

TOWARD UNCONDITIONED MAN

FOR the space of about one generation, members of our society have been reconciled to the possibility that the lives of individuals can be seriously messed up by misconceptions of purpose, distorted ideas of "morality," and unreal or naïve views of interpersonal relationships. So common is this admission that when an individual uses the term "therapy," he almost always means psychotherapy. It is not easy, however, to define what this therapy does for the individual. When it is successful, the former patient is said to have achieved "health" or perhaps "maturity." He makes some kind of "adjustment" to reality. In any event, what happens is spoken of in terms of subjective values which are accepted or understood intuitively. In his book, *That Difficult Peace*, Dr. Joost A. M. Meerloo puts it this way:

In every psychotherapeutic treatment there comes the moment when the patient has to decide whether or not he will grow up. The knowledge and insight he has gained have to be translated into action. By this time he knows more about himself; his life has at last become an open book. Although he understands himself better, he finds it difficult to leave the dreamland of childhood, with its fantasies, hero-worship and happy endings. But, fortified with a deeper understanding of his inner motivation, he steps out into the world of self-chosen responsibility and limited freedom. Because his image of the world is no longer distorted by immature longings, he is now able to function in it as a mature adult.

Obviously, this account of the individual human situation is open to a lot of criticism. Which are the "immature" longings and which the visions which need to be preserved no matter what the odds? The subjectivity of the prognosis makes it vulnerable to attack. Here, however, we are not arguing for any particular definition of "maturity," but want only to call attention to the generally accepted feeling that people need to seek and to gain the capacity to cope with the circumstances and relationships of their lives. The

idea of getting on the right track, through self-understanding, is becoming basic in our society. It is beginning to pervade education and will probably achieve the status of an unquestioned assumption before another generation has passed.

Two questions arise. What will be the effect of this assumption on politics? How will it influence thinking about the standards and values of Western civilization?

Taking the second question first, there is the obvious problem of collective morale. We know something about the difficulty experienced by the individual in facing himself. Before he comes to the critical stage of having to "decide whether or not he will grow up," he has to admit that something is wrong with his life. The common practice is to blame others for our dissatisfactions and pains. The secret or the seed of maturity seems to be in the recognition that no real relief is ever obtained in this way. If the seed take root, the individual begins his first faltering steps on the path to maturity by giving up the naïve egotism of childhood. He is not perfect. He acknowledges this, not just in general, but in particular. His personal desires are not the laws of nature. His judgments of others are not ethical first principles.

The great question is, how can a realization of this sort acquire a *social* dimension? A vast lore of self-congratulation and pride of achievement saturates the cultural traditions of Western civilization. There is the Victorian doctrine of unending progress, the American credo of Manifest Destiny. There are all the axioms and slogans of the great Success Story of the United States. A not inconsiderable segment of the population is seriously shaken by any questioning of these ideas. Whenever anyone attempts a public diagnosis of Western culture, after the style of the psychotherapists, angry

groups appear to defend the *status quo*. Not many people want to hear that they are "sick," or are members of a "sick society." If the critics persist, they are usually branded as insidious public enemies who are trying to undermine the good life of contemporary society.

What is really at issue in these debates? Usually, the arguments arise from challenge to several beliefs which are deeply ingrained in the American people. Most Americans acquire in childhood the conviction that they are *supposed to be happy*; that they are born to good fortune and prosperity; that they have the most advanced science, the most liberal or the "truest" religion, and the best possible political system as their birthright. These ideas have been the underlying gospel of Americanism for at least a hundred and fifty years. If you question them, what will you offer in their place? They are not just "ideas," but the foundation of a number of powerful institutions. To question them at all is to stand outside the main current of life in the United States. Actually, any sort of serious questioning or self-criticism has become a perilous activity in our civilization—perilous for both the questioners and the questioned. It is a civilization which has failed to develop any common existential ground.

But is it sensible to expect a historical movement so engrossing, so demanding of human imagination and energy as the sweeping expression which created the dominant culture of North America, to preserve or evolve a stance which is outside of itself and continuously critical of its own development? Are there any men who are not time-bound and culture-enclosed individuals? This is a philosophical and metaphysical—possibly a cosmological—question that will have to remain without answer here.

We turn now to an inventory of the circumstances which are pressing modern man to go outside the limits of his cultural assumptions—to find, that is, an existential ground on which he can stand, and from which he can make judgments and devise plans for some kind of new beginning.

We quote first from a talk by Lewis Herber, author of the recent book, *Our Synthetic Environment*, given over the New York Pacifica radio station, WBAI. After describing in some detail the changes in the external environment brought by modern technology—including the use of pesticides, air and water pollution, chemical additives in food, and radiation—Mr. Herber makes this conclusion:

The fact is that nonhuman interests are superseding many of our responsibilities to human biological welfare. To a large extent, man is no longer working for himself. Many fields of knowledge that were once oriented toward the satisfaction of basic human wants have become ends in themselves, and to an ever greater degree, these new ends are conflicting with the requirements for human health. The needs of industrial plants are being placed before man's need for clean air; the disposal of industrial wastes has gained priority over the community's need for clean water. The most pernicious laws of the market place are given precedence over the most compelling laws of biology

To speak very frankly, I doubt that a competitive economy can use the scientific advances of our time for the benefit of man. This fact has become apparent in the case of automation, which tends to produce unemployment and destitution rather than greater leisure time and material abundance. It is apparent in the case of nuclear energy, which is used primarily for destructive rather than socially constructive purposes. The same can be said for advances in chemistry and other areas of technology. While legislation may remove some of the abuses created by our competitive, profit-oriented economy, I think that only a fundamental solution can remove the problem of pollution itself.

We have reached a point in the development of our technology where the production of goods can be oriented entirely toward the satisfaction of human needs; where men can avail themselves of goods and services as freely as they avail themselves of air and water. We now have the means to establish a decentralized, moderate-sized city that combines industry with agriculture, not only in the same civic entity but in the occupational activities of the same individual. We have the means to establish a new equilibrium between our synthetic and the natural world that will remove, at its very source, the

pollution of the air we breathe, the water we drink and the foods we consume.

In short, we stand at a crossroads. Either we shall try to maintain existing social anachronisms, such as competition, the profit orientation, huge metropolitan concentrations and a highly centralized social system, or we shall place our social life on a rational basis by producing goods exclusively to meet human needs and by industrial, municipal and social decentralization. In the event that we decide to maintain things as they are, it is my conviction that we are faced with the steady erosion of human health and with eventual social disaster. By contrast, the tremendous opportunities opened by the technological advances of the past century are almost unbounded. They exceed by far the most imaginative flights of the old utopian dreamers. The use of our resources and technology for human needs constitutes an imperative, a compulsion on which depends the biological and social welfare of the present generation and generations of men to come.

You can listen to Mr. Herber, or you can call him a "socialist" and ignore what he says. The fact of the matter, however, is that only the radicals have the courage to tell the truth about these trends, which, sooner or later, will have to be remedied, whether by "socialist" or some other kind of action. A further comment would be that for a hundred years European conservatives ignored the criticisms of radicals, with the final result of alienation of enough people to create the present international disaster of the Cold War.

There must be a better way to work out such problems. Today, for example, the claim that "to a large extent, man is no longer working for himself," is only superficially a political issue. All classes eat much the same food, bought in the same supermarkets. They must breathe the same polluted air, are gulfed and beguiled by the same bland nonsense communicated by the mass media and are held in ignorance by the same neglect of the realities of world affairs. The children of all are exposed to the same second-rate education, and are modelled to the same conformist norms by the same timid teachers. It is hardly possible, today, for the rich to "buy" their way to a better life. The success of the acquisitive society has

spread its evils with the same uniformity that characterizes the elevation of the national standard of living.

Nor is "delinquency" a class phenomenon. In his article for *Harper's* of November of last year, Arthur Miller pointed out that the children of the rich succumb to the same patterns of behavior as the street gangs in New York. A gang of juveniles who live in Greenwich, Conn., the wealthiest community in the country, Miller notes, does "just as the slum gang does, but more subtly." He continues:

The Greenwich gang is conforming to the hidden inhumanity of conformism, to the herd quality in conformism, it is acting out the terror-fury that lies hidden under father's acceptable conformism. It is simply conformism sincere, conformity revealing its true content, which is hatred of others, a stunted wish for omnipotence, and the conformist's secret belief that nothing outside his skin is real or true. . . . I have heard most of the solutions men have offered, and they are spiritless, they do not assume that the wrong is deep and terrible and general among us all. There is, in a word, a spirit gone. Perhaps two world wars, brutality immeasurable, have blown it off the earth; perhaps the very processes of technology have sucked it out of man's soul; but it is gone. Many men rarely relate to one another excepting as customer to seller, worker to boss, the affluent to the deprived and vice versa—in short, as factors to be somehow manipulated and not as intrinsically valuable persons.

These are the qualities which make it so difficult for us to change—to stand outside ourselves and to *see* the stupidity of continuing with practices that are inevitably turned against ourselves. Meanwhile, the pressures increase.

Another item in this inventory is the ruthless efficiency of industrial progress. According to W. H. Ferry, of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, the reduction of jobs as a result of automation is a prospect which calls for "fundamental changes in our attitudes and economic organization." In a recent address before a labor organization, he said:

As a first step it is worthwhile to figure out where we are, and how we got there. The pertinent question is "What's new?" I think that the all-

important answer to this question is "Everything." There is, curiously, a good deal of resistance to this answer, so I'll enlarge on it a little. The bursting atom and the way in which it has made international war useless is the most obvious example of newness. But new as are the genocidal possibilities open to the great powers, they are only one instance among many of novelty.

It is likewise superficial to equate newness solely with colonial expeditions to the moon, or with such technical marvels as long distance dial telephones. I do not mean to deprecate technology, for, as you will see in a moment, I consider it the main agent of novelty and the most difficult political economic issue of many generations.

What is utterly new is the rate of change, the speed of acceleration of events and of social and technological development. What is new is the increasing irrelevance of history, and the dawning appreciation that we must make our own history with little help from what has gone before. While we need all the wisdom we can get from any time or continent, it would be a fatal blunder to rely on the pragmatic lessons of the past. History's lesson about war, for example, is that war occurs, ends, matters are somehow patched up, and a certain number of benefits flow out of it, like the invention of dynamite and atomic power. This is a suicidally false lesson today.

What is utterly new is the irrevocable linking of American destiny with the destiny of every continent and every nation. It is utterly new that the population balance of the world has been so upset that our progeny will in less than two generations have to accommodate themselves to the presence of five billion people in the world, as against the three billion now present. It is confusingly new for a nation brought up on the doctrine of "manifest destiny" to see this doctrine wither in the revolution of rising expectations. . . .

It is new that we should be perplexed about our national purpose. The conundrum of creeping leisure is new, as is the fact that we are the world's most stagnant economy, with no apparent ideas as to what to do about it.

What is especially new in the United States is abundance—the discovery that we have the capacity now to provide all the goods and services needed by all our citizens. Americans—but far from all of them—have more than they need of many goods and services, even with a great deal of shutdown capacity,

obsolescent machinery and methods, and unused farmlands.

What is not new is the woodenness with which such novelties have until almost this moment been greeted. . . . All the same it is slowly beginning to be realized that technology is having a greater effect on man than man on technology. To put it simply, technology is whittling deeply into the fundamental theories of the Western world. The theory of the family farm and small-scale agriculture has been demolished by technology. Technology has thrown all theories of war on the dump heap. . . .

But another and villainous aspect of technology is one suggestion that it is a force with a life of its own, its movement and destiny beyond the control of mere men. This may be called the diabolical interpretation, and according to it men go wherever technology bids them go, and do whatever technology shows it is possible to do. Man's will to do it or not to do it is, under this theory, an illusion. What can be done, must be done. The imperatives of technology cannot be resisted or controlled, they can only be obeyed. . . . The illusion that technology is always good leads us, for example, to grateful adoption of weapons systems that are in fact unspeakably vicious and anti-moral. Bertrand Russell accurately observed recently that "Man has never refrained from any folly of which he is capable."

Technology, which accounts for most of the staggering newness of our circumstances, is plainly here to stay: the question is, On what conditions? On its own conditions, or on moral and political conditions set by men? The danger today is not so much that machines will learn to think and feel, but that men will cease to do so. . . .

What is forced on us today is a reconstruction of economic and political theory. We are driven to it by our own technical accomplishment. . . . We now worship before the altar of economic growth, of an infinitely expandable Gross National Product, of the fulfillment of every want, of an economic machine that must be kept going for its own sake. But are these really our ultimate goals? . . . I do not suggest that growth and GNP are useless, only that they are yardsticks, not the final objects of civilization. The intractability of the unemployment problem can be taken as a token of the hard job of reconstructing both ends and means that lies before us. This kind of forecasting may, I know, have an apocalyptic quality, and it must be admitted that only the dim beginnings of the necessary rebuilding can so far be discerned. But why should we think, in a revolutionary age when

everything about us is being transformed at breakneck speed, that the economic organization should somehow manage to remain immune from radical change?

It is a self-defeating civilization whose advance into abundance turns a large and increasing sector of its population into involuntary paupers.

Where does this bring us? It brings us to the position of contemplating the kinds of breakdown and pain which are almost certain to compel the admission that we are off the track; or, if we are not off the track, that the track we have been traveling at "breakneck" speed is not taking us where we expected to go. We do have, in short, a "sick society." Our economic life is out of balance, and our political life has been rendered impotent by blind belief in slogans. Mr. Ferry names in his conclusion the central task which lies ahead—"the hard job of reconstructing both ends and means."

It is usual, at this point, to lay out your program—start defining what you want people to do. This is a fine thing, provided you can believe that anyone will rally round and help. But since MANAS does not have a million circulation, it seems more sensible to continue the analysis in another way. For example, what sort of people may be expected to take the initiative? For help on this question we turn to a recent paper by A. H. Maslow, which appeared in a new magazine called the *Structurist* (1963, No. 3). Dr. Maslow's title is "The Creative Attitude." Almost at the beginning of the discussion he says:

It seems to me that we are at a point in history unlike anything that has ever been before. Think, for instance, of the huge acceleration in the rate of growth of facts, of knowledge, of techniques, of inventions, of advances in technology. It seems very obvious to me that this requires a change in our attitude toward the human being, and toward his relationships to the world. To put it bluntly, we need a different kind of human being.

I feel I must take far more seriously today than I did twenty years ago, the Heraclitus, the Whitehead, the Bergson kind of emphasis on the world as a flux, a movement, a process, not a static thing. If this is

so—and it is obviously much more so than it was in 1900, or even in 1930—if this is so, then we need a different kind of human being to be able to live in a world which changes perpetually, which doesn't stand still. I may go so far as to say for the educational enterprise: What's the use of teaching facts?

Facts become obsolete so darned fast! What's the use of teaching techniques? The techniques become obsolete so fast! Even the engineering schools are torn by this realization. M.I.T., for instance, no longer teaches engineering *only* as the acquisition of a series of skills, because practically all the skills that the professors of engineering learned when they were in school have now become obsolete. It's no use today learning to make buggy whips. What some professors have done at M.I.T., I understand, is to give up teaching of the tried and true methods of the past, in favor of trying to create a new kind of human being who is comfortable with change, who enjoys change, who is able to improvise, who is able to face with confidence, strength and courage a situation of which he has absolutely no forewarning.

Even today as I read the morning newspaper, *everything* seems to be changing; international law is changing, politics are changing; the whole international scene is changing. People talk with each other in the United Nations from across different centuries. One man speaks in terms of the international law of the nineteenth century. Another one answers him in terms of something else entirely, from a different platform in a different world. . . .

What I'm talking about is the job of trying to make ourselves over into people who don't need to staticize the world, who don't need to freeze it and to make it stable, who don't need to do what their daddies did, who are able confidently to face tomorrow not knowing what's going to come, not knowing what will happen, with confidence enough in ourselves that we will be able to improvise in that situation which has never existed before. This means a new type of human being. Heraclitian, you might call him. The society which can turn out such people will survive; the societies that *cannot* turn out such people will die.

This seems the only sound approach to the future. Mr. Ferry speaks of the need to abandon the lessons of history—they don't, he says, apply. Dr. Maslow tells us that teachers of techniques are no longer teaching them, but are trying to develop

people who are able to improvise "instant" techniques for unforeseen situations. What are such people like? No doubt they are, as we say, "creative."

What else are they? Well they are people who are in some sense living on their own existential ground. Their identity is not locked up in patterns—not in habit patterns, not in methodological patterns. They are not, in short, what they've been; they are *what they are*.

Oddly enough—or rather, not oddly at all—these are the people who embody the Humanist ideal as put by Pico della Mirandola: men who are continually remaking themselves. For them, the "norm" is always a work of the imagination.

But such people, someone will say, are always a *tiny* minority. They have been, up to now. But up to now, we have always put the greatest possible discouragements in their way. Never before have we set out to actually help people to *be*. Never before have we erected the goal of absolute freedom as the object of education. Never before have we tried to devise a way of teaching that would produce *unconditioned* human beings.

REVIEW

A STUDY OF MONEY

IN his recent article in *Our Generation against Nuclear War* (Winter-Spring issue), Robert Jungk calls for an exercise of the social imagination which will "reach out beyond the present boundaries, and give name to what as yet cannot be clearly apprehended." It is in this mood that one should read a new booklet by Richard Gregg, *The Big Idol*, issued by Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad 14, India.

The idol is *money*. As you start to read this analysis, you wonder how anyone can hope to institute a reform in the medium of exchange. The people who have it want their money left strictly alone, while the people who don't have money are mainly interested in getting it. Yet the fact is that a life lived in comparative indifference to money is the best of all. How is such a life possible? It is possible to anyone who does what he does for its own sake, and for whom money is never anything more than an inadequate, if economically necessary, yardstick of material value.

Money is a tool. It enables people to do many things with greater efficiency. For example, if you are building a cabinet, you will need a screwdriver. You can hardly make the cabinet without a screwdriver, but throughout the operation, the cabinet is the important thing. The screwdriver is never regarded as anything more than a tool incidental to the building operation.

But people don't collect screwdrivers as symbols of power. Why, then, should they collect money, which is simply a tool of efficient exchange? Quite obviously, money is sought for its own sake because it is more than a medium of exchange. As Mr. Gregg points out, money has at least five other functions: (1) as a measure of value, usually in connection with prospective exchange; (2) as a vehicle or store of value, for the purpose of transferring value from one time to another; (3) as a means of transporting value from place to place; (4) as a symbol of credit or trust;

and (5) as a measure of the value of some future act or obligation. Mr. Gregg comments:

As a tool, money, in spite of its many uses, is not like multi-functioned machines, such as the complex metal-working lathes, or the grain combine that reaps, thrashes, winnows, and puts the wheat into sacks. In such machines the different operations are always performed in the same order or are at least completely controllable, and the result is uniform.

Doing so many things, money talks and has many meanings. That is to say, a dollar, regarded as a word in the language of economics, is ambiguous. I may intend to use a dollar only as a medium of exchange, but the man to whom I hand it may take it as a store of value, and proceed to hoard it. Or he may use it in any of the permutations and combinations of its functions. Of these, by algebraic rule, there are a great many. Hence, people cannot tell surely what result will come from a given use of money. The differing opinions of bankers and economists illustrate this uncertainty. It is so confusing that most discussions of it by economists and bankers are very dull and, to laymen, repellent. If in talking you used words that had five or six different meanings each, you could be sure of only one thing, that your auditors would misunderstand you. In the case of ambiguous words the context often determines the exact meaning, but with money, the context is itself usually ambiguous. So the use of money confuses men's minds, emotions and motives. . .

This confusion makes the abuse of money easy, and its control difficult. Money creates social problems, faced with which the common man is bewildered and helpless.

If money had no other function than to be a medium of exchange, whole sectors of modern life would be transformed. It would not, in this case, be sought as an end in itself. A man, for example, would not be led to suppose that his "security" depends upon money. He would recognize, instead, that true security depends upon stable human relationships of mutual obligation and trust. The use of money as a store of value has replaced these incommensurable moral values with the idea of a certain amount of cash—the more the better. Since the idea of security is closely connected with fear, the perfectly sound feeling of wanting to provide for the future becomes

perverted to a kind of avarice, pressed on by anxiety. The trust is now in the finite, intrinsically useless symbol, and not in secure organic relationships with life. And because we become habituated to thinking of security in this way, it is assumed that relying on money is *natural* and even good. Money thus becomes an isolating force which sets people apart from one another. Such psychological barriers pervade our entire culture:

Since money has come to be regarded by most people as the supreme value, we must not be surprised that employers under pressure of keen competition set money above human values. We must not even resent it. If we rig our economic system so that a business, in order to keep going, has to show money profit, in time of stress employers will inevitably cut wages rather than profits. They *must* do so in order to survive in that society, and can hardly be blamed for it. Some few employers by exceptional efficiency and unusual wisdom, can postpone this step, but not permanently. In the long run, if we retain our present form and mind functions of money, this sort of exploitation probably cannot be prevented by governmental or socialistic controls of any sort. Exploitation may be delayed a few years, but the intrinsic character of money, acting upon human nature, *must* work out in spite of exterior restrictions. Since the Soviet republic has not altered the functions of money, we are seeing already these results there also. Already a new class structure is developing with higher money income to the managers. The use of this kind of money tool determines the eventual nature of the economic system.

Where money is the end, an economy of ruthless exploitation develops, instead of constructive and fruitful relationships with the natural environment and other men. Even when humanitarian measures mitigate and labor movements control the degree of the exploitation of human beings, the natural world remains defenseless. Mr. Gregg quotes W. C. Loudermilk in a U.S. Soil Conservation Service study, *Conquest of the Land through 7,000 Years*: "If civilization is to avoid a long decline such as has blighted North Africa and the Near East for thirteen centuries and for centuries yet to come,

society must be born again out of an economy of exploitation into an economy of conservation."

As a practical measure to isolate the exchange function of money and to restrict it to this use alone, Mr. Gregg suggests the adoption of stamp scrip. Scrip works in the following manner: A dollar in scrip has room on it for fifty-two small stamps. Each week a two-cent stamp must be placed on the scrip dollar to keep it current. At the end of a year, the scrip dollar has paid for itself, plus four cents for printing costs. A person who receives this scrip will spend it for what he needs, right away, instead of saving or hoarding it. Scrip is therefore not a store of value, but simply a medium of exchange. It was invented in 1890 by a German businessman living in the Argentine. Mr. Gregg has a dramatic story to tell of the successful use of stamp scrip money by communities suffering from economic paralysis. Irving Fisher, the economist, has written a book, *Stamp Scrip*, on the function of this kind of money, and John Maynard Keynes refers to the idea approvingly in his *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*.

We cannot attempt any criticism of stamp scrip, since this is a subject for specialists to investigate. The importance of the idea, here, is rather for its illustration of what happens in specific instances when use is made of a kind of money which is tied to actual consumer transactions for actual goods and services. It must be noted, however, that the communities adopting stamp scrip did so only under the pressure of drastic emergency, such as gross unemployment and a freezing of capital. A parallel might be drawn between the setting of these experiments and the origin of the co-op movement in the extreme need of the Rochdale weavers. In other words, such changes or reforms are successful when the ordinary responses of human nature are modified by desperation. But these are not the only times when fresh discoveries involving moral insights have resulted

from extreme situations. Stable mental health may rise out of the challenge of pathological ordeals.

The particular value of Mr. Gregg's booklet, it seems to us, lies in making his readers aware of the anti-human *mores* that have grown up around the conventional uses of money, now taken for granted as proper or "normal" by very nearly everyone. Some of his concluding arguments seem well worth repeating:

Large-scale machinery and big industry have been rapidly built up on a foundation of individual and group morality that was adapted to the far simpler and slower social processes of a rural and village civilization. The old moral foundation is unable to support the modern high-powered institutions, and is cracking under the strain. If people desire to maintain both big machinery and freedom and equality, they must strengthen their cultural and moral foundation. I believe that the proposed money reform would be an important preparation for the needed moral foundation.

The adoption of this reform would, I believe, make clear some social responsibilities that are now disguised, and help eliminate certain unconscious hypocrisies which are now prevalent.

A separate form of money, created to act only as a measurable symbol of trust and credit, and divorced from the other present functions of money, would do much to release people's minds from the confusion between symbol and reality in relation to mutual trust. The reality of that imponderable state of mind and feeling would become stronger. The increase in mutual trust would add to the people's confidence in their leaders and help in many public problems.

Like machinery, money has given man an exterior power of control over his fellows out of all proportion to his inner powers—his self-control and wisdom. As stated earlier, this lack of proportion between inner and outer powers makes inevitable many immoral results from the use of money. It would be irresponsible and immoral of me to try to operate an airplane before I had developed understanding of its mechanisms and controls, before I had acquired skill in handling it, knew where I was going, and cared more for human life than for the thrill of flying. Without those preconditions, my trying to fly would involve grave danger to others as well as to myself. But the construction of the airplane might conceivably be simplified so that it would be

self-balancing, and more nearly fool-proof. Then the skill required for its successful operation would be within my reach and conscious responsibility. My use of it then might involve little danger, and so not be immoral. Similarly, by correcting the form and functions of money, we may make it more nearly related to man's present inner power of self-control and wisdom. Such a change should strengthen his self-control.

Our social and moral relationships are largely expressed in economic modes. But since our economic language, money, is clumsy, inaccurate, inadequate, ambiguous, and variable, our morals are gravely hampered. If money could be corrected and improved, an immense load would be lifted from the entire human race. I am thoroughly optimistic about human nature. As soon as it is given proper environment and proper tools, economic, intellectual, and moral, the race will enter a new era of happy development, assuming that we escape nuclear war.

COMMENTARY

A KIND OF HUMAN BEING

WE should like to try, in this space, to say something about the kind of people A. H. Maslow is talking about in his discussion of "the creative attitude." These are people, he says, who are comfortable with change, who are able to improvise, and who look forward to fresh circumstances and unfamiliar situations with confidence, strength, and courage.

They are people, we might add, who turn their encounter with life into relationships with the essences of things. In other words, they are people who live primarily in their minds. The currency of the mind is *meaning*, and for such individuals, reality is found in the comprehension of meanings.

There is a kind of life which is free from habit. That is, each event is searched for its present reality, its living aspect, not its relation to the past. Authentic thought is always extemporaneous. When a man says something out of his memory, he is not thinking, but echoing the image of a thought from the past—probably not his own. Relying on memory is often a kind of flight. It is an attempt to categorize something that happens in the present—to classify it and dispose of it by relating it to the past. Things of the present may be something *like* the past, but they are never the *same as* the past. To attempt to find the true image of the present in the past is akin to fear of the incommensurable quality of the immediate *now*, to submerge its mystery in a formula.

We sense this limitation of the classifying tendency when we long for that magic touch of wisdom which enables rare individuals to *deal* and *cope* with matters that will not submit to familiar definition. These are the moments which burst with reality, which break out of all frames and flaunt their unique wonder. Are they moments that we meet with delight, or do they make us

quail, as, sometimes, we react to the steady gaze of an unafraid and determined man?

The mind which is an appropriate vehicle of the ranging imagination is both symbol and stuff of the noëtic being. It uses the past as a sculptor uses clay. It has no interest in "security." The living flow of existence is at once its being and its only security. It is the composer making music and the poet singing. It is the envisioning line of the artist and the truth of the truth-saying sage. It is like the swing in the shoulders of a man who uses a shovel, the leap of the runner, and the poise of the dancing girl.

But most of all, in our age, it is act of comprehension, fulfillment of the mind's love affair with life.

CHILDREN ... and Ourselves

EDUCATION THROUGH INITIATION

[These reflections are derived from material for talks developed by Louise Louis, of Westwood, N.J. Her poetic mood clearly touches upon philosophy, and invites the reader to consider the "mystique" of the basic educational relation.]

THE boy was fascinated with the ocean's vast front, the scents and sounds. There was an unconscious relaxation of his post at selfhood—an intrigue with the amount of space and the expanse of power he witnessed.

In childhood we wade out, one hand on the golden cord of imagination, to where our toes feel the ocean's throbbing floor. By adventures of many kinds we are induced to BE—to seek, and to search. The child stands in the presence of a spiritual truth he feels without comprehending, and the adult is startled by the child's mature observation! He is susceptible to truth's cuing, prompting, and nudging. He is a treasure house of thoughts when he seems to us "indifferent." Heroism and cowardice take physical proportions and are literally stirred as sugar into his blood. He develops power!

But the adult thinks small experiences have short-range effect on personality; whereas the "thing" the adult wants most to make the child, the child is himself always becoming . . . *he is always becoming a "thinker."* What he needs is elbow room *to think* . . . about street signs, and people's faces, and tones of voice, and pictures in catalogues, and why a dog wags his tail. In an intense desire of the adult to have the child "prove himself," efforts at forced revelation are as insipid as concoctions in the kitchen intended for magic!

There is a prophetic story of William Ellery Channing. His biographer says Channing "was a noble, graceful boy of charming manner, responsive and imaginative." One night when he was awakened suddenly by a noise, he looked out of his window and saw a splendid star shining full

upon *him*. It fascinated him till it seemed to him "angel's eyes." His heart beat faster for the light seemed to be sinking into himself!

We know moments of "initiation" like this in our own lives. A *door*, for that child (as for us on such occasions), *opens into some world not read before*. Richter speaks of an inward occurrence witnessing the birth of his self-consciousness. One afternoon, he tells us, as a very young boy, he was looking out on a *stack of fuel-wood*. All at once the internal vision came like a flash to him, "I AM ME!" The *incommunicable world through which we all are walking lies hidden* in that poetic prelude of life—childhood.

We are prone to introduce the word "education" in the same breath with which we say, "thinker." We are convulsed in our rapid aging to measure education by subjects reviewed, galleries visited, until the adult himself is convinced of truth in the adage, "you can pack your mind with beauty and knowledge as a suitcase with souvenirs." More and more that same adult perceives what he has on his hands is a "busy" child with much activity of muscle relieving his brain; and this "discipline" is preparation for an adult who later trips over his golden cord and calls it "intellectualism." The ego "which cannot bear the star," atrophies! On every side the ego must resist the foisting of thoughts upon it with which *he* cannot coexist. "Survive or surrender!" What can he do?

He can love himself enough to rule out whatever stops his own highest possibilities to find his vein, to find what he can achieve with each tug of his golden cord. Centuries back, prehistoric man was forerunner of a new race. He lived obscurely. His parents were obscure. His walking was insignificant, yet there is no sharp difference between this old order and the new man today. There is a series of generations, each different from the other, but tied with the same golden cord and its responsibilities.

The deepest mysteries of society are *solved by living only*. We label a neighbor "queer." We

say he is "going nowhere." But this "nowhere" may be a very definite place of arrival for him. A train of thoughts has taken an abode in him and in *this* vein he accomplished his living; the "parasite of utility" or of "remunerative rewards" does not operate in him as a first cause. They are not his educational directives! We might even try *his* "place of arrival"

Mastery always brings the courage to reject materials presented. This begins with the child. Selectiveness keeps him from being swallowed by any institution in the acquisition of his intellectual persuasions as he grows up. It will not separate him from his fellowmen by over-refining his habits. A deep self-culture enriches him with more and more complete recognitions, and his habits, which may depend on a threadbare existence, are flooded with responses to tugs of his golden cord! These responses elevate him in his natural world and with his fellowman.

LOUISE LOUIS

This essay of enthusiasm might be called a venture into the dimensions of "natural religion." The child is a natural mystic—and mysticism cannot be successfully related, in academic terms, simply to particular schools of thought. Two quotations which illustrate this idea come to mind:

An examination of what is known of mysticism and mystical states of consciousness is of great interest in connection with the idea of hidden knowledge. If we follow neither the religious nor the scientific view but try to compare descriptions of the mystical experiences of people of entirely different races, different periods and different religions, we shall find a striking resemblance among these descriptions, which can in no case be explained by similarity of preparation or by resemblance in ways of thinking and feeling. (P. D. Ouspensky.)

The most beautiful and most profound emotion we can experience is the sensation of the mystical. It is the power of all true science. . . . To know that what is impenetrable to us really exists, manifesting itself as the highest wisdom and the most radiant beauty which our dull faculties can comprehend only

in their most primitive forms—this knowledge, this feeling, is at the center of true religiousness. (Albert Einstein.)

FRONTIERS

Crash Therapy, LSD, and Chemical Mysticism

THE pros and cons of experiments in brain-management via LSD, mescaline, and psilocybin are being hotly debated in the press, as well as in professional journals. There is little doubt that extraordinary transformations of psychic orientation typically occur, particularly with LSD. There is also evidence that addicts, either alcoholics or heroin-users, have often appeared to be "cured" as a result of some breaking of a personality-pattern coincident with the chemical ingestion. The how and the why of this process are still shrouded in considerable mystery, and much wondering continues. Largely because of the extraordinary experiences of an apparently mystical type which it frequently induces, LSD is sometimes thought of as a sort of "instant Zen."

The closing paragraph of an article in *Psychiatry* for May, by Dr. Sanford M. Unger, of the National Institute of Mental Health, provides a basis for evaluating the justifications offered for further experimentation with these psychologically potent chemicals. Dr. Unger writes:

Rapid personality change, translated into language more congenial to behavioral psychology, could be taken to describe a situation in which formerly dominant or high-probability responses, overt or mediational, were suddenly greatly reduced in frequency of occurrence; and, vice versa, uncommon responses, or those formerly *low* in a hierarchy, appear with greatly elevated frequency. . . . The degree to which such "artificially-induced" learning has been sustained has been a function, as with all behavior, of the ebb and flow of environmental contingencies. Thus, to point the issue: Do transcendental experiences at the human level, however they are interpreted, tread in this area of *superreinforcement*—with a potential for radically altering the probability of occurrence of "heuristic" mediating processes (for example, positive rather than negative self-concepts) which might channel behavior, at least temporarily, in new directions, toward a "new beginning"?

With Ruth Benedict's "Apollonian" Zuni, the tendency of the modern West is to regard paranormal

experiences, indiscriminately and often with little idea of their nature, as "pathological"—to be distrusted, feared, avoided. The Zuni Indian, said Benedict, "finds means to outlaw them from his conscious life. . . . He keeps the middle of the road, stays within the known map, does not meddle with disruptive psychological states. It would seem unfortunate were this *Zeitgeist* to unduly prejudice the exploration of therapeutic potential in the drugs here discussed.

In conclusion, let it be noted that the public health implications of drug-associated rapid personality change, should this phenomenon prove *not* to be a will-of-the-wisp, are apparently great. Intensive investigation would seem a reasonable order of the day.

While the language of the foregoing is quite technical, it is at least plain that from the standpoint of psychotherapy the "pros" for "mind-changing" by means of LSD are impressive. Since forms of schizophrenia as well as reports of mystical experience indicate the reality of regions outside of the patterns of ordinary psychic life, we may expect a merging of interest among ESP researchers and the laboratory men who collect data on the "mind-drugs." With the "self" psychologists, such as Carl Rogers and A. H. Maslow, a question arises as to the relationship between the "peak experience" or the process of "self-actualization," and the crisis in psychic orientation which LSD sometimes induces.

One recalls, for example, that the extraordinary effectiveness of the genius of Charles Dederich, founder of Synanon' dates from an LSD encounter some five years ago. Dederich, however, did not rush around advocating LSD for addicts and alcoholics. Walker Winslow's article, "Synanon Revisited," summarizes:

During the active period of LSD intoxication, his normal traits appeared merely in a sort of caricature. One phrase that came into his mind impressed him: "It doesn't matter, but, at the same time it matters exquisitely." He would go to his room and give way to tears for an hour or more every day. Even with the seeming grief, there was euphoria.

When the grief-bearing memories and the euphoria left, the strange feeling of omnipotence and

omniscience that had been with him from the beginning continued. He felt that he could resolve all paradoxes and, indeed, he did seem to confound many of the people he met and argued with. This lasted for nearly six months, but after that it remained certain that he had undergone a personality change. As the psychiatrist who had given him the LSD put it, "You were poised and were mustering your forces toward a goal that wasn't clear to you, and the LSD experience triggered those forces." Another LSD treatment simply made Chuck a little tipsy for a few hours. The omnipotence and omniscience of the earlier period had vanished, but he felt more sure of himself than he ever had before.

Anyone who knows Chuck knows that he is a realist who has very little belief in magic, chemical or otherwise, and yet he believes, with what seems good reason, that LSD was responsible for the personal clarity and drive from which Synanon emerged. He now thinks that LSD is not safe for alcoholics and addicts. The three alcoholics who took the drug with him have all gone to pot. Every member of Synanon who has taken LSD has returned to drugs, or become impossible to deal with. In his case, however, LSD does seem to have released a man to meet his destiny.

Synanon, MANAS readers will recall, is a self-help institution for drug addicts founded about five years ago in Santa Monica, California. (Those who are interested in the full story of this dramatic achievement in rehabilitation may obtain a pamphlet made up of MANAS articles and other material by writing to the Synanon Foundation, 1351 Ocean Front, Santa, Monica, Calif. The price of the pamphlet is one dollar.) The present attitude at Synanon toward the use of LSD seems to be more ambivalent—or, perhaps one should say, qualified. Even within a truly therapeutic community, such as Synanon has amply proved itself to be, there is no guarantee that the psychological disturbances which sometimes occur after the taking of LSD can be handled. In general, the Synanon philosophy has no room for the expectation of basic changes in personality pattern save those won by hard and constant personal effort. It is not the fear of "reversion" which is uppermost, but simply the conviction that no one and no "thing"—not even a miracle chemical—can do for you what you don't do for

yourself. One might argue, of course, that this attitude itself creates a sound environment for investigation of the effects of LSD, but it seems unlikely that the use of such drugs will be encouraged by a group that found its way back to health and normal life by cultivating a philosophy of self-reliance and independence of even the medication sometimes used to ease the process of withdrawal. It is certain that only those who have gained the maturity to withstand psychic shocks of an undetermined extent would be candidates for LSD research.