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admire Jung for the courage and openness with which he embraced both science and religion; but even more than these two, Rank's system has implications for the deepest and broadest developments of the social sciences, implications that have only begun to be tapped.

Paul Roazen, writing about "The Legend of Freud," aptly observed that "any writer whose mistakes have taken this long to correct is quite a figure in intellectual history." Yet the whole matter is very curious, because Adler, Jung, and Rank very early corrected most of Freud's basic mistakes. The question for the historian is, rather, what there was in the nature of the psychoanalytic movement, the ideas themselves, the public and the scholarly mind that kept these corrections so ignored or so separated from the main movement of cumulative scientific thought.

Even a book of broad scope has to be very selective of the truths it picks out of the mountain of truth that is stilling us. Many thinkers of importance are mentioned only in passing; the reader may wonder, for example, why I lean so much on Rank and hardly mention Jung in a book that has is a major aim the closure of psychoanalysis on religion. One reason is that Jung is so prominent and has so many effective interpreters, while Rank is hardly known and has had hardly anyone to speak for him. Another reason is that although Rank's thought is difficult, it is always right on the central problems. Jung's is not, and a good part of it wanders into needless existentialism; the result is that he often obscures on the one hand what he reveals on the other. I can't see that all his tones on alcoholism add one bit to the weight of his psychoanalytic insight.

A good many phrasings of insight into human nature I owe to exchanges with Marie Becker, whose fineness and realism on these matters are most rare. I want to thank (with the customary disclaimers) Paul Roazen for his kindness in passing Chapter Six through the net of his great knowledge of Freud. Robert N. Bellah read the entire manuscript, and I am very grateful for his general criticisms and specific suggestions; those that I was able to act on definitely improved the book; as for the others, I fear that they pose the larger and longer-range task of changing myself.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction: Human Nature and the Heroic

In times such as ours there is a great pressure to come up with concepts that help men understand their dilemma, there is an urge toward vital ideas, toward a simplification of needless intellectual complexity. Sometimes this makes for big lies that resolve tensions and make it easy for action to move forward with just the rationalizations that people need. But it also makes for the slow disengagement of truths that help men get a grip on what is happening to them, that tell them where the problems really are.

One such vital truth that has long been known is the idea of heroism; but in "normal" scholarly times we never thought of making much out of it, of parading it, or of using it as a central concept. Yet the popular mind always knew how important it was as William James—who cared just about everything—remarked at the turn of the century: "mankind's common instinct for reality... has always held the world to be essentially a theatre for heroism." Not only the popular mind know, but philosophers of all ages, and in our culture especially Emerson and Nietzsche—which is why we still thrill to them; we like to be reminded that our central calling, our main task on this planet, is the heroic.∗

One way of looking at the whole development of social science since Marx and of psychology since Freud is that it represents a massive detailing and clarification of the problem of human heroism. This perspective sees the tone for the seriousness of our discussion: we now have the scientific underpinning for a true understanding of the nature of heroism and its place in human life. If mankind's...

*In the following discussion I am obliged to repeat and sum up things I have written elsewhere (The Birth and Death of Meaning, Second Edition, New York: Free Press, 1972) in order to set the framework for the other chapters.
common instinct for reality" is right, we have achieved the remarkable feat of exposing that reality in a scientific way.

One of the key concepts for understanding man's urge to heroism is the idea of "narcissism." As Erich Fromm has so well reminded us, this idea is one of Freud's great and lasting contributions. Freud discovered that each of us repeats the tragedy of the mythical Greek Narcissus; we are hopelessly absorbed with ourselves. If we care about anyone it is usually ourselves first of all. As Aristotle somewhere puts it: luck is when the god next to you gets hit with the arrow. Twenty-five hundred years of history have not changed man's basic narcissism, most of the time, for most of us, this is still a workable definition of luck. It is one of the meaner aspects of narcissism that we feel that practically everyone is expendable except ourselves. We should feel prepared, as Emerson once put it, to recreate the whole world out of ourselves even if no one else existed. The thought frightens us; we don't know how we could do it without ourselves—but at bottom the basic resource is there: we could suffice alone if need be, if we could trust ourselves as Emerson wanted. And if we don't feel this trust emotionally, still most of us would struggle to survive with all our powers, no matter how many around us died. Our organism is ready to fill the world all alone, even if our mind shinks at the thought. This narcissism is what keeps man marching into point-blank fire in war at heart one doesn't feel that he will die, he only feels sorry for the man next to him. Freud's explanation for this was that the unconscious does not know death or time; in man's physicochemical, inner organic processes he feels immortal.

None of these observations implies human guile. Man does not seem able to "help" his selfishness; it seems to come from his animal nature. Through countless ages of evolution the organism has had to protect its own integrity; it has its own physicochemical identity and was dedicated to preserving it. This is one of the chief problems in organ transplantation; the organism protects itself against foreign matter, even if it is a new heart that would keep it alive. The protoplasm itself harbors its own, nurtures itself against the world against invasion of its integrity. It seems to enjoy its own pulsations, expanding into the world and ingesting pieces of it. If you took a blind and dumb organism and gave it self-consciousness and a name, if you made it stand out of nature and know consciously that it was unique, then you would have narcissism. In man, physicochemical identity and the sense of power and activity have become conscious.

In man a working level of narcissism is inseparable from self-esteem, from a basic sense of self-worth. We have learned, mostly from Alfred Adler, that what man needs most is to feel secure in his self-esteem. But man is not just a blind glob of idling protoplasm, but a creature with a name who lives in a world of symbols and dreams and not merely mate. His sense of self-worth is constituted symbolically, his cherished narcissism feeds on symbols, on an abstract idea of his own worth, an idea composed of sounds, words, and images, in the air, in the mind, on paper. And this means that man's natural yearning for organic activity, the pleasures of incorporation and expansion, can be felt limitlessly in the domain of symbols and so into immortality. The single organism can expand into dimensions of worlds and times without moving a physical limb; it can take eternity into itself even as it gaspingly dies.

In childhood we see the struggle for self-esteem at its least disguised. The child is unashamed about what he needs and wants most. His whole organism shouts the claims of his natural narcissism. And this claim can make childhood hellish for the adults concerned, especially when there are several children competing at once for the prerogatives of limitless self-extension, what we might call "cosmic significance." The term is not meant to be taken lightly, because this is where our discussion is leading. We like to speak casually about "sibling rivalry," as though it were some kind of by-product of growing up, a bit of competitiveness and selfishness of children who have been spoiled, who haven't yet grown into a generous social nature. But it is too all-absorbing and relentless to be an aberration, it expresses the heart of the creature: the desire to stand out, to be the bee in creation. When you combine natural narcissism with the basic need for self-esteem, you create a creature who has to feel himself an object of primary value: first in the universe, representing in himself all of life. This is the reason for the daily and usually excruciating struggle with siblings; the child cannot allow himself to be second-best or devalued, much less left out. "You gave him the biggest piece of candy?" "You gave him
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name, if you made it stand out of nature and know consciously that it was unique, then you would have narcissism. In man, physio-
chemical identity and the sense of power and activity have become
conscionous.

In man, a working level of narcissism is inseparable from self-
esteem, from a basic sense of self-worth. We have learned, mostly
from Alfred Adler, that what man needs most is to feel secure in his
self-esteem. But man is not just a blind glib of idolizing protoplasm,
but a creature with a name who lives in a world of symbols and
Dreams and not merely mate. His sense of self-worth is constituted
symbolically, his cherished narcissism feeds on symbols, on an ab-
stract idea of his own worth, an idea composed of sounds, words,
and images, in the air, in the mind, on paper. And this means that
man's natural yearning for organismic activity, the pleasures of in-
corporation and expansion, can be felt limitless in the domain of
symbols and so into immortality. The single organism can expand
into dimensions of worlds and times without moving a physical limb;
it can take eternity into itself as it goes upingly dies.

In childhood we see the struggle for self-esteem at its least
disguised. The child is unashamed about what he needs and wants
most. His whole organism shouts the claims of his natural narciss-
ism. And this claim can make childhood hellish for the adults
concerned, especially when there are several children competing at
care for the prerequisites of limitless self-extension, what we might
call "cosmic significance." The term is not meant to be taken lightly,
because this is where our discussion is leading. We like to speak
casually about "sibling rivalry," as though it were some kind of by-
product of growing up, a bit of competitiveness and selfishness of
children who have been spoiled, who haven't yet grown into a
generous social nature. But it is too all-absorbing and relentless to
be an aberration; it expresses the heart of the creature: the desire to
stand out, to be the bee in creation. When you combine natural
narcissism with the basic need for self-esteem, you create a creature
who has to feel himself an object of primary value; first in the
universe, representing in himself all of life. This is the reason for
the daily and usually excruciating struggle with siblings; the child
cannot allow himself to be second-best or devalued, much less left
out. "You gave him the biggest piece of candy?" "You gave him
more juice! "Here's a little more juice than I'll. " "Now she's got more juice than me! "You let her light the fire in the fireplace and not me. "Okay, you light a piece of paper. "But this piece of paper is smaller than the one she lit." And on and on. An animal who gets his feeling of worth symbolically has to minutely compare himself to those around him, to make sure he doesn't come off second-best. Sibling rivalry is a critical problem that reflects the basic human condition: it is not that children are vicious, selfish, or domineering. It is that they so openly express man's tragic destiny: he must desperately justify himself as an agent of primary value in the universe; he must stand out, be a hero, make the biggest possible contribution to world life, show that he counts more than anything or anyone else.

When we appreciate how natural it is for man to strive to be a hero, how deeply it goes in his evolutionary and organismic constitution, how openly he shows it as a child, then it is all the more curious how ignorant most of us are, consciously, of what we really want and need. In our culture anyway, especially in modern times, the heroic seems too big for us, or we too small for it. Tell a young man that he is destined to be a hero and he will laugh. We disguise our struggle by piling up figures in a bank book to reflect privately our sense of heroic worth. Or by having only a little better home in the neighborhood, a bigger car, brighter children. But underneath throbs the ache of cosmic specialness, no matter how we mask it in concerns of smaller scope. Occasionally someone admits that he takes his heroism seriously, which gives most of us a chill, as did U.S. Congressman Mendel Rivers, who fed appropriations to the military machine and said he was the most powerful man since Julius Caesar. We may shudder at the crassness of earthly heroism, of both Caesar and his imitators, hero of primary value in the universe and on this earth, but the fault is not theirs, it is in the way society sets up its hero system and in the people it allows to fill its roles. The urge to heroism is natural, said to admit it honest. For everyone to admit it would probably release such pent-up force as to be devastating to society as they now are.

The fact is that this is what society is and always has been: a symbolic hero system, a structure of statues and roles, customs and rules for behavior, designed to serve as a vehicle for earthly heroism. Each script is somewhat unique, each culture has a different hero system. What the anthropologists call "cultural relativity" is thus really the relativity of hero-systems the world over. But each cultural system is a dramatization of earthly heroism: each system cuts out roles for performances of various degrees of heroism: from the "high" heroism of a Churchill, a Mao, or a Buddha, to the "low" heroism of the coal miner, the peasant, the simple priest; the plain, everyday, earthly heroism wrought by guarded working hands guiding a family through hunger and disease.

It doesn't matter whether the cultural hero-system is frankly magical, religious, and primitive or secular, scientific, and civilized. It is still a mythical hero-system in which people serve in order to earn a feeling of primary value, of cosmic specialness, of ultimate usefulness to creation, of unshakable meaning. They earn this feeling by carrying out a place in nature, by building an edifice that reflects human value: a temple, a cathedral, a totem pole, a skyscraper, a family that spans three generations. The hope and belief is that the things that man creates in society are of lasting worth and meaning, that they outlive or outshine death and decay, that man and his products count. When Norman O. Brown said that Western society since Newton, no matter how scientific or secular it claims to be, is still as "religious" as any other, this is what he meant: "civilized" society is a hopeful belief and protest that science, money and goods make man count for more than any other animal. In this sense everything that man does is religious and heroic, and yet in danger of being fictitious and fallible.

The question that becomes then the most important one that man can put to himself is simply this: how conscious is he of what he is doing to earn his feeling of heroism? I suggested that if everyone honestly admitted his urge to be a hero it would be a devastating release of truth. It would make man demand that culture give them their due—a primary sense of human value as unique contributors to cosmic life. How would our modern celebrities continue to attract money and goods and make man count for more than any other animal? Only those societies we today call "primitive" provided this feeling for their members. The minority groups in present-day industrial society who shout for freedom and human dignity are really shamously asking that they be given a sense of primary heroism of which they have been cheated historically. This is why their in-
more juice? ‘Here’s a little more juice; more than I used to. ’"You let her light the fire in the fireplace and not me. ’"Okay, you light a piece of paper. ’"But this piece of paper is smaller than the one she lit. ’"And so on and on. An animal who gets his feeling of worth symbolically has to minutely compare himself to those around him, to make sure he doesn’t come off second-best. Sibling rivalry is a critical problem that reflects the basic human condition: it is not that children are vicious, selfish, or dominating. It is that they so openly express man’s tragic destiny: he must desp- perately justify himself as an actor of primary value in the uni- verse; he must stand out, be a hero, make the biggest possible con- tribute to world life, show that he counts more than anything or anyone else.

When we appreciate how natural it is for man to strive to be a hero, how deeply it goes in his evolutionary and organismic con- stitution, how openly he shows it as a child, then it is all the more curious how ignorant most of us are, consciously, of what we really want and need. In our culture anyway, especially in modern times, the heroic seems too big for us, or we too small for it. Tell a young man that he is destined to be a hero and he will laugh. We disguise our struggle by piling up figures in a bank book to reflect privately our sense of heroic worth. Or by having only a little better home in the neighborhood, a bigger car, brighter children. But underneath throbs the ache of cosmic specialness, no matter how we mask it in con- cerns of smaller scope. Occasionally someone admits that he takes his heroic role seriously, which gives most of us a chill, as did U.S. Congressman Mendel Rivers, who fled appropriations to the military machine and said he was the most powerful man since Julius Caesar. We may shudder at the craziness of earthly heroism, of both Caesar and his imitators, hero of the society. But the fault is not theirs, it is in the way society sets up its hero system and in the people it allows to fill its roles. The urge to heroism is natural, said to admit it honest. For everyone to admit it would probably release such pent-up force as to be devastating to societies as they now are.

The fact is that this is what society is and always has been: a symbolic hero system, a structure of statues and roles, customs and rules for behavior, designed to serve as a vehicle for earthly heroism. Each script is somewhat unique, each culture has a dif- ferent hero system. What the anthropologists call "cultural relativity" is thus really the relativity of hero-systems the world over. But each cultural system is a dramatization of earthly heroism; each system cuts out roles for performances of various degrees of heroism: from the "high" heroism of a Churchill, a Mao, or a Buddha, to the "low" heroism of the coal miner, the peasant, the simple priest; the plain, everyday, earthly heroism wrought by guarded working hands guid- ing a family through hunger and disease.

It doesn’t matter whether the cultural hero-system is frankly magical, religious, and primitive or secular, scientific, and civilized. It is still a mythical hero-system in which people serve in order to earn a feeling of primary value, of cosmic specialness, of ultimate usefulness to creation, of unshakable meaning. They earn this feel- ing by carving out a place in nature, by building an edifice that reflects human value: a temple, a cathedral, a totem pole, a sky- scraper, a family that spans three generations. The hope and belief is that the things that man creates in society are of lasting worth and meaning, that they outlive or outshine death and decay, that man and his products count. When Norman O. Brown said that Western society since Newton, no matter how scientific or secular it claims to be, is still as "religious" as any other, this is what he meant: "civilized" society is a hopeful belief and protest that science, money and goods serve man’s need for more than any other animal. In this sense everything that man does is religious and heroic, and yet in danger of being fictitious and fallible.

The question that becomes the most important one that man can put to himself is simply this: how conscious is he of what he is doing to earn his feeling of heroism? I suggested that if everyone honestly admitted his urge to be a hero it would be a devastating release of truth. It would make man demand that culture give them their due—a primary sense of human value as unique contributors to cosmic life. How would our modern cities contrive to satisfy such an honest demand, without being shaken to their foundations? Only those societies we today call "primitive" provided this feeling for their members. The minority groups in present-day industrial societies who shout for freedom and human dignity are really clamorously asking that they be given a sense of primary heroism of which they have been cheated historically. This is why their in-
sistent claims are so troublesome and upsetting; how do we do such an "unreasonable" thing within the ways in which society is now set up? "They are asking for the impossible" is the way we usually put our bafflement.

But the truth about the need for heronism is not easy for anyone to admit, even the very ones who want to have their claims recognized. There's the rub. As we shall see from our subsequent discussion, to become conscious of what one is doing to earn his feeling of heroism is the main self-analytic problem of life. Everything painful and shocking in what psychoanalytic genius and religious giants have discovered about man revolves around the terror of admitting what one is doing to earn his self-esteem. This is why human heroes are a blind drive toward the point where people up in passionate people, a screaming for glory as uncritical and reflexive as the howling of a dog. In the more passive states of meekness men it is disguised as a self-humility and complacently follow out the roles that society provides for their heroes and try to earn their promotions within the system: wearing the standard uniforms—but allowing themselves to stick out, but ever so little and so safely, with a little ribbon or a red buttonhole, but not with head and shoulders.

If we were to peel away this massive disguise, the blocks of repression over human techniques for earning glory, we would arrive at the potentially most liberating question of all, the main problem of human life: How empirically true is the cultural hero system that sustains and drives men? We mentioned the milder side of man's urge to cosmic heroism, but there is obviously the noble side as well. Man will lay down his life for his country, his society, his family. He will choose to throw himself on a grenade to save his comrades; he is capable of the highest generosity and self-sacrifice.

But he has to feel and believe that what he is doing is truly heroic, timeless, and supremely meaningful. The crisis of modern society is precisely that the youth no longer feel heroic in the plan for action that their culture has set up. They don't believe it is empirically true to the problems of their lives and times. We see a living crisis of heroism that reaches into every aspect of our social life: the droopings of university heroism, of business and career heroism, of political-union heroism; the rise of anti-heroes, those who would be heroic each in his own way—or like Charles Manson with his special "family," whose tormented heroes lashed out at the system that itself has ceased to represent agreed heroism. The great perplexity of our time, the churning of our age, is that the youth have sensed—for better or for worse—a great social-historical truth, that just as there are useless self-sacrifices in unjust wars, so too is there an ignoble heroism of whole societies; it can be the viciously destructive heroism of Hitler's Germany or the plain debasing and silly heroics of the acquisition and display of consumer goods, the piling up of money and privileges that now characterize whole ways of life, capitalist and Soviet.

And the crisis of society is, of course, the crisis of organized religiosity: religion is no longer valid as a hero system, and so the youth see it. If traditional culture is discarded as heroic, then the church that supports that culture automatically discredit itself. If the church, on the other hand, chooses to insist on its own special heroics, it might find that in crucial ways it must work against the culture, recruit youth to be anti-heroes to the ways of life of the society they live in. This is the dilemma of religion in our time.

Conclusion

What I have tried to do in this brief introduction is to suggest that the problem of heroics is the central one of human life, that it goes deeper into human nature than anything else because it is based on organic narcissism and on the child's need for self-esteem as the condition for his life. Society itself is a codified hero system, which means that society everywhere is a living myth of the significance of human life, a defiant creation of meaning. Every society thus is a "religion" whether it think so or not: Soviet "religion" and Marxist "religion" are as truly religions as are scientific and consumer "religions," no matter how much they may try to disguise themselves by omitting religions and spiritual ideas from their lives. As we shall see further on, it was Otto Rank who showed psychologically this religious nature of all human cultural creation; and more recently the idea was revived by Norman O. Brown in his...
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Persistent claims are so troublesome and upsetting; how do we do such an "unreasonable" thing within the ways in which society is now set up? "They are asking for the impossible" is the way we usually put our bafflement.

But the truth about the need for heroism is not easy for anyone to admit, even the very ones who want to have their claims recognized. There's the rub. As we shall see from our subsequent discussion, to become conscious of what one is doing to earn his feeling of heroism is the main self-analytic problem of life. Everything painful and subordinating in what psychoanalytic genius and religious genius have discovered about man revolves around the terror of admitting what one is doing to earn his self-esteem. This is why human heroes are so often bitter enemies that burn people up; in passionate people, a screaming for glory as uncritical and reflexive as the baying of a dog. In the more passive moods of melancholy men it is disguised as they humbly and almost complacently follow out the roles that society provides for their heroes and try to earn their promotions within the system: wearing the standard uniforms—but allowing themselves to stick out, but ever so little and so safely, with a little ribbons or a red bandanna, but not with head and shoulders.

If we were to peel away this massive disguise, the blocks of repression over human techniques for earning glory, we would arrive at the potentially most liberating question of all, the main problem of human life. How empirically true is the cultural hero system that sustains and drives men? We mentioned the master side of man's urge to cosmic heroism, but there is obviously the noble side as well. Man will lay down his life for his country, his society, his family. He will choose to throw himself on a grenade to save his comrades; he is capable of the highest generosity and self-sacrifice. But he has to feel and believe that what he is doing is truly heroic, timeless, and supremely meaningful. The crisis of modern society is precisely that the youth no longer feel heroic in the plan for action that their culture has set up. They don't believe it is empirically true to the problems of their lives and times. We are living a crisis of heroism that reaches into every aspect of our social life: the dropouts of university hermits, of business and career heroism, of political-action heroism, the rise of anti-heroes, those who would be hero in his own way or like Charles Manson with his special "family", those whose tormented heroes lash out at the system that itself has ceased to represent agreed heroism. The great perplexity of our time, the churning of our age, is that the youth have sensed—for better or for worse—a great social-historical truth, that just as there are useless self-sacrifices in unjust wars, so too there is an ignoble heroism of whole societies: it can be the viciously destructive heroism of Hitler's Germany or the plain debasing and silly heroism of the acquisition and display of consumer goods, the piling up of money and privileges that now accompanies whole ways of life, capitalist and Soviet.

And the crisis of society is, of course, the crisis of organized religion too: religion is no longer valid as a hero system, and so the youth seem it. If traditional culture is discredited as heroics, then the church that supports that culture automatically discredit itself. If the church, on the other hand, chooses to insist on its own special heroics, it might find that in crucial ways it must work against the culture, recruit youth to be anti-heroes to the ways of life of the society they live in. This is the dilemma of religion in our time.

Conclusion

What I have tried to do in this brief introduction is to suggest that the problem of heroism is the central one of human life, that it goes deeper into human nature than anything else because it is based on organicistic narcissism and on the child's need for self-esteem as the condition for his life. Society itself is a codified hero system, which means that society everywhere is a living myth of the significance of human life, a defiant creation of meaning. Every society thus is a "religion" whether it thinks so or not. Soviet "religion" and Marxist "religion" are as truly religious as are scientific and consumer "religion," no matter how much they may try to disguise themselves by omitting religious and spiritual ideas from their lives. As we shall see further on, it was Otto Rank who showed psychologically this religious nature of all human cultural creation; and more recently the idea was revived by Norman O. Brown in his
Life Against Death and by Robert Jay Lifton in his Revolutionary Immortality. If we accept these suggestions, then we must admit that we are dealing with the universal human problem, and we must be prepared to probe into it as honestly as possible, to be as shocked by the self-revelation of man as the best thought will allow. Let us pick this thought up with Kierkegaard and take it through Freud, to see where this stripping down of the last 350 years will lead us. If the penetrating honesty of a few books could immediately change the world, then the five authors just mentioned would already have shaken the nations to their foundations. But since everyone is carrying on as though the vital truths about man did not yet exist, it is necessary to add still another weight in the scale of human self-exposure. For twenty-five hundred years we have hoped and believed that if mankind could reveal itself to itself, could widely come to know its own cherished motives, then somehow it would tilt the balance of things in its own favor.

I drink not from mere joy in wine nor to scoff at death—no, only to forget myself for a moment, that only do I want of intoxication, that alone.

—Omar Khayyam
CHAPTER TWO

The Terror of Death

Is it not for us to confess that in our civilized attitude toward death we are once more living psychologically beyond our means, and must reform and give truth its due? Would it not be better to place death the place it actually and in our thoughts which properly belongs to it, and to yield a little more prominence to that unconscious attitude towards death which we have hitherto so carefully suppressed? This hardly seems indeed a greater achievement, but rather a backward step... but it has the merit of taking somewhat more into account the true state of affairs...

—SEYMOUR CRAIG

The first thing we have to do with heroism is to lay bare its underside, show what gives human heroes its specific nature and impact. Here we introduce directly one of the great rediscoveries of modern thought: that of all things that move man, one of the principal ones is his terror of death. After Darwin the problem of death as an evolutionary one came to the fore, and many thinkers immediately saw that it was a major psychological problem for man. They also very quickly saw what real heroism was about, as Shaler wrote just at the turn of the century: heroism is first and foremost a relief of the terror of death. We admire most the courage to face death; we give such value our highest and most constant adoration; it moves us
deeply in our hearts because we have doubts about how brave we ourselves would be. When we see a man bravely facing his own extinction we rehearse the greatest victory we can imagine. And so the hero has been the center of human honor and salvation since probably the beginning of specifically human evolution. But even before that our primitive ancestors deferred to others who were extrapowerful and courageous and ignored those who were cowardly. Man has elevated animal courage into a cult.

Anthropological and historical research also began, in the nineteenth century, to put together a picture of the heroic since primitive and ancient times. The hero was the man who could go into the spirit world, the world of the dead, and return alive. He had his descendants in the mystery cults of the Eastern Mediterranean, which were cults of death and resurrection. The divine hero of each of these cults was one who had come back from the dead. And as we know today from the research into ancient myths and rituals, Christianity itself was a competitor with the mystery cults and won out—among other reasons—because it, too, offered a healer with supernatural powers, who had risen from the dead. The great triumph of Easter is the joyful shout "Christ has risen!", an echo of the same joy that the devotees of the mystery cults enacted at their ceremonies of the victory over death. These cults, as C. Stanley Hall so aptly put it, were an attempt to attain "an immunity bath" from the greatest evil: death and the dread of it. All historical religions addressed themselves to this same problem of how to bear the end of life. Religions like Hinduism and Buddhism perverted the ingenious trick of pretending not to want to be reborn, which is a sort of negative magic: claiming not to want what you really want most. When philosophy took over from religion it also took over religion's central problem, and death became the real "cause of philosophy" from its beginnings in Greece right through Heidegger and modern existentialism.

We already have volumes of work and thought on the subject, from religion and philosophy and—since Darwin—from science itself. The problem is how to make sense out of it, how the accumulation of research and opinion on the fear of death is already too large to be dealt with and summarized in any simple way. The revival of interest in death, in the last few decades, has alone already piled up

a formidable literature, and this literature does not point in any single direction.

The "Healthy-Minded" Argument

There are "healthy-minded" persons who maintain that fear of death is not a natural thing for man, that we are not born with it. An increasing number of careful studies on how the actual fear of death develops in the child agree fairly well that the child has no knowledge of death until about the age of three to five. How could he? It is too abstract an idea, too remote from his experience. He lives in a world that is full of living, acting things, responding to him, amusing him, feeding him. He doesn't know what it means to lose a family, to disappear forever, nor to theorize where it would go. Only gradually does he recognize that there is a thing called death that takes some people away forever. Very reluctantly he comes to admit that it sooner or later takes everyone away, but this gradual realization of the inevitability of death can take up until the ninth or tenth year. If the child has no knowledge of an abstract idea like absolute negation, he does have his own anxieties. He is absolutely dependent on the mother, experiences loneliness when she is absent, frustration when he is deprived of gratification, irritation at hunger and discomfort, and so on. If he were abandoned to himself his world would drop away, and his organism must sense this at some level; we call this the anxiety of object-loss. Isn't this anxiety, then, a natural, organic fear of annihilation? Again, there are many who look at this as a very relative matter. They believe that if the mother has done her job in a warm and dependable way, the child's natural anxieties and guilts will develop in a moderate way, and he will be able to place them firmly under the control of his developing personality. The child who has good maternal experiences will develop a sense of basic security and will not be subject to morbid fears of losing support, of being annihilated, or the like. As he grows up to understand death rationally by the age of nine or ten, he will accept it as part of his world view, but the idea will not
deeply in our hearts because we have doubts about how brave we ourselves would be. When we see a man bravely facing his own extinction we revere the greatest victory we can imagine. And so the hero has been the center of human honor and adoration since probably the beginning of specifically human evolution. But even before that our primitive ancestors deferred to others who were extrapowerful and courageous and ignored those who were cowardly. Man has elevated animal courage into a cult. Anthropological and historical research also began, in the nineteenth century, to put together a picture of the heroic since primitive and ancient times. The hero was the man who could go into the spirit world, the world of the dead, and return alive. He had his descendants in the mystery cults of the Eastern Mediterranean, which were cults of death and resurrection. The divine hero of each of these cults was one who had come back from the dead. And as we know today from the research into ancient myths and rituals, Christianity itself was a competitor with the mystery cults and won out—among other reasons—because it, too, featured a healer with supernatural powers who had risen from the dead. The great triumph of Easter is the joyful about “Christ has risen!”, an echo of the same joy that the devotees of the mystery cults enacted at their ceremonies of the victory over death. These cults, as G. Stanley Hall so aptly put it, were an attempt to attain “an immunity bath” from the greatest evil: death and the dread of it. All historical religions addressed themselves to this same problem of how to bear the end of life. Religions like Hinduism and Buddhism performed the ingenious trick of pretending not to want to be reborn, which is a sort of negative magic; claiming not to want what you really want most. When philosophy took over from religion it also took over religion’s central problem, and death became the real “cause of philosophy” from its beginnings in Greece right through Heidegger and modern existentialism.4

We already have volumes of work and thought on the subject, from religion and philosophy and—since Darwin—from science itself. The problem is how to make sense out of it, the accumulation of research and opinion on the fear of death is already too large to be dealt with and summarized in any simple way. The revival of interest in death, in the last few decades, has alone already piled up a formidable literature, and this literature does not point in any single direction.

The “Healthy-Minded” Argument

There are “healthy-minded” persons who maintain that fear of death is not a natural thing for man, that we are not born with it. An increasing number of careful studies on how the actual fear of death develops in the child agree fairly well that the child has no knowledge of death until about the age of three to five. How could he? It is too abstract an idea, too removed from his experience. He lives in a world that is full of living, acting things, responding to him, amusing him, feeding him. He doesn’t know what it means for life to disappear forever, nor theorize where it would go. Only gradually does he recognize that there is a thing called death that takes some people away forever; very reluctantly he comes to admit that it sooner or later takes everyone away, but this gradual realization of the inevitability of death can take up until the ninth or tenth year.

If the child has no knowledge of an abstract idea like absolute negation, he does have his own anxieties. He is absolutely dependent on the mother, experiences loneliness when she is absent, frustration when he is deprived of gratification, irritation at hunger and discomfort, and so on. If he were abandoned to himself his world would drop away, and his organism must sense this at some level; we call this the anxiety of object-loss. Isn’t this anxiety, then, a natural, organismic fear of annihilation? Again, there are many who look at this as a very relative matter. They believe that if the mother has done her job in a warm and dependable way, the child’s natural anxieties and guilts will develop in a moderate way, and he will be able to place them firmly under the control of his developing personality. The child who has good maternal experiences will develop a sense of basic security and will not be subject to morbid fears of losing support, of being annihiliated, or the like. As he grows up to understand death rationally by the age of nine or ten, he will accept it as part of his world view, but the idea will not
poison his self-confident attitude toward life. The psychiatrist Rheingold says categorically that annihilation anxiety is not part of the child's natural experience but is engendered in him by bad experiences with a depriving mother. This theory puts the whole burden of anxiety onto the child's nurture and not his nature. Another psychiatrist, in a less extreme vein, sees the fear of death as greatly heightened by the child's experiences with his parents, by their hostile denial of his life impulses, and, more generally, by the antagonism of society to human freedom and self-expansiveness.\(^7\)

As we will see later on, this view is very popular today in the widespread movement toward unrepressed living, the urge to a new freedom for natural biological urges, a new attitude of pride and joy in the body, the abandonment of shame, guilt, and self-hatred. From this point of view, fear of death is something that society creates and at the same time uses against the person to keep him in submission; the psychiatrist Moloney talked about it as a "culture mechanism," and Marcuse as an "ideology."\(^8\) Norman O. Brown, in a vastly influential book that we shall discuss at some length, went so far as to say that the fear of death could be a birth and development of the child in a "second innocence" that would be free of the fear of death because it would not deny natural vitality and would leave the child fully open to physical living.\(^9\)

It is easy to see that, from this point of view, those who have had early experiences will be most morbidly fixated on the anxiety of death; and if by chance they grow up to be philosophers they will probably make the idea a central dictum of their thought—as did Schopenhauer, who both hated his mother and went on to pronounce death the "muse of philosophy." If you have a "near" character structure, especially tragic experiences, then you are bound to be pessimistic. One psychologist remarked to me that the whole idea of the fear of death was as import by existentialists and Protestant theologians who had been mauled by their European experiences or who carried around the extra weight of a Calvinist and Lutheran heritage of life-denial. Even the distinguished psychologist C. G. Jung seems to lean to this school and urges us to study the person who exhibits the fear of death, who places anxiety in the center of his thought; and Murphy asks why the living of life in love and joy cannot also be regarded as real and basic.\(^10\)

The "Morbidly-Minded" Argument

The "healthy-minded" argument just discussed is one side of the picture of the accumulated research and opinion on the problem of the fear of death, but there is another side. A large body of people would agree with these observations on early experience and would admit that experiences may heighten natural anxieties and later fears, but these people would also claim very strongly that nevertheless the fear of death is natural and is present in everyone, that it is the basic fear that influences all others, a fear from which no one is immune, no matter how disguised it may be. William James spoke very early for this school, and with his usual colorful realism he called death "the worm at the core" of man's pretensions to happiness.\(^11\) No less a student of human nature than Max Weber thought that all men must have some kind of certain intuition of this "worm at the core," whether they admitted it or not.\(^12\) Countless other authorities—some of whom we shall parade in the following pages—belong to this school: students of the stature of Freud, many of his close circle, and serious researchers who are not psychoanalysts. What are we to make of a dispute in which there are two distinct camps, both studded with distinguished authorities? Jacques Ellul goes so far as to say that it is questionable whether it will ever be possible to decide whether the fear of death is or is not the basic anxiety.\(^13\) In matters like this, then, the most that one can do is to take sides, to give an opinion based on the authorities that seem to him most compelling, and to present some of the compelling arguments.

I frankly side with this second school—in fact, this whole book is a network of arguments based on the universality of the fear of death, or "terror" as I prefer to call it, in order to convey how all-consuming it is when we look it full in the face. The first document that I want to present and linger on is a paper written by the noted psychoanalyst Gregory Zilboorg; it is an especially penetrating essay that—for succinctness and scope—has not been much improved upon, even though it appeared several decades ago.\(^14\) Zilboorg says that most people think death-fear is absent because it rarely shows its true face; but he argues that underneath all supposed fear of death is universally present.
poison his self-confident attitude toward life. The psychiatrist Rheingold says categorically that annihilation anxiety is not part of the child's natural experience but is engendered in him by bad experiences with a depriving mother. This theory puts the whole burden of anxiety onto the child's nurture and not his nature. Another psychiatrist, in a less extreme vein, sees the fear of death as greatly heightened by the child's experiences with his parents, by their hostile denial of his life impulses, and, more generally, by the antagonism of society to human freedom and self-expansiveness. As we shall see later on, this view is very popular today in the widespread movement toward unrepressed living, the urge to a new freedom for natural biological urges, a new attitude of pride and joy in the body, the abandonment of shame, guilt, and self-hatred. From this point of view, fear of death is something that society creates and that the same time uses against the person to keep him in submission; the psychiatrist Moloney talked about it as a "cultural mechanism," and Marcuse as an "ideology." Norman O. Brown, in a vastly influential book that we shall discuss at some length, went so far as to say that there could be a birth and development of the child in a "second innocence" that would be free of the fear of death because it would not deny natural vitality and would leave the child fully open to physical living. It is easy to see that, from this point of view, those who have had early experiences will be more morbidly fixated on the anxiety of death; and if by chance they grow up to be philosophers they will probably make the idea a central theme of their thought—as did Schopenhauer, who both hated his mother and went on to pronounce death the "muse of philosophy." If you have a "coward" character structure, especially tragic experiences, then you are bound to be pessimistic. One psychologist remarked to me that the whole idea of the fear of death was as import by existentialists and Protestant theologians who had been nourished by their European experiences or who carried around the extra weight of a Calvinist and Lutheran heritage of life-denial. Even the distinguished psychologist Charles Murray seems to lean to this school and urges us to study the person who exhibits the fear of death, who places anxiety in the center of his thought; and Murray asks why the living of life in love and joy cannot also be regarded as real and basic.
For behind the sense of insecurity in the face of danger, behind the sense of disarray and depression, there always lurks the basic fear of death, a fear which undergoes most complex elaborations and manifests itself in many indirect ways. . . . No one is free of the fear of death. . . . The anxiety symptoms, the various phobic states, even a considerable number of depressive suicidal states and many schizophasias simply demonstrate the ever-present fear of death which becomes woven into the major conflicts of the given psychopathological conditions. . . . We may take for granted that the fear of death is always present in our mental functioning.23

Hadn't James said the same thing earlier, in his own way?

Let sanguine healthy-minded do as best with its strange power of living in the moment and ignoring and forgetting till the evil background is really there to be thought of, and the skull will grin in at the banquet.24

The difference in these two statements is not so much in the imagery and style as in the fact that Zilboorg's comes almost a half-century later and is based on that much more real clinical work, not only on philosophical speculation or personal intuition. But it also contains the straight line of development from James and the post-Darwinians who saw the fear of death as a biological and evolutionary problem. Here I think he is on very sound ground, and I especially like the way he puts the case. Zilboorg points out that this fear is actually an expression of the instinct of self-preservation, which functions as a constant drive to maintain life and to master the dangers that threaten life.

Such constant expenditure of psychological energy on the business of preserving life would be impossible if the fear of death were not so constant. The very term "self-preservation" implies an effort against some force of disintegration; the affective aspect of this is fear, fear of death.25

In other words, the fear of death must be present behind all our normal functioning, in order for the organism to be armed toward self-preservation. But the fear of death cannot be present constantly in one's mental functioning, otherwise the organism could not function.

Zilboorg continues:

If this were as constantly conscious, we should be unable to function normally. It must be properly repressed to keep us alive with any modicum of comfort. We know very well that to repress means more than to put away and to forget that which was put away and the place where we put it. It means also to maintain a constant psychological effort to keep the lid on and inwardly never relax our watchfulness.26

And so we can understand what seems like an impossible paradox: the ever-present fear of death in the normal biological functioning of our instinct of self-preservation, as well as our utter obliviousness to this fear in our conscious life:

Therefore in normal times we move about actually without ever believing in our own death, as if we fully believed in our own corporal immortality. We are intent on mastering death. . . . A man will say, of course, that he knows he will some day, but he does not really care. He is having a good time with living, and he does not think about death and does not care to bother about it—but this is a purely intellectual, verbal admission. The affect of fear is repressed.27

The argument from biology and evolution is basic and has to be taken seriously. I don't see how it can be left out of any discussion. Animals in order to survive have had to be protected by fear responses, in relation not only to other animals but to nature itself. They had to see the real relationship of their limited powers to the dangerous world in which they were immersed. Reality and fear go together naturally. As the human infant is in an even more exposed and helpless situation, it is foolish to assume that the fear response of animals would have disappeared in such a weak and highly sensitive species. It is more reasonable to think that it was instead heightened, as some of the early Darwinians thought: early men who were most afraid were those who were most realistic about their situation in nature, and they passed on to their offspring a realism that had a high survival value.28 The result was the emergence of man as we know him: a hyperaroused animal who constantly searches for reasons for anxiety even where there are none.

The argument from psychoanalysis is less speculative and has to be taken even more seriously. It showed us something about the child's inner world that we had never realized: namely, that it was
For behind the sense of insecurity in the face of danger, behind the sense of disorientation and depression, there always lurks the basic fear of death, a fear which undergoes most complex elaborations and manifests itself in many indirect ways... No one is free of the fear of death...

The anxiety surmounts, the vague phobic states, even a considerable number of depressive suicidal states and many schizophrenia simply demonstrate the ever-present fear of death which becomes woven into the major conflicts of the given psychopathological conditions... We may take for granted that the fear of death is always present in our mental functioning.13

Hadn't James said the same thing earlier, in his own way?

Let sanguine health-minded do as best with its strange power of living in the moment and ignoring and forgetting still the evil background is really there to be thought of, and we shall grin in at the banquet.14

The difference in these two statements is not so much in the imagery and style as in the fact that Zilboorg’s comes almost a half-century later and is based on that much more real clinical work, not only on philosophical speculation or personal intuition. But it also continues the straight line of development from James and the post-Darwinians who saw the fear of death as a biological and evolutionary problem. Here I think he is on very sound ground, and especially the way he puts the case. Zilboorg points out that this fear is actually an expression of the instinct of self-preservation, which functions as a constant drive to maintain life and to master the dangers that threaten life.

Such constant expenditure of psychological energy on the business of preserving life would be impossible if the fear of death were not as constant. The very term “self-preservation” implies an effort against some force of disintegration; the affective aspect of this is fear, fear of death.15

In other words, the fear of death must be present behind all our normal functioning, in order for the organism to be armed toward self-preservation. But the fear of death cannot be present constantly in one’s mental functioning, the organism could not function. Zilboorg continues:

If this fear were as constantly conscious, we should be unable to function normally. It must be properly repressed to keep us living with any modicum of comfort. We know very well that to repress means more than to put away and to forget that which was put away and the place where we put it. It means also to maintain a constant psychological effort to keep the lid on and inwardly never relax our watchfulness.16

And so we can understand what seems like an impossible paradox: the ever-present fear of death in the normal biological functioning of our instinct of self-preservation, as well as our utter obliviousness to this fear in our conscious life:

Therefore in normal times we move about actually without ever believing in our own death, as if we fully believed in our own corporal immortality. We are intent on mastering death... A man will say, of course, that he knows he will the same day, but he does not really care. He is having a good time with living, and he does not think about death and does not care to bother about it—but this is a purely intellectual, verbal admission. The affect of fear is repressed.17

The argument from biology and evolution is basic and has to be taken seriously. I don’t see how it can be left out of any discussion. Animals in order to survive have had to be protected by fear responses, in relation not only to other animals but to nature itself. They had to see the real relationship of their limited powers to the dangerous world in which they were immersed. Reality and fear go together naturally. As the human infant is in an even more exposed and helpless situation, it is foolish to assume that the fear response of animals would have disappeared in such a weak and highly sensitive species. It is more reasonable to think that it was instead heightened, as some of the early Darwinians thought: early men who were most afraid were those who were most realistic about their situation in nature, and they passed on to their offspring a realism that had a high survival value.18 The result was the emergence of man as we know him: a hyperanxious animal who constantly invents reasons for anxiety even where there are none.

The argument from psychoanalysis is less speculative and has to be taken even more seriously. It showed us something about the child’s inner world that we had never realized: namely, that it was
The Terror of Death.

more filled with terror, the more the child was different from other animals. We could say that fear is programmed into the lower animals by ready-made instincts, but an animal who has no instincts has no programmed fears. Man's fears are fashioned out of the ways in which he perceives the world. Now, what is unique about the child's perception of the world? For one thing, the extreme confusion of cause-and-effect relationships; for another, extreme unreality about the limits of his own power. The child lives in a situation of utter dependence, and when his needs are met it must seem to him that he has magical powers, real omnipotence. If he experiences pain, hunger, or discomfort, all he has to do is scream and he is relieved and lulled by gentle, loving sounds. He is a magician and a telepath who has only to mumble and to imagine and the world turns to his desires.

But now the penalty for such perceptions. In a magical world where things cause other things to happen just by a mere thought or a look of displeasure, anything can happen to anyone. When the child experiences inevitable and real frustrations from his parents, he directs hate and destructive feelings toward them; and he has no way of knowing that ineluctable feelings cannot be fulfilled by the same magic as were his other wishes. Psychoanalysts believe that this confusion is a main cause of guilt and helplessness in the child.

In his very fine essay Wahl summed up this paradox:... the socialization process for all children is painful and frustrating, and none can escape forming hostile death wishes toward his socializers. Therefore, none escape the fear of personal death or symbolic form. Depression is usually... immediate and effective....

The child is too weak to take responsibility for all his destructive feeling, and he can't control the magical execution of his desires. This is what we mean by an immature ego, the child doesn't have the sure ability to organize his perceptions and his relationship to the world; he can't control his own activity; and he doesn't have sure command over the acts of others. He thus has no real control over the magical cause-and-effect that he senses, either inside himself or outside in nature and in others; his destructive wishes could explode, his parents' wishes likewise. The forces of nature are con-

fused, externally and internally, and for a weak ego this fact makes for quantities of exaggerated potential power and added terror. The result is that the child—at least some of the time—lives with an inner sense of chaos that other animals are immune to.

Ironically, even when the child makes out real cause-and-effect relationships they become a burden to him because he overgeneralizes them. One such generalization is what the psychoanalysts call the "silence principle." The child crashes insects, sees the cat eat a mouse and make it vanish, joins with the family to make a pet rabbit disappear into their interiors, and so on. He comes to know something about the power relations of the world but can't give these relative values: the parents could eat him and make him vanish, and he could likewise eat them; where the father gets a fierce glow in his eyes as he clubs a rat, the watching child might also expect to be clubbed—especially if he has been thinking bad magical thoughts.

I don't want to seem to make an exact picture of processes that are still unclear to us or to make out that all children live in the same world and have the same problems; also, I wouldn't want to make the child's world seem more lurid than it really is most of the time, but I think it is important to show the painful contradictions that must be present in it at least some of the time and to show how fantastic a world it surely is for the first few years of the child's life. Perhaps then we could understand better why Zilboorg said that the fear of death "undergoes most complex elaborations and manifests itself in many indirect ways." Or, as Wahl so perfectly put it, death is a complex symbol and not any particular, sharply defined thing to the child.

...the child's concept of death is not a single thing, but it is rather a consequence of mutually contradictory paradoxes... death itself is not only a state, but a complex symbol, the significance of which will vary from one person to another and from one culture to another."

We could understand, too, why children have their recurrent nightmares, their universal phobias of insects and mean dogs. In their tortured interiors radiate complex symbols of many inadmissible realities—terror of the world, the horror of one's own wishes, the fear of vengeance by the parents, the disappearance of things, one's
more filled with terror, the more the child was different from other animals. We could say that fear is programmed into the lower animals by ready-made instincts, but an animal who has no instincts has no programmed fears. Man’s fears are fashioned out of the ways in which he perceives the world. Now, what is unique about the child’s perception of the world? For one thing, the extreme confusion of cause-and-effect relationships; for another, extreme unreality about the limits of his own power. The child lives in a situation such as this, with no utter dependence, and when his needs are met it must seem to him that he has magical powers, real omnipotence. If he experiences pain, hunger, or discomfort, all he has to do is scream and he is relieved and lulled by gentle, loving sounds. He is a magician and a telepath who has only to mumble and to imagine and the world turns to his desires.

But now the penalty for such perceptions. In a magical world where things cause other things to happen just by a mere thought or a look of displeasure, anything can happen to anyone. When the child experiences inevitable and real frustrations from his parents, he directs hate and destructive feelings toward them; and he has no way of knowing that unavailing feelings cannot be fulfilled by the way of “wishing” or of “imagining.” Psychologists believe that this confusion is a major cause of guilt and helplessness in the child.

In his very fine essay Wahl summed up this paradox:

...the socialization process for all children is painful and frustrating, and hence no child escapes forming hostile, death wishes toward his socializers. Therefore, none escape the fear of personal death in symbolic form. Depression is usually... instantaneous and effective... 19

The child is too weak to take responsibility for all this destructive feeling, and he can’t control the magical execution of his desires. This is what we mean by an immature ego: the child doesn’t have the sure ability to organize his perceptions and his relationship to the world; he can’t control his own activity; and he doesn’t have sure command over the acts of others. He thus has no real control over his magical cause-and-effect that he senses, either inside himself or outside in nature and in others: his destructive wishes could explode, his parents’ wishes likewise. The forces of nature are confounded, externally and internally, and for a weak ego this fact makes for quantities of exaggerated potential power and added terror. The result is that the child—at least some of the time—lives with an inner sense of chaos that other animals are immune to. 20

Ironically, even when the child makes out real cause-and-effect relationships they become a burden to him because he overgeneralizes them. One such generalization is what the psychologists call the “unica principle.” The child crushes insects, sees the cat eat a mouse and make it vanish, joins with the family to make a pet rabbit disappear into their interiors, and so on. He comes to know something about the power relations of the world but can’t give these relative values: the parents could eat him and make him vanish, and he could likewise eat them; where the father gets a fierce glow in his eyes as he clubs a rat, the watching child might also expect to be clubbed—especially if he has been thinking bad magical thoughts.

I don’t want to seem to make an exact picture of processes that are still unclear to us or to make out that all children live in the same world and have the same problems; also, I wouldn’t want to make the child’s world seem more lurid than it really is most of the time. But it is important to show the painful contradictions that must be present in it at least some of the time and to show how fantastic a world it surely is for the first few years of the child’s life. Perhaps then we could understand better why Zilboorg said that the fear of death “undergoes most complex elaborations and manifests itself in many indirect ways.” Or, as Wahl so perfectly put it, death is a complex symbol and not any particular, sharply defined thing to the child:

...the child’s concept of death is not a single thing, but it is rather a complex of mutually contradictory paradoxes... death itself is not only a state, but a complex symbol, the significance of which will vary from one person to another and from one culture to another. 21

We could understand, too, why children have their recurrent nightmares, their universal phobias of insects and mean dogs. In their tortured interiors radiate complex symbols of many inadmissible realities—terror of the world, the horror of one’s own wishes, the fear of vengeance by the parents, the disappearance of things, one’s
lack of control over anything, really. It is too much for any animal to take, but the child has to take it, and so he wakes up screaming with almost punctual regularity during the period when his weak ego is in the process of consolidating things.

The ‘Disappearance’ of the Fear of Death

Yet, the nightmares become more and more widely spaced, and some children have more than others; we are back again to the beginning of our discussion, to those who do not believe that the fear of death is normal, who think that it is a twerotic exaggeration that draws on bad early experiences. Otherwise, they say, how explain that so many people—the vast majority—seem to survive the flurry of childhood nightmares and go on to live a healthy, more-or-less optimistic life, untroubled by death? As Montaigne said, the peasant has a profound indifference and a patience toward death that is probably reflected in his life energy and the values he places on it. He is prepared to believe death is for a reason, and he is not afraid of dying. Today, when we talk of death and its consequences, Montaigne would say “let’s all learn from experience.”

But its disappearance does not mean that the fear was never there.

The argument of those who believe in the universality of the innate terror of death rests its case mostly on what we know about how repression works: it is a necessary and effective process for psychological development. The argument is that if you claim that a concept is not present because it is repressed, you can’t claim that it is not a fair game, intellectually, that it’s not a real idea. A concept can be repressed and yet still exist. The argument is that repression is an important defense mechanism. It is a real phenomenon, and we have been able to study many of its workings. This study gives it legitimacy as a scientific concept and makes it a more-or-less dependable ally in our argument. For one thing, there is a growing body of research trying to get at the consciousness of death denied by repression that uses psychological tests such as measuring galvanic skin responses, it strongly suggests that underneath the most bland exterior lurks the universal anxiety, the “wurm at the core.”

For another thing, there is nothing like shocks in the real world to jar loose repression. Recently psychiatrists reported an increase in anxiety neuroses in children as a result of the earth tremors in Southern California. For these children the discovery that life really includes cataclysmic danger was too much for their still-imperfect denial systems—hence open outbreaks of anxiety. With adults we see this manifestation of anxiety in the face of impending catastrophe where it takes the form of panic. Recently several people suffered broken limbs and other injuries after forcing open the airplane’s safety door during take-off and jumping from the wing to the ground; the incident was triggered by the backfire of an engine. Obviously underneath these harmless noises other things are rumbling in the creature.

But even more important is how repression works: it is not simply a negative force opposing life energy; it lives on life energies and uses them creatively. I mean that fears are naturally absorbed by expansive organic strivings. Nature seems to have built into organisms an innate healthy-mindlessness; it expresses itself in self-delight, in the pleasure of unfolding one’s capacities into the world, in the incorporation of things in that world, and in feeding on its limitless experiences. This is a lot of very positive experience, and when a powerful organism moves with it, it gives contentment. As Santayana once put it: a lion must feel more secure that God is on its side than a gazelle. On the most elemental level the organism works actively against its own fragility by seeking to expand and perpetuate itself in living experience; instead of shrinking, it moves toward more life. Also, it does one thing at a time, avoiding needless distractions from all-absorbing activity; in this way, it would seem, fear of death can be carelessly ignored or actually absorbed in the life-expanding processes. Occasionally we seem to see such a vital organism on the human level: I am thinking of the portrait of Zorba the Greek drawn by Nikos Kazantzakis. Zorba was an ideal of the nonchalant victory of all-absorbing daily passion over timidity and death, and he purged others in his life-affirming flame. But Kazant-
lack of control over anything, really. It is too much for any animal to take, but the child has to take it, and so he works up screaming with almost punctual regularity during the period when his weak ego is in the process of consolidating things.

The "Disappearance" of the Fear of Death

Yet, the nightmares become more and more widely spaced, and some children have more than others: we are back again to the beginning of our discussion, to those who do not believe that the fear of death is normal, who think that it is a tetrotic exaggeration that draws on bad early experiences. Otherwise, they show how explain that so many people—the vast majority—seem to survive the slurry of childhood nightmares and go on to live a healthy, more-or-less optimistic life, untroubled by death. As Montaigne said, the peatman has a profound indifference and a patience toward death. The pessimist has a profound indifference and a patience toward death. As Montaigne said, the peatman is just as relaxed in death as he is in life.
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zakis himself was no Zorba—which is partly why the character of Zorba rang a bit false—for most other men. Still, everyone en-
joys a working amount of basic narcissism, even though it is not a
lilac's. The child who is well nourished and loved develops, as we
said, a sense of magical omnipotence, a sense of his own indescrib-
ability, a feeling of proven power and secure support. He can
imagine himself, deep down, to be eternal. Woe might say that his
repression of the idea of his own death is made easy for him be-
cause he is fortified against it by his very narcissistic vitality. This
type of character probably helped Freud to say that the unconscious
does not know death. Anyway, we know that basic narcissism is
increased when one's childhood experiences have been securely life-
supporting and warmly enhancing to the sense of self, to the feel-
ing of being really special, truly Number One in creation. The result
is that some people have more of what the psychoanalyst Leon J.
Sach has aptly called "Inner Sustenance." It is a sense of bodily
confidence in the face of experience that sees the person more easily
through severe life crises and even sharp personality changes. It
almost seems to take the place of the directive instincts of lower
animals. One can't help thinking of Freud again, who had more
inner "sustenance" than most men, thanks to his mother and favor-
able early environment; he knew the confidence and courage that it
gave to a man, and he himself faced up to life and to a fatal cancer
with a stoic heroism. Again we have evidence that the complex
symbol of fear of death would be very variable in its intensity. It
would be, as Wahl concluded, "profusely dependent upon the
nature and the vicissitudes of the developmental process." But I want to be careful to not make too much of natural vitality
and inner sustenance. As we will see in Chapter 6, even the
usually favored Freud suffered his whole life from phobias and
from death anxiety; and he came to fully perceive the world under the
aspect of natural terror. I don't believe that the complex symbol of
death is ever absent, no matter how much vitality and inner
sustenance a person has. Even more, if we say that these powers
make repression easy and natural, we are only saying the half of it.
Actually, they get their very power from repression. Psychiatrists
argue that the fear of death varies in intensity depending on the
developmental process, and I think that one important reason for
this variability is that the fear is transmitted in that process. If the
child has had a very favorable upbringing, it only serves all the
better to hide the fear of death. After all, repression is made pos-
sible by the natural identification of the child with the powers of
his parents. If he has been well cared for, identification comes
easily and solidly, and his parents' powerful triumph over death
automatically becomes his. What is more natural to banish one's
fears than to live an undisturbed power? And what does the whole
mechanism of repression signify, if not the giving over of one's life-
project? I am going to be talking about these things all the way
through this book and do not want to develop them in this intro-
dictory discussion. What we will see is that the same cut outs for him-
self a manageable world: he throws himself into action uncer-
tainly, unthinkingly. He accepts the cultural programming that turns his
nose where he is supposed to look; he doesn't bite the world off in
one piece as a giant would, but in small manageable pieces, as a
beaver does. He uses all kinds of techniques, which we call the
"character defenses," he learns not to expose himself, not to stand
out; he learns to embed himself in other-power, both of concrete
persons and of things and cultural commands; the result is that he
comes to exist in the imagined infallibility of the world around him.
He doesn't have to have fears when his feet are solidly mired and his
life mapped out in a ready-made maze. All he has to do is to
plunge ahead in a compulsive style of drivenness in the "ways of
the world" that the child learns and in which he lives later as a kind of
giant omniscience—the "strong power of living in the moment
and ignoring and forgetting"—as James put it. This is the deeper
reason that Montaigne's peasant isn't troubled until the very end,
when the Angel of Death, who has always been sitting on his
shoulder, extends his wing. Or at least until he is provo-
curiously startled into dumb awareness, like the "Hashbard" in John Con-
sidered's fine film. At times like this, when the awareness dawns
that has always been blotted out by frenetic, ready-made activity, we
see the transmutation of repression redistilled, so to speak, and the
fear of death emerges in pure essence. This is why people have
psychotic breaks when repression no longer works; when the for-
ward momentum of activity is no longer possible. Besides, the
peasant mentality is far less romantic than Montaigne would have
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down, to be eternal. We might say that his
repression of the idea of his own death is made easy for him be-
cause he is fortified against it by his very narcissistic vitality. This
kind of character probably helped Freud to say that the unconscious
does not know death. Anyway, we know that basic narcissism is
increased when one’s childhood experiences have been surely life-
supporting and warmly enhancing to the sense of self, to the feel-
ing of being really special, truly Number One in creation. The result
is that some people have more of what the psychoanalyst Leon J.
Szasz has aptly called “Tone Sustainment.” It is a sense of bodily
confidence in the face of experience that sees the person more easily
through severe life crises and even sharp personality changes. It
almost seems to take the place of the directive instincts of lower
animals. One can’t help thinking of Freud again, who had more
inner sustainment than most men, thanks to his mother and favor-
able early environment; he knew the confidence and courage that it
gave to a man, and he himself faced up to life and to a fatal cancer
with a Stoic heroism. Again we have evidence that the complex
symbol of fear of death would be very variable in its intensity. It
would be, as Wahl concluded, “profoundly dependent upon the
nature and the vicissitudes of the developmental process.”

But I want to be careful not to make too much of natural vitality
and inner sustainment. As we will see in Chapter Six, even the unusually
favored Freud suffered his whole life from phobias and from
dependency, and he came to fully perceive the world under the
aspect of terror. I don’t believe that the complex symbol of
death is ever absent, no matter how much vitality and inner
sustainment a person has. Even more, if we say that these powers
make repression easy and natural, we are only saying the half of it.
Actually, they get their very power from repression. Psychiatrists
argue that the fear of death varies in intensity depending on the
developmental process, and I think that one important reason for
this variability is that the fear is transmitted in that process. If the
child has had a very favorable upbringing, it only serves all the
better to hide the fear of death. After all, repression is made possi-
bale by the natural identification of the child with the powers of
his parents. If he has been well cared for, identification comes
easily and solidly, and his parents’ powerful triumph over death
automatically becomes his. What is more natural to banish one’s
fears than to live in a duaghted power? And what does the whole
-growing-up period signify, if not the giving over of one’s life-
project? I am going to be talking about these things all the way
through this book and do not want to develop them in this intro-
dictory discussion. What we will see is that we cuts outs for him-
self a manageable world: he throws himself into action unceasingly,
unthinkingly. He accepts the cultural programming that turns his
nose where he is supposed to look; he doesn’t bite the world off in
one piece as a giant would, but in small manageable pieces, as a
beaver does. He uses all kinds of techniques, which we call the
“character defenses”: he learns not to expose himself, not to read
out; he learns to embed himself in other-power, both of concrete
persons and of things and cultural commands; the result is that he
comes to exist in the imagined infallibility of the world around him.
He doesn’t have to have fears when his feet are solidly mixed and
his life mapped out in a ready-made maze. All he has to do is to
plunge ahead in a compulsive style of drivenness in the “ways of
the world” that the child learns and in which he lives later as a kind
of grain quintessence—the “strange power of living in the moment
and ignoring and forgetting”—as James put it. This is the deeper
reason that Montaigne’s peasant isn’t troubled until the very end,
when the Angel of Death, who has always been sitting on his
shoulder, extends his wing. Or at least until he is presently
startled into dumb awareness, like the “Husband” in John Cow-
 savant’s film. At times like this, when the awareness dawns that
has always been blotted out by frantic, ready-made activity, we
see the transmutation of repression redistilled, so to speak, and the
fear of death emerges in pure essence. This is why people have
psychotic breaks when repression no longer works, when the for-
ward momentum of activity is no longer possible. Besides, the
peasant mentality is far less romantic than Montaigne would have
us believe. The peasant’s equanimity is usually immersed in a style of life that has elements of real madness, and so it protects him; an undertone of constant hate and bitterness expressed in feuding, bullying,ickering and family quarrels, the petty megalomania, the self-depression, the superstition, the obsessive control of daily life by a strict authoritarianism, and so on. At the title of a recent essay by Joseph Lopreato has it: “How would you like to be a peasant?”

We will also touch upon another large dimension in which the complex symbol of death is transmuted and transcended by man—belief in immortality, the extension of one’s being into eternity. Right now we can conclude that there are many ways that repression works to calm the anxious human animal, so that he need not be anxious at all.

I think we have reconciled our two divergent positions on the fear of death. The “environmental” and the “innate” positions are both part of the same picture; they merge naturally into one another; it all depends from which angle you approach the picture; from the side of the disguises and transmutations of the fear of death or from the side of its apparent absence. I admit with a sense of scientific uneasiness that whatever angle you use, you don’t get at the actual fear of death; and so I reluctantly agree with Charon that the argument can probably never be clearly “won.” Nevertheless something very important emerges: there are different images of man that he can draw and choose from.

On the one hand, we see a human animal who is partly dead to the world, who is most “dignified” when he shows a certain obliviousness to his fate, when he allows himself to be driven through life, who is most “free” when he lives in secure dependency on powers around him, when he is least in possession of himself. On the other hand, we get an image of a human animal who is overly sensitive to the world, who cannot shut it out, who is thrown back on his own meagre powers, and who seems least free to move and act, least in possession of himself, and most undignified. Whatever image we choose to identify with depends in large part upon ourselves. Let us then explore and develop these images further to see what they reveal to us.

CHAPTER THREE

The Recasting of Some Basic Psychoanalytic Ideas

— From the child of five to myself is but a step. But from the new-born baby to the child of five is an appalling distance.
— Leo Tolstoy

Now that we have outlined the argument in the first two chapters, it is time to fill in the details. Why exactly is the world so terrible for the human animal? Why do people have such trouble digging up the resources to face that terror openly and bravely? To talk about these things takes us right into the heart of psychoanalytic theory and what is now the existential rebirth in psychology; it lays bare the nature of man with a clarity and comprehensiveness that is truly amazing.

Man’s Existential Dilemma

We always knew that there was something peculiar about man, something deep down that characterized him and set him apart from the other animals. It was something that had to go right to his core, something that made him suffer his peculiar fate, that made it impossible to escape. For ages, when philosophers talked about the core of man they referred to it as “essence,” something fixed in his nature, deep down, some special quality or substance. But nothing like it was ever found; man’s peculiarity still remained a dilemma. The reason it was never found, as Erich Fromm put it in