

M. Mead

Reprinted from *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*,
Philadelphia, Vol. 314 (November, 1957), pp. 10-14
Printed in U. S. A.

VALUES FOR URBAN LIVING

By MARGARET MEAD

Values for Urban Living

By MARGARET MEAD

Abstract: Technologic change may take away from the cities of the future all the functions once made necessary by war, poor communications, and the need to concentrate populations for production and consumption. But the unique function of cities in providing for contact among many kinds of human creativity will remain, possibly to be met by cities that are centers for the new conference methods of multimodal communication.

IN this paper I propose to consider which of the values associated with city life in the history of mankind may be expected to depend on the continued existence of the city no matter how extensive the technologic changes of the future may be. As I shall be concerned with values, I shall ignore the dismal possibilities inherent in underground building as a defense measure in a world continually divided against itself.

With the present possibilities of technical advance, the communication and transportation problems which once made cities essential can be solved outside an urban context. The telephone and closed television circuits can replace aggregations of offices and agencies dealing with common problems. The transportation of goods, raw materials, food, and so on, no longer demand central markets which, in terms of modern transportation conditions, are in fact a liability. So it would seem that the city as a center of manufacturing, distribution, or administration is no longer necessary. But with the kinds of change and growth in patterns of production and consumption which we may expect for a long time to come, there will have to be either residential or work-centered mobility. That is, we shall have to think in terms either of

fairly stably placed populations, with each family tied to its house and garden and to the enduring personal relationships of a delimited neighborhood within which human personal values are preserved, with the work parts of life set up as movable—factories and offices being composed of interchangeable, dismountable, and easily constructed units. Or we shall have to think of a world in which residences can be easily interchanged, new ties formed quickly, and individual families moved rapidly and easily from place to place. In the light of our present understanding of human behavior, the overwhelming choice would be for the former condition—for moving towards a society so arranged that the impersonal and technical aspects of life were those within which the greatest change and mobility were allowed for, uprooting pylons rather than apple trees, and asking members of the working team to keep adjusting to new people rather than asking such adjustments of friends and neighbors, pupils, and teachers. In a world organized so that choice were possible, one might expect a self-adjusting relationship to develop between the preferences of individuals—both those who preferred to stay in one place and those who had learned to relish and so to seek the delights of new experience

*Margaret Mead, Ph.D., New York City, is Associate Curator of Ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History. She is the author, among other books, of *New Lives for Old* (1956).*

—and the needs of society. The nice adjustments between the number of individuals who wished to live and work in the places where they had grown up and the productive use of their labor could, in an era of "free power," be made in a new way, hitherto impossible to men who had to transport their fuels many miles on the backs of slaves, or hundreds of miles in pipe lines or on railways, or thousands of miles in ships over the sea. Instead, power could go to people; work climates and adequate vitamins could be provided on the spot. In a world adapted to our present knowledge of the importance of roots, of continuity in human relationships, and of many relatively autonomous, significant centers of local culture, there seems no reason to believe that work could not be so distributed that people could live near their work and could also maintain homes on which they expended a great amount of energy and affection. The city as a center for providing work for those who can no longer be accommodated in agriculture and in the extractive industries would no longer be necessary. And with more sophisticated standards for the use of leisure and with less fear of Satan finding mischief for idle hands to do, the present situation in which those who work in cities spend up to five hours a day merely in getting from residence to job and back again could change. The sterile, nonproductive, wasteful use of time that is a byproduct of the way life as now organized would, by a redistribution of factories, offices, hospitals, and schools, give way to a new situation in which the old-time relationships of the small town could be reinstated.

CITIES AS CENTERS OF CULTURE

A third *raison d'être* of cities is that of access to high level facilities in medical care, the arts, consultant services,

and so on. Where in the past the dweller in the small town was isolated from the main stream of thought and the centers of action, life in a city meant, for the humblest member, being closer to the pulsing center of living. Much of this contrast, still striking in some of the underdeveloped countries where literacy is low, has already disappeared. Today it is not the size of the city which makes the difference, but the level of cultural life within a geographical region. The contrast between the participation by different individuals in the news of a great debate at the United Nations is a function of what the local television, radio, and press are willing to reproduce, not of the density of population in the town in which they live. Dwellers in great cities in the Middle West or on the Pacific coast waken to newspapers which headline trivialities of the village level, while farmers in upper New York State can follow, in the press and over radio and TV, the intricate details of an international debate. Documentary films and traveling art exhibits can be made available in any part of the world; the availability of films and of high-level national newspapers does not depend upon technical problems of distribution, but upon the arrangements under which films are distributed and newspapers are owned and edited. As new methods of storing and taping information also replace our present cumbersome library facilities, the communication systems which were once limited to the market places, the placards, and the assembly halls of great cities—and so were unavailable to the rural dweller—will disappear.

With neither defense, nor production, nor services as the determinants for urban living, there is still a value provided by city life which may demand some sort of urban-like concentration of population. This value is the value of free-

dom of interchange which follows unexpected routes, permits individuals to make new contacts, to maintain or break old ones, and brings together in face-to-face, multimodal relationships individuals of diverse temperament and vocation. The seething intellectual and artistic life which has characterized some cities of the past at one period and not at another and the absence of such life in other large cities is evidence that merely living in a large city does not guarantee a high level of intellectual, artistic, or scientific activity. Small cities, when they have represented the focal point of a country in a period of great activity, have produced a level of thinking, painting, and writing quite disproportionate to their size. But although great size will not lead, automatically, even to the construction of beautiful hotels, stadiums, concert halls, schools, and hospitals, some concentration of a diverse population, of individuals who represent the high points and the growing edges of many fields, seems to be a precondition of cultural fertility. The limited contacts of the village—in which individuals have known each other since childhood and have adopted habitual, comforting, but necessarily rigid role relationships—need to be supplemented by friendships and working relationships based on adult choices among many different, diversely experienced people. The excellencies of the local arts or even the continuing productivity of a modern physics research laboratory or of a psychiatric clinic depends on the stimulation of contacts with the imagination and present experience of other artists, engineers, scientists, statesmen, and others. Just as the centers of developing civilization used to lie at the crossroads of trade routes where strangers met, so today and in the future cultural life may be expected to depend upon the freedom and stimulation of many kinds of con-

tacts and upon personal ties of choice rather than those given by kin, neighbor, or small, limited, one-industry or one-activity communities. Under present conditions, the *products* of the highest levels of activity can be brought to the remote countryside so that process as well as product can be sent far and wide. Thus TV can bring to the student of the tiniest school the great speech, the music of a symphony orchestra, the details of some laboratory skill, religious ritual, the particular brush stroke of a great painter, or the steps in the rehearsal of a theatrical performance. But the opportunity to meet and talk, to plan and confer, to argue and wonder in groups of the diversely gifted and experienced is still, in any present projection of practical technology, dependent upon a great many such people being together in one place. In such centers they can meet and part, talk formally or informally, listen to music or look at a play *together*, and learn—in an interchange which is dependent upon the alert use of all five senses—what the others think and feel, catching the half-fledged dreams of other men, which would otherwise die, and giving them life.

CENTERS OF THOUGHT AND KNOWLEDGE

If one looks at history, it is possible to see that the need for such centers has been met in many ways through the ages. When religion is a vital issue, great religious centers have grown up with men of many talents within them. Special arts have tended to cluster together in one city rather than another, permitting more interplay among different temperaments. The courts of kings, monasteries, the abodes of oracles, the great medieval universities, centers of medical lore in the ancient world, all became such concentration points of human talent. Individuals

came and moved freely in these centers listening, participating, drinking in an atmosphere which stimulated artist as well as thinker, statesman, explorer, physician, and teacher. At the present time, such institutions as the Mayo Clinic or Oak Ridge are struggling with the problem of concentrating particular kinds of talent away from our large intractable cities, but also of bringing in other kinds of talent to keep their gifted membership from becoming too narrow or specialized. The creation of these small centers of research and practice is complemented by the growth of the small conference, "the peculiar institution of widening communications in a shrinking world," in which the ideal conditions of intense, free contact between deeply involved individuals from different disciplines, different countries, with different points of view can, for a limited period of time, complement the isolation in which individuals work.

Such a conference as that held some years ago for the opening of the Corning Glass Museum, in which leaders in diverse parts of the culture were brought together to discuss ideas of leisure, is an example of a twentieth-century attempt to create temporarily the advantages of intensified, high-level interrelationships, of which the city has been the condition, but at best an unreliable creator, in the past.

For the stimulation provided by a city like New York today, the young scientist or artist has to pay a tremendous price in high rents or long hours of commuting, in exposure to smog, struggle, delinquency, dirt. He also pays in the continued contact with thousands of weary, distraught, and lonely individuals for his access to "interesting people," until, in the frantic treadmill of the actual physical difficulties of living, he often sees far less of the friends and colleagues he came to find than if he had remained at

Oberlin, or Oak Ridge, or Pomona. In contrast, those who attend a conference are freed for a few days from all these prices and, in a setting where people can eat and drink, walk, talk, and work together, are presented with the distilled essence of the one thing which a city can give, but which a small town or a one-industry town never can.

CONFERENCES

Consideration of the way in which such conferences function, as men and women of the most varied temperaments and experiences strike sparks from one another's minds and form friendships eternally fresh and renewable through the years, suggests that in the future—when we no longer crowd together for defense against danger, want, or an inability to shift our productive activities and no longer huddle within a few blocks in order to learn what is happening in the world—we may build a new kind of city devoted only to the physical underwriting of such precious and irreplaceable contacts between equals, between seniors and aspirant juniors, between practitioners of the arts and sciences. Such cities would function only for such contacts. The daily routine business of the factory, the market place, the elementary school, the hospital, the laboratory would be located near the places where people live. Technology and not human nerves and the too short hours of any human life would handle what is now handled by urban crowding. In such cities would be kept the libraries which the scholar wished to consult. Here the plays, which would later appear on TV and on the road and which would be given by little theatres all over the country, would first be given; and many people would go there for first nights or for the openings of art shows. There would be clubs where people might gather in the sure hope of

finding an interesting dinner companion; streets on which one might meet any one of the exciting people from any part of the world; and conference facilities where every sort of group could meet to discuss science, art, religion, to brief newcomers, to work out together the next step in an idea. Cities would be representative of the growing edge of culture, of intensified high-level communication, filled always partly with people who only yesterday were strangers, partly with friends and colleagues from other parts of the country and of the world—places where people, and so human culture, would be free to grow.

Conferences like the Corning Conference, the Macy Foundation conferences, the work groups of the United Nations agencies, the conference for diplomats at Clarens, the meeting of poets at Bread Loaf are setting one part of this pattern; the growth of experimental conference centers like Arden House, the University of Michigan Center, the Statler at Cornell, the Pittsburgh Airport is providing a second attempt. Centers like the MacDowell Club, Yaddo, the Huntington Hartford Center, on the one hand, and complex settings for specialists like the Menninger Foundation, Riggs Center at Stockbridge, and Brookhaven, on the other, are a third approach, under modern conditions, to finding a distillate of what made urban centers of culture in the past—Athens, Paris, Elizabethan London—flourish and flower. The next step will be to recognize that all these scattered and exciting happenings—from a camp in the New Guinea mountains where various

kinds of scientists and explorers can meet, talk, and overcome the isolation under which they are working to the Harvard Salzburg Seminars or the Pittsburgh Airport—are trying to provide the one thing that remains the unique contribution of the city: A chance for rich, variegated, unexpected, easy, multidimensional human contacts in the flesh.¹

The city of the future—shorn of slums and smoke and of hordes of office workers pouring out onto hot pavements to stand in long meaningless queues or to push into buses and subways and trains—freed from the pressure of contact with strangers who would be happier somewhere else, a place to which people can go quickly and easily, and where they can move about without parking problems: Perhaps a weekend city, a vacation city, a conference city, will still be needed as a crucible of human imagination.

¹ For examples and discussions of this developing conference method, see, in the forthcoming issue of *Etcetera* and in *Conference on Small Groups*, edited by Mary Capes, an account of the conference held at Eastbourne, England, in 1956, under the auspices of the World Federation for Mental Health and the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation; "Conference at Corning," an article appearing in the August 1951 issue of *Fortune*; the series of Conference Transactions of the Josiah Macy, Jr., Foundation; and the reports of the World Health Organization study group on the Psycho-biological Development of the Child, J. Tanner and B. Inhelder, Editors, *Child Development* (New York: International Universities Press, 1957); also J. Soddy, Editor, *Mental Health and Infant Development* (New York: Basic Books, 1956), for a report of the conference held at Chichester, England, in 1952.

The Pattern of Leisure in Contemporary American Culture

BY MARGARET MEAD

Abstract: Leisure as a thing to be earned and re-earned was the typical pattern of traditional American culture. There was a definite rhythm between work and leisure, and all leisure was seen in the context of future work and good works. The depression and World War II brought about many imbalances in this system. In the last decade there has been a subtle shift in the balance from work and good works to the home. This is now the center for existence which in turn justifies working at all; the role of husband and father has become a vital one. Although there are many rewards in this home-oriented setup, there are also stresses and strains. These are often relieved by getting out of the home and away to work. At the moment our problem is to reach a new balance in which we discard the outmoded sequence of an age of scarcity and satisfactorily integrate the home ritual and shorter working hours of our new age.—Ed.

WITHIN traditional American culture, leisure is something that has to be earned and re-earned, except for the very old. Seen as play for the child, recreation for the adult, and retirement for the old, both child and adult have to earn their rights—the child by growing and learning, the adult by working. Unearned leisure is something which will have to be paid for later. It comes under the heading of vice—where the pleasure comes first and the pain afterwards—instead of virtue, where the pain or work precedes the reward. In some cultures, the joyful consumption of the harvest is felt as part of a natural climax structure; in others, the slightest feasting must be paid for later, almost as if it had been taken out of one's flesh. Within American culture, however, there has been a rhythm of work, virtue, and leisure. Good works—to be distinguished from work because they yield no monetary rewards and yet are enjoined and not enjoyed—are classified with work, and the Sabbath comes into

more and more of an ambiguous position.

The model year, with its model week units, is to be found in Australia, New Zealand, and English-speaking Canada, as well as the United States. It is a year made up of weeks in which Monday to Friday are characterized by work, meals—taken for sustenance before, during, and after work—and sleep which prepares one to work again. Meals are a duty on the part of the one who eats them “to keep his strength up,” and sleep is something one must “get enough of.” But regular meals and uninterrupted sleep cannot be claimed by people who are not “working.” In many working-class homes this differentiates men who work from women who merely keep house. Likewise, of course, children need their food and their sleep—or how can you expect them to do their lessons. There are small shifts in rhythm for special groups such as nursemaids with a day out on Thursday afternoon and butchers whose shops close on

Margaret Mead, Ph.D., New York City, is Associate Curator of Ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History. She is the editor of Cultural Patterns and Technical Change (1955) and author of New Lives For Old (1956).

Wednesdays. Except for these, the first five days of the week for the Christian and the first four days of the week for the Jew are exactly alike. When late parties during the working week result from unpreventable accidents such as birthdays or departures, they are expected to result in headaches and interfere with work the next day. Then comes Friday night—payday for the weekly wage earners, end of school for teachers and students, the Sabbath meal for the Jews. It is the night for dates, movies, later and more irregular eating, more consumption of alcohol, and, in some classes in some parts of the English-speaking world, weekly conjugal love-making, carefully avoided all week. Saturday falls between rhythms and is a day on which fun and recreation—getting fit so that one will be able to work some more—are almost prescriptive. There are preparations for Sunday: shopping for a traditional Sabbath meal or a picnic; chores in the morning and celebration, courtship, gaiety in the evening. Recovery requires several extra hours of sleep varying strongly between Catholics, church-attending Protestants, and nonchurchgoers. Sleep is needed to repair the effects of jollification least by the Catholics, most by the completely secular.

On Sunday morning there is a need for rest. This is either to make up for the fatigues of the week's work, the excesses of the week end, or to "get ready for the hard week ahead." All three are argued by different age groups with different degrees of conviction. They argue as to whether "rest" is to be labeled as "good," because it keeps up one's strength, or "self-indulgent," the result of staying up too late on Saturday, or not caring enough about going to church. This calendrically regulated evaluation of eating, drinking, sleeping, love-making, foregathering with friends, theatergoing, newspaper reading, alarm

clock setting, or turning over and going back to sleep, means that all of these various activities are seen in their relation to work. Some people may live for their week ends, a smaller number may endure the week ends in order to get back to school or work. Both states of mind are in the workweek context. The punctuations of Christmas and smaller holidays are bonuses—Sundays with less of the aura of religious duties, discharged or undischarged. It is not one's duty to sleep late or go to bed early on Washington's birthday so that one will be bright-eyed and fit on February 23. No one is to be as fit on February 23, nor on the late afternoon of February 21 either. But longer vacations such as a precious week taken in winter—with some apologies, for it is still felt that it is moral to escape the heat when people can't work so well anyway, but immoral to escape the bracing cold—or the two weeks to a month in summer are like extended week ends. They combine escape from routine and the right to relax with the duty to "get rested" and build up for the next year's work.

THE PERSISTENT BELIEF

Throughout this whole pattern—modified as it may seem to be by contemporary changes in custom, by the Californian's moral insistence on getting the most out of his climate at all times, by the young airplane workers who struck until they had satisfied their urge to go swimming, by the miners who used to time their strikes to the hunting season, by the recognition in some households that adolescents need more sleep, or that some small children do not need to be sent to bed as early as others—there runs a persistent belief that all leisure must be earned by work and good works. And second, while it is enjoyed it must be seen in a context of future work and good works. People who are called pleasure-loving simply accent one part

of this interconnected rhythm more than the others. But the extremes, between those who are never weary of well-doing and those who neither work nor engage in good works, simply serve to point up the pervasive pattern.

The word *recreation* epitomizes this whole attitude of conditional joy in which the delights of both work and play are tied together in a tight sequence. Neither one may ever be considered by itself, but man must work, then weary and "take some recreation" so he may work again. The linkage effects both joy in leisure and joy in work. It is wrong to work too hard; to become deeply, obsessively interested in work, or good works; one *should* have some recreation. And the minute that it looks as if there would be more time in between work and good works than the amount needed for "healthy recreation," alarm spreads over the country. People are going to have too much leisure. . . . Seen in terms of "normal needs for recreation," this means more time than is needed to relax and get back to work again—unearned time, loose time, time which, without the holding effects of fatigue before and fatigue to come, might result in almost anything.

UNEARNED GAINS

Experience of many different sorts has shown that the pessimists are right, that relaxations of this relationship between time spent in work and time spent in leisure do often result in boredom, apathy, frantic attempts to fill up the time, too much drinking, promiscuity, gambling, reckless driving, and so forth. Unearned gains are not moral gains, and so there is a tendency to spend them in ways which are labeled as immoral, or at least as idle luxury. In Elliot Jaques's study of an English factory,¹

¹ Elliot Jaques, "Psycho-Pathology in Industrial Life," *Twentieth Century*, Vol. 159, May 1956, pp. 493-500.

he found that men who were making more than they believed, on a non-verbalized level, to be fair were spend-thrift. This was characteristic of World War I war workers in the United States, whose position was felt to be twofold unfair—they were safe from the hazards of the trenches and were paid too much for their work, such earnings going into silk stockings and fur coats. And Jaques found that workers who were paid too little, within their deep evaluation of what their job was worth, became apathetic and wished to leave their jobs. The whole system is like a bowstring. If overstretched or slackened, pathological effects result.

The answer which the last hundred years have attempted to give to the problems of a discrepancy between the time and effort involved in work, the available patterns of good works, and the traditional amount of pleasure which could go with them without strain, has been the suggestion that people "take up something as a hobby"—that they should do something which is not serious, has no monetary value, and so will be of no use to anyone but oneself. It may, however, be "expensive," and so use up some discrepancy between earning and legitimate spending. It must be something which is somehow out of the value system, something neither good nor bad, neither quite work nor quite play, and which can therefore fall under the bridging concept of "recreation."

PRESSURES TOWARD A NEW EQUILIBRIUM

The period since World War II has seen a breakdown of this system of earned and re-earned limited pleasure. The depression brought a slackening of the whole system. When people did not have enough work, no money, and so no symbolic right to play, entertaining was curtailed, movie money was short, dates lacked gaiety, childbearing was post-

poned. Work when it came back would bring with it a renewed ability and right to get some joy out of life. But World War II introduced a mixed set of disturbances. These included war workers who made too much money; soldiers who had too little time on leave and who spent too much time in absolute dullness and boredom overseas; men and women who saw too little of each other; families who still had to postpone their little modicum of privacy and live with relatives. After the war, there came, understandably, a desire to recoup these quantitatively perceived losses, to get some joy out of life. This was, perhaps, less because joy was a goal than because of the desire to reattain an equilibrium which had been disturbed since the lush, disequibrated days of the late twenties.

Somewhere in the last decade there has come a subtle shift in this picture. This is a shift characteristic of our culture throughout its life and characteristic of most peoples who have depended on long hard hours of work for the majority in order that they should simply survive.² Conditions which have contributed to this shift can only be sketched in very roughly. They include a rising standard of living; rising wages; creeping inflation; and ways in which the relationships between work done, money made, and what one can buy are continually threatened. They also include a lowered standard of work proficiency in almost all fields; high wages for adolescents who often make more than their parents; easy installment

buying, so that a car is fully used up by the time it is paid for, and the threat that this prosperity will not last. Furthermore, there is the fear that there will be an atomic war, or at least a devastating depression produced by automation. These are the terms in which individuals are experiencing the rapid shifts in our economy. There is our emphasis on the importance of mass markets to keep up production, on improved standards of living in other countries as helpful rather than threatening to our economy, on the unlimited possibilities inherent in automation on the one hand and free power on the other. There is a freeing of men from drudgery of all sorts so that their potentialities may be utilized. This is a thing which has only been experienced before in occasional small societies under conditions of extreme and usually temporary felicity. Such opportunities have never been experienced for the large majority of the people of a great civilization.

THE SHIFTING BALANCE

The generation which has married since the war has responded to these conditions by shifting the balance from work and good works to the home. The home, in which one was once allowed a limited amount of recuperation and recreation in reward for working hard, has now become the reason for existence, which in turn justifies working at all. This does not mean that many young people are not working very hard. Husband and wife often both work, combining work, children, and going on getting an education. But the emphasis is different. Jobs are selected as they will bear on the home. In the familiar phrase of how a man will account to his Maker for his life on earth, having been a good husband and father heads the list. Good works in the form of community service within the social environment right around the home have been moved into home life, as has most of

²I have not discussed in this paper the conspicuous consumption of the rich. In the United States this is related to our ethical system by the larger, longer time balance between yachts and gifts to foundations, especially for medical research. It is related by the need for recreation of those whose political or business burdens are great, or, when it is a question of enormous salaries for television stars or baseball players, by putting it outside the system—like gambling gains, which should be used up in immediate conspicuous consumptions.

religious participation. "I had to join some church so my son could be a cub scout." Hours of work which permit a man to spend more time at home, length of vacation, amount of strain and overwork, all are valued as to how they will affect family life. As once it was wrong to play so hard that it might affect one's work, now it is wrong to work so hard that it may affect family life.

But has family life become leisure in this process of transformation? Reversing a proposition within the kind of moral book balancing characteristic of our culture produces many complications. A great deal has been done to turn modern home life into a self-rewarding delight. It has become something that is neither work nor something done in order to make a living, nor recreation, that is, something done to get you safely back to work again. The do-it-yourself movement, which parallels so neatly the shortage of skilled labor for home finishing and repairs, is not just a hobby. It is often a pleasant and meaningful contribution to family life. The newfound delight of young fathers in their babies is another intrinsically rewarding pattern which no large civilization has ever permitted its more privileged young men. The gay companionship of a large family, making do with a small house, one car, and two dogs, has many ways of fending off boredom and apathy and the demand for expensive entertainment. The car, the television set, the pets are seen as contributory to the home. Service on innumerable boards and committees in the community is also part of making the community safe for the children.

But there are hazards inherent in the old work-play rhythmic morality which lie just beneath the surface of these readjustments. If this home life really is to be classified as play, then it should be a good deal easier than it is. For our notions of play have been those of spec-

tator sports and easy enjoyment for a long time. Do-it-yourself with five children, besides being delightful, is strenuous, time consuming, backbreaking, nerve-straining, and confining—most of the things once characteristic of a good job which a man enjoyed. The job outside the home, if not seen as recreation in the spiritual sense, is becoming recreation in the physical sense. It is a relief from the exactions of the close personal life at home, a chance for a little peace and quiet, a quiet smoke, time to collect one's thoughts. The insidious old rhythm between enjoined activity and permitted brief limited relaxed behavior is reasserting itself. A girl goes to work until she marries, or after she marries, or after her children are in school as a supplement to the home. It is unfair of her employer to ask much of her work hours—as it would once have been unfair for him to infringe on her day off. If a man is doing the best he can, getting up at night with his young babies, taking them off their mother's hands as soon as he gets home, or perhaps getting supper because she has a part-time job too, it is unfair to ask him to wear himself out at work. As home life and personal relations thus take the center of the stage, the old rhythm remains with the job—less and less often a career—becoming the subsidiary, determined part of the sequence.

It is obvious that the whole question of *recreation*, which gives merely instrumental value to joy, needs a type of revision. This must be a revision which will make the members of a society—where delight in high level proficiency should now replace dogged willingness to work long hours for very limited rewards—able to integrate the shorter hours of work and the new engrossing home rituals into some kind of a whole in which these outmoded sequences, heritage of an age of scarcity, can be overcome.

A REPRINT FROM

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST

Organ of

THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
AND AFFILIATED SOCIETIES

VOLUME 56, NO. 3

JUNE, 1954

The AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST publishes original articles in the entire field of anthropology whether or not the author is a member of the American Anthropological Association. Contributions should be sent to Sol Tax, Editor, AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST, University of Chicago, 1126 East 59th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Books and pamphlets for review should be sent to David F. Aberle, Book Review Editor, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Subscription is by membership in the American Anthropological Association (annual dues \$8.50; institutional subscriptions \$9.00) and includes four issues of the BULLETIN of the American Anthropological Association (edited by Frederick Johnson) and the MEMOIRS as issued. Subscriptions, changes of address and orders for back numbers should be sent to Frederick Johnson, Executive Secretary, Box 71, Andover, Massachusetts.

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

Type manuscripts on one side of 8½ × 11 inch paper leaving ample margins, and double-space *all* material. Type footnotes on a separate sheet, bibliography on yet another separate sheet. Submit the original copy but keep a carbon to guard against loss.

Cite references to literature not by means of footnotes but in the text itself, e.g. (Spier 1921:501). Arrange the bibliography in alphabetical and calendrical order giving complete publication data for each entry, as follows:

- Herskovits, M. J. 1952 Economic anthropology: a study in comparative economics. Knopf, New York.
- Spier, Leslie 1921 The sun dance of the plains Indians. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 16:451-527. New York.
- 1929 Problems arising from the cultural position of the Havasupai. American Anthropologist 31:213-222.

Include "footnote material" in the text wherever possible. Number references to footnotes consecutively throughout the text.

Book Review and Book Note authors should consult current issues of the journal for correct form of headings and signatures.

Galley proof will be sent to authors of articles and Brief Communications. Lengthy or unusual changes therein will be charged to the author (the journal is charged for all changes). An order blank on which authors may request fifty free reprints and order additional reprints will be sent with the galley proof. Proof on other items will be read by the editors, and authors of Book Reviews will receive, gratis, a copy of the journal.

The Swaddling Hypothesis: Its Reception

MARGARET MEAD

American Museum of Natural History

IN THIS paper¹ I propose to deal with some of the confusions which have arisen during the last four years regarding the study of cultural character and which have been given their most definite expression in misrepresentations of the swaddling hypothesis developed by Geoffrey Gorer.² It seems important to clear these up not only for the sake of the general development of theory, but also because they provide an unusually good opportunity to examine the cultural setting within which theoretical approaches flourish or wither, pass unchallenged or attain ready acceptance. It should be the responsibility of professional students of culture to take into account this question of the effect of cultural setting on ideas. Conspicuous examples of this relationship are the heated tones in which questions of Old World origin of New World traits were discussed in the period of American isolationism, and the atmosphere of disinterested academic controversy in which such discussions are conducted today. Even the dramatic popularization of *Kon-tiki* fails to stir the same excitement that much milder speculations aroused in academic circles in the early twenties.

The principal misunderstandings have clustered around two foci: the difference between the history of a culture and the history of an individual personality, and the difference between hypotheses which attribute high efficacy to single causes and hypotheses involving circularity and dynamic equilibriums. Stated briefly, Gorer's hypothesis is that an unusually long swaddling experience is a significant aspect of the educational process by which human infants, born to and reared by Russian parents, become Russians. By analyzing the way in which Russian swaddling differs from the swaddling in surrounding areas, the special features of Great Russian swaddling are identified and related to other aspects of Russian child rearing. Gorer then invokes developmental theory from another field, that of psychoanalytically oriented studies of character formation in children in our own society, to provide a theoretical basis for hypothesizing the intrapsychic mechanisms involved in the process of the formation of Great Russian character, one expression of which can be found in the traditional attitudes of Great Russians toward external authority as being both hateful and essential.

Before discussing the assumptions involved in this hypothesis, it is important to dispose of the two principal misunderstandings. The first comes mainly from the fields of history and political science, where biology or psychology usually are not taken systematically into account. It is not, perhaps, surprising that some historians and political scientists have been unable to distinguish between statements about Russian culture or specific Russian institutions and statements about the Russian people. When Gorer discussed the way

Russians—human individuals born in Russia—learned Russian culture, students in these fields, accustomed to subsume human behavior under phrases like “technological revolution,” thought he was discussing the *origins* of Russian culture. However, this misconception should not, as it has done, confuse anthropologists and psychologists, the one having a fairly adequate theory of culture and the other having at least some working knowledge of child development. It is a working assumption of anthropology that human cultures develop from other human cultures through processes of diffusion, convergence, parallelism, and invention. We do not seek “origins” either in the events of early childhood, in the lives of single leaders, or in epidemics or famines; we may find in any one of these some of the conditions within which cultural change occurs. When there is an attempt to explain cultural change (such as “adoption of a sedentary way of life” or “shift from matrilineal to patrilineal inheritance under missionary pressure”), the cultural character formation existing among the representatives of the culture at the period being studied becomes one of the conditions within which change occurs. A different culture at the given moment of history would have meant a different character formation, since the abstraction “culture” and the abstraction “cultural character” are different ways of organizing material about the same human beings. In any detailed outlining of a change (such as, for instance, a revolution in which a different class with a different version of the national character is placed in power), the cultural character of those individuals who carry it out is taken into account—sometimes inexplicitly and unsystematically under clichés such as “peasant habits,” sometimes by using cultural statements such as “the practice of bride price” to cover behavior which could also be described psychologically. Because anthropologists have, on the whole, continued to recognize biological man, the inclusion of the character of a people in any historical statement has to a degree been taken for granted, although often it is not spelled out.

But although one culture develops from another through processes which, even though mediated by human beings, can be described in general terms without specific reference to the given biological carriers (as we discuss “urbanization” or “militarization,” for example), individual human beings as biological organisms embodying human culture do have a specific identifiable beginning at conception, and an equally identifiable ending. Early learning precedes later learning; certain types of events may preclude the possibility of later learning altogether. The common anthropological assumption of the psychic unity of mankind is that a child at birth is equally capable of learning any natural language and of coming to embody any human culture. No existing studies of racial differences or of the proclivities of different constitutional types have provided us with any evidence which would necessitate our abandoning this assumption. Therefore, if human infants at birth are capable of becoming equally complete representatives of Eskimo, Mexican, Siamese, French, or Russian culture (subject to the extent to which physical type is socially identified with particular cultural forms), then the process of becoming a member

of one culture rather than of another must be ascribed to learning. Because all human beings so far observed go through a process of development which in all its broad outlines has been found to be the same, it is possible to assume in discussing this process of learning, the same general type of implication of the organism. Furthermore, whenever children have been observed they have been found to display, within the limits of their biological development, the types of learning characteristic of their culture. The first ten words of French children are French, not Siamese. Children habituated to a diet of chili pepper will be able to eat hotter food than those who are not; children who have been accustomed to being carried passively will relax in the arms, and children who have been taught to hang on will hang on; children who have slept in cribs or been fed from bottles will respond to the sight of the crib or the bottle differently from those who have not. These points may and certainly should appear truistic to any educated observer—with or without anthropological training—but since so much of this controversy has focused around the inadmissibility of suggesting that anything that happens in childhood could have any effect in adulthood, it seems necessary to go over them. While the origin of any cultural institution after many thousands of years of human history is shrouded in a long historical past which can at best be traced laboriously through antecedent institutions, the life of any human being need not be so treated (see also Mead 1952, 1953; Mead and Metraux 1953).

In other words, the question *How did X or one hundred X's learn to be French?* is not the same question as *How did French culture arise for X or one hundred X's to learn?* In the synchronic study of national culture either in a country on which there is voluminous documentation or in any culture for which we have only speculative history, if our scientific concern is with the present population, the first question is a legitimate one. It does not, as has frequently been claimed, "ignore history." It merely, for purposes of a particular inquiry about a designated group of living individuals, holds history constant. By making certain that every individual being studied is actually representative of the culture of a given society which has a given history, we may then proceed to discuss how those individuals, who have identified beginnings, learn their culture. In such a discussion of how French or Russian children are handled, disciplined, and taught by other members of their societies, it is no more or less necessary to take into account the details of French or Russian history of two hundred years ago than to take into account the historical events of twenty thousand years ago. In the period under discussion, infants are being born into French society and learning to be French, or into Russian society and learning to be Russian. Before discussing how a French child learns to use a pencil, one may refer to the point at which man learned to make tools, discuss writing *per se*, or take up the standardization of the French language. All are historically relevant, but none is necessary in order to delineate the particular process through which living French children learn to write. *What* French children learn *about* the past, near or remote, is exceedingly relevant. Any synchronic statement (for example, about the pres-

ent functioning of French political parties) has to take for granted the historical antecedents of present-day France, of present-day Europe, of Indo-European languages, of the invention of human social organization.

In discussing a segment of human society during a period of, let us say, twenty-five years, one is making an artificial cut through a living fabric of members of that society of all ages; in discussing the life histories of individual human beings, one is dealing with an isolatable event which has a beginning—when the infant is cultureless. So, in discussions with historians and political scientists, it is important to stress that in *synchronic* studies of national character, we are discussing not the origins of the culture or the society, but the process of learning of identifiable human beings living within that society at a given period. (I am fully aware that any extrapolation over a twenty-five year period in a modern society, even without revolutionary changes, involves new problems, and they will be dealt with below.) We are concerned with the regularities within these individuals' learned behavior which can be attributed to their membership in a society or, specifically, a subgroup within the society. We are concerned with Great Russians, with Frenchmen, with Thai—not with Russia, or the Soviet Union, or France, or Thailand.

The second misunderstanding is an assertion that when a student of national character attempts to delineate the way in which being swaddled by Russians communicates to an infant in specific ways which become part of his culturally regular character, this description is equivalent to saying that swaddling *per se* by members of any culture will have definite predictable effects of the same sort on all infants, regardless of their culture. This assertion derives principally from attempts to apply to whole cultures findings on the clinical study of individuals, and it takes two forms: one based on Kardiner's treatment (1939) of cultural forms as "projections" of individual fears and hopes which themselves originate in infantile experience; the other, the sort of statement made by Kenneth Little (1950)—that the way to find out whether swaddling was an important element in Great Russian character is to trace swaddling as a single trait through a variety of cultures to see if it always has the same effect. The direct extrapolation from individual infantile fears to developed cultural forms is one that is usually rejected by anthropologists; they rely instead on the comparative study of related cultural forms to provide clues to the function any given form may serve in a given society, realizing that any given culture trait has been modified many times as it becomes embodied in members of different cultures with different characters. Confusion in the mind of the reader between the use of psychoanalytically based psychodynamics and psychoanalysts' speculations about culture is responsible for this misconception. Stated concretely, the Russian institution of a strong leader, whether called Czar or Stalin, is not to be attributed to swaddling. But the forms of the acceptance of such a leader are grounded in the way children are reared to be members of Russian culture.

The second misunderstanding confuses the use of cultural material in the study of educational mechanisms with the invocation of an educational mecha-

nism to describe the psychodynamics of a particular culture. If we wanted to know whether swaddling has any universal effects on child development and ultimately on adult character, then we would examine as many cultures as possible which used swaddling and finally come to a rigorous cross-cultural definition of swaddling, applicable to all instances where the infant body is tightly constrained by cloth or skin wrappings, which are wound around the child, constraining both arms and legs and not involving the use of a pillow, board, or cradle. Within these swaddling cultures, we would observe in great detail at just what point the swaddling was applied, how often the child was unswaddled, how long it was swaddled, etc. Then a proper sized sample of children for whom a constant type of swaddling had been established would be compared in those details which might be expected to be relevant, such as age of walking (established by actual observation and not by parental report), with a similar sample of children from cultures in which the child's body was left free and uncovered. If significant differences (for example, in the way the body was held in walking or the age at which the eyes focused) were found, then a further detailed study could be made among the different swaddling groups, possibly extended to users of cradle boards, swings, etc., to attempt to isolate just which features of the swaddling—even pressure on the whole body, comparable confinement of arms and legs, long periods without being changed, restraint of the hand-to-mouth gesture during teething, etc.—were determinative.

Not until such a complete study had been done could any statements be made about the effect that swaddling procedures had *per se*, regardless of the culture in which they occurred, that is, regardless of the configuration of cultural practices of which they were a part. It is important to stress that we have no such information on any single aspect of child rearing, and it is likely to be a very long time before the time and money are available to make such a study. Preliminary hypotheses which would repay investigation can be developed by the methods used by Whiting and Child (1953) if it is recognized that there is no possibility of proving anything by comparing such incomparable data on child care. It should be noted carefully that students of national character do not assert any universal effect of any single item of child care, such as swaddling, breast feeding, sudden weaning, etc., as may be suggested by advocates of particular regimens who attribute special characteristics to practices as world-wide as breast feeding. Neither are studies which isolate one item of child care such as breast feeding from the entire behavior of a group of mothers and then find no differences between the breast-fed and the non-breast-fed child (Peterson and Spano 1941; Sewall 1952) of a sort which students in the field of culture and personality need take seriously. We are attempting to understand the complex process by which a child with an innate biologically given potential, exposed to a certain very complex cultural configuration, develops a character structure with observable regularities which can be referred to the experience of being reared in that culture. To do this, we draw on whatever detailed clinical studies have been made of the

functioning of specific bodily disciplines or learning sequences. We attempt not to generalize blindly from breast feeding in one set of circumstances to breast feeding in another, or constraint in one setting (Greenacre 1944) to constraint in another, but to increase our capacity to assay the part played by breast feeding in any given historical pattern of mother-child relationships. Cross-cultural studies can be used to isolate universals, but such isolation is not the aim of studies of national character; they are more appropriately pursued under less complex conditions.

Suggestions like those of Little (1950) are therefore not relevant. We are not studying swaddling; we are studying Russians, using such data on character formation of individuals in our own culture and of members of other cultures as we have. This definition of aim immediately imposes another requirement; we do not focus upon those aspects of Russian education or of Russian child development which are, as far as we know, universal, but specifically on those which are special to Russian culture. So it is expected (but irrelevant) that when Russians are asked why they swaddle infants they reply first that it is done for the protection of the child. All peoples who coat their children with clay or butter, wrap them in buffalo hide or tapa or silk, swaddle them or fasten them on cradle boards will give as the primary reason for so doing their desire to protect the child. If we found a people who gave as a first response, "We do it in the hope the child will catch cold and die," their statement would be a profoundly interesting one. The converse is not true. Nor are we primarily interested in those aspects of swaddling that Great Russians share with surrounding Slavic peoples and that were once shared by most if not all the peoples of Europe.

It is essentially the *differences* in this widely distributed practice (Benedict 1949), the special reasons which Russians spontaneously supply for swaddling, and the specific ways in which swaddling images appear in their literature and art³ which are used by the student of national character to delineate Russian character by demonstrating the ways in which it differs from the culturally regular character of the Polish, Czech, or Eastern European Jewish peoples. In this particular case, it is the recurrent spontaneous emphasis on the child's strength, the extent to which it was thought the child could endanger *itself*, and the very long period of very tight swaddling which are significant and which provide a clue about the type of communication between adult and child which the swaddling mediates.

A further question is raised by those who ask why it is necessary to study child-rearing habits in order to understand the adult character of a given people. Granted that it is desirable to study the psychodynamics of any group of people if we are to understand the group, why is it necessary to go back to childhood? Is not the behavior of adults the best sample of the behavior of adults? The reasons for approaching the study of adult character via an account of child-rearing practices, interpreted by the knowledge we have of child development, are primarily functions of the present state of methodology. When we study the character formation of adults, we are dealing with a com-

plex synchronic system or set of systems for which we need a spatial conceptual model. The mathematics (and therefore also the more rigorous forms of conceptualization) for dealing with space, except in the very much simplified forms of map making, are still almost entirely lacking. If, however, we follow character as it is formed, introducing a sequential element by including the whole period from birth to maturation, we obtain a type of material which is more manageable. Because of the complexity of the material, simpler states are preferable to more complex states as objects of study, and very often it is necessary to invoke an observed change between two states in order to define the states themselves. When it is a question of studying a culture at a distance because there is no possibility of studying the living society, the living growth processes of the members of that society have seemed the best available substitute.

Finally, it is important to consider the validity of using any particular item of child training as a clue to the dynamics of the whole system of child-other interaction. We assume that culture is systematic, however diverse the historical elements which form its content may be. The circumstance that the same individuals administer the laws, hoe the beans, and worship the gods is a regularizing factor. When analyzed, the kind of law enforcement, the way the beans are hoed, and the manner in which a set of gods (who may be shared with all the other peoples of a continent) are worshiped will be found to be parts of the same configuration. This does not mean that all parts of a culture are in harmony with each other. Some parts may be strikingly discrepant, but the way the discrepancies are handled can be referred to the whole. The assumption is that these regularities are imposed by regularities in the biological nature of man and the functioning of the human nervous system and are not merely designs read into a mass of material by a human being, himself capable of perceiving pattern where no pattern is.⁴ However, if it is recognized that all the behavior of any given people embodies their culture, then it is reasonable to object when any single item of child rearing is made to carry undue weight as a determinant of cultural character. With this position the students of national character are in full agreement. Russian children undoubtedly learn about authority in a thousand different ways, simultaneously—from the fear that comes over the household when there is an unexpected knock at the door, from the tone of voice in which certain officials are mentioned, from the nervousness expressed by adults when infants cry, from the angry baby in the pantomime, from the legend of Prince Ivan and the witch baby born with iron teeth, from the position of the Red corner, from the stiffness with which adults sometimes hold themselves. Swaddling is not regarded as the only way or the most essential way in which infants may be educated to be Russians, but from a detailed analysis of swaddling practices, as described by adults, it was possible to analyze attitudes toward impulse and authority. The statement is not *swaddling makes Russians*. It is: *From an analysis of the way Russians swaddle infants, it is possible to build a model of Russian character formation which enables us to relate what we know about human behavior and what we*

know about Russian culture in such a way that Russian behavior becomes more understandable.

Nor does such a detailed analysis of swaddling practice imply that infants could not be brought up to have the same character formation if they were not swaddled. It does involve the assertion that if the parents, even if they did not swaddle their babies, retained the same character formation themselves, other educational devices (Mead 1951*b*) having the same communicative effect to the child would in all probability replace swaddling. If, on the other hand, the discontinuance of swaddling reflected a change of attitude on the part of parents, or on the part of educators who expressed it through parents, the changed attitude would in time express itself in many other ways also. The discontinuance of swaddling as a result of a government decree which was effective (which the attempts of the Soviet government to eradicate swaddling have not been) would not be expected to have an appreciable effect on Russian character formation if it involved no change in attitude on the part of parents. But a willingness to abandon swaddling, the spread of a belief that swaddling was too confining, a feeling that infants needed freedom to kick, would be expected to occur in company with other changes in attitude which would be communicated to children somehow, even if swaddling were perpetuated by effective government decree. It is the combination of an unusually confining version of a widespread practice, the age of the child which is thus confined, and an adult insistence on the need to protect the child from itself—the duration and type of swaddling—which are assumed to have distinctive effects in the formation of Russian character.

A further theoretical argument may be raised against drawing upon such an early period in infancy. Evaluating this argument calls for weighing the existing material on early memories, on the persistence of early experiences, on the importance of early learning. The case for the great importance of the very earliest learnings and for the extent to which childhood learning must be regarded as different in kind from adult learning, which primarily involves transfer of previous learning, has been cogently stated by Hebb (1949). As a general rule, discussions of the relative importance of different age levels in the formation of cultural character have to rely on material from psychological or detailed culture-and-personality studies in which exact ages have been recorded. Furthermore, in the study of culture at a distance, when the *society* cannot be studied as a living model (Mead and Metraux 1953), the child development model is the only model available.

In summary, then, as a method of constructing a model of Great Russian character formation, descriptive accounts and expressed attitudes of Great Russians were studied, the latter through anthropological interviews, and the accounts of swaddling were coordinated with material from developmental studies to provide an explanatory account of how the infant learned to be a Great Russian. No attempt was made, or could be made, to explain the culture of Russia or the history of Russia in terms of a child-rearing practice. No

claim was made that swaddling would have any specified effects in other contexts, or that swaddling was essential in the Russian pattern.

We may now turn to the second step, the application of the study of Great Russian character formation to an understanding of contemporary Soviet character. Our interest in attempting to delineate Great Russian character as it was at the time of the Revolution grew from the assumption that when we deal with cultural change the character structure of the individuals of which the society is composed at the period when the change takes place will be one factor in the nature of the change. Thus, we believed that whatever we knew or could hypothesize about the Great Russians of 1917 might be useful and relevant when we attempted to understand Soviet Russians in 1948. Such understanding would be an addition to the other types of understanding contributed by other disciplines—economics, jurisprudence, and so forth.

We were handicapped by poor data more in studying postrevolutionary Russia than in examining prerevolutionary Russia. For the earlier period we had living members of the old culture to interview and also publications about Russia which were less colored by ideological controversy than those since 1917 have been. The old czarist censorship of publications was negative rather than positive; for the later period, we have only officially approved publications. However, using the only methods available to us (just as specialists on Soviet economics have to go through unsatisfactory operations to arrive at their estimates), we set up a project which would combine work on the model of old Great Russian character, the stated purposes of the Soviet regime, and the manifest behavior of the Soviet regime as found in Party Congresses, Soviet publications, and so forth, and from this we attempted to derive a working model of contemporary Soviet character (Mead 1951a).

There are various tests to which this model can be put: To what extent are subsequent Soviet public acts in accordance with the model? To what extent does it agree with detailed interviews, including projective tests, of Soviet displaced persons? To what extent does it agree with the observations of other disinterested students of the Soviet Union?

It is important to realize that the model of Soviet character has not been challenged from any of these sources. The intensive interviewing done by H. V. Dicks and his associates in the summer of 1950 (Dicks 1952), and the early reports on the interviewing done by the Harvard research group interviewing ex-Soviet citizens in Western Europe, coincide substantially with the model which was constructed by this less direct method. Russian specialists like Crankshaw, while taking occasion to deride the weighty Freudian apparatus used to arrive at the results, nevertheless have recognized the accuracy of the picture when tested against their experiences. It must be emphasized here that the usefulness of the swaddling hypothesis lies in its function in leading to a coherent theory of Russian personality, within which our existing information about Soviet behavior can be ordered and made intelligible.⁸

We may now turn for a moment to the question of the high amount of affect which the discussion of this approach to Russian character has generated, viewing the controversy itself as a manifestation of contemporary culture. The attack has been led and maintained by the *New Leader*, and particularly by Dallin (Dallin 1949; Shub 1950; Wolfe 1951a, 1951b). The *New Leader* is devoted to the thesis that the Russian people are a freedom-loving people, exactly like Americans, and that they are oppressed by a tyrannous government for which they are not to be held responsible. It finds exceedingly distasteful the contention that there are traits in contemporary Russian character structure which tend to support the present dictatorship, and it has systematically attacked and derided not only the work on the Soviet Union but all other work of the same sort as "racist," "diaperology," etc., including the propagation of pieces of folklore such as its statements that Gorer did not know that Stalin was not a Great Russian, that no one in the Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures team spoke Russian, etc. This politically motivated attack is politically intelligent, because Americans may be expected to be more eager to liberate a freedom-loving than an authority-demanding people. Similar arguments were brought forward by those who objected to any attempt to localize Nazism in German culture and character rather than in the individual leadership of Hitler, who—like Stalin—came from outside the country.

A second set of attacks comes from the Soviet Union at the same time that attempts are being made there to alter the character structure of the present generation by prescribing types of infant training in the most minute detail and where attempts are even being made to substitute a motor-kineshetic imagery for visual imagery. (Haimson Ms.). But Marxian theory, which has always insisted that there is a correspondence between institutions and character, has never achieved any coherent theory as to how such a relationship is brought about, and the Soviets, in practice placing tremendous emphasis on early education, continue to reject any theory that attempts to delineate the connection.⁶

A third set of attacks stems from various types of self-regarding sentiment of Slavs or new Americans, who feel either that their historic culture has been demeaned by being traced to the details of infancy (a sentiment based, of course, on a total misunderstanding of the theory, which does not trace the origins of the culture but describes the process of learning within the culture) or that the success of their recent acquisition of a second culture, that of America, is impugned by the emphasis given to early childhood experience, in their case in the culture which they have now left. This latter feeling has a deep ethical justification in our traditional emphasis on the possibility of becoming an American as an adult. Once some research has been done on the way an adult, who as a child learned both about culture (and so became a human being) and about a particular culture (and so became a Navaho, or a Frenchman, or a Russian), can learn another culture, part of this difficulty can be dealt with. The difference between childhood learning and adult learn-

ing is to be compared to the difference between learning to eat and later learning a new dietary, or learning to speak and later learning a second language. More explicit statements about the possibility of change in adulthood under a new set of social and political institutions are needed to deal with these aroused objections.⁷ We are hampered here, however, by the paucity of usable research on the subject.⁸ This type of cultural opposition may be usefully likened to the opposition to theories of the importance of early childhood training by persons whose children have reached adolescence and who feel that such counsels leave them helpless, subject to remorse but with no chance to make reparation. If it were possible to plan research complexly enough, the danger of encountering such opposition might be foreseen and allowed for.⁹

A fourth type of opposition appears to come from the resistance which the explicit juxtaposition of statements about conscious and unconscious attitudes calls forth from those who have not been exposed to psychoanalysis, either in personal analysis or by working in other ways with the "primary process" and with "unconscious" materials. There seems to be less resistance when these materials are presented separately. Projective test results, if isolated from the rest of the culture, are often accepted as "scientific." Gorer's description of character-forming mechanisms explicitly implicates "unconscious" processes, and the objections are very often of the same sort as those encountered by Freud. As Freud was accused of "tracing everything to sex," Gorer is accused of "tracing everything to infancy." In these paired accusations, the words *sex* and *infancy* can both be regarded as surrogates for those aspects of experience which cannot be recalled without special operations and against which most persons have well-organized defenses. This situation, which was apparent in the first responses to Gorer's hypothesis about the Japanese (1943) and in some of the reviews of *The American People* (Gorer 1948), has been exacerbated in the case of the swaddling hypothesis by two circumstances: (1) swaddling is more respectable and less embarrassing to discuss than toilet training or castration fears (and note the extent to which scatological implications are brought in again by such words as "diaperology"); and (2) the idea of swaddling is peculiarly horrifying to Americans, one of whose major commitments is to freedom of movement.¹⁰

NOTES

¹ Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, December, 1952.

² Gorer and Rickman (1949), especially Appendix 1; Gorer (1949). See Golden (1952a, 1952b), Goldman (1950), Grygier (1951). For reviewers who have understood the position taken by Gorer, see among others Bruun (1950), Mosely (1951).

³ See, for example, Tolstoy (1913): "Here are my first recollections which I cannot arrange, not knowing what was before, what after, and about some of them I don't know whether they were dreams or real. Here they are: I am tied. I want to free my hands but I cannot do it, and I am crying, weeping, and my cry is unpleasant to me, but I cannot stop. Somebody is staying upon me. And it is all in half-darkness. But I remember that they are two. My crying affects them. They worry because I am crying, but they don't unbind me as I want them to, and I cry louder. It seems to them it is necessary [that I remain tied], while I know it is not necessary, and I want to

prove it to them, and I break out crying, which is repugnant to me but irrepressible. I feel the injustice and the cruelty, not of the people, because they are sorry for me, but of fate, and I pity myself. I don't know and will never learn what it was, whether I was swaddled when I was sucking and drew out my hand or was swaddled when I was more than a year old, in order not to let me scratch a rash; whether I collected in one memory many sensations, as one does in a dream. But it is true that this was my first and strongest sensation. And I don't remember so my cry, my suffering, but the complexity, the contrariety of the sensation. I want freedom, it doesn't hurt anybody, and I, who need it so much, I am weak and they are strong. . . ." See, also, Bylinov (1951).

⁴ This assumption can be tested by analyzing material on one set of cultural institutions, abstracting the pattern, and testing this pattern against an independent analysis of another set of cultural institutions from the same culture. Provided that the materials have been collected in the same detail and with the same degree of objectivity and that comparative material is available to distinguish what is actually characteristic of the culture rather than the area, it should be expected that the two sets of material would show the same configuration, which could be articulately related to the known regularities of growth, development, and functioning of the human nervous system.

⁵ See Dicks (1952:157): "Without entering deeply into the difficult question as to what might be the origins of this Russian Super-ego (concerning which no specific data were collected during my pilot study), it is possible to see in the general cultural ego-ideal the well-known features of Russian home discipline at the verbal level. This enjoins the virtues of truthful, meek behavior, and deplores rather than severely punishes rough and arrogant conduct and rewards goodness and obedience by maternal love. The same virtues are still stressed in recent educational publications in the Soviet Union. For the earliest level, only Geoffrey Gorer has, so far, evolved a coherent hypothesis. His critics have done the very thing he warned them against; mistaken the paradigm for the theory. Nothing in my observation has contradicted his views. Obviously 'swaddling' may only be the expression (as he would say) and not the *raison-d'être* for the dynamics Gorer's hypothesis covers. I should like to supplement his views by adding that though the Russian tends to behave *as if* he had experienced the privation-gratification cycle Gorer pictures, and so tends to have the diffuse persecutory anxiety and hopeless apathy, he *does* also experience the close nurtural-libidinal relation with his Mother, however fitful and intermittent, as Gorer shows. He also *does* have much warm and protective love and indulgence in his family, also mentioned by Gorer, however split and multiplied his object world becomes by later social conditions. The Russian thus *does* have opportunities for the internalization of good and loving objects, in relation to whom the severe depressive guilt of the second phase aroused in his still earlier and indubitable oral frustration rage becomes intelligible and, so to speak, theoretically inevitable."

⁶ See Vladimir Orlov in *Izvestia* (1952): ". . . American parrots, in doctors' mantles, spread fascist racial ravings, the goal of which is to prove the superiority of the American 'highest' race . . . Before American learned men was placed the problem: to prove the existence of a 'tense, destructive wrath' as an original trait of Russian character, and having proved it, to explain the origin of the 'anger and violence' of Great Russians. A large collective of workers of the American Museum of Natural History under the 'scientific' guidance of Margaret Mead were directed to the solution of the problem. By the curious admission of the *New Leader*, all the work of this group is conducted at the expense of the Navy Department. The solution of the problem turned out to be very difficult. 'Scientific' disagreements arose as to the stage of personality formation of the Soviet man at which 'limitless wrath and violence' originated to become the foundation 'of the particular characteristic of the Russian soul.' In Soviet man's mature years when he was engrossed in peaceful construction of factories and hydro-stations? Or in his young years, of a blue evening around the pioneer bonfire? Or possibly in childhood, in the crèches while playing with a doll or a teddy bear? The problem seemed insoluble. And the 'most learned' Margaret Mead was beginning to hint to her colleagues that they were getting money for nothing. As with many a great discovery, the discovery of the solution came simply. One staff member leafing through the 'Works of the New York Academy of Science,' came upon an article in No. 5 for 1943 by the psychologist and anthropologist Geoffrey Gorer, the same Gorer who although he had never been to the Soviet Union and does not know the Russian language, was advertised as a 'brilliant specialist' on the

question of interpretation of the Russian spirit and history. . . . 'Babies thus squeezed are limited in their movements which has an extremely traumatic effect on their sensations and calls forth a tense destructive wrath.' . . . Soon another article of Gorer's was discovered in a publication by Columbia University. . . . And again swaddling was given as reason for all the misfortunes suffered by the American war-mongers from the Russian character. The discovery appeared so valuable that the learned businessmen without hesitation decided to steal it and place it at the basis of their research without reference to the author. This is how Margaret Mead expounds her ideas on her future book in the magazine *Natural History* in an article 'What Forms the Russian Character?' 'Russian babies are swaddled as are newly-born in Eastern countries and in the past in Western Europe, but Russian babies are swaddled much tighter and for a longer period. . . . This early period leaves an imprint on the Russian character.' As asserted by Margaret Mead tight swaddling of Russian babies had and continues to have a decisive influence on Russian history. 'Wrath, anger, violence, stemming from the swaddling period' is considered by the American ignoramuses who over-reach themselves, as the source of 'civil war,' 'rebellion,' and revolutions. Were it not for this source there would be no offers of disarmament and the prohibition of the atom bomb, so inconvenient to the State Department. . . . What concerns the glimmers of sense, those are impossible to discover in Margaret Mead and her likes."

Columbia University Research in Contemporary Culture was a project directed by the late Professor Ruth Benedict under a contract with the Office of Naval Research, in which Geoffrey Gorer and Margaret Mead worked in the Russian section. The swaddling hypothesis was developed in 1947-1948. A series of successor projects on Soviet problems, under other governmental auspices, were located at the American Museum of Natural History between 1948 and 1952. For fuller details see Mead and Metraux (1953).

⁷ See Mead (1950) for this example of change from the interviews of a research worker: "In an interview with a woman we were discussing this question of guilt and guilt of everything one has ever thought. She said, 'You know, I remember the day I became an American.' This is a pre-Soviet Russian who had lived in Europe quite a long while. She said, 'You know, I was talking to a married woman friend of mine out on Long Island, and she was talking about having fallen in love with a man, and she said, "But nothing happened." And I said [said the Russian woman], "But didn't you enjoy him in your mind?" And she said, "Ye-e-e-s." And I said, "Then you *were* guilty." And she said, "But nothing happened." And I looked at her and I suddenly realized that in America you are not guilty for the things you *don't do*, and all my life was re-modulated. Everything that had once been so complicated became so simple. That was the day I stopped just being a Russian and started being an American'."

⁸ There have been a few speculative articles: Mead (1949); Ruesch, Jacobson, and Loeb (1948); Bram's provocative paper on the choice of a different nationality (1951); Allport, Bruner, and Jandorf's classical study on lack of change in personality under conditions of D.P. status, etc. (1941).

⁹ The best one can do is to channel one's research in this direction. My 1953 field trip to the Admiralty Islands was planned to study change within a single generation, in the persons of members of Peri village originally observed twenty-five years ago.

¹⁰ I have experimented with naïve audiences by mentioning the practice of swaddling only in passing when lecturing on Russia, but it tends to be elaborated on exhaustively in the question period, in comments in the local press, etc. Cf. also the comment of Bruch (1952) on American mothers' responses to suggestions of restraining children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLPORT, G., J. S. BRUNER and E. M. JANDORF
 1941 Personality under social catastrophe: ninety life-histories of the Nazi revolution. *Character and Personality* 10: 1-22.
- BENEDICT, R.
 1949 Child rearing in certain European countries. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 19: 342-50.

- BRAM, J.
1951 The elements of choice and fiction in ethnic self-identification. Paper delivered at American Anthropological Association annual meeting.
- BRUCH, H.
1952 Don't be afraid of your child. New York.
- BRUNN, G.
1950 How the bear ticks. *Saturday Review of Literature* (Nov. 11), p. 19.
- BYLINOV, A.
1951 The metal workers. *Oktiabr* (Dec.). Moscow, published by Pravda.
- DALLIN, D.
1949 Exterminate the Russians? *New Leader* (Oct. 29), p. 2.
1951 The new Soviet empire. New Haven.
- DENNIS, W.
1940 The Hopi child. New York.
- DICKS, H. V.
1952 Observations on contemporary Russian behavior. *Human Relations* 5: 111-75.
- DINERSTEIN, H.
1953 Leadership in Soviet agriculture. Glencoe, Illinois.
- GOLDEN, J.
1952a Review of: The people of Great Russia, by Gorer and Rickman. *American Anthropologist* 54: 415.
1952b Review of: Soviet attitudes toward authority, by Mead. *American Anthropologist* 54: 414.
- GOLDMAN, I.
1950 Psychiatric interpretations of Russian history, a reply to Geoffrey Gorer. *American Slavic and East European Review* 9: 151-61.
- GORER, G.
1943 Themes in Japanese culture. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 5.
1948 The American people. New York.
1949 Some aspects of the psychology of the people of Great Russia. *American Slavic and East European Review* 8: 155-66.
- GORER, G. and J. RICKMAN
1949 The people of Great Russia, a psychological study. London and New York.
- GREENACRE, P.
1944 Infant reactions to restraint: problems in the fate of infantile aggression. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 14: 204-18.
- GRYGIER, T.
1951 The psychological problems of Soviet Russia. *British Journal of Psychology* (General Section) 42: 180-84.
- HAIMSON, L.
Ms. The Soviet theory of action.
- HEBB, D. O.
1949 Organization of behavior. New York.
- Hsu, F. L. K.
1950 Anthropology or psychiatry: some test data from Hawaii. Paper delivered at Viking Fund Supper-Conference for Anthropologists, Oct. 20.
- KARDINER, A.
1939 The individual and his society. New York.
- LEITES, N. and E. BERNAUT
1953 The ritual of liquidation. Glencoe, Illinois.
- LEVY, D.
1938-39 Maternal overprotection. *Psychiatry* 1: 561-91; 2: 99-109; 3: 563-97.
- LITTLE, K.
1950 Methodology in the study of adult personality and "national character." *American Anthropologist* 52: 279-82.

MEAD, M.

- 1941 Review of: *The Hopi child*, by Wayne Dennis. *American Anthropologist* 43: 95-97.
- 1947 The implications of culture change for personality development. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 17: 633-46.
- 1949 Character formation and diachronic theory. *In Social Structure: Studies Presented to A. R. Radcliffe-Brown*, edited by M. Fortes. Oxford.
- 1950 Russian character and Soviet politics (RCC-PR 2). *Columbia University Research in Contemporary Cultures*, New York. (Dittoed.)
- 1951a Soviet attitudes toward authority. New York.
- 1951b What makes the Soviet character? *Natural History* 51: 296-303, 336.
- 1952 Some relationships between social anthropology and psychiatry. *In Dynamic Psychiatry*, edited by F. Alexander and H. Ross. Chicago.
- 1953 National character. *In Anthropology Today*, by A. L. Kroeber *et al.* Chicago.

MEAD, M. and R. METRAUX (eds.)

- 1953 *The study of culture at a distance*. Chicago.

MOSELY, P.

- 1951 A pro-Russian, anti-Stalin policy: *The new Soviet Empire* by David J. Dallin reviewed. *New Leader* (May 21), pp. 22-23.

ORLOV, V.

- 1952 Slanderers and swaddling clothes. *Izvestia* (Feb. 19). Moscow.

PETERSON, C. H. and F. L. SPANO

- 1941 Breast feeding, maternal rejection and child personality. *Character and Personality* 10: 62-66.

RUESCH, J., A. JACOBSON and M. LOEB

- 1948 Acculturation and illness. *Psychological Monographs*, No. 292. Washington.

SEWALL, W. H.

- 1952 Infant training and the personality of the child. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 22: 150-59.

SHUB, B.

- 1950 Soviets expose American baby. *New Leader* (June 17), pp. 11-12.

TOLSTOY, L.

- 1913 The first recollections. *In Collected Works (Polnoye Sobraniya Sochinenii)*, Sytin edition. Moscow.

WHITING, J. and I. L. CHILD

- 1953 *Child training and personality*. New Haven.

WOLFE, B. D.

- 1951a The swaddled soul of the Great Russians. *New Leader* (Jan. 29), pp. 15-18.
- 1951b Reply to Mr. Gorer. *New Leader* (May 21), p. 20.

A REPRINT FROM
THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST
SENT BY THE AUTHOR

To
