

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University Digital Commons

The Educational Leader, 1937-1959

University Archives

1-1-1953

The Educational Leader, Vol. 16, No. 3

Kansas State Teachers College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/edleader>

Recommended Citation

Kansas State Teachers College, "The Educational Leader, Vol. 16, No. 3" (1953). *The Educational Leader, 1937-1959*. 44.

<https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/edleader/44>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Educational Leader, 1937-1959 by an authorized administrator of Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@pittstate.edu.

PORTER LIBRARY

THE

EDUCATIONAL

LEADER



CONTENTS

THREE TYPES OF COUNSELING:

(Conclusion)

by Clyde R. Baird

III. A Comparison of Principles and Techniques

Similarities

Differences

IV. Conclusions

V. Bibliography

Nationalism: A Bulwark Against the Soviets?

Editorial

JANUARY 1, 1953

VOLUME XVI

NUMBER 3

KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE • PITTSBURG

THE EDUCATIONAL LEADER

*Published in January, April, July and October by the
Office of Publications
Kansas State Teachers College,
Pittsburg, Kansas*

AARON C. BUTLER • EDITOR

*Address all communications to the Office of Publications,
Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas.*

VOLUME XVI • NUMBER 3

THE EDUCATIONAL LEADER

VOLUME XVI • NUMBER 3

Three Types of Counseling (CONCLUSION)

III. A Comparison of Principles and Techniques Similarities

Nondirective, directive, and eclectic counseling are all concerned with the client-counselor relationship. To infer that directive counseling and eclectic counseling are counselor centered is somewhat questionable for the primary aim in all three schools is the focusing of the counseling around the client.⁴⁰ Despite accusations to the contrary by the nondirective group, the other two schools also are client-centered. Sensitivity to client attitude is very important for all schools.⁴¹ It is true that what might be done as a result of this sensitivity would take very divergent paths, especially with the nondirectivists on one side and the directivists and eclecticists on the other.

Certainly all three types of counselors would attempt to submerge their own emotional needs and prejudices, because the autonomy of the client in the independent evaluation of his problem is desirable.⁴² Once the client appears to bog down in his evaluation,

40. Cf. Thorne, *Principles of Personality Counseling*, p. 88 and Hahn and MacLean, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

41. See the following:

Edward S. Bordin, "Dimensions of the Counseling Process," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 4:242 July, 1948.

Erickson, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

S. A. Hamrin, "An Eclectic Approach to Counseling." In S. A. Hamrin and Frank S. Endicott's *Counselors at Work*, Evanston, Illinois, School of Education, Northwestern University, 1947, p. 133.

Rogers, "Significant Aspects of Client-Centered Therapy," p. 421.

E. G. Williamson, "A Concept of Counseling," *Occupations*, 29:188, December, 1950.

Thorne, *Principles of Personality Counseling*, p. 121.

42. Compare these authors:

Ray H. Bixler and Virginia H. Bixler, "Test Interpretation in Vocational Counseling," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 6no1:149, 1946.

Hamrin and Paulson, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

E. H. Porter, "Understanding Diagnostically and Understanding Therapeutically." In E. G. Williamson's *Trends in Student Personnel Work*, Minneapolis, Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press, 1949, p. 116.

Rogers, "Significant Aspects of Client-Centered Therapy," p. 419.

Williamson, "The Clinical Method of Guidance," p. 216.

different means of assistance or leadership would be assumed by the three schools with the directive and eclectic counselors most closely agreeing on the handling of the solution. The autonomy of the client would involve the free expression of feeling and failure to impose arbitrary patterns and goals upon him. None of the schools wish to foist counselor-made decisions upon the client.

All three schools of counseling attempt to establish rapport, since successful counseling can only grow out of a good working relationship. The client is accepted regardless of the attitude that he exhibits for the major aim is to aid him in adjustment.⁴³ Actually all three schools desire that the client verbalize his feelings, and pressure, perhaps a little more subtle in the nondirective counseling, is placed upon the client only in order for him to ventilate his attitudes.

The development of self-direction by the client is the primary aim of counseling in all three groups.⁴⁴ That the client must be assisted in attaining self-understanding and insight into his particular problem and its attendant forces would be accepted. While it is not often described by this phrase in nondirective writing, the aim is, in reality, the development of problem-solving ability. There is the objective in all three schools to assist the client in understanding his present problem and to help in developing enough appreciation of his relationships to his environment that he may solve future problems. The satisfaction of client needs is the primary objective in all three schools.

While it will not be readily admitted by nondirectivists but would be accepted by eclecticists, all counseling is directive to the extent that the counselor sets the stage for counseling. It is he who determines how much responsibility will be given to the client. Counselors in the three schools will direct the details of the case according to scientific procedures of the particular methodology they prefer. As a matter of fact, any counselor is directive to

43. These references will be helpful:
Erickson, *The Counseling Interview*, p. 215.
Hamrin and Paulson, *op. cit.*, p. 103.
Williamson, "A Concept of Counseling," p. 188.
Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy*, p. 41.

44. Compare the following:
Elliott and Elliott, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-225.
Hahn and MacLean, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
Hamrin and Paulson, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, p. 30.
Williamson, "A Concept of Counseling," p. 189.

some extent.⁴⁵ From the statements made by the client, the counselor will select certain ones to reflect back in order to aid the development of better insight or self-understanding.

There is also in all three schools the relationship of dominance by the prestige factor in the superior relationship of the counselor to the client. The nondirectivists may not wish to recognize this relationship, but they cannot deny that it is there and will affect the counseling process. Perhaps that is why some clients are bewildered and cannot accept the less active role played by the nondirective counselor. Both the client and counselor evaluate what takes place in counseling. The eclectic and directive counselors may be more verbal in this evaluation than the nondirective counselor, but it must be admitted that even he will use this evaluation to vary his reflection of client attitudes.

These three schools work on the premise that the client has the capacity for adjustment.⁴⁶ Some clients may demonstrate that temporarily they are unable to take the lead in reaching adjustment (although the recognition of a problem and doing something about it is a good sign), and as a result the directive and eclectic counselors will take this responsibility until the client is able to assume it for himself. This procedure would not be shared by the nondirective counselor, but all three schools would start from the basis assumption of capacity for ultimate adjustment.

This involves another element in thinking about the client and his problem. There would be acceptance of the whole person.⁴⁷ This means viewing him in a democratic light as an individual who has a right to independent thinking and adjustment. Every aspect of his being is viewed as an element in a "whole" person. He cannot be dealt with in segments for he is an integrated personality.

45. Cf. Hamrin and Paulson, *op. cit.*, p. 78 and Ruth Strang "Use in Counseling of Information About Vocations," *School Review*, 55:527, November, 1945. Also cf. Thorne, "Principles of Directive Counseling and Psychotherapy," pp. 161 and 162.

46. See the following:

John G. Darley, *The Interview in Counseling*, Washington, D. C., Superintendent of Documents, 1946, p. 9.

Hamrin, "An Eclectic Approach to Counseling," p. 133.

Rogers, "Significant Aspects of Client-Centered Therapy," p. 417 and 419.

E. G. Williamson, "Directive Versus Non-Directive Counseling," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, 25:335, October, 1950.

47. Compare these writers:

Edward S. Bordin, "Counseling Points of View, Non-Directive and Others," In E. G. Williamson's *Trends in Student Personnel Work*, p. 120.

Hamrin, "An Eclectic Approach to Counseling," p. 133.

Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

Stogdill, *op. cit.*, p. 177-179.

Thorne, *Principles of Personality Counseling*, p. 23.

Williamson, "A Concept of Counseling," p. 189.

That there must be tolerance and acceptance of the client's difference would be agreed upon by all three schools.⁴⁸ No good counselor who is well-trained, regardless of his philosophy, should attempt to remake the client in his own image. This precludes a judgmental and critical attitude of the client just because his views are at variance with those of the counselor. The directive and eclectic counselors would agree that if the client's attitudes are at wide variance with the society in which he lives, there are specific measures that will help him more quickly develop the awareness of variance. The nondirective counselor could not agree with the techniques employed, since he contends that only those insights that arise out of the thinking of the client himself can be of lasting value and integrated into his actions.

Although it is rare to find that nondirective counselors admit the value of interpretation in the counseling process, it has been admitted that interpretation, if used cautiously and intelligently, might increase self-understanding.⁴⁹ With this admission, both directive and eclectic counselors would agree, although they are probably inclined to use it far more often than the nondirective counselor. This same cautious approach to the case history is made by nondirectivists who usually state that the information-getting attitude will impair the counseling relationship. However, at times the case history approach may be indicated, but this is not the ordinary procedure. It is interesting that they agree with directive and eclectic counselors on the value of it in the counseling process,⁵⁰ although nondirective counselors indicate that it should not be obtained from each client, or become the starting point for every interview.

While a minimum emphasis is placed upon information-giving in the nondirective counseling process, there is close agreement between the eclectic counselor and the directive counselor on the value of information in reaching a solution to a problem. Nondirectivists have stated that information may be used when absolutely necessary in clarifying a choice or implementing a decision.⁵¹ So few nondirective writings mention its use that it would appear that it is rarely

48. Consider statements from these authors:

Hamrin, "An Eclectic Approach to Counseling," p. 133.

Ralph K. Meister and Helen E. Miller, "The Dynamics of Non-Directive Psychotherapy," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 2:61, January, 1946.

Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy*, p. 41.

Williamson, *Counseling Adolescents*, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950, preface, vii.

49. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, p. 216.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

51. Rogers and Wallen, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

desirable. This same attitude prevails concerning the use of tests, and while directive and eclectic counselors use them as a regular procedure, the nondirective counselor would use them when necessary. Tests, according to the nondirective counselor, might logically come toward the end of the counseling contact and arise out of the request of the client. That is, they might be used when the client sees the need for them. By both directive and eclectic counselors he would be aided to see the need earlier in the counseling process.⁵²

In summarizing this section on similarities among the three types of counseling it should be noted that there are some major agreements. All three schools base counseling upon respect for the client and his differences as a person. An attempt is made to view him as a total personality, not as isolated bits of action and emotion. A major goal is the development of self-understanding and self-acceptance. The client's capacity for adjustment is assumed by all three schools, and client goals and decisions are the aim of counseling. In reality, all three schools are working toward the development of self-direction in the client. Any counseling worthy of that label must aim toward maintaining personal autonomy and self-direction.

One can see that there are similarities in nondirective, and directive, and eclectic counseling. Do these similarities mean that there is no basic disagreement among the three schools? In answer it might best be said that there are some differences in underlying philosophy, but it is probable that the greatest difference is in how to reach some of the ends of counseling that were summarized in the above paragraph. This paper will next attempt to analyze these differences.

Differences

An evaluation of three types of counseling, nondirective, directive, and eclectic, reveals almost immediately three major differences. At least there are these between eclectic and directive on one side and nondirective on the other. These might be stated as differences in the amount of responsibility to be given the client; the importance placed upon diagnosis; and whether counselor

52. Compare the following:

Hahn and MacLean, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

Hamrin, "An Eclectic Approach to Counseling," p. 134.

Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, p. 250.

Rogers and Wallen, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-103.

Thorne, "Directive Psychotherapy: VII. Imparting Psychological Information," p. 145.

Williamson, *How to Counsel Students*, pp. 136 and 139.

responses to content should be on an intellectual level for reasoning through a problem or on an emotional plane aiming toward a deeper expression of feeling.

Analysis of the nondirective point of view reveals that stress is placed upon permitting the client to enter a warm, permissive atmosphere. From the beginning the client is in the position of solving his own problem, aided, of course, by a sympathetic listener who acts as a sounding board for the projection of the client's ideas. Nondirective counseling is based on the theory that there are growth forces within each individual which enable him to adjust to the environment.⁵³ Directive counselors believe that the counselor can view the client more objectively than the client can view himself.⁵⁴ This means that the directive counselor believes that he has greater insight into the client's problem than has the client. The directive counselor guides the client into channels of thought where he may in time go ahead without the help of the counselor. In contrast, the nondirective counselor creates a relationship wherein the client can do his own exploring, eventually to reach a solution of the problem under his own pace. The eclectic counselor uses either approach, depending upon the particular client and the particular problem. His would be the shifting attack.

Basic to the difference between nondirective and directive counseling on the amount of responsibility to be given to the client is the importance placed upon diagnosis. Both directive and eclectic counselors gather all the available information about the client to study before the interview.⁵⁵ This gives them an acquaintance with his background in order to evaluate his remarks and inferences during the interview. At the same time, if there are omissions in the data available, other information can be secured if it seems pertinent to the problem presented. The study of such information does not mean that they enter into the counseling relationship with preconceived opinions concerning the client. It might be necessary to shift the evaluation of the client and his problem as more information is gathered or is presented by him.

Nondirective counselors declare that the diagnosis would warp the attitude of the counselor, and they further declare that information concerning the background for most cases is superfluous

53. Rogers, "Significant Aspects of Client-Centered Therapy," pp. 417-418.

54. Williamson, *How to Counsel Students*, chapter 4.

55. Cf. Hamrin and Paulson, *op. cit.*, pp. 83 and 84 as well as Williamson, *How to Counsel Students*, p. 104.

56. Cf. C. H. Patterson, "Is Psychotherapy Dependent Upon Diagnosis?" *American Psychologist*, 3:155-159, May, 1948.

and often impedes progress.⁵⁶ Some nondirective counselors point out that the case history is important but that it is dispensed with much of the time since much damage can be done by the information-getting attitude.⁵⁷ To the client, the nondirective counselor believes, it appears that getting information is more important than the problem itself. It is believed that the case history interferes with the treatment process, and while the nondirective counselor might prefer a complete picture of the individual, a choice must be made between obtaining the case history and helping the client solve his problem.⁵⁸ At this point the directive and eclectic counselors would ask how one could help the client make progress toward solving his problem if one knows nothing about his background. Nondirective counselors would counter with the statement that by taking the case history one implies to the client that one can tell him how to solve his problem. The client will, therefore, take no initiative for his problem. Both directive and eclectic counselors would point out that they have found that the giving of information has therapeutic value for the client because as he verbalizes his past history, he perceives it in a new relationship.

On the third area of major difference the eclectic counselor again takes a middle ground with the directive counselor and the nondirective counselor being at opposite ends of the continuum concerning the degree of stimulation of emotional response versus intellectual response. Nondirective counseling places greater stress on emotional elements. Even though the client makes an intellectual expression the counselor attempts to understand the emotionalized attitudes.⁵⁹ Directive counseling believes that the main issue is to take the problem out of the emotional area where rationalization takes place and put the problem into an intellectual frame of reference.⁶⁰ It is the difference between the intellectual process of reasoning out the problem or placing the emphasis upon stimulation of a deeper expression of attitude.

Nondirective counselors declare that the directivist (and the eclecticist when he uses it) may use information in an attempt to solve a problem and thereby fail to note the disguise of motives by the client who requested information. Particular reference is made to the giving of test results, because this tends to keep the problem discussion on a content level rather than an attitude level.

57. William U. Snyder, "Dr. Thorne's Critique of Nondirective Psychotherapy." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 40:336-339, July, 1945.

58. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, p. 81.

59. Rogers, "Significant Aspects of Client-Centered Therapy," p. 416.

60. Williamson, "Directive versus Non-Directive Counseling," p. 334.

Both eclectic and directive counselors take the stand that it is not necessary to respond at the time an attitude is expressed. Perhaps they may do so initially and perhaps not, but in time they may call the attention of the client to the various attitudes he has expressed concerning a particular area.

The predictability of the counseling process is another important difference between nondirective counseling and the other two points of view. Analyses of interviews have revealed that there are steps through which a client will progress when the nondirective method is employed successfully.⁶¹

Both the eclectic and directive counselors use interpretation rather extensively in dealing with clients whereas the nondirective counselor is wary of its use. The nondirectivist fears that while he may make the right interpretation the client may not be ready to accept it himself. Or there is the danger that the counselor may misinterpret since he gives what he thinks the client is thinking. Eclecticists and directivists are of the opinion that the counselor's interpretation is based upon wide experience and broader knowledge. As a result he is better able to predict outcomes. This means that he must have skill in judgment-making, but this does not mean interpretation with a moralistic evaluation.

Opposed to the other two schools, the nondirectivist does not believe in giving advice, suggestion, or direction. He believes that the client will lean on someone else and fail to gain self-reliance. However, the eclectic and directive counselors believe that learning to make a choice is the most important outcome of counseling. As a result the counselor must bring past and future events into the picture in order to aid the student to the next step. While the directive counselor is skeptical of the value of judgments that the client would make about himself, the nondirective counselor works on the assumption that the client must be assisted to accept his own feelings. The eclectic counselor would stress the appropriateness of application of advice, suggestion, and direction. This appropriateness would be determined by the particular client and his particular problem.

It is recognized that there is usually critical evaluation of advice by the person who receives it, and he will accept or reject it according to his needs. At least there will be an immediate reaction, but the prestige of the counselor will be an element in the considera-

61. Cf. Rogers and Wallen, *op. cit.*, p. 47. and William U. Snyder, "An Investigation of the Nature of Nondirective Psychotherapy," *Journal of General Psychology*, 33:193-224, October, 1945.

tion of the advice and may be a factor in its later incorporation into the thinking of the client.

Nondirective counselors disagree with the other two schools on the use of reassurance in the counseling process. It is the contention of nondirective counselors that it will foster dependence on the counselor or tend to lull the client into a false sense of security. Eclectic and directive counselors find that it is helpful to relieve tension or despair when the client's burdens overwhelm him.

Reassurance for some clients will provide protection in an otherwise hostile environment, because in the counseling relationship there is an uncritical attitude. Much criticism is directed toward the use of reassurance because it does not appreciably influence underlying mechanisms. It tends to operate on a superficial level, but it is not considered harmful or dangerous. Much of the criticism arises out of its crude, unskilled use. It is harmful particularly when there is an attempt to hide the truth from the client. This may result in resentment as he senses the counselor's evasion of truth. It may do little harm to the client, but its irrelevancy may weaken rapport. Sometimes it is ineffective and a waste of time, especially if one uses it only as a "pat-on-the-back" gesture.

Some nondirective counselors have held the point of view that the more the client talked during the interview the more insight he gained. At least this is the conclusion that one is forced to make as he reads in the field. According to the research of Carnes and Robinson⁶² the amount of client talk cannot be used as a criterion of the effectiveness of counseling.

Their study concerned seventy-eight typescripts of counseling interviews. They involved the relationship of client talk and the different variables such as the counselor technique, the topic being discussed, the growth of insight, and the progress of the interviews. Only a low positive relationship was found with growth in client insight. There was, however, a higher correlation between client talk and client responsibility for the progress of the interview.

This bit of research becomes especially important when it is noted that there is usually a great deal of difference between the amount of client talk in directive and nondirective interviews. The latter group, in the research above, had a much greater portion of the time taken by the client talk than did the directive group.

⁶². Earl F. Carnes and Francis P. Robinson, "The Role of Client Talk in the Counseling Interview," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, No. 4:635-644, 1944. Cf. Snyder, "An Investigation of the Nature of Nondirective Psychotherapy."

However, this higher amount of client talk was apparently not more highly related to client insight.

Since questions are essentially directive in nature, the non-directive counselor very carefully avoids questions if at all possible except for the nondirective lead which is a very general question used to open the conversation of the interview but not to direct it. Both eclectic and directive counselors find it helpful to ask a client "Where?", "Why?", "When?", or "How?" since they will aid him in revealing feelings and attitudes. Questions like these force the client to face a fact. At least his attention may be directed to casual relationships which may have previously been unrecognized. Through questioning, the client can be led to perceive his part in the complicated environment in which he lives.

There is a significant difference among the three types of counseling being considered in that nondirective counseling has no elasticity of method. The rigid adherence to nondirective techniques makes it somewhat ineffective with certain clients.⁶³ Both directive and eclectic counseling make use of a wide range of techniques. The very flexibility of these two methods sets them apart from the nondirective method.

A major criticism of the nondirective method of counseling is aimed at the use of the method and not at the method itself. Very often articles devoted to nondirective counseling leave the impression that any deviation from the method is undesirable if not somewhat dangerous. On the other hand, the directive and eclectic counselors point out that the individualized approach must be used, and, therefore, a combination of methods may be more effective than either approach by itself. This combination of methods is also decried by nondirective counselors. While some nondirectivists admit that it may be better to use directive approach with a particular client,⁶⁴ one is usually warned to use a method consistently and not change from one to the other in the process of counseling. Yet as one reads recorded nondirective counseling cases, he will find that the counselor's replies often seem wooden and stilted. Frequently there appears to be failure to follow significant leads, since following significant leads would mean the use of techniques other than nondirective. When the interview bogs down, the continued use of the nondirective method often makes the situation worse whereas a directive question or an eclectic reference to previous

63. Thorne, "Critique of Nondirective Methods of Psychotherapy," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 39:465, October, 1944.

64. Snyder, "Dr. Thorne's Critique of Nondirective Therapy," p. 337. Cf. Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy*, p. 24.

conversation might have saved the interview. Placing all the responsibility on the client may block flow of expression, since the responsibility may overwhelm him and merely lead to floundering. At the same time, both directive and eclectic counselors suggest that the client often gives leads that may be of great importance but that the client may not be aware of the importance. At other times a directive approach is recommended when the client resists the uncovering of repressed material.

There is a great difference between nondirective and directive counseling in the philosophy of counselor training.⁶⁵ Nondirective counselors can be trained in a short period of time in the processes of relieving anxiety and helping people gain insights into their problems. These persons will not be psychological experts, but they will help fill the pressing need for counselors. On the other hand, the directive school looks upon counselor training as a long time process, since one must be more than a reflecting listener. His role is looked upon as that of an intelligent participant, a role that takes time to develop.

Perhaps it should be stated that Williamson⁶⁶ disagrees with those who use the term "eclectic" to denote the selection of the appropriate or relevant technique for a particular problem. He looks upon counseling as embracing a great variety of techniques, but he does not look upon these techniques as fused and interwoven into a unitary concept. Here, of course, he would find those who write of the eclectic approach in disagreement with him, since it is often pointed out that eclecticism is the methodology which offers the greatest promise for meeting different types of clients with different types of problems.⁶⁷

Differences among three types of counseling have been noted in this section. Three major differences set nondirective counseling apart from directive and eclectic counseling. These three include the differences in the amount of responsibility given to the client; in the importance of diagnosis; and in intellectual versus emotional response.

65. Carl R. Rogers, "Nondirective Counseling As an Effective Technique." In John R. Yale's *Frontier Thinking in Guidance*, Chicago, Science Research Associates, 1945, p. 112.

Cf. Williamson, "Counseling Adolescents, p. 20.

Also, see Thorne, "Principles of Directive Counseling and Psychotherapy," p. 165.

66. E. G. Williamson, "A Concept of Counseling," *Occupations* 29:183, December, 1950.

67. Thorne, *Principles of Personality Counseling*, pp. 22, 112, 120.

Nondirective counselors utilize reflection of feeling, simple acceptance, structuring, and the nondirective lead. Eclectic counselors draw upon these techniques but would turn, if believed helpful, to questioning, reassurance or praise, interpretation, advice and suggestion, persuasion, and explanation. Directive counselors are more extreme in the use of techniques just given for eclectic counselors, and they are more active in the interview from the very beginning of the relationship.

The greatest differences are seen between nondirective and directive counselors. Eclectic counselors follow nondirective techniques but use others that would not be accepted by the nondirective counselor. At the same time, eclectic counselors are probably not as active in leading the interview as are directive counselors and rely, if possible, upon passive techniques which are usually rejected by directive counselors.

IV. Conclusions

Most counselors in educational institutions will meet a whole host of problems in the typical day's work. What should they use as a basic philosophy in meeting these problems? Is it necessary to adopt one school of thought and rely upon it, regardless of the kind of problem? Are two of the main schools, directive and nondirective, so unrelated that it is not safe to shift from one to the other? Or can one believe with the eclectic group that the two schools are compatible? These are practical questions that need to be answered by the counselor who is attempting to develop a point of view that he might follow in dealing with the clients who come to him.

Since the nondirective counselor places his emphasis upon a role of acceptance and clarification of the client's expressed feelings, he creates a situation in which the client feels a great deal of personal freedom in using the counseling period. This approach seems particularly effective in establishing rapport and bringing to the surface the problem that propelled the client to seek counseling. But what about the client who feels that the "personal" problem has been alleviated but desires the assistance of the counselor in developing better study skills? Will the nondirective method be sufficient to help the client evaluate his ability in relation to school progress and in the selection of better means of handling daily assignments? What if he needs specific suggestions on how to organize his study program, how to study for a midterm examination, and how to utilize library materials? It would seem suggestions on these things would not be inappropriate, and prior to them it might be necessary

to evaluate the client's abilities and achievements by a thorough diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses. Is it possible that rigid use of the nondirective technique might tend to center the client's attention so much on the emotional aspects of his problems that he might fail to mention the specific help desired on methods of study or some similar topic?

The nondirective counseling approach will not be adequate for the handling of all problems. Very often a counselor attempts to maintain his reputation of being "client-centered," but he can still be "client-centered" and assist the counselee in making choices. Despite nondirective articles to the contrary, the directive counselor does not enter the counseling situation with a preconceived goal in mind and spend his energy pushing the client toward that goal. Instead, upon the basis of experience and training, he may believe that the data at hand suggest a probable direction and may start the interview in that direction, but he is quick to re-evaluate that procedure when the client disagrees with the trend suggested. Client-selected goals are the ultimate aim, and while alternatives are offered to the client they are not forced upon him.

If we look upon counseling in terms of the total adjustment of the individual, it will be necessary to view every aspect of his being. It is not advisable to divide problems into educational, vocational, and personal except for pure convenience of explanation, since all aspects of adjustment are interrelated. However, consider the student who cannot reach a decision regarding the vocation that he might select and train for upon graduation from high school. Back of his quandary is some aspect of adjustment that makes him indecisive in all matters. Must not personal adjustment be made before anything can be done regarding the selection of vocation? It would seem that different methods would be necessary to handle these different parts of the total adjustment problem. Until he has been able to handle frustration and tension can he assimilate test information and occupational data. There has to be a state of readiness for information of this sort, and there is a great likelihood that it will be distorted unless the tension and frustration have been met already. They can be best drawn out by the nondirective methods through which the client ventilates his feelings and sees them accepted without judgment or moralization.

At times one who is attempting to develop a philosophy in dealing with students in the face-to-face relationship of counseling cannot help wondering whom he should believe. There are so many con-

flicting views stated in the literature. There was this point of view in one issue of *The American Psychologist*.⁶⁸

Symptomatic or palliative therapy, involving suggestion, persuasion, reassurance, support, sympathy, etc., is admittedly ineffective in reaching at conflicts and tensions involved in maladjustment. In addition, these techniques, together with questioning, probing, advice and interpretation, restrict the freedom of the patient and foster dependence, which are inimical to his progress in solving his own problems.

In contrast, there was in the same journal the following article which had many opposite points of view.⁶⁹

Some of the neglected methods such as suggestion, hypnosis, reconditioning or reassurance may well turn out to have such startling possibilities when properly used as did uranium in relation to the atom bomb.

Both of these articles are dealing with a more advanced form of therapy than one might be concerned with in many educational institutions; yet these quotations are offered as the kind of thing that one experiences in attempting to evaluate the different points of view. In one instance there is recommended the use of suggestion and reassurance but in the other they are condemned.

In counseling one should help the individual in the way that he expects help. Very often direct assistance from someone else is necessary for him to achieve inner growth. Perhaps another client with whom one might deal would find direct assistance was restrictive to growth. Those individuals who seek information of some kind will not be helped by the reflection of their attitude of needing help. The client seeks out the expert for advice, suggestion, alternatives, or recommendations, and he does not come to have ideas imposed upon him but rather offered to him. Certainly, one cannot impose insight upon another, but one can provide information that will lead to the development of insight.

It seems to this writer that one cannot look upon counseling techniques as an "all-or-none" or as an "either-or" proposition. It must be a "both-and" approach to the use of techniques. Williamson⁷⁰ has suggested that the heart of the whole problem is centered

68. Patterson, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

69. Thorne, "Principles of Directive Counseling and Psychotherapy," p. 165.

70. E. G. Williamson, "Directive versus Non-Directive Counseling," p. 336.

upon the ideas surrounding the relation of inner and outer forces to individual growth. As a result, one must use techniques that develop both inner and outer forces.

When one is working with clients he should be aware that they are going to be members of a democratic society, and part of the counselor's job is to help them grow and learn and develop into members of the society in which they live. The individual must make his own choices, and in the counseling process he must be aided to develop that maturity which will assist him in understanding himself and his relation with other people.

Perhaps the client can best be assisted by what is frequently called the eclectic approach in counseling. From directive counseling this approach borrows the technique in using test data and all kinds of background information in assisting the client solve his problem. From nondirective counseling it utilizes the freedom of expression for aiding the client to talk out emotionalized attitudes and thereby experience insight into those attitudes. There is the further borrowing of the idea that the counselee does more of the talking, and at all times it is his responsibility to make decisions and to plan for himself.

The eclectic counselor should at all times attempt to identify the problem and utilize information that will help in the formulation of ideas (not attitudes) concerning the problem. Strict adherence to either the nondirective or the directive methods will lead to inflexibility and tend to make one less observant than necessary. That is, there will be a tendency to be more attentive to the technique than to the client. The good counselor needs to know the different methods and how to use them, being able to adjust them to different interviewing problems and different types of counsees. The effective counselor realizes that the technique must fit himself as well as the counselee.

All through his life the counselor has been developing ways of meeting and dealing with people. He will not be able to use an interviewing skill that is not congenial to his approach to people. Counseling becomes a personalized skill, and the techniques that one uses should be adapted to his personality and his differences and must be considered in relation to the personality of the client and his differences. As yet there is not enough evidence to indicate that any one method is superior to another. Success is seen in some

instances in all the techniques discussed in this paper. This suggests that they all are appropriate on occasions with certain clients and certain problems. One needs to know in which instances a technique has been used most successfully in order that he may shape it and adapt it to his own personality. The counselor needs to take the best of all the techniques and the various schools of thought. The methodology of counseling has its greatest promise in a synthesis of techniques in order that the counselor will be able to deal adequately with a wide variety of problems and a wide variety of personalities.

V. Bibliography

- Andrews, Jean Stewart. "Directive Psychotherapy: I. Reassurance." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1:52-66, January, 1945.
- Arbuckle, Dugald S. "Good Counseling—What Is It?" *Educational Administration and Supervision*. 34:304-9, May, 1948.
- Berdie, Ralph F. "Counseling: An Educational Technique." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 9no1:89-94, 1949.
- Bixler, Ray H. "Counseling: Eclectic or Systematic?" *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 8no2:211-215, 1948
- and Bixler, Virginia H. "Test Interpretation in Vocational Counseling." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 6no1:145-155, 1946.
- Bordin, Edward D. "Counseling Points of View, Non-Directive and Others." In E. G. Williamson's *Trends in Student Personnel Work*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1949. Pp. 120-129.
- . "Developments in Interviewing Techniques." In E. G. Williamson's *Trends in Student Personnel Work*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1949. Pp. 105-113.
- . "Diagnosis in Counseling and Psychotherapy." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 6no2:169-184, 1946.
- . "Dimensions of the Counseling Process." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 4:240-244, July, 1948.
- and Bixler, Ray H. "Test Selection: A Process of Counseling." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 6no2:361-374, 1946.
- Butler, John M. "On the Role of Directive and Non-Directive Techniques in the Counseling Process." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 8no2:201-09, 1948.
- Carnes, Earl F. and Robinson, Francis P. "The Role of Client Talk in the Counseling Interview." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 8no4:635-44, 1948.
- Combs, Arthur W. "Non-Directive Techniques and Vocational Counseling." *Occupations*. 25:261-67, February, 1947.
- Curran, Charles A. "Structuring the Counseling Relationship: A Case Report." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 39:189-216, April, 1944.
- Darley, J. G. *Testing and Counseling in the High School Guidance Program*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1943. Chapters 5, 6, and 7.
- . *The Interview in Counseling*. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, 1946.
- . "The Structure of the Systematic Case Study in Individual Diagnosis and Counseling." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. 4:215-220, November-December, 1940.
- Elliott, H. S. and Elliott, Grace L. *Solving Personal Problems*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1936.
- Erickson, Clifford E. *The Counseling Interview*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.
- Garrett, Annette. *Interviewing, Its Principles and Methods*. New York: Family Welfare Association of America, 1942.
- Hahn, Milton E. and Kendall, William E. "Some Comments in Defense of 'Non-Non-Directive' Counseling." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. 11:74-81, March, 1947.
- and MacLean, Malcolm S. *General Clinical Counseling*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1950.
- Hamrin, S. A. "An Eclectic Approach to Counseling." In S. A. Hamrin and Frank S. Endicott's *Counselors at Work*. Evanston, Ill.: School of Education, Northwestern University, 1947.

- _____ and Paulson, Blanche B. *Counseling Adolescents*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1950.
- Jones, E. S. "Graduations of Directiveness in Counseling." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 7no3:559-63, 1947.
- Meister, Ralph K. and Miller Helen E. "The Dynamics of Non-Directive Psychotherapy." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 2:59-68, January, 1946.
- Patterson, C. H. "Is Psychotherapy Dependent Upon Diagnosis?" *American Psychologist*. 3:155-159, May, 1948.
- Pepinsky, Harold B. "Application of Informal Projective Methods in the Counseling Interview." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 7no1:135-140, 1947.
- _____. *The Selection and Use of Diagnostic Categories in Clinical Counseling*. Applied Psychology Monographs. Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press, 1948. No. 15.
- Porter, E. H. "Understanding Diagnostically and Understanding Therapeutically." In E. G. Williamson's *Trends in Student Personnel Work*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1949. Pp. 113-120.
- Robinson, Francis P. "Are 'Non-Directive' Techniques Sometimes Too Directive?" *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 2:368-371, October, 1946.
- Rogers, Carl R. *Client-Centered Therapy*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951. Chapters 1-5.
- _____. *Counseling and Psychotherapy*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942. Chapters 1-9.
- _____. "Nondirective Counseling as an Effective Technique." In John R. Yale's *Frontier Thinking in Guidance*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1945. Pp. 105-113.
- _____. "Significant Aspects of Client-Centered Therapy." *The American Psychologist*. 1:415-23, October, 1946.
- _____. "The Development of Insight in a Counseling Relationship." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. 8:331-341, November-December, 1944.
- _____ and Wallen, John L. *Counseling with Returned Servicemen*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.
- Snyder, William U. "A Short-term Nondirective Treatment of an Adult." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Clinical Supplement*. Pp. 87-137, April, 1943.
- _____. "An Investigation of the Nature of Nondirective Psychotherapy." *Journal of General Psychology*. 33:193-224, October, 1945.
- _____. *Casebook of Nondirective Therapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.
- _____. "Dr. Thorne's Critique of Nondirective Psychotherapy." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 40:336-339, July, 1945.
- Stogdill, Emily L. "Techniques of Student Counseling." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. 4:176-180, September-October, 1940.
- Stone, D. R. "Logical Analysis of the Directive, Non-Directive Counseling Continuum." *Occupations*. 28:295-8, February, 1950.
- Straug, Ruth "Use in Counseling of Information about Vocations." *School Review*. 53:526-529, November, 1945.
- Thorne, Frederick C. "A Critique of Nondirective Methods of Psychotherapy." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 39:459-471, October, 1944.
- _____. "Directive Psychotherapy: II. The Theory of Self-Consistency." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1:155-162, April, 1945.
- _____. "Directive Psychotherapy: IV. The Therapeutic Implications of the Case History." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1:318-330, October, 1945.
- _____. "Directive Psychotherapy: VII. Imparting Psychological Information." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 2:179-190, April, 1946.

- . "Further Critique of Nondirective Methods of Psychotherapy." *Journal of Clinical Psychology. Monograph Supplement*. No. 4, July, 1948. Pp. 32-39.
- . "Principles of Directive Counseling and Psychotherapy." *The American Psychologist*. 3:160-166, May, 1948.
- . *Principles of Personality Counseling*. Brandon, Vermont: Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1950.
- Williamson, E. G. "A Concept of Counseling." *Occupations*. 29:182-189, December, 1950.
- . *Counseling Adolescents*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.
- . "Directive versus Non-Directive Counseling." *California Journal of Secondary Education*. 25:332-6, October, 1950.
- . *How to Counsel Students*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939. Chapters 1-7.
- . "The Clinical Method of Guidance." *Review of Educational Research*. 9:214-217, April, 1939.
- and Foley, J. D. *Counseling and Discipline*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949.

Nationalism: A Bulwark Against the Soviets?

However important we regard the issue of nationalism in the modern world picture, it is certain that nationalism is a prime target of Bolshevism on the march.

Nowhere in the array of Bolshevik techniques is this more apparent than in their ideology. Ideologically nationalism is good for only one country: Russia. All other nations, if nationalist as in the West, are sinful, or if pledged to Russia as in the satellites, are internationalist and in that special sense virtuous.

We use moral terms because Communist ideology describes itself in such terms.

It has become classic of course to include Marxian dogma in a discussion of Russian ideology, to indicate the numerous departures from Marx inaugurated by Stalin. These very facts are often molded to the theme that ideology is simply an occasional tool for the marshal. But it does not follow from the provable error of Marx that only the error has been evaded by Stalin; nor that of the wisdom of Lenin only the wisdom has been retained. It was, on the contrary, Marxian delusion that kept Stalin confident so long that collapse financially of the West was imminent. It was Lenin wisdom he ignored in the attempt to increase grain production in the Ukraine by invariable collectivization and mass purges, an attempt that failed.

It needn't be Marxism to be Bolshevik ideology and it needn't be Leninism to be dogmatically false. It can be a synthesis, or something new—Stalinism—and yet be false.

Soviet expansion has now entered the stage where ideology of nationalism must undergo the supreme test.

Prior to the success of the Chinese Communists in the Civil War, a single satellite commanded sufficient force to choose nationalism over Russian amalgamation: Yugoslavia. Reprisals against that country were momentarily expected to take military form. Five years have passed and only the verbal effluvia of religious excommunication has been posed by the Soviets against their "brother-in bonds."

The Chinese problem sooner or later will force an essential reconsideration of the Bolshevik ideology of final loyalty to Moscow.

Here is a country worth holding as an ally, yet a country strong enough to go its own way.

The reconsideration may be the responsibility of a new generation of Russian rulers if such postponements as the Korean diversion and non-admission to the United Nations can avoid a show-down over the utility of Russian partnership, or over the courtesy of a Russian withdrawal from Manchuria.

It would then be seen if narrow, unscientific education tuned to the refrain of party loyalty and that novel indicium of loyalty—conformity—can produce succeeding generations of originators, or selective emulators, of the quality of a Lenin or Stalin.

Can the Communist student “lose his chains” if potent nationalism is the first reef to test his neat ideological bark?

I think the emotional loyalty evoked by Communist ideology is such as to qualify it as a substitute for religious devotion as seen in the western world.

And generalizations about nationalism, religion and ideology are as deceptive as any other generalizations. Nevertheless certain historical facts are useful in comparing the relative force of these two, or three, phenomena.

For example, a proud Pan-Islam move of World War I was not successful in harnessing the Arabs to the Turks, while nationalism did succeed in winning them for the Allies.¹

On the other hand, religious independence for Pakistan was more intriguing to the Indian Moslems than a united Commonwealth of India.

From these it might be concluded that a non-nationalist appeal by Communist ideologists would not succeed with the Arabs (assuming they had the national force to make any difference) and would succeed in Pakistan.

But actually Russian ideology in this case brings to bear a double-barrelled piece: (1) Russian nationalism itself and (2) intolerance for all religion² and the substitution of Communist ideology for all religion, going on in Rumania.

So foreign nationalisms may be the tool of disruption used by the Bolsheviks, serving admirably to dismember little by little English, French and Dutch colonies. The sword is two-edged, however, once the dismemberment occurs. While Czech nationalism, fatally near the Moscow fulcrum, was summarily destructible, Chinese

1. Lenczowski, *The Middle East in Foreign Affairs*, p. 52.

2. *The Boston Herald*, August 17, 1952, p. 3.

nationalism, Indian nationalism, even Philippine nationalism weighing down a long leverage, are not so soluble in a flood of force.

Alliances consummated in the hope of national independence know no loyalties. India's Ghose was pro-Japanese not because he was a fascist but because he was a nationalist, opposed to Britain whom Japan also opposed.³

If the gamut of emerging strong nationalisms are a deterrent to Russian imperialism, they are no less a handicap to American hopes for joint defense.

Indian neutrality, in face of a Western heritage of a sort, is the evidence par excellence. Japan and the Philippines, too, though no military problem in the event of actual war, offer difficulties at the moment in that we have encouraged the very nationalisms now critical of us.

Our own nationalism hobbles us on occasion. A fact becoming increasingly and devastatingly obvious to Americans with a modicum of objectivity is that the American style of freedom is not a congenital human want. This cannot be answered by the contention that what is not known will not be desired. Flattering as it is to receive an Olympic star as a Russian deserter, we must nevertheless confess he and others like him fled from something known, and forfeited, to something entirely unknown, without positive appeal.

At best nationalism is a mixed asset in the East-West conflict. Again American nationalism is useful in stirring a war spirit but its embers after the armistice have in the past fed isolationism and a sacrifice of the peace.

Nationalism is a mixed asset of definite weaknesses.

It must assert national superiority which is always in danger of objective rebuttal.

Perhaps its greatest weakness is its dependence on a militant desire for freedom, which is not a constant flame in the human breast.⁴ There are less solid historical analyses than that many nationalisms would never have been born without external domination to provide a merging force.

Further, the intensity of the nationalistic urge is in no way related to capacity for self-government. The abandonment of the field in Burma by the British after the Second World War brought this point sharply into focus creating a vacuum favorable to foreign exploitation far worse than the British hegemony.

3. D. W. Brogan, *The Price of Revolution*, p. 250.

4. D. W. Brogan, *The Price of Revolution*, p. 250.

Nationalism has ideological as well as practical drawbacks. Carried to the ultimate logic, nationalism means self-determination for every group within presently constituted nations. It is thus self-destructive potentially.

But that the supposed expertness of Stalin on the subject (so long as you stay close to Russia) is confounded by the relatively anemic nationalist "deviation" of Tito is obvious. Manchuria, as a nationalist China's *sine qua non*, may yet prove the Communist heel of Achilles.

Apologists for the Bolsheviks idealize the Stalin tactic in allowing numerous 'autonomies', based on nationalisms within Russia. Their contentions pinpoint the varying forms nationalism may take.

If it has a pure form, nationalism is fundamentally a political movement. The "independence" it seeks usually is political independence. It may find economic dependence inescapable but this is, often as not, held a secondary consideration. In fact, before World War II incipient nationalisms in Southeast Asia were well-controlled with the mere promise of gradual independence-to-come, comprised of native participation in government but not necessarily economic reorientation.⁵

Comrade Stalin, the "genius" at solving nationalist problems, got by more cheaply yet. Neither political nor economic independence in any real measure was granted. The Ukraine and Byelorussia had the physical boundaries of states. They had the framework of a local government and the Constitution had some mumbo-jumbo about withdrawal from the Soviet Union by the states. The window-dressing was paper maché. At no time was any real sovereignty imparted to the local government. Local dialects and languages were encouraged. If the language in some of the outlying areas was only oral, the government in Moscow provided them an alphabet and a literature off the assembly line. The nationalist expression produced by Stalin may be regarded the minimum force a movement may have to get itself identified as nationalism.

Again it may be assumed in a different connection, that where nationalism is basically a cultural movement, or a religious movement as in Pakistan, any such jerkwater treatment as Stalin is famous for would stand as a straw in the blast.

In the same way as American nationalism of the superficial emotionality of the Hearst press is a weakness of the movement, from the point of view of the West, so a revival of Russian nationalism, such as carried over from the war against the Nazis, is an

5. H. M. Vinacke, *The United States and the Far East*, p. 4.

advantage of the movement for the West. For Marxism, the creation of a German Jew writing in England, never visiting Russia, is a succulent morsel in comparison to the bitter pill of Russification, though the long-term results may be no worse.

Russification made German sympathizers in the Ukraine, and in the Crimea. It makes guerrillas in the satellite countries today. Stalin's glorified solution of the nationalist problem was no solution at all. With two centuries of Russian habitation to help him he could not alter the German propensities of the pre-war Volga settlements.

It is a fascinating, perhaps sobering, speculation to imagine how weakness could be made strength if the Soviet Union were adaptable to favored-nation treaties with the newly formed nations of Asia and Southeast Asia, instead of ideologically committed to proselytizing them for the heaven of communism.

What are the prospects for such a shift?

At this point emerges two mutually exclusive threats to the Western world: (1) delay of the resolution of the East-West conflict until Russia and her satellites, possibly even China, are predominantly peopled and completely governed by the products of the Soviet educational experiment, typified by Gromyko and Malik, and almost ludicrously mysterious to Americans; (2) re-directing of the Russian or Chinese policies or both, by a dictatorship freed of ideological dogmatism altogether.

In the first case time works for us in a very special way: if these zealous automatons confound us, we also confound them. By the time they are ready for service to their state the entire foundation of their dogma may be swept away by a change, such as British socialism, which the flexibility of democracy allows but which the Russian mind cannot somehow fathom.

To date Communist policy has emanated from cerebra conditioned not by totalitarian education but by the individualism now subject to elimination under Communism.

This is not to assume that there is an ectoplasm of originality benefitting the thinking of subjects of a democracy, which is not available to subjects of a dictatorship. I do suggest, however, that Communist dogmatism exists, that it is growing, and that like any other dogmatism, including that perpetrable by a democracy, it can be harmful to the Communists as well as to us. This seems self-evident and yet contemporary views that Communist ideology is an effective sword of a single edge, prevail.

The second threat is more serious but less likely to materialize. Realism seems peculiarly reserved for mature nations. Young nations, in terms of growing strength, somehow must be brashly aggressive in all their doings. Moderation and mildness, attributes of long-lived power like Britain's are seemingly not available to the surging nation's leadership, even if that leadership is wise enough to value those qualities.

When we think of a Hitler who might have stormed England immediately France fell; who might have gone to India to meet the Japanese instead of to Russia to meet defeat; who might have evaded war with the United States for some time after Pearl Harbor, we have a mingled sense of relief in retrospect and foreboding in prospect. If Russia does not produce such realism perhaps China or India will. Perhaps for them nationalism could be utilized first as a weapon of empire dismemberment, then circumvented as an obstacle to favored-nation treaties.

In such an event, our salvation seems to me not to lie in making democrats out of them in our terms. We must admit the validity of their own destiny control. Eighty percent of America has never faced the fact that the white race is a pitiful minority the globe over. We cannot stand alone but temporarily, General MacArthur to the contrary notwithstanding. We fear they will bankrupt us, but actually we are bankrupt without them. Asia clamors for industrialization. Russia exports it plus ideology. We can provide it better and let it speak our ideology for us: live and help live.

In this respect the final advantage we can make of nationalism is the modification of our own nationalism.

We have a most compelling reason—survival—for doing so.