

THE VERTICAL THOUGHT MOVEMENT

by

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

Franklin Merrell-Wolff  
800 Eighth Street  
San Fernando, California

## THE VERTICAL THOUGHT MOVEMENT

### I

#### The Rolling-under of the Right

Despite the intensity of feeling aroused in the political campaign, which culminated in the presidential election of last November, objective analysis reveals the striking fact that the differences between the various candidates with respect to programs were far less significant than the agreements. There were no fundamental disagreements with respect to foreign and domestic policies in principle. Differences with respect to implementation and administration of policies did exist, as well as the conflict of personal temperaments, but in none of this is there revealed a basic ideological divergence. The voter was offered the opportunity of choosing between a more radical or more moderate development in the direction defined by the "New Deal" legislation, but there was no candidate or party that afforded representation of the sentiment favoring isolation or of the social philosophies opposed to the primary orientation of the "New Deal".

Yet the "New Deal", as a movement, both consciously and unconsciously, gives expression to philosophical, psychological, and even religious attitudes which are not capable of representing the needs of all men. In fact, the "New Deal" represents a tendency with decided orientation to the political Left and this fact is explicitly acknowledged by its chief representative. As the opposed candidate accepted the "New Deal" legislation in principle, we must regard his defined position as somewhat left of the Center, though not so far to the Left as the Democratic party. The other parties, with the possible exception of the Prohibition Party which is too particularized in its interest to be of great significance, all occupied a more extreme Leftist position. Thus the most significant fact which emerges from the total picture of the recent campaign is that of a situation in which the sentiment of the Right had no articulate voice within the political arena.

Unquestionably Wendell Willkie was the only candidate from whom any consideration could be expected by individuals possessing Rightist temperaments or holding Rightist philosophies. But there the hope for a reasonable consideration was more grounded in the temperament of the man than in the social philosophy to which he gave explicit espousal. Indeed, the reflective observer gains the impression that the body of citizens who naturally and by temperament belong to the political

Right are so far ashamed of themselves that they hesitate to formulate their position explicitly and openly. It is as though they accepted the adverse moral judgment of the collectivist Left and so were forced to work for their own interests and values in hidden and indirect ways, meanwhile giving lip-service to the valuations of the collectivist thinkers.

The resultant situation is a most unfortunate one. For the natural membership of the Right is a significant part of the total social body. An exclusively Leftist society would be very much like a man who had only a left arm. A complete man has both arms and possesses the complementary functions and valuations symbolized by both. Otherwise he is only an incomplete entity or psychical fraction. The same fact is true of the social body of all men. Accordingly, a society whose conscious orientation is dominated exclusively by the philosophies and valuation of the Left is, inevitably, radically unbalanced and hence defective as an organism. So, beyond the justified claim of the Rightists to a place in the sun, there is the further consideration that the social body as a whole, if it is to be normal and sound, needs the conscious and explicit contribution from the Right.

The complete amputation of either the Right or the Left is a psychological impossibility. Men cannot help being what they are in essential organization any more than an individual

is capable of complete amputation and destruction of an important psychological function and still remain a human being. But it is a well known fact of analytic psychology that a given function or attitude may be largely repressed so that it functions unconsciously instead of consciously. In this case, the repressed function operates in ways that are often quite destructive. Psychological balance requires that all functions shall receive a certain minimal conscious recognition. The same principle is true of the social body as a whole. If such a social body is to be healthy, then the interplay of the forces of the Right and the Left must be open and conscious in high degree. If, in substantial degree, the motivation of either the Right or the Left is forced into the underworld of indirection, the resultant effect is an unhealthy social body. Neither the Right nor the Left can be destroyed, but either can be largely submerged in the underworld of the social unconscious. The Russia of today and, in modified degree, present-day Germany and Italy, illustrate the effects of a radically submerged Right.

Almost from the beginning the dominant orientation of American policy has been directed to the Left. The fathers of our nation did aim to achieve a balanced government and strove to perpetuate the principle in the form of the Constitution. But the ingenuity of men has proven quite capable of

nullifying constitutional safeguards even without employing the method of explicit amendment. Thus, though the founders envisaged a selection of the Chief Executive by the leading citizens of the various States, and not by the people as a whole, yet this constitutional safeguard was quickly nullified by the device of pledging the votes of the members of the electoral college.\* This constituted the first decisive step in the move-

\*The offering of a pledged vote by members of the electoral college is really a violation of the spirit of the Constitution and is thus a violation of the oath to support the Constitution. It is the Constitutional duty of the elector to vote for a Chief Executive according to his sincere private judgment and not as a member of a party. Yet it appears that Washington was the only President ever elected in this way. The elector was supposed to be an outstanding and superior representative of his community who was asked to employ his genuine judgment in the selection of the President. If this course had not been nullified, then the Rightist sentiment would have played an open part in our government, as intended, instead of being forced to employ the methods of indirection. Even Thomas Jefferson, who is so commonly regarded as an outstanding representative of Leftist sentiment, would actually appear as a Rightist in the present setting, as revealed in the following quotation from a letter of his to John Adams: "I agree with you that there is a natural aristocracy among men. The grounds of this are virtue and talents. The natural aristocracy I regard as the most precious gift of nature for the instruction, the trusts and the governments of society. May we not even say that that form of government is best which provides most effectually for a pure selection of these aristoi into the offices of government." It is clear that Jefferson did not really believe that men were naturally equal in the sense of ability and character, whatever the Declaration of Independence may have said about men being created equal. The modern glorification of the "average" man receives little encouragement from Jefferson.

ment toward the Left. But today it is possible to list a number of deviations from the original purpose of the founders, and, in every case, the effect has been an increase of the open and explicit power of the Left. On the whole, the extensions of the right of suffrage have worked to increase the influence of the Left.\* In particular, the change in the method of selection of the United States senators from appointment by the state legislatures to the basis of popular election has distinctly increased Leftist influence. The delegation of legislative powers to executive commissions, quite contrary to any strict construction of the First Section of the First Article of the Constitution, has today enormously augmented the power of the Left, particularly in the case of the Labor Relations Board. Finally, domination of the personnel of the Supreme Court by men oriented to Leftist political and social philosophies and the attitude of loose construction leaves us with no security with respect to Rightist guarantees in the body of the Constitution.

To be sure, the influence of the Right has existed within American society in the broad sense. Private industrial government has been dominantly Rightist. Likewise, the pre-

\*This may not be the case so far as the extension of suffrage to women is concerned. I do not know whether women as a group lean more to the Left or Right. But the removal of racial barriers to the right of suffrage has distinctly favored the Left. In the last election the New Deal was more strongly supported by the colored and so-called foreign-groups' vote than it was by the basic Teutonic stock.

dominant influence of the colleges, the press, and the church has, on the whole, oriented itself to the Right. But insofar as the Right has had influence upon the Government it has had to operate through indirect means since it has experienced a progressive loss of direct recognition. At times the business community has been able to dominate candidates for office through various indirect devices effecting control of political party organizations. But all this does not change the fact that in our formal government there is no provision whereby Rightist sentiment is guaranteed representation. Consequently, as a sheer necessity of the natural will-to-survive the Right had to employ indirect and more or less subterranean methods to maintain itself in the face of a political entity which constantly threatened to become the enemy. The effect of subterranean methods always is the production of a dark coloring. Thus, most unfortunately for all, the Right has come to appear in the eyes of many as the expression of evil and selfish motivation moving in devious ways to undermine the noble-appearing idealism of the Left. The picture is a false one. The positive values of the Right are great indeed, though rarely appreciated, while the seemingly noble idealism of Leftist advocates all too often surrounds a rotten core of massive human cupidity.

Within recent years the power of political government, relative to the power of business and other non-political social institutions, has grown enormously. So that today the indirect

lines whereby heretofore the Right has been enabled to exert real influence have been largely nullified. Business and other social institutions now exist mainly through the sufferance of the government administration without any assurance of effective protection of constitutional limitation. Once business and the individual citizen could feel secure behind the championship of the constitutional lawyer, but now security of an uncertain kind must be sought more and more by the methods which belong primarily to the courtier. The Right is forced to choose between becoming a beggar at the political shrine or to exist as an outcast. This is a destiny wholly unworthy of the Right, which, in its full meaning, represents dignities of the highest order, and it should never be accepted. If the Left has a right to revolt, which has now received political and legal recognition, the Right most certainly possesses the prerogative of affirming itself upon grounds that are super-political.

Within recent days much stress has been laid upon the duty of all Americans to unite in an unified body and to forget the differences of the late presidential campaign. The assumption is that a common enemy threatens us from outside our borders. Perhaps this is so and perhaps not, so far as our existence as a national entity is concerned. If, indeed, our national existence is threatened, it is less a duty than a necessity of the will-to-survive that we should defend ourselves. But, in the

end, the continuation of national entities is less vital in the lives of men than the preservation or attainment of ways of life that liberate or lead to satisfying realization. Frustration and bondage are the great evils, and it matters little what the frustrating and binding power may be. Certainly Germany is less to be feared than the Nazi way-of-life, yet in many ways the trend of the New Deal runs parallel to the latter. The opposition between German National Socialism and traditional Americanism is indeed radical, but New Deal collectivism affords a much less radical contrast. Methodological differences still are great, but there is a clear ideological convergence. Indeed, disregarding differences of method which are largely a matter of racial temperament anyway, it is entirely possible that the gulf between traditional Americanism and the ideology of the "New Deal" is greater than the differences between the latter and German National Socialism, for both of these have a collectivistic orientation and give to political power overwhelming predominance. To the genuine Rightist either appears as the enemy which would either choke out his existence or reduce him to the status of slave. The right to life of any human type, that is what it is because of Nature, transcends the duties to States, which are, after all, merely conventional devices created by men. A call to unity on the basis of the Left carries no obligation that the Rightist is by moral duty bound to respect. Only from the Center can a demand be made that imposes equal moral obligation

upon the Right and Left. The capture of the Government by the Left - which Government is supposed to stand in neutral relation to the social attitudes - inevitably implies the forfeiture by the latter of any moral claim upon the loyalty of the Right. If the Right is to make sacrifices and fight, it may quite correctly insist that it should have something which it values to sacrifice and fight for. For a real Rightist, death is preferable to a slavish relation to the Left, since this implies domination of quality by quantity, which is sheer moral and spiritual prostitution.

Before America may rightly claim the role of arbiter of justice throughout the world, it must resolve the problem of true social justice within its own entity. Save at the very beginning, always the body has had more political recognition here than the head. Just as there are more cells in the body than in the head of the physical organism, so ever has mass-man possessed by far the greater vote and therefore the greater political recognition. Mass-man has never been politically the "forgotten man", else the formulae dedicated to "the people" would not have supplied the necessary shibboleths for successful candidates. For "the people" clearly does not mean all, but simply quantity as opposed to quality. How otherwise would such a phrase as "the people" define an issue between human beings? Politically, with us the Rightist is the "forgotten man", however much his superior skill may have served to nullify

political power through extra-political means. If there is justice in the claim on the part of organized labor for coordinate right in the determination of industrial policy, then surely the managerial and professional classes may claim with equal justice corresponding direct recognition in the political field. With the exception of the legal profession the latter have no political representation. A true democracy would afford a political representation that is proportional to functions rather than proportional to number.

If it is not yet completely eclipsed, as it is in Russia, yet everywhere throughout the Occidental world the Right is in the state of retreat. This development in America is but a part of a general tendency manifest throughout the whole range of the Western cultural milieu. It is as though the Wheel of Destiny had rolled to that point wherein the ordinary man has risen or is rising to the top with the complementary implication of submergence of the incarnations of superior quality. With one notable exception, the Right is losing power on all fronts. With a compelling dynamism the Left has risen in organized and self-conscious power, implementing its will through political totalitarianism. Before this rise, the Right, standing entrenched behind its Maginot line of traditional rights, has been fighting a losing battle. The position is a weak one, as has been so well illustrated in the recent Battle of Flanders.

Dynamic power is greater than the defensive potency of entrenched position. Thus the Right, conceived simply as a stable conservatism, is already defeated, and only "mopping-up" operations remain. <sup>Consequently,</sup> Thus, the Right, as merely the conservative group, cannot avoid the calamity of the "rolling-under". Entrenchment is impotent before fanatical and organized dynamism.

But the total meaning of the Right is not embraced in the concept of conservatism, as is so commonly assumed. Far more fundamentally the Right is the true creative source of new values, is indeed the root-source of all positive values. It was the Rightist Hegel who gave birth to a new form of thought, while the Leftist Karl Marx perverted this form into a sinister materialism. Indeed, a careful analysis of the total manifestation of the Right and Left reveals a conservative and dynamic aspect present in each wing. The emphasis upon the maintaining of seniority prerogatives on the part of organized labor reflects a conservative motivation as truly as the conservative attitude toward capital-property by the employing group. The conservatism is simply differently oriented in the two cases. On the other hand, the creative daring of a Rockefeller, a Ford, or a Jim Hill is nowhit less dynamic than the radical action of the extreme Left. The ultra-conservative banker or administrator of trust funds by no means affords a comprehensive symbol of the Rightist attitude. The creative spirit of youth abides in the Right no less truly than in the Left, nor is the latter

any less lacking in an orientation to the standpoints normal to old age. The old-age pension movements afford abundant manifestation of this fact. Something a good deal deeper than the opposition between conservatism and dynamism defines the division between Right and Left.

The Right is radical as well as conservative. When it becomes old in any cultural life-cycle it is quite natural that it should manifest mostly under the conservative coloring. At such times, if the Left is moving within its dynamic phase, the Right is naturally forced into the position of retreat toward death. And thus the lines are drawn within the Western World today. Oriented to the past too greatly, the Right is weak against Leftist power drawn from the future. It can meet the latter with greater power only by drawing upon the resources of a still vaster future. The Right must seek rebirth by the dynamic affirmation of power having a new orientation. Lying closer to the fountain-source of Wisdom than the Left, the Right is the best fitted ultimately to wield the larger balance of power. But it can realize its possibilities only by standing on the base of radical affirmation.

The "Vertical Thought Movement" is the Crusade of the Radical Right. It is the Right acknowledging itself and become proud of its spiritual dignity, bowing before nothing within the visible world.

## II

### Definition of the Right and Left

Thus far I have employed the concepts of the "Right" and the "Left" without supplying a definition of meaning. The terms are familiar within political and social thought and doubtless convey some meaning to the mind of the reader. Most commonly and most simply these words have been used with the connotation of "Conservative" and "Liberal", respectively. But it must have been clear from the context of the first <sup>chapter</sup> ~~section~~ that I had in mind considerably wider definitions. As a matter of fact, I have found the popular conception far too narrow to reveal the real significance of the contrast between the Right and the Left. As the result of extended analysis I discovered that the view which regards the Right as merely conservative, reactionary, or narrow simply reflects the prejudice of the Leftist who is overly confident of his own eternal superiority. This view no self-conscious Rightist would accept as possessing more than a very limited validity. It is as false and as true as the judgment of the Rightist who sees in the Liberal Leftist merely the manifestation of loose intellectual and moral habits. There is indeed an aspect of Liberalism that is merely looseness, just as there is an aspect of Rightism that is merely narrowness. So there is some truth in both statements, but it is the least significant part of the total meaning.

Historically the terms appear first in the politics of continental Europe where it was customary to place the conservative party to the right of the president in legislative assemblies, while the liberal or democratic parties were seated upon the left side of the house. At first glance this would seem to be an arbitrary arrangement. But just precisely that which seems arbitrary or instinctive is often a most significant key to psychological significance. The question arises, just why was the arrangement made that way instead of in the reverse pattern?

The right side is traditionally the place of greatest honor. The right is on the side which points to the East when the body faces North. But the East is traditionally and symbolically the source of Wisdom, the place where the sun rises. Also, the right hand is the dextrous hand both in the current sense of the word and in the original Latin meaning. In contrast, the left is sinister and ill-omened. At once, one derives the implication that those who sat to the right of the president were the wisest and most skillful while the Left carried with its liberality something that was sinister. Historically this was unquestionably true to the facts. Thus the nobility, which was typically wiser in government and more skillful in manipulation, fitted very well the meaning of the "Right". The Left had, or represented, the weight of numbers, which, when undirected by wisdom, always carries a sinister threat.

The study of the root meaning of words, together with their historical development, supplies most valuable psychological keys. In fact, in this way much of the unconscious psychology of mankind is brought to the surface in a way that is very illuminating. In this connection I shall quote a selection from a chapter on "The Significance of Liberalism" that forms part of a volume I plan to publish in the near future:

"Etymologically, we find that 'right' is derived from or related to the following: The Latin, 'rectus', meaning 'right' and 'direct'; the Zend, 'rashta', meaning 'straight', 'right', and 'just'; and the Sanskrit, 'rij', meaning 'stretch', and 'raj' meaning 'rule'. From all this we derive a multitude of specific connotations, of which 'the side of the body pointing eastward when an individual is facing north' is only one. Thus, 'right' carried the connotation of 'straight', in the sense of the 'right line'; of conformity with the moral law or being in accordance with truth, justice, duty, and the will of God; of righteousness, of true, actual, real, genuine, precise, exact, correct, etc. It also incorporates the notion of conformity with authoritative standard. From this it is easy to see how the idea of 'soundness', as opposed to wishful thinking, should play a part in Rightist thinking. Actually, scientific thinking belongs to the Right psychologically,

and, within the field of science, mathematics stands on the extreme Right, while biology, sociology, and much of psychology is, relatively, more to the Left. Roughly, Leftist thinking is anti-logical and pro-teleological, though this is a question of emphasis rather than an absolute distinction.

"The word 'left' carries the primary meaning of 'weak'. Clearly, it is that which is 'left-over', the central source of power being vested in the 'right'. Thus, the 'Left' is closely related to the notion of revolt, of wilful affirmation without authority. The ground of the 'Left' is not the authority of rightness, but of 'desire', conceived as essentially justified in its own nature. Hence, desire-philosophies, like Pragmatism, are typically Leftist philosophies; likewise, so are all philosophies grounded in the notion of 'life', in the restricted sense of 'will-to-live'. For this reason biologically rooted philosophies tend to be Leftist."

Further light is thrown upon the essential differentia of the Right and Left by an examination of the words "liberal" and "liberalism", since it is an extensive practice to identify Liberalism with Leftist thought. However, we shall find that these words supply two directions of implication and attitude that diverge as radically as do the Right and Left in politics.

Thus the meaning of "liberalism", as it was understood by Herbert Spencer, defines, in high degree, just precisely the ground on which the Right today stands opposed to the New Deal, which in turn is conceived by its proponents as liberal. The following quotation from Herbert Spencer can be found in the Century Dictionary under the second meaning of the word "liberal":

"The function of Liberalism in the past was that of putting a limit on the powers of kings. The function of true Liberalism in the future will be that of putting a limit to the powers of Parliaments."

Part of the effect of strict construction of the Constitution is just precisely the placing of limits upon the powers of the legislative bodies. Loose construction reduces those limits, as the late Justice Holmes affirmed more than once. In fact, Justice Holmes has explicitly affirmed the view that the Constitution did not give legislative authority to Herber Spencer's "Social Statics". Yet Holmes has been almost universally acclaimed as the great apostle of judicial liberalism. Here we see two competent thinkers radically opposed in viewpoint and yet each speaks in the name of Liberalism! Now the "New Dealers" clearly conceive of Liberalism in much the sense of Holmes, and "New Deal" appointments to the Supreme Court have resulted in the overwhelming domination of that Court by the theory of loose construction. The result is the relative re-

removal of limits upon the powers of the legislative branch of government. Accordingly, in the Spencerian sense the "New Deal" would appear as anti-liberal.

If we proceed to an etymological study of the word "liberal", an astonishing light is thrown upon the above divergence of meaning. "Liberal" has a dual root source. On one side it is derived from the Latin "liber", meaning "free", on the other from the Latin "libet", meaning "it pleases", and the Sanskrit "lubh", meaning "desire". In the second sense "liberal" is akin to "libidinous" which is also derived from "libet" and thus likewise is related to the word "libido", a term that has come to have a fundamental value in modern analytic psychology. In the sense of "liber", "liberal" very readily becomes the philosophy of "laissez-faire" which seeks to restrict the functions of government to the maximum possible, meanwhile affording the individual man the widest possible range of self-determinism. "Rugged individualism" is "Liberalism" in this sense. But, in contrast, "Liberalism" in the sense of "libet" by no means necessarily implies freedom from government. With many temperaments the responsibility of the freedom of self-determinism is by no means attractive, and with these types regimentation by the political or other collective entity is quite compatible with desire and pleasure. To be taken care of pleases many.

When we approach this subject from the psychological side we find that the dominating love of freedom is mainly a

characteristic of the thinking type; while the feeling type so largely fulfills itself through relatedness that regimenting laws are only little or not at all painful. If the primary orientation of the individual is to feeling and desire, the system of valuation is radically different from that of those who ground themselves upon thought-judgment. It makes a world of difference whether feeling leads and thought is viewed as merely instrumental, or, per contra, thought leads while feeling is left to adjust itself as best it can.

At last we are in a position to give the distinction between Right and Left some precision of meaning. The Rightist is one who correlates himself more to "correctness" than to "wishfulness", while the Leftist reverses this valuation. This does not mean that the Rightist lacks all desire nor that the Leftist scorns truth. It is simply a question of emphasis, a matter of more or less. At the extreme Right we have the religious-philosophical system of Buddha which preaches the mastery of desire and the destruction of tanha or the "will-to-live", while at the utmost Left we have the Dionysian abandonment in unrestrained libidinousness. Somewhere between these limits the majority of men abide, though unquestionably most men stand much closer to Dionysius than to Buddha. And thus it is that the unrestricted rule of the majority has a marked tendency toward the Dionysian pole.¶

(Footnote)

\*Frederick Nietzsche frankly repudiated the Rightist Christian morality and turned Dionysian, and was proud of it. But Nietzsche, through Spengler, appears as the prophet of the Nazis. This very clearly reveals the Leftist orientation of German National Socialism. It is a great mistake to regard the modern German government as Rightist in the absolute sense. It is to the Left of the Center, but more to the Right than Communism. It is only in contrast to the latter that the Nazis appear as relatively to the Right. When Hitler decided to cooperate with the leadership of the German army he simply effected an expedient compromise which somewhat modified his more extreme Leftist position. As a result, German military intelligence was not crushed in the sense that most other German intelligence suffered. This made the brilliant German staff achievements possible, while in Russia the thorough-going distrust of intelligence brought its normal fruit in the miserable staff-work of the Finnish campaign. The extreme Leftist fears and hates a free intellect.

So far we have identified the Right with the primary valuation of "correctness" and the Left with the accentuation of "wishfulness". This is only a part of the total picture. If we return again to the word "liberal" we find that it has developed quite an extensive range of meaning out of its root sources. Thus we find "liberal" in part defined as "of wide or ample range or extent", "not narrowly limited or restricted", "expanded", "free in views or opinions", "not narrow, bigoted, or intolerant", "generously inclined", "munificent", "magnanimous", "unrestrained", "unchecked", "licentious". This gives us a picture of something broad and expansive. We may thus say that in the best sense a liberal consciousness is one that is oriented to expansive breadth and tolerance. These attitudes are unquestionably virtuous and the typical Rightist would not hesitate to concede this. For the latter, broad-

mindedness, tolerance, and generosity become vicious only when they lead to a sacrifice of correctness, truth, and purity. So long as correctness, truth, and purity are not sacrificed, he may well say that the more broad-mindedness, tolerance, and generosity there is, the better it is for all men. But the primary value goes with correctness, truth, and purity. However, the genuine Leftist is so strongly oriented to expansiveness and breadth that in a situation in which he was forced to choose he would in greater or less degree sacrifice the correctness, the truth, and the purity.

In the meaning unfolded in the last paragraph we are arriving at the very heart of the significance of Liberalism, with respect to which the corresponding political orientation stands in derivative relationship. At his best, the Leftist is broad and tolerant, though in other aspects as the conservator of the natural life-attitudes, as opposed to cognitive other-worldliness, he may be anything but broad and tolerant. There is a sense in which the Leftist understands and values freedom, and, as well, another sense in which the Rightist may give 'freedom' the very highest value. But these two valuations clash head on. Freedom in one dimension implies restriction in another, and so when two men of opposite types meet they may very easily oppose the policies of each other, and yet in each case do so in the name of freedom! For this reason

the concept 'freedom', as an abstraction, does not serve to differentiate between the primary attitudes of the Left and the Right. The freedom to think an idea through to its ultimate logical consequence and then to insist that life must conform strikes with a fearful force at the very thing the Leftist values most. On his part he values the freedom to follow the desires which spring spontaneously out of the heart of concrete life, regardless of the implied violence to rational truth. Clearly, the Rightist is the more ascetic of the two.

Breadth and tolerance very readily suggest to us the figure of expansion in a horizontal plane. The Leftist is oriented primarily to lateral or horizontal relationship. He tends to encompass widely and extensively. His keynote tends to be extensivity, a wide spreading of himself, and thus we can very readily correlate his standpoint with the attitude of extroversion. Typically, he has the stronger feeling for the object, thereby depreciating the world of ideas. From this follows the strong accentuation of social morality. Often it appears that his social orientation is so strong that for him the being anti-social assumes the character of greatest evil. But for the Rightist, integrity is a far superior good. Thus for the latter, he who lives by a code of unshakable integrity is among the best of men, whether he is socially minded or not.

The man whose word is as good as his bond is preeminently the good man, the one possessed of character and worthy of trust. This is an integrity in dealings with other men, but even more than that, it is an integrity in thought. Naturally, the banker in peculiar degree values the character of men in this sense, but no less insistently does the scientist value men in the same manner. From the scientist's point of view, what worse criminal is there than the intellectual cheat? A Dr. Cook who fraudulently claimed the honor of scientific achievements stands on a lower moral level than the gangster, the kidnaper, and the exploiter. Indeed, if there were no men who had such a code, the development of scientific knowledge would have been impossible.

Now, there is something narrow and even ascetic about integrity. The man of integrity inevitably hates the lie and the careless attitude toward contradiction. The Machiavellian morality of the politician appears to him as composed of the worst scourgings from the depths of hell. Of all this the man of integrity is most intolerant, and so there is a sense in which we may call him narrow. But none the less there is a dimension in which his life does develop, though not in the sense of wide inclusiveness and expansion. To find wherein he is something more than merely narrow we must look for another dimension.

If we turn in the dictionary to the Greek combining form "ortho" we will find the key to the dimension on which the Rightist develops. "Ortho" means "straight", "upright", "correct", etc. A number of English words employ this combining form, and as one reads through their definitions he receives a general picture of something that is correct and upright and is, in general, as it should be. To a certain group of temperaments all this defines just that which is valuable. Representatives of this group may acknowledge that there is something good about being broad and inclusive, but not a good sufficiently great to justify any deviation from uprightness, correctness, or the general view that it is best that men, things, ideas, and attitudes should be simply what they should be. Here we have the primary orientation to an inner imperative of essentially unconditional character. Among thinkers this spirit is manifested most conspicuously by pure mathematicians.

Returning to the spacial figure, it is now clear that the line of development of the Rightist is in the vertical dimension. He reaches to heights and depths but has, in general, little horizontal spread. He is profound rather than liberal or broad. His thought and aspiration moves vertically, to the eternal truths and God, or to the unseen depths.

Just as the Leftist attitude parallels extroversion, so likewise in the Rightist we see much that is analagous to

the introvert. This correlation is very significant.

At last there emerges for us a partial definition of the divergent, yet inter-dependent, Right and Left. The definition is only partial as the total meaning of this opposition will grow to the very end of this essay. But, at least, we are afforded a starting point for the orientation of our understanding. The Right and the Left represent inherent and natural attitudes, both of which are developed more or less in every individual. But with many individuals the one attitude or the other holds the position of decisive dominance. In that case, the counter attitude is more or less repressed or depreciated. As a natural consequence, human beings can be classed into groups, and in the political and sociological sense this grouping can be identified with the traditional terms "Right" and "Left". However, there still remain many individuals in whom the development of attitude is by no means decisive. These naturally belong in the political Center, with a tendency to swing more one way or the other at different times and in different situations. Except in rare cases, those in the Center do not manifest the most comprehensive development of consciousness both in breadth and depth, but rather are in an amorphous and relatively undeveloped state. Mostly, those who are more conscious than the majority definitely and knowingly align themselves either with the Right or the Left. The basis of deviation and alignment proceeds according to the

lines of emphasis outlined below:

In this scheme the Rightist group is placed on one side, the Leftist on the other, while the column of words below each gives the quality, attitude, or orientation of each in contrast to the other.

<u>The Rightist</u> oriented to -		<u>The Leftist</u> oriented to -
Correctness	-	Wishfulness
Profundism	-	Liberalism
Depth	-	Breadth
Vertical component	-	Horizontal component
Introversion	-	Extroversion
Integrity	-	Social mindedness
Purity	-	Tolerance

This scheme is by no means a true picture of how each group appears typically to the other. The view of the other type is commonly much less flattering. If we take these views, the picture becomes disreputable. I shall suggest these secondary pictures by correlating the corresponding view of the opposite type with each of the seven words in each column.

Rightist view of the Leftist

		The Leftist seems:
Correctness	-	Inaccurate and careless
Profundism	-	Loose and shallow
Depth	-	Superficial
Vertical component	-	Without an orienting modulus
Introversion	-	The helpless slave of things
Integrity	-	Unreliable

Purity -

Not very clean  
(Disposed to combine  
forces with political  
bosses)

The Leftist view of the Rightist

Wishfulness -

The Rightist seems:

Selfishly occupied with  
his beloved ego

Liberalism -

Narrow minded and close-  
fisted

Breadth -

Unprogressive

Horizontal component -

Restricted horizon

Extroversion -

Timid in the face of experience

Social mindedness -

Anti-social

Tolerance -

A prig

If the members of each group were to tell the members of the other what each thought of the other, it would probably be impossible to enforce the laws against dueling. Fortunately, we have learned to be more or less discreet.

### III

#### The Psychological Orientation

The identification of the complementary dualism of Right and Left with the psychological attitudes of introversion and extroversion is hardly correct. More strictly the relationship is one of parallelity. This implies that the logical and psychological pattern of the introvert-extrovert relationship is transferred to the Right-Left relationship without implying identity of meaning. The final determination of the extent to which those who are naturally introverts would gravitate to the political and sociological Right, and extroverts to the Left, is an empirical question. But that there should be a general tendency of this sort seems unquestionable. The whole relationship here is complicated by the fact that the pattern of the thought, or the social functioning of an individual, is often not the true expression or implication of his personal psychology.

The philosophical or social theory which a given individual affirms may be the result of theoretical or pragmatic convincing rather than the development of spontaneous conviction. In this case the theory contradicts the individual's temperament. Among introverts this is a phenomenon that occurs quite frequently, though apparently it rarely happens among extroverts. Different factors contribute in the

producing of this result. For one thing, the introverted types are generally less articulate than their own extroverted brothers. Further, the extrovert is naturally much more effective in the manipulation of objective situations, including the "selling" of himself, his ideas, and valuations. Accordingly, the introvert is convinced in the face of an impressive array of fact and argument, which often stifles a much less clearly defined inner feeling. Very frequently he is forced to feel that there is something wrong with his own nature that caused the spontaneous side of himself to move and evaluate in an opposite sense. This view is all the more strengthened as it corresponds with just what his extrovert brother thinks. The result may often be a false extroversion as the consequence of overly intense effort at self-correction. Within the ranks of the Leftist intelligentsia there are undubtably many instances of just this type, and because the false position necessarily involves strong inner conflict they are particularly liable to become fanatical extremists. The inner battle becomes projected as the outer battle with a high likelihood of excessive violence.

There are philosophies and social orientations which are the normal counterparts or projections of the extroverted and introverted temperaments. A given individual can truly give himself only to the philosophy or social orientation which is

normal to his temperament. If he feels himself obligated to espouse the natural projection of the other temperament, then, in effect, he affects a chameleon-like adaptation to something alien. The "yea" of the objective consciousness is not reinforced by a corresponding "yea" of the inner man, who feels or thinks quite differently. If the latter is so far repressed as to have become unconscious, various psychopathic effects or even physiological disturbances may result. This unhealthy individual state may become projected as a social psychosis, particularly if the individual occupies an important place in leadership. Thus it should be clear that the harmonization of temperament with objective orientation is much more than a problem of individual psychology. It is, in a more ominous sense, a social problem of the first importance. The Vertical Thought Movement carries an implication of social therapy.

Instances of the dissonance between normal temperament and objective theory are particularly notable in the field of philosophy. It is hardly conceivable that any well developed extroverted temperament should ever express itself as a philosophy. All philosophy which is more than something childish implies an advanced development of intellectual abstraction. The material the philosopher works with is, inevitably, ideas rather than things or actual people. The tendency to function in this way, and the capacity to do so effectively, simply pre-

supposes the introverted attitude. But in the case of an extrovert philosophy the idea is given a theoretical depreciation in relation to objects that exist for sensible experience. In this case the philosopher, as he is, belongs to one type, while the philosophy, which he thinks, belongs to the other. For example, the orientation to the categories of life and to wishfulness, which is so fundamental to the pragmatic school, forces us to class this thought with the Left and doubtless most of the philosophic writers in this group would identify themselves with the Left as well. Yet, generally, if not universally, their individual temperament would be introverted. In contrast, the introverted thinker who constructed a philosophy which was a normal projection of his own temperament would belong to the Right both by temperament and by thought.

The foregoing considerations illustrate why it is that the meaning of "Right" and "introvert", and of "Left", and "extrovert", are not identical. In a more obvious but less significant manifestation we can carry the illustration further. The man of money is quite generally recognized as a Rightist. Yet an individual with the temperament and way of valuing which belongs to the Left may, and often has, become rich. The "new rich", in so far as that term expresses a typical behavior pattern, consist of Leftists in the temperamental sense who have become rich. They are essentially aliens to the money-thought, by which I mean a system of valuing, a moral code, and general

orientation to life and the employment of power which stands in the relationship of abstraction with respect to concrete muscular labor-effort, in much the same manner as the idea is abstract when contrasted to concrete experience. Yet, despite the fact that we have a considerable body of rich Leftists, in the above sense, yet the force of the interests and necessities of their new position very largely constrain them to vote and work with the political Right. These men are not Rightists in the profounder meaning of the word, but they merely have a community of interest with the Right.

Though it is the introvert who is much more likely to be untrue to himself than the extrovert, it would appear that the force of circumstance is very likely to constrain a genuine Leftist to be untrue to himself as well. An extrovert Leftist who has become a Rightist through the change of material circumstance does not therefore take on introverted habits of living, thinking, and valuing. He may remain perfectly true to himself as an extrovert, though becoming untrue to himself as a natural Leftist. On the other hand, the natural Rightist is typically but little affected by material circumstance. In fact, relative independence of objective circumstance is one of the more distinctive characteristics of the normal Rightist. His generally superior and wiser command of money-power largely depends upon his inward independence of money. As a type he finds it much

easier to renounce money and all that it commands than is ever true of the Leftist. The life of Buddha supplies the classical example of this trait:

From the foregoing it should be clear that the Crusade of the Radical Right is not a Voice speaking in the name of the rich because they are rich. Doubtless most rich men do belong to the Right in the profounder sense, particularly those who unite with wealth a strong capacity for restraint, good taste, and willingness to accept responsibility. But a prospector, for instance, does not become one of these simply by "striking it rich" in his wanderings and delvings into the earth. Indeed, the professional mind is much more fundamentally Rightist than that of the rich man, taken as a whole. Probably we shall find that the most thorough-going Rightists have never been rich and would prefer not to have to bother with wealth in the sense of money or property.

The apparently most common view which the Leftist holds with respect to the man of wealth is very far from flattering. He is seen as the embodiment of a purely selfish greed. It is not realized that for the genuine Rightist man of wealth, money is merely an instrument which is necessary for a certain kind of functioning. With the right kind of man money is an implementation of social statesmanship. On the other hand, a Leftist, possessed of the perspective of a statesman, would be much more inclined to look to votes and the manipulation of

votes by psychological devices as his source of social power. With him the money-motivation corresponds to his more inferior attitude. His view of the man of wealth is but a projection of his own attitude. He sees in the latter what he himself would be if he should suddenly become wealthy.

---

Although it would not be correct to identify the introverted individual with the Right and the extroverted individual with the Left, yet the social and political opposition of Right and Left does reveal a pattern that parallels the differentiation of the psychological types. We may speak of social functions, systems of valuation, and ways of proceedings which are similar to the contrasting orientations of introversion and extroversion. One group of social functions, systems of valuation, and ways of proceeding we call the Right, and the other the Left. The individuals who function in the Right may have either an introverted or extroverted individual psychology, but the more thorough-going the Rightist attitude the greater the probability that a given individual has an introverted individual psychology. The same correlation would exist in the Left, but in the complementary sense. An extrovert might identify himself with the Right by reason of a natural tendency to value more the opposite of what he himself is, with the complementary tendency operating in the Left wing. An introvert may produce

a Leftist system of thought, but in his private working in the development of his product he would behave like an introvert. He would work as a solitary monopolist to produce a collectivist system. In contrast, the true extrovert would develop his product preferably through group or team-effort. The latter, if directing his effort toward socialization, would be building toward a society which would favor the functioning of his own type, while the introvert who is striving in the same direction is tending to produce a society unfavorable to his own type of functioning. Ethical considerations might have constrained him to follow this course of action, but his success implies some degree of crucifixion for himself and those who are organized like himself.

An individual who has become broadly conscious of the larger social good may, quite justifiably, renounce his own private preferences in the service of the greater social well-being. He who follows such a course of action consciously has acquired the power to think on two levels, one of which is that of his own natural personality, while the other is that of a social evaluator or judge.\* Here the divergence between the personal psychology and the social or political attitude would not be a case of repudiation of one's own type, but rather a manifestation of a superior sense of responsibility, a quality which should form a fundamental part of the equipment of all

\*Apparently Justice Holmes was one who exemplified this capacity in exceptional degree.

judges and statesmen. The influence of such men may very well lie in the Right or Left with complete disregard of personal attitudes or preferences.

The Vertical Thought Movement is not merely a Voice speaking in the name of the better good of the introverts as a class or type. More fundamentally it is oriented to the recognition that human society as a whole is in a state of unbalance and it affirms that this unbalance can attain a rectification only by a much fuller acceptance of the Rightist function in the political field than is now the case. Much, if not most, of our best statesmanlike ability remains unused in the political field because it naturally belongs to the Right and is not popular. In fact, the soundest thought is rarely popular. Now this kind of ability is facing a serious restricting of the freedom essential to effective action in what has been heretofore its primary field of social power, i.e., the economic. The result threatens to be a wasting of this type of ability at the very time when we are in the gravest need of the best wisdom that we have. We need the services of the detached professional mind, both in the dimensions of ideation and administration, and without its being bound to submerge considerations dictated by wisdom and knowledge to the criterion of popularity. It is the duty of the physician to render his patient the service which medical knowledge indicates rather than to follow

the course of the latter's wishfulness. When the latter procedure is followed the art of healing degenerates into the mere administration of temporary comfort through symptom repression. In the larger political and social fields the same problem exists with this difference - that here unsound practice has far graver effects. Yet, since in a popular democracy on the whole only he has the opportunity to determine public policy who moves within the limits of current popular approval, there is a strong tendency to orient policy to symptom repression rather than to genuine healing. The greater wisdom lies in the Right while the greater popularity lies in the Left. The primary need of the day is wisdom.

#### IV

#### Relationship to the Zones of Culture

The meaning of the duality of Right and Left, as defined in this essay, is not identical with either the traditional nor the current view. The line of demarcation as drawn here leads to the inclusion of elements of both the Left and Right, in the older sense, within the limits of the new Right, and likewise in the case of the new Left. However, the new conception of the Right is more congruent with the old Right than with the old Left. The older view was too exclusively political, economical, and sociological in its orientation. While it is unquestionably true that economic and hereditary status does influence political and sociological attitudes, yet the view that these purely external determinants are of exclusive or even primary importance is merely a reflection of the prejudice of the extroverted mind. Far more fundamental differentiating determinants are of a psychological and spiritual nature. The state wherein the conscious attitude is mostly conditioned by external or objective circumstances is the effect of a predominantly extroverted orientation. In contrast, the more introverted an individual is the less is the conscious attitude determined by objective factors, and the more largely do subjective determinants rule. Thus it is quite

natural for change of status to effect a corresponding change in politics in the case of an extrovert, and the extroverted mind, instinctively realizing this fact relative to its own nature, tends to generalize its standpoint as valid for all men. Thus, in a milieu dominated by the psychology of the extrovert it is understandable that political division should be explained mainly as due to circumstance. This view is false from the standpoint of either the introvert or the true Rightist. The view that would be strictly correct from the latter perspective lays primary emphasis upon philosophical, religious, and ethical differences, since the more subjective factors appear as most significant.

By the means of a psychological approach it is possible to attain some degree of detachment from both attitudes and thus to reach a more objective and impersonal definition of these. However, this is possible only with the proviso that the psychological perspective is taken in the Center rather than in either wing.\* Psychology affords an external criterion of judging in the sense that it is not concerned with the inward contents of states of consciousness nor of systems of valuation but with phenomenological correlates of these states and systems. One does not have to feel in the way of an extrovert to discover that an individual with this psychology likes

\*For this purpose the psychology of Freud would not do at all, as it is extremely one-sided in its extroverted standpoint.

company and makes friends easily, nor is it necessary to feel in the manner of an introvert to recognize the fact that he is naturally retiring and likes solitude. Having isolated these two types in a group of individuals by such a criterion, it is an easy matter then to determine a corresponding contrast in social and political attitudes. Thus, specifically, the extraverted attitude tends to prefer collective bargaining both from the standpoint of the employer and the employee, while the introvert in both cases prefers, on the whole, individual bargaining. Theoretically, one would expect this to be the case, but the correctness of the correlation is easily verified empirically.\*

\*The current legislation, which virtually renders collective bargaining compulsory, is generally conceived as expanding the freedom of action of labor, while restricting the freedom of ownership and management. This, however, is only a superficial view. More fundamentally it is legislation favoring the extraverted attitude and is repressive, and even crucifying, to the introverted attitude. And this is true regardless of whether the individual is an employer or employee. Even more than employers, the introverts as a class are justified in viewing the present administration as the enemy. Legislation that was equally just to both psychological groups would leave freedom for individual determination both by employers and employees, as well as opening the door for collective action. Never was an administration in all our history less neutral than the present one, and therefore no President has ever had less right to claim that he was the President for all Americans than is true in the case of the present Chief Executive. He is a President of, by, and for the extraverts and the extraverted systems of valuation, but he is the active enemy of the introverts and their normal system of valuation. This is equally true regardless of whether the individual is rich or poor, employer or employee. In this situation many an American has the best possible ground for feeling bitter.

As already pointed out in the last section, a knowledge of the psychology of a given individual is not sufficient in itself to determine whether his conscious correlation is with the Right or Left, as here defined. It would be true, simply on the whole, that with a number of individuals the introverts would tend to gravitate toward the Right and the extroverts toward the Left. If, now, we take the correlation with present party divisions, the parallelity of orientation will be still less marked, though the Republican, Whig, and Federalist parties lie somewhat more to the Right, as here defined, than does the Democratic or the old Democratic-Republican party. Each party has a wing that is commonly called "Liberal", and these wings are in more psychological agreement than they are with the opposite wings, even though of the same party. The reasons why an individual chooses one or the other party are very complex. For one thing, heredity and tradition play a part, particularly in the South and Northeast. On the other hand, many professional politicians with their followers are largely lacking in political convictions and principles but are interested primarily in the personal perquisites of position. With us, a man of deep conviction has no party unless he belongs to the extreme Left, where the Socialist, Labor, and Communist parties lie, or feels so strongly on the matter of drinking alcohol that he is able to identify himself with

the single issue of Prohibition. The Rightist who is such by principle, conviction, and psychological orientation, has no party and he can vote Republican only on the ground that in so doing he is less untrue to himself than if he voted any other way. The Vertical Thought Movement differs from the Republican party in much the way the New Dealer group, in the sense that the latter is a self-conscious social movement, differs from the traditional Democratic party, but its divergence is in the opposite sense.

In the history of American politics the two principal parties have not differed very radically. On the whole, the winning of one side or the other was like the winning of one team or another in a game of football. It was merely a case of the one group seeking what the other wished, and the issue was decided at the poles. After elections, good sportsmanship was a manifestation of good taste on the part of either winner or loser. This was possible so long as no really vital differences of conviction and value were at stake. But now the situation is changed. This situation is changed by reason of the fact that the "New Deal" philosophy is a radical challenge of traditional Americanism. "New Deal" legislation carries policy outside the spirit and letter of the Constitution and requires for its judicial support the radical development of loose construction within the national judicial arm. This is tantamount

to the destruction of the neutral ground on which the major parties heretofore stood agreed. A significant portion of the citizenry finds itself an alien in the country in which it was born for generations. And it certainly can hardly be happy to find that the strongest support of the new tendency comes from groups that have, on the whole, more recent biological and ideological rooting in Europe. We have today a marked deviation from the traditional norm in the Leftist direction, and this at once implies an equal right and duty of the relatively inarticulate Right to deviate likewise in the direction normal to its own psychology and conviction. The overwhelming dominance of radical loose construction in the federal judiciary divorces constitutional construction from the sanctity which properly belongs to the Constitution in the strict sense. For loose construction can easily become nullification without amendment.

The Vertical Thought Movement is not a political party in the sense of either the Republican or Democratic parties. However, it has very definite political purposes, just as has been always true of the Socialist party. But like the latter its purposes are primarily educational. The Socialist party is oriented to a principle and a philosophy and reflects an underlying extrovert psychology. It does not seek the winning of candidates so much as the triumph of a principle. Hence, it is a crusade which continues between as well as during campaigns. The Vertical Thought Movement is likewise a continuous crusade oriented to a principle and conviction.

tion which stands in counterpunal relation to the Socialist Movement. It seeks ever the general social recognition of the principle for which it stands and leaves to other groups the practical administration of compromise, while remaining in its primary purpose uncompromising. contra?

Like the Socialist party, the Vertical Thought Movement is not oriented to expediency or convenience. Most fundamentally it is a philosophical and religious attitude. This is also true of the Socialist party, but not of the major parties. Despite the fact that the Socialist Movement historically sought to maintain a neutral religious position, yet, inevitably it has a religious position which becomes quite evident in its extreme manifestations - for Communism quite frankly affirms godlessness. This is an understandable attitude for the man of deep psychological understanding. It is, therefore, necessary for us now to proceed to a discussion of the Rightist religious roots as these constitute the most fundamental grounds of differentiation.

1. The religious orientation of the Vertical Thought Movement.

It is strictly in accord with the Rightist orientation to regard the zones of either religion or philosophy as just precisely the most important in the total range of human interest. While there may be moderate Rightists for whom this is not the case, yet on the whole for Rightists as a class

religion and philosophy occupy the peak of all culture, and culture, as such, is valued as an end-in-itself rather than as an ornament of natural life. This valuation is the most crucial and distinctive feature which differentiates the Right from the Left, particularly the extreme Left. The latter does give culture, and even religion, some recognition, but it occupies the position of super-structure, or even of mere ornamentation, built upon the foundation of natural or uncultured life-forces. The thorough-going Leftist gives primacy either to economic forces or to the "blood", which may be interpreted as "the Race". After the basic problems of economics or of the "blood" are resolved, then culture may be added simply as an enrichment of life. But the Rightist, as a type, sees foundation values in just precisely the zones covered by religion and philosophy. From this base the problems of economics, sociology, and politics are approached as factors which are incidental in an essential sense. Stating the contrast in an admittedly overly-simplified form, the Rightist approaches the problem of man from the perspective of religion while the Leftist approaches the same problem from an orientation to economics.

The Vertical Thought Movement affirms the primacy of the religious or philosophical attitude, and approaches the social, economic, and political problems as secondary. It is

not essential that the religious view of the individual should take any special form, but simply that the religious values should be primary or should share primacy with philosophy. The treatment of the sociological, economic, and political problems may be quite energetic and conscientious, but they occupy the secondary position.

An illustration of the truth of the above principle is afforded by reference to the geographic section of the United States which has been most consistently Rightist in American history. This section is New England, and particularly that portion of New England which has its roots in the early history of that section. More than in the case of every other section of the United States, the history of this geographic region is associated with religion. The early settlers here came to America, not primarily because of an economic or adventurous motivation, but in order to realize religious freedom.\* In the beginning, the whole of life centered around the religious core, and this orientation has left an impress which has continued, though in diminishing degree, to the present day.

\*It is interesting to note that the religious motif also dominated in the early history of California. But this belonged to the cycle of Spanish predominance, and it had become largely submerged in the face of more secular motivations before the American conquest. Yet, even today, the main centers of religious interest in the United States are in New England and in Southern California.

It is also significant that the earliest and best development of American culture had its center in New England.

The Vertical Thought Movement does not identify itself with any specific religious system or doctrine. Rather, it affirms absolute religious freedom, except in so far as a specific religious attitude may imply denial of religious freedom. But while it affirms religious freedom it does not do so in the purely secular spirit which may have a liberal attitude toward religion simply because it does not take religion seriously. The freedom is affirmed - combined with the very highest valuation of the religious dimension of consciousness as such.

The concept of religious freedom is capable of a two-fold line of emphasis. On one hand it may mean religious freedom in the sense of freedom of religious institutions, but on the other it may mean complete freedom for the development of direct individual religious experience. The Vertical Thought Movement affirms religious freedom in both senses, with the restriction that there shall not be religious freedom to deny religious freedom. It is distinctly Rightist to lay the focus of emphasis upon the freedom of direct individual religious experience. To one who has not been something of a special student of this subject, it may seem that this differentiation is unimportant, but actually there are important points of

conflict between individual religious freedom and institutional freedom. Religious institutions are born as the result of the direct and individual religious experiences of religious geniuses. But the institutions, in their turn, tend to prevent the development of free religious experience in the individual sense. Nascent experiences are canalized in the institutional patterns, although the profoundest religiosity never can be canalized. Now, ~~the~~ while the thorough-going Rightist may realize that the canalizing is necessary for many, and perhaps most, men, yet he lays the center of emphasis upon freedom for direct and personal religious experience.

The focus of emphasis upon individual religious freedom has implications that reach even into the field of politics. One instance is the problem of the conscientious objector in relation to military service. American practice in connection with military conscription has recognized the validity of conscientious objection. But it was significant that in the first World War the prime basis for determining the justice of the claim of conscientious objection was membership in a church which maintained a doctrine prohibiting killing, military or otherwise. Actually, the existence of such a doctrine as part of the creed of an individual's church is no proof as to the state of the individual's conscience. He may have accepted the doctrine as a result of teaching without

its ever having been an inner conviction, in which case conscientious objection is not truly conscientious. The genuinely conscientious factor has to be determined entirely apart from the creeds of institutions. The form of the law as it existed during the first World War centered the emphasis upon freedom of institution rather than upon real freedom of conscience, though, in practice, some concession was made in the latter case.

Clearly, in the field of religion, the focus of emphasis may be placed upon institution or upon direct individual experience. If the emphasis is placed upon the institution with a view to capturing the force of direct experience for the benefit of the institution, then we have an instance of Leftist religious orientation. But if the institution is conceived to facilitate and otherwise serve the development of direct and personal religious experience, then the orientation is Rightist.\*

\*Primitive Buddhism was the most rigorously Rightist of all religious manifestation of which I have any knowledge. Later, Buddhism developed an "Eye Doctrine" which included quite elaborate techniques that appealed to the eye and the other senses. This was regarded as valid in the sense of employing any expedient means which would help to carry the individual consciousness toward the state of Enlightenment. But primitive Buddhism was very rigorous and was really fitted to the needs of only those who already were near the state of Buddhahood. The following quotation from "A Buddhist Catechism", by Subhadra Bhikshu, illustrates the most rigorously Rightist religious attitude conceivable.

To the question - "Wherein does Buddhism essentially differ from other religions? - the following answer is given:

The institution can be master or servant, and this makes a world of difference. When the institution becomes preeminently dominant, religion tends to degenerate into politics, while the priests become more and more politicians. The Vertical Thought Movement views the institution as the servant of the man, and not the other way around.

For present purposes, we are concerned with religion only in its most essential character. There are wide divergencies of belief and practice that do not concern us at all.

---

"Buddhism teaches the reign of perfect goodness and wisdom without a personal God, continuance of individuality without an immortal soul, eternal happiness without a local heaven, the way of salvation without a vicarious Saviour, redemption worked out by each one himself without any prayers, sacrifices and penances, without the ministry of ordained priests, without the intercession of saints, without Divine mercy. Finally, it teaches that supreme perfection is attainable in this life and on this earth."

But while Buddhism affirms that this is all that is necessary in principle, it recognizes that more is required practically to be sufficient for all men's needs. Thus there is the mercy and help of the Buddhas as well as the employment of all expedient means.

The above is an illustration of an extreme Rightist attitude, but it is not the only religious position a Rightist may assume. So far as the writer is concerned, in relation to this essay, he is not promulgating any specific religious doctrine, save that of religious freedom. This is not because his own attitude is agnostic - it is anything but that - but because a general social movement must have the widest possible religious inclusiveness compatible with its primary purpose. Somehow, men who disagree must be able to unite.

Yet the study of religion reveals certain features that are ineluctable, if an attitude is to be classed as religious at all. A religion may, and generally does, include a positive social attitude, though there are instances of highly religious men who were distinctly anti-social and there are positive social attitudes which are purely ethical without a genuine religious component. Also, religions generally proclaim a belief in a Supreme Being, called God, Allah, Brahma, or by some other name, but this is not invariably the case, as is instanced by Buddhism where the Supreme Element is a Principle and not a Being at all. Further, religions generally develop more or less elaborate rituals, and some students of the subject regard the ritualistic feature as the determinant part of religion, but again primitive Buddhism constitutes an exception to this. If we look further we do find an element or feature that is always present in a religion or a religious attitude. Rudolph Otto suggested the word "numinosum" to represent this irreducible common-denominator of all religion. Dr. C. G. Jung has defined this as "a dynamic existence or effect, not caused by an arbitrary act of will".\* The essential fact is that there is Something or Somewhat, however conceived, which is so great and lofty that It embraces, comprehends, or overshadows the individual man so that the latter relates himself to It as That which is in all ways superior to himself. I

\*PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION, p.4, Yale University Press, 1938.

prefer to call this, in abstract terms, the Transcendental Modulus, which may be conceived as a Divine Being or as a Divine or Transcendental Principle. Whether it is correct to view this Transcendental Modulus as a Being or as a Principle, or, possibly, in some sense as both, does not concern us here. We affirm for all men the right to take the view which seems to them to be true. Our concern is with the general attitude toward the Transcendental Modulus, whatever its ultimate nature may be. The relationship of man to the Transcendental Modulus stands in contrast to his relationship to the mundane world, including the social world. Normally a man has conscious relations in both senses, but one or the other may have the primary position. The Rightist attitude gives primary orientation to the Transcendental Modulus, while the Leftist gives primacy to mundane relations. In this the Rightist stands in agreement with Jesus who formulated the law of love in two parts but places the love of God first and the love of man second. The specific statement of Jesus is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind", and as the second part, "Love thy neighbor as thyself".

Where the love of man is primary, it may be more intense than when the love of God takes precedence over the love of man, but in the latter case the love of man has the guidance

of a superior wisdom. Perhaps the Leftist would value the intensity of the human love more, but the Rightist, in general, would say that it is well to sacrifice something of intensity in order to gain the advantages of wisdom for love.

## 2. The philosophical orientation of the Vertical Thought Movement.

With certain temperaments the relationship to the Transcendental Modulus is more philosophical than religious. In large measure both philosophy and religion aim at the same objective with the difference that for the individual who thinks more acutely than he feels the relationship is mainly a philosophical achievement, while for one who feels more acutely than he thinks, it is chiefly a matter of religion. Both philosophy and religion differ from psychology in that they are both concerned with the inner content of Value and Meaning, while psychology is engaged exclusively with their phenomenological manifestations.

The differentiation between the Right and Left attitudes in philosophical thinking is traceable almost to the very beginning of the history of philosophy. The specific form of the line of demarcation assumed has varied a great deal throughout that period, but it is easy to recognize the contrast of primary attitude. In India the greatest philosophy has been very decidedly Rightist, though Leftist points of view did exist. Of all philosophical formulations ever written, that

of Shankara is the most extremely Rightist. The Atma doctrine of Shankara is both radically monistic and radically oriented to the Subject to all consciousness. In India no Leftist thinker ever achieved a position of comparable importance. On the other hand, in ancient Greece the Leftist thought found really strong representatives. Here one thinks of Empedocles and Aristotle, who contrast with Parmenides and Plato as the corresponding exponents of Rightist philosophical thought. The same contrast is traceable throughout the Middle Ages. It is easy to recognize the Leftist in the Nominalists and the Rightists in the Realists and the Conceptualists.

In the modern period we have the contrast of Rationalism with Empiricism, of Idealism with Naturalism, and Neo-Realism and of Transcendentalism with Vitalism and Humanism. Here we find in changing forms the opposition of Right and Left down to our own day. Now an opposition of this sort which has endured for at least 2500 years and which cannot be resolved by either reference to common fact or by the most competent argument is, most certainly, grounded in something of vital importance. Here the differentiation persists for the world's greatest minds. It is a fact with which both sociology and politics must make some practical adjustment. For, presumptively, the problem of sociology and politics is so to organize the human world that a common ground is found for all types

of men. Such a common ground is not to be found in a rigid organization adjusted exclusively to the needs of the Right or Left. The most just arrangement would be either one of relative formlessness or an elaboration of form which recognizes differences of type, caste, or class. This conclusion is inescapable.

With us here in America the problem has not arisen heretofore, just because of the relative formlessness of our political, economic, and social life. But it is against this formlessness that the New Deal philosophers have struck with especial force, and their attitude has been legislated into law, supposedly applicable to all men. The law now requires us all to live in a form adjusted to the Leftist system of valuation and concept of order. This forces the Right to affirm radically its right to exist. As a consequence, if there is to be no return to the relative formlessness we have known heretofore, then there can be no peace until there is a reorganization of society so that there is a recognition of differences of type, class, or caste. I assume that the "New Deal" leaders are not consciously venomous, but, if this is the case, then they are grossly ignorant psychologically.

All philosophies which find the primary value or reality in the Idea, in Reason, in the Self, in Consciousness, or in Spirit are Rightist. Per contra, all philosophies which find the primary value or reality in the Thing, in Sensation,

in Experience, in Purpose or Desire, or in empiric Life are Leftist. Perhaps more than any other thinker Emanuel Kant occupied a central position with respect to his formulated thought, though with respect to his personal temperament he was a particularly pure thinking introvert. Out of Kant both Leftist and Rightist streams are traceable. The main Rightist current developed through Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, while the more notable Leftist development flowed through Schopenhauer. From Schopenhauer it descends through Nietzsche to Spengler and forms the philosophical background of the present Nazi revolution.\* Another, still more Leftist

\*The Vitalism enunciated by Adolph Hitler in "Mein Kampf" appears Rightist only when contrasted with the more radical Leftism of the Marxians. It is scarcely less radically opposed to philosophical and religious other-worldliness than is materialistic Marxism. No proponent of a Vitalistic philosophy has a right to claim radical disagreement with Hitler. If Vitalism is correct, then Hitler is vindicated in every essential respect. The brutality of Hitlerism is simply the brutality that is found everywhere in uncultured life, only it has been accepted and systematized. I suggest that the reading of "Mein Kampf" is an illuminating experience.

Differences between Communism, Hitlerism, and the New Deal do exist, but these differences are far less than the gulfs between any or all of these social views and the radical Rightist position formulated here. All three stand fundamentally opposed to the view that primary Reality is found in the Idea, in Reason, in the Supreme Self, or in disembodied Consciousness, with respect to which both objective thing-hood and empiric life stand in derivative relationship. The three former ways of life may indeed fight each other to the death in order to dominate the world, but even so it is only a quarrel between brothers.

stream is derived from Hegel through inversion of the Dialectic Logic by Karl Marx. \*

3. The ethical orientation of the Vertical Thought Movement.

As noted in a previous <sup>chapter</sup> section, the ethical contrast between the Right and Left is largely reflected in the relative strength of the valuation of Integrity or of Social Mindedness. Out of these contrasting orientations more or less diverging ethical systems develop. The Rightist may very well admire Social Mindedness, but he will not grant that it has sufficient moral authority to justify the violation of Integrity for it. However, the Leftist, as a type, will compromise Integrity for a supposed Social Good. The Vertical and Horizontal character of these two ethical systems is quite clear. Social Mindedness moves horizontally in seeking the real or supposed good of the fellow human being, while Integrity implies a stronger orientation to the Transcendental Modulus. The genuine Rightist is not truthful because it pays or because of love of his fellow man, but rather because of his unconditioned love of Truth herself. If he were the last man in a dying world, the obligation to integrity would be as mandatory as ever. But in this ultimate situation there would be little meaning left for Social Mindedness.

Integrity and Social Mindedness, respectively, imply a high valuation of Purity and Tolerance. The radical Rightist

is a purist by temperament; the Leftist, at his best, is a man of great tolerance. However, there are senses in which we may speak of Leftist purity and Rightist tolerance. The extreme current Leftist movements insist upon purity of collective doctrine, in the sense that divergent thought and criticism are not allowed, though wide tolerance for irregularities in the zone of feeling-sensation may be allowed. On the other hand, radical Rightism, as instanced by the Puritans, was very strict with respect to irregularities in the zone of feeling-sensation but favored the expansion of the life of thought. Emerson, the greatest of all American Rightists, is the crowning example of this Puritan development.

#### 4. The psychological orientation of the Vertical Thought Movement.

*chapter*

In the third ~~section~~ I discussed the psychological relations in so far as they were connected with the attitudes of introversion and extraversion. Here I shall give only a brief consideration of the relation of the Right and Left to the functions of Thinking and Feeling.

Socialism, the preeminent expression of the Leftist social program, is the normal way of life for those who feel more acutely than they think. In contrast, the Rightist tends to be individualistic, which in turn is the normal way of life for those who think more acutely than they feel. On the whole, the Rightist attitude appeals more to the man of thought than to one whose life is led by feeling. But collectivism

or group-activity is a spontaneous mode of life principally for the extroverted feeling type. The more withdrawn introverted feeling type is more likely to be individualistic and Rightist.

Here we are dealing with distinctions that are really matters of more or less. Other factors may cause the man of predominant extrovert feeling to align himself with the Right, et visa versa.

#### 5. The sociological orientation of the Vertical Thought Movement.

In the larger sense, sociology is the science devoted to the study of man in all his aspects as a collective entity and thus it includes both economics and politics. Even this essay in its totality must be classed in the field of sociology, in this sense. However, it often happens that sociology is listed along with economics and politics as one of the three leading social sciences, but in this narrower sense I do not find very definite delimitation of meaning. Perhaps, more than any other science, sociology has indefinite horizons, for thinking of man as a social entity inevitably includes the study of man as an individual, just as the study of massive physical phenomena cannot be separated from the study of the electron. And then we finally reach the point where we realize that everything which touches man's conscious-

ness affects him in some way as a social entity. The final consequence is that the study of sociology leads to the investigation of everything and thus this science tends to become an universal science.

It is easy to see how with some minds sociology tends to have the value of the primary science, with respect to which all other sciences and philosophies stand in derivative relationship. But this standpoint defines one attitude among others, since there are other ways of consciousness for which social relatedness hardly exists, or has only a subordinate or derivative kind of life. It follows that he who bases his philosophy on the perspective of sociology or of social relatedness develops a distinguishable point of view. There are other points of view which stand in radical contrast. Thus if we were to compare the philosophies of Spinoza and John Dewey we have an excellent example of this divergence of orientation. John Dewey apparently gives the commanding place to social-relatedness and has even affirmed that the philosophy of the future would stand in the same relation to sociology that it once held with respect to mathematics. But Spinoza contrasts with this standpoint with particular incisiveness, since he incarnates in his thought much of the spirit of mathematics and wrote his main work in imitation of the form of geometry. For Spinoza, man as a social being is a largely irrelevant incident while the great Reality

is SUBSTANCE or GOD which "is in itself and is conceived through itself."

It is not our problem here to attempt a determination as to which viewpoint is ultimately correct. We are concerned simply with the fact that these two viewpoints, with radically opposed rootings, exist in the sum-total of human possibilities. If, ultimately, comprehensive social integration is to be achieved in conscious form, then some common ground must be found wherein both rootings are seen as mutually allowed. As yet we do not seem to be near any such perspective and thus must be satisfied, for the present, with a merely pragmatic adjustment, so far as practical government of society is concerned. Obviously the comprehensive position is not that supplied by either Dewey or Spinoza. But we can step aside from the inner values of both systems of valuation and view them objectively in the psychological spirit. It is easy to identify the respective attitudes.

Clearly Spinoza is an introvert in his own personal psychology and his system is radically Rightist in its orientation. Per contra, John Dewey's philosophy is frankly Leftist, whatever his individual psychological temperament may be. There is no room in Spinoza's system for John Dewey and, equally, no room for Spinoza in John Dewey's philosophy. Only in a relative formless organization of the social world or in an

organization which recognizes and provides for differences of type, class, or caste, is there room for both. Since the spirit of the times includes a general movement toward world-wide organization on a generally Leftist pattern, the only alternative to a crushing of Spinoza and men of his orientation is the so modifying the general organization that different fields of operation are provided for the various types.

The current threat to the Spinozian attitude is part and parcel of the general threat to all those who naturally belong to the Right. This simply illustrates the seriousness of the problem which shows all signs of becoming more acute in the future than in the present. The Right is threatened with amputation and so it is imperative that the members of the Right should become self-conscious, individually and as a group, and take such measures for self-preservation as are available and expedient. Partly this is a question of the more Rightist portion of mankind holding or seeking a place in the sun that is justly theirs, but it is also a general social problem, since the amputation of one vital side of man inevitably implies a state of general unbalance. With a stifled or radically weakened Right even the members of the Left would suffer a grievous loss, which would be none the less since its character is generally subtle.

The Vertical Thought Movement views sociology as a derivative and not as the primary science. It maintains the

primacy of the God-relationship, or the supremacy of the Transcendental Modulus, and then approaches the social problem from the vertical perspective. There is no question here of denying importance to social problems, but it is maintained that in the vertical perspective a base of reference is achieved, such that the social problem can be approached with the advantages of wisdom, which is not possible when the social thinker or worker is submerged in an exclusively sociological orientation. When greater value is given to the love of God, then greater wisdom is brought to bear in the implementation of the love of man.

It is distinctly Rightist to regard mathematics as more fundamental than sociology. It is distinctly Leftist to reverse this valuation.

There is a social problem which decades of scientific research and theorizing have been unable to resolve in a finally convincing way. This is the problem as to whether man is more conditioned by circumstance or heredity. There is much objective evidence that the life of man is conditioned by external circumstance, but there is an equally impressive body of facts that supports the conclusion that the hereditary factors are more important. It seems to be established beyond all reasonable doubt that both factors are operative in some measure. But the question of relative importance remains undecided in the strict scientific sense. This suggests the probability

that there is some third line of conditioning which remains as yet inaccessible to our scientific method. But, meanwhile, each individual is free to choose to which of the two factors he will attach most importance. Now, there has rarely been a muted scientific question on which attitudes have been conditioned by wishful thinking more than in the case of this problem. Quite clearly, the Leftist believes in the ascendancy of circumstance as a determinant of character, while the Rightist, no less emphatically, affirms that man is what he is because of his heredity. From these contrasting positions radically diverging social programs follow. The Leftist says that the better society of the future is to be achieved by changing the conditions of empiric life. Men are different because their circumstances of life are different, and not because of inherent nature. But the Rightist denies this and often suggests that the true road to a better future society lies in controlling the heredity of the future men. Each can document his position by highly convincing evidence.

Here we have a peculiarly vital clash between the two groups. Perhaps there is no single divergence that more definitely demarks the Rightist from the Leftist than the attitude of each with respect to this problem. In the case of many other fundamental differences large numbers would doubtless not have any decisive conscious attitude, but it

seems that the issue of heredity versus environment strikes home to most people who are at all thoughtful.

As is quite natural, sociology has roots which run deeply into biology. But it has other correlations which reach, no less profoundly, into the domain of religion. On the whole, scientific minds tend to seek for the sociological roots in biology, while religion is viewed as possessing a derivative significance. Often man is regarded as a kind of animal which possesses, among other peculiarities, a religious disposition. But for a profoundly religious nature this is an instance of "placing the cart before the horse". Particularly, if the individual has had deep personal religious experience, the primary causal factors are to be found in the religious dimension. In this case, biological factors have purely incidental significance. It is possible to develop the thesis of either view so intelligently that it is impossible for competent objective criticism to discredit either, in any ultimate sense. It is simply a fact that the manifold of all possible experience and consciousness is such that from different perspectives radically different interpretative pictures can be builded. These are differences that merely human government is not competent to resolve, and hence the government which exists for all men must be so organized as to remain neutral on that issue.

In the sense in which Darwin studied man, man clearly has aspects and biological roots that obviously parallel those of the ape. It is also true that the study of the psychologic unconscious of man reveals a hidden ape in the depths. But, on the other side, the mystic revelation reveals Divinity residing in other deeps of man, and this Divinity does not appear as a sort of epiphenomenalism or creative construct, but has the character of Root Source. And so it appears that in one aspect man is related to a God and, on the other, to an ape. Between lies the rational thinking entity, as thought characterizes neither the God nor the ape. Social thought may orient itself one way or the other. If the orientation is to the Darwinian ape, it is Leftist; if to the God, it is Rightist. The extreme Leftist is quite Godless, and so with him the thinking man finds his modulus in the ape of Darwin. The Vertical Thought Movement is oriented to the God.

When Nietzsche announced, "God is dead", he also implied the former existence of that which is now dead in the heart of man. There then remained for man only the ape in the subterranean unconscious and, hence, only degeneration unless man should create the 'Superman' out of the material he had left. Nietzsche did not destroy God but simply recognized what had already happened to the western psyche and strove the best he could to salvage what was left. God can be reborn in the

heart of man - and this is the supreme task of the Vertical Thought Movement. So long as man continues to move further to the Left, God will remain a stranger to him - at least in any vital living sense.

6. The economic orientation of the Vertical Thought Movement.

Economics shares with politics the distinction of being one of the two zones in which power can be wielded immediately on the objective field. The power of thought and of religion is real enough, but the effect of each is delayed and so determines more the form of the future rather than the immediate situation in the present. It is economics in its power relations that concerns us here, rather than the general science of economic relationships.

When political power rests in the hands of an aristocratic class which is aristocratic in fact, and not in name only, then the economic type of power definitely belongs to the Left. But when politics has become popular and there is no provision for genuine aristocratic influence in the government, then the aristoi can develop power only in the economic field. In this case, economic power becomes Rightist, while political power is Leftist. The present Leftist revolution in Germany, Russia, and Italy has resulted in the complete, or almost complete, eradication of independent economic power along with the thorough

domination by political power. The Leftist revolution with us in the United States has moved in the same direction, although it is not so far developed as yet. The radical increase of political power here, with a corresponding curtailment of economic power, is too obvious to leave room for any doubt. This is a phenomenon, mainly, of the last eight years, though the tendency is traceable still further back.

However, if one studies the effects produced by "New Deal" legislation he finds that along with the relative decrease of economic power there has been a definite shift to the Left within economic power itself. Heretofore economic power has been mainly conceived as identical with money power, but it is always potentially possible for economic power to become labor-power. Money-power always operates through various devices which produce some degree at least of monopoly control.\* Current legislation has sought out all, or nearly all, of these devices and prohibited them. But meanwhile the instrument of monopoly is not only allowed to labor - it has been so largely encouraged that it has become increasingly difficult for unorganized labor to maintain itself. The result is a radical increase of labor-power within the economic field, with the general consequence of a still greater shift of power to the Left.

The principle by which labor wields its power is not creative nor constructive but purely destructive. It is

\*Political power also depends upon the principle of monopoly.

based on the principle that labor, if it acts in concert, can stop the machine. Unquestionably labor can do this, as it has abundantly demonstrated, and, with the government operating on its side, industrial and financial management are practically helpless.

Theoretically, labor organizations exist for improving the standard of life of those who work. Often, though by no means always, short-sightedness on the part of industrial management has justified defensive organization upon the part of labor. But just so soon as labor-organization becomes entrenched in power, then the will-to-power begins to become ascendant over the earlier motivation of righting wrongs that were more or less real. The result is the generation of a new form of power with all its internal politics. This humanity of ours being what it is, the taste of a little power leads to a desire for still greater power without limits. In fact, this tendency is spontaneously restrained only in men of superior wisdom, but all such belong to the Right. Among Leftists the lust for power is without bounds or restraint, once the intoxicating draught is tasted. So, today, we see labor organization oriented not to the principle of just distribution of the social product, but to a demand for more and more without limit. In fact, industries that have worked out satisfactory relationships with labor upon their own initiative are viewed as most objectionable. The dominance of the power motivation is clear.

Ultimately, if the power-lust of organized labor is not curbed, the demand of organized labor will wipe out all the return from invested capital and perhaps encroach upon the compensation of management and the professional groups. This will bring all private enterprise to a final terminus. But since the demand to live will persist in the breast of man, the need for the products of industry will then force radical steps. Some dictator, either of the Left or the Right, will arise, but in either case labor will lose its freedom as well as capital. Perhaps then the latter will learn that the so-called "wage-slavery" was not so bad after all. Russia, Germany, and Italy have shown us what the results can be.

Wisdom and moderation on the part of organized labor could save the situation. But while such wisdom and moderation is possible in the case of those who are habituated in the exercise of judgment, such as locomotive engineers, only one who is grossly ignorant of crowd-psychology will expect the manifestation of these qualities in the case of labor unions as a whole, especially in the cases of the non-craft unions. The leader of masses must be popular, but in this world and in this age wisdom and popularity rarely travel together. So we may expect organized labor to be insatiable in its demands until we are faced with disaster.

With this disaster the last remnants of democratic freedom will pass. Democracy will run through its age-old

pattern and become dictatorship. This path could be avoided by radical modification of governmental form now, so that the good in democracy could be retained along with genuine aristocratic influence in government, but the trends of the times indicate that the die is cast. So it becomes necessary to plan for the hour when dictatorship becomes necessary.

It makes an enormous difference whether the dictatorial cycle is Leftist or Rightist. The Leftist dictators are strong in popularity but weak in wisdom and hence they are most extreme and most vulgar. Upon the bearers of real culture they strike the severest blows. And since culture-values are the only values of empiric life that give it any real worth, the Leftist dictator is sheer disaster. It is most important that the Right be prepared for the fatal hour, and not fear to assume the reins of power. This is a duty, since only by the superior wisdom of the Right will it be possible to preserve the greater ultimate good of Left and Right alike.

As I see the trend of the times, the day of money-power is definitely passing. The financial genius which played a genuinely valuable part in the past seems clearly to be of much less importance now. It is significant that the bankers were not necessary for the building of the "Ford Motor Company". Fundamental in the development of that industrial institution was a principle other than that of money, yet it was a Rightist

principle and not labor. It was technological genius. It was this genius and not money that commanded the situation. I do not mean to say that I see money passing out of the picture, but simply that it is taking a place as servant-function, rather than occupying the position of command. In fact, self-financing has become a very extensive practice in our industry today, and this simply means that bankers, including investment bankers, are becoming less and less important.

The future center of Rightist power in the economic field will become more and more the professional and managerial mind, and especially the technological mind. The base of power is clear. While labor has the power to stop the machine, it has not the power to create, start, and maintain the machine in operation. Only a special kind of intelligence can do this, and while this intelligence is in part the product of training, it is, even more, the result of natural endowment. There are only a very few minds, relatively, who are able to master the machine. Spengler estimates that there are perhaps only 100,000 such in all the world. These men are more fundamentally Rightist than capital itself, since capital is more objective, and therefore more materialistic, than the technological thought. Technological power is Rightist power and stands in counterpunal relationship to the Leftist labor-power.

The answer to labor-solidarity is technological solidarity. Consider what the results would be if there were a

"sit-down" strike of all those who understood the differential and integral calculus and the body of knowledge dependent upon this branch of mathematics. This would be an argument that organized labor could understand. Perhaps at last those who are oriented to the hand would learn that thought is making the hand less and less important. By thought a man can make a machine which will make the hand unnecessary. But the hand cannot take the place of thought. More and more, thought is becoming the great commanding power. It needs only to become somewhat more self-conscious.

By right, thought should be master and the hand servant. The reversal of this relationship is a peculiarly debasing kind of prostitution. The true relationship here is not democratic but heirarchical. The greater good of all demands this. Now thought is far more Rightist than capital. Indeed, it is not Rockefeller or Morgan who stands out as the greatest American Rightist - it is Ralph Waldo Emerson.

For primitive industry the hand may well have been more important than thought, but it is no longer so in this age. Technology has a two-fold descent. On one side is pure mathematics and pure science, becoming respectively applied mathematics and applied science. On the other side is intuition, the power that was so strong in Thomas A. Edison. Only the few qualify in this etherial realm. These few can form

the basis of power in the critical transitional age. They stand behind our present industry, and, more than any other factor, make it possible. They also stand behind the modern instruments of war, and made the blitzkrieg possible. Incidentally, this is a Rightist power which may some day finally overthrow the Leftist Nazi and Communistic systems. Hitler and those who think as he does form only one side of German power. Technological skill alone made the implementation of the German army possible, and it alone produced the remarkable timing of the military operations. This is something wholly outside the capacity of the man who wrote "Mein Kampf".

The signs indicate that the day of money-power is passing. But labor-power is not the sole alternative in the economic field. Potential dynamic Rightist power lies in the hands of those who through their knowledge and power of trained thought command the machine.

The day when the conflict of powers shall be finished is one earnestly to be desired. But it is a long road to the final taming of power, and meanwhile we must choose the dominance of the least undesirable form. The thinking of hand labor is brutal. Power established on this base must be avoided at all cost. Russia has shown that the dictator who rises from the orientation to the hand is the worst and most brutal of all. Anything is better than that. However, thought

commands from a higher and wiser level. Through technology thought has direct command on the field of physical relations.

When one submits the radically Leftist theory of value of Karl Marx to critical analysis it is quite evident that the author was blind to the fact of qualitative difference. A fundamental feature of this theory of value is the reduction of skilled labor and mental effort to a quantitative multiple of simple manual labor. Thus skill and thought, at least in so far as they are related to the production of exchange-value, come to have the significance of mere elaboration of unskilled hand-effort. The function of the hand is thus seen as fundamental, and, consequently, the foundation of all else. This theory is very vulnerable to objective criticism and is easily discredited on theoretical grounds. But the fact that this seemed to be a valid statement from the standpoint of Karl Marx and that it corresponded to the feeling of a considerable portion of the population is of genuine psychological significance. To an excessively extroverted consciousness it is quite natural to orient reality-value to the functioning of the hand, since this is tangible. In contrast, the more intangible functions of thought seem unreal. From this psychological perspective it follows rather naturally that the difference between skill and ordinary simple labor should be only quantitative.

It requires, however, only a very moderate degree of awakening of the introvert attitude to realize that the dif-

ference between thought-function and muscular- or hand-function is qualitative. Thus thought belongs primarily to another dimension of functioning. But entirely apart from the objective reality of qualitative differences, it remains psychologically significant that some men see only quantitative differentiation, or at least attribute most importance to it, while others are aware of qualitative differences and regard them as possessing most significance. Obviously these psychological differences in valuation correspond to the Leftist and Rightist attitudes respectively.\*

\*A particularly shocking manifestation of crude Leftist valuation is afforded by the dictator of the musicians' union. This dictator affirmed, not long ago, that it made no difference to him whether a man was a mere fiddler or a virtuoso on the violin. Both were subject to union dictation because they both functioned with musical instruments. Clearly, here the visible common denominator of a musical instrument formed the basis of classification. The enormous qualitative gulf between a mere fiddler and a virtuoso had no significance whatever. This is a particularly crude manifestation of the Leftist spirit and is especially shocking to those who really value art. The profounder Rightist valuation would lead to the judgment that the difference between the ordinary performer and virtuosity is more important and significant than similarity of instrument. Thus the virtuoso stood closer to virtuosity in quite diverse fields than to the merely ordinary in the same field. A master violinist is closer to, say, a master mathematician than he is to a mere fiddler. One often gets the feeling of something like prostitution in the valuations of union bosses, and when this touches art it is simply outrageous.

Among men, we can distinguish a scale, at the foot of which there are men who are physically active but in whom there is little or no directed thought, while at the other extreme there are those who function in a state of deep meditation or reflection with bodily activity reduced to a minimum. Most men stand somewhere between the extremes of this scale, but the central point is the place where the center of emphasis shifts. In the case of the majority, where the hand-function leads, thought serves simply as the instrumental aid of an objective muscular activity. These are clearly Leftist. But with others, the muscular activity becomes progressively instrumental to a primary thought activity. These are equally clearly Rightists. In so far as these two groups are related to the economic field, we have in this differentiation the most fundamental definition of the economic Right and Left. The mere investor of capital is far less fundamentally a Rightist. Particularly is this the case where the investor simply acts according to the advice of some expert. On the other hand, the investor who uses funds primarily to implement his judgment in the performance of an economic function is much more of a Rightist. He is primarily a Rightist, not because he has capital, but for the reason that his primary function is judgment. The whole of management and those who contribute professional services to economic functions belong to the Right.

The foregoing statement diverges more or less from the conventional view, but isolates the really important principle of differentiation. In radical Leftist movements the pure capitalist is merely a "red herring" drawn, consciously or unconsciously, across the trail to confuse the issue. The real issue is whether the functions of the hand or of thought shall hold the commanding position. The real attack is directed against professional and managerial minds.

Though in a technical sense 'capitalism' means the ascendancy of economic control from the base of capital, as contrasted to the base of labor, this definition really gives us a false perspective. Mere capital is a lifeless abstraction or collection of material objects which, by itself, is quite incapable of effecting economic or social control. Capital becomes a controlling force only in so far as it is the implement of intelligence. It supplies the means of functioning for a certain group who acts with thought or intuition rather than in the sense of muscular activity. The real ground of the Leftist resentment of this group does not lie in the presence of the capital, which is only an instrument, but in the more profound antagonism of sensation and feeling for thinking and intuition. The issue is grounded in recognized psychological conflicts.

As thought and intuition shift from the capitalistic implementation to the base of special technological knowledge,

the issue with labor will remain as before. The real battle will be for command, as it has been always. Today, through organization, and often by the help of minds that should be functioning in the Right, labor is making a real bid for dominant power. It is not striking simply at ownership but more primarily at the whole class of managerial and professional minds with the view of reducing the latter to the status of subordination. Hence, it behooves the professional and managerial groups to recognize and meet the issue before it is too late. For the ultimate command of social life by the hand is fraught with the gravest dangers to culture and all the superior values of life.

A few years ago the Fortune Magazine made a statistical study of the attitude of different social groups toward the "New Deal". The main support came from the Negroes and the chronically unemployed, while the main opposition was centered in the groups classed as professional, managerial, student, and retired. This is a statistical verification of our present thesis. With the exception of the retired group, where we may assume the primary motivation was that of mere conservatism, it appeared that the opposition was centered in those who functioned primarily in terms of judgment, knowledge, and wisdom. It is high time that those who compose these groups should form a common front, else they may some day find an intolerable way of life imposed upon them and may become so

crippled that they cannot adequately perform their vitally important social functions. For the true Rightist, it is better to die than to become a slave of those who are oriented to the functions of the hand with all their coarse-fibered valuations.

7. The political orientation of the Vertical Thought Movement.

It would seem that in all history there has been no problem of greater practical importance than that of the government of men. Yet, up to the present day, we have not found a solution which shows promise of being durable and satisfactory. In contrast, thanks to the contributions from applied science, it appears that we have solved in principle the primary economic problem, i.e., that of being able to produce enough to meet the demands of human need. But the transforming of this solution, in principle, into one of actual achievement involves more than the mastery of economic and technological processes. At this point the economic problem becomes interrelated with the governmental problem. Of the two, the strictly economic problem is the simpler since its material is of such a nature that it can be mastered by pure thought. However, government involves man in his complex totality as a psychological entity possessed of many functions, instincts, inclinations, prejudices, diverse limitations, etc. In this larger field pure

thought is much less competent, since thinking in its very nature as a specialized function does violence to other functions or attitudes which are ineluctable parts of the human totality.

If human society could be organized like a machine, substantially like the organization of an army, it would not be difficult to satisfy all strictly economic or material needs. But the price of such organization is the stultification of other aspects of the total human nature. Man, as a whole, cannot prosper in a machine-like life. Under such conditions the capacity for creativeness is destroyed. Yet it was a liberated creative capacity which rendered the solution of the primary economic problem possible in principle. Here is an example of the contradiction that one always finds when he studies man in any way that comprehends even an approximation of his totality. But sound government must deal with this totality. For if a government conceives man in too narrow a sense, then its organization is adapted at best to only a partial aspect of the whole man. The unrecognized or undervalued aspects feel the force of a repression which becomes the seed-ground of future revolt. In time the revolt-motive becomes so strong that even though it is embodied by only a strong minority of all men, yet, in the end, it achieves success. A relatively satisfied majority is weak before the dynamism of a minority which feels that it has all or nearly all to win and little or nothing to lose.

Many of us have thought that the best solution of this problem was to be found in the democratic pattern of government. Superficially it seems that government by the people is a government in which all men are equally represented. Hence all needs have the greatest possibility of recognition. But the study of democracy shows that it has different possible meanings, and, in every case, the desirable effect of an equal freeing for all men is not realized. Democracy produces its submerged groups just as truly as the other forms of government we have known heretofore.

Superficially, government of, by, and for the people sounds very well, but when one examines into the implications of this formula the picture becomes far less attractive. For one thing, what is meant by "the people"? Is it the whole of humanity taken in contrast with animal and other forms of life? Hardly, since we have no political issue with these other forms of life. Yet, "the people" is a significant political phrase because it is a favoring of something that is opposed to a something else which could wield power in the political sense. But this something else is composed of human beings who are presumptively also part of the people in the genetic sense. So it follows that "the people", in so far as it is a significant political phrase, really means part of the people. Democracy is thus government by one part of the people who seek

to dominate the other part. Consequently, in a democracy the latter group is the submerged and suppressed portion. Here again we find the reappearance of the causes which may lead to the overthrow of the existent governmental form.

If one investigates the meaning of the word "people", he finds that it means "the whole body of persons who compose a community" only in its primary significance. In the secondary sense it means "the subjects or citizens, as distinguished from their rulers or from men of rank or men of authority in any profession". Obviously, democracy is government of, by, and for the people in this second sense. Democracy is not only antagonistic to hereditary rulers and men of rank, but as well to 'men of authority in any profession'. With us democracy stands opposed to political power wielded by men of position through birth or property and by managerial and professional minds. The determining principle in democracy is rule by quantity abstracted from differences due to quality.

The diametric opposite form of government is an aristocracy. The ideal of an aristocracy is the rule of the best. Hence, the determining principle is rule by quality abstracted from quantitative considerations. Democracy leads to the under-valuation of quality while an aristocracy leads to a depreciation of quantitative determinants. Each form <sup>values</sup> ~~concerns~~ certain human values and depreciates others. Neither form is completely comprehensive.

The only kind of government which could be both widely and profoundly comprehensive and oriented to both quality and quantity would be some form of aristo-democracy. In such a government, and only in such a government, when properly organized, established, and accepted, would it be possible to combine the orientations to both wisdom and popularity. This is the ideal of genuinely stable government.

With us today the one-sided orientation to popularity has gone farther than ever before. Heretofore we have known something of a more or less crude combination of the aristocratic and democratic principles through having a dominantly democratic political government and a dominantly aristocratic economic government. But now the popular principle has been given ascendancy in both domains. The result is radically one-sided.

Radical democracy is not really opposed to totalitarianism. As a matter of fact, the great European dictators are more completely established upon the basis of popularity than has been any administration within our history. The dictators require more than a 60% popularity to secure a mandate. They have actually achieved more than an 80% vote of confidence. Hence they stand upon a more rigorously democratic basis than has ever been true in our history. It is entirely a misconception to view democracy as the diametric

opposite of totalitarianism. On the contrary, this opposite is an aristocracy, and, in a less radical sense, an aristocracy. It is not "the people" who are the oppressed in the dictatorships - it is precisely those who stand out as the 'best' in the genuinely aristocratic sense.

The Vertical Thought Movement is radically opposed to totalitarianism and favors the increase of general social and political power on the part of those men and women who are superior in the sense of knowledge, feeling, judgment, character, and wisdom. It favors such changes of governmental form as shall be necessary to give the bearers of superior wisdom a voice in government not inferior to power of those who are merely popular. This is an affirmation of the right of wisdom to power without the necessity of giving obedience to mere popularity. Sometimes that which is popular is also wise, but as a rule this is not so, since wisdom is the development of a mature, rather than of a young, consciousness.

The ideal of democracy is rule by the many, that of an aristocracy is rule by the best. The great problem of a democracy is that, except where the numbers are small and the relative personal statures of the individuals is about the same, the many never actually rule. Those men who are masters of popular psychology become the real rulers. Such men are represented by our political bosses and by the European dic-

tators, who are before all else men of the people who understand the common man. Per contra, the great problem of an aristocracy is the finding of a means for selecting the genuinely best. The hereditary device of selection has born some good fruit, but it is not good enough. Heredity is only a partial determinant of real superiority. Some more adequate principle of selection is needed. Perhaps psychology may some day offer us an objective basis of selection which is better than what we have known heretofore.

In all but the smallest groups, democracy of necessity assumes a representative form. But representation assumes the form of a problem which may be resolved in one or another of different ways. By the appropriate kind of method of representation, the representative body can fail completely to correspond to the most vital currents and differences among the citizenry. In the total relations of a citizen, one side alone gains representation while with respect to other sides the government may be so distant as actually to seem like something alien. To illustrate this point I shall list some possible methods of representation, noting the differences in the effects.

(a) Representation on a numerical-geographical basis. This is the method employed here in the United States with respect to the House of Representatives, and, generally, with the legislatures of the States. The representative is chosen

by a majority within his district, but it is assumed that he is fundamentally the representative of all citizens in his district. This implies the view that sectional or geographic factors are the most important determinants in forming the attitudes of a constituency. Thus differences between parties is conceived as less significant than the similarities of attitude, interest, and valuation imposed by geographic factors. Unquestionably geography is a factor, for there is a difference of temperament between mountain-men and plainsmen. Also an agrarian section has interests in common that stand in contrast to the interests of an industrial section. But while these communities of interest, valuation, and temperament may be very important when communication is slow and difficult and the population tends to be fixed, <sup>yet</sup> when communication becomes easy and rapid and there is a tendency for population to move about, they tend to become distinctly subordinate. Furthermore, the development of technology has had the effect of eradicating economic and cultural differences due to geography. The total result may be that trans-sectional affinities become stronger than the brotherhood of sections. When this is the case, geographic representation ceases to be truly democratic, even in the strict quantitative sense.

(b) Representation on a <sup>numerical</sup> numerical-economic-function basis. Representation on the ground of objective economic function has

been suggested, and I understand that it is employed in the totalitarian set-up in Europe. An individual's economic function does in some measure, at least, condition his attitudes, interests, and valuations. When this kind of conditioning is more far-reaching than that which is due to geography, then the numerical-economic basis of representation becomes more fully democratic than the first form. But it still remains quantitative, and therefore the least skilled, the least intelligent, and the least responsible portion of the community would have the largest representation in the legislative bodies. It is a form that is particularly favorable for radical Leftist tendencies.

(c) Representation on a numerical-psychological basis. There are differences of attitude, interest, and valuation which are clearly grounded in differences of psychological type. These differences are far more fundamental than the relative accident of geographic residence and objective economic function. In a growing degree, the personnel departments of industry are beginning to recognize this factor. But politically it has no recognition with us whatsoever. Yet, it may well be that the psychological factor is really far more important as a cause of social unrest and instability than the economic. I am very strongly disposed to think so. At any rate, if such is the case, then the wisest method of representation would be oriented to psychological difference rather than to either economic function or geography.

A given individual of necessity lives somewhere, has generally some economic activity, but in addition has an individual psychology which aligns him more closely with one psychologic group than with others. For a truly representative democracy it is most important to determine which of these factors is most vital in conditioning political grouping. When a less vital factor forms the basis of representation, then we form large bodies of genuinely forgotten men. Thus in our present representative set-up the whole class of introverted types is without representation. This is necessarily the case since only rather strongly extroverted natures have the natural capacity for 'feeling into the object' which is so essential for the successful politician. The result is that it is the extrovert who is elected, but no extrovert can ever represent an introvert. The only way that an introvert could be assured representation would be by constitutional provision which restricted him to the selection of introverts as representatives.

So far this plan for representation would still remain quantitative. That is, the types which had most members would have most representation. The result would be an accentuated valuation in legislation of certain types and the undervaluation of others.

(d) Representation on a qualitative-psychological basis. This form of representation assumes as its major premise the equal importance of the psychological functions and attitudes

in the political field. Thus it might be called a democracy of the functions. This democracy is affirmed only in the pragmatic and not in the absolute sense. It is entirely possible that the order of absolute valuation is heirarchical, but I see no way of achieving objective agreement on this question. Therefore, as a first approximation of the truth, it is assumed that all of the functions and attitudes are of equal importance in the social body, however much heirarchical schemes of valuation may be valid for individuals.

The democracy of the functions and attitudes implies that each function-attitude shall have equal political representation and exclusively by individuals who belong to the same psychological group as that which they represent. This implies further that if one psychological group had more individuals than another, yet the number of representatives of each in government would be the same. It is for this reason that this is called qualitative representation.

The resulting form of government would be a kind of aristo-democracy and would achieve far more balance than any which now exists. It would represent a relative swing to the Right as compared to current forms, but would actually lie near the theoretical Center. A shift to this form of modified democracy would be quite in accord with the purposes of the Vertical Thought Movement.

A Rightist movement could imply the complete abandonment of the democratic idea. But this would involve repressed valuations that are the counterpart of the repressions of the current forms of democracy. Wisdom seems to dictate the more moderate position as pragmatically the best. However, I should most certainly affirm that erring by being too much to the Right is better than erring by being too much to the Left.

Politics, as we have seen its historic development, corresponds to the worst elements of human nature. The ethic of politics has always been the ethic of Machiavellianism, except during the brief periods when the aristocratic sense of honor has been able to dominate the scene. The cleansing of politics is the Herculean labor of cleaning the Augean stables of the general social body. It is a particularly unpleasant task, but unless it is accomplished all the superior culture of mankind rests upon a rotten core - in which case the culture is vulnerable before the disease-breeding of the core. For modern social man there is no more imperative task than the eradication of the Machiavellian ethic from politics, and the substitution of the ethic of honor and integrity. Comparatively, the modern capitalistic economy, with all its faults, is much cleaner. Concentrating upon the faults of the latter simply has the effect of drawing a 'red herring' across the trail of the major evil. Here we are brought face to face with the

major weakness of all socialistic thought, whether revolutionary, administrative, or literary. Almost invariably these collectivistic movements carry the implication of the substantial increase of political power and the weakening of independent economic power. But politics, being what it is, this implies the Machiavellianization of social ethics. In my judgment this more than offsets any moral advantages which may be derived from an increase of collectivization.

Determination of Individual Alignment

A new definition of the Right, Left, and Center requires a new criterion by which an individual may determine just where he belongs. Traditionally, the classification has been conceived in all too simple objective terms. Thus it has been very common to classify men by political alignment and economic or hereditary position almost exclusively. But once it is realized that religious, philosophical, ethical, and psychological attitudes are no less definitive than the economic, political, and hereditary factors, the problem of classification becomes considerably complicated. In this case the determination is only partly objective, i.e., based on factors that are readily evident to an observer. The private, subjective orientation is of at least equal importance. We may assume that many, and perhaps most, individuals do not truly know where they stand until they have undertaken a rather extensive self-examination.

As an aid to self-classification I have formulated a series of statements in aphoristic form, half of which define a rather radical Rightist position, and the other half an equally radical Leftist position. The aphorisms are paired in such a way that the radical standpoint of either member of each pair tends to exclude or negate the complementary member. Undoubtedly most individuals will find that they wish to con-

serve some values from both sides, and thus do not stand in the extreme positions of either the Right or Left. But rarely will it happen that the individual gives exactly equal valuation to both attitudes formulated by the respective pairs of aphorisms. So the task undertaken in the self-analysis is that of isolation of the center of emphasis in valuation. For the purpose of the examination it must be assumed that the individual must choose one way or the other and that he cannot possess both sets of values, and that on the other hand he cannot refuse to make a choice. This attitude applies only to the actual self-examination, and does not imply an obligation to force himself afterward into the one-sided position.

There is no implication that any ethical or other inferiority in the choice is predicated one way or another. The two sides are complementary and interdependent in the social body. It is just as important that a genuine Leftist should function in the Left as it is that a true Rightist should function in the Right. It must be kept in mind that we are dealing with differences which are quite natural rather than artificial.

The list of aphorisms are organized with one stating the radical Rightist position and one opposite it stating the corresponding Leftist position. In the self-examination the individual chooses in each case which position applied to himself best. At the end he will generally find positive answers

on both sides. If 60% or more fall on the Rightist side, he may provisionally classify himself as a true Rightist; if 40% to 60% fall on the Rightist side, then he belongs to the Center; and if 60% or more fall on the Leftist side, then he probably belongs to the genuine Left.

List of Aphorisms

Right

Left

1. In all relations of life, including politics, wisdom is more important than popularity.

1. In all relations of life, popularity is more important than wisdom.

2. It is more desirable that the government should be exclusively in the hands of the best men and women than that it should be popular.

2. It is more desirable that the rulers should be popular with the majority than that they should be wise.

3. A wise government is preferable to a democratic government.

3. Democracy is more valuable than wisdom in government.

4. Money-power is preferable to political power.

4. Political power is preferable to money-power.

5. It is better that business men should dominate politics than that politicians should dominate business.

5. It is better that politicians should dominate business than that business men should dominate politics.

6. It is more important that business should be sound than that it should be humanitarian in its attitude.

6. It is more important that business should think in humanitarian terms than that it should be sound.

7. It is more important that a physician should be personally competent than that he should be personally acceptable.

7. It is more important that the physician should establish a right feeling-relationship with his patient than that he should have superior medical understanding.

8. It is better that competent reasoned thought should dominate government than that a warm human sympathy should dominate.

8. It is better that warm human sympathy should dominate governmental policy than competent reasoned judgment.

9. The highly trained, dispassionate, and detached mind of superior judges on the Supreme Bench should wield the dominant power as compared with either the administrative or legislative arms.

10. It is more important that a man should be truthful than that he should be socially-minded.

11. A man is not to be trusted if he reveals a careless attitude toward self-contradiction, however superior his feelings may be.

12. An honest man with a cold heart is preferable to a warm-hearted man who is dishonest.

13. One and God is a majority.

14. The moral obligation of the employee to the employer or to the 'job' is prior to the moral obligation to the fellow-employee.

15. The relationship of a student to his teacher takes priority over the relationships to fellow-students.

16. Stylistic literature is superior to literature based upon free association.

17. The best music is that which is developed according to its own law without reference to any other human value.

18. Art should serve aesthetic criteria exclusively.

19. Art should be oriented to an end-in-itself and never be used as an instrument of propaganda.

9. The executive will should stand ascendant over judicial determination.

10. It is more important that a man should have a social sense than that he should be truthful.

11. A man of socially superior feelings is to be trusted even though he is quite careless of self-contradiction.

12. A warm-hearted man, even though dishonest, is preferable to a cold-hearted man even though scrupulously honest.

13. The general consensus of public opinion is always a majority.

14. The moral obligation of the employee to the fellow-employee is prior to the moral obligation to the employer or to the 'job'.

15. The fellow-student relationships have moral priority to the relationship of the student to the teacher.

16. Free associationist literature is more valuable than stylistic literature.

17. The best music is that which is instrumental in expressing general feeling attitudes.

18. Art should express all attitudes whether they are beautiful or not.

19. Art may be legitimately used as an instrument to mold the political and other opinions of men.

20. Fiction should be used to paint pictures of life but should never preach.

21. Open and reasoned exposition is the only legitimate means for influencing the opinions of men.

22. Competency rather than popularity should constitute the one credential for high office.

23. The love of God is more important than the love of man.

24. It is more important that a man should so adjust himself that he could face the condition of being the last man in a dying world with equanimity than that he should perfect his social relationships.

25. It is more important that a man should live and act in accord with his individual conscience than that he should conform to the moral codes of society.

26. Heredity conditions men more fundamentally than circumstance.

27. When there is a conflict between the two, logic should rule desire.

28. Understanding is or may be a final value in itself.

29. Experience is valuable in so far as it leads to knowledge.

30. Ideas possess more reality-value than objects which exist for sensation.

20. Fiction is a legitimate instrument for the promulgation of social and other doctrines entertained by the writer.

21. It is legitimate to influence the opinions of men by psychological and dramatic means that are not open and explicitly reasoned.

22. It is more important that he who fills high office should be popular than that he should be competent.

23. The love of man is more important than the love of God.

24. It is more important that a man should perfect his social relationships than that he should be able to stand with equanimity as the last man in a dying world.

25. It is more important that a man should keep the generally accepted moral codes of his social body than that he should be true to his conscience.

26. Circumstance or environment condition men more fundamentally than heredity.

27. When there is a conflict between the two, desire or purpose should rule logic.

28. Understanding is always of instrumental value.

29. Knowledge is valuable in so far as it leads to more experience.

30. Objects which exist for sensation possess more reality-value than ideas.

31. A subjective intuition of transcendental Reality, combined with strong assurance, is more to be trusted than any amount of controverting experience through the senses.

32. Dominance of money-power is preferable to dominance of labor-power.

33. The right of individual bargaining in labor relationships should stand prior to the right of collective bargaining.

34. In industry those who function primarily with the mind should rule those who function primarily with the hands.

35. Society should be more oriented to the advance of superior culture than to the general well-being of men as they are.

36. The greatest values are attained by the awakening to Otherworldliness rather than through the enriching of mundane life.

37. Education should be oriented to the scientific spirit rather than to the cultivation of the will and determination.

38. Discipline in the formal classical sense is a better canon of education than the guidance of free impulse.

39. The authority of the inner spiritual Voice transcends all other authority.

40. Honesty in the relationship between a physician and his patient is more important than consideration for the feelings of the latter.

31. Objective fact is competent to controvert the subjective assurance of transcendental Reality.

32. Dominance of labor-power is preferable to dominance of money-power.

33. The right of collective bargaining should always take precedence over the right of individual bargaining.

34. In industry those who function with the hands should hold the commanding position and employ the thinkers as servants.

35. Society should be oriented to the general well-being of men as they are even though the advance of culture is sacrificed.

36. The best values are to be attained only by the perfecting of mundane life.

37. Education should be oriented to the cultivation of the will and determination rather than to the scientific spirit.

38. The guidance of free impulse is a better canon of education than formal classical discipline.

39. The authority of a divinely established religious institution takes priority over any inner Voice.

40. Consideration for the feelings of his patient are more important in a physician than honesty in his relationship.

41. Purity in thought, morals, and art is more valuable than tolerance.

42. Truth is more to be desired than happiness.

43. It is better to be correct than to compromise.

44. It is better to die for the Truth than to live through a lie.

45. Social policy should orient itself to the ideal of the self-determined and integrated individual.

46. The best philosophy is that which is married to mathematics.

47. The foundations of life and consciousness are spiritual.

48. Psychical factors are most potent in conditioning objective life and consciousness.

49. "That government is best which governs least."

50. The realization that a wise self-interest leads to the same policy as a wise altruism is more apt to be attained by a business mind than by the political mind.

41. Tolerance in thought, morals, and art is more valuable than purity.

42. Happiness is more to be desired than Truth.

43. It is more important to be able to compromise than to be correct.

44. It is better to live, even though by means of a lie, than to die for the Truth.

45. Social policy should orient itself to an integrated collectivity, even though every individual remained a one-sided specialist.

46. The best philosophy is that which is married to sociology.

47. The foundations of life and consciousness are material.

48. Objective circumstances are most potent in conditioning life and consciousness.

49. That government is best which most completely cares for and regulates the lives of its subjects or citizens.

50. The realization that a wise altruism leads to the same policy as a wise self-interest is more apt to be attained by the political mind than by the business mind.

Superior moral rightness or essential correctness does not lie exclusively on one side or the other. The questions are designed to isolate natural orientation and thus they are primarily significant in the psychological sense. Every man has a right to

his natural code of ethics and system of valuation. The question of the absolute superiority of one code or another, or of one system or another, does not arise here. Men are different by nature and have a right to be different. The problem of government is so to regulate life, or refrain from regulating life, that the widest and deepest range of development becomes possible. That government is best which stands in the most neutral relationship to the two attitudes of both Right and Left. But, today, with us and throughout the whole Occident, government is strongly oriented to the standpoint of the Left. The result is that the movement toward balance requires a strong development of the power of the Right in the political and general social fields.

The fifty aphorisms designed to isolate radical Rightist orientations are not to be conceived as formulating the program of the Vertical Thought Movement. They are designed simply to select those who psychologically should belong to that Movement. But it by no means follows that all those who belong to the movement in the psychological sense will be convinced of its wisdom or expediency in the field of action. Per contra, there may be those who belong to the Left in the psychological sense who, none the less, are so convinced of the importance of increased influence from the Right upon the political and social field in order to attain the goal of

balance that they will give the Movement support. Thus the Movement welcomes associates from the psychological Left as well as from the Right, but the definition of position is reserved to those who have a Rightist psychology.

Where there are radical differences between men compromise often supplies the wisest solution. But the view that compromise is always a possible or wise solution merely reflects the extrovert psychology. Some of the very greatest individual and social values have been attained and are attainable only by a rigorously uncompromising attitude. This is obvious in the development of pure mathematics and in all the profounder religious awakenings. In fact, it may be said generally that the man who sees in compromise a universally valid formula reveals thereby that he is lacking in all profundity of religious sense. And in the case of mathematics and of the mathematical sciences it is obvious that compromise spells disaster. There is no compromise between system and compromise. Albert Einstein once remarked that the merit of his theory of relativity lay in the fact that it was a self-contained system. If it failed in any part, it failed as a whole. Thus it was either wholly true or simply not true at all. Now, all pure mathematics is like this, and so it is useless to talk of compromise in this connection unless one wishes to destroy the totality of all pure mathematics. One may compromise interests but not principles.

Once it is realized that compromise is not an invariably valid canon of political policy, then the problem of government becomes enormously complicated. Provision must be made for those attitudes and values which require unconditional orientations, as well as for those which involve the interplay of give and take. I can find no solution of this problem upon the basis of a one-class society where the evaluating and regulating canons are the same for all. The only hope lies in the providing of different zones where quite diverse canons apply. The spirit of the times being what it is, I realize that this may sound like a very radical suggestion. In fact, I do not expect any early realization of the ultimate goal since there is presupposed a very extensive education in order to gain a fairly general realization of the problem. But we must move in this direction if we are ever to know a genuinely balanced and stable society. Meanwhile, it is the right and duty of those who feel the adverse force of general social undervaluation to affirm their position with all the strength they can muster.

## VI

### Objective of the Movement

So far we have given the concepts of the Right and Left a new definition and have provided a primarily psychological test for determining just who belong to the Right and Left in the new sense. We have also shown how the present political tendencies here, and elsewhere in the West, tend toward a radical release of the sentiment of, and increase of power of, the Left, resulting in a corresponding depreciation and suppression of the sentiment of the Right, combined with the curtailment of power of the latter. We have also noted that for a long period in the Occident the more extreme or Leftist orientation has held the dominant position, so that the present tendency is simply a more intensified accentuation of a protracted social movement. From this there follows a dangerously one-sided and unstable social orientation which can be corrected only by a very substantial increase of the influence of the Right. Finally, the Vertical Thought Movement is conceived to function in such ways as may be possible to increase the social influence of the Right until such time as a state of balance may be attained.

At this point it becomes important to give the Vertical Thought Movement a brief and specific delineation in

terms of a proposed program. The following is a preliminary statement which is to be conceived as by no means complete or exhaustive. The program falls under three heads.

1. The first objective of the Vertical Thought Movement is to give the Rightist attitude an adequate and just formulation. This task corresponds to a genuine need since the current popular interpretations of the Right are simply the expressions of what the Right means to one having the perspective of the Left. But the Leftist's view of the Right suffers from the same sort of defect which marks the extrovert's view of the introvert. The former views the latter from the perspective of his own system of valuation and finds him quite inferior. It is true that a natural introvert is inferior in the dimension in which the extrovert is most expanded, but his major development is in another dimension in which the extrovert is equally inferior. The introvert, who is true to his own type, can develop quite as uncomplimentary an interpretation of the extrovert, but he faces the disadvantage that the present objective field is dominated by extroverted systems. The consensus of opinion is against him. As a result he is often constrained, against his own inner feeling, to accept the extroverted valuation of himself and then he may proceed to make himself over on the extroverted pattern, often with pathological consequences. More than this results, since he often

fails to perform his destined social function and the consequence is that general society is starved for values it needs no less greatly than those of a more extraverted sort. This is the case in the relationship of the psychologic attitudes. The parallel situation exists in the relationship of the social Right and Left. The Leftist attitude has come to dominate social valuations, including morality. The Rightist is painted in far from complimentary terms, and over and over again one finds the natural Rightist speaking as though he accepted this Leftist valuation of himself and also the Leftist system of social valuations. This is the same sort of "selling one's self out" that occurs so frequently with introverts. Or, if the Rightist still insists upon the validity of his system, he yet pretends to serve the Leftist system, and this implies an indirection that is by no means wholesome. There is a real need for a just formulation of the genuine Rightist position.

There is no question here of denying all validity to the Leftist system of valuation. It is freely acknowledged that such a system has a relative validity. But it is relative to the Leftist temperament, and lacks authority with the Rightist temperament. It is, for instance, all very well for the Leftist to make social-mindedness the supreme virtue, but the Rightist has a no less valid right to place the primary emphasis upon integrity. And there is no reason why the Rightist

should concede that his morality is any less enlightened than that of the Leftist.

The Rightist who has understood the real significance of his type has no reason to feel ashamed. To be sure, there are unsavory chapters in the record of the Right, but there have been no less unsavory chapters in the record of the Left. The ruthlessness of a John D. Rockefeller, Sr., can be matched by the even greater ruthlessness of a Joseph Stalin. And if the latter is to be excused upon the ground that the end justifies the means, then a no less convincing apology can be developed in the interpretation of John D. Rockefeller. It is special pleading in the rankest possible sense to excuse the vices of the Left and then fail to apply the same indulgence to the Right. But on the positive side the Right may well be proud of its record of greatness, for if the greatest rulers and conquerors of the world have mainly been geniuses of the Left, yet the great world Saviours have been primarily oriented to the Vertical Dimension and therefore Rightists. Indeed, the Rightist has no reason to be ashamed of his type as a type.

The first objective of the Vertical Thought Movement is directed to the general reader and not to the Rightist alone. It is deemed as not exclusively desirable that the Rightist alone should come to understand himself. It is also hoped that the more open-minded and genuine Leftists should

be brought to realize that there are also superlative values in the custody of the Right which have worth for all men. A true Leftist, without in the least ceasing to be a Leftist, may none the less realize that the Right carries values that are by no means to be despised, but which are only weakly developed in the Leftist temperament.

2. The second objective of the Vertical Thought Movement is to draw together those who belong by temperament and conviction to the Right so that they may establish a common front in a generally antagonistic Leftist society.

This second objective is naturally oriented especially to the Rightists themselves. It affords a problem of particular difficulty since the genius of collective action is a peculiarity of the Leftist temperament. Yet, in a world where collective action is highly developed, unorganized or unassociated individuals stand at a hopeless disadvantage. Unquestionably the principle of association must be different from that which applies to a true collectivity. It is an association of individuals, affirming the right of the individual to be an individual, whereas a collectivity is an individual only when taken as a whole, while the parts are exclusively psychical fractions. We might, for instance, thus conceive of an association of men who work to protect the man-working in his rights as an individual as against collective bargaining. The working-man is

naturally a collectivist, for he is only a psychical fraction, but man-working is naturally an individualist since he has attained a substantial degree of individuation. But he may need the help of his brothers to survive in this age.

By no means does the Vertical Thought Movement exclude from its ranks the man whose economic function is mainly one of the hand. If such an one is man-working rather than a working-man, then he is not to be defined or classified by his visible economic function. Such an one may, at one time, work at sewerage disposal, at another time he may be manager of a business, or he may even be the founder of a religion. He actually is, in his own real nature, wholly unconditioned by his incidental functioning. This is an outstanding mark of the true aristocrat. But, in contrast, the natural collectivist type is conditioned by his functioning, and this marks him as a real plebeian, one who has inherently the psychology of a slave.

Clearly, the Vertical Thought Movement will not consist only of those who have property, who manage affairs, who are professionally trained, and who have superior education. For the greater part, all these do belong to this Movement, but it includes also an unknown number who are occupied in humbler engagement. By choice a Rightist may have selected inconspicuous paths, or he may not yet have arrived for general

recognition. The Vertical Thought Movement includes all these.

3. The third objective of the Vertical Thought Movement is the achieving of political recognition and influence in practical government that shall not be less than that of the forces of the Left.

For this purpose the Vertical Thought Movement may very likely become a political party. However, it will be a party oriented to a philosophy and seeking the implementation of that philosophy in social and political life. It will not aim at the political victory of its candidates through the employment of expediency and the compromise of essential principle. Its motive is thus essentially revolutionary or evolutionary, and it cannot be satisfied with the mere spoils of office. For practical reasons it may give support to the candidates of other parties who have an immediate chance of success, but such support shall not be conceived as a compromise with fundamental philosophy. It will be a party imbued with the sense of crusade for a cause, which continues between, as well as during, periods of elections. It will value a delayed success, for which the price of compromise is not exacted, above an early success paid for by the repudiation of fundamental principle.

Naturally there will be a practical program which will give concrete form to purpose, but this program will be

governed by the modulus of the fundamental philosophy, I shall not here attempt to formulate such a program beyond two or three suggestions. For this work the collaboration of competent specialists is required. Indeed, I hope that the whole thought I have suggested in this essay may serve more to stimulate further thought in the same line than to become anything like a rigid dogma. In any case, the spirit of crystalized dogma belongs more to the extreme Left than to the Right. Dogma implies the imposition of external authority.

The following three suggestions are offered as part of the proposed program:

\_\_\_\_\_ (a) Policy with respect to appointments upon the Supreme Bench.

Appointments shall be governed by the principle of balance. Since two theories of constitutional construction have developed in our history, both will be given pragmatic recognition. The policy in appointment, therefore, will be the maintenance of four loose constructionists and four strict constructionists upon the Supreme Bench at all times. The ninth member, who should be preferably the Chief Justice, should belong by temperament and theoretical attitude to the Center.

The theory of loose construction has received superior formulation at the hands of the late Justice Holmes. But, Justice Holmes, perhaps more than any other jurist within our history, had a conscious philosophical orientation. His own statements show that he was a Vitalist and definitely took

issue with the transcendentalistic systems of Hegel and Fichte. He exemplified the fact that orientation in judicial interpretation can be determined by a previously assumed philosophy. But so long as the clash of philosophies is grounded in profound and natural differences in men, and since these philosophies affect the interpretation of the function of law, no one philosophy should dominate the Bench of the Supreme Decision. The two main streams of philosophy can be correlated with loose and strict construction, respectively, and, as well, with the extraverted and introverted attitudes and the Leftist and Rightist standpoints. Both groups have an equity in the Constitution, but the dominance of one theory of construction is tantamount to confiscation of the equity of the opposed group. Today loose construction overwhelmingly dominates the picture. The result is radical unbalance.

Unfortunately, there never has been in our country a judicial mind oriented to the Right which manifested the philosophical ability of Justice Holmes. In fact, it is a decidedly rare phenomenon for a man of the grade of mind that would have made a competent philosophical thinker to choose the law as his field. In this respect Holmes is almost, if not quite, an unique figure. We need very greatly a Rightist philosopher upon the Supreme Bench to perform the same service for his side.

But, in any case, we need the reestablishment of balance in judicial interpretation, since otherwise over-develop-

ment to the Left will either imply revolution or else the progressive use of systematic oppression.

\_\_\_\_\_ (b) Policy with respect to representation in Congress.

There shall be at all times an equal representation of the Right, Left, and Center in both Houses of Congress. This means that one-third shall be by temperament and theory Rightist, one-third by temperament and theory Leftist, and one-third by temperament and theory Centrist. This could imply that certain seats are defined as fillable only by candidates that can qualify in terms of the requisite temperament and theoretical attitude, though elected by the general body of electors as at present. Or, better, these candidates could be chosen exclusively by electors who belong to the same psychological-political group. Probably constitutional amendment would be required to accomplish this end, but even so there would be no fundamental disturbance of the primary purpose of the Constitution.

This plan would eliminate all strong shifts in the primary attitudes of the legislators. Minor shifts would remain possible as two or more parties could develop in each group, but Rightists as a whole would always be represented, and, likewise, in the case of the Left and the Center.

\_\_\_\_\_ (c) Policy as to membership in the primary groups of the Right, Left, and Center.

The primary groups would not be parties in our present sense. Group membership would be determined principally by

psychological classification, and a member of a group could vote only for group candidates. Each group could have its competing parties and thus offer alternative candidates. The candidates must of necessity belong psychologically to the same group that they represent.

---

It does not seem necessary to offer any suggestions as to economic theory at this time. The crucial problem is that concerned with the organization of the Sovereign Power. If a state of durable balance can be established in this Power, then we have a base which is favorable to the working out of all secondary issues.

## VII

### The Final Word

This essay is but little more than an outline of an idea which has both profound and far-reaching ramifications. Much, much more remains to be said, and an adequately comprehensive statement can come into existence only as the collective effort of specialists in all departments of human interest and unfoldment. The present essay formulates a base, or system of reference, from which the total problem of man as a social entity is approached. It is less a statement of empiric fact than the delineation of a ground or viewpoint within which the whole body of fact may be integrated. But the motivation here is not purely scientific. It is frankly purposive. Sheer knowledge of man may supply a justified motive for research, but we live in a revolutionary cycle of tragic possibilities, and world history could conceivably take such a turn that men no longer would remain free to follow the lead of scientific curiosity. It is a matter of vital importance for all, for the pure scientist and for the recluse, as well as for men engaged in more "practical" affairs, just what form the future organization of society may assume. At this time it is no longer safe for any man to abstract himself from concern relative to political affairs. For in an age when politics assumes ascendancy, the bearers of the higher culture face the threat of obscuration.

Every social program implies a system of reference or perspective from which the social problem is defined. Even the simplest facts may be radically transformed in their meaning when viewed from a new angle, provided the change of perspective is appropriately chosen. Facts never define the view but are themselves predetermined by the viewpoint. Often thinkers and protagonists are unconscious of their own viewpoint. The individual sees the world in the way that he does because of the factors which predetermine his own temperament. The liberation of oneself from the limitations imposed by this relativity is possible only through the becoming conscious of the determinants of one's own temperament. When the individual has thus become conscious of himself, then he faces for the first time the possibility of realizing alternative viewpoints. He, then, can give his own temperament and the consequent interpretations an objective valuation. He may not be able, nor is it essentially necessary, to change his own temperament, but he will see that other men are differently constituted and so see the world differently. From this more objective base, and from this alone, is it possible to approach the total problem of sociology, politics, and economics with any hope of obtaining a comprehensive solution. This kind of objectivity is not vitally necessary for the purely individual life, nor the well-being of groups having similarity of orientation, but in the

common zone wherein the life of all individuals and all groups is regulated, it is an imperative necessity. The alternative of a society organized in accord with the comprehensive view is a society composed of masters and slaves, however the slavery may be disguised.

Every view of the present-existing society also implies an interpretation of history. This is true even of the races which have an ahistorical attitude, for the latter is, itself, merely a negative interpretation of history. The hypostatized or transcendental Idea of Hegel led to a philosophy of history having a clearly particularized character. But the Marxian inversion of the Hegelian dialectic produced the materialistic interpretation of history with the resulting delineation of a very different picture. So, likewise, the orientation to life or the 'blood' by Spengler gave to history still another meaning. In each of these cases the same body of empiric fact gave support to quite divergent views. Clearly, it was not the pure and detached facts of history which, by themselves, predetermined their own meaning. The facts became different when viewed differently.

There is an affinity between the materialistic interpretation of society and the Communistic organization of present-day society. A somewhat similar affinity is traceable in the relationship between Spengler's view of history and

German National Socialism. If we are, in our own social future, to avoid the consequences of either of the above organizations, then we must orient ourselves to a more adequate viewpoint. Now, here the need is not merely the affirmation of a different view upon the same level, for in that case we achieve only a different particularization, with all its implications of future conflict. Only through the realization of a more comprehensive perspective is real justice and durable peace possible.

I suggest that modern analytic psychology supplies us with a means of attaining a more impersonal and objective base of reference than any we have known heretofore. Perhaps the future will supply us with a basis that is still more adequate, but among current resources I know of no key possessing equal possibilities of superior orientation, at least not within the limits of the understanding of the Occidental psyche. The advantage presented by psychology lies in the fact that it employs a phenomenological or objective approach to material that often is so subjective that it remains hidden save for individual introversion. Psychology does not reveal the inner content of religious or philosophical realizations, but it can determine that such realizations are facts and that they do have profound influences upon conduct and valuation in the domain of social relations. Thus government cannot remain

indifferent to religion and philosophy. But if the individuals who are responsible for the resolution of governmental problems cannot themselves enter into the immediate content of religious and philosophical differences, then it is important that some means of effective pragmatic adjustment should be made available. For this, modern psychology seems to supply the only accessible key.

The difference between the political Right and Left has commonly been conceived as the consequence of circumstance, almost exclusively. Supposedly, men are Rightists or Leftists because of economic position, birth, or relative age of life. This view is far too superficial. When one approaches this problem psychologically he finds that the primary ground of political difference is lodged far more in natural temperament than in the incidents of circumstance. Something more than heredity, economic condition, or education predetermines the attitudes of men. These more external factors may of course so largely overlay and distort the true picture that the visible orientation of men is quite different from what it should be naturally. Many men are forced into false conformations without understanding the compulsions that operate upon them. But a false conformation does not destroy the forces which operate to cause social upheaval. For false conformation merely results in a driving-under or frustration of various instincts or

desires and these always carry with them an amount of psychical energy which in time builds up an explosive potential. Commonly, social man does not know just what it is that ails him and so, when a sacrificial victim - such as despised race or economic group, - is offered him, he projects his feeling of frustration upon the latter. It is but natural that violence and social upheaval should result. But the success of such revolutions does not remove the source of aggravation. The new social organization simply provides other compulsive conformations with <sup>their</sup> ~~its~~ corresponding group of frustrations, and once more fuel is supplied for a later revolt.

Clearly, to attain a truly just and stable society, provision must be made for the natural differences in men. To achieve this it is not enough to ~~so~~ organize a society that it shall fit the needs of a preferred psychological group. No matter how great the will to justice of the social theorist or promulgator may be, yet if he knows only his own psychology and that of the <sup>entourage</sup> ~~milieu~~ which is naturally drawn to him, then he is bound to produce a social system that is oppressive to those who are of diverse psychology. A given system may fit the needs of a given type, class, or caste reasonably well, but other systems are needed for other types. The result is that the final picture of a truly just social organization becomes very complicated indeed. Only exceptionally prepared minds can envisage it.

As yet we are not ready for the final form. But we can prepare an intermediate stage wherein the principal social forces can be afforded something like equality of political recognition. Out of the impact of these forces it is to be hoped that the final form will be evolved. Thus, I conceive it to be highly important that the political Right, Left, and Center shall be given formal recognition and political emplacement now. To achieve this end the center of emphasis must be placed upon the political wing which is currently subjected to the greatest undervaluation. That is clearly the political Right. Thus, the Vertical Thought Movement is, first of all in time, a crusade of the Radical Right, as the primary burden of achieving recognition always rests upon the relatively submerged groups themselves. But those who by natural temperament belong to the Left and have vision of the value of the ultimate goal may very properly support this Movement. The final end is not domination by the Right, but, rather, a state of profound social balance.