

LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC BULLETIN

VOL. 1, NO. 3

1983

JANUARY

GREENSON MEMORIAL EDITION

INTRODUCTION.....	3
by Samuel L. Wilson, M.D., Editor	
PREFACE.....	5
by Robert J. Stoller, M.D.	
MISUNDERSTANDINGS OF PSYCHOANALYSIS.....	7
PEOPLE WHO HATE.....	15
THE FASCINATION OF VIOLENCE.....	24



**LOS
ANGELES
PSYCHOANALYTIC
SOCIETY/INSTITUTE**

2014 Sawtelle Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90025

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Arthur Malin, M.D., President
Peter B. Gruenberg, M.D., President-Elect
Donald Siegel, M.D., Treasurer
David Meltzer, M.D., Secretary
Seymour Bird, M.D., Director of Education
Morton Shane, M.D., Assistant Director of Education
Maimon Leavitt, M.D., Executive Councilor
Milton H. Bronstein, M.D., Executive Councilor-Elect
Pamela Underwood, Administrator

LOS ANGELES PSYCHOANALYTIC BULLETIN

Editorial Board

Samuel Wilson, M.D., Editor
Richard Fox, M.D.
Joseph Jones, M.D.
Melvin Lansky, M.D.
John Lundgren, M.D.
F. Robert Rodman, M.D.

EDITORIAL POLICY

The purpose of the Editorial Board is to publish a quarterly bulletin that will reflect a high level of scientific discourse in the field of psychoanalysis. While particular emphasis will be directed toward the psychoanalytic situation in Los Angeles, contributions from other national and international sources will be welcomed and encouraged. The editors will consider papers dealing with theoretical and applied psychoanalysis, reviews of psychoanalytically relevant books, reports of scientific meetings, essay reviews, brief communications and letters. Materials can be accepted for publication only on condition that they are contributed solely to the Bulletin.

All opinions expressed in the Bulletin are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute or its officers. All manuscripts, letters and business communications relating to the Bulletin should be sent to the Editor, Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Bulletin, 2014 Sawtelle Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90025. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double-spaced on 8½ x 11 paper.



Ralph R. Greenson, M.D.

INTRODUCTION

It is with pride that the Editorial Board and the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society and Institute dedicate this issue of the Bulletin to the memory of Ralph R. Greenson, M.D.

The three lectures herein were obtained from a bound unpublished volume of twenty-four such lectures spanning the period of 1953-1978, compiled by Mrs. Hildi Greenson, Dr. Greenson's widow. Her introduction precedes each lecture. The lectures were presented by lay audiences with varying degrees of psychoanalytic sophistication.

While not representative of Greenson's scientific writing, teaching, or seminars, they do present a particular and unique aspect of the man. For Greenson was at his best when before an audience where he could give vent to his personal convictions. He did not hold back. This gained for him both ardent admirers and damning critics. One had the feeling that he enjoyed them both.

As Dr. Robert Stoller points out in his introduction, Greenson's most productive years occurred when psychoanalysis was more popular than it is today.

This mutuality notwithstanding, Greenson created an interest in and market for psychoanalysis with his personal magnetism. He loved psychoanalysis, and spread the news with a passion and fervor that does not often come our way.

So think back and in your mind's eye visualize that irascible, plucky man as he approached the lecturn with strong, energetic steps, eagerly anticipating the sheer pleasure of communicating with his audience, and of unabashedly being himself.

Samuel L. Wilson, M.D.
Editor

PREFACE

As is often true of creatively depressed people, Romi was a great optimist. What other type would believe you can change a society's ways of child-rearing, erotic life, physical and mental illness, politics, racial and religious prejudice, murder, and war by means of education, especially education in its least reliable form: public lectures?

Romi, our great, growling enthusiast, came to psychoanalysis in the late 1930's; by the War's end, we all know, analysis was established in the United States as an abundant promise. It would cure the neuroses and psychoses, revolutionize philosophy, uncover the roots of Art and the dynamics of History, bring reason to the brute realities in both fascist and democratic states, and be the general psychology that finally had the tools and the data for explaining human behavior. Not a bad start for an infant tutelage. And all this would be done by us analysts, a group of honorable men and women, almost none of whom were trained in philosophy, art, history, economics, politics, or psychology, in fact few of whom are even educated to be anything but physicians.

And there to meet us was a glowing audience, yearning for the wisdom that would guide them to sanity, decency, intimacy, openness, self-fulfillment — away from deceit and toward the unending progress of the honest mind.

Romi's public lectures in this volume begin in 1955, when the hope was so bright we did not see that it was only hope. And they end in 1978, when it would have taken a madman — which Romi was not — to still be optimistic. Most of the audience is gone, and that which remains is as unsure as are analysts whether Klein, Kohut, Fairbairn, or Lacan — signifiers or projective identifiers, classical metapsychologists or self-psychologists — will own the brave new world. Romi's audience has swept past him, and if we raise our eyes we see — for all our furors of theory — the same has happened to us.

With my bias that we analysts could state almost any of our observations or concepts in ordinary language, I am disappointed that Romi's simple way of expressing ideas has not defended him from the ravages of recent years. For, if you put aside his pulpit-y way of thwacking at sinners, you will find — though stated with embarrassing clearness — that he lays out most all the important ideas of psychoanalysis. Romi was forever horsing around, not the least when he was serious, but he did not believe, as do most people writing in our field, in the obfuscations of our fancy words. (Those who want to see how much blubber enlarges psychoanalytic writing should glance over the book Romi's friend Leites wrote in an effort to demonstrate how plain, even thin, are many of the concepts analysts cherish as explosive, revolutionary.)

Romi had the bad luck when these lectures begin, in 1955, to hit the crest of the wave, for by then it was easy to be an authority bringing the word to the unwashed. The season had changed, however. It was too late to use Freud's public lectures as a model: in the fifties, audiences and ideas had a different shape from that of the previous generation. I think, therefore, though the price would have been severe and immediate, that we might have done better to have gone private rather than public. Well, as they say, that's life . . .

For those of you who remember him, try not to read these lectures, but, rather, hear them with your eyes. Listen again to our raucous, humorous, pugnacious, clever, humane, tender Romi thinking he can scold the world (and himself) out of self-deception and into generosity, love, and freedom. That poor, gullible idealist.

Robert J. Stoller, M.D.

MISUNDERSTANDING OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

Romi Greenson had lectured extensively and repeatedly on child development for the School of Nursery Years, now the Center for Early Education. He began this lecture with the admission that since he had been the speaker for so many of these lectures, he supposed that he was "also responsible for much of the misunderstandings."

That was very impressive, the introduction by Dr. Hanna Fenichel. In a way I suppose I am responsible for much of the misunderstandings. However, I will not take the full responsibility. Later on I will explain to you why I think you are to blame, for part of the misunderstandings, anyway.

I thought it would be a good idea to talk about misunderstandings of psychoanalytic lectures because again and again I have heard people discuss psychoanalytic principles or raise questions about problems related to psychoanalysis, and they have given me the unmistakable impression that they fail to grasp the essential aspects of psychoanalytic thinking. It is astonishing because these people who come to lectures are eager to learn. One of the most flagrant examples of this concerned a lady at a lecture which I had given four or five times — you know, about the various stages and phases of development of children. I noticed her in the audience and after I finished speaking she came over to me and said, "Dr. Greenson, that was wonderful!" And I said, "You know, you look familiar to me." She answered, "Yes, well I come to every lecture." And I said, "Well, the same lecture?" "Oh, yes, I don't pay much attention to what you are saying, but I like the way you express yourself."

Well, what is it that people misunderstand in a psychoanalytic lecture? I would like to discuss this, and then later, discuss, why do they misunderstand.

The most frequent misunderstanding of psychoanalysis today, where parents are concerned, is their belief that psychoanalysts are in favor of complete instinctual satisfaction for children. People who hear psychoanalysts speak come away with the impression that the psychoanalyst said, "All instincts of children should be gratified as quickly as possible." If you give a talk, for example, about "mothering," the early oral phase of development, and the importance of mothering for the child, there are people in the audience who think you mean that the mother is to be a slave to the child; that every cry, every whimper, every sign of restlessness means take out the breast or the bottle and shove it in the kid's mouth. They have the idea that any pain or frustration damages the child. If you give a lecture on toilet training, problems of toilet training, there are mothers and fathers in the audience who will come away with the notion that the analyst said to let the child wet and let the child soil, that there is no reason to train them, and if they get to be ten or eleven and twelve, so what. Eventually they will get fed up with the mess and train themselves.

There are people who attend psychoanalytic lectures about the phallic phase, where children four, five, six become interested in sexuality, masturbation, curiosity about the parents, who come away from such lectures with the idea that their children should be permitted all kinds of sexual satisfaction. They should be allowed into the bedroom and one should walk around nude. If your little girl comes to join you in the bathroom and says, "Daddy, what is that?" And you say, "Why, this is my penis." And if she says, "I would like to hold it." You say, "Hold it, go ahead." Yes, these parents feel that masturbation should be permitted at any time, at any place, in front of strangers, or company, or on the street.

I gave rather crass examples, but they are by no means rare of what people think psychoanalysis advocates.

The same is true about aggression. Their child beats the neighbor's child and they consider this healthy. Let out your aggression! Or, the child kicks the father or the mother, this is healthy too. Just let out your aggression! Well, I gather from your laughter that you agree with me. That this is a misunderstanding. But why? Why is it wrong to permit immediate satisfaction of all instincts. Why? What harm does it do?

The excessively permissive parent, in a way, fosters excessive gratification. If you permit children to get immediate, instantaneous satisfaction, these children are apt to become fixated to this form of instinctual satisfaction. There are two attitudes which are responsible for keeping a child fixated on a certain level of development. Excessive frustration is one. The other, is excessive gratification. It is particularly unfortunate that the so-called progressive parent who wants to undo the tyranny of his own upbringing, is in turn responsible for the excessive gratification of his child, which leads to the fact that these children don't progress, don't mature. They stay on this level of infantile development, way beyond their years. An added complication due to excessive instinctual gratification is that the child has no motivation and no incentive to grow up. The mother who instantly recognizes the child's every need, by the tone of its cry, by his expression, anticipates everything it wants, is apt to have a child who doesn't learn to speak. I have seen such children, I have seen such mothers — who don't wait for the child to express dissatisfaction or some frustration, but instantly want to satisfy a need, even before that need becomes very obvious. I think retardation of development as far as speech, walking, motility, and as far as toilet control are concerned as well as fixating children to parents, all this comes about from the fact that the parent is under the impression that it must gratify every instinctual need of the child all the time and instantly. They forget to realize that one of the important aspects of maturing, of growing up, perhaps the most crucial signs of being adult, is the capacity to bear tension — the capacity to wait, to postpone. Infantile people cannot wait, cannot bear tension nor postponing. These parents, who are so quickly ready to gratify, who are nothing but the bearers of supplies, are parents who bring up children, who never learn the capacity to postpone gratification, i.e. to grow up. This is my first point about misunderstanding of psychoanalytic lectures.

My second point is very similar. People who go to psychoanalytic lectures often get the impression the psychoanalyst is against all authority. The psychoanalyst is against all force and coercion and discipline. These people have the notion that in bringing up children you ought to maintain that we are all equal. You call your child Johnny, and Johnny calls you Joe, or whatever your first name happens to be. His friends call you by the first name and you call them by their first name, and we are all equal. Oh, I may be bigger and taller, but we are really the same. They get the idea that this is what psychoanalysis tries to teach.

You know, it is important to remember some of the history of the development of psychoanalysis. Freud, in the 1880's and 1890's, when he first began to write psychoanalytically, wrote about the fact that most of his neurotic patients were the victims of straight-laced, severe, cruel parents. His first case history had to do with the effects of tyrannical parents on helpless children. Therefore, in the first psychoanalytic writing, this point was stressed again and again. How a cruel, stern, sadistic father had produced a neurosis in a little child. Similarly, the first analytic writings about the problems of sexual development, showed how in a strict, straight-laced Victorian upbringing, children

became neurotic when they were not able to discharge their tensions and get satisfaction for their instinctual needs. Therefore, the early psychoanalytic writings stressed these points. However now I think, partly because of Freud, times have changed. People seem to be going to the opposite extreme, where they bring up children in this so-called pseudo-democratic way in which we are all equal, and we vote on everything. So they say to a child, "You must do this." And the child says, "No, I don't want to." And they respond with "O.K., let's vote" or something like it. I think parents have the right and duty to be the ones who make certain important decisions. It makes sense that parents are supposed to know more, and have more experience, and be wiser. And maybe we could vote on whether a child gets a piece of candy or not, but there are many more vital issues upon which there is no voting. I think it is hypocrisy and delusional to let children grow up with the notion that they are the equal of the parent.

I have seen mothers and fathers who go out of their way to be buddy-buddy with their children. Although analysts are generally in favor of some *quasi-equal* relationship while playing, fishing or reading to a child, treating children as complete equals is going too far. They are not ready for this kind of premature equality, which only brings on guilt, anxiety and confusion. I think this behavior by the parents is in part due to the fact that many of them were products of a strict authoritarian upbringing, and now, want to undo this and give their children those liberties that they never enjoyed themselves.

I see this fear of being authoritarian as a fear of creating guilt feelings. There are parents who after hearing psychoanalysts speak, or reading a psychoanalytic book, draw the conclusion that you should bring up children without guilt. Don't make the child feel guilty. That is damaging! I have seen instances of this upbringing where the mother always minimized the transgression. I know of a little girl who stole. She stole a bracelet from another little girl. She was six years old. She stole it because she liked it. She stole it because she was envious of the other girl. She stole it because she was miserable, resented the little girl, and so she stole it. The teacher found it and told the mother. And then the mother said, "I know you didn't mean to steal it." However, she did mean to steal it! She wanted to steal it! But the mother made any response impossible for the child. Instead of making her less guilty, she made her feel much more guilty. This overly solicitous mother doesn't even let her child feel appropriately guilty or angry. If this mother had cracked her one and said, "How terrible to have stolen!" the little girl at least could have hated her mother. Now all she could do was keep it in and feel terribly unworthy.

Or, take the example of the child who beats the little baby sister, where the mother with this phony smile says, "I know you did not mean to hit her." Sure he meant to hit her; he probably would have liked to kill her. But the mother prevents the child from recognizing that people have such impulses. What happens as a consequence of this? First of all, the complete confusion of what is real. If you hit out of jealousy and rage and mother, who is the authority says, "You didn't mean it," then your own emotions cannot be real. They are strange and unique. What can you trust, what mother says, or what you feel? These permissive parents, with their Pollyanna attitude . . . you didn't mean this, I know you didn't have any such impulse or thought in you . . . foster confusion and added guilt.

Similarly, parents who once heard a lecture about children's fears, try to calm a child who is, let us say, afraid of an elephant in his room at night, by saying: "I'll get rid of the elephant. Go away, elephant! Go away, elephant!" Maybe this helps the child for a moment, but what about the ego of this child which is trying to establish some principles of reality. What is real and what is not real?

Another consequence of this kind of misunderstanding is to be seen in the deformities of conscience that children develop who were brought up by excessively permissive non-authoritarian parents. You would think that if you have such an easy-going attitude the child will grow up easy-going too. This is not true. If your easy-goingness is excessive, you will see certain pathological formations in the children. They may develop a severely strict conscience because you were not firm enough to serve as a model for them.

One of the most masochistic persons I ever treated was a child of a psychiatrist whose father never punished him, he only interpreted. When anything was wrong, the father said, "This means you wanted to do X," or "This means you are hostile against your mother," or this means this and this means that. Brought up in this so-called tolerant atmosphere, this boy developed the most severe self-torturing conscience that I ever saw clinically. Not only are you apt to get a severely strict conscience from this easy-going attitude, but you are also apt to get defects in conscience formations, in the form of delinquency. These children now, because they never had any models to go on, to incorporate, to make part of themselves, now pick up models someplace else, and these models are often delinquent, defective models. All kinds of distortions of conscience stem from this nambie-pambie attitude about what is right and what is wrong.

I think it is important to recognize that in growing up, children need models for right and wrong, better and worse, fair and unfair, just and unjust. They need these models because the child can then take these models and make them part of his own conscience. Remember, children need to form ideals. Part of the formation of ideals is based on the feeling that you, the parent, are strong and mighty. They would like to impart some of this within themselves, and strive to live up to it. By not being strong or forceful or authoritative, you make it impossible for them. There are still other important consequences from the lack of authority and the lack of discipline. The fact is that the child is looking to you for help in his struggle with his own instincts. If a child is overwhelmed with strong aggressive impulses to beat, to hit, to hurt, and if you permit it, because of some mistaken idea that he should act it out, it scares him. He is much more reassured if you grab him and stop him, then if you let him alone. Any of you who have children, you know that time and time again, children want to be controlled because they don't feel they have as yet this control apparatus within them. It is your duty to control them. To say, "No," or to grab or to hold them back. This is their way of learning to gain mastery over their own instincts. You make it impossible when you refuse to control and just sit there waiting for these emotional storms to go on their way.

Finally, evasion of authority brings about the problem that children get to feel that all conflicts are to be avoided. There are parents who have the notion that if you act as an authority and say, "No! I forbid! I prohibit" it will bring the child into a conflict, and that this is bad. Again, this is a misunderstanding. Conflict, though it brings trouble, pain and anguish, is also a means of contending with the world. All of living is tied up with conflict in one form or another. Our children must learn not to avoid conflicts, but to handle them, to meet them. The over-protective point of view leads children to adopting a passive, submissive attitude whenever there is trouble.

I have so far tried to describe to you two important kinds of misunderstandings that people who attend psychoanalytic lectures tend to have. Now I would like to answer the question of how should people feel in bringing up their children?

What does the psychoanalyst mean when he lectures or talks about a child's need for instinctual satisfaction? What does he mean when he talks about the child's need for

freedom and then also talks about the child's need for discipline and authority? Well, it was much easier to tell you what not to believe than what you should believe. Nevertheless, I would like to express some ideas. Psychoanalysis and Freud recognized that children have, from birth on, important and imperative instinctual needs and that these needs require a certain amount of satisfaction. However, Freud later on recognized that in the course of development the child must learn not only how to gratify his impulses, but how to curb them, how to master them, how to cope with them. Part of growing up is dependent upon the child's developing a set of inner controls which would replace the external controls of the parent; this is essential for maturation.

Psychoanalysis teaches that human behavior can only be understood if you recognize that the human being has a certain psychic structure which is influenced by various psychic forces. The ego, the thinking, acting, deliberating part of the personality structure is surrounded by different forces, and it is the task of this ego to decide, to try to relate these opposing forces, in order to get both satisfaction and also security. Security meaning freedom from fear and guilt. It is the task of the ego to cope with the instinctual demands, as well as with the conscience, which has its demands, and those of the external world. It is the aspiration of the human being to live happily within himself and with people in the world. Psychoanalysis tries to indicate complications in this achievement, how excessive frustrations and satisfactions produce complications.

I want to mention here another troublesome misunderstanding of what psychoanalyst lecture about. People get the impression that by constantly trying to understand what happens in children and adults, that by understanding, we also approve of the behavior. We explain and demonstrate and lecture in order to teach something about human behavior. But this does not mean that because we try to understand, we think an act is O.K. It is not true that understanding is synonymous with excuse. Except in psychoanalytic treatment, that is something else. That is different from ordinary life. This is an understatement, I realize it. But, I do want to say that the psychoanalyst, when he is a therapist, is there only to understand.

Misunderstanding of understanding has brought about this notion, that if you can describe a piece of behavior, or talk about a piece of behavior, it is cured, it is over, it is changed. Since analysts are always trying to understand, give explanations and insight, you too, at home with your child (and it does not have to be a child, it could be your husband or wife, or even a friend) should interpret and explain. When a transgression of some kind occurs, let us say, the child hits the little baby in the crib over the head with bottle, and you say to the child, "This is due to the fact that you envy your little brother, isn't it?" Now you are contented that you have handled the situation. Yes? Or the child breaks something in the dining room, or soils, or has a temper tantrum and screams when you have company, and you say to the company, "This is due to the child's envy, or the child is constipated, this is something anal." Or you say it to the child, which is worse: "I know what this is, this is your frustration at having had to move your bowels this morning."

In other words, there are people who get the impression that the way to live with children or with people is to be a kind of junior psychoanalyst. After having been exposed to a few analytic lectures or books, they decide now everything has to be verbalized, everything has to be talked about. They never react to a child, they don't get mad, they don't get glad, they don't kiss or hug a child — they interpret. They say, "Oh, you want me to kiss you," but don't kiss. "You want me to hit you," but don't hit. They interpret, they don't

react. Perhaps I exaggerate a little, but I do it in order to make you aware of this danger. By not reacting, emotions are now avoided. People get the idea that it is wrong for a parent or a friend to be annoyed, to love, to be angry, to be envious, to be miserable, to be depressed — that is wrong. And I say to you, it is right to be miserable and angry and annoyed and loving when the situation calls for it. There are so many which call for it. And it is wrong just to interpret them or put them into words. Feelings are the reality. This is what matters — not words, not interpretations.

An extension of this idea is that words now replace gestures. There is no more preverbal or non-verbal communication. You don't hug someone impulsively. You don't push someone in anger. You don't, you explain. And you talk and talk, and you never smack a child, scream at a child, or even laugh at a child. You are calm — dead and calm. When relationships are built on this kind of constant compulsive incessant thinking, all you are is a thinking machine with answers instead of reactions. I would even go further and say that parents who think they understand something about analysis, feel they are not permitted to *mis*understand their child, they are never to be confused. How wrong! Even an analyst will tell you how much they don't understand. It is permissible not to understand. And it is permissible to be confused, and not to know an answer right away. You can say, "I don't know," to a child or to a friend, even a husband. Just say, "I don't know. I'm mixed up. Don't ask me now, I'll tell you tomorrow." There used to be a time when parents thought this was the only answer they had to give, but now I think they have gone to the other extreme and feel they owe their children answers, interpretations instead of real and genuine emotional responses.

What is the result of this kind of misuse of insight, and misuse of communication, and misuse of understanding? In my opinion, it brings about a misuse of the intellect in children. Instead of using the intellect to bring satisfaction, to give pleasure, it becomes an end in itself; becomes a defense; becomes a way of living. You see children who are bright, quick, verbal, but are they happy? Most of them I've had occasion to see are not. I watch these tense little faces that are so quick, so bright, and I see how this intellect developed at the cost of their emotional development. These children grow up to have a contempt for anything emotional, they consider it weak, dirty and vulgar.

What does analysis really try to convey about communication and understanding. I've given you quite a blast about the misuse of understanding, but please remember, I am very much in favor of understanding, and children need to be understood. But they must be understood in the right way, not only in the intellectual way. It is so much better to demonstrate understanding to a little child by a look, by an affectionate glance or grabbing and holding the child, than by words. It is so much more efficacious than always having to resort to words. I think this is also true for adults. The child has to be understood, but in its proper time and place, when anger has passed. How confusing to the child if you grit your teeth, hold yourself tense and taut, and then try to say some words of explanation, or interpret a piece of behavior. What should he believe — your jaw, which hates him, or your kind words? How can he cope with you? I think it is much better if you are angry and cannot simply express it, not to talk, to wait until you are calm. Then try to understand. I think yes, in general, understanding should be added, but not in the heat of emotional situations. In retrospect when things are quieter, perhaps to talk about it then. Children need to feel the spontaneity in their parents because we hope they will be spontaneous. We hope they will be flexible, not rigid, not machines, not thinking machines. I think psychoanalysts stress understanding, but this doesn't mean just verbal understanding, it means emotional understanding. What good is it if you've only got the right words for what the kid is feeling, if you didn't capture the feeling?

Another misunderstanding that you get from psychoanalytic lectures is the fact that people, after they hear lectures, and I must say, after they have heard some of my lectures, have said, "Well, you listen to Greenson and you get the idea — kids are hopelessly complicated. It's impossible to be a parent." Freud once wrote that there are three impossible professions: One, bringing up children; Two, being a leader of a nation; and Three, being a psychoanalyst. You see how tough it is when you are two of the three.

At any rate, children are complicated and people are complicated. But I don't feel it is hopeless at all. I think children are complicated, and people are complicated when you're in trouble, when things are going poorly. Suddenly everything takes on this enormously complicated view. But when things are peaceful you get sometimes the impression that things are relatively simple. It is true that we psychoanalysts do go with microscopic detail into the behavior and motivations of different aspects of people's behavior; but as far as living is concerned I think analysis indicates few basic principles about living which, if they are achieved and mastered, make life relatively simple.

The combination of giving a child love and at the same time giving it a good representation of reality which is not in contradiction to everything else that is going on in the world around this child, that is of central importance. I think if parents can trust their own basic response, not from books or an analyst, if they love their child and feel they are in good contact with reality, I think bringing up a child is *not* an overwhelmingly complicated task. Of course, few people have this kind of composure, that they trust their own impulses. I think there are many complicated reasons for their lack of trust, but the parents I have seen who were good parents, were not parents who read the most books, or not parents who had the most analytic information, but were parents who had this kind of trust in their basic, everyday reactions and impulses. These were parents who could have emotions, who could love, who could be angry, who could reward and punish and hug and kiss and slap their kids. And these kids felt loved and grew up pretty well.

I have heard it said, and this is another misunderstanding of psychoanalysis, that healthy people conform. Sheer nonsense. There is no such an idea that conformity is what the analysts think is healthy. By no means. I think every analyst is too well aware of the miseries in the world today to ask people to accept this pleasantly. Sometimes it is necessary to accept misery and injustice and tyranny, but not to like it, and not to accept it blindly. I think a healthy person is a person who can also rebel, complain, squawk and fight, and not one who is in line with everyone and is the same as everyone. The healthy human being is flexible and part of being mature is feeling able to disagree. Children who conform and never make trouble are limited in their full emotional development. Of course, here the matter of degree is very important, and some can go to an extreme.

Another aspect of this problem is tied up with the idea that analysts teach, that if you're healthy, you won't have emotional problems. This is very far from the truth. It is inevitable in growing up and in being grown up, for emotional problems to develop. We don't want people to live without problems. You can live in a cell and someone will give you three meals a day and you will have no problem, but you will agree, that is not living. Of course, what is crucial is how you handle the problem, how you meet it, how you resolve it and attack it — this is what makes you either a healthy person or not a healthy person. There are all kinds of problems in this world which we have to meet, and not merely avoid. Now, what analysis does try to do is to make it possible for persons to live to the fullest extent of their abilities without guilt and unreal anxieties.

There are many real miseries in the world, and many real causes for anxiety. The real anxiety, real danger is usually much easier to handle than unreal, neurotic anxiety. I should not say "unreal." That does the neurotic anxiety injustice, due to the kind of terror neurosis brings.

I want to come now to the last part of my talk. Why are psychoanalysts misunderstood and what is the reason for people misunderstanding psychoanalytic lectures? I have thought about this, having lectured so often and having also been misunderstood. Why? First, why do people come to a psychoanalytic lecture? Often they come, not to learn, but to be reassured. They come out of some anxiety, some problem, and they hope I will say something like: "See, it is all right, perfectly all right to do what you are doing." They do not hear all that I say, only that part which agreed with what they were doing. I think this is one of the answers.

Another, I think, has to do with the fact, that they come with a certain amount of unconscious defenses, and they hope by coming, not to learn, but to get some kind of treatment from the lecture. They come out of some sense of guilt, of having done wrong to their children, and they don't want to listen in order to learn to do better, but to change the guilty feeling. It is the feeling they want changed. And thus, they don't listen to the content, but rather try to only perceive or gather something which will change this ill feeling. I would say they come to be treated in a way, in this kind of mass therapy, instead of to listen and to learn.

More important than all the other reasons is that many people come out of a desperate quest for certainty. They want answers, exact answers, and final answers. And they are always disappointed because we say "in general" this, and "in general" that, but answers, definite ones, we cannot give.

People expect from an analyst that he can give black and white, positive answers about every detail of behavior. They have learned to mistrust their own impulses, their own feelings. And out of this sense of loss, and confusion and quandry, they turn to a new religion, psychoanalysts. "Yes, the analyst will know." And he doesn't. He has certain ideas, certain approaches, but the definite and final answers he only knows sometimes when he analyzes a patient five times a week, for three, four and five years. Then he knows some of the answers.

The psychoanalyst, when he lectures, can do a few things. (And this will be my final remark.) What he can do is give a pretty systematic approach to begin to understand behavior. This systematic approach is an approximation of the most relevant, significant, decisive factors, in what motivates behavior. But in a lecture he can only give general approaches, general beginnings of understanding. In a lecture he can educate. He cannot cure blind spots. He cannot cure defenses. He cannot cure phobias or unwillingness to see and feel. What he can do is make people think a little more, think differently, think better, so that they can recognize certain problems. He may hope that they will try to get more help and information and that in this way perhaps they can prevent a neuroses from developing. After all, this is our big hope since we cannot cure all the neuroses of the world. Our hope is to prevent neuroses by helping parents to know more, to think more, so that they can help prevent the neurotic disturbances in their children.

Thank you.

PEOPLE WHO HATE

Out of town speaking engagements, such as this one in La Jolla, provided an opportunity to see old friends and meet new people, as well as enjoy a weekend holiday.

I would like to portray for you how a psychoanalyst looks upon people who hate, and what he sees in people who hate; and more than that, how he sees hate and people who do not know they hate.

I will begin by describing a few of the characters who I will try to analyze a little bit for you tonight. I will start with some kind of person I am sure you will recognize, or at least have read about - for example, a murderer. A man who cold-bloodedly murders his wife, a man who plans it, cleverly, carefully and has thought about it.

Another character in this gallery: a man who didn't plan it, but got drunk and got into a fight, and in this fit of frenzy, killed someone, let's say, his wife. I know you will feel for the subject matter.

A third character among people who hate is a man I saw last week in a locked ward in a hospital; when I asked him what was bothering him, he said, "Well, he had a red spot on his wrist that bothered him." He was worried if that was an infection. And when I looked at his wrist I saw two thick scars, one on each wrist, and I said to him, "What happened?" And he said, "Well, you know, I was full of bad, bad feelings. I'm no good, and I didn't want to be a burden to anybody, so I did a foolish thing - I cut my wrists." He belongs also in our gallery of people who hate.

I will mention to you a fourth, a woman this time, who goes from doctor to doctor, and they cannot find anything wrong with her. She doesn't hate anybody; she like people. But, she has terrible, terrible pain in her abdomen, and colitis, and it becomes clear she doesn't hate anyone, but her gut hates her. She also suffers from hatred, sick hatred.

I could add a fifth person, a Southerner . . . an upstanding citizen of Little Rock, who hates Negroes, believes that there is good reason for lynching. He belongs in this group.

A sixth is a delicate, tender little lady, fragile, who cannot kill a fly, cannot stand the sight of blood, but is mean and cruel to her children. You know the type. She belongs here too among the people who hate.

A seventh is a woman who complains about her bad luck. Married three times and strangely and unexpectedly always ends up married to the same drunken brute that she first divorced. Bad luck pursues her, she is accident-prone. So, let's add her to this group.

An eighth member should be the alarmists who are sure the Russians are going to destroy us. They know it, they have inside information from the neighbor next door. They believe the only thing to do is start a preventive war and kill millions of them. Let's add them to our group.

Unfortunately, I think, to sort of round out the picture I must look to my own profession, pick out a psychiatrist who loves to do shock therapy, who enjoys it and thinks this is the best kind of treatment. And if he has to take out a little piece of brain, well, he thinks that serves a useful purpose too. Let me add him to our group of people who hate.

It is very significant that all of us are enraged and infuriated as infants in this way. There is no difference, rich or poor, white or black, peasant's child, psychoanalyst's child, all are enraged and infuriated in the same way. We are also infuriated and enraged by the same thing, namely pain. Anything which causes pain, and so everything frustrating enrages and infuriates us. This is impersonal and indiscriminate. Rage, fury, anger, exist before hate. They are the forerunners, they are the substance from which hate later

I would like to begin by going back to the origins of hate. I said a few moments ago, that we all hate, but I want to add to that statement: we are not born with hate. We have to learn to hate, we have to grow into it, mature into it. In a strange way we have to become civilized into hating. By that I mean the following. Basically and essentially we are born with instincts, vital bodily instincts, the sexual, i.e. bodily pleasure instincts, and the aggressive instincts. We are born with this. Freud believed that the bodily pleasure instincts, the sexual instincts, had to do with love. He called this whole group of instincts, Eros, and then he described another group of instincts which he attributed to the death instinct. Freud believed in his later writings that all of us are born with an instinct that drives us to die. We seek death from birth on. This theory has been contested. Many do not agree with it, I am not sure I agree with it. But one thing is clear. Just as sexuality is parallel to the love instinct, so is aggression and destructiveness parallel to the so called death instinct. Perhaps there isn't a drive to die, but a drive to hurt, to destroy, certainly exists. There are analysts who will say, that only comes about from pain and frustration. Perhaps, but since life begins with pain and frustration, and being born is painful, it is already there at birth. No matter how you see it, the new-born starts life already with a great deal of aggressive drive and instinct. It is striking that already at birth, the new-born has inborn mechanisms to express his aggression and hostilities. All new-born children can express rage, fury, anger. They do not have to be taught that at all. You can see typical emotional reactions, bodily reaction, and above all, violent muscular reactions, with rage and fury.

Put together, it is quite a collection of characters. They all suffer, every one of this group, to be understood. Some of them hate consciously, and they're all different, and they have themselves. Some hate actively, they go out and do damage and others seem to be pursued by hate. In some the hate is transformed and what you see is not hate, but exaggerated, distorted pity or over-concern. Some apparently hate what they fear, and some fear what they hate. It is a very complex picture that I present here, but what all have in common is that they are sick in the way they hate. All these ways of hating that I have described are pathological ways of hating, are the result of distortions in the development of a person. However, everybody hates, it's true, more than that, hate is contagious. It is a curious thing, love is not contagious. Partly, of course, one does not love publicly, but hate publicly we all do. How easy it is to get supporters whenever you hate anything. How readily one can rouse a group of people, or a mob of people, to hate. To love? That is boring. Hate is inevitable. I'll go further and say hate is necessary, it is all over, we all have it, and I want to clarify that.

It is necessary to hate for good mental health. Good mental health does mean to love, but it also means to hate, but to hate well. The cases I have described, these nine different types, are sick, not just because they hate, but in the way they hate, how they hate and why they hate. I think it is my task tonight to try to explain to you the basis of pathological hatred; how to hate better.

develops. If you observe a child as it grows, as the ego develops, you will see the intensity of the rage begin to diminish, controls begin to develop, and as thinking commences the capacity to wait grows, the ability to postpone. Rage changes, it is directed from the pain itself to the situation which causes the pain, and from the situation which causes the pain to the person who causes the pain. Only when it is directed towards a person can we really strictly talk about hate. When a child who is enraged at his hunger pangs and at his stomach eventually stops hating his hunger and his stomach and hates his Mommy who doesn't bring him the bottle instead, that's when he has advanced to hate. Roughly, if you watch children you will see somewhere between one and three, (the smarter ones earlier), they develop this capacity to hate instead of just being infuriated or enraged. I think it is interesting to recognize that at first hate is preambivalent. That is to say you hate something or somebody, but the person you hate is very different from the person you love, even though the person who brings you the pleasure and the person who brings you the pain is the same one.

It is very curious to notice when children hate the Mommy who frustrates them and does not give them what they want, she stops being Mommy. She is a witch, or a step-Mommy, but not Mommy, Mommy is synonymous with good Mommy. All fairy tales are built on this, to separate the good and the bad mother; they are not the same, one is Mother and one is a false Mother, a witch, etc. But, as the child's thinking, judgment, perception, develop, he recognizes that the same Mommy who brings him the milk is also the Mommy who sometimes doesn't bring the milk. And he hates Mommy. There is a good Mommy and a bad Mommy, but Mommy it is. This is a big step in development. He has reached ambivalence. The ability to feel simultaneously love and hate for the same object is an achievement. Very sick people cannot do that. They always split objects apart, and the ones they hate are very different from the ones they love. It is a real problem. But from here on, hate becomes controllable. The intensity diminishes, it is no longer overwhelming, you don't have purposeless tantrums, explosions of wasted rage, because hate brings with it the need for action. I will come back to this point when I talk about the value of hate. Let me only say, as the child develops and his ego develops, he can differentiate various forms of hate, like aversion, resentment, dislike, annoyance, repugnance, disgust, etc., etc. all varieties of hate. Now hate becomes controllable, hate becomes discriminatory. It is attached to people for definite reasons, causes and it leads to purposeful actions, purposeful in terms of the child, of course.

One of the basic principles in understanding problems of hate is to realize that all uncontrolled, primitive hate, is a regression back to early childhood forms of rage, and is very frightening, not to the outsider alone, but to the person who feels it. Primitive hatred is perceived as a danger. It is a threat to one's own existence. We even say, one is eaten up with rage, bursting with hate, or full of poison, venom, consumed with hate. And all these phrases describe how primitive hate is a danger to the self. The man with the slit wrists was full of hate. He was full of bad feelings, and he believed he was full of rotteness and poison. He wanted to get rid of himself. I have seen a man, some time ago, who was tied in a bed. I was asked to see him by his dermatologist because this man had a terrible dermatitis which did not yield to treatment. In his sleep he tore his flesh to ribbons and was bleeding. Nothing restrained him, and when they gave him sedatives he even got worse. When I talked to him for sometime, I discovered all of this began shortly after the death of his father for which he felt guilty because he had been negligent. And every night, when he became unconscious, he hated himself, and he tore at his flesh, and ripped off his skin again and again to pay in this primitive way. It scared him to feel such primitive hate.

The more aggression, the more the self is in danger. Hatred has to be controlled for it always is a danger to the self. How we do this I will try to describe briefly, later. So much for a brief outline, insufficient, but all I can say here about the origin of hate. Let me go on to a new subject, a new aspect about factors which influence the development of hate.

Now that one has achieved the capacity to hate, what influences the development of hate in a person? Let's try to understand the characters described earlier, the murderer, the lady who can't kill a fly, the depressive, the phobic, the one who wants to bomb Russia. What happened? What factors influenced them? Certainly constitutional factors must play a role, and I would agree people vary in their temperament, in their basic aggressiveness or destructiveness, in their potential for hate. I would agree that there is some difference; but that this ever makes the difference between normal and pathological hate, I wouldn't agree. I have never seen anybody where I felt satisfied the difference was constitutional. But maybe we do not know enough about constitutional factors, and someday we will learn. There are constitutional factors, admitted, but I put them in secondary position.

The first important factor which influences the development of hate is the amount of frustration and deprivation which one has to endure in early childhood. As I have said, rage and hate are responses to pain, a response which means ill-will, an urge to destroy the pain or what causes it. Satisfactions make it possible for frustrations to be bearable. Above all, the sense of being loved, make it possible for a child to tolerate a good deal of frustration. But if there is a great deal of frustration and pain, and little or no love and satisfaction, you will get repeated reactions of rage and hate. Obviously excessive frustrations will produce excessive rage and hate. Unreliable satisfaction, plus frustration, will do the same thing. In the history of people who hate pathologically, you will always find excessive frustration, little love, or if there was love it was unreliable, undependable.

I want to talk about greed as a second developmental factor which influences what happens to hate. Greed is one of the first manifestations of what later becomes pathological hate. Greed has to do with the state of being insatiable, to want more and more, because one can never get enough and one does not trust that what one has gotten will ever come back again. If one only expects deprivation and frustration, one has to take in more and more in order to try to achieve some satisfaction. But this is done with rage, and what one takes in, one also hates, and because one hates it, one destroys it. So, there is never enough. I am describing, I hope, an infant, a disturbed infant, but I think I could be describing lots of other people.

I mentioned to you in my gallery of people who hate, a lady who didn't hate anybody, but her guts hated her. This is a lady who was greedy. She became richer and richer and it was never enough. She used to say, "Whatever I eat turns to poison." She hated everything she ate and she hated to spend for what she ate; it turned to poison and it hated her and she hated it. She never had enough, she wanted more and more possessions. Whatever is accumulated out of hate will turn against you, will even haunt you.

Next, what develops out of greed is envy: to want what someone else has, and to hate him for having it; to feel constantly like a have-not, and to hate everyone who has what you want, that is envy. This is not a desire to be an equal, oh no, but to take away what someone else has, so that he becomes a have-not and you instead will be the owner. This is envy. To have something for yourself, and if possible, to have it all to yourself, and alone. Some amount of envy is in all of us, but I must say, in my experience, it is more

prominent in women than in men. Partly because our society gives so many more favors to men, but partly, I think, for pure reasons of physiology and anatomy, where women feel they were deprived of this marvelous male organ, and they have something less. They resent it, and hate men for it, belittle them, and if they had the chance, would castrate them. Not all women, please, I do not mean all women feel that way. Someone said, "Thank God." I find envy a very common trait, and I do find it more pronounced in women, probably for this reason.

But, I want to mention to you a relative of envy, contempt. How often you see people who do not seem to suffer from envy, but are full of contempt, ready to belittle and despise. You realize, of course, that contempt is more palatable than envy. Envy is painful, one is ashamed to admit being envious; it is embarrassing, it is childish. But, contempt is grown-up, it is respectable. To have contempt is superior. But, did you ever try to study people who are full of contempt? What goes on? A crass example of this is to be seen in people who are prejudiced, who are fanatically prejudiced, against Jews, Negroes, Catholics. They have contempt for these "inferior" people. Consider Jews dirty, greedy, ambitious and cunning. Negroes they consider lazy, oversexed with brute strength. This contempt may be partly a projection. They project their own impulses onto the Jew or the Negro. But, wait. Did you not hear in every attack on the Jew or the Negro, by the fanatically prejudiced person, something that sounded like envy? I did. The Jew is ambitious, clever, successful. The Negro is over-sexed, but potent. Do you hear under the contempt the repressed envy that all prejudiced people have for the object of their prejudice? Contempt is one of the derivatives of hate. I do not want to pick only on the prejudiced ones, in this regard I'm broadminded. I will pick on other fanatics as well. You know all kinds of people who love mankind but hate people. There are many. Mankind is great, but for people they have contempt. That was certainly true for the fanatical communists.

We have talked of greed, envy, contempt. Now I want to talk about guilt, and the relationship between guilt and hate. Actually if you think about it a moment, guilt is self-hate. If you do something for which you feel guilty, you come away with the thought, "I hate myself for doing it." You know the cliché, "I will hate myself in the morning," after having done something for which you feel guilty. Technically, guilt is the reaction to tension between the super-ego and the ego, the conscience and the ego. But, where does hate come in? The conscience, the super-ego, is derived and built up on hate. (Not *only* hate, I stress hate for tonight's discussion.) Isn't it strange how much more often our conscience is cruel and mean and demanding, and how rarely kind and good-natured? Let me explain this briefly, simply, over simply.

Basically, conscience is formed roughly between the ages of three to six years, during the period we call the Oedipal phase, i.e. the triangle . . . child, mother, father. The child loves the parent of the opposite sex and feels rivalry, jealousy, hate and love for the parent of the same sex. I will take the boy as my example, it is simpler. He loves mother, sexual feelings are involved, loves father but also hates him and is jealous and frightened of him. How does he resolve this kind of an Oedipal conflict? The resolution of this basic, nuclear conflict comes about by the child internalizing part of his father. In order to cope with this man, this big, gigantic, frightening, lovable man who also is the object of his hatred, he has to take part of this father into himself and internalize this childish conception of his father. Now he has something in him with rules, values, standards of his father. This transformation is done primarily out of fear and hate, and I think this is why so much of the conscience is full of hate. Of course, it will depend a great deal on

how much love there was to the father, how brutal the father really was, how frightening, how cruel, how mean he was. That certainly plays a role. But the gentlest fathers, the most considerate fathers, will still have children who will build up a conscience which will have a good deal of hate, and in fact, too gentle a father can have the same kind of a result as a brutal father. In emotional development, extremes are very close to each other.

When the conscience finally is developed, this internalized version of the parent with its hate, the hate is now directed toward the self and toward the ego. This is a step in development. We have now, in addition to fear, reaction in the form of, "I will be punished by the parent." Something new, an internalized fear and guilt, a new emotion, self-hate. Now the father does not have to punish the child, nor does the mother. He punishes himself. When a child punishes himself, he has learned guilt. I described several instances: the man who tore his flesh, the woman who married three times and always somehow the same drunken brute. What motivated them? Guilt. And, why guilt? Because there is only one way to get rid of guilt and that is to suffer. Guilt demands pain, suffering, punishment. It makes a lot of difference how you do this, whether you consciously decide, "Yes, I have been guilty and I want to pay," do it correctly, rationally, reasonably, intelligently. Or like people I described who pay unconsciously and much too high a price. Unconscious guilt is irrational and terrible. The only way ever to get rid of guilt is by suffering, but one can suffer intelligently.

In the Army I saw this again and again. In the Air Force many of my soldiers were guilt-laden: they had run away from a burning plane and did not help the pilot, and the plane exploded, and they felt guilty. You can understand that. I certainly could. But what did this soldier do now? On the basis of his guilt, he got into trouble. He fought the MP's, he beat up an officer, he ran away from the camp and he was sentenced to ten years in prison in a federal penitentiary. Who did that help? No one. What good did it do, this pain, this suffering? When I saw this man in the psychiatric ward, which used to serve as the prison ward of the hospital, I would talk to him and say, "All right. You feel guilty, you should be guilty. I don't disagree. But pay intelligently. This man was killed and you feel guilty. Be smart, don't go to prison for ten years. Find out, does he have a wife, does he have a family? Take a year of your earnings, send it to them. They will benefit from it. You will feel better. Ten years in the penitentiary does nothing." I saw many such problems with guilt in the Army. I am reluctant to go on to the next chapter without mentioning a few interesting types Freud described. There are guilt-ridden types of people who may escape your notice. Those wrecked by success. You know the people who as long as they have adversity, they have a bad job, they complain about the boss, they complain cheerfully and go on working. When they become boss, they have a nervous breakdown. People who can always be vice-president and complain, but as president they have a depression and have to resign from the job. The suicide attempts you read about in the paper are often after a man has been given a promotion. Guilt; cannot stand success.

The Sunday neuroses afflict people who cheerfully complain during the week. Sunday without work, no suffering means instant misery. There are criminals from a sense of guilt. I once had to see a man in jail. I was asked by his brother to see him. He had just gotten out of the Army, a young man from a good family, intelligent and reasonable. To everybody's amazement, he went and held up a liquor store, and robbed the man of, I don't know, some thirty or forty dollars. When I talked to him, I asked him, "How did you get caught?" He said, "Well, it's funny, you know, after I held up that store, I was very curious about what was going to happen, so I got in my car and I rode around

the block. This man, literally rode around the block again and again, waiting for the police. The police were slow but he waited patiently. Finally, he got tired and double-parked. When the police came, saw a car double-parked, they went over to him and he said, "Yes, I did it," and they arrested him. I was puzzled and said, "Well, why did you do it?" He said, "I don't know. I've been so depressed and so restless since I got out of the Army. I don't know what to do with myself. I don't want to go to work. I can't settle down to anything." I said, "Well, what gave you the idea to rob?" He did not know. He thought of it, it came to his mind, he read it in the paper and he thought of it and he did it. I said, "Tell me something. Where were you, in the Army or the Air Force, or where?" Then he tells me in five minutes the story, the crux of the story. He was a flyer. He was shot down over Germany and was captured, and he was in a prisoner-of-war camp. There was an opportunity to escape, and he escaped. He could have told another person about it, there were just a few of them in on this escape route, but he didn't. And he had this terrible sense of guilt, that he didn't tell his friend to escape. This friend died, he found out later, and he always thought, "I killed him." I say to you, he had to rob, he had to go to prison because, unconsciously, he had to pay. How wrong and stupid and ignorant and destructive a way to pay. He was a criminal from a sense of guilt. Many of the organ neuroses (the so-called psychosomatic illnesses, in which an organ in the body becomes a scapegoat for hatred and now torments the bearer) have this quality of hate, internalized hate, and that is what guilt is.

So many people hate and don't know they hate. In some it is unconscious, as I have described. Why is it unconscious? Because hate is objectionable, one does not even like to use the word. In ordinary society you rarely say, "I hate," unless it is about something innocuous like, "I hate mushrooms." You don't ordinarily say "I hate so-and-so," You may say, "I dislike him," if you are particularly bold, but you usually say, "I'm not crazy about him," which means, "I despise and hate this man." In psychoanalytic circles you don't say that. You say, "I have negative feelings about him." Real elegant, huh? But meaningless, sterile and hypocritical. You don't like to admit you hate. Why? I cannot answer that completely. I can give you some ideas why.

First of all, hate is closely related to fear and dread. Particularly, primitive hate is frightening. Hate is not only destructive outwardly, but it is also a threat to the self. Whatever one hates, one is scared of, and whatever is frightening, is also painful, and pain is hateful, and then you get into this vicious cycle. You hate what you fear and you fear what you hate, and back and forth. Then, too, hate brings the innate response to destroy, to get rid of what you hate, and that brings about the fear of retaliation. If I destroy, I will be destroyed. That is not pleasant either. But on top of all of that, hate is related to love, and this complicates matters enormously, because, think a moment, to love means, among other things, to be vulnerable to the person you love, which means to be accessible to being hurt, and that brings with it, again, this innate basic reflex, hate, and one wants to avoid it. One does not admit to hating one's wife ordinarily because she hurt your feelings. Instead of being angry, you drop the platter of cocktail things on the living room floor, by accident of course. But, underneath it, there is hate. Combated, distorted, camouflaged, hidden, but hate. We fight it in many ways, and some of the people I described to you have worn the disguises of hate.

Let us look at some of the disguises of hate. The reaction formations of hate. You know, where hate is disguised by reversing it. The people who hate hate. Remember the I can't hurt a fly lady? She could not stand the sight of blood. But to her children, she was cruel, mean and cold. Why? The hate is hidden, but comes out in over-concern. She was

always worrying about them, and taking them to the doctor or taking their temperature and dressing them warm and giving them diets and food they hated, but it was for their own good! The hate creeps in, and she manages to make their lives miserable. I am reminded of the pacifist who will kill you gladly if you disagree with him.

Another category are those people who project hate. "I don't hate. They hate me." The Russians, they are barbarians, brutes, ready to kill us. Out of pure self-defense, with the best motives in the world, let's destroy ten million of them tomorrow. It's not I, it's them who hate. Paranoid reactions of all kinds are based on this. They are obvious and I think that you know that's so pathological and clear I don't have to stress it. The prejudiced ones I described, hate the Negro or the Jew for qualities they project onto that group.

There's one whole other group who hate, and vent their hate, not upon themselves, not upon certain people or groups of people, but who vent it on society at large. The whole group of delinquents who are children who hate. Teenagers between the ages of ten and eighteen, who did not internalize their hate and develop guilt and conscience pangs because they did not have the models for it. Their parents were either corrupt, people with no moral character, or parents who pretend to be moral and are hypocrites. Look into the study of delinquency and you will always find obviously demoralized or hypocritically pretentious parents who have latent delinquent tendencies, which their kids pick up.

I want to come to the conclusion of this talk by reminding you that though I said pain brings hate, pain also brings wakefulness, alertness. Satisfaction brings sleep. It is very pleasant. But pain brings wakefulness, thoughtfulness, action. People who work at maximum efficiency in their thinking or in their occupations, the really successful people, who are expert, and have mastered their field, they hate well. They think well, and they work well, because pain and the handling of hate make for this. It is only people who can sublimate their hate, who can use it effectively by doing, thinking, who become successful, because hate becomes turned into mastering difficulties, attacking problems, overcoming obstacles. This is the benign hate in healthy people. Good natured, satisfied people, are wonderful to have around but they do not necessarily make the greatest workers or thinkers. Though hate energies can be harnessed for work, please don't get the idea that if you do this, then you stop hating. There is plenty left over, as much as you will sublimate it and put it into work and thinking, there's still more. Drive along Wilshire Boulevard sometime. Look at the people in the cars and how they drive. Try once, to slow down two miles an hour slower than the guy behind you and you'll be destroyed. You rarely meet a good-natured driver.

Since not all our hate can be channeled, some has to come out in other forms. You know we have all kinds of harmless ways, like sports, go to the baseball game and "Kill the Umpire." There are good, clean ways of expressing aggression.

How do people develop the capacity to sublimate their hate? Briefly, with a goodly amount of predictable, reliable love in childhood, moderate, not excessive, frustrations and permissive expressions of hate which is not too destructive. Lots of large muscle activity, but physical restraint when outbursts of violent rages and hatred occur. The child must know that you are strong enough to control his terrible hate and that it does not overwhelm you. I said restraint, not necessarily punishment.

What do you do with adults who hate? That is much harder. Many of them do not know they are sick, this is the problem. The prejudiced ones; many of the jinxed people who feel it is just bad luck; the delinquents who feel society is at fault, they have to be made aware they are sick. If prejudiced people realized that prejudice is a sign of envy, I think it would make them neurotic, which is an improvement because if they are neurotic they can be treated. It is important to treat the sick who hate, they do well with all kinds of insight.

In general I would like to say that it is important to respect hate. We must realize that some healthy hates which are clear, undistorted, specific, appropriate and reasonable are necessary in order to function successfully. Hates, of course, which are either harmless or which have to do with issues about which we are willing to take a stand. I would like to say to you something you may not agree with. I think intelligent and active people ought to be willing to have enemies. I decry this quest for universal popularity. I think a person who is really worth something in a community ought to be hated by a few people. Besides, there are so many things that are worth hating. I mean this very seriously and this is what I want to close with. I would like to remind you where it is worth hating, if you are worried about what to do with hatred. Please; the perpetrators of injustice, hate them; tyrants and all tyranny, warmongers, people who like war, hate them. People who seem to want poverty and bring about poverty — hate poverty, hate ignorance, hate disease, hate all of these things. But above all, when you hate, be willing to act upon it and do something, and if you will do that, you will not hate yourself. Thank you.

THE FASCINATION OF VIOLENCE

The angry vehemence of the 60's created intense interest in a symposium at UCLA on "Studies In Violence." Romi was course chairman, a moderator and a speaker. An illustrious panel of experts participated. Sadly, three other participants besides Romi have since died: Paul Jacobs, Bernard Brodie and Margaret Mead.

Most people in our so-called civilized society would state with all sincerity that they hate war, abhor brutality and dread physical violence. At the same time it is our duty as behavioral and social scientists to face the startling fact that our most popular films are full of brutality, crime and war. The best selling books for the last fifty years concern Napoleon, the Civil War, World War II, and murder mysteries. The most beloved of all children's games involve killings and playing dead, playing cops and gangsters, or war, or cowboys and Indians, etc. During the recent assassinations, riots in our cities and universities, most people, the thoughtful and the blase, the young and old, blacks and whites, all shared on common experience, their eyes were glued to their television sets which depicted again and again the shootings, destruction, beatings, burnings, and lootings, and they stared repeatedly at the same sensational photographs in the newspapers and magazines.

As a psychoanalyst I am impelled to investigate this apparent paradox: men supposedly hate violence and yet they seem irresistibly drawn to it. I am not going to dwell primarily on those people who are severely neurotic or perverse about violence, the fanatics or the "lunatic fringe," who derive obvious and direct pleasure from inflicting pain and destruction, I shall focus on the so-called healthy man, or to put it more precisely, the unsick or the non-patient, who deplors brutality consciously and yet in unguarded moments seems to be captivated by the appeal of violence. It is my contention that the psychological key to understanding man's vulnerability to violence is based on his propensity to react to it with an admixture of dread, guilt, and loathing on the one hand, and with conscious and unconscious excitement, titillation and gratification on the other. This state of affairs forms that special frame of mind we ordinarily call fascination. I believe that man is fascinated by violence, far more than he realizes. As a result he cannot understand it properly and his attempts to cope with it are remarkably inept. I shall attempt to uncover some of the dynamics of the contradictory forces which make for man's fascination with violence.

Let me begin by clarifying what is contained in the concept of fascination. On a purely semantic level, fascination means to be held spellbound by some irresistible charm, to be ensnared, enchanted or entranced. It means to be in the grip of something in such a way as to be deprived of the power to think, act, or move for oneself. Fascination contains more than pure love, attraction or appeal. Romantic love can bewitch, beauty may allure, alcohol and "pot" may beguile, but things which fascinate do more than that, they paralyze, unnerve and incapacitate. If one analyzes a person who is fascinated by something it becomes apparent that he is in the throes of an insoluble conflict. I want to illustrate some of these points by describing a fragment from the analysis of a highly intelligent professional man a teacher. The findings differ from the non-patient only in being more vivid and more accessible.

The patient, Doctor X, described suddenly coming upon a terrible automobile accident in which one of the victims was lying on the street bleeding profusely. He stopped his car immediately, with the urgent intention of offering help. As he approached the prostrate form he could discern it was a white haired old man, bleeding from the mouth and

nose. He froze in his tracks. He could not go forward, nor could he leave. Other people rushed to help the injured man, my patient stood on his tiptoes to watch, but he was able neither to take his eyes off the man's face nor could he approach close enough to be of assistance. He was late for his professional appointments but he could not leave. He felt compelled to wait for the arrival of the ambulance so that he could ask the doctor how badly the man was injured, would he die or would he survive. My patient was appalled to find himself imagining telling his wife the story. He could see himself saying in a very matter of fact tone, "the man was critically injured, there was no hope, the doctor said he was surely going to die." As he thought this he felt himself quivering. He could not discern whether he was frightened or excited. Then he heard the man moan and Doctor X felt a lump in his throat, his eyes filled with tears and he almost shouted, "help him, please, somebody please help him." When the ambulance did arrive he was unable to approach. Only after the victim was taken away was Doctor X able to return to his car. Later that day, on his way home, he deliberately drove by the same spot and eagerly searched for some evidence of the accident. The next day, after a restless night, he searched the morning newspaper avidly to see if there was any mention of the accident and was disappointed not to find anything. He reluctantly and shamefacedly admitted that he had hoped to read that the victim had died. I want to stress at this point that Doctor X was not unusually aggressive in any of his overt behavior or beliefs.

I submit this clinical vignette as an example illustrating the conflicting components in fascination. Let me briefly point out the major psychoanalytic findings. For Doctor X the accident was an exciting, dramatic and terrifying event. He was delighted and horrified to be an eyewitness, to be "in", on such an important happening. Most of his life he was more of an observer than a participant, he was not usually "where the action is." The sight of blood stirred up his sadistic impulses but the white hair and the moaning evoked compassion and pity. The aura of impending death mobilized old death wishes he had had toward his own father and also childhood longings to be a good, loving, and devoted son. His instinctual component urged for revenge, "let the old man die, the tyrannical old bastard." His conscience said help the poor old man, he is pathetic, he needs you. His instinctual side retorted. "this is a victory, a triumph, be glad it is not you, he is helpless, not you." His conscience warned him, if you do not help him, you will be punished, you will die. As a consequence my patient's ego was torn by the conflicts and it regressed in its functioning. His logical, reasonable mind deserted him and he lost some of his intellectual capacities. Doctor X was transported into daydreams of glory and triumph. He was immobilized, trapped, captivated, ie., fascinated. During the restless night he dreamt of being on a raft, which was being swept out to sea. He screamed for help, but no one heard him. He awoke irritable, depressed, and puzzled. At the end of the analytic session with me, Doctor X shot me a startled glance and blurted: "My God, Greenson, your hair is white!" He shook his head, sighed deeply and left. Obviously, he had been killing off more than one tyrannical father and he felt I too did not heed his cries for help. The dream illustrated his sense of being flooded by his instincts, his reproaches to me, his father and society for the failure to control him, as well as his need for punishment for his violent impulses.

The crucial point of this clinical example is the fact that the automobile accident provided Doctor X with an opportunity to live out some of the deeply repressed conflictual strivings from his past and current life. Riots, rebellions and wars do the same for the average man. Let me illustrate this with examples from everyday life. I am not going to focus on the ringleaders, the anarchists, or the assassins, for they are fanatics, sick, or exceptional. I want to talk about those who are the followers, those who get sucked in unwittingly, the fascinated ones.

In the last six years, four outstanding leaders have been assassinated by guns: President John F. Kennedy, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, and Senator Robert Kennedy — and yet we Americans are not able to pass effective gun control legislation. The popular response is to blame the legislative stalemate on lobbyists, racketeers, or sportsmen. These answers may be partially correct but they are superficial and defensive. This conclusion is forced upon me when I read that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare statistics report that 80% of all killings and murders in the United States are not committed by criminals but by ordinary law-abiding citizens. Since 1900, there have been 767,918 people killed by guns in the United States, twice as many as were killed in World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam. 269,000 were called murder and 138,000 were so-called accidents. I say "so-called" because 360,000 were suicides and suicide is homicide turned against the self. I am sure most of us are shocked by such facts. It seems so alien to us, and yet, we are not able to pass an effective gun control law. Dick Gregory has said, "It is harder to fill a medical prescription than to buy a gun." Perhaps Freud was right when he wrote in 1915, that governments do not wish to abolish aggression and violence they only want to monopolize it. Certainly, the persistence of Capitol Punishment, murder in cold blood by the State, is a case in point.

Perhaps we are merely innocent victims of history, capitalism, imperialism or totalitarianism? Perhaps we can disclaim responsibility for the 13 major international wars in the past 150 years and I am not counting civil wars, brush wars, border wars, police actions, etc. But how can we explain the violent student rebellions in Berkeley, San Francisco State, Columbia, Wisconsin, Paris, Mexico and Spain? What about the riots in Watts, Detroit and Newark? What about the war between Nigeria and Biafra? And why the universal failure to find any workable solution that offers some realistic promise of a peaceful solution?

I propose that we turn from the more spectacular forms of violence and look at subtle violence, the cold violence, the violence in good taste, the violent non-violence that abounds in our society. The movie star we adore are the John Waynes, Steve McQueens and Humphrey Bogarts. Our favorite public figures are football players, boxers and generals. We do not lionize intellectuals or martyrs. On the day Linus Pauling received the Nobel Peace Prize, it was noted on the inside pages of the Los Angeles Times, while Madame Nhu was splashed over the front page.

Perhaps we should blame the news media, the motion picture moguls or the business tycoons. They are certainly guilty of producing merchandise that appeals to man's aggressive drives. Their aim is simple — offer the consumer what he wants. And we the public fall for it. The clever industrialists and advertisers know how to titilate the public's lust for destructiveness. The most popular cars are named Cougar, Wildcat, Fury, Barracuda, Spitfire, Marauder and Cobra. The poor Rambler is unloved. (American Motors now has a new car, the Rebel).

Let me quote an ad from General Motors for its Wildcat: ". . . hulking under the 2+2's hood is our whacking great 4 BBL 421. Horsepower — 338, torque — 459 lb-ft. Blam! . . . For stab and steer men, there is a new 3-speed automatic you can lock in any gear. Turbo Hydra-Matic . . . Just straighten right leg, wind it tight, move lever, repear . . . make small noises in your throat. Atta boy, tiger! . . . (The 2+2) is just a friendly little . . . sabre-toothed pussycat . . . One of these at fast idle sounds like feeding time at the zoo."

A Chrysler teen-age car ad reads: "Beauty and the Beast. That's the sleek Dodge Charger with . . . a deep breathing 426 hemi growling under the hood . . . Comes on like Genghis Kahn."

The news media and the entertainment industry do the same thing. But there are other organizations who indulge in socially acceptable, polite violence. I refer here to the subtle violence of the organization man, the bureaucrats, the little "Eichmans," the technicians, and the sane, "nice" people who work on war and instruments of destruction. All of this is very proper as long as it does not conflict with the code of conduct set up by the establishment. For example, one is encouraged to practice business under such slogans as, "success at any price," "cutthroat competition" and "making a killing." Even pharmaceutical houses manufacture and sell incompletely tested lethal drugs, which has not led to anything but a small fine, a mere slap on the wrist.

We are not merely the victims of seduction by the government and industry, we are accomplices and silent perpetrators of violent non-violence and violence in good taste. Aren't we all guilty, to a greater or lesser degree, of ignoring the blatant injustice of millions of hungry people in the richest country in the world. Didn't we ignore for years the degradation and mistreatment of the poor and the blacks in our ghettos, while we smugly went about our own business, salving our consciences with an occasional check or a sporadic passionate outburst to our affluent fellow accomplices. Isn't there a touch of Eichman in all of us; surrounded by horror, we watch it on television, and if we are upset we decide to take an extra few drinks or a sleeping pill to blot out our dreams and dull our senses? We tolerate the hypocrisy of the State and Industry because we too are hypocritical in following the dictates of our ideals. We tolerate and participate in the pollution of our air, water and forests and are, willing to take some meaningful action only when we are personally injured, above all when it hurts our pocketbooks or our property.

At this point I want to explore in some depth man's love and dread of violence. The limitations of time will make this a highly condensed analysis. I shall begin with man's love and need for violence.

Man is not born violent but he is born with a predisposition to violence which stems from an inner source, an ever-present wellspring which serves as the reservoir of violence. I am referring here to the psychoanalytic hypothesis that man is born with an aggressive instinctual drive. By aggression I refer to the innate urge in the child to use force in order to control, to dominate, to overcome, to master, to influence something in the outside world. Aggressiveness is necessary in order for man to establish contact with any external object, to maintain this contact, and to control the objects in the environment.

Aggression is the source from which violence originates. Most psychoanalysts consider aggression as one of the two major, primary motivational forces in man. This point of view is not popular, even among psychoanalysts, since it demolishes two of man's favorite myths — the myth of the innocent virtue of babies and the myth of man's innate nobility and his superiority over other living creatures. The facts are, however, that psychoanalytic investigation has revealed that the mental life of children abounds with the most hostile and destructive fantasies. Nursery rimes and fairy tales are loaded with cruelty and brutality. The prevalence of violent fantasies is equally true for childish adults; ie., regressed adults who are severely neurotic and psychotic.

There is further evidence for aggression being an instinctual drive. (1) We all come into the world with inborn channels for expressing rage and anger. We do not have to be taught how to express fury and we all look remarkably similar when we are enraged. (2) From birth to death various forms of aggression are present in such reactions as greed, envy, and jealousy. These tendencies can never be abolished, they are never absent for any prolonged period of time. They may be unconscious, repressed or displaced, they may be controlled or latent, they may even be sublimated, but they are always present, like the derivatives of the sexual drive. (3) The amount of aggression in a given person may be independent of the objective circumstances. We psychiatrists see certain children in whom the amount of aggression is out of proportion to their life experience. This is true in autistic schizophrenic children and in brain damaged ones. One only has to visit a newborn nursery to see the enormous variation in the babies responses to hunger and cold. Some newborns react with great outbursts of anger and rage and others are much more placid.

Violence is the exertion of force upon another person, group, nation or upon a place, a property or idea, against its will, so as to inflict injury, damage or pain. A violent act may occur in behavior, but it can also be carried out in language, feeling, thought or fantasy, it may be conscious or unconscious. Violence may take place by the omission of the act, as well as by its commission. Ignoring injustice, hunger and poverty, and degradation may be traced to unconscious violent impulses towards the minorities and the poor. Pacifism, passivity and neutrality are often more closely related to violence than to the love of peace. Calling a piece of behavior an act of violence often becomes a subjective moral judgment, a designation of condemnation. That is due to our failure to distinguish between good and bad, constructive and destructive, provoked and unprovoked, justifiable and unjustifiable violence. For example, in my opinion fighting Hitlerism was violent but not evil. Fighting in Vietnam is another matter. The riots in the ghettos were violent but I believe they alerted the dormant white majority like no other protest was able to do. I abhor the violence but I wonder whether marching in protest would have done as much, both in terms of alerting the conscientious or mobilizing the backslashers. As much as I deplore the violent demands of the militant students, I do not believe we would now be having courses in Afro-American history without them.

If we compare aggression and violence, we can see that aggression is the urge to use force without regard for the welfare of another person or thing. It is primarily self-oriented. Violence arises from aggression, but violence adds to the use of force, the intent, conscious or unconscious, to inflict pain, damage or injury upon a person or thing.

This part of the discussion has stressed the innate and constitutional sources of aggression and violence; however, I want to emphasize now that the psychoanalytic point of view maintains that usually the quality and quantity of aggression and violence is determined decisively by the individual's life experiences. Constitution and inheritance are rarely, if ever, the crucial factor. The most important source of violence stems from the early family life of the individual.

If we explore the histories of our most violent friends or acquaintances or if we study the social history of the criminal, the assassin, the delinquent, or the fanatic, we find that all these people have suffered from excessive frustration and deprivation, they have been neglected, humiliated or starved in early childhood and usually also in adolescence. The lack of any enduring loving human relationship, the absence of a reliable caring person in terms of love, concern, food, compassion and understanding makes for free

floating aggression, hostility and violence. It can be seen in the cold blooded behavior of autistic children and schizoid adults. The treatment of such individuals consists essentially in supplying them with what they were deprived of, love and controls, both. Children and adults of this type have to be removed from their sick environment in order to become treatable (Bettelheim).

The family or the upbringers play the major role in laying the foundation for problems concerning hostility and violence, but society, which is an extension of the family, also contributes significantly by its attitudes and standards concerning violence. It is important to realize that all forms of hate are far more contagious than love. Rioting sweeps many more people along in its path, and much more intensely, than do love-ins. I have already mentioned the appeal of violent movies, sports and news items.

Now let us turn to the dread of violence. Violence is terrifying because it threatens the intactness of the self, primarily and basically the bodily self. Secondly and later there develops a horror of being violated emotionally and intellectually. There is no self preservative instinct in man because man is not born with an awareness of self. However, man dreads pain and, as soon as an ego develops, he dreads all body damage since it is associated with pain. Later he cherishes his selfdom, his identity, and abhors anything which will endanger or diminish the self.

The most important factors in man's problems with violence are his conflicting impulses towards violence. He is impelled to violence upon others and he dreads it being vented upon himself. To clarify this interrelationship we have to pursue the way dread and desire lead into one another. The most extreme form of fear, or anxiety, is a state of mind we call panic. All traumatic events elicit panic reactions and the essence of panic is a feeling of being overwhelmed, of being helpless, powerless. We all dread violence unless we are caught up in a mood of committing some violence. We dread violence because we sense that violence can destroy us or render us powerless and impotent — a return to that most vulnerable frightening state of infantile helplessness.

People who find themselves in a state verging on helplessness or powerlessness may do one of two things; they may regress to despair or apathy — or under certain circumstances they may resort to violence. Here I come to the immediate and intermediate causes of violence. I have already mentioned that a history of chronic malnutrition, degradation, brutality, humiliation, frustration and emasculation may lead to acts of violence. If this occurs in a person who senses he is being pushed to the brink of feeling helpless, an act of violence is apt to occur. Violence is not only an act of hatred and revenge against ones oppressors, but it is also a defense against falling into despair, resignation, or deadly apathy. An act of violence may give one a temporary sense of power, in fact, it may create a feeling of omnipotence, the exact opposite of helplessness. Violence is quick, and therefore enticing for those who have been forced to endure indignities for years. Violence is magical, it transforms one by suddenly changing one's identity from a feeble, dependent nobody into a sense of somebodyness, a sense of manhood. Incidentally, the gun is correctly called the "equalizer." Actually, one not only achieves a sense of equality but of superiority. Small wonder violence appeals to the oppressed, the minorities, and the disenfranchised.

There is still more to be said about its appeal. Violence is contagious and tends toward group and mob formation.

All groups tend to regress; the more they are tied by emotional rather than intellectual bonds, and particularly if there is a dynamic leader, the more they are inclined toward hate reactions. The group and the leader dilute responsibility and guilt and bring a feeling of invulnerability. Furthermore, the group is an audience, a chance to exhibit one's courage and manliness by exposure to danger and death. For some violence is a means of becoming a member of a group, or belonging and thus appeals to the alienated adolescent who needs to "be in" in order to establish an identity.

Freedom of assembly facilitates crowd and mob formation and predisposes to violence among the uprooted, the poor and the unemployed (Arendt). Mob violence produces an exhilaration due to the sudden feeling of sharing a community experience which is very gratifying to the lower classes, the ignored and oppressed (Coles).

Violence is intense and vehement, and entices those who are searching for intensity. Empty, hollow people, people with little capacity for human relationships are prone to use violence as a means of filling up their empty lives. For some violence is a cry for help, a cry of distress, a signal of impending danger, of suicide. We cannot afford to ignore violence or severely condemn it. The gun, that great equalizer, can be turned against the self as well as the external world.

The most explosive trigger for violence is the feeling of righteous indignation stemming from the feeling of having been mistreated, of having been unjustly humiliated and degraded. If this joins with group or mob formation, violence is almost inevitable.

Members of political parties or groups who are imbued with the absolute righteousness of their cause, the political extremists, right or left, are tempted to violence. Fanatics, political or religious, are crusaders and history has taught us how bloody they were. Furthermore, the revolution promises a new life, a rebirth, a complete break from the miserable past, a chance to deny the past.

Let me turn once again to those who are fascinated by violence but who, for the most part, think they only participate in it vicariously, as observers or auditors. I am talking now about the vast majority of us, not only in this country but all over the world. Most of us in an affluent society do not resort to open violence because we have enough success and status. We only fear the consequences. But let anyone or any group threaten our possessions or status and I predict that most of us will be tempted to resort to violence. We successful ones — we who are "in", the haters of violence, will become the most violent. The greatest danger from the black militants and the student rebellion is the white backlash and the anti-intellectual backlash which I predict will be far worse than anything we have thus far experienced. The balance between the love and dread of violence is a delicate one and can easily be tipped in an opposite direction.

The fear of violence is greatest in those who repress their own violence and unconsciously project it upon people in the external world. The extreme fear, one might say, the paranoid fear of the stranger, particularly the strong one, the different one, be it in terms of color, politics or religion, is to a great extent based on this mechanism. Blacks tend to be paranoid about whites and whites are paranoid about Blacks. The same seems to be true about Americans vis a vis the Russians and vice versa. All of us tend to expect retaliation and retribution from those we fear and would destroy, from those we envy and from those toward whom we feel guilty.

I turn now to the final and shortest part of this presentation: the control of violence. I do not believe violence can be abolished because it is natural to man. Margaret Mead has said she knows of no society where there is a total absence of violence. In order to deal with violence effectively we have to recognize its presence in all of us. This requires honesty and humility. We must distinguish between justifiable and unjustifiable violence, constructive and destructive violence and defensive and offensive violence. We must teach our children such distinctions and how to cope with them. We must be vigilant with ourselves in recognizing the differences.

We may be able to control violent behavior by permitting and even encouraging certain forms and equivalents of violence particularly about objects which are deserving of hatred. It is desirable to fight against tyranny, poverty, disease, hunger and injustice. Here we may have the opportunity to transform physical violence into more civilized modes of action. The more we can use aggression constructively and with little physical violence, the more brutality and violence will appear stupid and despicable. We cannot do this by pretending to be above it all, that would be due either to ignorance or hypocrisy. Of all the animals on the face of this earth, man is the only one who plans the killing of his own species. Konrad Lorenz has said that man is the missing link between the animal and the human being.

To summarize: I chose the topic of fascination with violence because I believe that fascination is a particularly elusive and tricky adversary. I have the impression that we are in danger of being seduced by violence because we are not aware of how it subtly excites and titillates us despite our conscious abhorrence of it in some of its grosser forms. Unrecognized fascination with violence can stimulate our judgment and morals. We shall need our best judgment and highest principles of morality if we are to maintain (or should I say achieve) our loving concern and compassion for the fortunes of the family man. I make this presentation with the belief that our best hope for surviving the violence that surrounds us everywhere is to dissect, study, clarify and openly discuss the origins, development and vicissitudes of violence with people of different backgrounds. My earlier emphasis on the instinctual basis of man's aggression should not obscure the fact that man also has an innate tendency to love. Man is a social creature and also a thinking one. The combination of love, in its broadest sense, and intelligence, is man's greatest weapon against violence.

To put it another way, the best hope for man is to become more human, recognizing the frailties of the human condition including our fascination for violence.