who endorsed the apparently strictly economic consequences of the party program; and
5. "Intellectuals" or trained professionals ready to serve as propagandists for the importance they thus achieved.

The Rodnicks reached the conclusion that among all of the five groups listed, four common psychological factors dominated:

1. A demand for adulation exceeding ordinary social approval, that is, the need to stand above their fellow-men.
2. A feeling of belonging to something "big" such as World Communism.

²Notes on Communist Personality Types in Czechoslovakia. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1950, 14, 1.

3. A conviction of power in having a body of answers as to what is wrong with the world today.

4. A fatalistic sense of "riding the wave of human destiny."

Any one of these is a powerful force in human affairs. In combination and joined with ordinary physical courage, they make a formidable driving engine to which much of the impressive energy released by the Communist movement can be attributed. Much of this robust vigor certainly arises from a *repression or distortion* of a number of important urges operative in the lives of men today. It is one thing, however, to work off old grudges and belligerent resentments in a desperate effort to regain one's self-respect, but it is quite another thing to accept without compunction the artificially-created *misery of innumerable new victims* of the program to which one is committed.

The basic contradiction of the attempted new integration appears whenever in the name of expediency, ignoble practices are employed or sanctioned that inevitably obscure whatever decent impulses may have originally been present. This tragic mechanism is not by any means peculiar to Communists, but it appears in a severely exaggerated form in their characteristic behaviour.

In a recent volume, Charlotte Haldane, a former prominent figure in the British Communist Party and divorced wife of the well-known biochemist, J. B. S. Haldane, adds her personal testimony to the essential correctness of the interpretation presented in this chapter.³ The breaking point for her was reached during her tour of Russia when she came across an evacuated baby, dead of starvation. With that sight there perished the already waning belief that the Soviet Union was the hope of the world. Repeating the odyssey of many earlier sensitive observers, she finally left that unhappy country "with pity for the pinched, pale faces, the rags of the workers, with contempt for the sleek, cynical faces of the political bosses, and with hatred of the flourishing powerful, insolent faces of the real rulers of the country, the uniformed or plain clothes officers and men of the MKVD." The rejection of a former mirage could not be more complete. Reason has once more been restored!

A brief concluding word should be added about the place of psychology as a scientific discipline in the U.S.S.R. today. Psychology as a *weapon* is cherished and fostered by the regime, especially as an aid to industrial exploitation and in facilitating orthodox indoctrination in the educational system. But like workers in all the other sciences, with the possible doubtful exceptions of medicine, mathematics, and physics, Soviet psychologists are slavish tools of the state. To label an hypothesis "heretical" is

³Haldane, Charlotte, *Truth Will Out*, Vanguard Press, New York, 1951. p. 233

more damaging than to disprove it experimentally. The basic concepts and research context of the subject are decided, not by empirical data and rigorous analysis, but by the arbitrary decision of a government bureau without technical or scholarly qualifications for such judgments. Current Soviet psychiatry similarly reflects the official ban on the idea that there are internal creative possibilities developed by the growth and experience of the individual, or that there can be private causes for sorrow regardless of social setting, or even that there may be an "unconscious" affecting our actions. What is appallingly significant is not the truth or falsity of these views, but the colossal impertinence of a dictatorship's administrative agencies determining for better-informed specialists and experts what shall be offered as the correct version of reality in the complex world of the mind! Pretensions to omnipotence are here revealed in their most insolent form!

Other publications of the THREE ARROWS PRESS

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

by

ROGER PAYNE, B.A., LL.B. and GEORGE W. HARTMANN, Ph.D.

"It is, in my opinion, the best short treatment of democratic Socialism that has appeared in any language to date".

DAVID SHUB, Author of "LENIN: A BIOGRAPHY"

Cloth bound \$1.50

Paper covered \$1.00

A STUDY OUTLINE of over 200 questions to accompany this volume, prepared by the authors. Price 20 cents.

THE CASE FOR SOCIALISM

by

FRED HENDERSON

The book that converted Great Britain to Socialism.

Cloth bound 75¢

Paper covered 35¢

SOCIALIST PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM, a study course of 60 questions to accompany this book, prepared by **ROGER PAYNE, B.A., LL.B. and GEORGE W. HARTMANN, Ph.D.** Price 10 cents.

WHY WORK? OR THE COMING AGE OF "LEISURE AND PLENTY"

by

ROGER PAYNE, B.A., LL.B.

Answers the challenging question:

Why work six days a week, when you can get your living by working one?

400 pages.

Cloth bound \$1.75

Paper covered \$1.00

THE HOBO PHILOSOPHER OR THE MODERN DIOGENES, a 20 page pamphlet containing an outline of the above book by the same author. Price 10 cents.

Order Direct from the

THREE ARROWS PRESS

Room 516

•

303 Fourth Avenue

New York 10, N. Y.

WHY WORK?

OR

THE COMING "AGE OF LEISURE AND PLENTY"

BY

ROGER PAYNE, B.A., LL.B.

WHY WORK SIX DAYS A WEEK, WHEN YOU CAN MAKE YOUR LIVING BY WORKING ONE?

"WHY WORK?" was written by a man who has spent the last twenty years walking away from work. Roger Payne raises enough questions to keep an ordinary reader occupied for many evenings: Is work the solution of man's problems, or is it largely a waste of time? Do most people merely mark time hoping that some day they will get to do what they want to do? Why do men work six days a week to make a bare existence, when, as Payne says, they can get an abundant living in one day a week? The book is disturbing. It asks, and answers, the questions of unemployment, the use of leisure, and the way to a happier world.

Dr. G. Paul Butler.

New York Sunday Mirror.

400 pages. Cloth binding \$1.75. Paper binding \$1.00

—o—

"THE HOBO PHILOSOPHER," a twenty page pamphlet containing an outline of the above book. Ten cents.

THREE ARROWS PRESS

Room 516 303 Fourth Avenue

New York 10, N. Y.

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

BY

ROGER PAYNE, B.A., LL.B.

AND

GEORGE W. HARTMANN, Ph.D.

Why is there poverty in America, the richest country in the world?

Why are two-thirds of our families ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed?

Why do the capitalists take one-half of the wealth that the workers produce?

Why do the masses of the people toil hard and long for a bare existence?

Why do we have wars, depressions, and unemployment?

Here are the facts, the reasons, and the remedy:

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

Cloth Binding—\$1.50

Paper Binding—\$1.00

THREE ARROWS PRESS

Room 516 303 Fourth Avenue

New York 10, N. Y.