

Ramón P. Muñoz Soler

**SUBJECTS  
FOR  
THE FUTURE**

Excerpt from  
*Temática para el Futuro*

Translation by Héctor V. Morel

## **CONTENTS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

- I.** Advent of the Future
- II.** Methodology to Detect the Phenomenon of the Future
- III.** Future Society
- IV.** New Human Types
- V.** Message of the Future
- VI.** Consciousness of Future Man
- VII.** Cosmic Barrier
- VIII.** Crisis of Culture and Crisis of Man
- IX.** Birth of New Man
- X.** Vocation of Renunciation and New Mystique

Bibliography

## INTRODUCTION

This booklet contains ideas several times presented by way of lectures. Now, in this written presentation, the author felt proper to divide the main subjects into several chapters and, at a time, to precede every chapter with short significant words about its basic ideas related to the speech and its context. Gradually the reader will realise how these thought configurations many times have a symbolic analogical value and, therefore, are rather an invitation to go back to their source than to engrave them surprisingly the reader may find such words as “*egoencia*”, “cosmic consciousness”, “mystique”, “transcendence”, “vocation of renunciation”, “universal society”, etcetera, but all of them without peculiar semantic explanations, because the author’s intentions are not to “engrave permanently” such meanings, but only to offer certain point of contact, through language, to facilitate a relationship by similarity with the very essence of an aspect that is beyond those words.

# I

## ADVENT OF THE FUTURE

### *World of the future and future of man*

Very often people talk about the *world* of the future, about technique breakthroughs, about reactions of individual and human groups against the social establishment, and the appearance of advanced movements –political, cultural and social– can make us to lose sight of the existential dimension in which the phenomenon of the future develops in *man* himself.

### *“Colliding with the future”*

In his book *Future Shock*<sup>1</sup>, Alvin Toffler warns, “in these short decades between the present moment and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, millions of ordinary persons, psychologically normal, will have to cope with an abrupt collision with the future”. This Toffler’s short sentence introduces a substantial research work about this powerful “current of accelerated change” – in his own words– which, like an “elementary force”, “disturbs institutions, changes our values, and shakes our bases”. An accelerated change, he says, “invades our lives” and its “psychological and social consequences” reveal “adaptation” difficulties.

### *Change in the direction of time axis*

In fact, during these last decades, new ideas arose in the field of particular sciences, and also a new philosophical vision of the reality, new ideologies in politics, sociology, economy and religion, and new technique breakthroughs, from genetic control to outer space conquest. These ideas and discoveries changed the face of the world in some few years, and opened a serious enquiry about the very destiny of humanity. These changes are so remarkable, so radical, and produce so universal consequences, that now we cannot locate them in the frame of the so-called evolutionary thought development –when and if we understand as such a quantitative progress that is taking place from the past– but rather we should see them as an “irruption” of the future in an existential frame of the present. This change in the *direction* of time axis is sufficiently significant so that the so-called “phenomenon of future” may mark the birth of a new age.

### *Outer change and inner change*

“Prophets” of our time have glimpsed and sufficiently foretold this phenomenon of the future: they are intuitive wise men who discovered new laws of the universe, and studied this phenomenon from different points of view: in terms of prophecy (Ubbi, Bailey), of philosophy of history (Jaspers, Toynbee), of sociological criticism (Marcuse, Schischkoff), of prospective (Khan, Servan-Schreiber), of social psychology (Reich, Roszak), and even of disease of future (Alvin Toffler). In general, its

interpretation is psychological, social and technological; and its assessment, in terms of a quick change imposed by technique, of an individual resistance to our globalizing society, or of adaptation to changes; and its description contains new emerging cultures, new life styles, and new forms of institutions and social organisation.

All this is very important, but a trend to objectify the future with technological or social models may conceal the most essential aspect of a change that takes place in man himself and in a dimension beyond the field of the objective consciousness.

*Historical-social future and transcendent destiny*

Description of the *outer face* of the phenomenon of future: its historical-social consequences –not always the most significant– and reactions of individual dissatisfaction before a pressing organised society, can result in an image that hides the *inner face* of this phenomenon, a face that constitutes the intimacy of man –his “human medium”– from which you perceive the irruption of a future influencing not only his environment, but also his own being; not only his historic and social future, but also his spiritual future and his destiny as a human being in the cosmic becoming.

## II

### METHODOLOGY TO DETECT THE PHENOMENON OF FUTURE

#### *Methodological criterion*

In my opinion, after a review of the plentiful bibliographic material dealing with diverse facets of this “phenomenon of future”, we should establish certain methodological patterns to permit at least to see with clarity this phenomenon on its different levels of manifestation. From a methodological point of view, I feel we should not mistake quantitative changes for new *qualities*; we should not mistake reactions to the old for the essentially *new*; we should not mistake historic process of the becoming for mystery of *being*; and we should not mistake psychological-social dimension of man for his *spiritual* dimension, or his human development for his *transcendent* destiny.

#### *“Germs of Future in man” and spiritual dimension of the phenomenon of change*

Of manifold aspects connected with the phenomenon of future, in “*Germs of Future in Man*”<sup>2</sup> we have aimed at discovering its inner face and its spiritual dimension –which does not deny other expressions of this phenomenon, but on the contrary turn this phenomenon meaningful.

Subjects of the above-mentioned book describe not only changes on our agitated outer world, but also offer a point of opening toward the very future in its most essential aspect. Ideas there displayed are not a theory, or a result of statistical computer data of research centres, or a consequence of surveys done on sayings or works of others, but they reflect an inner experience lived in communion with similar souls. And our quotations are not simple bibliographic references, but symbolise a subtle weft uniting by similarity different thinkers on a spiritual convergence point *in* the future, in spite of their different particular viewpoints.

#### *Charles Reich and new consciousness of American youth*

We should emphasise the significant Reich’s contribution to understand the advent of the future during the last years. In his book “*The Greening of America*”<sup>3</sup>, Charles Reich sums up his thought as follows: “A revolution is arising. It will not be like revolutions of the past. It will be born in the individual, and will change the political structure only like its final act. It will not depend on violence to win, and in fact cannot be resisted by violent means. This is the revolution of the new generation”.

In my opinion, the value of Reich’s thesis lies in this fact: he takes problems of man out of the restricted field of political revolutions and social struggles, and focuses these issues on “Consciousness”: “*revolution by consciousness*”. In relation to the American society, he describes three stages of conscious development: Consciousness I, that of a pioneer, which is based on “competitive efforts and triumph of the virtuous and strong individual”; Consciousness II, that of a “corporate state”, mainly with

“organisation and conviction that any individual should unite his destiny with something of this kind, but bigger than him, and subordinate his will to it”, and Consciousness III, which is typical of a new generation whose only true reality is the individual, and that “begins with self-consciousness”.

Also Reich marks the emergence –we would say “germ of future”– of this consciousness in present man, and emphasises this fact as follows: “Consciousness III can co-exist with ancient patterns and values..., its development is on an early stage, and their constitutive elements may be described differently within one or two years”.

In the *New York Times*<sup>4</sup>, Marcuse criticises Reich’s thesis, and says: “Its better part may be a description of the Corporate State –not its assessment–. But all this has been distorted by a false perspective transforming social and political radicalism into moral rearmament”.

In fact, Reich does not speak of moral rearmament. Of course, one should not mistake an inner revolution of this kind –a “conversion”, Reich could say– for present socio-political revolutions in the world. Now, this incipient phenomenon of consciousness in a society claiming for material solutions urgent and immediate may be hard to detect, and its transforming force in relation to the future may not be perceived with clarity, but this does not justify to ignore this new emerging consciousness in germ, and much less, to devalue it.

#### *What is new consciousness?*

Doubtless, now very often people talk about “new consciousness”, and they approach this subject without a previous clarification of its meaning and range, but is this a new consciousness *in se* –by nature–, or a reaction of the *same* consciousness, which did not change its quality but reacts differently? People mistake objective consciousness for self-consciousness; mistake psychological consciousness for consciousness of being; and mistake social consciousness for spiritual consciousness. If you do not determine methodologically the nature of the consciousness and the level of its manifestation, your postulates as “new consciousness” can be nothing more than the same old consciousness reacting..., and beyond any doubt, a consciousness of this kind is not a new anthropological quality.

#### *Alvin Toffler and “acceleration of change”*

As we said in the beginning, Alvin Toffler has emphasised the “acceleration of change” as basic element of transformation in our present society. Toffler’s contribution should be assessed as an “*strategy of social futurism*”, in his own words, because –according to him– the impact of the “storm of futurism” must be in some way solved in terms of adaptation or in those of future disease. But we may ask: “What kind of future?”. I feel “rapidity of change” –according to Toffler and other authors, the key note in our time– is not sufficient *per se* to grant the condition of a new quality; on the contrary, it may be nothing more than a secondary note, a historic temporary modality of a movement started in the past, which not

for its *present* rapidity could be qualified just as a new movement. Or in other words, rapidity of change – as a quantitative function– is not sufficient *per se* to expose what is going to have *quality* of future, because apparently an upward movement to the future occurs today with same velocity of a downward movement to destruction or fall into an unforeseeable “entropy”.

*Theodore Roszak and “making of a Counter Culture”*

What to say about new life styles, about new institutional forms, about new forms of social organisation and about those of new sub-cultures? Where to find future: in culture, or in sub-culture?

Also in a recent book, published in the United States in 1969 –“*The Making of a Counter Culture*”<sup>5</sup>– Theodore Roszak analyses his so-called “technocracy”: “a social form in which an industrial society reaches the summit of its organisational integration”, and examines forms that, in terms of “counter culture” opposes youth to the mentality of a traditional culture. Roszak realises the impact of the future on modern culture is manifested by so variegated forms –and sometimes so different from a traditional frame– that, in order to mark this contrast, he does not find better expression than “invasion of centaurs”, as an analogical reference, according to Greek mythology, to “drunk and exasperated” centaurs trying to enter the Temple of Zeus in Olympia during certain festivals and forced by its guardians to go. And Roszak wonders if the “guardians” of the orthodoxy can stop this invasion of “present centaurs” and their variegated forms of counter culture –hippie liberalism, political students’ activism by new left, and neo-religious mysticism– which are rushing into the frame of our cultural tradition. Roszak thinks rather in terms of an irreconcilable collision between two forms of culture and two styles of living, a collision in which the “Apollo’s guardians” come off best. So, we are in front of a cultural dislocation, and of this risk: “Once a *fissure* of this kind broke through the social system, you cannot guarantee anything”.

But what is the meaning of this? Are we in the presence of a new culture in gestation, or is this a counter-culture reaction simply willing to “sweep” values of the past? Roszak himself marks positive elements of the young neo-cultures behind their aberrant forms: their influence as “methods to explore non-intellectual aspects of consciousness”; their “challenge to the scientific vision of the world, to the supremacy of cerebral knowledge, and to the value of technological exploits”; and ultimately, “the conviction that analysis and discussion finally should give way to an ineffable experience”.

We can admit this, but such neo-cultural traits are not sufficient to found a new culture.

*New vision, new technique or new ideology?*

From a methodological point of view, when one speaks of “new styles of living”, of new institutional forms, of new forms of social organisation, or of new forms of culture, it is important to wonder: “In fact, what are we speaking of?, of a new feeling of communion expressed by new forms of living together, or of the same old feeling reacting to familiar institutional forms and trying to be new



under the raiment of a novel organisation?”. And when we speak of a new art or of a new idea, it is important to wonder: “Is it a new *vision* or are we before a new technique or a new technology?”

*Adaptation, conversion and vocation*

Keeping in mind the above-mentioned considerations, in “*Germes of Future in Man*” we pose this thesis: today this coming “phenomenon of future” in a human being, is not only an outer transformation of quantitative kind, or a reactive consciousness, or a form of organisation; it cannot be reduced to rapidity of change; it cannot be reduced to a psychological, sociological or historical phenomenon; it cannot be reduced to a phenomenon of “adaptation” or “conversion”, but by nature it is a transcendent phenomenon of *vocation* (from Latin *Vox* = *Voice, a call*): it is a Voice of future bursting deeply into one’s being like a call to expand our individual consciousness on a vast cosmic consciousness. The answer to this call unveils a field of expanding and participating consciousness that we have typified as “*Egoencia*” of being.

### III

#### FUTURE SOCIETY

##### *Schischkoff and “guided massification”*

One’s concern to unveil an intrinsic dynamics of the “phenomenon of future” is theoretically and practically important at a time. When one speaks of preparing youth for the future, or of educating for the future... what future or education of what kind are we speaking of?; for what type of society are we going to prepare young persons or grown-ups?, for a society already inhabited by the same extant “monsters”, or for an entirely new society that we do not know yet? Because the society that now we may glimpse like a future society –in terms of prospective– may be no other thing than an enlarged fruit of that which already exists, that is to say, a fauna of giant collective organisms: modern “dinosaurs” behind the form of Reich’s “corporate state”, Herman Kahn’s “megapolis”, dehumanising anonymous corporations, degrading cultures, and all institutional forms ruled by the principle of a “guided *massification*”. This term, coined by Schischkoff, involves not only a way of organisation, but also a way of “education”, in Schischkoff’s words, “whose characteristic is to impose the same “*massifying*” medium on anonymous individuals who are separate each other and cannot be checked or contacted, since they do not know anything about their own existence. In these cases you do not need a *leader*, aware of his expansive strength, to bring this medium into motion. Certain especial images, words, news or communications, because are sufficiently strong, can cheer up or scare a human class as a whole”<sup>6</sup>.

##### *Marcuse and “fissures of the system”*

Should we educate our children for their adaptation or for their defence against these “monsters”?, for their “integration” into the mechanism of the collective mind, or for going beyond it?

Let us not forget one does not measure how great may be an age by the dimension or force of its fauna; antediluvian monsters are buried forever deep inside earth!: they had giant bodies, but small brains, and were fragile in front of new biological forms; and a renewing breath of life caused many powerful cultures to disappear. Now an analogous phenomenon takes place: great corporations and their material power is weak at certain turning points of their mechanical system. Some contemporary sociologists – Marcuse among them– have acutely marked such “fissures” in the system... and a collapse of the organised collective power can begin, not to give way to variegated cultures of today, but to facilitate the development of a new type of individuality.

## IV

### NEW HUMAN TYPES

#### *Typologies of the past*

The entire structure of present society –and even what one can glimpse for the future in terms of prospective– is based on a prevailing human *type* whose psychological inner medium responds to certain basic trends: in Reich’s view, the system of “corporate state” necessarily will operate properly with a human type who, as a worker, is every ready to work and, as a consumer, is ever ready to consume, and in Herman Kahn’s opinion<sup>7</sup>, today the prevailing human type tends to be “empirical”, “pragmatic”, “secular”, “utilitarian”, “contractual”, “epicurean”, “hedonistic” and devoted to enjoy goods of this world.

#### *Qualitative changes in the inner medium of man*

But what could be the perspective of a future based on a qualitative change of the inner medium of man?

A technological medium and a guided “*massification*” re-produce a type of man conditioned to “produce” and “consume”, and disconnected from *being*. In the process of “production”, we did not see the very consciousness trapped in the “product”, and also transformed into an “object”. This objectified psychological consciousness went very far and the communication door with the consciousness of being closed, and the inner medium of man is detached from the sources of cosmic life. In this “embedded” psychical medium, selfishness, separateness and sense of power began to grow out of proportion, and sense of transcendence, sense of existence, and sense of humanness disappeared; this medium tended to produce abortive and aberrant forms of life, and is giving rise to an existential teratology. This is the true crisis of the “establishment”: now one begins to perceive symptoms of “want” in the inner medium, and humanity gets asphyxiated in a medium that is opposite to life.

And we cannot correct this with “vitamins” or stimulating “hormones”, with new organised systems, or new salvation media: the point at issue is not a message, but a medium.

## V

### MESSAGE OF THE FUTURE

#### *A coming message*

Many people try to interpret the “phenomenon of future” in terms of a new coming Message. In fact, this Message is *already* vibrating in the spiritual atmosphere of the planet, but what is the use of this Message if we have not ears to hear the Voice, or an inner medium to receive it and make it ours?

#### *Technological medium and revelation medium*

In connection with a technological medium created in the electronic age, Marshall McLuhan says “medium is message”<sup>8</sup>, and adds, any new medium is an extension of perceptive powers of man, and a possible new chance to know and communicate.

But a medium that makes the message of future possible is not simply an information medium, but also a *revelation* medium, that is to say, a medium in which man of future can get self-revelation.

#### *Human medium*

Today humanity claims for a suitable *medium* to develop human life: this is a challenge to philosophy of education. The previous problem to any project of social organisation can be reduced to this key question: “What is the fittest medium for a full development of man as *human being*?” That is to say, before we wonder how to design cities of the future, what type of hospitals, schools, factories and sportive or artistic amphitheatres necessarily we will build, or what number of engineers, physicians or teachers we have to educate... previously we should ask this question: “Are we able to create a proper medium so that our children, and our young and old persons may develop like human beings?”.

The principle of future education will not consist in “adapting” man to an outer medium – specialising and educating him to “produce” this or that thing– but it will consist precisely in creating an inner *human medium*, that is to say, education to *be*.

## VI

### CONSCIOUSNESS OF FUTURE MAN

#### *Expansion of consciousness*

In the principal source of social transformation we may see it is necessary to develop a new quality of human consciousness. Several authors mentioned this need, and at the same time pointed out ways that apparently lead to this activation of consciousness. In *The End of Utopia*<sup>9</sup>, Herbert Marcuse examines the process of transformation in society and criticises Marxism by its excessive emphasis on the play of material forces of production, and emphasises the fact that these productive forces evolved and reached certain stage in which “a jump from quantity to quality is possible”. “What is at stake”, he says, “is the idea of a new anthropology, and not only theoretically, but also existentially: source and development of vital needs of freedom...”. “These new vital needs, like a social productive force, will bring about a total technical transformation in the world of life...” And later he adds: “I feel a development of consciousness, a work devoted to develop consciousness –if you prefer this idealistic deviation– today is one of the main tasks of materialism, of revolutionary materialism”. This subjective need of emphasising new qualities of consciousness –which in Marcuse is closely connected with a revolutionary process– underlies as need of “expanding one’s consciousness” in all young movements founded on psychedelic experiences. If we skip any deviation and pathology involved by a misuse of psychedelic drugs, and essentially we deal with the experience –as to very experience– we find a phenomenon of “expanded consciousness”. Let us consider again Roszak, when in chapter V of his above-mentioned book examines “use and abuse of psychedelic experience” in youth movements, says:

“If we accept the proposal that counter culture essentially is exploration of policy of consciousness, then a psychedelic experience becomes one, but just one of several possible methods to accede this exploration. It becomes a reduced chemical medium for a vaster psychic purpose, that is to say, a re-formulation of one’s personality, on which as much social ideology as culture is based”.

On his side, in his book “*Psychotherapy East and West*”<sup>10</sup>, Alan W. Watts examines points of contact between psychotherapeutic Western methods and techniques of certain Eastern philosophies such as Buddhism, Vedanta, Tao, Yoga, et cetera, and concludes the purpose of both types of disciplines is certain “changes of consciousness”.

### *Consciousness of cosmic man*

A new emerging consciousness, which we name “*Egoencia*”, is an existential unexplainable reality in terms of socio-historic dynamics, of psychic phenomenon, or of “liberating experience”; it is not a reaction to a social system in force –at least it is not in an essential way, even though may be in an accidental way–; it cannot be understood either, as a continuity, with a type of consciousness usually in force in society –which is a collective organised consciousness–; and even it is not an individual consciousness subjectively self-reflected: *egoencia* of being is the way of consciousness of cosmic man who is born, understanding for “cosmic man” a human type whose individual consciousness works in tune with cosmic consciousness. There is not any rational bridge to understand this phenomenon: for this purpose one needs a new method of discovery by similarity.

## VII

### COSMIC BARRIER

#### *The way to egoencia*

In “*Germes of Future in Man*”, “*Egoencia*” is a harmonious relationship between individual consciousness and cosmic consciousness, but it was necessary to expose the way or method to unite these two poles that usually one intuitively like two heads of an ideal bridge between Heaven and Earth, but missing the way to go from Heaven to Earth: hence our second book, “*The Way to Egoencia*”<sup>11</sup> arose, in which the way appears like a bridge of transit between existential anguish and mystique of the heart. What is the meaning of this?

Its meaning is as follows: man, restricted to a pole of immanence, today lives his existential anguish perhaps more intensely than ever, and if he can glimpse the other pole of transcendence, he lacks *media* to unite with it. We are before an existential “void”; there is a tremendous “abyss” between our individual consciousness and the cosmic consciousness; and apparently there is an insuperable “barrier” between our personal world and the universe of which we take part.

#### *New synthesis and crisis of systematic thought*

One needs a new *synthesis* to unite these two terms.

In the beginning of this century, a movement definitely tending to synthesis starts when science, through experimental method, gets into the depths of matter, energy and mind. After a fragmentation of the reality, analysis granted to man knowledge of the parts, but missed the whole.

As much the theory of sets in mathematics, Einstein’s formulations about relationships between matter and energy, contributions of psychosomatic medicine as to relationships of one’s mind with the physical body, Roberto Assagioli’s researches, and his school of bio-psycho-synthesis integrating his principles into a context of relationships between man and cosmos; as Teilhard de Chardin’s planetary-cosmogonical vision, and Paul Tillich’s theological synthesis, who tries to reconcile contemporary culture with faith, culminating on modern movements of interdisciplinary relationships between science, philosophy and religion, and the presence of advisers on synthesis in the highest research institutes –all these are expressions of a necessary synthetic vision of the reality.

But we should realise now it is neither sufficient a speculative synthesis behind the form of systems of cosmological, theological or philosophical kind; nor a scientific synthesis, such as one eventually emerging from relationships between particular sciences; nor even a religious synthesis, if we understood for it a system of beliefs. All these media, insofar as systematic thought constructions, are

insufficient to create a synthesis because the very thought structure is a medium of *division*, and not medium of union.

Recently, one of men who have expressed with more clarity this idea is the German philosopher Martin Heidegger. The old Heidegger, in his eighty, for the first time agrees to a TV interview with Richard Wisser, a young professor in Mainz University. This conversation, which sums up last Heidegger's conceptions, has been transmitted by the official German TV channel, published in a booklet<sup>12</sup>, and reviewed in several articles<sup>13, 14</sup>. During this interview, Heidegger denounced this fact: since the Greek, the human thought evolved and remained detached from being, withdrawn (*Entzug*) from being, and dealt only with the entity; and according to this, as much science as metaphysics and technique only can give a partial vision connected with their respective particular objects, but cannot accede a total being. "Just *thinking* can accede being".

Doubtless, we all assume to possess this thinking function; but this is not Heidegger's opinion, who intuitively thinks like a simpler "activity" than that of one's intellect, and demands a "return to the original contents of one's language". In regard to this *future* of thinking, he declares to be a mere forerunner of someone who will come and assume this difficult task, and in connection with him, he quotes Heinrich von Kleist's words: "I stand aside before someone who still does not exist, and now, one millennium before, I bow before his spirit".

#### *Media of relationship and media of union*

So, as long as thought is a medium of *indirect* relationship between individual consciousness and cosmic consciousness, apparently it is insufficient to cross the existential abyss of man: one does not need a medium of relationship, but a medium of *union*.

Between the human and the divine, between individual and cosmos, always there were media of "relationship" of different kind; also always we have been "connected" with the Moon: through imagination, through natural worship, or through telescopes, but all these "intermediaries" never could give us the living experience of treading on the Moon and to come into direct contact with her.

#### *Toward a physiology of the future*

A divided man *lacks* a fit organ to see directly the cosmic reality. To this purpose we need a medium to make the *union* possible in man himself, a medium on which life of the universe may be reflected.

This medium is being internally created in new man by means of *mystique*, not mystique like a belief or ideological system, but mystique like an integrative *function* of a human being, which may



facilitate the development of a new organ of spiritual perception that man needs to explore mysteries of the universe.

But to speak of a new function and of a new organ is to put us right now at the threshold of a physiology of the future.

## VIII

### CRISIS OF CULTURE AND CRISIS OF MAN

#### *“Crystallisation of ideological systems”*

In an article published in the literary Supplement of “La Nación”<sup>15</sup>, José Angel Valente considers the historic development of religious systems as much of West as of East— and emphasises what he calls “ideological crystallisation”, that is to say, “a mask of what originally could be a creative vision or a revelation of the divine” behind rigid forms of systems of ideas and of institutional structures. In front of this trend to ideological crystallisation, he says, mystique arises like a “creative manifestation of religious consciousness”.

#### *“Fixation of consciousness” and “crystallisation of life”*

When we spoke of “*The Way to Egoencia*” in connection with mystique, this is the sense we wish to give, that is to say, that of an intrinsic function of the human being, which leads the individual consciousness to remain ever “open” to the cosmic consciousness, and not “crystallised” in systems of ideas and personal beliefs that finally are opposite to life. Because ultimately, a crystallisation of ideological systems would not be so important; a rectification of theories is ever possible. But the biggest misfortune of man is the “fixation” of his own consciousness and the “crystallisation” of his own life, which, as a biological process, is irreversible and brings a germ of destruction and death.

#### *Mystique as an integrative function*

Dealing again with the “phenomenon of future”, which we have taken as central subject of this paper, and wishing to sum up in some way ideas posed by different authors in order to put them in tune with our own point of view, we say: today the whirlpool of future is manifested like a powerful stream that, by shaking the individual and society, becomes an active transformation agent; many changes produced by this activating force can be interpreted from the viewpoint of anthropology, psychology, sociology, science, or technology, but one cannot reduce this stream to these frames; to grasp in depth this phenomenon and its essence, intellectual media of our conventional culture are insufficient: we need mystique, like a spiritual integrative function, to lead man toward an entire development of his chances as human being. We name “*Egoencia*” the state of consciousness of this future man.

## IX

### BIRTH OF NEW MAN

#### *Advent of new being*

The advent of “*Egoencia*” arises in terms of a break with the known; that is to say, its gestation starts “out” of conventional ways of existence and *is born* in a virgin earth “out” of the system: but this “outside” should not be interpreted in topographic terms, but in terms of quality. This virgin earth is not some desert island, in some new organisation, or in some new outer life style, but it is the *inner medium* of man as to human being. We know the biological and psychological inner medium, but still we “lack” a spiritual medium; and the spiritual medium is neither a new belief, nor a new religious system, nor a new Message, but the *medium* that every man needs to *be* truly man.

In spite of a disorder reigning supreme in the world, in spite of anguish and lack of sense suffered by big human masses, and in spite of shadows threatening our existence, in the planet all conditions exist for the birth of a new man in every one of us; all media exist for the advent of a new *being*: we only need to put one foot on the way of freedom and to go through it until the end.

#### *Break with the past*

Today we live the birth of “*Egoencia*” as a choice to break radically off one’s relationship with the past: but this –expressed by many people, and interpreted by every one in his own way– if reduced to an outer relationship, drains the impulse toward a true break that should take place “in” the very system that every one of us is –in that of our old forms of thinking and feeling–, an indispensable break to “see” and “experience” by ourselves the new world. When we say to break off with the past, we do not mean to ignore or deny its values. First we have to say the past is not something out of man, –it is man himself. At every moment, man is an expression of the past until that moment. The past is a negative factor when crystallises in values that are not renewed permanently and becomes dead symbols; instead, the past is the only supporting point by which man can launch himself to the future when he is able to interpret it, when is aware of not being out of the existence, and when uses it as a basis of permanent transformation. From this point of view, to divide time into past and future is a delusion: time is continuous present making of the past a permanent transformation.

#### *Reactive consciousness and inner freedom*

We are in a crisis of the system, but rather a crisis of the “inner” system than that of the outer, and an individual with vocation to be free has this alternative: to wonder if he has vocation of inner freedom, or if simply he is a *reactionary*...: who reacts to something or to someone.

We have to change a prevailing viewpoint of one's reactive consciousness, we have to stop reacting; this may seem conformism but is not so: on the contrary, it is a *negative* value that should be incorporated into one's being so that our consciousness may acquire universal dimension. Reaction throws down a barrier and erects another; throws down a narrow prison and builds another that is wider and cosier; throws down an idol and rises another to the throne; undoes a bondage, and creates another... But when those walls of separateness that we erected within are destroyed, then our will-to-power is broken and we renounce to one's creed of possession, and in this "hollow", in the system, a stream of cosmic consciousness is flowing and *uniting* men. One does not throw down these inner barriers by reacting, but by *renouncing*, and the foundation of inner freedom of man lies in this renunciation.

## X

### VOCATION OF RENUNCIATION AND NEW MYSTIQUE

#### *Vocation of renunciation*

Diverse human movements are working to build a new world, but today the message of the future is made flesh in humanity by means of souls with vocation of renunciation.

One cannot understand this easily, and much less to explain it; we can declare this only when we lived it.

#### *At the threshold of a new mystique*

Now we are not only at the threshold of a new thought, as Heidegger would say, but also at the threshold of a new mystique, of a mystique of the heart.

Perhaps this may lead many people to believe we are soaring to summits reserved to some few persons, and that we are moving away from that new man we all want to be, and from that future society we want to see realised *in* the world, and not out of the world. Yet we should realise when mystique is born for all, and when some souls ascend to the highest summits of thought and contemplation, a stream of renewed life descends for all from these summits.

#### *Ideological bodies, institutional bodies and mystical body*

But this spiritual force needs a *body* to mould concrete facts on Earth. Every day we are going to understand better how this inspirational and moulding current of a future society cannot be made flesh in an ideological body, or in an institutional body, or in a technological body, or in a collective social body; such bodies are insufficient media to contain its tremendous potential of transformation. One needs a *mystical* body giving a fit *organ* to transform the blood of a terrestrial man into energy of a cosmic man; and this organ is the very heart of man: this is why we speak of mystique of the heart.

#### *“Religious revolution”*

During the last decades, apart from those so-called traditional religions in the West, a great number of spiritual movements of every kind emerged in America, which have greatly influenced society, and above all, youth. In his book “*The New Religion*”<sup>16</sup>, Jacob Needleman carefully examines the so-called “spiritual explosion”, especially referred to the diffusion in the United States of teachings and practices brought from the East: Zen Buddhism, Meher Baba, Krishnamurti, Transcendental Meditation, Yoga, Sufism, Tibetan Buddhism, Vedanta, and Humanistic Mysticism.

Also in Latin America schools and heterodox groups emerged with different orientations.

This entire neo-religious movement, still insufficiently studied, influences the phenomenon of change, which is taking place in the new American generation. But when we speak of new mystique, we refer to something different, which is beyond any religious orthodoxy or heterodoxy, and that is manifested in all human movements like an awakening of the individual soul to a new state of consciousness. This does not mean it is a detached and individualistic phenomenon: it is born of an individual search, but solved in a re-union of souls.

*Universal society of the future*

Apparently, sometimes we are alone in this search, but because of a wonderful law of similarity, those human beings with this Voice of cosmic consciousness vibrating in them, begin to recognise each other –beyond national, racial, religious or ideological frontiers– like members of a universal society of the future, and constitute *right now* the new force of human participation in the construction of a new world.

Here we are not preaching a return to a romantic “universal man”; what we precisely wish is an understanding of the meaning of *being* universal.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. **TOFFLER, ALVIN**, *Future Shock* (New York, Random House, 1970), p. 11
2. **MUÑOZ SOLER, RAMON P.**, *Gérmenes de Futuro en el Hombre* (Buenos Aires, 2<sup>nd</sup>. issue, Arayú, 1967).
3. **REICH, CHARLES**, *The Greening of America* (New York, Random House, 1970), p. 4.
4. **MARCUSE, HERBERT**, "Charles Reich: A negative view". In: *The New York Times* (New York, 6<sup>th</sup> November, 1970).
5. **ROSZAK, THEODORE**, *The Making of a Counter Culture* (Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969), p. 5.
6. **SCHISCHKOFF, GEORGI**, *La masificación dirigida* (Madrid, Editora Nacional, 1968), p. 28.
7. **KAHN, HERMAN-WIENER, ANTHONY J.**, *El año 2000* (Buenos Aires, Emecé, 1969).
8. **MCLUHAN, MARSHALL**, *Understanding Media* (Nueva York, The New American Library, Inc., 1965).
9. **MARCUSE, HERBERT**, *El fin de la utopía* (Mexico, Siglo XXI, 1969), p. 6.
10. **WATTS, ALAN W.**, *Psychotherapy East and West* (New York, Ballantine Books, 1970), p. 15.
11. **MUÑOZ SOLER, RAMON P.**, *El camino de la Egoencia (De la angustia existencial a la mística del corazón)* (Buenos Aires, Arayú, 1969).
12. **WISSER, RICHARD**, *Heidegger im Gespräch* (Freiburg/München, Verlag Karl Alber, 1970).
13. **MALIANDI, RICARDO**, *El "develamiento de Heidegger"*. In: *La Nación* (Buenos Aires, 19<sup>th</sup> April, 1969)
14. **PRESAS, MARIO A.**, *Un encuentro con Heidegger*. In: *Revista de Filosofía del Instituto de Filosofía*. Faculty of Humanities and Sciences of Education (La Plata, National University), # 22, pp. 90-95.

15. **VALENTE, JOSE ANGEL**, *Rudimentos de destrucción*. In: *La Nación* (Buenos Aires, 14<sup>th</sup> March, 1971).
16. **NEEDLEMAN, JACOB**, *The New Religion* (Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1970).