

INDIVIDUATING THE POSTMODERN IMAGINATION

By

Kenneth L. Wilson
Department of Sociology
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Birmingham, AL 35294
USA
1-205-934-8408
knwilson@uab.edu

August, 2008

Number of Words: 7,500
Running Head: Postmodern Individuation

Abstract

This paper attempts to respond to Ben-Aharon's call, in his Colmar lecture, for development of *individuation* in knowledge by examining the case of the American scientist. Ben-Aharon attempts to go beyond the psychodynamic individuation of Carl Jung, Erik Erickson, and humanistic psychology in general. The latter failed to bring individuation to the whole life of the scientist, who therefore split his being into an intellectual pursuing un-individuated universal knowledge on the one hand and a human being attempting to fulfill his individual meaning in social life on the other. Individuation for the social self then becomes a process of developing one's own creativity through increasingly free expression of that which makes us unique, but the intellectual self is left without help as the development of universal knowledge is thought to be inimical to creative individuation. Ben-Aharon attempts to bring creative wholeness to the scientist by showing how a combination of French postmodernism and Rudolf Steiner's anthroposophy promotes creative individuation even in science. For the analysis of scientific individuation I offer a method which interweaves all three sectors of society: scientific-cultural, legal-political, and economic. Scientific individuation is therefore related to larger cultural individuation processes where the key for successful individuation is found or obscured by one's culture. In terms of the three sectors, Americans' individuation is grounded in economic creativity, in entrepreneurship, which, I argue, serves as a potentially renewing source of individuation for the other two sectors, the legal-political and the scientific cultural. Thus the cultural capacity for American scientific individuation is influenced by whether or not American entrepreneurship as a mode of being is continually streaming to the other two sectors. I show instead that authoritarian corporate forms have come to dominate American economy and in large part because of this, authoritarian forms

have also come to dominate the rest of society. It is these forces that must be confronted before Ben-Aharon's knowledge individuation can reach the American scientist.

INDIVIDUATING THE POSTMODERN IMAGINATION

Nothing stands still for us.
This is the state which is ours by nature,
yet to which we least incline: we burn to find solid ground,
a final steady base on which to build a tower that rises to Infinity;
but the whole foundation cracks beneath us
and the earth splits open down to the abyss.
Blaise Pascal

End not in cosmic distances
through dreaming play of thought—
begin in widths of spirit,
end in the depths of thy own soul.
Rudolf Steiner

TWO CHALLENGES

This Norway conference on postmodernism and the anthroposophy of Rudolf Steiner is, I believe, part of an important world trend. I became aware of this trend in 2002 when I participated in an international conference in Athens on the future of art in a world increasingly dominated by science (Wilson and Lowndes 2004). And then I noticed many other international conferences, on linguistics and editing, on cognition and neuroscience, and so on. Invariably, these conferences were not just international meetings between specialists who were merely adding an international interest to their predominantly nationally focused societies. Typically, they focused on a general problem or topic that was current, worldwide in scope, and of interest to researchers, writers, or analysts from a broad array of perspectives. What is this trend? I believe that it is part of a natural evolution toward integrating world cultures.

One of this integrating trend's hallmarks is its respectfulness for home cultures. For example, the web site¹ for a medical conference this August, 2008 in India says, "This conference is the first ever big International meeting exclusively dedicated to the holistic approach in medicine. The conference will be extremely useful in the sense that it will be attended by hundreds of doctors and researchers from Modern Medicine (Allopathy), Ayurveda,

¹ <http://www.ayurvedaklinik.com/ichm/>

Homeopathy, Naturopathy, Reiki and Traditional Practitioners of Yoga, Acupuncture, Siddha, Unani, Chinese Medicine etc. We also invite the modern and traditional practitioners of medicine of all the countries. The goal of the conference emphasizes interdisciplinary research and holistic approach to medical sciences.” Because of its character of respectfulness, this trend should be distinguished from the world-economic trend known as globalization. I will use instead the term *global integration*.

The Norway conference attempts to further global integration by taking as its topic the integration of two bodies of work which are each already integrative in their own right, French postmodernism stimulated by a desire to overcome the catastrophic clashes of cultures in the world wars of the first half of the twentieth century and Steiner’s anthroposophy stimulated by a world-watch for the ending of Kali-Yuga, known across cultures as the dark age of descent into materialism and cultural isolation, that reached its conclusion at the end of the nineteenth century (even though its momentum carries on).

In addition to these two bodies of work from the twentieth century, an impulse for new cultural developments of the twenty-first century is represented by honored guest and participant in the conference, philosopher Ben-Aharon, known as an activist for integration, participating in the dramatic civil society-political-economic re-awakening in the Philippines, facilitating a combined Jewish-Muslim initiative for peaceful integration in the Middle East, and stimulating path-breaking initiatives in France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Canada, and the United States. It was Ben-Aharon’s 2007 lecture in Colmar, France, that stimulated the organization of the Norway conference. In Colmar, Ben-Aharon presented a cultural-philosophical history of twentieth century Europe, focusing on Germany and France, arguing on the one hand that the postmodernism of the French steered German, Heideggerian thought in a fruitful direction, and,

on the other hand, that Steiner's anthroposophy should be seen in turn as French postmodernism's continuation, especially from the point of view of the unique concept of individuation that arises from anthroposophy.

I explore Ben-Aharon's new concept of individuation in both its social-cultural and individual contexts. If we read Ben-Aharon's lecture as a call for awakening to individuation in culture, then we pay special attention to how he identifies the ways in which culture, contrary to its normally communal (anti-individual) nature, can serve as a force to facilitate individuation. Then we might say: when German identity, naturally rooted in such figures as Goethe and Schiller, floundered in Heidegger's philosophy, the new culture of French postmodernism attempted to rescue central Europe by providing a countervailing impulse. There are limitations to this reading, we wouldn't discuss postmodernism in general, for example, but there are also advantages—we could discuss postmodernism as *French* postmodernism utilizing Deleuze and Guattari's notions of conceptual personae and geophilosophy. We might then say: Ben-Aharon's analysis shows how French postmodernism was a cultural impulse toward "restoration of fluxuating *différance*," one that would not only protect cultural initiatives unique to the French in general, but also to French subcultures such as the French Jew (see especially Levinas' later work). Therefore this "restoration of *différance*" impulse also had the capacity to protect and restore other native cultural impulses, including Germany's own unique cultural development, which had been surrendered to Nazi authoritarianism.

So what Ben-Aharon finds in postmodernism, with this reading, is a kind of "cultural antidote" to unhealthy, authoritarian cultural trends that otherwise invade cultures. Such authoritarian plagues can kill culture by creating forces inimical to *différance*, and without the latter, unique culture cannot live. Therefore, at the cultural level of individuation, I would

wonder how my own American culture fared in the twentieth century and would want to ask conference participants from Norway and other cultural representatives how they thought their cultures also fared. With Ben-Aharon's characterization of the twentieth century relationship between Germany and France as an archetypal example, could other cultures benefit from a dosing regimen in postmodernism, and what kind of dosing regimen would be appropriate for each respective culture?

Increasing awareness of one's own cultural *différance* is not easy in the same way that Derrida's use of *différance* in language analysis is not easy. In identifying word differences according to a range of adjacent words, rather than as a specific signifier for a signified, *différance* arises out of the continuously fluxuating interrelationships between the word in question and its adjacent words. Applied at the cultural level, *différance* makes us aware that what is really our unique culture can only exist in flux with its adjacent cultures and therefore owes its existence to authentic *différance* in those cultures as well. In his Colmar lecture, Ben-Aharon shows some of the fluxuating interrelationships between German and French cultures, which embed them together as well as distinguish each. Therefore, restorative work for our own cultures can benefit from sharing of similar investigations for other cultures out of which our own *différance* comes into view.

Attention to the Colmar lecture's individuation at the individual level arises from the anthroposophical question. Ben-Aharon pointed out that the vantage point of Steiner's anthroposophy allows us to see that French postmodernism is not capable on its own of finishing its project, of actually providing a complete antidote to *différance* annihilating cultural plagues. While postmodernism introduces, especially in the work of Deleuze, a style of thinking that provides a necessary and potent tool to deconstruct authority and re-territorialize thinking on a

culture's unique and fluxuating ground, it was really Deleuze, Levinas, Derrida, etc., *using* this thinking that gave it its antidote making power. By itself, this new style of thinking can only be de-individuating (see the Colmar lecture). Therefore, whenever postmodernism is working potently as authoritarian antidote, there is always an unseen, health-giving factor in the individuality of the postmodernist. Not just the antidote, but the physician giving it is the necessary factor.

We find this factor through anthroposophy, which Steiner always said meant: wisdom of what it means to be a human being. For French postmodernism to be effective, the true individuating force must be carried past the de-individuating aspect in postmodern thinking to the individual thinker. The thinker who merely thinks can never achieve individuation vis-à-vis thinking's universalizing power. Therefore a second question from the Colmar lecture is not only for participants to ask how postmodernism might be restorative for their own cultures, but how this restorative might be better sustained through anthroposophy's move to carry individuation even into thought. I will spend the rest of my time attempting to articulate more of this unique meaning of individuation with respect to my own, American culture and my own life in academic science. For this discussion I will draw heavily from Ben-Aharon's book, *America's Global Responsibility*, which provides a diagnosis of America's ills, documents America's fall out of its own culture, and uses a blended postmodern anthroposophy to suggest a healing regimen whereby Americans can restore their healthy sense of *différance* among the world's cultures.

THE AMERICAN CASE

Just as individuation at the cultural level must confront political authoritarianism, individuation at the individual level must confront thought-authority, the belief that a life of knowledge contradicts a life of free individuality. In fact, Ben-Aharon suggested that this

thought-authority, found especially in academic approaches to jurisprudence and science, is a carry-over from old European intellectualism and stands as one of the most significant threats to American individuation. Individuation in American culture, therefore, confronts a kind of barrier at the border of legal and scientific thought.

This was illustrated for me recently in a conversation I had with a 28-year-old woman, Sarah, about to get her PhD in marine biology. She was greatly disturbed by a conflict she was having with her mentor, Margaret, an internationally known and respected marine biologist who was both well published and well connected with the National Science Foundation, having a continuous stream of grant funding. It was also clear from Sarah's conversation that Sarah was not only Margaret's prized student, but also the prized student in her department.

The conflict was brought on by a period of self-questioning and changes that Sarah had been going through for the past year or more. She had begun to doubt whether or not the established route to academic and scientific success was really what she wanted. Put differently, she *did* think she wanted an academic life, she felt confident in her ability to succeed in such a life, but nevertheless something in her kept rebelling, and rebelling more and more insistently as she got closer to her goal. She was coming to see that there was a side of her that was not happy with her academic goal and, she feared, perhaps would never be happy with it.

While Sarah had been careful not to discuss this with Margaret, their conflict erupted when Margaret had initiated an entirely appropriate (from the academic perspective) mentoring conversation about Sarah's future. In the midst of Margaret's outline of her suggested plan for Sarah, involving the seeking of a post-doctorate position, applying to NSF for independent funding support, continuing to get publications out, and finally landing a tenure track position in a well respected research university with the possibility of having her own research lab, Sarah

said, “Well, I know that’s what you are *supposed* to do, but I’ve been thinking lately that I never took time for myself, to travel, to see things from a different perspective, to really have a chance to think things over. I’m thinking that I might want to take a year off first before I jump into the ‘responsible’ life.” Margaret, rather surprised and taken aback, responded with, “Well, if you’re more interested in your social life than continuing your research, maybe this life (meaning, the track to success that she had so responsibly outlined) is not for you.” Sarah’s main feelings after the conversation were a sense of betrayal, that she had opened herself to her mentor with a combination of fear and hope, but that instead of supporting her with her inner struggle, Margaret had embarrassed her deeply, implying that a *dedicated* scientist would never have such notions.

Soon after that conversation she met three graduate students from Seattle (Sarah lived in Santa Barbara) at a party who were taking the summer to bike from Seattle to San Diego and who were announcing to any who would listen that they were seeking converts to join in on their crusade for free meandering. They were appealing to a fundamental aspect of the American soul expressed archetypically in Walt Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass*². Sarah was an avid biker and in good shape for long-distance biking so on an impulse she agreed to join them and left the next morning on what would turn out to be one of the best decisions of her life. Day followed day where the little group of four, each with different personalities and different strengths for the road, freely combined their insights to decide each morning where they would head next, and to begin an interweaving of changes in bike-order positioning and discussions ranging from new ideas in quantum physics to radical perspectives of mind, and from revolutionary notions in

² “Afoot and light-hearted I take to the open road,

Healthy, free, the world before me,

The long brown path before me, leading wherever I choose”

political economy to meaning in life. Her conversation with me took place after her return, after her re-integration into her research routine, but now with a new conviction that the side of her that had been rebelling must be heard. Her candid caveat was she had no idea how to listen to this voice, and, even more importantly, how to proceed into the great unplanned, unknown represented by this voice.

Sarah's problem is also my own, but I've come to believe that our shared problem is symptomatic of the American case in general. And so, a discovery of the means for Sarah to have her cake and eat it too, to pursue her love of marine biology with all the practical day-in and day-out activities that that entails, yet also, like her experience on the open road, freely and creatively, would have restorative implications for American character in business and government as well. It should help provide insight into the means to throw off constraining authoritarian voices and to live even the practical aspects of a scientific life creatively. Americans are a practical people and they would rather, if they could, have their ideals *in* their practical lives.

But we cannot begin this investigation in the scientific sphere if we want to understand American character. It was not science that provided the soil for American character but its revolutionary political economy. As Ben-Aharon observed:

A closer look at the work in progress that is the United States shows that its success originates in the ability not only to discover hidden laws and forces of nature, but above all to marshal and implement them in a well-concerted and integrated, socially productive process. At their best, Americans are capable of mustering and fusing together human intelligence, daring, intuitive imagination, courageous initiative, large sums of capital, and social and political will to achieve real advances in material culture. They can

integrate large and manifold social factors, without reducing their mutually enriching diversity into abstract and impoverished unity. These factors are molded into a unified power with a dynamic resolution to carry impulses into action that characterize this nation of otherwise staunch individualists. It is this creative tension between individualism and collective social will, the continuous pulling together and falling apart of the individual and the forces of social coherence, that generates a uniquely powerful momentum and energy that can be projected far and wide.

Therefore, insight into the American aspect of Sarah's problem must begin with political economy. Starting with economy, I trace themes of America's original character and its contrasting authoritarian, shadow character through the political-legal sector and into the scientific-cultural sphere. I hope to show that the solution to Sarah's problem is found in the recovery of original American character in all three sectors. This analysis can only be a beginning, so I only attempt sketches here of the difference between this approach and the standard view of the three sectors.

America's Economic Character: Hierarchy vs. Entrepreneurship

An important characteristic of both postmodernism and anthroposophy is to see all three sectors—economy, polity, and culture—not as social structures but as *ways of knowing* (epistemology) out of which the essential features of each sector take their form. Postmodernism, for example, sees the great conflagration of the twentieth century as natural outcome of divisive modern epistemology, one that is distancing and hierarchical, tending toward the domineering meta-narrative, and seeks instead for integrative epistemologies. Foucault saw the problem as a failure to appreciate epistemological diversity arising from an over-narrowing of the modern

episteme in his *Order of Things*. Derrida, beginning in *Of Grammatology*, characterized this over-narrowing as calcification of knowledge into fixed, dead concepts that need deconstruction, not of knowledge, but to clear the way for a revived knowledge that can cut through institutional and cultural fortifications of self-interest. And then Deleuze, who both Ben-Aharon and Foucault cite as the culmination of the best in postmodernism, proposed a comprehensive new epistemology and philosophy in *What is Philosophy?*, written with his long-time collaborator, French psychoanalyst Félix Guattari, that performs the remarkable task of providing a new world-view, of re-casting the world, actually, so thoroughly that we almost have a turn-key world, framed and furnished with a new kind of continuously-moving framing and furniture, ready for global integration habitation. We just have to get past the disorienting nature of mobile-place and step in.

Anthroposophy, on the other hand, sees the problems of our times as symptoms of the historical development of human consciousness through millennia-long ages culminating in the most recent age that brings the world trend toward differentiation to its current height in the differentiation in ways of knowing across cultures. World conflict, then, is not so much a product of differentiation into nation-states, but both are rather symptoms of cultural, epistemological differentiation. But the potential for a new age that began with the twentieth century could only be potential because of an important characteristic of the new age. While the previous ages proceeded with the inevitability of an external, natural law, the new age was of an entirely new kind, leaving a lawful-evolutionary vacuum that could only be filled with human goals. Steiner saw that there were both hopeful and grave implications of this new vacuum.

“If he is to go beyond merely satisfying his natural instincts, for which Mother Nature has provided, then he must seek these grounds in his own moral imagination, unless he finds

it more convenient to let himself be determined by the moral imaginations of others; in other words, either he must give up action altogether, or else he must act for reasons that he gives himself out of his world of ideas *or that others select for him out of theirs.*”

(Steiner, *Philosophy of Freehood*, emphasis mine)

Either the various cultures would recognize the work of the new age as the concerted work of all world cultures and begin a joyful re-uniting of the various epistemological discoveries as fruit for integration from the long period of differentiation, or differentiation would continue but now with weapons of conflict so potent that they could threaten the very continuation of the project called “earth.” Then began one of the most remarkable scientific-philosophical-artistic achievements in human history, Steiner single-handedly undertook the task of filling the vacuum, of beginning the vast and complex cultural work necessary for world cultural reintegration grounded on an entirely new epistemology (see especially his *Truth and Knowledge, Theory of Knowledge Implicit in Goethe and Schiller, Philosophy of Freehood*, and *Riddles of the Soul*), one that both honored existing cultural epistemological homes and provided the means for building pathways connecting all of the epistemological homes.

This new epistemology was rather a new *way* of epistemology (or *way* of ways of knowing) that allows one to see the worlds’ cultural differentiation as a collection of starting points, all equally valid but that these static starting points were only a beginning which now should collectively be brought into motion. So it is respectful in validating each starting point, yet developmental in also asking for something more. From this *way* of epistemology, cultures can no longer criticize each other in regard to the nature of their starting points, but cultures can and should ask of themselves and other cultures whether they have been faithful to their own cultural seeds and performed their good gardening tasks of seeing to it that their seeds were

watered, nurtured and grown beyond their seed state.

In this sense, one might say that American character found its original footing in its *approach* to business rather than in business (or the economy) per se. American business activity took its most positive initial style from its roots in the English liberalism of John Locke rather than the Scottish moral and economic philosophy of Adam Smith. It was Locke who served Thomas Jefferson as main source of inspiration during his composition of the *Declaration of Independence*. The first third of Locke's *Second Treatise* focused on how creative spirit or entrepreneurship is what raises humans out of a state of nature and therefore one of the functions of government should be to protect this entrepreneurship.

But even in this original form, the shadow side of creative spirit threatened to become the main focus of business. Locke's fifth chapter confused the accumulation of property with this virtue and instead of charging government with protecting the virtue of entrepreneurship, he charged it with protecting *property* and then later conflates the issue further by representing money as the vehicle for accumulating property, which in its direct form as grain, for example, would have to be consumed or rot when hoarded. The motive for entrepreneurship in the creative spirit, then, becomes lost and replaced instead with accumulating property. It is with a similar shift of emphasis that Adam Smith argued, in the *Wealth of Nations*, for freeing individuals for the pursuit of self-interest, mitigated by the invisible hand of free market competition and supported to the extent necessary with governmental restraints. Thus from the beginning, American character struggled with the tension between its shadow, self-interested accumulation of property, and its real virtue, creative entrepreneurship, without ever consciously confronting the healthy integration of the two. Because of this, their opposite styles of conducting business were never seen clearly and the shadow style of exploitative, hierarchical, managed business was

taken as a necessary component to business rather than a supportive, non-hierarchical, spontaneously developed work that could have been the main style of entrepreneurial business.

Because of the lack of recognition of this misstep and its institution as a (reluctant) practical necessity for business, the image now reigns that participants in this sector must abandon business altogether if they want to pursue individuation instead of self-interest. In Woody Allen's *Vicky Cristina Barcelona*, for example, Vicky, engaged to an up-and-coming New York businessman, holidays in Barcelona, staying with an older, established power in international business, Mark and his wife. The theme of the movie is presented in the image of this couple presented to the audience early in the movie. Mark's domineering power to take command is strikingly evident at breakfast but is in sharp contrast with the beauty of the open patio that overlooks Barcelona. But the contrast is most poignant in his relationship with his wife who, we learn later, is a free spirit who once sought individuation but gave it up out of fear and stayed in her marriage. Individuation processes are represented in a local, successful artist and his ex-wife, also an artist, whose stormy, even violent, relationship is famous throughout Spain. The movie's motivating question: will Vicky choose the un-individuated life of power and wealth centered in business, like Mark and his wife, or will she pursue an artist's life of her own with the artist and also accept its inherently stormy, even pathological, elements?

As felt by many who want individuation, going into (or marrying) business means that you have to sell your soul. With the loss of understanding of American character (that it can be joyfully fulfilled in creative practical pursuits), people who are genuinely interested in business are left directionless.

The negative consequences of American's lack of awareness of its own positive business character became magnified at the beginning of the twentieth century when Alfred P. Sloan,

President and Chairman of the Board of GM, transformed the marketing and organization of America's auto industry. Then, as others of the largest corporations in America followed suit, including also the big steel companies, General Foods, and DuPont, a long dark period of corporate hegemony, called by John Kenneth Galbraith the *new industrial state*, ensued in which market forces were gradually drawn under the control of the corporation through predatory practices of consumer manipulation in marketing (based on the use of product differentiation and planned obsolescence connected with advertising as the fundamental basis of consumer identity), and vertical and horizontal organization to control sources of supply and consumer outlets. This unprecedented era of power was extended internationally through the post WWII Bretton Woods agreement where the US dollar enjoyed the fantastic privilege of becoming the reserve currency for the convertibility of the world's currencies. Ben-Aharon follows this side of American business development on into the era of globalization, which then became an extension of these hegemonic practices.

But even during this dark period, bright-points of America's true business-based insightfulness can be found. Jeffrey Kaplan³ describes how Kellogg was inspired to shorten the workday:

From the earliest days of the Age of Consumerism there were critics. One of the most influential was Arthur Dahlberg, known to policymakers and elected officials in Washington. Dahlberg declared that "failure to shorten the length of the working day ... is the primary cause of our rationing of opportunity, our excess industrial plant, our enormous wastes of competition, our high pressure advertising, [and] our economic imperialism." Since much of what industry produced was no longer aimed at satisfying

³ "The Gospel of Consumption and the Better Future We Left Behind," *Orion*, May/June, 2008: 38-47.

the human physical needs, a four-hour workday, he claimed, was necessary to prevent society from becoming disastrously materialistic. “By not shortening the working day when all the wood is in,” he suggested, the profit motive becomes “both the creator and satisfier of spiritual needs.” For when the profit motive can turn nowhere else, “it wraps our soap in pretty boxes and tries to convince us that that is solace to our souls.”

The new workweek was billed to employees as “mental income”, and in fact, one reporter found that employees had non-material gains from their increased leisure time, doing “a lot of gardening and community beautification, athletics and hobbies ... libraries well patronized and the mental background of these fortunate workers ... becoming richer.”⁴ But when Senator Hugo Black introduced legislation in 1933 for a mandatory thirty-hour workweek, the industrial elite mobilized a major campaign against the idea and eventually succeeded in establishing their idea for accelerating consumption not only through blocking legislation, but also through their own-authored pamphlets, forced as required reading in the public schools.

The creative side of American business-character found strength for a significant re-emergence in the last third of the century. Fueled in part by new competition from Japan, some of the control of the new industrial state was freed up at the same time that a new, confident and assertive demographic cohort, fresh from anti-establishment protests of the sixties, began entering managerial positions in industry (see Naisbitt’s *Megatrends*). This cohort, attuned to the negative consequences of the shadow side of business, searched for a more human-centered way to do business. Tom Peters made this urge famous with his books, lectures, and high-level consulting workshops on *Passion for Excellence*. This movement in business was also connected to the human potential movement and its confirmation of individuation could be seen in the individual qualities of love for one’s work and self development that were regularly

⁴ Quoted by Kaplan, p. 42.

stressed as motivation for work rather than accumulation of property.

It is here that restorative cultural work can be done. America's sense for the virtue of its natural cultural heritage, the life of free creativity, must be found first here if it is to avoid the conclusion that it can only be found by leaving the mainstream of American practical life (as in *Vicky Cristina Barcelona*). American culture, if it can find itself, has the capacity to show other cultures that material production can be a kind of artistry that celebrates the human being through work that is life enhancing, and through a practicality that is consistent with the highest spiritual achievement. For American culture, if this new epistemology for the economy cannot be found, not only will those in the economy suffer from meaningless work and long work-hours, but this mentality will continue to overrun the other two sectors, the political-legal and the cultural-scientific, as well.

The Governmental-Legal Sector's Capitulation to Precedent

Marx and Engels already famously argued that the economic sector would overrun the government-legal sector in *Capital*. But their argument applied primarily to the time before Sloan and his transformation of big business. The nature and extent of the corporation's power over the government sector in the twentieth century required an entirely new analysis because the pivot on which the Marxian critique turned, the opposition between managers and workers was mostly co-opted by the new corporate organization and so the influence that corporations were able to exert over the government took on new forms. Galbraith supplied a good understanding of this new era of relationship between corporation and government, but more radical observers like James O'Conner (*Fiscal Crisis of the State*), Claus Offe (see *Contradictions of the Welfare State* and *Disorganized Capitalism* both with John Keane), David Held, Anthony Giddens, and

Barry Bluestone together gave a startling picture of the new corporate power. These works laid the blame for the problem primarily on the nature of capitalism rather than on a derailment of a valuable cultural heritage as is the focus here, but they nevertheless accurately show the extent to which corporate authoritarianism was able to dominate legal-political processes once it gained such a strong foothold in the economy.

Legal-political processes became, as consequence, characterized by a similar polarity to the entrepreneurial versus authoritarian polarity found in business. The authoritarian side of the polarity can be found in the tendency toward *precedent* in legal thinking, and on the free-creative side of the polarity can be seen in the analysis of Hernando de Soto (*The Mystery of Capital*), director of Peru's Institute for Liberty and Democracy, of the legal basis of America's successful entrepreneurship. De Soto argued that the exportation of the U.S.'s business and property law to poor countries has not helped because the best part of U.S. law did not arise in this fashion. Such law could not be sensitive to the unique contexts, customs, interests, and ways of conducting business in the local situations in which they must operate. Instead, his research into the local laws in Texas, Iowa, and California, for example, found that in most cases these laws were hotly contested and negotiated in each context and that the most fruitful laws often differed across context. Therefore a legal epistemology of precedent, the form of law-making that Ben-Aharon points out has gained ascendancy during the twentieth century, can be said to be the shadow of a living law that evolves from an epistemology of creative change, ever moving and adjusting to the needs of the local population in which it serves.

Restorative work in the legal system, then, would attempt to affirm creative epistemology as the means for the development and change of laws that is most consistent with American character. Such an epistemology for the legal system would also harmonize with the creative

entrepreneurship in the business sector. Perhaps the main impediment to the endorsement of such a legal epistemology is the deeply entrenched belief that just like one cannot be creative with morals without invoking the criticism of opportunism, one also should evolve laws that are invariant, good for all times and places. Law from this perspective is thought to be a knowledge of principle, and knowledge is only valid that can claim universality. It is to this same assumption that we turn when we examine the scientific-cultural sector.

The Scientific-Cultural Sector's Thought-Authoritarianism

Finally, just as both the economic and political-legal sectors of American society can be seen as sites of the main epistemological battle of the twentieth century, between epistemologies of authority and hierarchy on the one hand and epistemologies of creative inspiration and change on the other, so also can the third sector, the scientific-cultural, be seen in this fashion. But while I have characterized the American character as sourced in political economy, its strongest obstacle is found in the scientific-cultural sector. Entrenched prejudices against free creative individuation are found here. As the basis for this part of my investigation, I want to use the case of integrative medicine.

Initiatives for *integrative medicine* are now underway at many of America's leading universities and are accelerating in the new institutional environment of toleration fostered by the establishment of a Congress mandated fund for alternative medicine within NIH (1991), the provision for an institutional location within NIH in the new Office of Alternative Medicine (OAM, 1992), the publication of World Health Organization recognition of OAM (1996), and the establishment of the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine (NCCAM, 1999) as the 25th independent component of NIH. What was the basis of all this activity? *It was*

the political ethos of cultural pluralism, with its recognition and protection of inherent cultural differences in philosophy, values, and ways of living, including cultural approaches to health that produced NCCAM. But while the current political climate supports NCCAM, a closer look reveals that the latter's future in the long-term is by no means assured. A political and scientific self-contradiction threatens cultural integration in medicine. This self-contradiction arises from the problem of epistemology: can a scientific epistemology that originates in one culture be held to be the gold standard for all cultures (the position of Western medicine) without violating the political ideal of cultural pluralism? The epistemological question exposes the real problem. How can a political philosophy succeed that contradicts the essentially authoritarian scientific ethos of Western society?

American multi-cultural political philosophy evolved from experiences with virtually every possible form of inter-cultural contact, from genocide (of Native Americans) and slavery (of African Americans) to internal colonization (by European Americans) of captive labor (of Chinese and Latin Americans) and uneasy separatism (with the Amish and Mormons, and to some extent the Jewish, Japanese and Cuban Americans). But an overriding constitutional political ethos of democratic neutrality gradually worked its way, over a century of struggle, to the position of cultural pluralism. Cultural pluralism was advanced as the political ethos most consistent with US political philosophy in early twentieth century thought by Horace Meyer Kallen (1882-1974) and Randolph Silliman Bourne (1886-1918). They pitted pluralism against classical liberalism because of the latter's perceived over-commitment to uniformity. Citing the case of the Native American experience, they showed how the laudable liberal ideal of a national melting pot, a blending of all cultures into one, resulted, in practice, in Anglo-conformity, a mere hegemony of pan European-American culture. With the added experience of other minorities,

including the WWII incarceration of Japanese Americans in concentration camps and African American race riots of the 1960's, the melting pot ideal, which concealed Anglo-conformity, was exposed and replaced with the current political ideal of pluralism.

While American political philosophy steered clear of the dangers of the melting pot and its great ideal of multi-cultural unity, finding that the grandness of such an ideal could too easily disguise the authoritarianism of Anglo-conformity, American science was seduced by its version of Anglo-conformity⁵. While the danger in political philosophy came from the ideal of multi-cultural unity, the danger in science came from the ideal of unity in knowledge. The greatness of the two ideals makes them potentially blinding, and so, while political philosophy in America was constantly confronted and tested with America's multi-cultural suffering, and through that means exposed persistent Anglo-conformity, scientific philosophy claimed thorough hegemony and therefore remained unexamined.

Integrative medicine, I believe, has the potential of doing for science what immigration did for political philosophy: expose science's persistent Anglo-conformity, where, if unchecked, complementary and alternative medicines will only be allowed to integrate with Western medicine under the terms of Western scientific epistemology. Just as in political philosophy Anglo-conformity can be disguised by calling it cultural unity or cultural synthesis (a melting pot), Anglo-conformity in science can be disguised by calling it objective science. Therefore, let us reserve the term Science (with a capital "S") for approaches open to multi-cultural epistemologies and use the term Western science for Western science. Now we can say what Western science *is* by identifying its particular approach to epistemology, keeping in mind that

⁵ Philosopher Sandra Harding (1991, 1998) noted the problem as resistance among Western scientists and philosophers of science to multi-cultural epistemologies and argued that the effect of this resistance has been to help establish a Western cultural, political, and economic hegemony over the world's cultures.

Western culture should be free to explore whatever epistemology it wants, but that Science must be allowed to be a living, developing conglomerate of existing and always developing epistemologies from all cultures. Within the epistemological conglomerate that is Science, what is it that commands particular respect in Western science? It's facility with material phenomena. Western science is that pursuit within Science, which restricts itself to Deleuze and Guattari's "functionives". It can be, and has been, described pejoratively as "materialism", but in Science this attitude would never be taken. The pejorative attitude is one of frustration toward a project within Science that wants to claim a special position for itself, to be the elite of Science. It is a symptom of the disguised Anglo-conformity that has emerged in Western science, a science that wants to foreclose questions related to non-material phenomena.

How has such an authoritarian agenda within science proceeded and what is its global signature⁶? Wallerstein⁷ has discussed at length the gradual transition in Europe that took place especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries where university-based Western science gradually drew closer and closer to the economy. In America in the twentieth century this relationship has become especially close, led, perhaps, by the great success of Stanford University's land-lease program fostering the rapid development of a university business park. It was here that we first saw scientific developments in a university lab carried directly to business creation and production in the adjacent business park. Hewlett-Packard was one of the first beneficiaries to explode from this new Western science-business partnership. If we combine Wallerstein's description from nineteenth century Europe with America's twentieth century vision of the university business park, it is clear that an authoritarian material epistemology

⁶ Again, I wish to clarify that I don't think a consciously pursued material epistemology, conscious of itself as a worthwhile project within the larger epistemological comings and goings of Science, would have an authoritarian agenda.

⁷ Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

gradually separates itself from Science as a universally developing culture of cultures, and merges instead with, then serves, the material production forces of the economy.

The missteps in the economic sector work their way, in this fashion, through the legal-political sector and come to roost in the scientific sphere. Authoritarianism has blotted out the entrepreneurship and creative practical work in the economy, the contextually creative evolution of law in the political-legal sector, and finally finds its fullest expression in the thought-hierarchy of academic science where the only alternative for sensitive, individuation-oriented young scientists seems to be the open road.

The global signature of this threefold disaster is (1) the carrying of its disguised authoritarianism to world market dominance, where both the flooding of commodities into international markets and the rapidity of movement of financial instruments overwhelm foreign cultures, transforming them into material consumers and eventually non-individuated workers; (2) the exportation of precedent-based American grown legal structures to third-world cultures in the name of universality of justice, and (3) the spread of a material science to fuel the ever-increasing demand for new products disguised as universally valid knowledge. The type of Anglo-conformity known as globalization, then, is grounded not just on America's material epistemology, which, if it took its right place within Science could be balanced by the other world epistemologies. Globalization's ground is epistemological arrogance, the view that commodities are the products of the wonders of Western science, which is claimed to be the only science, and synonymous with Scientific progress. And to be, therefore, resistant to criticism.

But what can we say to Sarah? Her own desire, we can now say, is to bring the free, creative life she found on the open road back to the Science that she loves which is being oppressed by Western science, the staid monolith which can only slowly, as in "decades slowly,"

inch forward. What she unconsciously craves was articulated by Ben Aharon⁸:

After two centuries of being told that the terms “science” and “consciousness” or “spirit” were impossible to combine, we may assert that they are not. In 1987, neurologists Walter Freeman and Christine Skarda changed our conception of our thought processes, and taught us some new, basic lessons about the individual and social-human condition, namely “how brains make chaos in order to make sense of the world.” Shaping concepts and representations concerning reality is a creative, emergent process, and “truth” is our free creation, as we are actively engaged in real life when we research, experiment, and know.

If Sarah could just be allowed to practice her marine biology in this way, wouldn't this be, for all practical purposes, the same as her description on the road, biking to San Diego: “Day followed day where our little group of four, each with different personalities and different strengths for the road, freely combined our insights to decide each morning where we would head next, and to begin an interweaving of changes in bike-order positioning and discussions ranging from new ideas in quantum physics to radical perspectives of mind, and from revolutionary notions in political economy to meaning in life.” This, then, would be a science that is also consistent with American character, one that would allow Sarah, an American Scientist, to find her individuation not on the open road, but within her own, quietly lived, practical, yet infinitely free, life.

Movement toward this goal is something that perhaps can begin with this conference, but its vision must be broad and forward-looking into a perhaps distant future. Its contours must spring from individuals like Sarah finding this open road in their individual, scientific lives, but it is a goal that is coincident with social transformation. And this social transformation must not only include all three social sectors within its parameters as discussed above, but must extend and

⁸ *America's Global Responsibility*, Chapter 15.

interweave with similar social transformations in adjacent cultures, a topic that is beyond my current focus on American character, but which will nevertheless be necessary for a sustainable achievement of restoration of American character.
