

THE NEED FOR A PUBLIC PHILOSOPHY

AFTER reading the comments of Bayard Rustin in "The Clinical Society" (MANAS, Aug. 19), I was stimulated to carry the argument a bit further and explore the possibility of bona fide action, apart from the frustrating action of the Negroes to date. Even though their actions thus far seem purposeless and, according to the newspapers, promulgated by hoodlums (I don't believe this), mostly property has been the target of their wrath, as nobody has been badly hurt. They seem restrained to me, considering their justified hate. But they are *acting*, while we rest in our sick apathy. Mere words will not solve the problem, and it seems certain that if the problem is to be solved at all, so that we can set a proper example to the rest of the world, showing that we are civilized, it will be because they were willing to act rather than accept the soothing words of the intellectuals and politicians of our land. Our society will become great, or founder, on this issue, for we should be the most advanced and civilized Western nation faced with this problem, and how we solve it will have lasting effect on the rest of the world.

I particularly liked the reference to the "psychotic break," as it can be the end-point of the direction our present solutions are taking us. The present riots which we have been referring to are evidences of irrational behavior that do not totally disrupt society, but nevertheless they pop up at unexpected (to some) places and keep happening; they certainly do represent the premonitory symptoms of a greater sickness underneath, requiring therapy now, or the organism will go relentlessly onward to total disruption, a terrible racial conflagration so bloody that it will make South Africa appear as a Sunday School picnic. This no doubt could then spread to the rest of the world. Certainly much of the South Asian struggle and most of the African unrest is on the

basis of color, and needs little to make the situation much worse.

As yet, we have not had the psychotic break; but it is as possible as it would be in an individual who manifests irrational behavior before he loses his sense of reality. In the past evidences of the break have been the great wars, but it seems that the direction of our disease is such that it leads away from wars as our generation knows them, which may be a reason for thinking our present "defense" expenditures are also unreal, and this money can be better spent elsewhere.

What potential do we have to solve this problem? It will not be done on the individual level, changing what people feel in their hearts, for we would have too long to wait, possibly two generations for the strong feelings in people that the race issue generates to be willed out; love for each other will not occur spontaneously overnight in all but a few people, as sudden conversions are rare. The in-betweens will have to be educated and the hard-heads will probably have to die off. The private business sector? It is continually consolidating in such a way as to provide fewer and fewer jobs that require more and more skill, and thus cannot do a social task of so great a scope. In the steel industry, an area I know, health requirements are stricter, and those who have minor physical defects cannot even get labor jobs (for good reasons in the dangerous, heavy steel industry), because there is a large enough labor pool available to be selective. And those that are hired are not trained or prepared for even the basic problems of labor in such an industry. They have little or no idea what the work is like. They *could* be prepared for it, as is done in Swiss education, for even in such a heavy, dirty industry as steel there is interesting, challenging work that could be made dignified. But with seniority the keynote of union policy the normal job attrition at

the top of the labor force is not enough to make a dent in the labor pool of the youth coming of age. It is not just a problem of race. There are many whites and others who cannot get a job and who are just as restless as the Negroes.

Because of the apparent lack of planning in American industry, our operating managers who are very well qualified and surprisingly social-minded are often frustrated as well, for in spite of their best efforts they end up with obsolete capital goods because of what future markets may be. Their jobs become more difficult when they are forced to do on-the-spot maintenance while working at their highest capacity; this is expensive, and wasteful, but when production is at a low level, when they are not producing, or producing little, they dare not spend money on maintenance to keep men on the job, for the stockholder wants dividends no matter whether the industry is producing or not. Since these highs and lows of production are not predictable, even some of the older employees are forced into periods of idleness. Apparently, this is built into American capitalism because of lack of planning (or poor planning), to say the least. I mention this, because even though I feel that the corporation is still one of the best ways of doing business (producing goods), we still must learn how to live with it, and also we must realize that in reality its importance is diminishing as a great social force, and it can never provide enough jobs to cure the sickness we are now blessed with. Planning would help it do a better job, as has been done in France, for the economy is too complex to give these behemoths a free rein.

For the same reasons, the union position is also declining in importance, and unions are just as frustrated as everyone else; they are not the potent social force they once were. Their efforts, too, benefit a few at the expense of many. It seems to me that they spend their time "picking nits" when they could be considering the social consequences of their, at times, restrictive policies, and the fact that most of their efforts

force industry down the road of automation, not only because of increased labor costs. To me, the most characteristic factor of unions and union membership is a stultifying apathy, and their only concern is to nurture their own little segment of society, to feather their own nests, as it were. Management seems to me to be more socially motivated (at times in the wrong direction), but frustrated by the middle ground they must tread between the union and its members and the top management-stockholder complex that controls the purse strings. This is not to criticize any particular party; unions have a reason for existence, and the corporation must make a profit to stay alive, and therefore, no major effort seems forthcoming from this area to solve such a great social issue. The issue must be confronted on a higher level, and this sector brought into line. Unions, too, have discriminated horribly, and even if they didn't, there still wouldn't be enough Negroes put to work to matter. Finally, there are those who feel that it should not be necessary to *have* a job in order to exist reasonably and with dignity in our society. Who handles that one?

Most thinking Americans, who have self-awareness to some degree, realize that the measures instituted thus far cannot hope to make gains for the Negro, for as Mr. Rustin so ably illustrates, the goals are unreal—and actually the Negro has lost ground. All the efforts so far seem to "raise the neck hairs" on our more aggressive friends who already are polishing up their firearms and buying ammunition. Soon, everyone's frustration-tolerance will be passed, as is the Negro's now, and individuals will cease to matter—only color will be the consideration. The recurring theme of my thinking friends seems to be that only education (by the great educator mentioned in the Aug. 19 article?) on a scale radically different from what we now have, of both white and black alike, offers any hope. We feel that no one—white or black—is being prepared for the society of the future in this country, or the world, for that matter. People will have to be trained, not only so that they can

flourish as productive members of society, but also in such a way that they can rise above selfish aims based on color, creed, membership in organizations, nations, and not by totalitarian means that stifle the creative instincts dormant within us.

Education is in the public domain. It will require major revisions in its emphasis and techniques that only the federal government can instigate and coordinate, but not necessarily control. Our restless, troubled youth who are the main actors in the present racial dramas in the big cities, must also, besides being educated in the basics, be given tasks that can be coordinated somehow with this education—tasks that will give them dignity and purpose, make them proud to be citizens of this country and the world. This cannot be done on the state or local level. And neither political party is offering anything new along this line, speaking only of old shopworn platitudes of political expediency that turn one's thoughts away from real solutions. New thoughts are not always necessary, for some of the things instituted by Franklin Roosevelt could be resurrected and enlarged upon, especially if time has proven their worth. We must remember that much of what he instigated had only started when the war began. It seemed worthwhile then, but has never been resumed. He had people who were idle *doing* something, at least until they had to don the uniform.

Certain ideas of action would be better than our present tendency of injecting moralistic ideas of righteousness into American politics and the race question. If you travel our country by road you realize immediately that the new superhighways are only a scratch on the surface of the blight of our cities and countryside. These beautiful roads lead from dismal city to dismal city, bypassing towns made dismal because they have been bypassed. They lead to many undeveloped areas blighted and abandoned by industry, economically so sterile that they cannot absorb in any way the people they could bring for

tourism, for instance. The Appalachian area is one of the natural beauty spots of our nation, yet it is the worst off economically. The same can be said for most of the northernmost states, such as Maine, northern Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota. I believe the Pacific Northwest could use some economic impetus as well. There is much to be done in city and town, and the impetus and planning have to come from the federal government, as there is no other social institution to do it. I think of one FDR innovation, the CCC (I see where Sen. Humphrey has now brought it up again), which could be enlarged to include an educational program (voluntary) composed of both cultural and vocational subjects, along with a works program to beautify the country. This would give our youth a chance to prepare for the future; at the same time they would be working at a task they could consider useful and worthwhile, as it would make our country a better place in which to live. There are unlimited variations that can be worked out on this theme, even though it might smack of the "work through joy" of Hitler and the "New Lands" of the Communist countries. But it may be that there is some good in the other fellow's programs, even though his goals may not be the same as ours. These programs can be studied to evaluate their worth, as they are probably well chronicled.

Of course, this type of program would involve (to carry our idealism a bit further) a reduction of our unrealistic defense expenditures and a drastic revision of our foreign aid to pump-priming rather than the give-away tactics which support unrealistic ideological battles far from our shores. We should think a little like De Gaulle, especially in such a nationalistic world as we have today. These monies could be diverted to such a program without disrupting the economy too much, as it certainly would not cost anything like what the defense expenditure does, and the program could be geared to absorb those people put out of work by the defense production cutback until other vocations could be found for them. It doesn't seem to me that our economy can

go on and on having defense contracts forever shoring it up; some plan has to be evolved for transition to peacetime economics or we'll never become peaceful.

To carry the clinical analogy to its completion, we can diagnose the illness of our society as an imbalance and disorganization in many areas. This is a great country; but we have a crying need for public works both in the cities and the countryside, as well as treatment from the gross imbalance we find in the realm of human behavior. The American Dream is not fulfilling the real needs of our people, except for a fortunate few; economically it serves a majority, possibly, but we are not just economic entities. And then there is color. The current turmoil is overt evidence of erratic behavior of our sick society, and the things being tried now to correct this misbehavior are the old defenses against *dysorganization* and are not solving the problem; if things seem quieter, it is because these old defenses are repressive in nature, and the disease will inevitably pop out some other place, with more force because of the repression. We are nearing the fourth and fifth level of *dysorganization* (using Karl Menninger's classification so clearly defined in his book *The Vital Balance*), the level of violence, loss of identity, loss of reality awareness, with complete destruction of the individual (society) being possible. Societies do behave as individuals, and as with individuals, outside help is needed, or tremendous introspection and self-analysis. We are not ready for a supra-national institution to interfere, as no government has that much faith in what exists in this realm, so the federal government must be its own psychiatrist and patient, submitting itself to some serious soul-searching and analysis: it is possible that the impetus for such a change will come from the impending election, for people may realize how little we have to do with how our country is managed, as the choice presented to us now is really one of status quo or a step backwards—not much of a choice. And certainly the Negro may

be the fulcrum of this effort, for it is his action that is making us aware that we can't go on the way we're going. His gains will be our gains, and they won't be only economic; whatever benefits his situation will benefit ours, as we are all in the same boat. And he's not gaining now, he's losing, according to Mr. Rustin, or any astute observer. The present course of Negro action coupled with our apathy (the rest of us who stand by, passive) could lead to a national suicide via a huge racial convulsion as serious as any atomic holocaust, for it, too, could become world-wide.

Since we are at the peak of nationalism in the world today, and we are the most affluent nation, a leader morally and economically, we have the race issue presented to us as no other nation has it, and our government must be the one to instigate these needed changes. No doubt we can survive or perish on this one single issue, because of our professed leadership which voices loudly ideals of freedom. Suggesting ideas as we have here may lead to stimulation of thought by others which can produce practical solutions. Too, some things must be tried, or apathy and frustration will reign forever; or, at least until the total disruption occurs. We must not be afraid of making a few mistakes in trying social changes that have more noble intent, for no individual is perfect, nor are his institutions. We must act, and act boldly at times, or attribute all happenings to fate.

RAYMOND J. PY, JR., M.D.

Vermilion, Ohio

REVIEW

MUMFORD ON JUNG

LEWIS MUMFORD'S review-essay (in the *New Yorker* for May 23) on Jung's autobiographical *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections* is a reminder of how few men there are with both the inclination and the capacity to do a survey of civilization when they address themselves to any large question. Mumford succeeds magnificently in this. "The Revolt of the Demons" is an appreciation of Jung, plus review of his book, and it also manages tribute to Freud and an analysis of the insights of these pioneers—insights which go beyond all the conventional accounts of psychoanalysis. Mr. Mumford concludes with some provocative questions:

Will psychiatric care restore our mental balance if the "point of support in 'this world,'" of which Jung speaks, that sustained both him and Freud disintegrates any further or disappears? Will any quantity of tranquilizers, sedatives, and aphrodisiacs make up for the demoralizing absence of meaningful, life-sustaining daily activities? "Our cult of progress," Jung remarks, "is in danger of imposing on us even more childish dreams of the future, the harder it presses us to escape from the past." In that sense, the repudiated "avant-garde" in science, art, and technics turns out to be the rear guard—so many defeated and bewildered stragglers concealing their pathetic rout by counting every loss a victory. What a great number of our contemporaries still mistake for unconditionally desirable advances in modern civilization looks like an excellent prescription for sending mankind to the loony bin.

As for Freud, Mr. Mumford notes that the founder of psychoanalysis, in an early paper on psychotherapy, observed: ". . . it is only by the application of our highest mental functions, which are bound up with consciousness, that we can control all our impulses." With this as a point of departure, we reproduce what seem the most interesting portions of Mumford's "up-dating" of both Freud and Jung:

Our generation, far from accepting this challenge, has acted on the contrary principle; the more rational minds have utilized their intellectual

functions to further the automatism of the Space Age, while those who reject the kind of half-life world that is left have reentered the aboriginal world of the unconscious, returning to a level lower than that of any primitive tribe—the frustrating, inarticulate, demon-haunted state that may well have existed before graphic symbols or words had yet been formed. When Jung directed his patients to their traditional religions in an effort to apply discipline and order to the outpourings of the unconscious, he at least built on a solid historical foundation, though one now badly dilapidated. But only those who are still firmly attached to traditional values and historic continuities can guess what sort of effort is actually needed to transcend the limitations of both worlds in their present extreme forms.

Once we read the lessons of Jung's life and teaching correctly, we shall perhaps understand why the advances of science and technics have cheated us of their original promise, for they have led to the increase of predictable, mechanically perfect order, automatically spreading over and dominating—for a price—every aspect of our existence. Not only that, but they have brought on devastating eruptions of the unconscious, along with wholesale collective regressions into more infantile modes of life. The more objective and efficient the control on one side, the greater the subjective disruption on the other. The demons that seventeenth-century science promised to exorcise have returned even in exact science, all the more dangerous because they are concealed under the sterile garments and surgeon's mask of science itself. In any detached appraisal, the rocket with which we propose to shoot a man to the moon has the same degree of rational utility—or, rather, irrational futility—as the Great Pyramid, an equally superb technical achievement, by which an Egyptian Pharaoh proposed to secure his passage to heaven. As for the current dreams of "human improvement" prompted in biological circles by suspiciously hypermanic excitement over DNA, who but a Nobel Prize winner would now be so innocent as to trust a Nobel Prize winner with their execution? The very readiness to spring such proposals at the first hint of the possibility of direct genetic control over human breeding indicates severe psychological disqualifications—including a crass lack of historical awareness and objective self-knowledge.

There is abundant evidence in *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections* that Jung understood the development to which Mumford refers. But since his vision of the human "soul" was not religious,

his "reflections" are not tinged with bitterness, nor are they an expression of disillusion. Jung saw that the inevitable penalty of being human is to objectivise the distortions of our psyche in society; and, conversely, that it is none the less possible for the individual to find his way through the labyrinth of his self-made destiny and to emerge with greater maturity and depth of insight. Jolande Jacobi, in *The Psychology of Jung*, summarizes Jung's attention to the distressing developments described by Mumford by showing that Jung was well aware of "the predominance which our reason, our onesidedly differentiated intellect, has gained in the West over our instinctive nature and which expresses itself in our highly developed civilization in a masterful technique that seems to have lost every connection with the eternal depth of the psyche."

The way of religion is not the way back, however; nor will it be easy. In this respect Henry Murray has written:

In several other respects those who undertake today's great task of transformation are at a decided disadvantage: (a) they cannot seriously claim (without being committed to an asylum) that they are the chosen spokesmen of God's revealed purpose; (b) their advocated course of action is not appealing to self-interest, since the goal (world peace) is not within the reach of the private faith and works of single individuals; and, if finally attained by an immense collective effort, its benefits are more likely to be enjoyed by others (posterity) than by those who toil and suffer for it now; (c) since the goal (an institution to prevent war) can be established and maintained only by the rulers of the various sovereign states, it is, above all, these (often insensitive, aggressive, and myopic) rulers of these traditionally vain, amoral social units who constitute the ultimate target of the transformation process: (d) the realization of the goal will depend on the determination, wisdom, patience, and exertions of all the major powers—which introduces a radical psychological difference, since no single nation, inflated with self-esteem, can claim the credit: every power must be prepared to share the glory of this superlative achievement; and (e) as yet, no specifically inviting images of realizable rewards—convincing illustrations of mutually advantageous and enjoyable reciprocations between peoples of different

nations—have been proffered. For the chief motivators of constructive efforts, therefore, one is left with threats of punishment (atomic hell-fire). ("Unprecedented Evolutions," *Daedalus*, Summer 1961.)

Jung's acute awareness of the multiple possibilities of psychic reality made him wary of over-simplified affirmations. In other words, as a younger man, Jung had *intellectual* sympathy for certain religious attitudes, but he was not attracted by group beliefs which he found lacking in the qualities which finally made him adopt a philosophy of immortality. Jung never became "converted" to any structured faith, but his "thinking through" of religious questions enabled him to separate the wheat from the chaff.

So Jung, in a philosophic sense, was a true optimist—which is nowhere better illustrated than in his view of "boundlessness in thought":

Our age has shifted all emphasis to the here and now, and thus brought about a daemonization of man and his world. The phenomenon of dictators and all the misery they have wrought springs from the fact that man has been robbed of transcendence by the shortsightedness of the super-intellectuals. Like them, he has fallen a victim to unconsciousness. But man's task is the exact opposite: to become conscious of the contents that press upward from the unconscious. Neither should he persist in his unconsciousness, nor remain identical with the unconscious elements of his being, thus evading his destiny, which is to create more and more consciousness. As far as we can discern, the sole purpose of human existence is to kindle a light in the darkness of mere being. It may even be assumed that just as the unconscious affects us, so the increase in our consciousness affects the unconscious.

The decisive question for man is: Is he related to something infinite or not? That is the telling question of his life. Only if we know that the thing which truly matters is the infinite can we avoid fixing our interest upon futilities, and upon all kinds of goals which are not of real importance. Thus we demand that the world grant us recognition for qualities which we regard as personal possessions: our talent or our beauty. The more a man lays stress on false possessions, and the less sensitivity he has for what is essential, the less satisfying is his life. He feels limited because he has limited aims, and the result is

envy and jealousy. If we understand and feel that here in this life we already have a link with the infinite, desires and attitudes change. In the final analysis, we count for something only because of the essential we embody and if we do not embody that, life is wasted. In our relationships to other men, too, the crucial question is whether an element of boundlessness is expressed in the relationship.

COMMENTARY

THE HIGHER LIFE

IT is time to start putting two and two together in the matter of religion, and religion in the schools. What, for example, is wrong with teaching "religion" in the schools? If you put together what A. H. Maslow is quoted as saying in "Children," and what Carl Jung is quoted as saying in "Review," you get a fairly clear view of this issue. It becomes plain that the kind of religion that must be kept out of the schools is *sectarian* religion—religion which gives easy answers to hard questions, which encourages comfortable compromises on what Jung calls "the decisive question for man."

Sectarianism fears the honest questioning which authentic religion requires. It cannot tolerate the possibility that truth may be found by means not known—or at least not used—by the denominational religions of our time. It claims the prerogative of defining what is appropriately called religion and what is not. This, in a free country, is intolerable, and impermissible in the schools.

Let us rename—for our purpose here—Dr. Maslow's "peak experience." Let us call it an experience of the "heroic" in human beings. For the fact is that behind heroic men are the visions of the good which make them able to be heroic. In general, the role of church religion is to make people feel satisfied with their unheroic lives. There are exceptions, of course. There are heroic clergymen who move through their labors, with their eyes fixed on the stars.

How does sectarian religion compensate for its lack of heroism? By emphasizing sin. It teaches a self-abasing humility to balance the psychological ledger.

This was not Jesus' idea. Be ye perfect, he said, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect. The "peakers" have at least some first-hand grasp of what this means. The quest for the "boundless" in ourselves is of the essence of religion, and

philosophy is the *rationale* of the quest, while psychology, in the hands of the new psychologists, is becoming more and more an empirical approach to the same deep hunger in human hearts.

The problem of teaching "spiritual values" and of "religion in the schools" exists only because of the determination of the sectarians—the self-justifying "non-peakers" of religion—to exclude this sort of thinking in relation to religious ideals. We would not have the deadening effects of "secularism" in modern education if the people who claim to represent religion were themselves really free.

CHILDREN

. . . and Ourselves

EDUCATION IN RELIGION

THE lectures of A. H. Maslow on "Religions, Values, an Peak-Experiences," along the lines of earlier material which appeared in *Toward a Psychology of Being*, are exploratory in many directions. Yet it is no surprise that Dr. Maslow's reflections on the Supreme Court decision on prayer are very like those expressed in a series of articles printed here. We quote from his Introduction:

Some months after the Supreme Court decision on prayer in the public schools, a so-called "patriotic" women's organization—I forget which one—bitterly attacked the decision as anti-religious. They were in favor of "spiritual values," they said, whereas the Supreme Court was destroying them.

I am very much in favor of a strong church-state separation and so my reaction was automatic. I disagreed with the women's organization. But then something happened that set me to thinking for many months. It dawned on me that I too was in favor of spiritual values, and that indeed my researches and theoretical investigations had gone far toward demonstrating their reality. I had reacted in an automatic and reflex way against the *whole* statement by the organization, thereby implicitly accepting *their* erroneous definition and concept of spiritual values. In a word I had allowed these intellectual primitives to capture a good word and to put *their* peculiar meaning to it, just as they had taken the fine word "patriotic" and contaminated and destroyed it. I had let them redefine these words and had then accepted *their* definitions. And now I want to take them back. I want to demonstrate that spiritual values have naturalistic meaning, that they are not the exclusive possession of organized churches, that they do not need supernatural concepts to validate them, that they are well within the jurisdiction of a suitably enlarged science, and that therefore they are the general responsibility of *all* mankind. If this is all so, then we shall have to re-evaluate the possible place of spiritual and moral values in education. For, if these values are *not* exclusively identified with churches, then *teaching* values need not breach the wall between church and state.

The Supreme Court decisions on prayer in the public schools were seen (mistakenly, as we shall see) by many Americans as a rejection of spiritual values in education. Much of the turmoil was in defense of these higher values and eternal verities rather than of the particular prayer as such. That is to say, very many people in our society apparently see organized religion as *the* locus, *the* source, *the* custodian and guardian and teacher of the spiritual life. Its methods, its style of teaching, its content are widely and officially accepted as *the* path, by many as the *only* path to the life of righteousness, of purity and virtue, of justice and goodness, etc.

To seek the essential psychological meaning of religious affirmation and experience is to make a novel approach to the relationship of religion to society. As Maslow puts it, non-sectarian thought removes the confinements of tradition from the original affirmations of great teachers of humankind; further, by understanding of the universality of "peak experiences" the "dichotomy between higher and lower is being transcended." Dr. Maslow continues:

It is equally possible to call a peak-experience or any other "serious" experience *either* a reaching up to the heights *or* a depth-experience which is profound, which probes to the roots and the foundations. This is true in the sense also that "mind" or "spirit" or "spiritual values" do not soar some place "higher" in space or "above" the body, the animal, the instincts. A whole school of psychologists now believe that "spiritual values" are *in* the organism, so much a part of the well-functioning organism as to be *sine qua non*, "defining-characteristics" of it.

I do not wish to be understood as reducing religion—either theistic or non-theistic—to a code of ethics only.

These perspectives need to be translated or rendered in such a way as to reach the minds of the young before they are grooved by conventional religion—either led into sectarianism or by reaction made to reject any concern with "spiritual" values. Dr. Maslow writes:

If you will permit me to use this developing but not yet validated vocabulary, I may then say simply that the relationship between the Prophet and the Ecclesiastic, between the lonely mystic and the (perfectly extreme) religious-organization man may

often be a relationship between peaker and non-peaker. Much theology, much verbal religion through history and throughout the world can be considered to be the more or less vain efforts to put into communicable words and formulae, and into symbolic rituals and ceremonies, the original mystical experience of the original prophets. In a word, organized religion can be thought of as an effort to communicate peak-experiences to non-peakers, to teach them, to apply them, etc. Often, to make it more difficult, this job falls into the hands of non-peakers. On the whole we now would expect that this would be a vain effort at least so far as much of mankind is concerned. The peak experiences and their experimental reality ordinarily are not transmittable to non-peakers, at least not by words alone, and certainly not by non-peakers. What happens to many people, especially the ignorant, the uneducated, the naïve, is that they simply concretize all of the symbols, all of the words, all of the statues, all of the ceremonies, and by a process of functional autonomy make *them*, rather than the original revelation, into the sacred things and sacred activities. That is to say this is simply a form of the idolatry (or fetichism) which has been the curse of every large religion. In idolatry, the essential original meaning gets so lost in concretizations that these finally become hostile to the original mystical experiences, to mystics and to prophets in general, that is, to the very people that we might call from our present point of view *the* truly religious people. Most religions have wound up denying and being antagonistic to the very ground upon which they were originally based.

Psychologists and sociologists have had little difficulty in observing in orthodoxies the often ridiculous contradictions of the original teachings, but they find it hard to apprehend the validity of genuine value-seeking in a metaphysical context. The "third force" psychologists are such precisely because they are beginning to over-ride the contemporary anti-religious orthodoxy, and the discovery of both "pure" religion and unbiased psychological science may be largely in their hands.

After noting the inadequacy of conventional religion, Dr. Maslow makes similar criticism of conventional psychoanalysis:

Freudian psychoanalysis does not supply us with a psychology of the higher life, or of the "spiritual life," of what the human being should grow *toward*, of what he can become (although I believe psychoanalytic method and theory is a necessary substructure for any such "higher" or growth psychology). Freud came out of the 19th century, mechanistic, physical-chemical, reductionistic science and there his more Talmudic followers remain, at least with respect to the theory of values and everything that has to do with values. Indeed this reductionism goes so far sometimes that the Freudians seem almost to say that the "higher life" is just a set of "defenses against the instincts," especially denial and reaction-formation. Were it not for the concept of sublimation, that's what they would have to be saying. Unfortunately, sublimation is so weak and unsatisfactory a concept, that it simply cannot bear this huge responsibility. Thus psychoanalysis comes perilously close often to being a nihilistic and values-denying philosophy of man. (It is fortunate that any really good therapist in practice pays no attention to this philosophy of man which may not be worked out scientifically for another century. It is true that there *are* interesting and exciting developments in psychoanalysis today but they are coming from the unorthodox.)

FRONTIERS

Community and Individuality

DURING the early months of this year, Victor Paschkis, first president of the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, was touring Europe, preparing a report on autonomous approaches to the problem of "social responsibility" on the part of little known communities. Mr. Paschkis' first letter, printed in the *SSRS Newsletter* for March, brought word of his encounter with "one of the Communities of Work, near Lille, in Northern France, which manufactures wooden doors and windows." Dr. Paschkis wrote:

These Communities are worker-owned. But the peculiar and interesting situation is, that in these communities the workers *elect* their management. The president is elected by simple majority vote of all fulltime worker-owners. The president appoints the foreman, etc., but on the principle of "double confidence": all managerial appointments must be acceptable both to the president and to the workers' representative. In case of overflow of work, extra help may be taken on, but there are severe limitations as to how long and how many temporary workers can be employed.

Such communities of work exist since before World War II; this one community which I visited comprises about 80 workers and was started immediately after the end of the war. The several communities have an exchange of experience and staff services through a center (*Entente Communautaire*). Output per man hour is appreciably higher than in comparable "conventional" factories.

That a Utopian realization can be persistent, even in our time, has been demonstrated by the Communitarians since the early '40's. The evolution of the Communities of Work in France affords an inspiring example of such a determination, in this case related to the desire of a small manufacturer to create a productive community in which men could build a different kind of society around a different economic system. From a small beginning in 1940 in the town of Valence, in the South of France, this communitarian movement has spread to include

more than one hundred and fifty autonomous groups—where the distinctions between employer and employee have been systematically erased, where both capitalism and the concept of a proletarian dictatorship have also been eliminated.

Marcel Barbu, the founder of Boimondau, was a manufacturer of watch cases, a man who had been an assemblyline worker, a "union man," and finally the owner of a few machines in a piecework home industry situation. After the fall of France in 1940, the whole economic system was in turmoil and the obvious difficulties of life created an atmosphere conducive to the experiment of a small, self-reliant, economic society. Barbu's aim was not simply to produce the goods needed to allow workers to make a decent living, but to improve productivity sufficiently to "earn" free time for the participants, instead of increased capital. Barbu's first colleagues were not specialized industrial workers, but men free enough or determined enough to attempt such an experiment. Within three months, the original group had established its first success: they gained nine hours on a forty-eight-hour week, and, true to their original intent, decided to use the "earned time" for education. The community, in other words, paid each member to educate himself in the time saved by increasing production, by conscientious care of machinery, etc. The workers were willing to forego, at least for the time being, the opportunity to raise their material standard of living, so that their collective energy could be devoted to a greater intellectual and artistic development.

Within two years the community grew to ninety persons. They hired the best teachers they could find to offer the courses they wanted. Eventually, Barbu turned over his ownership of the machinery and his lease of property to the community, and, although he agreed to accept reimbursement, this was to be without interest—for an "unearned" income was anathema to the philosophy of the communitarians. The first articulation of the communitarian philosophy, it

should be noted, embodied some sweeping transcendental overtones. Following is a brief statement of the Boimondau philosophy:

1. In order to live a man's life one has to enjoy the whole fruit of one's labor.
2. One has to be able to educate oneself.
3. One has to pursue a common endeavor within a professional group proportioned to the stature of man (100 families maximum).
4. One has to be actively related to the whole world.

Since these communities were not to employ commonly accepted notions of authority in management it was imperative to generate thinking which would encourage individual responsibility and definition of a common "ethical minimum." (Here, too, we see the capacity to philosophize emerging among men who took to this task with native enthusiasm.) The "common ethical minimum" was described by Barbu and his colleagues in this way:

The mission of man is to improve, transform, and perfect nature and to draw the best out of it for the good of all men and of himself.

This end is considered sufficient by materialists. Christians accept it as intermediary goal. They feel they have the same mission, since they know that they will not reach their ultimate goal (to glorify God) without having achieved this intermediary goal. Therefore, there was unanimity as to that goal which was recognized as common to all, and this without misunderstanding, still less compromise.

The most complete account of the origin and development of the Communities of Work is to be found in *All Things Common*, an excellent book by Claire Huchet Bishop (Harper, 1950). Summarizing the remarkable persistence of these efforts, Mrs. Bishop writes:

It should also be clear that in a Community of Work though it is work itself that is common to all, it is not so as an established, ineluctable fact. A Community of Work does not mean plant community, enterprise community. The members might decide to do something else. The work, the plant, the field (there are rural Communities), is but the *economic expression* of a group of people who wish to search

for a way of life better suited to present living conditions and to a fuller expression of the whole man. It is true that there is no Community of Work without work but the work comes second in the title: "We do not start from the plant, from the technical activity of man, but from man himself." I have seen Communities of Work where people wanted to live communitarianly long before they had decided what kind of economic expression, work, they would tackle. The mere agglomeration or juxtaposition of workers in a factory does not make a Community of Work.

To be a part of a Community of Work one has to wish to enter much more than a collective business relationship. A Cooperative Grange League Federation Exchange member, in America, for instance, may have a sense of collective business relationship, even ownership as a co-operator. The aim is still profit, savings, returns, whatever it is called. It is ownership divided among many instead of a few. The ownership of many may become as important financially as a private ownership and necessitate delegating power to a manager and investing "savings" in bigger and bigger business. This is a statement, not a criticism.

In a Community of Work accent is not on acquiring together, but on working together for a collective and personal fulfillment. Of course, "objects" must still be made. Communitarians make them. In our present world, more and more objects are made, through mass production. Communitarians make them that way. They aim at a style of living which, far from relinquishing the advantages of the industrial revolution, is adapted to them. When asked why they get together, people in Communities of Work have different answers which, I found, all amount to this: "We want to be men."

These Communities of Work have developed an effective form of government, reaching from "grass roots neighborhood group" to the elective office of the "Chief of Community." But government office is not regarded as a symbol of status, and those who serve return immediately, following their tenure, to equality with other members. In other words, the *functions* of government and management are respected as functions, with varying results according to the qualities of the persons chosen. The saturation of the whole Community with this philosophy, over a period of years, makes it comparatively easy for

oversights or injustices to be accepted; in the long run, the communitarians are convinced that injustices within their Community balance out, and that to suffer a temporary disadvantage because of someone's poor judgment is merely to endure an inevitable condition of human life. Whatever happens is to be converted into a deeper understanding, into knowledge that will prevent one from making the same sort of mistake when he is raised to authority. This maturity of attitude has proceeded so far that the transgressor of Community rules is regarded as providing an opportunity for the other members to learn from his mistakes; the "wrong-doer" has contributed to the total fund of experience, and this will increase the Community's foresight and wisdom in the future.

It is perhaps because of these psychological factors that the communitarians attempt a continual evaluation of each member's worth to the Community—admittedly a risky procedure. A General Council establishes a "social rating" every three months, which is put on a bulletin board, then discussed and evaluated on the next occasion. Mrs. Bishop describes the scope of the social rating:

People who work industrially together are not single entities. In the family, each one, in his own way, is also working and his work has value for the Community. The Community of Work does not comprise only those who work in the factory (men and women) but also the wives and the children at home. The Community of Work is a community of families. The work the wives do at home is Work; housekeeping has professional value to the community. In addition wives can also contribute to the Community socially. So, like the industrial producers, they are rated professionally and socially and receive an allotment on their total human value. As for the children, they grow, and that is work too. So they too have to be "paid." They are so paid the moment the physician recognizes conception. A sick person who follows the doctor's instructions is paid. The work of a sick person is to get well.

The social value includes the courses followed (physical intellectual, artistic, philosophical, religious), the sense of fellowship, mutual aid, the

ability to perceive the common good and work for it, the sense of responsibility, and the work performed at the Community Farm.

Suppose one has been rated unfairly on the bulletin board because of misunderstanding or prejudice: What of it? To find encouragement in learning to deal with such an "unjust" situation in a mature fashion is a spur to personal growth. From the beginning, Barbu's companions saw the need to guarantee each member the right to speak his personal annoyance in frank and open terms—"to wash each other's heads," as the French say. The complete freedom of speech between the companions and Barbu created confidence, and this psychological relationship has been maintained throughout the various stages of complexity in internal government. The communitarians saw the necessity for a special discipline in this area. Special times were set apart during the week for liberating sessions—psychological explorations—and this brought understanding that each portion of the person's nature, even the querulous and petty portion, could receive its due expression at the proper time.

What was important was the individual himself. Each "therapy" session, each political meeting, each performance of an elective task, could be seen to be the opportunity for initiation into a deeper level of human understanding. From the outset, this conception of progressive growth into responsibility was regarded as a basic aim. No one entered the communitarian group without a three-month novitiate, nor before he had been unanimously accepted, and it seems to have been honestly believed that these "rites of passage" were as much for the protection of the new applicant as for the Community. The communitarians were not in a hurry either about production or about attaining their lofty aims. Psychological time, and not physical time, was of the essence. The people learned how to "make haste slowly."

Some broad generalizations respecting the achievements of the Communities of Work are offered in Erich Fromm's *The Sane Society*:

While many of the arrangements and principles of the Communities can be questioned and argued about, it seems nevertheless that we have here one of the most convincing empirical examples of a productive life, and of possibilities which are generally looked upon as fantastic from the standpoint of our present-day life in Capitalism.

They contribute to our knowledge of the possibilities of a new style of life. They also show that most of these communitarian experiments are executed by men with a shrewd intelligence, and an immensely practical sense. They are by no means the dreamers our so-called realists believe them to be, on the contrary, they are mostly more realistic and imaginative than our conventional business leaders appear to be. . . .

Most interesting is the solution they have found for a blend between centralization and decentralization which avoids the danger of chaos, and at the same time makes every member of the community an active and responsible participant in the life of the factory and of the community. We see here how the same kind of thought and observation which led to the formulation of the theories underlying the modern democratic state in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (division of powers, system of checks and balances, etcetera) was applied to the organization of an industrial enterprise.

Dr. Fromm later turns to the question of whether "conditions similar to those created by the communitarians can be created for the whole of our society." It may be, however, that the inspiration to be gained from the study of the communitarians is of a sort which each person may apply for himself, regardless of his personal situation; for here, as in other manifestations of the truly pioneering spirit, the inter-personal context is turned into a means by which the individual can acquire greater maturity as a human being.

The perspective of Utopia, in other words, is "real," if we acknowledge that man can never be fully defined without reference to his desire to span the gap between the world that is and the

world that might be. When the environment presses against ideals, one can fight back; but how much more satisfactory it is to fight *forward*—on ground one has reserved as one's special province of responsibility.