

**THE NEW YORK INSTITUTE OF METAPSYCHIATRY
P.A.G.L. FOUNDATION – WEST COAST AFFILIATE
Thomas Hora, M.D.
Director**

Newsletter

Year 10, No. 5

September, 1985

INTEGRITY AND SELF-ESTEEM

By Charles Gourgey

But above all, my brethren, do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or with any other oath, but let your yes be yes and your no be no, that you may not fall under condemnation. (James 5:12 (RSV))

These words from the Letter of James advise us to live a life of integrity. This is not mere moralizing; it is highly practical: without integrity, we will “fall under condemnation.” However, the author of the letter does not tell us what this condemnation is, nor what qualities of consciousness are needed for our “yes” to be “yes” and our “no” to be “no.” We will try to clarify these issues by asking three questions about integrity:

1. What is integrity?
2. What is the meaning of a lack of integrity?
3. What is the healing of a lack of integrity?

Turning to the first question, what is integrity? We observe that the word “integrity” comes from the Latin *in tangere*, meaning “untouched.” “whole.” Integrity is a state of being untouched. Untouched by what?

To understand what integrity is, we can do no better than look at the life of a man who devoted his whole existence to it. It is one of the best-kept secrets in the history of philosophy that the Greek philosopher Socrates was a highly enlightened spiritual teacher. He considered no value more important than integrity. Let us see how Socrates’ life expressed this value at a time of great crisis: during his trial and subsequent execution.

Socrates called himself a philosopher, which is Greek for “lover of wisdom,” seeker of truth. In his search for truth he walked the streets of Athens and visited the marketplace, looking for people who would enter into dialogue with him. In his travels he encountered many people who thought they knew the answers to many questions. Socrates alone confessed how ignorant he was, and so he would ask others to teach him. He would ask them, “What is virtue? What is good? What is beauty? What is piety? What is love?” Those whom he asked would answer his questions with arrogant self-assurance. Socrates would then

demonstrate that their answers made no sense; therefore, they knew no more than he did. In fact they knew less, since they thought they had knowledge, while Socrates alone knew that he was ignorant. Many were embarrassed and offended by Socrates' honesty and forthrightness, and the Athenian rulers decided they could no longer tolerate his presence.

Those who wanted to eliminate Socrates eventually brought him to trial. They accused him of impiety, atheism, and corrupting the youth with his philosophical speculations. Plato's dialogue, *The Apology*, records the trial of Socrates. In this dialogue Socrates explains how he could not abandon his search for truth, even if doing so were made a condition of his acquittal. "Whether you acquit me or not, I shall not change my way of life; no, not if I have to die for it many times." Socrates asserts the principle that "an unexamined life is not worth living." He mentions a "divine guide" that he must obey, that leads him to value the truth more than life itself.

Given such a defense, it is no surprise that Socrates was found guilty. Plato's dialogue, *Phaedo*, tells how Socrates was executed by having to drink the poisonous hemlock. The dialogue reports Socrates' last conversation with his students on the day he died. This conversation is a dialogue on the immortality of the soul. Socrates' students listen in amazement as their teacher describes the non-dimensional, living Soul, and how the realization of the living Soul overcomes the fear of death. Even though it is Socrates who soon will die, his students turn to him for reassurance. The crucial moment arrives when the officer enters to administer the poison. Socrates accepts the poison without complaint, without fear, and without attempting to delay the inevitable. He dies in dignity and in perfect peace.

Such is the blessing of a life of integrity: that even in a fatal crisis one does not fear. What was the secret of Socrates' integrity, and what does it tell us about integrity in general? For the answer we turn to another dialogue, the *Crito*.

The dialogue takes place where Socrates is incarcerated just after the conclusion of the trial. *Crito* is an old friend of Socrates. He visits Socrates in prison and tries to persuade him to escape. *Crito* has friends who could ensure the success of such an attempt. Socrates refuses, on the grounds that such an action would undermine law and order in Athens, and that his life after a successful escape would not be worth living. He would have to live in exile, at the mercy of a foreign government that would not tolerate his search for truth. He would be forced to live in violation of his deepest convictions, as "the flatterer and the slave of all men." He would be forced to live as a man without integrity.

Socrates' life and death reveal the meaning of integrity. Socrates set high value not on living, but on "living well and honorably and justly." He knew the values for which he stood, and allowed them to determine his actions. *Crito* actually tried to undermine Socrates' integrity. He wanted Socrates to adopt another set of values, which contradicted the values Socrates already held. *Crito* wanted Socrates to choose living over living honestly. Socrates could not do that, short of denying everything he represented and taught. Had Socrates listened to *Crito*, his "yes" would have become "no" and his "no" would have become "yes." He would have fallen into a life of condemnation, to be judged by himself and by others for

his loss of integrity.

Integrity is a quality of consciousness. As Socrates' life demonstrates, integrity is the possession of a single set of values. Integrity is having a consciousness "untouched" by contradictory sets of values. When we have integrity, what we say and do coincide with what we are.

If we know what integrity is, we can answer also our second question, what is the meaning of a lack of integrity? If we lack integrity, we are trying to manage two sets of values that contradict each other. In terms of the "Hierarchy of Values" by Dr. Hora, we are trying to live on two levels of the hierarchy at the same time. The behavioral expressions of a lack of integrity – insincerity, lying, cheating, stealing, manipulating people – are only outward signs indicating a split within our consciousness. They indicate that, although we would like our values to be spiritual, we also want something for ourselves and are willing to use deception to obtain it. A divided consciousness is unhealthy, and expresses itself in problems or even physical symptoms. Whenever we hold conflicting sets of values our self-esteem suffers. "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other." (Matthew 6:24) If we hold contradictory values, the part of our consciousness that cherishes one will hate the part that cherishes the other. The split within our consciousness enters our experience in the form of self-condemnation.

If we are on the spiritual path we may experience this self-condemnation with particular severity. We find Paul acutely suffering from it in the seventh chapter of his Letter of the Romans. Paul gives words to the split within his consciousness: "For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do." (Romans 7:19) Paul finds himself trying to serve both spiritual and carnal values; consequently he acts in violation of his best intentions.

If we lack integrity we suffer, since we behave in ways that we ourselves find objectionable. This is painful enough, but it is not the only way in which the absence of integrity destroys our self-esteem. Particularly if we are on the spiritual path, if we lack integrity we suffer from a sense of knowing that we are pretenders. Let us clarify this by taking a closer look at the hierarchy of values.

The hierarchy contains six levels. Five of the six are forms of wanting:

If our values are predominantly naturalistic, we want to survive.

If our values are hedonistic, we want to feel good.

If our values are materialistic, we want to have things.

If our values are humanistic, we want to be liked and accepted by others.

If our values are religious, we want to be accepted and favored by God.

If we are on the spiritual path, then presumably our values are spiritual. If our values are truly spiritual, then we do not want anything; we aspire only to be here for God. However, if we lack integrity, we are trying to live on the two or more levels of the hierarchy at once.

We may therefore find ourselves pretending that we do not want what we want. We may do this in a number of ways. We can pretend that what we want is really what God wants: "Since God is loving and intelligent, certainly He would want me to have a better job, or a better house, or a better car." We can pretend that we are really not interested in naturalistic, hedonistic, or materialistic values, since such interests are unworthy of spiritual students. We can try to influence others in God's name, by selling Metapsychiatry to our friends in order to spiritualize them, when we are really interested in getting them to think the way we do. Finally, we can even pretend that we are not pretenders.

No matter how we express our value conflict, deep inside we know we are pretending, and our self-esteem suffers. Our low self-esteem drives us to compare ourselves to other spiritual students, and we may even envy those who seem to be making more progress, or who seem free of the desire to serve two value systems. When we try to serve two masters we divide our consciousness, and lose our wholeness. This is the meaning of a lack of integrity.

We now reach the third question, what is the healing of a lack of integrity? The healing of a lack of integrity requires three things:

1. Ceaseless attention.
2. The willingness to be embarrassed.
3. A love of the spiritual qualities, peace, assurance, gratitude, and love, which we call PAGL.

1. Ceaseless attention is necessary since before a conflict can be healed, it must be recognized. The best way to acquire ceaseless attention is through a daily practice of meditation. We need to monitor our thoughts constantly, to observe whether the values we profess are really the values we cherish. This requires our attention at every moment, since at any moment a self-confirmatory value may invade consciousness. Ceaseless attention protects us from the painful consequences of acting on our impulses, saying or doing something now that we may regret later. If we remain unaware of the clash between spiritual and self-confirmatory values, we may believe we can have them both. Once we become aware of the conflict, we can cease to engage in it to achieve healing. Ceaseless attention corresponds to the first "R" of the therapeutic process: recognition.

2. The willingness to be embarrassed is the only medicine that can heal a pretender. If we are pretending, we are trying to preserve an image of ourselves that we know is false. If we are willing to be embarrassed, we become free of the tyranny of this false self-image. Instead of trying to defend this false self at all costs, it helps greatly if we can just stand back from it and laugh. If we are willing to be embarrassed, then we are able not to take ourselves too seriously. We also begin to disavow our invalid system of values. The willingness to be embarrassed therefore corresponds to the second of the metapsychiatric "Three Rs": regret.

3. A lack of integrity signifies a conflict of interests. It means we are interested not only in spiritual values but in something else as well. The only thing powerful enough to draw us away from our attraction to self-confirmation is the love of PAGL. We can acquire a love of

PAGL by applying the following principle: in the interpersonal world familiarity breeds contempt, but in the realm of Love-Intelligence, familiarity breeds interest. The more we familiarize ourselves with spiritual values, the more we study, the more we look around us for evidence of love, intelligence, and PAGL, the more our interest will grow until it seems to take off and fly with wings of its own. Once we begin to realize the tremendous freedom that integrity brings, freedom from intrapsychic conflict, from self-condemnation, and from having to pretend, we will not lightly abandon our quest for integrity. The love of PAGL inspires us to persist in this quest, and it therefore corresponds to the third of the metapsychiatric “Three Rs”: reorientation.

The reward of integrity is freedom. If we lack integrity we allow our self-confirmatory interests to master us. If we realize integrity, we are one-minded and free. The Zen master Rinzai called this “being one’s own master”: “If one is one’s own master everywhere, then wherever one stands, all is truth.” Wherever integrity stands, all is truth. This explains the opening words of our passage from James: “But above all, my brethren, do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or with any other oath.” When we swear, even if we swear truthfully, we are trying to convince someone that we are telling the truth. Nowadays we do not usually swear by heaven or by earth, but still we do what amounts to the same thing. We say to another, “You can believe me,” or “I wouldn’t lie to you.” Or “I’ll stake my reputation on it.” These are all attempts to convince others that we are truthful. However, if integrity characterizes our mode of being-in-the-world, we will not have to convince others to believe us. Our “yes” will be “yes” and our “no” will be “no,” and our “yes” and our “no” will speak for themselves. We will need no other words, since “wherever we stand, all is truth.”

Integrity is manifest, not only on an individual, but also on a collective level. Many spiritual disciplines, both past and present, have lost their effectiveness because they have lost their integrity. Such movements have compromised their values in order to appeal to a wide audience, or have resorted to influencing others, even proselytizing, in order to expand their ranks. It is easy to make such mistakes if one’s presentations of one’s principles are primarily verbal. This is why we are asked to preach Metapsychiatry nonverbally. It is impossible to be a nonverbal representative of Metapsychiatry unless we have integrity.

The realization of integrity is a great step forward in the process of spiritual maturation. Having integrity means that our consciousness and perception are consistent with our spiritual aspirations. “Wherever we stand, all is truth.” Where we stand, God stands. Our presence reveals God’s presence, and we become transparencies for Him. The realization of integrity enables us to disappear, so that God can step forward and show Himself. In the state of perfect integrity, individual consciousness and the living Soul are one.

SPIRITUAL INTEGRITY AS A LOVE OF GOOD

By Ann Linthorst

I’d like to begin our consideration of spiritual integrity with a little vignette which illustrates the problem of a lack of integrity. I have come to call it, “Adam and Eve at the Beach.”

Several years ago, as I sat on the beach at the Children's Cove in La Jolla, Calif., I witnessed the following incident. A little boy, a chubby cherub of about three, was frolicking in the wavelets a few yards from where his mother was sitting. A girl, older and more sure of herself, was playing with him. In her company, he ventured onto a ridge of rock that reached out into the cove. The girl said, "Go and ask your mother if you can go out on the rocks." The boy scampered off obligingly, spoke briefly with his mother, and scampered back. While he was still some distance away, the girl shouted, "What did she say?" "She said huh-uh," the boy shouted back. Apparently not hearing, the girl hollered again, "Can you do it?" "No," screamed back the toddler. "But what did she say?" demanded the girl. "She said hun-uh, she said huh-uh," insisted the boy.

There was a pause, as the little fellow drew up to the edge of the rocks, where the girl waited. Then, with studied casualness, the girl said, "Huh-uh means 'yes.'" I saw the tiny Adam hesitate for only a fraction of a second before repeating, in an awed whisper, the words: "Huh-uh means 'yes.'" As the deliciousness of the duplicity grew upon him, he repeated them with increasing vigor, "Huh-uh means 'yes,' huh-uh means 'yes.'" Finally, he began to chant them, the magic words, the formula for release from his quandary. "Huh-uh means 'yes,'" the sing-song went, as he and the little girl clambered along the forbidden rocks.

I waited, my eyes upon "the Lord God" mother, to see if she would descend in wrath upon the fallen Adam. I was fully prepared to leap to his defense, accusing the little girl, whose name was clearly Eve, declaring her the "guilty" one. But Momma apparently noticed that there was no real danger, and after a bit the children were back on the beach, and the little replay of the fall of man was over.

This little story seems worthy of the title of "the fall of man" because it contains the key elements of the human problem with integrity, as does the original story of Adam and Eve in the Bible. The little boy had a problem, an inner problem. He was torn between two conflicting values or concerns . . . two "goods." He wanted to please Mommy. And he wanted to play on the rocks . . . and, perhaps, to please the little girl. Her seductive suggestion that he could "misunderstand" his mother's directive and in this way satisfy both sides of the conflict was irresistible. That way, even if he got caught, he was not bad, he was just mistaken. And in the meantime, he could romp on the rocks with Eve.

A lack of integrity is a condition, or state, of consciousness. It is a state of conflict between competing interests or values. The most basic and universal conflicting values in human consciousness are those represented in this story: that between "should" thinking and "want" thinking. The conflict starts early and stays late. In fact, few people ever get beyond it. Most of us struggle, repeatedly, endlessly, with the push-pull of shoulds and wants. And, even though Metapsychiatry counsels against both kinds of thinking, we don't see how it is possible to think any other way. We think we are our want-thoughts; but we think we should be our should-thoughts.

Now, in addition to the conflict, this story illustrates the mistaken way in which we try to

resolve the conflict. Not realizing that they are dealing simply with thoughts, most people find it difficult, or impossible, to face inner conflict squarely and examine the values which give rise to the unpleasant sensation. And so, people generally try to resolve the sense of conflict by fooling themselves. We think, of course, that we are fooling others. We think, usually, that others are to blame for our conflict. And that may be true for the three-year-old boy. But it's not true for the 33-year-old-boy, or girl. It's not true for any of us. We are not in conflict because of others; we are in conflict because of the ideas of what is good which we cherish in consciousness. And so, we try to fool ourselves.

Students of Metapsychiatry are all familiar with both the conflict and the false solution. Unfortunately, most students are still in the grip of old should- and want-thinking patterns. When that is the case, anything to do with God or spiritual reality, anything said by Dr. Hora or Jan, is heard as an injunction . . . a "should!" "Valid" is taken to mean that God and Dr. Hora give us permission to do it; "invalid" means that it's forbidden. Students ask if sex is valid, or relationship, or drinking alcohol, or whatever, and then, when they hear that these values are existentially invalid, they are in a bind. They still consider them good, still want to enjoy them, but think that they should not do so. And so, they refrain, trying to pretend that they don't still value them, or they guiltily – or rebelliously – continue their practice and try to hide their interest from Dr. Hora or other students or themselves. (Huh-uh means yes.)

We can see that the little child's conflict begins in an interpersonal context. That interpersonal context of thought continues. Like children, we continue to believe that life issues are interpersonal issues – pleasing or displeasing the important people upon whom we think we depend for safety and survival and goodness. And even when there is no external authority, the same mentality prevails. It becomes our own should-thoughts that we think we must satisfy or fool. Years ago, I saw a man who, when asked a question about himself or his ideas, would always preface his answer with the phrase, "I like to think . . ." "I like to think I'm a good father; I like to think I'm honest," etc. The Metapsychiatric version of this is, when asked a question about one's thoughts or values, to try to figure out what the "valid" answer would be, or, when asking a question to try to figure out how to ask an invalid question using valid language.

Perhaps the first step toward spiritual integrity is the recognition that the issues of life are not interpersonal. The issues of life are all issues of seeing – or not seeing – how things really are. When we see spiritual reality, we see a goodness which is so clearly better than any of the seeming "goods" of personhood, that our values are refined and elevated. Until we see at least some aspect of spiritual goodness, we will all be pushed and pulled by various, conflicting ideas of what is good. But that's an issue between us and our own awareness, not between us and other people. It is a remnant of the child's perspective to fantasize that some big person somewhere – God or the therapist or whoever – cares whether or not we do this or that. When a man declared once, at a church retreat, "Oh, come on, Ann. Isn't a little bit of garbage good for the soul?" I could only reply, "No, a little bit of garbage is not good for the soul. But if you want to hold onto "your" garbage, be my guest. I have no interest in trying to deprive anyone of his cherished suffering."

If it is clear to us that there is no other issue in life than the state of our consciousness, how would we understand the issue of validity? We would understand that to call something “valid” means to indicate that it is real, and consequently, of real value, real goodness. To call something “invalid” alerts us to the unreal nature, the deceptive “goodness,” of that interest. We are, then, challenged to explore and observe the nature of our interest in it, to call into question that interest. We become open to discovering what is troublesome about that idea of the good, and we become interested in discovering a higher, non-dual, goodness.

A love of goodness is a key to growth toward integrity. We often say that one may be either driven to God by suffering or drawn by wisdom. But this is more a developmental sequence than a pair of alternatives. We all begin a quest toward spiritual good mostly out of a desire to escape suffering. But that motive will not bring us to God. The desire to escape suffering keeps us in a state of conflicting values: “I want my goodie, but I don’t want to suffer. I’ll give it up to avoid pain, but I still wish I could have it.” And then the student feels resentful and bullied: “God is bigger than me and makes me be good; but I resent it.”

This view is amazingly evident among students of Metapsychiatry. I’ve heard more than once the idea expressed that Metapsychiatry is a “spoil-sport” which takes away all the fun. This is a particular form of a lack of integrity which needs to be unmasked by asking oneself, “So, who is asking me to study Metapsychiatry, anyway?” If we feel bullied, we may be sure that it is not God or the therapist who is the culprit. It is the should-thinking within our own consciousness at work.

The conflict in values will never be healed by seeking an escape from suffering. It will only be healed by an authentic love of good. Never mind that, at this moment, none of us understands goodness in purely spiritual terms. Whatever is our highest level of appreciating goodness will suffice, as long as we love goodness enough to keep seeking to see it more clearly and love it more purely.

If God is all-in-all, then good is all-in-all. The substance of Life is goodness – omniactive Love-Intelligence; we call it in Metapsychiatry. This means that we are never dealing with something actually bad. We are always simply running into the fruits of the level of our understanding of the good. Metapsychiatry gives us very clear guidelines for understanding the highest good: spiritual values. Love and intelligence, harmony, order, beauty, joy, peace, creativity, reverence, gratitude . . . who would question that these are the supreme goods? Even though we do not, in the beginning, have much familiarity with these values, we can love them, love the very idea that Life is really this wonderful substance of good. And if we love these values, on whatever level we may understand them, this good begins to operate in consciousness, to refine our sense of goodness and to reveal to us where our concepts are lacking.

This is the crucial point. The human mind likes its goods tangible. The human mind operates to keep consciousness hooked on the specifics: good is this person, this place, this thing. Personal sense likes to delude itself that it can control the flow of good into experience, and if the good is kept tangible, then that delusion is supported. I can always go

to that person, place, or thing. Unfortunately, the good is also thus kept limited, and vulnerable: this person suddenly fails to deliver the good, or disappears; I can lose the precious thing, be unable to reach the place of goodness.

A love of goodness is not the same thing as a love of certain goods. A love of goodness keeps us looking beyond person, place, and thing. This is easy to understand when the limited good fails us, but it is harder to do when some particular person, place, or thing is gratifying our sense of good.

An incident which occurred a few years ago has helped me understand how particular goods can be pointers beyond themselves to the good of God. Our family was making a day trip to the Lake Arrowhead area on a winter weekend. We planned to stop first at the newly opened ice skating rink in Blue Jay and then go on for a meal at the Lodge here. Having not ice skated in many years, I was a bit anxious about it, but, at the same time, I wanted very much to participate with the family and not sit by the sidelines. When we rented our skates, I discovered that I could also rent a light metal frame, similar to a "walker," which I could use for support on the ice. This gave me an unexpected freedom and fearlessness while skating, and I was delighted. At one moment, as I contemplated the joy of skating easily, the lovely winter weather, the thought of a meal in this cherished spot, the special little "serendipity" of the skating frame, the thought came into mind: "This is really the perfect life." I felt a sense of sublime harmony and goodness, which lasted several days. The sense of good began with the specific details of the experience, yet, in my contemplation of those "goods," they became pointers to the nature of reality itself. At that moment, I identified as MY own life, that perfect Life which I knew about through Metapsychiatry.

John Hargreaves describes it this way:

"When you understand what you are experiencing as persons, places, and things – something to sit on, clothes to wear, friends, and all the rest of it – if your experience of these turns you back to Mind, and you know what, however wonderful, all that it really is is your communing with the one Mind appearing in a form and a language that you can understand . . . then you have translated matter back into its origin, Mind, and you are enjoying the one, spiritual universe, in the highest form you can appreciate. If you think that the appearance is, itself, the substance, then of course you have materialized it. You have thought that there is something outside of Mind. And you place that experience under the law of matter, which is always duality . . . sometimes good, sometimes bad."

Reality does not deprive anyone of anything: "At Thy right hand are pleasures forevermore." But reality's goods are perfectly good, and that perfect good, because it is the substance of real life, makes it impossible for us to find rest on any inferior level of good. If we fight for our inferior goods, we fight pure goodness, and we suffer. And our spiritual quest lacks integrity and is corrupted and blocked.

If we love to know that Life is omniactive Love-Intelligence; if we think it is a shame that God is Love, and nobody notices; if we regret that the culture bombards us not only with

horrible images, but with a love of horrible images; if we want our lives to be places where the horrible images dissolve and the loveliness of spiritual good appears; then integrity is established. We will not have to pretend not to be interested in things which we do, in fact, value. And we don't have to judge other students when we see them cherishing less than perfect good. Our interest will be in seeing through our highest appreciable good – whether it is a skating frame or a steak dinner or a view of the Alps – to the infinite Source of pure goodness and the perfect Life which is the only Life there really is.

REPORT ON TWO PAGL GROUP MEETINGS IN EUROPE

By Jan Linthorst, D.Min.

On Saturday, July 27 and Saturday, August 3, 1985, meetings were held in Oosterbeek, Holland, and Lucerne, Switzerland, organized by students of Metapsychiatry in both countries.

The meeting in Holland took place in the large recreation hall of the beautiful Valkenburchtflat in the woods and heather of Oosterbeek. The meeting was chaired by Gemma Linthorst and Ger Haak, leaders of the PAGL group in Holland. The formal announcement of the meeting had generated an unusually large interest, as enthusiastic participants came filing in at 1 PM from various parts of the Netherlands and Belgium and as far away as Frankfurt, Germany. There were three languages represented and discussions went on in all three with translations offered as the need arose. There was also an interesting range of age: from 18 years on up to 88 years. The meeting was in a retirement community where several residents study Metapsychiatry.

The meeting opened with an introduction by Gemma Linthorst and Ger Haak about the activities of the PAGL group and the translations just published and in progress. The literature of Metapsychiatry was displayed on a table and included two translations into Dutch: Forgiveness by Dr. Hora and A Gift of Love by Ann Linthorst.

Jan Linthorst introduced some basic ideas of Metapsychiatry in Dutch, followed by a discussion in English. Participants could ask questions in their own language. These questions were first translated and then answered in English. To everyone's surprise, it seemed that everyone understood perfectly well what was said as if it were said in their own language.

Following a break, Ann Linthorst discussed the metapsychiatric perspective on relationships and interaction thinking. This was followed by Fern Rubin's presentation of the organization of Metapsychiatric libraries and the methods used to make these libraries useful to students.

The following Saturday, a similar program was presented at a meeting in beautiful Lucerne, Switzerland. There, in a lovely garden of Villa Maria where some of us stayed, a group of students gathered at the invitation of Dr. Hans Rudi Staub and his wife Margrit. Hans and Margrit are longtime students of Dr. Hora's and conduct a marriage counseling practice in

Baden, Switzerland. Some of their students also attended the meeting. After a brief presentation, a lively dialogue developed, which was continued until late into the evening, when our Swiss hosts treated the whole group to an elegant dinner in the Old Swiss House.

In Switzerland, it became very clear how much of a universal appeal the ideals of Metapsychiatry have, and that language and culture and distances are in no way a barrier to spiritual understanding. Both meetings generated enthusiasm and inspiration in all participants. In parting, several offered to concentrate their study on translations of the literature into German, Dutch, and French.

These first European meetings also gave clear evidence of the tremendous interest and growth potential there is in Europe. It seems that, because of the fact that the students there are far from the centers in the USA, they have to work harder and study more diligently than we sometimes do. We came away with the strong impression that, because of their fine pioneering work, a very fruitful European conference could be held in about two years with students from the US and Europe participating together for the benefit of all.