

\$1.50

New Age Politics



The Emerging New Alternative
to Marxism and Liberalism
by Mark Satin



New Age Politics

The Emerging New Alternative to Liberalism and Marxism

'Inevitable?' asked Delores.

'Unless the human race can bring itself to abandon the goals and values of civilization, in other words, unless it can break the consumption habit — and we are so conditioned to consuming as a way of life that for most of us life would have no meaning without (it)'

— spiritualist to cowgirl, in Tom Robbins,
Even Cowgirls Get the Blues (1976)

Social institutions and social practices are not . . . inevitable. A variety of social institutions are viable within the framework set by biology. It is up to human beings to select those that foster the life styles they most value.

— Eleanor Maccoby and Carol Jacklin,
The Psychology of Sex Differences (1975)



Fairweather Press

A Non-Profit Publishing Cooperative

2344 Spruce Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada

Copyright ©1976, 1977 by Mark Satin.
All rights reserved.

This book may be reproduced, in whole or in part, for non-profit distribution only.
Or with the permission of the author (he's easy).

First printing: November, 1976
Second printing: December, 1976
Third printing: February, 1977

Cover drawing by Suzanne Soldan of Seraphics Artists' Guild (care of Ariel Women's Books, 2766 W. 4th Ave., Vancouver, Canada). Cover design by Alan Senszaki of *What's On Magazine* and CKVU-TV (Apt. 6, 1870 Yew St., Vancouver). Drawing on p. 8 by Maggie Shore, 1836 Arbutus St., Vancouver. Drawing on p. 33 by Suzanne Soldan. Drawing on p. 46 by Emily. Drawing on p. 66 by Marie Kellar of Seraphics Artists' Guild.

Distributed by:

Fairweather Press
2344 Spruce Street
Vancouver, B.C., Canada

Books may be ordered in bulk (five or more) for 90 cents each, postage prepaid.

Also by Fairweather Press (in preparation):

Marilyn Kalman, *Granville Street and Other Poems*

Bob Varlin, *Riders of the Storm: The Crisis of Male Sexuality in the Birth of a New Age*

Fairweather Journal, periodical (care of Doug Dobyns, General Delivery, Mayne Island, B.C.)

Canadian Shared Cataloguing in Publication Data

Satin, Mark Ivor, 1946-

New age politics : the emerging new alternative
to Marxism and liberalism.

1. Civilization, Modern - 1950 - 2. Social
values. 3. Radicalism - North America. I. Title.

CB428.S385

910'.03'09



Contents

Preface, 5

Part I: The Prison Within Us

- (1) A New Kind of Politics, 9
- (2) The Six-Sided Prison, 12
 - (A) Patriarchal Attitudes, 12
 - (B) Egocentricity, 14
 - (C) Scientific Single Vision, 16
 - (D) The Bureaucratic Mentality, 18
 - (E) Nationalism, 20
 - (F) The Big-City Outlook, 21
- (3) Racism: A Product of Capitalism — or of the Six-Sided Prison?, 23

Part II: The Prison Perspective

- (4) Tri-Level Analysis: How to See Through to the Prison, 25
- (5) History as if People Mattered: The Stages of Human Development, 26
- (6) The Monolithic Mode of Production: How the Prison Is Institutionalized, 30

Part III: On the Prisoners Themselves (On Ourselves)

- (7) Are We Economic People — or Self-Developing Persons?, 34
- (8) Is Our Main Enemy the Capitalist Economy — or the Stroke Economy?, 39
- (9) Should We Look to the Proletariat — or to All Those Who Love Life?, 41
- (10) Are We Suffering from Exploitation — or from Negative Symbiosis?, 45

Part IV: The World Beyond the Prison

- (11) New Age Society, 47
- (12) New Age Alternatives, 50
 - (A) Androgynous Attitudes: The Alternative to Patriarchal Attitudes, 50
 - (B) Spirituality: The Alternative to Egocentricity, 51
 - (C) Multiple Vision: The Alternative to Scientific Single Vision, 53
 - (D) The Cooperative Mentality: The Alternative to the Bureaucratic Mentality, 54
 - (E) Localism, Regionalism, Internationalism, Universalism: The Alternatives to Nationalism, 55
 - (F) The Human-Scale Outlook: The Alternative to the Big-City Outlook, 56
 - (G) The Biolithic Mode of Production: The Alternative to the Monolithic Mode, 57
 - (H) Cooperative Nonviolent Defence: The Alternative to Military Defence, 59
 - (I) Freedom to Give All We Wanted to Give: The Alternative to the Stroke Economy, 61
 - (J) Love of Life as a Social Value: The Alternative to All Class Distinctions That Are Based on Achievement, 62
- (13) New Age Political Economy, 63

Part V: Breaking the Prison Down

- (14) The Ballot, the Bullet — or a Cooperative, Nonviolent, Evolutionary Movement, 67
- (15) The Three Stages of New Age Becoming, 71
 - (A) Personal Change, 71
 - (B) Group Work, 73
 - (C) Cooperative Nonviolence, 74
 - 1.) The Message of the Deed, 75
 - 2.) Mass Noncooperation, 75
 - 3.) Mass Responsibility, 76
- (16) Beyond Hope and Despair, 77

Appendix: Are We Life-, Thing-, or Death-Oriented, 79

Bibliography: New Age Politics, 81



Preface

For my friend Gary, there's liberalism (hiss), Marxism (yawn) — but there's also 'what's happening'.

The thesis of this book is that there's a whole new coherent worldview emerging out of 'what's happening', and that this worldview necessarily includes a new politics.

The purpose of this book is to describe this new politics, a personal politics in the sense that it starts with us and our needs (whoever we are) rather than with anybody-but-us a la SDS 1969, and gradually works outward from there. . . .

(Hmmm . . . better make this a little more clear.)

More and more of us have, over the last 10 years or so, become deeply involved in feminism, spiritualism, new forms of therapy, the ecology movement, and other, similar movements. At the same time, though, the radical political movements of the late 1960's seem to have collapsed.

Could there be a connection?

I believe that the radical political movements declined as soon as they began to promote, in North America, a dogmatic Marxism that overstressed our need for things and failed to speak to our deepest needs, which are cultural, psychological and spiritual. And I believe that these other movements rose partly, at least, because they did contain a politics that did speak to our deepest needs.

But it was only an implicit politics, hard to see at first. And it was doubly hard to see just because it was so new and different from the politics that had gone before.

The purpose of this book is to make this politics explicit; to draw out, in some detail, its analysis of society (Parts I-III), its alternatives (Part IV) and its strategy for change (Part V).

Its purpose, in other words, is to describe the emerging new alternative to liberalism and conservatism, Marxism and anarchism.

In doing so it draws on the writings of nearly 200 New Age thinkers and activists: feminists like Marge Piercy, spiritualists like Chogyam Trungpa, psychologists like Abraham Maslow, therapists like Philip Slater, ecologists like Tom Bender, economists like E.F. Schumacher and Robert Theobald, sociologists like Peter Berger, neopacifists like Gene Sharp, New Age theoreticians like Theodore Roszak, and unclassifiable geniuses like Ivan Illich and Lewis Mumford.

My hundred most important references are listed in the Bibliography. Nearly three-fifths of them have been published since 1972.



I've begun to call this politics 'New Age politics' because so many members of the movements mentioned above have begun using the term 'New Age' themselves in their work. And I've begun calling it the 'Prison Perspective' because it finds that at the root of our troubles is a cultural complex whose six main elements make up a 'Six-Sided Prison' that traps us all.

In Part I I try to name and describe the six sides of the Prison: patriarchal attitudes, egocentricity, scientific single vision, the bureaucratic mentality, nationalism, and the big-city outlook. Capitalism and socialism are, I argue, both rooted in the Prison, as are racism, militarism, ecocide, etc.

In Part II I propose a method, 'tri-level analysis', for seeing all the way through to the Prison. I look at history as if people mattered more than changes in governments or economic systems. And I argue that the Prison is institutionalized by the 'monolithic mode of production' which creates effective monopolies not for its brands but for its products (such as mass-produced white bread or ^{pvt autono} rapid transit).

In Part III I argue that we're primarily Self-developing persons, not economic people. I look at what happens to us as persons in Prison society. And I propose a class analysis that sees people not as ruling-class, bourgeois or proletarian, but as life-, thing- or death-oriented.

In Part IV I try to suggest what the world beyond the Prison, 'New Age society', might be like.

And in Part V I argue against elections and revolution as strategies for getting us out of the Prison, and I propose instead a plausible scenario for a cooperative, nonviolent, evolutionary movement of a new type. I close by arguing that living a life of love in our culture of things and of death is an essential political act.



This isn't the first time that a post-Marxist, post-liberal political philosophy has begun to take shape in North America.

In the 1920's, black people were beginning to work out an original alternative to Marxism. But the black intellectuals were (according to black writer Harold Cruse) 'so overwhelmed at being "discovered" and courted' by white Marxists that they allowed their insights to degenerate into a pampered cultural vogue (the Harlem Renaissance), meanwhile accepting political leadership from these same white Marxists (14, 52 & passim. Note: numbers in boldface always refer to sources that I've numbered in the Bibliography). And many activists in the mid-1960's were trying to work out an 'independent' analysis of North American society — see, e.g., Greg Calvert and Carol Neiman's attempts to identify a 'new working class', later expanded into a book, **A Disrupted History**, 1971 ('disrupted' by Leninism); or the 1965 Student Union for Peace Action (Canada) literature list, which included pamphlets by McLuhan, education reformers, neopacifists and therapists, as well as by Marxists and liberals.

But then came Vietnam, and most of us, me included, began to want to come up with an analysis fast — an analysis that could tell us exactly what was happening and why and exactly what we should do about it. There was only one such analysis in town — Marxism. And so many of us became Marxists. But since Marxism did not and could not speak to our deepest needs — and since it was often simply wrong (see esp. Chaps. 1-2 below) — by the early 1970's most of us had begun to associate 'politics' with rhetoric and guilt, and had wisely left 'politics' behind.

If the experiences of the blacks and of the '60's activists can teach us anything, it is surely that we have got to learn to look at the world with fresh eyes and from our own point of view (cf. 94, 145). That, at any rate, is what I am going to try to do in this book.

(The New Age position is closer to anarchism than to Marxism or liberalism, but it differs from anarchism too in many ways, among them the following: anarchism is rooted in the socialist tradition, New Age politics in an amalgam of traditions of which feminism, ecology theory, Eastern spiritualism and Western psychology are probably the most important; for anarchism the 'main enemy' is capitalism, for New Age politics, the Prison ((which predates capitalism by hundreds of years)); most strains of anarchism believe in the 'ultimate necessity' of revolution and violence, New Age politics is uncompromisingly evolutionary and nonviolent — though it does believe that evolution can be speeded up; see Part V below.)



My last book was an autobiographical novel (83). I wanted to try to do for men what Doris Lessing, Anais Nin and others had done for women, to write as personal and honest a book as I could, and writing it made me cry, made me sick, made me swear that the air was 'thick with the dead', and made me cling to people as if I was drowning. So I looked forward to writing this book partly just because it would have to be 'objective' and almost formal, with lots of research, references, etc. (the 60,000-word version even has footnotes). But don't let that fool you: I feel passionately about every sentence in here, and every idea is rooted in my direct experience.

I was born in New York City in November 1946, Scorpio rising (and Scorpio setting). I was brought up by an artist and by a liberal college professor in small towns in the Midwest and in the South and for a long time I was a liberal too: civil rights worker, VISTA volunteer (domestic peace corps), good grades. All this changed with the war, and with my introduction to Marxism and (especially) to Marxists, who seemed to have all the answers I so desperately needed. In this phase of my life I was an underground journalist, president of an SDS chapter, and a draft resister — I started the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme and a hostel for resisters in Vancouver. (I was also a straight journalist, a Teamster, and a government bureaucrat!)

I broke with Marxism in the early 1970's when the 'revolutionary tide' receded enough for me to be able to admit to myself that Marxism didn't speak to my needs, which weren't for more and more things but for friendship,

Self-development and something to live for. Over the last few years I've been involved in many of the movements whose ideas I've freely (and, I hope, with all due acknowledgements) begged, borrowed and synthesized here.



This book couldn't have been written without the help of many people. I'd like to thank Michael Chechik for all those breakfasts at Lynn's Cafe; Michael Chechik, Bob Cole and Marilyn Kalman, for letting me borrow their typewriters; Mike Abbott, for letting me use the typesetting machine at Buy & Sell Press; Mike Burch (of Adams-Burch Ltd., book distributors), for his cooperation and advice; Mac Elrod, for a hundred small favours; Tasi Erland, for her encouragement; and Pam Belyea, Mark Drew, Gary Faigin, Suzanne Fournier, Ross Nelson, Melanie Ray and Elizabeth Shefrin, for giving me places to stay for a while.

For reading parts or all of the manuscript and telling me where to get off, I'd like to thank Miriam Azrael (& other people at Co-op Radio in Vancouver), Bill Blair, Val Blair, Kevin Busswood, Sher Busswood, Michael Chechik (& other people with the Greenpeace Foundation), Bob Cole, Debbie Divine, Doug Dobyns, Mark Drew, Jill Fahrni, Suzanne Fournier, Jack Gegenberg, Tanya Hockley, Robert Jacobs, Linda James, Marilyn Kalman, Mel Macdonald (& other people at An Alternate Community, Lumby, B.C.), Jacqueline Menard, August Miles, Jeannine Mitchell, Laurie Shaffer, Mike Shaffer, Elizabeth Shefrin, Roy Starrs, Sylvia Woodcock, Fred Wylie, and the Tuesday Night Men's Consciousness-Raising Group.

Finally, for gifts beyond words, Lisa Cahn, Gary Faigin, Jacqueline Menard.





Part I

The Prison Within Us



Chapter 1

A New Kind of Politics

Nearly everyone knows there's something deeply wrong in North America today. But how many of us can say just what it is?

If our politics are **liberal**, we might say that people are having a hard time making ends meet financially. But the average per person income in North America is over 6,000 dollars a year now — children included (see the World Bank's 1975 Atlas). Clearly, if we can't make ends meet on that amount of money, then our lifestyles have got to be a problem too.

We might also say that, in addition to the 'financial squeeze', we are just not putting the right men in office. (If we're liberal historians we'd say we've never really put our 'best men' in office. If we're liberal lawyers we might try putting ourselves in office. And if we're militant white liberal men we'd want to try putting black people in office, or women, or even black women!) But all these liberals are assuming that other people ('men in office') can solve our basic problems for us. And anyway, they're begging the question. Why can't we put the

'right' people in office?

On the other hand, if our politics are Marxist, we would surely say that the problem is 'capitalism': a handful of bosses are taking the lion's share of the profits. But most corporations average only 5-10 percent profit per year. A socialist bureaucracy has to spend at least as much on extra administrative costs.

If we are 'forward-looking' Marxists we might then add: It's not just the profits, it's that the goods are useless and the work degrading.

Nevertheless, people are still clamouring for all those 'useless' goods. And consider the fate of those politicians who have dared to call for 'meaningful' work or guaranteed incomes or reducing the work week. Even timid old McGovern got creamed.

'But that's because of all the propaganda in the media, and because of all the advertising'.

But why do people believe the propaganda that they read? Why do they respond to ads for goods that will knowingly harm them? Are we to conclude that North Americans are totally brainwashed — are suffering from 'false consciousness', as a Marxist might put it?

But if we do, then we must also conclude that North Americans **can't be held responsible** for the things they think and do. And then what can we say when a strongman comes along who promises to force people to act 'in their own best interests'? (Like in Russia. Or China.)

(I don't mean to knock the good things about Russia or, especially, China — the barefoot doctors, the decentralization of industry. But **none of the good things are intrinsic to communism**. They have, rather, to do with any serious attempt to break away from the monolithic structures of modern life; see Chap. 6.)

So. Politically we are in a next to impossible situation right now in North America. The liberal analysis leads to impotence and despair — or to a longing for a messiah. (Check out Jimmy Carter's campaign imagery sometime: it made masterful use of our longing for a messiah.) The Marxist analysis leads to bitterness and despair — to an anger that can, ultimately, only be directed back against 'the people' (who know not what they do) through a revolutionary 'vanguard' that claims to represent the people's 'true' consciousness as opposed to their false, or actual, consciousness.

(There are at least 12 **competing** revolutionary vanguards in Vancouver now alone.)

No wonder almost none of my friends are 'political' any more.

And yet, and yet. Any political theory should be able to tell us what's wrong with our society and what we can do to change it. If neither liberalism nor Marxism can do the trick, the point is not to give up in despair, and even less is it to return to other industrial-era political theories such as anarchism and laissez-faire. It is, rather, to work out a new political theory that can help us get our bearings in the post-industrial era that we are now entering. Or, since new political theories always seem to come along just when they're most needed, the point is to look around and see if a new political theory isn't arising already among the supposedly 'apolitical' movements that are at the forefront of our consciousness now.

As I suggested in the Preface, I believe that a new political theory — 'New Age politics' — is emerging out of the work of these movements.

It differs from liberalism and Marxism in many ways. With regard to the discussion above: it doesn't feel that the **personnel** of the system is the problem particularly; in free elections, people do tend to get the politicians they deserve. Nor does it feel that the **economic** system is the problem. As economic systems, capitalism and socialism each have their strong points (freedom and security, respectively); an enlightened capitalism and a democratic socialism would appear to make the most of these strong points; but taken to an extreme, socialism's 'security' tends to become regimentation, and capitalism's 'freedom' tends to become dog-eat-dog.

The New Age position suggests that the basic problem has partly to do with the scale of our society: the human scale is beautiful and nearly everything we have now is much too big (and powerful and speedy). And that has little to do with capitalism *per se*: Russia's SST is even bigger than ours would have been. (The New Age solution does not call for socialism, but for a mixed economy of human-scale enterprises; see Chap. 12-G.)

But even more, the New Age position suggests that the problem is with 'the people' themselves: with us: with what we have become.

And it holds that 'what we have become' goes back to a cultural complex whose six main elements predate capitalism by hundreds or even thousands of years — and are all still present, in greater or lesser degree, in the socialist countries as well.

The elements are: patriarchal attitudes, egocentricity, scientific single vision, the bureaucratic mentality, nationalism, and the big-city outlook.

(Incidentally — none of these elements was 'discovered' by me. They are all touched on by many of the books in the Bibliography. But it may be significant that no **other** element in the cultural complex has been suggested by more than one or two of these writers. And I believe this is the first time that the six basic elements have all been brought together.)

I like to think of the six elements as making up a 'Six-Sided Prison' because a prison is what sociologist Erving Goffman calls a 'total institution' (30) which is a perfect metaphor for what our society is fast becoming — a 'megamachine', to use Lewis Mumford's deliberately ugly phrase (65). (That question of scale again.) Moreover, calling the **cultural elements** a Prison implies that we're trapped not so much by the institutions of the society as by the culture of things and of death that we carry around in our **minds**. Basically the Prison is a way of **seeing** the world, a mental construct (as sociologists would put it) or an illusion (as spiritualists would) that we create every day anew.

And because we create it in our minds, we can undo it in our minds. We can change our consciousness individually and collectively so that we're not Prison-bound.

(Carlos Castaneda's books, e.g., 12, and Doug Boyd's **Rolling Thunder**, 7, are about **seeing** the world differently, which is why they're more revolutionary, for our time and place, than the **Communist Manifesto**.)

And if enough of us do this — if enough of us can break out of the Prison — then **and only then** would the institutions, goods and services that are set up to meet the needs of Prison-bound people lose (the Prison-bound aspects of) their appeal. (I mean, for example, 40-hour-a-week jobs and nuclear families, massproduced

goods and private automobiles, institutionalized medical care and compulsory education.)

Then all the propaganda and all the advertising in the world wouldn't be enough to make (most of) us want to take part in these institutions, or consume these goods and services.

Part V of this book is concerned with **how** we can break out of the Prison - **and with what we'll need to do then**. It deals with what political people call 'strategy'.

But let's not get ahead of ourselves. Our first task is to concentrate on what political people call 'analysis' - on the analysis of the Prison - on what it is and how it came about and how it harms us - so that we can better see why it should be changed and how it can be changed.

I am going to argue - and it is, I believe, the argument that is implicit in the work of the 'consciousness movement' as a whole - that it's **because we're trapped in the Prison** that we are responsible for the destruction of trees, Vietnamese, kulaks, whales, 'capitalist roaders' - you name it.

And we are responsible, ultimately, because we create the Prison in our minds.

It's because we're trapped in the Prison that there's economic exploitation, war, racism, imperialism, eco-catastrophe.

It's because I'm trapped in the Prison that I want this book to be better than yours, that I can't make it sound less rigid than it does, that I couldn't live with lovers while I was writing it.

It's because we're trapped in the Prison that there's liberalism and Marxism.

And it's to help us get out of the Prison that we need a new political theory - 'New Age politics'.



Chapter 2

The Six-Sided Prison

Here, then, are the first four sides of the Six-Sided Prison, in no particular order.

(A) **PATRIARCHAL ATTITUDES.** The patriarchy is a system of power in which — to put it crudely, as it deserves to be put — men rule and women obey. It is the means by which men are able to get women to be their secretaries, make their beds, prop up their egos, and enjoy doing it. Aspects of the patriarchy may be enforced by law or through such venerable institutions as wife-beating; but mostly it's enforced by a series of 'patriarchal attitudes' that we don't even notice.

Patriarchal attitudes are the attitudes, values and beliefs that are supportive of the patriarchy. The patriarchy wouldn't exist for a moment without these

attitudes, which are 'socialized' into us literally from the day we're born in the form of sex-role stereotypes.

For example. Men are taught to be aggressive, independent, rational, objective, intelligent, competent, ambitious, unemotional and detached (84, 6). And women are taught to be pretty much the opposite: passive, dependent, nonrational. . . .

Is it any wonder that men (want to) rule, and that (most) women obey?

We get these stereotypes mostly and most importantly from our parents. Our parents teach us their own sex-role stereotypes that have nothing to do with our own unique temperaments and interests but that lend themselves perfectly to the patterns of submission and dominance that are required by the patriarchy. (They don't do most of this consciously, of course. They do it more by the raised eyebrow and the exasperated voice, and by the example they set as 'mommies' and 'daddies'. See esp. 52.)

But where do our parents get these stereotypes from? Just how far back do they go?

Only one thing is certain: they go back thousands of years before capitalism.

Some anthropologists believe that societies have always been patriarchal in their power relationships. But many years ago Margaret Mead was able to prove that that is itself a patriarchal assumption. She went to New Guinea and reported on tribes that were patriarchal and matriarchal and even androgynous (*Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, 1935). Nevertheless, the overwhelming majority of societies over the centuries — over the millennia! — do appear to have been patriarchal.

There is some evidence that thousands of years ago the world was dotted with matriarchies. And these may have been more than just patriarchies spelled with an 'm'. According to archaeologist James Mellaart, there is strong evidence that in some of them there'd been no sacrifices of any living beings, no violent deaths, and — hard to believe — no wars for a thousand years (16, 78).

Nobody seems to know why these matriarchies ended. Predictably, Marx and Engels say that it happened because women lost control of the means of production. Not so, says anthropologist Helen Diner: we now know of matriarchies that existed in spite of that fact (20, 281-87). Elizabeth Gould Davis, another anthropologist, says that the matriarchies were conquered by power-hungry males (16, 119). Kate Millett, the feminist writer, thinks that it might have had something to do with men figuring out how babies are started (59, 27-28).

In any case, all these writers would agree on the main point: that fairly early on, women had lost whatever position they might have had in society. At different times and in different places, men have indulged in, for example, the practice of footbinding in China, an exceedingly painful practice that only began to end with Sun Yat-sen's revolution of 1911; or, for example, the persecution of 'witches' in Europe and North America, especially from the 15th to the 18th centuries when possibly nine million women were slaughtered — and along with the women, their entire, separate culture (21, Pt. III).

Obviously, in North America today, the patriarchy doesn't produce such horrors. But all things considered, women may not be 'better off today than ever before'. Elizabeth Gould Davis, for one, contends that women have been rendered more and more useless over the centuries, with an ensuing loss in power and in self-esteem (16, 303-05). And even if women are better off today in a material

sense, and are 'allowed to do more', that doesn't mean that the patriarchy runs any less deep or that it does us less harm.

For in any patriarchal society, those of us with XX chromosomes are made to feel powerless, inferior, incompetent, ignorant and unattractive. Or, if we don't feel these things, then we've had to go through quite a struggle to free ourselves from them. (If you doubt this, you'd better check up on 15, 21, 24, 47 & 71, for starters.)

And the patriarchy is almost equally harmful to those of us with XY chromosomes, and not only because power corrupts. The roles and attitudes that the patriarchy requires make it almost impossible for us to love or be emotional; turn us into success objects (as opposed to sex objects — though we can be that, too); keep us out of touch with our bodies; teach us to see women as inferior, and to hate women; and keep us from getting to know our children (84, 8-15). (If you can't see this in terms of your own life or those of your friends, you'd better get hold of 67: 93, Chap. 27; Jack Litewka, 'The Socialized Penis', *Liberation*, March 1974, 16-25; John Stoltenberg's two articles in *WIN Magazine*, 11 July 1974, 12-14, & 20 March 1975, 6-9; and, if you like poetry, 73.)

If we try hard enough and know where to look, we can begin to change our patriarchal attitudes: men's and women's consciousness-raising groups are helping many of us do just that right now. But we can't change our patriarchal attitudes completely unless and until we then go on to change — not capitalism — but Prison society as a whole. For each of the other original sides of the Prison (egocentricity, scientific single vision, and the bureaucratic mentality) **reinforces and perpetuates** the patriarchy: overvalues the 'male' traits of independence, rationality and competitiveness, respectively.



(B) EGOCENTRICITY. In the tradition of Western psychology, 'egocentricity' refers to selfishness and false pride, and to the notion that the world exists for our own, personal benefit. In the tradition of Eastern spiritualism, and in this book, egocentricity also refers to the notion that we are solid and isolated beings, sealed up in our skins like so many tin cans on a shelf.

In this view, egocentricity includes the notion that we 'are' our bodies or our social roles (as opposed to simply consciousness; 75, 122. As Alan Watts puts it, 'I have no other self than the totality of things of which I am aware'; 100, 120).

It includes the idea that we are different from other people (as opposed to the idea that we are all One, we are all pure energy, though we play the game of life in different ways; 74, Chap. 7).

And it includes the idea that we are afraid of losing our egos (or, if we are spiritualists, of losing our egolessness; 98, 70).

There can be no doubt about it: the notion that we are separate from trees, animals, stars, wind, rocks, minerals — from the life that is in all these things (which Rolling Thunder, a Shoshone medicine man, calls the 'Great Spirit'; 7, 52) — is a tragic illusion.

And yet — not only our separation from these things, but our domination of them, has been celebrated in our folklore for hundreds of years (and is celebrated in

Marxist economics; 85, 15).

But if our egocentricity doesn't come from capitalism — where does it come from?

According to Chogyam Trungpa, a Tibetan Buddhist and director of the well-known Naropa Institute in Boulder, Colorado, we should experience life as 'open space', without any egocentricity. And we did, at first, and as infants we still do. But we quickly become too active in this open space, too caught up in it, because we feel it's so inspiring. And our activity in open space causes us to have our first experience of duality — I-it — and it's the experience of duality that causes us to separate ourselves out from the world (98, 67-68, 122-23).

Unlike Trungpa's version of Tibetan Buddhism, Zen believes that our idea of ourselves can be useful (if we don't end up identifying it with our 'real nature'; 100, 120). And Meher Baba, the late, great Sufi mystic and spiritual teacher, is even more 'liberal'. He believes that the formation of egocentricity is a necessary evil. Without it, he says, experience would completely overwhelm us — at first. But as we grow older (he hastens to add), we can transcend and outgrow our egocentricity (79, 55-56).

Whatever their differences, Tibetan Buddhism, Zen and Sufism all seem to agree that egocentricity is a very deep-seated quality in us.

But we shouldn't conclude that it's always been with us.

Until quite recently most Asiatics would have been baffled by the 'civilized' idea of self. So would all those Europeans who, until modern times, stood outside the Judeo-Christian tradition. Traditional North American Indians are still baffled by it.

Probably most people in the world have done without it.

But our ancestors invented it.

Theodore Roszak, a New Age theoretician, says that it goes back to the beginnings of the Judeo-Christian tradition, when God was first seen as being something apart from us (81, Chap. 4). Philip Slater, a psychotherapist, says that it began with the first kings, because they were the first to be seduced into the fantasy of personal power (90, 18).

Either way, the point is that for thousands of years our egocentricity has been doing us all great harm.

It cuts us off from each other.

It keeps us from realizing our obligation to love and respect our environment; and without this love and respect for all things there can be no peace or understanding (7, 52).

It makes us keep wanting to go places, do things, have more. It makes us live in and for the future — or the past. We can never simply be where we are now (75; 98, 70).

It causes us constantly to emphasize our separateness from others through craving, hate, anger, fear and jealousy (79, 60).

It makes us terribly afraid of death (90, 18).

We can try to get out of our egocentricity. Through Yoga, through Zen, and through many other Eastern traditions and disciplines, and through encounter and growth groups, many of us are beginning to lose at least the most destructive aspects of our egocentricity. But we'll never be able to really strip ourselves of our egocentricity unless and until, having embarked on the process, we then also go on to change Prison society as a whole. For each of the other sides of the Prison

reinforces and perpetuates our egocentricity.

Patriarchal attitudes encourage men to be arrogant and women, defensive. Scientific single vision encourages us to see ourselves as the centre of the universe. The bureaucratic mentality encourages us not only to 'get ahead' but to trample on others in the process. Nationalism encourages us to 'get ahead' as a **nation** and to trample on other **nations**. And the oppressive nature of megalopolis encourages us to loathe and fear other people and to separate ourselves from them as much as we can.



(C) **SCIENTIFIC SINGLE VISION.** 'May God us keep, From Single vision and Newton's sleep' — William Blake.

Scientific single vision (or the 'scientific outlook') is a way, our way, of seeing the world. It's the way that most of us think about things, including ourselves, 'life in general' and the material in this book.

Scientific single vision is intellectual rather than sensuous, active rather than receptive, analytic rather than intuitive, verbal rather than spatial. It tends to be more interested in argument than experience, more interested in understanding things sequentially (in terms of cause and effect) than as patterned wholes, more concerned with time than with eternity (70, esp. 83).

In North America, it's the outlook *par excellence* not only of scientists but of doctors and lawyers, politicians and revolutionaries, businessmen and scholars — of nearly everyone who's managed to 'make it big' outside of the arts. Which is, maybe, why most of us are convinced that it's the **only** way of seeing the world, of getting at 'the truth'. People who come up with other ways of seeing are usually called 'crazy' or worse.

But are they?

Over the last 10 years or so, many of us have begun to discover whole cultures that share in an alternate way of seeing the world. Zen, Vedanta, Sufism, North American Indian culture — whatever their differences, each of them seems, in its way of seeing, to be the polar opposite of the scientific outlook: sensuous rather than intellectual, receptive rather than active, intuitive rather than analytic. . . .

At the same time, many recent investigators have begun to gather evidence that the two sides of the brain are specialized for different modes of consciousness. The left side of the brain is, apparently, specialized for analysis, verbal facility, linear time-orientation and the like; the right side of the brain for pattern recognition, spatial orientation, holistic thinking and the like (70, Chap. 3).

So the reality would appear to be that, not only do different ways of seeing exist, not only do some of them go back thousands of years, but that these alternate ways of seeing are rooted in the workings of the right half of the brain just as much as scientific single vision is rooted in those of the left.

Even in science's own terms, the alternate outlooks are as real and as valid as the scientific outlook!

The real question is, why is our culture so 'crazy' as to promote — to be partially based on! — an outlook that requires us to ignore the signals that are coming to us from the right side of our brains.

Theodore Roszak traces the scientific outlook back to the ancient Jewish belief that people who worshipped objects were being abusive of God (who was supposed to be invisible). According to Roszak, the Jews were simply suffering from a cultural misunderstanding; they didn't realize that for the peasants, God was manifest equally in all things. But the damage was done: from that point on, things began to lose their transcendent qualities and became merely objects to be manipulated (80, Chap. 4).

And that was only the beginning. Later we would come to actively dislike the natural world. According to Joel Kovel, a psychohistorian, this dislike began when we learned to dislike our feces (for as we became more 'civilized' we began to practice some pretty wicked versions of toilet-training); but it quickly and inevitably spread outward to all natural things (45).

Soon it was only a matter of time before we devised a system for subduing and punishing nature (as opposed to simply working with her), and cutting ourselves off from her as much as possible. According to Roszak, the most important step here was taken by Galileo, for he did more than any other person to define the 'real' world as only what could be precisely defined in physical terms: if it couldn't be counted, it didn't really count (80; & cf. 79, 71-72). According to Lewis Mumford, a cultural historian, the turning point was Copernicus's discovery that the earth revolves around the sun (and not vice-versa), for that appeared to give us the cultural authority to dominate everything everywhere (64, 29).

Either way, the point is that the scientific outlook arose well before capitalism, and that, because it was so narrow, it's done us all great harm. (In North America, it's begun to do us more harm than good.)

It's cut us off from other dimensions of reality besides the physical (92, 46).

It's helped us forget that after all the 'objective' facts are in, we still have to make moral choices and value-judgements (79, 75-76).

It's led to our worship of machines and of technique.

It's led to a situation where the human scale is lost, and 'progress' means mostly destruction.

It's led to a society made up of mostly unrelated specialties and specialists.

It's led to a separation of means and ends in almost every aspect of human endeavour.

It hasn't even delivered on what it promised in its own terms. We haven't understood the material world 'with absolute certainty' by ignoring our subjective experience of that world. We haven't understood human nature by describing it statistically. We haven't understood history by reading it 'scientifically' (79, 74).

Many of us are trying to expand our scientific outlooks now by immersing ourselves in Eastern disciplines or in encounter and growth groups or by working on our bodies — by getting back in touch with the sensuous, intuitive, holistic side of ourselves. We're not going to be able to change ourselves deeply, however, unless and until we also change the other sides of the Prison. For each of the other sides reinforces and perpetuates the scientific outlook. Patriarchal attitudes, for example, teach us that the traits that are associated with the scientific outlook are male traits, and therefore the ones we'll need if we want to make it in society. And the bureaucratic mentality has given that teaching the irresistible force of truth.



(D) **THE BUREAUCRATIC MENTALITY.** Bureaucracies are organizations that are run from the top down and that see people, us, as means to the bureaucracies' own ends (above all that of self-preservation). When bureaucracies are important in a society, as they are in ours, they naturally and inevitably tend to foster a kind of consciousness in us that I have come to call the 'bureaucratic mentality'. According to sociologists Peter Berger (3, Chap. 2) and William Howton (36), some of its key elements are:

- 1.) Status consciousness. Everybody has their place — 'above' or 'below' you.
- 2.) Depersonalization. Everybody comes to see themselves as things, objects, numbers.
- 3.) Predictability. Everything is done by means of 'regular procedures' that are known in advance.
- 4.) Orderliness. Everything is supposed to fit neatly into some category. (If it doesn't, we might just pretend that it doesn't exist — like we did with the patriotism of the Viet Cong.)
- 5.) Efficiency. This is not only the highest social value, it is the greatest metaphysical virtue.
- 6.) Arbitrariness. Rules and rituals are followed because they are supposed to be followed — because they are there.
- 7.) Discipline. Everybody is supposed to abide by the rules, or else.

If the bureaucratic mentality is a 'natural and inevitable' result of the rise of bureaucratic organizations, it can't be blamed on human nature. But it can't be blamed on capitalism either. For bureaucratic organizations (and their accompanying mentality) go back thousands of years. According to Lewis Mumford, they go back 5000 years, to Egypt and Mesopotamia (65, 199-201). According to Howton, they go back 'only' 2000 years, to Rome, because the Roman bureaucrats were the first to know that they owed their power to their offices, rather than to God (36, 89-90).

But bureaucracies have by no means appeared everywhere since Rome, or at all times. Why, then, does bureaucracy appear everywhere in the 'civilized' world in our time?

It certainly doesn't have much to do with our need for large, hierarchical organizations. It has a lot more to do with the improvement in the skills of organizations and in the ability of organizations to grow, unchecked (after the 17th century or so) by any values that were not Prison-bound (cf. 6; & see Chap. 5 below). Possibly the only change in our demand for large, hierarchical organizations came as a result of the growth in strength of the other sides of the Prison: patriarchal attitudes caused us to become more domineering; egocentricity, more ambitious; and scientific single vision, more arrogant. And 'important', centralized and hierarchical organizations are nothing if not a means for allowing us to be domineering and ambitious and arrogant (in our different ways) (cf. 6, 18).

Is there really any need to repeat out loud some of the harmful things that have been done to us by the bureaucratization of society, and by the bureaucratic mentality?

To begin with, take another look at those seven key elements of the bureaucratic mentality. Every single one of them encourages us to lose sight of our humanity in the interests of a 'higher' logic. Every single one of them encourages us to think of other people as a means — or, worse, as 'sand in the gears' (36, 40) — rather than as vulnerable, valuable, and unique human beings. (And communism, far from solving this problem, actually makes it worse, because it relies on bigger organizations; 6, 172).

Bureaucracies have become so big that they can't even deliver on some of their own values (efficiency, predictability, orderliness).

The fact that bureaucracy is impersonal makes it seem objective — a cardinal virtue for Prisoners, as we saw in the section on scientific single vision — and so the public interest naturally comes to be redefined as part of the private interest of bureaucracies (36, 44). (Look at our 'defence' policies!)

To work well, bureaucracies seem to require Prison-bound personalities (see Chap. 8) — people who aren't able to have warm and open personal relationships, and who are therefore apt to translate their frustrations into personal ambition or into 'serving the people' (cf. 6, 53).

But it isn't even a question of bad, or rather frustrated, individuals. No matter how life-loving we are, our consciences will be diminished at the point where we enter a bureaucratic structure. What happens is this: when we enter an authority system — or when we're living in one! — we no longer see ourselves as acting out our own purposes. We come to see ourselves as agents for others. The psychologist Stanley Milgram calls this the 'agentic state', and he argues that when we're in this state we no longer see ourselves as responsible for our actions (58). Which goes a long way towards explaining why so many of us are psychologically able to sell cars that are built to break down in five years, work strip mines, and murder each other.

The not-at-all-dead weight of the bureaucracy, then, and of the bureaucratic mentality, would seem to be overwhelming. Nevertheless, over the last 10 years or so, many of us have tried to extricate ourselves from bureaucratic structures both social and mental by setting up food co-ops, free stores, communal houses and the like.

But whether or not our cooperative ventures were 'successful', I think that nearly all of us were surprised and saddened by the compromises we had to make along the way. (I know I was.)

In our food co-ops, for example, even after the last vestiges of hierarchy were done away with, we still had to contend with patriarchal notions of the sexual division of labour' (so guess who ended up labelling the cheese); with the egocentric desire on the part of some of us to do as little work as possible (often because we had more 'important' things to do), and on the part of others to prove how 'selfless' they were and make the rest of us feel guilty; and with scientific single vision that made some of us approach our co-operative tasks with the same humour and joy that we might more appropriately have brought to the task of dissecting a frog.



The next two sides of the Prison owe their origins to the other four, but they could stand alone now if they needed to.

(E) NATIONALISM. It's natural for us to love our immediate surroundings — town, neighbourhood or countryside — but it takes an artificial effort to make us love a whole nation. It's natural for us to feel loyal to family and friends and to the people in our immediate communities, but it takes special civic training to make us feel loyal to everyone who's supposed to constitute our nation. And it's natural for us to feel loyal to some ideas or ideals that are shared by our friends, but it takes systematic efforts to make us feel loyal to an entire national ideology (32, 9-10).

The trouble is, nationalism seems so natural to us. But it only seems natural because we're living in giant nation-states, and because we're living in the Prison. In tribal society, our highest loyalties were to our friends and to our immediate communities. And even after tribal society was replaced by the great military empires, nationalism wasn't forced on us. All (all?) the Egyptians or Persians or Romans wanted from us was money and soldiers. They didn't want to weld us together into 'one people'. Or at least, they didn't try to. (Would it have even occurred to them to try? Would they have dared to try?)

Well into the 16th century, most of Europe was 'localistic' or 'universalistic' — not nationalistic. The peasants, by virtue of the work they did and the community they enjoyed with each other, were loyal to lord and village. Many religious people and scholars, by virtue of the Christian religion and the Latin language, were 'cosmopolites', the kind of people that dedicated nationalists have always mistrusted (and mistreated — in situations ranging from the 'labour' camps of Siberia to the book review page of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*) (cf. 32, Chap. 2).

In the 16th century, the triumph of Prison values plus new developments in military technology led to the 'emergence' — as they say in the polite history books — of the monarchical nation-state. And the nation-state was nationalist from the very beginning. It had to be and has to be, because it has to convince people to feel loyal to it rather than to their immediate or self-chosen surroundings. (This task was made easier because the Black Death and the schisms in the Christian Church had caused us to lose our faith and become afraid, and so we needed something to cling to and believe in.)

Even so, among all but the intelligentsia, the new nationalism spread slowly; it was given its first big boost by the French revolution. The revolutionary 'patriotes', nationalists, singers of the 'Marseillaise', short-sightedly identified the ideals of liberty and equality with the idea of nationalism. And so they crushed the peasants who tried to fight against the nationalization of the historic provinces of France and the elimination of provincial rights. Then they took their revolution abroad (32, Chap. 3).

Nationalism continued to grow in the 19th century, but mostly in the cities, and mostly even there among those who were rootless (good soldiers but bad workers).

It was primarily in order to foster our nationalism that government introduced the system of universal, compulsory schooling. According to Carlton Hayes, a historian at Columbia, universal schooling was intended primarily 'to unify a people by belittling their economic, social, (cultural), occupational and religious

differences and by emphasizing their national language and the inculcation of a common national patriotism' (32, 86). This strategy was fully justified during World Wars I and II, when there seemed to be a direct connection, in nearly every country on earth, between the number of 'schooled' people and the degree of unquestioning national loyalty (32, 87).

So nationalism has nothing to do with human nature — and nothing to do with political ideologies, either (by 1900 even communism had become a patriotic force). But just because it's been forced on us — has it really done us that much harm? Can we really speak of it as part of the Prison?

From the very beginning, nationalism has served as a kind of vulgarized religion, with its 'sacred' rituals and texts and its missionary zeal. And so we've come to feel that we are a chosen people; that our nation is eternal; that the deaths of its sons add to its glory; that we need to guard ourselves against foreign 'devils'; and so on and on (32, 164-65).

The nation-state has made us insufferably chauvinistic. If we are from big nation-states, we tend, inevitably, to feel that the world revolves around us and that other places, other ideas, other peoples, are of lesser importance. If we are from smaller nation-states, we tend to feel so defensive that often we shut ourselves off from outside influences even more completely.

Finally, nationalism has made us live vicariously, through an abstraction called the nation-state. It doesn't even exist really; try to touch it. It's just a construct that we carry around in our minds (see 22 and 69). If we de-constructed it there — well, if enough of us de-constructed it there — . . . but I don't want to get ahead of myself. The point is this: as it is now, we tend to spend more time caring about 'nationally important' plane crashes and stock market reports than we do in caring about the troubles and feelings of the people in our immediate communities.

Over the last few years, many of us have tried to change our loyalties — at least in our hearts and minds. Some of us have become 'world citizens' through constant travel or through exposure to other ways of seeing the world (I'm a homeless draft resister — I was forced to become a world citizen) (cf. 28, 263-64, 345). Many more of us have returned to a form of localism by doing intensive political work in our local communities or by starting community enterprises of one sort or another.

But we won't be able to lose our nationalism, really, until we leave the rest of the Prison behind. Because the rest of the Prison reinforces and perpetuates our nationalism and our nation-states. Egocentricity, for example, feeds Americans' sense that they are superior human beings, and Canadians' sense that they are morally superior to the Americans. And it makes us want to 'ride roughshod' over our national rivals. Is it any wonder that we can't see the world that's in front of our eyes?



(F) **THE BIG-CITY OUTLOOK.** By a 'big city' I mean any place that has more than half a million inhabitants or so. Because above that size, nothing is added to the value of a city, to its street life, its cultural offerings, its virtue (85, 67). The 'big city outlook' is what happens inevitably to our outlook on life when we end up

living in big cities no matter how 'nice' or 'cosmopolitan' they are.

What happens is this: the very existence of the extra hundreds of thousands (or millions) of people creates enormous problems that we can't get away from — and our big city outlooks are shaped by these problems: air pollution, noise pollution, overcrowding, overspecialization, rootlessness, anonymity, the loss of the human scale (I am deliberately omitting problems like rat control and physical deterioration that could conceivably be solved without reducing the size of our cities).

Because our big cities are so 'modern', so technologically advanced, it's tempting to conclude that the problems they pose for us are new and therefore traceable to 'capitalism' or 'technology'. But nothing could be further from the truth. Huge, oversized cities — 'megalopolises', the city planners call them — go all the way back to Egypt and Mesopotamia, where the first kings, eager to consolidate their new power, managed to replace the decentralized village economy with a highly centralized and therefore primarily urban one — 'centralized', that is, around the kings' needs (63, 34-37).

But big cities have not always been dominant since then. According to Mumford (and to his teacher, Patrick Geddes), they tend to become really big only toward the end of a civilization — which tends to suggest that their overexpansion has less to do with economic forces than with cultural ones (the Prison) (cf. 63, 526). Certainly that is the case today: all over North America, the whole cultural structure of rural life has been collapsing, and people have been pouring into the biggest cities even with no prospects of finding decent work there. The biggest cities — because these provide us (or appear to provide us) with what rural life never seemed to be able to: 'excitement', (vicarious) pleasures, 'real life' — in a phrase, the consolations of the Prison (85, 68-71). (Only by making it illegal for people to move to the biggest cities — as in China — has urban overgrowth been halted anywhere in the 'civilized' world.)

In Mumford's words, 'The persistence of these overgrown containers (everywhere) would indicate that they are concrete manifestations of the dominant forces in our present civilization; and the fact that the same signs of overgrowth and overconcentration exist in "communist" Russia . . . shows that these forces are universal ones, operating almost without respect to the prevailing ideologies' (63, 526).

If, then, the Prison is our jail within, our big cities are our jails without.

For living in a place where endless streams of anonymous people pass us by every day, helps to convince us that human life is cheap (a jailer's mentality). And living in a place where pollution, overspecialization, rootlessness, etc., appear to be unavoidable facts of life, helps to convince us that Prison values are necessary for our survival — that they are, in fact, natural and good.

The big cities that arose in Egypt and Mesopotamia were deliberately designed to bedazzle the residents with the achievements of the so-called divine kings (65, 208-09). The big cities today in their regularity and impersonality are designed to look like machines (though less, I suspect, because of the diabolical nature of our rulers than because of the soulless nature of the Prison).

The monumental architecture of ancient Rome was admittedly designed to over-awe the public. Can't we also say that this is the underlying function of the Toronto-Dominion Bank buildings in Toronto and Vancouver, or the World Trade Centre in New York, or the important government buildings in Moscow and

Peking? Can't we say that the latent message put forward by these massive and inhuman structures is: you, my friend, are vastly insignificant; you are merely a passing shadow on my lowermost windows; so **don't get out of line**. In a phrase, the big cities are big advertisements for Prison society — for its rightness and for its inevitability — advertisements that, by their very scale and by their totality, don't allow for any reply (cf. 81, 419).



Chapter 3

Racism: A Product of Capitalism — or of the Six-Sided Prison?

Several times now I've said that the Prison, as opposed to capitalism or human nature, is ultimately responsible for racism, war, imperialism, ecological destruction. In this chapter I wanted to show **how** the Prison is responsible for one of these horrors. I drew straws (I really did!) and picked racism. To simplify things I'll focus on white racism in North America.

What is racism exactly? Most of us seem to think that it's a prejudice against people on biological grounds (as in 'they have low IQ's'), which would mean that it doesn't predate capitalism. But I think that, if you look at the racists themselves, you'll see that their biological prejudices are really just rationales, excuses, that gave a kind of scientific validity to longstanding feelings of cultural prejudice. (And people would have felt a need for scientific rationales only after the scientific outlook had begun to take hold, after the descent, that is, of the Six-Sided Prison.)

In this view, racism is simply cultural prejudice writ large (and with a scientific twist). And cultural prejudice goes back at least as far as the ancient Greeks (61, 10-13).

The question then becomes, why are we culturally prejudiced against blacks and Indians and chicanos? Why are we so culturally prejudiced that improvements in the economic and educational status of nonwhites may cause us to feel even more prejudiced against them? Why were we culturally prejudiced against nonwhites from the very beginnings of the settlement of North America?

The answer, I believe, lies in the workings of the Six-Sided Prison.

Patriarchal attitudes gave us a precedent for oppression, the oppression of women throughout history and in the family. Black and Indian and chicano oppression is **modelled on** the oppression of women — the parallels are exact and startling (24, Chap. 5).

In addition, the patriarchy gives us an image of masculinity that leads inevitably to racism. For example, most white people with cocks are brought up to believe that the repression of emotion is normal, so they come to look down on people like blacks and Indians who are (supposedly) able to express their emotions more freely.

Egocentricity encourages us to build walls around ourselves, and therefore contributes mightily to our tendency to see nonwhites as 'the other' . . . if not as 'the enemy'.

Scientific single vision causes us to think of the traits associated with the left side of our brains as 'light', and those with the right side of our brains as 'dark' (70, 83). And it causes us to be prejudiced against the traits that are associated with the right side of our brains. And so we think of darkskinned people as sensuous ('lazy'), receptive ('passive'), intuitive ('stupid'), etc.

In addition, scientific single vision led to our mistrust and eventual domination of natural things in the name of a 'higher rationality'; and this led in turn to our alienation from our bodies and to our culture's distortion of natural functions — in plainer words, to our love-hate relationship with shit. And in our culture, as any first-year psychology student can tell you, most of us subconsciously identify blackness with shit, and darkness with 'impurities' (45).

The bureaucratic mentality encourages us to feel that the world is **naturally** made up of powerful and powerless, winners and losers, jailers and jailed — whites and nonwhites. (Bob Dylan's one protest song of the early 1970's, 'Ballad of George Jackson', puts this sentiment perfectly.)

Nationalism requires us to conform to the characteristics of the dominant cultural group. In North America, the dominant group is white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant ('the WASP's'). Minorities that are obviously, even physically, unlike this cultural group are automatically suspect (32, 102).

In addition, the nation-state encourages us to think of other nation-states as 'weaker', 'poorer', 'menacing', etc. And these qualities naturally rub off — in our minds — on the people who are living in these other nation-states.

Megalopolis, overlarge and overbearing, gives us an arena in which all our racial prejudices can be acted out in an appropriately vicious and satisfying manner. (As the Prison gets stronger, the old Roman Coliseum is transformed into megalopolis itself.)

I could go on — and so, I'm sure, could you — but by now I hope my point is made. Racism isn't a 'part of human nature', and it isn't confined to capitalism, either. (Does anyone doubt that Stalin could have carried out the extermination of the Jews, which he'd planned, had he lived? Or that the Communist Party could convince the Chinese in a very short time to fear — and believe in — the 'white peril'?)

The conditions for cultural prejudice are deep-seated in all of us, for they were put there by the Prison. And if we don't change the Prison, changing our economic system or changing our schools won't do much to change our racist attitudes. It might even make us more subtly and deeply racist. For if we pass and enforce 'good laws' our racism might simply be driven underground, to pass out of our conscious minds and live on in the fantasies and symbols that nourish the Prison (cf. 45).





Part II

The Prison Perspective



Chapter 4

Tri-Level Analysis: How to See Through to the Prison

Because it's so pervasive and runs so deep, the Prison isn't immediately obvious to everyone, obviously. In order to see through to it, it helps to keep in mind a method that I call 'tri-level analysis'.

I call it that because it looks at the world on three levels at once. The first is concerned with the passing events of daily life; the second, with economic and political power; and the third, with the Prison itself.

(I didn't invent this method, incidentally. It's been used under other names, or simply intuitively, by many people over the years. In psychology, for example, Daryl Bem has done a 'tri-level analysis' of the levels of belief — he calls them 'primitive', 'higher-order', and 'nonconscious'; see Bem, *Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs*, 1970. And, for example, there's a sociological convention of distinguishing among ideas, ideologies and worldviews.)

To my mind, the greatest practitioner of tri-level analysis (he doesn't call it that, of course) is a French historian, Fernand Braudel. In his magnum opus, *The*

Mediterranean, history moves on three levels at once.

On the first, the most superficial level are the **events** that fill our daily newspaper — elections, murders, wage demands; ‘surface disturbances (in Braudel’s words), crests of foam that the tides of history carry on their strong backs’ (10, 21). This is the level the liberals concentrate on, because it lends itself to irony and can be written about without challenging ‘the sysyem’, any system.

On the second level is the history of **groups and groupings**, of changes in governmental and economic forms (monarchy to democracy, feudalism to capitalism and so on). This is the level the Marxists concentrate on, when they’re not in power.

On the third level, invisible to liberals and Marxists alike, is the history of **structures**. In *The Mediterranean* Braudel focuses mainly on changes in geography and climate, but it’s clear that this level could — and should — also refer to deep-seated changes in states of mind, points of view; in custom and routine; in personality and consciousness (see 34, esp. 519). Therefore, this is the level where the Prison can be found. (Or, as an unemployed Shakespearian actor might put it, ‘Full fathom three the Prison be’.)

This third level of history isn’t impossible to change; but it is the hardest to change. (It’s the level William Irwin Thompson is operating on when he sets out to describe a ‘transformation of culture so large that it isn’t an event any more’; 97, 10.) No wonder most political activists have chosen to ignore it!

And yet — and yet — if it’s true that governments and economic systems determine the nature of events, as the Marxists say, then it’s also true that the third level of history — the Six-Sided Prison — determines the nature of governments and economic systems, and their quality, and the quality of events. If we simply ignore the third level of analysis until ‘later’ we’ll end up with no social evolution at all, in any deep sense. And we may end up with a stronger Prison.



Chapter 5

History as if People Mattered: The Stages of Human Development

Suppose our history books told us that the minds and hearts of people were the determining factors in history, and that governments, economics, and so on, were not so determining. Would our history read any differently? Would it hold out hope for the future?

This chapter is an attempt to answer these questions. It is **only** an attempt, and it owes a great deal to an article by Ivan Illich (38) and a book by Lewis Mumford (66).

Before I begin though, I'd like to say something about the other so-called 'critical' way of looking at history: Marxian dialectics. This method (revolution-evolution-revolution) bears a suspicious resemblance to the process of male orgasm. It would also seem to be an expression of the dualistic consciousness fostered by the scientific outlook: I-it, us-them, either-or, etc. (since if we want to think dialectically, we have to forever be dividing things up and polarizing them). According to Robert Pirsig's philosophical adventure story **Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance**, if we want to understand the world in all its complexity we've got to drop the concept of dialectics altogether. Marx got it from Hegel who got it from Aristotle, who defended it on the grounds that it came before anything else, a statement that's patently absurd. As a matter of fact, dialectics came from rhetoric which is a product of the myths and poetry of ancient Greece — of intuition and imagination, in other words — and it's these qualities we need to bring to history in order to understand it (72, esp. 385).

I'd also like to deal with what I think is the underlying objection to history-as-if-people-mattered. Isn't it true that we emerged 'out of the animal realm' mainly because of our ability to make tools? Isn't it true that our tools in the broadest sense (our technologies and our second-level, governmental and economic forms) have made us what we are? Aren't we — isn't 'man', the saying goes — basically a maker?

Not so, says Mumford. We aren't primarily tool-making, we're primarily 'mind-making, self-mastering, and self-designing' (65, 9). We are in charge of our own Self-development.

And so it's always been. For until we developed a culture, our inner life must have been a madhouse — we wouldn't have been able to recognize a tool, let alone use one. Our first and greatest need wasn't to change the world but to change ourselves, and the only instruments we had for doing this were our own gestures and sounds. The most important thing tools did for us is that they helped us carry food, and freed our mouths for speech.

Speech, language, allowed us to create a symbolic culture, and it is this that got us out of the animal world: not our tools. Many birds and mammals were more proficient with their tools. The unique human achievement was the **shaping of a self** by means of this symbolic culture (a necessary evil even to most Eastern spiritualists — see Chap. 2-B); and from that point on, our main business was our own Self-development (including our own Self-transcendence if we chose; see Chap. 7) (65, 3-10).

The point is this, that in the last analysis we ourselves determine our consciousness. The material world helps, but we're **responsible**.



If I was asked to write a history-in-which-people-mattered-for-more, I'd organize it around two main stages of human development — and I'd argue that we're on the brink of a third stage, or on the brink of destruction.

The first stage is that of **Old-World people**.

By 'Old World' I don't mean Europe before 1492, I mean the world as it existed up to say 7000 b.c. — up to the first city-states. For until then the Six-Sided Prison

hadn't even begun to develop, and we lived by an entirely different worldview.

We worked hard in those days, but not any harder than we needed to. Free from patriarchal power drives, egocentric pride and the like, we didn't think of the world as a project, and we didn't feel a need to pour into our working life the energy that could and did go into sex and play and rituals (androgynous sex — tribal rituals!). We felt that our lives were in harmony with the rhythm of nature and with natural forces, and though we could never have said this if anyone asked, our main effort was to preserve that harmony. A concept like 'progress' or even 'history' would have simply baffled us (cf. 80, Chap. 4).

The second stage is that of so-called **Civilized people**. It has lasted up to our own day and it divides easily into three sub-stages, as follows:

(1) **Classical culture**. At this sub-stage, which lasted for about 8000 years, the first four sides of the Prison came clearly into view.

We began to work not only harder than before, but more compulsively. Not for material reasons (people weren't noticeably better off in this period) but for psychological ones: the descent of the first four sides of the Prison gave us a new sense of our power over things. And we began to identify with our kings. The result was towns, ships, canals (but also war-chariots, pyramids)

But these new things were purchased by the death of the ideal of harmony. And they were purchased by a willingness — almost an eagerness — to forget about many of the games and rituals that we enjoyed so much before. We became more skillful and more selfish, more law-abiding and more vicious. The pace of life intensified, and we began to see life as a burden to be lightened.

(Towards the end of this period, a counter-trend emerged on the level of consciousness, and this counter-trend has continued, in different intensities and in different forms, to the present day. In Classical culture it took the form of large numbers of people becoming very conscious at a spiritual level.)

(2) **Modern culture**. At this sub-stage, the first four sides of the Prison meshed, and the next two came into being. It dates from about the 13th century and has lasted to the present day. More specifically it dates from the Black Death and the schism in the Christian Church — for these things made us feel fearful and betrayed; and in response, we grasped at the sides of the Prison as if we were drowning.

Our new nations, our new cities, our new products and technologies, did manage to offset our loss of certainty; but they also took us farther away from the natural world and from the world of natural behaviour. They took us so far away that we began to love life less and love things more. In time we began to crave the Prison's products mainly because we could think of nothing better to do. And we tore up half the planet just to give ourselves these false gifts (see, e.g., 13). And we worked longer hours in the 20th century than we did in the 13th, and we enjoyed ourselves less, both on and off the job (see 17). (How could Prison-bound people have enjoyed themselves more?)

(3) **Post-modern culture**. At this sub-stage, the Six-Sided Prison has clamped down on every one of us. We're not there yet, but in some parts of the world — in the Soviet Union, certainly, and in some sub-cultures in North America — we're not so very far away.

In Post-modern culture we'll govern ourselves by a completely depersonalized scientific 'intelligence'. We'll be loyal, happy and harmless (we won't be critical, joyful or potent). We'll do what we're told, and we'll do it well.

The third 'stage of human development' is that of **New Age people**, and it's the alternative to sub-stage (3) — in other words, to spiritual suicide. A description of New Age people and New Age society is attempted in Part IV, and here I just want to examine the historical evidence for signs that we may be moving in that direction. (Signs, not laws as in a Marxist reading of history. Giving up that 'certainty' is the price we have to pay for disbelieving in scientific single vision.)

First, following Braudel's lead (Chap. 4), some evidence from geography — from astronomy even. David Spangler, a West Coast spiritual leader, puts it accurately enough: 'Earth moves through 12 ages during the course of 26,000 years as the equinoctial points revolve around the ecliptic through each of the 12 zodiacal signs or arcs. We are now leaving one age and entering another . . . (and it) is not far fetched to assume that (this) may bring about the exposure of Earth and the life-strains upon it to differing energies from the cosmos' (92, 108). If we can develop ourselves enough to be open to these energies, we should be able to break out of the Prison and go on to create something better.

My next two arguments are rooted more firmly in the history we've just been reviewing. They suggest that the Prison is **producing its own gravediggers** by going against deep-seated, third-level tendencies in our hearts and minds.

The first 'gravedigger' is the fact that the Prison has become a threat to our physical survival on earth (because of its 'ecocidal' tendencies and because of its system of military defence). Most psychologists believe that we have an innate, biological need to survive (see, e.g., 26, Pt. II; & see 19). Therefore, our need to survive may help to carry us out of the Prison and into a New Age where our desire to have things can be replaced by something more compelling — by a desire to develop ourselves and to relate to each other in a life-loving manner (see Part III below).

Well — we've always managed to make the right biological adaptations before.

The second 'gravedigger' is the fact that the Prison has taken away our rationale for the inevitable pain and sadness of life. (I don't mean the pain that comes from starving, I mean the pain that comes when, for instance, someone we love dies.) Peter Berger, a leading sociologist, calls this rationale a 'theodicy', and he claims that having a theodicy is an inherent human need (5, 31).

To provide us with a theodicy — to explain, without explaining away, our suffering — is what religion used to do, before we lost our faith and tried to replace it with the Prison's values. However, neither the scientific outlook nor any other side of the Prison has been able to generate an alternate theodicy. There are, of course, secular theodicies, such as national patriotism and Marxism. But while these might be comforting to those of us who face death on the barricades, they're not going to be very comforting to those of us who have heart attacks in the penny arcade (cf. 5, 32). The Six-Sided Prison can't answer our need for a theodicy, and it's our search for a theodicy — for 'something to live for', in the watered-down popular phrase — that's carrying many of us out of the confines of the Prison.





Chapter 6

The Monolithic Mode of Production: How the Prison Is Institutionalized

The Prison doesn't exist **only** in our hearts and minds. It is institutionalized by means of what I call the 'monolithic mode of production'.

(I'm sorry to have to introduce another cumbersome new term, but I couldn't see any way around it since it refers to something cumbersome and all too real. Marx used to speak of the 'capitalist mode of production', but the monolithic mode is common to both capitalism and socialism — it's a third-level concept if anything is! More recently Kenneth Boulding, the economist, has spoken of 'monolithic' and 'polyolithic' organizations, in 6; Ivan Illich of the 'industrial mode of production', in 42; and Lewis Mumford of 'monotechnics', 'polytechnics' and 'biotechnics', in 64; and the 'monolithic mode of production' is a synthesis of their views.)

The 'monolithic mode of production' makes it almost impossible for **alternatives** to exist to the products it creates. In North America, some of its Leading Products are professionalized medical care, massproduced housing, organized religion, nuclear-family child care (see Chap. 8), and universal, compulsory schooling. These products are produced by 'monolithic institutions': the medical profession, the housing industry, the church, the family, the school.

All these institutions are 'monolithic' because they establish what Illich calls a 'radical monopoly' over the production of goods and services. Of course, when we hear about monopolies it's usually Exxon's or U.S. Steel's — some corporation's monopoly. That's a second-level monopoly, a **brand-name** monopoly. Monolithic institutions are third-level monopolies, more deep-seated, more profound, much harder to root out. Their monopolies are those of the **products** they create. Not AMA-certified doctors then but professional medicine, not the Catholic Church but church-centred religion, not the University of California but the university system of higher education — these are the kinds of monopolies that have been produced by monolithic institutions.

The transportation industry is an excellent example of a monolithic institution (see 40). Like the medical profession, the school system, and so on, the transportation industry is a third-level monopoly. Its product is the private automobile (and other speedy vehicles: planes, trucks, busses). Of course, automobile manufacturers don't advertise their product as 'the automobile'. They tell us to 'buy GM instead of Chrysler' and so on. And there are always reformers who are telling us to 'break up GM' and so on. But on the third level of analysis, all the manufacturers, and all the reformers too, are telling us the same thing: without the private automobile, we're diminished as human beings. And our cities

are designed and our society is run on the basis of, you might even say for the convenience of, the private automobile. Our cities are not, for example, designed more compactly so that most of us could walk or bicycle to work if we so chose.

We could say the same kinds of things about all the other monolithic institutions that I mentioned above. It is almost impossible now to build our own homes because of all the building codes (whereas even 30 years ago nearly 30 percent of our homes were owner-built). It is impossible to educate ourselves outside of the government-approved school system (though nearly everyone in education now concedes that learning only happens when people are motivated to learn, and that most of us can only be motivated on our own initiative or on the job — not by school; see 39). It is impossible to exist outside of the job economy if we're not on welfare. And so on. All these things are impossible not because the capitalists have 'pulled the wool over our eyes' (there are probably more exceptions-that-prove-the-rule under capitalism than in the socialist industrial countries), but because the monolithic mode of production is the **natural and inevitable institutional underpinning** of a society whose members are Prison-bound.

To return to our example. If the monolithic mode of transportation were changed to one that gave priority to bicyclists and walkers **tomorrow**, most of us would freak right out. Some of us would hire poor people to wheel us around in carts. (Well — it's been done before.) Almost none of us would be happy. And why? Because the Prison has caused us to feel that it's **important** to get where we're going as fast as possible and with as little exertion as possible and in as 'distinguished' or flashy a manner as possible.

(In this view, providing a 'good' system of public transit would only be compounding the problem. For the problem isn't the domination of 'the private automobile' so much as the notion that we've got to get to wherever it is we're going as quickly, smoothly, etc., as possible. It isn't even speed *per se* that's the problem but the fact that we can't escape from it if we want to be a part of our society.)

This is why I say that the Prison is institutionalized by the monolithic mode of production. It creates a monopoly not only of products but of products that — when they are dominant in a society — reinforce and perpetuate Prison values. And the link between the Prison and the monolithic mode is solid; for it was the Prison that generated the monolithic mode in the first place.

The monolithic mode can be traced all the way back to the beginnings of Modern culture. As we saw in Chap. 5, by the 15th century most people were in no mood to see that the old values (reverence, leisure, play, ritual) needed to be added to, not destroyed. After the Black Death and the splits in the Christian Church, they cast their old values aside and seized on Prison values with a vengeance. Spurred on, then, not by a desire to live more joyously, but by patriarchal fantasies of conquest, egocentric visions and desires, scientific arrogance, and bureaucratic-hierarchical forms (especially the nation-state and the military), they managed not only to develop **but to abuse** standardization, prefabrication and mechanization centuries before the 'industrial revolution'. (Appropriately enough, these monolithic standbys were all first developed in the state-organized military arsenals in an early megalopolis, Venice.) (64, 149).

In North America, it wasn't until the early 20th century that the monolithic mode actually triumphed. Alongside monolithic tendencies had always been the

'polyolithic mode of production' which drew on a pool of tools, machines, materials and processes that went back hundreds or even thousands of years. This 'technological pool' was, in an important sense, our heritage, and it had been passed on from generation to generation by skilled craftspeople and work teams. But when the jobs of these people were finally eliminated (by standardization, prefabrication and mechanization), the technological pool, and the polyolithic mode of production that had depended on it, was of course — hey presto! — eliminated too (64, 154).

The monolithic mode has developed in three main stages (42, Chap. 1):

(1) **Each institution appears to earn the right to achieve a monopoly in its field.** In medicine, for example, around World War I medical school graduates became almost as good as herbalists at curing diseases. That was enough to convince Prison-bound people to identify healing with patriarchal, scientific, bureaucratic, professionalized health care. Professional medical associations were given the power to set standards and limit entry, and herbalists were prosecuted (& see 41).

(2) **Each institution comes to frustrate the end it was originally designed to serve.** In transportation, for example, the creation of faster and faster vehicles led to the creation of greater and greater distances within cities. Soon it was taking people longer to get to work than it ever had before (& see 40).

(3) **Each institution becomes a threat to society itself.** Each institution begins to threaten our physical selves and-or to take on aspects of the absurd. In transportation, for example, 55,000 North Americans were killed on the roads each year, and literally millions injured badly enough to be taken to hospital. Nevertheless, we continued to spend an average of 1600 hours a year on our cars (driving them, earning money to pay for them, parking them, etc.) and we drove them less than 7500 miles a year: less than five miles an hour! (40, 30-31).



Where does all this leave us?

In a situation that finds us beginning to live **through and for** our institutions, as our 'needs' and those of our institutions mesh ever more finely. In other words: in a vicious circle. The institutions reinforce the Prison which reinforces the institutions and so on and on endlessly. Moreover, the Prison and the institutions are continually convincing each other of the (patriarchal, egocentric and bureaucratic) need to grow in scope and in power.

(Look at our metropolitan areas. Look at who gets, or takes, the lion's share of the world's resources.)

Both liberals and Marxists join in the demand to increase growth, even though most of the goods and services we supposedly need now are needed only because the Prison has rendered us so completely dependent on the monolithic mode of production — on institutions doing things **for** us (and because we can think of nothing better to do; see Chap. 5). Neither liberals nor Marxists feel comfortable with the by now routine observation that at least 75 percent of the work we do would be completely unnecessary, were people able to escape the Prison and lead lives in which friendship and creativity were their central purposes. (According to Paul Goodman, the educator, a reasonable subsistence level could be maintained using **one-tenth or less** of the labour-time and money we now use; see Paul and

Percival Goodman, *Communitas*, 2nd ed., 1960, p. 203.)

And there's another problem. Our system of defence, commonly known as the 'war industry', is totally dependent on monolithic institutions — its tanks, its war planes, its military officers and so on, could only be produced by monolithic institutions. If we want to change our monolithic institutions and get rid of the Prison, we're going to have to change our whole system of defence. (Fortunately, there is another viable system of defence, 'cooperative nonviolent defence', and it is described in Chap. 12-H.)

But our military men, most of them, would almost certainly resist this changeover to a new and nonviolent system of regional defence. And so would many of the corporations that provided the tanks, planes, etc. And the military and the corporations between them would always be able to rally a substantial number of people — especially death-oriented people (see Chap. 9) — to their side.

(Please note well that I am **not** saying that 'capitalism' will 'inevitably' keep us from entering the New Age. I am saying that the military and its corporate retainers will probably try. I can imagine the same thing happening in all the monolithic countries, capitalist and socialist alike.)

We can deal with these Strangeloves, if at all, only at the tail end of a cooperative, nonviolent, evolutionary movement of a new type — one that manages to involve the vast majority of us in New Age ways of acting, thinking and being. Part III asks — among other things — whether such an evolutionary movement is even possible for us; Part V asks how it might be brought to pass.





Part III

On the Prisoners Themselves (On Ourselves)



Chapter 7

Are We Economic People — or Self-Developing Persons?

Liberals tend to believe that our need for material things is endless — a belief that obviously helps to justify the monolithic mode of production. Marxists tend to believe that our need for things will eventually be satiated, but they can't say when. . . . (The Marxist psychologist, Wilhelm Reich, still seems terribly avant-garde to Marxists because of his suggestion that sex should be thought of as a basic need.)

What gives us the authority, what gives us the right, to ask people to live differently? What gives us the gall to ask people to live lives where work and consumption would matter much less to them than love and play and creativity?

(There is, of course, the ecological doomsday answer — if we **don't** cut down on our consumption, then . . . — and it is a powerful one; see 2 and 13. But I am looking for an answer that has more positive connotations.)

The question cuts deeply, I think, because those of us who do favour love, play and creativity — those of us who are oriented to life rather than to things or death (see Chap. 9) — are in such a minority. It takes so much of our strength just to keep on believing in our own values and priorities (or even in our sanity. It doesn't occur to most of us that an entire society can be insane; but see Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society*, 1955, Chaps. 1 & 2). Certainly most of us don't try to push our values and priorities on to others.

Marxists, on the other hand, are only too eager to tell us what our values and priorities should be. That's because they're 'true believers' in a system of norms laid down by an authority transcending the individual (26, 20). History, *Das Kapital* and the State are common examples of such an authority.

I believe that if we look, not to some authority, but directly at people and into people, and try to find out what we're like, we'll discover that we all do basically have the same needs — and that these needs aren't being met and can't be met by the way we choose to live now.

I think the most basic thing that can be said about us is that we can't help wanting to live. It's our deepest inner nature to want to live, and it's this that defines us when all else fails (26, 29).

But wanting to live — being alive — is a dynamic concept. It's the nature of all living organisms to develop or die, and people are no exception to that rule. If you want to live, you're not going to want to stand still or regress, you're going to want to evolve. Being alive and developing our potentialities are, then, one and the same thing (cf. 25, 297; 26, 29; & 27, 71; & see also Chap. 5 above, where the same argument is made from the point of view of anthropology).

So — to return to our original question — what gives us the right to ask people to live differently is the fact that we aren't developing our potentialities by working in order to work, and consuming in order to consume. Life is stagnant under these conditions, and the fact that nuclear or ecological disaster threatens simply bears out the rule that if we cease to evolve we die. Most of us have ceased to evolve. Therefore, all of us might die. **And that's not fair.**

Moreover, I want to be able to develop my potentialities no matter what the rest of us might want. And that means having some options in society — more than I do now. But I won't have those options until a lot more of us are turned off of the work ethic (work for work's sake) and turned on to love, play and creativity: turned on to developing our potentialities.

Finally, though I don't want to sound like a good samaritan or anything, I'd like people to develop their potentialities because it's the only way they can get to know themselves and life. I think they'd like it better here if they did that. I know I would.

But what are our potentialities, exactly? And how do we develop them? Could there be any agreement here?

In the next part of this chapter, I'd like to show that in the dynamic process of being alive, each of us goes through (or attempts to go through) a series of seven stages of **Self-development**; and that these stages make up a hierarchy of potentialities — a **hierarchy of human needs**. These seven stages represent a synthesis of the work of seven very different persons: Gopi Krishna, an authority on Kundalini Yoga (31, esp. Chap. 2); Lawrence Kohlberg, an academic-experimental psychologist (44); John Lilly, a neurophysiologist (50, esp. Chaps. 10-17); Abraham Maslow, a 'humanistic' psychologist (54, esp. Chaps.

21-23; 55, esp. Chaps. 4-7 & 11-12; & 56); Ram Dass, formerly Richard Alpert of Harvard and now a Hindu mystic (75); Carl Rogers, the first rogerian psychotherapist (77, esp. Chap. 7); and Chogyam Trungpa, a Tibetan Buddhist (98, esp. pp. 121-48).

I tried to combine the work of Easterners and Westerners, of academics and therapists and spiritualists, because I wanted to come up with a series of stages that could apply to all of us regardless of our temperaments or personalities.



Stage One. According to many different systems of Eastern philosophy, the invisible but very real 'psychophysiological' energy for this stage is centred at the bottom of the spine, and no wonder: it's the stage where our **physiological** needs — for food, shelter, warmth, etc. — are most important (and also our need for sex, to the extent that our sex drive is physiologically motivated).

At this stage we tend to be unwilling to talk about ourselves, close relationships tend to seem dangerous, we try hard not to pay attention to our feelings — and we don't want to change ourselves, either. We tend to obey rules only to avoid punishment. Those of us who get stuck at this stage tend to become fascinated with being hungry, say, rather than with satisfying our hunger.

Stage Two. Those of us who are able to gratify our physiological needs reasonably well come to be motivated by our **security** needs — for safety, order and so on. Their energy centre is at the navel, naturally.

At this stage we tend to speak only about things that don't concern us personally ('the weather'). When we do speak about ourselves, we tend to speak in the past tense, and our feelings are described as objects and aren't described clearly. We tend to conform to authority to get rewards, have favours returned and so on. Those of us who get stuck at this stage tend to become overly dependent on things that are safe and familiar — and tend to fear change.

Stage Three. At this stage, whose energy centre is in the heart region, we're motivated primarily by our **love** needs — for friendship, belongingness and affection, and also for sex, to the extent that our sexual feelings are motivated by love.

At this stage we tend to express ourselves more freely, though we aren't really willing to accept our feelings and still tend to think of them as shameful, bad or abnormal. We tend to conform to authority in order to avoid the disapproval or dislike of others.

Stage Four. The energy centre for this stage is also in the heart region, for here we're motivated mostly by the need for self-esteem — for a sense of mastery and competence in the face of the world and for a sense of ego control.

We still tend to describe our feelings as objects, but as objects in the present. Sometimes our deeper feelings break through against our wishes, and then we try — not very successfully — to accept them. Mostly, though, our feelings centre around our fear that we should be 'doing more' — for anyone but ourselves, usually. We tend to conform to authority to avoid censure and guilt. If we get stuck at this stage we tend to lose ourselves in veritable orgies of self-condemnation.

Stage Five. At this point, some of us will pass directly on to Stage Six. But others of us will come to be motivated by a need for the **esteem of others** — for recognition and prestige that is honestly earned.

At this stage, whose energy centre is still at the heart, we tend to experience and express our feelings fully. There's still more fright than pleasure in this. But there's also a desire to be these feelings, to be the 'real me'. We tend to conform to authority to maintain the respect of an 'impartial spectator' judging in terms of community welfare — 'the law' (if it's fair) or 'the masses' will do. If we become stuck at this stage we tend to become obsessed with comparing ourselves to others.

Stage Six. At this stage, whose energy centre is at the throat, we're motivated by the need for **Self-actualization** — by the need to be true to our own nature. We try to become what we can be . . . whatever that is. But as a matter of fact, our basic values and priorities at this stage are remarkably similar. We tend to see reality clearly and to be at ease with it. We tend to be open to experience. We tend to be spontaneous, simple and natural — to live fully in each moment. And we tend to work at some activity (it may or may not be our 'job') that allows us to feel competent and self-reliant. (We aren't waiting to have our needs met 'for' us by our husbands or wives or by other monolithic institutions.)

Emotionally, we allow our feelings to flow, and we experience them with great vividness. Our relationships are deep and profound. We obey authority — when we do — in order to avoid self-blame (which isn't the same as guilt); we operate by the morality of individual principles of conscience. Unlike Stages Three through Five, this one is almost irreversible. The only drawback to remaining in it, and not going on to Stage Seven, is that we almost inevitably begin to feel superior when we find that we can live for mostly intellectual or emotional or spiritual rewards. We become 'spiritual materialists', in Trungpa's apt phrase.

Stage Seven. Not all of us who reach Stage Six feel impelled to go on to this stage. Those of us who do are motivated by the need for **Self-transcendence** — the need to achieve a serene or contemplative state of being.

The energy for this stage is centred between the eyebrows or on top of the head, depending on the degree of transcendence. In the former case we're able to see the 'laws of the universe' in operation everywhere. In the latter we simply merge back into the One. In either case we've left dualism behind; in either case we're able to speak the language of poets and seers; in either case we're able not only to feel, but also to know, the sacredness in all things.

Like those of us at Stage Six, those of us at Stage Seven operate by the morality of individual conscience — but we also have a sense that our 'personal' morality fits a larger design. We're able to experience our feelings more vividly than before, and to see them more clearly, too. We come to experience life as a process, not as a series of structures that we've built up in our minds. And even when we do 'construct' our experiences in order to make sense of them, we hold our constructs loosely; for we are forever experiencing the ability to choose new ways of being.

There are two disadvantages to being at this stage. First, many of us find it difficult to be at this stage and function competently in the material world. Second, many of us are prone to a kind of cosmic sadness. But it is always possible to return from this stage to Stage Six. In fact, Six and Seven may be thought of as complementary — as complementary dimensions of a whole Self.



The main point of all this is as follows.

The reason why we seem to be primarily 'economic people' has nothing to do with 'human nature', as the liberals would have it, or with the notion that we're 'economically deprived', as the Marxists would. Beyond a certain minimum point, beyond the hard-core poverty level, the feeling of economic deprivation is a relative thing and a subjective thing, and has a lot less to do with our economic assets than our cultural and psychological and spiritual ones. Some families can lead joyful and fulfilling lives on 5000 dollars a year and others feel deprived with five times as much.

The real political question in North America today isn't, How can we bring everyone up to a standard where no one feels economically deprived? Since the feeling of economic deprivation is relative and subjective, that's an impossible task by definition. The real political question is (or should be), Why do most people live in such luxury . . . and yet still feel economically deprived? An answer to that question is desperately needed because the world simply hasn't the resources to give everybody even a North American cat's standard of living (let alone a North American dog's).

The answer given by the Prison Perspective is that in most cases the deprivation isn't really economic at all. In most cases the feeling of economic deprivation comes from the fact that the monolithic mode of production, and the Prison that's behind it, inevitably blocks our needs for love and esteem — the needs that are important at Stages Three through Five. And that throws us back onto Stages One and Two, onto our physiological and security needs, onto our needs for material things.

So the reason we need so many things — the reason we 'need' maybe 10 times more than we really need (see Chap. 6) — is simple. It is that our needs for material things are the only needs that most of us can meet in Prison society.

And there's another thing. By blocking our needs for love and esteem, the Prison makes us feel lonely and worthless, weak and inferior. And so we produce more and more in order to win back our dignity, and consume more and more in order to buy back our humanity (see 87, esp. 169 & 258).

Unfortunately (or maybe fortunately!), meeting our material needs isn't enough to keep us happy, or even sane. For as we've seen, we need to develop ourselves if we want to feel alive, and if we want to stay alive.





Chapter 8

Is Our Main Enemy the Capitalist Economy — or the Stroke Economy?

That's quite a charge to bring to bear on Prison society — that it blocks our needs for love and esteem.

How does it do this exactly? How does it keep so many of us from being loving and self-respecting — from being **whole** — human beings? How does it give us all 'Prison-bound personalities'?

It does this by convincing us that there isn't enough affection to go around, by convincing us to make our contribution to what therapist Claude Steiner calls the 'stroke economy' (93, 131-32), a system of emotional control that's more devastating to most of us in North America than the capitalist economy.

In an efficient monolithic society like ours, nobody dies of hunger — after all, there wouldn't be production and consumption if there weren't people. (There are, of course, still problems of distribution in our society, but these can be traced to the workings of the Prison, and there are equally severe problems of a different sort under socialism — **both** systems are Prison-bound.) But in every monolithic society, and ours is the most 'advanced' in this regard, millions of us are dying slowly inside from lack of strokes.

A stroke is a unit of human recognition. A positive stroke is a unit of friendship or affection or esteem; a negative stroke, a unit of indifference or worse. Without strokes we couldn't survive, and when we feel we can't get or give positive strokes, we try to get or give negative strokes (cf. 93, 127).

Some of us have literally died from stroke hunger (93, 136). Nearly all of us are unable to meet our needs for love and esteem because of the lack of freely given positive strokes. It's an economic scarcity — we are indeed living in a depression and it's getting worse.

If **only** we could cure it by inflation or unemployment!

On the second level of analysis, there seems to be no reason why we can't give and receive strokes freely. (Liberals may point to 'human nature' with a sigh, and Marxists may point to 'capitalism', but these are obviously rationalizations not reasons.) As a matter of fact, in Old-World society people probably did give and receive strokes freely. But on the third level of analysis we can see that the Six-Sided Prison, which replaced Old-World with Civilized society, **inevitably** makes us feel that there aren't enough strokes to go around. And so we withhold strokes from each other and even from ourselves, even though each of us suffers for it.

Here's how the Prison causes and perpetuates the stroke economy:

The patriarchy convinces those of us with penises that we need to control those of us with vaginas. The most effective way that penis-people can do this isn't by physical or economic force but by withholding strokes from people with vaginas. To defend themselves, people with vaginas will withhold strokes from people with penises. (Those of us with penises will usually win out anyway, since we tend to be able to withhold gratification longer; see 90, 128-29.) The withholding of strokes is a technique that is taught us when we're small and our parents use the 'withholding of love' technique to control us (90, 121; 93, 132). (It's an even more prevalent technique in Russia; see Urie Bronfenbrenner, *Two Worlds of Childhood*, 1970.)

This brings us to the nuclear family.

The nuclear family serves as a kind of transmission belt for the Six-Sided Prison. It's the 'key link' without which the entire monolithic mode of production would be on very shaky ground.

The nuclear family is the key link partly from pride of place (it's the first monolithic institution we encounter so it prepares us for the others), and partly because it manages to embody the first four sides of the Prison in almost pure form.

The patriarchy is embodied in the dominant male — 'husband' or 'father'; egocentricity is embodied in the isolated family's notion that it's 'us' against 'them'; the scientific outlook is embodied in the dualism this notion implies; and bureaucratic-hierarchical forms are embodied in the hierarchy, pets, kids, Mommy, Daddy.

Because the nuclear family, by its very structure, embodies the first four sides of the Prison, it matters very little whether our parents are loving or unloving, generous or repressive, etc. The Prison would be taught to us in any case.

And because the family teaches us the Prison, the family also teaches us the stroke economy.

But it's not the only teacher of the Prison (see Chaps. 2 & 6), or of the stroke economy, either — as we're seeing in this chapter.

To continue:

Egocentricity convinces us that we're separate, isolated beings, which makes us want to hoard our strokes. It also causes us to feel foolish and hurt when the strokes we offer are rejected, so much so that we can almost never dare to bring ourselves to offer strokes freely.

Scientific single vision makes us see the world in hyper-rational terms, and it isn't 'rational' to give and receive strokes freely . . . is it? (Somebody might get hurt! Industrial production might be curtailed!) Scientific single vision also makes us see the world in quantitative terms, and so we suppose there's only a limited number of strokes we can give or receive.

The bureaucratic mentality encourages and even requires us to withhold strokes from 'rivals' (real and potential) and to give strokes in a calculating way.

Nationalism teaches us that there are lots of enemies in the world. And it teaches us that 'everyone wants what we've got' and that it's important not to give it to them.

Megalopolis surrounds us with dehumanized and dehumanizing structures and is disproportionately filled with people who are suffering from massive stroke

hunger. It doesn't provide us with an atmosphere that's conducive to giving or receiving strokes freely!

As the Prison clamps down on us more totally, it becomes harder and harder for us to give and receive positive strokes — love and esteem. Sometimes I think that the hippies were the last great flash of the dying flame of life (for six months or so there back in '66). But in my better moods I am also aware that much of the aimlessness of modern life can be explained as a form of 'search behaviour' (searching for strokes) — a term coined by rat psychologists (93, 136). I am able to see that much of the consumption in North America is an attempt to purchase substitute strokes. And I am able to believe that much of the hateful behaviour in the world is a way of getting negative but necessary strokes.

Certainly these things are true for me.



Chapter 9

Should We Look to the Proletariat — or to All Those Who Love Life?

According to Marx (what a dreadful way to start a chapter!), socialism would be fought for by 'the proletariat', by the working class, by all those whose basic needs were frustrated by predatory capitalism. In North America, most members of the working class weren't willing to fight for socialism, but they did change capitalism enough so that they could meet their basic needs, their physiological and security needs (see Chap. 7).

The working class finds it incredibly hard to meet its middle needs, for love and esteem, and almost impossible to meet its higher needs, but **so do the rest of us**. We're all in the same boat when it comes to these needs, when it comes to the Prison.

But we can't expect all the classes to join together and fight for New Age society. In fact, we can be almost certain that none of them will. For every social and economic class, as a **class** (as opposed to a collection of individuals), has a substantial stake in monolithic society. What would happen to the industrial proletariat if we wanted fewer goods? To the much-vaunted 'professionalism' of doctors if their professional organizations no longer had the power to keep competent 'nonprofessionals' from healing us?

No, New Age society won't be brought about by any particular class acting in its interests as a class. But it may be brought about by all those **individuals** who are able to see that Prison society is making it impossible for them to meet their interests as **individual human beings**.

Or, in more 'political' language: if revolution is defined on the third level of analysis, then the potentially revolutionary class is no longer the proletariat — though it will certainly consist of **members** of the proletariat (and the bourgeoisie

and the lumpenproletariat and — yes — even the ruling class!). It will consist of all those who want to change their lives and lifestyles in a way that is consistent with the New Age alternative (see Part IV).

But who are these people exactly?

To distinguish the proletariat from the bourgeoisie, Marx devised an **economic** class analysis. To distinguish those who are trying to develop themselves as human beings from those whose higher needs have been blocked by the Prison, we need to make use of a **psychocultural** class analysis.

Marx asked, where do you work? We need to ask, are you life-oriented, thing-oriented or death-oriented?

But can it be done?

Of course it can! In our political work, we've just become so used to thinking of people in terms of their 'relationship to the means of production' (even liberals do this) that we've become blind to the fact that there are many other ways of thinking about people — and, in a society where most of us can afford to eat properly, many more useful ways.

For example: many researchers have found that, in North America today, race, religion, education, birthplace, sex and-or ethnicity are more important than economic factors in determining our political preferences (see, e.g., David Segal and David Knoke, 'Political Partisanship', *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 29, 1970, 253-62).

But as we saw in Chap. 7, we don't consist **primarily** of the social and economic roles (or 'games') that we play. We're **primarily** engaged in developing ourselves (or in developing substitutes for our failure to do so), and the most important thing about us — the one that determines our behaviour more than any number of socio-economic 'factors' — is the relationship we have with life. Do we love it — or do we love death instead? (As a draft resister of 11 years' standing, I can't resist this: Do we love it — or have we left it?) Or are we somewhere in between, neither immersed in life nor 'attracted' to the dead, but drawn, more or less, to **things**?

The most meaningful class analysis that we can make today is one that distinguishes among life-, thing- and death-oriented people. These psychocultural classes cut across traditional social and economic lines. At the same time, they appear to underlie many of the differences among people that we've noted in this book.

And these three class dimensions are **precise** — they're at least as precise (and therefore as practical to use) as the Marxist dimensions, 'bourgeois' and 'proletariat'. What makes them appear less precise is just what makes them deeper and more significant: you can't tell just by **looking** at a person (at her collar, at her skin, at her hair) whether or not she loves life. But in one sense this is an advantage, for it keeps us from making snap judgements about people. And in another sense it doesn't matter, since there are at least four clinically precise methods that can be used to find out whether a person loves life, things or death (see 25, 408-09). Probably the simplest is by means of a brief questionnaire devised by Erich Fromm, the psychologist, and Michael Maccoby, a social psychologist (53, 215-21). This questionnaire has been included in the Appendix, along with the scoring code Maccoby used and the results he got among three groups of people.

(Before you turn to it though, some words of warning. Maccoby says that the questions need to be updated frequently — and they were worked on last in 1968. He says that some of them don't apply to nonwhites. And he says that many

educated or political people tend to answer them according to how they figure they're supposed to answer them and not according to how they really feel. For these people he recommends projective tests. See 53, 221-26.)

Fromm and Maccoby broke people's responses down into two categories, life-loving and death-loving. These have the virtue of simplicity, but they're also poles of a duality, and dualistic thinking is Prison thinking nine times out of 10 (see Chap. 5). In real life, people are oriented all up and down a **love-of-life spectrum**, which for convenience's sake I've divided into thirds: hence my life-, thing- and death-oriented classes. Because they're segments of a spectrum (fluid) rather than poles of a duality (rigid), my three classes don't imply that anyone is irrevocably cut off from love of life — that anyone's 'class interests' are truly irreconcilable with another's (as the ruling class's were said to be with the proletariat's). Instead, they're meant to suggest that it's in everyone's class interests to advance up the spectrum toward love of life. This is so because love of death isn't a **biologically normal** impulse, as Freud assumed. Love of life is biologically normal, but love of things and love of dead things is the result of a crippling process — is 'the outcome of un-lived life' (25, 406), of the failure to progress beyond the physiological and security needs. However, love of things and death, like love of life, probably isn't completely absent in any of us.



Now for a description of the classes. It owes a great deal to Fromm's masterpiece, **The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness** (25, esp. Chap. 12) and to Maccoby's article on the subject (53).

Those of us who are primarily **life-oriented** tend to feel at one with life. We don't have a possessive attitude toward people or things; we enjoy people and things more because we're free from a need to cling to them. We want to be more rather than have more. We want to construct rather than destroy or retain. But what's more important than any of these traits is the attitude we have — a responsiveness to what's most alive and growing in ourselves and in others.

It's pretty obvious who the life-lovers are in terms of this book. They're the ones who've managed to break free from the Six-Sided Prison; who aren't fooled by the false promises of the monolithic mode of production; and — since understanding isn't everything — who've also managed to reach Self-development Stages Six or Seven (or are definitely on their way there). In North America, probably no more than 10-15 percent of us are primarily life-loving at this point in time. 'Little pockets of humanity', in Tom Robbins's bittersweet phrase (76, 356) and in the mystique of the counter-culture; but the truth is, life-lovers can be found everywhere, in every social and occupational milieu. (Incidentally, I don't feel that I'm in this category; but I'm working on it.)

If we're **thing-oriented**, we tend to see everything as a commodity — not only all things but all people, not least of all ourselves. We collect injustices done to us (and, if we have a political conscience, to exploited groups) as if these injustices were valuable possessions. We dream of romance and of power. If our shirts button on the left, we lavish a great deal of affection on our cars and other shiny devices; if our shirts button on the right we lavish our affections more on our

'appearance'.

These people are trapped by the Prison, though they're capable of seeing that at least some of its sides are neither necessary nor desirable. They're taken in by monolithic institutions, so much so that they don't think the world could go on without them, but they're willing to admit the desirability of alternatives ('if it weren't for human nature', etc.), especially after sexual intercourse. They're stuck at Self-development Stages Three through Five (which is why they dream about romance and power), but like Marx's proletariat, they can be made aware of their plight if the right approach is taken (see Chap. 15).

The great majority of us (probably 70-80 percent of us) are largely thing-oriented, and being able to see this is being able to see where the political left has made one of its greatest errors. For Old Leftists have always insisted that most of us are life-oriented, and many New Leftists such as Herbert Marcuse have countered with the assertion that most of us are death-oriented. Both positions can be used to justify dictatorship (to save us from the supposedly death-oriented ruling class or to save us from ourselves).

Those of us who are death-oriented tend to be fascinated by the not-alive — not only, or even necessarily by corpses and decay, but also by the many mechanical artifacts that abound in megalopolis. There is, for example, the salesperson who will always add up even two or three small items on the calculating machine, or the person who will always take the car to the corner store. It's like being thing-oriented only many times more so. Our feelings aren't so much repressed (as is the case with thing-oriented people) as withered. Often they'll take the form of crude passions, such as the passion to win (at other people's expense) or the passion to destroy.

These people are so caught up in the Prison that it's hard to even tell them about it. (Try it and see.) They're so wrapped up in monolithic institutions that they aren't capable of thinking up — or even thinking about — alternatives to them. They're stuck at Self-development Stages One and Two, so they think of work as a duty and pleasure as an immorality. Often they're quite 'successful', but they're hell to have to live with. Probably 10-15 percent of us are largely death-oriented. (see 53, 209n, 222).



In 1848, Marx saw capitalist society as a battleground between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. I'd like to suggest (along with Erich Fromm, anthropologist Jules Henry, and who knows how many others) that monolithic society is a battleground between those who love life and those who don't.

Unfortunately for the scientific pretensions of tri-level analysis (i.e., unfortunately for its value as myth), there appears to be nothing 'inevitable' about the outcome of this battle. As we've seen, the Six-Sided Prison is gaining in depth and strength, and monolithic institutions are making it harder and harder for us to meet our needs for love and esteem, without which we cannot develop ourselves — we cannot be ourselves — we cannot truly live. In this view, it's only a matter of time before the world becomes unlivable, for one reason or another. But as we've also seen, many of us are managing to escape from the Prison by means of the

attack on sex-roles, the rediscovery of the supernatural, and so forth. And many of us are becoming aware of the perverse effects of monolithic institutions through our political work or through social experiment. If a desirable and workable alternative can be forged out of the ideas that many of us have been coming up with over the last 10 years or so (Part IV); and if many of us who are thing-oriented can meet our needs for love and esteem by taking part in the rich and life-giving experience of a cooperative nonviolent movement — a new-style, evolutionary type of movement that aims at putting these ideas into practice (Part V) — then, perhaps, the forces of life will triumph (cf. 25, 397-98, & 32, 475-76).



Chapter 10

Are We Suffering from Exploitation — or from Negative Symbiosis?

Liberals believe (or pretend to believe) that societies are run on the basis of the **social contract**. They believe that we have prime ministers, laws, 40-hour-a-week jobs and so on because we mutually agreed to live this way. No one would deny that this is purely a myth . . . and an increasingly useless and insulting one, at that.

Marxists believe that all societies — or at least, all 'class' societies — are based on **exploitation**; in modern times, on the exploitation of the 'proletariat'. This view is difficult to square with the fact that we could simply vote for less 'exploitative' governments than the ones we have now.

It seemed important to me to come up with a term that could describe our situation as I've analyzed it in this book and as it's seen by many of the movements and authors whose ideas I've been relying on. Therefore, I'd like to steal a term from ecology and propose that we're living in a state of **negative symbiosis** with our society.

In a symbiotic relationship, both parties come to need each other. If they come to need each other's strengths, the relationship is often called **positively symbiotic**. If, however, they come to feed off (and reinforce) each other's weaknesses, the relationship is often called **negatively symbiotic**.

So when I say that we are suffering from negative symbiosis, I am saying that our relationship with our society (with the world of work and institutions) is doing us harm and is doing society harm. If we can right this relationship, we can right all others.

Parts I-III were about how and why our needs and those of the society have become negatively symbiotic. They argued that we are, by nature, Self-defining and Self-developing, but that the descent of the Prison within us has made us much more interested in self-aggrandizement than in Self-development. And so we've created 'monolithic institutions' that make it almost impossible for us to meet our

needs for love and esteem and Self-actualization and Self-transcendence, but that do make it possible for us to meet the needs that are generated by our Prison-bound personalities — for romance, for power, and most of all, for a seemingly endless supply of goods and services (literally 10 times as many goods and services as we need to meet our physiological and security needs).

Inevitably, as time went on we became more and more dependent on our monolithic institutions, until our Prison-bound personalities and our monolithic institutions began to reinforce and perpetuate each other in a classic case of negative symbiosis.

So — where does this leave us?

People who think of themselves as part of a 'social contract' are able to feel warm and secure . . . and justified in their use and abuse of others. People who think of themselves as 'exploited' are able to feel self-righteous and vengeful . . . and have a cover for their envy (of precisely what they claim to want to destroy). But those of us who understand that we're living in a state of negative symbiosis with our society can take no comfort in the fact. We can only take comfort in our efforts to change our monolithic institutions — and to change the Prison within us.





Part IV

The World Beyond the Prison



Chapter 11

New Age Society

What would New Age society be like? Is it really worth hoping for?

None of us can say what it would be like — exactly. But if we look at the way history seems to be trending (Chap. 5), and if we look at the kinds of things that are being said now by those of us who are taking part in the emergence of a New Age politics, then I think we can begin to see some of the contours of New Age society, some of its possibilities, some of its mights and maybes.

In this chapter I'd like to say some general things about New Age society. In the next chapter I'm going to look more specifically at what New Age society might put in the place of some of the cultural elements and institutions that I've been criticizing: androgynous attitudes in place of patriarchal attitudes, spirituality in place of egocentricity, freedom to give all we wanted to give in place of the stroke economy, and so on. Finally, in Chap. 13, I'm going to try to describe the politics and economics of New Age society. (In these chapters, even more than in the others, I'm going to be relying on what other New Age people have written and said and intuited.)

New Age society would be a society of **enough** goods (as opposed to a society of scarcity or excess). In Civilized society there is no such thing as enough (see Chap. 7), but in New Age society we would be free of the Prison and so we would find that our needs for things were actually quite limited. (Many of the goods we would need would actually be **tools** we could use to make our own goods with — and to make our own face-to-face communities with. That's the point of the **Whole Earth Catalog**, 9, whose subtitle is 'Access to Tools', and of Ivan Illich's book **Tools for Conviviality**, 42.)

New Age society would be built to a **human scale**. Monolithic structures — buildings, institutions, cities — would be broken up and reassembled or simply done away with (could New Age architects ever make us feel at home in our huge office buildings, even after they were converted into cooperative apartments, studios and the like?).

New Age society would be **people-centred** (as opposed to production- or institution-centred). The goal of our institutions and industries wouldn't be to further their own, internal ends (efficiency, growth) but to allow us to meet our needs for Self-development, both on and off the job (cf. 64, 395).

New Age society would be **depolarized**. Because of the dualisms that the Prison generates (he-she, I-it, us-them, etc.), conflict in Civilized society has usually taken the form of what Alan Watts calls the 'game of black-and-white' (99, Chap. 2). In New Age society, the dualisms (and the Prison) would have lost their force, and we would be prepared to own up to our own 'internal multiplicity and confusion' (90, 197).

Information exchange (as opposed to goods exchange) would be the central 'task' of New Age society (95, 143-44). Goods would be produced more easily because of the application of new information to machines, and because of our own learning abilities (95, 158). Institutions would be conveyors of new information (how to build your own house) much more than of services (let us build you a house). We would even come to see ourselves not as owners of goods (status, money, pricks) so much as sharers of information (thoughts, feelings, experiences).

What would some of the values of New Age society be?

New Age society would foster **both autonomy and community**. Marxism stresses community at the expense of autonomy, and liberalism does just the reverse; but each of these values requires the other, and is the logical extension of the other, like the dark and light sides of the moon. By stressing the one and repressing the other, we don't come to know either, since the one that's stressed gets exaggerated and distorted: autonomy becomes isolation and community becomes conformity. In New Age society, we would learn to make our own decisions and not to hang on to others. But that wouldn't isolate us from others; on the contrary, it would make us more attractive to others and more confident about being in community with them (cf. 93, 372).

New Age society would foster an attitude of **reverence** for life and the world. Reverence for life means learning to see the sacred the eternal, the symbolic in a person and the world (54, 50). It means a reverence for future human lives, most of which are threatened. And it means a reverence for other species. Pueblo societies have it right: in them, even plants and animals are given a voice in

political decisions through certain rituals and dances (91, 104). In New Age society, more and more of life would be taken in by this attitude of reverence, until we could all say, with Marge Piercy, 'The lion arches in my back, the goat kicks in my legs . . . ' (To Be of Use, 1973, p. 92).

Many good people feel that reverence for life is the highest value (see, e.g., 27, 92); however, I feel that beneath it and beneath all things lies what Robert Pirsig calls **Quality** (72).

Quality is hard to define — exactly; and according to Pirsig, it can't and shouldn't be defined. It is whatever feels right and good to us when we're at Self-development Stages Six or Seven (72, esp. 351-52). If, as Erich Fromm says, reverence for life is the basis for the art of loving, reverence for the Good is the basis for the art of living, for the art of Self-development.

For thousands of years people felt no need to define Quality, it was so natural a concept. But in Civilized society, in order to defend the concept from the Prison (which had begun to descend), the philosopher Phaedrus did try to define it — and therefore mystified it. And then Aristotle redefined it as being less important than reason. And from that time on, we've been willing to do things that are 'reasonable' even when they aren't any good (72, 352-53).

Does anyone doubt that in New Age society, Quality — our intuitive, Stage Six and Seven ideas about the Good — would temper and guide all our other values, reason included?

And what would we be like in New Age society?

It's hard to say. The New Age person wouldn't have a uniform personality or temperament. Unlike the 'New Man' of Chinese or Cuban Communist theory, and unlike the emerging 'market-oriented' personality type in the rest of the world (see 26, 75-89), New Age people would be as varied as New Age society itself.

Even individually, we would be **many-sided** (56, 91). And so most of us would choose to lead 'a way of life which cycles harmoniously between travel and indwelling, between city and country, between community and isolation . . . (between) the polarities of engagement-retreat, creation-reception, etc.' (78, 208).

Probably more of us would — most of the time — be more receptive than active. The world, after all, would no longer be seen as a project, and a receptive attitude would allow us to see the world more clearly and to be at peace with it.

Certainly we would **lose our aggressive habits**. In Civilized society, those of us who are operating in terms of scarcity-excess are resentful and aggressive (they have to be — they can never get enough). But in New Age society, since there would be **enough** material goods — and a cornucopia of the other kind — most of us wouldn't have a neurotic need to feel deprived, damaged, threatened, slighted or used; and it would show in the quality of our behaviour (25, 306).

In New Age society, we would be willing to admit to a lot more **personal responsibility** for our actions than we are now. And we would understand very clearly that we couldn't develop ourselves without **helping others** develop also. And so we would integrate working on ourselves with a myriad of volunteer tasks. (We would find it silly and maybe even counter-productive to polarize these things in our minds, like we so often do at present.)

We would **love** other beings in a **desireless** way — not because we wanted something (some thing) from them, but because we saw them as lovable. Love and lovemaking would come to be seen as 'the vehicle of a mutual

realization, where the creation of new selves and a new world of being is as important as reproducing our kind' (91, 93).

Finally, I think that many of us would come to be known by our **protean natures**. By this I mean that we would never be satisfied with one identity, we would always be reaching out for several — or for none. And I mean that we would always be looking to make ourselves over again, in whole or in part — always be looking for situations of rebirth, in psychohistorian Robert Jay Lifton's phrase (49, 331) — always be looking to develop ourselves.

(Many of us — not all of us.)



Chapter 12

New Age Alternatives

(A) ANDROGYNOUS ATTITUDES: The Alternative to Patriarchal Attitudes. In Chap. 2-A, we saw that patriarchal attitudes turn us into half-people — into 'men' or 'women'. In New Age society, our attitudes, values and beliefs wouldn't have anything to do with sex; they would be sex-free, or 'androgynous'.

Androgynous attitudes can't be typed. They are simply the attitudes that are natural to us (to our temperaments and personalities) when we are free of sex-roles and when we are at Self-development Stages Six or Seven. Certainly men would learn to be more emotional, to be more in touch with their bodies, and so on; and women would learn to stop feeling incompetent, dependent and weak. But beyond that, our androgynous attitudes would be as varied and as protean as New Age society itself.

Once our sex roles were broken down, we would find that there were very few differences left between the sexes (see, e.g., 52). Even the much-vaunted biological differences are wildly exaggerated, in our minds, by our patriarchal stereotypes. According to Andrea Dworkin, a New York feminist, it is truer to say that we are multisexed than that we fit into neat man-woman categories. Females and males both produce female and male hormones; the male hormone determines the sex drive in both females and males; there are many males with supposedly female characteristics (highly developed breasts, high voices, wide hips, no facial hair) and many females with the reverse; muscle strength and development are culturally determined; and so on (see 21, 175-83).

In New Age society, then, not only would we lose our sex roles, but we would lose the greater part of our sexual identities, and we would come to think of ourselves (and not just our attitudes) as androgynous.

Why is it important to become androgynous? Why is it a New Age goal? Simply because we can't become whole without becoming androgynous (and we can't

develop ourselves if we're not whole — obviously). If we want to become whole, we're going to have to get back in touch with that part of ourselves that has been lost to us through sex-role training and patriarchal attitudes. We're going to have to discover and conquer the Open Space that has lain hidden, until now, deep inside ourselves, in the form of sexually 'aberrant' feelings and attitudes (cf. 15, 171-72).

Matriarchal attitudes are occasionally proposed as the New Age alternative to patriarchal attitudes (see, e.g., Jane Alpert, 'Mother Right', Ms., vol. 2, Aug. 1973, 52-55+). Androgynous attitudes would — or could — include many traditionally matriarchal attitudes (among them compassion, unconditional love, supportiveness and generosity), but they would — or could — include much else besides. The point is simply that they be free of patriarchal attitudes (and that they embody Quality, that is, the Good as we perceive it at Self-development Stages Six and Seven). For example: many religious mythologies provided a 'primal androgyne' that managed to combine male and female energies in a synthesis that was greater than the sum of its parts; even the symbols of Yin and Yang were united at one time in the holy woman T'ai Yuan, who was an androgyne (21, 167); and I am sure that many of us would try for such a synthesis in our own lives. 'I am both male and female', says Sydney Banks, a Vancouver-area spiritual leader. And you look it, too, Sydney: you are absolutely gorgeous.



(B) SPIRITUALITY: The Alternative to Egocentricity. Many New Age people — historians and psychologists among them — have called for the creation of a new spirituality (see, e.g., 18, 300-01; 27, 143-46; 64, 413; 97, 149). We need a new spirituality if we want to get beyond the isolation, pride and guilt that ego imposes (see Chap. 2-B) and if we want to have a foundation for constructing a new theodicy, a new and more believable rationale for life's suffering that can give us back our sense that life is worth living for, and fighting for (see Chap. 5).

For most of us, New Age spirituality would have to be genuinely new. It couldn't be an imitation or even an updating of the Eastern philosophies because these philosophies are completely outside of our spiritual heritage. (We could all learn from the universal truths of Eastern spiritualism; New Age politics is partially based on Eastern spiritualism; but only a temperamental minority of us could ever live our lives by Eastern spiritualism.)

But what is our spiritual heritage? Not Christianity. Christianity was just another Eastern religion, and by the time it reached the West its doctrines had already begun to be watered down (despite the teachings of Jesus and some other lost souls — and I'm not even sure about Jesus). It was imposed on us by the Church after the Prison had begun to descend; it was imposed on our own, natural, pagan religion which we had been celebrating for thousands of years (76, 231).

The Old Religion celebrated life. Its central figure was 'a hairy, merry deity who loved music and dancing and good food' (76, 231). Its objects of veneration were plants and women's culture. There were priestesses, wise women, midwives, goddesses, sorceresses. 'There was no dogma; each priestess

interpreted the religion in her own fashion' (76, 233).

The Old Religion can't be re-established in a society of space age technology, but it is our spiritual heritage, and in New Age society we could establish links with it and adapt it to our needs (cf. 81, 464-65). We could also establish links with the spiritual heritage of the first inhabitants of our continent, the Indians.

Plant-worship has an obvious parallel in our growing recognition that the quality of our environment — both natural and people-made — has a lot to do with our health and sanity and spiritual growth. In his book *Environmental Design Primer*, architect Tom Bender advocates the 'spiritualization of our surroundings' by building things that are in harmony with nature and with natural forces (2). And in his novel about a technologically sophisticated but spiritually oriented society (which he calls 'Ecotopia'), Ernest Callenbach has his 'ecotopians' spontaneously hugging trees and kissing them and maybe even making love to them (11). (Androgynous people would do that! — see 21, 184-92.)

North American Indian spirituality has a lot to teach us along these lines (see 7 and 18). It also appears to be a more this-worldly version of Eastern spiritualism. Doug Boyd, who has studied the Hindu mystic Swami Rama and the Shoshone medicine man Rolling Thunder, reports that 'Swami Rama's method is to work internally, to withdraw the mind's attention from external perceptions. . . . Rolling Thunder's way is to work externally, to sharpen the senses, to embrace the world. . . . Through interaction with his environment (Rolling Thunder) learns about the natural world and then comes to understand his own nature. He becomes one with nature, one with himself, one with the Great Spirit' (7, 116-17; & cf. 18). For an attempt to make a contemporary religious statement using traditional Cheyenne materials, see Hyemeyohsts Storm, *Seven Arrows*, 1972).

Significantly, among those of us at Self-development Stages Six and Seven, religious worship has already begun to rely less on the tradition of the sky god and more on the tradition of the earth goddess. As sociologist Robert Bellah sees it, 'The sky religions emphasize the paternal, hierarchical, legalistic and ascetic, whereas the earth tradition emphasizes the maternal, communal, expressive and joyful aspects of existence. . . . The earth tradition is tuned to cosmic harmonies, vibrations and astrological influences . . . (and it) expresses itself not through impersonal bureaucracy or the isolated nuclear family but through collectives, communes, tribes and large extended families' (1, 159-60).

Mary Daly, a Boston feminist, believes that the new spirituality can learn even more from the feminist movement, that the current 'unfolding of woman-consciousness is an intimation of the endless unfolding of God' (15, 36). In this view, God isn't a noun (let alone a gender) but a verb, an endless Being; and those of us who are trying to develop ourselves are at One with God, because we are challenging our own non-'Being' in Prison society and actively participating in God the Verb (cf. 15, 33 & 43).

A compatible view — minus the feminism — has been put forward by psychologist Abraham Maslow. Just before his death he wrote that the values that are shared by us at Self-development Stages Six or Seven, truth, beauty, simplicity, comprehensiveness, mercy, etc., should be thought of as 'Being-values' that can 'serve the purpose of the eternal and absolute that people have always sought' (54, 339-40).



(C) **MULTIPLE VISION: The Alternative to Scientific Single Vision.** In Chap. 2-C, we saw that our scientific way of 'seeing' the world requires us to ignore many of the insights of the Eastern philosophies, and to ignore many of the signals that are coming to us from the right side of our brains. It is not going too far to say (as many spiritualists do) that our 'reality' is so narrow as to be an illusion.

In New Age society, scientific single vision would be replaced by 'multiple vision', by a new synthesis of many ways of seeing the world. Different New Age thinkers have proposed different versions of this synthesis, but I think that all of them would agree on one point: that if we can't learn to combine the functions of the left and right sides of the brain — if we can't learn to be intellectual and intuitive, analytic and holistic, active and receptive, etc. — then we are finished as human beings.

Beyond that, there would probably be general agreement with some points made by Robert Ornstein, the psychologist: that we need to recognize 'the importance of consciousness itself as an object of inquiry'; that we need to recognize that we are 'sensitive and permeable to subtle sources of energy from geophysical and human forces'; and that we need to greatly expand our conception of the normal (it was, for instance, until recently considered 'paranormal' to be able to control our nervous systems, despite the fact that yogis had been doing it for thousands of years) (70, 204-05).

But beyond that, there are some radical differences of opinion. For example: Ornstein believes that most of our technical scientific work should continue, tempered but not basically changed by our new insights, while Theodore Roszak believes that our new holistic-intuitive insights should not only temper but dominate our scientific work (81, esp. 455).

Like Roszak, most New Age thinkers believe that the scientific enterprise would be very different in New Age society. To Robert Bellah, it would be based on a fusion of 'ecstatic reason' and myth (1, 153). To William Irwin Thompson, it would be based on a fusion of music, math and spirituality (96, 58). To Robert Pirsig, it would be based on a fusion of religion, art, and conventional science — a task that is possible because Quality, or the Good, is the central term of all three (72, 261-63; & see Chap. 11 above).

What might this new science produce in the way of insight? William Irwin Thompson summarizes what might be called the conventional wisdom of multiple-vision science: (1) 'There is intelligent life in the universe beyond earth'; (2) 'The gods do not talk to us, they play through us with our history'; (3) 'Our religious myths are the detritus of the lost history of earth'; and (4) 'Matter, energy and consciousness form a continuum' (as in the worldview of the Hopi Indians) (97, 138-39; & cf. 76, esp. 317-18). Alyce and Elmer Green, a pair of psychologists who have come as close as anyone to working in this new mode, infer from Doug Boyd's experience with Rolling Thunder (7), Carlos Castaneda's with Don Juan (12), and other recent investigations of 'research subjects who have unusual powers of perception and control', as well as from 'pondering yogic theory', that a 'unique energy field, a "field of mind", must surround the planet'; that 'each individual mind with its extension, the body, must have the inherent

capability of focusing energy for manipulation' of both internal and external 'events'; and that 'the individual mind and the general "field of mind" meet in the unconscious' (7, 271-72; & cf. 92).



(D) THE COOPERATIVE MENTALITY: The Alternative to the Bureaucratic Mentality. In Chap. 2-D, we saw that our bureaucratic and hierarchical institutions are causing us to suffer from what I called the bureaucratic mentality. Once we were able to see beyond the Prison, however, we would want to live by a cooperative and reciprocal mentality; so in New Age society, bureaucratic institutions would be replaced by cooperative and reciprocal ones.

Kenneth Boulding, the economist, has proposed three 'iron laws' that suggest very strongly that our new, cooperative institutions would have to be small. There is, first, the 'law of optimum size': every institution has an optimum size, and attempts to push an institution beyond that size will result in bureaucracy no matter how life-loving its members may be. Second, there is the 'law of hierarchy': 'The larger the organization, the more elaborate will be its hierarchical structure'. Finally, there is the 'law of oligopoly': if there are only a few organizations, 'a situation of acute instability and conflict will be created' (6, 78-79). (Therefore, our institutions would have to be independent and diverse as well as small.)

But if we wanted to do away with the bureaucratic mentality, it wouldn't be enough for our new institutions to be small (and independent and diverse). They'd also have to allow for systemic thinking (as opposed to linear thinking). According to economist Robert Theobald, linear thinking is the type of thinking that we engage in when we set short-range goals and then try to achieve them regardless of the second- or third- level consequences of our actions (95, 10). It's the type of thinking that we engage in when we have our bureaucratic blinders on. (Strip-mining for coal is a notorious example of its consequences.) In New Age society, we would want our institutions to allow for 'systemic thinking', which is process- not goal-oriented and which does focus on second- and third-level problems and processes. 'A person thinks systemically when he perceives connections, interdependencies and reciprocal relationships in the real world in which he lives' (95, 10). Strip-mining for coal would be definitely out.

But even a society of small institutions whose members were allowed to think 'systemically' would not necessarily be rid of the bureaucratic mentality; for as we saw in Chap. 2-D, the bureaucratic mentality is rooted in our willingness to follow orders. Therefore, in New Age society, we would have to create institutions in which we could refuse to follow orders; in which we could exercise what Theobald calls sapiential authority (94, 115; 95, 64-71).

Sapiential authority requires us to refuse to follow orders, rules, guidelines, standards, whatever, if these do not seem good and right to us (if they do not seem like Quality orders, rules, etc.; see Chap. 11). By the exercise of sapiential authority, we would finally be able to assume responsibility for our actions, and to make judgements in terms of our conscience rather than in terms of the dictates of some authority. A tall order, perhaps; but if we were at Self-development Stages

Six or Seven, we wouldn't want it any other way.

But if New Age institutions gave us the right to exercise sapiential authority (the 'right to say no'), how could New Age society survive?

New Age institutions would have to agree not to fire or otherwise punish their members for exercising their sapiential authority. Their only alternative, then, would be to accommodate themselves to the special needs and perspectives of their dissident members. For their part, members would have to be willing to engage in 'give and take' with their institutions; to share their views and change their views; to feel responsible not only for their own development, but for that of their institutions as well (94, 98-99).

Still a tall order, perhaps, and a delicate one. But only in this way can the bureaucratic mentality be definitely replaced.



(E) LOCALISM, REGIONALISM, INTERNATIONALISM, UNIVERSALISM:
The Alternatives to Nationalism. In Chap. 2-E, we saw that it is natural for us to identify with our local communities or with the world at large, not with the nation-state; and we saw that nationalism is deliberately and inevitably fostered in us by the nation-state for its own ends. In New Age society, nationalism would be done away with, because the nation-state would cease to exist; and localism and internationalism would become real options for us, because the new form of government would be primarily local.

In New Age society, towns, neighbourhoods and rural counties or districts would take on many of the functions of the old nation-state — partly to keep Boulding's anti-bureaucratic 'iron laws' at bay in the field of government (see Chap. 12-D) and partly to give renewed meaning to that old word, community. These **human-scale communities** would make all the laws, collect all the taxes, be the source of final judicial appeal, and be the sole source of defence. Probably most of them would choose to run most social services, own and-or run many industries, and support many cultural institutions and events; but they could choose to have nothing to do with any of these things, or everything to do with all of them. And if we didn't like it, and we couldn't change it (by petitioning the Coordinating Council or through voting or through speaking up at the 'town meeting' — however our community chose to run itself), then we could always move. After all, there would be thousands of other kinds of places that we could choose from. Or we could start our own local communities. Certainly many black people, Ukrainians, women, etc., would choose to do just that.

These communities could, if they chose, confederate into regions, for the more efficient administration of services and for the economic advantages of a common market. But under no circumstances could these regions be given the power to make laws, collect revenue, or conduct defence.

In turn, and, hopefully, in time, these regional confederations might link up with other regional bodies (that were based on nonviolent forms of defence) to form a kind of **world confederation** that could oversee the equal exchange of information, resources, wealth and tools. In most policy areas, however, power — and responsibility — would remain with the local communities.

The idea of a world confederation of freely sharing communities of autonomous and responsible individuals, basking in their cultural and economic diversity, would, at any rate, be a powerful ideal in New Age society, and would provide a common bond among those of us whose highest loyalties naturally went out, not to our immediate communities, but to all humankind.

And there is another kind of loyalty, an even broader one, on the horizon: a loyalty that is especially noticeable among those of us who are at Self-development Stage Seven. It is the loyalty to all life, to all manifestations of consciousness, everywhere — in birds, bears, trees, rocks, snow, on other planets, and in other universes. I am sure that this kind of **universalism**, aided and abetted by the multiple vision of New Age science (see Chap. 12-C), would prosper and flourish in New Age society.



(F) THE HUMAN-SCALE OUTLOOK: The Alternative to the Big-City Outlook. In Chap. 2-F, we saw that big cities — cities of maybe half a million people or more — are advertisements for the Prison by their very nature. In New Age society, therefore, we would want our big cities to be drastically reduced in size and in shape.

That should not be difficult, since we are drawn to big cities primarily because we are Prison-bound (Chap. 2-F) and in New Age society we would no longer be Prison-bound.

There would, of course, still be cities of half a million people or slightly fewer. New Age society would be nothing if not diverse, and merchants, drifters and intellectuals would probably always prefer large cities to small ones (81, 416). But most of the rest of us would probably not choose to live in cities of even this size (except for brief periods), since Self-development can take many forms, and most of them require not the passionate anonymity of city life but the rootedness and warmth of human-scale community.

What would these new Prison-free dwelling-places be like? They would take on every form under the sun — and I mean that literally. Some of them would be country communes. Probably most of them would try to break down the distinction between city and country altogether (see, e.g., 2). Others would go the opposite route, like Paolo Soleri's 'arcologies', medium-sized 'cities in the image of people' that would be physically, ecologically and to some extent economically self-contained (a prerequisite, perhaps, for local self-government) . . . and carefully designed to promote face-to-face encounters. You owe yourself a couple of hours in the library paging through Soleri's lovingly intricate designs for these arcologies (*Arcology*, 1969; & see also Buckminster Fuller's ideas for a floating tetrahedral city, in 28, 350-51, 361-62).

But at least for the first few decades in New Age society, most of us who choose to live in cities would have to be content with living in deconstructed and reconstructed versions of our present cities. Ernest Callenbach, in his 'ecotopian' novel, presents a wonderfully attractive vision of the new San Francisco. For example: 'Down Market Street and some other streets, creeks now run. These

had earlier, at great expense, been put into huge culverts underground, as is usual in cities. The Ecotopians spent even more to bring them up to ground level again. So now on this major boulevard you may see a charming series of little falls, with water gurgling and splashing, and channels lined with rocks, trees, bamboos, ferns . . . ' (11).

Another reconstructed city has been imagined for us by Diane Schatz, a West Coast artist, in a series of drawings for **RAIN: Journal of Appropriate Technology** (2270 N.W. Irving, Portland, Ore.). In one of these drawings, we are in the middle of a city of perhaps 100,000 people. But — what is this? There are no cars in the street, but plenty of bicycles, pedicabs, delivery-bikes, and a bus that appears to be run on solar energy. The parking garage is being turned into a food co-op. Next door is an urban farming school. Across the street is a store that gives music lessons, a public bath house, a community credit union — and separate but equal garbage cans for 'compost' and 'trash'. Kiddy-corner is a 'hot wok' joint (chopped food cooked at higher temperatures for shorter times, in 'woks' — saves on energy and is better than Macdonald's). Next door to that is a store selling hand-made shoes. Upstairs we can see people actually making the shoes (a man is using the sewing machine). Upstairs from that is an apartment, and upstairs from that, a rooftop restaurant. All the roofs are being used: gardens, greenhouses — greenery everywhere — and also domes, windmills, and various devices for taking in solar energy. Blimps pass by overhead.

But it is the people that are most noticeable. There are people everywhere: talking intently on the rooftops, reading the paper at sidewalk cafes, watching from the windows, lying in the mall, building things. Straight people with sunglasses and freaks with long hair; competent-looking women and dreamy-looking men (and also, I should add, the reverse). Everyone looks happy or eager or intense, and very much centred in the present.

Of course they do: that's what happens when you live in a city of the human scale.



(G) THE BIOLITHIC MODE OF PRODUCTION: *The Alternative to the Monolithic Mode.* In Chap. 6, we saw that the Prison is institutionalized by means of 'monolithic institutions' that establish a monopoly not of brands but of processes: in healing, there is a monopoly of professionalized and institutionalized medical care; in transportation, of rapid transit: in education, of universal and compulsory schooling; in contributing to society, of the job economy; and so on. In New Age society, we would be free of the Prison, and so we would want to replace our monolithic institutions with 'biolithic' ones. 'Biolithic' is a fancy and possibly pretentious term (I've had too much schooling to know any more) for industries and institutions that do not require us to 'do things their way', that allow for the existence of industrial and institutional alternatives.

Biolithic institutions would offer us the widest possible choice of goods and services (and also of information, tools and resources). They would not do away with professional medical care, cars, etc., but in a biolithic society these things — because they tend to be monolithic — would have to be definitely subordinate to

products and processes that fostered diversity (by fostering self-reliance, say, or by being ecologically more sane). (For a nice introduction to biolithic technology, see 8 or 9.)

For example: professional medicine, as we've seen (Chap. 6), depends on restricting our access to medical information and on restricting the numbers of people who are allowed to practice medicine. In biolithic society professional medicine would not be 'done away with', but basic medical information would be made available to all of us — and so would the tools that we might need to care for ourselves and to cure ourselves of most diseases. And paramedics would be trained to make house calls or to set up shop in local communities. Oriental and herbal medical practices would be fostered and encouraged (for the extraordinary and mostly untapped possibilities of these, see Naboru Muramoto, *Healing Ourselves*, 1973, & Jethro Kloss, *Back to Eden*, 1971) (cf. 41).

Similarly, in transportation, cars would not be eliminated altogether. (In some places, anyway.) But if we wanted a diverse society, one in which our right to walk and our right to a human-scale environment were not overwhelmed by the automobile, we would have to devise a form (or forms) of transportation in which the automobile was definitely secondary.

These might be as diverse as the cities that adopted them. Probably one alternate form would be a much-improved system of rapid transit — but, as we saw in Chap. 6, rapid transit does not really get us away from the Prison-bound needs for speed and efficiency. So I would suspect that a more popular substitute for reliance on the automobile would be a system of bicycles, pedicabs, and out-of-town buses (see, e.g., 78, 228-34). I would also suspect that a maximum speed limit would be set on travel between cities (say, 35 mph), partly to save on energy and partly to get the pace of life back under control (cf. 40).

In education, schools would not be eliminated. But none of us would be forced to go to school, neither by the law nor by the threat of poverty or job discrimination in later life (see 35, 199). So I don't think schools would be very popular.

But we would be learning. For New Age families would be producing autonomous and Self-developing young people (see Chap. 12-I); and so New Age society would be able to rely on **self-motivated learning**. Sooner or later, when it was right for us, nearly all of us would choose to find our natural niche in what Ivan Illich calls a 'learning web' — a series of educational networks that could help us gain access to information and understandings. Networks might begin with: bulletins that would allow us to describe the learning activities we wanted to engage in, in order to find a partner or partners for our inquiry; bulletins that would allow us to list our skills and experience and the conditions under which we were willing to share our skills; and bulletins that would allow us to find the things we were interested in (things stored in museums, laboratories, etc.) (see 39, esp. 111-13; & cf. 35, esp. Chaps. 8-12, & 78).

As for work, in Chap. 6 we saw that it is almost impossible for us to exist now outside of the job economy (or off of the welfare rolls). That clearly abridges what New Age society would consider to be our inalienable right to do as we please. Therefore, in New Age society we would receive a guaranteed basic income as a matter of right. We could then be fully responsible for deciding how we wanted to develop ourselves; and if we decided that what we wanted to do could not be structured in to a job situation, we would be free to go our own way. (Since we would be free of the Prison, there would be no question but that the great majority

of us would put our time to some good use.) (cf. 94, Chap. 3).

In all these areas, then, biolithic institutions and practices would make for a great deal of diversity. But I would like to stress two things that they have in common.

First, they all seem to be intent on protecting a new set of rights: our right to care for ourselves, our right to a human-scale environment, our right to arrange for our own educations, our right to do as we please. There is nothing arbitrary about these new rights: they all follow inevitably from the premises of a society that is committed to Self-development.

And, second, all these biolithic institutions would be helping to make material reality — information, machines, techniques, etc. — more accessible to us.

Our monolithic institutions are able to survive (as monolithic institutions) by blocking our access to reality. Professional medicine survives (as a monolithic institution) by keeping us from the opportunity to heal ourselves; rapid transit, from being able to rely on our own two feet, or even on bicycles; schools, from being able to educate ourselves; the construction industry, from being able to house ourselves; and so on. Is it any wonder that we have been rendered more and more dependent on our monolithic institutions?

In this context, a Marxist revolution would be pointless or worse. For what good would it do to socialize the means of production, when only a few of us can understand the information or master the techniques that our means of production require? We would toss out the capitalists — and end up bringing in technocrats to run things. And that would be worse!

What we need to socialize, really, is access to information, machines, techniques, etc. — access to skills — access to material reality. We need to make it possible for everyone to at least have the opportunity to run their own lives: to heal themselves, house themselves, transport themselves, etc. And that means, above all, that most of our institutions, machines, techniques, etc., would have to become much smaller and simpler and easier to understand than they are now.

What we need, then, are biolithic institutions and a biolithic technology.

Only biolithic institutions would make it possible for us to become less dependent on big capitalists and on professionals, technocrats and bureaucrats. Only biolithic institutions would make it possible for us to take responsibility for our lives and to become Self-developing human beings.

(So the Prison Perspective is not anti-technological. It holds out the hope that a biolithic, human-scale technology can be devised that would give each of us the opportunity to understand our environment better and to shape our environment in the way we see fit.) (cf. 37, 48-+).



(II) COOPERATIVE NONVIOLENT DEFENCE: The Alternative to Military Defence. In Chap. 6, we saw that our system of defence is totally dependent on monolithic institutions, and that if we wanted to change our institutions, we would also have to change our system of defence. Obviously, the new system of defence would have to be compatible with New Age society: with local government, with biolithic institutions, and with people who were oriented to life rather than to

things or death.

Fortunately, such an alternative system of defence has already been devised. It has even been practiced, imperfectly and incompletely, in Gandhi's campaigns in South Africa and India; in the Danish resistance to Hitler; in the American South during the civil rights drive of the 1960's; and in many other places, mostly in this century.

Gene Sharp, a Boston-area defence strategist, has written two extremely valuable books that try to work out a complete defence strategy and tactics based on these campaigns (88 & 89; the second of these is a thousand pages long!). He calls his defence strategy 'civilian' (not civil) defence, because it relies for its effectiveness on people's own sense of responsibility and worth rather than on guns (88, 67). (It could also be called 'neopacifism' since it is based on a study of mostly pacifist campaigns from the perspective of a North American in the 1970's.) I am going to call it a system of **cooperative nonviolent defence** (or simply 'CND'), because it relies on our ability to work together as well as responsibly, and because it would be completely useless if we were to engage in any kind of interpersonal violence.

Responsibility, cooperativeness, nonviolence — what could be more New Age than that?

If a New Age community (town, neighbourhood, country district) were to be invaded, the invaders would have a hard time figuring out what to do with themselves.

There would be no tanks to blow up. There would be no planes. There would be no military hardware of any kind.

There would be no soldiers to fight against. Possibly there would be no one to meet them at all, when they arrived.

Still, much would be happening.

We could be delaying the invader's entry into the community by blocking the roads with thousands of abandoned vehicles. And when the invader did get through, we could wear mourning bands, stay home, defy curfews, etc. All these actions would let the invader know that we meant to resist the occupation of our community — forever if need be.

The invader's soldiers could be told that the resistance was not being directed against them personally, but against their attempt to take control. (That might encourage them to be less brutal than they would be if they thought they might be killed.)

Eventually there might have to be more substantial forms of noncooperation. For example, we might simply refuse to carry out the invader's orders. Or, for example, attempts to exploit our (relatively paltry!) economic capacities might be met with limited strikes, the 'disappearance' of Coordinating Councilpeople, etc.

In the long run, injuries and deaths — in retaliation for such behaviour — might be common. But they would probably be less common than if we were to take up arms ourselves.

The main point would be to keep the invader from getting control of our institutions. For in CND, keeping a free press, or keeping the invader's propaganda out of our educational networks, would be a more important 'strategic objective' than the possession of, say, a given mountain. And since our institutions

would be biolithic — incredibly diverse — getting control of them would be an almost impossible task in the first place.

In CND, then, even under the worst of circumstances, we could still hang on to a measure of autonomy for our community and its institutions. And as the invader failed to break the resistance down totally — because he failed to break us down totally — there would be unrest within his country, and international pressures would mount. Even the invader's soldiers would begin to wonder what they were fighting for (or rather, not fighting for).

In time, the occupation would be defeated, and the invader would leave (88, Chap. 3).

Clearly, then, cooperative nonviolent defence would not only make use of our New Age sense of responsibility and worth, it would **reinforce** it, by 'shifting the source of defence power from modern technology to the people themselves, to their determination and ability to act' (88, 70-71).

Quite a task. But New Age people wouldn't want to defend themselves in any other way (see also 23 & 46; & see Chap. 15-C below).



(I) FREEDOM TO GIVE ALL WE WANTED TO GIVE: The Alternative to the Stroke Economy. In Chap. 8, we saw that the Prison gives us 'Prison-bound personalities' by convincing us that there aren't enough positive strokes to go around (positive strokes are units of friendship or affection or esteem). As a result, we are fearful of giving or even receiving strokes — we are like merchants when it comes to strokes. In New Age society, the sides of the Prison would be collapsed by their New Age alternatives; and as a result, we would have **earth-bound personalities** (cf. 90, 117).

To be earth-bound is to be life-loving, responsible, and self-developing. It is to be here-and-now centred, spontaneous, creative and understanding (90, 120-21). And it is to be willing and able to give (positive) strokes if we have them to give; to ask for strokes if we need them; to feel free to accept them if we want them; to feel free to reject them if we don't want them; and to feel free to give **ourselves** strokes (93, 137-38).

Also in Chap. 8, we saw that the nuclear family is a very important source of Prison values, including the stroke economy. In New Age society, the nuclear family would not be 'done away with'; but if people were free of the Prison, it would surely be radically altered. More importantly, it would be only one of many living arrangements that New Age people might choose to create for themselves; and it would almost certainly not be one of the more popular ones.

For one thing, most New Age people would find it unnatural and constraining to be committed to one person only — erotically, emotionally, or whatever.

For another thing, most New Age people would realize that it's easier to give young people Prison-free and stroke-economy-free upbringings in families where there were many nurturers, not just one or two. If we felt down or upset, our young people would have many other sources of love to turn to — so they wouldn't grow up fearing the loss of love (and that fear leads directly to the stroke economy; cf.

90, 115-21). And if we were sharing our nurturing duties, we would find it relatively easy to offer **unconditional love and respect** to our young people — and that would make it even more possible for them to grow up free of the fear of the loss of love — free of the ‘withdrawal of love’ technique of child-rearing (see Chap. 8 above). (Some psychologists go so far as to argue that unconditional love and respect are the absolutely necessary prerequisites for Self-development; see, e.g., 54 & 77.)



(J) LOVE OF LIFE AS A SOCIAL VALUE: The Alternative to All Class Distinctions That Are Based on Achievement. In Chap. 9 I argued that in New Age society we would be oriented to life (rather than to things or death), and that we would, therefore, necessarily be off of the production-consumption merry-go-round. Unfortunately, however, for hundreds of years — ever since the Prison came down in full force — most of us have been able to meet our needs for esteem (and self-esteem) only in the world of production and consumption — only by ‘making it’ in terms of some status hierarchy or other, only by making a lot of money, say, or by running a handsome home, or (ahem!) by getting our books published in Toronto or New York.

We could get rid of hierarchical systems of achievement and reward when we were free of the Prison, but unlike a pair of young Boston-area academics, Richard Sennett and Jonathan Cobb, I don’t think we could get rid of standards of dignity altogether (see 87, 260-61). For as we saw in Chap. 7, our needs for esteem and for self-esteem are among our basic human needs. And these would seem to require us to feel that we had accomplished **something**.

Therefore, I believe that New Age society would acknowledge that the kinds of activities that we engage in when we are life-oriented — friendship, creative activity, and Self-development — are our most valuable and necessary pursuits. And, therefore, I believe that we would be able to meet our needs for dignity in New Age society if and when we were actively giving and sharing in friendship and-or creative activity, and when we were engaged in Self-development.

(For a fictional-autobiographical foray into the world of friendship, creativity and Self-development, see 47, 68 & 71. For an account of some of the special problems that men will have in leaving the world of production behind, see 67 & 73.)





Chapter 13

New Age Political Economy

If we ever do manage to replace Prison values with their New Age alternatives (androgyny, spirituality, etc.), we wouldn't want to spend most of our time in the production and consumption of **things**. We'd want to spend as much time as possible in friendship, creative activity, and Self-development — even if this meant that we'd have to reduce our 'living standards' considerably.

What would a political economy be like that had people and not production at its core?

It would above all be **decentralist**. For according to most New Age thinkers, only a society where governments and economic enterprises were **localized** would allow us to make the decisions that affected our lives. Only a society where governments and enterprises were **human-scale** would allow us to feel at home in the world. Only a society where governments and enterprises were **diverse** would give us enough options so that we could develop ourselves freely.

Not surprisingly, capitalism and socialism are both highly **centralist** in outlook. All capitalist firms have to be profit-seeking, so they tend to take a narrow and selfish view of things, centralizing and plasticizing everywhere in order to make more money (85, 259). And all socialist parties and economic systems are based on 'democratic centralism', which means 'you advise — we decide; and when the decisions are reached, you obey — or else'.

Because capitalism and socialism both tend to be centralist — and because they are both rooted in the Prison (see Chaps. 1 & 2) — New Age political economy is going to have to be genuinely new. It is going to have to combine the freedom of capitalism and the security of socialism into a whole that would be different from, and greater than, the sum of its parts (cf. 4, 63, & 62, esp. 192-93).

What would this new system look like? I don't think that anyone can say — exactly. And besides, as we've seen in Chap. 12-E, New Age communities would be completely self-governing and could adopt whatever political and economic institutions that they liked. Nevertheless, in a society that was based on New Age principles, I think that most communities would agree with most or all of the following ideas.

In most socialist (and anarchist) scenarios, the new society would be run by a confederation of factories and offices — by 'worker's councils'. In New Age society, however, we would each have a right to a say in things, whether or not we were able to structure our activities into 'jobs' — for the simple reason that we are all alive, and therefore equally valuable . . . equally One.

But how could we structure the decision-making process so that all of us could have a say — a real say — in the decisions that were made?

Maybe we should start by deciding what New Age government should **not** be like.

On the one hand, it shouldn't mean that we would only get to advise decision-makers of our views (at public meetings, say). This type of 'citizen participation' — which is common now in North America, as well as in the socialist states — still puts us in the role of petitioners (for the redress of grievances), of people asking someone else to solve our problems for us. It doesn't allow us to assume any real responsibility (94, 112-13).

And, on the other hand, New Age government shouldn't mean that everyone should get to vote on all issues through a kind of continuing referendum system (a scheme advocated by many North American 'futurists' and also by some New Leftists and anarchists). It is simply not true that all of us are equally able to make decisions on all issues or that all of us are willing to spend a great deal of time in thinking about each issue (94, 114). Moreover, in a diverse society, we should have a right **not** to (have cultural pressure brought to bear on us to) be 'political' (62, 68-69). Probably most of us will always be oriented to private life, not to public life (at least for the greater part of our lives) — after a while even Castro recognized that the revolutionary is a personality-type, not a valid model for the new 'Socialist Man'. In New Age society, socially committed people would also be regarded as a personality-type — a necessary type, but no more noble a type than the others.

In New Age communities, then, we would want our democratic governments to fall midway between the extremes of no-final-decisions-by-us and all-final-decisions-by-all-of-us. We would want our democratic governments to allow those of us who were informed about (or concerned about) a **particular** issue to be involved in the decision-making process — in the **final** decision-making process — on that issue (94, 114-15).

There are, of course, many ways that this could be done. The simplest, and perhaps the most attractive, would be for the decision-making units to be made up of **Groups** of all those people who were informed and/or concerned about an area, problem, issue, crisis, etc. One Group of citizens might be in charge of housing policy, a second Group in charge of medicare policy, a third Group in charge of New Year's Eve festivities, and so forth. And there could be Groups formed around passing issues, and Groups formed to prevent issues from arising. The point is simply that the Groups themselves — and not their (or our!) elected representatives — would be making the actual decisions about housing policy, New Year's, etc.: the same kinds of decisions that politicians and bureaucrats now make largely by themselves.

The groups would not, of course, be expected to make **technical** decisions — these might be made by experts who were working in consultation with these Groups, and who were, perhaps, employed by them as well. But the Groups would make the **policy** decisions; and the purpose of the experts (and of all other administrative bodies) would be to implement these policy decisions.

If this system was to work democratically, membership in the Groups would have to be open to all of us regardless of age — and I don't mean just adults — status, beliefs, etc. If there were officers, they would have to be elected, and rotating. And Group meetings would have to be advertised well in advance.

If a Group felt that it was becoming too big, it could, among other things, divide into sections and hold sectional meetings and sectional votes.

Some New Age communities might choose to have these Groups present their decisions to an elected governing body or to a 'town meeting' for a final vote. Other New Age communities might allow final decision-making power to rest with the Groups — though the governing bodies would have to decide how much money to give each Group. And there might be competing Groups! All kinds of variations could be worked out.

It hardly needs to be added, though, that this form of government (which I like to call **New Age democracy**) could only work if there was trust among us. Without such trust, there could be no open discussion in Groups, and we would not be able to learn and grow and change through the process of Group discussion. Without trust, there would be a multitude of hostile and competing Groups that might refuse to work together or even to consult with each other. Without trust, New Age government would end up being even more divisive and inefficient than our present capitalist and socialist governments (cf. 94, 114-15).

On the other hand, the fact that we were free of the Prison would make the success of this genuinely democratic form of government a real possibility. I am sure that most New Age citizens would be willing to run the risk.



In New Age economy, decentralization would require the breaking up of many national and 'international' firms and the transfer of ownership of their separate parts to the communities in which they were located. However, it would not necessarily require the establishment of workers' control over industrial and office management. Since New Age society would value diversity more than purity, most New Age communities would be hospitable to all kinds of enterprise, privately-run, collectively run by Groups of citizens, cooperatively run by Groups of workers, or whatever. Just so long as the firms were not so large as to divorce ownership from participation (on a day-to-day basis), and just so long as the firms were not ecologically harmful. (Other conditions would surely be worked out by the communities themselves, according to their needs and desires.)

There would be no danger that capitalism, American-style, might restore itself, since if we were free of the Prison, we would simply not stand for the kind of behaviour that has made people super-rich in North America today (for some examples of this behaviour — and for the argument that most of us envy and even imitate this behaviour, in our smaller ways — see 51).

Besides, no matter who owned them, all New Age economic enterprises would allow a great deal of latitude to those of us who worked in them. We would be able to determine how many hours we wanted to work each week. We would be able to share our jobs with friends. And we would be able to work at our jobs in many capacities — and at many levels of responsibility. Many factories and offices might choose to rotate their tasks.

So New Age jobs would provide for our own Self-development. But the New Age economy would not be used to provide jobs — or Self-development — for all. For in New Age society, we would have many other and more interesting things to do

than produce and consume goods (and we would each have a guaranteed basic income; see Chap. 12-G). Moreover, we would not need to use the work-world as a kind of detention home for adults — to keep us off the streets, to give us the dignity that we can't find anywhere else, to keep us from beating our wives or committing suicide. Therefore, there would simply be a lot less work for us to do in New Age society — maybe 75 percent less (see Chap. 6).

The different communities would, of course, decide exactly how much they wanted to cut back on production. But I think that most communities would begin by prohibiting the production and-or consumption of all goods that were deemed to be in violation of our New Age rights — our rights to a human-scale environment, to quiet, to clean air, etc. (some of these rights were mentioned in Chap. 12-G, and all of them follow from the premises of New Age society. They would be defined separately, and no doubt differently, by the different communities) (cf. 60).

Communities might also cut back on production and consumption by making it easier for us to pool and share goods — from garden tools to automobiles (2, 29). Many of these goods might be stored in neighbourhood garages, or 'goodbaries'. Would they need attendants?



Summing up, we can say that New Age political economy would require us to be a lot more responsible and a lot more life- (as opposed to thing-) oriented than we are today. But since we would be free of the Prison in New Age society, we would welcome that challenge, and rise to it in style. If Cuban or Chinese society can be described as one big schoolhouse (and their communist leaders do so describe them), then New Age society can be described as one big walk-up apartment, with tea on the kettle and mats on the floor.





Part V

Breaking the Prison Down



Chapter 14

The Ballot, the Bullet — or a Cooperative, Nonviolent, Evolutionary Movement?

So far in this book, we have seen that Prison society cripples us in many ways — so much so that we tend to be our own best jailers (Parts I-III). We have also seen that a genuine alternative to Civilized, or Prison, society is at least possible for us now (Part IV). What we have yet to see is whether we can get from here to there. And, just as important, whether we can do it without becoming just like the liberals and the Marxists in the process.

One thing is sure: it is important to do something. For, as we have repeatedly seen, the Prison is growing in depth and in strength, and we are becoming ever more dependent on monolithic institutions (rather than on our selves). Unless this process is reversed, and soon, there will be no escaping from it, and life, including our own lives, and those of our kids, will become as comfortable, as regimented, and as flat as is life in a real prison, or in any other 'total institution' (see 36). Then there are all the disasters, nuclear and ecological, that are waiting for us if we can't learn to love life more than things (according to Robert Heilbroner, a

well-known economist, most of us are already subconsciously thinking, 'let the drama proceed to its finale, let mankind suffer the end it deserves'; **An Inquiry Into the Human Prospect**, 1974, 142-43).

Some New Age people believe that elections, all by themselves, could usher us in to the New Age (see, e.g., 82, 204, & 97, 180). Others believe that a violent revolution would be necessary — at least at some point (probably, e.g., 8 & 43). And many ecologists and architects believe that we can do more good by trying to change the environment than by trying to change people directly. However, I believe that there is an emerging consensus among New Age people that sees serious — in fact, fatal — flaws in all these solutions, and that calls, instead, for a three-step sequence of personal change, group work, and cooperative nonviolence, the three steps together making up a **cooperative, nonviolent, evolutionary movement** of a new type.

But first — just what are the New Age objections to the ballot, to the bullet, and to the 'design strategy'?

Liberals hope to bring about social change by the ballot — by voting. And it is certainly true that many first- and second- level (see Chap. 4) reforms have been voted in, and it is obviously worth our while to continue to vote them in. But we can't change society on the third level of analysis — we can't break out of the Prison — through the electoral process. That's just not how Prisons operate.

For one thing, election speeches, door-to-door campaign workers, etc., can rarely if ever change people's underlying beliefs and values. (Our attitudes maybe — but the Prison is a matter of our nonconscious ideologies, not of our attitudes.)

For another thing, elections aren't designed to encourage us to make our own decisions or in any way to take responsibility for our lives; instead they're designed to encourage us to give our responsibility away to somebody else (usually tall, dark and pompous) who promises to make our decisions for us.

Finally, there are many non-governmental sources of power in North America — the military, the corporations, the unions, the professions. Most of them have vested interests in monolithic society — in fact, most of them could not exist in their present form without it (see Chap. 6). Therefore, most of them would use their power to prevent any third-level changes from taking place, no matter what we 'said at the polls'. (Imagine what the military might do if we 'voted' to replace the military with a system of cooperative national defence! Consider that in Chile, and in a less spectacular way in British Columbia, non-governmental power blocs recently conspired to bring an end to even democratically-instituted second-level reforms.)

The Marxist solution, on the other hand, and usually also the anarchist solution, is to call for the bullet — to call for a violent revolution. But if voting helps keep us passive, taking up the gun helps keep us death- and thing-oriented; it is equally much a Prison-bound activity, so it could never lead to a New Age society. And it drives most life-oriented people out of the revolutionary camp, for most life-oriented people would never pick up a gun, except maybe in self-defence. (Which is one big reason why so many violent revolutions turn totalitarian.)

Another problem here is that violence leads to the centralization of power. For one thing, violent revolutionary organizations require hierarchy and centralization in order to survive police repression; and, once begun, this is a process that can never be stopped . . . even 'After the Revolution'. For another

thing, a regime that is born out of violence and centralization will require continued violence and centralization to defend itself against internal and external 'enemies'. Finally, the violent struggle for power always weakens the independent revolutionary institutions and social groups that grew up before the violence started . . . leaving the new state that much more powerful (89, 800-02).

An apparent alternative to the ballot and the bullet is the 'design strategy' advocated by many ecologists, engineers, architects and artists. According to the design strategy, it is next to impossible to change people's values or to change their political behaviour; but if we changed the design of the environment in a life-enhancing manner, then people too would change, and their values and their politics would become life-oriented almost as a matter of course.

Even though this strategy does manage to take us off of the old liberal-Marxist continuum (by recognizing that people's underlying values are the central problem), its weaknesses are obvious. Unless and until people's values are changed, where are we going to get the money to build our beautiful new buildings and our 'floating tetrahedral cities'? (From the CIA?) And where are we going to be allowed to build them? Not in place of (or even next door to) the Toronto-Dominion Bank buildings! Architects and planning students have been trying to 'work from within' for years — with almost no success (I was a planning student for a while, so I know, I know). Soleri's students have taken to building the first 'arcology' with their bare hands, literally in the middle of the Arizona desert.

But if the ballot and the bullet are both false options — and if the design strategy is no option at all — where then can we turn?

On the second level of analysis, voting and violence do appear to represent all of our options. But on the third level of analysis, we can see that voting and violence are based on the same false assumptions about political power. The New Age perspective is based on different assumptions. And so it can lead to a different strategy for change.

On the third level, we can see that both liberals and Marxists assume that political power is ultimately in the hands of an elite — of competing elites or 'countervailing powers' (a favourite liberal term) or of a 'ruling class'. And so both assume that in order to change society, we have got to change elites — by voting in a different elite, or by killing off the ruling class and setting up a 'dictatorship of the proletariat', that is, a dictatorship (89, 8).

The Prison Perspective sees political power from quite a different angle. It sees that governments — all governments — depend ultimately on people, and that political power is therefore fragile because it depends ultimately on the support of many different groups of people (89, 8). In this view, political power doesn't grow 'out of the barrel of a gun'. Negative sanctions help to maintain a ruler's political power, especially when the going gets rough; but even the ability to impose sanctions depends on the obedience and cooperation of some of us. And the rest of us would have to fear the sanctions — more than we valued our freedom — for the sanctions to work (89, 14; & cf. 94, 83-84).

Political power depends, then, ultimately on our consent. And in North America, we give that consent for the most part freely. We give it for many reasons besides fear of sanctions: we feel that we should, we identify with our rulers, we know that things could be worse, we are lacking in self-confidence (89, 19-24) — above all, though, is the fact that the Canadian and American governments are governments of, by and for the Prison-bound. They are based on, and they foster, all the Prison

values. Is it any wonder that most of us are loyal?

In order to change Prison society, then, we are first going to have to **withdraw our consent from the Prison within us**. Otherwise we wouldn't want to change things on the third level of analysis, and all our elections, all our violence, would only help to produce societies that were more comfortable and more efficient Prisons. For the 'enemy' is within us as much as it is in the outside world (see esp. 99, 124; & see Pogo). And it is in the outside world **because** it is in us.

At the same time, though, we can see that changing the Prison within us would **not be enough** to change Prison society. For the Prison has produced monolithic institutions that are self-perpetuating and that help to perpetuate the Prison within us (see esp. Chap. 6). And our governments are based on these institutions.

So we are going to have to **withdraw our consent from these institutions — and from our governments —** as well as from the Prison itself.

It is because political power rests on our consent — it is because we have realized that we are **ultimately responsible** for our situations — that many New Age people have been able to talk, write and dream about a cooperative, nonviolent, evolutionary movement of a new type. Based on my reading of hundreds of books (and on countless discussions), I can report that its purpose would be, first, to encourage us to begin to break out of the Prison within; second, to encourage us to work against Prison structures (and for New Age structures) in small groups; and, finally, to allow for us to work against Prison structures (and for New Age structures) by means of cooperative nonviolence.

(Its purpose would be to **allow us to withdraw our consent from the Prison and its structures — and to give our consent to New Age alternatives.**)

It would have to be cooperative and nonviolent because — obviously — authoritarianism and violence go so directly against New Age values. But can there even be such a thing as an 'evolutionary movement'? Isn't that a contradiction in terms? Don't I really mean 'revolutionary movement'?

Not at all. On the first or second levels of analysis, we can speak of revolutionary change. But on the third level, I think we can only speak of evolution, unfolding, process — of changes so deep and thorough that they have to go by another name (cf. 80, 74-76). Moreover, changes of that magnitude could not be forced on us. We would have to grow into them. And that could only be an evolutionary process.

But just because it would have to be evolutionary doesn't mean that it would have to be **slow**. Tom Robbins uses the term 'evolutionary outburst' to describe what is happening to our religious beliefs (in **Another Roadside Attraction**, 1971, p. 160). Theodore Roszak anticipates 'an evolution of consciousness that will unfold with the sweep and depth of revolution' (80, 74). Even Buckminster Fuller, who disagrees with proponents of the human-scale on so many things, is able to speak of our impending 'evolutionary transformation' without batting an eye (28, 145).

An evolutionary movement is (among many other things) a way of speeding up the evolutionary process of New Age becoming.





Chapter 15

The Three Stages of New Age Becoming

In this chapter I am going to try to describe the three stages of an ultimately successful evolutionary movement: personal change, group work, and cooperative nonviolence. In order for the evolution to a New Age to prevail over the devolution of the Prison (into Post-modern culture; see Chap. 5), the vast majority of us would have to go through the first stage, probably most of us would have to go through the second, and most of us would have to be at least supportive of those of us who went on to the third. (We can think of these stages in psychologist Robert Jay Lifton's terms, as constituting a symbolic form of death and rebirth: **confrontation** of self; **reordering** of personal and social priorities; and **renewal** of self and society. And we can think of them as the New Age alternative to Soviet-Maoist 'thought reform', or brainwashing. See 48, esp. 388.)

(A) **PERSONAL CHANGE.** In order to change ourselves deeply, we are going to have to try to break out of at least one side of the Prison. (If we can break out of one side, we can see the rest of the Prison for what it is — it is a single, solid structure, after all.) This is important not only for our own sakes, but for the sake of the evolutionary movement as a whole. Because in North America, the fight is not for a living wage but for the right to enjoy life. And so we are going to have to get in touch with ourselves if we want to do more good than harm. (In the 1960's, I think that most of us felt too guilty or too beset by urgency to begin with ourselves — and it's because of this that our movements degenerated; see 83.)

I wish I was able to explain how to break down each of the six Prison walls. But the truth is, I am still hacking away at my own. Many of us who have chosen to fight our patriarchal attitudes have joined men's and women's consciousness-raising groups or work collectives; others of us have simply chosen not to spend much time with members of the opposite sex (men should see *Morning Due: Journal of Men Against Sexism*, 811 33rd Ave. E., Seattle; many women have found good ideas in Boston Women's Health Book Collective, *Our Bodies, Ourselves*, 2nd ed., 1976, & in *Quest: a feminist quarterly*, 1909 Que St. N.W., Washington, D.C.). Those of us who have wanted to break down our egocentricity have joined meditation groups of various sorts, or have gotten involved in the spiritual wing of the counter-culture (see *East-West Journal* or *New Age Journal*; in Canada, see also *New Directions*, 1962 W.4th Ave., Vancouver). Those of us who have chosen to break down our scientific single vision have joined groups doing body-work, dance, or group-therapy, as part of the process of getting back in touch with the intuitive, holistic and nonlinear parts of ourselves (see, e.g., 93).

Some of us who have wanted to get rid of our **bureaucratic mentalities** have been dropping out of the work-world for a year or more, and living cheap but interesting lives on our savings (see esp. Ernest Callenbach, *Living Poor With Style*, 1972). Others of us have managed to break down our bureaucratic mentalities — and also our **nationalism** — by getting involved in human-scale projects in our local communities (food co-ops, daycare and the like — see, e.g., Gary Faigin, *Basic Equipment Manual*, 1976), and by speculating about the larger implications of our efforts (see the *Co-evolutionary Quarterly*, Box 428, Sausalito, Calif., published by 9, or *Planet Drum*, Box 31251, San Francisco). Finally, many of us have gotten over our **big-city outlooks** by spending a year or more in the country, or in a communal situation, or in both (see *Communities: Journal of Communal Living*, Louisa, Va., or the *Mother Earth News*, Hendersonville, N.C.).

If we begin to break through one of these six Prison walls, it will be hard for us to avoid the pain of realizing how badly we have been crippled as human beings — how difficult it is for us to be honest or spontaneous or real. And we may also become aware of the nothingness that lies beyond and behind our world — the void that the Prison is meant to structure out of our consciousness (see Chap. 1; & see 69). These new awarenesses can, of course, be of great benefit to us (and to society), but at first nearly all of us tend to be caught up in despair over one or both of them. This despair is probably unavoidable, for, as therapist Philip Slater puts it, 'Despair is the only cure for illusion. Without despair we cannot transfer our allegiance to reality — it is a kind of mourning period for our fantasies. Some people do not survive this despair, but no major social change within a person can occur without it' (90, 2).

In order to survive this despair (without simply giving up), we are going to have to understand that the Prison is not only a personal problem, but that it is imbedded in each of us, and in our monolithic institutions as well. This understanding would give us some perspective on our struggle. We would no longer expect to change ourselves in a week or a year; instead we would begin to think of ourselves as Self-developing people by nature (and we would want to continue to develop ourselves). This understanding should also make us want to join groups that were working against Prison values and monolithic institutions in the world outside. And that would bring us to Stage B.



(AA).ADDENDUM: What Could Get Most of Us to Embark on Stage (A)? Lifton says that the process of personal change can only begin with a crisis (48, 388-90). That may be so, but in Prison society, any kind of valid self-discovery amounts to a crisis. If fighting in Vietnam has begun the process of personal change for some, discovering that we are not able to be honest with anybody, or discovering that we are not in touch with what some of us choose to call God, has brought it about for others.

The number one problem for an evolutionary activist is, how to make it possible for **most of us** to make these self-discoveries **and to act on them** (rather than simply repress them). One possible answer is provided by cognitive-dissonance theory. Even though the Prison distorts, in most of us it cannot completely shut out our feeling that we are not all that we could be, that our lives are empty and

meaningless, and that our society is doing us all great harm. But in most of us, these 'dissonant' understandings are drowned out by a barrage of rationalizations: I don't have the money, I don't have the time, maybe my kids, etc. The only way for these dissonant understandings to win out in most of us would be for us to find ourselves in situations (1) where our socially approved beliefs and values no longer made much sense to us, and (2) where we felt we could get some kind of reward if we allowed our dissonant beliefs and values to come to the surface. Both these conditions would be met if society were to be caught up in an evolutionary movement of a new type — in a movement that made it crystal-clear that Prison values were harmful, and at the same time, **provided us with living and practical alternatives** in the form of groups of life-loving people who had already rejected Prison values in favour of their New Age alternatives — groups of people at our workplaces and in our communities who were available to help and support us in our changes (see B below).

A supplementary answer comes from self-perception theory, which argues that the fastest way to change our beliefs is to change our behaviour. For example, favourable attitudes toward desegregation of schools have been found to follow not precede the desegregation of schools. It follows that if a cooperative, nonviolent movement were able to provide us with life-loving groups and situations and experiences — and given half a chance we would choose to take part in them, because it is biologically natural to love life, as we saw in Chap. 9 — then we would find ourselves acting in ways that were life-loving, whether or not we had beliefs that were life-loving. And if our life-loving behaviour continued to 'feel right' to us, we would come to feel a need to reassess our (socially-approved) beliefs — including our beliefs about ourselves.



(B) GROUP WORK. Depending on our interests, temperaments and levels of commitment, we would choose to focus our energies on **Caucuses, Counter-institutions, Clubs or Groups.**

1.) **Caucuses** could be set up in factories, offices, professional organizations. At this stage, their main task would be to encourage working people to think of themselves less as economic people, and more as Self-developing persons. They could attempt to do this by propagating New Age positions (or rather, New Age perspectives) on immediate workplace issues and by attempting to change office rules, union demands, professional standards, etc., in line with these perspectives. And they could make resources for personal change available for all.

2.) **Counter-institutions** could include food co-ops, co-op stores, free-schools, radio stations, etc. (& see 85, 158-59) — the list is potentially endless. The important thing — what makes them counter-institutions — is that they be based on New Age values, not on first- or second-level ideologies like liberalism or Marxism (cf. 46, 80-84).

3.) **Clubs** would be for those of us who were only comfortably committed to the task of speeding up New Age evolution. They might consist of 10-50 people, preferably mixed in age and status, who might meet once a week or so to discuss public issues and private troubles from a New Age point of view. Clubs might also undertake some practical work such as engaging politicians, businessmen and union leaders in public debates, or contributing time or money to the Counter-institutions. Clubs would not be able to reproduce New Age values in all aspects of their existence; nevertheless, they could be a powerful force for propagating New Age values among sympathetic non-activists (cf. 27, 160-64).

4.) Groups of 6-20 people would be for those of us who were most committed to New Age values and who were most eager to propagate and live by them. More often than not, perhaps, group members would live together (in ashrams, communes, etc.); the important point, though, is that Group members would be actively involved in helping to change each other and to speed up New Age evolution. Some Groups might consist of collectives of some or all of the people working in a Caucus or Counter-institution; other Groups might have their own projects. In addition, many Groups might support the work of a New Age group outside their countries, in order to learn to see their work in trans-national perspective (cf. 27, 164-68; 42, Chap. V; 46, 72-77; & 78, 32-33).

After a while, Caucuses, Counter-institutions, Clubs and Groups might begin to band together in order to pool resources and ideas, share a common office of information and a common publication, and co-sponsor regional travellers and an annual Festival of Life (see esp. 46, 72-77).



(C). COOPERATIVE NONVIOLENCE. If Caucuses, Counter-institutions, Clubs and Groups are able to get a majority of people on their side — and if the members of all these New Age groups have continued to develop themselves — they would be able to embark on the third and final stage of the evolutionary movement, the stage of cooperative nonviolence.

Before I describe the three sub-stages that this stage might consist of, I'd like to explain why New Age groups would choose cooperative nonviolence to help them usher in the New Age.

Cooperative nonviolence isn't a passive means of struggle, as the Marxists claim; it is only effective when it gives its practitioners a sense of release (46, 59, 203). But it doesn't encourage or even allow for a violent type of release, as the liberals claim. For it requires the highest type of self-regulation. In other words: only Self-developed people can use it to help the world evolve.

Cooperative nonviolence doesn't try to make other people feel guilty or evil. It does try to point out to others that they're wrong — in advanced cases, it even tries to prevent others from carrying out their wrongdoing. But it simply couldn't work if its practitioners lost all respect for their opponents (see 23 & 46).

If violence centralizes, nonviolence decentralizes. For one thing, nonviolent groups wouldn't have to be dependent on a Central Committee for weapons or money; their tactics would require no weapons, little money, and lots of sensitivity to local nuances and needs. For another thing, a successful violent revolution tends to vest great powers of violence in the central government, as we've seen, and that tends to convince people that they would be helpless against it next time around (a conviction that makes a lot of sense — consider, e.g., Shay's Rebellion in the U.S., the Kronstadt and Makarenko rebellions in Russia, and the resistance to collectivization in China in the early 1950's). But cooperative nonviolence is different. The more that we engage in nonviolent struggle, the more potent a tactic it becomes in our hands — and the more willing and able we are to use it when it suits us (89, 805).

Engaging in acts of cooperative nonviolence would help us to develop ourselves. Cooperative nonviolence would encourage us to end our submissiveness by getting us to stand up to people and groups that might have seemed 'superior' before. It would increase our sense of courage and self-esteem. And it would help us be more enthusiastic and less cynical (89, 778-88).

All in all, then, cooperative nonviolence is a way of teaching people to be strong (and receptive) enough to run a New Age society. Erik Erikson, Harvard psychologist, compares nonviolent action to psychotherapy and finds many interesting parallels; for instance, that in both movements the practitioners learn to be nonviolent to themselves as well as to others (23, 244-52, 436-40). Chogyam Trungpa, Tibetan spiritualist, draws a distinction between aggressive and truthful action. He says that Christ chasing the money lenders out of the temple is an example of truthful action, 'because he saw the precision of the situation without watching himself or trying to be heroic'. And he adds: 'We need action like that' (98, 182).

In what is probably the single most influential book among radicals, *The Wretched of the Earth*, Algerian psychiatrist Frantz Fanon argues that revolutionary violence is necessary and desirable because it serves a therapeutic function for the oppressed. In North America, however, where most of us are suffering from negative symbiosis and only as a result of this from exploitation (see Chap. 10), it would seem more therapeutic for us to assert our strength in a way that was not Prison-bound: in a way that was oriented to life rather than to death. Cooperative nonviolence would depend on our doing just that.

There are many kinds of nonviolent techniques, and in order to use them as effectively as possible, New Age groups might want to initiate a **three-stage sequence** of increasingly mass-based kinds of techniques. (This sequence represents a synthesis of the work of many nonviolent activists and writers. I am especially indebted to the writings of George Lakey, an East Coast strategist and activist, esp. 46.)

1.) **The Message of the Deed.** The first groups that engaged in cooperative nonviolence would attempt to hasten New Age evolution by trying to 'act the New Age out in the present'. This would be more valuable than any number of words in letting people see, and sense, what New Age society is about.

One good way to do this might be by means of 'dilemma demonstrations' — so-called because they 'put the opponent in a dilemma. . . . If he allows the demonstration to proceed, the movement gains the opportunity to educate people. If he represses the demonstration, people are awakened further to the underlying nature' of Civilized or Prison society (46, 103). The voyage of the good ship Greenpeace to the French and American nuclear test sites was an excellent example of a dilemma demonstration. And it was 'acting the New Age out in the present' because the Greenpeaceers were acting as if we'd already banned nuclear weapons (cf. 46, 121).

Also at this stage, New Age groups could begin to introduce some nonviolent action into their regular programmes. Free clinics, for example, could begin to collect the taxes that would normally go to finance the 'defence' portion of the federal budget — and use the monies to set up facilities for poor people. (A similar thing has already happened in Philadelphia; see 46, 120).

Caucus members could act out the Message of the Deed in their professions. Social workers could refuse to force welfare recipients off welfare. Lawyers could insist on jury trials. Doctors could perform abortions on demand. Teachers could refuse to give grades. The point is always to act out the New Age in the present . . . (46, 121).

2.) **Mass Noncooperation.** The Message of the Deed necessarily consists of actions by small groups of committed people, or even by individuals. After these people had perfected their techniques (and developed themselves more) — and when the society was ready — they might begin to initiate acts of noncooperation by vast numbers of us — by all of us whose consciousnesses had been raised to the

point where we could see that we had to choose between the culture of life and the culture of things and of death.

At this stage there might be mass boycotts of goods, mass tax refusals, and giant strikes. (And what strikes! For example, auto workers might strike not for higher wages but for the right to determine how company income is spent.) Mass civil disobedience campaigns might prove unmanageable — partly because the police were unreliable . . . (46, Chap. 6).

Reforms might be granted left and right, but repression would continue to discredit the government. And people would not be content with reforms — they would want the evolution into the New Age to be allowed to continue . . . (cf. 46, 199).

3.) **Mass Responsibility.** Mass noncooperation might make Prison society ungovernable; but in order to evolve into the New Age, we are going to have to do more than this. Among other things, we are going to have to replace all of our monolithic institutions with their biolithic equivalents (see Chaps. 6 & 12-G); and we are going to have to decentralize our governments (see Chap. 12-E).

These are the kind of things that would be happening at this, the final (sub-stage of the final) stage of our evolutionary movement. New Age Caucuses would be achieving dominance in their respective fields — and redefining the fields. And Counter-institutions would be achieving dominance in their fields as Civilized or Prison institutions collapsed or were discredited and more and more of us transferred our loyalties. (People would still be buying Fords and reading the *Vancouver Sun*, but these would no longer be representative of the dominant kinds of transportation or media; see Chap. 12-G.) Local and regional governments would be formed, consisting — initially — of **Coordinating Councils** made up of local and regional representatives of all the Caucuses, Counter-institutions, Clubs and Groups. (These would be less formed than formalized. For many years prior to this stage, Coordinating Councils would probably exist as shadow governments or even as alternate governments to which we might (have tried to) transfer our loyalties. Coordinating Councils might have evolved naturally out of the common activities that Caucuses, Counter-institutions, Clubs and Groups engaged in at Stage B; see B above.)

The only task left would be to make sure that the remaining centres of opposition to New Age institutions and values — numerically weak but probably nationally coordinated and violent, and therefore dangerous — were not able to prevent the vast majority of us from entering the New Age.

This is where the Clubs and Groups would come in. Both would have been growing by leaps and bounds — not only in numbers, but also in experience. The Clubs would have organized large numbers of us into support-groups for the New Age evolutionary movement, thereby making it possible for those of us who were sympathetic non-activists to find some role (probably this would be the great majority of us since, as we've seen, the majority of us are not activist personality-types). One of their major roles would be working with those of us who were not sympathetic but who were not inclined to resist the New Age by means of violence. One thing they could do would be to provide a forum where those of us who were not sympathetic could go to air their grievances and obtain reliable information. Another thing would be to interest those of us who were 'neutral' in personal growth (cf. 82, 206).

The Groups, for their part, would be taking on the most dangerous tasks of the 'mopping-up' period, including — above all — the task of confronting the military and its corporate retainers with disciplined nonviolence. And they would be in charge of closing down all the agencies of the national government and all the big corporations; and they would help in transferring the resources of these to the

local governments (cf. 46, 148-50).

Obviously, these tasks could not be carried out without some kind of central coordinating body. So at this stage if not earlier, a national Coordinating Council would be set up consisting of representatives of all the regional Coordinating Councils. This national Coordinating Council would be very different from the Central Committee of the Marxists because its task would not be to constitute a national government, but simply to aid the regions in the coordination of evolutionary 'mopping-up' operations of a national scope. Moreover, the national Coordinating Council would be entirely dependent on the regions for funding (and the regions on the local governments, as we saw in Chap. 12-E). It would simply have no power apart from the cooperation of the regions — and no power to induce the cooperation of the regions.

By the end of this stage, New Age evolution would finally be free to continue forever, unimpeded by violent threats of a national scope, or by monolithic institutions, or by anything but the scars and stripes left by the Prison. Would these ever heal completely?



Chapter 16

Beyond Hope and Despair

In the last two chapters, I tried to suggest a way out of Prison society — a way that would be democratic and evolutionary and based on New Age values — a way that would not be possible without the support of the vast majority of us. But if it isn't possible for there to be an evolutionary transformation of society until most of us have begun to change ourselves and are willing to take part in a cooperative, nonviolent movement — then what hope does it have, really? And therefore what hope do we have? What is there that can keep us from despair?

People are born with hope, and when they lose it they become corrupt and harden their hearts (27, 205; 48, 167-68). The only apparent alternative to hope is despair, and I believe it is to ward off this despair that liberals continue to fool themselves about the nature of Prison society, and Marxists continue to dream of violent, 'proletarian' revolution in North America. Those of us who have gone through Stage One of the evolutionary movement should know that we need to 'face the void' and get to a space that is beyond hope and despair . . . that transcends either, and by doing so, allows us to see things clearly enough to be able to survive as ethical and compassionate and vulnerable people.

In order to survive with integrity in a world that seems bent on self-destruction and in which we seem to be our own best jailers, we must begin with the fact that we are Prisoners. But we must never allow ourselves to believe that we are only Prisoners, or that we are not, ultimately, responsible for our plight. (A pair of black Marxists have recently argued that in North America, the Marxist

assumption that we are **not** ultimately responsible leads to dependency and parasitism — not to social change. See James and Grace Lee Boggs, **Revolution and Evolution in the Twentieth Century**, 1974, Chap. 11.)

To survive with integrity, we have got to learn an important lesson from Eastern spiritualism: we have got to learn to be in monolithic society (if only because we are), but not of it. We have got to draw a line between ourselves and Prison society and refuse to cross that line, no matter what it costs us in status or in suffering. For we have got to retain our humanity. And Civilized or Prison institutions refuse to allow us to express our humanity, that is, to go beyond Self-development Stages One and Two (see Chap. 7; & cf. 19).

This doesn't mean that we're going to get a chance to 'act like heroes'. For the descent of the Prison isn't an event but a condition of daily life, and in these kind of circumstances the old kind of heroism is dead — as dead as the Weatherman bombers or Patty Hearst's friends. Storming the Pentagon or shooting some corporation executive won't help end the culture of things and of death — especially if we still can't speak to each other, or look at the world with fresh eyes. Instead we need to develop a new concept of heroism — one that recognizes that in North America, the struggle to evolve in a New Age direction, as individuals and as a culture, may be more valuable than trying to inspire Prison-bound people to fight for more things (cf. 19; 48, esp. 378).

By refusing to work for a violent revolution, we would not be 'giving up the struggle'. As we saw in the previous two chapters, we would be struggling — nonviolently — against the Prison, which is more responsible for the sterility of our lives (and of our society) than 'human nature' or 'capitalism'. But even if we can't do any more than embark on the stage of personal growth, even if we can't get a strong group together, or if all our group efforts fail, we would still be learning to preserve our worth as human beings. And that is an absolutely crucial part of the **political** struggle today. For without life-oriented people — without people who have reached Self-development Stages Six or Seven, or are definitely on their way there — there can be no New Age evolution. And only New Age evolution can take us off of the production-consumption continuum and out of the Prison (cf. 76, 355-56; 82, 198).

Beyond hope and despair, then, there is something absolutely crucial to do, and that is to live. To live with simplicity and intensity, gentleness and generosity, so that the idea of a freely Self-developing humanity does not die, however comfortable or 'happy' or obedient the mass of the people may become.





Appendix:

Are We Life-, Thing-, or Death-Oriented?

(from 53, 218-19; see Chap. 9 above)

I. Life-Loving versus Anti-Life Questionnaire

1. Would you, in general, agree or disagree with the statement: Cleanliness is next to godliness?
2. What are the three worst evils: murder for gain, murder out of passion, robbery, homosexuality, rape, treason, adultery, drunkenness, dirtiness, greediness, dope-selling, cruelty to children, betrayal of a friend?
3. Have you given thought to how you wish to be buried: much, some, none?
4. What are the three greatest virtues: discipline, love, obedience, defence of honour, patriotism, joy of life, cleanliness, punctuality, charity, consideration of others, honesty, sincerity?
5. Which is a better quality for a (person) to have: to cook well or be able to keep a house neat?
6. How many times a year should one visit the cemetery where loved ones are buried?
7. Are you in favour of capital punishment?
8. What annoys you most: a person who is too messy or one who is too neat?
9. How important do you feel it is for those who break laws to pay for their crimes: very important, somewhat important, not important?
10. Assume you saw a burglar running away from your house with some of your valuables. Would you: shoot him to wound him or kill him if you could, shoot to scare him, let him go and call the police, do nothing?
11. If you were to buy a new car and soon after found a scratch on the door, how upset would you be: very upset for quite a while, somewhat upset but not for a long time, little upset, not upset?
12. Is it irresponsible for a person to spend most of his income on food, pleasure, and travel and not save any money except for life insurance?

II. Scoring Code — see p. 84 below

III. Theoretical Rationale (excerpts)

Question 1. Many people who believe cleanliness is next to godliness are attracted to rigid order. Furthermore, even though they say what concerns them is cleanliness, they are also looking for dirt.

Question 2. Necrophilic individuals tend to see the worst evils as adultery, robbery, drunkenness, dirtiness, homosexuality, and dope-selling. This reflects a

rigid moralism and, in the case of choosing robbery as most important, the fact that they consider the protection of property more important than crimes against life and love. There is a particular hostility against drugs and liquor in those people, not all of them necrophilic, who worry about self-control. The more biophilic individuals consider greediness as one of the worst evils, since they are aware that greed is an emotional attitude which underlies many crimes. Biophilic individuals also consider cruelty to children and betrayal of a friend to be worse than robbery, homosexuality, or adultery, which in some cases are motivated by vital interests.

Question 3. Necrophilics frequently think a great deal about what they want done with their cadavers. The more grandiose want impressive tombs. This is not to say that a rather biophilic person might not at some time think about how he wants his remains disposed, nor that he represses all thoughts of death. But thinking about his corpse would not be attractive nor interesting for him; quite the contrary.

Question 4. Those on the anti-life side tend to consider the greatest virtues to be obedience, defence of honour, and cleanliness. . . . The biophilic considers love, joy of life, and charity as the most important virtues.

Question 5. Although some who prefer neatness are hoarding and obsessive and not necrophilic, in general the attraction to order as the greater pleasure than good food trends toward the anti-life pole. In some cultures, however, the response to this question may mean something very different.

Question 6. The necrophilic orientation is expressed in attraction to what is dead, which may be rationalized in terms of respect or devotion. (For example, one individual with an extremely necrophilic orientation visited his mother's grave more frequently and devotedly than he visited his mother when living. This person is also a rigid moralist and a gun collector.)

Question 7. Individuals with anti-life attitudes tend to favour the death penalty, just as in general they are attracted to favour killing as a solution to social problems.

Question 8. Individuals with strong biophilic tendencies dislike sterile, rigid order in a person who is overly neat. (Of course, this does not imply that a messy person is any more life-loving than one who is neat.)

Question 9. The anti-life attitude usually includes the feeling that it is very important for people to pay for their crimes. While more biophilic individuals speak in terms of rehabilitation of criminals or of protecting society from criminals, they do not think in terms of retribution. Nor do they consider that the problem of crime will be solved by prison.

Question 10. This question touches the feeling that property is more important than life.

Question 11. This question was based on the clinical observation that individuals with strong anti-life tendencies become very upset when their property is damaged.

Question 12. This question was also based on clinical observation that those with anti-life attitudes resent and even hate those people who use their income to enjoy life. The question is put in a mild form, but it still elicits strong reactions.



Bibliography: New Age Politics

- (1) Robert Bellah, **The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial** (Seabury, 1975).
- (2) Tom Bender, **Environmental Design Primer: A Book of Meditations on Ecological Consciousness** (Schocken, 1973).
- (3) Peter Berger, Brigitte Berger and Hansfried Kellner, **The Homeless Mind: Modernization and Consciousness** (Vintage, 1973).
- (4) Peter Berger, **Pyramids of Sacrifice: Political Ethics and Social Change** (Basic, 1975).
- (5) Peter Berger, **A Rumour of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural** (Doubleday, 1969).
- (6) Kenneth Boulding, **The Organizational Revolution: A Study in the Ethics of Economic Organization**, 2nd ed. (Quadrangle, 1968).
- (7) Doug Boyd, **Rolling Thunder** (Delta, 1974).
- (8) Godfrey Boyle and Peter Harper, eds., **Radical Technology** (Pantheon, 1976).
- (9) Stewart Brand, ed., **The Whole Earth Catalog**, 16th ed. (Penguin, 1976).
- (10) Fernand Braudel, **The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II**, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (Harper & Row, trans. 1974).
- (11) Ernest Callenbach, **Ecotopia** (Banyan Tree, 1975).
- (12) Carlos Castaneda, **Journey to Ixtlan: The Lessons of Don Juan** (Pocket, 1972).
- (13) Barry Commoner, **The Closing Circle: Nature, Man & Technology** (Bantam, 1971).
- (14) Harold Cruse, **The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual** (Morrow, 1967).
- (15) Mary Daly, **Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation** (Beacon, 1973).
- (16) Elizabeth Gould Davis, **The First Sex** (Putnam's, 1971).
- (17) Sebastian de Grazia, **Of Time, Work, and Leisure** (Anchor, 1962).
- (18) Vine Deloria, Jr., **God Is Red** (Grosset & Dunlap, 1973).
- (19) Terrence Des Pres, **The Survivor: An Anatomy of Life in the Death Camps** (Oxford Univ. Press, 1976).
- (20) Helen Diner, **Mothers and Amazons: The First Feminine History of Culture** (Julian, trans. 1965).
- (21) Andrea Dworkin, **Woman Hating** (Dutton, 1974).
- (22) Murray Edelman, **The Symbolic Uses of Politics** (Univ. of Illinois, 1964).
- (23) Erik Erikson, **Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence** (Norton, 1969).

- (24) Shulamith Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* (Bantam, 1970).
- (25) Erich Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (Fawcett, 1973).
- (26) Erich Fromm, *Man For Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics* (Fawcett, 1947).
- (27) Erich Fromm, *The Revolution of Hope: Toward a Humanized Technology* (Bantam, 1968).
- (28) Buckminster Fuller, *Utopia or Oblivion: The Prospects for Humanity* (Bantam, 1969).
- (29) Allen Ginsberg, *The Fall of America; poems of these states 1966-1971* (City Lights, 1972).
- (30) Erving Goffman, *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates* (Anchor, 1961).
- (31) Gopi Krishna, *The Awakening of Kundalini* (Dutton, 1975).
- (32) Carlton Hayes, *Nationalism: A Religion* (Macmillan, 1960).
- (33) Jules Henry, *Culture Against Man* (Vintage, 1963).
- (34) J.H. Hexter, 'Fernand Braudel and the Monde Braudellien . . .', *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 44 (Dec. 1972), 447-539.
- (35) John Holt, *Freedom and Beyond* (Dell, 1972).
- (36) William Howton, *Functionaries* (Quadrangle, 1969).
- (37) Ivan Illich, 'The Alternative to Schooling', *Saturday Review*, vol. 54 (19 June 1971) 44-48+.
- (38) Ivan Illich, 'The Dawn of Epimethean Man', in Bernard Landis and Edward Tauber, eds., *In the Name of Life* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 161-73.
- (39) Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society* (Harrow, 1971).
- (40) Ivan Illich, *Energy and Equity* (London: Calder & Boyars, 1974).
- (41) Ivan Illich, *Medical Nemesis* (London: Calder & Boyars, 1975).
- (42) Ivan Illich, *Tools for Conviviality* (Perennial, 1973).
- (43) Herbert Kohl, *Half the House* (Bantam, 1974).
- (44) Lawrence Kohlberg, 'Development of Moral Character and Moral Ideology', in Martin Hoffman and Lois Hoffman, eds., *Review of Child Development Research*, vol. I (Russell Sage, 1964), 383-431.
- (45) Joel Kovel, *White Racism: A Psychohistory* (Pantheon, 1970).
- (46) George Lakey, *Strategy for a Living Revolution* (Grossman, 1973).
- (47) Doris Lessing, *The Golden Notebook* (Ballantine, 1962).
- (48) Robert Jay Lifton, *Home From The War; Vietnam Veterans: Neither Victims Nor Executioners* (Simon and Schuster, 1973).
- (49) Robert Jay Lifton, 'Protean Man', Chap. 15 of *History and Human Survival* (Random House, 1970).
- (50) John Lilly, *The Centre of the Cyclone* (Bantam, 1971).
- (51) Ferdinand Lundberg, *The Rich and the Super-Rich: A Study in the Power of Money Today* (Bantam, 1968).
- (52) Eleanor Maccoby and Carol Jacklin, *The Psychology of Sex Differences* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1975).
- (53) Michael Maccoby, 'Emotional Attitudes and Political Choices', *Politics and Society*, vol. 2 (Winter 1972), 209-39.
- (54) Abraham Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature* (Viking, 1971).

- (55) Abraham Maslow, *Motivation and Personality*, 2nd ed. (Harper & Row, 1970).
- (56) Abraham Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being*, 2nd ed. (Van Nostrand, 1968).
- (57) Seymour Melman, *The Permanent War Economy: American Capitalism in Decline* (Simon and Schuster, 1974).
- (58) Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View* (Harper & Row, 1974).
- (59) Kate Millett, *Sexual Politics* (Doubleday, 1970).
- (60) Ezra Mishan, *The Costs of Economic Growth* (Praeger, 1967).
- (61) Ashley Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, 4th ed. (World, 1964).
- (62) Barrington Moore, Jr., *Reflections on the Causes of Human Misery and upon Certain Proposals to Eliminate Them* (Beacon, 1972).
- (63) Lewis Mumford, *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961).
- (64) Lewis Mumford, *The Pentagon of Power* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1970).
- (65) Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Human Development* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967).
- (66) Lewis Mumford, *The Transformations of Man* (Harper & Row, 1956).
- (67) Jack Nichols, *Men's Liberation: A New Definition of Masculinity* (Penguin, 1975).
- (68) Anais Nin, *The Diary of Anais Nin* (Harvest, 1966-).
- (69) Michael Novak, *The Experience of Nothingness* (Harper & Row, 1970).
- (70) Robert Ornstein, *The Psychology of Consciousness* (Penguin, 1972).
- (71) Marge Piercy, *Small Changes* (Fawcett, 1974).
- (72) Robert Pirsig, *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance: An Inquiry into Values* (Bantam, 1974).
- (73) Kenneth Pitchford, *Color Photos of the Atrocities; poems* (Little, Brown, 1973).
- (74) Linda Quiring, *Island of Knowledge* (Ganges, B.C.: Sydney Banks Spiritual Foundation, 1975).
- (75) Ram Dass, *The Only Dance There Is* (Anchor, 1972).
- (76) Tom Robbins, *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues* (Houghton Mifflin, 1976).
- (77) Carl Rogers, *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy* (Houghton Mifflin, 1961).
- (78) Michael Rosman, *On Learning and Social Change* (Vintage, 1972).
- (79) Theodore Roszak, ed., *Sources* (Harper Colophon, 1972).
- (80) Theodore Roszak, *Unfinished Animal: The Aquarian Frontier and the Evolution of Consciousness* (Harper and Row, 1975).
- (81) Theodore Roszak, *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Postindustrial Society* (Doubleday, 1972).
- (82) Jerry Rubin, *Growing (Up) at Thirty-seven* (M. Evans, 1976).
- (83) Mark Satin, *Confessions of a Young Exile* (Toronto: Gage, 1976).
- (84) Leonard Schein, 'An Introduction to Male Psychology, Consciousness, and Liberation', paper (privately printed, 1975; write 11139 132nd St., Surrey, B.C.).
- (85) E. F. Schumacher, *Small Is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered* (Perennial, 1973).

- (86) Franz Schurmann, 'Arcana of Empire', Part I of *The Logic of World Power*
- (87) Richard Sennett and Jonathan Cobb, *The Hidden Injuries of Class* (Knopf, 1972).
- (88) Gene Sharp, *Exploring Nonviolent Alternatives* (Porter Sargent, 1971).
- (89) Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Porter Sargent, 1973).
- (90) Philip Slater, *Earthwalk* (Anchor, 1974).
- (91) Gary Snyder, *Turtle Island* (New Directions, 1974).
- (92) David Spangler, *Revelation: The Birth of a New Age*, 2nd ed. (Rainbow Bridge, 1976).
- (93) Claude Steiner, *Scripts People Live* (Bantam, 1974).
- (94) Robert Theobald, *Beyond Despair: Directions for America's Third Century* (New Republic, 1976).
- (95) Robert Theobald, *Habit and Habitat* (Prentice-Hall, 1972).
- (96) William Irwin Thompson, *At the Edge of History* (Harper & Row, 1971).
- (97) William Irwin Thompson, *Passages About Earth: An Exploration of the New Planetary Culture* (Harper & Row, 1974).
- (98) Chogyam Trungpa, *Cutting Through Spiritual Materialism* (Shambhala, 1973).
- (99) Alan Watts, *The Book: On the Taboo Against Knowing Who You Are* (Collier, 1966).
- (100) Alan Watts, *The Way of Zen* (Vintage, 1957).



II. Scoring Code — Life-Loving versus Anti-Life Questionnaire (see p. 79 above)

Add points for the total score. A low score indicates life-loving attitudes. A high score indicates anti-life attitudes.

1. (Agree) - 1 point.
2. 1 point if adultery, robbery, drunkenness, dirtiness, homosexuality, dope-selling are chosen. Add points.
3. 2 points for much, 1 point for some, 0 for none.
4. 1 point for each if obedience, defence of honour, cleanliness are chosen.
5. 'Keep a house neat' - 1 point.
6. 0 - 0, 1 to 4 - 1, 4 or more - 2.
7. Yes - 1 point.
8. 'Too messy' - 1 point.
9. Very important - 2 points, somewhat important - 1 point, not important - 0.
10. Shoot to wound or kill - 3 points, shoot to scare - 2 points, call police - 1 point, nothing - 0.
11. 2 points for 'very upset', 1 point for 'little upset' or 'somewhat upset', 0 for 'not upset'.
12. Yes - 1 point.

(Some mean scores in 1968-69: among all the first-year students in a University of Chicago lecture course, 5.9; among all the mothers in a 'middle-class' school district in Palo Alto, Calif., 7.4; among a random sample of people-over 21 in Santa Cruz, Calif., 9.5. See 53, 237-39.)

'This is the right approach'

— SWAMI KRIYANANDA, spiritual leader

'A really positive and reinforcing synthesis of ideas — it helped give me a sense of direction . . .'

— JEANETTE GRITTANI, feminist folk musician

'A brisk, readable, compact attempt to sketch out and integrate, in an appealingly personal first-approximation way, the new politics that goes with what has begun to happen in the wake of the New Left'.

— ERNEST CALLENBACH, author of ECOTOPIA

**This book is about the new politics
that is arising out of the ideas
of the feminist, men's liberation,
spiritual, human-potential, ecology,
appropriate-technology, education-reform,
and neopacifist movements of the 1970's
and out of the ideas of disillusioned social scientists
and political people who share these concerns**

MARK SATIN has written two other books: a novel, **BIG PLANS**, published as **CONFESSIONS OF A YOUNG EXILE** (Toronto: Gage, 1976), and the **MANUAL FOR DRAFT-AGE IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA** (Toronto: House of Anansi, 1968), which sold 100,000 copies in eight editions. He has been a good liberal (Mississippi, good grades) and, later, a good Marxist (president of an SDS chapter, director of the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme); currently he is involved with many of the movements whose ideas he has written about here.