ABSTRACT

GOVERNMENT ON THE COUCH:

HAROLD LASSWELL AND ERICH FROMM

AS POLITICAL THEORISTS

by Franklyn Wedgwood York

This paper presents summaries of the psychological and political theories of Erich Fromm and Harold Lasswell. An attempt is then made to evaluate their contributions to political theory.

Fromm and Lasswell were selected because they are concerned with all of politics, they are perhaps the best known exponents of a psychological approach to politics, and they represent two ways of viewing the problem. Fromm is a psychologist writing about politics and Lasswell is a political scientist using psychology.

Lasswell's psychology is found to contain a psychoanalytic component, a perceptual psychology relating to the use of symbols and a statement of the values men pursue. His political science introduces the concept of world revolutions and offers the hope that a new science, policy science, may be created.

Franklyn Wedgwood York

A brief description is given of the community Lasswell envisions through the use of policy science.

Fromm's psychology is seen to be based on the human situation -- man's fundamental aloneness and relatedness and his self awareness. The human situation creates an existential dichotomy; the way man reacts to his existential dichotomy determines the kind of man he is. If man exercises his reasoning, working and loving capacities, he is good. If not, his personality becomes crippled. Fromm's political science is concerned with the effect society has on man's development. Fromm finds modern society wanting in many respects and outlines a community where man may develop his potentialities to the fullest.

Fromm's political theory is evaluated. His insight into many of the human effects of politics is seen as his strength. His vagueness and failure to acknowledge societal problems as something which requires serious study are seen as his major weaknesses.

Lasswell's political theory is seen as a revolt against the formalism of many earlier political scientists. Lasswell is praised for cutting through the rituals of politics to political reality. He is questioned for cherishing premature hopes for his policy science.

Franklyn Wedgwood York

Finally, Lasswell and Fromm are compared; it seemed that Lasswell placed far more importance on the means of attaining the good society than did Fromm. The importance of a political theorist's view of man in determining his political theory is mentioned. Lasswell and Fromm are distinguished from their less psychologically oriented colleagues by the breadth of their theories, by their concern for all of politics' effects on the individual and by their desire to prescribe as well as describe.

Approved Donald W. Olmsted

GOVERNMENT ON THE COUCH:

HAROLD LASSWELL AND ERICH FROMM AS POLITICAL THEORISTS

By

Franklyn Wedgwood York

A Thesis

Submitted to the College of Social Science

Michigan State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Social Science

1963

To my Father

To my Father

To my Father

Acknowledgements

I should like to thank Drs. Donald M. Johnson, Joseph A. Schlesinger, Bruce L. Smith, and Charles Wrigley for their counsel and assistance. Special thanks go to Dr. Donald Olmsted, the chairman of my committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The history of science offers several examples of the progress of one science stimulating another.

Progress in the study of geology and genetics has aided the theory of evolution.

In more modern times both chemistry and physics have contributed to the study of life in the new discipline biophysics.

The amazing deductions of Newtonian physics made many men try to construct similar systems to explain all phenomena. Laplace made such an attempt.

In the social sciences, one field has frequently come to the aid of another and often the field aided is political science.

There seems to be a special fascination in writing about politics. Perhaps it is because the grand theorists of the past like Spencer, Bentham and Marx were interested in reconstructing society and politics is the study of those who hold final power in society.

In any case, our own age has not been bereft of one social science coming to the aid of another. And perhaps our age is peculiarly suited to political explanations contributed by psychology.

To repeat a truism, it seems that never has an age both promised and threatened so much. We are faced with the contrasting visions of a disease and poverty free millennium and a thermonuclear hell! Political knowledge has lagged so far behind the physical sciences that their discoveries may destroy us instead of aiding us.

This paradox cries for explanation, and among the explanations which have been offered are those of the clinical and social psychologists. There is a supreme irrationality in progress for one's own annihilation, and psychology which since Freud has been concerned with the irrational in man may have much to offer in the study of politics.

I have chosen to examine the theories of Lasswell and Fromm because:

1. They are perhaps the most famous exponents of a psychological approach to politics.
2. One is a psychologist writing about politics, the other a political scientist using psychology to help explain politics.
3. Both Lasswell and Fromm take a broad view of politics and are concerned with explaining all of politics rather than some one part.

This thesis is not a very systematic appraisal of the political theories of Fromm and Lasswell. Also, I fear that the presentation of the views of Fromm and Lasswell is too long and my evaluation of them too short. I can only answer

that social science theories of the breadth of Lasswell's and Fromm's are not yet themselves very systematic and that it seemed advisable to present Fromm's and Lasswell's views as I saw them so that the reader would have a better idea what I was trying to evaluate.

LASSWELL'S PSYCHOLOGY

An award to Lasswell from the American Council of Learned Societies speaks of him as the "selective transmitter of the Freudian vision;" this seems a succinct description of Lasswell's psychoanalytic accomplishments. As might be expected of a political scientist, it is in the application of psychoanalysis to politics rather than in the creation of new psychoanalysis that Lasswell shines.

But there is more to Lasswell's psychology than just psychoanalysis. My reading of Lasswell has suggested the following three part division of his psychology.

1. A psychoanalysis based largely on Freud, with an admixture of Sullivan in his later writings.
2. A sort of perceptual psychology to explain the importance of political symbolism or propaganda.
3. An enumeration of the goals or values men pursue.

I. Psychoanalysis

Let us examine each of these psychologies beginning with psychoanalysis. Freud invented psychoanalysis, and Lasswell is quite ready to acknowledge his importance.

> Modern psychopathology is itself a recent development, and undoubtedly the most revolutionary figure is Sigmund Freud.[1]

Lasswell is a rather orthodox Freudian, especially in his earlier writings. These examples taken from Psychopathology and Politics may prove illustrative and interesting in comparing Lasswell with Fromm.

1. Lasswell is often concerned with a single traumatic event.

> A salesman's solicitude for the blind is traced to his sister's pulling out the eye of his favorite cat.[2]

> A judge's aversion to an attorney is traced to the cigar the attorney is smoking which reminds the judge of an unpleasant school incident.[3]

2. Lasswell is often concerned with a specifically sexual etiology.

> Mr. A, an agitator Lasswell discusses, is motivated by his struggle to keep his sexuality in check.[4]

> Miss G, another agitator, is motivated by penis envy to have a male child.[5]

3. Lasswell conceives of libido, in relation to a limited number or amount of affective relations.

---

[1]Harold D. Lasswell, Psychopathology and Politics, (Copyright 1930, University of Chicago; New York: Viking Press, 1960, Compass books edition), p. 17.

[2]Ibid., p. 70.

[3]Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[4]Ibid., pp. 94-95.

[5]Ibid.,, pp. 122-123.

> Narcissism is encouraged by obstacles in the early love relationships or by overindulgence and admiration in the family circle. Libido which is blocked in moving toward objects settles back upon the self.[6]

4. Importance of early childhood experiences. Lasswell discusses the childhood of almost everyone in his biographies.

5. Perhaps most important for his political theory, a somewhat dubious outlook on unfettered human nature.

> A journalist B is motivated to crusade by his latent homosexuality.
>
> A driving administrator J, is motivated by castration anxiety.
>
> I believes in the League of Nations and world peace to atone for the guilt he feels in harboring murderous and incestuous impulses toward his parents.

In "The Triple Appeal Principle," Lasswell explains retention of three employees by an executive on the basis of their appeal to the id, ego, and superego. A colorless but skillful controller appeals to the ego principle of "expediency." A compulsive irritating martinet of a secretary appeals to the executive's superego which he assuages by putting up with her. A field worker who is unduly friendly with his co-workers' wives appeals to the executive's somewhat inhibited id.[7]

Lasswell's later writings (Power and Personality and Democratic Character) are less unabashedly Freudian and show

---

[6]Ibid., p.125.

[7]"The Triple Appeal Principle: A Dynamic Key," American Journal of Sociology, January 1932; Reprinted in The Analysis of Political Behavior (Oxford University Press, New York, 1948).

a Neo Freudian tinge.

1. Lasswell is more concerned with the effects of status differences on personality.

> Dr. B pushed by his mother, who felt she had married beneath herself, into medicine acquires an anti-democratic attitude.[8]

2. Lasswell praises Sullivan's conception of infancy.

> Unless there is some early basis for trust in the benenvolence of the surrounding world, we can hardly expect that the individual will develop predispositions capable of carrying him through adverse experiences. This is the deep significence of the "good mother" image in contributing to the formation of a perspective that fosters inclusive identifications with other people.[9]

3. The most important change in Lasswell's psychoanalysis, however, is his greater confidence in the benevolent potentialities of man.

> Let us take as the outstanding characteristic of democratic character, in reference to identifications the maintenance of an open as against a closed ego...The democratic attitude toward other human beings is warm rather than frigid and expanding rather than exclusive and constrictive.[10]
>
> Let us speak of the democratic character as multi-valued, rather than single valued, and as disposed to share rather than to hoard or monopolize.

In Psychopathology and Politics, Lasswell suggested the following formula to indicate the relation between private motives and public consequences.

---

[8]Harold D. Lasswell, Power and Personality, (Copyright 1948, W. W. Norton & Company; New York: The Viking Press, 1962, Compass books edition), pp. 152-154.

[9]Harold D. Lasswell, Democratic Character printed in The Political Writings of Harold D. Lasswell, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1951, p. 502.

[10]Ibid., p. 495.

$p \} d \} r = P$

Where p = private motives
d = displacement onto a public object
r = rationalization in terms of public interest
P = the political man
} = transformed into[11]

The task of psychoanalysis is to penetrate the rationalizations of political man to find his real motivation. This is a task for which ordinary logical thought is poorly fitted. Logical thought considers only conscious motives which are often but rationalizations for the real unconscious motives, as the several cases I have quoted and the many more Lasswell discusses show. Were all the things that Mr. A agitated for come to pass, Mr. A would find something new to agitate for. His agitation is not an end in itself but serves his craving for deference. The judge would not come to like the attorney by being told what a nice fellow the attorney was; the judge had to understand the source of his dislike, the cigar, which to ordinary logical thought would seem completely unrelated.

II. Perceptual Psychology

The second part of Lasswell's Psychology is the psychological underpinning for his stress on the importance of symbols in politics. Lasswell is not so explicit about this part of his psychology as the other parts. Nonetheless I think we can discern certain psychological premises running

---

[11]Lasswell, Psychopathology and Politics, pp. 75-76.

through his discussions of symbols.

1. The relation between a symbol and its referents is not always perfectly clear. The same symbol can mean different things to different people. This is especially true of abstract and value ladden symbols (e.g. political symbols).

   In "Psychology of Hitlerism," Lasswell says that the Jew served for the lower middle class as the symbol of the plutocracy and also of the radical agitator. He served as the symbol of the nouveau riche for the aristocracy, the symbol of Germany's defeat in World War I for the soldier, and the symbol of urban immorality for the strait-laced peasant.

2. Inadequate information allows a symbol to become increasingly unrelated to its referent.

   It was easier to idealize the Belgians in World War I than it would have been to idealize the French and the British, since there was less known about the Belgians.

   In a California attitude study, it was found that the Turks were a more hated group than the Chinese or Japanese although almost nothing was known about the Turks.[12]

3. Symbolic indoctrination is most effective when it is unconscious.

   In Politics: Who Gets What, When, How, Lasswell says:

   A well established ideology perpetuates itself with little planned propaganda by those whom it benefits most. When thought is taken about ways and means of sowing conviction, conviction has already languished.[13]

4. Symbolic indoctrination is often exceedingly pervasive.

   In Politics, Lasswell says:

---

[12]Harold D. Lasswell, Politics: Who Gets What, When, How, (Copyright 1958, Meridian Books, Inc., New York; Copyright 1936, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York).

[13]Ibid., p. 31.

The individualism of bourgeois society like the communism of a socialized state must be inculcated from the nursery to the grave...Penny banks instill the habit of thrift; trading in the schoolyard propagates the bourgeois scale of values...money is scarce and it is not wise to buy the bicycle now.

Gossip, fiction, motion pictures sustain the thesis of personal responsibility for failure or success.

Social and industrial difficulties are automatically traced to personal equations. If conditions are wretched at the X coal mine, it is because the owners back in New York didn't know about it.

Not desperation through unemployment, not insecurity through crop failure, not diminished administrative efficacy because of greater burdens of prohibitory regulation, but personal motives and struggles are the subject matter of the secondary means of communication in the bourgeois world.

When such an ideology impregnates life from start to finish, the thesis of collective responsibility runs against a wall of noncomprehension.[14]

5. Symbols can be manipulated in ways in which the objects they refer to cannot. It is much easier to add 1000 and 3000 pounds on paper than to lug that much lead to a scale.

   Again in Politics, Lasswell says:

   An established elite is usually so well situated in control of the goods, violence, and practices of a community that a challenging elite is constrained to rely chiefly upon symbols. After all symbols are cheap and elusive; they can be spread by word of mouth beyond the eye of vigilant authority; they can organize concerted action among the disaffected and promote the crisis in which other methods are serviceable.[15]

6. Manipulators of symbols receive higher deference than manipulators of things. The writer rates above the skilled worker.

7. A symbol is often confused with its referent, thus a

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 31-33.

[15] Ibid., pp. 168-169.

> change in symbols is mistaken for a change in things. The garbageman feels better now that he is known as a sanitary engineer.

III. Enumeration of Values

In Politics and World Politics and Personal Insecurity, Lasswell lists safety, deference, and income as three general, representative values. In Power and Personality and Democratic Character, Lasswell expanded this list to include power, respect, affection, rectitude, well-being, wealth, enlightenment, and skill.

This enumeration of the values men pursue serves two purposes. (1) It is a means of finding who the elite are, i.e. the elite is that part of society which gets the most safety, deference, income, etc. (2) In Power and Personality and Democratic Character, it is a means of determining an ideal political order, a Free Man's Commonwealth.

In Politics, Lasswell discusses the distribution of safety, deference, and income. He concludes that the safety peak is not so steep as that of income and deference.

In Power and Personality, Lasswell goes much further in his discussion. He considers the interactions among values and the ways in which one value may be used to pursue another. Thus Paderewski's musical skill was a springboard to power in liberated Poland and Cleopatra's (or Liz Taylor's) use of affection is well known. As the title of the book indicates, Lasswell is most concerned with those who seek power as a value. Lasswell sees the seeking for power as means to overcome low estimates of the self. He sees this seeking for

power as most likely to develop when there are extremes of indulgences and deprivations.

FROMM'S PSYCHOLOGY

I. The Human Situation

The basis of Fromm's psychology is the human situation, as he calls it. The human situation arises when animal life which had previously lived according to instinct evolves to the point that it becomes aware of itself.

> At a certain point of evolution, there occurred a unique break, comparable to the first emergence of matter, to the first emergence of life, and to the first emergence of animal existence...When the animal transcends nature, when it transcends the purely passive role of the creature...man is born...This birth of man may have lasted for hundreds of thousands of years, but what matters is that a new species arose, transcending nature, that life became aware of itself.[16]

This self awareness is not without its problems. The animal had lived in harmony with nature in the sense that it was instinctually equipped for the conditions it had to meet. Man, equipped with self awareness realizes he must die and is forced to try and solve an insoluable dichotomy on his own.

> Self-awareness, reason, and imagination have disrupted the "harmony" which characterizes animal existence. Their emergence has made man into an anomaly, into the freak of the universe. He is part of nature, subject to her physical laws and unable to change them, yet he transcends the

---

[16] Erich Fromm, The Sane Society (New York: Rinehart & Company, 1955), p. 23.

> rest of nature. He is set apart while being a part; he is homeless, yet chained to the home he shares with all creatures. Cast into this world at an accidental time and place, he is forced out of it again accidentally. Being aware of himself, he realizes his own powerlessness and the limitations of his existence. He visualizes his own end: death. Never is he free from the dichotomy of his existence: he cannot rid himself of his mind, even if he should want to; he cannot rid himself of his body as long as he is alive -- and his body makes him want to be alive.[17]

Fromm feels that in man's existential dichotomy is to be found the source of all human progress. Man, unlike the animal, cannot simply repeat the pattern of the species, he must live. Man's birth is essentially a negative event. He is the most helpless of all animals at birth and must develop as he lives - indeed man's entire life can be looked on as his further birth and it is the essence of his tragic dichotomy that he must die before his is fully born.

Learning to live with the human situation is hard.

> The fact that man's birth is primarily a negative act, that of being thrown out of the original oneness with nature, that he cannot return to where he came from, implies that the process of birth is by no means an easy one. Each step into his new human existence is frightening...We are never free from two conflicting tendencies: one to emerge from the womb...from bondage to freedom; another to return to the womb...to certainty and security. In the history of the individual, and of the race the progressive tendency has proven to be stronger yet the phenomenon of mental illness and the regression of the human race to positions apparently relinquished generations ago, show the intense struggle which accompanies each new act of birth.[18]

What then is the answer to the human situation?

---

[17]Erich Fromm, Man For Himself (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1947), p. 40.

[18]Fromm, The Sane Society, p. 27.

> There is only one solution to his problem; to face the truth...To recognize that there is no power transcending him which can solve his problem for him... recognize that there is no meaning to life except the meaning man gives his life by the unfolding of his powers, by living productively...[19]

The way man reacts to his existential dichotomy determines the sort of man he is. Basically there are two ways: (1) To deny his uniqueness and self-awareness through compulsive activity or slavelike submission to powers outside himself. (2) Living life for himself by the unfolding of his own productiveness.

This might be called the productive non-productive dichotomy and it is found throughout Fromm's work. The productive non-productive dichotomy manifests itself in many ways. To wit:

1. Love v. symbiosis
2. Self-love v. selfishness
3. Humanistic v. authoritarian conscience
4. Pleasure: happiness v. pseudo-happiness
5. Reason v. intelligence
6. Productive work v. laziness or compulsive activity

II. Love

> Human existence is characterized by the fact that man is alone and separated from the world; not being able to stand the separation, he is impelled to seek for relatedness and oneness.[20]

---

[19]Fromm, Man for Himself, pp. 44-45

[20]Ibid., p. 96.

> Love is not primarily a relationship to a specific person; it is an attitude, an orientation of character which determines the relatedness of a person to the world as a whole, not toward one object of love. If a person loves only one other person and is indifferent to the rest of his fellow men, his love is not love but a symbiotic attachment, or an enlarged egotism.[21]

Love is an important part of productiveness; the ability to achieve oneness with others and yet remain an independent entity.

In discussing love, we must be very careful to distinguish between what is commonly called love and what is truly love. Love is used in our culture to refer to every feeling short of utter disgust. People think that loving is a matter of finding the right object when love is a general orientation not directed exclusively toward one person.

The perversion of love most fraught with political significence is symbiosis. Real love seeks oneness with others while preserving the individual's integrity. Symbiosis seeks oneness with another by destroying the integrity of the self. Symbiosis is a manifestation of the sado-masochist character.

The masochist seeks to overcome his unbearable state of aloneness by merging himself with a larger more powerful entity. The masochist seeks to rid himself of his self by humbling and debasing it; pain is not the masochist's final aim, it is the destruction of his self for which the masochist tries.

---

[21]Erich Fromm, The Art of Loving (Copyright 1956, New York: Harper & Bros. 1962), p. 46.

The sadist is the other side of the symbiotic coin; the sadist tries to overcome his aloneness by incorporating others in his self. He seeks absolute power over others. There is no greater power over another person than that of inflicting pain, so the sadist is often cruel to his object. But as with the masochist, pain is not the sadist's ultimate interest, it is the loss of the independent self. Indeed there are "kindly" forms of sadism, the sadist is willing to grant his object anything it wants -- except the most important thing -- the freedom to be himself.

Everyone has a little sado-masochist in him and the two traits are generally found together, hence the name. This should not surprise us, since they spring from the same desire -- to be rid of oneself.

Sado-masochistic, especially masochistic phenomena, are likely to be confused with love. It might seem there is no better proof of love than the willingness to give up one's self for another. But love affirms one's self and masochism is its very opposite. We shall have more to say about love in the section on self love.

III. Self Love

Freud was wrong in opposing self love and love for others. Libido is not a fixed quantity, which runs out if it is spread too thin; Freud's narcisistic person doesn't love others but he doesn't love himself either.

Men like Calvin and Luther ranted against self love and called it incompatible with goodness, but this is only

because their "good" man was sado-masochist who denied his self.

Real love is basically a conjunctive relation and this conjunction extends to oneself as much as to others. The Biblical injunction "love thy neighbor as thyself" expresses this idea.

Many people whom we think of as self interested have lost all interest in their real selves. Fromm uses Ibsen's Peer Gynt as an example. Gynt followed "an army that of wishes, appetites, desires!" and lost his true self.

> The failure of modern culture lies not in its principle of individualism not in the idea that moral virtue is the same as the pursuit of self interest, but in the deterioration of the meaning of self interest, not in the fact that people are too much concerned with their self interest, but that they are not concerned with the interest of their real self; not in the fact that they are too selfish, but that they do not love themselves.[22]

In contrast to such "self interest" as Peer Gynt's, true self interest is a manifestation of productiveness. The loving person loves himself as much as any one else.

> ...Not only others, but we ourselves are the "object" of our feelings and attitudes...Love of others and love of ourselves are not alternatives. On the contrary, an attitude of love toward themselves will be found in all those who are capable of loving others.
>
> From this it follows that my own self, in principle, must be as much an object of my love as another person. The affirmation of one's own life, happiness, growth, freedom is rooted in ones capacity to love, i.e., in care, respect responsibility, and knowledge.[23]

---

[22]Fromm, Man for Himself, p. 139.

[23]Ibid., pp. 129-130.

True self love is also an expression of potency in contrast to the sadist's will to power. The man who has the ability to be himself for himself will be a good man.

IV. Conscience

> "There is no prouder statement man can make than to say: 'I shall act according to my own conscience'."[24]

Socrates preferred death to compromising his conscience. But the men of the inquisition and predatory warmkers have also claimed to be motivated by their consciences. What sort of thing is conscience that it can bring out the best and worst in man?

Fromm suggests the confusion springs from the use of one term, conscience, to cover two very different things, authoritarian and humanistic conscience.

"The authoritarian conscience is the voice of internalized external authority." The norms and sanctions of the family, church, and state become internalized and become "part of oneself." This authoritarian conscience is the result of the individual's symbiosis with the authority he happens to serve. And it is this authoritarian conscience which Freud has called the super ego. Freud mistook this kind of conscience for all of conscience.

This internalization of authority has two consequences: (1) Man becomes the strict taskmaster who treats himself as his own slave by taking over the role of the authority.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

(2) The authoritarian conscience more or less cripples the individual's productiveness and generates sadism and destructiveness. We see the source of auto da fe better now.

Fromm sees the Oedipus complex not in the child's incestuous desires, but in his rebellion against the authoritarian commands of society transmitted by his parents. All of the parents' frustrations and insecurities are transmitted to the child who is made to feel guilty for all his normal strivings. Even in our non-authoritarian culture the child is expected to conform to "common sense."

Humanistic conscience is the antithesis of the authoritarian; humanistic conscience is not the commands of a foreign authority, rather humanistic conscience is knowledge about ourselves, not abstract alienated knowledge but caring, loving knowledge. Humanistic conscience enables us to differentiate those acts which aid in the realization of ourselves from those which cripple our selves. Conscience can help us become what we potentially are. It is the voice of loving care for ourselves.

The voice of humanistic conscience is soft and in our culture listening to it is especially difficult; we have learned to listen to everyone but ourselves. Tragically the less man listens to his conscience the softer its voice becomes and it is weakest when he needs it most.[25]

---

[25]Fromm, Man for Himself, taken from p. 158.

V. Reason - Productive Thinking

To understand productive thinking, we must distinguish between intelligence and reason.

> Intelligence is man's tool for attaining practical goals with the aim of discovering those aspects of things the knowledge of which is necessary for manipulating them. The goal itself or, what is the same, the premises on which "intelligent" thinking rests are not questioned, but are taken for granted and may or may not be rational in themselves.
>
> Reason involves a third dimension, that of depth which reaches to the essence of things and processes. ...Its function is to know, to understand, to grasp to relate oneself to things by comprehending them. It penetrates through the surface of things in order to discover their essence, their hidden relationships their "reason."[26]

Intelligence may be directed toward any sort of aim; the paranoid may show great intelligence in supporting his irrational premise that everyone is engaged in a conspiracy against him. Intelligence shows us the "how" but not the "why."

In contrast, reason asks, what are we being intelligent for? Reason would show the paranoid the falsity of his premises. Reason cares, it is interested in its object. Reason is not detached and alienated it productively relates the thinker and his object. Reason is also objective, it sees things as they are, not as it wishes them to be.

Reason also requires seeing oneself as one is. Reason is insight into one's existential dichotomy.

---

[26]Fromm, Man for Himself, pp. 102-103.

VI. Pleasure

Hedonistic ethics was right in locating the source of happiness in man himself, but it was wrong in equating happiness with simple pleasure. For there are various kinds of pleasures, are we to equate the pleasure a masochist feels in submitting to cruel authority with the pleasure a productive person feels in creating a beautiful painting?

Freud thought there was one kind of pleasure, the relief from painful tension. Fromm agrees that this is one kind of pleasure and calls it a necessary but not a sufficent condition for happiness. Also while normal physiological needs are relieved when the sought for goal is obtained, irrational psychic needs such as the craving for power are by their very nature insatiable.

Fromm also goes on to distinguish between the realm of scarcity and the realm of abundance. Freud's pleasure is a phenomenon of the realm of scarcity and essentially an animal kind of pleasure; specifically human pleasure is a phenomenon of the realm of abundance. As an example Fromm distinguishes between hunger and appetite, hunger is rooted in the realm of scarcity and to satisfy it is pleasureable because it relieves painful tension; appetite is rooted in the realm of abundance and its satisfaction is an expression of freedom and productiveness.

Fromm then goes on to distinguish between joy which is the pleasure from a particular expression of freedom and productiveness and happiness which is a continuous or integrated

expression of joy.

To determine whether or not an individual is truly happy we can not rely on what he says for even though he may not be consciously lying to us and may actually think he is happy he may be really very unhappy. Since happiness is an expression of the whole person, a drawn face or frightened eyes may reveal far more about a person than his statements. Fromm calls pleasure or happiness which exists only in the person's head, pseudo pleasure or happiness.

VII. Work

> In the process of work that is the molding and changing of nature outside of himself, man molds and changes himself. He emerges from nature by mastering her; he develops his powers of cooperation of reason, his sense of beauty. He separates himself from nature from the original unity with her, but at the same time unites himself with her again as her master and builder. The more his work develops, the more his individuality develops. In molding nature and recreating her, he learns to make use of his powers, increasing his skill and creativeness. Whether we think of the beautiful paintings of Southern France, the ornaments on weapons among primitive people the statues and temples of Greece, the cathedrals of the Middle Ages, the chairs and tables made by skilled craftsmen, or the cultivation of flowers, trees or corn by peasants -- all are expressions of the creative transformation of nature by man's reason and skill.[27]

In work then, man has another opportunity to realize himself. Work reunites man with nature yet preserves his self integrity. We can observe the importance of work in small children; they are constantly busy learning new things, discovering and growing. Their products may be clumsy at first,

---

[27]Fromm, The Sane Society, pp. 177-178.

but this does not matter, for it is work as process which counts, not the thing produced.

Much of modern "work" is not work at all but compulsive activity. Man works because it is his duty, or because he must to eat; he sees nothing in work but a means to get money. There is no joy or creativity in his work. Thus "work" is often disliked and man is thought of as naturally lazy. The fact that men do not like to work testifies to the unsatisfactory nature of their work, not to their inherent laziness.#

Dr. Olmsted has pointed out that Fromm's discussion of work borrows heavily from Veblen. I might add that nearly all of Fromm's work borrows from other writers and that Fromm often does not acknowledge his debt.

LASSWELL'S POLITICAL SCIENCE

I. Introduction

In considering Lasswell's political science, I shall emphasize those parts of it which are most closely related to his psychology at the expense of others not so closely related. I can only plead limitations of time, since Lasswell is a complex figure and it did not seem possible to do full justice to him in a Master's thesis. Also, my division of Lasswell's work into political science and psychology may seem rather arbitrary. Nonetheless some division seemed advisable and one can look on these two sections as parts I & II of Lasswell's psychological political science.

Lasswell sees psychology related to politics by our old friendly formula. $p \} d \} r = P$

Lasswell provides several interesting examples of the role of private motivation in public affairs.

> John Bright's grief at the death of his wife was transformed into political action in the defeat of the Corn Laws.[28]
>
> Joseph II of Austria became "the revolutionary emporer" with the discovery that his beloved, lately deceased, had never loved him.[29]

In Lasswell's psychology I mentioned that extremes of

---

[28]Lasswell, Power & Personality, p. 51.

[29]Ibid., p. 51.

indulgences and deprivations are likely to lead to accentuation of power as a value.

> Genghis Khan was surrounded by memories of a glorious past in the face of childhood adversity...His entire childhood was a struggle against adversity. The results are well known.[30]

II. World Revolutions

However, while we are concentrating on the psychological parts of Lasswell's political science, we cannot ignore one distinctly social or political aspect of his thinking. This is the idea of changes in the entire political order. Lasswell sees our political order as changing from one in which the skill of "bargaining" was preeminent and income and deference were very inequitably distributed to one in which violence and symbol manipulation are preeminent and income and deference are more equitably distributed. These changes in the political order are marked by "world revolutions." Lasswell considers the French and Russian Revolutions world revolutions. The French Revolution brought about the rise of the bourgeosie and the Russian Revolution, the rise of lower middle class skill groups. Lasswell does not feel that the true proletarian revolution has occurred as yet.

These world revolutions attempted to unify all mankind, but each failed and became restricted by revival, partial incorporation, and functional differentiation. Restriction by revival is the revival of some of the practices of the ancien regime by the new regime; restriction by partial incorporation is the adoption of some of the revolution's vocabulary or practices by rival elites, thus

---

[30]Ibid., pp.43-44

the Nazis took over some of the vocabulary of the Russian Revolution. The name "Russian Revolution" exemplifies restriction by functional differentiation. The world revolution becomes parochial, the world revolution of 1789 becomes the French revolution.

III. Psychology of Hitlerism

We have seen how the individual may act on the political order but this is only half the story; the political order acts on the individual.

Lasswell's article, "The Psychology of Hitlerism," provides an example of this interaction of personal and political forces.

Changes in the social (political) status of the lower middle class led to their suffering deprivations of safety, deference, and income. The lower middle class was being shoved under by the rising German plutocracy; the inflation of the 1920's dealt the final blow when their precious savings were wiped out and they saw themselves merged with the despised proletariat.

But these deprivations were not transformed into political action until the appropriate rationalization or symbolism was found. Marxism provided a symbolism against the plutocracy but Marxism was a working class ideology. Nationalism had provided an ideology but Germany's humiliating defeat in World War I had greatly weakened this symbol.

Into this situation stepped Adolf Hitler, the son of an Austrian customs inspector.

Hitler had the answers, he had something for everybody. The lower middle class was given the opportunity to put meaning into life with the symbols of Germany's new might. Germany had not lost the war; she had been betrayed by Jewish internationalists. Their economic troubles were not from capitalism but Jewish profiteering. Marxism was not the ideology of the little man but the creation of a scheming Jew. The excesses of the twenties for which the middle class felt secretly guilty, were likewise the work of the Jews, hadn't psychoanalysis been invented by a Jew?

For the professional people, Hitler had the answers, Germany's professions were crowded. They were dominated by Jews. The solution was easy.

For the industrialists, Hitler promised an end to radical Jewish labor agitators. For the land owners who were threatened by the rising capitalism, an end to Jewish international finananciers.

Many of these aims were clearly conflicting and almost the only group Hitler performed for was the industrialists. How was Hitler able to succeed?

If we recall the discussion of symbols in Lasswell's psychology, we may see the matter a little clearer.

Hitler made the Jew serve as a symbol of all Germany's troubles. The Jew was particularly well suited to cathect the hostilities of the lower middle class and Hitler originally a member of that class understood their hostilities.

Hitler made few real improvements in the state of the

lower middle classes, but a change in symbols is often mistaken for a genuine change. "New meaning has come to life, symbols are welcome substitutes for bread, and a lowered standard of living is but a sacrifice to the cause of national resurrection."[31]

IV. Policy Sciences

Lasswell's political science, however, is by no means solely for the benefit of those who merely like to watch the world go by. Lasswell not only wishes to understand politics, he also hopes to implement democratic values.

For the implementation of democratic values and the free man's commonwealth, Lasswell sees the need of a new profession, policy science. The policy scientist must be master of all the social sciences.

> ...a different type of education will become necessary for those who administer society or think about it. This education will start from the premise that it takes longer to train a good social scientist than it takes to train a good physical scientist.[32]

The policy scientist will understand psychoanalysis so that he will know his own and other's real motivations; he will know the interactions among the various values men pursue. Also, he will be able to place events in their proper historical perspective, aid those trends which further his goals and fight those which impede them. As an example of

---

[31]Lasswell, "The Psychology of Hitlerism," Political Quarterly (London, 1933). Reprinted in Analysis of Political Behavior, Oxford University Press, 1948, pp. 235-236.

[32]Lasswell, Psychopathology and Politics, p. 201.

lack of understanding of historical trends, Lasswell, in Power and Personality, cites the bickering of socialists and capitalists.

Both capitalists and socialists assumed that with the elimination of the other, the millenium would arrive. Heaven on earth would be assured by the perfect market or the perfect government. But "monopoly politicians" (big businessmen) and party politicians (government bureaucrats) have made a mockery of these dreams. The socialists' "world Revolution" and the capitalists' "war to restore business" would result in thermonuclear anihilation or the consolidation of the garrison state.

Capitalists and socialists should recognize the similarity of their aims and work together to preserve freedom from war and the garrison state.[33]

V. Symbolism

The policy scientist should recognize the need for promoting a democratic myth through the Appropriate symbol manipulation.

In his earlier writings (World Politics and Personal Insecurity and Politics), Lasswell has stressed the irrational basis of this myth. In W P & P I, Lasswell says that an "American Capital" would:

1. Have a slogan for a title
2. Be thick, so as to appear authritative and discourage reading by the masses

---

[33]Lasswell, Power & Personality, pp. 206-215.

3. Be systematic and quantitative, so as to appear impressive.

4. Have an ethical legalistic as well as an analytic vocabulary

5. Use illustrations which refer mainly to American experience.

6. Have an invidious style, so as to instill the proper rancor toward the negative symbols

7. Be somewhat ambiguous, contradictory and obscure as a whole so as to facilitate redefinition by the elite.

8. Be dull, to discourage reading by the masses

9. Have an activist prescription[34]

VI. The Good Society

Throughout his earlier writings, Lasswell is convinced of the basic irrationality of man and takes a very dim view of politics efficacy in solving human problems.

> ...The consensus on which order is based is necessarily nonrational...The capacity of the generality of mankind to disembarass themselves of the dominant legends of their early years is negligible, and if we pose the problem of unifying the world we must seek for the processes by which a nonrational consensus can be most expiditiously achieved.[35]

Lasswell suggests that the best way to get men to unite is to get them to fight against somebody so that all hostilities are directed against objects outside the community. "The well known peacefulness of being at war." But with the world as our community, who are we to unite against? Lasswell

---

[34]Lasswell, World Politics & Personal Insecurity, Copyright 1934; Reprinted in A Study of Power, Copyright 1950; The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, p. 219.

[35]Ibid., p. 237.

follows Andre Maurois's suggestion and considers the possibility of the earth's being unified by an attack from the moon, but he concludes that the minority faction on earth would probably unite with the majority faction on the moon, creating a new interplanetary balance of power.[36]

Lasswell considers the setting up of some sort of world control agency. We could multiply League of Nations edifices and erect on every continent offices furnished in alabaster and gold. But what coercive power would these have? Any attempt to attain power would run up against vested interests and fail.

Lasswell is also somewhat dubious about the efficacy of democratic procedures.

> The premise of democracy is that each man is the best judge of his own interest, and that all whose interests are affected should be consulted in the determination of policy...The findings of personality research show that the individual is a poor judge of his own interest. The individual who chooses a political policy as a symbol of wants is usually trying to relieve his own disorders by irrelevant pallatives.[37]

Lasswell sees the best chance for a good society in what he calls preventive politics. Preventive politics is the diagnosing and treatment of those conditions in society which lead to pathological results.

> The preventive politics of the future will be intimately allied to general medicine, psychopathology, physiological psychology and related disciplines. Its practioners will gradually win respect in society among puzzled people who feel their responsibilities and who respect objective findings.[38]

---

[36] Ibid., p. 238.

[37] Lasswell, Psychopathology and Politics, p. 194.

[38] Ibid., p. 203.

Lasswell's later writings, Power and Personality and Democratic Character, have taken a more optimistic view of the possibility of a good society (but still sure of the need for policy science or preventive politics). Through the policy sciences it may some day be possible to create a free man's commonwealth.

Lasswell discusses the possibilities of a free man's commonwealth most fully in Democratic Character. The basis of the free man's commonwealth is the broad shaping and sharing of the eight values mentioned in Lasswell's psychology; power, respect, affection, rectitude, well-being, wealth, skill and enlightenment. This list may be summarized under the headings of deference and welfare. Power, respect, affection, and rectitude are deference values; well-being, wealth, skill and enlightenment are welfare values.

The democratic character, the citizen of the free man's commonwealth, is distinguished by an open rather than a closed ego.

> Let us take as the outstanding characteristic...the maintenance of an open as against a closed ego. By this expression our intention is to convey the idea that the democratic attitude toward other human beings is warm rather than frigid, inclusive and expanding rather than exclusive and constricting...Such a person transcends most of the cultural categories that divide human beings from one another and senses the common humanity across class and even caste lines within the culture, and in the world beyond the local culture.
>
> Let us speak of the democratic character as multi-valued, rather than single-valued, and as disposed to share rather than to hoard or monopolize. In particular, little significance is attached to the exercise of power as a scope value.[39#]

---

[39] Lasswell, Democratic Character, pp. 495, 498.

[#] By scope value, Lasswell means an all encompassing number one value, as opposed to limited instrumental value

Exclusive concentration on any one value can have deleterious consequences for society as Lasswell shows.

Preoccupation with rectitude produces the blue nose, well-being the hypocondriac, wealth the miser, skill the amoral technician.

The democratic character should have all the components of his personality at his disposal. Conflict within the self produces all manner of nervous diseases.

The job of creating the free man's commonwealth is not easy.

> The task is nothing less than the drastic and continuing reconstruction of our own civilization and most of the cultures of which we have any knowledge. Since the basic postulate of behavior is the maximization of indulgences over deprivations, our task is to consolidate democratic conduct by directing the indulgences toward those who act democratically and the deprivations toward those who do not.[40]

As in his earlier writings Lasswell sees this as a job for the social sciences. Indeed he calls this their goal.

> It is insufficently acknowledged that the role of scientific work in human relations is freedom rather than prediction. By freedom is meant the bringing into the focus of awareness of some feature of the personality which has hitherto operated as a determining factor upon the choices made by the individual, but which has been operating unconsciously. Once elevated to the full focus of waking consciousness the factor which has been operating "automatically" and "compulsively" is no longer in this privileged position. The individual is now free to take the factor into consideration in the making of future choices.[41]

---

[40] Ibid., p. 513.

[41] Ibid., p. 524.

FROMM'S POLITICAL SCIENCE

I. The Human Situation

To begin Fromm's political science, let's return to the human situation. Man is faced with an existential dichotomy, aware of himself, man is faced with the task of living his life. Man must die before he is fully born, and man must seek some way of overcoming his terrible sense of aloneness.

Although Fromm's greater concern with societal influences is considered a distinguishing point between him and Freud, Fromm is by no means convinced that society is the paramount influence on personality.

> While it is true that man can adapt himself to almost any conditions, he is not a blank sheet of paper on which culture writes its text. Needs like the striving for happiness, harmony, love and freedom are inherent in his nature. They are also dynamic factors in the historical process which, if frustrated, tend to arouse psychic reactions, ultimately creating the very conditions suited to the original strivings.[42]

However, although these existential dichotomies are given, we must be very careful to avoid confusing them with merely historical dichotomies.

> Radically different from existential dichotomies are the many historical contradictions in individual and social life which are not a necessary part of human existence

---

[42]Fromm, The Sane Society, p. 81.

> but are man made and soluable either at the time they occur or at a later period in human history. The contemporary contradiction between an abundance of technical means for material satisfaction and the incapacity to use them exclusively for peace and the welfare of the people is soluable; it is not a necessary contradiction but one due to man's lack of courage and wisdom. The institution of slavery in ancient Greece may be an example of a relatively insoluable contradiction, the solution of which could be achieved only at a later period of history when the material basis for the equality of man was established.[43]

In The Sane Society Fromm points out some of the unnecessary contradictions in modern society. These include:

1. Our abundant crops are a burden, although there are millions of people starving throughout the world.

2. We use our high literacy rate to read the cheapest kind of trash, but decry any attempt at government regulation as an infringement upon our liberty.

3. We have greatly reduced the average number of working hours but do not know how to use our newly gained free time.

4. We and the advanced Western countries have a higher suicide and alcoholism rate than less developed countries.

Important as these contradictions are, they are dwarfed by such paradoxes as:

5. Our increasing material abundance has made possible greater and greater wars in which each side considers itself fighting for all that is holy and glorifying God by killing off millions of men. A few years after the slaughter yesterday's enemies are today's friends and vice versa.

6. Now we are faced with the possibility of mutual thermonuclear annihilation.

---

[43]Fromm, Man for Himself, p. 43.

II. Historical Sketch

Why? Fromm says that man has achieved freedom from but not freedom to.

The Middle Ages were characterized by material want and great lack of personal freedom. Even so, each man knew where he belonged, each man was related to his work and understood his place in the world in terms of the readily comprehensible medieval cosmography.

Medieval man's life was hard, but the church promised eternal bliss if he tried to live a good life and did good works. The tribulations and injustices of the present world were to be rectified by a divine hand in the next. Money making was viewed as a necessary evil, to be closely watched lest it become an end rather than a means. Communism was the ideal rendered unreachable by man's original sin. The guilds were for the mutual protection of all members and any inventions or advantageous buying had to be shared with fellow guild members.

The Renaissance changed all this. The traditional cosmography was swept aside by Copernicus. Luther and Calvin did away with the idea of a church mediating for man and a God happy with each good work, "as an old woman with a few coins."

But traditional ways yielded most to the new deity, money. Money making was no longer regarded as a necessary evil but as the virtue. A man built his way to heaven on golden stairs. The guilds became different; some members

accumulated more money than others and began to hire others. The basis of equality of guild membership was destroyed. Capital had begun to employ labor.

In short, then, the Renaissance freed man from the bonds of the middle ages. There was no need for a vast church mediating between man and God, God had no need of a clerical hierarchy to do his job for him. He could keep in touch with each of us on an individual basis. Birth and lineage were of little importance, a man was as good as the amount of money he could accumulate. The guild restrictions on seeking one's advantage were a handicap to the progress of man.

The Renaissance destroyed the medieval bonds which had restricted man but they also destroyed the meaning which these bonds had given to life.

In Fromm's psychology we saw that the individual is driven to overcome his existential dichotomy. We also saw that there are two general ways of doing this:

1. Attempting to deny his self awareness.
2. Accepting his existential dichotomy, and recognizing that the only meaning in life is the meaning he puts into it by living productively, through love, work and reason.

In Escape From Freedom, Fromm says:

> Once the primary bonds which gave security to the individual are severed, once the individual faces the world outside of himself as a completely separate entity, two courses are open to him since he has to overcome the unbearable state of powerlessness and aloneness. By one course he can progress to "positive freedom;" he can relate himself spontaneously to the world in love and work, in the genuine expression of his emotional, sensuous, and intellectual capacities;

> he can thus become one again with man, nature, and himself, without giving up the independence and integrity of his individual self. The other course open to him is to fall back, to give up his freedom, and to try to overcome his aloneness by eliminating the gap that has arisen between his individual self and the world.[44]

Fromm discusses two ways of escaping freedom:

1. Authoritanism
2. Automoton conformity

III. Naziism

The political orders providing a means of escape into authoritarianism are the modern dictatorships, particularly Naziism.

In discussing Naziism, Fromm sees it as determined by both psychological and economic factors. He criticizes those explanations of Naziism which attribute it to one factor.

Fromm cites the following factors in the rise of Naziism:

1. The great decline of the national symbols of Germany following World War I.
2. The fear of German industrialists of communism.
3. The disillusionment of the labor and liberal classes.
4. The decline of the lower middle classes begun by the turn of the century and greatly accelerated by the inflation of the twenties and the depression of the thirties.
5. The authoritarian predispositions of the lower middle class which gave Naziism a great appeal for them.

---

[44]Fromm, Escape From Freedom (Rinehard & Company, New York, 1941), p. 140.

In the interests of brevity, I shall skip over the first four points, mentioning only that they are very similar to Lasswell's analysis in "The Psychology of Hitlerism" and that Fromm attributes great weight to the role of Germany's industrialists in her politics.

> The important thing is that it was not Hitler who caused World War II, but the same alliance between industry and the military which had been the driving force behind World War I.[45]

The fifth point, the authoritarian predispositions of the lower middle class, Fromm considers crucial. Fromm discusses Naziism in relation to the concept of symbiosis and finds that Hitler's relation to his followers is a sado-masochist one. He also indicates the masochism mixed in with Hitler's sadism, as when Hitler delights in discussing "nature the cruel queen of all wisdom."

Fromm closes his discussion by again stating his basic appraisal of authritarianism.

> The function of an authoritarian ideology and practice can be compared to the function of neurotic symptoms. Such symptoms result from unbearable psychological conditions and at the same time offer a solution that makes life possible. Yet they are not a solution that leads to happiness or growth of personality...The escape into symbiosis can alleviate the suffering for a time but it does not eliminate it...The authoritarian systems cannot do away with the basic conditions that make for the quest for freedom; neither can they exterminate the quest for freedom that springs from these conditions.[46]

---

[45]Fromm, May Man Prevail? (Copyright 1961, Anchor Books Edition, 1961), pp. 171-172.

[46]Fromm, Escape From Freedom, pp. 238-239.

IV. Modern Democracies

So Naziism was an escape from freedom, so what? America is the home of the free; our sons fought and died to defeat Naziism. We have the highest standard of living the world has ever known; surely America and the Western democracies have achieved "positive freedom."

Fromm is not sure (as a matter of fact, he's pretty damned sure we haven't). For Fromm, a good society would promote mental health, which is:

> Mental health is characterized by the ability to love and to create, by the emergence from incestuous ties to clan and soil, by a sense of identity based on one's experience of self as the subject and agent of one's own powers, by the grasp of reality inside and outside of ourselves, that is, by the development of objectivity and reason.[47]

Once again we see that the road to man's salvation is work, love, and reason. In Fromm's Psychology, each of these modes of relatedness to be genuine and productive, had to come from man himself and be for man himself. Now let's follow Fromm's analysis to see the effects of modern democratic society on love, work, and reason.

Naziism replaced love with symbiosis, modern society has replaced it with a superficial and manipulative friendliness. Modern man does not love as a passionate affirmation of his simultaneous separateness and relatedness to the world, rather he is friendly in order that he may "get something." People are enjoined to have a "pleasing personality"

---

[47]Fromm, The Sane Society, p. 69.

so that others will like them and do things for them. Marriage is looked on as a sort of business partnership with each partner (even our language equates the two!) expected to be fair and to "hold up his end of the bargain."

There is a fundamental ambivalence in modern society toward love. On the one hand there is themanipulative attitude just discussed, on the other we are constantly admonished not to be self centered and not to think only of ourselves in pursuing our own interests. But as we found out in Fromm's psychology the trouble is not that we love ourselves too much but too little.

What has modern society done for reason? Certainly we have plenty of intelligence; we build bigger cars, more complex gadgets and better bombs. But we seldom ask for what.

Much of modern thinking is pseudo thinking. Our opinions are convincingly put but they are not really our own.

Fromm gives the example of an old fisherman giving a weather forecast on the basis of his own long experience and contrasts this with a modern urbanite offering a forecast as his own while parroting what he has heard on the radio.[48]

Modern man takes other's thoughts and manipulates them. He is so busy being intelligent that he has no time to exercise his reason.

A great deal of The Sane Society is devoted to discuss-

---

[48]Fromm, Escape from Freedom

ing work in modern society. In Fromm's psychology, we saw that work should be a means of man's realizing himself. In the process of creating, man asserts his integrity and relatedness.

But to do this work must be meaningful. Today men are paid higher and higher wages and work shorter and shorter hours but their work becomes increasingly less satisfactory. Modern technology has subdivided each task until often the individual office or factory worker performs only the most meaningless tasks. The worker may only screw in a bolt or refile forms; he has but the haziest conception as to how his task fits in with the purpose the whole organization is trying to accomplish.

Machinery, the things man built to aid him, have come to rule him. Things employ men.

Fromm cites Park Forest, Illinois as an example of where modern society is taking us.

Park Forest, as most know, is a planned community of junior executive homes. People move to Park Forest out of economic necessity but even those who go on to earn enough to move to more individually designed living quarters are loath to leave Park Forest.

The basis of Park Forest's charm is its warmth; everyone is accepted and a craving for acceptance is characteristic of the alienated selfless man modern society has produced. Men crave acceptance from others because they have not accepted themselves.

Acceptance is achieved by adjustment or to use an uglier word - conformity. The residents of Park Forest have deified social utility. Adjustment begins early, if a child likes to be by himself, this is a matter for concern.

Adjustment involves getting everyone to participate in community life. A junior executive comments appreciatively on his metamorphisis; before coming to Park Forest he and his wife used to live pretty much to themselves. They used to lie in bed Sunday morning and read the paper or listen to the symphony. Now under the broadening effect of Park Forest they exchange visits with friends.[49]

Two other effects of adjustment are its leveling tendencies and its proscriptions against privacy. A woman before coming to Park Forest liked to listen to "The Magic Flute," now she engages in "diaper talk" like everybody else. A man offers profuse apologies for not inviting his friends in, "he was feeling bad and will try to make it up to them later."

For those miscreants who fail to adjust, complete ostracism is the penalty. A woman, invited the other women to a too formal party which they showed up for in bathing suits. The woman was systematically excluded from all further social intercourse.

Friendships are determined not by the residents' individual human qualities but by their homes' proximity to

---

[49] Fromm, The Sane Society, 154-162; taken from the article, "Park Forest," William H. Whyte Jr., Fortune Magazine, May, June, July, August, 1957.

one another. The piece de resistance of this conformity, Fromm feels, is the residents' unquestioning acceptance of it. Does it work, not why, has become the key question.

Park Foresters have adjusted then, but are they happy? Fromm thinks not. We saw in discussing his concept of happiness that neither simple pleasure nor the individual's statements are sufficient guides to determine whether or not he is happy. Happiness must be something which comes from the whole person's productiveness, Park Forest happiness is pseudo-happiness.

Park Foresters are intelligent, do they have reason? "At Park Forest, everybody is in the same boat, but nobody seems to know where the boat is going."

All of modern society is not as far gone as Park Forest, for the junior executive is particularly susceptible to the manipulative trend of modern society. A skilled worker or a farmer is not yet so ready to conform. Nonetheless Park Forest starkly shows the direction our society is heading, as fewer and fewer people will be farmers and skilled workers, and more and more will be manipulators in the future.

V. The Good Society

If modern society is not fulfilling man's basic needs, what sort of society will?

Fromm thinks communitarian socialism is an answer and cites the Boimondu watch case factory as an example. Founded during World War II, by Marcel Barbu and his friends, Boimondu is based on the principle that the distinction between employer

and employee should be abolished. At first complete freedom of speech reigned between them, but they found that "telling each other off" led to a waste of time on the job so, they unanimously set aside part of the week for a discussion period.

Their better life was to be more than economic, however, so they sought to find a common ethical basis. There were individuals of widely differing beliefs among them, Catholics, Humanists, Communists, Protestants, materialists, and atheists but by examining not what they had been taught by rote but their own individual ethics which they had gained themselves, they evolved a common ethics.

> Thou wilt love thy neighbor
> Thou shalt not kill
> Thou shalt not take thy neighbor's goods
> Thous shalt not lie
> etc., etc.[50]

The group then decided it would like to educate itself; their productivity was so high that they were able to take time off from work for courses in such things as physics, literature, and basketball.

Payment is for the work of the whole individual.

> A first class mechanic who can play the violin, who is jolly and a good mixer, etc., has more value to the Community than another mechanic, equally capable professionally, but who is a sourpuss, a bachelor, etc.[51]

The community is governed by a General Assembly, which

---

[50]Fromm, The Sane Society, p. 308; taken from All Things Common, Claire Huchet Bishop, Harper & Bros., New York, 1950.

[51]Fromm, The Sane Society, p. 310.

meets twice a year. Only unanimous decisions are binding on the members. The general assembly elects the various officers who do the day to day task of running the community, again all decisions are unanimous.

Life at Boimondu is organized along two sectors: the social and the industrial.

The industrial sector is made up of teams of not more than ten men each, the teams go on to form shops which go on to form the service.

The social sector deals with all other parts of life at Boimondu. Here too, everything is organized into teams, which carry on the various social activities of Boimondu.

These teams like these of the industrial sector are organized into sections. The sections and teams include:

1. Spiritual Section:
   - Catholic team
   - Humanist team
   - Materialist team
   - Protestant team

2. Intellectual Section:
   - General Knowledge team
   - Civic Instruction team
   - Library team

   . . .

5. Mutual Aid Section:
   - Solidarity team
   - Household Maintenance team
   - Bookbinding team

   . . .

8. Sports Section:
   - Basketball team (men)
   - Basketball team (women)
   - Cross-country team
   - Football team
   - Volleyball team
   - Physical culture team[52]

---

[52]Fromm, The Sane Society, pp. 314-315.

Fromm then includes a further list of the principles of Boimondu. In concluding his discussion of Boimondu, he says:

> Summing up the most remarkable points in the principles of these Communities, I want to mention the following:
>
> 1. The communities of work do make use of all modern industrial techniques, and avoid the tendency of going back to handicraft production.
>
> 2. They have devised a scheme in which active participation of everyone does not contradict a sufficently centralized leadership...
>
> 3. The emphasis on the practice of life as against ideological differences. This emphasis enables men of the most varied and contradictory convictions to live together in brotherliness and tolerance without any danger of having to follow the "right opinion" proclaimed by the community.
>
> 4. The integration of work, social and cultural activities...
>
> 5. The situation of alienation is overcome, work has become a meaningful expression of human energy, human solidarity is established without restriction of freedom- or the danger of conformity.[53]

Fromm cites other examples of communitarian life, the Mennonites and Israel's agricultural settlements.

> They all contribute to our knowledge of the possibilities of a new style of life.[54]

To those who shout, "Dreamer!," Fromm answers that such glib condescension was accorded the railroads and airplane in their infancy.

In a later book, <u>May Man Prevail?</u>, Fromm is less concerned with radical social reform than with averting the

---

[53] <u>Ibid</u>.

[54] <u>Ibid</u>.

possibility of nuclear warfare. He says that Russia has become a conservative managerial state with no further interest in world revolution and counsels universal disarmament and greater aid to underdeveloped countries as means of avoiding world destruction.

But all these solutions of societal problems prelude the truly human problems.

> When he has overcome the primitive state of human sacrifice, be it in the ritualistic form of the Aztecs or in the secular form of war, when he has been able to regulate his relationship with nature reasonably instead of blindly, when things have truly become his servants rather than his idols he will be confronted with the truly human conflicts and problems.[55]

---

[55] Ibid., p. 362.

FROMM EVALUATION

Fromm's psychology is based on the premise that when man does things for himself, he is good.

When man submits to things outside himself and denies his reasoning, working and loving capacities, he is bad.

The good society will further man's capacities and belief in himself.

I. The Human Scale

Fromm is a graceful writer, sensitive to such problems as militarism and nuclear warfare, the dehumanizing influence of modern working conditions, and the banality of many mass media. Fromm is also a perceptive social critic in pointing out, for example, that there are few real differences for the worker in working for a big privately owned or governmentally owned corporation.

Fromm's interest is man and the ways man can better himself. Since we are all men, this gives Fromm's work a general attraction a treatise, on say bee keeping, is likely to lack.

Fromm's writings have had a great appeal, and I do not think that the adulation he has been given is entirely misplaced.

Fromm's greatest strength is his stressing of a human scale. Briefly, the concept of human scale is the idea that

things must be interpreted in terms which are meaningful to human experience. The human scale concept does not deny the importance of very large, very distant, or very tiny things, but it does say that these things should be understood through scientific training or some other valid means. To say that light travels at 186,000 miles an hour, that the earth has existed two billion years, or an electron weighs 1 trillionth of a gram is not to speak in meaningful terms to the average man, and it does not explain these concepts, to say that light travels very fast, that the earth is very old, or that an electron is very tiny.

Quantitative differences are qualitative differences and it is meaningless to come out with some gloriously large or gloriously small figure without a meaningful context of knowledge about it. If we say a Ferrari is fast, Adenaurer is old, or the diamond your sister's cheap fiance bought her is tiny, people have an idea of what we're talking about, applied to light, the earth or an electron, these terms lose their meaning.

Often analogies are resorted to, to "explain" such things as the speed of light, the age of the earth, or the weight of an electron. But analogies have a purely heuristic value and like the concepts themselves require a meaningful context in order to be meaningful themselves. If I say that a beam of light could travel around the earth twenty times in the length of time it takes you to blink your eye have I really made the concept any clearer?

Often these analogies that people dream up are a positive hinderance in understanding the concept. Thinking of light going lickety split, the earth as a sort of superannuated Methuselah, or an electron as little itty-bitty grain of something, makes it more difficult to understand such things as an absolute limit on speed, geologic change, or quantum jumps.

In a sense, the ignoring of a human scale is a form of reduction, things are "just" bigger or smaller, older or younger.

Now back to Fromm, although I have taken my illustrations from the physical sciences, the same injunctions against the use of terms without a human scale, applies to social phenomena as well. Fromm recognizes this.

Following Berle and Mean's analysis of the ownership of modern corporations, Fromm points out that owning something in its entirety, personally, is a very different thing from owning a tiny part of some vast corporation, such as General Motors or AT&T. The concept of legal ownership has lost its meaningful context.[56]

Fromm offers several other examples of this as when he criticizes the modern work situation for allowing no scope for man's talents because each man does such a tiny job. He sees that voting by the millions is not the same as voting in small numbers. He recognizes that much of our culture is

---

[56]Fromm, The Sane Society, pp. 104-108.

deluged with facts and numbers which have no meaning for the average man. "The Federal budget is 100 billion dollars." "Ten million out of work," "The world may be plunged into Nuclear warfare," and "Buy Bufferin" are mixed together until all sense of meaningfulness and proportion are lost.

Fromm's book, May Man Prevail?, is not another The Twenty Years Crisis; it is essentially a middlebrow effort. But Fromm provides a critique of Herman Kahn that transcends the rest of the book.

Speaking about Kahn's book, On Thermonuclear Warfare, Fromm says:

> The moral problem is even given less weight in Kahn's reasoning than the psychological one. The only question posed is how many of us will be killed; the moral problem of killing millions of fellow human beings -- men, women, children, -hardly is mentioned... One comes to a rather shocking suspicion when one reads the following statement, a quotation from an earlier statement Kahn made in testifying before the sub-committee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on June 26, 1959. "In other words; war is horrible. There is no question about it. But so is peace. And it is proper with the kind of calculations we are making today, to compare the horror of war and the horror of peace and see how much worse it is.
>
> Answering a reporter who questioned this statement, Kahn said "I meant that the quality of life after a thermo-nuclear attack would not be much different than before. And who the hell is happy and normal right now? We'd be just about the same after a war - and we'd still be economically useful.[57]
>
> We are dealing here with one of the most crucial problems of our age - the transformation of men into numbers on a balance sheet; one thinks it is a "reasonable" calculation to weigh the death of one- to two-thirds of the nation, provided that the economy will soon recover. Indeed, there have always been wars; there have always

---

[57]Fromm, May Man Prevail?, p. 196.

> been people who have sacrificed their own lives or killed other humans - out of love of liberty or in mere drunken orgies of hate. What is so new and shocking about the contribution of our age is the cold blooded use of bookkeeping methods to encompass the destruction of millions of human beings.[58]

The ignoring of a human scale is more than just an academic problem. In social problems it can have tragic results as Fromm clearly sees.

If his use of a human scale is Fromm's strength, his not using it is part of his weakness.

E. H. Carr suggests Fromm's other weakness. In The Twenty Years Crisis he quotes L. T. Hobhouse as saying, "Among the most primitive peoples the evidence of the truth of an idea is not yet separate from the quality that renders it pleasant." Carr then goes on to say that this is characteristic of the primitive or utopian stage of political science. Investigators will pay little attention to analyses of cause and effect but will devote themselves to the elaboration of visionary projects whose simplicity and perfection give them a universal appeal. Carr compares such projects to the search for the philosopher's stone.[59]

Fromm is a utopian, but he is not looking for the philosopher's stone of politics he thinks we don't need it. As I see it, this is the other part of his weakness.

Fromm regards man's death as a tragic biological

---

[58] Ibid., p. 197.

[59] Edward Hallett Carr, The Twenty Years Crisis 1919-1939, (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1949), pp. 4-5.

necessity, whereas he feels that the social problems of our time require only the exercise of man's courage and the application of wisdom he already has.

> We, today, who have easy access to all these ideas, who are still the immediate heirs to the great humanistic teachings, we are not in need of new knowledge of how to live sanely - but in bitter need of taking seriously what we believe, what we preach and teach. The revolution of our hearts does not require new wisdom - but new seriousness and dedication.[60]

The foregoing represents Fromm's utopianism, the following, his ignoring of the human scale.

> Many a reader will raise the question whether findings won by observation of individuals can be applied to the psychological understanding of groups. Our answer to this question is an emphatic affirmation. Any group consists of individuals and nothing but individuals, and psychological mechanisms which we find operating in a group can therefore only be mechanisms that operate in individuals.[61]

This statement is a trifle ambiguous and as a matter of fact, Fromm does make frequent use of social explanations and does not rely exclusively on the findings of individual psychology. Nonetheless, this statement exemplifies the strain running throughout Fromm's work that if people want to have a good society they can just "up and have it." Fromm's utopianism seems to make him forget that one cannot use concepts without a meaningful context. Fromm ignores the human scale.

Fromm's utopianism has a pervasive effect on his

---

[60]Fromm, The Sane Society, p. 344.

[61]Fromm, Escape from Freedom, p. 137.

social theory.

I. The ills of contemporary society.

Since Fromm does not believe that there are any great problems to organizing society, he sees societal problems as somehow unreal-tragic because they are so unnecessary.

As an example, we might take Fromm's criticism of our mass media.

> We have a literacy above 90 per cent of the population. We have radio, television, movies, a newspaper a day for everybody. But instead of giving us the best of past and present literature and music, these media of communication, supplemented by advertising, fill the minds of men with the cheapest trash lacking in any sense of reality, with sadistic phantasies which a halfway cultured person would be embarrassed to entertain even once in a while.[62]

Admittedly, The State Journal and Father Knows Best are not the equal of Coleridge or Dostoevsky, but for that matter neither is Fromm. Simply because people can read does not mean that they are going to read the finest works of literature at their command, overnight.

Our mass media are lousy, but more good literature is being read today than ever before if book sales and library use are any indication. If our taste is improving slowly, it is still improving. Fromm's utopianism has lead him to ignore the strong points of contemporary society.

Fromm's solution is government sponsorship of uplifting programs, but plenty of good literature is available free at the public library and in Great Britain private American style trashy television has proven more popular than

---

[62]Fromm, The Sane Society, p. 5.

Fromm style government sponsored television.

II. Lack of Empirical Support

It is hardly news to anyone who has looked at Fromm's writings that he offers little empirical support for many of his broadest generalizations.

> Undoubtedly a relatively primitive village in which there are still real feasts, common artistic shared expressions, and no literacy at all - is more advanced culturally and more healthy mentally than our educated, newspaper reading, radio-listening culture.[63]

A work need not bristle with statistics and reports of controlled experiments to be scientific, but these and statements like them are simply too far out to even be called false. This is the voice of the poet or mystic not the student of society. And just as the truth value of an idea is independent of the quality which renders it pleasant, so it is independent of the beauty with which it is expressed.

In keeping with such statements as the one just quoted, we should not expect that Fromm would find congenial the company of those who regard the problems of society as complex and requiring considerable study before generalizations are even tentatively offered.

Indeed, even such broad theorists as Marx and Freud are considered prisoners of their time by Fromm and inferior to such humanistic philosophers as Spinoza.

I sometimes wonder if the vagueness of many of Fromm's formulations is not part of his appeal. The student of Fromm

---

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 348.

may read what he wishes into them.

Fromm's dislike of a great deal of empirical support might explain why he seems more at home with history than with the stricter social sciences. History is still largely a speculative discipline.

One might think that this lack of concern for fact gathering would leave Fromm's mind free to spin new theories. Unfortunately this is not the case. One of Fromm's books sounds pretty much like another. Fromm's work is non-cumulative, to use Robert Merton's term.

Fromm's liking for the poetic as opposed to the empirical makes him leave his description of the human situation in its rather vague original formulation. This seems a pity for it is an idea that might have been very fruitful, properly used.

III. Homeopathy

Maybe some of the preceding criticisms came solely from my oral sadism, but the following one is from the heart.

I spent quite a little space in Fromm's political science describing Fromm's critque of Park Forest and his praise for communitarian socialism. Fromm said those who scoffed, were like those who scoffed at the early airplanes and railroads. I think Fromm's scheme has more in common with perpetual motion machines and pills to turn water into gasoline than with early trains or airplanes. But aside from the unrealizability of the communities of work is their nature, Fromm sees them as Heaven on earth; I see them as hell.

I shall begin my discussion of this by taking a quotation from John Schaar's book on Fromm.

> Fromm has a faith in the noble savage which makes Rousseau's faith seem a pale negation by comparison.
> Given this view of man, it is all but impossible for Fromm to come to terms with the restraining institutions of a society. In his view practically all institutional restraints are either unnecessary or demonstrably harmful. Fromm wants to abolish the authority of one man over another.
>
> There is an irony in this. Fromm's faith in man and his desire to see man freed from restraints would in the end, turn the individual over to the worst tyranny of all- the tyranny of neighbors. This appears most sharply in his utopia: that warm and friendly community would bring men so closely together and expose them so nakedly to the influences of their neighbors that it is doubtful rather any free and creative spirit could stand the ordeal. So eager is Fromm to break down the barriers between men that he forgets that barriers are defenses against the encroachments as well as separations from them.[64]

There is little I can add to Schaar's critque, except to offer a few examples.

On page 310, of The Sane Society, Fromm mentioned that payment was to be for all activity which had value for the group. "A first class mechanic who can play the violin, who is jolly and a good mixer, etc., has more value to the community than another mechanic equally capable professionally, but who is a sourpuss, a bachelor etc."

Payment for all activity of value to the group! Are we going to have our friendly neighbors tell us; we didn't

---

[64]John H. Schaar, Escape From Authority: The Perspectives of Erich Fromm (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1961).

smile this week, so no bonus. At least in our society a man can frown if he wants to. Remember Park Forest? I thought we didn't have much privacy there; Fromm's community makes the Park Foresters look like hermits. At least a man could get away at work for awhile, at Boimondu, as the title of the book Fromm took his description from, suggests, all things are common.

On pages 314-315 Fromm listed the various teams to encompass all social and cultural activities. Everything from humanism to basketball and countereffort (whatever that is) has a team. Everything is reduced to the same dreary level. Was Hamlet written by a team? I might mention Fromm's dubious assumption here that a productive character is always a nice guy, happy, truly well balanced and so on. Van Gogh, Wagner, Coleridge, Pound?

Fromm has seen that the good things of life must be on a human scale: he has forgotten that the bad things come that way too.

LASSWELL EVALUATION

Lasswell's work might be viewed as a revolt against the formalism of previous political scientists.

Political science developed from public law and was much given to studying the documents of government. This is still the approach followed in high school government courses. "The Senate has 100 members.", "A bill to become law must be passed by both houses of Congress and signed by the President.", "The Governor of Michigan serves a two year term."

This was the approach followed by many Progressives who saw the solution to the problems of democracy in various procedural legal devices. The referendum, direct election of Senators, the recall, the direct primary and many other devices.

Formalism reached its height in modern times in the Kellogg - Briand Pact and the declining years of the League of Nations. This has been beautifully described by E. H. Carr.

> There were determined efforts to perfect the machinery to standardise the procedure, to close the "gaps" in the covenant by an absolute veto on all war. The Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance, The Geneva Protocol, the General Act, the plan to incorporate the Briand-Kellogg Pact in the Covenant and "the definition of the aggressor," were all milestones on the dangerous path of rationalisation. The fact that the utopian dishes

> prepared during these years at Geneva proved unpalatable to most of the principal governments concerned was a symptom of the growing divorce between theory and practice.[65]
>
> Once it came to be believed in League circles that salvation could be found in a perfect card-index and that the unruly flow of international politics could be canalised into a set of logically impregnable abstract formulae inspired by the doctrines of nineteenth century liberal democracy, the end of the League as an effective political instrument was in sight.[66]

It was just about this time, when the sterility of studying the institutions or forms of government alone was becoming painfully apparent, that Harold Lasswell published his most famous books.

Lasswell goes farther than Carr, who questioned the feasibility of a democratic international order. Lasswell casts doubt on the feasibility of domestic democratic politics.

> The democratic state depends upon the technique of discussion to relieve the strains of adjustment to a changing world. If the analysis of the individual discloses the probable irrelevance of what the person demands to what he needs (i.e., to that which will produce a permanent relief of strain) serious doubt is cast upon the efficacy of discussion as a means of handling social problems.
>
> The premise of democracy is that each man is the best judge of his own interest, and that all whose interests are affected should be consulted in the determination of policy.
>
> The findings of personality research show that the individual is a poor judge of his own interest, The Individual who chooses a political policy as a symbol of his wants is usually trying to relieve his own disorders by irrelevant pallatives.[67]

---

[65]Carr, The Twenty Years Crisis, p. 5.

[66]Ibid., p. 6.

[67]Lasswell, Psychopathology and Politics, p. 194.

> In a sense politics proceeds by the creation of fictitious values...The terms in which he (the person) couches his own interest vary according to a multitude of factors but whatever the conditioning influences may be, the resulting theory of his own interest becomes invested with his own narcissism. The political symbol is presumably an instrumental makeshift toward the advancement of the other values of the personality; but it quickly ceases to be an instrumental value and very quickly becomes a terminal value, no longer the servant but the co-equal, or indeed the master. Thus the human animal distinguishes himself by his infinite capacity for making ends of his means.
> It should not be hastily assumed that because a particular set of controversies passes out of the public mind that the implied problems were solved in any fundamental sense. Quite often the solution is a magical solution which changes nothing in the conditions affecting the tension level of the community, and which merely permits the community to distract its attention to another set of equally irrelevant symbols. The number of statutes which pass the legislature or the number of decrees which are handed down by the executive, but which change nothing in the permanent practices of society is a rough index of the role of magic in politics.[68]

Lasswell's disdain for the study of only the forms of government is shown by his choice of mentors, Marx and Freud.

Marx and Freud were very different theorists but they both showed that the most precious institutions of Victorian Society were a facade concealing a seething reality beneath.

Free trade and laissez-faire economics were not the greatest glory of all time but were a means of oppressing the proletariat. Love for momma was sublimated incest and friendship was latent homosexuality. The manifest functions of society concealed their real latent functions.

---

[68]*Ibid*., p. 195.

Lasswell sees political institutions as Marx saw economic institutions and Freud saw individual man.

Almost all of the manifest purposes of politics are not its latent or real purposes. Nearly everyone of Lasswell's works is built around this theme. Whether we think of his many portraits of political personalities, his critique of ordinary logical thinking, his analysis of propaganda, or his concept of power's use to overcome low estimates of the self, the same idea is present that the social scientist must peek beneath the exterior to find reality.

There is an important change in the tone of Lasswell's later works.

In World Politics and Personal Insecurity written in 1934, Lasswell said:

> The capacity of the generality of mankind to disembarass themselves of the dominant legends of their early years is negligible, and if we pose the problem of unifying the world we must seek for the processes by which a nonrational consensus can be most expeditiously achieved.[69]

In Power and Personality, written in 1948, Lasswell said:

> The fully developed citizen of a democratic commonwealth will willingly and skillfully play at least certain minimum roles. He will share the perspectives of democratic doctrine, which as we have had occasion to say, include positive identification with humanity (and with all smaller groups whose activities are consistent with the larger whole); demands for a society where within the framework of shared power and respect all values are made more abundant and available; and expectations that men can do on a universal and permanent scale what they have so often accomplished on a more temporary and local scale.[70]

---

[69]Lasswell, World Politics and Personal Insecurity, p.237.

[70]Lasswell, Power and Personality, p. 150.

Nonetheless there is a basic continuity in Lasswell's political theory. His later works reflect far greater optimism in the beneficent potentialities of man, but he does not see these potentialities being brought out by ordinary political means.

Lasswell is in favor of democracy in his later books but it is the ends of democracy which Lasswell favors, not the ordinary means to their achievement. Lasswell sees the job of promoting democracy as the task of the policy scientist, who is the personification of the practitioner of preventive politics he discussed in Psychopathology and Politics. Lasswell has two aims then, as I see it.

1. To penetrate the covering of rationalizations and irrelevant symbols which conceals the real workings of politics.

2. To suggest means to a rational political order, a free man's commonwealth, to put politics on a firmly scientific basis.

How well has Lasswell succeeded? Very well in his first aim, I think; the second is more difficult and it is not surprising that his successes have been more modest here. Let's briefly consider Lasswell's luck with his first and close by considering his second.

After being deluged with exhortations to love mother, God, home and country, urgings to get America moving, and cries to save democracy, Lasswell makes revealing and refreshing reading.

Lasswell's many personality sketches show the devious means by which personal motivations are rationalized in terms

of the public good. One may consider the exhibitionist Judge Z who loved to show the anomalies of the law, the socialist M whose love of man was a reaction formation of his hatred of his brother, P, the great patriot who prays for war so that he may destroy and work off his guilt feelings at the same time by risking death, or the many other cases Lasswell discusses.

Lasswell injects a bit of humor into the dry science of politics. S wrote letters to public men accusing them of graft and being dominated by "big biz." Mr. Sinclair was after him because he had written a letter to the Chief Justice calling his Honor's attention to the Teapot Dome Scandal. Sinclair had paid S's own sister to throw him out on the street. S prevented John W. Davis's election, "I wrote Hearst and that turned the trick."

Lasswell's analyses of ideology and propaganda are likewise good reading. There is his insightful statement of the inculcation of bourgeois values and his delightful list of the requirements for an "American Capital."

His description of cartoon stereotypes in Politics is instructive. For years Japan was portrayed as a little man with a kimono; growing Japanese power changed the stereotype to one of a military man.

He graphically describes one of the effects of imminent revolution on formerly sacred symbols.

> Diabolism appears, which consists in reversing the previous taboos; the Bronx cheer supercedes the salute to the flag.[71]

By breaking down the barriers of formalism, Lasswell has let his imagination stray far beyond the courthouse and legislature.

> What is locally called government often has very little to do with this function. We know that what is called government in a mill town may have but a modicum of influence on important decisions; they may be made by the board of directors of the mill.[72]

Lasswell quotes Eugene O'Neill's Mourning Becomes Electra, in describing politics as a substitute for success in one's private life.

Lasswell is a realist in his description of politics and by being a realist he has been able to see the sources and workings of politics, in places a formalist would have missed.

What now of Lasswell's luck with constructing a more rational political order? How goes the free man's commonwealth?

The free man's commonwealth is a large order.

> The task is nothing less than the drastic and continuing reconstruction of our civilization and most of the cultures of which we have any knowledge.[73]

But the need is great and nothing less is safe.

> In coping with our present-day difficulties in the hope of reducing provacativeness, we must not lose sight of

---

[71]Lasswell, World Politics & Personal Insecurity, p. 107.

[72]Lasswell, The Analysis of Political Behavior, p. 6.

[73]Lasswell, Democratic Character, p. 513.

> the fact that even certainty of annihilation cannot protect us from the paranoid psychotic. If we knew that another war would actually eliminate us, we would not be safe from war. All mankind might be destroyed by a single paranoid in a position of power who could imagine no grander exit than using the globe as a gigantic funeral pyre. And the paranoid need not be the leader of a great state. He can be the head of a small state or even of a small gang.
>
> Even a modicum of security under present-day conditions calls for the discovery, neutralization and eventual prevention of the paranoid. And this calls for the overhauling of our whole inheritance of social institutions for the purpose of disclosing and eliminating the social factors that create these destructive types.[74]

And we have the tools.

> We cannot at this moment in history, pride ourselves upon what we know or what we put into practice about human relations. Nor can we rely upon any one path to the understanding of politics and society. We can, however, congratulate ourselves upon possessing many of the procedural tools which are capable of penetrating further into the interelations of man in society than has been possible hitherto. And we possess a new sense of direction and of urgency for the effective application of the instrumentalities of science and policy.[75]

Before we congratulate ourselves too much, however, I should like to throw a little cold water on Lasswell's scheme.

Robert K. Merton in his brilliant book, Social Theory and Social Structure, calls for an abandonment of grand theorizing and an emphasis on theories of the middle range. Merton sees hopes for vast conceptual schemes which will direct the attentions of thousands of research workers as apocalyptic. Merton points out that just because Social Science and physics

---

[74]Lasswell, Power & Personality, p. 184.

[75]Lasswell, Democratic Character, p. 525.

exist in the same century does not mean they are at the same stage of development. Twentieth century social science has far more in common with 16th century physics than it does with twentieth century physics. Social science lacks many centuries of intervening work; Einstein cannot follow hard on the heels of Kepler.

Merton compares the need for the solution of social problems with the need for a cure for heart disease. If seventeenth century medicine had been judged on its ability to cure heart disease because of the need for a cure, it would have been judged an utter failure. So it is with social science, necessity is the mother of invention but we need the father of the requisite scientific knowledge.

Lasswell has suggested a World Survey of Personality Formation and various sampling procedures to guide the policy scientist. Also, as I mentioned in the section on his political science he feels that the aim of social science should not be so much prediction as the increasing of human freedom.

The increasing of human freedom sounds much prettier than mere prediction, but it really begs the question. Any science can have practical as well as theoretical aims. Merton describes the use of Seventeenth century astronomy and physics in aiding navigation. But in order to achieve its practical aims a science must be able to predict what effect its proposed means will have. In order to navigate, sailors had to be able to predict the relation between their sextant readings and their location on the sea. In order to increase

human freedom, Lasswell must be able to predict which actions will do so.

In the line of prediction, social science's achievements have been quite modest. Our election predictions are still little better than those of intuitive unsystematic observers. Yet, Lasswell thinks of embarking on the vast task of predicting which kinds of environments produce which kinds of personality. To be sure a start has been made along these lines, but only a start. We do not have nearly enough systematic information to even think about beginning a wholesale reconstruction of society.

Merton distinguishes between systematic social theory and an approach to social problems.

I think Lasswell has an approach, albeit a sophisticated one. Lasswell has a number of remarkable insights but these do not bear any real deductive relationship to one another. Sophisticated as Lasswell's books are, they are no more sophisticated than Carr who does not make Lasswell's claims for social science.

Lasswell is unquestionably a brilliant thinker and a highbrow writer unlike the middlebrow writer Fromm. His realism and his far ranging imagination have added greatly to our knowledge of political science. But he should be careful in his attempts to produce an Einsteinian political science that he does not produce a Hullian one.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH TO POLITICS

In my introduction I mentioned that it might be interesting to see the differences in the approach of a political scientist using psychology and a psychologist writing about politics. Clearly there are a great many differences in Fromm and Lasswell's approach. Fromm has a naive faith in man's ability to better himself and sees the ideal political order as a basically simple one.* Lasswell sees the ideal political order as a rather complex one, requiring great sophistication in its governing. If we throw in Freud for good measure the difference between Fromm and Lasswell may become a bit clearer. Freud in Civilization and Its Discontents is very dubious about the possibility of any political order being able to make man truly happy.

Now my point is that Fromm is a good deal more like Freud than Lasswell is. Fromm like Freud sees politics as something somehow extraneous and artificial. In Fromm's view man is good living in the right society but this is because he was good to begin with not because the society makes him good. It is Lasswell who assigns the most importance to

---

*If I may be a bit fanciful, I should like to hazard the guess that this one of the things that makes Fromm easier reading, for Fromm is writing for the lay citizen who will bring about his own utopia, whereas Lasswell is writing for the policy scientist who will bring it about for the citizen.

achieving the right political order, through the exercise of policy science.

This comparison of Freud, Fromm, and Lasswell also illustrates the intimate connection between one's view of man and one's view of politics. All political scientists have some sort of implicit psychology; it might be beneficial if they made it explicit as Lasswell and Fromm do theirs.

If Freud is a child of Hobbes and Fromm a child of Rousseau, Lasswell might be called a child of Comte. With these differences in mind we may point out some of the similarities in Fromm's and Lasswell's work which differentiated them from more orthodox political scientists.

Compared to their less psychological brethren, Lasswell and Fromm manifest a broader view of politics in two ways.

First as mentioned before, Lasswell and Fromm are concerned with all of politics. Their work contrasts with such books as The Costs of Democracy, which is concerned with campaign funds, U. S. Senators and Their World, which traces the careers of the solons of our upper house, and Southern Politics, which is concerned with the politics of a particular region. Lasswell and Fromm are concerned with all the politics of all the world.

Second, Lasswell and Fromm are concerned with all of politics' effects on the individual. In contrast with those theorists who are concerned soley with pocket book effects, Lasswell and Fromm take a broader view of the interaction of

the political order and the individual. Lasswell discusses the way in which certain political jobs gratify certain kinds of personalities and considers various values the political order may bestow. Fromm stresses the need for a political order which will further all the productive capacities of man.

Finally, Fromm and Lasswell have not been content to merely describe politics, their psychology has made them see certain political practices as beneficent and others as malevolent. Both Fromm and Lasswell have found ordinary political procedures inadequate and have described utopias which fulfill the needs their psychologies see man as having.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Birnbach, Martin, Neo Freudian Social Philosophy, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1961.

Carr, Edward Hallett, The Twenty Years Crisis 1919-1939, MacMillan & Company, Ltd., London 1949.

Fromm, Erich, The Art of Loving, Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, New York & Evanston, 1956.

Escape From Freedom, Rinehart & Co., New York, 1941.

Man For Himself, Holt Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1947.

May Man Prevail?, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York, 1961.

The Sane Society, Rinehart & Co., New York, 1955.

Sigmund Freud's Mission, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1959.

Freud, Sigmund, Civilization And Its Discontents, Tr by Joan Riviere, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York, 1958.

Lasswell, Harold Dwight, The Analysis Of Political Behavior, Oxford University Press, New York, 1948.

Democratic Character, printed in The Political Writings of Harold D. Lasswell, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1951.

National Security and Individual Freedom, McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, 1950.

Politics: Who Gets What, When, How, Meridian Books Inc., 1958; Copyright 1936, McGraw Hill Book Co.

Power & Personality, The Viking Press, New York, 1962; Copyright 1948, WW Norton & Co.

Power & Society, Harold D. Lasswell & Abraham Kaplan, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1950.

Lasswell cont'd. Psychopathology and Politics, The Viking Press, New York, 1960; Copyright 1930, The University of Chicago.

"The Selective Effect of Personality on Political Participation" Printed in Studies in the Scope and Method of The Authoritarian Personality, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1954.

The World Revolution of Our Time: A Framework For Basic Policy Research, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1951.

World Politics & Personal Insecurity, Copyright, 1934; Reprinted in A Study of Power, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1950.

Merton, Robert K., Social Theory And Social Structure, The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1949.

Schaar, John H., Escape From Authority, The Perspectives of Erich Fromm, Basic Books Inc., New York, 1961.