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The Presence and Promise of the New Consciousness

By Benjamin Mehrling

The counter culture controversy—that is, the claims and denials over the arrival of a new kind of person, a new breed, a new sensibility—widely discussed in the late sixties, has reached a new level of intensity. The critics are now taking the initiative, putting forward arguments intended to show either that the youth movement has been faddish, laden with contradictions, and a luxury of the “elitists,” or that it never did exist except in the imaginations and wishes of its identifiers and “discoverers.”

I believe the critics have largely failed to take into account just what the discoverers of the new sensibility have been trying to tell us. Their evidence and arguments, which I shall review, soundly demonstrate the emergence of a new consciousness which is both durable and expanding.

This being the case, then it is clearly time for those of us involved in higher education to respond appropriately to this growing—and I think vital—sub-culture. Just as in past times we accommodated education to, say, “aristocratic,” “puritan,” and “bourgeois” consciousness, we now ought to accommodate to the new consciousness. Therefore, I shall also suggest some approaches for the education of the new consciousness, which, lacking a better term, I shall sometimes designate simply as “new con.”

EVIDENCES OF NEW CON

In order to make convincing the presence and nature of new con I have chosen to outline the arguments of Margaret Mead, Buck-
minster Fuller, Theodore Roszak, Charles Reich, Daniel Yankelovich, and Carl Rogers. I assume the reader will regard at least most of these persons as capable of writing authoritatively on this question.

**New Con as “Prefiguration.”** We begin with anthropologist Margaret Mead who compares today’s youth with frontiersmen entering and settling a new and unknown territory. The only real difference between them and former pioneer immigrants, she observes, is that instead of geographical migration, theirs has been accelerated migration in time.

Mead reminds us of a plethora of changes which have taken place only within the past few decades—the period within which these youth were born:

> The invention of the computer, the successful splitting of the atom and the invention of fission and fusion bombs, the discovery of the biochemistry of the living cell, the explorations of the planet's surface, the extreme acceleration of population growth and the recognition of the certainty of catastrophe if it continues, the breakdown in the organization of cities, the destruction of the natural environment, the linking up of all parts of the world by means of jet flights and television, the preparations for the building of satellites and the first steps into space, the newly realized possibilities of unlimited energy and synthetic raw materials and, in the more advanced countries, the transformation of man’s age-old problems of production into problems of distribution and consumption—all these have brought about a drastic, irreversible division between the generations.¹

It is Mead’s thesis that an irreversible generation gap has taken place: “The break between generations is wholly new: it is planetary and universal.” Whereas for centuries elders reminded their youth, “I have been young and you have never been old,” our young people can now correctly say, “You have never been young in the world I have been young in, and you never can be!”²

Previously children learned primarily from their forebears (she calls this postfiguration); their elders knew more because of their experience of having grown up within a cultural system. Today, however they tend to distrust knowledge and authority of the past or to regard it as inapplicable; they are therefore forced to depend upon one another for support and growth and judgments (prefiguration). “It is

---


² Ibid., pp. 49-50.
not only that parents are no longer guides,” she states, “but that there are no guides...”³

Another characteristic of the youth of whom she writes is their identification with the entire world: they think in terms of world community, even though they are acutely aware of the absence of organizations and sanctions by which a world political community can be achieved. This world-awareness has had associated consequences: their identification with all people is removing old distinctions between “my” group and “theirs.” Indeed, for them, killing a political enemy is not qualitatively different from murdering a neighbor.

Finally, they are preoccupied with the present. They view their inheritance from past generations as “a colossal failure” and they as yet lack a compelling vision of the future or confidence that there will be a future. Yet, they want somehow to begin all over again.⁴

**New Con as “Universal Man.”** Buckminster Fuller, too, believes he has discovered a world-consciousness among a large number of our youth. Fuller, popularly known for his geodesic domes, but who prefers to be recognized as a comprehensivist, relates that in his constant travels around the world he is witnessing everywhere “the swiftly accelerating birth of world man,” especially in North America. He applauds the Berkeley students who demonstrated at midwinter 1964-65. That event encapsulates his contention:

> The students were not inspired by their loyalty to their own particular family, to their particular college, to their particular town. They were not interested in the state. They felt no loyalty to their nation. Their elders were shocked. But the students had not lost their fundamental idealism... They felt it immoral to be chauvinistic and patriotic. The young people were and are only interested in the whole world and the welfare of all humanity.⁵

Until recently the entrance of the universal person had been prevented by ignorance and obsolete knowledge, Fuller reminds.⁶ Now, the youth “have at last glimpsed the realization that they no longer must leave the solutions of the world’s problems to the politicians or to anyone other than themselves.”⁷ Design science and the new knowledge are firing their imaginations and hopes as they begin to realize that it is possible for them to plan a good future which also is compati-

---

ble with the requirements of survival; that by "doing more with less" here on spaceship earth (as they have seen accomplished on ocean-going vessels and spaceships) there will be enough to go around; that more wealth can be generated through cooperative planning than by competition; and consequently that war and starvation and deprivation are not inevitable nor insolvable.

**New Con as "Counter Culture."** Theodore Roszak, who popularized the term "counter culture," believes we are witnessing the entrance of a cultural phenomenon "so radically disaffiliated from mainstream assumptions of our society that it scarcely looks to many as a culture at all..." Indeed, the offended are often inclined to misjudge it as a "barbaric intrusion." 

According to Roszak, our industrial society has spawned a highly integrated and efficient—but humanly debilitating—"technocracy," which, in turn, has given birth to the counter culture. This "technocracy" is described as,

... that social form in which an industrial society reaches the peak of its organizational integration. It is the ideal which we usually have in mind when we speak of modernizing, updating, rationalizing, planning. Drawing upon such unquestionable imperatives as the demand for efficiency, for social security, for large scale coordination of men and resources, for even higher levels of affluence and even more impressive manifestations of collective human power, the technocracy works to knit together the anachronistic gaps and fissures of the industrial society.

The cruel consequence and ultimate insult of technocracy is social engineering: "entrepreneurial talent broadens its province to orchestrate the total human context which surrounds the industrial complex." It infects politics, education, leisure and entertainment, culture as a whole, and the unconscious drives.

What went wrong? What conditions led people to consent to surrender their souls and march to the edge of annihilation?

For the answer Roszak takes us back to the sixteenth century, which marks the beginning of an intensification of the objectification of nature (including the human body) and the general acceptance of the proposition that science alone possesses the methods of "knowing." Allowing for exceptions, epistemological blindness has prevailed since Bacon and Descartes proclaimed the superiority of the

9 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
10 Ibid., p. 6.
scientific method. Gradually all nonempirical methods came under the cloud of suspicion and contempt. Modes of knowing such as insight, revelation, imagination, historical disclosure, and intuition occupied either a low position or no place at all among the epistemological options. Mystery, oneness, symbolic attachment (including myth) were crowded out by empirical arrogance.

Today, Roszak observes, the so-called scientific method reigns, and post-industrial man kneels obediently before his sovereign—technocracy. In certain instances the obedience has been conscious; more often it has taken place below the level of awareness. Most people never question whether their empirical commitment is anything less than the one true god. They simply behave that way.

Borrowing from the poet William Blake, Roszak uses “single visioned” to describe persons comprising a passing and decadent culture. Single vision amounts to the triumph of reductionism (dreams, mysteries, symbols and myths are regarded as “nothing but . . .”), loss of soul, totalitarianism (technocracy), and impending environmental collapse. (Incidentally, Herbert Marcuse uses the term “one-dimensional man” to designate the same condition. Roszak and Marcuse share the view that science has become the dominator of man, but whereas Marcuse advocates the alternative of historical transcendence, Roszak calls for a return to the Old Gnosis, meaning a respect for the various approaches to knowing.)

The scientific enterprise has survived and, indeed, thrived, by clinging to certain spurious presuppositions which generate vigorous public support. One of these is the assumption that science will lead to the good life and the good society. Another is domination. From the time of Bacon and Descartes science has been regarded as a method of “controlling,” rather than cooperating with or empathizing with nature. Indeed, it was necessary first to desacramentalize nature (to think of nature as mere dead, objective matter) in order to get the scientific enterprise moving. And a third single-visioned assumption is the dichotomization of the world into objective-subjective, body-mind, fact-value, natural-supernatural, and so on. While this tactic may have been convenient for getting rid of the annoying intrusions of the “other world,” the attempted separation merely demonstrates the inadequacy of science to deal with the whole of reality. It contradicts the historical and intuitional conviction that the world is “one.”

The counter culture, an outgrowth of single-visioned culture, represents a struggle to recapture wholeness of the person and the world. This new culture affirms a lifestyle which contradicts single-visioned culture: it is concerned about communitarian values and ventures, the

13 Where the Wasteland Ends, pp. 178-263.
non-intellectual aspects of human existence, the expansion of experiences and the use of various modes of “knowing,” trust of feelings, identification with nature, self-discovery and wholeness, cooperative efforts toward social reform, and simplicity of life.

**New Con as “Consciousness III.”** Charles Reich of Yale University Law School believes that the “corporate state” is generating rebellion, revolution, and even its own destruction:

> It is our theory that the State itself is now bringing about its own destruction. The machine has begun to do the work of revolution. The State is now generating forces which will accomplish what no revolutionaries could accomplish themselves. There is nothing the State can do, by possession of power, to prevent these forces from bringing it down.\(^{14}\)

Since the corporate state owes its existence to willing workers and willing consumers, it tries harder every day to preserve the system by keeping the worker contented and passive. But work and consumption and life in the corporate state are becoming increasingly oppressive, artificial, and unsatisfying. Increasingly people are doubting its rationality.\(^{15}\)

Reich claims to be able to identify three kinds of consciousness existing within present society, however, in tension.\(^{16}\) Consciousness I, the origins of which are rooted in the nineteenth century, is the traditional outlook of the farmer, small businessman, and the worker who wants to get ahead. Consciousness II, the prevailing mode since World War II, is in league with the corporate state. Behind a facade of optimism it views persons in pessimistic, Hobbesian terms, interpreting human beings as aggressive, competitive, and power-seeking; it places great confidence in institutions, bureaucracies, and organizations; it accepts technological manipulation of man and nature; it chants the myth of meritocracy. Especially is Consciousness II man characterized by his bifurcated life: he disclaims personal responsibility for what his organization or society does; he lives as both public and private man with respect to the realm of values; and he accepts the administration of public and personal consciousness as a necessary function of society.

Presently Consciousness III includes mainly youth and some adults who have become aware of an alternative and vital life style. They have a glimpse of just how desirable life can really be, as well as an intense awareness of current dehumanizing and disastrous trends.\(^{17}\)


These persons, Reich believes, make up the vanguard of an approaching revolution, one which will not be violent nor successfully resisted by violence.\textsuperscript{18}

Consciousness III persons are seen by Reich as not primarily political activists, a feature which Adelman scorns and ridicules—and misunderstands. Adelman misses the point.\textsuperscript{19} Absorbed in criticizing new con for lacking “will-energy” to prepare for and enter the institutional mainstream, he passes over Reich’s explanation, which I quote below:

The Corporate State cannot be fought by the legal, political, or power methods that are the only means ever used up to now by revolutionists or proponents of social change. We must no longer depend wholly upon political and legal activism, upon structural change, upon liberal or even radical assaults on existing power. Such methods, used exclusively, are certain to fail.\textsuperscript{20}

In place of political activism as ordinarily understood, Reich predicts an effective “revolution by consciousness”:

The only plan that will succeed is one that will be greeted by most social activists with disbelief and disparagement, yet it is entirely realistic—the only means that is realistic, given the nature of the contemporary state: \textit{revolution by consciousness}.\textsuperscript{21}

He distinguishes between the immediate and the eventual purposes of new con, although these should not be understood as altogether sequential. The first stage is mainly living out vital life, which itself exposes the false premises of the corporate state and thereby weakens its structures; and the second stage is taking roles in creating and administering a truly humanized society.\textsuperscript{22}

Let us now look at a profile of this new revolutionary consciousness taken either directly or inferentially from Reich:

The Consciousness III individual especially expresses liberation, which means he is able to build his own philosophy and values. He accepts no imposed system, values or goal, and, unlike Consciousness II, he refuses to accept unthinkingly the goals set by society. He chooses to live modestly in order to retain the freedom he cherishes.

He is energy—the energy of enthusiasm, happiness and hope, and he draws energy from the group, the community, from eros, from the uninhibited self, from his freedom from servility to technology and the amenities created by Consciousness I and II.

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Greening of America}, p. 300.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 300.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 307
He emphasizes being true to one's self. He affirms life and seeks constant personal change and growth. He is in touch with his feelings and appreciates his body. He believes in the worth of every human being. He enjoys noncompetitive, nonjudgmental, honest relationships.

He is unimpressed by traditional motivations—competition, envy, jealousy. He has little concern for titles and status, and no intense ambitious concentration—he prefers to relax and see what happens. He is suspicious of analysis, logic, rationality and principles, since reason leaves out too many factors and values which experience has proved to be vital and necessary. His sensitivity to injustice and his feeling of responsibility combine to heighten his resentment of personal helplessness and entice him into the decision-making arenas.

Before leaving Reich, let us look at his vision of the new society which he believes the new consciousness can bring into being:

When the new consciousness has achieved its revolution and rescued us from destruction, it must go about the task of learning how to live in a new way. This way of life presupposes all that modern science can offer. It tells us how to make modern science and technology work for, and not against the interests of man. The new way of life presupposes a concept of work in which quality, dedication, and excellence are preserved, but work is nonalienated, is the free choice of each person, is integrated into a full and satisfying life, and expresses and affirms each individual being. The new way of life makes both possible and necessary a culture that is nonartificial and nonalienated, a form of community in which love, respect, and mutual search for wisdom replace the competition and separation of the past, and a liberation of each individual in which he is enabled to grow toward the highest possibilities of the human spirit.23

*New Con as "The New Naturalism."* We turn now to Daniel Yankelovich's third survey and study of student values and attitudes. Conducted in 1971 and financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, this impressive survey discloses first of all that student alienation continues and is increasing.24 Students tend to mistrust institutions, they believe the family structure is no longer working, they feel that our present system of government is democratic in name only and that special interests actually run things and manipulate the masses into thinking that their opinions really count, and they find it difficult to accept authority and power. Sixty-nine per cent rejected the traditional belief that hard work can be expected to "pay off"—an increase of thirty per cent in just three years! So much for increasing alienation.

Yankelovich discovered also that while a stabilization of certain cultural characteristics reminiscent of the late sixties is taking place, the same students tend to reject the kind of political thinking and methods associated with that period. This separation of the cultural from the political should not be interpreted as an abandonment of the political sector, he cautions. Rather, students are concluding that the approaches of those years were not only unproductive and counterproductive, but that the methods used at that time contradict their life style and world view. In short, the political methods employed to achieve social and political reform were inconsistent with the more powerful revolution currently in operation.

Those in the vanguard of the cultural revolution mistrust the use of power. They see power as a form of bulldozerism. They believe that transformation in people's basic values must take place without the need to employ coercive power because power destroys the very values they wish to advance.25

A "positive idea" is energizing the student movement, Yankelovich believes: it is "The New Naturalism." Just what does he mean by the new naturalism?

The essence of the idea is that we must initiate a new stage in man's relationship to nature and the natural. In the hierarchy of values that constitute man's conception of *summum bonum*, the student-led cultural revolution elevates nature and the natural to the highest position. Whatever is "natural" is deemed good; whatever is artificial and opposed to the natural is bad.26

Although it is not always clear just what is natural and why, it would seem that the natural at least fulfills inherent human needs which at present are being frustrated. He lists eighteen aspects of the natural which reside either implicitly or explicitly in the movement's philosophy of nature. I have condensed his list in the following comparative fashion:27

The "Passing" Sensibility

A1—Darwinian concept of survival of fittest, competition, individualism, mastery over nature.

B1—Objectivity, trust of conceptual knowledge, scientific method, detachment.

The New Naturalism

A2—Interdependence of all things and species in nature, cooperation, individuality.

B2—Trust of sensory experience, celebrating the unknown and the mystical and mys-

---

25 Ibid., p. 179.
26 Ibid., p. 169.
27 Ibid., pp. 169-71.
Cl—“Artificial” organization, social artifices and rules supporting this consciousness, “official” authority.

C2—Living close to nature, living in groups, looking and feeling natural, nonverbal expressions, self-knowledge, authority by winning respect, introspection, rejection of rules which interfere with natural expression and function.

**New Con as “The Person of Tomorrow.”** From his direct experience as a psychoanalyst and leader of encounter groups, Carl Rogers flamboyantly announces the entrance of “new man,” the “person of tomorrow” into history.28

This new man is described as almost the antithesis of the puritan man; his characteristics run counter to the orthodoxies, dogmas, forms and creeds of the major western religions; in his person he contradicts traditional views of management, education, the military, uniformity, marriage, bureaucracy. He has no use for highly structured institutions; he values organization which is fluid and adaptable.

Especially he insists upon authenticity; he reacts against sham, phoniness, pretense, wherever he finds it. Although he has often been accustomed to the affluent life and readily makes use of material things, he is unwilling to accept material rewards and material things if they mean he must compromise his integrity in order to do so.

He seeks community, closeness and intimacy, shared purposes, and he values both verbal and nonverbal communication. Accepting the transitory life as a fact of life, he moves in and out of groups easily, but he quickly develops close bonds when he enters a group. He can cooperate with others with great effectiveness, not in order to conform or to be a good fellow, but to pursue goals which he is convinced are valid or meaningful.

He is a searching person. He accepts uncertainty, and he is willing to live with anxious uncertainty. There exists a certain rhythm within his life—between change and stability, between anxiety and temporary security. He likes to be close to elemental nature.

He is an open person—open to himself and close to his own feelings. He is also open and sensitive to the thoughts and feelings of

---

28 Carl Rogers, *Citizens of the Seventies: A New American Man* (From a transcription of a taped radio presentation by the National Information Network from Northeastern University with cooperation of the Associates for Human Resources.)
others. He is able to communicate with himself more than any other previous man. He is spontaneous. He trusts his feelings, experiences, and potential. He is outraged about injustice, which he regards as unnecessary. He is vitally alive.

The six summaries of the new consciousness, identified as Prefiguration, Universal Man, Counter Culture, Consciousness III, The New Naturalism, and The Person of Tomorrow, are strikingly similar. With forcefulness and confidence resulting from calculated observation and analysis, they proclaim the historical arrival of a new kind of person.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NEW CON

The six conclusions are identical: a historical event of the arrival of a new kind of person has taken place. And the six profiles of this new person are remarkably similar.

Let us now turn to three other areas of consensus which have been alluded to but now require closer examination. They are "uniqueness," "permanence," and "urgency."

Uniqueness. The emergence of new con is a historical event without parallel in history. Naturally one is tempted to abstract particular features, such as Rousseauian primitivism, and thereby identify the movement with another era, but such an attempt ignores other evidences and the historical context. Perhaps the most powerful argument posited for the uniqueness of new con is the new setting—brought about by accelerated change, technology, and new information.

One should also resist the temptation to regard new con as simply another facet within American pluralism. Alvin Toffler, for example, would have us believe that the arrival of technology has made possible the survival and expansion of the idea of pluralism, that new con, therefore, can coexist within the total pluralistic setting of which American tradition prides itself. This is clearly not what the writers whose views I have summarized have in mind. The pluralistic interpretation undermines the redemptive character of new con.

Finally, one should avoid identifying the new consciousness with certain reform movements. Black power, women's liberation, gay liberation, and the new left—to name just a few—are not examples of the new consciousness, although new con may be sympathetic to some of their goals and even participate in their cause. Movements of the kind mentioned are essentially imitative of and congenial toward the tactics and assumptions and goals of the establishment. Their approaches and presuppositions are basically inconsistent with new con.

Permanence. Although this new subculture should not be regarded
as unchanging or unchangeable, neither should it be thought of as a mere fad, soon to disappear. We can expect new con to be with us for at least the foreseeable future. According to Carl Rogers, “he is not a spot on the evolutionary line, soon to die out or be discarded;”29 Daniel Yankelovich predicts “the new naturalism will continue to grow at an ever-increasing tempo;”30 Theodore Roszak assures us that “the generational revolt is not likely to pass over in a few years’ time,” and that its numbers and influence will increase;31 and we repeat Buckminster Fuller’s observation that, “In my constant travel around the world I witness everywhere the swiftly accelerating birth of world man.”32

**Urgency.** Most importantly, our writers agree that the disappearance of the new consciousness could result in disaster.

Victor Ferkiss, professor of government at Georgetown University, has written a sobering book in which he recognizes two incompatibilities: the arrival of the technological age, and the continuation of social-industrial control by “bourgeois man.” Since Ferkiss does not acknowledge the arrival of the new consciousness, he anxiously awaits the entrance of “Technological Man” onto the scene before disaster takes place. Vacillating between hope and dread, he writes:

Humanity is on the threshold of self-transformation, of attaining new powers over itself and its environment that can alter its nature as fundamentally as walking upright or the use of tools.

On the other hand,

... there are certain patterns of institutional and personal behavior that are almost as resistant to change as those of the lower animals and social insect.33

Ferkiss sees a combination of the “animal irrationality of primitive man, with the calculated greed and power-lust of industrial man, while possessing the virtually God-like powers granted him by technology” as leading to “the ultimate horror.” 34

Human survival requires that nineteenth-century industrial man be replaced by Technological Man, the latter described in terms similar to those already used to describe the new consciousness.

It is not an overstatement to say that the discoverers of the new

---

29 Ibid., p. 3.
30 Changing Values on Campus, p. 179.
31 Making of a Counter Culture, p. 40.
32 Utopia or Oblivion, p. 340.
34 Ibid., p. 34.
consciousness regard those persons as nothing less than saviors of society, of the future. Charles Reich talks about the time when the new consciousness "has rescued us from destruction" and later on claims that "only (new con) can make possible the continual survival of man as a species in this age of technology." Should the new consciousness fail, Theodore Roszak predicts,

... there will be nothing in store for us but what anti-utopians like Huxley and Orwell have forecast—though I have no doubt that these dismal despotisms will be far more stable and effective than their prophets have foreseen.

Carl Rogers believes that new con “can create a culture which will nourish and nurture those qualities” of the new consciousness, “for it may be that [new con] holds a great deal of promise for all of us and for our future.” He continues,

In a world marked by incredibly rapid technological change, we desperately need his ability to live as a fluid process. In a world characterized by overwhelming psychological sham and pretense, we certainly need his uncompromising integrity.

And Margaret Mead has said that inasmuch as we have survived to see post-World War II babies enter adulthood, there is hope for the future through them.

Earlier we recalled that there have been other instances of the arrival of other sensibilities into the world. Their impact, in some instances, was felt for centuries, even to this day. The “puritan consciousness,” to name one, stubbornly persisted and penetrated and reshaped virtually every sector of American life. It is my view that we should regard the entrance of new con with utmost respect and sober consideration.

We have examined evidences and descriptions of the presence and character of the new consciousness. We have seen that it is unique, that it is not passing or faddish, but entrenched and expanding. We have been shown that it offers not a threat but hope for a very desirable future, and we have been warned that catastrophe could follow its failure. These are important reasons for inquiring into appropriate approaches for the education of the new consciousness.

**APPROACHES TO EDUCATION**

The new person, says Carl Rogers, knows traditional education as it really is—“the most rigid, outdated, incompetent, bureaucratic in-

---

35 *Making of a Counter Culture*, p. 19.
37 *Citizens of the Seventies*, p. 7.
38 From an address delivered at Ford Hall Forum, Boston, October 8, 1972.
stitution in our culture." He questions whether educators and administrators can learn to communicate with this new person, whether they can hear him, understand him, participate with him, and allow themselves to become involved in significant relationships with him.39 Still, he, like the other identifiers of new con, echoes Roszak's claim that the saving promise of new con makes urgent the need to understand and educate him.40

My concern here is not to present proposals for new structures and new methods, but rather to introduce four "approaches" which correspond to four beliefs held by the new consciousness: the comprehensiveness of the world; the desirability of cooperative intelligence; the urgent need to set out in new directions which are compatible with nature and human nature; and the concern that the achievement of full humanness is at least as important as the attainment of other knowledge and skills.

**Collaborative Approaches.** By collaborative approaches I mean shared intelligence, cooperative planning and activity, engaging dialog, egalitarian relationships, mutuality and interaction, the formation of a network of obligations. The values associated with collaborative approaches are compatible with the assumptions of new con. Indeed, such persons tend to feel comfortable in dialogical situations.

The fundamental presupposition of collaborative approaches is that truth does not "descend" from "on high," but rather emerges from a patient, expectant, and shared search. The traditional model of the pyramid of vertical line is replaced by the horizontal circle; and in place of "up" and its term-equivalents, the authoritative term is "dialog." It is thoroughly egalitarian.

As pre-institutional in nature, collaboration places institutions and structures at the disposal of group creative interaction, to be shaped and reshaped as the result of deliberation. It is not anti-structure, but averse to institutions as determiners of values and courses of action.

Collaboration is especially helpful for generating an atmosphere which is conducive for analysis and criticism, as well as for satisfying the need for clarification and synthesis. Furthermore, it promotes confrontations with another's views, the unexamined goals of society, and the various internalized myths and images of reality.

Collaboration depends upon and respects the experiences and knowledge of all the participants. The teacher is fellow-teacher and fellow-learner with the students. The information explosion, the easy access to information and ideas outside of class, and the diversity of experiences of the participants assure that sharing brings more relevant information and insights to a situation than if one person, presumably

---

40 Making of a Counter Culture, p. 1.
the instructor, were to assume the traditional role of dispenser of knowledge and wisdom.

Collaboration can stimulate the development of individual intentionality, creativity, and a sense of importance and potency, as well as produce an even greater sophistication and increased confidence in the group process. Furthermore, experiencing success through collaborative approaches tends to expose the dehumanizing aspects and other weaknesses of authoritarian, hierarchial, and competitive approaches, while enhancing the attractiveness and merit of cooperative ventures.

Collaboration tends to liberate individuals to question, explore, trust and appreciate themselves, as well as to strengthen their belief in the desirability of interdependence over and above domination-submission or nineteenth-century independence. It leads persons to realize how much they need one another, and its success in college or university could influence its use in other sectors. It could lead to a revival of democracy.

**Holistic Approaches.** By holistic approaches I mean emphasizingunities, networks and webs, interconnections, relationships, coherence, interdependencies. We have seen that the affirmation of unity is one of the internalized commitments of the new consciousness.

Holistic approaches are compatible with the search for a world view—community, commonality, harmony, world accord. Holistic approaches recognize that events taking place on one sector of the globe affect the whole, that the world is one. They acknowledge the importance of cooperative over exploitative relationships with nature.

A comprehensive world view implies concern and responsibility for the happiness and well-being of the world community; it recognizes that a great deal of misery in the world is unnecessary; it assumes that a developed world view extends the boundaries of responsibility; it argues that the benefits of science and technology should be used to reduce the misery within the world; it affirms that individual identity will be strengthened, not lost, as a person closely identifies with the entire family of man.

Not only is the world a unity, so is mankind, and so is the person. Each individual is a mind-body, an integrated whole related to the system of wholes—mind-body-society-nature: totality. Holistic approaches can sensitize a person to the realization that the goals, needs, and desires of human beings everywhere are strikingly similar, if not identical.

Commitment to holistic approaches further implies respect for a broad spectrum of modes of understanding. This means first of all that the scientific method will be placed in proper perspective alongside other modes of discovering truth. It means that a consideration of the various methods—comprehensive coherence—will be employed in
seeking truth. It recognizes that the same conclusions may sometimes be reached by various modes of discovery and that in other instances one form may lead to a truth which another is altogether incapable of reaching.

In sum, holistic approaches in education affirm the unity of the person, the commonality of mankind, the comprehensiveness of the world, the interdependence and connections of events, and a responsible concern for the well-being of persons comprising the family of man and for nature which supports that family.

**Solutions Approaches.** When Robert Kennedy said, after Bernard Shaw, “Some men see things as they are and say, ‘Why?’ I dream of things that never were and say, ‘Why not?’” he echoed the spirit of the new consciousness, and he knew it.

Solutions approaches, thoroughly compatible with the new consciousness, means that the emphasis in higher education be shifted from problem definition to problem solving. What the new con student needs is reassurance that many of our existing problems can be solved; he needs an institutional environment which supports the idea of an open future; he needs encouragement to follow his inclination to participate cooperatively in shaping the future; he needs the skills and knowledge which can help him create and test solutions as well as to understand theoretical and historical information.

The professor with the financial grant and assignment to carry out research and make recommendations ordinarily represents formal education’s involvement in problem solving, while students learn about wars, prisons, kingdoms, reforms, tycoons, corporations, and the like. Students are presented reportings of former and present attempts of “experts” and politicians to solve problems, but not taught in any serious way to redirect the present by discovering and correcting the errors of the past or to solve the problems of today’s and tomorrow’s society. Problem definition, I believe, reinforces a sense of helplessness and passivity rather than intentionality and public responsibility. I regard the work of Ralph Nader and his associates as an excellent example of solutions approaches.

Included in solutions approaches is valuing and decision making. A meaningful and, therefore, relevant education for the new consciousness, disenchanted with traditional authority and facing an uncertain future, requires struggling with the relationship of information to values to choosing. Choice problems are now overtaking production problems. Choice options will continue to increase. Consequently, the problem of deciding among competing alternatives is an important aspect of solutions approaches.

Obviously, solutions approaches will lead to the shift of a considerable amount of education to present and future tense. This is not intended to suggest a disregard for the past, as previously noted, but
using the past for vital immediate and future purposes. The shift could very well strengthen one’s attachment to the past and develop his appreciation for contributions of the past.

We should expect that students involved in solutions approaches will want to initiate and take part in effecting change. However unsettling this may be for others, they should not be prevented or discouraged.

**Humanizing Approaches.** We have observed that the development into personhood is a major interest of the new consciousness, that new con tends to be attracted to authenticity and repelled by phoniness. Dialogical, comprehensive, and problem-solving approaches are all supportive of personal development.

Although questions pertaining to one’s existence have always been enticing, with the arrival of the new consciousness they have reached a new dimension of significance: who am I? who is man? what is meaningful living? what constitutes the authentic and the phony? Questions having to do with identity are not isolated from those dealing with relationship: how shall I relate with others? how do I enter into relationships which are mutually satisfying and, when desirable, productive of shared goals? Combined with the pursuit of personal identity and shared experiences is a third question: what shall be my “life style”? how shall I live out my life?

Approaches in higher education which I regard as humanizing are those which promote self-appreciation and self-understanding; cooperative inquiry and the skills and attitudes of interaction; a sense of interdependence; sophistication in skills needed to control one’s own life and to change one’s own attitudes, ideas, and behavior; affirmation, control, and appreciation of one’s own body; participation in institutional and social redemption; personal security to respond intentionally to pressures of conformity, tribalisms, provincials, and chauvinisms; awareness of one’s inner resources as well as one’s abilities and limitations; enjoyment of natural beauty and expressions of human creativity; identification with the world’s people; ability to make choices and to recognize that one’s choices affect the lives of others; the development of a personality structure that will not be overcome by disappointment, failure, or despair; a capacity to enter into empathic relationships with others; taking risks; liberation to curious, creative, and experimental; using the past with effectiveness and satisfaction; and affirmation of uncertainty and change.

We can benefit from Carl Rogers’ suggestion of four ways our educational institutions can help students to develop as truly human. They are (1) through bringing students face to face with the real problems of their existence, (2) through teachers who are themselves whole persons, men and women with ideas, feelings, and personal needs, as well as knowledge and skill, who demonstrate wholeness in their
relationship with students (I would include other mediators of being as well), (3) through an atmosphere of acceptance and understanding rather than judgmentalism, and (4) through the provision of all possible resources for learning, including many not ordinarily connected with traditional education.41

In summary, I have attempted to demonstrate the historical entrance and significance of a new kind of person, and to propose approaches which could vitalize his education. I have tried to be persuasive: nothing, however, could be more persuasive than for the reader himself to engage in a collaborative-holistic-solutions-humanizing approach, combined with an emphatic relationship. In that context he will discover for himself, I believe, students deeply committed to meaningful and purposeful learning; he will discover, too, I believe, as I have, the presence and promise of the new consciousness.