

Psychosynthesis Research Foundation

ROOM 314, 527 LEXINGTON AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017
TEL: PLAZA 9-1480

REGISTERED OFFICE
TREASURER
602 BELLEVUE RD.
WILMINGTON, DEL. 19809

April 1, 1967

Dear Colleague:

The eighth and last meeting of the 1966/67 series of Psychosynthesis Seminars (held on the third Friday of each month) will take place on Friday, April 21st at 7:30 P.M.

William Wolf, M.D. of New York City will speak on what the future may hold for psychotherapy.

The meeting will start promptly at 7:30 P.M. and will be held in the "Directors Room" on the mezzanine floor, Park Sheraton Hotel, 7th Avenue and 55th Street, New York City. There is a public car park across the street from the hotel.

We trust it will be possible for you to be present.

Cordially,

Jack Cooper, M.D.
192 Brewster Road
Scarsdale, N.Y. 10583
Phone: 914-725-4541

Date & Time of meeting: Friday, April 21, 1967 - 7:30 P.M. prompt
Place: "Directors Room", mezzanine floor, Park Sheraton Hotel, 7th Ave & 55th Street, New York City
Speaker: William Wolf, M.D.
Subject: An Exploration into the Future of Psychotherapy

PSYCHOSYNTHESIS SEMINARS

1966/67 SERIES

Eighth Meeting: April 21, 1967

Subject: An Exploration into the Future of Psychotherapy

Speaker: William Wolf, M.D.

Participants:

Stephen Bendich
Jack Cooper, M.D.
Mrs. Rena Cooper
Mrs. Martha Crampton, M.A.
Jack Feder, Ph.D.
Miss Virginia Glenn
Frank Haronian, Ph.D.
Frank Hilton
Mrs. Hilda Hilton

Mrs. Betty W. Keane, M.A.
Emanuel D. Kotsos, M.D.
Victorija Mickans, M.D.
Miss Margaret Rose, M.A.
Harold Streitfeld, Ph.D.
Graham Taylor, M.D.
Mrs. Shirley Winston, M.A.
William Wolf, M.D.
Alfred Yansky, M.A.

Dr. Cooper: To-night we are concerned with what the future may hold for psychotherapy and Dr. William Wolf is our speaker. He was telling me before the meeting about a group in Norway he will be visiting later in the year and will be speaking to them on "Mankind 2000", so to-night we will have a little preview.

Dr. William Wolf: This evening, for a change in pace, we will speak about a subject which is quite different from what we usually deal with here, but one which I believe is of considerable importance. I hope it will stimulate thought because, as I see it, the importance of any lecture is not so much in presenting facts but to stimulate the mind for further development of a subject. I hope that this will be further promoted by subsequent discussion.

Why should we think 25 or 30 years hence? Isn't it good enough to just go on with our work as we have been ^{doing} and leave well enough alone? The answer is, of course, that we are in the midst of a period of profound transition with quick and basic changes in almost every area of living and we must be mentally ready to go with the accelerated and accelerating progress.

Let me mention here parenthetically that one of the large Foundations has asked a colleague of mine and me to write a treatise which would design a curriculum for a future "medical school", although this term may not be appropriate in the future. We are to outline the kind of material which the student will have to learn if he is to function optimally in a society that will exist at that time. We must realize in this connection that it is necessary to train young men now, so that at the height of their careers, which will be 25 or 30 years hence, they would be able to serve society as it will, in all likelihood, be constituted then.

If we want to know what psychotherapy is going to be like at that time and how we should train professionals as functioning psychotherapists, we ought to have a more or less clear idea of the structure of our future society. Will it be simply a continuation of what we have now and can we simply extrapolate from the present, or will there be basic differences?

What I propose to present to you here this evening is a distillate of studies and thoughts which I was able to gather and formulate over the last 10 or 15 years during which time I had the privilege of participating in groups such as "Mankind 2000" which Dr. Cooper mentioned. There are others, for example, the one described in Sunday's Times magazine where Frederick Pohl and others discussed the manner in which we will be living in the year 2000. There is a great deal stirring in this area and we who are in the vanguard of therapy must be prepared for the challenge. Psychosynthesis is, I believe, a methodology and type of understanding which is well oriented toward the future.

Society will structure itself according to two basic premises: one will have to do with living space on this earth and the other with automation and cybernation. We feel that these two factors will be the deciding ones in the structure of the coming society. When talking about living space we must consider two factors: Population increase and Urbanization. That is to say, we will have more people, perhaps twice as many in 30 years, living in a much reduced space because of accelerating urbanization. It is estimated that before long 80% of the population will live in cities, so called megalopolises, and only 20% outside. This estimate is more or less generally accepted.

Over-population, or what is often referred to as the population explosion will probably not be lessened to any significant degree by any measures that are known now. Even the various contraceptive measures, known at present, do not give us promise of lessening the population increase to a figure below 3% a year. At this rate the population will be doubled in about 30 years.

The urbanization process whereby, as stated, 80% will live in cities will have arrived sooner than that. Megalopolises are already on the drawing board. It is visualized that they will consist of a cluster of tall structures, stretching over miles, each housing millions of people. One might reach, let us say, from New York to Boston, another from Miami to Jacksonville, another from Los Angeles to San Francisco, probably one will be in the Northwest and several in the Middle West. No doubt, every megalopolis will be self supporting, have all the facilities and necessities which people would require, food, recreation, entertainment, communication and inter-communication, etc. Individuals will therefore have very little opportunity, or even desire to move to far places except perhaps occasionally. This will create, no doubt, among other things, conditions where "crowd diseases" will become frequent and often severe. By crowd disease I do not mean epidemics but psychologic disorders due to crowding, and we, in the psychotherapeutic fields, will have to deal with these conditions in both a prophylactic as well as curative manner.

When a great many people are crowded together in a limited area, very peculiar things happen. You probably know of Graicunas, the French mathematician, who figured out how the number of relationships between individuals increases as more people function in a closed, limited space. With one person there is, of course, only one relationship, namely he with himself. With two people there are two, one from A to B and one from B to A. With 3 people the number of relationships toward one another increases to 6; with 4 people it rises to 18, with 5 people to about 45, with 6 people to 100, with 7 people to about 220 and with 8 people to almost 500! Note the geometric progression. Now, some of these relationships may be significant and others less so. Some may be mutually helpful, others mutually antagonistic, but the sheer number is staggering. To make these optimally constructive will surely be a task for us psychotherapists, and it will challenge all our ingenuity.

An effective way to conserve space, when one has to deal with a great number of individual elements or entities, is to organize or structure them into an ever tighter organization. Whenever elements are organized into a totality, space is conserved. Take for example, the human body. Imagine that every one of the quadrillion of cells which constitute it were like amebas, free floating and independent of one another. They would occupy a space perhaps as large as the state of New York. But being neatly organized into tissues and organs they can be comfortably housed and functioning superbly in the human body, occupying no more than a few cubic feet of space. Moreover, the totality, the human being, can accomplish feats that no single cell could even hope to, not even a smaller group of cells. But in the process of organization each individual cell had to lose a great deal of its integrity and freedom, its possibility of individual existence, its mobility and its shape had to change also.

A liver cell in the body, for instance, cannot move independently. It can, however, produce proteins, enzymes, bile, glycogen and other compounds that the rest of the body, including itself, needs and which no other cell in the body is able to produce. But it cannot live by itself, it is completely dependent for its very

life upon all of the rest of the body, the totality of the group. The group provides food, electric potentials, magnetism, raw materials, etc. Also, such a cell is necessarily deformed. It does not look like a free floating cell that is round, nor an ameba with pseudopods. Its shape is such that it fits well to form liver tissue with similar cells in juxtaposition to it. Thus it has certain strengths as well as weaknesses.

Now, if we transfer this analogy to a social structure we rather expect that the human being, which in this context would be the equivalent of our liver cell as an element in the structured society, will be entirely dependent on the totality of society for even mere survival. I think we are aware that this is already the case to a large degree. Breakdown of any of the multitudinous services in a city paralyzes seriously everyone in it. Certain deformations of the individual will also gradually come about because of the fact that much of our physical and mental efforts will be taken over by mechanical devices. As mentioned earlier, there will be less locomotion, less physical work, less of certain mental activities as they are taken over by various devices, etc. No doubt, efforts will be made to substitute activities for these deficiencies and it will be our task to help bring about an optimal balance, whereby physical and mental weakening processes can be reduced. We will have to see to it that the individual develops and evolves further by the use of our new capabilities, new forces and new discoveries and that we take optimal advantage of our new leisure, encourage such pursuits as Self-realization, spontaneity, artistic pursuits, philosophy, religious experiencing and the like.

The other basic factor in our future society will be Automation and its extension, Cybernation. The difference between the two is that in automation the human being plays an essential part, while with cybernation one type of device regulates or activates another without the necessity of human intervention in the process.

Through automation we will be eventually relieved of the necessity to labor in order to produce goods and services and thereby earn our livelihood. To a considerable extent this is already the case and the trend will increase as time goes on. Soon we will have to ask ourselves the question: If we won't have to labor, what are we going to do instead? In passing, I should like to draw here the distinction between 'work' and 'labor'. Labor is an activity, usually unpleasant, in order to earn a livelihood - something that somebody else tells us to do. Work, on the other hand, is simply an activity, doing something. In the English language we have two words to denote the difference. Most other languages also point up this difference by using two different words. In Spanish we have Obra and Trabajo, in Italian Opera and Lavoro, in German Werk and Arbeit, etc. Work is not necessarily labor but labor is always work.

In order to be able to optimally adjust to this new kind of automated life we will have to learn to think in a new language, the computer language, i.e. conceptualization that can be used by the computer. Recently we had a very interesting experience where this issue was brought out. We had an occasion to organize a meeting in the Academy of Medicine for the purpose of discovering what use psychiatry could make of a computer. We invited computer experts, who had supposedly used their devices in psychology, and psychiatrists for a panel discussion. The audience was composed largely of psychiatrists and psychologists who hoped that they could interchange thoughts with the computer experts. It turned out that the evening was a colossal flop. The computer experts had

absolutely no feeling for psychiatric needs and the psychiatrists felt lost in the technicalities which the computer people felt so strongly about. Amongst themselves both groups had a fine time but there was little inter-mingling between the two groups, nor was there much intercommunication. We discovered that we will have to develop skill in thinking automatically in 'bits of information', the only language that a computer understands, in addition to our accustomed holistic, abstract manner.

One of the consequences of automation will be, of course, that people will have a great deal of leisure time. The question which we who are engaged in psychotherapy, in common with sociologists, economists and others, will be faced with is: How can we best structure and advise about people's activities, work if you will, their leisure pursuits, so that on the whole they will be conducive to self-fulfilment and happiness, rather than lead to boredom and other concomitant difficulties? Our duty will be, as I see it, to find ways and means to activate the individual's potentialities and discover measures whereby he can develop into wholesome maturity.

To do this best, it seems to me, is to resort to what is known as "factoring", a procedure whereby every individual is periodically examined, tested and inventoried, so that all his strengths and assets as well as his weaknesses and liabilities are assessed, thus permitting a comprehensive, meaningful profile to emerge. At first glance this looks forbiddingly formidable, but with a computer it should not be too difficult. You may require as many as 500 or 1000 items on each individual, elicited periodically, (because there will naturally develop significant changes as a person grows older, being different as a child, an adolescent, an adult or a senior citizen).

Let me give you an idea of what I mean. We might determine an individual's assets and liabilities by historical knowledge, presented or elicited, by testing or by more or less sophisticated examinations. We may record, for example, his age. If he is 2 years old he will have certain assets and potentialities as well as liabilities which a person 30 years old or another 90 years old will not have, to give an extreme case. Sex will naturally have a significant bearing. So will physical characteristics - whether he or she is strong or weak, healthy or ailing, well formed or deformed and so on. Other natural endowments would be noted, such as skin color, inherited traits, endurance, skills and aptitudes. Obesity or leanness, racial descent, whether tall or short, bright or dull, quick or slow, inhibited or free, egocentric or other-oriented, goal directed or diffuse, creative or stereotyped, spiritually inclined or materially pragmatic, cautious and anxious or daring and unconcerned, tense or relaxed and so on and on. We can also note his psychological needs or difficulties, his status problems, job, activity satisfaction, rejection problems, love and family relationships, environmental assets and difficulties, etc. All these and many more could be recorded and incorporated in a meaningful profile which would be valid at the time it is compiled, but must, of course, change as time goes on.

Another important factor, a very important factor, indeed, has to do with the social, economic, moral and other values that will prevail at any particular time. They will surely differ markedly, in the foreseeable future, from those which we take for granted today. You see, most of us assume unquestioningly that certain customs, a certain behavior and certain assumed necessities, are permanent and basically unchanging. The question arises, can we assume this, will they really be similar in 25 or 30 years? I seriously doubt it. At the present time we think, for instance, that the family constellation is the basic unit of society. Will that be

so in the future? I hardly think so, for several reasons:

The way the family is now constituted, i.e., a father, a mother and children of varying ages, is a space wasting arrangement and in many ways unsound. Since space will be increasingly a limiting factor, some modification will have to be devised. There is an increasing number of knowledgeable, forward looking persons who feel, as I do, that there is no good reason why a family should remain as such permanently or, indeed, for too prolonged a time. Why should 2, 3 or 4 persons, often abominably matched, be compelled to occupy a closed, large space and in addition occupy it exclusively when the same space could comfortably house more? Why is it best that two generations, 25 or 30 years apart in age, i.e. parents and children, who have very few interests in common, be compelled to permanently occupy the same rooms? Obviously, a three year old child has entirely different needs and interests from a 25 or 30 year old adult (although the child does need an adult for sustenance, warmth, support and initial education). When you see the way many parents relate to their children you cannot help noticing the strained, awkward tension between them, which is quickly relieved when children of the same age group together and adults of the same sex interact. Moreover, children among themselves are likely to stimulate one another and tend to mature better, and this holds true as well with adults. Communities exist already where this sort of arrangement is utilized. There, the parents and other adults do join with the children but not as a compulsory, inseparable arrangement as seen today in our ordinary family constellations. I am suggesting, therefore, that the family unit, as a unit, will be superseded by more optimally constituted groupings. How soon, I don't know, undoubtedly it will be a gradual process and meet, at least initially, with great resistance.

Another drastic change that we may expect to occur has to do with the concept of personal possession. As we have the arrangement now, it wastes space enormously. One or two persons owning exclusively a house with all its furnishings, utensils, pictures, etc.; two or three people occupying it, often only a small part of the time, squanders space. Moreover, personal possession makes for needless duplication and multiplication of goods and even thoughts and while we are capable of producing the excessive number of items, their storage and housing create serious difficulties. If the concept of personal, exclusive possession were modified it would follow that many tensions concerned with the acquisition and protection of possession would be relieved.

I mention these trends, and I could cite many more, because we, psychotherapists must keep our minds flexible enough and be sufficiently inwardly free to go with these changes without undue anxiety. We must loosen our absolute conviction that there is only one way for us to live and function, namely the way society is structured now. Whether and in what way matters will be better or worse is another question.

Now to come back to our leisure problem. When we have obtained a profile of the individual, we will say to him: "At this particular age this is your profile. These are your strong points and these your weaknesses. Here is a list of 100 or 200 activities in which the strong points are useful and needed and your weaknesses do not count. You can choose out of this group the one or two that you prefer." We therapists can assist him in his choice and attitude toward the work.

I believe it can be assumed that every person derives pleasure and

satisfaction when he occupies himself with work that is congenial, in which his strong points are activated and which fulfills his needs. His next step will then be, hopefully, that as he works, he will strive to develop and grow. Again, this is where we in the profession can be of help so that he may realize his inner Self, with a capital S, and his self with a small s. There will be little reason for the individual to oppose such an arrangement, since it will take his desires, likes and welfare into account, and also because he will be no exception since everybody will do this and the measure will be applied to everyone.

As matters are now, our activities and mode of living are such that we surround ourselves with all sorts of defense mechanisms because we are compelled to perform and act in ways we would rather not do, or we exist with family relationships that we despise or are afraid of. We, psychotherapists, will be charged with the task of forestalling these types of difficulties, rather than dealing with them after they have occurred. In general, our aims will be group oriented, that is, the emphasis will be an endeavor to assure that the group as a whole can function well and that the individual, as an element of the group, contributes optimally to its functioning rather than hindering it.

The other goal that the individual will set himself will be to inwardly develop his Self, his will, his inner light, his inner being; in short, all the phases with which we are so familiar. But I feel that those of us who are in the process of preparing ourselves and others for the future, would do well to realize the fact that the group, the organization, will be the primary concern and will greatly overshadow that for the separate individual.

Such an orientation is not easy for us to take. In fact, it is a very bitter pill to swallow with our present value system. I encounter this reluctance whenever I speak on the subject. We are accustomed to teach that the most important concern is this 'I'. I must be content and happy, I must develop myself, I must live, I must be a total human being. Anything that deviates from this, anything whereby I must relinquish any of my desires produces anxiety and is resisted. No doubt, I would like to have certain values and attitudes to which I have become accustomed, remain undisturbed. The question - and what I propose to present - is, what is most likely to happen? I say 'most likely', excluding, of course, catastrophic occurrences like an explosion of the hydrogen bomb, the development of new forces or energies like anti-matter, new brain functions, new field forces, etc. which may change all our present concepts in a moment. But, excluding these, we can look ahead with clarity and have the courage to change easily with the future, recognizing what is already going on now and to what a reasonable extrapolation of present happenings is likely to lead us.

For instance, when we say that the family unit is not going to be the unit of society, it sounds frightening. And all of us will say "This we surely don't want". Perhaps we can forestall it, I don't know. But the way to do this is to recognize now that this is the present trend. This is one of my main reasons for submitting all this to you. For I know that some of us here this evening are likely to become leaders in our profession and will have a good deal to do with future events. We will have to decide which future attitudes and happenings will be predominantly harmful and negative, when viewed holistically, and which wholesome and positive; which we would want to encourage and develop and which to avoid or oppose. Many of us would not like, for example, to think that psychotherapy will, in common with other branches of the healing arts, become largely automated. In a recent article on the future of medicine we expressed the conviction that in about 25 to 30 years there will be no physician, as we know him

today, nor will there be a dentist or psychiatrist, since most of what the physician does now, can be done better by a device of some kind. In many areas this is already common practice and every day new devices or better use of older ones emerge upon the scene.

As I mentioned earlier, much of what the psychotherapist does at the present time can be done by automated devices. This is true with respect to diagnosis as well as therapy, including manipulative and other types. You are probably familiar with the set-up that one of the great Aluminum Corporations in California has where some 250,000 employees are served. They have there a series of rooms, I believe 19 in a row, and the patient starts with room #1. There he has his history taken which is fed into a computer. In the next room blood and urine samples are taken, in #3 x-rays are taken, then an ECG and so forth until he reaches the last room. All pertinent data are automatically recorded, including a physical examination. So far no physician has seen him, only nurses, technicians and clerks. Only then does the physician enter the picture, looking at and evaluating the findings. All is then computerized and the diagnosis as well as the indicated therapy is revealed.

Something of this sort can be devised with respect to psychologic matters, by way of testing, recording of reactions or behavior, by determining electrical potentials, field forces, biochemical reactions, photographic recordings and so on. Many of such procedures are already, right now, being used. We are inclined not to like such a mechanical approach because we are in possession of special endowments which we are anxious to put to use. The fact is, however, that it is inevitable that much of our work will be performed by automated devices.

If we look at our work with an unprejudiced mind, we may ask ourselves: What really does the psychotherapist do when he encounters a patient? He first takes a history. This might be short or prolonged, depending upon the style which the therapist follows. If he is a Freudian it is longer, if he adheres to a different school it is shorter. Some therapists take no history, except for a few perfunctory questions, in order to evenly develop the patient's own resources for handling any problem or situation with which he may be confronted. But that is a matter of technique. Whatever the style of approach, however, a great portion and sometime virtually all can, theoretically, be done by automated devices. In many cases the latter may even do a better job of it, especially when we consider that there are therapists who are less than well skilled or experienced. There would be less likelihood of poor performance if highly trained technicians, monitoring well designed devices, would perform the bulk of the diagnostic and much of overall therapy. An important consideration in this connection would be that such technicians could be well trained in a comparatively short time and be rather easily available. Let me stress emphatically, however, that no mechanical device is likely to perform where the aim is profound, inner experiencing or spiritual opening or development. There the human therapist will be indispensable for a long time to come.

We will probably have three different kinds of persons concerned with therapy: Those, just mentioned, who will man the devices, machines and apparatuses, highly but variously trained (one would do the testing, one the photographing, one the history taking, etc.). He will be the one who will ordinarily have the principal contact with the patient. We may call him the TE, technical expert. The second person concerned with therapy will be what I call the MA or medical academician. He will correlate the findings obtained to form a meaningful, holistic picture of

the patient, taking full account of his environment and group surroundings that must inevitably be an essential factor in his psychologic functioning; and he will also have the task of progressing the methodologies and make new discoveries, devise new combinations and new ways of looking at findings in order to make them more meaningful, more accurate and more revealing. He would also evaluate the more difficult, out of the ordinary case. Under these circumstances he may actually see or examine the patient. In other words, he will be the scientist, more or less as we see him today.

A third person will look after personal relationships and will be concerned largely with personal warmth and empathy. He will probably not be a medically or technically trained person but rather a priest or minister type individual or simply a warm, interested lay person. In fact, such a one might be much better for the purpose, for as we observe many therapists in various disciplines who practice at the present time, they rarely show great evidence of pleasant warmth and empathy. We rather note a feeling of distance, officiousness, superficial courtesy and such, but very little personal involvement, not to mention evidences of real concern or love. If we have, however, such a third person like the one I just mentioned, he will be happy in the job of involvement, sympathy and personal concern with the patient's problem and being happy to do the work will be likely to be good at it. As matters stand now, the psychiatrist or psychologist all too often does not make the effort and does not like to meaningfully involve himself too deeply. He may also feel that it is not to the patient's advantage. In many instances his main concern is whether his particular discipline is effective, etc. There is a certain justification for all these attitudes but it surely does not make for the best therapy.

Another question that arises has to do with the quantity of information that is elicited by automated devices. When the psychiatrist or psychologist takes the history, he has certain ideas and notions. He asks certain questions which elicit responses which in turn suggest further questions. By so doing he can reduce the number of questions to a minimum. With a computer there is no need for this for it can handle thousands and thousands of questions with ease in a few seconds, especially when it will be fully developed. As we look around, our whole culture is geared toward surplus and waste, so wasting questions will be well in line with this trend. Every day we see more products disposable. You use a thing once and throw it away. If you have to buy one item you are often better off to buy half a dozen or a dozen and throw the excess away. Recently I saw an article "The case for Waste" where the writer showed that it is much better to waste materials in order to save time and gain ease and comfort. This is in contradistinction to the past where the reverse was true - time and comfort didn't count for much but materials did. Since materials are now abundantly available, don't cost much and can be produced in virtually unlimited quantities, we can waste them. Of course, that does not solve the problem of what to do with the wasted materials and how to dispose of them. But this is beside the point.

With respect to asking a surplus of questions, we will get into that kind of trouble also. If you must ask 1000 questions, when five pointed ones would suffice, what will you do with the useless 995?! But this, I think, is the trend and we will have to find some solution for this problem. We will have to find a way to handle the avalanche of verbiage, paper, etc. Moreover we could also ask: What will we do with the time we save and the comfort we will attain?

I think I had better stop here and see if we can enlarge upon the subject by way of discussion. I know I have touched upon many controversial points and I know also that some of you have views that differ markedly from mine. This should make for a stimulating discussion.

DISCUSSION

Cooper: We now invite questions from the floor, and as a start I would like to amplify a point in line with psychosynthesis. I have here an article by Dr. Wolf which appeared in the American Journal of Psychotherapy in October, 1966, "An Invitation to Explore the Future of Medicine". Here he talked about the inner life of the individual and about the use of the leisure time we will have in the future: "Inner life will probably be enhanced and made more meaningful....Strong reactions, acting out, wide swings of emotional states will be reduced....The meaning and concept of 'mature behavior' will change significantly, in that play, games, daydreaming, enjoying childlike spontaneity and the like in adult life may acquire greater approval; non-material pursuits such as poetry, music, graphic arts, philosophy, or religious experiencing may be given higher status." I would agree entirely with what Dr. Wolf wrote and I would like to put that up for further discussion.

Wolf: This was a talk which I gave before a group of psychiatrists. This is the point: when we are relieved from various mundane work, then these higher types of experiencing and thinking will have an opportunity to develop in the individual. Now what I did tonight was to take the other side of the story and show the mechanical or the materialistic features, mainly for the purpose of shaking up the rigid ideas which we all have and which we have developed in our own growth. You see, it is a very great pity that the change will be opposed, the change for progress will be influenced by people in power. Now the people in power are usually older people; they have attained a certain status - professors, heads of corporations, or whatever - and they are tied down by vested interests and are usually of a rigid mind nature. They do not like to change. As I said in the beginning of my talk "Why should we worry ourselves about the year 2,000 when we can get along beautifully as we are doing now?" Well, it is simply that we will not get on beautifully then; what is going to be we may not like, I don't like it either because I have been brought up in a particular way; but fortunately some of us have been able to keep sufficiently flexible that we can live this way or we can live another way equally well. And as long as this new thing, this automation, this population explosion, has occurred and is occurring and you cannot stop it, we must adjust to it. Therefore we take the situation as it is going to be, and utilize it optimally. This is the point.

Haronian: You said many provocative things tonight but the one that strikes me as the most exciting - or frightening perhaps - is the future of the family, the likelihood that this type of social unit is going to go by the board. I think we have had and now do have instances of organizations something of the sort that you have been describing. I visited the Bruderhof in Repton, New York, a few years ago and although it certainly doesn't incorporate the vocational possibilities, the computer possibilities that you described, it certainly has much of the social organization that you mentioned. Two points about it that strike me: one was an observation by a friend of mine who knew something about such communities, who said that in her experience in studying them they never succeeded unless they had a strong religious orientation. Secondly, a very personal reaction to my visit: I was depressed by it. (Wolf: What depressed you?) I don't know but I found it depressing. I think it was a denial of the kind of value that you mentioned before, the value of the individual, which I have been brought up to emphasize in my own life; and I sensed the antagonism of this kind of community to my individuality if I were to be a member of it. Perhaps that is what I found depressing about it.

Wolf: Yes, the kind of situation that I suggested here is no worse actually if one is capable of becoming neutral on the matter; that is, becoming nothing in the sense of having no preconceived notions. You see, you and I and all of us have preconceived notions as to that and obviously we know that the family is the thing - the father, the mother and the child and so on - and actually before this present era of psychology a great many axiomatic statements such as mother-love which was supposed to be a necessity we know now does not necessarily exist. It took us quite a time, and in fact we haven't got rid of it yet, to let go of this notion that there must be a love between a child and its mother, that there could be no rejection of the child or that there could be no rejected mother; there just couldn't be. But nowadays we know differently, but only gradually did we learn it. We had a lot of time for altering our views - between Freud and now is 50 or 60 years - but now we don't have that length of time for shifting positions and we have to be more flexible. We have to be much more flexible now and this is my whole stress. We should learn - and this is where psychosynthesis comes in so beautifully - to become nothing; that is, to lose these defensive rings around us and be capable of mentation of a non-rigid type. This is why the older people, these people in power, are likely to be the more rigid; and they will cause a great deal of sabotage in the smooth transition.

You see, the transition we are going through is something phenomenal, from the industrialized to the cybernated. It is almost unbelievable that we shall be freed from labor; the term labor will cease to exist; money as such will not exist; money will very shortly be meaningless. (Cooper: It's here already with credit cards!) Not only credit cards but actually only computer registering is necessary. In other words, if I go to a store to buy a pair of shoes I don't pay cash or by check; the store simply telephones to the bank and all transactions are done automatically. Even now certain people in the telephone company don't get paid; the company pays the rent, the grocer, and everybody else. The employee gets only enough for his car fare and coins that he needs for everyday things; the rest of it is done by simple bookkeeping, including even his personal investing.

Haronian: One of the things I hear in what you are saying is that the more we progress towards the development of technological skills for the assessment of an individual's qualities, skills and aptitudes, physical characteristics, etc., the better we are able to categorize people; and you do not talk at all about the categories you are going to use - except very briefly. You seem to be saying that at the same time we have to be balancing this extremely sophisticated technological skill with a great deal of development of the inner man. This is the side that this group is largely interested in. We take the other side more or less for granted, people are doing these things; but it is this other side I would like to get some more reaction to, from the other people; what this is going to mean for a personality.

Wolf: You see, the reason why I brought out this side, and I did it on purpose, was because I would like to see a balanced kind of view. Now I personally am not terribly happy with this computerized kind of being - obviously. My work is of a very similar nature to what we are doing here; but I have to watch myself that I do not lose the other side; it is for that reason that I brought this up. I could have very easily gone into, let us say, how to develop the inner self, or how to meditate and all that sort of thing, because this is what I really like to speak of. But we are going into this age in which we will have the problem of seeing the individual both as a member of the group, where the group will eventually be the dominant factor and where the group integrity will be the

essential, and where a person who is out of the group will be a lost individual - just as, for example, in the olden times the worst punishment that you could meet out was banishment because he could not live as an outcast, actually couldn't live. Therefore, we as psychotherapists must be able to strike a balance. If we take the individual alone and only help him in his individuality, are we doing enough? This is my point, and I doubt it. In other words, are we really giving him the best service by doing that or, isn't it necessary to also show him how to be in addition an optimal member of the group?

Hilton: This is somewhat on the lines of what Marshall McLuhan is hammering at. He says the world is now becoming a tribal village. (Wolf: Yes, yes.) But I don't think we can take this mechanization for granted as you, Frank, suggested because we don't yet realize the implications. We admit that automation and the population explosion is going on but we haven't fully faced up to what it is going to mean.

Haronian: Well, I think he has told us what it is going to mean - I didn't mean to imply that we are taking it for granted, but the more we develop the technological side, the more we are going to need the side he was alluding to. Dr. Wolf talks about the group, but I feel a kind of gap or hiatus in your discussion as to how we are going to form these groups, how these groups are going to be constituted and held together. What is going to make them work?

Wolf: That is a very good point. I should have brought it out. The thing that will hold the group together, as I see it, is first of all by example. In other words, everybody will feel a certain way since everybody will be brought up to be a member of a group and will think in these terms. Therefore, there will be no resistance - I am putting it in definite terms and perhaps I should not - but there will be no resistance to functioning as a member of the group if he is brought up from early childhood with this orientation. Now if I am brought up as an individualist and I have my own way of thinking and my own way of doing, my own way of expressing myself and my own way of living irrespective of what somebody else thinks, irrespective of how it affects the other person - as long as I stay within the law - if I am brought up that way then I resist very strongly to living my life as a member of a group because I want to be an individual. However; if I am brought up to know that the really important thing is that the group be fully integrated and fully functioning without a flaw and that it is my privilege, not duty but privilege, to contribute to that, then I have no resistance. This attitude is created by the way it is represented and, of course, it will be represented to him largely by example. For instance, I had an office at one time, when I was doing medical work, and in the waiting room I had a canary in a cage. A lady about 70 years old came in and had to sit a while in the waiting room; when she came into my office she gave me hell - how dare I have a canary in a cage! A bird must be flying freely and out in the air. On her next visit she opened the cage, but the bird didn't move; it was quite happy in that cage. So she took the bird out and sat it on top of the cage. The bird stayed there for a while and it wasn't five minutes before it was back in the cage again. Obviously he was very happy there. He had there his home, his food, and everybody played with him. Now if it had been a wild bird, one that had been brought up in the wilderness, then of course this would not have happened; but this canary was born in a cage, had his livelihood, and had no resistance to living in the cage. This is the point.

It is so difficult for us, who are grown up, to adjust to new ways, to see that there are other ways of being happy, content and functioning; and of

fulfilling oneself other than by living the way we have been brought up to live. We don't like the probable future society; but it isn't what we like; we must see what we are going to have. This "like" is always in the way when we are trying to conceptualize. This is the main reason why I brought this up.

Taylor: Dr. Wolf, we agree, I am sure, with what you said, but one observation I have to make is that to date in human history advances in art or science or technology have been made by the man of genius or the creative man transcending group thinking. There is a danger of stagnation; if you have a herd mentality and a massive group thinking and nobody grows beyond that, then you have psychological death.

Wolf: Absolutely right! And I am glad you brought that point out. There will be, as there always has been, individuals who will not fit into the group and part of them will be the "Medical Academicians" I mentioned; in other words, the individual who will look for other things. Now this that I described will apply to the great majority, the 98 or 99%. The danger is not in this group formation; the danger would be if we would prevent in some way this individual from developing. But that the majority will be in group formation, I do not question at all and I don't believe any of us question that. I am thinking now of the patients we are going to see - if we will see any patients, that is - the patient that the machinery cannot handle alone. What we have to look into is the individual who is creative and who is the exception. That person it will be our duty to develop to his optimum. I think that type of person will be ostracized in a way, but he will be so constituted that he will be able to live while the other individuals would not be able to live apart from the group.

Mrs. Keane: We will need a group set-up that will foster the growth of such an individual?

Wolf: Certainly; to develop the total growth of the individual. The exceptional person will, however, develop a particular skill extra well. In other words, in the group he will function so that one activity will be developed to an extremely high degree and the others will be subdued and atrophy eventually. You will have individuals who will be wonderful in one direction but who will be helpless to a large extent in most other directions - as we see it in any organization, in any tight organization.

Mrs. Crampton: You mentioned that there would be one person who would be especially good at giving love and warmth; psychosynthesis emphasizes the direct training of various undeveloped functions such as the will, the intuition or the imagination or whatever it happens to be. Dare we say that we might have individual specialists in the training of these various functions?

Wolf: Yes, you see, the individual who will give warmth and empathy will not be a therapist; he will simply be a warm person. (Cooper: A social worker?) Yes, a social worker, or any very lovely, warm, broadminded, big person; and the therapist will be largely a device. (Haronian: A mechanical device?) Yes. This is something akin to what they do partly now in Russia, and it works quite well. In other words, a conditioning, behavioristically oriented. We don't like it; I repeat to emphasize this; but it is bound to come about because these devices are capable of doing it and once they are capable of doing it they will be used. This is the hard fact. This is not just my opinion; this has been

expressed over and over again by some of the greatest thinkers.*

Cooper: This will happen in the next 25 or 30 years; you and I, Frank (Haronian) may be replaced by a computer! (laughter)

Wolf: Yes, but you both may be able to guide it into an optimally desirable direction and that is why we should now know what the trend is so that whatever negative features there may be, we should be able to watch for and guard against; let it come in the direction that is useful.

Cooper: One of my colleagues said the other day that for years he has been teaching students over at a college in New York City; he said "I am no longer teaching, I have been replaced by a computer!" So we are rapidly reaching this stage that Dr. Wolf speaks of.

Wolf: Yes, what they call "program teaching" is just that. We thought that we could never get along without a teacher. 30 or 40 years ago could you have envisioned a school without a teacher? You couldn't, yet it is practically here; although it may not yet be good and improvement may be necessary.

Winston: I don't believe that all these marvelous techniques are going to be used to eventually produce a society in which 98% of the people will only be slightly more animated than a computer and 2% who are crazy but good for one particular specialty. Furthermore I think that this is a dangerous projection from industrialism and that when computerization is applied to human disciplines it is going to work in the same old way. I don't believe that people can be separated at any stage of development, particularly not in early childhood; nor that 2% will have creative potentials and 98% will go into human robots. I think that every single human being, if allowed the leisure and freedom to develop the qualities you spoke of - to be playful, spontaneous, have religious insights, etc. - will want to develop these things. And furthermore, when they are free of the necessity of subordinating their individual sense of self to a machine - they will not be part of the machine because the machine will function without them - these people will want to, and insist on becoming human beings, perhaps for the first time in the history of man. We will begin to see a mass movement of people to become more human.

Furthermore I would say it is beginning now; and again, we don't like it because we look at these young people who are boldly claiming their right to be human and what do we see? The boys have long hair, the girls have short hair, the boys wear beads around their necks, etc. and they walk around Central Park; (Here the speaker was referring to the April 15th peace demonstration in New York City. Ed.) They smile, they give you a daffodil, if nuns show up they shower them with flowers

*

For instance the following excerpt from Medical News, England, received a few days after the Seminar. Ed. :

"London - The medical profession in 20 years may consist of two types of physicians - one who deals directly with the patient and one who computerizes diagnosis and treatment.

This was envisioned by Sir Edward Wayne, Regius Professor of Medicine, Glasgow University, in a speech to the Royal Postgraduate Medical School here.

Sir Edward said he believes that within the next 10 to 15 years automation would take away diagnostic decision making which at present forms the major part of the doctor's skill. A great deal of change in medical education will be necessary to adapt to the changing pattern of medical care brought about by automation, he concluded!"

and candy; if the police show up they shower them with flowers and candy and they are proclaiming love and friendship. They take all the empty cartons and beer cans and garbage and make an abstract sculpture in the Park, and people of our generation walk around and only see garbage, but they think it is beautiful.

And I must say they are not aggressive people; they run around the Park holding hands and nobody gets shoved. And I did not see one homosexual in the mob, which is more than I can say of a comparable mob of our generation. These people wear whatever they like wearing - some of the men were wearing girls' blouses and the women were wearing pants; they were behaving like individuals; they were being creative, each in their own way; they were gathering, they were singing, they were drumming, they were dancing - of course, the police did not like it because they were not sure that it was decent to act like this. Each one was dancing, each his or her own dance.

But this is happening, and these are the people who are running away from all family pairings, and they are getting together in groups. And they are getting together in groups not through any sense of compulsion, but because they want to be free; and within the groups they are free. And these groups have no recognized leader or if they do have a leader the leader insists on as much anonymity as possible. One of these groups produces works of art for the market and call themselves "Usco" which means "us company," and none of the productions are individually signed. Everything that is produced is the property of the group; and whatever money is taken in belongs to the group. Other groups such as the Diggers of San Francisco make a point of giving - food, clothing to whoever comes to them in need. They don't give lectures; if a 15 year old girl comes and she is pregnant and she is dying of starvation, they don't lecture her, they just give her food. What she does with the food is her affair.

And I think this is the movement; these people are already living in a kind of tribe; they have a communication among them which is so close we can hardly even understand when they talk to each other, let alone understand the words of their songs. But it is happening and my point is that they are not becoming mechanized; they are not becoming robots; they are not conforming even to one another; they are striving as much as possible to become completely individual human beings. They haven't got there yet, but they are very, very young, but I think we can learn from them and not from projecting what we know about mass production on to the human race.

Wolf: As Dr. Cooper read from my article, my feeling is that these things will be developed because of the increased leisure. However, I said this: in about 30 years - or possibly 40 - we will have the megalopolis; and in a megalopolis you will have a structurization which is different from what we have now. The structurization will be such that the closeness of individuals in such a group will be much greater than what it is now. And I also said that as a result, physical locomotion will be reduced; it is already reduced now a good deal, except for sports and special activities. You go on any university campus and see that students if they must go from one building to another need a bicycle or an automobile. When I went to college we had to run all over the place on our two legs but they don't do that any more, and there will be much less of this as time goes on and school areas are more constricted. As a result there will be definite structural body changes, and also changes in mental activities as well as capacities when the computer takes over mental tasks to a large extent. Our job will be to prevent much of the negative aspects by promoting the religious, social, artistic, creative potentialities. We will have to be instrumental in

developing these in the individual so that he will retain as much as possible of these higher values. It will be up to us to help the individual grow in two ways and not in one way as we do it now. At present we develop the individual largely in one way, namely as an individual functioning as such; but we will also have to teach him - and doing him thereby the best turn - additionally to be an optimal member of the group. And if he is brought up with that orientation from birth, by example and by his confreres, a powerful irresistible pressure will be subtly produced on him so that he will willingly and normally conform rather than object.

I see no great difficulty in that. We see this happening in all kinds of societies - where the group orientation is an essential. That does not mean that a person does not have his own individuality. That must be in addition, but much of the present individual strivings will be curtailed because of the computer and the tighter structurization.

Cooper: May I comment on that a moment. Surely these young people Shirley spoke of must also sooner or later come to the realization that their food has to be produced by somebody, that someone has to do the policeman's job, etc. The pendulum will swing for a moment to the group that Shirley was talking about, but later these people have to wake up to the realization that members of this group will also have to till the soil, or whatever is necessary to maintain society - feed the data into the machines, etc. They are free at the moment only because we are in an in-between stage, but as that group expands there is going to be hunger, all types of diseases running rampant through it, because they are violating basic natural laws. Then the heads of the group will start asking themselves: "What are we doing wrong?" So we will see this movement go back and forth and if we are wise we can help gradually, little by little, the members of this group to realize that they must maintain a balance and stay as closely as possible to the center line.

Winston: This is already happening because they are thinking out ways of providing the necessities of life and still not submerge the freedom of the individual.

Feder: You (Dr. Wolf) seem to imply that in the future unless we therapists fight against this trend, forestall some aspects of group thinking, that all sorts of terrible things will inevitably happen, or at least that the individuality will be stamped out; and that it is our job supposedly. (Dr. Wolf: I did not say that.) Unless we do something about it; that man is going to become more and more structured in such a way as to lose his individuality and that our job is to forestall certain negative aspects of the kind of living that he is inevitably going to find himself in. My feeling is that this is a projection without taking into consideration how man will react to the kind of living that you described very accurately, I think - the megalopolis.

Now, it is very possible that man may react against such a type of living without the "priest therapist" having anything to say about it. I don't think that it is really our role to see to it that 2% of future society will come off more creatively and that 98% will be optimally adjusted to the group. I don't know; it may work out, that with all the technological advances man may be forced into such a mould, but what you are not taking into consideration is how he will react. In answer to Dr. Haronian, when he asked how the group will be held together, you said "by example" and you gave the example of the canary. The implication is that if man is born into a certain type of society, a certain structurizing, that he will have no resistance to it. Well, up till now man resists all sorts of things; he is also infinitely adaptable, so there is no knowing whether

man will react in a completely conforming or non-resistant way. So in this projection that you make you seem to be using notions more appropriate to mass production than to a dynamic being reacting to this. The very fact that he is reacting to it is left out in your presentation. There is no dynamic interchange, unless we see to it that he doesn't fall prey to all the negative aspects.

Taylor: Suppose many react to it with horror and nausea, what are you going to do about it? You don't know. (Feder: No.)

Wolf: Let me ask you a question in this connection: "Do you steal from people ordinarily?"

Feder: Yes, I think that most people do.

Wolf: Most people do? But you don't do it for very long because you believe the police will get you.

Feder: A lot of people do steal, and the more you steal the more you get away with.

Wolf: What I mean is that you have a certain example - there are certain things that are illegal, because you had been brought up to believe this is the right thing to do.....

Feder: But as Shirley Winston said, we have been brought up, our children have been brought up to respect their elders, but there is much less of that today than there used to be. Boys are supposed to wear short hair and now they wear long hair, etc., and these are ways in which individuals react. Your implication is that all you have to do is to bring up people in a certain way and there won't be any resistance, and that is not indicated by past history.

Wolf: I am wondering about that - whether that is really so, whether in ordinary history you don't find it is exactly that way; the way the individual is brought up, that way he lives. (Feder: The very fact of change refutes this notion, whether you take a dialectical Marx definition or whatever. Change does come about.) Excuse me, I want to interrupt you here. Let us take, say, an African tribe: they are brought up with certain notions, and they are taken for granted. There is no problem about this. These notions we think are silly but they are not at all silly for that tribe; and they conform to the things without resistance and they follow whatever rituals they have. (Feder: Until they come in contact with another group.) But if they don't? That is the whole point. (Feder: But that is what is happening in the world; there is more and more interchange. We do not live in an isolated society any more. We cannot take as an example an African village and project this as to what will happen in the year 2,000.) I think you are misunderstanding what I said; I gave that as an analogy to what you were saying. I wanted to bring out what happens when you are brought up in a particular way by example and by teaching, by imprinting particularly - this is where the imprinting is very important; imprinting is a type of experience which occurs at a particular time, very early in life, in a human in the 18th or 30th day of life, I believe. (Feder: There is very little evidence for imprinting in human beings.) lieve.

(Oh yes! oh yes there is. (several voices at once. Ed.)

Feder: I agree that we don't like what will be happening, that much of what you say will happen. We have been brought up with different social values and whether we like what is going to happen or not it is happening. But the fact that you are

brought up in a certain way with no resistance to anything, this doesn't make sense.

Wolf: May I interrupt again concerning that one word "non-resistance"; perhaps you are not using the word in the same way that I am. Non-resistance is not a blocking effect. It is simply that I don't resist. This is not a question of where I am giving in; you see, the word non-resistant in the way that I am using it is not a giving in to something or a giving up, because I am overwhelmed; it is simply a question that the other attitude never comes up. (Feder: But why doesn't it come up?) (Mrs. Hilton: Because his sense of values has changed.) Yes, because the values will not be there in the way we have them now.

Feder: In China the values were to respect your elders and it was a very, very rigid family structure; now communism came about despite this; so I don't see why your assumption that when we get to the year 2,000 and live in very highly structured societies that it won't occur to anybody to resist what they have been born into because it does occur to people to resist.

Wolf:. That is what I said - there will be some.

Cooper: Yes, our job is not to change this particular situation but to help people who come to us to adjust to it. (Jumble of cross talk, nothing decipherable. Ed.)

Feder: ...to adjust the person to resist; Freud discovered the notion that people constantly resist, and the problem that the therapist has is that he is constantly involved in resistance; and the idea that the human being is going to be born who, because it is a very highly structured society, will not resist - (Wolf: Again, I think you are using the word semantically different.) I don't think so at all; I don't think it is a semantic problem. You gave the example of the canary that doesn't even think of leaving its cage; he doesn't resist.

Winston: If you look at the history of the Soviet Union for 50 years; at least there has been a determined effort by the state over a vast area to eliminate this kind of individualism and this is done by taking vast portions of the population that insisted on being individual and sending them away where they would die or shooting them outright; and by constant propaganda, pressuring the children from early ages with the importance of placing the community ahead of individual interests. As a result, after 50 years of this constant pressure, what is happening is that more and more we have individual monetary rewards, people are wanting their own houses, their own cars; so that movement has been going on in spite of the tremendous widely organized cultural and economic society; and even the psychiatrists were impressed into this service of the state; but people, being what they are, despite all this are becoming individuals.

Wolf: Yes, you are quite right, but this is a somewhat different situation all together because in the first place that was the only country at that time that was communistic; but it had communication - telephone, telegraph and so on - with other areas so that really the example there is that of suppression of individualism. I am not thinking of suppression of any kind at all; not suppressing anything. This to me, as I see it, is a developmental thing; and with a developmental thing you don't resist. This may not be in 30 years, it may be 40; it will certainly need a whole generation. (Winston: In the USSR they had two generations.) Yes, but under suppression.

Cooper: Yes, that was suppression and yet they have plenty of space there.

Wolf: Yes, and there was no necessity. This future society will be a necessity, and not because of my edict.

Cooper: Yes, this population explosion will compress us; 80% of the population will be coming into these megalopolises. We are moving into it already; I am watching in Westchester County at the present time the authorities trying to keep out the high-rise buildings.

Wolf: All the remarks I have made, are not meant as dogmatic statements. My main purpose was to stimulate thinking. I do not say that I am right and I am not even interested as to whether it is right or not. What my real purpose is is to stimulate thinking and to call attention to the fact that we must get rid of mental rigidities of any kind. Whether the rigidity is in this direction or that direction doesn't make much difference; rigidity of any sort is difficult to overcome especially when it comes to value systems because value systems are taken for granted. My purpose was not so much to argue as to whether I am right or that this particular kind of structurization is right. I really wanted to present certain points so that some of us will begin to recognize that we have to keep our minds, our eyes and ears open as we do our psychotherapy, keeping the future as well as the present in mind.

You and I, as we do our psychotherapy the way we have been doing it right along (you have one method, I have another) need at the same time to use a third eye to see where we are heading, and how we can best help people as society changes. I must also keep an eye on how society changes. It may change differently from the way I outlined, and that is all right too; but most importantly I want to overcome rigidity. This is really my greatest difficulty and aim. I have had trouble, all my life, with people with this rigid kind of thinking and with people who say: "This is right and we will stick to it!" This is not good; it is not a healthy way of doing things; and we psychotherapists in particular must be flexible. We use all the methodologies at our disposal and we constantly learn from each other and so alter our ways. So my purpose was to stimulate thought, and not at all to say: "Now I am giving you this scheme and this is going to be it!"

Hilton: I think, Dr. Wolf, that the discussion so far has underlined the whole point that you have been trying to make: that we are moving into a world completely different from ours and so our thinking has got to be completely different. It seems to me that much of the discussion has been 1960 thinking applied to a society 30 years hence, and that type of thinking is not going to be adequate.

Wolf: Yes, that's right. Part of intelligence is flexibility; it is part of the definition of intelligence. This new orientation we see coming already to a certain extent; it might take a different turn - we don't know what it is finally going to be. But take the question of a laser; the laser didn't exist eight years ago; today it is a fait accompli and we are using it for all kinds of astronomical photographic and medical work; and this is a brand new thing. So, you see, anything might happen rather quickly. We may have anti-matter; we might have thought transference - a subject which is drawing much attention just now. This alone would change our lives markedly. We should be flexible enough and not say, "It is silly" or "It is a fake." It may be a fake, but it may not be, and most probably it isn't.

Yansky: I am not quite sure of the various positions but it seems to me that all

you are saying, and the disagreement, is that an analyst or a therapist should be flexible; also according to the patient's needs you want him to be adaptive to society, you want him to be integrated....this has always been, I should think, a good therapist's goal. So in 1960 he functions this way and in 1970 according to the situations as we shall see them functioning then. I disagree with you (Hilton) about how we function in 1960 not being ready for the year 2,000. We don't know, we disagree with what will be in 2,000, but as we come along we can see what we think will be in order.

Wolf: Well, one of the things in this connection is that much of what we now do in analysis will be done by someone else or by devices of various kinds. That was one of my points in my opening talk before you arrived.

Yansky: That segmenting or splitting off - that I disagree about - I did not have too good a feeling about it.

Wolf: Neither did I at first! (Cooper: You will have to get used to it!)
(laughter)

Yansky: What you seem to be saying is that a certain compartmentalization... (Wolf: No! No! not compartmentalization - I did not mean that.)...there seem to be all sorts of splits there that do not allow a patient to be whole.

Feder: You said that the personal contact would be with a person who gives warmth, but it may be very appropriate to give warmth to a certain patient but not to give warmth to another patient...and this compartmentalized notion that the diagnosis will be taken care of by a machine, and that there will be behavior therapy, which you say works. Whether it works depends upon what the premises or criteria for working are. If I want someone to change his behavior or a certain aspect of his behavior it can be changed by conditioning. Many other things in terms of inner experience are not so adaptable to behavior therapy, conditioning therapy or whatever else. So that the inner experience cannot be so readily profiled. You mentioned before, and I agree, that to get an answer from a computer you will have to conceptualize the question in computer language; inner experience is not generally oriented towards computer language; it is a very primitive type of experience but I am not sure that it can be programmed. So there will be aspects of the human being which cannot be put into this profile, therefore the idea of doing therapy with the profile will certainly be valid for certain kinds of treatment but I do not think that will necessarily be the case 30 years from now. I don't think that program teaching will replace teachers. There are more teachers now than there have ever been and the idea of the university without teachers is ludicrous; I do not know any educator whom I have read who has ever seriously suggested that there will be universities without teachers. Programmed learning is not to replace teachers; it is to free teachers to teach; that it will do away with what you call labor, to really teach and to communicate. The need to be aware of the reality of the future. I think that is very true.

Wolf: That is a very interesting thing you have brought up. Now you talked about a university without teaching and you assumed that a university is an absolute necessity. (Feder: No, if we have a university.) If we have a university, what the university will look like then, I do not know; but you see, even such concepts have to become flexible in one's mind. That was all that I meant. Also I did not say that program learning will replace fully the human element. Of course not; an experience is an experience, which is an individual thing, and this is clear.

However, a great deal of what the therapist or teacher does now can be done by a device but, of course, a great deal cannot be done mechanically.

Crampton: I think what put you off, Jack (Feder), was the idea that all therapy would be a form of conditioning, but there are many methods of inner action such as the development of the will which is not conditioning. (Feder: But that is not done by machines.) But certain aspects of it could be programmed; I think there could be a program of self-development or of certain aspects of the will. This has not been developed yet, but theoretically one could program this kind of thing.

Feder: I don't see how you are going to program inner experience. (Wolf: Are you an analyst, if I may ask?) Yes.

Wolf: Yes, well you see, the point there is that analysis is one way of determining and understanding the individual, and Freud of course, when he devised analysis, had as his goal a desire to understand what makes the individual tick. His purpose was primarily to understand; at first he was not so much interested in therapy. Now the question - at least to my mind - is whether to understand the individual is a sine qua non in therapy. Many people say it is; I question it, and feel that understanding the patient, while surely desirable and interesting, is not an absolute necessity in order to produce a therapeutic effect. If this is so then much of therapy can be performed by devices other than psychoanalysis.

Feder: I don't see how the two connect.

Hilton: That requires thinking into the future.

Cooper: I must interrupt for it is now 10 o'clock and as this is our last seminar for this series, I suggest that next season one of the first things we discuss in our future seminars is how to devise techniques to help us to become flexible. (Wolf: Right!) In some kind of way we shall have to develop techniques in the coming years to develop flexibility. I want to congratulate Dr. Wolf on the way he has stimulated our thinking.

END OF SESSION