

Ramón P. Muñoz Soler

**Dawn  
Of  
New man**

A faithful recorded talk between the author and members  
of the “Instituto de Difusión de Estudios Sociales (IDES)”

Excerpt from  
*Alborada del Hombre Nuevo*

Translation by Héctor V. Morel

**Dr. Osvaldo Depaula.** (President of IDES)

In accord with our conversations during the last meetings of the Council, we were expecting this session. And our expectation is double: first, because of the task done by Doctor Muñoz Soler analysing papers published by the Magazine of this Institute; from the first issue to the fourth, Doctor Muñoz Soler has read all of them and did commentaries in this sense, which have really been a helpful guide and orientation, and a clarification about certain subjects perhaps potentially in our minds, but still not expressly posed. This same concern was greater and greater by our contact with the first of his books – “*Germes of Future in Man*”– which contains a considerable number of ideas that we longed forward to seeing written somewhere. Doctor Muñoz Soler’s book explains many phenomena of daily living, which in my opinion are deeply incomprehensible, and at the same time his book is a message of future by its conception of man of tomorrow and by his so-called expansive individuality actually instilling both trust and faith at a time.

We have talked to Doctor Muñoz Soler if it is possible a personal commentary about this book that we have read with so much interest, and if it is possible to expand our mutual contact, which we feel will be very useful. Doctor, please, we expect your words.

**Dr. Ramón P. Muñoz Soler**

In fact, I will not deliver any speech, but simply I propose a conversation because I believe dialogue is the basic principle of your Institute... I feel so, at least. So you may start this dialogue that I am going to continue, or rather, we all will continue.

*Q.* – Personally I am interested in a question that also is a highly important current issue. In one of the chapters of your book, you refer to Method and you say present man, being unsatisfied in many aspects with daily living, seeks diverse methods and tries to find individual satisfaction and achievement and, for instance, is in quest of Oriental philosophies, or in search of drugs –lysergic acid–, or ultimately even I feel that even hippies are living in certain way because they may be unsatisfied with ordinary life and try to find something better. I would like to know your opinion –even though you refer to this in your book– and further details about this type of methods in vogue, such as yoga, lysergic acid and other drugs, and the hippie life style, and what are you proposing instead like a way to achieve this urge for individuality of man, which ultimately we all long for.

*A.* – So, you request a criticism of methodological systems...; let us say, a criticism of systems of living?

*Q.* – In your book, you propose a method that, in my opinion, is very interesting, but I would like further explanation about this method.

A. – As one poses like that a question about *how*, that is to say, about *method*, we may run the risk of objectifying the problem, that is to say, the risk of making it concrete; and when we make something concrete, once we gave it certain form –in this case, the concrete method– we run the risk of losing sight of the basic idea we want to grasp. In my view, a previous question should be proper... that is to say, let us not worry about method: I feel method arises in terms of something that we want... It is of no use to speak here of a method to climb the Aconcagua or the Himalayas if we are not receptive and we do not *want* to climb, and if we do not want this in such a way that we are eager for living it. I feel a discussion about methods surely would take the whole night in connection with what is better: if going by foot, by car, riding a mule, or by plane... Instead, I feel in our present conversation on level of a clarifying dialogue, our attempt to grasp in depth our basic idea –yours and mine– is more important before we get lost in methodological details, whose significance I do not deny –on the contrary, I feel it is important to know the best method to climb the Himalayas–, but I deem more important for a group like this, which aims at the future, to stop for a while and to deepen rather this idea of future than a method. That is to say, I would dare –if you agree– to set aside for a while this question about method.

Q. – And what would be this idea of future in your view?

A. – I believe it would be better for you to elaborate it, because also you have lived it and wish to experience it, and even, to assign to it a form in social models. Apparently one of the aims of this Institute is perhaps to experience a new idea about man and to assign to it a form in society. Perhaps, this young lady, beside me, may tell if this is or not your central idea, so we may get a basis to continue our dialogue.

Q. – I believe it is like that... I am new here...

A. – May someone else tell in a more concrete way if this is or not the idea of this group in terms of future?

Q. – Well, this group arises from a dissatisfaction. Originally, we were unsatisfied with certain aspects of the reality; we can agree with certain aspects of the reality, and disagree with other aspects of it. So we intended to seek something new and, as a previous step of this search, first we decided to study this reality in order to start from serious foundations: first, to know the reality, and later, to propose reformations of this reality. At this point of our group, the idea of partially reforming the reality –in connection with political, social or economic realities– is more or less latent, but not entirely expressed, and is not totally satisfactory if we cannot find satisfactory ideas on political, social and economic level as a whole; moreover we see systems structured upon diverse opposite forms that fail and are in crisis. So we begin to think that, besides necessary mass reformations, we need reformations of individual kind in every one of us. That is to say, as long as man keeps his present mental structure and remains so far subject to the same ambitions and passions, no solution there will be for so much frustration easily detected among young persons –who are very disoriented and without any horizons– and also among old

people, who are really disappointed in the Argentine scene. We are interested in your book since you reflect the same language: that is to say, the existence of a new man, a man of future is imperative.

A. – Your last sayings may be a useful connection with the question about methodology. That is to say, let us come back to methodology. So the idea of “*Germes of Future in Man*”, which coincides with your idea, has to be connected, like a methodological starting point, with the idea of a new man, and not with that of a new type of institution or a new type of organisation. So the key to the social phenomenon aiming at the future is, beyond any discussion, a new man; that is to say, a new man who may assign a form to a new society, and not a methodology exclusively seeking institutional models. From this point of view, and coming back again to the question about hippies and certain new movements, now it is very important to emphasise the significant unrest in certain countries for a quest of new institutional models. Let us see the case of hippies and the so-called communes in the United States; during the last five to seven years three thousand communes emerged there, that is to say, three thousand groups of young persons who try and experience new forms of living in community: some of them are hippies, others not; some of them are politicised, others not; and some of them are religious-minded, others not. So one of the main causes to form these communes is a dissatisfaction derived from family life in crisis –and this gives rise to five hundred thousand young persons escaping and migrating from their respective families to different points of the country. But now, in practice, one can see how old problems of young people, experienced in their respective families, take place again in communes, and the principle of an entire self-sufficiency –basically opposed to the old system of family authoritarianism– is being revised; to such an extent that some authors who studied communes say the latter soon cease to be if they lack certain authoritarianism: that is to say, we return to the starting point. So an old unsatisfied man –who every one of us may be– will fail if he wants to seek a methodology for new social –mere formal– models of only new institutional structures. As time passes by, organised forms of social life change, certain forms are better, others are worse, but if man does not change within, he reproduces in new institutional models the same vices, the same complexes, his mental tortures, the same difficulties to live together, whether living in a conventional family, in a hippie community, or in an Israeli *kibutz*. In my view, the methodological problem should be focussed on a basic aspiration: to *be* a new man. Before one thinks of a particular methodology we should wonder if we can absorb the idea of the future in ourselves. On the other side, the idea of the future is neither restricted to “*Germes of Future in Man*”, nor to any other book, but is an idea – or rather, a force– which already exists in the world and is simultaneously detected by different individuals whose vocation is to be new men, and it is at this point that –in my opinion– we should focus the method. I feel if we are unable to live and experience in ourselves the idea of a future man, what we can socially define will be nothing but a replica of the past.

(A young lady)

Q. – In fact, what is a future man?, and how to channel this vocation to be a future man?

A. – Again we deal with *how*, and with our attempt to find objective elements. I do not believe today we may define a future man by objective character traits, by his peculiar thinking, by his personal beliefs... by his clothes, by his long hair or by his short hair... Future man is an aspiration of present humanity, made vital and concrete on certain individuals who are forming right now a new social force: this is a future man.

*(Another young lady)*

Q. – And what patterns do we have to recognise him?

A. – Again we try to make the human phenomenon concrete, or to define or objectify it, and one of the main characteristics –functional, if we may say– of a future man, is precisely his refusal to remain trapped in the objective trend of his consciousness, which is one of the greatest of tyrannies of mind. Usually we live under the tyranny of an objective consciousness: we want to objectify everything, from our ordinary thoughts and wishes to the highest of present speculations of science. Future man is precisely open on a non-objectified field... like you did by yourselves... Once I asked Osvaldo –also with my old objectifying mind– “What do you seek in your Institute?, What are your ideas?, And what are your basic patterns?...”, quite simply he replied and said: “We have no patterns”; and this is a perplexing situation. Isn’t it?

Q. – Excuse me, if Osvaldo told you we have no patterns... in our case the point is as follows: our Institute is for a dialogue, but perhaps more than this, is for self-knowledge. So in our different activities, in our schedule, which may be meetings of young persons, lectures, talks or discussions, if at certain moment we objectify, we intend to be individually subjective later; that is to say, we aim at establishing and continuing a dialogue with others through self-knowledge.

A. – Right!, this is the pattern, that is to say, a method to reflect ourselves on others, and not a method of tyrannical objectification chaining us to fixed aims that later become opposite to other aims... isn’t it? Over and above, today a new man is mainly eager for self-knowledge, that is to say, to reveal his being, to recover a being precisely lost by an objectifying trend of his consciousness. *Egoencia* is simply to be this: to recover our being.

Q. – Doctor, in connection with ideas contained in your book, may you clarify what you call renunciation and prophetic method?

A. – Well, renunciation is the methodological foundation of one’s opening. Renunciation is the main foundation of one’s essential opening.

*(The same interlocutor)*

Q. – And prophetic method?

A. – This is the meaning of “prophetic”: insofar as every one of us can perceive the future, in the same proportion every one makes use of a method that at present is not exclusive of great prophets of the human race –of course, say the latter make use of it on level of great prophecy... we could say– but we are making use of this prophetic method insofar as here every one wants to perceive what is coming from the future. One of the characteristics of future man –and here an answer arises in connection with a question asked by this young lady about “what patterns” of self-knowledge could we offer–, one of the characteristics –we repeat– of this future man, is precisely his especial sensibility by which he is receptive to the future. Instead, most human beings live in terms of the past, and their forms of thinking and feeling are connected with a reserve of past experiences whose energy moves their thoughts, feelings and actions; while a new man has an opening, an especial sensibility, and an especial receptivity to events coming from the future. So in this sense, every one of us is making use of a prophetic method, which was not a characteristic of precedent generations... isn’t it? So far, all psychological methods to know man, including such a modern method as psychoanalysis that went in the depths of the subconscious, all these methods are in terms of the past and of knowing layers of the human experience belonging to the past. Just recently, we begin to see, as it were, a new sensibility on a group of men in different parts of the world, and this sensibility enables them to receive the message of the future. Even they do not receive this message by means of great messengers –doubtless great messengers transmit it on different operational levels– but simultaneously on different parts of the planet, a group of souls are directly receptive of this message of the future; and this group of human beings, with a new consciousness, and recognising one another by similarity, form the new generation and are a new hope for the world. It is the emergence of a new human type that still is in germ. Still we cannot speak of definite traits, or of fixed characters, because such a structured typology is patent when a race is old...: it is then when definite traits of a race and culture appear. But now we are speaking of a culture in gestation. This very term “*germs*” of future in man marks what at present we call new expansive consciousness, opening to the future, and *egoencia* of being; it is a new qualitative germinal trait... which is in gestation. A new consciousness in you or perhaps in me does not appear like a new splendid quality; this is why perhaps you may excuse better in yourselves and in me certain hesitation before this incipient receptivity to the future; in order to “see” we have not an instrument as perfect as our physical eyes –which perhaps how many thousand years the human race took to perfect and perceive our physical environment–. But a new type of consciousness and a new type of germinal perception in man is being developed; who knows how many thousands years have to pass until a full development of these germinal qualities in new human types. It is very important to recognise this, because many individual and social phenomena of our time have to be interpreted in terms of incipient functions, in terms of just-born functions... thence it is difficult, and even perilous to objectify them. Because nowadays also everybody speaks of new man, and does not know well what is a new man. We should wonder, what new man are we speaking of?: first question in methodological criticism. A hippie may believe he is a new man simply by his rebelliousness, long hair, or non-conventional clothes; revolutionary groups, aiming at destroying old social structures, also believe they are new men by virtue of this only fact; individuals of certain religious groups believe they are new men

by virtue of certain new belief or new ideology; and the same occurs in advanced fields of art, science and technique. So every one wishes the feel objectified and recognised in this new human phenomenon by appropriation of some especial trait, distinctive and external; modern literature increases this confusion and tries to assign to this social class or that, to this ideology or that, or to this generation group or that, characters of new man –when for instance one says young people possess traits of new consciousness, and we do not realise we may find things of any kind in young people–... So, plainly speaking, our so-called new man is an inner human trait, or quality, thence one's difficulty to objectify it.

*Q. – May we say it is a psychological aspect or a sociological aspect?*

*A. – We cannot reduce the quality of new man to a psychological aspect or to a sociological aspect. It is an inner state of consciousness, which we cannot define as psychological because the psychological aspect is an aspect of being; we have to place it in being; or perhaps may be better to say it is an individual way to be. If we say it is sociological we are dividing and projecting it on the screen of society; and then we would say it is sociological because this phenomenon takes place among hippies, or among leftist revolutionary groups, or among vanguard art groups, or among advanced science groups. If we say it is psychological, also we are dividing it because psyche is a part of man, and it is not man. In my opinion, we can understand one another, from a terminological point of view, if we approach modern philosophical currents aiming at being of man. New man, in the sense we assign to this term, is a way to be, and therefore, a way to be total, psychological, sociological, physical and spiritual at the same time: so we enter the field of a united, integrated man, and go out of the field of divided man that every one of us is. At this point perhaps we may outline a little better this phenomenon of new man: today to speak of new man is to speak of vocation of integrality and of a possible going out of respective fields of specialisation and vital objectification in which we are trapped. Every one of us is trapped in a partial field: by our profession, culture, race, religion or ideology, by this social group or that, or by this nation or another... and in such a situation we struggle and discuss about competency and predominance, and quest of partial solutions. To speak of expansive individuality is precisely to go out of all this, to renounce to all this, and to enter a new existential dimension and a new field of consciousness of expansive kind, that is to say, that may be total. Because we have not a total consciousness, we have a restricted consciousness –objectively conditioned by our family, race, nationality or profession– but we have not a universal consciousness: ... unfortunately we have not it. But insofar as we “are open”, at least during certain instant of our lifetime, our consciousness expands at this moment of opening: and this type of expansive consciousness is a medium of union among men.*

And now I return to your point: your Institute is open to all positions, at least as a possibility, since it refuses to fix an objective position. In some way, I feel if you keep your dialogue as method, then in some way a possible union with other groups will derive from the same method, which is an opening.

*Q.* – Osvaldo said you have read all issues of the Magazine of this Institute; and I would like to ask: what are your conclusions from it?

*A.* – In general, my impression is good; and my best impression was precisely the absence of a reactionary ideology... I'll try to explain myself: reactive....; because nowadays almost all social movements are based on a reactive consciousness... they react for or against something or somebody... they are constantly reacting. Apparently I did not see a reactive position in the Institute's Magazine; on the contrary, your group is open and balanced –we would say balanced, in dietetic terms– [*laughs*], containing all ingredients...; that is to say, a group in which there is a balance between first, the spiritual aspect as a the highest aim of being, second, the social aspect as an expression of man in community, respect for tradition –in the best sense of this term–, and appreciation of the individual, and third, opening to dialogue; and in my opinion these doctrinal elements –if we may term them so– are valuable, over and above if you are custodians of those elements. I feel these values, open to universality, should be guarded... I do not know if I explain myself.

*Q.* – Just you made use of the word *custodians*, and I associate it with the word “leaders”; in this case could not they be synonyms?

*R.* – First, I'd like to tell one thing: when the purpose of a group is to give an idea and *wants* and loves this idea, and wants to strengthen it, this group should assume and disseminate it in a remarkable way, but also to guard it in order to keep its purity... So, if this Institute, in which dialogue is the fundamental principle, does not respect it, and transforms dialogue in polemics, discussion, proselytism, or anything else, doubtless the expansive power of this group toward universality is going to decrease.

*Q.* – So, starting from our need of being united behind this new idea of new man, since at this moment this man is not concrete and cannot be displayed –in an objective way–, then I feel all those man-made forms of the past, even those tending to certain opening, could delude us and be a false image of new man. In plain terms: from a political viewpoint, present social ideas; and from a religious viewpoint, for instance, religions or a wide-spread religion; isn't it?

*A.* – I feel so; there are very few new ideas in our present world; and also I believe many ideological façades offered today like new ones are not new by only novel, and this is not the same. So, the first function of custody in a group like this is precisely to create in the very group sufficient power of investigation and study to detect what is actually new, and to discover those apparently new façades that only are covering or concealing the old.

*Q.* – Doctor, apparently something is not clear: one can perceive a new man in germ, and precisely because he is so new, we cannot give his definite characteristic traits; now, we are in a position to recognise –personally I hold to this– the emergence of a new man is necessary, but to investigate in depth the possible characteristics of this new man is not necessary because we would not get anything –there are



not any patterns yet—; but, even on assuming intimately we aim at becoming men of these characteristics, then if I join a hippie community—in accord with your book— would I follow a wrong way?

A. – I did not say it is wrong...

(*Young lady*)

Q. – It is not the proper way if he who enters a hippie community does not possess will-to-change, because then he is likely living the life of a bourgeois behind hippie appearance.

A. – Of course... I am not at all against hippie communities; on the contrary, I feel they may be the proper way for those people whose vocation is to be hippies.

Q. – Subjectively proper...

A. – Of course!...

Q. – I feel man evolves historically. So, new man is not an exclusive phenomenon of this age, but he appeared on many precedent ages; that is to say, from caveman to present man an evolutionary process has taken place, and the scale of new man appeared many times in history; now, every one of these scales gave in due time a society of certain kind, or...: over and above, I do not share the idea of the young man who said there is a whole interactive frame between the social frame and the individual as being. We are a product of our social environment, with a series of conflicts derived from our environment. I feel the problem is connected with this question: if we are living a transition age, not only of national kind but also global, in which new forms are appearing, is not this germ of future man a phenomenon of social transformation that has to come? Now, possibly, also there are other patterns of Teilhard's sayings about an approach to a new point, the omega point, that is to say, toward a much bigger universal approach point. So I believe search of new man cannot be reduced to a subconscious problem, but has to be a problem of action. Even we do not know how it is going to be, but according to how we form institutions, that is to say, according how we form the whole frame, social, economic and political, a new man is going to appear there.

A. – Also this is my opinion... partially. Doubtless, this very "Meeting" you have promoted is a way to detect a new man: you detect a new man on a meeting of persons, and his development is in terms of social community, but one should be careful and not to believe he simply arises like a product of the environment.

Q. – Excuse me, Doctor: a new man is born of group interaction; even though he is subjectively born, he is manifested or channelled in a group. And this the purpose of this Institute: to channel all our opinions and concerns through an institution that reunites us in a group. Individually we would not get anything at all, but collectively we can reach something, and we name this something *IDES*.

A. – You are right... but I believe we should precisely be careful with the group: a group may act in terms of opening or in terms of prison, like in any group. In present society we are suffering a mass phenomenon: we are *products* –as this young man said– of our environment, and this is our misfortune, isn't it?, to be products of our environment. Nowadays groups, big corporations, a corporate state –as Reich calls the United States– are mass states of consciousness, and any group can become another mass organisation. So, a group is two-faced, and one has to know how to recognise these faces. On one side a group acts in terms of meeting and opening; it will be open to the future as long as we can keep it in this opening. But on the other side also it has a demonic face –let us call it so– every group has it, and it is then when this group becomes another corporation, another mass, in which an individual also can remain annulled, trapped... Then, these new groups should have certain operative flexibility to function in both faces. Because, of course, you can make many things, you can promote a very significant collective action, when and if this group contains within, in its heart, under its custody, certain spirit of individuality that may be kept; otherwise this group will become another mass, will collide with others, will be ruled by an ideology, or will be in conflict with itself... I do not know if I explain myself.

## II

Q. – Excuse me, Doctor, may you tell what is your so-called method of life?

A. – Well, I feel a method of life is... You ever return to methodology, and it seems to me all right (laughs)... Method of life is the method of a new man; that is to say, one should live and incarnate ideas, and not simply theorise about them. A new man, a new society emerge in terms of method of life, and not in terms of ideology.

Q. – Here some persons did not read your book; so may you clarify what is this method?

(Another interlocutor)

Q. – You say, to incarnate a method of life... In general, may you give an example –as Osvaldo says– of your so-called incarnation of a method of life?

(Another interlocutor)

Q.– For instance, in this chapter, you refer to “harmony of an individual with rhythms of nature”; later you speak of “mind control” and, finally, of “reserve, use, and transformation of human energy” and, at a time, in this last section, you refer to a control of energies linked with “sex”, “word” and “sight”.

A. – I return to the starting point: is there sufficient vocation to live in terms of a method of this kind, or not?; because method arises for a person who wants it...

Q. – But the issue at stake is that sometimes one should know the method in order to know if we want it.

A. – Such as you have summed this up, a method is too much extensive to explain it with some few words, but let us start from this basis: we are too far from this type of methodology. So let us start recognising, if possible, how far usually we are from all this! First, if we wish to be in tune with natural rhythms, we must confess we do not know them; and if we know a little of them –because at least we are aware of the day-night rhythm– actually we do not practice it because we are switching over day and night and vice versa: even we are unable to practise such elementary things like that!.... Second, it is beyond any arguments that the method must refer to a control of energy, but does every one of us wish to control this energy?, we are so far from all this!; we get used to a consumerist society, we consume any thing, we spend any level of energy, ours and of others, for our own gratification... but do we want any control of this energy? On the other hand, if we are unable to intuit the fundamental purpose of our efforts, it will be very hard to practise a method like that. If I do not love an ideal of human transformation, it is very difficult to renounce to my ordinary pleasures, and to my wishes and likes, and to renounce to sex, conveniences, money and travels, and even to renounce to things that according to people grant a pleasant living. In short, if my life has not a transcendent sense, why to speak of sex reserve?, why to speak of sex reserve in a world of voracious desires, in which the only sense of existence is for people to be a little happier and a little more self-forgotten, and in which sex offers the great solution: self-forgetting. So why to speak of human energy control in a high consumerist society, which constantly is offering us things that, because of our inner voracity, we buy, and we cannot renounce to anything because the power of publicity and environment –as our friend would say– is more powerful than our good intentions to get self-control? So, why should we try a new method of life?

Q. – Since you speak of control, I feel this control was in force throughout history in convents of different religions...

A. – Yes, but for him who loved to practise it!

(Same precedent interlocutor)

Q. – Of course, but it was ever in force... So, if we speak of a new man, we cannot feel control is a new characteristic; control was ever in force.

A. – Agreed!: new man may desire to put in tune his individual living with life of the cosmos, but this does not mean he is inventing laws of the cosmos; man neither invented the gravitation law, nor cosmic radiation laws, nor rhythms of nature, nor human energy laws: these laws have ever been in force, but present man has to re-discover his relationships with the cosmos. But first, as a previous question –we repeat– we should wonder if our love is sufficient to desire these things, or if this is mere intellectual

curiosity connected with doctrine and knowledge... with something we wish to grasp in order to enrich our mind and to know a little more...

Q. – Excuse me, you cannot expect any answer from a question like that!

A. – No, but methodologically we wonder this way; methodologically we have to ask constantly this question; I do not say one has to answer it... I say we have to wonder, because our very question is going to display the way leading to the answer.

Q. – I do not grasp with much clarity your sayings about institutions... You spoke of dangers that an institution like ours can create, or of possible risks we may run: in plain terms, when you spoke of this, did you refer –as it were– to the “label” of an institution?

A. – I did not to a “label” at all... I rather refer to the spirit of an institution; a group is going to be an expansive force if remains with open spirit.

(Same interlocutor)

Q. – With same open spirit, but not denying the positive fact of creating a position-taking...

A. – Of course!

(Same interlocutor)

Q. – Oh!

A. – Therefore I say, if the heart of the group pays close attention to its initial principle... Because your Institute is also germinal, and many germinal things abort during their first gestation months.

(Young lady)

Q.– Excuse me, somehow I take up again the subject of a previous question that we wonder constantly: a sort of being fully and deeply conscious of ourselves; the initial question is as follows: if I bring here a person who is entirely unaware of our considerations, and I tell him, “See, here we deal with a new man”, the first reaction of this person is to objectify, and perhaps my own question is an objectification...; but in a “zero-kilometre” state, if I wondered “For what?”, and got a proper answer to this “For what?”, later I could ask questions of all kinds about ways to follow... but can I get the answer about “For what?”, about what advantage may I take from being a new man? and about being conscious of myself will enable me to be happier?

A. – Are you asking this question to yourself or to me?

(Same young lady)

Q. – I am asking this question to you. May you answer?

A. – But are you wondering about this at the same time you are asking this question to me?

(Same young lady)

Q. – Yes, of course!, and not from now.

A. – Then, how do you answer this question in yourself?

(Same young lady)

Q. – I did not find an answer yet.

A. – You did not find it... but first you wish to know what advantage you are going to take...; if it is advantageous or not, if it is profitable or not...

(Same young lady)

Q. – But it is to certain extent cold to talk like that... but... I feel all has its “For what?”.

A. – This may be the first trick of one’s mind: as you project your “For what?”, if you wonder if it is going to be useful or not, and what benefits can you get, you are already closing the field to a deep answer.

Q. – Of course, excuse me, but if you do not wonder “For what?”, your own conviction is going to be false; that is to say, if one does not wonder “For what?” –I see this in the young lady’s case– if one does not say “For what?”, it is because we are going –as it were– like a sort of little lambs, like cannon-fodder, who obediently tell: I am going... I follow something... but I do not know where I am going to; so, before we take one step, first we should ask: “What is expecting us ahead?”; the point at issue is not pessimism or optimism to cope with a method or a new way to live, but: “What is there?”, “how to represent it?, how to reach it?, how to do it?, and how to live it?”, and certainly we are going to pose: “Is my going advantageous?”, but not for a cold, monetary or opportune advantage; “Is it advantageous to myself and to the good of the entire community, and to all those with whom I want to be?, is it advantageous to me if I go by the sidewalk across the street, or if I remain at the same place?: this would be “For what?”.

A. – This premise surmises a false starting point, because this position keeps a duality between the “sidewalk across the street” and you; when you say, “Is my going to the sidewalk across the street advantageous or not?”, you plainly deny yourself and feel new man is on the sidewalk across the street, and this is a rational position...

(Same interlocutor)

Q. – Well, I apologise for my interruption, I mentioned a sidewalk, but perhaps may be a step...

A. – I believe new man is born or not in every one of us: this is a fundamental point! It is not proselytism or the presence of someone, me or anyone, coming here to talk about new man like he who is offering a product, while others begin to think if to buy it or not could be useful (laughs)... I apologise for my irony.

Q. – I remember certain passage of your book...; I am going to answer for you, Doctor, but citing a part of your book. In his book, Doctor Muñoz Soler says he admits duality, but these dualities are in the frame of a whole: so, first it is the whole, and later we can speak of dualities...

A. – So, not to be lost in details of the phenomenon: this would be the “quid” in methodology; not to be lost in details of this that we want to grasp as new; not to be lost in an excessive detailed speculation of rational kind, which will close our field. So perhaps you noticed I am somehow reluctant to speculations, and even reluctant to answer questions in an objective way, because I do not like to close the perceptive field. We all have a consciousness tending to objectification but, at the same time, this objectification closes the field of knowledge; so let us leave this field open, let us leave one’s sensibility open; let us not ask too many rational questions closing the field to a receptivity of some kind beyond the rational aspect... this is all; let us try to be in tune, and to talk –so as we are doing now– but let us not close the field with formulae, believing that, because we have offered a formula or answer, we have already explained something, when perhaps merely we have put a screen. So it may be proper not to restrict this conversation to some few persons, but all should participate, because insofar as we participate more and more, greater and greater will be our chances to understand what we want understand.

Q. – In spite of your answer to this young lady’s question –about “For what?”– I dare to say there is a very positive basic point: the fact that she asks the question... and basically a thirst for quest already exists; as she does not get an answer –which would be a secondary step– her first question facilitates her to be present in this group. She said, if I bring here a person and tell him, “We are speaking of a new man”, this person could be curious to join the group since he is not going to ask: “What is a new man?”, but he will say, “Oh!, perhaps I may find some answer to my own questions”.

A. – You see how methodology is richer and richer insofar as our conversation is deeper and deeper... because we are making use of a methodology! So, this young lady has a valuable curiosity about the question, not about the answer: because an answer can be moulded by me, by my conditioning, my education, my nature, my ignorance, and whatever, while the question is always alive. Therefore, when she asked me a question and expected an objective answer, I brought her back to her individual ego so that she could open the field to a genuine answer; by refusing to respond, more or less I meant: “Keep your question!”. In my opinion, you are right because in one’s enquiry, in one’s existential anguish before

our difficulty to find an answer... in this very sorrow, if you love knowledge, you are going to find the answer. Instead, if I give you an answer, my answer is strange to your being and out of your being: it is an answer coming from me and, therefore, it will not be an egoencia's answer; egoencia is born in being, it is not born of one's neighbour sayings, of a leader's sayings, or a book's sayings, because this is bondage of being: because such and such says so, because the author of the book says so, because one's neighbour of the sidewalk across the street says so...: such a neighbour of the sidewalk across the street is non-existent, and such an author or such a book does not exist either. Egoencia is born when we are willing to deny all answers of this kind –schematic, formalist and cultural– which apparently say much and actually do not say anything. Insofar as we can produce a question in ourselves and –before an answer that does not come to us– insofar as we can remain alone with the same question, and continue to ask, at this very moment we are already entering a new field.

Q. – In regard to your above-mentioned renunciation –in my opinion, to certain extent a problem connected with our last sayings– I feel if we are renouncing to something, to something that we wish, and in front of the system of new being, and in accord with your sayings, renunciation is unnecessary... because when you do not need it, you set it apart. Therefore, we even go through a false way if we try to cope our consumerist problem related to all those things, with renunciation used as a method to achieve a new being... So, had we to dispose of these things, it would be because we do not need them, and not because we renounce by following a method.

A. – Would you like to converse about the subject of renunciation? I feel the last chapter of the book “Germs of Future in Man” deals with renunciation, isn't it?; I say I feel because once I wrote it, I did not read it again.

(Reading the book):

Yes, it is “Renunciation”.

Q. – Also I was going to pose the subject of renunciation –an exciting subject– but, in fact, I intended to consider it later (laughs). If you don't mind, here you refer to anxiety and anguish of man because of crises and conflicts... and you say all these previous troubles can be solved if one becomes a new man, and assumes a new ideal...; at least this paragraph suggests this. I feel here we all agree with this approach, but we wish to see with more clarity the problem of renunciation; and it was this paragraph that brought me more doubts because I may be entirely identified with this, but this is one thing, and an entire renunciation to material things, to material goods and to our social structure is another thing altogether... (laughs).

A. – We should say, “Just a moment!”, isn’t it?... “Let us see if this is advantageous”... “I have to think of this!”... “This is awful!”... (laughs).

Well, we should be open to the problem in order to understand renunciation, because if we do not understand it, we are going to objectify opinions, we are going to exalt a value, to create some myth, or to form a false image that is going to scare us... If Christ’s disciples –supposedly, advanced beings– were frightened when he spoke of renunciation, naturally!, we will feel more frightened... and we are frightened right now! (laughs). We should realise that today social doctrines for the future necessarily are to be based on renunciation... I say this with few words, like a guideline, and I leave it as a subject for your own meditation. We should understand this: we cannot dispose of renunciation if we speak of freedom, of inner freedom. If all this context of ideas here developed about new man is not founded on renunciation, then would be another ideology, another humanism. People talk too much about freedom: social freedom, political freedom, economic freedom, freedom of ideas... but we have not the freedom. For centuries, humanity has been in search of freedom by different means, but every one of us remains in bondage in the wake of our own trends, ideologies, goods, family, race, and hereditary genes. Renunciation is a universal law of liberation: let us start there; I did not create it, and it is not a theory of “Germs of Future in Man”; it is a law of human freedom, an integrative law. Through renunciation man can release his own energy –partially here I deal again with a question about energy reserve–; one cannot release human energy without renunciation. Let us see if we can understand this...

(Young lady)

Q. – I would remain repressed...

A. – Or objectified in connection with something. We get used to materialise energy in something, to spend energy: if I have much energy potential, then I spend much –I eat much, I condense and make it concrete with something in a possessive way... but I do not release it; I do not release my own energy to offer it to humanity, in the event humanity may need this energy. But if I renounce, I release energy to the same extent; while desire, or possession of whatever type, objectifies, restricts and reduces one’s being: this is the law, willy-nilly; the point at issue is not an ideology, but a law. I do not know if you see this... or if you agree; even though I do not feel the point at issue is to agree or not, but I would like to converse about it.

Q. – So, technically is renunciation a previous step to any type of liberation of man?

A. – The point is that, in regard to something as concrete as an answer to economic global problems, we need the spiritual foundation of renunciation to achieve a fair distribution of wealth, which diverse systems of economic organisation cannot get. Yes, goods do exist indeed –as Marcuse says–, all material-intellectual conditions exist in present society to put an end to famine and destitution; but if we do not achieve this by lack of wealth, but by lack of renunciation. A law of renunciation should be the



moral foundation of new economic systems intending to expand the productive force of man, and to universalise it. Because if I appropriate to the fruits of my work, then my energy remains in the service of my own personality, and not in the service of humanity. And the same happens with intelligence and other goods of culture...So, if we speak of an expansive new man, he should necessarily be devoted to renunciation: to a higher or lower renunciation –I do not know–, but any expansive man is a man who renounces to himself. Perhaps even you have renounced today to stay at home, or to eat... today I did not eat to come here and I feel you did not eat either: these are little signs, I do not consider them virtues, they are constructive elements of a new society claiming for expanding human energy. If I do not renounce to my comfort, to my conveniences, and to my goods, I cannot participate in a universal way. This is why renunciation appears like a law, and not like a virtue to become holier, to reach Heaven, or to perfect one's soul –which it is likely I may achieve when and if these things exist–, but like a participating human function of the new society... A man without renunciation will be adrift in a new society.... he is going to suffer much, and the accelerated movement of renunciation will displace him: –this is the shock of the future, in Alvin Toffler's sense–.

Q. – A concrete case: for instance, technically, if I improve my tasks on politics, and I have to perform social activities, first I should wonder: “What am I going to do?, am I going to achieve a personal work?, or am I going to act in terms of my professional mission?”.

A.– So, we should wonder if we are going to act in terms of a mission connected, in our opinion, with the sense we want to give to our existence in order to achieve that sense and not to be frustrated men; and in order to... –and here we find “For what?”, in accord with this young lady's sayings–, if you have a good –in this case, your intelligence, your professional aptitude– you can find a sense of your existence at the moment you offer this good, and not insofar as you keep it for your personal use and advantage, that is to say, to know more, earn more, or possess more. You achieve the sense of your existence insofar as you give, and not insofar as you receive; because generally, when you receive, you feel satisfied for a while, but later you feel a deep existential frustration; and today all humanity is existentially frustrated; why?: because we do not give ourselves. And renunciation is simply this; renunciation is not a speculative theory, but a need of giving oneself –not a need of giving things, but a need of giving myself in order to achieve my being–: again, it is a need of being...; it is not an exclusive a religious virtue, isn't it?, not confined within monasteries... and you begin to feel it as a new need of men of the new times.

Q. – Again, what is the motive of our organisation?: first, the source –certain dissatisfaction–, later we speak of method and, now, we have the final part connected with the purpose, but not a purpose in the sense of my personal advantage or not, or in the sense of my achievements, but a purpose with a vaster sense, that is to say, a purpose of existential kind, and obviously connected with some higher principle, with God. Well, how may you connect with God that which a new man tends to feel?

A. – This is a very important question connected with egoencia of being... because egoencia of being appears as a harmonising principle of human-divine values, and not as new humanism: and again we deal with methodology. Today, speak of God is sometimes to speak of something we do not know, and to identify with this term an ideological façade, a confessional façade, and an external pose before life, when perhaps one's intimate being is denying this God. So, today many people refuse to speak of God because realise to speak of God for the sake of speaking, or to believe for the sake of believing... is something meaningless. Recently, during a conversation with a young man from the United States, precisely about "Germs of Future in Man", he said: "See, this book is good, but you should introduce certain amendments and, among them, you should substitute the word God for any other word". "Well", I said, "yes, but we cannot weaken the actual sense of its message either"... And he insisted on it, "Substitute it for the word transcendence, for instance". And he added, "The word God, at least among young university students like me, and also in other young groups, produces such a reaction, that they do not want to have anything to do with it". And why do not they wish to have anything to do with this word?, because recently in the United States, the Vietnam war and inner social shakes pointed out many things... for instance, many persons who swear by the name of God and by their country on assuming official tasks –whose image is far much publicised there than here through mass communication media– later find themselves involved in war crimes, production of toxic gases, racial discrimination, or interests of big corporations. Thinking people do not admit this duality in a man who, on one side, swears by the name of God, and on the other side, does exactly otherwise. So, today those statements about God should be –in my opinion– more precise, more authentic, and more internal than external. I feel renunciation, in terms of life, and not in theoretical terms, is a value by which we can come into contact with our so-called God. In my opinion, the point is not to come and say I believe or I do not believe in God, because this perhaps is meaningless; if I am in bondage in the quake of my desires, possessions, or personal selfishness, what is the use of saying I believe in God?, what is the value of this external statement? But if I have sufficient love to start the way of renunciation, then, insofar as I renounce to myself, what we call God will become somehow a reality in me. So, here, renunciation takes the first place as method –and of course, on human level– that is, one's human value that will come into action for the revelation of our so-called God like a reality and not like another illusion: renunciation is the most generous value that a man can put into action in the presence of God. I feel one cannot buy the divinity with beliefs, doctrines or superficial words of some kind because I tell the divinity I love Her, or I believe in Her, and She will be manifested in me, if my heart and my being has nothing to do with my words. But insofar as I may acquire human generosity, that is to say, renunciation, this mystery that we call God begins to be existentially in force in my life, not like a belief. If I am able to renounce, surely I am going to be open to the divine; but if I say I believe in God, and later I am ambitious and selfish, if I consume all my earnings, and exploit my neighbour, and join to groups devoted to exploit humanity... what God are we speaking of? This is my opinion.

Q. – A last question, not to tire you... Also in your book you refer to mind control: may you explain the meaning of this?

A. – It seems to me that so far, during our conversation, we have exercised certain mind control: we were observing each other and, in my view, this is the beginning of mind control. Because usually people also talk too much about mind control and its exercises. Above all, we find much oriental literature, and plenty books on mind concentration and exercises to get senses more acute and thought control... and concentration on a point, head down, et cetera. I believe all these things –at least as to their usual practice– are partial exercises; I feel mind control should be a harmony of both human and divine values, which we call *egoencia*, because otherwise we will do something partial; we may spend half an hour staring at the point of a pin, and after this exercise surely our mind will become more vigorous, more objective, but also when we believe to check our strengthened mind, this mind is checking us, and we are more alienated than before. Mind should be in tune with our being as a whole; so, our mind should recover its true function as a medium, as a servant of the whole, and to renounce to its hegemonic desires to control our being. Again we are at the starting point; that is to say, again we recognise we cannot restrict us to partial methodologies; because then we are going to become vegetarians since we believe by certain especial diet we are going to acquire the sense of the future, we are going to concentrate every day half an hour on the point of a pin, or we will be head down believing that with such things our mind will become more agile, more disciplined, and more dynamic, but we will get only an hypertrophy of some partial function: like an athlete exercising day by day his muscles and getting good muscles in detriment of the harmony of his entire being; many people exercise their minds and practise concentration exercises, and you see them rigid, tough, objectively self-controlled and, at the same time, fanatical with their situation and unable to put in tune other functions of being: and as a result of this, mind got carried away, giving rise to a new bondage.

Now you will understand why I refused to respond objectively to questions about method because we ran the risk of fixing numerous mind schemes, formulae, prescriptions, and exercises, and of believing we could become new men through certain exercises. Instead, I feel in the beginning one should not pay much attention to a methodology of this kind, and rather we should try to become sensible to this that we wish to acquire, in our soul and heart, as a sense of opening. As soon as this sense of opening becomes real, vocational and dear to ourselves, we all are going to see that all this methodology already exists, that we can transmit and learn it easily, that it is going to be within our reach, like a meaningful method of improvement. It is like to tell someone who asks us, “What can I do to know sciences?, to know secrets of nature?”. “Well, do you love to study?”. If you love to study, there are many ways to accede knowledge in a methodical way... isn’t it?

Thank you for your kind invitation to this meeting, and my congratulations to you all... I feel you can achieve a very beautiful work when and if you keep this sense of cordiality of tonight. This meeting has kept a level of opening to communication, and did not result in polemics or in a tribune for

ideological preaching –of someone intending to convince others–, or in opposite ideas producing contrary forces...; our meeting became friendship. If your group keeps and observes this sense of friendship, receptivity and respect for the most partial positions of all, I am sure that a young group like this can really present new ideas and feelings to society, and will attract –not by preaching, but by similarity– many people who expect a new message from someone who knows and lives it.

Buenos Aires, 30th December, 1970