

The Reasoning Loon

[insert list of alternate titles]

By: Wm. J. Garland Copyright ©2009
November 28, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Forward.....	1-iv
Acknowledgements.....	1-v
Chapter 1	From Madness to Sadness..... 1-1
1.1	A loon in the mist..... 1-1
1.2	Alone in the midst..... 1-1
1.3	The question that woke me up 1-1
1.4	The result 1-2
1.5	Why are people hypocritical? 1-2
1.6	Too late to turn back 1-2
1.7	An explosion of questions..... 1-2
1.8	Rules, rules, rules..... 1-3
1.9	Why vs How, scientific method..... 1-3
1.10	Why continue to ask why?..... 1-4
1.11	Common sense doesn't always apply..... 1-4
1.12	Pursuing the question separates the men from the boys / the sickness / my guilt..... 1-5
1.13	My student years..... 1-6
1.14	This mate thing / learning about people..... 1-6
1.15	A look forward - this book explains the madness..... 1-6
Chapter 2	Sociobiology 2-1
2.1	Biology and Self-interest 2-1
2.2	The Primal Engine 2-1
2.3	Genes 2-2
2.4	Stress and its flip side - Harmony 2-2
2.5	Mechanisms of stress and harmony 2-3
2.6	A look forward to the next chapter 2-3
Chapter 3	Development of Tools 3-1
3.1	Man, the reasoning animal..... 3-1
3.2	Socialization -> communication -> circle of trust, based on reason [true?] 3-1
3.3	Organization -> growth, success..... 3-1
3.4	Family unit as the basis for the circle of trust / inside and outside circle 3-1
3.5	Reason expands the circle..... 3-2
3.6	Reason is a double edged sword 3-2
3.7	Reason stands alone..... 3-2
Chapter 4	Reason Stands Alone 4-1
4.1	The reasoned question extends the circle..... 4-1
4.2	The question is like the physical challenge / the establishment dislikes it 4-1
4.3	The self-referential nature of the question - of the Tonal / Nagual introduced..... 4-1
4.4	Harmony as guiding light 4-2
4.5	Reason shows hypocrisy 4-2
Chapter 5	The Circle of Trust..... 5-1

5.1	Circle based on force, not individual harmony / is stable [?]	5-1
5.2	I found individual harmony as basis for circle works	5-1
5.3	Circles depend on the topic	5-1
5.4	Circle is the basis of society / force as a basis -> enforcement -> institutions	5-1
5.5	Harmony as a basis is missing -> limits growth of the circle	5-2
5.6	World sings flat when people are out of tune	5-2
Chapter 6	The Individual	6-1
6.1	Why is man not harmonious	6-1
6.2	Maslow	6-1
6.3	Pain's role / Janov	6-1
6.4	A healthy person / living life with Quality, with Harmony	6-2
6.5	Barriers: blindness, fear, power, retirement	6-3
6.6	Can we expand the circle? Can we extend Harmony?	6-4
Chapter 7	Growth of Harmony	7-1
7.1	Society as an organism	7-1
7.2	Man is there to serve society / he is special to himself	7-1
7.3	Reason-> indifference -> equality -> the green movement, but still self-centred	7-1
7.4	Utility / the factory	7-2
7.5	Where do values fit in?	7-2
7.6	Main issue is to expand the circle based on Harmony of the individual	7-2
7.7	My aim is the same as that of religion, etc. But I explain why	7-3
7.8	Summary of why harmony is the route / need balance of reason and harmony	7-3
7.9	Question everything to get back harmony	7-3
7.10	Self-inquiry	7-4
7.11	Love someone	7-4
7.12	Evolution is too slow to give us the change we need	7-4
7.13	Thinking as a route to harmony / other routes	7-5
7.14	Let me be / my "I"	7-5
7.15	The mind is a process	7-7
7.16	Expansion not likely and system is unstable	7-7
Chapter 8	The Dilemma	8-1
8.1	The dilemma: present day horrors vs little chance of growth	8-1
8.2	The prisoner's dilemma	8-2
8.3	Carment's study	8-3
8.4	Tit for Tat	8-4
8.5	Scaling up	8-4
8.6	Winstanley's study	8-5
8.7	Pogo: We have met the enemy	8-6
Chapter 9	Sadness	9-1
9.1	Ideas as offspring	9-1
9.2	Living with non-reflective person / opposing values -> need reason	9-1
9.3	Problem of equal importance / who's the boss?	9-1
9.4	Critical level of altruism? Need to adapt mentally	9-1
9.5	Man must like himself	9-2
9.6	Self-esteem / know thyself / like thyself	9-2

9.7	What is Harmony?	9-2
9.8	One bad deal / make the best of it.....	9-3
9.9	Are you part of the problem or part of the solution	9-3
9.10	The Loon Wailed	9-4
Chapter 10	Passion - the Basis for Proceeding.....	10-1
10.1	How you spend your time is how you spend your life	10-1
10.2	Follow the Passion	10-2
References.....		11-1

LISTS:

Forward

Acknowledgements

Chapter 1 From Madness to Sadness

1.1 A loon in the mist

Listen.

[Insert the early morning lake scene. Expand on the following.]

There I was, paddling through the morning mist. Not a ripple on the lake. Glorious sunrise. A loon visible in the mist. Warning warble as it goes about life, following some inner path. It dove out of sight and I held my breath, waiting for it to surface, trying to anticipate where it would surface, looking for a primal pattern. A solitary loon in the midst of life. There is something wonderfully right about what has transpired. Listen.

1.2 Alone in the midst

[Blend from the lake scene to the lone reflective mind trying to make sense of it all.]

There I was, frozen in thought. Of all the experiences of life for a middle aged person, how come this simple scene is so wonderfully powerful, so wonderfully right? So connecting? How deep does one have to go, how far back, before a connection is made between this primal sense of harmony and roaring machine of modern society? How does one think about non-thinking things? How does one rationalize the non-rational? Can one?

I am alone in the world. There is me and there is the rest of the world. There is this mind, isolated, only able to perceive the rest of the world. I am alone in the mist. I am that loon in the mist. I am that loon in the midst.

1.3 The question that woke me up

There I was, standing before the pulpit at age 13, mostly arms, legs, and ears. A handful of other kids were standing there, too. I wonder what they were thinking. I know I wasn't thinking about much, least of all, what I was doing there. I had always gone to church on a regular basis without many complaints. What they taught you seemed reasonable enough. I was never too sure about the truth of the details, such as names and places, but that wasn't important as I was concerned. What mattered was the content. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto to you" and all that. In fact, I kind of liked it. What a nice place it would be if everyone followed the gist of Christianity. I even went so far as to buy my parents an illustrated bible! Upon receiving it, there was a long pause and finally "How nice". I guess they were wondering what kind of monster they had created. My father, a staunch atheist, would have had second opinions about his eldest son, carrying his name, becoming a minister.

At any rate, there I was , standing before the pulpit at age 13, mostly arms , legs, ears, and little else, especially profound thoughts. I was probably admiring the beautiful wood of the railings and the luster of the brass fittings. There was a certain harmony that I couldn't explain, but you could feel it. I never understood it at the time or even tried to verbalize it. I was just standing before the pulpit, performing the ritual of joining the church. A fly landed on the brass fitting. I was trying to figure out how a fly could have feet sticky enough to hang upside down and still be able to walk. Part way through thinking about this marvellous phenomena my ears locked in on the minister who was asking us whether we were willing to serve God and the church for the rest of our lives.

Now wait just a minute. This was not your run of the mill "sit up straight", "wash your hands", type ritual. He wanted a long term commitment. He wanted my word. My father had taught me that a man was only as

good as his word. Of all the gifts my parents and their parents have given me, the legacy of choice was the most precious to me. This was heavy stuff. I'd have to think about that.

1.4 The result

From that point on I was oblivious to the ritual and rituals have not held any fascination for me since then. There was something very serious and important in the minister's question. I felt it. I needed to know. I was taught by that very same minister that houses are better built on a firm foundation, like rock, rather than on a shifting one, like sand. "Prove to me that God exists", I asked him point-blank afterwards. "I can't", he replied, "you'll just have to believe". Sorry, I couldn't accept that. I needed a firmer foundation than that before I devoted my life to anything.

And so, my inquiry, my questioning began. I inquired into most everything. Not just school work, but people, living, life. The moment you take a laid back attitude and observe people interacting with people the contradictions, paradoxes, dilemmas and hypocrisy flood in.

1.5 Why are people hypocritical?

Why do people act Christian on Sunday and anything but the other six days? Why does 1/4 of the world go to bed hungry every night? And why don't those Sunday Christians do something about that? Why do some folks pat you on the head and say, "my what a lovely boy", one moment, and swear at you should you be walking in their path while they jockey for position in the church parking lot?

Every time I tried to answer one question, I'd get six more. I was getting nowhere fast. The grownups didn't help. If they knew, they sure were keeping a good secret. I was certainly not encouraged to inquire into the matters. All I had to do was toe the line and be like everyone else. Then everything would be alright.

1.6 Too late to turn back

But it was too late for such advice. They shouldn't have asked for such a commitment if they just wanted me to be part of the factory. If they had let me be and asked only small considerations, I'd probably still be a congenial slave to the institution of life. But it was too late. Once a person has been introduced to the mode of living exemplified by inquiry, by observing, then that person has only two choices in life: Go back and live with the hypocrisy, the lies, the dishonesty; be part of that. In so doing, he dies inside in order to coexist with others. Or he continues on his path of inquiry. In so doing, he maintains himself at the risk of not being able to co-exist with his fellow man. For nobody is exempt from the question. Hence the questioner is a threat.

At the age of 13, I wasn't aware of the seriousness of my decisions. Had I been, I might have turned back. But the pull of the void created by a quantum jump in awareness was too great. I had no fears or obligations anyway. As long as I stayed a "good boy", I was treated well. I could think whatever I wanted, however. And think I did.

1.7 An explosion of questions

But the questions keep growing and growing in numbers. The only area that seemed to give answers was in the sciences and mathematics. And so, I reoriented my questions away from people and took up more scholarly pursuits. The enjoyment, utility and rewards were high. Inquiry was encouraged, up to a point. At least I got some answers. Technical pursuits geared to sustaining and enhancing life seemed noble enough, not that I didn't have serious reservations about such matters as pollution caused by technology. But as time went on, the old feelings came back. People decided on the use of technology and I was intent on being in the technology business. I also started dating. The inevitable conflicts of two people in close company, in

adolescence to boot, also brought back the old questions that had been left to simmer on the back burner. There's no getting away from it. Sooner or later you have to deal with people. I had to understand the issues and resolve the questions. Bureaucracy, politics, wars, hate was flourishing along side of love between individuals. It seems as if everyone, or virtually everyone loves someone close to him, such as a spouse or a good friend or a parent or a sibling. Yet at the same time that person can hate another to the point of mass murder during wartime. How can a man justify killing or harming others and then come home to hug his wife and kids? What is love, hate, good, bad? Where do emotions come from?

1.8 Rules, rules, rules

Grownups made the rule abundantly clear. Seemingly an opportunity was never missed to expound on some rule. There were rules for eating, sleeping, walking, talking, sneezing, breathing. Yes, even breathing. Why, even a baby knows how to breath!

I keep getting stitches in my side when I ran -- chest out, stomach in when you inhale, reverse when you exhale -- according to the rules. I must have been high on manhood before some authority decided that belly breathing, like a baby, is the right way after all. My stitches went away.

This system of rules was rather too arbitrary for my liking. This was my life they were trying to squeeze into some arbitrary pigeon-hole and I didn't like it one little bit. I would have gone along with it if grownups knew better, like they said they did. But I was amassing evidence to the contrary. The captain of the ship was lost and we were adrift, I was sure of it.

1.9 Why vs How, scientific method

Oh, the ship ran well enough. People were doing their jobs day in and day out. The whole process seemed smooth and efficient enough. The economy rolled along. The butcher came by every Thursday. Pea soup on Saturdays for lunch. The national anthem at assembly every Tuesday morning. And so on. As long as you only asked how to do something, life was fine. Everyone knew how and tirelessly explained how. But nobody knew why! People tended to get irritated if you pushed too hard, so I never got very far at that point. Besides, high school was interesting. Mathematics, the language of science, was my first love. It seemed a wonderful language. Right up front was the statement of the axiom -- a self evident truth that nobody really tried to defend. The sciences were the same. The whole basis of scientific thought was to start with something, a premise or axiom or hypothesis or whatever, clearly stated. And then, by building on this, some conclusions could be arrived at. Even the process of arriving at a conclusion, inductive and deductive reasoning, were laid out up front for all eyes to see. Honesty, pure and simple - and powerful. But that wasn't the end. Science went on to compare its conclusions to observed fact. Methods, such as statistical analysis, even existed for comparing hypothesis to fact. If the hypothesis didn't agree well enough with fact, back you go to find out why. If you finally got agreement, congratulations, you've just given birth to a theory. If a theory hung around long enough it was promoted to a law. And a good scientist would use that theory or law for what it was worth, no more, no less. The theory wasn't considered the last word. It was a working model that was used to try and understand the world. Good theories had useful lives but when a better theory came along, the better one was used to understand a little better.

Of course, this line of thought was not dwelled upon in any class. Everyone was fully occupied with the details of such and such a law and where it could be used. How, not why. But the "why" was there in black and white in the text books. Usually you could find it in the first chapter dealing with definitions and such. Most teachers and students dutifully "bored" their way through such drudgery without much introspection. But I saw it. For me it had a special significance. It felt right. It had promise. Even though it would be

twenty years before I would gain insight as to how truly significant these concepts are, it felt good at the time.

I was infatuated with mathematics and science. This didn't go over particularly well with classmates. You're not "in" if you like school. How square. Here was that "people" issue again. So far I had succeeded in establishing a healthy doubt and disrespect (at least internally) about grownups and in alienating myself from my peer group. This was not a joyful state for an adolescent. It was clear to me: either they were wrong or I was wrong. On the one hand were amassed evidence and feelings. On the other hand were all those people, the majority, I disagreed with.

1.10 Why continue to ask why?

Perhaps it was stubbornness. [insert "relentless" story?] Perhaps the overriding consideration was that I was encouraged to work along the lines that I felt held the answer anyway: science. It was very enjoyable, immediately rewarding because of the enjoyment and in the long term prospects for a job, and it was even socially relevant. Whatever the reason, I assumed I was right until proven wrong. But, like a good scientist, I keep both options open. I could be wrong. So that was science.

Non-science was another story. How anyone could relate to the standard bill of fare history, geography, english, literature, music, art, etc., was beyond my understanding. A mark of 67% came up so often in these subjects that it was predictable. I concluded that I was being pushed through on those subjects because I would end up in the technical field anyway thereby making these subjects of little utility, I never missed a class, I handed in my assignments in on time, and the teachers didn't want me sleeping in the back row again next year.

University was better. More sciences, little humanities. Paradise! Calculus, differential equations, chemical reactions, nuclear reactions. Finally, the fundamental laws of motion come to life. And more, so much more.

1.11 Common sense doesn't always apply

One interesting conclusion was that common sense doesn't always apply. Here's an example. If a couple had four children and there is an equal probability of having boys or girls, what combination of sexes would you deem most likely? That is, would you expect a 2-2 split for boys vs. girls and thus expect to see on average an equal distribution of sexes? Or would you think a 3-1 split (3 of one sex vs. 1 of the other sex) more likely? My common sense tells me to expect a 2-2 split. My common sense is also wrong! A 3-1 split is more likely. I didn't believe it either. But just work out all the possible outcomes (B=boy, G=girl):

4-0 BBBB 3-1 GBBB

3-1 BBBG 2-2 GBBG

3-1 BBGB 2-2 GBGB

2-2 BBGG 3-1 GBGG

3-1 BGBB 2-2 GGBB

2-2 BGBG 3-1 GGGB

2-2 BGGB 3-1 GGGB

3-1 BGGG 4-0 GGGG

Out of 16 possibilities, 5 have a 2-2 split, 2 have a 4-0 split and 8 have a 3-1 split. So there is an 8/16 or 50% chance of a 3-1 split, a 6/16 or 37.5% chance of a 2-2 split and a 2/16 or 12.5% chance of a 4-0 split. [need to admit that the most common split is 2-2 if you distinguish between 1-3 and 3-1. It depends on how you ask the question. Conclusion: be careful how the question is worded. Semantics are important.]

The common sense argument goes like this. For the first child, it could be a boy or girl with equal probability. Same for the second, third and fourth children. So overall, on average, there is an equal chance of either sex. Thus a 2-2 split is the logical conclusion. Unsettling, isn't it? For the good scientist, it's unsettling enough. But he has his scientific method to fall back onto. He'll simply (?) re-look at his hypothesis and regroup his forces taking this new knowledge into account. For the pseudo-scientist or the scientific priesthood who have not progressed beyond the "how" to the "why", it creates some havoc, lots of verbal diarrhea and nothing positive or progressive.

The layman will suspect a trick and sluff it off as academic. The average person, I've noted, doesn't care to press into uncomfortable areas. Life is trying enough as it is. Worst of all, since the layman can't easily distinguish between a true scientist and those who are brothers of the priesthood, he will look upon the dissent amongst the scientists as proof of their incompetence and cause for mistrust of "this whole technology bit anyway".

1.12 Pursuing the question separates the men from the boys / the sickness / my guilt

It's no fun having your foundations kicked out from underneath you, physically or mentally. But, how you respond to such happenings is the key to growth. At this point the "men" are separated from the "boys". These things I learned during my stay at university. I also learned some things about people. I observed that students are, to a measurable degree, pawns, valued by the university for the government dollars assigned to each living (but not necessarily thinking) body. I learned that these pawns are sometimes moved at the expediency of "the system". Funny, I thought the system was set up for the students, so that they could learn and grow and become the leading citizens of tomorrow. Funny, I thought you passed or failed based on aptitude, not on whether you happened to get caught in a battle between professors, tenure and grant money. Funny, I thought professors were there to teach. Research went hand in hand with teaching, one helped the other to learn about the world, to grow, to help young people be part of this process so that we could make the world a nicer place. For you, for me, and for the 1/4 of the world that go to bed hungry every night. And for the 20 million a year that die of starvation. And for the more than 200 million that have died in wars in the last 82 years (ref). How naive! Even after observing all these things, I still maintained a somewhat positive outlook towards our institutions of higher learning. After all, you can always find examples of corruption. It wasn't rampant, I told myself. After all, I got a fine education, enjoyed myself and even got a socially significant job. And it was true that individual educators worked hard within the system, some with the best of intentions, but far too many sought to optimize their personal agendas. But, it wasn't all bad. I valued learning highly and I was permitted to learn. I didn't have much to complain about.

[more examples of sickness here and in chapter 8]

After all, an extremely high percentage of our tax dollar is assigned to education. Instilling noble thoughts

into the forming mind of the youth of today is a high priority of our nation. How naive. I'll get back to this poppycock later.

1.13 My student years

But I digress. The long and short of my university career was that, apart from a growing skepticism of university politics, I revelled in it. I emerged, bright-eyed and bushy-tailed, ready to conquer the world and rid it of all its ills.

1.14 This mate thing / learning about people

There was another line of development in parallel to my career. I had married my high school sweetheart part way through university. One characteristic of hers, relevant to the point at hand, was that she was an Arts student. Her line of thinking had diverged from mine, it seems, somewhere around birth. How a grown person could exist without the slightest desire to inquire into differential calculus was beyond me. Her goals were similar to mine in the broad context of humanity but her approach didn't stand up to the slightest bit of scrutiny. Once again, I assumed I was right until proven wrong. Luckily, we both have a live and let live attitude. She put up with my incessant "whys" and I put with her approach to life, even though it didn't have a firm rational. (It seems prudent for me to add immediately that it was rational all along, as will be evident later.)

At any rate, emerging from university, I felt the declining interest in things purely technical and a growing interest in things human. I felt things technical had taken me far enough and I was ready to get down to the more relevant questions on human nature. Technology is directed and used by and for (and on) people in a manner that wasn't always clearly good. Could there be a connection between domestic and individual relations on the one hand, and the more global human condition on the other hand? It seemed likely.

So at age 26, armed with the latest in mental weaponry developed by years of training in mathematics and the other technical arms of reason, I set out to do battle with life.

The first thing to do was infiltrate the enemy line. The reconnaissance lasted for years. Infiltration, discovery, retreat, examination, regroup, infiltrate again, and so on. It was like a blind man trying to learn about elephants. Just when I thought I'd figured it out, I'd learn that there was a lot more to an elephant than a trunk or a tail.

1.15 A look forward - this book explains the madness

After a time, and with the indispensable help of others who inquired, a pattern emerged. A pattern which served to lay the ground work for the resolutions of my questions. What emerged was not "the" answer. Rather it was a synthesis of ideas, an integration of parts into a whole. Just as a set of equations set down to describe, say, the path of a rock thrown in the air does not tell you where the rock will land until you have solved that set of equations, then this synthesis does not tell you where man will land. It won't even tell you the details of how he will get there. But it will describe the rationale behind the seemingly irrational behaviour of man. It should give insight into the insane madness of life. Once we can see the pattern, the madness disappears. What's left is sadness. And the realization of the central role of passion and the pursuit of quality.

This book is about an honest inquiry. I hope it might prove to be an aid to your inquiry and, so, be a small part of creating a better life, a considered life, for us all.

state up front -- man has no intrinsic value!

Chapter 2 Sociobiology

2.1 Biology and Self-interest

To lay the groundwork for the emergence of the pattern, we begin with man and his most basic and enduring characteristics as a sociological organism: self interest.

The fact that we are biological organisms is inescapable. Some argue that it is not possible to say just what we are because we merely perceive the world through our senses and our perception is, thus, indirect and subjective. Nevertheless, subject to error and refinement, our present view of the world in a biological sense has great utilitarian value. No information exists to refute our present perceptions in this area. Indeed, facts that confirm our perceptions keep rolling in.

The perception that we have today of ourselves is a relatively modern (or rather, recent) one. Prior to Charles Darwin, man placed himself aside from animals. Man's perception of himself was hopelessly tangled with his view of morals, ethics and God.

Like many other key investigators before him (for instance Socrates, Aristotle, and Galileo), Darwin's observation on evolution were considered heresy by the establishment, the church. It wasn't what Darwin said about survival of the fittest and evolution that caused the fuss. Darwin did not preempt God. He did not make any moral or ethical statement about what ought to be. But he did shake the religious establishment in a profound way.

Yet he continues to be misunderstood even today, almost 150 years later. Recent writings by Wilson(1), Singer(2), and Barash(3) have gone a long way towards debunking moral and ethical conclusions arising from biology or more precisely, sociobiology, the systematic study of the biological basis of all social behaviour.

And so it is with my writings here. The emphasis here is on "what is", rather than "what ought to be".

2.2 The Primal Engine

[insert here a summary of chapter 12 of "The Bottomless Well" - notion of the daily thermal cycle caused by the rotation of the earth as the basis for the heat engine that unzips and zips DNA - helical sugar - phosphorous strands (the energy stores) joined by cross-link bars (the genes, the information stores). We are energy seeking machines. We have evolved sensors to find and exploit sources of energy. Pattern recognition is, thus, fundamental to what we are and how we survive. We thus have evolved to recognize patterns that lead to the satisfaction of needs. The feelings (sensors and emotional) we have are part of our control and regulation of our actions that seek to optimize success. Good and Bad are thus defined. Rational thought extends the complexity of interpretation of what is Good and what is Bad. Our passion for music, for a hobby, ... for life is really just a manifestation of the quest for Good and the avoidance of Bad. Passion is the reflection of your inner voice (inner engine) and it needs to be heeded. Else internal stress goes up and, if unheeded for too long, leads to a destructive distress. [see also my email of Jan 10, 2008 to the CNS list server]

2.3 Genes

The recent discovery of the DNA molecule as the blueprint of an organism and the discovery of genes gives

rise to the modern perception of evolution : gene selection.

One view is that we are merely the means by which genes propagate. Now our genes have no mind of their own in the sense that we have a mind. But our genes determine our basic makeup. Thus our colouring, sex, etc. are a function of our genes. Our whole being, including our minds, are, to a large degree, a function of our genes. If the characteristics given to us by our genes lead to a successful life with many offspring, the genes survive. If not, those genes are selected against. Gene selection leads to many interesting commentaries on the structure of our society, see, for instance, Barash (3). But I hint at the basis of gene selection just enough to introduce the concept of self-interest, stress and harmony as biologically based characteristics.

I think that most of us have recognized self-interest as man's most enduring characteristic. Some teachings would have us throw self-interest aside in favour of some higher cause such as patriotism, family, or God. But it cannot be cast aside. Self-interest is a biologically inherent characteristic and it's there for a reason. Gene selection and survival of the fittest ensures that those individuals who are not concerned about themselves are not likely to survive and procreate. Once again, I caution against any interpretation of this in a moral or ethical sense. I introduce it here, in terms of biology, to emphasize its real basis. It is not a pathological characteristic to be suppressed or felt guilty about. Nor is it a characteristic to be used to justify war. It is simply basic to human nature. The importance of self-interest in understanding the pattern behind this seemingly mad world will become clear in later chapters. Let's leave it hanging there so that we can discuss a natural spin-off of self-interest.

2.4 Stress and its flip side - Harmony

Given that an individual is interested in his own survival (on average he is, otherwise he's selected against), the more successful individual, all other things being equal, will have some means of detecting danger, of reacting to that danger and of reducing that danger. This much seems obvious. What may not be obvious is that stress is such a device for detecting and dealing with danger. What we feel as stress is a reaction to an unhealthy situation. You feel yourself slipping on a path of ice. Your muscles react to regain balance, your heart pounds, your adrenalin flows. Your body is in a state of stress, ready to do battle with the enemy, be it a patch of ice or a wild animal. To maintain a constant state of alertness requires a much larger amount of energy (food intake) than a resting state. It's hard on the body as well. Ask anyone who has an ulcer from worrying too much. All species, it seems, have selected against a constant state of alertness. Instead, it was more successful to evolve a means of detecting danger or it's converse, safety. Furthermore, an individual who could seek out and find a safe environment was also surely more successful than one who couldn't. So we have the flip side of stress: HARMONY.

(EXPAND ON ERIK MOLL'S IDEA; CAN'T HAVE ONE WITHOUT THE OTHER. WE WOULD NOT NEED OR RECOGNIZE HARMONY IF ALL WE HAD WAS HARMONIOUS - WE WOULD INTEGRATE IT OUT. EXPAND ON INTEGRATION SINCE WE NEED IT LATER---> LEADS TO BLINDNESS)

I define harmony here as the reduction of stress. We all know harmony in our own way of thinking. Inevitably, however, it is connected to a state of health or repose or quietness or (safety) in an organism. That harmonious organism could be a bird in a state of balance with nature. The bird is in harmony with itself in that all its parts work together. The bird is also in harmony with nature. Nature is also in harmony with itself. Even a barber shop quartet has harmony in that the voices blend and work together to make something that we recognize as having some quality, as being harmonious. Harmony is synonymous with fitness. An organism in harmony is fit in the evolutionary sense. Harmony is the lack of stress - a situation that is more

likely to exist when we are not in conflict with others - ie when we cooperate. Competition is stressful.

I don't mean to imply by all this that the state of harmony is a static state in the sense of a final destination. States are not necessarily static. In fact, life is a process, it is open-ended. A static situation, no matter how harmonious in the short term, quickly becomes boring and, hence, stressful. We seek that "sweet spot", that balance between being underwhelmed and being overwhelmed. Either extreme is stressful. In fact, stress is desirable, is pleasurable and is sought - up to a point. Over-stress is distress. Some stress is really just the playing out of life's dynamic - through it we feel alive. Enjoy the ride! Mental and physical activity can be steady state but not static. The activity is the essence of life. It IS life. [good spot to mention quote "How we spend our time is how we spend our life"]

2.5 Mechanisms of stress and harmony

Because of our ignorance in this area, we must leave aside any discussion of how the mechanisms for self-interest, stress and harmony work within the organism. [pattern recognition - neural nets] It is not needed for these writings at any rate. Even if evolution is proven false tomorrow, the fact remains: man exhibits the above characteristics. And the characteristics form the basis for his behaviour.

[Explore pattern recognition: It is reasonable that so much of our brain is tied closely to vision (about 80% of our brain). This aspect evolved first and remains dominant. Reason is just a tool that now appears to dominate only because the 80% is fast and automatic. It is in the background. We spend our time dealing with the analysis part in the buffer. This is awareness. The defined region (the Tonal or rational part) is like a subroutine to the undefined region (the Nagual or non-rational part). The undefined region is our meta-program. Pattern input -> pattern recognition -> sense of harmony / stress -> spectrum of actions (from immediate, unreasoned action to analysed, reasoned action.] [Rasmussen's mental model of response]

In keeping with the theme of the scientific method, discussed in the Chapter 1, it is more meaningful to set the basis for the pattern I'm seeking firmly upon reality than to simply say that man is self-interested, etc. It seems to me more harmonious. I like to build my castles on firm foundations. A clear assumption is one form of foundation, familiar to scientists. It may not be so familiar to the non-scientific. Man's characteristics mentioned so far are not unique. Any animal exhibits the same basic drives. Nevertheless, they form the first piece of the puzzle.

2.6 A look forward to the next chapter

The second piece has to do with the fact that man went beyond other animals in a key area.

Chapter 3 Development of Tools

3.1 Man, the reasoning animal

It is difficult and perhaps meaningless to pinpoint a precise difference between man and other animals. Other animals possess virtually every characteristic that we possess. The difference is more of extent than kind. Man has been called the reasoning animal, the tool making animal, the pattern seeker, the social animal, the communicating animal, the only animal who reflects on things past and projects into the future. These are all true. And, to quote Mark Twain. he's the only animal that blushes.....or needs to.

3.2 Socialization -> communication -> circle of trust, based on reason [true?]

Somewhere along the path of man's development, early on, man socialized to enhance his chance of survival. Now, it is not clear that he socialized for the purpose of survival in a deliberate manner. It seems unlikely that a prehistoric creature could lay down such a plan and carry it out. More likely, those that socialized, survived. Development in the area of communication was probably simultaneous. It's important to have some sort of a code for behaviour when in a group. Communication skills, no doubt, were selected for. With this, a limited circle of trust could be setup. Cooperation surely had, and has, its advantages. You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours. This trust could be maintained by a direct mutual need or by fear of an external enemy. Singer² covers the whole area quite nicely and shows how this leads to reasoning as a communication tool, as a survival tool.

To illustrate with a simple example, let's assume that you are an early man and have just killed some small game. There really isn't enough to go around the group but some rather large friends of yours are demanding some of the food. Being rather more clever than strong, you attempt to convince them that they should have none. It is unlikely that you could appeal to their sense of fair play by any argument founded on the premise that you are worth more than they are and thus should keep the meat. Rather, about the only scheme that would endure is an impartial scheme in which general guidelines are laid down and apply to all. Perhaps you might say that whoever catches the meat gets to keep it. That might sell, but be careful because you could be on the hungry end next time. Or you could carry the biggest stick and rule by power. If you tried the power route, having reasoning skills is certainly advantageous in outsmarting your foe. Physical power is usually no match for mental power in the long run. Here we have the beginnings of the political arena, crowd control by direct force or by philosophical ideals, laws, institutions, and all the other aspects of life that we've grown to know and love. And it's all based on reason. [not at this stage, I think?]

3.3 Organization -> growth, success

Consider the castles of old England. States, at that time, were small. Technology had not advanced to the stage that more than a small territory could be defended. As our power grew, we controlled larger and larger tracts of land - the globe grew relatively smaller. The general standard of living rose sharply because of the cooperative and coordinated efforts which were permitted when times were more secure. (We have a long way to go yet - 200 million people died in wars in the last 82 years!)

3.4 Family unit as the basis for the circle of trust / inside and outside circle

The major advances in social development took place prior to the rise in war technology. The family unit, clans, etc. were established and the circle of trust existed many thousands of years ago. Man himself, and hence his ability to establish and maintain a trust (without technical means), has not changed since then. Beyond the circle of trust, open competition prevails. Self interest prevails within the circle and outside the circle. The only difference is the kind of relationships established to maximize the return on one's investment. This may sound pessimistic but reality is reality!

3.5 Reason expands the circle

Reason is an excellent tool, it turned out, to expand the circle of trust. Thinking could become more abstract and extend farther ahead in time and farther afield in space. Groups could plan their activities and thus survive better than those groups who did not plan as well. Reason was (and is) used to convince someone that his self-interest was best served by being part of the group (circle of trust). Fear of an outside enemy is a common reason used to keep people together. It is the roots of patriotism, of families, of war. If an enemy didn't exist, you could always make one up. One very recent example of this is the Argentine invasion of the Falkland Islands. What better way to unite a rebellious nation than to focus on a common external enemy?

Reason, as a tool, did well. Aristotle formalized it and our modern societies are based largely on Aristotelian reason. Certainly, they couldn't exist without it.

3.6 Reason is a double edged sword

But reason, like everything man develops, is a double edged sword. Reason could cut through chaos to form order. It can be used as a means of control. But equally, it can control you. Because, for reason to work, it must be an impartial reason, applicable to all, including yourself.

3.7 Reason stands alone

Reason, a clever device made by man to serve man, once formed, got out of control. It became an entity onto itself and stood alone. Man now became the slave of reason; there was no turning back. Man, at this point, is surely quite different from other animals.

Chapter 4 Reason Stands Alone

4.1 The reasoned question extends the circle

If communication was limited to a grunt or a gesture, interplay and development of concepts could not take place. If you snarled when your rather large friends wanted some of your meat, that response couldn't be discussed to any extent. The choices that your friends had are rather limited. Retreat or a display of force are the two dominant responses. But with developed communication skills, reason could be employed. Most importantly, a challenge could be issued verbally. The new response could be: "Why not? Why can't I have some meat?".

That step into the abstract was (and is) crucial. The challenge, or in a more abstract sense, the question or the inquiry, transformed the tool of reason into a power that existed apart from man. Reason took on the air of indifference. Language made fuzzy communication clear. Lengthy, logical thinking was now possible.

4.2 The question is like the physical challenge / the establishment dislikes it

The challenge, in physical form, is as old as the first living species. The challenge, in an articulated form, is man's speciality. Socrates comes to mind as the forefather of inquiry as a way of life. No doubt, he was not the first. Nevertheless, he serves as a convenient and well-known image generator for me to use to convey the concept of the inquiring mind. His society, the Greek society, was one of the first that had enough leisure time (at the expense of slaves) and quality of life to indulge in inquiry to a significant extent. The story of Socrates (see, for instance, *The Republic of Plato*⁴), his life of inquiry, his corruption of the minds of the youth with subversive (anti-establishment) thoughts, his trial and death sentence all serve as an example to be repeated again and again throughout history. You see, the trouble with honest inquiry is that it applies to everyone - even to the people in power. They were now held accountable to the penetrating, unforgiving, passionless question. This did not go down well with the establishment. It still doesn't. Oh, it's true, all free-world countries have freedom of speech clauses in their contracts. But that freedom does not extend to a direct challenge to the establishment. Even today, in "free" countries, it is all too easy to get branded as subversive and get accused of heresy or treason. The Jews believe in themselves. They question. As such, they naturally became the enemy of the state - no matter what that state is, unless it is an inquiring one. How many of us have heard "Everyone hates the Jews"? How many of us have had the guts to dig deep inside ourselves and really ask why? And before the scientific reader gets too smug, note that the scientific establishment is no exception, as far as establishments go. Science is firmly based on reason and the scientific method. Challenge to that basis is not permitted. To successfully challenge the basis of science, one would have to show it to be unjustifiable by scientific means. The institution of science does not admit to inquiry onto itself. One has to go up one level in hierarchy, to philosophy, to question the scientific method.

4.3 The self-referential nature of the question - of the Tonal / Nagual introduced

Ultimately though, the challenge ends up with the challenge to itself - it ends up as self-reference. [??clarify by example of why ask why. Use my notes on this] Language is not absolute. One needs a dictionary to get the meaning of a word in terms of other words. The arguments are ultimately circular. This is the land of the Tonal, using the words of Don Juan, the teacher of Carlos Castaneta [5]. It is the land of reason, of the known. Our societies today exist almost exclusively in the land of the Tonal, such has been the success of reason. But it cannot meaningfully exist without the counter world of the Nagual. According to Don Juan, we are born in the Nagual and gradually, as we link up with "reality", the Tonal dominates. The Nagual doesn't disappear; we "know" it or feel it through our intuition, gut feelings, our desire for quality, for harmony. Pirsig [6] beautifully describes his inquiries into quality and came to the conclusion that it is undefinable, even though we all know quality when we see it. I contend that quality and harmony are facets

of the same thing, the inbred instincts that arose through gene selection as an aid to survival, as the flip-side of stress.

4.4 Harmony as guiding light

I like the analogy of quality or harmony as the guiding light on the train of thought, or, if you will, the tracks it runs on. The train itself is the power of reason, separate from man. Man is a passenger on the train. Man guides the train via his feelings on quality. Man inherently knows what is good and what is bad. Man is inherently capable of setting ethical standards if he is in harmony with himself and his environment, if he is a healthy organism. As we shall see in a later chapter, man in today's society is rarely healthy enough. Reason, therefore, is not being guided properly. Reason got away from man because, collectively, man was too out of tune with himself to handle the power of reason. He got quite drunk on reason. Our modern technology is built on reason. Our power to pollute and abuse our environment and ourselves is second to no other species.

But not everyone has been drunk. There were and are some with enough tenacity to follow their souls (harmony and quality again?). [insert on the divided brain leading to the feeling of the presence of 'the other']. They took a good question and followed it through to the bitter end, even though it was socially uncomfortable. Scientific examples such as Galileo, Newton, Copernicus, and Einstein come to mind. Paradoxes abound in our thinking; see Gardiner [7], for instance, for an amusing introduction to paradoxes. Paradoxes are the end points for thinking in many people. They stop thinking if a paradox appears. Too bad, because paradoxes are the starting point for discoveries and advancement for those brave enough to inquire beyond the paradox.

4.5 Reason shows hypocrisy

Reason contains within it another gift. Through reason, hypocrisy becomes evident. The one dominant hypocrisy, practised by so many people, that comes immediately to mind is the brotherly love preached by all and held in such high esteem, compared to the atrocities practised by these very same people. How can moral and ethical standards be held in high regard by the majority of the world when so many are being maimed, starved and killed. How can the two coexist? Why is there a double standard: love your neighbour and hate your enemy?

At one time, I actually believed that people did feel a love for their neighbour. Indeed, they believed it enough to go out of their way to make others believe. But why did they only talk about it on Sundays? Where were all the Christians when you really needed them, from Monday to Saturday? I suppose I knew the answer a long time ago. Perhaps I just couldn't bring myself to believe it until reason cornered me with its inescapable conclusion.

Chapter 5 The Circle of Trust

5.1 Circle based on force, not individual harmony / is stable [?]

Man, as a social animal, has not evolved, for the most part, beyond the circle of trust based on force. Technology has been used to extend the size of the circle to nations involving many millions. [castle text from earlier??] However, the key to the stability of such societies is the enforcement of laws governing the local peace and harmony. Nowhere does harmony exist based on the individual, on a trust from within the individual. [can we say the circle has been stable? Our past has hardly been stable - examples?. How do we measure stability?]

5.2 I found individual harmony as basis for circle works

Brotherly love is a force from within the individual. I supposed it to be the basis for the circle of trust. Altruism [define??] was explained to me at an early age and I bought the concept. I practised it and found it actually works. I invariably received greater rewards than when I acted selfishly. True altruism stems from a feeling of harmony. Harmony within yourself. It extends to others and theoretically has no limit. I aspired to that because I found that it worked. That is a self-interest motivated altruism and some might argue whether it is altruism at all. Singer [2] claims it is. So be it; it is strictly a matter of definition. The key element of an act in determining its degree of altruism is the intent. If the intent was not self-serving, it is altruistic. Only the doer of the act can judge that.

At any rate, given that some degree of altruism exists (since I practised it as best I could and I know that I am not unique) and given that I found it to work, I had no reason to suspect that it was not widely practised. But at the same time, self-interest to the point of greed was also self-evident. It was clear. Anyone inside the circle of trust was treated in a cooperative manner. Anyone outside the circle was treated as a competitor.

5.3 Circles depend on the topic

The game was further complicated by a different circle of trust for various topics. For instance, one individual could be counted on to, say, mind your kids for awhile (quite an honour and responsibility, I felt) but could not be counted on so much to leave money lying around the house (quite a trivial matter in comparison, I also felt). Could there be an underlying philosophy behind this seemingly irrational behaviour in which one person could treat another with love or hate, trust or mistrust, depending on the circumstance? Of course there was. It is obvious to most people. All actions are based on self-interest. Trust was given only when necessary, when it could be counted on and when it served self-interest. Family squabbles disappear if an outside enemy is perceived. Neighbourhood squabbles disappear if the municipality is to be fought, and so on.

5.4 Circle is the basis of society / force as a basis -> enforcement -> institutions

Society's very base is the circle of trust. The size of the circle defines the size of our society. The benefits of a large cooperative group were real and obvious. Reason provided both the means and the incentive to widen the circle. But, as I've said, the circle is based on force or what I call an externally imposed trust (external to the individual) as opposed to an internally generated trust (coming from within the individual). An externally imposed trust is a troublesome one. It requires an establishment-type structure to carry out the laws set up for the purpose of maintaining the trust. The church is the institution for religion, the school is the institution for teaching, the judicial and legal systems are the institutions for judgement and enforcement, etc. These institutions are a terrible burden on society's resources, and all because man cannot be counted on to intrinsically generate harmonious behaviour from within.

5.5 Harmony as a basis is missing -> limits growth of the circle

So harmony enters again as the central thread, the guiding light. It seems to be missing in most people and that is why I feel that society as a whole is unhealthy. People require these institutions to keep them in line because they are drunk on the benefits of reason. **Quality no longer guides them as individuals.** [This is a key conclusion. This is why I value Ochre Pit Cove or Elsie's Dad's way of life. Pirsig quote again] But just as reason took on a life of its own, so did the institutions. "Power corrupts" is one way of saying it. Those leading the institutions were given a "reason to be", a goal to accomplish. Most start out with honourable intentions. Invariably, those successful institutions grew and now the means becomes the end. The goal is now self-serving: expand, survive. The institution is like a new species, governed by self-interest and self-propagation. Whatever happened to the ideals of serving the people? "What to do?" says Zeus, "The gods are drunk." The encouragement of individual development was no longer in the best interest of the institution. Better that the individual stay in line and follow the dogma ... for the good of all, of course. If any individual wanted to grow fully, in tune with himself, that was not encouraged. Institutions grew because man needed them. Now man's creation limits him, one again, from further growth.

5.6 World sings flat when people are out of tune

So I could see the reason's behind man's hypocrisy now. He was caught in his own devices. But one thing was very clear. Man was not in harmony with himself or his environment. Or as Perth County Conspiracy [8] sang:

"The whole thing is
that the world sings flat
when the people are out of tune"

But why should we be like that? Is there nothing we can do?

Chapter 6 The Individual

6.1 Why is man not harmonious

My hypothesis so far has stated that man has an inherent sense of harmony. He has a basic desire to reduce his internal stress. Why, then, is he generally not harmonious?

6.2 Maslow

Maslow [9] gave the first clue to me by defining a hierarchy of needs that man strives to satisfy. In short, the lowest level, to be satisfied first, is the level of physiological needs: food, water, air, rest, shelter, sex. Once those are satisfied, man aspires to ensure safety needs are met: protection against danger, threat, being deprived of things. Onwards and upwards to resolve social needs: love, affection, social interaction. Next highest in hierarchy is esteem: self-respect, to be able to give and receive. At the pinnacle is self-actualization: the desire for self-fulfilment, to become everything that one is capable of becoming. This is the level of reflection, questioning and the attainment of wisdom. The needs are not necessarily felt within the individual in that order. The need having the most power at the moment is the one that the individual seeks to satisfy. Those of less power are minimized in order of urgency of satisfaction. Once a need is fairly well satisfied, the next "higher" need emerges and occupies the attention of the individual and influences his behaviour. Gratified needs are not active motivators and because a satisfied need only allows a new need to emerge, man is a perpetually wanting animal.

Some might argue about the details of each level but the overall picture seems valid enough. There is not much point in discussing altruism to a starving person or mathematics to a school kid five minutes before lunchbreak.

It is easy to see how individuals, then, are stuck on a lower, baser level in underdeveloped countries. These people are seeking harmony at an important level: existence by getting enough to eat. It would be irrational of them to consider achieving harmony at a higher level such as self-actualization or to extend a cooperating hand to others when that means less for themselves. Evolutionary instincts seem to be operating correctly in such circumstances.

But what about people in the "have" countries who have sufficient food, etc., and who should, if Maslow is correct, be making great strides up the ladder of needs? They seem to be stuck, in the majority of cases, somewhere around the safety level or social level, with frequent dips back down to the physiological level without sufficient cause. Was Maslow wrong or is there another factor to consider?

6.3 Pain's role / Janov

No, I think he was basically correct. Each level, however, warrants expansion to cover all the traps that can hang people up and prevent them from growing. The work of Janov [10] was my first introduction into these traps called neuroses. [Also maybe thinking with indifference requires a degree of abstractness not available to most peoples' intellect.]

Consider the primal role of stress again. It is a useful survival device. But it is a double edged sword like all devices. We need to be stimulated into action, that is the role of stress. But we also need a protective mechanism to limit the amount of stimulation to a healthy level. Overstress is distress [11]. Pain is the protective mechanism that lets you know that your body is being overstressed. In cases of extreme stress even the pain is suppressed. Shock results. The body is numbed so that it can best deal with the emergency at hand, such as a broken limb or whatever. Severe shock makes you unconscious as a protective measure for

the vital brain organ. On a physical level it is easy to comprehend. What isn't so obvious is that a similar process occurs on a mental level.

A fully developed brain of an adult is very resistant to oversteering. Mental faculties are usually sufficiently developed to comprehend any situation sufficiently so that freaking out is unlikely (but it can happen, of course). What Janov and his Canadian counterpart, Verney [12], found is that the young, developing mind is very susceptible to the oversteer situation. Pain results from traumatic experiences as viewed from the perspective of the child. These experiences might look very ordinary to an adult who understands the rationale behind the event.

A bad day at the office is easily understood by an adult and all sorts of deviant behaviour is written off in this manner. A sudden spurt of anger is forgiven if the reason behind it is understood. But a child often cannot understand the reason. All it sees is the anger. All it feels is the Pain. If the Pain level is too high to deal with, it will be blocked. Suppression of feeling is the result. No more will that child allow anyone to hurt him in this manner. That individual does not respond in a completely normal manner anymore. Most responses to a given stimulus are normal. But certain stimuli, say a certain facial expression or loud noises, evoke non-normal responses. These neuroses remain deep down inside a person even after he has reached full mental capability. Usually the person is not aware of why he does not trust, say, a person with large teeth or a loud voice. He doesn't like him and that's that.

All sorts of non-harmonious behaviour is explainable by this theory. Overeating, desire for excess material wealth, hoarding of worthless material goods, abnormal sexual behaviour, compulsive intellectuality, you name it, can be seen to derive from traumas in childhood. Primal therapy is the unfolding process whereby, in a clinical setting, the traumas are recreated (by the patient) and the patient relives the trauma but this time with a fully developed mind. He now understands the past event and abnormal behaviour disappears. It has worked enough to remain a valid process.

Now, of course, it is not the next best thing to sliced bread. Even if it is not true, in the context of this discourse, it serves to illustrate a possible rational means whereby seemingly normal, intelligent people get stuck on a level short of self-esteem and self-actualization for no apparent reason. These people are no longer harmonious within themselves. Expecting ability in the broad context of expanding the circle of trust of harmony is expecting too much from these people. How can a person inquire deep within his soul when he doesn't like himself, when the Pain has blocked access to inner feelings? Inquiry causes too much internal stress.

6.4 A healthy person / living life with Quality, with Harmony

One image to describe the feeling is the image of being your own best friend. A healthy person has inner quality, inner harmony. He can be alone without being lonely, secure in his own thoughts, content with his image of himself, however imperfect. His thoughts can come home without fear or pain. Honesty to oneself is a basic axiom in a healthy person. Dishonesty causes disharmony and disharmony is a stress. The healthy person cannot allow it.

This is the ideal man. If you now go back to interpret many diverse writers on the subject of man in his ideal state in the light of harmony and the above discussions, then those many diverse writers seem to be unified, talking about the same thing. Aristotle's ideal man [13], Socrates inquiries, Christ's sermons, Pirsig's search for Quality [6], Don Juan's [5] path of knowledge (wisdom) all circle the same concepts using words that had meaning to them.

So one should strive to live his life with Quality, Harmony.

[Skimmed through Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance and found this quote:

"When one isn't dominated by feelings of separateness from what he's working on, then one can be said to "care" about what he's doing. That is what caring really is, a feeling of identification with what one's doing. When one has this feeling then he also sees the inverse side of caring, Quality itself.

I think that if you are going to reform the world, and make it a better place to live in, the way to do it is not to talk about relationships of a political nature, which are inevitably dualistic, full of subjects and objects and their relationship to one another; or with programs full of things for other people to do. I think that kind of approach starts it at the end and presumes the end is the beginning. Programs of a political nature are important end products of social quality that can be effective only if the underlying structure of social values is right. The social values are right only if the individual values are right. The place to improve the world is in one's own heart and head and hands, and then work outward from there. Other people can talk about how to expand the destiny of mankind. I just want to talk about how to fix a motorcycle. I think that what I have to say has a more lasting value." - Robert Persig, Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance, page 290-291, Bantam Books, 1974. Lots of other good quotes in the book.]

This is what empowerment is all about. We need to be empowered but to do what? To pursue quality! This is what people want. Not more power to do their jobs more efficiently!

6.5 Barriers: blindness, fear, power, retirement

Neuroses aside, there are still many barriers preventing progress along the path of wisdom. Don Juan cites fear, blindness, power and retirement as the four main barriers or enemies. The path is dangerous since it is a venture into the land of the unknown, the Nagual. It is painful in the sense of Janov. It can lead to insanity because when you are alone with no-one to relate to on such matters as inner harmony (in the sense of Carlos Casteneta and Pirsig). This is fear.

Blindness means insensitivity to one's surroundings due to constant dulling exposure. One no longer questions the familiar or sees the hypocrisy. Too often a child, seeing with new eyes, sees the obvious which we have tuned out. Habit and examples of others had desensitized the person into unawareness. This lack of reflection, unawareness or lack of thought is the great villain. Most crimes (including the NAZI persecution of the Jews) are committed without reflection on the meaning of what was done or what is being done [14]. This generates the question that underlies this whole book: how does a reflective person live among non-reflective people? This also provides a clue to what could be done.

Encourage people to reflect. Easier said than done. Possible ways:

- a) raise the standard of living to allow more free time for people to think. This time will be abused by most, I'm sure.
- b) Teach the forming mind.

The first justifies nuclear sales to developing countries. We have again the double edge sword problem. Any power can be used to help or hurt. Do we have enough reflective people to ensure the proper use of power? Catch 22.

Power is an enemy to true progress because it is so easy to get drunk on power, to get corrupt and to misuse the inner power that a healthy man possesses.

Retirement is the final enemy: giving up the fight when things look bad, not having faith in one's beliefs and

capabilities, not having the gumption to continue, assessing the other people and saying, "Why should I be the oddball?" and then selling out your soul, your inner harmony, for a phrase. That's retirement.

6.6 Can we expand the circle? Can we extend Harmony?

These are some of the reasons that man is literally beside himself, why he cannot be trusted to generate enough inner harmony to expand the circle of trust. Is there no way to extend the harmony?

Chapter 7 Growth of Harmony

7.1 Society as an organism

With the birth of new ideas, a new terminology is also born. Such is the case with biology. One common term used is "organism". We usually think of an organism as a lower life form such as a single cell or a primitive plant form. Of course, all life forms are organisms, including man. Organisms, at least healthy ones, are characterized by a harmonious structure. This concept can be extended to include groups of men and we can say that a healthy society is like a healthy organism in that its parts, the individual men, live in harmony with each other so that the organism as a whole survives. There is a difference, however.

7.2 Man is there to serve society / he is special to himself

As far as we know, the cells making up an animal or plant do not have a mind of their own. Their role is strictly functional and invariant. The prime directive is clear: the organism has priority over any if the individual parts. Man's societies are unique in that the individual components (the people) compete within the overall structure for priority in survival. Our latest, democratic and free, thinking is that the organism of society is there to serve the individual. Even though man's physical world has undergone a decentralization via Copernicus (the earth is not the centre of our solar system or the universe), Darwin (man is not as divine or unchangeable or pure as the old church would have it) and others, man still holds himself of prime importance. The world is his, to be used by him as he sees fit [15]. Man has not received his full come-uppance yet. The only thing special about man is that he thinks himself special! Oh sure, he is clever, far cleverer than any other known animal. Or is he? Look where his cleverness has taken us.

A less clever animal might have thought twice before doing a thing like that! Oh, I guess we are not entirely to blame. Our talents simply outpaced our wisdom to employ them. Although man intrinsically feels himself important (remember, it is a natural outcome of evolution to be that way), he has failed to realize, by and large, that he has no more intrinsic value to the total world or universe than a cat or a dog or even a stone.

7.3 Reason-> indifference -> equality -> the green movement, but still self-centred

Reason had the power to stand apart from man by that very quality, the quality of standing apart from man: indifference. Logic applies across the board, to all men, to all creatures, to everything. Slowly, painfully slowly, man is extending this principle of indifference, of equal value, of equal rights. The circle is growing. Man is becoming more aware of the limitations of our planet, thanks to the hippy movement, the ecologists and groups like the Club of Rome [16][17]. Spaceship earth and lifeboat ethics are common buzzwords. But any extension of the circle of harmony is due to fear, due to the desire to survive. Man is not concerned about the environment for its intrinsic value. No, he is concerned about the environment only insofar as it affects man and man's intrinsic value. As a book by the Club of Rome [18] says:

"A revolution is required, revolution of the human spirit."

I interpret that to mean that we must change from a circle of trust enforced by external means to a circle generated by inner harmony. [the warrior has to believe??] The only lasting solutions are those achieved by a genuine desire to co-exist with your neighbour and your environment, a coexistence based on the desire for inner harmony within yourself and, because no one element has more intrinsic value than any other element, the recognition of the desire for inner harmony in your neighbour. This is what people intrinsically want when they talk of empowerment. Either that or to watch TV and drink beer.

7.4 Utility / the factory

Although I have stated earlier that the individual good is enhanced by the individual working towards the total

good, I do not make a doctrine of "Utility"¹. Utility is a predominant aspect of our materialistic society. It is a great enthusiasm destroyer. It requires that things be pursued because of their usefulness, not because of the joy of pursuing it. Because there is a definite end goal in sight, there is a loss of freedom - one cannot follow ones whim, ones intuition. One cannot play, one loses control. One becomes part of the system, the factory. Ones individuality is suppressed. More on this in chapter 9. Recognition of the role of utility leads to setting of priorities. Setting priorities determines goals, direction and reduces freedom; loss of enthusiasm results.

Thus, the state should serve the individual, not vice versa. Utility is good insofar as it enhances the "individual" good. Utility is not an end; it is a means. Individual quality remains king. The "I"'s have it!

I am true to my nature,
My nature is truth. [or beauty?]

7.5 Where do values fit in?

Now, how about values? How do they fit into the pattern? Morals vs ethics: The degree to which people are moralistic is the degree to which they are dogmatic [Static Quality in the words of Pirsig [25]]. To try to resolve contemporary issues is fruitless if the conflicts stems from differences in values [read morals]. Most people are self-consistent (rational). Some have made logic errors or suffer from definition problems. These errors are relatively easy to spot and fix. Most attempts to resolve moral issues are bandaid treatments of the symptoms. Jews vs Arabs, individual vs individual, it's all the same. When two groups have fundamentally conflicting axioms (morals), there can be no lasting resolve short of restructuring the axioms. The issue is not, therefore, "Who is right and who is wrong?". It is not "How shall I judge the situation?". Right or wrong is relative to the person and situation. The issue is the size of the circle of trust, of harmony, of expanding it, of trying to get both sides to see how they are both part of the whole, how cooperation is the only way, as shaky and unstable as it is. Seeing this and realizing the low probability of ever achieving this harmony and the even lower probability of maintaining it for long leaves one (a) pessimistic and (b) uninterested in the details of the quarrel over who hit who first, just as a parent really doesn't care which child struck first. That's not the main issue.

¹ Utility: In philosophy, the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Utilitarian: Aiming at usefulness rather than beauty, style, etc. In philosophy, the doctrine or belief that the greatest good of the greatest number should be the purpose of human conduct, especially as developed by Jeremy Bentham and John Stewart Mill. The doctrine that actions are good if they are useful. Thus a utilitarian society (ex: the present day), the individual is lost.

Quality is lost!

Enthusiasm: Ardent zeal, from the Greek "theos", possessed by a god (soul, intuition - Quality).

[insert summary of Matt Ridey's "The Evolution of Virtue"]

7.6 Main issue is to expand the circle based on Harmony of the individual

The issue is how to get the children to expand their circle of trust and harmony and cooperation. In this way the fitness of the whole structure is enhanced. And since it is based on individual harmony, the self-interest needs are simultaneously and automatically satisfied. If this sounds like cooperation, you're right, it is. If it sounds like brotherhood of man and universal love, you're right, it is. If this sounds like religious teaching, you're right, it is. It's all the same thing. But there is a difference between my thesis and the others. Religious movements, hippy love-ins, you name it, all preach or lecture about the way. They talk about how to do it, about what has to be done, about what happens if you don't or if you do. They use analogies. To try to bring home the message to tuned-out minds. What the heck does it mean when Christ said that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to go to heaven? Could that simply be imagery referring to a person unable to move to the level of self-actualization or harmony, as per Maslow, because he is stuck on a materialistic level? What the heck is the brotherhood of man? Harmony of man? What the heck is love, let alone universal love? [insert quote on caring] They all talk about these things. But they never explain why what they preach is true. They try, mind you. But referring to the sacredness of the word of God is just not an explanation. No, I like to build my castles on rock, not on a vacuum.

7.7 My aim is the same as that of religion, etc. But I explain why

That is the difference between my thesis and theirs. The conclusions are the same but I hope that I have laid out for you the reasons (or, at least, good working hypotheses) for why man is like he is, what his characteristics are that make him like he is. These reasons are far from complete. But, hopefully, they're complete enough to give some credibility to the path that I have outlined leading to world harmony. There's logic behind it.

7.8 Summary of why harmony is the route / need balance of reason and harmony

Man is like he is due to inherent properties and the effect of his environment. Long term evolution and gene selection have favoured self-interest and led to the mechanism of stress and its negative: harmony. Man further evolved as a tool maker. Communication and reason are examples of his more powerful tools. Disinterested or indifferent or impartial reasoning stood on its own and led us down a road of no return, full of surprises. Societies grew based on enforced trust and the dominance of reason made us lose touch with our innermost workings, specifically that of the nature of harmony. We don't need to suppress reason. We are alive today because of it. It is not a bad thing. It is simply a tool. What we need is to bring ourselves back into balance. Reason has to be balanced with humanity. That is one form of harmony.

7.9 Question everything to get back harmony

How do we get back our innermost humanity? Strangely enough, reason provides a ready answer. I have mentioned already the role that the "question" played in our growth as a society. [Ortega's "What is Philosophy?" discusses the validity of doubt as the starting point of philosophy] It makes us accountable for our actions in a direct verbal manner. The question is also the key to gaining inner harmony. It is as simple and as hard as that. Make no mistake, adopting a questioning attitude is stressful. It is ironic that the path to harmony entails the loss of it! Not surprisingly, few are willing to sacrifice the short term for longer term gains. [Analogy of activation energy. Sometimes some external event can encourage someone to rise to the occasion.] However, if you can stand the Pain of reflecting on who you are, what you want to be, whether you're honest with yourself and an infinite list of pertinent questions, then you are on the path to wisdom or the path to righteousness as Christ would say. (I particularly detest the word "righteousness" because of the present-day meaning of "goody-goody". I'm not talking about being "goody-goody". I'm talking about being

healthy, about surviving.) The amazing thing about being in harmony with yourself is that good and bad are not really relevant any longer. A healthy, harmonious person is "good" (ie honest, kindly, patient, etc) because to be otherwise hurts. It is stressful to be non-harmonious. You do not have to force a healthy person to act appropriately because for him it is natural to do so. He is in tune with himself and his surroundings. He is sensitive to the world, he feels it.

So, the recipe is: Question everything. That is a bit like my car manual under the section on engine removal:

Step one: remove all connecting hoses, cables and bolts.

Step two: remove engine.

Thanks a heap!

7.10 Self-inquiry

I'll try to detail a specific application to illustrate or illuminate the way. [Mention danger of the path] The first step, the hardest, is self-inquiry. I can't help much with that because it is an experiment of one. If you try to never lie to yourself when you question yourself, you're well on your way. The moment you become content with yourself is the most dangerous moment, for that's when dogmatism sets in. The questioning must never stop.

7.11 Love someone

The second step should be easier and is perhaps best done simultaneously with the first step: love someone. Whom you love doesn't matter so much. But defining love would be a help. Ortega [19] [look up ref] came up with the best description I've ever heard or read. Basically it starts with trying to understand someone, say your spouse. Put yourself in the other person's shoes. This involves some risk and consideration on your part. You have to trust that person to some degree and give of yourself. That leaves you vulnerable to the pain of ridicule and rejection (all the better to know yourself so that introspection and questioning by others is not painful). [insert excerpt from Life in the factory re questions to ask] Perhaps, if you are lucky and wise, a two-way understanding will be the outcome. One you understand someone, respect seems to naturally follow because the person's qualities and problems become clear. We all love beauty (harmony again) and we all have enough inner harmony to be beautiful inside if we have eyes to see it. After respect comes trust. There will be a natural sharing of feelings and ideas. Experiences are shared and problems are solved together. Eventually, the desire to co-exist becomes a need because the two souls are one - the inner harmonies of the two individuals are intertwined. That is love. Love is harmony. Thus the loss of love is a loss of harmony and a gain in stress. Thus it hurts to lose a love. [Milton Mayeroff: "On Caring" : love is the willingness to provides an environment where another may thrive.] To strike up a quantum mechanical analogy, the solution to the one-body problem (one particle in a potential field) is not trivial but it is simple enough once the problem is properly formulated. The solution to the two-body problem is quite a bit more difficult. (In the human case, the one- and two-body problems are best solved together.) The many-body problem has not yet been solved in general, either in quantum mechanics or in societies.

7.12 Evolution is too slow to give us the change we need

Physical evolution is the historical (should I say, prehistorical) way of solving the many-body problem. The environment was changing slowly and the built-in flexibility of nature was sufficient to keep up with the times. But when man hit the scene, he began changing it. His superior capacity to survive (reason) soon taxed the system and so, man entered the human race. It was a race of man against himself [cf arms race]. His technology drove him farther and farther out of synchronization with himself yet he could not stop because other men would out-do him if he slacked off. [cartoon]. Natural selection was not fast enough for the species of man to evolve to suit. Evolution has to be replaced by something else. But what? Think, man,

think! [insert thinking and gene selection]

7.13 Thinking as a route to harmony / other routes

Why, that's it, of course. He should think! And if you think about it you'll probably conclude, as I have, that the individual is the key. Reason, trust, harmony and all that, provides the only viable route.

There are other routes to removing the major block to worldwide peace and harmony, the limited circle of trust. These include:

- a) Enforcement: Technology could, if we tried, provide ups with personal monitors like lie detectors to enforce the truth. However, the real solutions should come from within the individual, not from some scheme that smacks of George Orwell's "1984" [20]. People are too dishonest and have too many skeletons in the closet to allow this scheme.
- b) Convince people by some philosophy like communism, religion, freedom, bill of rights, etc., of a monistic or single overriding principle to believe in or adhere to. This is, in fact, the present state of affairs. Surely, we can do better than that. This put the state before the people and supports war, etc. [paper by ex-nun on ecology movement - Iron mountain think tank]
- c) Adopt a philosophy which puts the individual first as in Jewish philosophy. This is an improvement. Good. But it is anti-establishment! Expect to be persecuted.
- d) Provide a high standard of living and encourage the personal growth of individuals (as per Maslow) beyond the petty needs and into self-actualization. Better.

This leaves the only viable route, in my opinion, as I've already discussed.

- e) Quality / Harmony: Live your own life with Quality / Harmony. Practice individual integrity. Instill this into young people. This is the thought behind the hippy movement. The problem here is that nice guys finish last and we quickly degenerate into the lose-lose situation, as discussed in the next chapter. There may be, however, a way around this problem.

The overcoming of excessive self-interest, or should I say, the establishing of harmony, the goal of the present exercise, is possible by providing something more important or, failing that, controlling greed by showing how a certain kind of behaviour (as a group) maximizes individual gain. This is the power behind philosophy. The person behind a truly completing philosophy rules the world. This is the point (b) above. Faith and hope (of individual gain, even for example, life after death) are powerful devices. Without this faith in life being worthwhile, as an example, we wouldn't bother to live and procreate. Evolution, again, by default, sees to it that we exhibit the desire to live, to believe, to have faith. [Re philosophy of the Western world, how many people question the philosophy of freedom, free speech, etc. We believe it enough to kill for it. Yet it has no basis other than our belief in it! - expand as per slips of paper] Don Juan's warrior, in fact, has to believe. There is no alternative. He is a living dual personality: fully aware of the futility of it all - death is inevitable, but living as if everything mattered. All is equally important because nothing is important.

"Nothing is worthwhile doing,

Doing is the only thing worthwhile."

But not mere doing; it must be done with impeccability, with soul, with Quality. The only real joy is in doing something well that matters to you. Why are hobbies so dominant? Where else can an individual practise quality? As such, such endeavours should be encouraged.

7.14 Let me be / my "I"

So live your life with Quality. Be willing to die for Quality? Not me. I uphold the principle of Quality only.

I may be forced to live otherwise, but I can think as I please and the hope of future Quality will keep me going. I would fight to death for the freedom to think. I would do battle against mind control. I hold my freedom to think sacred. It is all I would have left after all else is gone. Without it "I" am dead. "I" would

fight for it.

So the motto should be "Let me be!". That does not mean "Leave me alone!". It means let me grow to what I can be. This is my deepest and prevailing wish for my child, my wife, my friends, for anyone - for them to be what they can be [Milton Mayeroff: "On Caring" : love is the willingness to provides an environment where another may thrive.] My circle extends to all people, to animals, to the land. Unfortunately, I must set priorities and they are: self, family, friends, nation, humanity, animals, the land. This is no different than the priorities most people set. There is a fundamental difference, however. The difference is in sensitivity, in intent, in awareness. Most care for self and family and can sacrifice all else without regret or conscience. I feel for them all and regret having to compromise anyone or anything.

I will kill if need be. But I will cry because of what I had to do. I will always strive for the impossible goal of humanity extended to all things: harmony. This is my hope. The inhumanity of today is insufferable without the fantasy or neurosis or ideal or the dreams. There seems to be no free lunch. It is only through sensitivity to things around you that you are aware of reality, and so grow in wisdom and knowledge. But it is this sensitivity which makes reality so painful. As with technology, the more powerful the device, the greater its potential for effect, good or bad. I'll dance to the music for awhile but I'd just as soon be in oblivion, thank you all the same.

I do not worship Quality or freedom or soul or wisdom or whatever. I merely protect it for it all I have or could ever have. It is "me". It is "I". It is my core, my essence. All else is built on this. I protect it because I have been bred (by the force of evolution) to protect it . I am the warrior for the "I". Death soon follows when I cease to value or protect it. So why not give up protecting it if I don't think life is worth living? Well, it is not death that bothers me, but dying. Plus, evolution provides a mechanism which does not permit it.

But why not just ride the waves, go with the crowd? It is easier than all this self-analysis and self-righteousness". I cannot go along because that would be worse than death. "I" is that part of me that recognizes and values Quality. It is the core upon which the rest of me is built. If the "I" goes, nothing else is left. I do not want to be like the gamesman, the successful businessman who, after a long profitable career, looks back at the things he's accomplished, the people he's stepped on, the principles he's inwardly compromised, the inhumanity he's done. He looks back and regrets it. He is dead, he has lost his soul, his "I".

Becoming a businessman / salesman², in the degraded sense of the word, goes against harmony because it pits one against someone else. This "them-us" attitude is the cause of a lot of our problems. People don't complete on a fair basis, by putting out a quality product and letting it go at that. No, people spend more time on cutting throats, putting down the competition rather than raising themselves up. Why else are Newfie jokes so popular? I want nothing to do with this. Unfortunately, you have to protect yourself from this. It's the old jungle warfare - Christian ethic conflict or Capitalism vs Socialism conflict (not Capitalism and Socialism as concepts but the degraded reality of the concepts). [Aug28/82 re inside and outside the circle of trust.]

Back to the question: How do you get people to work on themselves, making themselves better rather than

²Business / sales is (should be?) value neutral in the raw / pure definition since it is just the mechanism of trade interaction. But how we conduct that trade ... ah!, it is here that we have a personal choice.

putting down the other guy? Back to Quality. Seek it to gain wisdom (the position of having good judgement) to live in harmony with our environment (people, land, etc.). There are many other forms of wisdom, of course, but this form is the most needed at this time.

What is the person like who values humanity, harmony, the “I” of himself and others, who has reached the satisfaction within himself rather than through artificial means (drugs, material goods, social status, etc.)? He is a person who values other people and things for what they are, not for what he can gain from them. [compare to Aristotle’s ideal man] He cannot “use” anyone, because he has no needs in that area. If he is your friend, it is because he desires your friendship in itself, not for his “use”.

7.15 The mind is a process

All this, of course, is just a working hypothesis, nothing more. One day, we may have an explanation for the inner workings of the mind [neural nets and pattern recognition??]. I suspect we will eventually come to understand it as a process, not a thing, just like computing in a computer is a process, not wires or integrated circuits or physical things. Awareness may be akin to the buffer where processing goes on. The parallels are numerous. I suspect that after they pull the last thread from the weave of the mind, they will find nothing left. The mind is the weave. The biological material will provide the parts. The activity of the parts provide the non-substantial substance of the mind. But however shaky as a hypothesis, the route of harmony based on reason and trust is the only viable route that I can perceive.

The essence or “being” of man is the process of life, the weave. This process, to exist, must move, change, evolve, progress. We are pattern seekers as a means of directing that process. Evolution has provided this to us. “Reason” is one way of establishing patterns. Faith is another. But reason has no more of an a priori basis than faith. ??The success of a line of thought in providing a successful link with reality is the test of the method of establishing a pattern.?? We have, in fact, a faith in reason only because it works. At the beginning there is a faith in a methodology. Our present day understanding of “faith” has taken a subservient role to “reason” only because reason won - it was more successful. But, as per “The Evolution of Physics”, the bottom line in physics is field theory - a mathematical construct that one merely accepts as true without explanation - one has faith in it. We have come full circle in the tonal - nothing is truly explained. We explain things only in terms of their relationship to other things. There is no absolute. Gödel wins. Compare Western culture which tried to freeze reality in concrete realism (art) while native culture tries to capture the essence or flow of nature, of humanity, of harmony [ref: The Primal Mind].

7.16 Expansion not likely and system is unstable

Maybe you disagree. Maybe you’ll come up with a better way. I hope so because although I’ve come from a feeling that the world is insane (madness) to a feeling that the world is simply caught in its own devices, a further look at the reality of it all indicated to me that the expansion of the circle of trust is not forthcoming in the near future and the likelihood of a major catastrophe in the near future is high..

I am left with an inescapable dilemma ... and sadness. And a tenuous path forward through the fog.

Chapter 8 The Dilemma

8.1 The dilemma: present day horrors vs little chance of growth

A dilemma is a choice between two evils. What are the two evils?

The first evil is our present-day reality. As I've mentioned, man has developed tools which gave him power over the environment. Man is now a great big creature in a very small lifeboat. Things are getting very shaky indeed. There are enough nuclear warheads in the world to destroy every city several times over. One 15 kiloton bomb hit Hiroshima in 1945. Today there are over 50,000 nuclear bombs with a total destructive power of over 15,000,000 kilotons [18]. The Regan administration spoke of a "limited nuclear action" because the USA does not have sufficient conventional weaponry to survive a conventional attack by the Soviets. Wonderful. [insert stuff about the fallacy of reason when it comes to peoples' emotions and the Rand corp, von Neumann, pre-emptive strike, etc]

If the war doesn't get us directly, there's always overpopulation, pollution and starvation. Malthus [21] had the right words when he described how war, famine and pestilence would act to bring us in check. But let's be optimistic. Let's assume we maintain our precarious balance and continue on as we are. You and I will be alright. But I'm afraid that we have first class cabins in this boat. The majority doesn't, Remember, 1/4 of the world goes to bed hungry each night and 20,000,000 people a year die of starvation alone. If you find that acceptable, you're sick. [#s from Sidall. Also deaths related to drinking and driving (50% of all auto accidents) heart attacks -> unhealthy people, deaths due to poor designs (ie poor quality)] And the whole catastrophe is maintained by a circle of trust based on external force. It's them against us everywhere you look. [need more examples of how the current state of affairs is not acceptable - make the horror real. Put here or in chapter 1?]

The second evil is the fact that the only alternative that I know, establishing a circle of trust based on individual harmony, is very unlikely to come to pass. And even if it did come to pass, is basing a society on something as fragile as trust a good thing? Any social mental activity is based on trust. Trust in that concept, ex: reason, God, national laws. But the roots of that trust is a trust that people look after themselves. The Supreme Court, for instance, is subject to mistrust on the slightest provocation because of that self-interest characteristic. Basing a society on fragile trust may not be the "be-all and end-all" of social systems, but it is the best we have. Perhaps the only way we can expand the circle and enhance harmony is the old way of identifying an enemy to us all [Iron mountain report]. The problem is, the enemy is us. We're killing ourselves directly (in wars) and indirectly via pollution of all sorts. The route already chosen is to forget the individual growth to self-actualization and harmony. The route historically chosen is to short-circuit the whole inward growth thing and go straight to a "do it or else" approach (this is what the hippy movement rebelled against). Behave or the planet dies of pollution! Behave or you get sent to bed! It's the same approach. Children have to be directly controlled to some extent until their reasoning powers are developed, until they are "acclimatized" (programmed) to their society. With any luck, a parent can control a kid with respect to his environment just enough to ensure his safety and to keep his environment and his mental attitude hygienic for growth. It seems that the establishment behaves in much the same manner towards the individual. Must we treat people like children? Treat a child like a child and he'll behave like one. Is this happening to our society?

Anything based on trust is very fragile. The stock market is a good example. In the last two centuries, it has collapsed every 50 years or so. Everything is fine as long as the majority cooperates and follows the rules. But, as the saying goes, nice guys finish last. Or do they?

8.2 The prisoner's dilemma

A few years ago, I was introduced to the win-lose game. It goes like this. There are two teams (of any size) who are separated from each other. The only communication is through a mediator. There are 21 rounds to the game. In each round, team number 1 gets to vote A or B. Team 2 votes X or Y. Points (money) are awarded according to the following table:

		Team 2	
		X	Y
Team 1	A	+3 for Team 2 +3 for Team 1	+5 for Team 2 -3 for Team 1
	B	-3 for Team 2 +5 for Team 1	-5 for Team 2 -5 for Team 1

If both teams vote to cooperate (ie the vote is AX), then both teams receive 3 points. If team 1 cooperated and team 2 didn't (ie the vote is AY), then team 1 lost 3 and team 2 got a bonus payoff of 5 points, and so on. If both teams tried for the payoff, they both lost big. That's a crude model of the world. If we help each other, we all do okay. The nice guy is vulnerable though to a cagey self-interested person. If the nice guy decides he's had enough and goes for the payoff because he has been a sucker, everyone loses. Chaos results if we all run amuck.

The game was made more interesting by increasing the payoff as the rounds went on by the use of a multiplier:

Round	Multiplier	Resultant Payoff per point
1 through 10	1	\$1.00
Negotiation		
11 to 13	2	\$2.00
14 and 15	3	\$3.00
16	4	\$4.00
17	5	\$5.00
18	6	\$6.00
19	8	\$8.00
20	10	\$10.00
21	20	\$20.00

The first 10 rounds amounted to a “feeling out the other team” period. After the 10th round, team representatives met to talk things over so as to maintain things if all was going well or to fix things up if things were not going well. Then the game proceeded in serious because the stakes were getting higher.

My first game was telling. The first ten rounds yielded AX combinations straight through. Ah, I thought, cooperation is working. I represented my team in what the mediator said was the shortest negotiation he had ever seen:

“Looks like you understand what to do.”

“Yep.”

“Keep it up.”

“OK.”

Rounds 11 to 20 also yielded AX consistently. But Round 21 is the big test. Lack of cooperation would not be punished in a future round because there were no more rounds. If one team chose to be self-interested and the other team chose to be cooperative, the self-interested team would win handily. [result would be completely different if no end round] [open games vs closed games]

Now there were a couple of additional factors that arose. One was that the mediator was putting up the money. If the total net payoff gained by the two teams combined was greater than zero, the mediator payed up. If it was negative (indicating excessive self-interested action), then the teams payed the mediator. So if the teams viewed the game as competition against the mediator, it was clear that the best payoff from the mediator to the teams was received by AX votes for all rounds (similar to the realization that we maximize world harmony by cooperating).

The second factor was the personalities of the particular teams. This game was being played as a learning experience at a week-long company supported course on supervisory skills. Of the twenty or so participants, only two had doctorates. I was one (in team 1), the other happened to be in team 2. At the negotiation, the other fellow learned that I was in team 2 (there were several simultaneous games going on). This turned out, I later discovered, to be a crucial factor.

All of us on team 2 felt that cooperation was a superior approach and that some risk was involved in a show of good faith. Yet we agreed to risk it because we didn't want to be the ones to collapse the system. Even if we won, we had planned to spend the money on the others by buying the drinks afterwards. We reasoned that the other team were reasoning the same way as well. We voted X.

Team 1 voted B and we lost. So much for cooperation. Afterwards, the other PhD came up and said, “I didn't want to win necessarily; I just didn't want to lose to you!” A Jewish friend of mine once said to me, “You know, people don't realize how the Israelis are thinking. Do you think they will take defeat lying down? No way. If it comes to that, if the Israelis really have their backs to the wall and really think that it is over for the Jews, they won't simply succumb. They'll take everybody with them.”. The Israelis have nuclear weaponry [?], so ... Now I don't want to single out PhD's or Jews as having that kind of mind. I want to make it clear that the majority of us think that way. Is it an idle threat when you hear someone exclaim, “I'll get even if it is the last thing I do!”?

8.3 Carment's study

Carment[23] detailed some work in this area by studying PDG's (prisoner's dilemma games) which are variants on the win-lose game above. Let me quote some results:

“... if the penalty becomes sufficiently large, we move into the area of "dangerous games", also known as games of "chicken", in which mutual defection is disastrous. These would be models of situations in which individuals or nations pursue individualistic or competitive directions to such a degree that the resource is completely depleted. In these cases "loss of face" often becomes the overriding factor and the need not to back down or show weakness may overwhelm more appropriate responses [yea, where have I seen that before?]. The American experience in Vietnam is a case in point and the current relationship between the Federal and Alberta governments may be moving in the same direction.

Generally speaking, studies in our laboratory and elsewhere indicate that in the PDG situation subjects choose to defect, that is not cooperate, between 50 and 60 percent of the time, irrespective of variations in the pay-off matrix.

... One major research question has been concerned with modifying the reluctance of individuals to be cooperative in these dilemmas. A strategy which has been examined in this regard is unconditional cooperation where no matter what one person chooses the other is consistently cooperative. Does cooperative responding then increase? On the contrary it decreases markedly. North Americans, at least, take this as an opportunity to exploit the other person. Pacifists and the soft-hearted are usually taken complete advantage of under these conditions. The most effective means for inducing cooperation has been found to be a matching or "tit-for-tat" strategy in which cooperation is met with cooperation and defection with defection.

... if you believe that you are likely to be exploited it is foolish to be cooperative, ...”

8.4 Tit for Tat

[summary of computer competitions]

So that's the long and the short of it. You're damned if you do and damned if you don't. It seems as if people are just being reasonable in their self-interested behaviour. But it is only reasonable if the majority are out of tune with themselves. Perhaps there's a critical level. If a significant percentage of people were harmonious and cooperative, there would be a chance. It seems that man's society is chronically below that critical percentage. We're caught in a Catch-22 type of situation. The people who need to be convinced of the need to inquire into their inner selves are the very ones who are afraid to. They avoid the issue at all costs. Anything but the truth.

8.5 Scaling up

Cooperative strategies lower stress, ie, increase harmony. Inner harmony makes it easier to cooperate since a harmonious person has a flatter "gain curve" and is better armed to handle the stress of fighting for expanding the circle. Whether harmony extrapolates to a general solution is a question that only be answered on a systems level, not on an individual level. It is a many-body problem. This is where Axelrod's work on the Prisoner's Dilemma games fits in. He showed that Tit-for-Tat is the winning strategy in computer simulations of the win-lose game. For real life, we will undoubtedly have to modify the strategy somewhat. Still the basic strategy seems sound and is certainly intriguing. It is my personal strategy:

1. Be nice (don't hit first)
2. Be provokable (hit back if hit)
3. Be forgiving (revert to being nice after hitting back)

4. Be clear (so all can see your strategy).

We humans seem to have put a heavy bias on not trusting or forgiving easily; trust is hard to make and easily broken. Many Tits for one Tat. But is this a winning strategy in today's world?

Re point 1: It seems prudent that we should be nice (ie trust) in proportion to the trust previously established plus some delta which is taken on a risk basis - to promote trust but not to leave yourself too vulnerable. Risk only what you can afford to lose.

Re point 2: Punishment should fit the crime.

Re point 3: It seems to take 10 to 20 cooperations to wipe out one defection.

Re point 4: KISS approach. Easier to trust what you understand.

The above strategy is stable, self-propagating, self-consistent, simple, robust and adaptable.

8.6 Winstanley's study

Winstanley [17] did a study of the "Limits to Growth" phenomena and concluded (and I paraphrase him in the context of these writings):

"... Man is a biological species like any other, but he has an unprecedented ability (in an evolutionary sense) to alter his environment rather than adapt to its dictates. This is at the root of man's success as a species, in spreading over almost every part of the land area of the earth and in rising to a position of dominance. It is also at the root of his failure.

... man cannot continue forever to defy nature; to set himself apart from his environment. There are constraints on his activities.

Firstly, there are the truly global 'Limits to growth', the real ultimate physical boundaries to man's activities on earth. These are only two -- space, and climatic stability. ...

... The second set of problems are not global physical limits. They are concerned with distribution - of resources, especially food, of knowledge and of power. ...

... with the communications networks, interdependence and expectations built up between all nations of the world, regional crises increasingly have global repercussions; these form the third set of problems.

... There is also a fourth set of problems, resulting from the increasing remoteness of life in the technologically advanced nations from the basis of reality. The further and further we become removed from our environment, the less the 'human' values appear relevant and so our cities are full of unhappy, discontented people, driven to strive always for more than they have. Alienation of youth, violence, the drug culture, and many other social indicators are evidence of this effect of what perhaps is simply the phenomenon of over-crowding.

If we examine all these problems in an evolutionary context, world models become irrelevant. Not

only has man an unprecedented ability to alter his environment; he also has an unprecedented ability to analyse his position in the world, and to project that position into the future. We do know the results of our behaviour; we know the future implications of following current trends. In fact we discuss it and write about it incessantly. We are not unaware either of the problems or of what is necessary to solve them. The answers are fairly obvious -population control; a simpler life with less emphasis on consumption in the developed world; a greater attention to the necessities of life and a redistribution of resources on the basis of human rights rather than rights of wealth or possession; a greater concern for our environment including our fellow men; and a sense of responsibility for the consequences of our actions.

However, the greatest irony of the situation is that while man, unlike probably any other species, can understand and assess both his present and his future, he has no more ability than any other species to actually do anything about impending problems until they are actually upon him. Of course, institutionally, politically and economically these solutions pose tremendous problems - but they are not insurmountable stumbling blocks if we really want to change the system. Theoretically we are quite capable of such change, but in practice it is clear that we lack the ability to develop both the will and the motivation.

Both individuals and governments operate on the basic driving force of self-interest - each operates in such a fashion as to maximise his own short-term gains from the system. Most individuals are not concerned with the welfare of others across the world unless they can help without sacrificing - except to the extent that they can appease whatever conscience they have. Why should anyone alter any part of his life for some dimly perceived 'common good' whose benefits he may never reap? For the future, his concerns remain limited to his own lifetime -or perhaps that of his children, to whom his self-interest may be extended. For governments, as Revelle (1975) has pointed out, 'infinity is the election after the next one'. And nationalism provides a justification for selfishness.

There is of course nothing 'wrong' with this attitude. It is necessary for individual survival, although it doesn't help the species as a whole. It is not a criticism but simply a statement of fact that man seems incapable of identifying with the kind of global awareness that is necessary to solve the problems - at least, he is incapable of developing such a capacity within the short time necessary. And it would, as Heilbroner has pointed out, be entirely irrational to expect him to make sacrifices for a future he will never see. ...

... While we go on talking and arguing both within and between nations about the details of a situation we already understand well enough to begin to solve, we make no moves on the scale necessary to solve it. ..."

8.7 Pogo: We have met the enemy

So that clearly leaves us with the old cliché, "You are either part of the solution or you are part of the problem." Pogo [24] also recognized the sad truth when he said "We have met the enemy and he is us!"

Chapter 9 Sadness

9.1 Ideas as offspring

Just as people, because of gene selection, naturally want to propagate their kin (genes), those people who have expanded their circle and are more into mental development, who value more esoteric things, wish to see their ideas procreate. It is perhaps not coincidental that peoples' ideas become their babies. Peoples' word become extensions of themselves and they don't want to see it die. Maybe this is why some people like to do lasting things and don't like to do transient or sloppy jobs. Maybe this is why some like to teach. In this way, they're propagating their ideas. If the expanding is a natural evolution of self-centeredness, then the development of the mind, as a reasoning tool allowing a large circle, is an evolution of our genes. What survives is the fittest. The domination of the mind (reason) over the baser drives is not necessarily better. But if it survives, it is fitter for that environment. Truth is a powerful axiom but not everyone is secure enough, likes himself enough, to handle the honesty. Anything but the truth. If not the truth, then what?

9.2 Living with non-reflective person / opposing values -> need reason

Back to the question: How does a reflective person live with a non-reflective person? Or, more generally, how does one person with one set of values live with another who has conflicting values? So this is the true value of the developed, reasoning mind. It forms the basis for a large circle of trust and for harmony. But like the banks and the stock exchange, is basing a society on something as fragile as trust a good thing [repeat of earlier]? One good thing about self-interest is that you can depend on it! It makes for a very stable society in the sense that the fundamental rule doesn't change. It stays stable right to the bitter end when collapse occurs. For our survival, we must stop killing each other and our environment. (Upon which we depend). Thinking is the feed-forward term essential to our survival.

9.3 Problem of equal importance / who's the boss?

But having reached the level of being a quality or harmony seeker, with a large circle of trust, all the environment takes on a uniform importance. You become equally sensitive to all and will avoid killing a fly if possible. The fly becomes as much of a kin as your family because there is no reasonable basis for setting a priority of one thing over another if you start with the premise that I am no more important, intrinsically and globally, than you. In order to achieve harmony with all our environment, we cannot allow one part to take precedence. [??]

For example, the human body. Cancer is considered a disease because some cells multiply without regard to the other cells. This is also illustrated by the joke about the parts of the body arguing over which part was boss. The brain felt it should be because it was smart and controlled the body. Similarly the lungs felt that were the most important. Etc. The rectum won the argument by closing up and causing the rest of the body to malfunction. (Thereby proving that you do not have to be smart to be boss, just an ass-hole!)

9.4 Critical level of altruism? Need to adapt mentally

Perhaps there is a critical altruistic level at which altruism will grow, below which it decays to a random level. As mentioned before, we seem to have existed entirely below the critical level since the only means so far of maintaining our limited circle of trust is by force or by promise of immediate return.

The thinking person in a developed society does not maximize his fitness by having lots of kids. Typically he has one or two kids. The thinking person who communicates and teaches others to cooperate, expand the circle, makes a better (?) Society and hence, in the long run, a society should select for this altruistic and teaching person. But this does not make any statement as to absolute right or wrong. This may be the only

way we can keep up with our technology. The physical selection process was okay as long as the environment didn't change too rapidly. But we are in a rapid change situation (brought on by our mental capabilities). The only way we can keep up is to adapt mentally. We've been hoisted by our own petard. The mind is the monster. The enemy is us. We'll have to fight our way out of and over our love for sweets, fats, rest, etc. These were valued when they were in short supply. Now that we have an overabundance of them, we need to inwardly grow so that we can handle the excess without growing fat, ill, etc.

9.5 Man must like himself

Thus it seems most basic that a person likes himself. That is the first priority. He must be honest to himself, to his "I". Otherwise he is a shell, he does not value himself, he is a deviant from the type of individual most likely to survive evolution. Self-centred individuals survive. So first, a healthy person is in harmony with himself. To maximize his personal harmony, it behoves one to be in harmony with his environment, of which other people are a part. He seeks to establish the harmony by setting up a "trust" and will seek to maximize the circle of trust. This requires communication, mental development and the tool of disinterested rationality: reason. Equal consideration of others naturally follows. A person who does not believe in himself is fearful, not brave. He cannot handle reality because it is a constant reminder of his not liking himself. He cannot go home to himself. He needs material things (drugs and other diversions), to drown the reality, the truth. Anything but the truth. He is afraid to ask a seeking question for fear of what he will find. Without the question, no progress can be made towards humanity, harmony. Reason or impersonal rationality is not accepted as a tool by these people. No expansion is possible.

But it's the old Catch-22 situation. A non-thinking person cannot be made to think his way through to know himself because he deliberately avoids thinking for fear of seeing. Lack of harmony causes Pain (as per Janov). It is blocked off by escaping - anything but the stressful truth.

9.6 Self-esteem / know thyself / like thyself

Self-esteem gives the person the guts (enthusiasm) to stand up and ask "Why?". I think many, if not most, people are "stuck" at this basic level. This is the fear barrier of Don Juan. There is also blindness, power and retirement (as discussed before) to contend with. Small wonder only a few make it past all barriers. It requires a recklessness, a strong desire, a moral braveness (Twain's words). It requires a harmony within yourself first. Socrates was right: Know thyself! I'd go a step further: Like thyself! As per Maslow, a person has to have the baser physical needs resolved before he can contemplate self-esteem. Once he has self-esteem, he can contemplate self-actualization (wisdom). I'd say a person who has self-esteem and likes himself is better suited to have satisfied his physical and emotional needs. So although people do satisfy needs in a priority as per Maslow, self-esteem is most basic to well-being, an expanding circle and harmony.

The value of harmony / self-esteem, etc, is that it gives someone a "flat gain curve". It is easier to deal with this kind of person - their behaviour is predictable and rational. It gives the person the inner strength and resolve to carry on - to want and be able to carry out the Tit-for-Tat strategy - to follow through.

9.7 What is Harmony?

What is HARMONY? It is the reduction of stress. It's the closest thing to a definition of Quality. It is a non-understood desire, not yet available to our Tonal. It is perhaps a quality or characteristic that evolved. The individual in harmony with himself and his surroundings (ie low stress and conflicts) was more likely to procreate. Those species that desired harmony were fitter. It is not the only criterion for successful procreation, not by a long shot. But by whatever means, we seem to desire it.

Whatever its roots, it is clear that an organism in harmony with itself is more successful than one who is not. Again, the majority are so caught up in maintaining a local harmony, at the expense of others, that they cannot afford to give more, to trust in order to establish a wider circle.

So we arrive back to the pursuit of Quality / Harmony from within as an overriding directive towards worldwide Harmony. The low probability of success of expanding the circle justifies in my mind my refusal to have my own kids - admittedly a very personal decision with no implied judgement of others. I'll make the best of the situation since we're here.

9.8 One bad deal / make the best of it

But, all in all, the whole thing is a value neutral deal. We're here because we are here, folks. That's it. There probably isn't a great eternal plan. There probably isn't any life after death. There probably isn't a God. But even if there is, the conclusion is the same. The whole thing boils down to you and me and how we choose to deal with today and tomorrow. Forget about depending on social norms or morals or civil law or the UN or any other artifact as a means to world peace. They are essential, yes. But they are inoperative without that underlying factor: harmony. And that can only be supplied by you and me.

Pirsig said it best: [repeat of quote given in Chapter 6, section 3]

"When one isn't dominated by feelings of separateness from what he's working on, then one can be said to "care" about what he's doing. That is what caring really is, a feeling of identification with what one's doing. When one has this feeling then he also sees the inverse side of caring, Quality itself.

I think that if you are going to reform the world, and make it a better place to live in, the way to do it is not to talk about relationships of a political nature, which are inevitably dualistic, full of subjects and objects and their relationship to one another; or with programs full of things for other people to do. I think that kind of approach starts it at the end and presumes the end is the beginning. Programs of a political nature are important end products of social quality that can be effective only if the underlying structure of social values is right. The social values are right only if the individual values are right. The place to improve the world is in one's own heart and head and hands, and then work outward from there. Other people can talk about how to expand the destiny of mankind. I just want to talk about how to fix a motorcycle. I think that what I have to say has a more lasting value." - Robert Persig, Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance, page 290-291, Bantam Books, 1974.

9.9 Are you part of the problem or part of the solution

If this sounds like a lot of hard work with a low probability of success, you're right. If you think that I'm completely out in left field, then sit back and fret no more. But, please, the next time you complain or otherwise air your views on some aspect of our little factory, stop a second and ask yourself, "what have I done to understand the situation? Am I asking someone else to consider me? To understand me? To trust me? If I am asking this, what right do I have to ask this? What have I done to earn this favour? What have I done for him lately?" Let's face it, as the old cliché says: If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem. No investment, no dividends.

With these thoughts in mind, the process of making life better in the factory can begin; a process whose final outcome, our lives, is best viewed as the taillight of the Caboose on the train of thought which is guided by the wisdom of the individuals, by the quality of their decisions, by their inner harmony.

[If not us, then who? If not now, then when? - dig up original quote]

[expand on the factory, use nuclear power paper as an example?]

[quote Ortega on revolt of the masses and the demand for rights without obligation?]

9.10 The Loon Wailed

Weekend at the lake prompted the following poem:

The Loon Wailed

The loon wailed,
Feeling the thrust
As the canoe pierced the dawn.
The mist healed this intrusion,
Preserving the harmony of the loon's realm.

The sun permitted this thorn
Because it needed a witness.
It squinted its story, bleeding purple,
Grey, brown, gold, silver, pink;
Revealing to the messenger the reality of beauty,
And the inadequacy of reason in guiding the soul.

Later, released by the full morning sun,
The witness returned, touched and changed,
Babbling of the land beyond reason
To those who had not seen.
But it was a land that could not be felt
In the words of reason.
Just as the land of reason cannot be rationalized
By the land of beauty.

The sun stood proud yet knowing full well:
Tho' this ant of reason was small and fragile,
There were many others and they incessantly toiled,
Drunk on the power of reason,
Blind and numb to a harmony they no longer perceived.
The sun had failed once again;
The loon wailed.

Chapter 10 Passion - the Basis for Proceeding

10.1 How you spend your time is how you spend your life

The previous chapters try to analyse the situation, pick it apart. They uncover the nature of the problem and point to a path forward - the individual seeking a quality life. But what does this mean in the sense of how does a person go about doing this? Right this minute, now, in the middle of life happening all around him every second of the day. It's real-time. We're doing 120 km/hr on the freeway of life. No time to take your eyes off the road. Yes, it's true - there is a real limit to what we can do from day to day, minute by minute. But we do have choices to make that come up regularly if we have the eyes to see and the courage to entertain. Little choices abound: a smile or a warm touch here and there. [Elise's story of a dime in the phone booth] [Xmas gift choices]. Bigger choices (career, family decisions and other forks in the road) are less frequent but occur often enough to make profound opportunities. But if you have a clear goal (in the sense of a heading, not a destination), then when the opportunities arise, you can bias the choice. How are you going to go about your life? What career? What does life mean to you? Here's where passion comes in.

[relate passion to quality - passion is the manifestation of the desire for quality]

Quote the lyrics from "Drift Away" - the Nylons

Day after day I'm more confused
And I look for the light
Through the pouring rain.
You know that's a game that I hate to lose
And I'm feelin' the strain, ain't it a shame.

(Chorus)

Oh, give me the beat, boys, and free my soul,
I want to get lost in your rock and roll
And drift away. (Repeat)

Beginning to think that I'm wasting time
I don't understand the things I do
The world outside looks so unkind.
And I'm counting on you, to carry me through.

Oh, give me the beat, boys, and free my soul
I want to get lost in you rock and roll
And drift away. (Repeat)

And when my mind is free
You know a melody can move me
And when I'm feelin' blue
The guitar's coming through to soothe me
Thanks for the joy that you've given me
I want you to know I believe in your song
Rhythm and rhyme and harmony
You help me along, making me strong.

(Repeat chorus and fade)

[Insert discussion on gifting and the rationality of maintaining a balance of what you can do locally vs globally. Keeping the industrial machine alive in the western world is the best route to helping the impoverished. Insert stuff from nuceng web pages. This is in the end, I suppose, a justification for maintaining a reasoned balance between what we do for ourselves and what we do for others. We must maintain the factory if the factory if to produce the wealth needed for all. Excerpts from the Skeptical Environmentalist, etc. re the improving data on pollution. Ditto the lowering of hunger rates. Still a long way to go however. Make this a separate chapter?]

10.2 Follow the Passion

I thought of this while walking from Euston Station to George Hotel in London while on vacation.

- took lessons in pottery. Result was some really substantial works. Shout. Thick. Good for ballast. If you need some ballast for your canoe, just let me know. What I did learn was an appreciation for good pottery and the artistry behind it. Now, whenever I pick up a pot, I think of that. That is a lasting thing.

- likewise, I am not musical but I stand in awe of good music and the musicians.

- I stand in awe of nature, good thinking, good friendship, good science, good math, engineering. All these things are awesome. Sometimes it takes my breath away, sometimes I cry.

- I stand in awe of good humour.

Where does this all come from? Why should I feel this way? Why should I care?

It is an evolutionary trait. Pattern recognition enables the use of strategies. We need to recognize who you can trust to behave in a predictable manner. It is that simple. Cooperative strategies, even though they are used within one team as it pits itself against another, is a winning strategy. An individual is no challenge to a team. It's that simple. So how do you recognize a person's intention? Well, when a person is passionate, you can count on them behaving in a manner that is true to that passion. This gives a level of predictability to behaviour. Thus passion is a winning evolutionary strategy. Passion is real. It is a base emotion. It is stable.

Deny it and stress goes up. In the end, you'll come back to it. It is something you can depend on to motivate you.

So how does this relate to how you go about your life? What career? What goals? What do you want to do?

If you look at life rationally, you could deduce that you should work to better mankind, ie you benefit if we all benefit. Or you could deduce that you should optimize for yourself and the marketplace do its thing. Or focus on your family, etc. Or get into a profession that is needed at the moment, ie be part of the great scheme to keep the factory going. But there is no real reason to keep the factory going. In the end, life is meaningless at the highest level. But it is not meaningless at the local level - to you or me.

The base meaning of life to you and me is that which drives us when we are not driven by external forces or aberrant behaviour. We are driven by our passions. They set the goals. Our rational thought is simply the engine.

What if you worked your whole life to, say, teach math or reading because it is essential, you reason, to an informed society and a better life? You want to help build a society of reasonable people. What if you have sacrificed your dreams to follow a utilitarian path only to discover, in the end, that the utility of the situation has changed. You have just given your life for nought. [Can't predict the long term outcome - Siam story, can

flip flop easily] What if you eventually realize that man invariably ends up in a conflict that reason cannot address? Even fully literate, rational people are just as socially rudderless and conflict ridden as primitive societies. In fact, the situation is likely worse in a modern society because they have bigger populations, bigger weapons, etc. Education is not the answer. What if that were true? Then you would have wasted your life labouring on what you felt needed to be done, not on what you wanted to do. This is not a dress rehearsal. Your life is now over. Regrets!

I think it would be better to follow your passions. Do what you feel is right. You really can't trust reason to provide a guiding light for your inner self because your inner self is not related to reason. You need to find your inner self and then use that desire to do positive things. This is a sustainable, empowering, self-reinforcing strategy. To do otherwise is to engage in work that drains, not invigorates. When you are engaged, the enthusiasm and pleasure spreads like a good laugh. It is infectious. This will yield better results for society and for you. It is more robust to changes in politics, technology, etc. You are more likely to be good at what you do when you are passionate about what you do.

We can't all have the luxury of following our passions. But we can benefit from trying to insert that bias as best we can. And that points to a tragedy of poverty that rests on top of the already gut wrenching pain and suffering of poverty. The impoverished simply do not have the luxury of following their dreams. We, in the wealthier part of society have the luxury of choice (thanks Mom and Dad). We should not squander that luxury.

So how does one identify one's passion? Maybe the question is how does one not identify it. It will resurface like the loon, given half a chance. No matter what.

Listen.

References

- 1 E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology: The new Synthesis*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1975.
- 2 P. Singer, *The Expanding Circle: Ethics and Sociobiology*, The New American Library, Meridian Books, New York, N.Y., 1981.
- 3 D. Barash, *The Whisperings Within: Evolution and the Origin of Human Nature*, Penguin Books, 1979.
- 4 *The Republic of Plato*, Translated by F. Macdonald Cornford, Oxford University Press, New York, First Printing 1941.
- 5 C. Castaneda, *Tales of Power*, Pocket Books, Gulf and Western Corporation, New York N.Y., 1974.
- 6 R.M. Pirsig, *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*, Bantam Book, William Morrow and Company, 1974.
- 7 M. Gardner, *Aha! Gotcha: Paradoxes to Puzzle and Delight*, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1982.
- 8 Perth County
- 9 Maslow
- 10 A. Janov, *The Primal Revolution*, Garnstone Press, Great Britain, 1974.
- 11 , *Stress, Not Distress*,
- 12 T. Verney, *The Unborn Child*,
- 13 W. Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, Pocket Books, Gulf and Western Corporation, 1961.
- 14 H. Askenasy, *Are We All Nazis?*, Lyle Stuart Inc., Secaucus, N.J., 1978.
- 15 A. Robertson, *The Value Society*,
- 16 D. Meadows, et al, *The Limits to Growth*, Signet Book, New American Library, New York, NY, 1972.
- 17 G. Winstanley, *The Limits to Growth: a Review of World Reaction*, Office of the Science Advisor, Environment Canada, Ottawa, April 1975.
- 18 A. Peccai, *One Hundred Pages for the Future*, a Futura Book, Pergamon Press, Great Britain, 1982.
- 19 Jose Ortega Y Gasset, [Def'n of Love Ref]
- 20 G. Orwell, 1984,

21 Malthus [War, Famine Ref]

22 E. Sidall

23 D.W. Carment, Attitudes Towards Pollution Control and Energy Conservation, the Tragedy of the Commons, McMaster Institute of Energy Studies Newsletter, Vol 2 #2, June 1981, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.

24 Pogo,

25 Lila