

Semantography Series No. 350

PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF
INTERNATIONAL VIOLENCE

Lecture by Prof. Dr. Jerome D. Frank M.D. of John Hopkins University, Baltimore, and Bliss' address after Dr. Frank's lecture in the Science Theatre of the University of N.S.W. Sydney on August 12, 1971.

Group conflict, the chief instigator of violence, is the law of life, and the threat of violence with occasional resort to it to keep the threat credible, plays an important role in maintaining social order. Through it the weak gain concessions from the powerful before they are driven to desperation and the rulers maintain order. In healthy societies the actual display of violence is rare, and threats are largely symbolic. The vote, for example, can be viewed as a substitute for a fight in that it is a test of strength, determining which side would probably win in a battle. Moreover, order is maintained by institutions, in which all members of the society have confidence, for adjudicating power struggles and protecting the loser, operating under a code of laws.

Under some conditions conflict, however, violence can get out of hand and humans resort to the most powerful engines of destruction at their disposal. All that has saved mankind from destruction by this means so far has been the inefficiency of even the most powerful weapons. With the creation in the past few years of enormously deadly biological and chemical poisons and, of course, nuclear weapons, this safeguard has been removed.

Humans are group creatures and the group, not the individual, is the survival unit. When it is threatened, individual members are expected to sacrifice their lives in its defence and are motivated to do so. In this, humans differ not at all from baboons, and are not too different from ants. Thus, paradoxical as it may seem, the greatest threat to human survival is not aggression but altruism. It is the threat to the group of which one is a member, not to oneself, which evokes the most powerful aggressive response. Advocates of non-violence can easily accept the notion of accepting death for themselves rather than attacking their opponent, but find it much harder to defend the non-violent position when the threatened victim is a wife or daughter. In this, too, humans resemble animals, who fight especially viciously to defend their young.

But humans add a unique dimension to their allegiance to the group, through their capacity for what Arthur Koestler has termed self-transcendence. The human group gains the allegiance of its members not only because it is the biological survival unit, but because it embodies and preserves certain ideals, values and symbols. When Kamikaze pilots committed suicide for their emperor, they had more in mind than the little man sitting on the throne of Japan, and when men offer up their lives for the Flag or the Cross, it is for the concepts these bits of cloth or wood represent. Even an abstraction as vague as a better world for our grandchildren may suffice to call forth the supreme sacrifice.

Group conflict arises when each group perceives its goal as achievable only at the other's expense. Domestically this type of conflict becomes violent when groups feel intolerably frustrated or threatened, and have lost faith in the institutions of society to satisfy their claims or to protect them. Thus in the United States today, many Negroes have lost faith in the ability or desire of the white community to satisfy their legitimate aspirations, and many whites fear that their jobs, homes, and lives are jeopardized by militant negroes and that law enforcement agencies can no longer protect them. As a result both sides take to arms. A main source of resistance to gun registration is the fear of all groups that they will be unilaterally disarmed and thereby left at the mercy of their enemies. Thus in his presidential campaign Governor Wallace spoke of the good people giving up their guns and the bad people keeping theirs, and Negroes express fears that if they register their guns, they will be disarmed and the whites will not.

Analagously, on the international scene violence erupts when nations find themselves in conflict and cannot appeal to any supranational institution to resolve the issue and protect the weaker, (not because such institutions have

broken down, but because they do not yet exist) and each perceives yielding to the other as a threat to its survival.

Groups in conflict for any length of time regularly form images of each other as enemies, and the enemy image is remarkably similar, no matter who the conflicting parties are.

This is illustrated by the findings of repeated surveys of Americans concerning their characterizations of people of other countries. In 1942 and again in 1966 respondents were asked to choose from a list of adjectives those that best described the people of Russia, Germany, and Japan. In 1942 the first five adjectives chosen to characterize both Germans and Japanese (enemies) included warlike, treacherous, and cruel, none of which appeared among the first five describing the Russians (allies); in 1966 all three had disappeared from American characterizations of the Germans and Japanese (allies) but now the Russians (no longer allies, although mere rivals than enemies) were warlike and treacherous. Data were reported for the Mainland Chinese only in 1966, and predictably, they were seen as warlike, treacherous, and sly. (Gallup Poll, 1966)

The adjectives applied to the Japanese and Germans as war-time enemies no doubt accurately described their behaviour..as they do that of all nations at war, including the United States..but it is noteworthy that Americans did not apply these adjectives to the Russians when they were allies, although the Germans undoubtedly saw them as warlike and treacherous, and that Americans now use these terms for the Russians and the Chinese although there is no direct evidence that they apply. The Russians have been talking and acting with great restraint and Chinese bellicosity is restricted to words; neither nation has shown any particular signs of treachery.

The characteristics of the enemy image have been most extensively studied with respect to the United States and the Soviet Union. A detailed content analysis selected mass and elite publications in these nations a few years ago found that virtually 100% of the relevant items described the national goal of the other as military expansion, and their military doctrine as including a pre-emptive strike. About 2/3 of each believed that negotiations were possible and could be successful only if our side were stronger. A majority of each saw foreign aid given by their country as motivated by altruism, that offered by the other in the service of their expansion. (Angell, Dunham and Singer, 1964).

This is supported by many reports of personal interviews, some systematic and some informal. One of the latter, by an American scientist who had an opportunity for long, informal conversation with his Russian counterparts is worth quoting: "The Westerner regards the Russians as controlled, for the most part without their knowledge, by an oligarchy of rapacious and malevolent men who seek constantly to foment world revolution. The Russian is equally convinced that the West (which means really America, for in Russian eyes all other Western countries are American satellites) is being victimized by a small group of profit-mad 'monopolists' who pull the strings that control government, press, and radio and who try to instigate wars in order to sell munitions. On the level of informal conversations such as ours it was impossible to resolve this difference in viewpoint. Each of us was repeating what he had read in his own newspapers, and each was suspicious of the other's sources." (Krauskopf, 1961.)

The enemy image leads to the application of a double standard of morality, which in turn reinforces it. Since the enemy's motives are always presumed to be bad and those of our side are good, the identical act is viewed as good if performed by our side and bad if performed by the enemy. A psychologist showed some American fifth- and sixth graders photographs of Russian roads lined with young trees. When he asked why the Russians had trees along the road, two answers were: "So that people won't be able to see what is going on beyond the road," and "It's to make work for the prisoners": but when he asked why some American roads have trees planted along the side, the children said "for shade" or "to keep the dust down". (Bronfenbrenner, 1963.)

The double standard of evaluation was illustrated by a formal study conducted in 1965 in which a large number of college freshmen were presented with fifty statements concerning belligerent and conciliatory actions that had been taken by both the United States and Russia: for half the students the acts were attributed to the United States, for the other half to the Soviet Union. They were asked to indicate their feelings about each statement by marking it from +3 (most favorable) to -3 (most unfavorable), and as might be expected, an action was scored more favorably when attributed to the United States than when attributed to Russia. For purposes of statistical analysis the scores were transformed into 0 to 6 scale, so that scores above 3 would be favorable and those below 3 unfavorable. For example, the average score for "The U.S. (Russia) has established rocket bases close to the borders of Russia (the U.S.)"

was scored 4.2 in the United States form and 1.0 in the Russian one. (Oskamp, 1965.)

The image enemy nations form of each other, of course more or less corresponds to reality. Nations that failed to recognise that their enemies might be treacherous and warlike would not long survive.

However, the enemy image impedes resolution of the conflict by causing both sides to overemphasise confirming information and filter out information that does not fit. It also creates a self-fulfilling prophecy, leading enemies to acquire the evil characteristics they attribute to each other. In combatting what they perceive to be other's cruelty and treachery, each side becomes more cruel and treacherous itself.

The mutual enemy image is one example of how symbolic components aggravate human conflicts. Even more troublesome is the tendency to formulate both domestic and international conflicts in terms of values rather than tangible goods. Negroes fight for better housing and better jobs, but these are subsumed under such concepts as freedom, equality and justice: whereas whites appeal to self-determination and law and order.

Although domestic struggles may be bitter and destructive, they do not seriously threaten the existence of the social system as long as both sides profess the same values. The life of the society is at stake when one side challenges its basic assumptions as when Blacks demand a separate state, which attacks the concept of integration of peoples of all races, or militant students of the New Left argue that the democratic system is no longer viable and must be overthrown.

International conflicts are caused by conflicts of national interests. As long as these interests are viewed primarily as tangible, such as control of territory, population or resources, and neither side strives for the complete occupation of the other, they too remain within bounds. They become threatened to the survival of the contestants, and today to the survival of mankind, when the interests at stake are couched in terms of which world view shall prevail, and when the promulgators of each world view believe that it cannot survive as long as the other exists. Unfortunately, today many people view international struggles in this way..they see all as skirmishes in an apocalyptic struggle between Communism and Free Enterprise to determine which will eventually secure the allegiance of the whole world, and proponents of each ideology see the other as a never-ending threat that can be eliminated only by the destruction of its advocates.

Ideological components of conflict remove constraints on violence for two reasons. In contrast to fights over tangible aims, which end when the aim is achieved, ideological struggles have no natural end. A fight over property stops when one side has firmly secured it, but an idea ceases to be a danger only with the death of the last survivor who holds it, and even then it may crop up again. Hence religious wars tend to be especially bitter, stopping only when both sides are exhausted, with the survivors still clinging to their beliefs.

Furthermore, ideologies are often more important sources of psychological security than possessions, so a challenge to them is a greater threat. Because of their power to conceptualise, humans are forced to recognise the insignificance of their individual lives, which appear to be nothing more than brief, tiny flashes of experience in a universe that does not seem to care. This is intolerable to many people, and to counteract it they create ideologies which give meaning to existence. For them, the loss of their ideology, as might follow defeat by a group that maintain an incompatible ideology, may be worse than biological death, so they prefer to die.

Traditional international wars were waged by the military of each side, that is by institutions of a nation whose special function it is to defend or promote its interests, and the civilian populations were regarded as more or less innocent bystanders who might get trampled under foot to be sure, but who were not directly involved. In this war differed from domestic strife, in which the whole population is on the firing line. Today as a nation's military strength has come to include its human and industrial resources as well as the size and efficiency of its army, and methods of killing have become more and more massive and indiscriminate, this distinction between international and domestic strife has largely broken down. A further reason for the disappearance of this distinction is the rise of guerilla warfare as the main defense of weak nations against stronger ones attempting to subdue them. Since the success of guerillas is known to depend on the active support of the population, everyone becomes a combatant.

In any case, international conflicts show a strong tendency to escalate..that is, once nations become engaged in war, whatever inhibitions humans have against killing their own kind..and like other predators, we probably have some..are abolished.

One reason for this is that so much of the killing is remote. If ordered to douse a child with burning napalm, even the most hardened soldier might hesitate a bit, but he can do it on a massive scale from an airplane. That is mass methods of killing reduce the enemy to a statistic.

TV, which puts everyone on the firing line, as it were, reduces this impersonality, and so may have an inhibiting effect.. perhaps partly responsible for unprecedented opposition to the war in Vietnam, decline in the sale of war toys.

An often overlooked disinhibitor of killing ⁱⁿ humans, which plays into the newer methods of mass killing is sheer obedience. All social structure depends on a hierarchy of power, and members of even the most democratic societies readily obey legitimate authority. If they did not social living would be impossible. The power of obedience was elegantly, if somewhat horrifyingly demonstrated by a study in which normal American adults were told by the experimenter that an experiment for which they had volunteered required them to deliver very painful, possibly lethal, shocks to an inoffensive stranger. About two-thirds of the subjects carried out these orders. The closer subjects were to the victim psychologically, the more likely they were to disobey, but even when they forcibly had to hold the struggling, screaming victim's hand on the shock plate, about a third complied. (The victim, of course, was an accomplice..he received no shocks.) Perhaps the most disquieting finding was that if the subject only had to throw a master switch which enabled someone else to give the shock, over 90% complied. (Miligram, 1968) That is, we are all too ready to hand over responsibility for our acts to a legitimate authority. So it is not surprising that when a Polaris submarine commander was asked how he felt about the destructive power under his control, he replied: "I've never given it any thought. But, if we ^{ever} have to hit, we'll hit. And there won't be a second's hesitation." (Cary, undated)

The power of obedience also probably explains in part why enemy soldiers slaughtered each other just as ruthlessly in hand-to-hand combat as with shells and bombs, but other factors are undoubtedly also involved. Sheer self-defense is undoubtedly one, but an additional factor is the "dehumanization" of the enemy. Denial of common humanity to the enemy is one effective way of removing inhibitions human may have against self-slaughter.

One source of dehumanization, already mentioned, is that the enemy holds an antipathetical ideology. He is no longer a human but the embodiment of a hated abstraction, such as Communism, Imperialism, Islam and the like. As a believer in false gods he partakes of the demonic, and so must he be destroyed.

Another way in which the enemy is dehumanized is to make him into a beast, on the grounds that he commits atrocities. Whether or not a method of killing is viewed as an atrocity depends on whether it is considered legitimate, not on the amount of pain or suffering it inflicts. Who can say whether it hurts more to be disemboweled or to be roasted to death by napalm? Yet in the Vietnam war, the United States regards the former as an atrocity while the National Liberation Front refers to napalm and crop poisoning as "the most cruel and barbaric means of annihilating people." (Malinowsky, 1966.) Each side continually invokes the atrocities of the other to arouse the indignation and increase the urge to destroy the enemy.

Another important disinhibitor of the human propensity to kill may be related to the psychology of commitment. A very powerful motive for human behavior is the protection of one's image of oneself. Since the military man's self-image rests on his courage and willingness to die for his country, his self-image is apt to become involved in the fight. This ~~creates~~ the danger that if a conflict is sufficiently desperate and prolonged, the primary goal of both antagonists may shift from gaining its initial goals to proving that it is more determined or more courageous than the enemy and the best way to do this is to show that it is willing to keep on fighting longer. History is replete with examples, a recent one being the Battle of Verdun, which, as you may remember, cost the lives of about a million soldiers in World War I. According to a military historian, it continued long after its military significance had passed away because: "it had somehow achieved a demonic existence of its own, far beyond the control of generals of either nation. Honor had become involved to an extent which made disengagement impossible." (Horne, 1966.) Perhaps the state of mind of the generals (the soldiers, who did most of the dying, had no choice but to obey orders) was analogous to that of persons who suicide rather than face intolerable loss of self-esteem.

The best hope of getting group violence under control internationally lies in reducing the sense of frustration of the peoples of the underdeveloped world and strengthening the sense of community which is a prerequisite for the development of effective international peacekeeping institutions.

It is a truism that a major instigator of violence in humans is anger, and a powerful source of anger is frustration. The important point is that the sense of frustration depends less on the absolute level of deprivation than on the size of the gap between what a person has and what he expects to have, or believes himself to be entitled to.

Recent urban riots cannot be explained by the low standard of living of the rioters..in absolute terms even the poorest dweller in the Negro ghetto is better off than millions of Asians. Yet the denizens of the Calcutta slums quietly starve to death, while the Negroes in our cities explode with rage and frustration. Their bitterness arises from the gap between what they have and what they have been led to expect.. and the gap has been increasing.

The same phenomenon, which has been called "relative deprivation", explains the rising tide of violence in most of the world's newly independent countries. The citizens of these lands expected independence to bring a rise in the standard of living..instead it has often been accompanied by a fall.

The sense of relative deprivation has been aggravated by television and, especially, the transistor radio, which makes the poor of these nations aware, as never before, of what other people have. To overcome their frustration requires rapidly raising ^{their} living standard, but as with attempts to improve the lot of lower-class American negroes, aid to them must be offered in such a way as to preserve the self-respect of the recipients and permit them to share in decisions regarding their welfare. The point was well stated by a Negro Vista worker: "Black people want black control of their lives and activities more than anything else. If they make mistakes, let them be black mistakes..we're tired of white mistakes in our lives."

Failure to observe this principle largely explains why American economic aid has created more resentment than good will and why the Peace Corps has been relatively successful.

The central principle, as described by one of its senior psychological consultants, is that "The Peace Corps must be seen as a program that is compellingly relevant to the recipients' well being, as a form of assistance that can be accepted without compromise of autonomy or loss of personal dignity." And to this end it operates on "revolutionary" principles: "The volunteer lives simply, with the people...He is assigned to work under the supervision of host nationals within existing administrative structures." (Hobbs, 1963):

The Peace Corps' aid projects are defined as collaborative efforts, in which the volunteer learns from as well as teaches the host, and the goal is for the host to take over the job himself. The volunteer works as a peer among peers, not as a superior with inferiors, using the host's language and operating in general on the principle that other people are more receptive to your views if you show that you understand and respect theirs.

Just as domestic tranquility in the United States depends on restoring the sense of community of all Americans, so world peace requires the creation of a sense of community of all the world's people, transcending their national allegiances. In the past, there was no prospect of achieving this goal, but now for the first time tremendous advances in electronics communication and mass transportation may be bringing it within reach. We have not even begun to use the potentialities of international communication satellites, for example, to increase international understanding.

With potential enemies, these means offer new opportunities for constant communication, without the distorting effects of intermediaries, such as the hot line, as well as direct surveillance by satellites, both of which should yield more accurate information as to the opponents' intentions and capabilities. In itself, this would impose restraints on preparations for hostilities by both sides, and would also help to reduce any distortions arising from the enemy image. An important inhibitor of violence within communities is public opinion, and one can discern..if one looks sharply..the beginnings of a world opinion, whose increased power can perhaps be seen in the striking differences between Russia's behavior toward Czechoslovakia last year and its attack on Hungary a decade ago. Its motives are probably the same, but the subjugation of Czechoslovakia is not easy to achieve with the whole world, and especially the other Communist parties looking on.

More importantly, nations whose interests conflict also have many interests in common which are jeopardized by an intensification of hostility, and these common interests loom increasingly large as the world shrinks and opportunities for fruitful international co-operation increase. Today the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have a strong, short-term common interest in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear powers, and a long-range one in promoting international stability, since local flare-ups always carry the potential of forcing a major confrontation. This creates incentives for joint undertakings to raise the economic level of the impoverished nations.

Social psychologists have shown that the most powerful antidote to enmity among groups is co-operation toward a goal that both groups want but neither can achieve alone. At first glance survival would seem to be such a goal since all people desire it and its achievement requires international co-operation. Under some circumstances, however, survival takes a back seat compared with the urge to destroy the enemy. Moreover, the long-term measures required for national survival, such as general disarmament, appear to increase the short-term risks of destruction by an enemy, so mobilizing the urge to survive works both ways.

Modern science, however, has created many opportunities for co-operative activities among nations to attain goals that all of them want but none can achieve alone. We know from the experience of one such activity which led to the treaty demilitarizing the Antarctic, (the International Geophysical Year) that this fosters habits and attitudes of co-operation which gradually become embodied in institutions. Scientists have devised dozens of such projects which can be activated as soon as the world's leaders are willing.

In addition to building habits of co-operation, some of these activities afford constructive outlets for man's aggressive competitiveness, which must be rechannelized if it is not to find periodic release in war. The conquest of outer space and the undersea world meet this need since they demand the fullest exercise of courage, determination and all the other manly virtues and are highly competitive. At the same time, people everywhere experience these ventures as projects of mankind, not the monopoly of any one nation. Thus both Americans and Russians can sincerely mourn when an astronaut or a cosmonaut is lost, and they can sincerely congratulate each other on a new space triumph, which they could hardly do on the invention of an improved nuclear missile.

A sense of community among peoples of different nations would lay the essential groundwork for the creation on an international scale of the domestic model for controlling aggression, namely the rule of law administered by specialised institutions.

The job devising these new international institutions with machinery for enforcing their decisions under international law is primarily one for political scientists, and jurists. Psychiatrists and psychologists must guard against delusions of grandeur in this regard. Our contribution at best represents no more than 10% of the solution..but it is a crucial 10%. Sociopsychological analysis can make significant contributions. On the one hand, they can indentify the psychological factors that intensify the mutual image of the enemy and aggravate armed conflict, as the first step toward effectively combatting them. On the other, they can suggest how certain psychological principles might be mobilized to foster the feeling of world community on which the new international institutions must rely for acceptance. Perhaps these contributions, when integrated with the more important ones from other disciplines, may yet be enough to tip the balance in favor of survival.

References

- Angell, R.C. Dunham, V.S., and Singer, J.D., 1964. Social Values and Foreign Policy Attitudes of Soviet and American Elites, Journal of Conflict Resolution, 8: 329-491.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., January 5, 1963. Why Do Russians Plant Trees Along The Road? Saturday Review, p.96.
- Cary, W.H., Jr., undated. Madmen at Work, The Polaris Story, Philadelphia: The American Friends Service Committee.
- Gallup Poll, June 26, 1966. "Image" of Red Powers, Santa Barbara News-Press.
- Hobbs, N., 1963. A Psychologist in the Peace Corps, American Psychologist, 18: 47-55; p.53.
- Horne, A., February 20, 1966. Verdun..The Reason Why, The New York Times Magazine. p.42.
- Krauskopf, K., 1961. Report On Russia: Geochemistry and Politics, Science, 134:539:542; p.542
- Malinowsky, R.V., May 2, 1966. The New York Times, p.1.
- Milgran, S., 1968. Some Conditions of Obedience and Disobedience to Authority, International Journal of Psychiatry, 6:259-276.
- Oskamp, S., 1965. Attitudes toward U.S. and Russian Actions: A Double Standard, Psychological Reports. 16: 43-56.

When I read in the papers that Prof. Frank will speak at the University of NSW I was determined to do all I could to be allowed to speak too. I sent off the following letters to Prof. Frank and Prof. Cawte and I was happy when Prof. Frank replied. I was then given the honour to address the vast audience immediately after Prof. Frank spoke. Here below are the letters and the text of my short speech.

Professor Dr. Jerome Frank,
Professor of Psychiatry,
John Hopkins University,
Baltimore Md. U.S.A.

August 9, 71

Dear Professor Frank,

On behalf of my friend Dr. D.N. Everingham M.P. and myself allow me to welcome you to Australia. We both have worked for over 20 years on the same problem you are going to lecture here: how to save man from himself.

Twenty ^{six} years ago, your colleague Professor Dr. Brock Chisholm gave two lectures in Washington on this burning problem (see Psychiatry Washington Vol. 9 No. 1 February 1946). Chisholm maintained that the cause of human warfare is (among other factors) abstract language. Good men will kill other men with a clear conscience when they are told that the other men are "evil". Chisholm demanded a "Re-education of Mankind". But he could not offer any proof that man - before the invention of abstract meanings - did not kill his fellowman. Neither could he offer any method how to re-educate mankind.

I have found the archeological proof and the method and published it in 1949. My approach to the editor of Psychiatry was turned down. But other scholars listened to me. Dr. Everingham and the late Professor Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard. He commissioned me to write a paper which I titled

"A possible Proof and Tool for Chisholm's Theory on
the Cause and Prevention of Human Warfare"

as a condensation of my larger writings of 1949 and 1950. Dr. Everingham followed this up with his own paper

"Psycho-Semantics, Adult Emotion, and War"

and with a letter to the Editor of the Australian Medical Journal which was published in the issue of December 6, 1952 under the title

"A Message to Mortals".

Then in 1955 Everingham delivered a lecture at the Medical Congress in Sydney titled

"Semantics and Psychiatry"

where he again stressed the value of my method which he used in the mental hospitals of Gladesville and Kenmore, N.S.W.

I submit to you the first 3 papers and hope you will invite me to a short talk. My request to you and to the scholars who are organising your lectures is that you and they should mention our names and work as a proof that Australia too has scholars who have gone far ahead than you and others thinking in the same field have gone. I am entering my 75th year and I have always rebelled against the disastrous trend that men who pioneer new ideas are ignored during their lifetime. I beg you not to ignore this letter and to call me (66 55 140 any time).

I am sincerely yours,
C.K. Bliss.

Professor Cawte of the University of N.S.W.,
Dr. Chapman of the College of Psychiatrists,
The Editor of the Medical Journal of Australia,

9 August, 71

Gentlemen,

On behalf of my friend and your colleague Dr. Douglas Nixon Everingham M.P. now a member of the Federal Parliament of Australia and residing in Rockhampton Queensland I submit to you copies of my letter to your distinguished guest Dr. Jerome Frank.

I beg you to take notice that Dr. Everingham and I have gone much further than the thoughts as expressed in the article in the Sydney Morning Herald by Shaund McIlraith titled

"Step One to Survival"

In particular I have made Step Two, Step Three and Step Four.

The only Professor who realised and recognised my work was Prof. Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard who alas, died shortly afterwards to my intense sorrow. He made efforts to bring me to Harvard, which all came to naught by his untimely death.

Since then I have approached dozens of scholars who had only well-meaning nothing-meant words. I could fill a dozen teaching jobs at colleges and universities but I prefer to stay aloof of the dreary duties of a teacher and remain independent in thought and action.

I am now entering my 75th year and have given up any hope of recognition during my lifetime. The arrival of Dr. Frank has given me some actual pain in making me realise that my publications are unknown and my pioneering work not appreciated in Australia too. Nemo propheta in sua patria honorem habet.

Now I am writing to you, asking for the modest mention of my name and Dr. Everingham's name as pioneers who have gone further than Professor Frank in their thoughts. Some months ago I designed somehow in desperation this letterhead to tell people the scope of my work. Step Two concerns aspect 2 and 3. Step Three aspect 6, and Step Four aspect 4 and 5. Please forgive me when I am sending Dr. Everingham's and my papers only to Professor Frank.

Again please mention our name before or after the lecture of Professor Frank coming Thursday at the University of N.S.W. I shall be there. Thanking you,

I am Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss

LETTER OF PROFESSOR DR. JEROME FRANK TO C.K. BLISS

Dear Mr. Bliss,

August 9, 71

Thank you for your letter and the enclosure which I have read with interest. I concur with many of your ideas, especially that war waging is not innate and that the human propensity to use evaluative concepts constitutes to conflict. These ideas are developed (along with others) in Sanity and Survival, which unfortunately seems hard to obtain in Australia.

I also knew and greatly admired Brock Chisholm, but felt (and, I think, got him to agree in a public discussion) that intelligence alone is an inadequate and indeed dangerous guide to conduct. Unless one regards stealing, for example (or for that matter making nuclear bombs) as wrong, what is to prevent indulgence in these activities.

Also, while I am sure that many human difficulties can be traced to faulty communications and that improvement in their realm will help to reduce conflict, I do not believe that this or any other single corrective measure will suffice.

Undoubtedly these comments fail to do justice to your thoughts, but unfortunately limitation of time and energy preclude my going into them more deeply. I have been scheduled to the healing point.

It is good to know that we are working toward the same goal, and along similar lines. If enough of us continue to exert our best efforts, even though no two of us will fully agree, perhaps our combined influence will tip the balance toward survival.

With best wishes to you and Mr. Everingham, and hopes that you will gain increasing recognition.

Sincerely
Jerome D. Frank.

TEXT OF THE SHORT ADDRESS GIVEN BY C.K. BLISS AFTER THE LECTURE OF PROFESSOR DR. JEROME FRANK IN THE SCIENCE THEATRE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES ON THE 12th AUGUST 1971. CHAIRMAN PROFESSOR KILOH.

Personal Note by C.K. Bliss: I was not sure whether I shall or shall not be able to speak, and thought that I might do so during the following discussion. To my great surprise Professor Kiloh, with the concurrence of Professor Frank, decided that I shall address the audience immediately after Professor Frank's lecture as an extension of it. When I started to speak from my chair, I was invited by Prof. Kiloh to come to the lectern and address the audience from there. I was greatly honoured by this. Here is what I said:

Mr. Chairman,

I wish to thank you for your kind attitude and for giving me the opportunity to speak about my work. And I wish to thank you too dear Prof. Frank for your kindness and for your detailed letter I have received from you.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As you can see, I am a man at the end of my life, entering now my 75th year. But today I am a happy man. A man has come to our shores, Professor Frank and what he is saying and thinking I have thought and said for the last 32 long and bitter years. I published my book 22 years ago and it can be found in many universities around the world. But I could not find recognition for my ideas because they are in opposition to the ideas we have been taught to believe, as you will soon hear.

I was Hitler's prisoner 32 years ago in the concentration camp of Buchenwald. There was also a zoo there for the "enjoyment" of the Nazis. Often I stared in sorrow from my large cage which held over 20,000 human animals into the small cages of the other animals they too innocent prisoners of Hitler. Then a thought flashed through my mind. Men are killing men, but lions don't

kill lions, tigers don't kill tiger, wolves don't kill wolves and so on throughout the whole animal kingdom.

Now this is something which is difficult to believe. After all, we have seen dogs fighting dogs, cats fighting cats, stags fighting stags, etc. etc. But, as Professor Frank pointed out these are not fights for killing the opponents. Males fight during the mating season for the favours of a female, but they don't try to kill each other about a female.

Apparently, as Professor Frank pointed out, there is an instinctive natural law governing the brains of animals of the same species. I found later the formulation of this law by Professor Ashley Montagu who spoke these incredible words:

"Among the same species of animals the highest ethics is supreme law". Man is the only animal that kills his own kind in ever increasing massacres.

But then, I thought, if we assume that early man evolved slowly from the animals, there must have been a stage when gorillas didn't kill gorillas, chimpansees didn't kill chimpansees, and early man did not kill his fellowman. Is it perhaps possible to find some sort of evidence of this blessed stage of peace on earth and goodwill to all men? (Continuation of lecture on page 11.)

I had a great applause. The hall was full and many came forward to me to get S.S. 240 "A Summary of the author's Thoughts and Findings" They all came to the lecture because of the publicity. Here below are the 2 articles by the Medical Correspondent of the Sydney Morning Herald Mr. Shaun McIlraith and the letters we exchanged.

STEP ONE TO SURVIVAL

by Shaun McIlraith

With mankind on the brink to oblivion through a nuclear inferno, what does one do to improve the chances of survival?

The question biggest and toughest of all time, is raised by the distinguished American psychiatrist, Dr. Jerome D. Frank, who will visit Sydney next month.

Seeking an answer, Dr. Frank, Professor of Psychiatry at John Hopkins University, Baltimore, proceeds from the following arresting premise:

Because the destructive capacity of modern weapons is unlimited and already enough to erase civilisation, war must be abolished.

Massive nuclear stockpiling, with all its attendant hazards, is drawing the world toward the objective, he believes, "It is virtually inconceivable," he argues, "that acting deliberately and in full possession of all the facts, the responsible leader of a nuclear power would instigate a general nuclear war, because in any rational calculation both sides would lose."

In pondering feasible alternatives to war as a means of settling international conflicts, Professor Frank, as psychiatrist and psychologist, examines such matters as human and animal aggression, why men kill, how nations regard their enemies, and the psychological forces which prompt escalation.

While not professing to know exactly what are the roots of war or how to pluck them out, he sees hope in mobilising the affiliative emotions, love and trust, which are as powerful determinants of human behaviour as hate and suspicion.

"The most pervasive psychological obstacle to successful negotiations is mutual distrust," he says.

He quotes the words of a former high State Department official: "For Moscow to propose what we can accept seems to us even more sinister and dangerous than for it to propose what we cannot accept."

He turns to the results of psychological experiments - students playing diplomatic "games" - to analyse the forces at work at the international conference table.

From the way the students exploit a given briefing he deduces that better communication between the opposing sides is of prime importance in steering negotiations to more productive ends.

His most controversial suggestion is that the great powers, and particularly the United States, should consider Gandhi-style "non-violent action" as a reply to acts of provocation and even open aggression.

Professor Frank has presented his thinking on the immediate need for an infinite peace in a book, "Sanity and Survival" - psychological aspects of war and peace, published in 1967.

The book caused a stir at the time, mainly because its passing reference to the danger of serious errors of judgement being committed by aging and mentally incapacitated national leaders in time of crisis.

Interested Sydney people will have the opportunity of hearing him in person at a public meeting at the Science Theatre, University of New South Wales, on Thursday August 12, at 8.p.m. He will talk on "Psychological Aspects of International Conflict".

Professor Frank is coming to Australia as visiting professor for the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists.

In stressing that both sides must lose any nuclear war, Professor Frank warns about "the trap of words" which lulls populations into a false sense of security.

He instances "massive defensive shield" as an example of how past language, appropriate to the pre-nuclear era, colours thinking by the discrepancy between the words and what they mean. There are, he insists, no shields to nuclear weapons, only a precarious "balance of terror".

Looking to animal behaviour for some hint on how man might be weaned away from war, Professor Frank notes that fights between members of the same species are ordinarily kept from getting out of hand by instinctive devices.

For example, rattlesnakes, which are immune to their own venom, wrestle but do not bite each other.

He hopes humans may be able to imitate the animal knack of expressing aggressiveness in non-lethal ways, but is forced to admit that passive obedience to orders is the soldier's main motive for killing.

"Obedience to legitimate authority is one of the strongest motivating forces in the life of all normal members of organised society," he says.

Disarming under a system of inspection, he argues, would involve no greater risk than continuing to accumulate weapons, and would enhance American prestige by making possible vastly increased aid to under-developed countries.

Non-violent action, he says, is based on the conviction that "it is possible to appeal successfully to an enemy's conscience because as a fellow human he cannot help being affected by the demonstrations of willingness to suffer for one's convictions without bitterness or retaliation."

Those who find Professor Frank unconvincing on this point, should heed his qualification that all he suggests is merely the first step toward combating the deep-seated and pervasive psychosocial forces supporting war.

DANGER SEEN IN WAR GLORIES

By Shaun McIlraith

Organisations of exservicemen perpetuated unrealistic thinking about past glories and superior arms which were dangerous in the nuclear age, Professor James D. Frank said yesterday.

They kept people thinking in terms of the past "while the world has changed completely", he said.

Nationalism and a belief in winning by exercising superior violence were obsolete concepts which did not work in the modern world.

Professor Frank said national sovereignty had been so eroded that no nation could protect its citizens against nuclear war or the destruction of its environment by other nations.

Outmoded thinking on armaments encouraged the belief that a defence could be developed for every attacking weapon.

But there was no defence against nuclear weapons. The intelligence employed in creating such a defence inevitably explored ways of circumventing it.

Professor Frank, professor of psychiatry at John Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, is in Australia as visiting professor for the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists.

He is the author of "Sanity and Survival - Psychological aspects of war and peace."

He said yesterday a blackmarket in atomic weapons might wrest decisions about war and peace from the major powers.

Such a blackmarket might develop because of the failure to account fully for the thousands of pounds of weapon-grade plutonium now produced annually in the United States.

"This stuff has been shipped all over the country without any security on the grounds that nobody would be crazy enough to pinch it," he said.

A physicist had told him that a few engineers with the knowledge would need only a few pounds to manufacture a nuclear bomb.

This posed a domestic threat and also the risk that a blackmarket bomb would find its way to Egypt, Israel or some other non-nuclear country.

Professor Frank has warned that mankind may be destroyed in nuclear war unless it finds non-violent solutions to international conflicts.

He will address a public meeting in the University of NSW Science Theatre on Thursday night on "Psychological aspects of international conflict."

Mr. Shaun McIlraith,
Medical Correspondent,
Sydney Morning Herald,
Wattle Street,
Broadway. NSW

10 August 1971

Dear Mr. McIlraith,

Congratulations to your second article in today's Herald "Danger seen in War Glories". I was glad to realise from the sub-title that you are the medical correspondent for the

Herald. The more~~so~~ will you be interested to hear what I have to say.

I refer to our phone conversation yesterday and am glad to know that you want to see what I have written to Professor Frank. Usually, I hate to write to reporters unsolicited. They are hunted animals working to a deadline and forced to do what the city editor tells them to do, and nothing else.

However, you may be interested in my story and you may write a story and submit it to your boss. Maybe he will buy it from you. Indeed, I have a fantastic tale to tell. The editors of the Sydney Morning Herald have, during the last 21 years, been very kind to me, and quite a number of times stories about me and my work have appeared mostly on the leader page, once even accompanied by a cartoon. There were controversies in letters to the editors. Mr. Harriet brought recently two of my letters to the Editor (Himalayas and Buchenwald).

In short, dear Mr. McIlraith you are not running the danger of being told to leave cranks alone. It is true, that my story is fantastic, but this was the truth with every new idea which overthrew the old accepted ideas taught at the universities.

And this brings me to Professor Frank. What he is saying now I had said 33 years ago when I was Hitler's prisoner in the concentration camp at Buchenwald. I was one of over 20,000 human animals and there were other animals in a zoo for the "enjoyment" of the Nazis. I had an opportunity to study animal and human behaviour and from there on I went on and on and made one discovery after the other.

Now read my letter to Prof. Frank, and see that you are included in the list of men who receive a copy of my letter. Read also the accompanying letter to Professor Cowte and others. And if you will be present at the lecture on Thursday I shall be pleased to meet you. I am,

Yours sincerely,

C.K. Bliss, B.Sc.

Continuation of Bliss' lecture from page 9.

By an oversight the rest of Bliss' lecture has not been typed on page 9 and follows now herebelow after the last words typed on page 9...and goodwill to all man?

I am happy to report to you that I found the undeniable evidence in the cave paintings of old stoneage man. And then I found a few archeologists and anthropologists who indeed pointed to the later stage and said that the evidence shows that new stoneage man became a killer of his fellowman.

But why? There are many answers to this why, and we have heard some of them today. The answer I like best has been given by a colleague of Professor Frank, whom he greatly admired, the late Dr. Brock Chisholm. Chisholm said that good and honest men will kill men when their leaders tell them that the others are bad, or evil, or wrongheaded, and that it is our duty to kill them. In short it is, as Professor Frank pointed out, the use of abstract and abusive language. Chisholm demanded a "Re-education of Mankind" and Professor Frank too demands this re-education. However, Chisholm could not offer any method for this re-education.

Now Ladies and Gentlemen, I am an engineer, and I have worked out a method which is so simple that teaching can begin with the toddlers in the kindergarten. Anyone interested in my archeological evidence and in my method may come forward after the lecture to me.

And so I thank again Professor Kiloh and Professor Frank and all of you for listening to me, and I am happy that I could at last for the first time in my life in public ^{say} that I sincerely believe that my evidence and my method may indeed one day help to bring about that blessed lost stage of mankind, a future of peace on earth and goodwill to all men. I thank you.

There was good applause. And after this, the discussion began, but unfortunately owing to my hard hearing on account of my old age, and due to the low voices of the people in the audience it was impossible for me to record the questions and answers given by Professor Frank.

When Professor Kiloh adjourned the meeting many people came forward and I distributed to them my small brochure "A Summary of the Author's Thoughts and Findings" (Semantography Series No. 240), and the reprint of an article of mine which shows how children can be taught Tolerance with my symbols, "One Writing for One World" (Semantography Series No. 308). Professor Frank answered many questions and I too did the same until the lights went out.

I was elated when Mrs. Cawte introduced me to her husband Professor Cawte of the University of N.S.W. and as they live in Coogee, they invited me (who has no car) to join them and they brought me home.

Thus ended a most happy event in my life, an event which indeed compensated me for the many unhappy hours of the past.

I wish to express again my sincere thanks to Professor Frank, Professor Kiloh, and Professor Cawte. Their kind attitude was so much in contrast to unhappy confrontations by other scholars in the past that I attribute to them the success of my short address and I wish to thank them again and again.

Continuation of the correspondence commenced on page 10, continued on page 11 and now continued to the end.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Sorry for the delay. I had thrown out my copy of the speech and had to obtain another. I've been trying to sell the idea here of a story on you, but we are very short staffed here and I always have a lot to do on my round. But something may come of it.

Regards Shaun McIlraith

I tried to get in touch with Professor Frank but he had left. Meanwhile a letter from Dr. Everingham arrived. So I sent it, together with my own letter to Professor Frank in Baltimore. He kindly answered quickly. And then I wrote to him my last letter.

All in all, the great appluse I received and the kindness from the Professors Dr. Frank, Dr. Cawte and Dr. Kiloh were a wonderful tonic.

Dear Professor Frank,

I appreciated your clear approach to the politics of survival on T.V. last night.

You will perhaps be badgered (his own word) by an old formerly Viennese friend of mine, C.K. Bliss, to look at his sequel to Brock Chisholm's writings on the origins of war in mankind's use of labels.

I commend his work to you. In some ways it anticipates recent work like Aumrey's "African Genesis." It also compliments his own religious stand, that humanists agree that there is a wondrous complexity in the harmonious co-operation among cells, societies, species and eco-systems, a complexity which can excite ethical response and awe in "materialistic" scientists as well as religionists.

As a scientific humanist and agnostic I quite agree, and hope that such a view will lead to an "ultra-ecumenism".

Yours sincerely,
Doug. Everingham,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Parliament of Australia.

Prof. Dr. Jerome Frank,
John Hopkins University,
Baltimore.

Dear Professor Frank,

This letter may reach you when still in Australia. I learned today that you checked out from the University Club today. No doubt you are going to visit other States and in the course of your duties hold discussions and give lectures in the other capital cities. But I sincerely hope that you will have some time too for visiting some of the most beautiful places of Australia, as for instance the Whitsuntide Islands within the Barrier Reef.

I am writing to you this letter of thanks but I feel unable to find the proper words to express my overflowing heart of gratitude towards you. I have met some stern Professors in the past and these occurrences have burned holes of unhappiness in my mind. But when I saw you on television, always smiling, always ready to crack a joke, I knew that you are a kind man and that you would take kindly to an outsider who does not happen to be a Professor of this or that.

And indeed, I was not mistaken in my assessment of your kind personality. Your detailed letter made me happy and your indulgence of letting me speak after you was a wonderful thing to do. It was balm to my heart.

I happen to be an industrial research chemist and had the misfortune to be in the hands of the Japanese when the atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Consequently, the whole story about nuclear weapons was and still is for me one of great concern and I have made a close semantic analysis of the whole affair. I won't bother you with it but I intend in a few months to send you something which may indeed induce in you a happy smile as I have good news for you with regard to nuclear weapons.

And so dear Professor Frank thanks a thousand times for your kindness. Ah yes one more item. I have asked Mr. Shaun McIlraith the medical correspondent of the Sydney Morning Herald to lend me for a few days the text of your lecture which he has. I am issuing and publishing a series of papers about all aspects of my work and about all contributions by other scholars. This series is collected by a number of great universities around the world, and I intend to use the text of your lecture as one issue. As soon as I have mimeographed the text I will send it to you and shall add whatever else you want to have added. I hope you will agree to this.

And so again bon voyage Professor and god bless you and your family and the people of America.

Yours sincerely, C.K. Bliss.

Room 124, Phipps Clinic,
John Hopkins Hospital
Baltimore. Maryland 21205 U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Bliss,

Thank you very much for your very kind letter of August 13, which pursued me across the Pacific. It was much appreciated. I was happy to meet you, if only briefly, since you so obviously represent in yourself the principles for which you stand, and I have no regrets at all about offering you some time to acquaint the audience with your interests. I was gratified to note after the lecture that you had considerable response.

I have referred your letter to the Librarian at Hopkins without comment since, not having seen your book, I am not in a position to endorse it, nor, unfortunately, do I have time to look into it; so we shall have to leave it to his judgement.

You may, of course, feel free to do whatever you wish with my lecture.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

Jerome D. Frank, M.D.

Dear Professor Frank,

You have written to me from Baltimore. How wonderful! You are the kindest Professor I ever met. All professors of language, biology, zoology and other assorted sciences have treated me very badly, ignored my pleading letters, etc. etc. The blessed exception was Harvard Professor of Anthropology Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn who wanted to bring me into Harvard. Alas, he died too young.

Allow me to express my thanks in a constructive way. I include a letter to the publisher of your book "Sanity and Survival" ordering 2 copies, of which one will go to you which please donate to a library of your choice, your home library perhaps. The second copy will go to me. I shall read it and then donate it to the National Library of Australia in Canberra which will take all my manuscripts, correspondences, books and the issue of the Semantography Series. Your lecture will go there too and at present will go first into the university library of Duke University and Louisiana State University as I am filling the standing orders for these 2 libraries, afterwards the other ones.

In my letter of August 13, I promised some good news about the nuclear weapons, and I include it herewith a chapter under the title "The horrendous Lies about the "Nuclear Bombs". I include also the chapter about Chisholm's theory that words make war. However, I must explain to you the rather crazy make-up of these chapters with pictures alongside and the rebellious tone throughout the text. As a doctor and psychiatrist you will understand me.

My good wife and I were idealists. We believed that my work would be received with open arms by the scholarly fraternity, especially after Professor Oliver L. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh spoke in 1951 in his lecture to the American Association for the Advancement of Science about my "heroic work" and that I have realised the 300 years dream of Leibnitz, a "Symbolis Universalis". But utter apathy was the result. My wife and I were thrown into deep despair. She had a heart attack and never recovered. She died in 1961. I lived in desolation, and in trying to get out of it, I "abreacted" my unhappy feeling in conceiving a "popular picture pocket book" for the common man and woman. In this I spoke not too kindly of orthodox and organised science which prefer to let men of vision die first before their writing is elevated to "great thoughts". Max Planck said that a new idea does not gain ground by convincing its opponents. It gains ground as the old scholars die out one by one. In this mood I told about Chisholm and also about the lies concerning Nuclear Weapons. I am sure you will read these pages with the clinical detachment of the psychiatrist, and you will understand.

As said in the beginning, this is my last letter to you. I feel I have overtaxed your kindness, and please just think well of me, and don't go to the trouble to answer. Otherwise I might write to you again. Beware! I am with kind regards and renewed thanks,

Yours sincerely,
C.K. Bliss.

I was elated when a letter arrived dated October 16 written by Dr. Morgan H. Pritchett Ph.D. Librarian of Collection Development, who informed me that the University has ordered my book "Semantography-Blissymbolics" and shall be glad to receive also the text of Professor Frank's lecture, and articles on his visit, etc. I consequently despatched this issue to him, and one copy to Professor Frank.

Thus ended a happy event in my life.

The End