

THE BROAD HUMAN VALUES IN  
EDUCATION FOR INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT –  
HOW ARE THEY TO BE DERIVED?

by TONY MACELLI

This discussion-paper examines in Part I three common approaches, each based on a different image of the nature of man, which are used as sources of the values to be used in educational and in human development work. A fourth approach, considered to be more satisfactory, is then developed in Part II.

A. *Three Approaches to Deriving Values*

First Approach: Essentialist

Second Approach: Gnostic Existentialist

Third Approach: Pure Existentialist

Ontological Freedom in the Third Approach

Summary and Comment

B. *A Fourth Approach Synthesised: Freedom + Precedents*

Elements of the Nature of Man: A-D

Freedom a Major Part of the Nature of Man

Proof that Man changes his Nature

Teilhard on Self-Evolution

Using the Freedom + Precedents Approach

A. THREE APPROACHES TO DERIVING VALUES FOR EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

There are, in responsible education and social change, some key issues to be considered. For example, 'what is the total man?' and, 'how do we promote the total man in development?' From these, the question arises: how do we derive the necessary values? How do we choose, create, criticise those values ('ideas of what is desirable') in the field of human development in its broadest sense?

For the educational philosopher, for the educator, for the agent of social change, there are many issues which on specific occasions clamour for responsible value-decisions, the outcome of which would then be included in the educator's and change agent's

ideology and strategies. How are these decisions to be made? The method used must not be completely arbitrary. We are attempting in this study to appreciate a 'mankind approach' focused on mankind and the whole man, and it seems that this orientation to development leads us to some guidance on how to make these value-decisions, conceptual framework for human development, rather than a full theory of development. Instead of covering more of these specific values, then, we shall need to concentrate here on the broad general guidelines that one may use in formulating values and making value-decisions. In trying to develop these guides, we shall consider first three common alternative approaches to this task.

### *First Approach: Essentialist*

Economist and thinker Walter Weisskopf<sup>1</sup> tells us that man happens to be a kind of creature who experiences everything in terms of a dialectical trinity, as he calls it, consisting of:

- (i) A basic split or *antimony* between self and world caused by consciousness and the power of symbolising;
- (ii) A *polarity*, or polarisation, of the two antinomic poles;
- (iii) An *ultimate unity* of the two.

The antinomy reveals two aspects of something which is ontologically one, i.e. the two components have one and the same nature or being. Self and world or subject and object do not exist in isolation from one another; also, the polarity is merely an intermediate link between the antinomy and the ultimate unity. The whole dialectical trinity is symbolised by the yin-yang sign of the Tao in Chinese philosophy, which has two intertwined halves included in the union of the circle.

Paul Tillich<sup>2</sup> believes that in the Christian tradition there are the fundamental concepts:

*First, esse qua esse bonum est.* This Latin phrase is a basic dogma in Christianity. It means 'Being as Being is good,' or in

<sup>1</sup>'Existence and Values,' in *New Knowledge in Human Values*, ed. A. Maslow, Gateway, 1960.

<sup>2</sup>*Theology of Culture*, edited by R.C. Kimball, OUP, London, p. 118. On page 123 we find the following:

'It (depth psychology) was the discovery of the meaning of the word "sin" ... Sin is ... universal, tragic estrangement, based on freedom and destiny in all beings ... it is separation, estrangement from one's essential being. That is what it means; and if this is the result of depth-psychological work then this of course is a great gift that (it) has offered to theology.'

the biblical mythological form: God saw everything that he created and behold, it was good.

The *second* statement is the universal fall – fall meaning the transition from essential goodness to existential estrangement from oneself, which happens in every living being and in every time.

The *third* statement refers to the possibility of salvation. We should remember that salvation is derived from *salvus* or *salus* in Latin, which means 'healed' or 'whole', as opposed to disruptiveness.<sup>3</sup>

These three considerations of human nature are present in all genuine theological thinking: essential goodness, existential estrangement, and the possibility of something, a 'third', beyond essence and existence, through which the cleavage is overcome and healed. ... man's essential and existential nature points to his teleological nature (... *telos*, aim, that towards which life drives). *If you do not distinguish these three elements, which are always present in man, you will fall into innumerable confusions.* (e.a.)

In other words, we have again, essential goodness, existential estrangement, and a healing and making-whole of the cleavage.

In the above attitudes towards human values in the context of human being and becoming, the important thing about man is his 'essence', an Idea à la Plato within which is defined the ideal and the true nature of man. Approaches to human values naturally follow.

According to this type of approach, which we may call the essentialist ontological approach, the nature of man is ahead of his actual existence, in just the same sense as the idea of a perfect circle is ahead of any actual circle drawn on paper. Man as he actually exists is seen to be necessarily less perfect than his description in the Idea of his essence.

From this inadequacy, and from the desirability of approaching this essence, the essentialists derive our values: these values, or ideas as to what is desirable, are those which can be intuitively or otherwise comprehended as being rooted in the essential nature of man, of World, of Being. The implication for development values is that we must first find the ways in which man is estranged from his real self (including his estrangement from society and from

<sup>3</sup> 'wholeness' and 'holiness' have the same etymological meaning. This is an interesting perspective on our concept of 'integralisation' or making-whole in development, through education and social change.

nature) and then incorporate these findings into our development theory and practice. 'Development' of man would thus mean making man approach his 'true and essential nature'. This is the guideline that this type of approach would indicate for formulating developmental values.

### *Second Approach: Gnostic Existentialist*

There are, however, different approaches to deriving values for life and development. What we shall call the 'gnostic existentialists' derive in one way or another the values that are to guide us from actual existence. This is different from looking towards the 'essence'.

This approach includes the naturalists, for example, who tend to use such things as the following for clues as to what is desirable: physical laws, empirically-determined biological drives such as survival, the elements of successful scientific method (experimenting, being pragmatic, etc.), the anthropological observation of actual behaviour, etc.

Going a bit beyond the naturalists are the humanist approaches, which we also include among the gnostic existentialists because they do hold that values can be confirmed by known reality, by actual existence. The humanists have found a unifying principle in the human self, the human person – as, for example, in Maslow's self-realisation or self-actualisation. The humanists include more in their view of reality than do the naturalists. Erich Fromm tells us about the observed existential needs of man:

... he needs ties with his fellow man; he is aware of his aloneness and his separateness ... he has the urge to transcend the role of the creature ... by becoming a 'creator'. Man needs ... a sense of identity ... (and to orient) himself in the world intellectually.<sup>4</sup>

Those aspects of the humanists' approaches where the view of human reality includes transcendental concepts of some kind may be sought of, insofar as they do this, as essentialist approaches as well.

Existential signposts are thus used as guides in these types of approach to discover what man should be and what man should want. 'Development' would mean ironing out unnatural situations and working towards fulfillment, an image of the latter being obtained mainly from scientific observation and inferences. This is the guideline which, according to these types of approach, we should use to make the value-decisions of development.

<sup>4</sup> see Weisskopf's Comment in *New Knowledge in Human Values*, p. 210.

### *Third Approach: Pure Existentialist*

Apart from the (a) essentialist ontologists' and the (b) gnostic existentialists' approaches there is still a major orientation towards finding out what is desirable for man's life and development. This is what we can call the (c) *gnostic existentialist approach*. For the pure existentialist the only 'essence' that there is in man is his actual existence.

To put it another way: for every creature that we can imagine or perceive, its essence precedes its existence, e.g. the idea of a perfect circle is the normative idea (or Idea) to which we compare an actual imperfect circle drawn on paper; to this, there is only one exception – namely, man.

Now in the case of the human being, the situation is reversed: for man and man alone, his existence precedes his essence. First a man *is*; and *what* he is is settled in the course of his existence, and is not predetermined, nor an antecedent condition of his existence.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, we cannot look up the answers when we are trying to discover what man is, what is expected of him, and what he can hope for.

The humanity of man, therefore, does not consist in the virtue of his choices. But in their genuineness, in the fact that he has made choices. It is decision, Jaspers says, that makes existence real.<sup>6</sup>

### *Ontological Freedom in the Third Approach*

Man is not only free – man *is* freedom. Human development then is invited to create its own directions, and anything about man which he is not truly free to control and 'decide away' is really not part of his nature as man, his human-ness. What guide is given by the agnostic existentialist to the group of citizens, to the change agent, the designer of development programmes? In another extract from Kaplan's description of existentialism we find the attitude in which such questions are to be answered.

As the existentialist sees it, we are responsible for more than what becomes of us; we are also responsible for what becomes of others. When we make a choice we are choosing not merely for ourselves, but for all men. In this act of choice, we are

<sup>5</sup>Werner Kaplan, *New Worlds of Philosophy*, Random House, N.Y., 1961, p. 103-104.

<sup>6</sup>Geoffrey Vickers, *Freedom in a Rocking Boat*, Penguin, Middlesex, 1970.

saying not merely 'This is what I choose', but also 'This is what is *to be* chosen.' By my experience, I am determining what all mankind everywhere is forever to become. My act defines not just my essence but the essence of mankind.

It is my choice that makes me human, and thereby makes something of humanity. In this choice, I am acting as a representative of mankind, as though any man, existing as I am and so circumstanced, would make the same choice ... Thus existentialists universalize individual choice after the manner of the Kantian categorical imperative: you must never will what you cannot consistently will to be willed by all other rational beings. (p. 108)

An awesome responsibility indeed.

#### *Summary and Comment*

We have considered three approaches: (i) that based on a knowable and known essence of man from which man is actually estranged – ontological essentialist; (ii) that based on a knowable criterion for (development) values which is derived from the actually observed forces of existence, including psychological, biological, physical, laws and also including statistical anthropological and sociological measurements – the gnostic existentialist approach, including naturalists and humanists; and (iii) the agnostic or pure existentialist approach which holds that man does, and must, make his nature up with every act of his in life and development, a total emphasis on truly free choice.

Today, those development programmes that limit themselves to perfecting technological and economic services are falling short of their responsibility. There are urgent and important value issues ('what should we want?') to be resolved. For the desires that man expresses, in the form of social protests and consumer behaviour, are not merely the desires to make use of modern machines and devices. There is, perhaps more fundamentally, the need to *re-visualise*, redefine, redescribe man within the modern milieu. And the modern milieu is characterised by high densities of interaction, considerable machine-generated power (even in the not-so-rich countries), and an increased level of awareness (through education and the media).

Against this new backdrop, man is trying, in all parts of the world, both to rediscover and to reinvent what it means to be human. Hence the importance of value questions. And whatever he perceives that to be – probably (even for a poor villager) some synthesis of the glimpses of love, truth and beauty, and lack of

suffering, which filter through from surrounding science and technology, from religion and art – whatever these images of the new-human are, man will incorporate them into his values.

But which, if any, of these broad approaches to the derivation of new human values are we to adopt as a guide for answering Vickers' question 'what should we want?'<sup>7</sup> We shall not attempt to vigorously deny or justify any of them here. We must note that each of them has a certain intuitive appeal, having a foundation in one's own experiences and inclinations. All have elements which are important for individuals and for mankind today.

None of these however seems to be able to command an exclusive acceptance from our point of view. The idea of 'development' and the fact of the current critical 'Threshold' times both turn our eyes to the idea of a radical freedom which man has to exercise in changing himself. This fits in with the magnitude of the cosmos in space and time: intuition suggests that as great things were possible in a universe before Man, so great things are to be allowed for, *a fortiori*, in a universe where there is a conscious centre for reflective evolution. This would seem to exclude the 1st, or essentialist approaches, if these are interpreted as not taking into account such a radical freedom.

Conversely, man – what we normally call man – hardly starts from scratch, ontologically, every day. He does have a 'nature'; he 'is' something, beyond simply an entity with the power to change itself. This nature is valuable and worth respecting and 'developing'. These considerations seem to exclude the 3rd, or pure existentialist, approach.

The 2nd, or gnostic existentialist, approach respects the 'nature' of man as it can be deduced from known, hard existential evidence. Our objections to this approach are that there are other kinds of evidence and that more explicit emphasis must be given to the possibility of changing whatever 'nature' there is, through 'development', by means of education and social change.

I thus feel it necessary to synthesise a fourth approach, the freedom-plus-precedents or semi-existentialist approach.

<sup>7</sup>Some understanding (although certainly not a complete one) of these will be gained from a description of the Highest Common Factor among spiritual convictions of every major theology. Some of these elements (not all) are even in the traditional lore of primitive people. Such a description may be found in Aldous Huxley's *The Perennial Philosophy*, Collins, London and Glasgow, 1958. At present this book seems to be out of stock in North America.

## B. A FOURTH APPROACH SYNTHESISED: FREEDOM + PRECEDENTS

In this section we outline the basics of the fourth approach to the formulation of development values.

(i) we list the various elements that make up what we normally conceive of as the essence or nature of man, stating that *only part of his essence* is so determined or described.

(ii) we emphasise that a radical ontological freedom constitutes a large part of what makes man man.

(iii) we prove that although the elements mentioned above are valuable, they are *subject to change* through man's freedom, which is also part of man's essence or nature.

### *Elements of the Nature of Man: A-D*

It seems quite reasonable and defensible to say that there are elements in reality which determine and influence *parts of the essence of man* (i.e. of that which makes him what he is.) For these elements, we would suggest the following:

(a) *spiritual*, transcendental-immanent factors.<sup>8</sup>

(b) *broad universal forces of nature* that Teilhard de Chardin<sup>9</sup> describes as being involved in the phenomenon of evolution, of life, and lately the phenomenon of man on his planet. The characteristics of these forces include a tendency for life, (indeed, for matter) to intensify certain aspects of itself by tuning in on itself in an involution (*enroulement*) that creates higher manifestations of consciousness or interiority. They include the increase of consciousness accompanying the increase in complexity,<sup>10</sup> and other broad, large-scale forces. These forces are qualities of matter, and their normally imperceptible influence is manifested over long periods of time as the effect of the environment and the organismic subsystem on the social actions in the sociopolitical system. They also to some extent affect the personality and the culture system, and when they are recognised by the culture of mankind they will become even more of an important force within man as man.

(c) man's *hereditary legacy* is another element which is not (yet?) separate from man as man. The hereditary make-up includes

<sup>8</sup> see *The Phenomenon of Man, The Future of Man*, etc.

<sup>9</sup> *The Phenomenon of Man*, Fontana, (p.66), and elsewhere.

<sup>10</sup> see Calvin S. Hall, and Vernon J. Norby, *A Primer of Jungian Psychology*, New American Library, N.Y. 1973; also *From the Life and Work of C.J. Jung*, by Jung's private secretary Aniela Jaffé, (transl. by F.F.C. Hull, Harper and Row, N.Y.) for a simple account.



the archetypes isolated by Jung, notably the self-archetype (not to be confused with 'oneself', in the sense of the conscious ego.)<sup>11</sup> This Self archetype is apparently something common to all human beings, and since it influences the way that they make themselves, grow, and make decisions in their respective lifetimes, it is difficult to see how it can be regarded as anything but part of human nature. As the ego is the centre of conscious personality, the Self is the unifying and ordering centre of the total conscious and unconscious psyche, which unifies other archetypes and which is a link with the biological past. We need not go so far as to agree with Jung's conclusion that:

The Self (-archetype) is our life's goal, for it is the completest expression of that fateful combination we call individuality.<sup>12</sup>

We should nevertheless recognise that self-knowledge is an important step towards self-fulfillment. All the more importantly when we find that the person who is out of touch with his unconscious self has discordant relations with other people, on whom he tends to project the repressed part of his unconscious. Similar facts should be borne in mind when considering the weight to be given to the individual in comparison to the collectivity as targets of developmental approaches. That is, the individual (and his 'internal', hereditary, 'nature') is important, not only as such, but also as a member of a collectivity.

(d) the structures and processes which make up man's present and historical life, including the *events of history*,<sup>13</sup> also help to make up the nature of man. The events, as well as the *habitual symbolisations* (comparisons, modes of thought, analogies used in communicating, etc.) of one's own lifetime, too, must be included, as Gautama Buddha used to emphasise. 'All that we are is the result of what we have thought', states the opening of the well-loved Buddhist text, the *Dhammapada*. It is true that man makes

<sup>11</sup> *Collected Works of C. J. Jung*, vol. 7, p. 238.

<sup>12</sup> even when influenced greatly by geographical resource distribution, geological disasters, biological diseases, etc.

<sup>13</sup> of course, if we consider the individual person as the system, its (or his) environment is not only the ecological/spiritual environment but also the sociopolitical and the cultural.

In any open system, (i) the boundary between the system and its environment is always more or less arbitrarily drawn; and (ii) the considerable interaction with the environment (from the definition of open system) means that what the system (in this case a single person) actually *is* [in really clarify] a function of both what's within and what's beyond this boundary.

culture, but it is also true that culture makes man, especially the symbolic heritage from the past, distant and recent. For any individual person, much of the environment is a mass of symbols and images. Like all environments<sup>14</sup> this must be considered an essential factor making up the open system that we call 'a person'. *Social structures and social processes*, including the ones from the point of view of any particular individual's lifetime, thus help to make man what he is and thus have a bearing on any derivation of values from the nature of man.

Having listed all these factors which make up human nature, one can see that the 'ontological antinomy' arises in connection with each. Thus, respectively, we are familiar with (a) the 'death of God'; (b) the fears for the stagnation or self-destruction of the human race in spite of the progress of evolution so far; (c) 'back to nature' cults; (d) alienation from society and culture. We cannot now stop here, however.

#### *Freedom a Major Part of the Nature of Man*

For *alongside with* the elements a-d, the *other* major factor which influences the nature or essence of man is his freedom. For one thing, it is largely responsible for any estrangement between man as he is and his good, 'true' being. The freedom to act responsibly and irresponsibly, to sow good or to sow evil seeds. Even other factors like ignorance, pride, poverty, and insecurity (factors which may appear to lie at the root of the 'estrangement') can be overridden by man's freedom to choose, and, above all, to create.

Even though elements a-d are valuable and not to be excluded, probably the major weight is to be given to *human freedom* as the main component of what makes man man. None of the four types of factor mentioned in a-d, neither separately nor together, define man or determine his essence or nature completely. Human nature is not immutable.

It is true that – as Marx might say – man must place himself in line with the directional movement of history, and first find out what that direction is. But it is perhaps even more important to make conscious decisions and make a creative use of the future. Whether or not any predetermined essence of man a-d dictates fully or (more probably) only partly and sketchily the 'proper' future of man, man to be true to his 'nature' must use his freedom to determine which path in fact to follow. This is because man's ontological freedom – the freedom to intervene and alter his very being –

<sup>14</sup> see Huxley's *Perennial Philosophy*, p. 10.

is an important, even if not the only, component of man's essence and nature.

*Proof that Man changes his Nature*

Man can operate in those areas not completely defined (or not touched on at all) by the factors mentioned that make up his essence. Man can also, however, *change* the factors himself, and he can also go against some of them, or contradict them. In this light, let us take the factors a-d again in turn.

(a) man can, for example, change spiritual/transcendental factors (certainly insofar as they relate to him). Our knowledge of, and thus our participation in such realities can be changed – certain religious traditions forcefully tell us – by habitual social action. Others emphasise personal meditative disciplines; some approaches emphasise both, in synergy.

William James writes: 'practice (of certain behaviour) may change our theoretical horizon and this in a twofold way: it may lead us into new world and secure new powers. Knowledge we could never attain, remaining what we are, may be attainable in consequence of higher powers and higher life, which we may morally achieve.'

Jesus Christ declares: 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.'

Sufi poet<sup>15</sup> Jalal-uddin Rumi uses the metaphor 'the astrolabe<sup>16</sup> of the mysteries of God is love.'

Practically all of spiritual traditions hold that by performing certain acts, or by having a certain frame of mind – or both at once – it is possible for man to *participate*<sup>17</sup> more in a transcendental/immanent cosmic reality, and thus become something different in that sense. For example,

As a mother, even at the risk of her own life, protects her son, her only son, so let there be goodwill without measure between all beings. Let goodwill without measure prevail in the whole world – above, below, around: unstinted, unmixed with any feeling of differing or opposing interests. If a man remain steadfastly in this state of mind all the time he is awake, then is come to pass the saying 'even in this world holiness has been found'. (Metta Sutta)

<sup>15</sup> Greek *aster*, a star; and root *lab* as in *lambano*, to take. An orienting instrument formerly used for taking the altitude of the sun or stars at sea, now superseded by the quadrant and the sextant.

<sup>16</sup> *becoming-in-participation* certainly qualifies as an *education* paradigm!

<sup>17</sup> *The Future of Man*, p. 240 ff.

Many schools of thought hold that with love and faith man is capable of intervening in the very ontological constitution of the universe, including himself.

(b) as to the broad universal forces of nature described by Teilhard de Chardin, even Pere Teilhard himself warns us that we have not only the freedom to go along in their direction and fulfill the universe's tendencies in a creative and truly human way, but we also have the power to stop the fruition of these forces through us. For example, he believes that a hope in the future is necessary, and also a will to progress and advance – for in the face of a total (cultural) lack of such hope and will, the universe will be powerless to bring a good future about. He also mentions other possible self-assertions against the universe, such as through unlimited multiplication and unlimited pollution of the genetic pool.<sup>18</sup>

Another, the most important, aspect of man's ontological responsibilities is that of Agape:

Cosmically speaking, as I have said, man is collectively immersed in a 'vortex' of organisation which, operating above the level of the individual, gathers and lifts individuals as a whole towards the heightening of their power of reflection by means of a surplus of technical complexity. But even the nature of the *reflexive*<sup>19</sup> phenomenon, what rule must this evolutionary process observe if it is to fulfill its purpose? Essentially, the following: that within the compressive arrangement which gathers them into a single complex centre of vision, the human elements (individual persons) must group and tighten not merely without becoming distorted in the process, but with an enhancement of

<sup>18</sup> reflection = thought; reflexion = involution, or enroulement: 'the noosphere turning in upon itself' in analogy to the ascent to a new form of life which happened during the 'reflexion' occurring when the first primitive megamolecular life-forms spread to make a complete biospheric envelope around the planet.

<sup>19</sup> Teilhard de Chardin uses 'centricity' to denote a centredness or self-hood of some particle or element, i.e. its interior life, its consciousness, which accompanies material synthesis and complexity (see *Phenomenon of Man*, p. 70). Radial energy is a progressive universal force drawing the the holon towards even greater complexity and centricity or self-hood. This is distinguished from the other force, that of 'tangential energy', which links the holon or element with all others of the same order of complexity and centricity. This recalls Koestler's S.A./INT tendencies applied to dynamic evolutionary processes. Note: Teilhard does not use the concept of holon, which is Koestler's (*The Ghost in the Machine*, Arthur Koestler Hutchinson, London, 1967).

their 'centric'<sup>20</sup> qualities, i.e. their personality.

A delicate operation and one which, biologically, it would seem impossible to carry out except in an atmosphere (or temperature)<sup>21</sup> of unanimity or mutual attraction. Recent totalitarian experiments seem to (corroborate) this last point: the individual, outwardly bound to his fellows by coercion and solely in terms of function, deteriorates and retrogresses: he becomes mechanised.

... only union *through* love and *in* love (using the word love in its widest and most real sense of mutual internal affinity) because it brings individuals together, not superficially and tangentially but centre to centre – can physically possess the property of not merely differentiating but also personalising the elements which comprise it.

This amounts to saying that *even under the irresistible compulsion of the pressures causing it to unite, Mankind will only find and shape itself if man can learn to love one another in the very act of drawing closer.* (e.a.) *The Future of Man*, p. 244-5.

(c) the genetic structure of man is already (conceptually, at least) susceptible to modification by scientists.<sup>22</sup> *Selective* treatment of ovum or sperm chromosomes and genes with chemical tools, with special viruses, or with short-wavelength radiation is still some way off, and when available it will first be used to forestall genetic deficiencies. However, it will undoubtedly be used later for designing a new human being, free from disease and with increased physical and mental powers. Selective modification of unconscious archetypes and other traits<sup>23</sup> by gene-changing is probably a more complicated but similar task.

In any case, we already practice control over our bodily structure through incest prohibitions, discouraging defective persons from having other than adopted children,<sup>24</sup> other forms of genetic counselling, etc. And we already practise control over at least the

<sup>20</sup> Here, of course, Teilhard is reminding us by analogy that the first megamolecular life-forms on earth could only arise when the molten earth cooled so that the temperature (which is to say the degree of agitation of the atoms of matter) was low enough for the biochemical bonds to start forming without being torn apart. The above extract is from the *Future of Man*, p. 244-5, (e.a.).

<sup>21</sup> Genetics: *The Futurist*, Vol. II, April, 1968; and June 1968, pp. 31 and 45-6.

<sup>22</sup> Personality control through genetics: *The Futurist* Vol. I, April, 1968, p. 20, p. 35.

<sup>23</sup> Genetic counselling, *The Futurist*, December 1968, Vol. II, p. 116.

<sup>24</sup> *La Vie Cosmique*, p. 131; *Ecrits du Temps de la Erre*, p. 23.

content (if not the form) of our archetypal forms by psychotherapeutic means.

(d) Historical structures and processes can be changed by man, notwithstanding the fact that to some extent they do determine what man *is*. Individuals and institutions have made radical changes in man. But man's culture, man's habitual patterns of thought, man's symbolic universe in general, and man's social structures and processes – all these man can modify through planned change. We have in the past (and through cumulative learning and increased potential sensitivity we may do better in the future) used symbolic forms like emotional symbols, ideologies, scientific world-views, etc., to change all these parts of man, and so to change man's nature.

Needless to say, man has also changed Nature, and thereby converted himself from a hunter and herb-gatherer to a plastic-steel-and-concrete-dwelling sophisticate who often eats synthetic foods of which the very molecular composition is controlled. So much for an unchangeable 'essence' of man!

In short, while the pure existentialists say that the human being (having no essence except his existence) in every action defines and determines his own essence or nature, we, instead, should say that the human being in every considered action *adds to* his own nature or essence (and, indeed, even to the nature of the universe.)

#### *Teilhard on Self-Evolution*

Teilhard de Chardin strongly emphasises that we understand what man is by considering his power to 'know that he knows', and the associated freedom that accompanies the emergence of man. This is the freedom to design his own evolution – a self-evolution, for the first time in the history of the (presently-known) universe. No longer an evolution merely 'undergone'. Man is actively at the helm of a universe that has become sentient through him. In Teilhard's words,

The true summons of the Cosmos is a call consciously to share in the great work that goes on within it: it is not by drifting down the current of things that we shall be united with their one, single soul, but by fighting our way with them . . .<sup>25</sup>

Revolution, by the very mechanism of its syntheses, charges itself with an ever-growing measure of freedom.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> From *The Future of Man*.

<sup>26</sup> *The Phenomenon of Man*; p. 310 (e. a.).

... it would be more convenient, and we would be inclined to think it safe, to leave the contours of that great body made up of all our bodies to take shape on their own, influenced only by the automatic play of individual urges and whims: 'better not interfere with the forces of the world!' *Once more we are up against the mirage of instinct, the so-called infallibility of nature.* But is it not precisely the world itself which, culminating in thought, expects us to think out again the instinctive impulses of nature so as to perfect them?

Reflective (conscious) substance requires reflective treatment. If there is a future for mankind it can only be imagined in terms of a harmonious conciliation of what is free with what is planned and totalised. Points involved are: the distribution of the resources of the globe; the optimum use of the powers set free by mechanisation; the physiology of nations and races; geo-economy; geo-politics; geo-demography; the organisation of research developing into reasoned organisation of the earth.<sup>27</sup>

'The mirage of instinct: the so-called infallibility of nature' ... what a succinct, decisive stroke Teilhard makes with these words to clear the path for man's ontological freedom!

Thus, the attempts in various societies to preserve and respect past human culture is not to be denigrated, but alone it is a pitiful expression of human sensibilities to the past, present, and future. These efforts must be accompanied by courageous joint attempts to design a culture (in the broad sense of the word) for today and tomorrow. Human values and other symbols, human interests, human activities – in fact, as we have said, all parts of the insight/behaviour system – are the objects of man's creative responsibility. These are the guidance vis-à-vis development values given to us by our fourth approach. Development is now seen to be a process of purposefully and respectfully enhancing the 'whole man' and yet – equally purposefully – continuing a radical self-evolutionary shaping and changing of man's nature.

It is also important, for the educator and the agent of social change, to appreciate the level of *collective* responsibility. The pure existentialist formulation described by Kaplan a few pages back, as well as the writing of several of the popular existentialists, seem to be concerned almost exclusively with the individual – in view of which it is little wonder that they felt despairingly that man was not able to rise up to this great and overpowering responsibility. On this theme, we find more inspiration from an-

<sup>27</sup> *Phenomenon of Man*, p. 21.

other passage by Teilhard:

We have said that progress is designed to enable considered action to proceed from the will-power of mankind, a wholly human exercise of choice. But this natural conclusion of the vital effort, as we can now see, is not to be regarded as something to be consummated separately in the secret heart of each ... (individual). If we are to perceive and measure the extent of Progress we must look resolutely beyond the individual viewpoint. It is Mankind as a whole, collective humanity, which is called upon to perform the definitive act whereby the total force of terrestrial evolution will be released and flourish; an act in which the full consciousness of each individual man will be sustained by that of every other man, not only the living but the dead. And so it follows that the *opus umanum* laboriously and gradually achieved within us by the growth of knowledge and in the face of evil, is something quite other than an act of higher morality: it is a living organism.

*Using the Freedom + Precedents Approach*

Using the above freedom+precedents paradigm for the derivation of human values for education and development, one comes across any number of domains or situations for which values may be derived, for example values relating to the social bond, to the economics of distribution and sharing, to the time-scale used in planning, etc. The semi-existentialist or freedom-plus-precedents approach cannot of course be relied on to give a very specific and unique solution every time. But it does provide an inspiration, and one that is qualitatively different from those of the other approaches. Using also his experience and judgement, the educator and the agent of social change might allow themselves to be influenced by this paradigm and image of man in deciding what values are truly human.