

ARE ALL RADICALS INSANE?

By

THEODORE SCHROEDER

LIBRARY
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY



From

PSYCHE AND EROS

Vol. II. Nov.-Dec., 1921

New York City

358-369

Are All Radicals Insane?

By THEODORE SCHROEDER, *New York*

"Aunt Fannie, bent upon the scandal of the neighborhood, sees many things which exist nowhere but in her own eyes. Yet she can bring you the confirmatory shreds of evidence. What is evidence enough for the utter condemnation of our enemies would be laughed to scorn if applied to our friends." (Prof. Ralph T. Flewelling. *Personalist*. 2:209.)

Recently I was stimulated by the announcement of an article on: "The Psychology of the Radical." (*Yale Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 89-101; Oct. 1921.) The author was Dr. Stewart Paton, a neurobiologist and psychiatrist. This raised hopes, that at last something worthwhile was being done for mental hygiene, in an important but neglected field. Doubtless he would instruct the sane, educated, and economically fortunate persons who read the *Yale Review*, just how society should conduct itself, especially toward the disinherited ones. I thought that the object of this advice would be to minimize the development of the morbid emotional conflict, which expresses itself in morbid radicalism, as well as the morbid patriotic conservatism. It is the intensities of these two groups that precludes the peaceful progress of the democratization of welfare. Unlike Dr. Paton, I was seeing all this morbidity as a human psychologic problem, rather than as a political or eco-

nomic class-problem. From this viewpoint, the mob violence of, for, or by well fed conservative patriots and by underfed or morbid revolutionists, presents the same psychologic mechanism and the same sociologic problem, in spite of the economic differences.

However, I was doomed to disappointment. Instead of a lesson in mental hygiene, I found a special plea on behalf of the economically fortunate ones, which suggested that all radical critics are insane. There is no intimation that all morbid radicals have their exact counterpart among conservatives. This false perspective was portrayed to Dr. Paton's evident satisfaction, and apparently without his having any personal acquaintance with any actual radical, and without any intimate study of any radicalisms. The natural tendency of his essay is to intensify the fears, and to rationalize the hatred of all morbid conservatives, and he admits "a widespread epidemic of insanity" including "all parts of the world, and among all kinds and conditions of men". Thus Dr. Paton has done his bit toward making impossible that mutuality of understanding, upon which alone depends our peaceful social evolution. By thus promoting a revolution by violence, Dr. Paton was actually violating his professed desire to the contrary. But why?

On the whole Dr. Paton presents a

smooth, easy-flowing discourse stating many psychiatric commonplaces, in their most logical and plausible form. The insanity of all radicals is conclusively proven by him, for all those who are uncritical, because uninformed about modern diagnostic methods, and who enjoy Dr. Paton's wishfulfilling phantasies about the characteristics that he ascribes to all radicals. In short his conclusions were reached by such immature intellectual processes, that one may well wonder what ails Dr. Paton? It is therefore Dr. Paton's mental processes that I propose to review. In what follows all quoted words, not otherwise credited are Dr. Paton's. All italics are mine.

PATON'S RADICAL UNDEFINED

It is important to note that Dr. Paton makes a diagnosis of "*the radical*", not of *a radical*. Nothing in his essay suggests that he has ever made a personal study of even one accredited radical. Furthermore, he does not inform us by what test one becomes an integral part of this imaginative, all-inclusive, synthetic personality of his own creation, which he calls "*the radical*". Obviously, here he is not using the methods of scientific precision, although his paper was prepared for highly educated readers. What morbid compulsion was behind this abandonment of his training in clinical methods? Apparently he is using the collective singular "*the radical*" much as it is used by ignorant and morbid persons, for whom it serves as an epithet of reproach, expressive mainly of fearful feelings. It also serves Dr. Paton as a convenient escape from the study of concrete realities, and gives the fullest play to his phantasies. Is not this conduct of Dr. Paton's just like that

of his "*the radical*"? And is it not likewise symptomatic of a personality that "*is crippled emotionally*"? If Dr. Paton was not mentally afflicted, just like "*the radical*", would he not have deemed some definition of "*the radical*" to be an indispensable prerequisite for a group-diagnosis? I leave the answer to Dr. Paton, because I am not a psychiatrist.

TESTS OF RADICALISM

I am sure, however, that I possess more than average acquaintance with radicals and radicalisms. I confess this with fear and trembling, because that confession alone may prove my insanity, according to Dr. Paton's intellectual methods. But then if I avoid the confession of this reality, that evasion would also tend to prove me insane. Tough luck!! Isn't it? But, that is part of the risk and the reality of living on the same earth with Dr. Paton.

Different groups of radicals each have a different procedure, crystalized into creeds that are often conflicting, but all designed to accomplish similar aims. The most inclusive, unifying factor among economic and industrial radicals can be expressed in this definition: A radical is one who is actively seeking to remodel our social system, according to the Communist Manifesto where it says: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need." Within the narrow range of his family, probably even Dr. Paton practices this creed. Why not extend the range indefinitely? Only a little narrower is the aim of those socialists who prefer the following words of Abraham Lincoln: "To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government".

(Schleuter, Herman. *Abraham Lincoln and the Working Class*, p. 40.) Perhaps I should add that by the "whole product of his labor" the socialist means its social value, as distinguished from its market value, under our competitive system of exploitation.

Presumably Dr. Paton was familiar with these creeds, when he attempted an all-inclusive diagnosis of radicals. It is therefore, of persons who promote the realization of one or the other of these aims that he says: "Nor do they [radicals] seem to understand the importance of refraining from advocating the adoption of social systems of which *the best* that can be said is that it is a conception *not of sound minds*, but of those weakened by a feeling of inadequacy." In the light of these facts concerning the radical's aims, which Dr. Paton evades, his diagnostic conclusion about the insanity of "the radical" is not so obviously correct, as to have justified him in omitting all sustaining argument, or data. His unsupported conclusion is therefore adjusted only to the needs of those conservatives who are "crippled emotionally", and who wish their morbid fears rationalized, and are predisposed to accept uncritically anything that is offered. In Dr. Paton this method of diagnosis and its predetermined results, suggest a prejudice that is evidently conditioned by a fear of assuming a mature man's responsibility in a democracy of service, where privileged parasitism is prohibited. Does not that fear imply such a feeling of inadequacy as belongs not to sound minds? Dr. Paton's wholesale diagnosis is also of the "all or none" variety, which he says evidences morbidity. Again I ask, what is wrong with Dr. Paton's emotions? Are they as "crip-

pled" as those of "the radical"? According to my concept of evolutionary psychology such aristocratic feudal-mindedness and its craving for aristocratic privileges, are the very psychological essence of an infantile parasitism. It is really too bad that Dr. Paton is so fearful of being weaned from parasitic pap, that he must declare insane all those who propose the democratization of service and of welfare. I fear he will suffer very much if the Bolsheviks should catch him and make him work for a living, just as wholesome but no better than that of any other. Would he then organize the I Won't Workers, and think sabotage or revolution an evidence of sanity?

PATON'S TESTS OF INSANITY

We have already seen that Dr. Paton found it desirable to make a psychiatric diagnosis of an imaginary synthetic radical, rather than a real, live one. It appears also that he found it more convenient to prove the morbidity of his hypothetical imaginative creation by the use of unusual standards of sanity. Seemingly at least, to be adjudged sane by Dr. Paton, we must be quite conservatively and aristocratically conventional in our way of meeting every critical situation. Therefore, according to Dr. Paton, in determining soundness of mind, the all important inquiry is, "what a person does". To act out of harmony with the privileged beneficiaries of things as they are is more than a significant symptom. Dr. Paton is quite conscious that conduct as a test of mental soundness, is not unusual among psychiatrists. He admits that: "*relatively few students of human nature understand the biological soundness of this [his] view.*" My own

mere layman's ignorant suspicion is, that most specialists in human nature have outgrown Dr. Paton's viewpoint upon this subject, and that some painful feeling of inadequacy has here made him boastful of his own backwardness.

Making physical manifestations a matter of prime importance, in psychiatric diagnosis of mere functional disorders, is the unenlightened layman's way of determining insanity. It has also been the way of the physician, at the beginning of psychiatry. With the growth of scientific observation and of its data, some have outgrown the older descriptive psychiatry, in favor of the genetic approach to diagnostic problems. Some have retained the antiquated viewpoint of the descriptive psychologist and have been content merely to elaborate their descriptions, and call that progress. I suspect that Dr. Paton belongs to the latter class. Then perhaps his error is that he mistakes a mere refinement of the descriptive psychiatry to constitute a new diagnostic method. To me it seems true, that the relatively sane and insane often indulge in the same conduct. The difference between the morbid and the wholesome ones is often found mainly in the differences of the quality of the underlying compulsion, and of its genesis. Such considerations have lead to the genetic approach to mental problems, which is completely ignored by Dr. Paton, while he is diagnosing "the radical". Under this our more modern view, "what a person does" is seldom a sufficient test, in borderland morbidity, but serves rather to give definition to the problem of diagnosis, which is to be solved by a study of the genetics of the conduct. Now the all-important inquiry is to discover the organic or psy-

chogenetic *why* and *how* of the compulsion behind the conduct to be diagnosed.

Being only a presumptuous layman in psychiatry, I must quote at least one authority in my support. First, I will remind the reader that Dr. Paton nowhere intimates that his imaginative collective "the radical" is in all its human units organically afflicted. Dr. W. H. B. Stoddard, an eminent psychiatrist, has recently confessed his more complete acceptance of this newer viewpoint in the third edition of his: *Mind and its Disorders*. There he says: "The physical manifestations of a functional disorder must be regarded as secondary, not primary, as I taught in my first edition." (*Psycho-Analytic Rev.*, 8:347.) Since Dr. Paton obviously failed to subordinate the outgrown descriptive psychiatry, in favor of a psychogenetic investigation of "the radical", does not this show in Dr. Paton such a "lack of discrimination and [such] inappropriateness of the response" to the radical's stimulus as justified him, in a case of "the radical", in adjudging him collectively insane?

CASE OF "THE FREEMAN"

The Freeman, of New York City, is a journal that professes to be "radical" and is just radical enough to advocate the single tax. It will hardly be classified as radical by the organized radicals whom Dr. Paton fears most. In an advertisement the *Freeman* was recommended to "tough-minded readers" (doubtless in Wm. James' sense) who indulge in "fundamental thinking". Now it seems to me that any "well balanced personality", other than Dr. Paton, and one that is "not forced to

withdraw from reality", and is therefore, "capable of appropriateness of reaction to [such an] occasion" would assume that the *Freeman* meant to use the word "fundamental" in the ordinary sense of: essential, important, unsuperficial. But, Dr. Paton tells us that if one is influenced by morbid fears, then "in the flight from reality he abandons the accumulated experience that man has gathered together during the progress of civilization". This accumulation is partly recorded in our dictionaries. One so afflicted might write of that advertisement as did Dr. Paton: "Probably he [who wrote the advertisement] would not have used these words, if he [and the prospective readers] had understood [that Dr. Paton had overruled the dictionary so] that 'fundamental thinking' is the kind of thinking characteristic of primitive people, or 'the civilized man after deterioration. Dr. Paton also informs us that: "*We find plenty of 'fundamental thinking' in cases of shell shock, nervous breakdowns and dementia praecox*". (For editorial criticism see: *The Freeman*, 4 (No. 88): 222-3; Nov. 16, 1921.) Now behold that miracle in diagnosis! By the simple trick of changing the usual meaning of a single word from his victim, Dr. Paton, the distinguished professor of neurobiology and celebrated psychiatrist, has proven a radical publisher, and those who enjoy the *Freeman*, to be quite insane like unto cases of "shell shock, nervous breakdowns and dementia praecox."

In this marvellous feat of diagnosis, Dr. Paton has left nothing to doubtful inference. "Shell shock, nervous breakdowns, [or] and dementia praecox" is conclusively established by the indis-

putable confession of the culprit himself. Isn't it wonderful? It even beats the so-called third degree administered by our lawless sadistic policemen as a means of extorting truthless confessions.

But, in my ignorance, I wish to know: Is this verbal trick of Dr. Paton's an illustration of "the improvement of mental processes" which is not "hair-splitting human argument", from which he says the insane radical must be "diverted" in order to enable the race to recover its sanity? Or, is Dr. Paton only compensating for not having studied any actual insane radicals, by making himself an exhibit of morbid mental processes? Is Dr. Paton really "all there"? These last quoted words are not from Paton's essay. He is too *skientifique* to use slang.

ON BEING CRIPPLED EMOTIONALLY

Dr. Paton himself has told us the symptoms when one "is crippled emotionally". Such persons are guilty of "withdrawal from reality" he says. This means that such persons ignore accessible facts which are pertinent to their interests or their problems, and consequently they live relatively much according to the demands of a world of their own phantasy. Such persons construct very plausible and logical arguments, to justify their morbid emotional needs, by the process of substituting wishfulfilling fictions in lieu of records of actual observation. Their justifications seem less logical, just as soon as the ignored data are adequately co-ordinated with the rest. Furthermore, persons who are "crippled emotionally" show it by "not relying upon well co-ordinated and integrated intellectual processes". "The radical", that is all radicals, show these

symptoms as Dr. Paton knows without having examined even one radical. Accordingly "the radical", that is all radicals, are seemingly considered by him to be "crippled emotionally". But does not Dr. Paton, in the article now under review, show all these same symptoms of "crippled emotions"?

It might be interesting to ask, since he fails to report a clinical study of even one of the available radicals and fails to supply a differential test for "the radical" group to be diagnosed (as above indicated) whether Dr. Paton is not unintentionally illustrating a "withdrawal from reality"? Also whether or not the failure to co-ordinate any concrete study of any particular radicals with his other psychiatric data, indicates that Dr. Paton, (at least when radicals are concerned) is incapable of "well co-ordinated and integrated mental processes", and therefore "is crippled emotionally"?

In psychiatric diagnosis, by some who are not "crippled emotionally", the present reaction of individuals will be co-ordinated with the environment and with the subject's character, both past and present, as an important method for the more intelligent determination of relative "inappropriateness of the response". From this point of view, all insanity is relative. I believe that in our lucid moments Dr. Paton and myself could agree upon this last proposition. However, it appears from the article under review, that Dr. Paton, by ignoring available data and by ignoring relativity, is "not relying upon [any such] well-co-ordinated and integrated intellectual processes", in reaching his conclusions about the relative insanity of his collective, imaginative, "the radical", or about the relative appropriateness of the radi-

cal's response to his particular environment.

If all insanity is relative, then the diagnosis of a group must include a study of the environmental background, in co-ordination with the provocative stimulus, as the only adequate means of determining relative degrees of "inappropriateness of the [radical] response", as a "well-graded and appropriate reaction". Dr. Paton does not even pretend to have done this. Instead he resorts to his own phantasy. Not claiming to have made a personal study of even one particular accredited radical leader, he proceeds to compare his synthetic imaginative "the radical" with an equally imaginative abstract ideal of mental processes, rather than with any actual process generally in use, among capitalists let us say. That is exactly the mental trick which morbid conservatives and morbid radicals always play, and it is symptomatic of their disorder. It is by such methods that Dr. Paton concludes that "*the best* that can be said is that it [the social systems advocated by 'the radical'] is that it is the conception *not* of a sound mind". Did Dr. Paton here allow "the wandering of desire [to] direct both instinct and interest and shape his entire program of living" especially his attitude toward "the radical"? If so, was it because Dr. Paton himself "is crippled emotionally"? Perhaps his feeling of inadequacy makes him doubt his ability to make good under a social system that would deprive both him and me of our present privileged positions. But why is he afraid? Are only the fearful ones now to be classed as sane? Are those of us insane who are unafraid even of Bolsheviki?

PSYCHOLOGIC EXPERIENCE AND UNDERSTANDING

Probably Dr. Paton never had the longing of a disinherited, disemployed and painfully hungry wobbly to exchange a bounteous sweat for a long overdue the next meal. If that should be so, then he is not too well qualified to decide just what is "a well graded and appropriate reaction" under such conditions. The feeling-value engendered by such experiences, even in the healthy-minded, can be adequately understood only by those who have felt them. They can be apprehended in proper perspective only by those, who have had the experience and then have surmounted the conditions thereof, so as to be entirely free from the fear of a repetition of the experience. That is a kind of preparedness for efficient living that may be beyond Dr. Paton's experience, and therefore leaves him fearful of his own adequacy, under industrial democracy.

Had Dr. Paton's crippled emotions permitted him to be more intelligently fair, he might have made a study of "the radical's" background of life in the city slums, and in the lumber camps of the south and the northwest; then he might have tried making a living as a short-weighted coal miner in Virginia or Colorado; Also it would have been helpful to him to get a few touches of high life as a worker in the copper mines, around Bisbee or Butte; he might also try mining around Cripple Creek, or hold a common laborer's job under the steel trust. Thus equipped, in addition to his neurobiologic lore, he could have expressed a valuable judgment of *relative healthy-mindedness*, by asking himself if he could remain as sane, let us

say as Lenin or Gene Debs now is, if the crazy Bolsheviki during all his life had compelled him to choose between starvation and such a life as our American radicals have witnessed, at some such places as the above? Then, too, he might have been able to enquire how far his affluent and equally morbid friends are the responsible beneficiaries of having morbidity forced upon others. Without having used these means for determining relativity in the "appropriateness of the response", and without having studied even one particular radical, does not his group-diagnosis of "the radical" show him as "not relying upon well-co-ordinated and integrated intellectual processes"? If so, then is he not, by his own standards, made to appear as one who "is crippled emotionally"? One wonders how far he is removed from "nervous breakdown." If he regressed mentally in typical "dementia praecox" fashion, would Dr. Paton then join the Anarchists, Socialists, Syndicalists, Bolsheviks or the I. W. W.? By the way, I wonder if Dr. Paton knows what words are symbolized by those terrible letters: I. W. W.? Is it just an "I Won't Work" club, of rich people out of a job?

Of course, I am not a neuro-biologist, so I am not able to diagnose Dr. Paton's case from this one article of his. In my ignorance it would be difficult for me to say whether Dr. Paton is suffering from dementia praecox, or senile dementia, or both, or neither; or from home brew, or just plain cold feet. I am only putting it up to him to apply his own diagnostic methods and tests to himself, just as he applied them to his synthetic phantasmal "the radical". I admit that I am disqualified from answering such ques-

tions as I am asking, and disqualified even in other ways than by not being a neuro-biologist.

"SLOPPY SENTIMENTALITY"

Dr. Paton further says: "The radical who talks *so much* about his love for the people and the masses, is not any surer of the basis of his humanitarianism than is the man sure of his honesty who boasts publicly of possessing this particular virtue." In my ignorance, I believe that to be a true statement of a frequent psychologic mechanism. But—I suspect that here again Dr. Paton illustrates "a flight from reality" and resorts to a wishfulfilling phantasy in creating "the radical", whom he wishes to prove insane.

For nearly twenty years I have been engaged in fruitless effort to promote, among conservatives like Dr. Paton, the intellectual hospitality which is indispensable "to the emotional and mental dispositions favorable for the peaceful and rational adjustment of international and social difficulties." By the way: Dr. Paton then was too busy to give any aid to the peaceful solution of human problems. His feet were still warm then. Before the Russian revolution all effective lawless violence was used by conservatives, and therefore was sane.

To keep informed on invasions of free speech, I subscribed for and read many radical periodicals. For some years I conducted an open forum in Brooklyn where I weekly heard radicals and conservatives debate. For more years I lectured before thirty or forty liberal and

radical clubs and always was publicly subjected to their criticisms. In this manner, during the lecture season, I appeared from two to eight times per week before radicals and in debate with them. I have talked with every theoretic variety of radical, and have seen some of them exhibit all the same symptoms of morbidity, that can be found among Dr. Paton's conservative friends. Yet, I have never heard or read of one radical who "talked much [or at all] about his love of the people and the masses."

I have heard a very few pious conservatives say that people generally and radicals particularly, should love their exploiting neighbors as themselves, and should turn the other cheek, etc., etc. Also I have heard persistent rumors that an occasional conservative politician with a corporation label talks of his love for the common people. But according to my observation, the radical's *conscious* attitude is not one of wanting to be loved, nor of offering love. Earnestly and persistently he demands economic justice, according to unconventional standards of justice, that will give him the entire product of his labor. This conception of justice the radical insists is based upon a larger co-ordination of facts than can be marshalled in support of the sentimental approval of the generally accepted standards of economic justice. The talk of a generally diffused love is so foreign to the conscious part of his psychology that I must doubt that Dr. Paton had at hand even one such statement, taken from among the many

thousands of pieces of literature issued by accredited radicals* Am I wrong in my surmise, Dr. Paton? Perhaps such radicals as are devoted to the dogma of economic determinism, will all have a ready explanation for Dr. Paton's necessity for creating a fictitious radical, and then for declaring his collective imaginary radical to be insane, by comparing his imaginary personality with an equally imaginary and undefined abstract ideal of mental processes.

If Dr. Paton had possessed a better understanding of the genesis and mechanism of the subjective conflict, which is the essence of "crippled emotions", or if he had applied that understanding to an actual study of a few accredited radical leaders, he would have seen the absurdity of his phantasy of a radical preaching a morbid love of humanity. No- the morbid radical shows his morbidity, when it exists, by a conscious attitude and public conduct, that is always negativistic toward the great crowd. The victims of the same subjective conflict, who hold the love attitude in consciousness, become religious, or 101 per cent patriots, some of whom so love God, or the masters of their country, that they must organize mobs to kill economic heretics and even imaginary enemies. Dr. Paton never preaches mental hygiene to such. I wonder why?

THE WAR INSANITY AND PATON'S REMEDY

In this article Dr. Paton says that: "A large part of the world since 1914 has shown signs of insanity." Some persons more familiar than Dr. Paton with what had been going on in the real world, saw the symptoms many years

before 1914. Long ago some radical humorist suggested that the inhabitants of other planets must be using this world as their insane asylum. Had Dr. Paton been in open-eyed relation with the realities of his larger social environment, he too might have known the widespread "signs of insanity" long before 1914. Then he would have co-ordinated such American movements as: Holy Rollers, Holy Jumpers, Angel Dancers, Theosophy, New Thought, Divine Science, Christian Science, Mormonism, and scores of other freak religions, all exhibiting the same psychology as the more orthodox revivals, under Billy Sunday and under the army of less efficient imitators. He might thus have also known of mass violence inflicted upon religious, industrial and economic heretics, negroes and whites, all by respectable conservative mobs, sometimes by the police, all acquiesced in by the general public, and through relative inaction in effect approved by our courts. Then he might also have heard of a score of riotous suppression of free speech, in as many important American cities and long before the war. If in addition he had been able to study judicial action with the critical eyes of both a lawyer and psychologist; And likewise had he studied the clergy and the great newspapers,

*Nettlau, Max. *Bibliographie de l'anarchie Bruxelles & Paris, 1897*, 294 p. This has since been extended in manuscript so as to contain about 100,000 items, including anti-radical items. For a select list of recent material see: Zimand, Sacel, *Modern Social Movements*. Descriptive summaries and bibliographies, H. W. Wilson Co., 1921, 250 p.

with a desire to discover their distortions, evasions and suppressions of facts; If Dr. Paton had lived in the world of reality and had studied all this to see how much of dissociated personality is everywhere evidenced, war insanity would not have been novel to him. Had he studied the frame-ups against radicals, their lawless deportations, as from Bisbee and elsewhere, and their legalized deportations to foreign countries; Also the mobbing and killing of organizers, of even the conservative American Federation of Labor, and had he studied critically the judicial decisions in cases, of radicals and on labor problems, and free speech cases, the symptoms of insanity brought to his notice by the war could not have seemed new.

Being economically privileged he could, before the war, indulge his phantasies and create a world to his liking, just as his imagination created "the radical" to fit his emotional needs. Hence the evidence of our racial infantilism and childishness, that he first saw during the war, came to him as a newly created fact, rather than as an acute culmination of long existing and obvious tendencies.

What is more important, however, is that we consider the remedies offered by this distinguished psycho-therapeutist. Fortunately he makes it very simple, just as simple as his diagnosis of "the radical", and wholly free from technical jargon. The ability to simplify the complex, especially in abnormal psychology, is convincing evidence of real genius. If anything more is necessary to prove Dr. Paton a genius, his remedy for racial insanity supplies the need. All we need to do, he tells us, is to advise the insane radical (and shall I include the international financiers who are masters of

war and peace?) "to cultivate a disposition favorable to a peaceful solution of social difficulties." And this changed disposition seemingly can be very easily brought about, by simply "diverting attention from hair-splitting human arguments to the improvement of mental processes". The National Committee of Mental Hygiene will please take notice of this very simple remedy. I find no other suggestion in his article. Obviously this change away from a morbid disposition is deemed, by Dr. Paton, to be so simple as to need no elaboration of technique. Just tell it to the insane ones, in his words and the cure is effected, no doubt! Was Dr. Paton really trying to help along "only good mental hygiene" or was he perhaps exhibiting in his own sacred person some symptoms of shell shock? I am not a psychiatrist, nor a university professor, so I must leave it to him to answer.

TESTING RELATIVE MORBIDITY

I have already indicated that morbidity is always a matter of relativity. From this viewpoint it might be instructive to make a comparative study of the emotional disturbance of Dr. Paton and some selected radical leader. As a means to this end, it might be interesting to have a public debate between Dr. Paton and some such radical as Morris Hilquit or Clarence Darrow. But they are skillful lawyers and therefore Dr. Paton might not have an equal chance. Next I think of Gene Debs and big Bill Heywood. But at this writing Debs is still in jail for having cultivated "a disposition favorable to a peaceful solution of social [international] difficulties", and Dr. Paton is not helping him to get a pardon. Bill Heywood is in

Russia, a fugitive from what is judicially called justice. So that is impractical, besides being unfair to Dr. Paton, who is only a psychiatrist and perhaps not a specialist in economics. Next I think of Roger Baldwin, Scott Nearing, or Max Eastman. These men like all the rest whose names I am mentioning have done things, disagreeable things, and have been under arrest. But also these last three have been "educated" and like Dr. Paton they have been university teachers. I wish to make it easier for Dr. Paton because I too am something of a privileged parasite, and have in my insane way a fellow feeling for him. Perhaps the radical's insanity would shine brighter if we selected some one who has seen more of the inside of jails than of universities, to say nothing of never having been a Professor. Just an ordinary wobbly should represent the radicals. I want Dr. Paton to shine at his best in this comparative test. So then, I would like his permission to arrange a public debate between him and Red Doran, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Bill Z. Foster, Anton Johannsen, or Kate O'Hare. One of these extremely undesirable citizens would defend his or her own personal economic radicalism and jail record and Dr. Paton is to show its lack of co-ordination of economic data. This debate, right out in public, would be a mildly "critical situation" especially if Dr. Paton and his opponent each are victims of a morbid money complex. Then let us have present a committee of psychoanalysts, who are specialists in functional mental disorders. Let this committee decide for the public whether Dr. Paton or his radical opponent gives the more numerous signs of being "crippled emotionally" by their avoidance of

the hard cold realities that come to the human cogs of our economic and industrial machines.

Dr. Paton, by declaring in effect that "the radical" collectively is insane, has practically issued the challenge, for testing a relative sanity. I wish to have his challenge accepted. Has he such a "a sense of accomplishment and [of] being emotionally equal to the occasion" of such a test, which feeling he says "is a measure of a person's preparedness for actual life"?

Will he come to the fore and give us an illustration of that "sane intellectual leadership now urgently needed in every phase of life" because, obviously to him, not even the conventional politicians supply it? Will he now, by contrasting his own superior capacity for "well-graded and appropriate reactions" to the stimulus of the insane radical, or of his economic theories, set the world an example in 'good mental hygiene'? Will he show just how our acute problems, of the unemployed rich and the disemployed poor, are to be peaceably settled on a higher intellectual level for determining economic justice, and with the permission of the beneficiaries of things as they are? Thus he could "assist students [by illustrative example or otherwise] to recognize signs of insanity and to become familiar with the principles of good mental hygiene," and at the same time he could help the rich "to cultivate a disposition favorable to a peaceful solution of social difficulties" by inducing them to accelerate the natural processes of democratization.

This debate would also enable him to show that he alone among moderns has profitted by rediscovering what Dr. Paton says "the Greek recognized . . .

[namely] the effect of graceful posture and action upon the finer sentiments and the entire intellectual life." When showing us how a "graceful posture" will produce a more refined sense of economic justice, Dr. Paton surely will shine as compared with his awkward, clumsy, insane, radical, opponent. Thus he will stand out in bold relief, while he demonstrates that he alone never loses, much less does he "abandon the accumulated experiences that man has gathered together during the progress of civilization." Will he agree to meet such a radical in economic debate, if I find a jobless one with leisure, to meet him?

If Dr. Paton's self-sufficiency will permit, he will come, and by exhibiting his superiority he will prove that these radicals think as do victims "of shell shock, nervous breakdowns, and dementia praecox." If he won't face this test of relatively wholesome views on economic problems, then may we not infer that the real impulse for his article was to mask his fear and feeling of inadequacy? Here then is his chance to prove himself more sane than those who invite us all to practice: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

And yet, Dr. Paton is obviously such a kind and gentle soul, that his genial temper breathes all through his article. Evidently he never had his collar mussed by riding a breakbeam. Also he is not sufficiently informed in evolutionary psychology to see that his profound prejudices are formed on an infantile level of desires, and justified on a childish level of mental processes. Apparently his prejudices also leave him quite unconscious of the pernicious influence of such an article, as of his underlying great fear of radicalism.

Have I proven Dr. Paton as insane as "the radical"? If so it is because I have been only as unfair as he was toward radicals, and like him, I have ignored the genetic approach to the problem of diagnosis. Lest the radicals who may read this, shall too hastily think Dr. Paton insane, I will requote the lines at the beginning of this article. "Aunt Fannie bent upon the scandal of the neighborhood, sees many things which exist nowhere but in her own eyes. Yet she can bring you the confirmatory shreds of evidence. What is evidence enough for the utter condemnation of our enemies, would be laughed to scorn if applied to our friends."

Explanatory Correspondence

The following letters add two items of interest. First, they confirm a suspicion as to Dr. Paton's feeling of adequacy. Second: His letter corrects an inference of mine that he had not studied any radicals. It is still uncertain whether his radicals were only of the parlor variety, and whether he studied enough of these in number to warrant his all-inclusive generalization. Here are the two pertinent letters of our correspondence.

T. S.

December 4th, 1921.

My dear Dr. Paton:—

I have written a review of your mental processes as exhibited in your article on: *The Psychology of the Radical*. I hope to place it for publication in some magazine. After that I will have some reprints. I think I would like to publish your article together with mine. Perhaps you, too, would feel better satisfied to have your article entire, accompanying my criticism, so that it may correct any derogatory impression that my comment tends to create. For some minds no doubt, my article will supply new proof of the correctness of your conclusions. Anyway, why not pass on to the general public the issue of the relative maturity of our mental processes?

So then, in the spirit of being a "good sport" I am writing to ask your permission to reprint your article with my own. If you are wholly satisfied with your superiority of wisdom as to the psychology of radicals, perhaps you will be willing to even pay a proportionate share of the cost of joining your propaganda [with mine] (in the two), so as to make the contrast the more conspicuous. Then I propose that we place them in such public libraries as preserve pamphlets. I understand that the *Yale Review* is to print "two brief replies." I might like to include them also, if I can get permission to do so.

Awaiting your pleasure, I remain,

Most cordially yours,

THEODORE SCHROEDER.

December 16th, 1921.

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

I have been out of town and therefore have been delayed in answering your letter.

I appreciate your desire to have the two articles printed together, but I think you will not misunderstand me when I say I prefer to let my case rest. For twenty years I have been very much interested in the study of the personality. It seems to me that the only hope for our civilization is to find out enough about the human animal to be able to regulate his behavior intelligently. My conclusions were based on the study of the personal histories of radicals I have met. I refer of course, only to those who call themselves radicals. The person who is thoroughly honest does not say very much about it. He lets his deeds speak and in the same way the person who is convinced he is intelligent enough to bring about radical changes for the better in civilization does not feel compelled to emphasize his radicalism.

If anyone is greatly interested in this subject they can do a great deal of good by getting a sum of money to be expended in the scientific study of the inferiority complexes. This is a great problem and one requiring special study.

Very truly yours,

STEWART PATON.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF SCHROEDERIANA

1913

Partial bibliography of the writings of Theodore Schroeder dealing largely with problems of religion, of sex, and of freedom of speech.

Free Speech league. (New York) April, 1913, 8p., 84 titles.

1919

Authorship of the book of Mormon. Psychologic tests of W. F. Prince, critically reviewed by Theodore Schroeder * * * to which is now added a bibliography of Schroeder on Mormonism. Reprint [except bibliography]. American Journal of Psychology. (Worcester, Mass.) XXX pp. 66-72. January, 1919. 18p.

Bibliography pp. 10-18, lists 65 titles, some of which duplicate material as by revision, republication or translation.

Sankey-Jones, Nancy Eleanor, 1862—

Theodore Schroeder on free speech, a bibliography by Nancy E. Sankey-Jones. (New York) Free speech league. 1919. 24p.

Lists 149 titles, some of which duplicate material by republication or translation.

1920

Sankey-Jones, Nancy Eleanor, 1862—

Theodore Schroeder's use of the psychologic approach to problems of religion, law, criminology and philosophy. A bibliography by Nancy E. Sankey-Jones. (Cos Cob, Conn.) 1920. 16p.

Lists 75 titles, some of which duplicate material because of revisions, republications or translations.

1921

Sankey-Jones, Nancy Eleanor, 1862—

A unique heathen, to which is now added: Theodore Schroeder on the erotogenesis of religion. A bibliography * * * Enlarged from the Freethinker, London, April 17, 1921.

Lists 43 titles, mostly selected from the last list.