

Directives
for new life

Foreword to the Second Edition

This slender volume was written in December 1970 at the suggestion of young friends of mine who felt that my approach to the social and personal problems then reaching a state of acuity could be of value in helping many people of their generation to come to a more fundamental realization of the real nature of their problems. Whether or not the few thousands of copies in circulation have had any such effect can hardly be ascertained. The 1972 Elections and what transpired during the months of campaigning seem to have shown that the majority of American people are essentially self-satisfied, fearful of change and presumably unaware of the most basic issues to which mankind is now challenged to give a self-transforming and world-transforming response.

To decide which of two candidates for the Presidency were, as persons, most reliable in times of crises and best fitted to a grueling job was not the most important question, though it appeared to be so even to many young and progressive voters. The deeper issue was one having to do with the human value of practices and goals which have become entrenched in our American way of life during the last hundred years and especially since the end of World War I and II.

The sporadic revolt of many youths marking the years 1966 to 1969 and their protest against the Viet Nam war — or was it not rather against their enforced participation in it — has simmered down. It was not the most sensible or effective way to meet the issue, because it took an emotional and at times violent form instead of dealing with the basic issue of our times: do we or do we not want the type of society and civilization which today is ours and which may lead us to some catastrophic upheaval?

Such an issue can be truly faced only if one clearly is aware of all that is at stake and accepts a total but intelligent commitment to a process of transformation. That process demands a complete reeducation of mind and feelings, a new approach to human beings, to the earth-as-a-whole, and to the concerns of daily living. It requires a willingness to develop a new, but sustained and practical way of banding together in terms of super-personal and sociocultural goals clearly envisioned.

Such demands are not acceptable to the vast majority of human beings in our Western world. They imply a spiritual and mental revolution, a revolution in consciousness. They imply objectivity, a sense of historical processes, and the courage to question everything that has been so long taken for granted. This is a formidable enterprise; yet it is hesitantly beginning here and there. Eventually a creative minority may feel sufficiently sure of the validity of new (or deeply renewed) premises, and consecrated enough to the task ahead, that it can take practical and concrete steps to bring to a focus the unclear dissatisfaction of the masses.

The first step is to clarify issues. This is what I have attempted in this small volume and in a much larger one which should appear during spring 1973. It is entitled: **We can**

Begin Again — Together. (Omen Press, Tucson, Arizona.) I have no illusion as to what such efforts can accomplish, yet it has been repeatedly said that nothing is more powerful than an idea whose time has come.

The time for the acceptance of the main ideas which I have formulated in this work, and in many others dealing with related topics, will come when the behavioral patterns, the intellectual idols and the deeply rooted feelings of egocentric ambition, possessiveness and greed for power upon which our society is now based will evoke no longer any enthusiasm, but instead indifference or disgust. It could be a long time off. It need not be. Forces may be at work more powerful than old institutions or even human inertia. If a sufficient number of individuals and steady groups with clear purposes can be attuned to these forces of transformation, and courageous enough to focus them into their minds and souls, the day will come for human rebirth.

December 1972

Chapter One

A Reassessment of Individualism and Freedom

Men, women and children living in the Americas, in Europe and in many lands once colonized by Europeans are thinking, feeling, behaving and **experiencing** in terms of the basic concepts, feeling-responses, attitudes and beliefs of "Western civilization." Whether they are aware of and like or dislike this fact, they live within Western civilization as much as fish live within the ocean; unless they have made sustained and often strenuous efforts to at least partially emerge from it, in so far as they are able to do so while still inhabiting the countries dominated by the Western way of life and its laws.

Why should one want to strive after such an emergence, or as people say today, to "drop out"? Obviously because one is dissatisfied, or even appalled by the conditions of existence today and the prospects of a further development of Western ways of thinking, feeling and behaving — and especially by prospects of an increased control of everything by scientists and technocrats in association with the so-called "industrial-military complex." Problems related to the growth of the corporate state, of industrial production and forced consumption, of population explosion, etc. — plus the possibility of an ecological disaster or of nuclear and biological warfare have been analyzed convincingly in recent books. Attention has been paid to the rise of a "counterculture," to its causes and its present day characteristics; but these studies do not go far enough. They do not thoroughly and clearly deal with what is basic in Western society and its official culture; i.e., with many things which even young rebels still take for granted, yet which, if they remain as they are, make a truly new society or "New Age" humanity practically impossible.

Above all these books do not present fundamental **principles** upon which such a new society should be built, and they say little about how we today could start giving a constructive form — tentative though it be — to these principles.

This is therefore what remains to be done. And the first thing is to make up our mind what our attitude toward Western civilization as a whole should, or can, be today. This Western civilization means that we have to answer a basic question: Is the present period to be seen as one of readjustment, following the rise of electronic technology and related scientific-industrial procedures — a period which can and hopefully will lead to a glorious technological future; or else, has our Western civilization already proven obsolete and catastrophic because of its misuse of the powers generated by the evolutionary development of the human mind?

In other words, should we try to work within its present structures (social, economic, political, religious, cultural) hoping to transform them radically by pervading them with a new spirit — or is it not more constructive to try to start work on the preliminary phases of the building of a new society?

This does **not** mean that **all** the values and achievements of Western society should be repudiated and forgotten, but that new foundations of human thinking, feeling and behavior

should first be established. After they are established, **at least in seed**, then we could use these Western achievements, but only for a specific, limited and controlled use.

But what do I really mean by Western civilization? Our answer in this small book will have to be very brief. The beginnings of Western civilization can be traced to around 600 B.C. — the time of Gautama the Buddha, Lao Tze, Solon and Pythagoras in Greece, Zoroaster in Persia, and also of the destruction of Jerusalem, the beginnings of the great Persian Empire under Cyrus and of Republican Rome. I have called this period that of the Great Mutation which put to an end the Archaic Ages. It marked the (at least external and social) beginnings of a process which stressed in man the development of the consciousness of being an "Individual," relatively free from the until then quasi-absolute domination of the all-enveloping tribal psyche with its traditions and taboos.

In order to become an "individual" man must develop an analytical and objective mind. He must give up his quasi-infantile dependence upon tribal religion, ritual and tradition. He must not only think for himself, asking endless questions, analyzing every claim to authority with a keenly analytical mind, but he must also feel and act with self-reliance, self-confidence, and at least relative originality. If he does not, then he is not an "individual"; but only a "specimen" operating according to collective traditional moulds.

The nearly worldwide, even if uncoordinated, Movement of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. became perverted in many ways. As a compensation for its intellectuality and its use of the new mind as a servant to old emotions and social ambitions, we see emerging in the first centuries B.C. and A.D. religions of compassion and love — mainly Mahayana Buddhism in Northern India, Christianity in the Mediterranean world. And Christianity too became perverted through over-dramatization and the Pauline idea of guilt and divine atonement. Jesus had sought to establish a foundation of spiritual individualism — the God within idea, the feeling of "divine sonship" for **every** individual human being. But a powerful Church deified him so that it could act as sole and exclusive intermediary between sinful man and God; and it even became a political and armed power.

What the Western world experienced since the early Renaissance in the 16th century has been an attempt to integrate Greek intellectualism and formalism — operating now in a new empirical manner with sharpened tools of analysis with a dogmatic Church-controlled type of moral humanitarianism. This type of integration had to proceed through the efforts of individuals still dominated by dogmatic concepts, even in the "New World" and in a revolutionary Europe extolling **abstract** concepts of liberty and equality and a very limited sense of fraternity — i.e., fraternity within a socio-economic class or national boundaries.

The Industrial Revolution in the first part of the 19th century and the Electronic Revolution in the 20th, simply exaggerated and spread over the whole globe motives and values which were inherent in the very fabric of Western civilization. These values more and more came to dominate men and women whose lives and activities were molded by the characteristic approach of the Western world to individualism, equalitarianism, freedom, achievement, progress, morality, religion, citizenship, etc.

This being so, it seems quite naive to believe that by improving certain methods of operation, passing a few more laws and changing leaders, the perversions and misuse of new energies, the violent and deceitful political approach, the greed for money and social power, the prejudices, ambitions, fears and hatreds, and the pollution of the entire Earth can be brought to an end. It is the total attitude of human beings which has to be changed, and this means the attitude toward other people — especially loved ones — and society in general. But this is not all, for the attitude of men and women toward the Earth and toward nature and natural processes of life and death has also to be utterly transformed, if we are to avoid an ecological catastrophe and over-population.

We deal today mostly with symptoms, at best with diseases which can be made into entities and named — and this not only in medicine, but in every area of human existence. Nothing can be done unless one meets in a straight-forward manner the **whole situation** — and this means Western civilization as a whole and all the values it has accepted, officially or unofficially. This does not mean that this Western civilization has not produced great achievements; but these are not the ones that have been considered most important.

The basic achievement resulting from the Great Mutation that began some twenty-five centuries ago is that human beings — or at least a very large number of them — have emerged from the strictly biological, tribal and static level of archaic societies to the individualistic and mind-oriented level of a highly dynamic civilization. Because of this change of level of consciousness, societies and cultures which were based almost exclusively on **local** conditions have been superseded by a now world-wide global civilization. This means that for the first time mankind-as-a-whole is now an experienceable fact. Every man can know and, in a sense at least, meet every other man; and the Earth-as-a-whole can be experienced in all its varied life-conditions and climates by every individual person. These are the great achievements of Western society; and the ability to be actually mankind-conscious, instead of tribe conscious or nationalistically conscious, represents an immense evolutionary step. All other benefits of technology are relatively secondary, even if they are the cause of greater comfort and more leisure.

Unfortunately every achievement has its shadow, and the shadow of our Western civilization is immense. It is darkening all aspects of man's nature, and the whole globe. The ability to communicate with all other men and to feel one with them could conceivably lead to absolute communion in a total nuclear war catastrophe. Men can become one in death as well as in life. We must opt for life. How?

We will not achieve this purpose by placing the blame on scientists as men of science, nor on politicians as such nor by fighting against men who simply act according to the way their society has conditioned them to act — whether they be policemen, generals, salesmen or gangsters. What must be changed are the basic taken-for-granted values according to which these people operate. And the most fundamental of these values are those which deal with our glorification of "the individual" as a separate entity unrelated to his environment, yet having to "prove himself" by achieving "success" in terms of what he can show to

impress this environment, thereby boosting his ego-pride and satisfying his possessive and accumulative drives. **We must reassess our Western concept of Individualism.**

The French aviator and author, Saint-Exupery wrote in his beautiful book **Flight to Arras**: "The individual is a path. Man only matters who takes that path." But what does one mean precisely by "Man"?

In order to understand it one has to realize that the development of individuality in the human kingdom proceeds along a dialectical sequence of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. The thesis is the tribal organism which operates under the compulsion of "life" — i.e. of biological instincts and psychic drives linked with them. In the tribe there are actually no "individuals"; there are only many human beings having superficially distinguishing personal characteristics, yet essentially united within a psychic "womb" out of which they have not been really born, born as individuals.

The **antithesis** phase of human evolution represents the process of individualization, which produces under certain circumstances the "rugged individual," the totally self-reliant, aggressive, fundamentally isolated and insecure person who does just as he wills regardless of consequences to others and especially to all sub-human living organisms. In a more strictly socially organized environment the Frontier-man or the robber baron becomes the average man of business or professional man oriented toward wealth, success, prestige, and with a minimum of social consciousness, except in official occasions which requires the use of standardized phrases and "noble sentiments."

The phase of **synthesis** is still mostly in the future, yet there have been many anticipatory attempts, in almost all cases stifled by the inertia of the past. A number of "communalistic" groups or brotherhoods — but not communist in the Marxian sense — have existed for a time in Europe and even in America, but usually bringing together men with a definite religious background and under the leadership of a powerful Father-figure or Prophet. The essential point to consider in such groups belonging to the barely beginning phase of "synthesis" is whether the participants in the group come to it **as individuals** or merely as devotees of a charismatic and perhaps God-manifesting (or so he may claim!) personage. During the "antithesis" phase of basically unrestricted individualism there had to be polarizing and complementary social movements, or else pure anarchy would have been the result; and when the biological instincts operate with an admixture of sharpened intellect and dynamic inventiveness, and the human group lives in a harsh climate, the ideal of spiritual anarchy is obviously unworkable. Thus religion, and the emotional cement of cultural and in most cases political nationalism, are required to keep individuals within productive patterns of order. The larger the group, the stronger must be the requirement for "law and order" — at least until a **basic change of consciousness** in a great number of individuals makes possible the more or less spontaneous and natural harmonization of individual differences, so that a social organism" can come into being.

But what is an organism? It is constituted by a vast number of units (cells) which fulfill, **each in its own place**, a specific function in relation to the Whole. In the following

chapters we shall present a much clearer picture of what is involved in this concept of "organic individualism"; but the point to stress here is that it is a concept of synthesis. That is to say, in it we find reconciled and transformed (or is it, "transfigured"?) the principle of biologically and physically compulsive tribal unanimity, and the principle of autonomous and self-reliant individualism.

Whenever there are existential wholes — at whatever level, cosmic, biological, social or personal — one can always see two principles at work: The individual and the collective. These two principles operate very much as do the Yang and Yin in Chinese philosophy. No individual can exist alone and unrelated to other individuals. There is a tendency which brings every individual into some kind of collective pattern, and any collectivity can only survive by allowing some of its members to emerge out of its matricial psychism as creative individuals.

In physics today, and indeed in every field of thought, we find a struggle between an "atomistic" and a "holistic" (from *o/los*, whole) approach. Atomism has dominated the official thinking of Western thinkers and particularly of modern science, but holism is now in slow but gradual ascendancy. The two approaches are complementary just as tribal consciousness and individual consciousness are. What we need, in the days and centuries ahead, is a dynamic solution to the problem of harmonizing in a steady society the requirements of both the individuals and the community.

American democracy was a noble attempt to perform such a feat; and within the pattern of small town living for which it was conceived, it might have been ideal **if** what was back of the institution of slavery (i.e. economic profit) had not been allowed to retain its stranglehold on a society of abstractly "free and equal" individuals. When immense new powers were unleashed and the wasteful exploitation of the continent began, every negative feature of individualism became monstrously exaggerated. Nothing can be done to really stop the exploitation and pollution of Nature, and of human nature as well, unless the ideal of uncontrolled, proud, success-hungry and self-righteous individualism is radically transformed.

The glorification of the individual by a religious philosophy which tells that every man is a totally individual and unique Soul, who does not really belong to the Earth, but is sent into this "vale of tears" to learn hard lessons and to rule over every living creature introduces into the social ideal of the self-sufficient, totally responsible and free individual a higher dimension which makes the transformation of man more difficult. In a subtle way it makes it more difficult, even though it was meant to help a race of human beings with a tough temperament, violent drives and ambitious minds to refine and spiritualize their cravings for individualized power and conquest. If every man essentially is a strictly individual Soul, a "monad" living more or less in spiritual isolation from other monads, then "Man" is atomized. The one being of Humanity is divided into a myriad of independent units, the essential task of which is to "return" to the original and undivided One. But this path of

return does not lead through communion with all other beings, but rather it consists in total surrender of individuality to **the** One, i.e. to God.

This at least is the more mystical concept. In practice the Church, whether in the Christian or the Mahayana Buddhist ideal, is understood to be a mystic community in which all believers unite in their aspiration toward Unity. But this is mostly a transcendent Unity; it does not refer to the wholeness of a **functional organism**. What is needed today at the threshold of the evolutionary phase of synthesis is an organic **sense of community**; and this community can now include all human beings in a global organism, Man.

An individual person may have **potentially** within himself all the powers of Man; but he can actualize only a limited number of them, and indeed he can hardly actualize any of at least the higher powers without the support and cooperation of other men. The biblical Adam should not be considered as a man, but instead as an allegorical representation of Man. indeed, our entire Western society has to learn not to take symbols as literal facts; and this applies to many things indeed.

We have also to realize that the basic factor in society is not the "Individual", but instead the "person", in the deepest sense of the term. A person is a human being who, accepting his place and function in society — or in any limited community — realizes his individuality in function of his relatedness to all men, or more abstractly, to Man. A person is a focalized expression of certain aspects of Man. He does not exist in vacuum, in isolation. He and all other human persons are **related** fields of activity and consciousness; Man operates through all of them and in their interrelatedness.

The religiously inclined or mystical mind may think that I am here only substituting the word Man for God. But, if substitution there is, it is a very significant one, because it makes God real here and now, as a fact upon which one can build the future community of Man, the global society. We are entering an Age in which spiritual concepts and utopian dreams can become concrete realities. We may have to give up the special formulations of great spiritual ideals to which, personally or as a group, we are so emotionally attached, **in order to** allow these ideals to become universally real — real for every human being on this Earth.

We may have to give up our worship of the individual because it is based on a false concept, or rather on a concept the value of which has been to give form to a necessary revolt against and an emergence from the compulsive power of the womb-like tribal state. I repeat that in the archaic tribe there were no individuals — to be an individual has meant historically to have emerged from the binding envelope of the archaic community. In recent days it has meant to have become free from the less absolute, yet still very dominant power of a particular culture, family and traditional way of life. One is an individual **against** some kind of bondage. One becomes a true "person" **in relation to and for** the actualization, together with other individuals, of some of the immensely varied potentialities of Man.

Young people insist on "doing my thing", but what they mainly mean is **not doing** what their society insists they should do. When they have dropped out, they very often do not know what to do with their "freedom". They are not free; they are "out of gear". You

cannot drive a car in an out of gear condition, unless you are on a steep slope; and the end result many times is catastrophic.

The ideals of freedom and equality are worshipped in name by our supposedly democratic society; but like many forms of worship this one works only on special occasions and is denied, or leads to patent absurdities, on "normal" working days. Our Constitution proclaims in its Bill of Rights a few basic freedoms **of** — speech, assembly, opinion, etc. President Roosevelt spoke eloquently of four freedoms **from** especially tragic conditions. But few indeed are those ready officially to speak of freedom for — yes, for the accomplishment of the basic purpose of one's existence, viz. the actualization of one's innate potential as a focal point through which Man can express an aspect of himself.

To give human beings freedom "of" and "from", while making it very difficult to realize what they should be free "for" — this is almost criminal. It is a subtle glorification of purposelessness, which in turn makes it possible for strong individuals to enslave — spiritually and mentally at least — the less "free citizen", the "liberated" woman, and the child able to respect no one and none of the values hypocritically praised by his elders. Is there really freedom in being able to do whatever you want, yet being unable to want anything in particular? One may call this the freedom to be bored; and our technological society's approach to the increasing leisure time of its citizens is rather appalling. T.V. watching and golf playing as a standard diet spiced with card-playing, aimless driving and a generous dash of sex-play: what a program!

If we had a real, encompassing and evolutionary sense of history we would realize that the cry for freedom is essentially a form of protest against a kind of social order which has become oppressive and unbearable to dynamic groups or intense people who feel intuitively that any form of allegiance to the traditional status quo is destructive of the germs of a greater life ready to break through the collective inertia of the vast majority of the people. The yearning for freedom if it be a yearning for freedom presupposes oppression; or, from the compulsive power of so-called animal instincts and destructive emotions or psychological complexes, it **presupposes** the realization that a new and higher step in personal evolution is about to be reached, and the struggle is against the inertia of one's own past habits. But the longed-for condition of freedom is **always** desired or imagined in relation to and in protest against the **feeling** that one is bound or stopped in one's process of growth.

Real freedom consists in the full ability a person has to change his allegiance. It is the ability to choose that to which one feels the need to commit oneself. There is no life without some kind of allegiance or commitment; only, for most people, the nature of the allegiance and what they give allegiance to are unconscious, taken-for-granted and compulsive or automatic factors. A person pays allegiance to his family tradition because it is **his** family. He is unfolded within it; he has not emerged from it, so that he has no objective view, no true perspective on it. Yet for him there is no question of "freedom" until he becomes aware that he is bound by this instinctive bio-psychic and cultural allegiance.

It is senseless for a colonial power to bring the brighter colonized natives to its capital and to send them to college where they become aware of the noble democratic ideals the country professes in theory. The colonially oppressed person becomes then aware not merely of the difficulty he faces at home, but he interprets these difficulties as an arbitrary form of oppression rooted in the less than noble yearning for power of the economic and political rulers of the colonial nation. This is of course what Marx clearly saw to be the self-defeating factor in capitalism; the ruling class had to educate the people it needed in order to have them perform technical operations, but this education makes the working class and the natives of colonies aware that they are in bondage, thus impelling them to want freedom. What Marx may not have foreseen is that, once the proletariat gains freedom of a sort through economic power and enjoys an average kind of affluence, they become attached to the values and social concepts of their former oppressors. They turn out to be new "bourgeois" and bitter enemies of anyone who seeks to change the capitalist-democratic stem. Thus the hatred of "hard hats" for the protesting long-hair youth.

All this is certainly not to say that freedom of itself has no value. It is **necessary** to go out of gear when you go from one gear to another; but the problem, when you go out of gear, is to know where the position of the new gear is and to move unhesitatingly and with a precise gesture from the old to the new position. The old allegiance has, however, a great deal of inertia, and I am not speaking here mainly of the social, cultural and political inertia of a national collectivity (or of any institution and even of any ideological or "esoteric" group), but of the psychic and mental inertia which a man has to overcome **within himself** before he can become wholly attuned to the quality of a new allegiance.

It is a matter of **quality of living** which in turn is the expression of a quality of beingness. How one reaches a new allegiance may depend on purely individual problems and circumstances, and the seemingly worst methods may in some cases produce very valid results. It has always been stated by men of great spiritual stature that there were many paths leading to the ultimate Reality. There are many types of individuals, and each one represents one kind of path. "The individual is a path; Man only matters who takes that path." The only real freedom is that of being able to take a path as **an individual** — it is the freedom to be reborn.

It is essential for young people to realize that the freedom to do nothing or to drag a purposeless existence is a most negative kind of freedom. One should not yearn to get out of gear "just for the fun of it". One should change gears because there is a voice, or definite urge within, which not only impels to change but states that there is a new gear to get into a new allegiance, a new work to do, a new life to experience.

I have spoken of the "transpersonal way"; but in using the term, transpersonal, I am referring to an activity that is focused **through** the person, not merely to a reaching out **beyond** or above the personality. It is a life so totally consecrated to Man (or let us say also, God) that Man acts through the person. Such acts have a character of sacredness in the sense that they are both creative and necessary.

They are "creative" because they are attuned to the vast tide of human and planetary evolution; they are small or big crestings of that tidal movement; they represent each a step forward — whether it may appear to us as constructive or destructive in terms of our cherished ego-centered and culture-centered notions. They are also "necessary" because, in this transpersonal way of life, freedom and necessity become one. One can indeed truly state that when a man hesitates between two courses of action which he is free to take, and tabulates in his mind the pros and cons of each possibility, he is not truly "free". He is only free when the whole of himself spontaneously acts in a particular way because his whole being cannot take any other course of action. He is so irrevocably committed to one mode and quality of being, thinking, feeling and behaving — his **dharma** — that he **cannot** make any choice that does not fit in with his commitment, his total allegiance.

The essential point, however, is that this commitment is **conscious**; it is made as an individual. An animal's actions ruled by instincts are unconsciously motivated; the moves he makes are made by the species, not by himself as a particular specimen. This is the difference between the "thesis" and the "antithesis" phase of organic evolution — the difference between unconscious compulsions and conscious attunement. The stage of individual hesitancy, intellectual argumentation pro and con, and egocentric decisions — even if the ego is eager to reach beyond its sociocultural limitations and personal hang-ups — refers to the "antithesis" phase of evolution of human consciousness.

Today we are coming — at least a great many dynamic and "in-spirited" human beings are coming — to the beginning of a world-wide state of synthesis. This is the basic fact. The development of the intellect and of the proudly (or dejectedly) isolated ego, of an either-or kind of rationalism, and of an earth-bound narrowly personalistic and materialistic (or ,scientific") humanism have been indispensable steps; and they may still be so for a vast number of human beings. But much of what they produced in terms of social, religious and cultural values is now obsolescent, if not obsolete, because loaded with the potentiality of world-wide destruction of man and nature.

The real freedom for men and women who are open to the great evolutionary rhythm is to be so totally committed that there can be no hesitancy, no ego choice — that it is no longer they who act as mere individuals, but Man that acts through them. What these acts are do not matter — they are what circumstances **need** them to be. What matters is the **quality** of the action.

This quality can be likened to that inherent in the very nature of seeds, for in every seed it is the species that acts; and because of this, the seed is victorious over the processes of autumnal disintegration, decay and death. The seed remains through the death of the yearly vegetation; but all that is of the nature of leaves inevitable disintegrates. Seed and Leaf: a most significant and today crucially significant dualism.

Have you consciously opted for life in the service of Man, and become like a seed — or have you passively accepted the fatality of decay together with the vast majority of the

human beings existing at the close of this present evolutionary cycle? This is the ultimate question **now**. It is first and last a question of quality of being, or thinking, feeling and behaving.

Our modern society has stressed in the most extreme manner, quantity and all quantitative values. It had to do it, just because it had built its concepts and its technology on the basis of intellectual analysis, ego-individualism, and of an atomistic approach to knowledge divorced from any relation to the quality of living of the whole, i.e. of mankind and the Earth. Thus our modern mentality, our science, even our psychology and our news-reports are sick with quantitative data — indigestible, because meaningless in terms of the life of the whole. They confuse all issues because they never reach the essential values, the inner knowingness that deals with quality, not with quantity. They deal only with competition between forces, with binary yes-no, either-or judgements, with a world of false choices which never go to the roots of any matter and do not touch the wholeness of any whole, because all that matters to modern man is the behavior of parts, and the "how many" of everything.

Quantity deals only with abstract entities considered as units in a statistical type of score. The individual in our democratic system is such an abstract entity, the citizen, valued only in terms of his computerized votes and of how his supposedly "own" opinions enter as units within a percentage proclaimed by influential polls. In our world increasingly dominated by the military and the industrial-commercial elites, what counts is the number of casualties in Viet Nam, the amount of profit, the Gross National Product, the interest rate — and how many more human beings will predictably crowd our polluted biosphere and atmosphere. Everything must be **measurable** in order to be accepted by the high-priests of our official knowledge which destroys reality in order to measure it.

Of course our Western technology has produced amazing results and **in relation to its premises** great achievements; but at what cost? It is highly questionable whether this Western technology is the only possible kind of technology, whether our quantitative scientific knowledge is the only possible kind of knowledge. Modern man has released power by destroying **matter**, and this seems inevitably to leave waste products which, when accumulated, will destroy as well all **life**.

This is the method that fits the era of atomistic individualism, analytical research and mechanical inventiveness. But we are close to another era and, while the development of the mind and of the sense of individual responsibility has obviously produced permanently valuable results, the value of these results must now be thoroughly reassessed. They must be reassessed with reference to far more important values than a human pride of achievement, a sense of mastery over inanimate materials and the ability to cure ailments many of which are the results of our technological activities and our poisoning of all that we touch, breathe and eat.

As already stated, the greatest **human** achievement of science is that it enabled every man to be aware of the existence and ways of life of all men, and thus **to experience Man**

in concrete reality and in relation to the whole planet, Earth which, for the first time, became also a concrete reality in cosmic space, an organism in which mankind has a definite function, to perform.

We cannot understand and evaluate this function in terms of quantitative knowledge, for what counts is the **quality** which mankind represents in the all-inclusive wholeness of the Earth-organism. This quality is not a measurable factor, no more than one can measure love or beauty — though modern scientists eagerly try to do so and in the process, through the popularization of their measurements, help in the degeneration of the qualities they touch with electronic fingers and cold computerized minds.

Knowledge is not everything. Indeed, unless the condition of the knower and the results it will inevitably bring to those to whom it is transmitted and for whom it is applied are taken into consideration, knowledge can be destructive, just as intellectual pride is in most instances. What is needed today more than ever is "wisdom"; and wisdom arises in the "heart- mind" of men and women who have become attuned through love to the great rhythms of life and of the universe. Wisdom is intelligence raised to the level at which everything interpenetrates everything else. It is the faculty in the human mind which deals holistically with always new relationships between forever transformed existential wholes. It is the ability to see and to meet every situation as a whole, in the context of a still larger whole in which this situation fulfills an always meaningful, withal temporary role. It is peace through, as well as beyond conflicts between individuals transcending yet including all that struggles away from and toward the dynamic equilibrium of the universal Whole.

Where there is no wisdom there can be no real "authority", only the exercise of power; for authority resides only in the whole. It manifests temporarily only through a person who acts **for** and indeed **as** the whole — a person whose entire life is dynamized by an irrevocable commitment to serve the purpose of evolution and to allow Man to find in himself a focus for creative transformation.

Such a life is, in the deepest sense of the term, a "sacrifice". It is not lived for the self; its depths are untroubled by the vagaries and surface storms of the ego. It is, as uniquely as possible, simply what it is. It acts as a catalyst to human transformation, and if it pays the price so often exacted by the inertia of society and the fears or envy of ego-men who will die the inevitable death of autumnal leaves, this too is accepted as a function to be performed.

In this, authority may be revealed clothed in wisdom; as seeds too accept the death of germination, fathering forth thereby the birth of new life.

Chapter Two

A Revaluation of Man's Relationship to the Earth

The most fundamental features of a human society are derived from the characteristic manner in which the members of this society feel, understand, evaluate and express in a variety of actions their relationship to Nature — thus to the planet, Earth, within the biosphere of which they live, and also to their own bio-psychic nature and their body.

For instance, while the American Indians have always felt themselves to be integral parts of their natural environment and sought to live in perfect harmony with it, the basic attitude of Western man — and particularly of our Puritan ancestors and of the Frontier — man, or even the real estate man type — is that man is a special creature made by God to rule over, to transform to his own advantage and indeed, to use as he sees fit, rationally or irrationally, all that exists in this world. The God-created Soul of a man has been given the whole universe as its plaything or as a school to flex his physical or intellectual muscles and learn various lessons.

Very little that is truly effective can be done to transform and heal Western society and its collective mentality as long as this attitude, and the opposition between "this world" (dark and sinful) and "the other world" (filled with radiant Souls and divine Light), retain their powerful hold on Western man's unconscious — as long as they are inculcated, deliberately or subconsciously, on children, if only through the examples given by their parents.

Ever since the first Geophysical Year, international scientific studies have shown irrefutably that the Earth as a whole is an organized system of most closely interrelated and indeed interdependent activities. It is, in the broadest sense of the term, an "organism". The so-called life-kingdoms and the many vegetable and animal species are dependent upon each other for survival in a balanced condition of planet-wide existence; and they depend on their environment, conditioned by oceanic and atmospheric currents, and even more by the protective action of the ionosphere and many other factors which have definite rhythms of operation. Mankind is part of this organic planetary whole; and there can be no truly new global society, and perhaps in the present state of affairs no society at all, as long as man will not recognize, accept and enjoy the fact that mankind has a definite function to perform within this planetary organism of which it is an active part.

In order to give a constructive meaning to the activities of human societies all over the globe, these activities — physical and mental — should be understood and given basic value with reference to the wholesome functioning of the entire Earth, and we may add of the entire solar system. This cannot be done (1) if man insists on considering himself an alien Soul compelled to incarnate on this sorrowful planet, and (2) if we can see in the planet, Earth, nothing but a mass of material substances moved by mechanical laws, and in "life" nothing but a chance combination of molecular aggregations.

Progressive minds today tend to preach that the dichotomy of mind and matter, and of psyche and body, is the great illusion; that one must go beyond such dualities, for "it is all one" and all "energy". As I see it, the Earth is only one organized "field" of activities — and so is the **human person** — but these activities take place at various levels, in different "spheres" of being and realms of consciousness. The lithosphere is not the biosphere, and the latter not the noosphere or ionosphere. The Earth is not **only** a material mass. Consciousness is not only "human"; it exists at animal and vegetable levels, and most likely must be latent, or operating in some form, in the molecule and the atom; and all these diverse and in a sense hierarchical modes of activity and consciousness should be seen integrated in and perhaps transcended by an all-encompassing and "eonic" planetary Consciousness.

The concept of a "planetary Mind" should be today readily understandable and acceptable; it would be if men in the Western world were not so deeply conditioned in their thinking by a feeling of uniqueness and proud superiority with regard to all other forms of life — nay more, by a feeling that they do not really belong to this planet and must escape from it, by spiritual if not physical means. To state that it is a basic intractable feeling-intuition is one of these statements which take for granted that our Western and Near-Eastern tradition is fundamentally superior to all other traditions; for what seems to us an "innate idea" or incontrovertible realization is usually but the inbred or unconsciously inherited way of interpreting some far more fundamental fact of man's existence. I am referring to man's insistent drive and capacity for self-transformation, which for many centuries has manifested as an irrepressible urge to emerge from **collective reactions to existence** and to develop **individualized responses in terms of reflective self-consciousness**.

This basically "human" drive indeed establishes man's function within the Earth-organism, it is an organic function, very much in the sense that the central nervous system fulfills a definite organic function in a human body. There is nothing absolutely transcendent in the nervous system, in its billions of cells and its chemico-electrical current. Rather, the nervous system is the means whereby a linking process is made possible between **two levels of existence, of activity and consciousness**: we call these levels, body and mind. Teilhard de Chardin, likewise spoke of biosphere and noosphere with reference to the Earth as an organic whole.

Humanity's function within the Earth-organism is to extract from the activities of all other operative systems within this organism the type of consciousness which we call "reflective" or "self-consciousness" — or, we may also say to **mentalize** and give meaning, value, and "name" to all that takes place anywhere within the Earth-field. I should add that this field may well extend up to the lunar orbit and thus include what the ancient astronomers called "the sublunar realm". It certainly covers more than what we can see and touch.

This "mentalization" process operates through what we call culture. To each region of, and living condition in the total field of the Earth-organism a definite type of culture inherently corresponds. Each region is the "womb" out of which a specific type of human mentality and culture can and sooner or later will emerge. All these cultures — past, present and future — and their complex interrelationships and interactions are the collective builders of the Mind of humanity; and this means of the **conscious Mind of the Earth**.

Our Western society — first around the Mediterranean sea, then around the Atlantic ocean — has aroused and focused in the one planetary Mind of the Earth an extraordinarily sharp and emotionally intense type of consciousness, essentially related to the peculiar conditions characterizing the geography and climate of the Mediterranean regions. One should also presumably relate this wave-length of consciousness, in terms of basic magnetism, to the towering massif of the Caucasus, and of its extension through the mountains of Persia and Afghanistan — then later on to the Alps. Likewise the type of human consciousness which developed through the sub-continent of India since the Aryan period can be related to the type of Earth-magnetism which flows from the Himalayas southward, perhaps being polarized by the older region of the Blue Mountains in the plateau of South-Central India near the latitude of Madras and Pondicherry.

Whether or not one is ready to accept, at least as an hypothesis, the reality of magnetic centers on the Earth-centers apparently related mainly to mountains — the plain evident fact is that a culture develops out of the **collective experiences** of a group of human beings — usually **not** of the same racial stock — during a relatively long period and in one particular geographical region. A culture expresses in symbols (language, art-forms, myths), gives conscious meaning to, and institutionalizes or traditionalizes collective experiences; it does so through the focalizing agency of individual persons.

Today the symbols and traditional ways of thinking, feeling and behaving of our Western society have lost at least their superficial validity because they are no longer able to give constructive meaning to the new collective experiences of a humanity which has become radically transformed by technology, and which has extended far beyond its original habitat, i.e. the regions around the Mediterranean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean. Men everywhere are torn apart by the conflict between loyalty to old cultures whose institutions have proven inadequate under the changing situation and their deep-rooted urge to expand their consciousness and reintegrate their shattered mentality around new and all-human symbols and values.

How can this reintegration proceed? Because mankind is now **a global reality** experienceable by anyone whose mind and psyche are not closed tight by fear, insecurity and sentimental attachment or habits, it should be obvious that the fundamental symbol should now be "the globe". Diverse races, traditions, cultures have to recognize that they are **all children of the Earth**; then only can we **realistically**, and not merely idealistically, speak of "Universal Brotherhood". This Earth is "the land" of mankind. It is humanity's only home. We have been able to circle around this home, just like young children who, now able

to walk, venture on the ground all around this home. It is folly to promote "the idea of mankind", and to try to find out all it implies, without thinking of the Earth within which this mankind is born and constantly reborn. We know about the anatomy of a human body; but it is only recently that we are beginning to look at the whole Earth and to study its morphology, its telluric processes and the functions of its continents, its **one Ocean** (falsely divided by separative cultures into many seas), its atmospheric currents and its higher spheres.

Many years ago, I attempted to study the relationship between the shapes of the continents and the character of the cultures which were born out of their subcontinental regions. **(1)** The larger volume of which this is a condensation discusses such a relationship. I can only mention here the remarkable homological relationship between Asia and Europe, each with three southward directed peninsulas. These peninsulas gave birth to corresponding types of cultures and we can establish a broad, yet very significant parallelism between Indo-China (with its prolonging Indonesian islands) and Greece (also with Crete and other islands) — between India (together with Ceylon) and Italy (together with Sicily) — and between rectangular Arabia and square Spain, lands of strong and passionate people. India and Italy became the seat of the great religions which spread respectively over Asia and Europe, and while India is topped by the concave Himalayas, open widely to northern influences, Italy is crowned with the convex shape of the Alps, closing it in — a good symbol of the personalizing and dogmatic character of Roman Christianity.

An attempt was made early in this century by modern *geopoliticians* to study the distribution of the land-masses of the Earth and the seas from a global point of view. The English MacKinder and the German Haushofer promoted such a geopolitical approach; but it was for the purpose of conquest and war. And when they spoke of regions in Central Asia at "the Heartland" of the world, they did not mean it in a spiritual sense; all they could think of was how a nation might control politically the entire world of man. I spoke instead of **geomorphic** approach — of "geotechnics" as a study referring to the constructive management of the resources of the globe — and not only material resources, but human resources, cultural and spiritual.

Indeed the great issue we must face, as we seek to formulate seed-ideas as foundations for a new and worldwide all-human society, is the inescapable need there is — in every field of human activity, personal as well as collective and social-cultural — to **replace politics by management**. Power (the basic issue in politics) is not to be sought for in the individual unit — be it an individual person, a nation or an institution — but only in terms of the Whole. Energies have to be managed for the sake of the Whole; and not only the whole of mankind, but of the Earth. Resources have to be produced and distributed in terms of the needs of the entire planet. Production and distribution cannot be left to chance and the vagaries of a Market economy featuring the cravings of ego-controlled pseudo-individuals, conditioned by manipulated fashions and selfish interests. Uncontrolled

individualism had its purpose in a period of transition (antithesis); but it must be transformed into an organic and functional type of individualism (synthesis).

Such a transformation is certainly a most difficult task. Many will say an impossible task; for the examples of totalitarian countries and totally managed economy which have been recently witnessed are most depressing. But if they led to so many nefarious results, hardly compensated by some very real achievements, it is because these **external** methods and procedures were started on the foundation of power-politics and under the constant pressure of opposed forces. What is needed, first, is an **internal transformation**, a radical change of consciousness. It is perhaps the metanoia that John the Baptist preached; but metanoia is not "repentance"! It is a going beyond (*meta*) the psyche-mind (*nous*). It is the reintegration of the individual into the whole.

How can this be accomplished? This is, of course, the crucial question and there can be no easy answer. The momentum of political tragedies and military horrors in the use of power for the benefit of privileged groups, or of nations which happen to have large resources and power-greedy ambitious men, is so great that one may easily believe in the relative imminence of a world-wide catastrophe. It may not be a nuclear or a bacteriological war. It may be a gradual poisoning of all that men live by — and of their minds clinging desperately to a suicidal status quo. It may be that the Earth itself will react to the insanity of mankind's behavior, as a human body often reacts to the constant pressure of destructive thinking and feelings in terms of serious illnesses.

It is indeed quite possible that it is too late to reverse the spiritually disintegrative current of commercial Westernization of mankind; **unless** the new youth, which today refuses to accept the devastating and hypocritical standards of our society, its ruling elites, and so many of its frightened and egocentric adults, becomes increasingly and positively conscious of what it still might do when it reaches a position of social power. But, alas, there are as many young people who have accepted the blandishments of our affluent society; and power-politicians in any field will not easily let go — no more than an individual's ego finds it easy to surrender its stranglehold on the body and the volitional mechanisms when confronted with the vision and promise of a new and greater life dedicated to the Whole, whether we think of this Whole as Man or God.

Yet one must begin the attempt. Even if a tragic and widely destructive crisis should have to be met, this is no reason for despair and a sense of futility.

As fall begins the soil receives not only decaying leaves but small, inconspicuous seeds. In these seeds the future of life is focused. If it were not for them, when spring once more returns, there would be no new vegetation. We need therefore seed-men and seed-women for "the day after tomorrow". We need them not merely as visionary and deeply-centered individuals, but as "seed groups" within which **a new quality** of interpersonal relationship and a new awareness of what a harmonized mankind could achieve, in cooperation with the Earth and its powers, can gradually develop.

Many youths are moving confusedly, hesitantly, often blindly in the direction of communal living. This motion should become conscious, deliberate, fully constructive and meaningful. It can only be truly meaningful if it embodies a new quality of existence and therefore can demonstrate its validity in concrete and creative facts as well as, in the transformation in depth of the participants in the new communes and "seed groups".

1. Modern Man's Conflicts — *The Creative Challenge of a Global Society*

(Philosophical Library, New York) 1945-46.

Chapter Three

The Transformation of Interpersonal and Group Relationships

If the basic problem is initially how to induce a radical transformation of the individual and of society, how can one begin? We are usually told by spiritual teachers and many psychologists that a really permanent social transformation can take place only after a significant number of individuals have experienced an inner reorientation and "rebirth". Theoretically this undoubtedly is true; but individual persons are born in a society and culture whose images, traditional beliefs and examples mould their psyches and minds. The society comes first; then the individual. It is possible indeed for human beings to emerge from and drop-out — physically or mentally — from their psychically coercive or merely meaningless environment; nevertheless the pressures exerted by society are so strong or so subtle that relatively few persons can break through alone. This break-through is always made possible, in one way or another, by a catalyst, or a severe shock and crisis.

It is the fact of **relationship** which induces deep-seated transformation in a person. A man who would be all alone, unrelated to anything, would remain what he is — just as a motion remains what it is (i.e., it has "inertia") unless slowed down by friction or deviated by an external force. Individual selfhood has inertia; it is through relationship that changes occur.

The problem is therefore, if change is desired, how to bring about relationships through which a certain kind of desired change can most easily and naturally take place. This actually should be the essence of any social process which aims at inducing basic transformations in the fabric of society — or, conversely, of educational pressures whose purpose it is to maintain at all cost the status quo — a well-known process indeed. This practically and concretely means that anything basic that can either change a person, or freeze him in a traditional kind of mental-emotional conformism, has to depend on the kind of "group" from which he can draw partners. The character and level of the interpersonal relationship may, of course, greatly vary. It can be an ideological or learning relationship, even one through the intermediary of a book, perhaps whose author may be dead; but, in a very real sense, it is — if effectual — a relationship between persons. Nothing truly transforming is "impersonal"; and this includes the relationship between a **guru** and his disciples.

However, a relationship can be both personal and nonexclusive; that is, it can be focused at any time (i.e., not diffuse or sentimentally vague), yet focused upon several partners included in a multi-focus and perhaps multi-level association. And a realization of what this may mean can be gained from the most significant way of characterizing a truly "universal" Being: God is the Being, the whole of whose nature and attention is focused at any moment upon any place in the whole universe. He is totally present and related to each person everywhere; however a person can respond to this totality of God's being only to the

extent that he is **able to experience divinity without seeking exclusively to possess God.**

These last sentences suggest the nature of the problem of interpersonal relationship within groups, the purpose of which is to bring about in a factual and concrete manner the transfiguration of individuals, so that they in turn can act as catalysts for the transformation of wider groups and of society as a whole. This problem requires for its complete solution in the participants in the group an attitude of non-exclusivity, non-possessiveness and, one should add, of openness to change and to the symbols of change in our present time. Also required are a capacity to let go of old attachments and old habits, physical as well as mental-emotional, and courage as well as perseverance.

Group-relationship can never be vital enough to induce basic and radical changes in the participants unless there is actually **interpenetration**, that is, unless ego-barriers and psychic-emotional fears are dissipated, and the "interpersonal life" can flow smoothly and vivifyingly. This implies a pervasive quality of equally shared love.

This "love" quality can operate in several ways depending on the character of the group relationship. There are groups which are formed because of a common devotion to a spiritual teacher or guru; they are the now familiar **ashrams** in which a saintly personage, who is (or subtly claims to be) "liberated", gathers around himself a number of devotees. These devotees essentially seek to reach a higher stage in their evolution **through** the holy man who has become to them a "fascinating" exemplar and guide — and in some cases an object of worship and a "master" demanding absolute obedience.

In such ashram type of group — which, in Western countries especially, can take an oppressive, degenerate, and spiritually perverting character — the whole group of participants is held, as it were, within the **psychic matrix** (or "aura") of the guru. In a very real sense, though the fact is most often unpublicized, the traditional ashram is an extension of the guru's total being. The character of the interpenetration process unifying the members of the ashram is essentially psychic, with mental overtones. Because of this centering of the interpenetration process at the psycho-spiritual level, the biological-sexual currents of interpersonal relatedness are usually dammed-for the same reason as a swift river is dammed so that electrical energy may be produced. "Electrical energy", in the case of the ashram type of interpersonal relationship, symbolizes the currents of devotional aspiration and love which, as it were, the guru gathers in and utilizes for the collective work of transformation — if he is a true guru.

In a somewhat different and less focalized and personalized way, the same situation, and its accent on "asceticism", prevails in a closed monastery or nunnery, except that the integrating Power of the monastic group is the Christ-Image (or Buddha Image) and the Mother-Church — a prolongation of the "divine Incarnation" at the origin of the religion.

There can be groups of closely related persons who come together on the basis of mental concepts, or as devoted learners of a common ideology; but the interpenetration of

minds is of itself alone rarely steady enough, because mind in itself is a centrifugal and individualizing force: love must be needed as an integrating power.

When we are dealing with groups in which modern youths gather, who at least partially withdraw from the pressures of depersonalizing social patterns and of factory or office job routine, the situation is basically different. It has unclear possibilities as well as serious handicaps. It is usually chaotic or rather inchoate; that is, it is unformed, unstructured, and in many cases it expresses a negative, because mostly aimless, kind of escapism. This is the situation in a great many "communes"; but in spite of this, it presents the possibility of becoming the means for social "experimentation", while providing a refuge in which the alienated drop-out youth may experience a process of self-renewal and ego-catharsis. Such communes can be, and I believe will increasingly become places where **something new happens**, where preparations can be made for the full development of a basic change in the **quality** of the interpersonal relationship uniting all the members of the group.

Here again interpenetration in an atmosphere of love, sharing, and availability of each to all **when need arises**, is essential if the group as a whole is to become a **field of transformation**, and eventually a center from which new qualities of living and a new social consciousness can radiate. But what kind of interpenetration, sharing, availability? The needs of participants in such communal groups are in most instances very personal, biological (wholesome food and clean air, for instance) and sexual-emotional. The group must therefore satisfy these basic needs, through cooperative work and sexual relationships. What matters, however, is not the routine of working together to raise vegetables or building better shelters and the love-making **in themselves**; it is **how** they are done; it is the quality of the comradeship and the love, the elimination of ego-barriers and insecurity, the fresh and spontaneous response of one to another, the readiness to share, the availability.

However, all this presents great difficulties in a relatively large commune. Therefore the general concept of commune should be complemented by that of the "seed-group" — a group integrating a very few individuals of both sexes who feel related by a deep-rooted love and consecration to a definite way of life expressing a common worldview.

The difference between a seed-group and the traditional family group with its tribal and procreative background is essentially that the family is rooted in the genetic **past**, i.e., in a community of origin; it depends on biological-cultural factors. The seed-group on the other hand is a gathering of individual persons who deliberately have chosen to commune in a life dedicated to a common purpose, thus future-ward. A human being is born unconsciously and compulsively in a family; the "communicant" in the seed-group selects freely his partners.

Family attachment is a product of biological sameness reinforced by ancestral traditions, and by the long habit of being together from childhood through personal growth and its many crises. The "love of companions" united in the seed-group is an open and free realization of community, based on significant activity and the will to serve as a seed-

manifestation of an ideal of life and a quality of relationship which should be the foundation of various kinds of social processes and of groups of all-human unity — unity in diversity.

How this love of the companions expresses itself through days and months of cooperative togetherness should not be an essential issue; but it obviously should demonstrate a type of psychic interpenetration similar to that found in harmonious marriages. It demands the availability of each to all, a deep openness and sincerity, understanding and patience in intimate relationships — whatever form these relationships actually take. Our modern society is haunted by sex problems exacerbated for commercial purposes by the media and the nefarious and totally indecent power of publicity and advertising. Sex is everywhere an issue, if not a hallucination and a tragedy — or a farce. It was not so in tribal societies where nature's rhythms still held sway. It need not be so in a future harmonic society; for the constant crises, the fears and jealousies of insecure and proud individuals which so often find their cathartic release in sex should not remain as harassing symptoms of the vast shadow cast by the evolutionary movement toward individualized consciousness and freedom from unconscious biological compulsions.

We can indeed slowly move to a new and generalized understanding of the meaning of sex, now that the long era of differentiation and of focusing upon the need for greater productivity and fertility is coming to an end — how ever distant still this end may be. This is the beginning of an age of interdependence and synthesis — an age of interpenetration. Any limit to the process of group interpenetration — whether at the physical, psychic or mental level — is for the individual person to establish according to his or her **capacity for response to other individuals and to particular life-situations.**

There are some communes where the rule of life in common is that every member should be available sexually to every other member. This of course is meant, deliberately or not, as a symbol of total protest; but while such a ritualization of protest against Puritan rigidity may have a cathartic value and be a test in self-surrender for some people, it is as arbitrary in its looseness as any severe "blue law".

To speak in somewhat similar cases of 'free love' is senseless. Can there be real love that is not free? The difference between this 'free love' and our modern type of conjugal love is that the latter exists in a focused situation with a theoretical degree of permanence, while free love is very often unfocused and therefore usually more superficial, though perhaps intense for a time. The question, however, is NOT to move from one exclusivistic focus in marital relationship to many unfocused and superficial encounters, especially if it is merely to prove a point, boost one's ego, or escape from boredom and a gnawing sense of alienation. What is to be done is to move from exclusivity to inclusivity, from possessive to unpossessive relationships, while keeping a focused approach to all relationships one enters into a polyvalent, rather than monovalent type of relatedness. It is to be able to share without rigid boundaries, to be available without fear, yet with discrimination; for discrimination is always necessary, not only in terms of what a close relationship can do to oneself but also to the other participant or participants.

The modern nuclear family is a new departure, hardly a century old. The old-type family, linking several generations and many relatives in a broadened kind of tribal togetherness vitalized by a particular family-ideal, constituted a necessary and very meaningful foundation in the pre-industrial and especially pre-automobile and pre-electronic society. It is now almost a relic of the past. The modern American family cannot be a solid foundation for harmonious social processes, especially not for the education of the children; for **in the present state** of its individual components — parents and children — it constitutes a field of such acute and mostly unresolvable tensions that it almost inevitably leads to traumatic experiences, psychological complexes and basic insecurity. This group-insecurity is of course immensely reinforced by a generalized social insecurity — the fear of losing one's job, the fear of nuclear catastrophe — and an equally general feeling of spiritual emptiness and futility.

Above all perhaps, the fundamental value and meaning of the family has always been in the past determined by a biological-cultural need **to preserve** a definite and particular racial type, religious faith and collective way of life. Sex in such a setup was in principle, if not exclusively, a procreative function, at least far more so than the interplay of personalized feelings or psychological needs; its psychic overtones were likewise meant to reinforce the collective sense that one belonged to a particular family, class and culture.

The moment sexual acts relate human beings of very disparate racial and cultural backgrounds, and they become specifically personalized and for the purpose of bringing a strictly individual kind of fulfillment to the partners, the traditional concept of family begins to break down. Then the partners in the new kind of pseudo-family are not deeply or consciously motivated by the urge to "preserve" anything of a super-personal, collective nature. The implicit purpose of the relationship is **to transform the partners** — at least to change their psychological feelings, to broaden their tense ego-patterns and to give them what they did not have before as lonely, alienated teen-age individuals — or I should say, pseudo-individuals.

Once a marriage is meant to be a means to induce transformations, and the nuclear family finds itself an insulated unit unrelated to "the land" or the past, only superficially related to other similar units always on the go, never stable professionally or otherwise, never securely integrated in a relentlessly competitive society in a constant state of crisis and generalized "brinkmanship" — then indeed this American type of family loses its real meaning. It may still be used to embody the procreative urge and the psychic remains of the instinct for "making a home" for children, but the results, for both parents and children, are most rarely positive. A more or less frightened and confused reliance upon tradition and psychological insecurity may keep the family relationship superficially intact; but the deeper psychic substance of the relationship has gone. It is like a Hollywood movie set — all surface, a mere showcase. Within it, disparate egos are struggling, playing an incessant game of one-up-manship.

What is needed now — or at least as long as mankind is in this state of crisis, transition and catharsis — is a new type of group relationship in which the individual ego-patterns, and the conjugal tensions can be absorbed, smoothed out and harmonized by a sense of common dedication to a vital social-cultural and spiritual purpose — a **transforming purpose**. What is needed is a group of a few adults, perhaps from four to ten, which can provide a varied and loving, but not possessive and complex-ridden environment in which children may grow up in multiple interplay. It is to such crucial and today acute needs that the ideal of the seed-group comes as a potential answer. That such an answer involves a constant awareness of what is at stake and the solving of various problems of relationship is obvious. The seed group should not be conceived in terms of "hedonistic" purpose — i.e., for the sake of pleasure and comfort — but rather in terms of what I would call a "heroic" determination to help create a new type of social consciousness based on an open, unpossessive and polyvalent love.

It is the love of the companions, for whom life is a song of work beautifully and selflessly performed in a community of understanding and devotion to every task. And in its most inclusive aspect it is Christ-love, the Bodhisattva love that encompasses not only all human beings but the whole Earth.

Chapter Four

Instruction, Education, and Initiation

The movement of "progressive education" is based on the belief in the quasi-absolute value of individualism in all human affairs, and therefore in social democracy and economic laissez-faire. It found its earliest expression in the 18th century with Jean-Jacques Rousseau and later was eminently developed by John Dewey, Maria Montessori and more recently by A.S. Neill in his "Summerhill" experiment. John Dewey was essentially a humanist and pragmatist, and he was a strong believer in the power of the American ideal of democracy to bring about, through freedom and individually oriented activity, the full development of human creativity. He was likewise a fervent advocate of the empirical methods of science.

He realized also that the basic approach to education is essentially related to the type of society fostering a particular system of education, even though traditional methods may lag behind social changes and anachronistic structures are retained. This inertia of educational institutions is particularly evident at the present time, because basic social changes have been so rapid. The breakdown of the larger family group and of village communities, and more recently that of the small isolated and conflict-ridden nuclear families, has altered radically the essential character of the education of young children. Not only the working and weary mothers, but the community as a whole in which a young child could learn so much by direct contact with artisans, animals, cultivated fields and open interactions between the villagers, can no longer have a decisive and wholesome educative role. Their functions are taken inadequately by nurseries and kindergartens, private or public; and the Montessori "structured environment" can never be a complete substitute for the experiences a child can have in a healthful and productive community of men and women constantly engaged in vital tasks directly related to natural and functional life-processes.

In our "corporate state" society and its anarchistic, competitive and drugged cities, products of man's technological ambition to master everything, except himself, a complex hierarchy of schools and universities is proving inadequate and depersonalizing. Its planned extension "from the cradle to the grave" will not alter the basic aim of the education. The system is actually, if not theoretically, geared to the production of **minds** which will be able to operate ever more intricate machines or social mechanisms (legal, medical, administrative, etc.). Whatever else the student may acquire from being involved in, and conditioned by the system is incidental — the frosting of the cake, niceties to show off under the heading of "culture" and "the humanities".

It is against such a **de facto** situation that so many youths are revolting, with boredom or hatred in their hearts. This situation will not, indeed cannot radically change, except in isolated and borderline instances, until a new society is built on deeply transformed foundations. This transformation requires the reconstitution of the small community. The

community as a functional, productive organism, must be the social unit in a global world, not the anarchic individual. As we shall see in the next chapter one must distinguish between the **spiritual** identity and integrity of an individual person and the **functional** value to mankind of his activities. Education, in the wide and somewhat confusing meaning of the word, deals with both the spiritual and the functional factors. Children and adolescents have to be "instructed", in the sense that they must learn how to function productively in society, at whatever level it may be. They must even more fundamentally be "educated" — that is, "led out" of the maternal and social matrices and "initiated" into ever more complex and inclusive realms of **consciousness** and **decision-making** (which involves the will and imagination aspects of the psyche). To "lead out" means to stimulate in the growing consciousness of the child's total organism the urge to actualize as much as he can of his innate individual potential. It is to help him develop **faculties**, including the ability to learn how best to adjust to his environment.

INSTRUCTION is the process whereby the accumulated harvest of human experience is transmitted from one generation to another. Man is characterized — to use Korzybski's significant term — by his "time binding" capacity. Through various types of symbols (language, writing, art-forms, etc.) the experience and knowledge of the past is transferred to the young minds during their formative years; and in a period of rapid collective changes and discoveries, this process of transference should last more or less through the whole life so as to avoid an overload of obsolescent concepts and incomplete or inadequate facts. On the other hand, care must be taken not to be swayed by fashionable theories which may soon be disproved or radically reinterpreted; and in that sense a certain amount of resistance to changes of but barely substantiated validity can be constructive.

Instruction is a centripetal process of absorption and assimilation. All eating processes are forms of "instruction"; but man absorbs psychic and mental as well as physical foodstuff. The crucial question is: will this food be **assimilated**? Unassimilated food easily turns into toxic material. Thus the function of assimilation must be aroused, mobilized for action which means in school, the desire to learn. In order to understand the problem one should realize that the instruction process can, and should operate at two levels. The most common and "natural" type of instruction deals with the process of learning how to satisfy the immediate needs of the organism, and, later on, of the total person desirous to assert his autonomy. But what is taught is conditioned by the social, religious and cultural beliefs of the parents, and the immediate environment. Problems arise when the teen-age mentality is caught into a tide of revolt against these beliefs and the results they have produced. The school seeks to condition the child so that he may willingly and smoothly function in a particular kind of society; but if, consciously and deliberately or under the pressure of a collective fashion or mood, the youth has no vital desire to **function** in such a society, or positively refuses to do so unless compelled by force, this type of instruction

cannot be fruitful, even if a certain amount of knowledge is memorized and useable under pressure.

There is, however, a super-cultural or pan-cultural type of instruction which could not only stimulate the mind of a youth dissatisfied with the increasingly commercial, rigid and depersonalizing pattern of our technological society, but prepare it for a significant participation in the building of a new society. Ever since his cradle days the child would be acquainted with the foods, the music, the images and symbols, the ways of life of all human cultures, and an attempt would be made to develop his mind no longer in terms of the way of life and the taken for granted concepts of a particular culture, but in terms of what is **essentially human** at the basis of at least those cultures whose basic philosophy is well known.

The inherent meaninglessness of our educational system at this time of international interchange is that it takes for granted that our Western civilization with its concentration on technological achievements is so superior to all other cultures that its accumulation of a particular kind of knowledge alone is worth transferring to the new generations, not only here but all over the globe. It is because many youths refuse to accept this attitude that they become fascinated by Oriental ideas and meditation practices, and seek in "free universities" and "growth centers" another type of instruction as well as a stimulus for the actualization of latent capacities which no official institutions of teaching can or even want to offer them. The arid and obsolete rationalism of European scholasticism combined with the empirical behaviorism and socio-psychological materialism of most American Ph.D.'s is being fed to minds that rebel against absorbing it, then forgetting it the moment the "degrees" are obtained to insure a decent job.

The entire process is career-conscious and profit-oriented. It is "functional", of course, in an institutional sense; but this means that the goal is to feed our various institutions (business, professions, government bureaucracy) **instead of individual persons**. One used to speak of army-recruits as cannon-fodder; our schools seek to produce machine-fodder for the artificial mechanisms of our corporate state. The process obviously is not new; it was known in Europe in a somewhat different form; but it was not so efficient in depersonalizing individuals because it was, after all, operated by persons, and not by "systems" devised to speak to computers.

INITIATION is a process marking the entrance (or expansion) of an individualized human consciousness into a new field of experience. It implies a more or less lengthy and severe period of preparation and transition necessary for a successful taking of this new step in personal growth. In older human societies it was brought to a conscious focus by tests and "rites of passage".

Initiation implies a reordering of energies and purposes in terms of a new type of experiences related to a changing kind of functional participation in the community. It leads to, yet it also requires a change in consciousness. The preparatory phase of the process

refers to the change that is needed **before** the initiation; that is, the ability to desire, to will and to be ready to take the new step has first to be developed, and in formal rites of initiation its effectiveness must be demonstrated by a successful passage through definite tests — physical, psychological or at least symbolical.

This implies that any initiation is a victory over the inertia of habits of thinking-feeling and behaving in terms of what was once normal functioning, a dying to the past and rebirth to an unfamiliar and uncertain future — thus a victory over fear and an act of faith in the yet-unknown. The victory must be won by the individual person; but in this crisis the individual should be — and always in the past was — sustained by the invisible, yet potent will and love of the community. The group should be the natural helper. It prepares the field of battle through adequate instructions; and it makes it possible for the victorious not to become intoxicated with his success, so that he may fulfill, humbly and devotedly, his new interpersonal and social functions — and whatever more transcendent function it may be at the planetary level of what are called the "great Initiations". **At any level the initiate assumes a new function.** It is as he acts functionally that he actualizes a new phase of his total human and individual potential of existence; but, of course, there are many levels and modes of activity. A yogi in a mountain cave may be intensely active, fulfilling a definite function in the planetary organism of Man and the Earth.

Rites of passage and initiation were experienced by children reaching adolescence, by men and women leaving the "student life" to enter the phase of full and joint participation in the community, and finally there were rites for the aged ones ready to pass into a new realm of consciousness at what we call death. These tribal rites have been retained in a more symbolical form in the sacraments of the Church. As every day can be a death-rebirth experience, the truly dedicated man can begin his day with the ritual of the Mass, a symbolic participation in the activity of the universal power of unceasing transformation which the Christ-principle represents — and which, in the symbolism of astrology, is Uranus.

EDUCATION, in the largest sense of the term, should be a way of periodical rebirth in consciousness — a constant challenge to function at an ever more inclusive level, in a more effective manner and in terms of a more fully actualized and creatively radiating personality. It requires an individual mobilization of energy, a stirring of the imagination, a wider and ever more responsible dedication to the work of humanity; it requires as well the support of a community. Such a support cannot be replaced by money lavishly spent on fancy buildings and huge salaries for teachers who, in so-called higher education, usually teach very little and are mainly concerned with ego-satisfying "research" insuring greater social prestige as well as a larger income. What is needed is a psychic and focused kind of support. It can only be available in the new type of "group" pervaded by a vital feeling of community and by interpersonal and unpossessive love.

The existence of such groups is essential for a wholesome education of children. First of all, it will make it possible for these children not to be subjected to the tensions, conflicts,

arguments and ineffectual disciplining of too busy and too emotional parents in the nuclear family of our technologized society. It will make it possible for a greater number of children to play, experiment and work together in non-adult situations — so that they can develop healthfully, without being like hot-house plants whose growth is "forced" by all kinds of chemicals, and in the case of children, by numerous adult pressures, ego-stimulation and ambitious image-projecting. The child should live with other children in his own world, unbothered by and non-competing with adults. The children-group should maintain its own patterns of order, under the unobstructive supervision of understanding adults who have no possessive claims upon or personal aspirations for the children. Yet, of course, this does mean a constant separation between children and adults; for as soon as possible children should find some form of functional participation in the activity of the group and learn from the examples provided by this communal work.

The ideal of "permissiveness" in child-education is rather meaningless in that it refers to a largely false situation. The young child should be afforded all possible occasions **to be what he is as a child and in his own place**, but not as a yet-unformed and uninitiated pseudo-adult. The child should be loved, but not sentimentalized about, or over-protected — a mask for possessiveness. As soon as possible the child should be urged — if that were needed! — to ask questions; but the real educator should be able to lead children and adolescents to ask **relevant questions**; and they are relevant when the child has observed attentively what has happened. He should be led to observe a situation as a whole, as objectively as possible — and to relate it to other situations. The problem of the educator is how to structure life-situations in which the child is interested to participate in a focused manner, a manner which will naturally lead to a demand for critically needed information and experienceable data.

The most important point, and the one most forgotten in our affluent yet vacuous society, is that education and the basic methods of instruction should NOT be made "easy".

What Herman Keyserling called our culture-of-making-things-too-easy does not build spiritual "muscles" or penetrating minds. The kind of will it develops in children is a negative ego-will — the will to take advantage of adults' weakness and conflicts, and to challenge their shaky power that may even seek police support to bolster up or revenge itself.

All this is rather impractical in conditions normally present in our modern families with various marriages and divorces, and with the children being rushed to nurseries, kindergarten and spiritually deadening schools. These are limited to the goal of giving to the children a type of instruction intended to condition them to an unimaginative and benumbing acceptance of narrowly formulated ideals which everyday reality belies. They do neither educate nor initiate. Superficial reforms in schools and universities can no more change the situation than a few laws forbidding big business firms or Federal institutions to dump ecologically destructive waste products into the water or the atmosphere will actually stop the wholesale and world-wide pollution of the Earth. Every person jealous of his or her individual rights contributes to it, actually and morally. The very foundations of our Western

world mentality, now being exported to all countries, have to be totally altered, and somehow the most basic feeling-responses of at least a majority of the people must become transformed. And the crucial question is how this can possibly be done.

As one considers all that is outwardly happening in the world today, it is difficult to believe that anything short of a world-wide shock or cataclysm will be sufficient to effect such a total transformation. Yet, as it has been repeatedly said, nothing is more powerful than an idea whose time has come. What is necessary therefore is to induce in as many minds as possible the unshakeable conviction that the time has come.

One may think of this as an educative purpose. A new "seed man" can inseminate the minds of many who are yearning for a change, the character of which they are unable to formulate clearly, and therefore for the actualization of which they are not ready to upset their superficially comfortable way of living. A clear formulation would require a thorough understanding of the deeper causes of the present world-situation — and this refers to the process of "instruction". But a knowledge of causes, effects and expectable end results is not enough. The emotions have to be mobilized; which usually means the dramatization of crucial issues. More than this, the individual should be led to a state of consciousness in which he is willing **to accept** a personal crisis of growth and a radical change in consciousness. Through "e-ducation" his energies being mobilized in a state of faith in a possible future able to fulfill all that he is deeply aware of today being unfulfilled, the individual-in-crisis may then be "initiated" into a new kind of participation with other individuals in a new life situation.

What the reader of theosophical and mystical writings often fails to grasp is that the much publicized great spiritual Initiations do not merely refer to some wondrous ceremony or even a mere transfer of occult god-like powers; they imply above all an "entrance into" a transcendent community of illumined beings with whom, from then on, active and intelligent participation is not only possible, but required. No person can, in this sense, be initiated unless he or she is ready to take an active part in a new and far more inclusive "field" of existence dynamized by energies of higher vibratory intensity than those available to present-day human beings.

At a lower because far more restricted level, and in terms of the capacities of normally intelligent and especially eager and dissatisfied individuals, the process of education that would lead to some lesser type of initiation demands the realization of the meaning and value of the seed-group; and the seed-group today is to a large extent related to the youth movement toward the formation of communes. These present day communes constitute a preliminary step — a step which in some instances leads to greater emotional confusion. But chaos is the mother of a new order, **provided** this matrix is fecundated by a vision attuned to, and focusing, in answer to particular needs, the great tide of human evolution.

The most basic initiation, at a strictly human level, would be actual birth as a child in a real seed-group. This could mean truly an entrance into a new world in the making. But to be indeed a real initiation, the parents and the entire group would have to have been

instructed in the ultimate purpose and function of the new life of community. They would have been "led out" of their old ego-consciousness and into a reverent and dedicated acceptance of the part they have to play in the planetary process of collective initiation of mankind — a process gradually, even if tragically, unfolding, as a cycle closes and another is about to begin.

Chapter Five

Principles for the Structuring of a Harmonic Society

It would be unwise, and it is impossible within the scope of this small volume, to attempt to picture even in broad outlines **what might be the kind of social system that would be most likely to emerge after a profound reorganization of mankind on a global scale**. For a relatively long time the process of re-structuring a society of such a scope and obvious complexity would almost inevitably know ups and downs, and perhaps crucial conflicts; unless a very large section of the coming generations spontaneously would experience such a change of consciousness that, perhaps under some quasi-divine guidance, they can readily accept as valid and necessary some basic principles of social organization, such as, for instance, is envisioned by adherents to the Bahai Faith.

There have been various books written since the European Renaissance describing social Utopias. In ancient Greece, Plato apparently attempted the same thing, though his underlying motives may not have been those long attributed to him. Ancient India had also worked out a social system of great significance in terms of her underlying worldview, a system outlined in detail in the **Laws of Manu**. This system was based on a complex cosmology and applied psychology, even though in its earliest phase it may have emerged as an empirical way of meeting a special multi-racial situation.

To the Western sociologist and historian thoroughly steeped in an empirical and pragmatic philosophy it seems evident that large issues dealing with social organization are met and solved by human groups in terms of the immediate needs of complex situations; or, as Marx claimed, in terms of strictly economic factors related to the ownership of means of production, it is evident that such factors do operate at the level of everyday living, but it seems naive and unintelligent to believe that they are the only ones to cause a restructuring of society. Powerful ideas and images which give to a dynamic vanguard of mankind new values to live by, a new root-feeling of the role of the individual and the group, and a yearning for new modes of relating to, both, other men and Nature in general should be seen **preceding and undertoning** the decisive changes produced by the socio-economic transformations of the everyday life.

One can argue endlessly on this point, and it is not unlike the old problem of what comes first, the chicken or the egg. Our Western civilization and its institutions of learning are now more or less officially committed to a materialistic and empirical approach; but a rather dramatic change is now in process. Already at this time the realization that there exists a realm of structural and structuring "archetypes" — a "world of formation" as Kabbalists and occultists all over the world would say — is beginning to operate as a conditioning factor in the development of a new collective mentality. Yet the very concept of "archetype" has been interpreted in a variety of often confusing ways, partly because of either a totally transcendental, or a psychologically empirical approach.

"Principles of formation" do not exist outside of the concrete world that is real to human experience: they refer to structural patterns existing **within** that world. They are manifestations of a cosmic principle of order — what I have called a holistic and cyclo-cosmic principle — which is inherent in the universe and which conditions its myriad of manifestations. The whole planet, Earth, is a structured field of interdependent activities; it is an "organism" with a definite rhythm of growth. Mankind operates within this field, fulfilling a definite function in it. Man's evolution is therefore equally structured. It passes through various phases in a more or less dialectical process. I have already referred to this thesis-antithesis-synthesis sequence. It does not operate only at the socio-economical and political level studied by Karl Marx. The great historian, Arnold Toynbee, referred to it in his study of whole civilizations — their formation, growth, crises, and disintegration. He presented a still wider dialectical sequence of primitive societies, a variety of civilizations, and a still future type of all-inclusive global organization of mankind; but his conclusions as to the character of this future state have been vague and probably vitiated by his deep sense of still belonging to the Western and Christian tradition.

I feel very strongly that unless one thoroughly reassesses in terms of a wider worldview the concept of "the individual" so basic in our Western society and also those of "equality" and "freedom" — it would be difficult if not impossible to understand and evaluate the structure of a future global society. The essential problems posed by a society including all races, cultures and types of collective mentalities and innate tendencies are totally insoluble on the basis of our present-day democratic system even at its best. They could only be solved if a clear distinction is made between two equally basic levels of human operation and indeed of consciousness and thinking-feeling. One of these levels refers to **the individual identity** of a human person — a "spiritual" factor; the other level, to the **functional character** of a human being's participation in "the work of the world", i.e., in the many activities which, in a collective sense, makes human existence possible on our planet.

Our American democratic society recognizes to some extent these two levels; but it does not carry this recognition to its logical and necessary consequences, because its concept of "the citizen" refers to an abstract political entity in a quantitative system of values — i.e., to the rule of the greater number of such abstract entities acting on polls and voting machines. Because it is an **abstract** concept it has constantly to war against the very **concrete** and more realistically powerful factors of social status, economic class-distinction, and even ethnic and racial collectivism. The result is a struggle, very characteristic of our Western civilization, between "spiritual" and "material" values; and, in the struggle, material values are bound to win in the type of setup within which the Industrial and the Electronic Revolutions took place. As I see it, all forms of belief in the possibility of other results simply refuse to see the facts of human existence as it operates today.

This is NOT a really pessimistic view; it is pessimistic only in terms of the capacity of our Western civilization to solve the very practical and concrete problems resulting from

modern technology and what it made possible — an all-human planetary society. Technology has made such a society both possible and impossible. It has brought all men together in a state of collective thinking-feeling which makes it impossible for them to work together **on the basis of our present understanding of the relationship between spiritual values and functional necessities**. The problem is therefore very clear-cut. It can only be solved by a new grasp of what constitutes spiritual values, and what the harmonious functioning of all human collectivities over the entire globe requires.

The structuring concepts which I present are attempts at envisioning how mankind might operate, so that every individual person would be given an **optimum** chance of realizing in depth his or her individuality in conditions which would make possible a harmonious functional organization of production, distribution and consumption at all levels of human activity, mental-cultural as well as physical. The key to such a structuring is the communal group; but the group seen in a new light and with a concrete and multi-level function. Such a group-concept depends for its effectiveness on a polyvalent and non-possessive approach to interpersonal relationships. It depends on a quality of relatedness which can simply be defined as "love"; but love in a new dimension of living — a love which perhaps was known as **agape** in the very early Christian communities, but which might include even a broader, more conscious and more explicitly operative sense of relatedness.

The ideal of a universalistic and compassionate quality of interpersonal relationship is not new, but it could not operate on the basis of some of the Biblical statements concerning the relationship of man to the Earth and to a tribal God, or an I AM God, glorifying an absolute kind of individualism. It could not operate in a world in which aggressive Germanic races, featuring personal allegiance to a power-seeking Chief, came to dominate most of Western Europe. Therefore a complete change in the character of all types of interpersonal relationships is one of the first conditions which have to be met.

How it will be adequately met is a difficult question to answer; for we are dealing with a kind of vicious circle. This change would become a matter of tradition in a society that would be based upon it, yet such a society cannot be formed until enough human beings develop an ineradicable devotion to the ideal and the conscious determination to embody it in group-formation.

When one contrasts a spiritual realm where the identity of every individual person is a principle of fundamental validity with the everyday world-wide level **functional differentiation** of human activity, one comes close to the classical philosophical contrast between "being" and "doing". All men are equal in essential being, in as much as Man operates through each and all; but the capacity for functional activity differs in each person, according to a variety of factors referring to heredity, environment, and some will add "Soul past". The **spiritual** unit is the individual person, **not** as a mere abstraction (a voting citizen), a mere number in social statistics, but as an organic whole; and the atom is an organic whole. The **functional** unit is the group, as a social "molecule" within the vaster organism of Man, concretely active around the globe as mankind.

There must be, of course, groups of various sizes. Hierarchical values are scorned by the unsocial individualist, yet this is part of the emotional atmosphere created by any revolt against a rigid political system of hierarchization of **power**. Complex functional activities within an organized field inevitably imply a **de facto** natural hierarchization. The molecule is contained within a cell, which is contained within an organ, operating within a body which is one of myriad component wholes within the still vaster planetary, solar-systemic and galactic whole. Hierarchization applied at the wrong level — that of the individual identity of every person — is nefarious. It is a necessity at the functional level.

At this functional level, the basic unit should be the larger and partly autonomous ethnic group linked with a particular region of the Earth by a magnetic-organic and characterological **resonance**. Nothing would be so meaningless as a global society in which all cultural values would be standardized. This is one of the reasons why technological interchanges must be limited to an optimum, instead of a maximum effectiveness — at least when the new society will have begun significantly to operate; in the process of breaking down the cultural-political and racial barriers now existing on the basis of mutually repelling and blindly followed traditions, technology can well be allowed to act as the destroyer that it essentially is — for indeed modern science is a catabolic factor in that it tends to bring all values to a depersonalized and deculturalized level.

The phrase "unity in diversity" has recently been widely used; but the word, unity, is ambiguous. What is desirable and necessary in a global society is **organic wholeness** — a wholeness which implies a variety of interdependent organs, each working according to its own inherent and structural rhythm. Each basic region of the Earth-surface is an "organ" within the organic wholeness of the planet; likewise every human culture-born as it is of specific geographical, telluric, climatic and magnetic conditions — should be considered an organ within the organic wholeness of a planetary all-human society.

The great majority of human beings, today and most likely for a long time to come, are **basically** "culture men." They are attached by invisible threads to their birth-place, to the ancestral land. This may not be obvious in the United States; but it is so throughout the so-called Third World and still in Russia, and to a large extent in Western Europe. There is nothing wrong in such a feeling of rootedness in a particular Earth-region. **Human beings need roots, until they reach the completely mature stage of seed-man.**

Another illustration may clarify even better what I mean. In the human body, there are myriads of static cells which constitute the substance of the different organs; but there are also cells which are involved in the circulatory systems of the body — the blood and lymph cells particularly. They are functional units in the dynamic body-processes.

One should certainly not carry this analogy too far, but it is quite obvious that even today there are individual persons who are involved in a constant circulation of goods, ideas, news; and some of them at least have lost a feeling of attachment to their homeland. They are, we say, citizens of the world. Some of them are totally dedicated to the work of the United Nations, above and beyond their sense of allegiance to their natal country.

Obviously if mankind is to function as an at least loosely integrated global organism, many more such world-men will be needed. They will operate in an unceasing circulatory state — mobile, dynamic, dealing with integrative processes. World-men versus Culture-men means also "universalists" versus "particularists." This very significant contrast, in practical terms, refers to two operational "levels. The future planetary society must not only account for both types of activity, but develop the men operating at both levels **according to their innate capacities and feeling-responses as individual persons.**

It would be senseless to attempt at this time to determine the processes or methods which should best be used for the selection of individuals best fitted by temperament and intellectual abilities to fulfill each of these two basic functions. It should be a **self-selection**, yet each regional group or smaller community would naturally have something to do with the process. The various tests used today in schools and business organizations in the selection of curriculum and of personnel would obviously be quite inadequate in dealing with such a basic situation; and there need not be any rigidity or irreversibility in the selective process. Neither should there be the anarchy of the rugged individualism approach to social functioning; for in so far as world-organization is concerned, the functional unit would be the group, and within the group each individual would find his or her own particular field of operation according to his or her own individual nature — but also according to the exigencies of the group-structure considered in relation to the situation which it occupies, together with other groups, in the larger whole.

What is involved in the process is evidently a problem of organization and what we today call management. The essential point is that **management should exclude politics**; and by politics I mean a jockeying for power over other human beings. In the evolutionary Age of Scarcity the problem of getting sufficient power for the necessities of life and for a personal surplus insuring security and relaxed enjoyment of interpersonal relationship and culture was a difficult one to solve; thus a constant struggle for a good part of the inadequately available power was inevitable. The value of technology is that it promises **when properly used** an adequate supply of power and useable materials; it therefore should make this struggle to gain adequate amounts of energy and goods unnecessary and obsolete.

There would still remain the human tendency, so much in evidence today, to want **power over** other human beings, i.e. the feeling of mastery which feeds the craving of the individual ego for expansion and domination. **Everything** in our competitive and aggressive Western society tends to increase and glamorize this craving; for it is nearly always included in the ideal of "success" and stimulated by the glorification of ambition. The development of group-consciousness and of a social functionalism which demands harmony and total cooperation is ultimately the only, or nearly the only way of eradicating this yearning for personal power, power over other human beings; and all educational processes should operate toward this basic aim.

It obviously will not be easy to balance, on the one hand the natural desire of the individual for self-expression and expansion, and on the other the group-need for harmony in cooperative functioning. The harmonizing of the mentality and the managerial activities of the "world men," in charge of the global integration and distribution of the resources of the Earth, with the regional and ethnic needs and feelings of the vast number of "culture men" — this too will involve many problems. When two potentially opposite types of drives are constantly interacting and interdependent, tensions inevitably can be expected. A third factor is therefore required, whose function is to harmonize the opposites. A third basic type of individual persons should therefore be allowed and urged to develop, the "harmonizer" who is, ideally at least, the man of wisdom.

A threefold concept of social organization has been embodied in the American Constitution and it operates in our parliamentary democracy in terms of a "division of power" between the Executive (with all its present-day agencies), the Legislative and the Judiciary. But this threefold pattern refers essentially to the political sphere, the sphere of power. The really decisive factors in American society operate at the level of business and interests — including national interests in a chaotic and jungle-like international sphere. This refers to the functional level, but function is thought of in terms of an anarchistic market economy in which the operation of the whole is subjected to the passions and ego-whims of individuals, and to emotional mass-reactions largely manipulated by special interests and the media they control.

In such an unintegrated system, laws and police-force are indispensable so as to establish a maximum of order and cohesion. But **laws do not produce harmony**, they produce complexes, criminals, and prisons; for any external "don't" invites challenge and coercive patterns — and a lawyer class prostituting human intelligence in complex and clever attempts to circumvent laws or impress juries by emotional dramatizations. Any society in which the individual and the State apparatus face each other without intermediary and defy each other breeds violence and sooner or later anarchy. The Supreme Court and much more the Department of Justice are parts of the political machinery and the jockeying for power. The qualifications for being a judge are mainly legal and deeply involved in politics and in economic class distinction. And the function of the Supreme Court is only meant in fact to check the danger of too radical innovations or misuse of power with reference to a sacrosanct Constitution, which no longer deals with functional realities of present-day mankind.

The above-mentioned "harmonizers" would symbolize the wholeness of mankind, or of any lesser social organism. They would be operating at **every level of group-organization** wherever needed to arbitrate conflicts, or more accurately, **to harmonize differences**. They would have "authority" as representatives of the wholeness of any whole. They would not operate with the hollow pomposity of a Court room, but where the action is, where men function. In a sense at least they would be more like European village-priests than modern judges; but priests committed to no particular religious institution —

unless human beings in the future still require the binding patterns of a new world-religion. The harmonizer would act by his or her presence reminding any group — especially, above the level of small communes, at the regional level — that they are functional units, molecules and cells within the organic wholeness of planetary Man.

These harmonizers would particularly deal with the tensions arising from differences of points of view and temperaments between culture-men, close to the land and its ethnic overtones, and world-men whose minds operate primarily in terms of global management and of a balance of production, distribution and consumers requirements. Some planet-wide police force would probably be necessary, depending on the general state of human development and the tone of the relationship between larger regions; but most individual problems and individual refusals to accept communally established functional regulations would be dealt with within the small groups or communes, that is, at the very place and time they arise. There is nothing more absurd than our modern Court trials in the atmosphere of big cities and under the pressures of special interests or media-fed mass emotions, perhaps two years after a law has been broken and the offender has languished in jail, or been given a peculiar kind of "freedom" if able to raise enough money.

Any functional "misdemeanor" in a group should be dealt with immediately within the group or, if it involves inter-group conflicts, within a larger regional whole. A "crime" would simply be an "inorganic act" — a disturbance in the flow of the collective life of the group. Its psychological or collective causes would be discussed and, if necessary, in the presence of a harmonizer. The offender might require psychological treatments or a period of rest and re-education; or it might have been the very atmosphere and "tone" of the community which should have to be improved and revitalized. The concept of punishment will become totally obsolete, and the sense of guilt should be repolarized into a feeling of wasted time and ineffectual effort, whether it be in terms of the individuals growth or of his participation in communal activity.

The establishment of regional boundaries is likely in many cases to cause at first serious problems. Basically it should take place according to "geomorphic" functional realities. Continents and their interior structures should remain the basic factor, but what their shapes will be, one or two centuries from today, is unpredictable in spite of all scientific theories and various prophecies of great telluric changes. It would be futile to even consider the matter; but it is conceivable that rather vast migrations of population may have to take place in order to re-establish a close correlation between racial-ethnic collectivities and the land to which they are related by a kind of vibratory bio-psychoic attunement. The idea of a "melting pot" of races may be most valuable **in a time of crucial transition** — that is, during the 18th, 19th, 20th, and probably 21st centuries. A new genetic human type may thus be produced; but this is, I believe, only an ideal of crisis. The fundamental situation is one in which human collectivities and Earth-regions exist in a kind of fruitful symbiosis which establishes a definite variety of cultural experiences and products.

The culture-man type is responsible, by individual temperament and functional destiny, for such relatively independent and creativity-enhancing cultural wholes. World-men would interrelate and integrate the products of these various regional cultures for the sake of mankind as a whole; but no attempt to produce an "international style" should be promoted, just because monotony is not harmony — and regimentation by fashion can be as severe and senseless as regimentation by Army-regulations.

Humanity is an organic structure interpenetrating at every point the organism of the whole Earth, in a sense as nerve-fibers interpenetrate all organs of the body. Man's function is to bring to a conscious state the variety of conditions which he is able to experience in, or beyond, the biosphere. The organization of a planetary society able to harmonize all types and temperaments of human beings should therefore follow rather closely the indications which the continents, the ocean and the atmosphere (and other spheres) of the Earth would give us if we were not so proud, and in our pride and vacuous intellectualizations so deaf to the vast harmonies, not only of this planet, but of the entire universe.

Chapter Six

The Time For Mutation is Now

It is one thing to envision and formulate, even in their most general outlines, patterns of a new society, and quite another thing to propose "directives" for action during the long and possibly tragic process of transition from the present state of mankind to a global and harmonious condition of all-human existence. Deeply discontented and rebellious individuals, and even more the oppressed and/or starving people of the Earth, long for, or insistently demand action. But what kind of action and at what level? In terms of violence, or of slow political and diplomatic efforts using present-day institutional procedures to radically transform the institutions, or of a vast non-violent crusade hoping to disintegrate resistances and overcome social inertia by the magic of dramatized "love" — or if these modes of **outer social activity** are considered ineffectual, impractical and at least partially self-defeating, can we place our faith an **inner process of transformation**? If so, what does this inner process entail?

It should be quite clear to anyone able to think unemotionally and with the slightest historical sense that the imposing of ideals by violent action is a self-defeating operation. Revolutions have changed political structures and to some extent economic procedures by removing forcibly most of the members of the ruling elites, and they have given to another class of people the opportunity to rule; but such a change has always proven to be mostly external. Even when ultimately successful in an outer sense, violence at first breeds more violence, more terror; the basic human drives and the quality of interpersonal relationships are not transformed, at least not for a very long time. If they are even partially transformed or transmuted it is because some groups of persons are able, under the new social conditions, to radiate a quality of being which can demonstrate objectively its usefulness in reconstructing **in a new way** some of the old values which had been lost in the climate of destructive violence.

We see a good illustration of this process when we look back to the centuries which followed the total collapse of the Roman Empire in the West under the onslaught of Germanic "barbarians." After the breakdown of large estates using slaves and the destruction of waterways and other socio-economic mechanisms of production, and with the cities mostly in ruins, confused and distraught people having sought refuge in the country found themselves in many places without even a rudimentary knowledge of agriculture. In the slow process of reconstruction the Benedictine monasteries, which began to be formed here and there during and after the seventh century A.D., became small islands of safety and human reconstruction in regions left in chaos. Soon afterward, the Celtic monks from Ireland, who had accepted Christianity willingly without destroying what had been Celtic colleges, journeyed to Europe and they also established chains of monasteries which served as places of refuge and re-education while spreading the spirit of Christianity.

These various monastic centers surrounded by villagers to whom they offered security in case of frequent attacks by marauding bands became the "seeds" of the Christian culture of the Middle Ages. This culture united all of Western Europe in a spiritual sense, even under the political pressures of feudal lords forever struggling for power; and it inspired the building of the most remarkable Romanesque and Gothic cathedrals.

Will our Western society also succumb to the onslaught of new "Barbarians," some of whom are in our midst just as Germanic mercenaries were a large part of the Roman armies garrisoned in many cities? Will the Eastern and Western halves of our civilization destroy each other deliberately or inadvertently? Or can we expect telluric changes of major importance, deeply altering the shapes of continents, perhaps as the result of a shifting of the poles, or of some other ecological tragedy producing severe changes of climates? These and other more speculative possibilities have been mentioned. They may not be actualized; yet it seems difficult to see how the momentum of the follies and the blind pride of Western man can be stopped, if no more or less spectacular intervention occurs — which nevertheless would no doubt produce very cathartic results.

There seems to be only one hope for a relatively smooth and progressive solution. It is the hope that the young people who today are seriously involved in their "Great Refusal" to be a party to the type of civilization in which their parents and grandparents operate, will retain their ideals and, developing them in a more mature form, be able to pervade our institutions with their feeling for love, beauty, and peace. The crucial questions are whether or not there is a sufficient number of these young idealists and whether or not their elders, while still in control, will resist any basic change in our "technocracy" and resort to any means to frustrate, pervert or destroy all that menaces their power. Another unknown is the reaction of men returning from Viet Nam — and the result of the drug habit among them as well as among adolescents now in their early teens.

All these factors and the lack of clarity of purpose and more-than-temporary commitments, even among many youths who are aspiring to truly open and love-radiating relationships within a sane society, make one wonder if it is not wiser to be ready for a more or less radical breakdown of our present society — and this not only in the United States. My personal intuitive feeling has been, even before the outbreak of World War I, that our Western civilization has reached the symbolical fall period in its cycle. Many people today expect changes related to a "New Age" more or less validly called the Aquarian Age; and I also believe that in a little less than one hundred years a new cycle will begin. But this is only one aspect of the problem. There is no reason, astrologically or otherwise, to believe that the beginnings of this New Age, or of any cycle, will usher in a general condition of perfect peace, innocence, and ideal togetherness among all men, women and children — who might by then be overcrowding the globe if no catastrophe reduces considerably our world-population. All that might be expected is that these ideal conditions may exist within relatively small groups which in some ways may remain impervious to outer disintegration, as seeds are impervious to autumnal decay.

These seed-groups may resemble what in Biblical lore is spoken of as "the remnant," and also referred to as "the People" (which is also the original name of some American Indian tribes). The allegory of Noah's Ark is also a reference to the existence of seed-groups in which the quintessence of the past is preserved and impregnated with the potentiality of rebirth — **rebirth after a radical mutation in consciousness.**

The universal tradition of a Golden Age during which "gods walked among men" is another symbol of the seed-state — which, when it occurs, is experienced by only a portion of human life on this planet. The ghosts of the disintegrated past linger on, surrounding this Golden Age condition. Even after the seed germinates under the vernal sun, small and frail germs push through the crust of the soil still covered with decaying leaves. **Within the seed,** "gods" — the life-energies and the great symbols of the future vegetation — are present. The life-species is active **in a focused state** within the seed; Man is active within the irrevocably dedicated seed-groups. But mankind may still be floundering in the darkness and materialism outside of it. Still, somehow the power of the seed wins — in due time and season.

A great Parsi Teacher I knew, B.P. Wadia, said some 45 years ago "There is nothing you can do **to** Kali Yuga; but a great deal you can do **in** Kali Yuga". And Kali Yuga represents the Age of darkness, but **also** the period of gestation of a new humanity. No man can stop the decay of a civilization whose cycle is ending. He can only fully understand what this "ending" implies, and make the ultimate choice: to die with the leaves, even if it be a golden death during the "Indian summer" of a culture-cycle — or to experience victory over death in the seed-state of **creative togetherness.**

We should not be sentimental about natural death; this indeed is the great American sickness! A sentimental attachment to useless and obsolete things — or persons — is one of the greatest obstacles to spiritual living. Jesus said: "Let the dead bury the dead — take your cross, and follow me". Every spiritually conscious personage has said more or less the same words; but Western man, through centuries of materialization of ideals and of institutionalized fear, has cringed before the inevitable cyclic change. The only death to avoid is a useless death for a futile and stupid cause, or the type of artificially and meaninglessly delayed death in sterile hospitals. The true and fertile death is that of the seed; for, out of the torn seed, the new plant rises — new, because within this seed a radical mutation has taken place.

Of course, the truth in all that I have just said in symbolic language depends on whether my diagnosis of the state of the world is correct. Many people may believe that our present world-crisis refers only to a serious, but eminently constructive process of readjustment which would leave unchanged the great basic values of our Western civilization, itself the splendid crown of human evolution; and in order to weather the storms what we need is more rationalism, a greater faith in science and technology, and as well in the God-inspired vision of the American Fathers — and the hard work necessary to

convince the whole world that this vision is indeed that of the "New Order of the Centuries" (*Novus ordo seclorum*) and that American technology is the only way to actualize it.

I reluctantly cannot accept this evaluation of our world-crisis, though I came to America from France fifty-five years ago with great expectations and intense faith in the "New World" sung by Walt Whitman. I came to an America very different from what it is today, yet one in which the harsh karma of slavery and of the wholesale destruction or despoiling of Native American tribes was nevertheless inherent, and in which the industrial virus from Europe had already grown to far more spectacular proportions.

If I am right in my present understanding and evaluation of where we stand now, not only in the U.S. but all over the world, what then can those individuals do, who share my sense of value, my vision and my dedication to the task of paving the way for a new world-wide society?

If these individuals have accepted the destiny of the seed-man or seed-woman, what they must do is to become fully open to the process of inner change which will result in a new **mutation** within their total person — an inner change, a transmutation of values, of ideals, of feeling-responses, of one's attitude toward work; work performed with similarly oriented and dedicated individuals in a community of spirit, of mind and of love. This means a revolution in consciousness focused within and sustained by interpersonal group-relationships — and not merely the vague, diffuse, emotional revolution in consciousness glamorized today by writers who probably take much too much for granted.

The focusing of the new life within groups integrated by a clear vision of the past and the future, as well as by the present need does NOT mean isolation from society and lack of concern with social and educational issues which could be significantly modified by any form of social action performed within the range of the institutional structures of our present society. In our quantitative society, number matters. One needs not be over-involved in political issues in order to vote or to support and participate in social and educational enterprises. Even if compelled by the necessities of life to work in offices or factories, the radiation of the presence of a future-oriented and dedicated person can effect subtle but valuable changes. Everywhere the key issue is that of interpersonal relationship — and the main effort is to draw individuals who are in a state of transition and a crisis of consciousness away from the subservience to the taken-for-granted traditions of the past and toward experiences of new **qualities** of thinking, feeling and acting — experiences after which no return to the past is possible.

There is a type of individual person who longs for the challenge of pioneering a "New Age" type of community away from the pull of the big cities and the perversions of the media. Such "communes" are most needed, as matrices for new personal realizations and for the interplay of truly open interpersonal relationships in an atmosphere of cooperative work in a natural environment. They are significant, in terms of the building of a new humanity, to the degree that they are not merely a place of refuge for lost souls and confused minds, but **a field for the transformation of the whole person**. From these

communes more totally dedicated and integrated seed-groups should emerge. But these seed-groups can be formed under any conditions and in any social or racial environment.

The central issue is to bring about an irreversible **mutation in consciousness and in feeling-responses**.

The first step in such a process is inevitably an inner personal discontent with what is. The second step is openness to and assimilation of new ideas and enthusiasm for stimulating and mind-transforming symbols and images — which leads most often to meeting an "exemplar" and inspirer, and perhaps a guide. The third step is to allow the new realizations, the transforming relationships and the work in common to repolarize in depth all that one has been, and above all the ego that had so long sought for constant self-assertion and glorifying self-images which other persons were called upon to reflect, if not to admire or worship.

Very little can be done alone. Even the seemingly solitary and lonely "genius" depends upon the dynamizing power of human relationships. Even the guru needs chelas to fulfill his destiny. Relatedness is the one basic agent of metamorphosis. The crucial question is what the quality of the relationships will be.

The whole of society is based on relationships. The whole Earth is an immensely complex and integrated field of mutually interacting relationships. Human evolution is a series of changes in the basic character of interpersonal and intergroup relationships. At first, for many millennia man lived and progressed through tribal relationships, much as animals function in colonies, herds or complex societies totally controlled by biological imperatives and compulsive instincts. Then the tribes grew into empires; bloods and minds interpenetrated; and the ego-man arose, jealous of his independence and his relative capacity to control his narrow destiny as an individualized person and as a thinker. Now at least one crucial phase of this revolutionary process of individualization is coming to an end; and it may be a tragic end for a vast portion of mankind, and a radical catharsis for those who will remain as seeds for a future society.

A new evolutionary level of human consciousness is even now seeking to find in men and groups everywhere focal points for manifestation; and at that level the keynote is love — agape, the love of the companions through whom Man may find agents for synthesis and for the harmonization of his myriads of potentialities through cooperative action. This new level of human evolution may not be fully activated in the centuries to come; there may be sub-cycles within larger cycles, and we may witness only the luminescence of early dawn. Yet the challenge is with us, today. It is indeed **within** us. To refuse to accept it can only mean spiritual defeat for the individual person, and in however small a measure, to mankind.

Everything else is secondary. People are in bondage; large classes of men and women suffer agonizing deprivation or senseless outrages to body and soul. Violence stalks the passers — by on the crowded streets and stinking tenements, or the atrocious battlefields. Yet all this is secondary. It is dreadful action followed by passionate but futile reaction —

and this over and over again. It is all part of this necessary, but perhaps unnecessarily tragic, phase of human evolution through which we are living and dying. But **now** is the time for mutation. It is a basic mutation, just as fundamental as that which led tribal man to form civilizations where minds and individuals learned to think, to question, to gain personal independence, to assert their ego-will and yearn for personal power and lustful excitement.

The mutation of love. The magic power of harmony. The changing, beautiful patterns of togetherness. Creative togetherness. Creative of all-human tomorrows within the vast field of an Earth whose boundaries extend far beyond the merely measurable and merely physical. The beautiful field of a cleansed and transfigured Earth.