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INTRODUCTION

This is a study in the uses of power and the role of authority in adolescent development. A basic feature in the emotional maturation of every human being consists of his or her continued encounters with relationships of power and authority, encounters that involve interactions of both conflict and collaboration between the growing person and the others in his environment who assert some degree of control over his behavior, beginning with parental control. Every human must resolve the problems of these encounters in order to establish an adult capacity to relate to others and to the social environment. As we will see, there is a range of possible solutions, from adaptive to maladaptive to disastrous, and these have been undergoing significant changes due to the rapid evolution of social structures and functions. The contemporary circumstances of modernizing western societies have lent intensity to the conflict, and the recent crisis of authority helps to crystallize some of the issues in what we consider to be an ongoing intergenerational conflict.

Power and authority are weighty words, signifying limits, the coercive challenge to freedom, the mass of formal civilization as it weighs on each of us. These terms are often used interchangeably, but their connotations in interpersonal interactions are often significantly divergent. The definitions and distinctions to follow are our own for the purposes of this report. They emphasize the differences as they may be conveyed and felt in psychological, interpersonal terms, rather than the many areas of blend and overlap, some of which will also be noted.
Power: a physical term with mathematical definition, an engineering word, which, in the human context, reminds us of the formal constraint that police, armies, and governmental forces employ. It is the capacity to make individuals or groups do what they would rather not do by exerting force or the threat of force, to impose a decision unilaterally. In this sense, it conjures up the stereotype of the boss, the dictator, the person who controls supplies, the person with the gun, and, at times, the parent with the very small child.

Authority: no physical meaning here, nor any symbolic formula in algebraic terms. It is an altogether human word, one that may bespeak adoration and veneration, that describes respect for the police officer’s badge rather than fear of his gun. A scholar may have authority by virtue of his knowledge, may be an authority because of his command of his field. A spiritual leader may have authority in part because of his virtue, in part because of the role he plays in the lives and feelings and perspectives of the faithful, or even of the non-believers.

Power, in our usage here, resides in the ability to coerce; authority, in the belief systems of people. Stalin spoke to this when he asked: “How many divisions does the Pope command?” Power is demonstrable, material: It can be measured. Authority is more negotiable and subject to validation; it is contained in symbols and meaning sequences in the established web of human relationships and cultural attitudes. Authority is a broader concept and involves more complex processes. Effective authority depends on an interpersonal exchange in which the functions of decision and control, whether exercised by persons or by laws and institutions, are perceived as legitimate, and which dissipate unless continuously validated and reinforced. Legitimacy depends upon a wide range of qualities including precedent, expertise, moral assumptions, and expectation of the fairness or justice of decision. The capacity to exercise even legitimate authority may require the “power” to enforce it because even validly-based authority may still be rendered socially, interpersonally or intrapsychically impotent. However, the kind of power that rightfully belongs to such authority is psychologically different from that which is illegitimately usurped and unilaterally imposed, which is the quality that we are here distinguishing from authority.

Such power is a less subtle function. In the narrowest sense power grows from the barrel of a gun as Mao Tse Tung observed. As we have noted, power is often a component of authority, but it is only one component; its validity derives from the rightfulness of the authority, and it is not then an end in itself. When the capacity of authorities to dispense justice, to act morally, to cope with change is questioned, their authority is eroded; frequently the response of authorities, whether parents or political leaders, is to escalate the exercise of coercive power in the assertion of control. In a similar vein, that which looks like authority in the sense we use here may sometimes have a hidden basis of coercive power. For example, while the Pope commands no divisions and his spiritual authority may be thought of as legitimate by those of the Catholic faith, there remains the coercive force of official condemnation, excommunication, even damnation, to keep those who would question him in line.

Whether one speaks of scholarly authority, religious authority, political authority or parental authority, the situation is inherently a dynamic one. There will be fluctuations, with moments of greater stability that may alternate with periods of unease and insecurity. The essence of authority, however, is that it must forever be worked at to be maintained, both by those who bear it and those who accept it.

Certainly one of the sources of the recent crisis of authority arises from a crisis of legitimacy; adolescents who have wider knowledge than their parents in some respects, or constituents whose special knowledge exceeds that of lead-
ers, become less likely to accept unquestioningly decisional authority. Likewise, those authorities who lose their moral credibility will find their authority unenforceable on its own merits. An example, to be treated in detail later, is the impasse between parental and legal authority and adolescent use of marijuana. Adults’ insistence upon lumping all hard and soft drugs together, their unwillingness to look at their own damaging drug use (tranquilizers, alcohol, etc.), and their frequent gross overreaction to marijuana usage, have combined to cause their authority to lose its legitimacy. This loss of legitimacy has harmed both adults and adolescents by providing adolescents with a rationalization for ignoring valid authoritative cautions against the many forms of drug misuse that are genuinely self-destructive.

The assumption that the process of adolescence involves a high degree of taking one’s own authority is relatively recent in some cultures and conflicts with some deeply established traditional patterns. This is a conflict that needs to be worked through in every family. (The prime minister of one modernizing nation told a GAP member about his own conflict; he found himself internally compelled to show respect for his traditional father by taking care to keep his feet flat on the floor and not smoking, at the same time that he was the prime leader in a revolutionary modernization of his nation’s political system that included repudiation of traditional authority principles.)

It is within the context of these distinctions between legitimate authority and coercive power that we will view the adolescent-adult authority gap. We will study the role of power and authority in human development, in the culture, in the parenting function, in the world view of children, and in the interaction of child and adult. We will look at some facets of how adults exert power or exercise authority over youth, and how the young struggle with both the past and the present in their attempts to prepare for their own authority roles in the future.

While we have tried to incorporate the knowledge from various relevant disciplines and the experience of professionals from diverse but related fields, we speak essentially from our particular area of knowledge and experience, that of psychoanalytic psychiatry. The information and hypotheses may be useful to other mental health professionals and to any others who become embroiled in adolescent-adult authority conflicts.

In the absence, in the English language, of singular pronouns referring to both sexes, and to obviate repetition of the cumbersome “he/she” form, we have retained the standard usage of the masculine as generic. In every instance where the context does not clearly indicate that one or the other sex only is under discussion, the masculine pronoun refers equally to both sexes.

We will first provide a background in which the adolescent-authority issues can be stated and seen in their current context. Within this background, we will state our thesis. We will explore the interplay between the cultural matrix and the families that are the carriers of that culture, and the bearing of this interaction on our field of interest. We will also consider the relevance of law, custom, and authority to adolescence and to psychiatry. A section on development follows, which attempts to trace the development of the individual child in respect to power and authority interactions and emotions, and to study the responses of parents who themselves have unresolved needs and conflicts related to the various developmental levels.*

* Much of the developmental material in this section will not be new to child development specialists, though it may be useful to those in other fields. However, the tracing of the relationships between developmental stages, and authority and power attitudes, is a correlation that we consider warrants its inclusion.
This is succeeded by a scrutiny of selected phenomena of the adult-adolescent authority confrontations—what happens in such frameworks as the family and in minority groups, and in such specific confrontational arenas as sex, drugs, and music. Then a section which speaks to the psychiatrist’s role at this interface is followed by an exposition of what we believe to be an effective family process of dealing with the adolescent—to learn to negotiate.

When we began preparing this report, the issues that were related to the adolescent-adult authority gap were immediate, penetrating, imposing, and at times imperative. Adolescent reactions were catalyzed by this country’s engagement, and potentially every adolescent’s involvement, in an unpopular, frightening, and dishheartening war. Adolescent sensations were beginning to be heightened by drugs, rhythms, violence, invective, rhetoric, and argument that challenged unanswered the values, lifestyle, and established power of adult society. Participation in war was resisted and refused, pursuit of adult status was avoided and repudiated, laws were defied, morals were rebuked, roles and rules were no longer bounded by convention. It was a time of affluence for many, a time of revolt for others. An economic margin, seemingly wide through the years of inflationary growth, gave the impression that all change was possible without the consequence of markedly diminished living standards. Adolescents and adults were engaged in a forceful struggle that included violence, self-neglect, and death at war.

Now as we near publication, the issues between adolescents and adult authority are not as strident nor as blatantly adversarial. The apparent limitlessness of adult political, military, and economic power has proved to be a myth. Inflation and unemployment now challenge the degree of affluence of some and the financial security of many.

The character and intensity of this conflict of power and authority between adolescents and adults has begun to
THE ISSUES AND THE CONTEXT

Assumptions and thesis

This report seeks to describe and to explain the necessary struggle between youth and age over access to power and achievement of authority, and to suggest means for coping with these human developments. It rests on certain assumptions:

First: That inherent in the passage from adolescence to adulthood is the inevitable encounter between the generations, which often results in conflict.

Second: That this conflict arises from the nature of human development in its biologic, psychologic, social and cultural dimensions. Both the youth and the adults play contributory roles.

Third: That this conflict may be expressed largely in covert, fantasized, or symbolic terms, or may take form as overt, dramatic, and even violent actions.

Fourth: That the outcome of this conflict is complex and shifts with time and setting. It may assume varied forms but it always requires adaptations on the part of both generations.

Based on these assumptions, we view the character of the conflict as very much an expression of its setting. The conflict always takes place within a social context. The nature of
the engagement between the generations is profoundly influenced by the culture and by the social constellation that surrounds and permeates each growing youth and each family member.

The unspoken codes, the official laws, the shared values, the customs, traditions, language(s), symbols, and the other cultural given affects the form and outcome of the conflict. The group structures, the group codes, the social codes for specific groups and subgroups, the web of subcultural relationships within the larger cultural matrix—all these may serve and express this conflict. These various official and unofficial laws and social codes tend to become central items in the adult-youth conflict.

The outcome of the conflict is uncertain. The adolescents' struggles with authority may be kept covert; they may find temporary overt expression only to yield to existing forms of social structuring; or they may serve as the basis for change in laws, codes, and social practices. The conflict creates moments of challenge and fluidity within social codes and practices. These can stimulate constructive societal growth or, alternatively, they can provoke regressive societal constriction and rigidification. Thus, the long-range effect of this conflict can lead to group and individual growth with increased flexibility, integrity, and self-understanding, along with greater empathy and compassion for others. It can also cause defensive retreat to a more inhibited, unyielding, and static position with a reinforcement of righteousness, a suppression of openness, and an intolerance of challenge or variety.

Psychiatrists are concerned with human conflict, its effects, and its resolution. They seek means of dealing with conflicts so as to increase mastery, catalyze mutual understanding and empathy, remove blocks to growth, and achieve maximum freedom of individual expression within the social context. By the same token, they oppose styles of conflict resolution that provoke regression, inhibit growth, rigidify and dessicate human relationships, and stress compliance and conformity at the expense of appropriate individual self-realization.

The cultural matrix

In this section we will set the cultural context in which the recent intense adolescent-authority conflicts have been and are occurring. What follows includes as part of that context a brief description of the traditional patriarchal characteristics that represent the modal norm of Western culture well into the twentieth century, and which are undergoing change. Such changes are certainly only partial and incomplete at this time, and their future extent and direction are unknown. Thus, both the fact of traditional patriarchal culture, as well as the changes that are taking place in that complex of assumptions and institutions, contribute to the current forms and qualities of adolescent-authority conflicts.

Many believe that some of the consequences of patriarchy are sufficiently well known to deserve condemnation and change. Less well known are the consequences of those changes which, in good faith, are being made and being advocated. Least known of all is the extent, if any, to which the cross-culturally and historically predominant pattern of male dominance is biologically rooted—for good or ill—and therefore resistant to social change on grounds other than self-interest. The questions that will be raised regarding the effects of these changes upon adolescent-authority interactions fully accept existing differences of opinion and paucity of data; they do not represent unthinking subscription to traditional patriarchy, but reflect the fact that change creates questions for which answers cannot exist until the changes themselves become new norms.

We consider that some measure of rebellion against
adult authority is a normal and necessary feature of the adolescent process, and that its absence may signal some failure of optimal ego development. Nonetheless, there are troubling aspects to the recently evolving situation. The legitimacy of those in authority is questioned with unusual frequency. Some assert that this legitimacy is not being functionally earned and validated, and that when confronted, those with power react by asserting still more arbitrary power. We have sought for some pattern in the apparent chaos of impressions coming from the adolescent population; what emerged for us is the presence of a crisis in the operation of power and authority, and the exacerbation of what has often been called the generation gap—that presumably inevitable difference in the ways two generations view each other and the world.

Generations, however, succeed one another without break, and the only significant "gap" occurs when there is a failure of understanding and identification between a given age group of parents and the age group of their offspring. We must consider not so much the gap between the generations as the style of the relationship between them. The style of interactions changes and has changed with time, and constitutes a major force in history. Out of these changing styles evolve changing cultural forms of handling authority, which in turn feed back into the modes of authority relationships between individual members of different generations.

We believe that the crisis in the operation of power and authority originates in the styles and shifts of authority in the family. What happens at home during childhood and adolescence shapes social institutions in a fundamental way. The family is the laboratory of personality and the seed bed of the future. It provides the contemporary experience of any youth cohort, and forms the bridge between individual personality and the cultural style of each new generation. Psycho-

ology, in this way, becomes one of the determinants of history.

It is vital to realize that societal attitudes and cultural institutions are largely contingent. Any culture can only embody and codify the consensus of beliefs, practices, adaptations, and defenses of the humans who comprise it. Of course, these cultural forces then exert influence—generally in opposition to change—upon each individual's attitudes in subsequent generations. But this often powerful cultural influence is nonetheless static; it has no intrinsic energy. Its institutions and its effects will change only when the most influential individuals who comprise it decide there should be change.

The crucial importance of recognizing that culturally shared attitudes and modes of interacting can change only when people change them is that early family interactions can then be seen in their appropriate determinative light. There are differing styles of handling authority within families that characterize various cultures and varying time spans within the history of any culture. One of the major influences upon the exercise of authority or power within the family grows out of the sex role behavior of mother and father with each other and with their children, and the child-rearing practices consequent upon these roles. Where sex roles and sex-specific character traits have been significantly divergent, which has been true in most known cultures, the predominant identification of children with one or the other parent would influence authority issues: Their subsequent coping with and exercising of authority and power would reflect those characteristics associated with the dominant parent.

It is obvious that no culture is monolithic in such respect. By definition, however, sex role stereotypes and child rearing patterns are more shared than random in any cohesive
culture. Thus an understanding of how varying cultural expressions of authority conflicts can grow out of specific culturally shared childrearing and familial patterns provides a dynamically coherent continuity between family experience and cultural modes. It is a cultural parallel with the approach taken in the next chapter—the attempt to understand the evolution of specific adolescent and adult authority attitudes by tracing the interactions of developing children with different kinds of parents and parenting influences.

The emotional roots of respect and obedience, and their opposites, lie in parent-child relationships. To demonstrate this thesis, we need to look into both the invariant and the variable aspects of these relationships. The basic attitudes toward authority which began in infancy become increasingly set during adolescence. But those experienced in dealing with these youngsters well know the difficulty of distinguishing between some apparently ominous fixing of future pathology and the turmoil of normal adolescence.

The legitimacy of parental authority is sanctioned by the biological fact of prolonged early dependency in humans. At times, parents may attempt to shirk or deny this, but the fact of biological responsibility and authority remains. The authority of any human being is not absolute, however, is never in fact absolute or permanent. Authority must always be legitimated by some performed function; in the case of parenthood, by lengthy caring protection for the helpless and vulnerable. As the youthful individual gradually attains self-direction, this biologically-based sanction of parental authority must modify progressively to accommodate the changing roles of each cohort generation.

One of the more recent family-interwoven historical sources of adolescent-adult authority conflicts lies in the temporal coincidence of the Great Depression and the technological advances that followed so closely upon it. Recent technology has truly made the globe one neighborhood, made local "tribal" solutions to problems virtually obsolete, and precipitated a staggering complexity into all major social decisions; the human mind sometimes seems inadequately evolved, both emotionally and intellectually, to encompass the complexities. But because changing social history always occurs in the life of different individuals at different stages in their personal growth, in a real sense it is not the same history that has happened to today's adolescents and to the parent and older power wielding generations.

To take a middle class example, consider the majority of such parents and other older adults in positions of authority who experienced the Great Depression in their adolescence. Many of them witnessed their fathers and mothers struggling, sometimes heroically, just to keep the family together economically. Thus, material affluence means different things to them and to their children. Many of that parental generation value, perhaps over-value, material security, and have taken pride in giving each son and daughter clothes and cars, college education and travel, and all the other things that money can buy. In a now questionable but well-meaning way, their lavish provision of these things, lacking to them as children, has meant success to them as parents.

However, having known these comforts and securities all their lives, many of their adolescent, middle class children "couldn't care less" about them, and were inclined to misunderstand what hard work and achievement meant in terms of life style and price in personality strain for parents. Money to those adolescents was no problem, and hence they often had wholly unrealistic notions about established economic processes. They could experiment with new, perhaps nonviable social "families," forgetting that all solutions are elitist that are not possible for all members of society. Affluence deprived this class of youth from learning important techniques for coping with a stressful economic world; the frustration of that world comes to them as if it were somehow a
shocking and unique discovery of their own, a world for which they frequently consider their parents personally to blame.

This sequence of circumstances, of course, does not obtain for ghetto youth and those poverty-bound families who have always been poor. And it may well be that it is the socially obscure but upwardly-mobile and less privileged classes that are obtaining the know-how of our system, because rewarding socioeconomic niches still await those who will inherit the ongoing future through knowing how to handle it. This is a sad denouement for middle class parental good intentions.

Another major aspect of the generational differences in experiencing the same social historical events is related to the effects of the amazing spurt in technological progress, perhaps especially in the area of mass communication. It is easy to forget that radio was in its infancy in the childhood of the current authority generation, and that none of them grew up with television. The non-existence of instant, global communication made for a perception of problems and conflicts on a smaller, more local, and infinitely more manageable level. Moral and ethical issues could at least appear to be simpler and more absolute; the isolation of potentially contradictory realities affecting other groups in other cultural conditions and eras was aided by the sense of vastly distant space and time. Thus, parents could teach rather simplified morals and values with relatively complacent confidence, and it may well be that the youthful generation accepted the proffered moralities with all too desperate a seriousness.

For example, as students, children are told that the traditional authority of British kings was dethroned by legitimate revolution because that authority became arbitrary, unjust, and finally intolerable; in its place Americans set up the divided authority of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Adults were nevertheless shocked when young people stated, with evident conviction, their obstinate non-consent to dying in foreign invasions they alleged were unsanctioned by court and legislature, as constitutionally required. As to unresolved local problems, they assert, how can “the Establishment” be considered responsible if it does not respond? Our children are taught the American dream of equality; yet many adults are shocked when adolescents sympathetically join the historic revolt of blacks, which they allege is legitimated by the adults' professed morality. The young are taught patriotic pride in American ideals, but adults become defensive when youthful moralists sternly point out that many states were founded on lands stolen from slaughtered American Indians, regional wealth founded on the bodies of black people, and national wealth on the laboring poor. Are Indians, blacks and the poor not Americans?, ask these alarming youngsters.

American children are taught pride in our history, and yet many adults really do not understand when youngsters argue parallels between genocide by Hitler and the actions of Americans from Hiroshima to Vietnam, and parallels between Russian and other imperialisms and American postwar colonialism in Asia and elsewhere. We take pride in American productivity; but our adolescents ask, at what cost in rapacious despoilation of world raw materials that are finite and unshared—at what cost in wasteful stripping and pollution of our own environment?

These are all uneasy and controversial questions. It is probably both just and accurate to recognize that neither the adults who taught simplistic ethics, nor the younger generation that demands that they be acted upon at face value, have been at all prepared for their inadequacy and inapplicability to global social problems of overwhelming proportions. By way of illustration, many adults would like to ignore the historical injustices done to American Indians. Those youth who join in the demand to give vast tracts of developed and utilized lands back to the Indians are often equally blind to
the fact that this oversimplified "moral" restitution could be accomplished only at the cost of equal injustice to even more millions of people who live there and have bought their homes and businesses there, whose very livelihood and survival now depend upon that same area, and who are innocent of any responsibility for the original injustices.

But the parents who did—and must, in the exercise of their rightful responsibilities—undertake to teach morals and values to their children cannot escape engagement by their children in those same moral terms regarding the quality of their exercise of authority. And if the adults cannot "cop out," neither can the young "drop out," without disastrous consequences to themselves, simply because their parents were usually not sufficiently prescient to prepare them for a then-nonexistent world. It is not our purpose here to take a position on any contemporary moral issue under controversy between adolescents and adults, but merely to point out and illustrate the often misunderstood nature of this particular gap in communication between the generations.

Over a much longer span of time than that dating to the Depression, changes have been taking place in family structure which greatly affect intrafamilial models of authority, the nature of the authority exercised by either sex, and the modes of and opportunities available for learning to assume appropriate authority. Although the nuclear family of procreation is fundamental in human biology, the nuclear family as an independent social unit is considered to be the exception in cultural history; the extended family is far more common. In our own middle-class culture the nuclear family as the predominant family unit is a rather recent development, although in earlier times in this country frontier families often functioned without extended family networks. Today, extended families remain far more common in cultural groups outside the dominant middle class, and may account for some of the strengths to be found in otherwise severely disadvantaged circumstances.

Within the now modal nuclear family, there have been changing cultural-historical styles in parent-child relationships. For example, in an early American pioneer family, the relationship between parents and their children was vastly different from that of today. In those agrarian days, a boy was constantly around his father, helping with the chores. He learned, without thinking, how to become a man, and what it was like to be a man. At the same time, a girl was constantly with her mother, learning to do what women and mothers did.

One essential feature of the changing family styles within our culture has been a massive decline in the stature of the father and the devaluation of his authority.* We have lived in a patriarchal society. In particular, our family structure has been patriarchal. According to our traditions, final authority and power in the family were vested in the father. Strength, mastery, and knowledge of the outside world, wisdom, moral rectitude and moral enforcement, the abstract virtues of honor, probity, justice, fair play and heroism—all these were attributes of the father. To the child, the father was the final authority for impulse control and the curbing of instincts. The father was to be feared and respected; ultimately it was his physical strength that could be called upon to enforce control. In this patriarchal family ideal the father was allied with the monotheistic God who appears in the religious books as God the Father.

To the mother fell the role of nurturer, gratifier, soother and comforter, and symbol of the erotic sensibilities and aesthetic sensitivities. She represented the more emotional qualities of warmth, tenderness, forbearance and patience.

* For an extended discussion of this point, see Galdston.
The details of intimacy were her province. She mediated between father and child, the representative of Mercy in contrast to Justice. In this relationship context, the father was dominant. The mother honored and obeyed the father. The father provided for, protected, and cherished the mother. This, of course, describes an idealized image, which real families approached in varying degrees. It was, however, the middle and upper class official view of appropriate family and sex roles. It determined the ways in which they strove to present themselves publicly and to their children; it influenced their child-rearing philosophies, and it communicated itself with particular force to those upwardly-mobile families determined to take their place in the middle class.

Since the time of the Industrial Revolution, the socioecononomic underpinnings of the patriarchal family model have been steadily eroded. Also, the traditional theological belief structure that supported this model has been increasingly challenged. Along with this development, many mothers found themselves in positions of great controlling power in the family, functioning in many ways in the roles of both mother and father, as described by Erikson in his discussion of the “American Mom”. A major portion of the population has moved beyond the limitations of the sustenance economy. More to the point, our culture has evolved to a point at which the superior physical strength and size of men seem to confer less and less real or obvious economic or social advantage.

Women’s economic and financial status have risen greatly. There have been changes in the legal status of women in the direction of equal rights. Women have come to recognize themselves increasingly as fully capable and responsible in areas of social and political action. Modern birth control techniques have given women effective control over the number and timing of offspring; this has permitted a shift of interest to matters outside of the home. Within the home, the technology of labor-saving devices has made it possible for women both to perform housekeeping functions and to hold outside employment. In the past 50 years, the number of women who have completed a higher education has swelled enormously. Many have attained this education in a coeducational setting, competing successfully with their male contemporaries. An increasing number of women are restless and dissatisfied in their roles of housewife and mother within the traditional context.

At the same time, the very nature of our technological mass society has produced an even greater challenge to the stature of the father. The nature of the middle-class father’s work may be highly specialized and technical. It might involve him in some form of consultation, or in a position within a corporate-administrative hierarchy. In either case, it is all too often something remote from or incomprehensible to his children. Thus, he may remain the “provider” without providing his children with a clear image of what a man does to make his way in the world. The long work day, the hours of commuting, and the competitive stress of the commercial or professional world leave many men depleted. They come home with little to contribute to family life. As a result, they are insufficiently available to participate in the bread-and-butter parenting, disciplining, and decision-making regarding their children.

A caricature of an ineffectual male role is reflected in the entertainment media, which so frequently portray father as stupid, bumbling, ineffective—a clownish buffoon. From the early comic strips such as “Bringing Up Father” and the now seemingly eternal “Blondie” to the typical family situation comedies on television, one is hard pressed to find one in which dad is represented as a man of intelligence, dignity, and legitimate authority. In the typical plot line, major family crises—often precipitated by some paternal blunder—are ul-
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Ultimately resolved by mom, the teenage daughter, a rescue squad of neighborhood kids, or even by some unrealistically precocious seven- or eight-year-old. Father is regarded with thinly disguised condescension and sometimes affectionate contempt.

Given these unfavorable conditions, the father cannot easily transmit role identity. His basic position in the home has traditionally been to provide a valid source of authority to deal with social and behavioral issues. How well he can do this becomes a function of his personal capacities for authority and leadership, and his aptitude to pass on a sense of traditional masculine presence to his children in his limited “spare time”.

This does not even touch on the issues that confront the poor and minority groups. Here, the opportunities are much fewer for men to find any work life with dignity outside the home, much less to provide for their families in a satisfactory fashion. These serious limitations present enormous obstacles to the experience of masculine leadership and authority.

At the same time that fathers have come to spend less time at home, mothers’ role as principal childrearing agents have expanded. In the home in which father is the economic provider and mother remains at home, children of both sexes are almost totally reared and conditioned by mother, during the early years at least.* A normally nurturing and maternal mother “knows,” by virtue of her long biological heritage of innate maternalism,* that all children are equally dear—that is, equally in need of nurturance, and equally able to give her pleasure in this. But women do not know how to teach boys to become men any more than men know how to teach girls to become women, and every primitive tribe is aware of this fundamental truth.* In an adult competitive world operating essentially by values set by men, which historically has been, still is, and may remain the norm, men know that all people—men or women—are not equal. In adult performance, some are better than others, whether in strength or in knowledge or in some ardously learned professional skill. In that world it is not who one is (mother's categorically loved one), but what one is (in competitive terms more typical of male values) that makes the difference.

It is impossible to believe that the family changes described do not have direct bearing upon the specific problems of present day adolescents. A child reared chiefly by a traditionally maternal woman may know only that he is lovable or in need of love. Thus when such a boy or girl finally meets the world outside the family, he wonders why he is not as well received as another, or he may respond with outraged and naive tantrums at not being accorded instant status.

If it is true that social roles are best taught by those who must fulfill them, then a mother-mediated childrearing pattern as described above cannot prepare boys for what remains, whether for better or worse, an invidiously male world. This shift in family balance of authority roles does not confer the same disadvantages upon girls. In order to establish a masculine identity, boys must dis-identify with their earliest object of identification—mother.© When mothers and female teachers are forced into the position of being the models for virtually all manifestations of authority and power, boys are often similarly “forced,” in their desperate effort to forge a sex-specific identity, to repudiate qualities

* While the majority is shrinking, this family constellation remains true for the majority of preschool children at least, an estimated 66 per cent of whom (1974 statistics) have mothers who remain at home. Of the one-third with working mothers, two-thirds of those mothers are employed full time.©

* Vide infra, p. 85.

* Women, of course, can help boys to grow to cherish their maleness, just as men are important for the development of parallel qualities in girls; but these self concepts are of a different mental and emotional nature than those germane here. To whatever extent functional social roles have been and may remain sex-specific, such roles are best taught by those who have successfully experienced and fulfilled them.
that are essential for adult authoritative function, as well as purely human values (such as tenderness, nurturant behavior, etc.) which inappropriately become associated with gender roles.

In sum, the current mode of our parenting reflects a major trend away from patriarchy. This shift carries with it profound potential consequences for the psychological development of children.* Family structure is determined by both social and biological factors. It is extremely difficult to separate these two elements from one another. What emerges most clearly, however, is that in the face of profound societal influences, the structure of parental family roles in our culture is undergoing highly significant changes. At the same time, there is increasingly well-documented evidence that there are innate, species-specific biological differences in temperament and in specific aptitudes between the sexes.*

Historically and cross-culturally, cultural positions of real status and power (not nominal power as in Victorian England) have virtually always fallen to men: the most carefully researched study finds no genuine exceptions. It is against this anthropological background that family authority sex roles are changing (and it must be noted that historical fact is not an argument against any possible constructive changes).† D'Andrade has reviewed many anthropological studies, and finds a striking consistent cross-cultural division of labor according to sex in the most diverse societies. When one finds predominantly similar behavior throughout a species regardless of circumstances, it is unlikely that it is coincidence. It is more likely that such behaviors are manifestations of species characteristics that are, or have been at least, innate. Were the family and social

roles under discussion here completely arbitrary or entirely learned, one would expect statistically a more random distribution.

Of importance also is the fact that natural selection would have favored those traits that allowed for the most effective function in the roles into which each sex naturally fit. Maternalism is one example. Men are certainly capable of being emotionally nurturing, but they cannot be biologically and literally nurturing (suckling), and equally certainly they did not typically fulfill the maternal role throughout the millions of years of evolution. It is a biological truism that the offspring of any female who lacked the nurturing characteristics of maternalism would be less likely to survive. Her genes would be less likely to enter the species gene pool. Over the more than 150,000 generations of hominid evolution,* the gene pool would come to be dominated by those linking maternalism with females. The same might be said for all the traits that are cross-culturally sex-specific.*

None of this background has anything to do with whether all of these traditional roles are good or bad, and far less with

* Whether the consequences are brightly promising or grave is an issue of wide differences of opinion for which there is as yet insufficient outcome evidence to allow decisive judgment.
# See Appendix A.
† See pages 85-87.
any special pleading to perpetuate all the stereotypes. A reasonable case might well be made that *Homo sapiens* may be evolutionarily ill-prepared for its own ultimate survival for the very reason that major decision making has innately fallen to or been assumed by males, very possibly on the basis of their biologically determined higher testosterone levels, which itself may have played a role in the violently aggressive, inhumane, and nonconstructive quality of much of male-dominated history.* But if indeed technology has proceeded to a point where a good part of the advantage and responsibility of greater physical stature and physical aggression is negated, as well as rendering some other of the traditional roles either unnecessary or counterproductive, then the changes facing both adults and adolescents are of an entirely different order of magnitude.

The accession to authority positions by adolescents and the according of authority to them by adults is typically subject to conflict and disruption. When this takes place in a culture in transition, it is much more hazardous. When function, perhaps even survival, may require a shift in sex roles and their associated power and authority roles that go counter to characteristics that may well be biologically innate and evolutionarily reinforced, one is confronting a task of epochal, evolutionary proportions. The magnitude of the task of dealing with authority issues is simply on an entirely different plane.

When, as is currently true, society experiments with the sex role structure of the family, those involved cannot be certain whether modifications are running against the currents of millions of years of evolution, or whether they are finally doing away with some time-bound ethnocentric factors. It is our position, however, that human beings are not infinitely plastic in their capacity to adjust temperament and character, especially sexual character, to any and all social change. Can humanity force its own evolution in time, if that is necessary? In trying to custom-tailor shifts in innate traits, is humanity overstepping itself? How many appropriate shifts will humans be smart enough to devise, and how much irreparable damage will they do in trying to modify roles for which there are as yet no adequate substitutes? What are the effects of day care centers for very young children as compared with one mothering figure's maternalism? Might they sometimes be better? If they are not, will we be willing to find and finance superior alternatives for those mothers who have no choice? In the areas of power and authority, how much is constructive role shifting and how much is pathogenic role blurring, and how can we tell? These questions merely illustrate the new order of magnitude in the issue this report addresses.

We must ask ourselves to what extent is the association of authority with masculine dominance (patriarchy) biologically determined and to what extent is it a product of culture. When the authority of the father is undermined, what is the influence of this on the adolescent process? When fathers are, to a great extent, absent from or ineffective in the lives of their adolescent offspring, are adolescents of both sexes being deprived of something essential for the attainment of full human development?

Are there innately differentiating qualities of masculine and feminine authority? If there are, can unique attributes of masculine authority be transmitted by women, or those of feminine authority by men? If there are innate masculine/feminine differences, can the women who deny them transmit the qualities of feminine authority to their daughters or model them for their sons? These are all particularly crucial questions should it turn out that biological factors override social efforts, such that social power and authority remain obdurately a predominately male role.

The psychological development of children is based on the

* See Appendix B.
interaction between innate, unfolding biologic-maturational forces and the effects of the environment. This is a finely-tuned process. The external social influences are impinging on a complex dynamic sequence of critical maturational phases. If these social forces do not permit the species- and sex-specific characteristics of an individual to unfold without significant deviation, much can go awry.

All of the family/culture interactions discussed illustrate not only the relevance of the family to the origins of authority issues; they also add a poignancy to both the adolescents' and the adults' tasks at this time in cultural history. The learning and the transmission of legitimate authority has undoubtedly always been arduous in any culture, and the more complex, the more difficult. However monumental the difficulties peculiar to the contemporary family in contemporary culture, they permit no excuse for avoiding grappling with the issues; they remain imperative.

It is the business of adolescents to criticize the past because, eventually, all of them will have to live with its consequences. Youth is not the eternally timeless time it seems to young people to be. At the end of adolescence is the world of adult realities, and the new adult generation will have to live with its own solutions and, hopefully not quite as arrogant but just as fallible, find itself the foil for the childhood and adolescence of its succeeding generation.

One of the spokesmen of the adolescent generation wrote "Stop the world, I want to get off!" But history is what one cannot resign from because history is alive in people, here and now. To suppose that one can "drop out" from the past is fatuous, because it is right here, now. The very possibility of that fantasy depends not only upon a failure in identification with parents and their real adult problems, but also upon a failure to apprehend objective reality. Worse yet, a dropout ethic may be the prime technique for never growing up at all, and for remaining in a feckless, ultimately deprived, incompetent, and irresponsible adolescence forever. What new Skid Row awaits, in time, those who indulge in a search for "inner space" but who never encounter real social space?

Law, custom, and authority

It is important to understand how adolescents view codes and values in relationship to sexuality, authority, and established law or custom. In order to do this, it is useful to consider the history and relevance of existing social codes to youth's developmental experiences. The interaction between social codes and what happens in adolescence forms a dynamically developing sequence that has multiple implications for psychiatrists. It affects theory, technique, and treatment.

During the last decade, adolescents have challenged many of the culture's ethical and moral concepts. Some of these concepts include the continuity and stability of written law, the development, hierarchy, and structure of family relationships, and the relevance of traditional religious positions in regard to what is sinful and what is acceptable behavior. Inevitably, psychiatrists have begun to grapple with similar issues. It would therefore seem useful to explore the character and development of some of the norms and customs, the laws and values, that have been inherent in our society.

Every culture sets forth certain standardized models for behavior that are intended to regulate individual action. These are concretized as social norms or customs. The concept of norms or normative behavior implies that the majority of a given society accepts such a pattern. At some point in the evolution of a norm, an essential ingredient is the willingness of the majority to endorse the application of social pressures in the service of conformity with the norm. These pressures can be both informal and institutionalized.
The last decade has revealed many flaws in our means of establishing and supporting acceptable norms.

The term “custom” generally applies to the less stringently regulated activities of people in society. Teaching and expecting adherence to custom are the means of establishing social control over such activities. Within a hierarchy of behavioral values, violations of customs become the small misdemeanors, and the fulfillment and carrying out of custom the minor merit badges or kudos. It is authority, the authority of usage and tradition, that defines the acceptance of such customs.

Law, on the other hand, implies a system of carefully organized and defined sanctions, often of a powerful nature. Such sanctions evolve over time and become part of a coherent hierarchy. Historically, legal sanctions have included torture, branding, mutilation, whipping, public shaming, exile, and ultimately, imprisonment and death. Today, only the latter two are commonly employed for the punishment of serious crimes, but whipping and public shaming in some forms are still commonly used to punish and belittle children and adolescents. Fines and the levy of damages are resorted to for less important breaches of codes. However, it is important to recognize that the official element of law, the functional and operative element of law, is its socially sanctioned power to use force to compel compliance.

Thus, the defined elements of law include: 1) Regularity, which implies a social normativeness, a predictability in the use of law. 2) Official authority that offers sanctions in a formal way. 3) Power: the possible application of physical force to compel compliance.

The concepts of substantive law, the law of content, and procedural law, the rules of organization or adjective law, recur in an interwoven fashion throughout the evolution of law from ancient to contemporary times. Substantive law defines the norms or customs that are to be supported or enforced by the authority of the society. These customs regularly include sanctions against such acts as homicide and adultery and injunctions about certain kinship relationships and the violation of such relationships. Procedural law defines the basis for legitimacy of law and how laws are to be enforced; it generates the rules for handling issues of substance or content that arise under substantive law. It amounts to due process.

In the nature of things, social life demands restrictions on certain behaviors. As a result, important distinctions must be made: the concerns that will be dealt with through the relatively informal social control of custom—these typically include child rearing practices, education and religious concerns—must be distinguished from those that will be placed in the legitimated, codified domain of legal force.

Within this framework, the transgressions of adolescents might be considered either as violations of custom or of law. The one, albeit handled in a rather complex and muddled way, is less severely responded to; whereas the other is handled by the threat of application of physical force. The response to these phenomena becomes complicated in times of cultural change when the legitimacy of the laws themselves is called into question. It is then recognized that many laws are merely the codification of capricious, ethnocentric, time-limited preferences on the part of the ruling faction of the society. For example, laws that regulate the minimum ages of voting, working, drinking, military service, and legal responsibility, the nature of sexual behavior, parental actions against child, infant and fetus, are manifestations of current views, concerns, and social preferences.

The concerns of ancient law differed from those of today. In ancient times the strongest sanctions were leveled against people who employed physical power and violated the persons of others, whether aggressively or sexually (this usually implied the breaking of a kinship ritual) or against people...
who used magical power and engaged in witchcraft. Thus in decreasing order of importance, the hierarchy spelled out homicide, adultery, witchcraft and so on for similar offenses. Theft was far down the list. Presumably, goods were held in common in ancient times and the issue of theft was not critical. It is only when people value personal goods or property that their loss is important. In shared communal life theft law would be of relatively minor concern. Hence, it was only when agriculture and the importance of goods and inheritance developed—when people came to own things and other people—that a much greater reliance on theft law emerged. It is interesting that in the communal movement of the recent past there have been attempts to decrease the importance of goods and ownership, thus making laws about theft less important.

A system of public procedures or sanctions came into being when kinship groups were no longer able to resolve issues of ritual violation acceptably in a private fashion. Ritual chiefs were invented to help organize these disputes and, in time, the concepts of lineage, chieftdom and royalty, together with royal law, emerged. In recent years royal law has receded in the face of the diversified and complex body of common law and the legal system as we know it today.

This historical review, however fragmentary and condensed, helps us understand and analyze the significance of code concepts to adolescents and authority. The task is particularly important because this is a time when the nature of the society’s view about morality, values and ethics is being debated. 9

In the past the psychiatrist’s role had been that of analyzing meaning for the individual patient and, in a sense, for the society. He often accepted society as a given, and in general depended on its “validity,” the validity of its codes. For various reasons, many parents in our society have given up their moral responsibilities for the rearing of children and have delegated these responsibilities to experts in human relationships. As the society increasingly abdicates its role as giver of meaning, the psychiatrist, along with many other value-bearing agents, is asked to take on more of this task. It is important that the psychiatrist recognize this potential change in his function; he must either accept it, refuse it, or come to some compromise in regard to it.

As experts in human relationships, we need to be quite clear about our role in regard to patients and changing codes. To do this, we must discuss the part we play in the forming and advocacy of these codes, and come to some conclusions about where we stand. On the one hand, we have the highly prescriptive codes of ancient law that state exactly how moral issues are to be handled. These views are carried forward in our contemporary world by some of the religious rules and the customs of various societies. On the other hand, we have the statement of John Stuart Mill, 10 who promulgated a most extreme, individually-oriented responsibility for the handling of relationships. A century ago he stated: “The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of the civilized community against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not sufficient warranty.” 11 Mill further stated, “...each person is a proper guardian of his own health, whether bodily or mental and spiritual. Mankind are greater gainers by suffering each other to live as seems good to themselves than by compelling each to live as seems good to the rest.” 12

A major job for psychiatrists in the future may well be to reacquaint ourselves with the origin, development, and structure of codes in order to understand their highly valuable, though often quixotic, nature. We must examine our own codes of professional therapeutic conduct regularly, and ac-
quaint our patients and the general public with the fact that
codes are mutable and are, in this era, in a powerful process
of change.

Many factors have complicated our attempt to codify our
ideas about healthy developmental concepts for children and
adolescents. Dynamic psychiatric codes are to a great extent
based on a concept of an “average expectable environment,”
which is difficult to define in this time of rapid change. Some
of this change, according to Keniston,13 involves the increas-
ing affluence of young people, “continuous disengagement
by youth from adult institutions, confrontation with alterna-
tive moral viewpoints, and the discovery of corruption in the
world,”14 and the immense increase in the number of adoles-
cents involved in the education and developmental process
rather than in work roles. As a result, the youth-society has
begun to fashion new rules for itself. It has become a special
force released not only from the dependency of childhood
but also from the responsibilities of marriage, parenthood,
and work that are characteristic of adulthood.

Because of their affluence, numbers, and freedom, many
young people have found a way to live outside the law, to test
the laws that exist, and, in a literal sense, to conduct them-
selves in a way that ignores laws previously held by society.

In those areas where there was no substantive law and
adolescents defied custom, there has been an attempt to use
law as the element of control or coercion. Presumed law
breakers have been identified by their deviance from cus-
tomary behavior. For example, youth with long hair and
unconventional dress have been restrained or arrested for
presumed use of narcotic drugs.

One of the areas in which psychiatric theorizing and
treatment can go forward is in the study of the interfaces
among customs, laws, codes, and psychological and psychiat-
riic counsel. Naturally, the first job of psychiatrists is to ed-
ucate themselves in regard to these issues and then to ask
whether they can take on commitments for influencing their
form and content.

For the last 60 years dynamic psychiatrists have worked in
a professional atmosphere that takes for granted a certain
stability of the superego, of relationships between parents
and children, and of the behavior expected of children. Such
expectations cannot be met in the rapidly changing times in
which we live.
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THE CHILDHOOD ORIGINS OF ADOLESCENT AND ADULT ATTITUDES TOWARD POWER AND AUTHORITY: A PSYCHOANALYTIC VIEW

The oral stage

The infant is truly helpless in the strictly survival sense of the word, but in his relationships with his nurturers and in his interactions with his environment, he is not in any simple sense passive and helpless. From the time that his physiology settles down after the disruptions of birth, he is active and busy. It is easy to observe and even to measure the way he studies his environment with his eyes;1\textsuperscript{2} and there are by now numerous accounts about this very active seeking of the nipple, his rooting, and sucking, during the experience of feeding.\textsuperscript{3}

Active struggles and the attempts to exert one's power as well as attempts to resist another's force are identifiable from the outset. Everyday observation documents that many babies oppose their caretakers, and fight back against those who would minister to them from a very early time. Does the mother\textsuperscript{*} want the baby to cuddle? The average baby will, but many will not. Does she want the baby to sleep through the night? Some infants cannot or will not comply with this parental desire, and some turn day into night with potentially disastrous results to the burgeoning parent-child relationship. Bettelheim describes some of this early behavior in

\textsuperscript{4} The significant caretaker for a baby need not be the biological mother; indeed it often is not. Father, foster mother, nurse, older sibling, grandparent, any of many people may become the primary caretaker, the psychological mother, for the infant. We will use the generic term "mother" to represent this psychological mothering person.
relation to later attitudes toward active mastery as contrasted with passivity:

Because while the infant can make it clear, through the way he holds his body, whether or not he feels comfortably held, he cannot ensure that this active expression of his feelings will meet with a positive response. That will depend on how the mother reacts. While he can and does act in his own behalf, his view of himself and the world will depend on the failure or success of his efforts. Consistent nonreward for being active may even lead to his giving up trying to shape his interactions and yielding to passivity. The same is true for the way he adjusts to being picked up or diapered or bathed. When he is active, be it in nursing, or in watching the world, he is at the height of his encounter with life. But how his activity succeeds, and the response it receives, will significantly color all his later attempts at self-motivated action.

Among the most trying struggles of early childhood is that which develops over the baby who will not eat well, especially where the mother treasures the image of a round, chubby, cherubic appearance in a baby as her measure of success and goodness. Similarly, babies often fight changing, dressing, and undressing from their very earliest months.

Thus, the precursors of power struggles and authority issues can appear literally from birth onward. They are always a part of childrearing, and can often emerge from problems of temperament of mother-infant “fit.” All human beings have their innate patterns of mood, activity level, and personal style. When the match between the infant’s style of action and response meshes well with mother’s pattern (and with her expectations), the likelihood of power struggles is minimal. On the other hand a baby who is difficult and unpredictable and an overcontrolling mother who needs to exert her power over what is hers, and who sets a high priority on control, will shortly be in trouble. The same baby with a somewhat more easygoing mother might do very well.

In a relatively short time, the baby begins to develop tactics and mechanisms for coping with helplessness and powerlessness. The baby seeks to master the floods of stimuli and emotion that sweep through him. Many of these are mother-connected, and therefore these mechanisms of mastery elaborate themselves around various experiences with her. Thus, the precursors of denial and avoidance will be readily visible in baby’s turning his head away, or falling asleep in the face of unwished-for encounters. Where there is tension, for example, between mother as nurturer and baby as feeder, the baby may turn away from the breast or may keep falling asleep in the course of being fed. The baby’s behavior at this point is not power-connected; he is seeking simply to reduce a felt discomfort. But he may evoke reactions within his caretaker of a defensive or retaliatory sort. These reactions could engage the two of them in a pattern of behavior that may develop into power struggles.

Among the great communicators of infancy are those of smiling and crying. It is hypothesized that the image of the mother that gradually forms in the infant’s mind is split into two aspects (perhaps two groups of partially “constructed” images of individuals). The smile-evoking “good mother” is connected with all inner feelings of pleasure and satisfaction—to see her, to think of her, is all good. She understands his messages and relieves his distress; he is capable of eliciting pleasureful response; and, through the connection with her, he feels powerful. The cry-evoking “bad mother” is the one who fails to feed, who fails to respond to signals so that the baby feels helpless, who causes undesired feelings, and who requires and enforces compliance so that he may feel subjugated. This image of the “bad mother” is brought to mind by all inner feelings of distress, pain, frustration, anger, and dissatisfaction.

Along with the emergence of patterns of defense, the baby is sorting out the reality of his own body as distinct from that
of his mother’s body and from the world around him. It is a major task for the rudimentary ego to integrate mother’s face, voice, hand, and breast and thus construct some perceptual image of her. Primitive concepts of what is inside and what is outside the self are being formed. One theory postulates the infant’s experience in this way: what feels good is what is inside me, and that is me; what feels bad is outside me, and I project all that outward and perceive it as not me.

During this early development, the baby is reformulating and refining his perceptual experience. Even though he can begin to sense that he and others are physically apart, he cannot yet accept this reality; his need for mother is too great. So, he compromises; he accepts a two body unity, a sense of fusion and oneness of all that is good in him and mother as a single entity. This is his symbiotic phase—he perceives himself to be fused with and coextensive with the good mother.

The baby thus shares in the power of someone who seems to him an omnipotent giantess. In the development of feelings of power or helplessness, this identification has enormous implications. To be one with so powerful an individual as mother is to belong to something greater than oneself, something superhuman. It is in this relationship that the foreshadowings occur of how power will later differentiate from authority in human affairs. Clearly mother wields immense power over the infant. She can force him to comply with her will in spite of his protests. At the same time, there is sublime pleasure in yielding oneself up to the perfect care of an omnipotent provider. It is the transformed and unconscious elaboration of this state of mind that makes all people vulnerable to subsequent authority experiences of an irrational character. Everyone is prone to play and replay one or both of the roles of symbiote in significant later relationships—to exert charismatic authority here, and to yield oneself up and forego freedom and autonomy there.

By the time of adolescence all these early events and emotions are totally unconscious, probably never to be recalled. However, many subsequent characteristic features of adolescent behavior have their roots in this elemental anlage during the first few months. Examples are their submission to others, their devotion to various “heroes” and leaders, their attaching themselves to groups wherein one can feel an immense sense of close union, and the exaltation and exhilaration of being part of something greater than the self and to which one yields up much of one’s autonomy or one’s substance or even one’s life. As symbiote one can be either baby or caretaker, and in later years when this status is relived through regression or because of character patterns set in early life, often one is both. Thus, as adolescent, one can be follower or leader, and sometimes both in different contexts. The unconscious dynamics of that choice vary with individual specifics, and while much is known about them retrospectively, the outcome of a given childhood pattern still cannot be predicted with certainty.

The nature of the ego during the early months of existence bears considerable study. One ego area involves the control of emotion. Infancy is a time when the child is peculiarly the victim of his feelings. He has few techniques to control, to modulate, or to redirect intense emotion, and it is a time when any strong affect sweeps through the organism in a total way. No such total flooding is likely to occur in later life except in temporary or highly pathological states. But in adolescence, emotional storms are no rarity, and in some individuals they may call to mind these early ego states. These outbursts can bring about power confrontations of vexing and frightening character. Where the growing child has had to cope with too much stimulation at too early a time,
his later adaptation may show such evidence of stormy dys-
control or he may defensively adapt by constriction and
inhibition.

Another dimension of difficulty is the possible
couragement of passive attitudes that can be transformed
into power struggles. Either overgratification or excessive
frustration of early wishes may result in a pattern of relating
oneself to one's world in a passive way. The quality of the
resultant character traits is different, however. The over-
gratified child has no need actively to earn or to deserve what
he wants; the world is supposed to come up with whatever is
desired because it always has. This easily develops into an
attitude of belligerent selfishness that characterizes the
spoiled individual. Within the home this is often a successful
use of power; outside the home it is a source of serious
struggles. In mild to severe degrees, this orientation is fre-
quent in suburban America where the realities of affluence
and the philosophy of permissiveness may combine to make
some element of overgratification a common factor in child-
rearing.

The deprived* child, on the other hand, bears the burden
of an inner sense of futility: There is no benefit in being
active, no way to be heard, no way to be gratified; one is at
the mercy of unassailable powers who give as they wish, and
against whom one's own efforts are fruitless. During adoles-
cence, in its milder and more common forms, this adaptive
style involves a low level of ambition, a commitment to

* There are a tremendous variety of deprivations: deafness, blindness, inadequate
diet, poor child/parent fit, parental emotional withdrawal or unavailability, periodic
or intermittent neglect or mistreatment, etc. And it is worth emphasizing that
although the cause of the deprivation may be impersonal (a parent may have died
in a disease epidemic), the infant is thought typically to personalize it (the parent has
deserted him). Thus the consequences of any deprivation are often expressed later
in inappropriate and disruptive power confrontations involving individuals or
groups.
Reflections of oral conflicts in parental behavior

There are, of course, widely diverse sources for the form and expression of parental interactions with their children, and, specifically in keeping with the focus of this study, the ways in which they exercise their power and authority. In particular, there are stage-derived patterns of thought and imagery that play a vital role in a parent's subtle but central communications to a young child; a person's patterns of parenting contain reflections of any major fixation points in his or her individual development. And the younger the child, the more meaningful these non-verbal messages will be.

As each phase of childhood is discussed, the attempt will be made to match with it a description of parents who have unresolved conflicts originating in the same phase. After considering what a child going through that phase demands of and offers to a parent, we will consider the parent who has incompletely mastered that phase. To the extent that a person functions as parent, he acts out of his basic orientation to the past as well as his reality perception in the present. What will such a parent ask from, and offer to, a baby?

Consider a mother with profound early oral stage fixations. (We acknowledge but will disregard the many clinically modifying realities that are likely to be present, such as grandmother, a husband, other siblings, and the like, and will consider only a simplified schematic of such a relationship.) The maternal need for nurturance may be so great that from the outset mother seeks a kind of "feeding" from the baby, and communicates this need to her child. In the language of conditioning, the baby is rewarded only if he does something that mother interprets as nurturant to her—if, for example, he smiles to make her feel good when she is depressed, or "makes nice" and pets her. At a later stage, the reward comes if he also puts food in her mouth, or in some other way mimics taking care of her. Then she smiles back, hugs him, and tells him how good he is, how nice he is to his mummy. Later, an outside observer might perceive that this parent reverses roles with her younger, and wants him to do the caretaking while the mother acts as though she is passive and dependent. That mother, of course, is not truly passive; she is subtly but powerfully active in the role of demander: "You aren't doing enough for your mother; you owe her so much; do more!"

Inevitably the child so regarded is asked to achieve a certain degree of precocity; he has to take care of mother, to make decisions, to supply needs. Where the child has the capacity for such precocious adaptation, he may indeed take on his appointed role. In effect, the parent employs parental power to make the child assume precocious responsibility. The resultant power and authority tangles are complex and grave. Who in fact is controlling whom? For the youngster, a slow accumulation of bitterness and resentment is a common outcome. In adolescence such a young person often begins to comprehend what has been done to him and his resentment may be deep and abiding. He may flagrantly and defiantly rebel against continuing to function in that role, or he may keep it all inside himself and figuratively bite back the angry words and thoughts. Moodiness and depression are then likely to punctuate a basic pattern of being very responsible and submissive.

However the adolescent copes with it, he is in a complex position. There is something beguiling about being the parent to one's parents, and this is not lightly given up. But there is also something profoundly unfair in this, and the youngster does not escape this feeling. Fortunate counterbalancing influences may mitigate the conflicts and minimize the subsequent maldevelopment, but often the pattern leads to a sense of being cheated, deprived, used, and generally mistreated—and all the while one is made to feel guilty for feeling this way. Paradoxically, in such instances the parents
experience themselves as deserving so much more than they receive from their child.

One of the remarkable qualities of parent-child exchange in the early oral period is the amount of tacit communication and mutual adaptation that occurs. For example, the mother, spooning food into the high-chair baby finds that at some moment he turns his face away, fusses, and gestures with his hands. A little experimenting reveals that he wants some milk. She lets him have this and then goes to work with the spoon again, which he gladly accepts for awhile, only to interrupt once more with some other set of signals for her to “read” and respond to.

An active process of communication, exchange, and negotiation is going on between the two, where the mother’s ends are adapted to the baby’s requirements, and the baby learns how to please, displease, express, and effect transactions with his caretaker. Ground rules are established, signals defined, and, where development proceeds well, a sense of mutual respect for each other’s boundaries and requirements prevails. Each recognizes areas where concessions must be made to the will and the needs of the other, and each will bargain successfully for something extra for himself from time to time. Thus, negotiation can be present from the very beginning of human social experience.

To be sure, negotiation is subject to pathological forces as well as healthy ones. In this respect, we will exemplify two possible degrees of pathologic variant that can emerge. The first continues to involve some process of negotiation, with the same tactics used, but with stakes that are meaningfully different. Thus, even if an overbearing adult is determined upon some degree of coercion of the relatively helpless child, he can still bargain to some extent about the degree of submission or compliance that will be exacted. If the baby must have his solid food at a certain time whether he feels like having it or not, he can spit out some of it, or only take a limited amount, and that will be acceptable. Without words, the exchange takes place and some sort of agreement is reached. Neither party is altogether happy, but they find a modus vivendi and their conflicting needs are not pushed beyond that.

A second alternative is that no negotiation is permitted and no compromise accepted. The infant must comply, and a variety of troubled and troublesome states can follow. There can be a series of psychophysologic responses on the baby’s part, like choking, or vomiting, or falling asleep. Behavioral reactions, can be resorted to such as threshing about, turning one’s head from side to side, clenching the jaws to keep the spoon out, pushing away with the hands, or arching the back and crying—with the parent grimly pursuing, and forcing, and sometimes slapping or screaming at the infant.

Derivatives of these patterns can persist for years, with an endless replay of these oral exchanges of defiance, submission, domination, forcing, evading, fighting against, compelling, and in so many different ways, engaging in the power struggle. Such behavior is, of course, not always of oral phase origin, but to whatever extent these issues do derive from early oral experience, the problems are truly preverbal; words and language have little effect in regulating the respective behaviors of the involved family members. Regardless of whatever such people say to one another, it has little emotional or behavioral meaning. The problem is not one of purposeful deception; it is deeper than that. They do not think or feel in verbal terms, but relate essentially with behavior and emotion. No contract they make with one another is likely to hold; no threat, accusation, declaration of love, or act of reconciliation is emotionally credited. They are, instead, excessively alert to the behavioral cues that will tell them what the other person “really” feels or means, and they react to these signals in behavioral ways. This poses special problems to those who intervene and try to help with such
situations, and requires primary attention in treatment planning of any type.

The anal stage

During the second and third years of life, the anal period* of development, the stage is set for a normal, age-appropriate appearance of another kind of power struggle. This is the period of major civilizing when control of body functions begins to be formed into the mold of the culture. It is also a time for definitive delineation of the self as distinct from the caretaker, the self as imitator, actor, doer, and controller. It is a time for the delineation of the psychological boundaries between the child's body and the parent's. And, finally, it is a time for learning both how to oppose and how to comply—and it is therefore a fateful time for engaging the issues of power and authority. The oral stage exchanges lay the groundwork; the anal stage experiences are especially influential upon the character of power and authority-related attitudes.

The inner drives of this period transfer their emphasis from oral taking in and biting to anal and urethral holding in or letting go and to muscular control of every sort. There is a powerful need to act and an equally strong wish to control the actions of others. Because the child is able to tolerate increased self-reliance and muscular development, but still has developed only rudimentary peer relationships, the healthy concepts of group play need to be taught and enforced by a watchful adult. In other words, a group of two-year-olds is essentially a group of individualists; none has a concept of group mediation. It is this self-centered, possessive, aggressive behavior—normal in toddlers—that is the mark of anal phase regression in many thwarted adults.

Territoriality and ownership become serious issues—there are treasured possessions, transitional objects, and staked out areas of ownership or domination. A sense of individual self develops with defined borders and specific identity. The child learns what it is like to be invaded, both literally as with an enema or injections, and figuratively in terms of psychologic boundaries as through physical restraint or the taking away of toys. Negative behavior is a commonplace, and yields to compliance only after some assertion of individuality in the form of an initial refusal. Rage, aggression, and violence are not uncommon expressions during this developmental stage, and tantrums, destructive activity, and cruelty are often encountered.

This is the stage when action seems to become the dominant mode of expression; it plays a major role in communication, relationship, and reality mastery. A remarkable number of muscle patterns must be learned and subjected to socializing forces. During this time the child gets what is apparently a primary satisfaction from doing things with his body and muscles. Toddlers are often busy and active people. Moreover, there is a profound need to master reality through action, to explore the dimensions of one's life space, to touch, handle, push, pull, manipulate, and generally come to develop a relationship to the world through kinetic exchange. Social reality, too, comes to be known by learning where the boundaries are between self and sibling, self and caretaker, self and peer. There is an evident need to experiment with and to explore what it means and how it feels to move in on others, to invade their boundaries, and take their possessions, as well as how it feels to have one's own boundaries invaded.

Another vital socializing activity of the time, although in-
volving many complex steps, is the attaching of verbal names and associations to feelings and to behavior. The child begins to learn to connect muscle patterns with verbal sequences. Words come to initiate or evoke all sorts of control of, or at least interferences with, the former relatively free thrust of impulse. Some may be as simple as "no-no"; others take the intricate form of, "You must let mommy know when you want to make peepee." The child hears them from the parents and begins the stepwise processes of internalization that will contribute to the later formation of the superego.

With words, it becomes increasingly possible to shift from a primary power-linked relationship style to one with a more symbolic authority-dominated character. Words automatically incline the user toward the conceptual, the abstract, the symbolic. They can take the place of things and actions, and they become vehicles for emotion. The wish to be loved by the parent and to be held in good regard begins to move into the forefront. One can now talk about things, declare love, obtain reassurance; the earlier fears of destruction or abandonment can also be put into words, reassurances can be heard, and the fears can lose some of their immediacy. Thus, at the very height of the power struggle, the gradual transformation of the relationship toward an authority-dominated exchange is taking place. The way becomes open for issues in a relationship to move away from: "Since my parent is stronger and bigger than me, will my parent keep me safe or allow me to perish?" and begin to approach: "Is my parent to be respected and obeyed because she helps me feel good?"

More to the point: can one discuss things with one's parent, make one's wishes known, argue one's cause, and thus learn to experience and assert authority as well? It is often possible to carry out a valid process of verbal negotiation with very young children.

Obviously this shift will take place only under favorable conditions. Issues concerning power are particularly cogent at this age in terms of the strengths of the toddler's drives and the struggle with controls in managing them, and the youngster is more prone to act and to provoke action. Where circumstances are not favorable, the opportunity is also present for development to be dominated by nonverbal patterns. A sudden slap without warning, an abrupt ejection from a scene of interaction, the use of words as assaultive weapons rather than as conveyors of meaning about limits and controls, the violent manhandling when some adult or larger sibling loses control—all the many elements of "action orientation" are also best taught at this stage. Thus, the power orientation can be augmented as well as transformed, depending on how the child is reared.

Because of the daily struggle with drives and their control, the toddler relies to an extraordinary extent on the caretaker to help him in this critical arena. The same kinds of aggressive or sometimes violent nonverbal behavior by those from whom he needs to learn control clearly have the opposite effect. The child's level of development inclines him to interpret events in aggressive or violent terms even when they are merely determined and forceful, and this lends special color to his later behavior. Developmental data suggest that what is perceived passively as spectator or victim at this time of life is frequently reproduced years later as a character trait of aggressive action. From feeling powerless, he reverses roles to strive to feel powerful through action and force.

Magical thinking becomes enmeshed with patterns of impulse control and environmental mastery; the elaborate bedtime rituals of many toddlers speak vividly for the need and use such youngsters have for magic. The prime purpose, of course, of all magic is to exert power over reality. For the child who feels so small and helpless, especially in the face of inner pressure, compulsive sequences of all sorts, ceremonies, special things that are said and done, may well be his chief means of coping with inner and outer demands. On the
whole, such behavior is part of healthy development. It is an age-appropriate tactic for mastery, however illusory, during this stage of development. Only if the child is unable to develop realistic internal controls, or is subject to excessive or inconsistent external control, is he likely to use such patterns too much. Under such circumstances, these can sometimes be the beginning for such later disturbances as compulsive neuroses as substitutes for genuine mastery.

A prime goal of the struggles in interpersonal relationships now is the gradual achievement of separation from the earlier symbiotic bond, along with an adequate level of individuation. There is an inevitable ambivalence here. The youngster is at once mourning his loss of total attachment and at the same time striving for his independence. These simultaneously necessary and yet altogether divergent yearnings make for many of the conflicts of this period, and most children show phase-specific difficulties of some sort. The paradigm of the period is an interaction in which provocativeness and control are the everyday stuff of relationship. The child clings to his object of dependency and, at the same time, provokes her and demands his freedom.

Overt assaultive aggression is no rarity in this period, particularly toward a new sibling. Whatever degree of subtlety or refinement the toddler may begin to elaborate in the power struggle with parents, it is often not exercised with the baby. There the impulses are likely to take the form of crude, direct, physical domination. But such attitudes can find expression toward parents and other adults as well. The biting, which became possible a year earlier with the development of teeth, can now take a prime place in the child's interpersonal tactics. Spitting might also appear. Hitting, kicking, and even using crude clubs or other weapons are seen during this era and sometimes require active control.

It is not unusual for the behavior, indeed the total psychological posture, of many a teenage delinquent to be described in such terms as "... attempting to deal with adolescent problems with the emotional equipment of a two-year-old ..." Close examination of such a troubled teenager is likely to reveal a tendency toward driven and restless activity, low frustration tolerance, ready use of magical thinking, and responding to any upsetting stimulus by action—often impulsive and ill-considered action. There is, often, an apparent lack of the moderating capacity for fantasy (the impulse is acted out rather than daydreamed about), a rather constricted use of language and the frequent resort to words as epithets (to the point that normal speech may be studded with obscenities) as well as an overall sense of angry childishness in many relationships.

These youngsters may be sullen and silent in interviews, and quite ready to say they do not like to talk. Occasionally they are garrulous, given to logorrhea in the service of an endless "snow job," which they may later describe as "bullshit." And their histories, more properly called records in many instances, are rife with vandalism, cruelty, and violence. They make up much of the daily case load of the juvenile court worker, and they exemplify in many ways the stereotype evoked by the term juvenile delinquent. Dynamically, it is no gross distortion to consider them as unreconstructed two-year-olds who may not need treatment so much as corrective childrearing.

Where passivity has become associated in the child's mind with pain or humiliation, he will often react to any situation that recalls the traumatic state by leaping into some form of activity. This may vary from diffuse restlessness to specific and directed behavior. The child who becomes a driven and compulsive worker, or who cannot stand criticism without immediately becoming provocative or running away from the situation, or who responds to teasing by fighting, may be coping with a fear of passivity in unconstructive ways. The goal of the response is to convert the situation into one in
which the child is the doer rather than the one to whom something is done. There are children who learn early that their most effective coping techniques and best defenses against unfulfilled needs lie in the expression of rage. Anger can be used as a defense against many conflicted or more risky emotions; it may seem the safest of all possible feelings. If one is angry, he is less vulnerable to being taken advantage of, to being mocked, scorned, or hurt. For the child, the logic of the angry position is impeccable. Thereafter any welling up of yearnings for closeness or comfort are likely to lead to an angry outburst or, in an older child, to a bout of vandalism. If rejection seems inevitable, it feels better to appear to cause that rejection through offensive anger than to be at the mercy of it. In wrath there is the illusion of dignity, self-respect, strength. Above all, anger wards off one of the most painful of human feelings; the sensation of helplessness. In brief, in anger there is a possibility of power.

The impact of such a stance on parent-child interaction is self-evident. If attempts at closeness lead to angry reactions, and attempts at reproof provoke rage, there is little left as neutral territory where parent and child can meet to resolve legitimate authority issues without fighting. The youngster who may have passively accepted his lot during his first year of life might begin to fight back in the second or third. Where the younger child might withdraw or fall asleep, the toddler will become muscually excited, goaded into noisy and aggressive activity, and thus sometimes become the target for additional manhandling. Often a parental response that is intended to be corrective ends up as assaultive.

Like the oral phase, anal phase problems in adolescence can take their character from sphincteric function directly, from associated training and behavioral sets, and from ego-connected developmental events characteristic of that time of life. It is not unusual for enuresis to persist into the teens, but soiling does become relatively uncommon after puberty—although occasionally there are cases where this persists. Much more commonly, dirtiness, sloppiness, verbal soiling through scatological speech, and messiness in body care, clothes, or manner of dealing with the immediate surroundings can continue directly from unresolved anal problems; from early childhood onward the individual is a slob. While this might gratify some covert wish within the parental unconscious, the child is unaware of that aspect. It is on the whole calculated to provoke a never-ending sense of irritation and frustration in most parents. Without doing anything else that smacks of overt rebellion, the youngster who determinedly clings to expressions of anality in his appearance, demeanor, and habits can maintain an intense authority struggle with his parents in which he is almost inevitably the victor.

Where the childhood sphincteric pattern has been one of retention and constipation, the adolescent is likely to be a stubborn person, set in his ways, and easily triggered into digging in his heels and refusing to cooperate. The way to power for him is to withhold assent, and his position of choice is, “I won’t! You can’t make me!” Any kind of parental address is in danger of being perceived as an attempt to force him to comply and to this he responds instantly by negativism and unyielding refusal. This is often true even in areas where the parents’ and the teenager’s wishes coincide. Thus, even a youth who enjoys music may give up practicing his instrument or taking lessons if this activity is highly valued by the parents and gets swept up in the power struggle between the generations. Academic achievement is frequently another innocent bystander, victimized by the need to defeat the parents in an endeavor prized by them. Fortunately, this is not the usual case; indeed, many a gifted youngster will use his talent or competence to get himself out of the house and find his rewards away from home.
The key to much of this complex and disturbing behavior is identity formation in the anal phase. Since this is the period in life when separation and individuation are the important goals of ego work, it is the striving for autonomy that becomes the hallmark of daily interaction. In the teens, once again this sequence replays; many youngsters go to inordinate lengths to achieve a sense of separateness and some version of independence. The working out of this need is one of the origins of authority conflicts. The following are only a few of the numerous axes along which this work of separation is conducted, but they can serve as illustrations.

In adolescence the earliest and the easiest way to detach is to turn against the former supporter and to devalue or to oppose him; this intrapsychic maneuver simultaneously defends against the equally natural tendency to remain comfortably dependent. This is the classic teenage picture of finding peripheral and minor ways to challenge parental authority. Usually it confines itself to safe areas—clothes, hair, etc.

But it is not the only way; both the child and the adolescent have other possibilities as well. To protect against loss and loneliness in the separation-individuation phase, the child can continue to cling in some way. He can retain the memory of the grande, idealized mother image, and continue to look at adults in this way, or to think of him or herself in these terms. When one does this, a part of oneself or of important people around one remains larger than life—superhuman.

From this vantage point we can view the movement through this anal phase as a gradual sorting out of the grandiose unity of symbiosis into two component portions. The psychoanalytic concept of narcissistic development suggests a very specific course for this aspect of personality unfolding. The power and grandeur inherent in the very nature of the symbiotic context can become in some measure internalized; the now separated child is himself or herself a bearer of grandeur, the self is megalomaniacally perceived and valued. One feels powerful, superior, commanding—two-year-olds in the grip of such emotions are literally unrealistic, ready to run away on their own or to do battle with the parents over some refusal. The child gives orders, or falls shrieking to the ground in a wild tantrum of frustrated arrogance if subjected to physical limits. Given good child-rearing, this narcissistic stance is gradually tempered in later years so that the individual is filled with a strong sense of self-confidence and self-worth, and at the same time pursues high ideals.

This level of maturity may not be present during the teens, however. At this period, it is not rare, especially when under stress, for a boy or girl to talk and think in grandiose terms. Where the youngster embarks upon a project, it is bigger than anyone else’s, bigger than the room in which he began it. If he seeks revenge, it is in terms of getting gangs of friends to join him in a mass assault which will utterly destroy the opponent. If there is interference with some wished-for project, the youngster is ready to take it to the mayor, or the president, or the superintendent of the hospital. The adolescent is all too ready to dig in and take an unrealistic stand: “Nobody can tell me what to do! I’m the only one who has a right to decide anything about myself!” He will speak as though he is all-powerful, or has a right to be. There is an exaggerated disdain for authority. For most youngsters this sort of hyperbole is merely an overblown statement of a wish for more autonomy. For the more disturbed, it is evidence of their swollen, narcissistic self-perception.

The alternative adaptive form is to externalize the grandiosity, to project it all onto the parent. Then one develops an attitude of submissiveness and compliance to the adult. The child has been able to get past the full sense of unity and fusion, but retains a dependent link to the parent through
obedience and compliance. Such youngsters are unnaturally good and provide little stress to the caretaker. This sort of adaptation probably lends itself to later dependent authority relationships; the youth continues to see certain figures as heroes or tyrants of more or less grandiose proportions, and toward whom he continues to be submissively yielding.

There may frequently be a vacillation between personal grandiosity and uncritical idealization of significant others; the child shifts unpredictably back and forth from arrogant demandingness to servile compliance. In his teens the youngster is amazed and confused to find feelings of worthlessness, self-abasement, an extraordinary sensitivity to criticism standing shoulder to shoulder with self-importance, fantasies of grandeur, and a secret—or not so secret—sense of looking down on everyone from a vantage point of patronizing superiority.

When there is healthy progress in these narcissistic developments, they slowly descend from their post-symbiotic heights to an ever more realistic level where neither one’s own narcissism nor that projected upon others is of excessive proportions. Under optimal conditions, this primitive narcissism forms the basis of the ego ideal and continues to operate as a positive force in personal behavior thereafter. It serves as a guide; a leading image toward which one can strive. In projected form, it allows for enough idealization of others so that they can serve as models. It furnishes the future adolescent with his earliest source for the crucial work of mature ideal formation.

Reflections of anal conflicts in parental behavior

For the parents, there are a variety of responses that may emerge from unresolved conflicts dating to the anal phase. A child can be regarded as a possession, prized or despised, an object to be collected (the large family is pointed to as “quite a collection”) or an item to be gotten rid of.

Parents, too, can be still struggling with unresolved residues of the separation-individuation process. Their parenting may be dominated by the need to find their own independence from the child. The major concern is “getting away” and “having a life of one’s own.” The child is experienced as a clinging, entrapping entity against which the parent must fight to achieve his autonomy. Much parental neglect is a direct product of a continuing struggle with such unfinished developmental business. The original individuation problems provide the scenario, and only the stage upon which it is acted is different. In some instances, the occasional eruption of child abusing behavior is the reenactment by a physically overpowering adult of the tantrum of the overwhelmed two-year-old struggling with his autonomy conflicts.

Where issues about loss of their own parents’ love have continued to fester as nagging, hurting presences in the parents’ psychic life, this concern may be displaced into fear of loss of the child’s love and can create an endless state of parental uncertainty. How is one to prevent such loss of love—how can one set limits on a child when the constant worry is that “he won’t like me if I displease him”? When the child can fill the parent with anxiety by indicating displeasure and threatening to withdraw his affection, what power is thus vested in him! The hapless parent is once more the potential victim, and the ensuing pattern of childrearing will obviously sacrifice discipline and control to seduction and overgratification.

For the child, it is inescapable that he will entertain similar expectations from all future relationships, and he will be filled with baffled, uncomprehending, narcissistic resentment whenever he fails to exert similar power. Thus, where the parental position is one of helpless fear of their own
authority, when they feel altogether controlled by the child, always at his beck and call, ever attending to his whims and struggling to gratify his every wish, all the power is thrust into the hands of the children. Such children's development is sure to be skewed. Instead of becoming victims or rebels, such youngsters become the tyrants. They take their control for granted, and, depending on the severity of the parental problem, they become more or less unable to cope with the inevitable frustrations that come with growth. As teenagers they are likely to be contemptuous, demanding, arrogant, selfish, and bossy, a combination designed to keep the generation gap from closing, and not calculated to endear them either to adults or to their own peers.

Another dimension of parental problem may be the over-idealization of the child. This problem may represent anal fixations (inappropriate overvaluation of their own bodily products), or disturbed narcissistic development (unresolved grandiosity is projected upon the child as representative of their perfect selves). For example, the child can be viewed from the outset as without blemish or flaw. Not only can he do no wrong, but he is praised to the skies and given to understand that he is different from other people—special, better. If there is by chance some external reality such as choice lineage, unusual talent, or exceptional physical appearance, the idealization may focus on that. But no external reality need be there; the child is better because he is part of mother or father, and therefore inherently better. Later, one is likely to encounter another version of the grandiose, narcissistic teenager.

The other side of the idealized child is, of course, the devalued one. This, too, can have anal origins (disgust for one's bodily products) as well as narcissistic ones. It is no great rarity for a parent not to like a given child. It becomes much more serious when there is a narcissistic core to the relationship, and the grandiosity is retained by father or mother; the child is devalued, not good enough. Under these circumstances, the parent may do his duty toward the youngster, but the message gets across, and that child grows up with as great a degree of self-hate as his idealized counterpart may be possessed of self-love. Similarly, the child who is devalued because the parent cannot value that which is part of himself is stunted in the development of self-worth. Neither beginning will make it easy to bridge the generation gap in later years. In particular, the devalued child lacks all power; he is helpless and lacks both an inner and a parentally recognized basis from which to negotiate and achieve increasing personal authority.

The struggle for control that is so much a part of anal phase management can have special impact on a parent whose primary perception of his offspring centers around the need for total control and total obedience. The consequence of this parental style on children is considerable, and by adolescence there are inevitably adaptational difficulties. The youngster may submit and be terrified of the parent and afraid to express any vestige of autonomy; or he may rebel so that the parents' approval is the "kiss of death" for everything from skirt length to career choice. In less extreme situations, compromise solutions can emerge as when the youngster learns how to give the parent the semblance of obedience and compliance demanded while he covertly goes about doing what he pleases (and what he pleases is exactly what the parent most disapproves of). Of course, this implies that enough latitude was left in the childrearing to allow for some flexibility and for the survival of alternative modes of behavior. Or, a youngster might alternate modes of behavior between doing and undoing, episodically complying, then defensively defying, and, in turn filled with guilt, returning to comply again and to start the cycle once more.
The phallic-oedipal stage

Core gender identity is established early, probably in the second year of life. But it is not until the phallic stage* that genital concerns come to the forefront, and sexual role differentiations begin to take on richer meanings. The child discovers new qualities of pleasure and danger in sexuality, and relates himself to his parents in those terms. Now, both authority and power become connected with the attributes of maleness and femaleness. One seeming source of power is that of phallic possession, and the attendant fears of castration. Another is that awesome capacity to produce life, as seen in the female who is pregnant. This, too, may easily be perceived in terms of power, since the power to create life implies the power to destroy it.

The presence or absence of the penis, the sensations that come from handling one's own penis or clitoris, and the phenomena of erection and detumescence, all collectively contribute to the experience of this time of life. Both boys and girls engage in elaborate fantasy explanations for what happened to bring about the presence of the penis in the one, and its absence in the other; and usually possession of a penis is the initially preferred state. Similarly, womb envy (a parallel term to penis envy, denoting the boy's envy of woman's procreative capacity) is as potent a source of wishful fantasy and as aggrieved a sense of deprivation for little boys as is penis envy for girls. By this phase of development most children have learned that women bear children and that men do not. For the young, relatively homebound, child it is often the productivity and home-sustaining activity of the mother that is most constantly obvious. Likewise, it is mother's disciplinary power that is most often exercised over the young children. Both sexes dream of being masterful men and productive women, and each sex may yearn sometimes to be the one and sometimes the other.

As the child sees it, it is the parents who originally gave—or withheld or took away from—each child important body structures for their own whims and reasons, and it becomes vital for the child to divine the bases on which parents act. Daydreams are the very heart of these experiences, and some of the most important developmental activities during this period take place in fantasy. Particularly with regard to penis envy and castration fantasies, these imagic activities reach their greatest pitch of intensity when children are fingering their own genitals and experiencing a sort of feedback loop between self-engendered sensation and self-engendered idea. These masturbatory fantasies are incorporated in whole or in part into later character structures.

In particular, certain phases of phallic adjustment come to play a tremendous role in sorting out the power/authority aspects of parent-child relationships. Of great consequence are the simple facts of anatomy. The child sees, touches, and feels his own body, unique to his sex, and sees others' bodies. The little boy, for example, who sees his father's penis, especially when the penis is erect, might be consumed by painful feelings of rivalry and inadequacy as he compares his own body to father's. The driving wish to be bigger than, better than, more outstanding than father can serve a decade later to fuel a great deal of adolescent work, often with constructive potential. This is one of the great founts of ambition, and

* The phallic stage refers to that period in the child's life when fantasies, sensations, and concerns regarding his genitals become of central importance in his development. The term originated in the belief that at this age still both boys and girls knew of only one genital, the penis. Evidence of an early awareness of the vagina and of specific female sexual sensations from infancy render that meaning untenable. However, the designation "phallic phase" retains dynamic developmental validity because there does exist a period during which both sexes seem to value only the penis, though this period is relatively brief and non-pathogenic in healthy girls, and does not imply that female sexuality is a secondary rather than a primary development.
the hard driving, success oriented teenager is often nourishing his energies from this inner wellspring of rivalrous yearning and distressing infantile comparison.*

Not infrequently, however, the envy of the child's mind turns to rage and leads to a less sublimated outcome. There may be recurrent intense fantasies of taking away father's big penis and making it his own. Such fantasies are, or become, unconscious, but then do become a source of future character structure.

In adolescence, these character traits find expression in power/authority struggles as patterns of provocative behavior which collectively add up to an unending onslaught by the young on the adult man. Such young boys can become almost diabolical in their passion to cut father down to size, humiliate him, bring his efforts to naught. This might be carried on very indirectly, especially where the youngster also fears retaliation. In the extreme case, however, a continuing and persistent drumfire of sarcasm, confrontation, and denunciation sounds through the household, and may readily generalize to all adult society. Often it is only parental authority that is the target; here no actual violence occurs. Disputatiousness is the instrument, and only in a symbolic sense is the youngster set on taking away whatever is the parent's prerogative and making it his own.

The situation becomes more serious at the point that the level shifts from the symbolic word to the material act. These become the clinical cases, the legal and social problems. They may start in puberty with smoking, drinking, and demands for money, the use of the car, and the total right to regulate their own activities, and go on to those less rational attempts as overthrowing school and university governance and wresting away political power.

A somewhat analogous situation can exist for the little girl. The typical female child goes through a phase of penis envy. Under reasonably good circumstances she masters this; the innate positive drives toward femaleness again become predominant after this temporary distress, and she grows thereafter into the natural acceptance and enjoyment of being a woman. Circumstances are not always good, however, and in some instances the penis envy fixes. It can then become a dominant theme in the girl's life. It can express itself through rivalry with men at every stage in the youngster's life from compulsively driven tomboy to ruthlessly competitive business executive. It may take the more aggressive form of a wish to castrate men, to take away their position, their money, their role (whatever becomes for the girl her particular equivalent or symbol of phallic presence), and make them her own.

But men are not the only targets for such feelings. Since the mother is often regarded in fantasy as the source of the "castration," the youngster is at least likely to level her attack on her own mother, and on women in general, as on men. The child may be filled with a passion for revenge, and carry out many activities that appear to have no motive other than retaliation. In her teens, such a youngster is likely to be as grandiose, challenging, defiant, and negative as the phallic boy described above.

Thus the door is open for a wide range of symbolic provocative acts that may include obscene language, verbal defiance, refusal to dress or to wash as the parents prefer, refusal to keep the "right" company, and overt disobedience. There is a special form of lying that often accompanies this, in which the youngster seems to have to make up lies when it does not matter, where there is no need. In the extreme situation, the behavior can become very antisocial indeed,
and can be one of the sources of indiscriminate sexuality (with attendant risk of pregnancy or VD), and running away from home.

Males are not the only apparent wielders of power and authority. The visible anatomical facts of female breasts and childbearing must also be dealt with. These attributes become associated with power issues that are uniquely female. Mother’s breasts are as visually impressive as is father’s penis. Mother is the food provider in most homes regardless of her suckling status. But for the child, boy or girl, who witnesses mother nursing a younger sibling or who is dimly aware of having once been nourished by those breasts, the breasts take on a virtually magical food-giving and comforting power. And the power to give likewise implies the power to withhold.

Either parent can be fantasied as the giver or withholder of a penis. In mother’s case, she is similarly the “arbitrary” dispenser of the other bodily sources of power—care, nurture, and control. And inseparable from the anatomical emblems of female power are the realities of parental presence or absence, and of discipline. Thus both nurture and creativity can become associated with femaleness—female breasts and the female reproductive body. And, under current patterns of childrearing, so may the brute power of physical discipline. The associations thus begun and fixed in this phase of development are only strengthened when children move into their early school years. The authority of the teacher, the power of approval and disapproval, and disciplinary power remain the province largely of females. The lesson is even more forcefully driven home as little boys find themselves so often judged by standards derived from the behavior of normal little girls, who tend to be more verbal, more compliant, less disruptively rambunctious.

Many of the repercussions in the later adolescent struggles with power and authority consequent upon these associations with female anatomy and physiology are quite similar to those described with regard to phallic power. There is both the healthy identification which spurs adolescent strivings toward productivity and creativity, and also the envious anger that fires repudiations, denunciations, furious verbal attacks, and personally and socially destructive acting out. Pathologically premature sexuality in girls and willful early pregnancy may be fueled by the wish to wrest inappropriately the power of creativity from mother.

There are healthy facets as well as disturbances in adolescents’ efforts to cope with those authority issues that are best understood in female rather than in purely phallic male terms. Since creativity and productivity in contemporary society have such strong unconscious female elements, these qualities require acceptance of and identification with these female components. For both sexes, the legitimate authority that comes with productive academic achievement and creative intelligence and with the nurturant qualities inherent in the preparation for socially constructive functions and professions—medicine, for one example—implies that the healthy exercise of authority requires the ability to identify with and to internalize both masculine and feminine qualities.

The way is not always smooth, however. Envy and defiance of female power underlie many of adolescent boys’ derogatory and rebellious attitudes toward their mothers; avoidance of reawakened oedipal temptations is not their sole determinant. Unresolved conflicts reflecting a fear or resentment of female qualities may cause indifference toward school performance and intellectual development, hostility toward such social demands, and in the more severe instances, school failure and dropout. Boys who despair of ever achieving the power they ascribe to women may become the passive drifters, the wistfully out-of-date flower children forever seeking
mothering by their more productive girlfriends under the guise of trying to "find themselves." One of the most pathologically destructive outcomes is acted out by those boys who misuse their phallic power, willfully impregnating girls, and thus turning female creative power against them.

Conditions of this sort are radically influenced by sibling patterns and the actual physical interactions among siblings, but the chances are that the ultimate determinants of these patterns, as of so many others, will go back to the child-adult interactions.

The Oedipus complex. As a child goes through the oral and anal phases, he is emotionally involved not only with his own body, its sensations, and its functions, but with the parental bodies and functions as well. And now the phallic child feels, looks at, and explores his body, and turns toward parental sexuality in all its dimensions. Characteristically, the child now has wishful fantasies of genital sexual interaction with the parents. But it is not only the genitals; the now more developed ego of the child continues to elaborate the older notions of possessing a person—having someone all to oneself—of having a husband or a wife.

In its original version the Oedipus complex took the form of little boys wanting their mothers and little girls wanting their fathers. In each case there was an accompanying wish to get rid of the other parent, now experienced as a rival.* But this understanding of the Oedipus complex is oversimplified. The development of both genders during this phase sees currents of attraction to and repulsion from both parents. Thus at some point the little boy is erotically drawn to the person of his father. He wishes to become the father's love object to take the place of mother. Here he seeks not to

rival father by fantasied activity but to yield to him in fantasied passivity. Submission is the other side of power, and the little boy is drawn toward both polarities. Later, in adolescence, this may take the form of wishing to be independent and to escape from the seduction that father represents, or wishing to be a failure and thus passively invite father's love, or in a disguised way to invite father's attention by arousing his angry disappointment.

The little girl follows a somewhat different course during this period of awakened and intensified sexual feelings. Since her initial love object also was mother, her first sexual desires are focused upon mother, and she wishes to love mother in the way she imagines father does. In this, the girl's phallic phase, she wishes for a penis so as to be mother's sexual partner and to give mother a baby. It is partly out of inevitable frustration of this wish, but largely in response to innate feminine and heterosexual strivings, that she shifts her wishes and sexual fantasies onto her father and moves into her oedipal phase.

Similar to boys during the oedipal phase, girls experience fantasied power struggles. There is a wish to displace mother and the parallel fear of mother's retaliation. There may be a pull toward submission, with the girl renouncing her heterosexual desires for father in order to retain mother's continued love, usually the regressive, infantile qualities of prerivalrous love. And since the little girl need not fear actual castration at the hands of her rival—she has and ultimately needs no penis—castration anxiety does not add its force to her oedipal conflict. In consequence, she does not renounce her desires nor repress her fantasies as sharply or as totally as does the little boy. Thus, in the event of defective maternal identification, there are roots of continued rivalry and power struggles with mother that interfere with the tasks of later development, and may reflect themselves in repetitive and disastrous sexual competition with other women in later
stages of life. In addition, even though the girl's phallic phase healthily leaves no damaging traces because it is contrary to her innate femaleness, where the girl-mother relationship has been pathogenic, the girl's resentment can, as previously described, lead to serious authority-defiant behavior.

The healthy outcome of the Oedipus complex for both sexes is consonant with their biologically innate male or female development, and these early heterosexual feelings do not become reversed, denied, nor defiantly retained. The parent as object of those feelings is relinquished; they come under the sway of the superego, and move toward eventual expression in the choice of extrafamilial sexual objects and marital partner. Under normal conditions they are fated to be lived out with appropriate objects and gratified. They will make for lust, for love, and for tenderness.

Some aspects of the Oedipus complex continue to influence relationships with parents during adolescence, often manifested in authority interactions. It is characteristic of early adolescence that oedipal objects are closer to consciousness, and as puberty advances, these ideas are brought to the surface with a sort of naked immediacy that can precipitate outbursts of negativistic, provocative behavior. It often happens, for example, that as a boy masturbates, during his moments of erotic excitement, he might find himself fantasizing mother or sister, or someone like them. His need to disown the thought leads him to reject mother or sister as a defense; he picks a fight with them, acts provocatively toward them, will not talk to the one or the other, and in general turns against them in a manner that appears to them to be as uncalled for as it is incomprehensible. But he needs distance, and the hostility and disobedience may be the only way he knows at the moment to achieve that end.

The smooth course of development may be punctuated by mother's pregnancy and the arrival of a new baby. The phallic youngster's mind is filled with endless theories and speculations about how the baby got in there, how it will get out, how it grows, whose it is, and so on. Given warm, mature, and realistic parental handling, such issues can be dealt with well, mastered, and leave the youngster in a state of heightened competence and control. For many children, however, whose preparation for phallic-oedipal concerns and events has been deficient, there is a measure of narcissistic defeat with such events. Thus, the boy who felt mother loved him most of all, and who then must face the realization that mother is "replacing" him with another baby, and with father's baby at that, might view this as a bitter and humiliating personal disappointment.

This sequence will play its role in his teens when he seems driven by an unending compulsion to disappoint his parents in turn. They want respect and he is foul-mouthed, they value propriety and he makes the neighbor's daughter pregnant, they emphasize family togetherness and he moves out to live with "hippies," they consider education important and he drops out of school. Point by point he frustrates and negates their every yearning, just as he felt they did to him once upon a time. From being helpless he becomes all-powerful by utilizing a most tragic and influential interpersonal power maneuver: self-destruction.

In adolescence, the phallic-fixated girl who unconsciously fantasies getting back the penis that she imagines was taken away can feel a peculiar pressure to take things from the open counter of the department store, particularly things that will adorn her body like sweaters, skirts, jewelry, or underwear. She does not know that she is repetitively using inappropriate, and therefore unsuccessful, techniques to repair her fantasied damage. The boy who is struggling with similar penis-deprivation, penis-humiliation concerns, will similarly steal clothes, books, ornaments—he too will adorn
his body by what he takes from others. It is not by chance that the current term for such behavior is “ripping off”; unconsciously, he is “ripping off” because he was “ripped off.”

A girl who is trying to cope with heterosexual feelings toward her father by side by side with more infantile yearnings toward mother may join forces with an older out-of-home girlfriend who becomes her teacher and confidante, and under whose guidance she then turns toward being boy-crazy or promiscuous. Thus, she achieves a once-removed realization of her yearnings toward both parents and can at the same time protect herself from knowing anything about these unacceptable feelings that involve them. In her relationships at home, she is distant, disinterested, evasive, has nothing much to say to either parent (although one or the other might be able to communicate with her to some extent) and becomes hostile when any attempt is made to deal with her choice of friends or her sexual behavior. Since so much of what the girl yearns for is incestuous, and hence forbidden, she feels hemmed in and constricted simply by being near her parents; they seem inimical to her and in every way she can fight back against them, admitting them no authority over her.

It is clear that there are countless variations possible in adolescent patterns of coping with reawakened oedipal urges, and many of them manifest themselves in authority issues with parents and other adult parent figures. As indicated, even the healthiest of adolescents may challenge authority as a means of distancing themselves from incestuous or dependency urges, and where original oedipal issues were not effectively resolved, serious power/authority conflicts are virtually inevitable.

The superego and the ego ideal.* The gradual resolution of the oedipal phase is accompanied by the relatively firm establishment of the superego. This complex developmental step takes place gradually over a period of years. Initially, an infant has no inner voice of self-control to guide him. During his first two or three years, when he is subject to the inevitable control and prohibitions encountered especially during toddlerhood, he normally learns to exercise some control over his actions. But these controls are not truly internalized. Basically, he is dependent upon outside—parental—influence for control of impulse; even those isolated instances of seeming self-control operate out of fear of external punishment. Then, in conjunction with the mental development that is part of and results from the resolution of the Oedipus complex, he gradually develops a newly organized mental capacity that is ready to begin maturing so as to fulfill, ever more effectively, its lifetime task of internal regulation of behavior.

This is the mission of the superego, to bring an individual into a cooperative relationship with his immediate social environment. It involves an internalization of the values and traditions of his family and of his culture (to the extent that his family embodies cultural values), the values implicit in the life style of his neighborhood, and the outlook of his parents on what is right and what is wrong about human behavior. The oedipal child is a great learner, and he internalizes and assimilates values constantly. He begins to establish as enduring presences within himself the views, the attitudes, and the voices of his father and mother. This is a process that extends over several years. Within the child all these impressions, incorporations, and identifications presently begin to knit together to form a dynamically integrated and responsive entity, the superego.

* There are few internal mental structures, the formation and function of which enter so intimately into future authority interactions. The discussion of their development involves complex theoretical explication, but is necessary in order to understand the authority connections, especially with regard to the often neglected maternal contributions.
As it takes form, the superego has two main aspects. The first is the part that warns, inhibits, prevents, and punishes the individual who would violate the internalized values and principles. In order to take in such a set of identifications and transform them ultimately into an adult conscience in future years, circumstances have to be at least minimally favorable in that there must be some reasonably consistent parenting figures in the child's life. There should be a positive affectional bond with one or both of the parents; there should be some parental interest in impulse control and behavior that is made clear to the child; there should be a stable parental set of values, conscious and unconscious; and there should be some positive recognition that the superego is coming into existence and is given parental approval and reward.

Needless to say, such a set of conditions is not always forthcoming. When it is not, then superego formation is impaired. Superego control can be inappropriately and harshly excessive; some suicides at least can be traced to a punitive superego. If it is too harsh, it may lose its functional capacity because the child must repress or deny it. The defense against an excessively punitive superego may be to project that inner unforgiving and implacable quality upon the outside world, and fight against all restraint as though it were externally imposed. To recognize the internal nature of such a prohibitive and guilt-producing superego is to be helpless before its omnipresence.

The superego may also be deficient in its formation and fail to provide sufficient internal controls to guide constructive behavior. Without internal controls it is far more difficult to achieve and to value appropriate behavior, and such individuals are far more likely to seek immediate gratification than to value positive social achievement.

The other aspect of the superego is the ego ideal. This has origins, too, in early parental relationships, but its deepest roots reach back into what is speculated to be the infant's most primitive self-concepts. In the earliest, undifferentiated stage, when infantile omnipotence is at its most untroubled, the infant is, as Freud noted, his own ideal. This stage is rather fleeting, and he soon comes to share that fantasied omnipotence with, and to share in the fantasied omnipotence of, mother. Even this symbiotic union is short-lived, and as Jacobson states, there is "... a transition from desires for a complete union with the mother to strivings to become only like her. Such strivings ... form the first, primitive nucleus of the future ego ideal." Throughout the early years of childhood there is incomplete distinction between the self and the mothering person, and the narcissistic kernel of the ego ideal forever retains the grandiosity of that early omnipotence.

As the oedipal child internalized the parental images, whose prohibitions and demands become the forerunners of the conscience in the superego, he also internalizes and fuses the magic idealized images of the self and of the love objects and transforms them into the ego ideal. While the first idealized love object for both sexes was mother, by this age father has become immensely important, and the development of the two sexes has begun to diverge sufficiently that this early ego ideal formation is somewhat different for boys and for girls.

The boy's yearning for his father, which is a normal part of the complex oedipal emotions, is called the negative Oedipus complex. It is the fate of this yearning to become added to and to form a major part of the core of the boy's ego ideal.* Thus the childhood sexual drive toward the parent of the same sex becomes changed into an ennobled abstraction. The idealized image of the father is perceived as less and less immediate and sensuous and becomes an abstract ideal. It will move farther from the concrete memories and experi-

---

* This brief description largely follows Blox, but it differs from his formulation in recognizing earlier components to the core of the boy's ego ideal, namely the narcissistic self and the idealized mother.
ences of childhood and become a progressively developing set of values, principles, and models toward which youth's aspirations and ambitions will forever strive and never quite attain. The ego ideal evolves until late in adolescence, during which it flares up in the form of classic adolescent overidealism. Not until the end of adolescence is its grandiosity finally dissolved, and it evolves into the tempered idealism of maturity.

Melded with the idealized father is the idealized mother. Her contribution to the ego ideal is most conspicuous in the aspirations toward creativity, and toward nurturant professions and relationships. Her place in the most primitive core of the ego ideal may account in part for the frequent tendency of men to idealize women.

For the girl, the maternal component of her ego ideal comes naturally; it was there from the beginning, and she has never had to dis-identify with mother in order to achieve her own sex-appropriate identity. The idealized image of father, too, is internalized. And the girl also must progress from the narcissistic grandiosity of the early magical ego ideal to the maturity of ideals high enough to spur constructive self-criticism and striving, but realistic enough to avoid despair, paralysis of effort, or rebellious repudiation.

The development of the ego ideal is an intricate intrapsychic process, and there are many potential vicissitudes that can become reflected in conflicts both with authorities and in the exercise of authority. Both the parents and the growing child have to be able to withstand the child's gradual realization that the real parents cannot measure up to the internal idealized images. This requires that the parents be capable of giving sufficient validity to their values and themselves, despite the fact that they are real and fallible instead of ideal and omnipotent, in order to compensate in the youngsters' mind for that loss of omnipotence. It also requires that the youngster have the ego strength to withstand the blow. Those youngsters whose parents tumble too precipitately from their magical thrones, whose parents offer too little of real value in compensation for their lost perfection, or who stubbornly try to retain the facade of omnipotence after the child begins to know better, will often respond by devaluing their parents totally. Nothing they say or believe in has worth, and any efforts to exercise even reasonable authority may be met with contempt or defiance.

The first reevaluation of internal parental images usually takes place when the child is about eight to ten years of age, and failure to withstand the impact of parental reality at this time can result in a stormy preadolescence. When the same issue is definitively joined in later adolescence, a similar failure may not only disrupt orderly authority relationships at home, but spread to society at large. Since the parents once represented the child's whole world, their images determine in large part the expectations with which he enters and engages the real world. Just as parents whose real qualities engender in their children a willingness to give the adult culture the benefit of the doubt, so those whose images have been excessively devalued also are projected upon the world. These are the adolescents who a priori mistrust and derogate all adult authority and all adult-valued cultural institutions. The "establishment" is guilty until proven innocent, and proof of innocence is virtually impossible with a prejudiced jury of one. Authority conflicts are constant, or the adolescent attempts to drop out of the adult culture entirely and set up his own, which he has the illusion is all pure and trustworthy.

The child's ego strength is crucial in the transition to a constructive ego ideal because in its primitive core the fantasies of a grandiose and omnipotent self are fused with and
indistinguishable from similarly idealized fantasy images of the parents of his symbiotic infancy. If the parents are imperfect, so must he be, and that demands ego strength to withstand. Inappropriate attitudes toward and dealings with authority await those who cannot tolerate their own deflation. Sometimes, to ward off the threat to their own magical power, they will refuse to accept a reevaluation of their idealized parental images. If their particular parents fall short, nonetheless there must be somewhere parent substitutes who will not let them down. They may go through life seeking and serving various kinds of demagogues, upon whom they project their need for the omnipotence that they secretly share. Those who in adolescence fail to cope successfully with the reevaluation of their unconscious omnipotence retain their grandiosity and may refuse to recognize the authority of anyone else. Or they may not be able to deny totally the impact of reality, and may swing unpredictably from unachievable self-expectations and haughty disdain to despair, paralysis, and passive compliance.

Thus the issues that are involved in ego ideal formation are of great significance to authority relations. The degree of stimulation the child receives, the kind of model he is offered, the help he is given in controlling impulse, the guidance in doing things for abstract reasons, the encouragement to idealize without magical or omnipotent expectations, the use of language to help with abstracting are all crucial to this aspect of development. He needs that quality of adult companionship that both helps to provide and to reinforce a sense of control, and also offers a model of adult reality that is an acceptable substitute for the primitive narcissism of the internalized images. These are major areas of interaction that can refine, or that can disrupt and render maladaptive some of the basic unconscious attitudinal sets that will become associated with authority relationships.

Reflections of phallic-oedipal conflicts in parental behavior

When the child who retains serious unresolved conflicts characteristic of the phallic period grows to adulthood and becomes a parent, the urges and pressures of his fixation level also help mold and shape his parental behavior. Thus, for such a father, his child may unconsciously represent his childhood phallus, and showing off that child in person or by picture is prompted by his own needs more than by mature pride in the child. “That’s some baby you’ve got there,” say the admiring friends, and in the father’s unconscious it were as though his little three-year-old penis were suddenly big and admired. For a mother who had to repress an inappropriately exaggerated wish for a penis and her correspondingly excessive disappointment at not being so endowed, here at last is the fantasied vindication of her feeling that she should and could obtain this longed-for object. To such a mother, the baby unconsciously symbolizes the missing penis; she has it and it is hers, she can show it off freely and it will be admired, and no one will be allowed to take it away again.

There is, of course, no intention here to mis-brand all parental pride as pathologically fixated phallic exhibitionism. That would constitute a gross injustice to one of the most healthy manifestations of good parenting. The distinction between the appropriate and the inappropriate may be obvious indeed, or may be quite subtle. In essence, the issue revolves around whether or not the parental pride is both reasonable in extent and expression and whether it reflects genuine qualities and characteristics of the child, as contrasted with using the child merely as a vehicle for unconscious parental needs. It is in these latter cases that the child is inevitably damaged. The “show-business mother” who drags her child to every try-out and pushes him unmercifully
into vicarious exhibitionism is an almost ludicrous but all too real example.

For mothers who misuse their children for unconscious phallic gratification, this new possession is so important that presently the marriage may deteriorate; the husband pales into insignificance, he no longer counts, only the baby is important. Marriages have been shattered as a result of such developments. The entire range of voyeuristic and exhibitionistic impulses can be called into play here. Such a parent can watch the baby for hours on end, make scores of slides of the baby in every conceivable position, and speak uncasingly of his observations to whomever he can corner—there is no end to the pleasure. The child that grows up within such an atmosphere of displaced phallic exhibitionism may someday have to cope with the fact that his value is not in himself and his real qualities, but lies in the connection with someone else's body, in the satisfaction of someone else's need.

The association with authority conflicts lies in the double kind of damage done to such a child's developing self-concept. While he is still young and dependent, the parent's overvaluation invests him with excessive and unrealistic power; the parent is too narcissistically involved to exercise appropriate authority and impulse control. But this situation lasts only so long as the child is willing to act as an extension of the parent. As the child grows and matures and begins to reach toward realistic increments of personal authority based upon his real needs and individuality, this is resented and strenuously resisted by the parent. The child's individuation is felt unconsciously as a repetition of the original intolerable loss or deprivation.

The consequent power struggle, often occurring in adolescence, may be desperately intense. The youngster may be able to retain his original unrealistic pretense of power and value paradoxically only by submission. If he fights to gain some rightful authority over his own life, he finds himself divested of his former power and worth in his parent's eyes, as devalued as he was once overvalued. The adolescent-parent rifts that result from such unresolved oedipal conflicts in a parent can be among the deepest, most violent, and irreparable. Clearly such a youngster has had the poorest possible preparation for mature authority interactions in other areas of life.

Occasionally a child will be identified not with the excessively overvalued penis, but with the inappropriately devalued female genitalia. Then the attitude is one of constant disappointment, endless invidious comparison, and chronic dissatisfaction. A child who grows up under such circumstances lives in the shadow of always being less than was wished for, never all he should be, a continuous source of dismay for the parent. For a mother with strong phallic longings—the sort of woman who never got along well with her own mother, never had close girl friends, and never liked other women—the arrival of a girl baby can be a genuine emotional disaster. And, of course, men too can harbor fears and defensive repudiations of female genitalia; thus, fathers also may respond negatively and rejectingly to the birth of a girl.

The types of rearing that a girl will get might then build toward major difficulties in feelings of personal worth in general and of valuing femininity in particular. Such a girl may enter adolescence feeling that all girls are worthless and that no one would want her. Her girl's body is essentially unlovable. Her feminine menses are awkward and filthy. To be pregnant is horrible and ugly, and bearing a baby is painful, bloody, and disgusting. Given such a rearing, she can either submit and passively accept the depressive position thrust upon her, or she can defy. If she is to find herself at all as a person, and has no growth-permitting
alternative such as effective psychotherapy, she then has to pit herself against the devaluing parent in an intense and stressful way. She must run away from home, or marry early, or at least act in ways that oppose her parents and confront them with her defiance of their views and values. Such defiance may spread and generalize from the sexual area to include almost all parental and adult values.

Some parents deal with oedipal feelings by displacement and externalization—they are ultra-liberal and even suggestive about the youngster's sexuality, asking only that they be kept informed of the various experiments and adventures that befall their children. Totally unrelated to the particular pubescent's inner readiness, a son may be supplied with condoms, a daughter may be put on the pill, the parents' preoccupations blinding them to their individual child's psychosocial developmental level. The youngster may be made to bear many highly personal confidences from father or mother before adolescence is very far advanced. Sex is a subject of much interest in parental conversations, and the message sent more or less overtly is: the parent gets his or her oedipal gratification vicariously—they do not actually have sex with their own children, but they involve themselves in it in a participatory way that is a far cry from the mature and helpful exchange that all developing youngsters need.

Such parents also find many other ways to live out their oedipal conflicts. They might dress in a manner indistinguishable from the teenager, smoke pot with the youngsters, join in their beer parties, use their in-group slang, and ultimately offer their son or daughter sibling rather than parenting. Sometimes a major motive for this pattern is the need to avoid any hint of intergenerational struggle. The sense of parental authority is so weak or repugnant to these parents that they cannot feel right in such a position, and they avoid it at all costs. They not only exert no authority; they also give neither model nor direction. Since they do not wish to abandon their children and cannot give them valid parenting, they compromise by joining them. The fact that this leaves teenagers at the mercy of their impulses without adequate models or moderating external support is not comprehended by such adults. They misunderstand and misapply Rousseau and assert that one need only listen to one's "natural" instincts.

Occasionally one encounters a youth who responds to such rearing patterns by becoming moralistic, puritanical, and religious, and also by repudiating his parents' ways. He mystifies them. But how else is he to find his own identity, and to individuate? To some teenagers, this is even more pressing than the urgency of sexual desire. It is not unheard of for some such youngsters literally to sermonize their families.

In relation to authority-power conflicts between parents and adolescents, generational boundaries are perhaps the most significant. Generational boundaries involve not only clear and appropriate delineation of parental roles and responsibilities from those of the children. They also imply the establishment of a definite demarcation between the family of origin and the family of procreation. Often the establishment and maintenance of both of these boundary formations are interdependent. Some parents are still children in relation to their own parents. They suffer from the intrusion of the grandparents' generation into the process of rearing their children. Most parents pass on to their son or daughter the patterns (or their reactions against them) of authority involvement which they experienced while growing up and from which they never completely emancipated themselves. Their unresolved struggles with their own parents make it difficult for them to learn how to resolve authority conflicts with their children, especially their adolescent children.
The latency period

As a developmental phase, latency is characterized by a relative growth and enhancement of the ego. In the child's inner self, the continued development of the superego and the beginnings of the ego ideal contribute to a constantly richer and more complex personality and mental structure. In his larger environment are also major changes; he moves from play school to work school, and encounters a radical change in the level of social expectation. Thus latency is accompanied typically by major alterations in both the inner and outer milieu. One of the responses to this growth is the shift from one way of thinking to another, from the fantasy orientation of the phallic-oedipal period to more reality connected thought, from solving problems with wishes, dreams, and play to focusing on objective learning and mastery. There are, therefore, profound transformations in all areas of function.

Of particular importance in the development of attitudes toward power or authority are the new and vital increments of ego mastery acquired in peer relationships, school experiences, and social participation. The child can now more readily pursue cognitive interests. In school and elsewhere, learning to enjoy being curious, to enjoy learning itself, to enjoy participating in the phase-appropriate work of preparing for future social and cultural roles, all are at least as important as the content of what he learns. He can experi-

ence inner controls and begin to cope with them. He experiences peer group ethics and action in a new way, and encounters the local norms and rules of social interaction. And he learns the pleasures associated with latency: the games, projects, hobbies, group activities, knowledge, and productivity—and as a result, life is richer.

With so much that is not only ideally available, but that must be accomplished for healthy ego development in latency, there are myriad ways in which developmental deficits can occur. Parental and school indifference can impair the pleasant anticipation of one's social future in an upper middle class suburban child as readily as in a ghetto child. But probably nowhere is the example of the consequences of the failure to accomplish latency tasks as dramatic as in the "poverty cultures."* Fully granting the complexities and the many instances where socioeconomic cause and damaged effect do not follow the oversimplified stereotype, what is meant here is twofold: We refer to those socioeconomic conditions, whether urban or rural, in which the circumstances to be described are more the rule than the exception. And we refer to that majority living under such conditions who are not fortunate enough to have whatever resources

* The latency period is brought on by the resolution of the Oedipus complex with its attendant repression of sexual wishes toward the parent(s), and extends until the beginning changes of puberty. The repression of oedipal sexuality is accompanied by the turning outward of much of the child's energies toward new cognitive and social activities. It was originally thought that latency was related also to a biologically determined diminution of the sexual drive itself, but subsequent studies have failed to corroborate any actual decrease in either sexual drive or sexual activity in children during this period. However, the intense genital and sexual focus of the phallic oedipal stage does diminish relatively due both to the repression and to the cognitive maturation which enables the new interests of this period to be actualized.
are necessary to escape the devastating consequences of those conditions. It is with these caveats, that the socioeconomically deprived are unfortunate epitomes of those who are unable to make full developmental use of latency.

There are simultaneously too many children and not enough money. There are too crowded living conditions and not enough protection for any one child. The parents are emotionally overwhelmed and physically exhausted by the struggle simply to survive in addition to trying to care for children who are emotionally starved and intellectually blunted. The family grows within an inner matrix of socio-economic conditions and sometimes even subcultural values that lead away from academic and cognitive mastery and culture-syntonic endeavor, while at the same time it is trying to adapt and make its way within a larger culture that demands precisely such achievements. Under such conditions, the individual child will experience a combination of over-stimulation, deprivation, and impossible demands on his adaptive capacity that will ill prepare him for constructive relations with or assumption of authority.

Many such children have no real latency experience at all—they are unsuccessfully grappling with pregenital and oedipal issues all during the grade school years. Such developmental lags render them unready to make use of the ego developmental opportunities appropriate to this phase. And once in chronological latency, like their parents in the same defeating circumstances, their own problems of survival in their non-protective and non-supportive social milieu make it difficult for them to salvage enough emotional energy to devote to what opportunities are available.

Latency socialization is seldom as near nonexistent in urban conditions such as those described, as is pleasure in learning socially constructive skills, but it is often severely skewed. Survival or escape preoccupies a large proportion of the parents and other adults, so that even many latency children live in a world of other children and younger adolescents. When their subculture lacks any effective or legitimate authority that is recognized by the dominant middle class culture, raw and often primitive power is all that is left to all but a fortunate few. These children neither learn nor are taught to achieve legitimate authority in the sense used in this report, but they learn the lessons of power very well. For boys it is often physical power, for girls it is typically sexual power, and for both it is the power of shrewdness and of personal manipulativeness and charm. What such children do learn in their version of latency fits them well for a future in the same socioeconomic milieu but leads to frustration, authority confrontation, and power struggles in dominant culture interactions. Where the dominant culture fortunately does genuinely attempt to reward, and foster, and incorporate those who value social and cooperative productivity and who enjoy that socially contributory role, it is in just such qualities that such children's latency development leaves them deficient.

It may be that girls in urban "poverty cultures" sometimes fare better than boys. While poverty, and the powerlessness that accompanies it, is demoralizing for anyone, it takes an especially heavy toll among males with traditional self-concepts of masculinity; and in their sense of frustrated defeat they often abdicate the usual family roles of provider and authority. The girls, therefore, often have fewer illusions, in contrast with their middle class sisters, about being able to depend upon their male peers for material support once adulthood is reached. And they still can produce children and they still provide much of the material and nurturing support, so their self-concepts as providers and their approach to learning and contributory social participation may be less undermined. None of this, of course, is meant to minimize the corrosive effects of such conditions upon all people, regardless of sex.
This particular subgroup of children arrives at puberty with little of the work done that would enable them to cope with the new stresses of that period. Their adolescent adjustment is a matter of sad record. The statistics are horrendous in terms of school dropout, pregnancy, rape, shoplifting, armed robbery, drugs, alcoholism, inability to hold a job, marital failure, disturbances of parental functioning, and other forms of social and personal distress. And it is no coincidence that much if not most of this dysfunctional behavior manifests itself in power and authority arenas—precisely in those areas so compromised by failed latency.

Many of the same kinds of failed latency development are also seen among middle class and affluent children, but for different reasons. Here it is not that their parents and surrounding culture cannot provide the necessary growth-promoting conditions, but that for various reasons they do not. School systems preoccupied with content and "accountability" and teacher training more concerned with the form than the quality of teaching may stultify or even destroy the joy of learning and convey little or nothing of the pleasant anticipation of future socially contributory work. Self-concerned, dissatisfied or, too often, absent parents may present poor or even negative models at just this time when it is so vital for the child to see that what he now is experiencing has had positive value in his parents’ lives. Parents mistirely determined to make their children’s lives “happy” may produce genuinely deprived children by undermining the serious work aspects of latency, actively opposing good schools' and teachers’ efforts to impose reasonable demands upon students, to expect and demand follow through and completion of tasks, and to make realistic distinctions between students who do or do not function appropriately. None of these circumstances readies a child for effective interactions with authority or for its legitimate exercise.

The latency age child of any socioeconomic level is more cognitively able to perceive, think about, and evaluate the manifestations of authority or power at home and elsewhere. He can compare his own parents with those of his chums and with teachers. If he recognizes the abdication of authority, or insensitive and rigid authoritarian power at home, it can lead to rebellion against and defiance of all parental authority, and it frequently generalizes to other adult parent figures. In the community, just as minority children often witness brutal or dishonest misuse of police power, the children in affluent suburbs often witness their parents and adolescent siblings getting away with dangerous or criminal behavior through crass official condoning of the privileged, an equally destructive lesson about authority.

In addition to sociocultural influences, there are constitutional differences in the rate and timing of biological maturation that affect the accomplishment of the ego’s normal tasks in latency. Latency is a time when the child can learn mastery over the impulses and the conflictual turmoil of the anal and phallic-oedipal phases. At the same time social skills can develop which, in addition to their intrinsic value, also aid in providing the self-confidence needed for coping with impulse. Secure instinctual mastery is not learned easily, and the effects of shorter or longer latency periods can be studied by comparing the later personalities of children who had either an early or a late puberty.

The evidence suggests that it is latency, not the prelatency phases, which is most significantly truncated or extended as a result of early or late puberty. Early maturation confers considerable immediate social benefit upon boys, their greater prestige and popularity relating both to their advantage in valued sports activities and to their ability to keep up with the earlier physical maturation of girls. However, longitudinal studies show them to exhibit emotional overcontrol, conservativism, lesser creativity, and an orientation toward power and conformity. By contrast, the late matur-
ers, although they continue to manifest social insecurity and negative self-concepts, are more independent, more insightful, more flexible and tolerant, and give freer play to their creative initiative and curiosities. These different characteristics correlate with the relative mistrust and fear, as compared with acceptance and utilization, of one’s drives and impulses. The relevant factor appears to be the length of latency—the span that a boy has to achieve the ego development and strength necessary to cope with the sudden intensification of the sexual drives of puberty.* The early maturer, with his less time and less mature ego, is more likely to regard his drives as difficult to control and dangerous to his security. The late maturer is more ready to cope with them and to respond to them as constructive and positive aspects of himself.18, 19, 20, 21, 22

Comparable studies carried out with early and late maturing girls23, 24, 25 reveal a more complex picture of the adolescent consequences than is true for boys. The findings are essentially not relevant to this report because the consequences as described are not directly linked to power and authority issues, except that early maturing girls are subject to more negative evaluation by adults which is probably related to adult concern about early sexual activity.

Superego formation at the resolution of the phallic-oedipal stage opens up a new set of potential problems. Of primary significance, the narcissistic difficulties that now appear are perhaps the most common. The gradual process of separation and individuation that begins toward the close of the first year of life implies that a highly grandiose and glorified state, that of fusion with a god-like, omniscient and omnipotent mothering person, has to be undone and exchanged for a more factual account of both one’s self and one’s parent(s). This is quite a demand for life to make on so

* This is not the only variable in terms of maturation which influences attitudes toward and mastery of impulse,26 but it is the one most directly related to latency.

young a child; it is no wonder that he often retains some unrealistic and exaggerated image of himself, as well as a remarkable capacity to view at least some adults in overidealized ways.

Hopefully, the earlier concepts begin their long process of gradually settling down into both a more mature self-concept and a more realistic component of one’s inner self-expectations, and the internalized “idealized other” will begin to undergo tempering of its excessive quality so that this earliest form of the ego ideal at the close of the oedipal period can begin its evolution in the direction of realistic rather than grandiose goals. Where these processes do not go well, however, the latency child may have great difficulty either in discarding a dominant sense of grandiose self or in dispensing with the need to view others as having extraordinary powers. The result is often an enormous hypersensitivity to criticism coupled by an equally excessive hunger for praise—in short, a narcissistic disorder of appreciable degree.

Such children are often very difficult to deal with. They cannot accept criticism from either parent or teacher. When something they attempt meets with less than the response they require, they might then refuse to do any further work. As a result they have major impediments to learning which easily translate into authority conflicts since learning so often requires the capacity to take guidance from someone who has the authority that comes with greater knowledge and experience. They may withdraw or become “fresh” and disobedient. Sensitive overreactors of this sort commonly become the scapegoats of the more aggressive children; they are such prime targets because they jump so visibly when one sticks any kind of “pin” into them. They thus fail to learn the early authority preparatory lessons of give and take that must take place in those childhood peer groups.

With such preparation, adolescence is usually a dif-
difficult period. The transformations of puberty add their weight of stress to the youngsters' already compromised ego coping capacity. They continue to have difficulty dealing with authority because any authority, whether legitimately exercised or powerfully misused, implies some unacceptable lack of perfection or omnipotence in themselves.

Since narcissistic disorders result in both grandiose self-images and over-idealization of others, such youngsters usually have certain idealized figures in their lives about whom they can tolerate no criticism and with whom they might feel a certain sense of fusion. These are their heroes, larger than life, omniscient and omnipotent. Heroes are not per se evidence of pathology, of course, and when ego ideal formation follows a healthy course and the child's inner goals become tempered with reality, they can be important models in latency and can help these children maintain a certain balance—they have a star to follow. But the narcissistic child's heroes are those toward whom there is uncritical submission, and who can exert any kind of power or domination over him. In adolescence, such children can become the kinds of demagogue followers described earlier.

Accidental factors can short-circuit latency tasks. Children who lose a parent during this time by any means—death, divorce, desertion—have a more difficult time and are more likely to have difficulty with the necessary realistic reappraisal of their original omnipotent perception of that parent. Where the circumstances of loss do not realistically reinforce the child's feeling of having been deserted, as in the death of a parent, he could be prone to overidealize that parent and have difficulty in early ego ideal formation. Future relationships with authority figures unconsciously associated with that parent could result in unquestioning submission or be subject to devastating disappointment reactions and subsequent resentment and aggression. If the circumstances do represent desertion or are presented as such, for example by a bitter and vindictive divorced spouse, the excessive devaluation of the lost parent can produce ego ideal problems proceeding from the opposite pole. In either circumstance, the parent's unavailability for the child to reality test his memories and internalized images can be a two-sided handicap: neither the good nor the bad aspects of that parent—and therefore the internalized aspects of the self—can be as readily modified into an acceptable reality. And if authority conflicts develop with the remaining parent or the step-parent, the hitherto devalued missing parent may be suddenly and defensively idealized in the service of resisting parental authority. This is a particularly frustrating maneuver for the parent because here the inaccessibility of reality testing serves the child's or adolescent's defiance.

This is a particularly significant issue because the current frequency of divorce means that a very significant proportion of latency (as well as other age) children live in one-parent families. There are few exceptions, of course, to the fact that one parent is better than none, and one good parent may be better than two bad ones or two in serious conflict.* However, the one-parent family is not the ideal, and it imposes inevitably more difficult tasks for the child, as well as increased responsibility upon the remaining parent to be sufficiently knowledgeable and sensitive to be able to prevent the loss from resulting in undue ego damage.

**Reflections of latency conflicts in parental behavior**

The later the developmental phase under discussion, the more difficult it becomes to link adult maladaptive function clearly to that specific phase; any unresolved problem from that period is almost bound to have detectable roots that

* This position is not unanimously supported by research, as in a recent study of socially disturbed young people from Israel.57
penetrate still deeper. Also, the older the child, the more directly related his phase-specific tasks of development will be to practical adult performance and function. Therefore, developmental deficits dating from latency may enforce not only subtle emotional conflicts in parenting, but also gross deficiencies in the cognitive aspects of parenthood. And failure to learn to be, and to enjoy being, a productive member of society may result in severe limitations in the socioeconomic ability to provide subsequent children an emotionally optimal childhood. Unresolved latency problems carry with them this broad gamut of potential dangers.

The parent whose own misguided parents prevented him from learning the personal satisfaction of real accomplishment during latency by protecting him from the appropriate requirements and demands of school may well turn out to be hampered in two areas when he is himself a parent. He may never have learned to value and enjoy productive performance, with the resulting poor school record and a history of school dropout or substandard occupational or professional level. Whether man or woman, if this parent is the provider, he will certainly provide less well for his own children. At the same time, he will not only provide a poor model of a socially contributory role and of cognitive mastery for his children to identify with, but also will likely fail to recognize his children’s needs in this area since one cannot teach what one has not learned.

Another example of latency phase problems affecting parenting functions might be a pair of brilliant professional parents who had a history of failure to socialize along the usual peer group lines during latency; their precocity allowed them little in common with their school and neighborhood friends. Their intellectual or artistic capacities were outstanding enough that these were able to serve as successful, or at least adequate, defenses against the pain of isolation and social loneliness. A similarly bright child of theirs might benefit from special attention but suffer from spoiling and a certain communicated disdain for being like others, and would arrive at latency unprepared for the give and take of effective peer group interactions. Probably arrogant, perhaps provocative, he would not only endure distress at the hands of his peers but also be deprived of parental help if they too have no sure concept of the importance of the socialization tasks of latency. Should his abilities not equal theirs, or for some reason be less available as a defense against social alienation, he may become bitter and hostile as well as arrogant, a combination that renders appropriate accession to legitimate authority impossible.

At the other end of the socioeconomic scale, there are parenting problems that derive from having spent one’s latency as one of those damaged by his financially and culturally underprivileged milieu. Those children who could not and did not learn to take pleasure and pride in the kinds of accomplishments and cooperative endeavor prized and rewarded in the larger culture have a severely compromised future when they arrive at parenthood. Indeed, the galling contrast between his own life and that of those in more comfortable circumstances, and what he perceives as the indifference or exploitiveness of those with social or financial power toward those in his socioeconomic status or minority group, often engenders resentful hatred and rejection of those very abilities and endeavors that could improve his lot and ultimately that of his children. It is a contradiction in terms to expect that a parent can teach his children to value that which he hates.

The parent who salvages the ego strength to try to become a consistent provider rather than drifting in and out of subsistence jobs and welfare is too often still handicapped by socioeconomic forces he cannot singlehandedly change, and therefore still may not be able to provide enough to save his children from a similar “non-latency,” or to make construc-
tive participation seem appealing to them. In some instances, his determination to better their lives and futures may "make flowers bloom in the desert." But it also can have a more unfortunate result; his drive may so obsess him as to turn him into an unbending taskmaster, afraid to be loving and human for fear his children will slip away from him into the poverty mainstream, and thus alienating them from himself and from his values in the process. In general, the majority of poverty-crippled parents have little real social power or recognized authority in the larger dominant culture, and this has compromised their opportunities for learning about or exercising legitimate authority. It is difficult for them to avoid perpetuating this lack in their children.

It was earlier pointed out that some circumstances may favor girls in severely underprivileged conditions; due to both biological and cultural realities their sense of productivity and personal value may rest upon firmer ground. When this obtains, they can be more effective in conveying positive meaning to the necessary pursuits of their latency age children—at least to their daughters, and often to sons as well.

Recalling the discussion of how latency socialization in underprivileged subcultures may be conducive to experiencing and learning more about power than about authority, it is clear that this will reflect itself in later parenting. Those who understand only power or submission can use and teach only power or submission, and so the power-authority conflicts of the underprivileged tend to perpetuate themselves.

Failure to accomplish or to inculcate that increment of identity Erikson calls industry is, as frequently stated, never limited to any one socioeconomic level, and perhaps the most immediately obvious example affecting the middle class relates again to the Great Depression. Those parents who were themselves school children during the 1930s often missed out on the fun and the play of latency. Many were forced by sheer economic necessity into premature adult function; they had to work from the moment they were able so as to help support their families, and even schooling was sometimes secondary. With World War II and the post-war boom, their industriousness paid off frequently with affluence, but the depression scars were not lost.

In general, the attitudinal pendulum swung, and they wanted to spare their children the grimness they remembered and to give them the carefree childhood they themselves had missed. Where this philosophy was carried too far—and it too often was—it produced the stereotyped adolescents of the 1960s: Nothing had been required of them, so they valued neither affluence nor productivity. They could proclaim their superior idealism and despise the adult authorities who had made their lifestyle possible, but they knew little or nothing of how to work realistically toward those ideals, or of how to gain the legitimate authority necessary to be effective. It was here, in the delayed consequences of their parents' deficient latency work—not in either their parents' affluence or their valuing of productive and contributory endeavor—that their parents unwittingly let them down.

Unfortunately, even many of those parents who came a bit later, whose latencies occurred in the war years and shortly thereafter, were similarly unprepared to make their own children's latencies optimally useful, although for different reasons. First there was the war, which preoccupied virtually everyone, and then the country was in an economic boom. Things came easily to post-war latency and teenage middle class youngsters. Even though many of them studied and worked, it seemed almost impossible to fail. There were relatively so few losers that even though their phase-appropriate ego development in latency appeared normal, one may speculate that they may have been insufficiently aware of the importance of what they learned. They were
unaware of what to stress and to insist upon in their later parental roles and took for granted that their children would learn the lessons of latency as easily as they themselves did. Thus, for their own children, a lack of realistic demands by adult authorities and a seeming absence of real world consequences appeared to characterize their interactions with authority both at home and in school. At the same time this same cohort of children was being actively exposed to world and cultural changes and to drastically different social philosophies that often served to undermine their insufficiently reinforced commitment to the work tasks of latency.

Considering again the effects of early or late pubertal maturation upon the time available for latency tasks, the reflections in parental functioning of these differences in latency accomplishments suggest themselves readily. The more authoritarian father may contribute to greater utilization of the socializing and work-learning opportunities of latency, but his need for control will impair his children's learning their own inner controls; he is unlikely to facilitate his own de-idealization, which is so necessary in later latency. Authority will not easily pass from him to his teenage children, and their increased sexuality will strike him in a vulnerable area and exacerbate the power-authority conflicts.

Mothers, of course, can also be authoritarian and overcontrolling, though whether for the same reasons is not known. Such parents may be fixated at a latency phase life style and character structure, one characterized by "good boy—good girl" and "law and order" value systems, referred to as conventional morality by Kohlberg. Studies suggest that shockingly few adults in this culture ever develop beyond that stage, and one can expect that latency phase parents will foster the same developmental deficits in their children.

We have discussed the problems that can arise in a latency child who loses or has lost a parent. In his own later parent-

ing, the adult may strive to live up to his own grandiose perception of his parent in the eyes of his own children, thus making it difficult for them to moderate their own fantasies of omnipotence, and laying the foundation for intense and painful authority conflicts when the unprepared-for disillusionment inevitably occurs. Or, conversely, he may not present himself as someone of value to identify with if excessive devaluation of the lost parent disturbed his development of his own self-esteem.

When oedipal and pregenital wishes are not successfully tempered and socialized in the resolution of the Oedipus complex and by means of the developmental opportunities of latency, there remain deficiencies in the youngster's superego. In later life, the exigencies of social existence and the needs for social acceptance may act as external forces of sufficient strength to prevent the direct behavioral expressions of these wishes by the adults who harbor them, or guilt may have caused their repression, but the wishes continue to exist unconsciously in their original and emotionally charged form. As parents, they may nonverbally encourage their children to act out those disavowed desires, resulting in asocial or delinquent or self-damaging behavior in children who otherwise do not display antisocial character structures and whose parents do not overtly model unacceptable behavior.

As in all stages of development, there are qualitative differences in the damage done to parental function by phasespecific developmental failures. In latency the child is already significantly a part of the extrafamilial environment and culture, and now the unsettled developmental business adds a more clearly operational aspect. The child not only has emotional difficulties; he also does not learn the cognitive skills to operate in the social setting of legitimate authority issues. He does not cognitively conceptualize what he needs and is missing nor, often, even credit its impor-
tance. As a parent, if his earlier developmental stages were more secure, he may admirably fulfill the child's affective and nurturant needs, but he would be more lacking in both knowledge and the social authority (the power to affect the cultural institutions that are new instrumental in his child's development) to make it possible for that child to achieve the optimal degree of ego development uniquely available during latency. Latency is a time when good parenting increasingly includes community effectiveness as well as healthy childrearing.

Conclusion

Much of this chapter has discussed the psychoanalytic viewpoint of development that is already well known to behavioral specialists, but not as well known to other professionals, even though the words and the names are familiar. Within the limits of our collective competences, we have incorporated socioeconomic and interactional material, fully mindful that cultural and other factors bulk larger than can be given full treatment in this chapter. But our special focus has been upon childhood origins, and those, even though they take place within a particular culture or subculture, occur primarily within the intimate intrapsychic development and interpersonal relationships of individual children and their individual families.

However, we consider this as more than a review, and is therefore useful and necessary even for many professionals in our own field. We are not aware of a similar attempt at the specific synthesis of relevant aspects of developmental dynamics with particular later manifestations of adolescent and parental attitudes toward power and authority.

An overview of this synthesis reveals a progression from more global to more discrete influences affecting intergenerational authority conflicts, from privately intrapsychic and narrowly familial interpersonal dynamics to those involving larger numbers of people, broader cognitive awareness of social realities, and increasingly complex alternative responses. This is reflected both in the nature and quality of the child's original reactions and in his later emotional, characterological, and behavioral manifestations. Thus, oral stage influences, necessarily preverbal and more all-embracing, are seen to have the potential for attitudes and conflicts that are both more pervasive and less accessible to verbal intervention. This is as true in their manifestations in adult parental attitudes as in those shown by children and adolescents.

It is unnecessary to trace further the changes through the different stages of development, but it is important to point out in summary that the origins we have described have relevance on both sides of the conflicts with which this report is concerned. It is not only the adolescents engaged in intergenerational power and authority struggles who are revealing through their behavior and emotions the patterns and limitations enforced by their earlier experiences; the adults with whom they are in conflict respond also out of the wealth or the poverty of their own developmental preparation for exercising and passing on authority. Hence, this chapter underscores the crucial point that no such intergenerational conflict can be understood primarily in terms of the adolescents' immaturity and developmental deficits. The constructive resolution of such conflict must also recognize that many parents and other adults have their own developmental deficits that help shape the character of the troubled interaction and that require complementary modification.
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DYNAMICS AND SELECTED PHENOMENA OF THE AUTHORITY GAP

There are many crucial issues that arise out of the confrontation between adolescents and adults, and many specific and active expressions of their conflicting interests. Our culture does provide institutionalized measures for the orderly passing on of authority, but the adequacy of these structures is in question, however, at least by many of the more vocal youth. As things stand, the means of authority transmitted are mediated by adults. Youth often views these means as covert tactics for denying them power rather than as providing routes of access to valid authority. The official channels are thus often held in contempt and are not used. As a result, the acting out of the authority struggles between the generations takes place in devious ways and in obscure arenas where there are no established ground rules. Communication about the essential conflict may be negligible, and the issues are often but poorly understood by the vehement antagonists. Under such conditions, the probability of arriving at an adaptive resolution is at best random.

We believe that youth is impatient for power and its rewards. We say this in the full knowledge that there are also young people who seem satisfied to utilize the culturally approved means of advancing their status. But it has generally been true that change is initiated by a forefront minority, and the size of that vocal minority of impatient youth varies greatly at different times.

The complementary generalization, is, of course, that adults are traditionally jealous of their prerogatives. This probably still applies to the majority. Here, too, there are exceptions. These range from those who are wise enough to welcome the fresh views of youth, to a seemingly growing number who appear eager to abdicate their responsibilities. Perhaps it is not surprising in a time of radical cultural change that many adults are becoming discouraged and anxious about the apparent inadequacy of their own answers to importunate cultural questions.

The struggles, the issues chosen, and their outcomes run the gamut. They extend from effective and adaptive interchange on the one extreme, to mutually destructive and self-defeating consequences on the other. The material that follows will select representative phenomena illustrating the gulf that often exists between official authority and the adolescents' response to it. At any given moment it may be impossible to evaluate the outcome of a particular struggle between youth and adult. In cultural strife of this sort, all judgment is finally subjective. It is at once a function of emotional investment, inescapable ethnocentricity, and time-bound vision. It must be remembered that many of today's heroes were yesterday's malcontents.

It is quite logical that issues regarding the use of and response to authority should peak during adolescent development. The reasons overlap intrapsychic, interpersonal and cultural modes of response. The interaction of these various forces, both typical and idiosyncratic, affect adolescents individually and in their larger group formations. Thus where conflict exists, it will find individual expression as well as broader patterns of response that may vary during particular periods in a culture's history.

Intrapsychically, adolescence stands at the developmental convergence of many processes that express themselves quite normally in authority struggles. Both ego and physiological maturations have arrived at the level of at least some adult function; in less complex societies, adult function (and often
adult status) would almost automatically accrue at this time. But in some societies, including our own, there is a major disjunction between procreative readiness and socioeconomic maturity; this imposes considerable frustration upon developing youth. Imperative biological drives are making their presence felt in an increasingly adult body. This state of affairs conflicts strongly with a childrearing and educational system in which the possessors of those bodies are still considered children.

As they grow, adolescents are clearly capable of increasing degrees of autonomy, but neither they nor the adult society are clear about the limits of their expanding responsibility. Adults may withhold responsibility that an adolescent is ready to assume, yet the adolescent may be allowed other responsibilities before he is able to deal with the consequent problems. For example, many parents would grant a 17- or 18-year-old girl the right to marry even an insufficiently educated or trained boy, and to assume all the responsibilities of a family and children, but would firmly attempt to deny contraceptives to her if she were unmarried. When realistic increments of authority are withheld, unrealistic demands often ensue. Moreover, since adolescents are, indeed, not yet adult, they often cannot distinguish between what is a realistic demand and what is not.

This is also the period in which a youth must finally differentiate himself from his parents; he must find his own identity, as well as appropriate new love objects. A powerful motive for distancing oneself from parents is the adolescent reawakening of the oedipal attachment. In flight from the anxiety of that attraction and as a defense against his liking them too much, the parents are often derogated. Other adults may also be cast in the role of parent substitutes; in that event, however, they become targets of the same unconsciously motivated repudiation. In such circumstances, rationality has little power, and the conflicts may not be resolved through reason. In whatever ways the adult may attempt to exercise authority, the adolescent may respond idiosyncratically.

Much adolescent behavior results from the accumulated years of experience in dealing with parents. Even in late adolescence, parents may still be overly involved, concerned, and may try to retain excessive responsibility for their children's behavior, habits, functioning, achievements, and success. The vagaries of parental exercise of authority will be sharply reflected in what students expect from other responsible adults, how they approach them, and how they attempt to gain their own ends.

Of central importance is the process by which adolescents explore, test out, challenge, learn, and ultimately gain access to decision-making for their own lives. This process is vital to the adolescent's concept of authority. The average parent recognizes the difficulty of predicting what adult life is going to be like for his children. Adults cannot be supremely confident regarding the future; they cannot always guide adolescents in terms of what to do when they grow up. But they can guide them in terms of how to be responsible. Demand vs. negotiation, dependence vs. autonomy, intransigency vs. compromise, power vs. authority—all are at least partially forged at home.

The intrapsychic dynamics of adolescent authority coping are complex and powerful. Nonetheless they are insufficient to explain how a normal phenomenon at times becomes a cultural problem of intense proportions. Some of the crucial causes must be sought in the actualities of the adult culture. In recent years, it is apparent that adults themselves have come increasingly to doubt the given (religious, moral, legal, and governmental codes and mores) upon which they have based their authority. The result has been an insidious and public erosion of adult authority. For many young people, this broader cultural phenomenon has been a devastating
recapitulation of earlier experience with parents who were unsure of their own authority bases. Adults' doubts seem to be both empirical (what we've done has not worked) and metaphysical (what we've always believed in may not be true). It is very difficult for a reflective adult to maintain confidence in his authority when the foundations of his judgment are frequently thrown into grave question or clearly demonstrated to be absurd.

Lack of confidence in the effectiveness and basis of their authority has led parents to assume postures without conviction and to make assertions that lack substance. Instead of operating from a base of functionally earned authority, adults have often relied upon coercive power or upon evoking guilt in the adolescents. Such use of arbitrary force leaves little or no room for questioning or negotiation. This position conveys weakness rather than strength, and it is readily threatened. Power struggles follow soon and under conditions unfavorable for both the adolescent's development and the well-being of adults.

Other changes have contributed to undermining the adults' sense of confidence in their roles. As discussed in detail earlier, technological advances have had a tidal wave effect upon male-female sex roles; women can do technical and intellectual work as well as men; and the net effect has been changes in the family structure and its built-in areas of sex-specific authority. Just who is in charge of what is currently in flux. The everlasting certainties of religion, which derive from family authority and in turn reinforce it, have diminished. (This may not be true for the conforming majority, but these are not the people who initiate change.) Consequently, the power hierarchy, from older to younger, loses a major source of strength. At the same time, there is a gradual dissolution of the extended family, with its own inherent hierarchy of accumulated wisdom and authority. As this moves youth into an ever more exposed, unstructured, and unsupported position, whom can youth credit?

These changes in the adults' feeling of security must reflect themselves in the degree and quality of confidence engendered in youth. It is probably less important that adults be right than that they believe in themselves and are believed in by the emerging generation. As a youth becomes aware both of adult failures and of adult uncertainty, he is more likely to fall back on his own resources, even though the very same circumstances may have left him very poorly prepared, in order to survive.

In addition to family structure, there are vast changes in the real world. Our technological culture has accelerated the rate of change. Probably more than ever before, technology has presented a different world to different generations. Margaret Mead suggests that the only natives in today's world are youth; the older generation may be anachronistic, provisionally tolerated visitors from elsewhere.

One must also look to social forces and group dynamics in order to grasp the contemporary context of authority conflicts. Academic high school and college ostensibly are designed to prepare youth for ultimate entry into the work force. In reality they serve all too often only to delay constructive participation; in effect, they serve to wall adolescents off from actual work in their society. Perhaps only the most mature and academically gifted adolescents can visualize the long-term future gains of extended formal education (though this does not necessarily protect them from some of the other frustrations inherent in this system). The other students feel increasingly useless and excluded from identification with adult endeavor.

Within many or not most schools, teachers seldom share a common project with any group of the students in such a way that the teachers occupy a position of participant leadership.
The teachers' authority without leadership further hampers adolescents' learning to achieve authority; they are seldom integrated into a working apprenticeship-leadership system.

In the course of separating from parents, adolescents naturally turn toward their peers. But in school, the natural and formal peer group units (classes) are fragmented from classroom to classroom. The genuine peer groups of friends formed by adolescents are usually unrelated to classroom associations; they are surely not integrated into task-oriented, appropriately led, work-producing experiences.

Isolated from the kind of adult-world participation that would permit healthy identity formation, and in a constantly shifting group of peers, the adolescent is forced to forge a peer world entirely separate from adult interaction. At the same time, he is kept in a state of considerable insecurity about the permanence of his group—the emotional "place" where he feels a sense of belonging. Such groups tend to defend their existence by strengthening and rigidly defining their boundaries. The differences between themselves and others are exaggerated: the others become perceived as threats. Quite naturally, adults are outsiders. Since real authority emanates from adults, such authority is suspected of being motivated by aims inimical to those of the adolescents. Adult authority is resisted, and a substitute "authority" of youth is proclaimed instead.

In addition, the geographic mobility of many families often further disrupts the integration of adolescents into functional social units that cross generational boundaries. Such circumstances have often led to the formation of an isolated and defensive adolescent "subculture." The same forces that produce it oppose the normal developmental tasks of adolescence. Such tasks include the assumption of mature work responsibility and productivity. They involve the development of a secure sense of self-sufficient identity via increasing involvement in a real world, with real

authorities with whom youth can identify. Accomplishing these tasks is not facilitated by the choices to which adolescents are often limited.

Within this framework, a few of the most characteristic areas of authority struggle will be described. The examples are best documented in most instances for boys, and while they may apply equally to girls, the fact is that most of the knowledge and data collected have been about males. No attempt is made to be all-inclusive; the authors are fully aware of the numerous and equally illuminating phenomena omitted. But while each reader will probably think of examples of authority conflict that are not among those chosen herein as illustrative, it must be realized that within any particular culture, the major arenas within which the struggle occurs are not truly random. The greatest conflicts usually take place around the most important cultural belief systems and taboos that are being challenged by adolescents at a given time. They are also a reflection of the areas in which the degree of authority granted (with its contingent rewards) diverges most widely from youth to adult.

For example, the recent intense conflicts between adolescents and adults over youthful sexual behavior meets both preconditions for serious clash: The challenge of the taboos against premarital intercourse strikes at what remains a deeply held belief system in this culture. And the divergence between the degree of sexual self-determination and its attendant rewards granted to youth by adults, as compared with that which adults grant themselves is extreme. Thus it is no mystery that adolescents would find sexuality a prime arena for authority confrontation. On the other hand, although there is a current youthful faddism about health foods, our culture as a whole is not beset with major dietary taboos, nor are there major discrepancies between what adults allow themselves to eat and what they allow adolescents to eat. Therefore, except in individual instances and
family settings, food preferences do not provide a suitable issue for wide-spread major authority battle.

**Authority and family conflicts**

Home is probably the most important site for working out the techniques of gaining access to authority. Power and authority are part of family life. It is important to exert appropriate controls and facilitate mutual regulation in the best interest of the family as a whole. It is precisely within this area of mutual regulation that most of the adolescent-authority struggles in the home occur. It is not surprising that there is a close similarity between adolescent-authority struggles in the home and those that occur in school or in relation to drugs and sex. (Indeed, in the final chapter of this report, the negotiation of authority issues within the family will be used to epitomize a healthy mode of teaching the adolescent to gain access to and to exercise legitimate personal and social authority.)

It is difficult for parents to view regulation as reciprocal. They often take too much responsibility for their adolescents' appearance, manners, dress, behavior, and mores. One of the major causes of power struggles in the home involves the fact that parents use their power to regulate their adolescents' mores and behavior rather than exercise authority to establish mutual regulation within the family. The excessive responsibility-taking of parents does not allow or encourage youth into age-appropriate sharing of responsibility for the purpose of effective mutual regulation within the family. This hampers adolescents' learning to take responsibility and to achieve authority through a partnership in which authority is shared with the parents.

Many authority struggles in the home are precipitated or worsened by the fact that parents get drawn into dealing with their youngsters on *ad hominem* grounds. Rather than being a matter of education or standards, regulatory issues become intense "you-me" struggles that work against the developmental needs of adolescents by maintaining or threatening to maintain them in a close dependent relationship with their parents. The intense interpersonal character of these struggles may be complicated by the fact that the parents' feelings of success or failure often depend on their ability to control their offspring. Adolescents who can successfully personalize the battle can often gain gratification by being "one up" on their parents. The more the parent struggles, the more gratified the adolescent. Overturning parental authority by this maneuver provides adolescents with a sense of triumph and a spurious feeling of independence. Actually, these struggles only serve to perpetuate the adolescents' enmeshment with their parents.

In the midst of heated arguments with their adolescent offspring, parents commonly resort to wild threats or dictatorial pronouncements which put the parents in an indefensible position. A father and mother may assert that they will have complete control over behavior (such as smoking marijuana) which in fact they cannot control, or they may threaten removal of all privileges unless they are obeyed. The adolescent will quickly perceive the parents' vulnerability and the indefensibility of their position. Young people readily point to their parents' hypocrisy regarding control of behavior, commenting on areas where the parents' control is ineffective or poor. The parents' unthinking assertion, impulsive threat, or hypocritical stance then become the target of youth's righteous indignation. As a result, both adolescents and parents may lose sight of the regulatory issue that is at stake, and the adolescent can deny or avoid his responsibility. Beyond the fact that it is often indefensible, parental use of coercive power has an added danger. If it is successful, it may exaggerate and prolong an adolescent's dependency.

As noted, control issues within the home are complicated
by parents' lack of confidence in their own authority. This leads to inconsistent, confusing or arbitrary attempts at control which lack substance. More than that, it also leads to parents clinging tenaciously to outdated forms of control which had worked when their children were younger. In continuing to employ anachronistic modes, parents treat their adolescents as much younger children. In this type of home adolescents possess minimal, or at best token, authority. Lacking experience with appropriate levels of shared responsibility, these youths are inadequately prepared to assume appropriate ranges of authority. In contrast, some parents, doubting or disillusioned with their own authority (and overwhelmed by a sense of impotence in regard to regulatory issues), turn excessive responsibility over to their adolescent children. This sudden and premature access to dominance and control also presents difficulties for youth. The youngsters never went through a process of becoming increasingly involved in and entrusted with responsibility and decision-making; power has been bestowed, but it is not a legitimate sense of authority that has been earned.

For many complex intrapsychic and interpersonal reasons, the authority of parents may be split. In such a situation an adolescent can play one parent off against the other, avoid issues by precipitating disagreements between the parents, or form an alliance with one parent against the other. Splitting the parents’ authority stimulates the adolescent's oedipal conflict and impedes development.

Many families experience frustration and dissatisfaction in marital, social, or work functioning. This can lead to overcompensatory emphasis on parental functions; indeed, the conflicts arising in these other areas can be displaced into or acted out in the parental role. The authority of one or both parents is therefore called into play far more than is necessary and may be used or misused to express or defend against stress in other spheres of the parents’ lives. This type of parental entanglement with children runs counter to major developmental needs of adolescence, and leads to particularly stormy and problematic interactions.

Like sex, aggression can be used as a means of defying parental authority. While encouraging competitiveness in general, most parents do not tolerate their children’s aggressive competitive behavior when it is turned toward them in particular. Many children learn during the anal-muscular stage that their parents cannot cope well with direct defiant and negativistic behavior. In the same period, during toilet training, they may also find that they possess peculiar power through the ways in which they handle fecal elimination and cleanliness. In early adolescence there is a typical and normal regression to pregenital behavior and emotions; it need not represent pathological fixation or regression. The anal-muscular stage is echoed by sloppiness, defiance, obstinacy, scatological language, and “bathroom” humor.

As a result both of early developmental experiences and of the normal expression of early adolescence, these youngsters rediscover that “fresh” or “foul” language, angry emotion, or oppositional behavior, will successfully challenge their parents' authority. It may, in fact, precipitate parental loss of control, which further undermines their authority. Since constructive management of aggression on the part of both parents and youth is critical to the development of effective mutual regulation, such defiance and its sequelae impair the process in a devastating way. Even in the absence of a pathogenic degree of anal fixation, inordinate success in the use of such anal regressive techniques in power struggles with parents may perpetuate these maladaptive approaches to authority conflict.

The authority struggles between the adolescents and their
parents can have a most unfortunate, vicious cycle character. Where there is a lack of mutual experience with functionally earned authority, the authority and credibility gap tends to widen. Parents' uncertainties are magnified, and this weakens their capacity to function with genuine authority. Most harmful of all, adolescents and their parents may disengage from each other, abandoning the interactional ground where growth and change can occur. So many of the authority-related issues—education, work, sex, drugs—are sufficiently complex and lacking in clear answers or guidelines that the young require parents who can stay with them in confronting and solving problems. Parents who defend themselves by disengagement and by the use of authoritarian pronouncements neglect their responsibility and become models of non-authority.

At best, the rapidity of cultural change and the complexity of the current issues make the content of any specific stance uncertain and open to question. This, as indicated earlier, focuses on the importance of the process by which adolescents gain access to power or authority, and on the quality of parental guidance in relation to how to be responsible. Parental disengagement teaches neither the content nor the process of authority, but rather how to be irresponsible.

**Authority and student-school conflicts**

Student revolt, as a relatively expectable behavior, has long been common in European universities. In this country, it began to gain currency in universities in more destructive form in the '60s and swept like prairie-fire through our colleges. Even that, however, was more understandable, and more acceptable, to most adults, than the emergence of similar behavior by “children” in high schools.

The traditional hierarchical posture in both junior and senior high schools has been virtually a teacher-administration dictatorship, with students possessing minimal or token authority. To the adults involved, this is logical because until one has learned, one cannot be expected to know what one should learn. Students are regarded as children, albeit older ones, for whom the staff functions in loco parentis. There are also rewards for the involved adults. Such a structure reinforces their sense of knowledge and wisdom (the preservation of which is a vested interest), and it affords them the comfort of avoiding self-questioning. Another significant reward is the simple pleasure of being dominant.

For youths set in the traditional mold the system is logical for much the same reasons: They associate knowledge and authority with full adulthood, and assume that by learning what adults have to teach, they will reap rewards that are both real and adaptively valuable. Moreover, there are also compensations for their nonauthoritative role. They are approved for conforming, and they have their own vested interest in nonresponsibility. For these youngsters, a great deal of regressive pleasure is associated with additional years of carefree play and the postponing of the overwhelming confrontation with unshielded reality.

For many other young people, of course, there is ambivalence over this prolongation of childhood. As mentioned earlier, the academic track is probably appropriate for only a minority of young people. For the majority, school means an enforced segregation from productive and rewarding tasks in the larger world. This is both emotionally frustrating and maturationally stultifying.

More and more teenagers are challenging adult authority at even the junior high school level. In terms of real adaptive consequences, perhaps the most important change is the students' demand for a greater voice in policy decisions. This includes decisions about course material (the insistence upon "relevance"), instructional format, disciplinary dispensations,
and administrative matters such as racial ratios of students and teachers.

It is vital to recognize that we cannot make blanket evaluations of such student positions. For example, a minority student may demand more attention and recognition for his group and its history, and refuse to go to school in protest because he feels these issues are being neglected. It is often evident that he has a real complaint. In order to dramatize it, however, he is utilizing a mechanism that is immature and ultimately self-damaging. To complicate matters further, the valid complaint may be one that is much discussed within his cultural group. These preoccupations may blind him and his group to ongoing curriculum revisions in his school that are actually designed to meet these very needs. On the other hand, he could be up against a genuinely backward school.

Regardless of whether the school is progressive or backward, if he should then join with other disgruntled students and commit a violent and destructive act, the upshot may be quite unpredictable. This could result in constructive changes in that school—a "good" end justifying a "bad" means? Equally likely, there may be a reactionary backlash, resulting in a loss of progress made in this and in other schools.

Without at this point considering (or discounting) the irrationality in the adults' reaction, such a negative consequence usually follows upon the regressive roots of the students' violence. Usually different for each student in a destructive gang, such violence may reflect the omnipotent immediacy of the demandingness of an orally fixated youth, the irrational demand for immediate autonomy of one who has regressed under stress to the anal-muscular phase, or ego ideal pathology in another who expects omnipotent perfection from the idealized adults and hates them with equally intense passion whenever they fail to make reality perfect instantaneously.

It is to be understood that in such minority group exam-

pies as cited, the realities of socioeconomic deprivation typically interfere with healthy development and leave many such adolescents vulnerable to fixation and regression. Also, while granting the validity of many minority student complaints, we hold the position that violence by anyone is difficult to regard as a constructive solution except perhaps as a truly last resort. We also recognize that student violence in general is more often committed by majority culture students than by minorities. And we are here making a definite distinction between destructive violence and constructive forms of student activism. Student violence, especially among early adolescents, is very seldom dignified by the mature perception that all less damaging avenues have truly been exhausted; it characteristically has inappropriate and regressive intrapsychic origins that make it impossible for those adolescents to comprehend progressive compromises as genuine victories. In other words, there is often a characteristically adolescent blend of the childish and the mature, the rational and the irrational, in such student rebellion. Simplistic solutions are no better than simplistic demands or the simplistic intransigence of school authorities.

The authority struggles in high schools often follow a characteristic pattern. There is a breakdown of respect for teachers and administration, and a discarding of commonly accepted restraints on behavior and interaction. Adolescents who have had disappointing or traumatic experiences with authority figures—inadequate parents, indifferent teachers, brutal police—are prone to overgeneralize their experience. As described earlier, some parents with unresolved phallic conflicts are unable to regard their children except as fulfillments of their own unconscious fantasies. So intent is the parent on self-fulfillment that the child is given no voice regarding his own needs. He learns that his parent(s) will not hear him, and in reactive anger he turns against all parental and adult wishes and values.
This is but one developmental origin for the tendency of some adolescents to displace their anger and distress from their specific personal experience onto adult society as a whole. In this way, the entire cultural value system may become devalued in their eyes. The youngsters engage—blatantly and provocatively—in a series of disapproved activities, and there is a loss of interest in the value of achievement per se. Here, we are painfully struck by our ethnocentric bias: Who is to assess the future adaptive value of a work-and-achievement ethic in a culture that some think may soon no longer need as many workers?

At the college and university level, these conflicts and their manifestations are quite similar; in this context, however, they are more intense and often more destructive. The students' sense of postponement and cultural uselessness heightens with age. It often infects even those who believe in the future value of their studies. They want a greater place in the world NOW. The kinds of demands for sharing—or taking over—power usually involve issues similar to those enumerated for high school students. Since the youth involved in radical movements at the university are older and in some ways more mature, they can bring more powerful pressure to bear.

But it is precisely because they are virtually adult that these authority struggles cast some of their maturational deficits into sharp relief. There have been a few exceptionally gifted leaders and some remarkable triumphs. But in general it is our impression that the success of students' confrontations owes more to the confusion of administrations than to the effective organization of the students. As we noted, there are widespread inadequacies in the way we rear children to assume authority. Moreover, our youth are isolated from the kind of real work in which they could learn to organize for joint projects. As a result, they are usually grossly unprepared to exercise the power they demand. They retain an exhilarating sense of identity and purpose as long as they share in a group goal; they can fantasize sharp (albeit inaccurate) distinctions between who "we" are and who "the enemy" is. Often, when their stated goals are within their grasp, they sacrifice these by maintaining their intransigency; in fact, their group identity is emotionally more important. They have too often been deprived of the chance to develop the maturity and the necessary skills to actualize their goals. The fact that some of those goals sometimes materialize is a disquieting tribute to behavioral serendipity. Disaster may as easily—and often does—occur.

Once the dust has settled, one can observe further phenomena related to this authority struggle. Some students have learned some real leadership skills, and move on to use them constructively. Others subside into academic routine, somehow with enough ego resources to withstand further delays and preparations for getting into the "real world." Some desert the academic setting for more direct and immediate involvement in the work world.

Unfortunately, some lack the resources for any adaptive course. Unable to accept and learn from authority, and unable to assume mature control even over themselves, they withdraw into a peer world of similar losers. They turn to mysticism, drugs, naive primitivism, or simple apathy. In any case, the goal is to shut out reality, to avoid congress with a world with which they cannot cope. These are the real casualties of this kind of intergenerational struggle.

On the other hand, the conduct of the adults in this conflict is seldom exemplary in its maturity. When the students refuse to play according to the (authorities') rules, more often than not the effect upon teachers and administrators is demoralizing. They are untrained in the guerilla warfare of students and disarmed by the repudiation of what they may sincerely have regarded as a stance of mutual respect. Faced with an encounter, their responses are frequently primitive.
The “law and order” stance is currently popular, but promises no better resolution than the earlier permissive one. The failure of either approach is not mysterious. Students’ discontents are often reflections of massive cultural transitions. Thus, they may not be able to be satisfied by even the most appropriate modifications made by individuals. The cultural dilemma remains.

At another level, the students’ felt distresses may be expressions of intrapsychic growing pains, related intimately to each young person’s individual history, family experiences, and current needs. These, too, often defy practical solutions, because such solutions are like an analgesic applied to an area of referred pain.

It is unlikely, however, that issues in individual development are adequate to explain the mass phenomenon of adolescent-school authority conflicts. Drastic intrapsychic deprivations have always existed and have always found some expression. In recent years we have witnessed culture-wide repudiation of teacher authority as early as in junior high school. It is likely that this reflects more all-embracing cultural disjunctions that have been expressed in various ways within individual family relationships.

In any individual instance, the resolution of such an authority struggle depends upon the resiliency and maturity of each participant. There are adolescents whose opinions or wishes were never heeded at home; for example, those of orally fixed parents who forced role reversal upon their children because the parents’ own needs had to be foremost. In school, however, they may encounter more sensitive and respectful adults and learn to assume more meaningful authority through interaction with more mature authorities. The same young persons in a reactionary and authoritarian school will surely have their preconceptions verified: “That’s the way grown-ups treat you.” Their recourse may be to submit, or, having learned their lesson well, to tyrannize others in any situation in which they can wrest a modicum of power. A student’s own insecurity may lead him to seek reassurance desperately from the authorities at school. He needs a sense of their inner strength, of their certitude as adults. He may be undone, and even precipitated into a depressive crisis, by an administration that retreats pell-mell before student challenge.

Authority and minority group conflicts

The differences within each minority group, as well as the similarities among these cultural groups, are readily identifiable. However, these adolescents very often have similar experiences as related to authority and the authority gap. These adolescents are most likely viewed as representative of a cultural group rather than as individuals. More frequently than not, their experiences are rooted in their ethnic identity and in the societal response to the characteristics inherent in these identities. The stresses of biculturality compound the struggle for many minority group adolescents. The daily confrontations with confusing, if not conflicting, cues, especially for the black adolescent, are not infrequently overwhelming. These experiences often precipitate a broadening of the gap with authority figures in the community at large, as is readily observable in the higher than average unemployment rates among black youth.

One striking illustration of the combination of adolescent and minority group characteristics as they manifested themselves in authority confrontation is provided by the actions of scores of middle-class black youth during the sit-in movement of the early 1960s. They defied the Jim Crow laws, which dictated that blacks were inferior and, therefore, necessarily had to be barred from making use of public accommodations in the same manner as white Americans. In so doing, they also defied the teachings of their elders, both
their parents and their once highly respected teachers. They observed that the postures of authority, assumed by their elders, had been repeatedly attacked and weakened by majority group power, power that had been reinforced by institutional prejudices and discriminatory legislation. Often viewing the circumstances (as related to authority) of their parents and parent surrogates as causative in molding "Uncle Toms," these young people resorted to their own methods of dealing with broader environmental forces.

The frequent observation of authority figures themselves defying the rules in many neighborhoods "set aside for minority groups" leads their youth to question the legitimacy of both the authorities and the rules. For example a number of behavioral science studies cite experiences of ghetto-bound adolescents who are daily aware of the deficiencies in law enforcement in their communities. The illegal activities of the individuals invested with the responsibility of upholding law and order serve to widen the gap between these representatives of authority and many black and Puerto Rican youth who live in overcrowded and underserved inner-city neighborhoods.

Struggles for community control of schools also illustrate this phenomenon. Here, we often see students caught between parents and school personnel in the battle for power and control. It may be that such confrontations narrow the gap, at least temporarily, between the adolescent and his parent(s), but widen the gap between the adolescent and the school authorities. However, as previously pointed out, in some school settings adolescents have viewed parents and community authorities to be of the same persuasion; and by rebelling, they have directed their energies toward establishing some sense of their own authority.

The development of ethnic consciousness has served to narrow the authority gap between some minority group adults and adolescents. For example, the theme of black consciousness that nationally recognized blacks have woven into their daily work—be it in the political environment, the sports arena, scientific endeavors, or the lecture halls of academe—sounds a harmonious chord with the loud exclamations of scores of black adolescents. However, here, too, a widening of the authority gap, as related to "the man," may occur. This is more readily observable when the representatives of "the man" react negatively to the aforementioned processes of unification.

In families that provide the growing child with clear-cut authoritative models, there is often less of an authority gap at the approach of adolescence. In strongly religious families, their manner of worship and the activities of the church may provide such models. In some of the smaller religious sects, it has been noticed that the religion itself and the family unit are the foci of all church supported activities. For many a youth, establishing independence from the family of origin does not change this. The religious ties remain intact and the authority gap is less difficult to bridge.

However, in the stressful everyday living of the lower socioeconomic family, the authoritative models are not sharply defined. Early de-idealization of the parent is often experienced, especially among the very poor, with concomitant loss of respect for parental authority. When a father is alive, but is not physically in the home at all, his authority is greatly diminished or non-existent. Nor does his mere presence necessarily guard against this state of affairs. For example, the father may have a depreciated view of himself because society and/or his family casts him in an inferior role. Such a negative self-image may be reinforced by other "authority" figures in the household (mother, grandparents).

Not infrequently, the black child's early de-idealization of the father is brought about by his awareness that he has little, if any, capacity to be an assured protector—especially against racial discrimination. A black father is not likely to be as
successful in interceding for his son who has been arrested for a minor traffic violation as is the white father, who is more readily listened to by the police sergeant or arresting officer(s). The same situation would likely be experienced by a non-Caucasian father whose ethnic identity is readily observable.

For many children of the poor, slum family—whether they have one or two parents—there are multiple caretakers. These rearing experiences may make for multiple lines of authority and resulting diffusion and confusion. In the many instances in which one authority figure reigns in the household, that person is usually the mother surrogate. The results for the adolescent are varied, as depicted in the reported studies by clinicians and behavioral science researchers. Recent references, however, cast some doubt upon the previously published conclusions, which emphasized the destructiveness of the “black matriarchy,” a phenomenon identified as reinforcing the ineffectiveness of the father as an authority figure. Authors of the more recent publications point to the positive aspects (i.e., protectiveness, holding the family together) of the black matriarchy. Other studies cite evidence to illustrate the egalitarian nature of the interaction of black parents. In such family settings one may be likely to see a blurring of the traditional roles of mother and father.

Authority and adolescent sexuality

Sexuality is an omnipresent facet of adolescent life. It lures the youth with all the promise of sensuous achievement and fantasy fulfillment. But it has more meanings still. Besides being an end in itself, sexual activity can be used to serve all manner of non-sexual ends. In particular, it can become a vehicle for the expression of adolescents’ attitudes about and toward authority and power.

As an expression of authority concerns, sexuality can be described in three areas of relationship: 1) in the relationship with cultural authority; 2) in the interpersonal relationships with parents and other adult authorities; and 3) in the aspirations toward inner self-determination—a kind of intrapsychic authority. There are, of course, differences between children and adults, and between the child mind and the adult mind. In any of the areas named, therefore, there are genuine differences between degrees of readiness and capacity to assume and exercise authority. For example, in most states an adolescent girl of any age is given the sole legal right to decide whether or not to keep her out-of-wedlock child. But does this give any consideration to her developmental capacity to function as a good mother, usually in the absence of a husband? Or does it take account of any rights the child has to effective and consistent parenting? Thus there are all shades of reality vs. unreality in the ways adolescents use sex to act out their struggles with authority.

Every culture shapes the ways in which sexuality may be used to this end. Overtly and covertly, the intricate relationships between sex and authority are always defined. In middle-class United States culture, both overt sexuality and authority officially rest with and belong to the adults. In the official morality of the culture, sexuality is treated by adults like a possession; it is withheld from youth, and is represented as a reward, a fringe benefit of authority status to which youth should aspire. The right to indulge in sex is granted only after youth has agreed to pay the required price: to accept the ground rules for sexuality as laid down by cultural authority.

It is true that this culture is beginning to witness a very gradual increasing acceptance of youthful sexuality, but such a change affects primarily the minority of upper middle class parents. Some of these parents may even put their daughter on the pill fairly early in adolescence. Often, however, that
acceptance is largely a form of resignation, adopted by default. Permissive standards have by no means penetrated to the grassroots majority. Prohibitive standards continue to be the adult norm; otherwise, adolescents would not find sexuality so rewarding an area for challenging adult authority.

The overt means by which society maintains its control of sexuality include the inhibition of childhood sexuality, the prohibitions applied to adolescents, and the fixed rituals for gaining access to sexuality. These very rituals demand allegiance to the principle that the authorities control sexual rights. For example, the act of getting married as a means of gaining sexual rights is tacit acceptance of the adult-enunciated dictum that marriage is, indeed, the proper way to legitimize sex. The marriage ceremony thus perpetuates society's control of sex because the young couple now has at least submitted to and complied with adult rules. The decision to do so often means that even the inwardly rebellious youth has identified with and become part of the authority structure.

In addition to these formal requirements, there are also subtle and covert techniques by which the status quo of adult control is maintained. One is the general adult denial of childhood sexuality—the belief in the sexual innocence of children. Another is the pretense by adults that overt adolescent heterosexual activity is exceptional rather than commonplace behavior. Despite media coverage of teenage sex, adults reassure themselves by pointing to studies reporting no real increase in adolescent coital activity. Only those who have fooled themselves into thinking that it has always been rare are likely to be impressed. These pretenses allow adults to define any discovery of child and adolescent sexual behavior as a manifestation of sickness, disturbance, perversity, or evil. By this definition, overtly sexual teenagers are “disturbed”; thus, adults are saved from perceiving any challenge to their sexual prerogatives. These various maneuvers are supported by adults' capacity to forget their own early sexual behavior, or, retrospectively, to disapprove of it even in themselves.

This general principle (adult control of sex) is not restricted to our culture. The existence of puberty rites as initiation into adult status is widespread. But in our culture, sexual taboos at all sub-adult levels are unusually all-embracing. Other cultures tend to focus their taboos more upon whom one may have sex with, rather than upon whether one is granted a sexual outlet. Judeo-Christian culture is virtually the only major culture that permits no guilt-free orgastic sexual act outside of marriage. Adolescence is a time during which sexual drives are extremely intense, yet abstinence is held to be the ideal. Thus, the culture clearly defines sex as a privilege of adult-authority status, a vital issue in the transition from child to adult-authority.

This discussion refers not simply to procreation but to all forms of overt sexual behavior. Our cultural attitudes toward adolescent sexuality are such that we are as much concerned with the fact of sexual activity as we are with reproduction. Were this not so, society might welcome the technological ability to prevent conception during the adolescent period, instead of regarding it as a dangerous opportunity for unleashed eroticism.

The most influential models for both sexuality and authority are a child’s parents. The parental sexual interaction and the family power structure exert major influences at both the interpersonal and intrapsychic levels.

Many youths still accept the culture’s traditions and assumptions. With relatively little apparent conflict, they utilize
the sanctioned rituals to join the ranks of adulthood and achieve the prerogatives of authority. Among such young people, overt challenge to society's control of sex is minimal. They offer their compliance in return for ostensible social rewards and a good conscience. For many such adolescents, the basis of their value systems arises from parentally-derived prohibitions rather than from self-determined standards.

However, on every side, one observes increasing defiance of adult control of sex. One form is the open refusal to comply with the prescribed rituals to achieve sexual rights. A related pattern of defiance is the refusal to pretend to wait. When adolescents do not keep their sexual activity secret, this destroys the belief that youthful sexuality is rare, and seriously challenges the definition that it is necessarily disturbed or perverse.

A most telling form of defiance is the refusal to accept the prescribed social consequences of overt sexuality. In many instances, such consequences exist only when both youth and authority agree to treat them as real; they fade when one or the other no longer accepts or enforces their reality. An example is social ostracism as punishment for “unchaste” behavior. Young people more and more live in a community of near-age-peers; among many such groups, technical virginity is increasingly irrelevant as a criterion of approval or disapproval.

A particularly clever technique of mocking the authority position is to act literally upon ideals that society professes, but by which it certainly does not live, such as, “make love, not war.” This not only “usurps” the sexual rights of adults, but makes them look silly and hypocritical when they object. Another example is racial intermingling in choice of lovers or spouses.

The repudiation of adult control of sex may be expressed in areas other than overt sexual activity. Thus, many young-sters are busy defying or redefining sex-related phenomena which have traditionally been defined by adults. Some examples are: violent activism by girls, passive protest by boys, girls’ engaging in active pursuit of boys and sex, women’s demand for equal orgastic and sex-freedom rights, acceptance of non-dominant and domestic, “housewifely” roles by men, long hair and adornments on boys, non-seductive clothing on girls, and the “uni-sex” look (which began some years ago among teenagers). In all these examples, there is a negation of adult expectations and stereotypes. The young have simply assumed the right to define and pursue sexuality in their own ways.

Many adolescents feel a strong need to define themselves very sharply as different from, rather than less mature than, adults. (After all, to acknowledge themselves as less mature would automatically permit adults some rightful authority.) This also plays into the use of sex as a counter in the authority struggle. The peer group culture denies adolescence as a stage of development, and redefines it in terms of life styles and ideals. The adolescent adhering to this peer culture will try—or feel forced—to deny sexuality as something to be postponed for any reason until adulthood. Early sex, for these adolescents, becomes a “proof” of equal status and repudiation of adult authority. In the context of such youth culture concepts, many adolescents are, in effect denied the opportunity to delay sexuality in accord with their own inner timetable of readiness. For them, their need to belong and be accepted overrides their inner anxieties and precipitates them into premature involvement, with resulting predictable psychological damage.

In the family that adheres to conventional cultural values, the resultant adolescent sexuality may indeed cleave in a general way to the traditional cultural patterns (the adolescent may generally accept the culture’s mores). But even though the family is the carrier of culture, the microculture
of the individual family and the wider "out there" culture are
seldom identical. Individual differences in adolescent sexual
adaptation derive from the various highly personal ways in
which a given youngster's parents handle and express their
own sexuality and authority.

The gender and sexuality of the dominant parent and that
of the more submissive parent become object lessons. They
teach how authorities use sex and how sex is used on
authorities. Depending upon who uses sex how and upon
whom, sexual identity can become hopelessly intermingled
and confused with power identity. Needless to say, such
sex-power constellations run the gamut. They extend from
the most pathological, pathogenic, and exploitive, to the
most healthy, mutually supportive, and considerate relation-
ships. Some of the more easily defined sex-power prototypes
to which children are exposed are: sex is loving and consid-
erate (a constellation in which there is minimal power con-
tamination of sexuality); sex is coercive-exploitive (in which
sex is used to gain and hold power); sex is cruel and violent
(in which sex is used to display the power to hurt the weaker
partner); sex is perfunctory and physical (in which sex is
used to deny the value and defeat the power of the partner);
sex is actively negated and derogated (in which non-sex is
used as a source of power); sex is masochistically endured (in
which guilt is coerced in order to wrest power from the
ostensibly more powerful).

The sexual behavior of any adolescent can be considered
in its relationship to the parental matrix. It may be, varia-
tively, an imitative parody of the same-sex parent, an attempt to ape
the more powerful parent, a rebellious defiance against the
more authoritarian parent, a healthy identification with the
appropriate parent, or a healthy rejection and differentia-
tion from disturbed parental power-sex models.

Parents have generally taken a position of being sexually
suppressive, and the teenagers view other adults as similarly
inclined until proven otherwise. Adolescents can, therefore,
predict with fair accuracy that overt sexual behavior will
often produce a gratifying degree of consternation in adult
ranks. In an effort to break away from parental restrictions
and establish their independence, youngsters will often in-
dulge in a public exhibitionistic display of everything from
hand holding to heavy petting, not only because it is fun
(sometimes it is far more an anxious display of bravado), but
because of their tickled anticipation of the response it will get
from most adult onlookers.

The accuracy of the adolescents' perceptions, and the ab-
surdities of which adults are capable, is illustrated by an
experience of one of the authors. In her role as consultant to
a school for the blind, she was asked to help cope with a boy
who was openly masturbating in class. The reason the
teacher gave for requesting consultation was that he was
"disrupting the class." Upon inquiry, it developed that the
only sighted person in the class was the teacher herself.

A slightly more complex example of a parentally derived
pattern of using sex to cope with authority might be seen in a
family that includes a seductive-coercive mother whose tech-
niques were effective in keeping her husband "in line." An
attractive daughter growing up in this atmosphere would
have little preparation for mutually tender sexuality. But she
would have had ample apprenticeship for getting good
grades by flirting with her teachers, without really producing
good work.

It might be noted that a healthy handling of the sex-
authority complex at one level does not necessarily render
the other levels trouble-free. Thus, an adolescent from a
non-restrictive "sex is loving and considerate" family may
proceed to act upon that concept in high school or college,
and run afoul of the adult authorities who regard sex as
something they have a right to regulate.

Intrapsychic authority here refers to the result of internal
emotional development, a slow maturation of the ego, which eventuates in the capacity to master one's basic drives, to make decisions, and to regulate one's own life and affairs with appropriate attention to both external reality and internal needs. The particular importance of this is that this authority over the self and its interrelationship with the environment is a prerequisite for the rational exercise of interpersonal or cultural authority.

There is a lengthy progression from childhood dependence and lack of mature judgment to adult autonomy and capacity for authority. In our culture, this progression follows a different timetable than does that of physiological sexual maturation. Procreation can occur from the beginning of adolescence. Our culture is highly technological and requires elaborate and sophisticated levels of ego development in many areas. This is certainly true in order to function with authority and adult sexual responsibility; more maturity is demanded under such circumstances than has usually been achieved by the mid-teens. The fact that physiological readiness and social maturity develop out-of-phase with one another induces stresses and conflicts and adds to the inevitable burdens that are part and parcel of psychosexual development. This circumstance can, and often does, cause difficulties in integrating sexuality with the assumption of authority and its responsibility. A delay in the development of normal sexual interests may betray a covert wish to deny or avoid oncoming authority and responsibility, an unconscious effort to remain a dependent child. An early rush into heterosexuality may be an attempt to deny the reality that adult sexual function and the assumption of adult responsibilities are, in truth, inseparably linked. In some cases of premature heterosexuality, the behavior may represent two conflicting unconscious attitudes: on the one hand, a demand for adult status for which the ego is unprepared; on the other, an attempt to prolong childhood by treating sex as a form of play, something without real consequences. This is one of the reasons why adolescents will so frequently ignore the possibility of pregnancy.

On the other hand, it should be noted that adolescent use of sex as a vehicle for coping with authority is by no means always pathological. Adolescents are normally progressing toward full heterosexuality. Some cultures and some child rearing practices—ours included—force adolescents to break taboos and defy prohibitions in order to express their sexuality. Some are emotionally ready much earlier than others. They then incur the danger of being labeled sick or bad by the defining authorities. Adolescents may be forced into genuine abnormality by the inaccessibility of guilt-free sexual channels and outlets. Sometimes it may be the definitions that are inappropriate and the adolescents who are normal.

**Authority and drug use**

No authority issue has attracted more public notice or concern than has the adolescent use of drugs. In a manner shared to some extent with sex, it is an ideal battleground for adolescent purposes. It combines a form of defiance over which adults are largely powerless, with an unparalleled opportunity for accusing adults of hypocrisy.

Some drugs have always been around. Until the advent of contemporary youth culture, however, they had not been widely publicized. The basic cultural position was that habitual drug use is detrimental—few argued with this generally sensible consensus. The traditionally available drugs seemed capable of producing serious psychological dependence, and there was much to suggest that they impaired the user's contact with reality. The plight of known addicts—non-productive at best and criminally destructive at worst—confirmed common opinion. A general ignorance existed about the major "soft" drug, marijuana. This made it possi-
ble both to overlook the marijuana users who were not visible as typical addicts, and to assume that marijuana shared the same dangers.

That this public opinion eventually prevailed regarding marijuana has many interesting connotations. During the nineteenth century, and through the early '20s of this century a number of serious medical reports were written, indicating potential or demonstrated therapeutic applications of this agent as an analgesic-hypnotic, appetite stimulant, anticonvulsant, an agent that could interrupt or prevent neuralgias such as migraine and *Tic doloureux*, antidepressant and tranquilizer, antiasthmatic, antitussive, facilitator in withdrawal from opiates and alcohol, minor anaesthetic, and antibiotic. It is, of course, doubtful whether all these claimed benefits would stand up under careful research methods. Yet despite both this earlier scientific interest and the obvious fact of less devastating effects from use, research languished, and even the authorities insisted that it be classified with the major narcotics. Even the opium derivatives, with their far greater addictive and damaging qualities, have not been medically ignored as had cannabis.

Side by side with this public attitude toward addictive drugs has been a selective inattention to the comparable or even more serious effects of society’s preferred and legally acceptable drug, alcohol. Finally, another part of the background of the eventual conflict was adult society’s eager acceptance of the flood of new synthetic tranquilizers and antidepressants. In addition to valid medical uses, these became artificial means of doing away with emotional distress—magic means that demanded no ego growth or increased intrapsychic mastery by the individual. Their use has become so widespread that it is regarded by some public health specialists as an “epidemic.”

It was the youthful beatniks of the 1950s who “rediscovered” pot and catapulted it into public awareness and controversy. They proclaimed marijuana as their cult drug, used it in place of alcohol, and initiated the demand for its legalization. Perhaps coincidentally, seemingly unrelated developments were taking place at the same time. Medical science had developed new and powerful mind-altering substances, such as LSD. And the “cold war” with its expanding nuclear weaponry was producing a new kind of reality, one capable of overtaxing the ego strength of a sizeable portion of the population, particularly adolescents. For many, this certainly intensified the need to find some means of avoiding participation in an overwhelming world in which individual coping power seemed inconsequential.

It is obvious that the increased drug use was presently a source of genuine concern. But the massive adult response to the sudden adoption of drugs by the adolescents was in itself a major provocation. A mixture of honest concern, fear, ignorance, hypocrisy, and punitiveness turned the drug issue into a pitched battle. Adolescents, as well as some adults, were characteristically quick to detect the ignorance and hypocrisy in adults’ authoritarian stance, and equally characteristically incapable of assessing the real potential problems and consequences attendant upon drug use.

This study will not attempt to examine the full range of the many intrapsychic motives for drug use except to give illustrative examples of such motives. The stated conscious reasons are usually curiosity and peer pressure, followed closely by pleasure and mood elevation. It will only mention some of the ways in which drugs become a vehicle for confrontation with authority. As is true with other youth culture phenomena, drugs have become incorporated into the “life style” concept of adolescent peer group culture. Adolescents who see themselves as part of the youth culture *rather than* the culture at large, repudiate all adult attitudes about drugs, whether valid or invalid, and redefine drugs as one of the reasons why their own life style is superior. The illegality of
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Drugs make their use a means of peer group entry, and an agent for further defining the boundary between “us” and “them.”

Drugs are a particularly effective weapon for turning the tables against adult authority. The open and nearly ubiquitous drug traffic at large rock concerts is common knowledge and is beyond the authorities’ capacity to control. Youth can realistically put “the establishment” on the defensive by mercilessly pointing out the adult culture’s overuse of alcohol and medications. Ignoring the vast differences between marijuana and many of the other major drugs, adolescents nail the authorities to the wall by demanding that they prove the dangers of all drugs.

Some obvious facts lend a heady strength to youth’s position. The general adult position of lumping together marijuana and other mind-altering drugs and medications makes it patently impossible to demonstrate the dire consequences of all drug use. Alcohol demonstrably wreaks infinitely greater social and individual havoc than does marijuana. The legal status of alcohol, therefore, places the adults in a seemingly indefensible position. As is typical of adolescents in such an encounter, the sober realities of their own position are denied in favor of the one-upmanship they can gain over those in authority.

It might be pointed out that many similar issues are involved in cigarette addiction. Many adolescents begin to smoke as a form of defiance and a means of breaking away from parents. Since many of their own parents smoke, they are utterly contemptuous of a “do as we say, not as we do” stance, focusing on their parents’ inconsistency while being inattentive to the real consequences to themselves. And at the same time, the smoking often represents a most unfortunate and self-destructive form of identification.

The impasse between adolescents and adults is heightened by the fact that for both, drug use typically shares the same very early oral stage roots* and seeks the same maladaptive solutions to the sense of powerlessness. Where drug use is excessive, both generations are revealing an intolerable degree of helplessness, and displaying regression to the infantile omnipotence of the symbiotic phase. Whatever the drug of choice, it represents the magic capacity of mother’s breast and milk to soothe all distress and to restore the sense of total power over threatening adversity from overwhelming external reality. This drug use has unconscious meanings that extend back into the primitive reaches of the earliest preverbal relationships. Seen from this developmental point of view, neither adults nor adolescents will easily or willingly relinquish this magical source of imaginary power. Those who would seek to deprive them are unconsciously seen as threatening them with return to helpless dependency and annihilating vulnerability, and must be opposed in every way. And since the roots are preverbal, rational discourse between those caught in equally regressive behavior patterns is often futile.

The convergence of such factors as the ubiquity of the hemp weed (not to mention other substances) and the utter unenforceability of laws against drugs means that the vast majority of adolescent drug users can effectively nullify the social controls in this area. It is true that many are caught and punished; there are approximately 700,000 people arrested each year for marijuana involvement. But they are a tiny fraction of the actual experimenters and users (estimated at 24 million), and the frequent excesses of legal sentences further polarize youth and authorities.

Drugs also blot out the world of adult requirements. A frightening number of adolescents stay “stoned” through most or all of their classes in school. The faculty members become resigned or make themselves self-protectively un-
aware. They can do little either to change the situation or to get through to their students. Surprisingly, a fair number of these young people still manage to maintain at least passing grades—a fact with sobering and unexplored implications.

Of course, there is every level of drug use. For the occasional, nondependent adolescent user, it is likely that it symbolizes to some extent a gauntlet flung at the feet of authority. But those who are “into” drugs more deeply are, as described, confessing some inner awareness of ego deficits that render them unequal to the demands of contemporary reality. In blocking out the adult world in such ways, such adolescents are also retreating from the very realities that make for their ultimate survival. Walled off from significant experience by scrambled perceptions, the necessary maturation is impossible.

In this as in other arenas of authority struggle, adults are in a very difficult position. The culture’s traditional child­rearing practices allow it the right to proscribe a particular activity arbitrarily. Once this is challenged by adolescents, they often find that the other courses of action open to them are limited. When they move from exercising authority to wielding power, they find that the success of punitive enforcement depends on the controllability of the activity—a highly limited alternative with drugs. Reasoning and caution depend upon the adults’ credibility quotient. Individual adults may measure up admirably in this respect but collectively, in this realm, adult credibility is dubious. Cooperative effort to explore the realities of various drugs and their effects depend on the previous experience of both generations with cooperative endeavor. Again, there has been little.

As a result, there is usually an angry, a resigned, or a cynical standoff. Some adults threaten, and pretend their laws have meaning. Others side almost wholly with the adolescents, often unaware that they are encouraging the youngsters to act out for them their own rebellious urges. And in some places, adults have begun to work effectively to forge a pattern of cooperation and mutual respect which is often a new experience in the youngsters’ lives.

**Authority and youth-culture music**

The music of the youth culture, especially that which was so popular from the early 1960s into the early 1970s, occupies an important place in adolescents’ struggles with various authority issues.* It is a rather complex reflection of these intergenerational problems because only to a limited extent is the music itself a violation of emotionally important cultural sanctions. Far more germane is its use as a vehicle for the expression of attitudes and values that challenge cherished cultural positions. Nonetheless, its enormous popularity and the multibillion dollar industry that has grown up around it marks it as a significant phenomenon in its own right.

Purely on its own merits, the music and lyrics do offer some direct affront to adult society’s sensibilities. (To avoid constant repetition, references in this discussion to this genre of music will be understood to include the lyrics, unless otherwise indicated.) Much of the music of this period is a physical assault upon the ears. This is not to say that it is...
without intrinsic merit. But few would deny that much of it represents an aggressive and possibly purposeful disregard of the tones and harmonies that had been characteristic of parental generation preferences. Added to those differences is the earsplitting level at which the records are played and to which it is amplified in live concerts. This, too, drove away the greater proportion of the adult generation, isolating the adolescent within a self-made cacophonous cocoon of sound, and intensifying the intergenerational boundaries.

The lyrics, too, sometimes represented a direct confrontation with the codes of behavior dictated by adults. Profanities and obscenities gradually became commonplace. An expression such as "mother-fucker," which first appeared in a commercial record in 1969,* was an intrinsic violation of cultural taboos regardless of the ideological context in which it occurred. But a distinction is being made here between the defiance value of the music per se, as in its noise level and use of taboo words, and its far more important impact as a vehicle for defiant attitudes. While adult response to acid rock, for example, often did not take cognizance of such distinctions, there is, after all, a vast difference between singing about LSD and taking it.

The music played its greatest role as an expressive medium. It conveyed the conflicts, dissatisfactions, frustrations, and anger felt by young people trying to find their way in a culture felt by many of them as hypocritical (as in "killing for peace"). It was probably in the association between that music and the drug culture that it achieved its greatest notoriety, but it is misleading to regard that as its only significant message. It was also a vehicle for the expression of many other crucial and painful concerns.

The driving beat of "hard rock" in the late 1950s (Everly Brothers, Chubby Checker, Elvis Presley) was replaced by folk rock in the early 1960s (Bob Dylan; and Peter, Paul, and Mary). The "new" music was a reflection of the attitudes and feelings of American and British youth. The literature of the time (such as Updike's *Rabbit Run*, Salinger's *Franny and Zooey* and Roth's *Goodbye Columbus*) glorified adolescence and emphasized it as a period of identity crisis.

During this period, alcohol was initially the most heavily used drug, but marijuana gradually assumed major importance. The transition from alcohol to cannabis can be seen in the music of one of the first popular folk groups, Peter, Paul and Mary. Their music had excellent rhythm and harmony, and the lyrics read like poetry; their ability to communicate a feeling of togetherness and openness was contagious. As marijuana was used more and more widely, they began to write of the experience, and "Puff the Magic Dragon"** is generally conceded to be the first marijuana song.

Donovan P. Leitsch of England was very popular also, and the theme of cannabis constantly found expression in his songs such as "Sunshine Superman,"*** "There is a Mountain,"**** and "Mellow Yellow,"***** excerpts of which are, respectively:

"Sunshine came softly through my window today,
I could have tripped out easy,
but I've changed my ways."**

"First there is a mountain, then there is no
mountain,
then there is."***

"Going to have forever to fly."****

---


** SUNSHINE SUPERMAN. Copyright © 1966 by Donovan (Music) Ltd. Sole Selling Agent Peer International Corporation. Used by permission.

*** THERE IS A MOUNTAIN. Copyright © 1967 by Donovan (Music) Ltd. Sole Selling Agent Peer International Corporation. Used by permission.

**** MELLOW YELLOW. Copyright © 1966 by Donovan (Music) Ltd. Sole Selling Agent Peer International Corporation. Used by permission.
Bob Dylan was the most influential artist of this first period, the personification of its adolescent yearnings. His first album *Bob Dylan* (1962) contains the themes of wanderlust, political alienation and quest for identity. Early expressions of social protest can be found in his song, "Talking New York" in the lines:

'A lot of people don't have much food on their tables,
But they have a lot of forks 'n' knives,
And they gotta cut somethin'” *"*

His subsequent records of this period continued the preoccupation with alienation and vague identity, and focused upon the threat of war and the feelings of anger and frustration.

The popularity of Simon and Garfunkel began in this early period, and they, too, blended a sense of alienation, anomie, and loneliness with excellent harmony and good poetry. The characteristic tone of their work can be sensed from typical lyrics such as those from "The Sound of Silence" and "Richard Cory," excerpts of which follow:

"The words of the prophets are written on the subway walls and tenement halls and whispered in the sound of silence." *

"So my mind was filled with wonder when the evening headlines read: 'Richard Cory went home last night and put a bullet through his head'!” *

The Beatles began their phenomenal rise to being the number one group of the 1960s in 1964. As John Lennon once said, "We're more popular than Jesus." Their earliest music varied between harmonious love songs and 1950s' style hard rock. Their music was well written, the words were easy to understand and identify with, and the Beatles themselves personified the emotions, strivings, and conflicts of adolescents. Adolescents found something vibrant, charismatic, different, and youthful with which to identify with. "Norwegian Wood" (1965) was their first marijuana song, followed by "Day Tripper" (1965) about a broken romance with marijuana, and "I'm Only Sleeping" (1965), a description of a marijuana "high." "Nowhere Man" (1965) was their first social protest song and attack on the middle class:

"He doesn't have a point of view, knows not where he's going to, isn't he a bit like you and me ... making all his nowhere plans for nobody." *

As idols of the youth culture, the Beatles obviously condoned and even extolled social protest, marijuana, and sex, as exemplified in a line from "Love You To."

"Make love all day long, make love singing songs." *

And they provided a transition into the acid rock of the later 1950s in "Tomorrow Never Knows" in the line:

"Turn off your mind, relax and flow downstream, it is not dying." *

By 1966 the music had changed to a new form, and this new period extended into the late 1960s. The term for this phase, acid rock, reflects a distinct shift in both the favorite drugs of misuse and the emotional preoccupations of youth. The mainstay drugs were cannabis and the hallucinogens, especially LSD. Barbiturates, the newly synthesized sedatives; and

---

*TALKING NEW YORK.* Words and music by Bob Dylan. Copyright © 1962, 1965 by Duchess Music Corporation. New York, NY. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

*THE SOUND OF SILENCE.* Copyright © 1964 Paul Simon. Used with permission.

*RICHARD CORY.* Copyright © 1966 Paul Simon. Used with permission.

*NOWHERE MAN.* Copyright © 1965 by ATV Music Group. Used by Permission. All rights reserved.

*LOVE YOU TO.* Copyright © 1966 by ATV Music Group. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

*TOMORROW NEVER KNOWS.* Copyright © 1965 by ATV Music Group. Used by permission. All rights reserved.
the minor tranquilizers, Librium and Valium, were very popular too. Poverty, minority discrimination, concerns about police activities, and growing disaffection with the Vietnam War and with government policy in general were associated with increasingly harsh and violent attacks on the social order and middle class value systems. Rebellion against any kind of sexual restraint increased.

The Beatles are considered the most influential group of the late 1960s. Many of their songs during this phase are about experiences on psychedelic drugs, or actually recreate those experiences in sound and words, as in “Revolution 9.” This song, one of the most popular among heavy users of psychedelic drugs, is quite abstract, with different sounds coming in and fading out of both speakers at the same time. Included are a woman at orgasm, a man screaming rape, an eerie sounding voice repeatedly saying “number nine,” a cocktail party, very loud applause, a cheering section from a football game, gunshots and mortar fire, and a small child’s voice invoking us to “come naked.” Social protest is not the Beatles’ major theme, though there is superb satire in “A Day in the Life” (1967), and the “dropout” theme is strong in “I Am a Walrus” (1967). The Beatles also wrote about another drug usage shift in “Happiness Is a Warm Gun” (1968), about amphetamines and heroin,

“I need a fix ‘cause I’m going down, down, down to the bits that I left uptown... happiness is a warm gun, when I hold you in my arms and feel my finger on your trigger, I know no one can do me no harm because happiness is a warm gun.”

The undisguised sexual reference is equally obvious in these lyrics.

Three of the best known acid rock groups were the Jefferson Airplane, Steppenwolf and The Rolling Stones. All three exemplified both the pattern of drug usage and the mounting violence in the social scene. Grace Slick of the Jefferson Airplane especially personified the sexual revolution in “Hey Fredrick,” Her blatantly sexual lyrics,

“... either go away or go all the way in,... on wire wheels the four stroke man opens wide

reflect her personal exhibitionism at live concerts as well as her public and unconventional sex life. She originally named her out-of-wedlock daughter “god” with a small “g,” but later changed her name to “China.” Jefferson Airplane mounts one of the most explicitly violent attacks upon the establishment in “We Can Be Together” (1969),

“We are all outlaws in the eyes of America... we are obscene, lawless, dangerous, idiots, dirty, violent... and young. All your private property is target for your enemy, and your enemy is me... up against the wall mother-fucker, tear down the wall, tear down the wall.”

As with Jefferson Airplane, psychedelic experience is a constantly repeated theme by Steppenwolf and The Rolling Stones. Also shared is the frontal attack upon the existing social order and middle class values. Steppenwolf extols the war protest movement (“Draft Resister,” 1966), the violent overthrow of society (“Move Over,” 1967), in which the old are told to get out of the way of the young, and attacks the stifling effect of bureaucracy and political repression (“The Monster,” 1967). The Rolling Stones express the same hostility and alienation in “Sympathy for the Devil” (1967),
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"I shouted out who killed the Kennedys? And after all it was you and me."*

And they satirized the hypocrisy inherent in adult drug use in "Mother's Little Helper" (1966),

"Mother needs something today to calm her down and though she's not really ill, there's the little yellow pill. She goes running for the shelter of her mother's little helper and it helps her on her way, gets her through her busy day."#

In a quite unusual twist on the theme of this period, Steppenwolf sang a bitter diatribe against narcotics pushers, "The Pusher" (1966),

"You know I've seen a lot of people walking around with tombstones in their eyes, but the pusher don't care if you live or if you die. God damn the pusher."†

There were many other popular singers and groups of this era, such as Led Zeppelin, Three Dog Night, Sly and the Family Stone, Iron Butterfly, Jimi Hendrix and Janis Joplin. Their work exemplified all the themes already described. At the end of this period, Crosby, Stills, Nash and Young recorded some of the most pointed protests against some of the most widely publicized outrages, such as the Kent State shootings ("Ohio," 1970),

"'Tin soldier and Nixon coming, we're finally on our own ... gotta get down to it, the soldiers are cutting us down ... what if you knew her and found her dead on the ground, how can you run when you know?"‡

and the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago ("Chicago," 1970).§

* SYMPATHY FOR THE DEVIL. Copyright © 1968 Abkco Music, Inc. All rights reserved. International copyright secured. Reprinted by permission.

† MOTHER'S LITTLE HELPER. Copyright © 1966 Abkco Music, Inc. All rights reserved. International copyright secured. Reprinted by permission.

‡ Incident of the Needles in their arms, and many more die with relatively low blood levels of narcotics.

§ The cause of death is usually similar to anaphylactic shock: one-third of the patients die with the needle in their arm, and many more die with relatively low blood levels of narcotics.
the heroin addict. *Let It Bleed* exposes more anguish, suffering, and alienation than any of the previous albums by the group.

The final album produced by the Beatles as a group, *Abbey Road* (1969),\textsuperscript{51} features drug songs largely dealing with hard drugs and sex. The Rolling Stones' 1971 album, *Sticky Fingers*,\textsuperscript{52} is strong “smack rock,” with “Brown Sugar” referring to cocaine and heroin use; “Sway” describing heroin withdrawal; “Didn’t You Hear Me Knockin’” referring to an addict trying to get heroin from a pusher; “Sister Morphine” a description of morphine overdose; “Dead Flowers” again about narcotic addiction; and “Moonlight Mile” describing a cocaine high. These are all excellent examples of the changing patterns of drug use of the period. Steppenwolf also gets strongly into the narcotic problem, *Steppenwolf 7* (1971),\textsuperscript{53} with “Fat Jack” about a pusher, and “Snowblind Friend” about a cocaine addict. Both groups continue to record bitter social protest songs.

Simon and Garfunkel’s last album together, *Bridge over Troubled Waters* (1970),\textsuperscript{54} is similarly reflective of the change. The title song can be read as an advertisement for heroin. “Keep the Customer Satisfied” appears to refer to the life style of a drug pusher, and “The Boxer” describes the aimless wanderings of a poverty pocket youth who goes to New York to seek his fortune. The sense of hopelessness and the feelings of the poor come through strongly.

A particularly fascinating phenomenon through all of this time is the life and career of Bob Dylan. He had been the epitome of the identity confusion, angry political alienation, and protest against social injustice that had its beginning in the folk rock era. Just at the end of that period he was nearly killed in a serious motorcycle accident and disappeared from public view for some time. His last album before this had been largely social satire. He wrote no new songs for more than a year, and there were many rumors of his death, reinforced by his one single piece of the period, “Positively 4th Street,”\textsuperscript{55} in which he exhibited a degree of paranoia presumably from the misuse of amphetamines. Then between 1968 and 1970, several new albums were recorded which both reestablished him and revealed him to be a very much changed pop artist. It was apparent that his close brush with death had a profound effect upon his emotions. There was less hostility and fatalism, increasingly more country western and love songs, and the social satire was gentler. Even his notoriously abrasive voice became softer and more melodious. His most recent albums reflect him at peace with himself, and beyond the stage of adolescent rebellion. He has resolved his authority struggle, apparently through a return to the family and romantic love, as exemplified in “Sign on the Window” (1970).\textsuperscript{56}

“Build me a cabin in Utah, Marry me a wife, Catch Rainbow trout, Have a bunch of kids who call me “Pa,” That must be what it’s all about.”\textsuperscript{*}

He was probably the best example of early adolescent rebellion, authority conflict, and diffused identity in the early 1960s. Following his music to the present is a study in growth from adolescence to mature adulthood. It is interesting that his development does not follow the pattern of increasingly violent protest and increasing preoccupation with ever more self-destructive drug misuse.

There is a second type of music characteristic of the early 1970s that had been heralded several years earlier by the changed Bob Dylan; more subtle social protest and soft love songs. Different social issues assumed prominence, such as

* SIGN ON THE WINDOW. Copyright © 1970 by Big Sky Music. Used by permission. All rights reserved.
ecology, population control, feminism, and an intensified demand for peace; they are naturally reflected in the music. Peace songs became especially popular. Many of the established groups began to record these themes, such as Crosby, Stills, Nash and Young with “Cowgirl In the Sand” (feminism) and “Southern Man” (racism) in 4-Way Street, 1970;57 and The Guess Who with “Share the Land” and “Hand Me Down World” in Share the Land, 1970.58 These are joined by new popular singers and groups, Elton John, The Carpenters, James Taylor and Melanie. The newest additions to the highly popular list, such as John Denver and Olivia Newton-John, are almost entirely concerned with this second type of theme. Interestingly the drug of choice for this music is alcohol, especially beer and wine. It appears that adolescents have gone the full cycle from alcohol in the 1950s back to alcohol in the 1970s.

The preceding has been only the barest skimming of the music of the 60s and early 70s. There are infinitely more omissions, both of popular groups and of representative lyrics, than inclusions. And obviously much more can be said about the phenomenon itself than can be stated in an authoritative explanation of it.

There is nothing new in the existence of songs of social protest. They have existed probably as long as vocal music has existed (e.g., “The Marseillaise,” labor movement songs, etc.). There is similarly nothing new in the use of music as temporary escape. What may be new in this time in history is the type of songs, the ways they integrate with youth culture, the ways adolescents have integrated them into their own age-specific needs and conflicts, and the psychosocial exigencies peculiar to this point in cultural-historical time.

At the simplest level, the enormous role of its particular music in youth culture may in large part be a sociofact of an affluent technological culture. The millions of dollars available to the performers and the record companies clearly are important too. The relatively inexpensive, culture-wide dissemination of new music is virtually total. This is one area in which even poverty-youth are less entirely disadvantaged; they can be just as familiar with current music through the ubiquitous cheap radios, record players, and tape recorders as can those adolescents who are more affluent. Thus the massive extent of the youth music phenomenon may not result from any intrinsic quality in the music, or from any unique characteristic peculiar to contemporary adolescence. The same thing might have occurred in other cultures and periods had the technical ability existed. While the existence of a designated youth culture may reflect special contemporary sociodynamics, its size—and consequently the youth music market—is merely a function of current demographic realities.

The type of music is something else again. Enough has already been discussed about the particular kinds of stresses and coping requirements imposed upon adolescents by a transitional culture at this point in history and technological development that it need not be repeated. Suffice it to say that the youth culture music reflects the most insistent and burning concerns, and the most popular activities, of youth. And this reflective function of music requires some comment. While many adults tended to blame music for creating the drug culture, this is not an accurate conception of cultural phenomena. What was happening was that many adolescents were beginning to have certain experiences, and popular music was written about those experiences. As the experiences changed, so did the music. Young people were imperatively concerned about various intrapsychic conflicts and disturbing social phenomena, and music was written about them.

This is not to deny that any activity or attitude that is given saturation distribution by all mass media cannot have a feed-
back effect; it can. Just as constant exposure to physical violence and mutilation as culturally accepted entertainment can dull one's revulsion and render violence acceptable, so can the extolling of drug experiences or violent social action make those behaviors more acceptable to adolescents who otherwise might have found them unsuitable personal expressions. And the degree to which adolescents were bombarded by these themes and attitudes undoubtedly increased their behavior-shaping effects. But the direction of influence is predominantly from people's needs and experiences to the cultural reflections of them. This may be witnessed by the fact that although many popular groups are still writing strong "smack rock," it has failed to stem the emergence of other concerns and artists, such as John Denver and Olivia Newton-John, or block the popularity of a new generation of youth culture entertainers who respond to those concerns.

What youth music reflects may contain some new elements. We are unacquainted with any other culture or period in history in which the use of addictive and mind-altering drugs has reached the proportion that is true of contemporary adolescents. If sedatives, tranquilizers, and other synthetic psychopharmacologies are included, the same must be said of the adult culture. To some extent, one must look again at the temporal accident of availability. Had such oral-magic escape routes—a seductive temptation for all humans inherent in the consequences of their shared psychobiological development—been always as readily available, would other populations have chosen to escape the tribulations of cultural change and uncertain future in similar ways? One may speculate that they probably would have done so. There can be little disagreement that it is difficult to fantasize greater tasks imposed upon the ego strength of adolescents than the peculiar concatenation of contemporary social, technological, and historical conditions now imposes. But it would be ethnocentric naiveté to assume that at no time in

the past could there have existed equivalently perceived pressures combined with a seeming paucity of answers.

Nonetheless, for whatever reasons, the epidemic drug use and misuse by adolescents appears to be a unique historical phenomenon. Inevitably, the celebration of that experience becomes a major characteristic of music appealing to adolescents. And that gives youth culture music a unique quality, one that has not been seen before.

Similarly special to the times is adolescents' openness about their concerns and dissatisfaction. This is, of course, a matter of degree; one can quote examples of open expression of adolescent turmoil in many other historical and cultural contexts. But here, too, the media and the general acceleration of available knowledge have contributed. Adolescents now know more about current issues and about what is at stake. They are also exposed unceasingly to adult mistakes, to adult inability to formulate or agree upon solutions to critical problems, and to the clay feet of many highly placed and self-righteous adults. The open exposure of conflict and differences is an inherent experience of their life space, and they adopt it naturally. Consequently when they hurt, they do so openly, publicly, and through their music. They do not subtly hint at their sexual yearnings; they express them through explicit sexual lyrics, overtly erotic rhythms, and the graphically sexual movements and exhibitionism of their favorite performers (such as Alice Cooper and David Bowie). The same applies to their identity struggles, their alienation, their social protest, everything. Again, this lends their music a raw, anguished, confrontational quality, and gives it a flavor that sensitively mirrors contemporary life.

Given some of the modalities in which youth music reflects the realities of adolescent life, how have the mass of adolescents used this music? Quite clearly, they have used it both as self-expression and as communication. And it is fair to indicate that for the majority it has served as vicarious self-
expression. While probably the majority of adolescents have experienced some drug use, only a minority have had extended experience with hallucinogens and hard narcotics, and a still smaller minority become pot heads, speed freaks, or heroin addicts. The rest can get some sense of drug-induced sensations and can participate vicariously in the experiences through the remarkably potent evocative qualities of the music, without having to take the ultimate self-destructive risks. Thus drug music can substitute as a safe drug-trip.

Similarly, the wanderlust, the sexual hedonism, the social protest, and the advocacy of violent overthrow of the system are largely experienced vicariously by the majority. It is not that these sentiments are not genuine among adolescents, or that most adolescents do not actively express some of them and some adolescents actively express most of them. It is that the music represents an exaggeration, a distilled concentrate of those feelings shared by adolescents generally. And also, one can identify with a song about violent overthrow without risking gas, bullets, and jail. We are not taking a value position on this issue, as for example whether activism is "bad," or whether singing about rather than doing is a form of moral cowardice; these are complex issues beyond the scope of this discussion. We are simply stating a major function such music has in the normal psychodynamics of adolescence. It expresses their undiluted and uncensored fantasies and emotions in much the same way that the grisly fairy tales so popular with four- and five-year-olds represent gratification of their oedipal fantasies on a primitive id level.

Youth music also communicates, both to other youth and to adults. Its communication of shared internal and external experiences among peers, and the bond it strengthens, is obvious. Its communicative function vis-à-vis the adult culture is more obscure because it embodies considerable ambivalence. On the one hand, to those who can decipher the words and will listen to them, it is a direct statement of adolescents' position on many issues that are intergenerationally relevant. The statements are more often than not provocative, challenging, or denying of adult authority in many spheres of interaction in which the adult culture will not willingly relinquish that authority. But hidden beneath the defiant bravado is an invariable connotation of communication, the fact that it is a two-way process. If adults will listen to what adolescents feel and think, and be mature enough to focus upon the issues rather than the flamboyant expressions, most adolescents will probably respond. Some mutual accommodation and negotiation in the process of growing up and the accession to legitimate authority can take place.

On the other hand, that same music intrinsically erects a barrier. So much of it is purposely so offensive in quality, noise-level, and content to the majority of adults that it unmistakably conveys the message, "Stay away! Don't intrude!"

In this set of conflicting qualities, youth culture music epitomizes the very essence of adolescent psychodynamics, which are not unique to one time or one society: ambivalence between love for one's parents and rejection of them; the need for distancing and autonomy simultaneous with the continuing need for sensitive guidance; and for rational authorities with whom to identify and from whom to learn. As with every other manifestation of adolescence, one generation is no more at fault than the other except in extreme instances. Adult culture must bear the consequences of failing to listen for what is valid in what youth are literally screaming at them. And adolescents must bear the responsibility for making their communication so offensive and unintelligible that they are left largely to themselves, adrift on their drug-oriented music and immersed in a medium that perpetuates their own, often self-destructive, attitudes.
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There are many ways that the psychiatrist can further understanding and help with the negotiation of authority issues that arise between the adolescent and his family. His technical help can be of service in the context of the youngster's school and with other important socializing elements in his society. Decisions involving television, drug use, dress, automobiles and many leisure-time activities inevitably generate disagreements. These have dynamic implications and often require negotiation between the teenager, his parents, his siblings and other societal figures. The psychiatrist can assist families in identifying what are, in fact, legitimate developmental issues. He can help clarify realistic responsibilities and freedoms that are appropriate for various members of the family, including both the parents and the adolescent, as well as the other siblings whose needs are of equal importance.

Traditionally, the psychiatrist has been concerned with the therapeutic needs of the individual adolescent patient and with his developmental process. Because of the swift rate of change in societal fashions and goals, the psychiatrist must now study diligently and continuously in new areas. He needs to be able to grasp new issues as they emerge, and to be of help to the individual patient as well as the family. The details of family structure, family development, and the changing concerns and codes of families and society are basic to the actual treatment process with adolescents and their families. A considerable literature that sheds light on these issues is now developing and merits close attention.

There are swiftly accelerating changes now taking place in our conception of laws and codes. To the extent that they work with adolescents and their parents, psychiatrists would do well to keep up with such matters. In some ways we are moving toward a society that is increasingly directed toward a Kantian or a liberal theory of law. This theory has two postulates described earlier that are integral to a great many societal concerns. According to this liberal theory, law is concerned with the organization and form of relationships. It is procedural and not substantive. It describes the acceptable means by which society organizes itself, but does not specify the content of that organization. In this view law is quite separate from morality. It should not be used for the imposition of private belief upon the state or on the individual.

From this standpoint, many areas of social behavior remain outside the scope of law. Such issues as sexuality and certain aspects of parental responsibility for child behavior are left to individual definition rather than to the responsibility of legal action. Thus, many concerns that were in the past closely defined by law or, at least, by stringent custom are now relegated to individual negotiation within the family. The psychiatrist can be of help in educating families to this greater freedom of thought and action so that the adolescent, his parents and his siblings can come to agreement in areas that have no codified guidelines within the society.

This is a time when the customs of the past do not seem immediately relevant to our present societal situation. As a result, a loss of credibility in authority has developed, a loss which is the very basis of much of our discussion in this report. Because this state of affairs can undermine emotional stability, a psychiatrist can be of great help in the negotiation of issues that develop between adolescents and their parents.

Many adolescents are given great freedom of possible action in a variety of ways. Some of these ways may be ego-
oriented and rational. Some may be dominated by unconscious impulses and conflicts, particularly if the adolescent finds himself thinking in terms different from his parents about the acceptable limits of his behavior. The therapist can aid family members in the identification of issues in dispute and facilitate the deliberate resolution of such issues.

In addressing the adolescent and his parents, the therapist must decide whose agent he is in his work. One view regards the therapist as the agent of the parents, the society, or even of the adolescent alone. Another sees him as agent for the whole family—the whole network. Such a view allows him to help the members of this network negotiate their legitimate developmental conflicts and wishes. Therefore, coercion would not be necessary, and regression or symptom formation need not ensue. Many of the issues that come up between adolescents and adults are intergenerational as well as individual developmental issues. They require effective family efforts to find adequate and appropriate developmental solutions. What comes out of this must be solutions of use to each generation involved.

The task of the psychiatrist can be to point out distortions in communication, to offer the opportunity for an open relationship to all those in the family who seek him out, and to help them find a way that will allow them to develop beyond the conflicts that emerge and hamper them. An interesting responsibility may now fall to psychiatry. It can begin to consider how to help the children—or parents—who are not defined patients but who are deeply involved in the developmental conflicts generated around authority issues.

It is the task of the psychiatrist to separate true therapeutic issues (i.e., intrapsychic and intergenerational ones) from societal ones. These therapeutic issues need to be separated as well from legitimate developmental problems. In fact, both sets of issues need to be distinguished from those societal issues that may be influencing conflict at all of the levels considered.

One of the major tasks of psychotherapy is to define those issues that can be resolved through the process of therapy. For example, an adolescent may ask to stay out later at night than his parents permit. This request may be a legitimate societal one, an important developmental request on his part, or an opportunity to act out his conflict with his parents, often fueled by difficulties that exist between father and mother.

The therapist must decide whether he is truly committed to help the adolescent and his parents understand themselves and become free to use the power, authority, responsibility, and opportunities they all potentially share. On the other hand, the psychiatrist may find himself to be acting as an agent of the society, an easy role to slip into, as most societies have a powerful vested interest in developing adolescents who are in their image and who will follow their traditions and “fit in.” That is, this society is interested in developing adolescents who will continue in the educational process and achieve success, who will remain sexually abstemious until they are married, refrain from the use of drugs, and dress in ways that do not cause conflict with the older members of the society.

Adolescents and adults need each other. While it is important for all family members to live their own lives, find their own expressions of selfhood, and discover their own self fulfilling or, at least, gratifying areas of satisfaction, there is also a need to find and develop mutual satisfaction, esteem, and fulfillment. If the gap between the generations is too great, not only may youth disengage from adult institutions, they may fail to assume their adult roles altogether. They may not find sufficient meaning in themselves, their lives, or their parents' lives to want to pass on a way of life onto the next generation (their own children and other people's children).
Correspondingly, if the gap between the generations is too great the adult generation may not benefit from the stimulation, the renewal, the discovery, and the satisfaction which comes when the next generation takes over.

When the gap between the generations is too wide, there is the danger of intergenerational discontinuity. This begets the additional hazard that adolescents may not be successful in their transition to adulthood. It is important for adolescents to discover the corruption in the world without such disillusionment that they abandon the world. Similarly, adults need the help of youth to confront the problems in their institutions, the timebound limitations of their old morality (and their values and codes) and the corruption of their exploitative world.

The therapist must be able to step between the pitfalls inherent in the attempt to carry out the wishes of parents in the society. Instead, he must seek out the true conflictual problems of the adolescent who is often action-oriented or non-intellectual, and his parents who have different directions. The therapist can be of great help to parents. He can allow them to transfer authority from themselves to young people, without feeling that they have lost a defining part of their own being. The therapist can help parents to adopt new roles that give them satisfaction and free them from the need to keep their adolescents dependent and subjugated. Adults may develop new areas of authority or substitute other types of satisfactions for the authority they formerly exercised in relationship to their adolescents. Therapy can aid in working out relationships in a fashion that can be mutually gratifying and strengthening.

The psychiatrist must be willing to deal with the inevitable narcissism, idiosyncratic or seemingly anti-social and destructive views of adolescents and their ideological and uncompromising ways. He must be able to resonate with the adolescent's wish to quit school, leave home, or challenge constituted authority. He may find himself pressed when confronted with the inevitable uncertainties, sexual exploitations, jealousies, and competitive relationships that develop within families. However, he can try to steer a course that allows these issues to be defined clearly and resolved through negotiation and understanding.

In this period of rapid social change the psychiatrist has often become an agent for maintaining the stability of society. He should be an agent both of stability in its best sense and of change as it is necessary. To do this, it may be important that therapists include, among therapeutic issues, the evaluation of their own views about value issues. This process of self-confrontation, acknowledgement of inadvertent bias, and value examination must be open and ongoing in the work and life of any psychiatrist who engages with adolescents.

Because of changes in adolescent value orientations it is important that the regressive and dependency requirements traditionally involved in becoming a patient be considered. Many adolescents now find it unacceptable to adhere to the rigid treatment schedules that are common or the payments that are part of traditional treatment. Many adolescents regard the experience that they wish both in therapy and life in a way that is different from the view held by many therapists. In working with adolescents today the therapist must at least know something of, if not accept, the mystical, irrational wishes and concerns on the part of adolescents, as these concerns are expressed in Zen Buddhism, the use of consciousness-altering drugs, a wish to experience biofeedback, hypnosis, meditation, and other means of transforming consciousness.

It is fruitless to make demands upon youth that are incompatible with their developmental stage and legitimate developmental needs. Such demands are incompatible with the establishment of genuine social responsibility. Some degree of social responsibility is necessary and inevitable.
Though adolescents may wish to “do their own thing,” they must still relate to the social context in which they are “doing their own thing.” They must take into account the impact of “doing my own thing” on others. Within the family, this issue is particularly important for the significance of generational continuity. That is, adolescents must be responsible to their parents and parents responsible toward each other in order for generational continuity to be achieved.

Therapists who keep value and authority issues in mind can help the troubled family and its adolescents, as well as the larger society. The goal of the work is to share and transfer authority in such a fashion that mastery rather than domination can be the result for both parents and their adolescents.

We have addressed ourselves to the intrapsychic, interpersonal, and cultural origins of authority and power interactions and conflicts. Here we will present an interpersonal, family-oriented model and set of guidelines for modifying dysfunctional adult-adolescent power and authority conflicts—a negotiation model. It emphasizes that adolescents need to learn to take responsibility, and suggests that they gain access to authority through an active process of exchange with their parents. In effect, growing up in a family implies a partnership, a conjoint effort in which power and authority are shared between the generations. With the passage of time, they are gradually transmitted from age to youth as they are functionally earned, although at very different rates.

A model built upon the process of negotiation requires adolescents and parents to confront themselves and each other around rules, regulations, guidelines, discipline, codes, and values. Ideally, this confrontation would bring the power and authority dilemmas of both generations out into the open, and foster the achievement of a sound functional basis for control and regulation within the family. Through negotiation, adolescents can explore, test out, challenge, learn, and ultimately acquire decision-making power within the family and in the home; through demonstrated competence and maturity, they would achieve authority as well. In this way, parents too could maintain an effective and successful basis for their authority and for their use of power—their authority would continue to be functionally earned or legitimated.
The model of negotiation stipulates that regulatory functions and behavior in a family are part of a mutual process. Thus, parents cannot regulate the mores or every aspect of the behavior of their adolescent children. Regulation is reciprocal: one cannot talk about responsibility-taking without considering concomitantly responsibility-giving; nor can the behavior of an adolescent around issues of discipline be studied without taking into account the behavior of his parents around the same issues of discipline. The adolescent's disrespect toward parents or disregard for their authority is all too often complemented by the parents' lack of respect for themselves, for each other, or more significant still, for their own authority.

To look at regulation as reciprocal does not negate the importance of each individual's internal controls. Instead, it puts these individual mechanisms to work in their current psychosocial context. The way the individual adolescent uses his controls continues to be shaped by his current interactions with his parents, just as their behavioral control is influenced and shaped by their exchanges with him.

Similarly, the use of an interpersonal model for the resolution of authority conflicts does not negate the importance of unconscious, intrapsychic conflicts originating in earlier stages of development, or of the internalized parental images that may have been distorted under conditions of disturbed development. One consideration here, of course, is that distorted internalized images have to be continually reinforced by parental reality for there to be clinically significant and excessive authority conflict in adolescence. While, as described, at various developmental stages it is possible for a child to begin to internalize inaccurately distorted parental images, the very concept of healthy development implies that parents' supportive and emotionally appropriate real selves will eventually allow undistorted internal images to replace the child's distortions. Where the child has internalized par-
In order to obtain a clearer understanding of this model, a clinical illustration of moderately severe disciplinary problems in a young adolescent boy will now be presented.

**Clinical Illustration**

Tom B. is 14 years old. He was brought to the clinic because, despite superior intelligence, he was failing in high school. In addition to his academic difficulties, Tom had frequent confrontations with teachers over his disruptive, provocative, and disrespectful behavior. He was sent to the principal's office many times; on several occasions he was sent home. This paralleled his experiences the previous summer when he had been sent home from camp because of similar behavior. In addition, his parents expressed concern over Tom's conduct at home: he teased his brother, challenged his parents' authority, disregarded their wishes, and got into angry, disrespectful arguments. Finally, Mr. and Mrs. B. were worried about the group of boys with whom Tom was friendly. These boys had the reputation of being wild and of using drugs.

When the B. family was seen, the factors involved in Tom's presenting problems became evident. Tom was a smallish, slender, fearful adolescent who was hypersensitive and over-reactive to any and all issues that remotely related to his adequacy. Desperately needing to be accepted and liked by his peers, Tom had fallen into a pattern of appealing to them through his disrespectful behavior with teachers. He was afraid of not being successful, and this fear intensified because of his parents' over-concern about academic success. As a result, Tom avoided academic competition and allowed his school work to lapse.

Mr. B. was a stylishly dressed, aggressive, hard-driving businessman, who set inordinately high standards for everyone in the family, especially Tom. Compulsive by nature and unable to relax, Mr. B. constantly nagged other family members about their responsibilities and criticized their mistakes, shortcomings, and slowness. His aggressive demanding approach, however, was a thin facade that barely covered his chronic lack of confidence, strong feelings of inadequacy, and powerful unmet needs for affection and nurturance.

Mrs. B. was an attractive, anxious, and depressed housewife, vulnerable to her husband's criticism and easily defeated by her son's challenges. She accepted and, at times, seemed actively to seek a devalued position. For example, she quickly informed the therapist of her years of psychiatric care, which included several hospitalizations and shock treatment. While outwardly compliant, she struggled for control and retaliated through inactivity, withholding, and silence. She also suffered from a lack of affection and respect from the family, and perhaps even more from her own, at times merciless, self-criticism.

Jim, Tom's six-year-old brother, was an appealing, verbal, immature boy, who successfully manipulated his parents into gratifying most of his wishes. Jim had little interest in school, took little or no interest in age-appropriate responsibility around self-care or the care of his belongings, and experienced marked difficulty in his relations with peers. Despite this, neither Mr. nor Mrs. B. felt that Jim had any problems. They focused exclusively on Tom as the family member who needed help.

At the interpersonal level, another dimension of Tom's problems became apparent. In almost any interpersonal exchange, Tom's defensive belligerence came across as provocative. Although angered and frustrated by Tom's manner, both parents tolerated and accepted it. Limits were not set, except transiently, and prohibitions and punishments either were not forthcoming or were inconsistent. In fact, both parents were over-indulgent toward Tom; he could and
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... and to appease him, or to induce better behavior and school work, bribes of expensive gifts or extra spending money were frequently offered. The parents not only felt ineffectual and powerless in dealing with Tom, they were also afraid of offending him and losing his love. Indeed, there was a significant reversal of roles with Tom making decisions about family and parental matters, and expressing approval or disapproval regarding his parents' behavior. If one of his parents sided with him, or acceded to his wishes, he expressed approval; at the same time he would criticize the other parent for failing to do the same thing.

As family interviews progressed, it became dear that Tom's current problems were an exacerbation of long-standing patterns. The parents had always been over-indulgent and unable to control him. This was especially true of Mrs. B., who was overprotective and tended to react intensely to everything he did. Despite its negative valence, the intensity of Mrs. B.'s response to Tom's misdeeds indicated how much she cared and how much she was concerned by them. She indicated that she was closer to Tom than his father was, and emphasized their "special" relationship.

The most dramatic aspect of the interpersonal processes in the B. family involved authority and power issues. Tom disregarded parental wishes and was openly disrespectful. He challenged his parents' motives and interests, devalued their judgment, and questioned their intelligence. Moreover, Tom expressed distrust of adults in general and contempt for governmental and school authorities. He often told stories of teachers being hypocritical and unfair, and he brought up newspaper articles regarding governmental mistakes or mismanagement.

Mr. and Mrs. B. contributed to Tom's conflicts with authority in many ways. They were inconsistent and contradictory in their expectations and demands. More to the point, they were at cross purposes: what Mrs. B. proposed, Mr. B. faulted or did not support; and whatever Mr. B. proposed Mrs. B. undermined. Fundamental to this pattern of parental disagreement was an underlying marital conflict. Mrs. B. resented her husband's devotion to business and his frequent traveling. She felt lonely and unappreciated. Mr. B., in turn, resented his wife's complaints, her inability to cope when he was away, and her desperate telephone calls to do something about Tom.

Excerpts from a clinical session will demonstrate the nature of the adult-adolescent authority gap that existed in their family. The following excerpt is from an early treatment hour:

Mrs. B.: As soon as the family is seated, Mrs. B. says the week went "pretty well," and then launches into a description of Tom's bad habits and "fresh" behavior. She implies that he may be mixed up in drug use with his friends, and comments that his friends seem "awfully wild." But rather than deal openly with this concern, she focuses on Tom's "fresh" behavior at home. Looking for help, she cites an example. "Tom didn't get up when he was called. I went up three times. Harry wasn't home. (To Tom) You wouldn't do that if your father were home. If he was home ..."

Tom: (Interrupts—aside to his father)—"Boy, I can see why you like to go on trips (referring to mother's nagging)."

Mr. B. (Smiles at Tom's remark.)

Mrs. B.: (Going on, speaking to the therapist)—"Then when he did come down, he did nothing but complain about my cooking—we don't have anything interesting for breakfast. Then when I asked about his homework, he flew into a rage. He was like a wild man; I couldn't do a thing to stop him. (Weakly, to Tom)—"You shouldn't talk to me that way, Tommy ... It got so bad ...that's when I called Harry."

Tom: (Again interrupting)—"Boy, do you exaggerate ... You don't know what you're talking about. She's really a case, ..."
isn't she, Doc? Sometimes I think you're just stupid. I told you
I know when homework is important, and I know what I have
to do and what I don't have to do."

Mr. B.: (Does not say anything or do anything regarding
Tom's disrespect toward his wife).

Mrs. B.: (Looking more and more uncomfortable)—"Tom,
I know you have good judgment (in an appealing tone), don't
get me wrong; I know you have a good head. You know your
father and I are worried about your grades. You want to go to
a good college, don't you? We want you to, and you know the
teacher complained about not getting your homework in."
(Mrs. B. appeals to outside authority—the value of education,
the teacher, rather than her own authority, lacking confi-
dence in her parental and personal right to confront Tom
about her concern regarding his school work.)

Tom: "College, college, college... that's all you care about!
College, not me, you just want to see that I get into college—I
want to work, that's it... work... play my guitar, have my
own group."

Mr. B.: Look here, Tom, that's not realistic. You know...
Tom: (Interrupts)—"What do you know; you're old-
 fashioned. Now-a-days kids are leaving school all the time."

Mr. B.: (Annoyed)—"And getting mixed up with drugs, I'll
bet."

Tom: "I knew that would come up! You're always on me
about drugs."

Mrs. B.: "Really Harry, Tom is right—you do bring up..."

Mr. B.: "Janet stay out of this. I was only trying to point out
that dropping out of school is not always a good idea. (Ap-
pealing to Tom)... Tom, you really ought to think about how
important college is. Even if you are going into music, you
should think about it. You do have to get your homework
done; you know what the teachers have been saying."

Tom: "You're as bad as she is... worse. You don't know
what you're talking about—there are plenty of top musicians
who didn't finish school."

"Tom then launches into a long tirade against homework, teachers and school. He ridicules
the way the teachers manage his classes and the stupidity of
their homework assignments. As part of this tirade against
school, Tom points out that teachers don't even care, using
the example of his history teacher who emphasized reading a
particular book and then never followed through with any
class discussion."

Mr. B.: (Somewhat defeated in pursuing his own concerns
and distracted by Tom's argument, shifts the subject to talk
about how difficult it is to manage)—"Dr. M., I don't think
you know how difficult it is to manage—I mean when I get
these calls from Janet. You know, I'm in a business meeting
and I get this call—I don't know whether I should come home
or not. You know I really have important business... (Turn-
ing to his wife)... Sure Tom quieted down when I spoke to
him—that's because I'm firm. You get hysterical, Janet! All
you have to do is be firm."

Mrs. B.: "That's easy for you to say; you're not home all the
time like I am. I have to deal with these problems every
day—day in and day out. You're away most of the time. When
you are around, Tom doesn't behave the way he does when
I'm alone. I just don't know how to handle him. I can't
manage him. He won't listen to me. I just can't control him.
He ignores me, he's fresh, he uses abusive language. What
can I do?..."

Mr. B.: (Instead of responding directly to his wife's plea,
Mr. B. looks to the therapist)—"I've told her many times, Dr.
M., I have to be away—it's my job. I don't like it; I'd rather be
home. Janet doesn't realize... It wouldn't be so bad if she
wasn't so easy with him. When I talk to him he pays atten-
tion."

Later in the session, when Mr. B. does respond to his wife's
pleas for him to intervene, he tended to get on Tom in an
aggressive but ineffectual manner. Clearly many things
about Tom—his long unkempt hair, his unruly defiant be-
behavior, poor school work, etc., distress and worry Mr. B.
Unfortunately, however, Mr. B. gets just as upset about
Tom's failure to brush his teeth, or to hang up his coat, or eat
with his mouth closed. Mr. B.'s method of getting after Tom
usually starts with a lecture (he has already concluded that Tom is wrong) in which he moralizes and takes a superior position. When his father gets after him in this manner, Tom responds with provocative defiance such as, “It’s none of your business,” or, “Why should I listen to you?” or accusingly, “You’re never around when I need you.” Tom’s defiant manner succeeds in frustrating and irritating Mr. B., who becomes increasingly angry, thereby losing his effectiveness in exerting control over Tom. At this point, Mr. B. either gives up, demonstrating that he is powerless, despite his stance as a forceful authority, or he threatens excessive punishments that do not fit the crime (which Tom quickly labels as a misuse and abuse of authority).

Throughout the session, it was clear that Mr. and Mrs. B. did not have a clear sense of their own authority. In an ineffectual way they insisted, threatened, cajoled, pleaded, bribed, and punished Tom. They attempted to control factors (for example, Tom’s school work) that were beyond their control. As they spoke they changed their position fairly frequently, with the result that Tom could sense their lack of conviction or find inconsistencies in their approach to discipline issues.

The interactional sequences in the B. family contained a number of common themes:

1. Tom readily showed open disregard for parental standards, values and authority.
2. Despite Tom’s disrespect, both parents appeared afraid of angering Tom or of losing his love. They tended to compete with each other for his approval.
3. Both parents, especially Mrs. B., focused excessively on what was wrong. Even if at some point most interactions with Tom had gone well, the parents nevertheless focused exclusively on any one interaction that was problematic.
4. Tom’s disrespect and misbehavior were always worse when Mr. B. was away. Characteristically, Mrs. B. felt totally at a loss to cope with Tom under these circumstances. The situation frequently culminated in a crisis over discipline about which she would then call her husband, pleading with him to intervene. Thus, in part, Tom’s misbehavior and lack of discipline were used by Mrs. B. as a means of expressing her need to have her husband home more as well as her resentment over his lack of support.
5. Whenever Tom was disrespectful toward his mother, his father either smiled and said nothing or he joined in criticizing his wife because she didn’t know how to handle Tom.
6. Tom often sought to split the parents—to divide and conquer. As part of this, he would seek an alliance with one parent against the other. Sometimes he tried to induce the therapist to join this pattern of taking sides against one of his parents, usually his mother.
7. The underlying issues of marital discord frequently got displaced onto Tom and onto the frequent authority conflicts. Mr. B. found fault with his wife’s management of Tom and undermined her authority by showing his disrespect for her. Mrs. B. implied that her husband was responsible for Tom’s misbehavior because he was away on business so much, and she covertly challenged him by not doing what he asked and becoming even less able to control Tom. At the same time, when he was dealing with Tom, Mrs. B. undermined his authority by taking Tom’s part or commenting that Mr. B. was being harsh or too strict. For his part, Mr. B. was reluctant to deal with Tom and became angry when his wife undermined him in this fashion. As his rage increased, his wife responded that his display of temper was exactly what frightened Tom and what Tom complained about to her.

The negotiation model

In the B. family, the ground rules for authority struggles were unclear or confused. Moreover, there were no mecha-
mechanisms for transmitting authority. As a result there was no clear means by which Tom could explore and test out his parents' authority, no framework within which he could increase his own responsibility taking, and no way to acquire appropriate access to legitimate power and authority of his own. While it is true that Tom had access to a certain degree of power by role reversal, belligerence, and by bullying—especially of his mother and brother—this power was short-lived, not legitimate, and at times anxiety provoking. The opportunity to resolve their authority conflicts appealed to the B. family and they agreed to work on this area, using the model of negotiation.

The model of negotiation is intended to provide a family with a structured means of exploring and resolving authority conflicts. This approach encourages the parents not to try to use power to regulate their adolescent son's or daughter's mores and behavior. Instead it emphasizes the reciprocal nature of regulatory patterns in a family. The goal is mutual regulation.

The model of negotiation was applied to the B. family. The steps taken in setting up the process were as follows:

1. Mrs. B.'s position as ineffectual, devalued and "sick" was not accepted and was, indeed, actively countered. After underscoring areas of her competence and observing that she didn't give herself enough credit, the therapist established the firm guideline that she must not allow herself (or be allowed by others in the family) to fall into this devalued position. (At the same time, this countered Mrs. B.'s attempts to control and exert power by inactivity, weakness and failure.)

2. Tom was required to negotiate all issues directly with both parents around self-care, self-management, privileges, rules and responsibility taking. The therapist offered to be his consultant (a combination of assistant, advisor, and mentor) in these negotiations.

3. Mr. and Mrs. B. were asked to form a team. While they did not have to be in complete agreement with each other, only mutually agreed upon rules, regulations, limits, and rewards would be recognized and operate in the negotiation process.

4. It was emphasized that Tom needed to take initiative and assert himself effectively. In relation to each issue for negotiation which Tom brought up directly, the parents had to decide whether it was negotiable or non-negotiable. Tom could not expect his parents to meet his needs simply because he wished it. At the same time his parents had to decide what they were willing to negotiate. The parents in turn were encouraged to use the therapist as a consultant on the criteria for deciding what was and what was not negotiable. For the most part this came down to whether the parents were willing to share or relinquish responsibility of an age-appropriate nature to Tom if they felt that he could manage it satisfactorily. Non-negotiable issues involved parental standards, values, best judgment, and strong preferences regarding life style.*

In addition to establishing the framework for negotiation, a number of goals were set up in connection with the family's personal-interpersonal problems:

1. To strengthen the parental dyad by increasing the frequency and effectiveness of their communication, providing them with more mutual satisfaction and esteem, and increasing their resistance to their son's disrespect.

2. To strengthen the intergenerational boundaries and lessen the strength of Tom's dependency and authority conflict by countering his ability to split his parents by means of allying himself with one of them against the other.

* The process of negotiation requires parents to take responsibility for their adolescent's welfare. It further asks all the involved family members to make commitments to the importance and value of their relationship to each other. Through exploring and deciding what is and is not negotiable, family members discover the reciprocal nature of authority issues and begin to define the values, codes, and guidelines by which they will regulate their lives.
3. To strengthen Tom's age-appropriate autonomy in relation to his parents by getting him to take responsibility for his own affairs.

4. Within the context of the patients' functioning as a team, to improve father-son interaction with mother's support, and to increase mother's ability to set limits and discipline Tom with her husband's support.

The authority struggles in the B. family were really a cover for a whole series of underlying personal-interpersonal conflicts. In the course of the clinical effort to structure a process of negotiation for them, these issues became ever more manifest. As Tom continued to avoid taking responsibility, his anxiety about growing up, his concern over body size, and his fear of competing became much clearer. Obviously he preferred to remain enmeshed in authority struggles and to hide his anxieties behind the overprotectiveness of his mother and the overcontrol of his father. As they explored the reality issues involved in their frequent arguments over discipline, it became evident that the failure to resolve these issues was a conflict-detouring mechanism which helped the parents avoid facing their own personal problems. Mrs. B. did not have to confront her chronic depression, and Mr. B. his constant fear of business failure. Both could thus evade dealing with their marital discord.

The new emphasis on defining appropriate boundaries between the generations and on clarifying parental roles began to counter the pathological patterning that surrounded authority in their family life. Helping Mr. and Mrs. B. work as a team was a critical factor in developing effective family negotiations around discipline. The father's role became a particular focus. Mr. B. learned to support his wife and to provide leadership in their parental teamwork. They began to make progress in establishing flexible but consistent limits for Tom. In the face of his parents' teamwork, Tom was forced to bring more issues to negotiation. He was in turn encouraged to earn rights and privileges. As father's leadership role in the family became more central, Mrs. B. was relieved of much of her overinvolvement in parental functions. Concomitantly, she was able to become more involved in meeting her husband's needs, their social needs, and her own adult needs. Tom responded well to his father's becoming more forceful and effective, and he seemed relieved by the lessening of his mother's overinvolvement in his affairs. As Tom succeeded in handling more responsibility, he became more able to talk about his anxieties. At the same time he was able to take some risks, particularly in his school work. Eventually he was able to bring these latter concerns to the therapist for individual work, as well as to his parents for their support and help. Finally, when discipline problems were no longer a concern, Mr. and Mrs. B. chose to continue treatment as a couple focusing on their marital difficulties.

Usefulness and applicability of the negotiation model

1. The empirical testing-out quality of negotiation is designed to enable parents to discover the confusions and contradictions in their use of authority. This is particularly needed with disorganized homes and in families where the parents disagree. This approach helps parents recognize their lack of confidence in the effectiveness of their authority, their use of postures of authority without conviction, of forms without substance.

Parents are also helped to articulate the goals and objectives of control, limit-setting, discipline and punishment with
their adolescent children. Many parents do not have a clear sense of what they seek to achieve through the use of discipline; some parents use controls to demonstrate and maintain a position of superior power; other parents control out of anxiety about their adolescent children's acting out sexually, in relation to drugs, or in some criminal manner. Still other parents exert control in one area with the magical wish that it will lead to control in another area (e.g., good habits will result in good school work).

Finally, this empirical quality of negotiation enables adolescents and their parents to question and disagree with one another. Each confronts himself and each other around rules, regulations, codes, and values in order to develop a functional basis for mutual regulation in the family. Once some clarity and consistency have been achieved, adolescents can challenge and test out in relation to specific values. Perhaps for the first time, parents begin repeatedly to experience an effective basis for their authority. Negotiation is less concerned with the content of authority; instead, it places greater emphasis on the process by which authority issues within the family are mediated. It provides a practical means for adolescents to explore, learn, and ultimately gain access to decision making, power, and authority within a family context.

It should be noted that the developmental model suggested here is not common in the adult world. In their own relations with authorities, adults seldom have an experience with a person in authority who is not only benevolent, but who also indicates that ultimately his or her position or function can be taken over. Indeed, for many adults, the "real" world as they know it is "dog-eat-dog and devil take the hindmost." In view of this, it is not surprising that they tend to transmit to their offspring the overcontrolling, overbearing, and aggressive forms of authority which they have experienced. What is stressed in the adult world is the overthrow of authority by subversion or assault, or the bestowal of authority as a gift or a birthright, or access to authority by accommodation—being good, playing your cards right, being accepted into a position of power and authority. These modes of accession to power and authority would be too dangerous, or would be contrary to growth-producing responses to the needs of the developing adolescent.

2. There are a number of qualities inherent in negotiation. Among these are direct exchange to resolve disagreement and bargaining to remove obstacles and achieve progress. Such approaches enable parents to approach authority issues in terms of their standards, values and best judgment. It is obviously better to work out decisions about control and discipline in terms of educational and character building objectives, than in terms of threat and coercion. This approach helps parents to avoid the one in favor of the other. At the same time, it provides adolescents direct experience with parents who are willing to work on solving problems with them. It also assists parents in avoiding hypocritical or indefensible positions. These are stances that adolescents readily perceive, and may use as excuses for realizing their own impulses.

It is a growth experience for adolescents to show initiative and assert themselves in relation to obtaining changes in rules and increased freedom. It is essential, however, that these youngsters earn their freedom and rule changes through demonstrating that they can carry the additional responsibility involved. It takes active intervention to counter the common tendency to grant authority through false progression—e.g., through parental abdication of responsibility or the overturning of parental authority.

3. Negotiation emphasizes relative parity, equivalent but not identical rights, and the critical importance of mutual respect; in this way it assists adolescents and their parents to correct for overvaluing or undervaluing one another. Respect and esteem can increase as a result of a sense of competence in
negotiating boundary management and mutual regulation. In addition, adolescents learn that this respect is reciprocal, and that their parents can accept responding to the adolescents' expectations, goals and values. There is a very common tendency for parents to overvalue their adolescents and to overinvest in parental roles. The corollary of such overinvestment in the parental role is the lack of sufficient and appropriate investment in other roles. Parents often sacrifice their own personal, marital or social aspirations to the interests of their children. In a similar way, frustration and dissatisfaction in marital, social or work functioning can lead to defensive overcompensatory emphasis on parental functions. As a result, the authority of one or both parents may be used or misused to cope with stress in other aspects of the parents' lives.

Negotiation should help parents to function as a team of mutually helpful partners in dealing with authority conflicts within the family. This lessens the common tendency of troubled parents to blame, oppose, and undermine each other, a phenomenon that is peculiarly detrimental to adolescents. Struggling to master the developmental tasks of adolescence, youth is not helped by seeing his parents fighting over discipline, splitting over regulatory issues, or threatening separation. One goal of negotiation is to foster individual and mutual esteem in the parental partnership.

4. By focusing on the ongoing current of authority conflicts in the family, negotiation can serve as a useful means of uncovering and bringing these conflicts into the open. As part of this process, adolescent and parental concerns about authority are brought out and dealt with. Adolescent views on authority and power in general, their disillusionment with social and moral values, or with the authority of the law and government come to the forefront and can be distinguished from their legitimate conflicts with parents. An exchange of views on Watergate, racism, the work ethic, or middle-class social structure between adolescents and their parents can be quite therapeutic, but these issues must be separated from intrafamilial authority struggles. Similarly, the authority dilemma of parents can become manifest. The parents' realistic difficulty in knowing what codes to use in guiding their adolescents is acknowledged, and their uncertainties regarding social and sexual mores, drug use, political activities, dress, and behavior are readily brought out in direct exchange with their youngsters. No fixed value position on these issues is likely to hold up for long; the empirical approach that emerges from negotiation has at least the advantage that its effectiveness can be corrected and stabilized by feedback.

5. Negotiation provides a structured and controlled technique by means of which family members can struggle as aggressively as necessary in resolving disagreements. Since authority conflicts involve considerable frustration and anger, negotiation can involve a good deal of aggressive confrontation and direct expression of ambivalent feelings—feelings with contradictory elements of hostility and caring exist at the same time. In certain respects negotiation teaches family members to recognize, express, and resolve ambivalent feelings, and to fight effectively and fairly to achieve their ends. It can thus serve as a vehicle for family members to learn to subordinate aggressive impulses to the satisfaction of personal-interpersonal needs and the attainment of mutual or complementary goals.

There has been insufficient recognition of, and respect for, the inevitability of ambivalence in intrafamilial relationships (or for that matter in any other important strongly invested relationship). It is important to have a structured, controlled opportunity for family members to express their ambivalence toward each other in a comfortable way. Regardless of the particular normality/pathology balance present in a given family, the process of negotiation focuses
attention on the family's difficulties in managing aggressive feelings and behavior. Rather than viewing such responses as "bad" and unwanted, they are experienced as an inevitable and, in many ways, a necessary part of family life. Without direct expression of aggressive feeling, especially in relation to interpersonal libidinal frustration, conflict resolution within the family is seriously hampered.

It is thus necessary to express anger over frustration of needs within the family as part of this process; the negotiation model assists parents and adolescents to be appropriately counter-aggressive, to oppose hurtful aggressive behavior effectively, and to defend their rights and interests. Parents often fear their own and their adolescent's aggressiveness. As a result they may be too indulgent; they worry that a struggle for control may become too dangerous, or they may engage in a struggle for power as though their authority is really threatened. Adolescents, on the other hand, often see their parents lose control of their anger or give up prematurely, rather than experiencing their parents as capable of goal-directed, controlled aggressiveness—e.g., fighting effectively for their own and other family members' rights and interests.

During their growing up, adolescents have often had little experience with transgressing parental standards or wishes, or with discovering that they can make their parents very angry without injury to their mutual relationship. They have not had occasion to offend and anger parents by their aggressive behavior and then to be able to restitute, repair and be forgiven. Similarly, most parents have had little experience with restituting, repairing, and being forgiven by their children when their aggressive behavior has been excessive and hurtful. Families need to encounter the limits of aggressive feelings and behavior, and to develop the ability to undo and atone, to forgive and forget. In negotiating around authority conflicts, one expects expressions of aggression which will hurt feelings, offend, and anger. These actualizations of ambivalence offer opportunities for family members to learn how to cope with hurt, to make up afterwards, and to forgive.

This is an extremely difficult task for families in our society because social, economic, and political forces tend to oppose this development. In virtually all social and work groups, even the mildest forms of aggression or ambivalence expressed within the group are strongly discouraged or punished. Groups of affiliation rarely tolerate direct aggressive resolution of disagreement or conflict. Instead, ambivalence is projected and displaced onto scapegoats or outside groups. Conformity is the expectation and members of the groups are warned not to "make waves" or "rock the boat." Economic, social, and power status sanctions reinforce the demand for conformity and the prohibitions against being anything but nice.

Negotiation provides a functionally useful means by which adolescents and their parents can undertake the difficult task of dealing with their ambivalent feelings and with the kinds of frustrations that bring these feelings into being. Family members learn to be more comfortable in communicating ambivalence in relation to interpersonal need frustration. This enables them to engage in conflict resolution more effectively. As a result, they become more successful in meeting each other's needs (they do indeed learn how to make love, not war).

6. By its structure and function, negotiation tends to counter "you" versus "me" positions and converts them into "we" exchanges, which hopefully become agreements. This process fosters mutual identification among family members. Emphasis is placed on complementarity, partnerships, teamwork, common goals, and mutually beneficial solutions. This promotes family members' identifying with each other's needs, interests, and goals. Mutual identification, in turn,
facilitates the management of ambivalence and aggression within the family system. Through mutual identification, family members experience each other as allies in working out conflict, rather than solely as gratifying or frustrating in relation to needs. Mutual identification modulates the intensity of intrafamilial conflict and counters the one-winner model of conflict resolution. Through mutual identification, parents and adolescents can experience sustained and enduring qualities in their relationship relatively unaffected by the vicissitudes of need frustration or gratification around authority struggles. Thus, mutual identification increases the satisfactions and decreases the threats in the relations between adolescents and their parents.

Mutual identification contributes to one of the most important advantages of the negotiation model—it provides a process by which adolescents can gain access to decision making, power, and authority. While negotiation offers a means for parents and adolescents to work out authority conflicts, and establish short-term rules, regulations, and guidelines, the rapidity of change in our society makes the content of authority (long-term guidelines, codes, values) uncertain and open to question and doubt. This rapidity of change makes the process by which authority is transmitted from one generation to the next all the more critical. Under such circumstances parents cannot be confident regarding the future. They recognize the difficulty of predicting what adult life is going to be like for their adolescents, and they know they cannot guide adolescents in terms of what to do when they grow up. Negotiation, however, provides a means of guiding the young in terms of how to address themselves in a responsible way to whatever may arise. Research into the processes of interaction which characterize healthy families strongly validates the advantageous qualities of negotiation enumerated here by demonstrating that just such open, affiliative, conflict-resolving qualities are directly related to the emotional health of the family members.

7. The negotiation model is in no way limited to family interactions or family therapy; the use of a family example should not obscure this broader applicability. The quality of family relationships that embodies the principles of negotiation are not only growth producing childrearing principles, but also are of therapeutic value when they must be applied in non-home settings such as institutions and schools. Negotiation as a therapeutic approach to family conflicts deals with intragroup dynamics, whereas authority conflicts between adolescents and adults in schools or institutions such as treatment and correctional homes often have more aspects of, or begin at least as, intergroup conflicts; they do not have a pre-existing, cross-generational group identity.

It is in these non-family arenas that one often confronts most sharply the persistent struggle with the internalized parental object. Particularly with institutionalized or delinquent youngsters the original parents were particularly noxious. They now may be separated from the parents by removal from home, or perhaps by death, and it is not the parents who are trying or able to modify their own images in the youngster's mind. It is often more difficult and takes much more and longer effort to help an adolescent incorporate more legitimate ways of dealing with his own or others' authority when the original internalized parental image remains an unchanged negative one.

It is often possible, however, to create the family group identity in non-family settings, and in fact it is advantageous to do so. It recreates the family setting and replaces the original dysfunctional one with an emotionally reeducative one. Particularly in the small group format of good treatment and correctional homes, the adolescent can reexperience the painful emotions and unconstructive coping tech-
niques associated with his home situation, and learn new and more functional authority related behavior. In such settings the dynamics quickly become intragroup and provide a model for future groups, including his own future family, of which the adolescent will be part.

Even in groups where adolescents and adults do not remain constantly together, as in public and non-residential schools, the model has validity for conflict resolution. Although the interactions remain largely intergroup, the applicability is determined by the degree to which the adults are willing to legitimate their authority in open exchange with the adolescents, rather than simply to exert power. Where they are willing to share authority in appropriate areas, to negotiate increasing life space responsibility, there will be more effective relationships between the generations.
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CONCLUSION

The students of human psychological development and behavior, especially when they attempt to discern and to foster the “healthy,” invariably confront certain omnipresent dilemmas. One is the staggering complexity of the subject. Some years ago, our Committee on Adolescence formulated a modest-length report on normal adolescence.* Learning to exercise legitimate and flexible personal and social authority is but one of many equally vital tasks hopefully achieved during normal adolescence. This report focuses upon only that one aspect, and it is much longer and more detailed. Yet with regard to every issue discussed we are aware of how much more of what is known or speculated could be added and, far more sobering, of how much is not known.

Another dilemma is inherent in our clinical focus. Every experienced psychiatrist knows too well the intimate interplay between health and pathogenic conflict, to deny that disturbance teaches invaluable lessons about health. But it remains true that illness is a variation of health, not the other way around. It is illness, however, that clamors for our attention and, on the worldly level, has commanded the lion’s share of financial and research resources because human suffering and social damage are involved. Nonetheless, we must constantly remind ourselves of relatively how much less

we understand in depth about those who have not needed to present themselves for our scrutiny.

In a related vein is the sense of caution and humility engendered in anyone who would address the delineation of "normal." We tend to think of normal in terms of process—an openness to and capacity for interactions throughout the developmental phases of the life cycle that enhance freedom of choice, responsible and rewarding interpersonal relationships, and the realization of mental and emotional potential. Yet these are almost indefinable generalities. We offer negotiation as one kind of model of maturation-promoting interaction, but we are mindful that this is too often an elitist model, less applicable or unavailable to those, for example, who have little capacity for verbal communication, who have no viable and stable youth-adult matrix in which to carry on negotiation, or who need an amenable family with whom to negotiate.

And inevitably there is the spectre of unwitting ethnocentrism, however alert we may try to be to evidences of its presence. Of what value are our formulations when applied to a preliterate culture with ritualized, traditional modes for the transmission of power and authority? Are we willing to attempt to defend the value position that such non-authoritarian modes of accession to authority as we prefer are truly better for all people? Or that all those who have successfully utilized different modes are "disturbed," "immature," or culturally less highly evolved? Might there be imminent but unforeseeable alterations of such magnitude in mankind's social and physical environment that would render our cherished processes of normal development—however effective until now—utterly inapplicable? How would learning to exercise legitimate authority in the rearing of children benefit the individual couple in a world in which the decision to procreate were no longer an individual right?

Such dilemmas offer us a tempering perspective, but they need not cause a paralyzing nihilism. We can only address the times and circumstances that are possible for us to know, and we can be content with that human limitation. That understood, some conclusions and principles can be drawn from the foregoing report:

1. Both power and authority are human realities; given the history of mankind it is futile to deplore the use of power in human interactions. Adolescents should be helped to understand both—in particular their dynamic differences—and to cope with both.

2. Power is often exerted in just those interpersonal relationships in which authority transactions would be more constructive. In such circumstances, power can be seen as a defense engendered by the failure to have legitimated one's authority, or the failure to recognize that one's authority need not apply in a given situation.

3. Appropriately legitimated and exercised, and transmitted from generation to generation, authority functions appear to be more flexible and more constructively adaptable to a wider range of human relationships than is the exertion of power. However, there inevitably will be circumstances in the healthy rearing of children in which it is necessary to exert power.

4. Learning to exercise authority or to wield power is most obvious as a task during adolescence, but it is in fact a continuing process virtually from birth. Because of the determining strength of this earlier learning, the later adolescent/authority interactions may at times bear little relation to the realities of the context in which they occur.

5. Some of the conflict between adolescents and adult authorities is determined by the normal developmental conflicts of adolescence; other aspects are related to individual family interactions and cultural power/authority postures that provide additional reasons for conflict and probably determine the manifest expressions of such conflict.
6. Adults need to recognize their unceasing ethical obligation to legitimate their authority in order to be credible to adolescents.

7. Adults need to recognize adolescents’ right to increasing maturation-appropriate increments of personal and social authority.

8. Adults who have no confidence in their own appropriate spheres of authority cannot transmit that quality to adolescents. Conversely, adults must be comfortable with their human fallibility and with the limitations of their valid authority in order to inculcate reasonable authority attitudes in adolescents.

9. Childrearing philosophies that focus upon teaching youth how to think about and to relate to authority, rather than what to think and to do, are more broadly applicable and are not necessarily ethnocentric. It is in this connection that we view the process of negotiation as one of the more useful modalities for both teaching and learning legitimate authority.

10. Cultures in major transition provide a particularly difficult milieu in which to exercise, to transmit, and to learn constructive authority attitudes. Likewise, cultures that open the largest number of interactional and life style options and alternatives to growing youth also increase the potential for destructive and maladaptive authority postures.

11. Psychiatrists can effectively intervene in authority conflicts only by possessing adequate understanding of the social issues involved and sensitive awareness of their own authority-related value systems.

In this report, we have endeavored to describe intrapsychic and interpersonal processes that are germane to the development of authority conflicts. Inevitably, and perhaps unfortunately, we have most frequently illustrated our points with examples in which one or the other party to the interaction might be considered “at fault.” Despite this, the assessment of fault is beside our point.

The assumption of blame and the acceptance of responsibility are two vitally different ways of perceiving one’s role in and contribution to any interaction. Regardless of the fact that adolescents have not had a hand in forming the culture into which they were born, and children never help themselves, they are still equal actors in any authority conflict. They still bear the responsibility to use their not yet adult minds to try to transcend any flaws in their rearing and early experiences. And they must inescapably live with the consequences of their attitudes and behavior in any authority conflict.

Nonetheless, the very fact of adolescents’ innocence of their own rearing and of the adult culture implies a different quality and degree of responsibility on the part of the adults in authority. While adolescent/adult confrontations may often constitute an impetus for cultural change, the capacity to effect change resides in the hands of those with the operative cultural power and authority—adults. Only adults can reevaluate the laws, codes, and customs around which authority conflicts occur. Only adults can reexamine the childrearing philosophies and practices that so basically determine the psychological qualities that any given adolescent brings with him to any authority conflict. Only adults can reconsider the means whereby they help youth to learn to assume authority. And only adults have the authority—until each succeeding youth consort takes their place and itself becomes adult authority—to bring about whatever constructive changes are dictated by experience and wisdom.
APPENDIX A

The research on sex differences is voluminous. Much of it is descriptive and observational, but even the research that attempts to explore possible correlations between biological sex differences and sex-specific emotions, behaviors, and attitudes would probably number in the hundreds if not thousands of scientific articles and books. Here we will limit the discussion to the latter, with only a brief enumeration of the various categories of research data available. For more exhaustive discussions of the data themselves, the reader is referred to comprehensive overviews. Rather than burden this summary with references that would bulk many times longer than the discussion itself, the specific references will be found in the overviews, except where data not referred to in those overviews are mentioned.

A further distinction and limitation must be noted. There will be no discussion of differences of maleness and femaleness per se, which are defined here as the basic anatomical, hormonal, and reproductive differences; without further evidence these are not presupposed to result in psychological differences. The innate differences referred to in the text are distinguished as masculine/feminine differences, defined here as sex-linked psychological and behavioral manifestations, including social behavior, not directly related to the physical and physiological aspects of copulation, reproduction, and suckling. Only where basic male/female differences are implicated in these latter distinctions are they here considered relevant.

Much of the data derive from studies relating sex-linked behavior with fetal exposure to androgenic substances. The findings from human fetal endocrinopathies—most relevantly the adrenogenital syndrome and progestin induced hyperadrenocorticism—is consonant with but less marked than those in experimentally induced analogous conditions in subhuman primates and other mammals. The presence or absence of androgen at the appropriate critical period in fetal development for a given species organizes various brain centers, especially certain portions of the hypothalamus, for the later mediation or release of a gamut of sex-specific behaviors. Most basic is the evidence that sex orientation (choice of sex object) is normally innate; in mammals, including humans, with normal endocrine exposure during fetal development, it is easier to elicit sexual response to a member of the opposite sex than to one of the same sex.

With respect to a broader range of behaviors and attitudes often thought to be entirely learned, there is evidence for a similar biological basis. Girls who have been pathologically exposed to androgenic substances during the critical period of fetal development (6 to 12 weeks) display, during childhood and adolescence, behavior more typical of normal boys. These girls engage in much more rough-and-tumble body contact play, and get into and initiate more fights. They prefer boys’ toys and games such as guns, swords and toy machinery over dolls, kitchen toys, and house play. They were more often long-term tomboys with a preference for playing with boys rather than girls. They showed little interest in infants or in taking care of infants, such as in babysitting, and little of the typical play rehearsal for future maternal or wifely roles, but were more concerned with future jobs and careers. They preferred functional clothes and showed little concern about attractiveness of appearance.

The masculine/feminine distinctions enumerated are statistically significant between normal boys and girls, and the preference for masculine expressions in fetally androgenized girls compared with normal girls is also statistically significant. The girls in these studies were unambiguously reared as girls from birth; indeed, the parental tendency was usually to rear them in a hyperfeminine fashion because the parents frequently feared that the fetal masculinization might make them homosexual. And the shift toward masculine pursuits was characteristic both of those with progesterone induced hyperadrenocorticism, who had no intrinsic disorder requiring continuing therapy postnatally, as well as of those with congenital hyperadrenocorticism.

This evidence for innate temperamental differences is consonant with that of other studies. Boys with the adrenogenital syndrome are fetally exposed to abnormally high levels of androgen; they display a statistically significant greater intensity of normal masculine behavior. Masculinized play behavior is strikingly present in
fetally virilized female subhuman primates. Conversely, in a study of boys whose mothers received large doses of estrogens and a lesser amount of progesterone during pregnancy, they were found to be less athletic, less aggressive, and less assertive than controls whose mothers did not provide that hormone environment for their fetuses. A comparison of maternal attitudes in transsexuals and those with the androgen insensitivity syndrome also lends tangential support. In the latter condition, the individuals are genotypic males with formally functioning testes, but they have a congenital enzymatic defect that renders their body cells and tissues unable to respond to androgen. Thus they are born and grow up with functionally non-androgenized (“female”) brains. Transsexuals (male to female) have no such deficit, and their bodies and brains respond normally to their fetal androgen; hence their brains are normally androgenized, although emotionally they consider themselves completely feminine. Those with androgen insensitivity syndrome display the typical feminine fascination with infants and maternal activities; transsexuals, however fully they feel identified with females, are significantly less attracted to infants and maternal behavior.

There are studies that indicate that the differing adult levels of the various male or female sex hormones are causally related to innately different qualities of behavior and affect in the two sexes. Testosterone appears to be related to various forms of aggressive behavior, whereas estrogens exert a calming and stabilizing effect (see Appendix B). Similarly, the tender and erotic components of adult love may be separately mediated. Androgens are responsible for erotic feelings in both sexes, but in a study of women exposed exclusively to either androgens or estrogens alone, androgens were accompanied by feelings of erotic desire alone, and estrogens were accompanied by feelings of tenderness and the desire for physical closeness in the total absence of erotic interest.

Also related to adult hormone effects is the premenstrual syndrome. The most comprehensive review of research details a wide variety of troublesome behaviors and emotions that cluster disproportionately into that roughly 25 percent of the reproductively capable woman’s life comprised of the seven days of the premenstruum and the menstruum. The presently most meaningful explanation relates the syndrome and its effects to the sudden and sharp drop in progesterone level shortly prior to beginning flow. Most women are untroubled by the premenstrual syndrome; and psychological factors are known to play an important role, but the cyclic changes of the menstrual cycle and their contribution to emotions and behavior pertain only to women.

There are cross-culturally validated sex differences in intellectual aptitude. While not all studies are in complete agreement and the correlations are complex, there is a general consensus that girls statistically exceed boys in various aspects of verbal skills, and boys exceed girls in mathematical reasoning and skills involving perception of spatial configuration. Regardless of the many individual exceptions, sex-linked aptitudes would reflect themselves in statistical differences in interests, occupations, interpersonal interactions, etc. Further support for the role of sex chromosomes or their effects in determining spatial ability is the fact that in girls with Turner’s syndrome (genotype 45, XO) there is serious defect in spatial perception.

Natural selection during evolutionary time preserves and concentrates in the species gene pool those mutations and combinations that are favorable for survival. The relevance of this to maternalism is discussed briefly in the text. Hamburg  and Beach  review the field of sex differences from the evolutionary perspective and discuss the adaptive and survival value of various innate masculine/feminine differences.

There are a number of biological sex differences that conduce to varying degrees of sex-linked vulnerabilities, both physical and emotional, which are chiefly disadvantageous to males. The greater physical vulnerability of males (proportionate male spontaneous abortuses, higher infant mortalities, greater susceptibilities to many diseases, shorter life expectancy in general) is related in part both to the known benefits of heterozygosity conferred by two X chromosomes, and to the greater chromosomal mass of two X chromosomes compared with the combined XY mass and the probable X location of one or more genes responsible for the production of immunoglobulins. Differential sex-linked physical vulnerabilities would seem but tangentially germane to innate masculine/feminine differences, but any level of awareness of those
advantages or disadvantages could certainly provide a biological basis for reflection in attitudes and behaviors.

Biologically based emotional vulnerabilities are more clearly relevant. Girls achieve their appropriate sexual identity consonant with their first love object, mother. Boys must dis-identify with that first object in order to individuate as males; not only does this enforce added tasks in achieving secure masculine sexual identity, but also there is the constant pull both toward wanting to be like the opposite sex and toward infantile passive dependence—both of which must be struggled against. It is suggested that the consistently higher cross-cultural rates of sexual deviations in males compared with females reflects the innately greater biological complications along the course of masculine sex identity and, therefore, the sex-specific vulnerability to conflict and failure. Sex-linked differences in tolerance toward sexual deviations may share the same basis.

Kestenberg focuses upon the anatomical difference of predominantly internal and invisible genitals and sexual sensations in girls, in contrast with mainly external and visible genitals and sexual sensations in boys, and links the different ego developmental and coping tasks posed by one or the other bodily condition with various sex-linked personality characteristics and tasks. Likewise, a number of studies of anatomical sex differences and their differential sex-specific effects are summarized in Gadpaille. Anatomy is not destiny in the specific and female derogatory sense originally theorized by Freud, but neither are anatomy and physiology meaningless. Different environments produce different people, and each sex possesses and grows up in different bodily environments.

This brief listing is not even a comprehensive enumeration of categories of data supporting innate masculine/feminine differences; presentation of the data themselves and the original sources would comprise at least a monograph in itself. It is not implied that the factors mentioned affect all persons or even the majority of persons to the same degree or in the same manner. And it is unquestioned that most or all innate sex differences currently identified are massively modifiable by learning and by social forces. This summary is appended here simply so that the incorporation of innate masculine/feminine differences in the reasoning and thesis of the text does not stand undocumented or without allowing the reader to pursue the bases for the concept.
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The considerable research linking higher levels of aggressive behavior with androgenic substances, of which testosterone appears the most potent, has been comprehensively reviewed by Moyer. That there is a quantitative and possibly qualitative distinction between typical male and female aggressiveness is not demonstrated by statistical incidences of specific behaviors alone. Estrogens produce calming of violent aggression in men, and androgens increase such aggression in women. Ehrhardt and Baker have reported that fetally androgenized girls not only display more typically male aggressive play behavior, but also initiate more fights. Goldberg has correlated the hormonal data with cultural anthropological data, and has marshalled impressive documentation for hormonally determined male aggressiveness as the basis of the predominance of patriarchy.

What is alluded to here is the consistent statistical difference in direct interpersonal aggression as expressed by men or women. It is clear that there are some women who are more violently aggressive than most men, and some men more avoidant of direct aggression than most women. In so predominantly learning an animal as Homo sapiens, innate tendencies are highly modifiable and exceptions are to be expected. The existence of occasional, isolated cultures in which typical male aggressiveness is not overtly observable is no more surprising than the existence of individual exceptions. The question of whether such cultural exceptions, if genuine, result from the ability of socialization consistently to override male aggressiveness or from locally inbred differences in fetal androgenization is completely unresearched. However, the issue is not whether male aggressiveness and its often deplorable behavioral, interpersonal, and social consequences can be constructively modified by appropriate childrearing and socialization; hopefully it can. The issue is to what extent male physiology contributes a biological component to masculine social behavior that has affected the course of male dominated history, and that complicates the process of currently desired socialization.
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