

# Renewal

"There is no  
easy formula for  
this renewal."  
—Lewis Mumford

June 21, 1982

New Values, New Politics • Mark Satin, Editor

Volume I, No. 24

## Massive Peace March Included Tenderness, Political Manipulation

When 750,000 people came together June 12 in New York to march and rally on behalf of the nuclear freeze, media coverage was unusually sympathetic. Even the *New York Times*, traditional punching bag for demonstrators during the Vietnam war, carried an inspiring story, "Spectrum of Humanity Represented at Rally," complete with pictures of mother and child and police officers wearing necklaces of folded origami peace cranes.

RENEWAL was there from beginning to end, marching in different contingents, poring over leaflets, and listening, listening, listening. We are glad the media was sympathetic, but it is also true that, in the effort to present a sympathetic and understandable portrait of the demonstrators to the American middle class, much of the reality of the demonstration was, once again, lost.

### Tenderness

Most establishment commentators stressed that the rally was "peaceful," as in the *New York Times's* page one paragraph one, "Hundreds of thousands of peaceful demonstrators . . .," or New York police chief Patrick J. Murphy's widely-quoted comment, "Everything we planned worked like a textbook exercise." However, the vast majority of the demonstrators were not just peaceful in the *New York Times*/Police Chief Murphy sense of peace-as-the-absence-of-violence. On the march, on the lawn at Central Park, on the subways and buses and caravans home, the thing that bound the demonstrators together was a rare and nourishing kind of tenderness.

It was present in the painstakingly careful way the different contingents, newly arrived in New York, unfurled their homemade banners. It was present in the patient, guileless way marchers introduced themselves to one another. Most of all, perhaps, it was present in the way the marchers looked at each other; acknowledged each other.

"If you've lived in New York," one demonstrator told RENEWAL, "you'd understand this never happens here. It's like the demonstration gave us an excuse to drop some of our defenses and try to be human beings with each other." "It's what I'll remember best," another demonstrator told us. "It was the *real* disarmament rally," said a third, "disarmed human beings."

### The June 12 Committee

The demonstration had been in the planning stages for over a year. It was organized by the "June 12 Committee," a coalition of 28 activist groups ranging from the middle-class environmental group Greenpeace to the Com-

munist Party-dominated U.S. Peace Council.

In January, it looked like the organizing committee was about to split apart, partly because of the demands of the far left groups for adding certain popular left-wing slogans to the demonstration/rally and partly because of a demand for 33% representation of racial minorities on all decision-making bodies. These demands caused some of the more transformation-conscious groups including Fellowship of Reconciliation, Friends of the Earth, and the Nuclear Freeze Campaign itself, to break away from the organizing committee and establish a new group to run the event.

This initiative was in effect quashed when the remaining "rump" of the rally organization, calling itself the "Third World and Progressive Peoples Coalition" (TWPPC), called the New York City Parks Department and said that, as heirs to the original rally permit, they expected to receive it. It did not take the breakaway groups long to realize that, if they pushed hard with a similar request, the city might not grant either request (Mayor Koch is not exactly a friend of the peace movement). In the end, the breakaway groups did the only thing they could do to preserve the credibility and viability of the march: reconstitute the original coalition by giving in to all the TWPPC demands.

It's because of this that hundreds of thousands of people who'd come to New York intending to demonstrate on behalf of a freeze and reduction of nuclear weapons, were handed the June 12 Committee's official leaflet announcing to all the world (including the press) that the demonstrators saw themselves as part of a massive "disarmament (sic) and social justice movement"; that the demonstrators felt "the U.S. government is the least willing to stop its nuclear insanity"; and that the demonstrators wanted not just a freeze but massive job creation programs and a "transfer of resources from military spending to meet human needs."

Not one word was said on behalf of those demonstrators who would rather have spent the freed-up resources reducing taxes, reducing the national debt, meeting *global* needs, or improving conventional weapons. Not one word was said on behalf of those demonstrators who feel the problem with our social services is not their level of funding, but the *kind* of education, health care, housing, etc. they provide. Not one word was said on behalf of those who think our task is not to "create more jobs," but to do away with already rampant featherbedding and planned obsolescence, simplify life styles, encourage job sharing, etc.

"This leaflet could have been written 40 years ago," said one ungrateful demonstrator from Quebec, summing up the words and feelings of many. "My God, the PQ (Quebec Party, now in power - ed.) is more future-focused than this."

### The Marchers vs. The Speakers

Anyone who spent much time in the crowds might have noticed a fascinating split between the demonstrators themselves and the ideas expressed by most of the speakers.

Most of the American speakers had first come to prominence in the 1960's and still reflected the political positions and prejudices of that time: Bella Abzug, William Sloane Coffin, Barry Commoner, Dave Dellinger, Robert Drinan. . . . With nearly all the speakers, the rhetoric was as thick as that of Republicans and Democrats on the campaign trail. In four hours of listening, RENEWAL heard few speakers who envisaged a positive role for the U.S. in world affairs ("U.S. out of El Salvador!" was the general thrust). We only heard one speaker, the black actress Ruby Dee, who spoke *politically* of values, simplicity and spirituality: "(Let us overcome) our obsession with money. . . . Let us become the students of God." On the subway going back to Penn Station, one of the demonstrators — a high school student — said, "The speakers, you know, there was so much violence — 'Fight for this! Fight against that!' Even when they called for unity, you know, their voices sounded like they meant something else."

As soon as the speeches began in Central Park, "the march" turned into what were in effect two marches: thousands of people pouring into the park and thousands of people pouring out. The people who left were in good spirits but many said things like, "Here they go again!" or "I've been to this movie before."

A second option people had was to stay in the park and tune the speakers out. About two-thirds stayed, and for the vast majority of them the speakers were no more than background noise. The real business of the demonstration could then take place: making new friends, making political connections, and testing their *own* ideas on one another. The only two stage events that broke through these core purposes were Linda Ronstadt's rendition of "Blue Bayou" and James Taylor's rendition of "Up on the Roof" — songs that spoke to the feelings in demonstrators' hearts, feelings that most of them had not yet been able to translate into a practical, coherent politics.

## Kaleidoscope

**Vasconcellos's manifesto; community workshops; political games**

John Vasconcellos, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the California State Assembly, has written his latest "Capitol Report" (letter to constituents) in the form of a veritable manifesto on transformational politics. No elected official at any level has ever taken such an explicitly transformational message to his or her constituents.

The critical political question, writes Vasconcellos, is "How do we provide environments (including human relationships) which enable persons to grow themselves into healthy human beings?" His suggested answer: we must lower expectations that government will do everything for us, and, at the same time, take much more responsibility for things like birthing, parenting, education, health, and violence prevention (copies from: Vasconcellos District Office, 2435 Forest Ave., San Jose, Calif. 95128).

The Planetary Initiative for the World We Choose has published a discussion guide for facilitators of the Initiative's "Issue Exploration Groups." Written by Donald Keys, the discussion guide could serve as a useful point-of-departure for facilitators of many other transformation-minded political groups (Initiative: 777 U.N. Plaza, N.Y. 10017).

Jessica Lipnack and Jeff Stamps, authors of the best guide to New Age organizations (*Networking*, reviewed in #19), gave a well-received talk last month to over 30 people at the United Nations. "It was the first time

we'd spoken publicly together on anything," Lipnack told RENEWAL. "It was like being on another planet!" Core of their message: "The United Nations does not function at some higher rung of authority than nations, but rather horizontally, dealing with nations as equals. . . . A Network of relatively sovereign nations cohering through shared values and interests is quite possibly more healthy for humanity than the creation of a supernatural coercive authority" (copies for \$3 from: Another America Networking, Box 66, W. Newton, Mass. 02165).

Friends of the Earth, which may be the most "transformation-minded" of the established environmental groups, reports that it now has 20 active regional and local branches — up from 10 two years ago — and that it's looking for people to start more. If you're interested, Bob Scowcroft at the FOE National Office has prepared a useful "branch packet" and a list of project proposals you can immediately take on (Scowcroft: c/o FOE, 1045 Sansome St., San Francisco, 94111).

Werner Erhard, whose est training has long been the most popular self-development program in the country, is putting the finishing touches on a workshop designed to create and develop community — The Community Workshop. "If we are going to create a world that works for everyone," says Erhard, "we must learn to function in communities; to be effective and produce results

in participation with others." The first pilot workshop, with over 1,000 participants, took place in San Francisco this spring (S.F. Area Center: 765 California St., S.F. 94108).

An unusual seminar, "Tools for Community Economic Development," has been scheduled for July 18-25 in western Massachusetts. Experts from three continents will be helping participants examine and devise the kinds of "self-financing programs, organizations and legal structures" that can bolster local economies. Among those experts: George McRobie, chairman of the Intermediate Technology Department Group of London, and Shann Turnbull, from Australia, author of *New Sources of Money* (E.F. Schumacher Society, Box 76A - R.D. 3, Great Barrington, Mass. 01230).

When she isn't acting as consultant to the U.S. Agency for International Development, the American Association of Community Colleges, and other groups, Judith Barnet is producing "simulation games" on global issues, suitable for classes, political discussion groups or groups of friends. Their political thrust is definitely transformational; for example, "Who Needs Enemies?: A World Hunger Game" has players try to end world hunger by the year 2000. And "Nukes or Cukes?: An Economic Conversion Game" has players compete for a budget of \$225 billion with requests totalling twice that amount (Barnet: Box 276, Barnstable, Mass. 02630).

**New World Alliance update****Alliance chapters flourish, fizzle in cities across the U.S.**

The New World Alliance has tried to start chapters in at least seven major U.S. cities. The results suggest that "transformation-oriented" political people have only just begun their journey-of-a-thousand-miles.

On the positive side, the Milwaukee chapter — just three months old — is flourishing. "Tonight we had a gubernatorial candidate talk to us," Milwaukee's Robert Thompson told RENEWAL, "and at our next meeting we'll have a couple of people from hunger organizations talk to us. . . ." "Us" is about 30 people, including elected officials, educators and community organizers.

Also on the positive side, the Los Angeles chapter has been meeting regularly since November. In the last couple of months, it has given talks before high school assemblies and participated in drafting the California State Democratic Party platform.

And there is the Riverside, Cal. chapter, the Alliance's "flagship" chapter. "One thing four or five of us are doing is putting together a directory of humanistic services for the (Riverside metropolitan area)," Riverside's Mel Gurtov told RENEWAL.

In the four other cities, however, the results have been less than uplifting. Even in Los Angeles and Riverside, the results have been disappointing as compared with the high hopes — and the potential.

In Los Angeles, a founding meeting was called to "unite many kindred organizations for political action." About 70 people came. Now the chapter is down to 10-12 participants, "and different ones want the chapter to go in at least four different directions," says L.A.'s Gerald Goldfarb.

In Riverside, first there were 60 people meeting every other week, then there were fewer people meeting once a month, and now there are five people meeting irregularly.

In Dallas, Susan Walton began "getting people to come over. But they had the hardest time getting involved in politics. . . ."

In San Francisco, a chapter organizing meeting facilitated by Alanna Hartzok drew at least 30 people. "The San Francisco affinity group began meeting every other week," Hartzok told RENEWAL, "but after a couple of months there was almost no one left."

In New York, a "chapter in formation" grew out of the Alliance's first political awareness seminar (see RENEWAL #9). But monthly meetings failed to hold people's interest. Next, says New York's Wendy Moge, a smaller group of people drafted a questionnaire "to help possible chapter members articulate the kind of chapter they wanted to see." The result: "About three or four of us kept meeting until recently," says New York's Michael Blinick.

In Washington, D.C., another political awareness seminar led to a party which led to 10-12 people getting together regularly for months and trying to decide what to do. "I tried to get together a networking meeting of like minded groups," says D.C.'s Jim Easterly, "but the only people that could come that day were Friends of the Earth. . . . I feel the (chapter) is kind of winding down now, unless some major thing happens."

Why has Milwaukee been successful so far? And what's gone wrong everywhere else? In the next Alliance update, the chapter organizers themselves will try to explain it.

**Renewal**

RENEWAL is published every three weeks except the first week in August by Renewal Inc., 1629 Columbia Rd. N.W., Ste. 628, Washington, D.C. 20009, 202-234-0747, in cooperation with the New World Alliance. The opinions expressed are the editor's own and are not necessarily those of the Alliance.

Please address all correspondence to P.O. Box 43241, Washington, D.C. 20010.

Subscriptions: \$15 a year in the U.S. (\$19 first-class postage), \$19 in Canada, \$12 Third World, \$22 elsewhere. Back issues \$1 each. Also available: Mark Satin's *New Age Politics*, \$6; the Alliance's *Transformation Platform*, \$6; Renewal Inc.'s address list of over 1,000 change-oriented periodicals on self-adhesive labels, \$50.

Editor: Mark Satin

Typesetting: Amy de Boinville, 301-587-0085

Printing: Newsletter Services Inc., 202-529-5700

Legal Counsel: Gerald Goldfarb

Founding sponsors (partial list): Ernest Callenbach, Fritjof Capra, Duane Elgin, Vincent Harding, Willis Harman, Hazel Henderson, Karl Hess, John Holt, George Leonard, Jane Mansbridge, Patricia Mische, Jeremy Rifkin, James Robertson (Britain), Carl Rogers, Theodore Roszak, Robert Theobald, John Vasconcellos

## Bookends

Schnall's stern hope;  
Hamaker's stern warning

It's a shame Maxine Schnall's *Limits: A Search for New Values* (Clarkson N. Potter c/o Crown Publishers, 1 Park Ave., N.Y. 10016, \$15) had to come out at the same time as Daniel Yankelovich's heavily promoted *New Rules* (review this page). Their theses are strikingly similar, and in some ways Schnall's is the better book.

For one thing, she doesn't trash the humanistic psychologists — she cites Fromm and May in support of her conclusions. For another thing, she writes out of her own experience and those of her friends and friends' friends — who poured out their hearts to her — very much what you'd expect from the founder not of a worldwide polling firm but of Wives' Self-Help in Philadelphia.

According to Schnall, the 1930's-50's were characterized by self-denial and compliance with the demands of others; the 1960's, by self-indulgence and rejection of others; the 1970's, by self-reliance and distrust of others. The 1980's must and will be characterized by self-fulfillment and concern for others. Self-fulfillment is the "sane middle ground" between strict compliance with "traditional authoritarian norms" and today's "empty, loose, guilt-free system." The quest for self-fulfillment has already begun, and with it the quest for a "public value system that supports personal and social responsibility without smothering individual initiative under a juggernaut of rules."

There are some path-breaking formulations in this book, e.g. the concept of "lateral mobility" which just may come to substitute for the debilitating concept of upward/downward mobility. But what makes this book the perfect complement to Yankelovich's is the author's remarkable ability to ground her argument in the everyday lives of her subjects and the everyday life of our culture (the movie "10," the Pope's visit to the U.S., internal rifts within the feminist movement . . .).

Two years ago, Hazel Henderson sent a packet of papers by John D. Hamaker to dozens of independent researchers and economists along with a fascinating introductory letter which began, "This material is potentially a very big story. . . . Now, many of the papers of this 68-year-old scientist and engineer are available in the form of a book, *The Survival of Civilization* (Hamaker-Weaver Publs., Box 457, Pottersville, Mich. 48876, \$8).

Hamaker's major thesis is that a major hidden factor in the carbon dioxide build-up in the atmosphere is the progressive de-mineralization of our soil, thanks to our over-dependence on "chemical agriculture." The build-up of carbon dioxide has already begun to play havoc with our weather, says Hamaker, and it is only a matter of time (10 years?) before we'll begin to experience massive crop failures, famines, and the melting of the polar ice caps — the beginning of the end of civilization. Among the remedies suggested by Hamaker: remineralizing our crop lands, changing over to "natural agriculture," and making a massive political commitment to renewable energy sources (since fossil fuel combustion is another crucial source of carbon dioxide build-up).

In her letter, reprinted here, Henderson makes the proper political point when she says, "If Hamaker is right, then it means that not only is the transition to (a renewable-resource-based society) economical, a potential decentralizer, good technologically, etc., but it is absolutely necessary for our survival."

## Servan-Schreiber's computerized society

Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber's recent book, *The World Challenge* (Simon and Schuster, \$15), is a clarion-call for a "computerized society" — not just in France, not just in the First World, but everywhere — everywhere at once. "A computerized revolution can provide the foundation for a new world-wide prosperity. . . . Computerized society offers us the means of turning every individual into a creator. . . ."

The title of Servan-Schreiber's previous book, *The American Challenge*, referred to the management challenge posed by the biggest American corporations. That challenge is dead, says Servan-Schreiber (with obvious satisfaction); by the mid-1970's, Japan, France and Germany had reached "the same level of efficiency" as the U.S. The world challenge is much broader. On the one hand, the challenge is to the Western "way of life" and it is posed by the imminent exhaustion of raw materials, the demands of the Third World for a more just distribution of those materials, the increasing power of OPEC. At the same time, the world challenge is to industrialism itself and it is posed by "the technological revolution under way and the emerging information society." Subliminal theme of this book: the only way to contain the first challenge is to give in to the second.

The first half of *The World Challenge* deals with the Third World which is not what you'd expect from a book about "the information society"; but according to Servan-Schreiber, it would be a tragedy

if the Third World were to industrialize in the same way that the West did 50-100 years ago. "Another Marshall Plan consisting simply of financial aid would not work," he explains. "In an era of automation and computerization, old infrastructures based on heavy industry are no longer productive. Computerized infrastructures for the Third World could make it possible for whole stages of development to be bypassed."

The second half of the book deals with the First World — particularly Japan, which has made a conscious and collective (in John Connally's sense — big labor, big companies, big government) decision to create the world's first computerized society. By contrast, the U.S. appears positively backward: "The Americans now fear change, and they are bewildered. Everyone is waiting, while continuing to act as they did in the past. There is no (more) enthusiasm for undertaking new things. . . ."

The problem with this book lies not in its critique of industrial society but in its failure to examine equally critically the kind of society that electronics, computers, etc. would put in its place. Would it really be more fulfilling for us to do more of our work in offices and at computer terminals? Will we really need all those goods that those robots will be producing for us (and they certainly will be producing a lot of goods if we simultaneously opt for full employment as Servan-Schreiber suggests). Where will the energy come from to fuel this society?

## Yankelovich's "ethic of commitment"

Daniel Yankelovich's *New Rules* (Random House, \$16) is the only Transformational Book Award nominee to make the *New York Times*'s "Notable Books of the Year" list; all the same, it's received a remarkably bad press. To socialist Christopher Lasch, it "obscures the political dimension of recent changes"; to libertarian David Brudnoy, it's "painfully obvious"; to Aquarian conspirator Marilyn Ferguson, it's the handiwork of "another critic of the inner journey."

According to Yankelovich, the "struggle for self-fulfillment" in the U.S. today is the "leading edge of a genuine cultural revolution" and it is rife with dangers and opportunities. The main danger is that many of us will continue to think of self-fulfillment as merely the opposite of self-denial.

Drawing partly on hundreds of face to face interviews and partly on 30 years of opinion polling (e.g., for *Time* Magazine), Yankelovich says the American public can be usefully divided into three groups: those "who are self-consciously building their lives around norms that make a moral virtue of self-expression" (17%); those who "retain many traditional values, including a moderate commitment to the old self-denial rules, even as they struggle to achieve some measure of greater freedom, choice and flexibility in their lives" (63%); and those who cling loyally and/or fearfully to the old rules of self-denial, self-sacrifice, etc. in exchange for money and status (20%).

Yankelovich's point is that the first two groups are new — very new — on the American scene, at least in such large numbers, and are pointing the way to a vastly different future. He offers dozens of statistics to prove his point; e.g., in 1967, 85% of Americans "considered premarital sex as morally wrong"; in 1979, 37%. More persuasive, for me, are his interpretations of interviews with largely middle class Americans who had simply

begun — almost despite themselves — to resist the old "giving/getting compact" and stumble about for something "more."

In fact, Yankelovich does not ignore politics; he simply does not agree with Lasch's politics. He devotes some of his most interesting chapters to tracing the economic roots of our psychocultural changes. Nor does Yankelovich turn out to be a critic of the "inner journey," though in his Chapter 23 there is an amazingly wrong-headed assessment of the allegedly elitist and anti-social theories of the humanistic psychologists, Maslow, Rogers, May et. al., all of whom would probably agree with the rest of Yankelovich's book. It doesn't take a once-published and once-burned author to suspect that Yankelovich included this chapter just to keep from being dismissed by the reviewers as a true believer. His argument is not with those who are trying to change the old rules, but with those who are refusing to put anything in their place; those whose ethics consists simply of "anything-goes-so-long-as-it-doesn't-hurt-anybody-else." His argument is with those who believe that all of our "needs," every one of them, can and *should* be satisfied simultaneously — when most of our "needs" are really only desires and many of them are contradictory!

So what "new rules" does Yankelovich propose? If self-denial is the thesis, and duty-to-self the antithesis, then the synthesis is what Yankelovich calls an "ethics of commitment." In fact, he says, such an ethic is already emerging — thanks in part to the life experiments of the "heroic" 17%. "The word 'commitment' shifts the axis away from the self (either self-denial or self-fulfillment) toward connectedness with the world. The commitment may be to people, institutions, objects, beliefs, ideas, places, nature, projects, experiences, adventures, callings. . . ."

## "Second stage" men's groups redefining men; politics affected

A new kind of interest in men — in what we're about, in "male energy" — has begun to surface here and there across the U.S.

On the west coast, Keith Thompson, a California writer, has brought together "not a group really — just a very informal bunch of men" known as the Drunk Monks. Much of their inspiration comes from the poet and mythologist, Robert Bly.

On the east coast, Joseph Jastraub, teacher in the Department of Innovative Studies at the State University of New York-New Paltz, has co-founded a group called Friends of the Mountain. Much of their inspiration comes from immersion in the culture of the Native Americans.

### "Drunk Monks"

"Most of us were almost the stereotyped 'soft' kind of men Bly talks about," Thompson told RENEWAL in an exclusive interview (he does not want to serve as a spokesperson for the men's movement and neither he nor his group is prepared to handle inquiries). "We'd always found meaning through our relationships with women, often older women, and we'd been involved with feminism to a large extent. We're into poetry, meditation — making contact with our feminine side had been one of the purposes for our being in the world for the last 10 years." But according to Thompson, after a while, that no longer felt like enough (for these men); it no longer felt quite right. He quotes from a recent telephone interview he did with Bly: "(Soft men) are not interested in healing the earth, or starting wars, or working for (profit-oriented companies). . . . But something's wrong. Many of these men are unhappy. There's not much energy in them. They are life-preserving, but not exactly life-giving. . . . It seems as if many of these soft young men have come to equate their own natural male energy with being macho. . . ."

Thompson and his friends more or less consciously set out to become what Thompson calls a "stage two" men's group — a group that would be "more than reactive or even responsive to the feminist movement as it's been defined" — a group that would try to discover and define what "natural male energy" might be. To that end, they started going out into the wilderness "for three, four, five days or a week; and (pretty quickly) we'd get down to what was happening with the women in our lives, with older men, with our fathers, with our teachers; and we'd spend a lot of time enjoying the wilderness. We found we were bonding on very deep levels. The whole thing had a religious quality to it — that's why they called us 'monks' — and we might have been soft when we went out there, but we always came back rowdy — I don't know why — and that's why they called us 'drunk.'"

What kinds of learnings took place out there? "I want to be strong and assertive!"

Thompson says. "It's OK to be a male — so many of us had feelings of shame, so many of us were not even sure if we wanted to be an adult male, (let alone a) responsible, disciplined adult male. (In the 1970's) we were going to be totally free, open, and accepting, but now I think that more is required: discipline, for one thing, but discipline from an inner sense or source."

But what inner source? Here's Bly: "(It's) a very hard thing for us to conceive the possibility that the deep nourishing and spiritually radiant energy in the male lies not in the feminine side, but in the deep masculine. Not the shallow masculine, the macho masculine, but the deep masculine...."

### Friends of the Mountain

A fascinating complementary perspective is being developed by Joseph Jastraub, who's been facilitating a "men's circle" at Friends of the Mountain since late last year and who'll be organizing a "men's quest" — eight days in the wilderness — this July 10-16. "It's time for men to shift their emphasis from relating to goddesses to relating to gods and see what they have to offer," Jastraub told RENEWAL.

"In the men's circle, we're exploring some of the ways men have got together in the past. We do sweat lodges; we gather around a big drum, and do drumming — and pipe ceremonies. . . . We try to get into the quality of experience of men from those times. . . . Nobody knows exactly what we're learning but it's very, very strong, (and we're convinced now) it's a different energy that comes through a man's heart (than a woman's)...."

A recent issue of *Many Smokes: Metis Earth Awareness Magazine* contains an article by Jastraub, "The World Needs a Man's Heart," and a number of other articles that provide a theoretical backdrop for Jastraub's group work. Cloud Anderson, for example, a Reichian therapist, writes that the "sensitive artist" type of man is no better than the

"macho man"; if the latter has "lost the ability to express needed emotions," the former "cannot express powerful emotions like anger or strong sexual feelings because they terrify him."

### Political Implications

What are the political implications of this new way of looking at men? Many of the political "innovations" dating from the 1960's and 70's and epitomized in groups like the New World Alliance — the abhorrence of structure, the celebration of consensus, the aversion to strong leadership and any kind of discipline — may come to be seen less as reflections of the transformational "ideal" and more as reflections of a stage many feminist/radical men were going through at that time. "Boys acting out," is how one friend of mine uncharitably puts it.

In the future, some kind of synthesis between the insights of the 1960's and 70's and the taken-for-granted practices of the 1940's and 50's will almost surely take place, with women this time as full partners in the process. In fact, that synthesis is already occurring. Celebration of consensus is giving way to a situation-dependent mix of consensual and parliamentary forms (see Jane Mansbridge, *Beyond Adversary Democracy*, reviewed in #8). Anarchic and purely person-to-person strategies for getting us from here to there are beginning to give way to consideration of strategies involving traditional organizational forms, publicly recognized leadership, etc., as well as work in small groups, plenty of honest and supportive interaction, etc. (see Ernest Callenbach, *Ecotopia Emerging*, reviewed in #15).

For more information: Thompson-Bly interview, *New Age*, May 1982 (244 Brighton Ave., Allston, Mass. 02134, \$2); Joseph Jastraub, c/o Friends of the Mountain, 68 Mountain Rest Rd., New Paltz, N.Y. 12561; male energy issue, *Many Smokes*, Spring 1982 (Box 9167, Spokane, Wash. 99209, \$2).

## Renewal

*New Values, New Politics*

Renewal Inc.

1629 Columbia Rd. N.W., Ste. 628  
Washington, D.C. 20009

Issue No. 24

NON-PROFIT ORG.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
PERMIT NO. 213  
YORK, PA