

HIPPIES AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

William H. McGlothlin

Within the past year, the use of psychedelic drugs among the nation's youth has undergone dramatic changes. Not only has the incidence of drug-taking behavior rapidly increased, but it has been embedded in an open and vital movement the ethic of which is as exciting as it is unbelievable. The drug use and the movement are intimately related; neither can be understood separately from the other.

A brief sketch of the events leading to the current phenomena begins in 1963 with the cooperative effort of Timothy Leary and the news media to popularize LSD. In 1964-65, LSD became increasingly available on the black market, but its use was primarily limited to small groups at a few colleges. With the exception of Leary's Psychedelic Review, communication between interested groups continued to be dependent on the popular media. In 1966 three important influences emerged. First, the underground newspapers (Berkeley Barb, East Village Other, Los Angeles Free Press, etc.) provided the psychedelic groups with their own communication channels--ideas could be rapidly exchanged, and groups events effectively advertised. Second, the rock music groups, which were among the first to sample the magic of LSD, began to spread the message to the entire teen-age population. Third, the advertising industry, the ability of which to commercialize and vulgarize is only slightly exceeded by its ability to create new jargon, made "psychedelic" and "turn-on" household words; kids who had never heard of LSD learned what was "in" from their cereal boxes.

But it was not until January 1967, when 20,000 persons joined in the first "Human Be-In" in San Francisco, that a genuine movement took form. A year earlier, 10,000 had attended Ken Kesey's three-day Trips Festival, but at that time there was no organization or stable psychedelic community to sustain the resulting momentum. Following the January Be-In, similar large-scale gatherings became almost weekly occurrences in Los Angeles and other parts of California under the label "Love-In." These soon spread to New York and other Eastern cities as well as to such unlikely spots as Tulsa.

The Haight-Ashbury hippy community in San Francisco, virtually non-existent a year ago, suddenly had a permanent population of ten thousand. Thousands more utilize it as a weekend gathering place. The term "hippy," which is now so completely accepted by adherents and public alike, has only been in general use for a matter of months. Other descriptive terms such as "the love generation" and "flower children" quickly followed and various symbols such as the Hopi god's eye and the Egyptian ankh became widely accepted and displayed. Rock music continues to be highly responsive, providing the best articulation of the flower children's new ethic. Hippy

radio programs have sprung up, giving advice on everything from how to handle a bad trip to techniques for meditation.

Thus, in a matter of months, the hippies have achieved a name, public identity, style of life, and a serious commitment to an ethic dedicated to individual freedom, love, and personal honesty. I shall attempt to show that this development is essentially a religious movement, and bears a striking resemblance to early Christianity.

As a point of departure, I should like to refer to a paper presented by MIT Professor Huston Smith at the June 1966 Berkeley LSD Conference entitled, The Religious Significance of Artificially Induced Religious Experiences. Professor Smith began by comparing drug-induced and naturally occurring mystical or religious experiences and concluded that since they are phenomenologically indistinguishable, there is no reason, in principle, why they should not have equal religious significance of a lasting nature. He then proceeded to outline reasons why he felt that, in practice, the psychedelic movement would not have a significant religious impact. His principal arguments were: (1) the tendency of the present culture to dismiss such experiences as essentially meaningless; (2) the failure of the psychedelic movement to establish a stable community or church; (3) tendencies toward antinomianism; and (4) the failure to formulate a convincing social philosophy and integrate the psychedelic experience with ongoing life.

At the time of his address (June 1966), I found Professor Smith's arguments convincing. From the vantage point of an additional year's observation, I am forced to come to an essentially opposite conclusion. On the first point, while it is true the lasting power of the psychedelic experience is quite fragile in a Western achievement-oriented competitive society, the hippies have now created their own non-achievement-oriented culture which sustains and reinforces the message of the psychedelic experience. Also, the hippies are young. They are not firmly committed to the materialistic value system of their parents. They frequently have the adolescents' idealistic tendency to rebel against the status quo, independent of involvement in movements. The disciples of Jesus made little headway with the ideologically entrenched Jews, and turned instead to the poorer class gentiles for whom the total de-emphasis on material possessions was not a radical change. Similarly, the hippy movement cannot convert the older segments of society, but can claim success with today's uncommitted youth. Leary recognized this several years ago, when he gave up on the intellectuals and directed his efforts exclusively toward youth.

When Professor Smith gave his address, there was indeed no stable psychedelic community or self-reinforcing church. There is still no church in the traditional sense (although several of the orthodox clergy are supporting the movement), but there is now a large hippy community, and there is certainly no lack of reinforcement. The typical hippy spends his time with others of like mind; listens for several hours each day to any of several radio

stations which broadcast only acid rock which in turn assures him that he is part of a vital movement that will convert the world to love; and he shares the weekend with 5,000 other hippies at a love-in.

Professor Smith's observations that the hippies have failed to formulate a convincing social philosophy, are guilty of antinomianism¹ and have generally not integrated their ethic with the demands of reality, are as valid today as they were a year ago, and even more obvious. Hippies exhibit an incredibly naive attitude toward basic economics, support an ideology of complete anarchy, and show no evidence of acquiring self-discipline. However, to dismiss such a movement as having no future is, I think, to confuse the early and later phases of its growth. Orderly, rational, graduated change is simply not the stuff from which movements are made in their early stages. Eric Hoffer, in The True Believer, is explicit on this point: "It is futile to judge the viability of a new movement by the truth of its doctrine and the feasibility of its promises." What is important is the "kindling of extravagant hope" in the believer. "When a movement begins to rationalize its doctrine and make it intelligible, it is a sign that its dynamic span is over; that it is primarily interested in stability."

Ernest Troeltsch, in The Social Teachings of Christian Churches, makes a similar assessment with respect to early Christianity. It contained no blueprint for a social philosophy, nor is there evidence that Jesus had any intention of founding either a Church or social movement. Christianity appealed primarily to the lower classes who united "simplicity of feeling with a non-reflective habit of mind, a primitive energy, and an urgent sense of need." It was only later in the second century that the "deep inward energy" was fused with the more intellectual forces.

It is my contention that the adherents to the hippy movement display a similar sort of primitive energy, and that this is in part due to a common experience with psychedelic drugs. Like the early Christians, the hippies evidence a sense of ultimate values with an accompanying disdain for threats of punishment. The hippies not only do not have a social philosophy, they explicitly reject any effort to formulate such a policy on the part of their would-be leaders. The simplicity of their belief is reflected in the lyrics to a song about the flower children, "they really know they're right," as well as their one-word communications of "love" and "peace." The strong emphasis on regressed magical thinking is further evidence of a primitive or childlike state of mind.

¹The theological doctrine that by faith and God's gift of grace through the gospel a Christian is freed not only from the Old Testament law of Moses and all forms of legalism but also from all law, including the generally accepted standards of morality prevailing in any given culture. (Websters 3rd New International Dictionary)

Jesus' deceptively simple teachings are also most accurately described as a doctrine of love. Following Jesus' death, his disciples attempted to put his teachings on love into practice in what Troeltsch calls a "religious communism of love." Possessions were shared for the good of all, but there was no attempt at organization or defining rules. However, there was heavy dependence on the support of fellow converts with whom they resided, just as hippies today have found it necessary to form communes and other reinforcing groups. The early Christian's doctrine was one of unlimited love of all mankind, friend and enemy alike, with a childlike lack of concern as to how this was to be carried out in practice. This idea of universal brotherhood and love is the central theme retained from the teachings of Jesus. It has given rise to numerous experiments in the past 2000 years, both in and outside the Church, but it is doubtful if any have matched the present hippy version for sheer lack of structure. Compare the gesture of the revivalist minister asking the members of the congregation to shake hands with the stranger next to him, with the sharing of thousands at a hippy love-in; or the cultist nature of the many utopian developments during the past century with the hippy slogan, "Love a cop today."

Intimately related to Jesus' teaching of love was the treatment of earthly possessions. Wealth was considered a danger to the soul, and to achieve perfection, one must give away all material possessions. Man cannot serve God and mammon. The poor and humble would enter the kingdom of God before the rich and proud.

In addition it is not only the giving of all one's goods, but the spirit of giving that is important. One must not trumpet his good deeds, one must do them in secret: give and share freely with no thought of anything in return. The Diggers distribute food, clothings, and shelter to indigent hippies in what is actually an attempt to carry out this philosophy. Like everything else about the hippies, the Diggers are unorganized, spontaneous, and anonymously generous. At one time the Diggers attempted to eliminate the distinction between giver and receiver by having recipients of food pass through a "frame of reference" which signified that the food was available simply because it was theirs.

The genuineness of the hippies' expression of love may be questioned, but it is difficult to deny their voluntary choice of poverty. Their de-emphasis on materialism is closer to primitive Christianity than was that of the ascetics, who came later in the history of the Church. The teachings of Jesus did not deny pleasure, nor glorify poverty for its own sake. Troeltsch writes that Jesus "teaches quite plainly that food and work are only of value insofar as they are necessary to life." This is the same position taken by the hippies.

Even the unrealistic attitude of the hippies regarding future needs has a parallel in Jesus' teachings. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus advised his followers not to think of what they would eat, drink or wear tomorrow. They should give no more thought to these needs than do the birds of the air or lilies of the field. "Ask and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." Jesus did not advocate abstinence; the Kingdom of God was to be one of abundance.

The hippies are best known for their rejection of the materialistic value system, but this is only one of many possible "ego hang-ups" they seek to avoid. These are expertly described under the "hang loose ethic" in J. Simmons and B. Winograd's It's Happening. Ideally, the hippy would like to achieve a so-called game-free state in which he can behave without pretense in every situation, a state which he feels he achieves in the psychedelic experience. Again, early Christianity provides a parallel in what Troeltsch calls "unlimited, unqualified individualism" which is attained through the avoidance of pride, vanity, egotism, and other aspects of self-love which stand in the way of union with God.

The highly idealistic teachings of Jesus are frequently explained, in part, by the accompanying apocalyptic doctrine, which was expected to be fulfilled in a relatively short time. Some have suggested that the hippies' behavior may be due, in part, to a pessimistic apocalypse born of the uncertainty of the H-bomb age. However, the hippies display the most unbridled optimism. Their hope, as expressed by Simons and Winograd, is virtually a Kingdom of God in itself: "The long-term solution almost all swingers agree is to turn the world on. Their dream is to live in a world of beautiful people in which everyone grooves on their own things and doesn't interfere with anybody else in doing it". Thus, faith of primitive Christianity and the hippies' "extravagant hope" have much in common.

Another similarity is the lack of an activist approach in both movements. Jesus was indifferent to the State; he made no efforts to produce social reform through modification of existing institutions. Primitive Christianity grew by means of conversion of the individual rather than by modifying the social order. Similarly, the hippies do not generally participate in activist endeavors, even though they may be in sympathy with the cause. The activist-oriented New Left has, from time to time, attempted to enlist the hippies in a common cause of individual freedom. These efforts have been singularly unsuccessful because activism is directly opposite to the hippy ethic, and, in fact, the ranks of the New Left have been substantially depleted through conversions to the hippy movement. The early Christians believed that love conquers all barriers, and the hippies have put their faith in flower power.

I have discussed several similarities between hippies and early Christians. There are also several differences. Early Christians were almost entirely from the lower class; the hippies come from the disenchanted young of an affluent middle class. The Christians had an overwhelming belief in God; the hippies do not have this belief. Jesus taught strict self-control with regard to sex; the hippies generally prefer meaningful sex relationships, but are not necessarily bound by formal sanctions.

Unlike early Christianity the hippy movement lacks a central figure or leader. Leary served in this capacity during the early years, but his position bristles with too much anti-establishment hostility to accord with the current love-oriented hippies. The hippies are not so much anti-establishment as beyond the establishment.

From a practical standpoint, the major difference is in the area of self-discipline and responsibility. The early Christians were industrious and supported themselves, although they occasionally were also troubled by the passivity that has traditionally afflicted religious movements. Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians reads: "For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies." In the same letter, Paul laid down the rule: "If any would not work, neither should he eat." The Eastern religions have found it necessary to formulate similar rules. It is interesting to note that some of the hippy radio programs and other constructive elements are beginning to cite the actions of Eastern religions in combating self-centeredness, and are urging the hippies to assume greater self responsibility. However, the hippies are especially susceptible to indolence in that they are virtually all young, immature, and from relatively affluent families which apparently have made little if any effort to instill a discipline of self-support. On the other hand, the early Christians were older and from a poorer class with firmly ingrained work habits.

The hippies themselves do not identify with Christianity, early or otherwise, except perhaps to point out that Jesus had long hair. They are more likely to emulate the techniques of the religions of India, or Zen Buddhism; and more recently, have shown an affinity for the American Indian. I think the attractions of India lie in the fact it is the most religious of all contemporary nations; it has a long history of resistance to materialistic values; its religions do not conceptualize a rigid God; its beliefs are tolerant of other religions; and, in general, it provides a much richer model for religious practices than does the rather sterile current-day Christianity. Enchantment with the American Indians is probably based on their stubborn resistance to the achievement-oriented value system. Nevertheless, I would continue to argue that primitive Christianity, which bears little relation to the current Church, provides a better model for the hippy movement than do Indian religions, Eastern or Western. The highly idealistic philosophy, the emphasis on demonstrative love, the strong denial of materialistic values, and the need for the support from communal living are much closer to early Christianity than to present-day Eastern religions.

Role of Psychedelic Drugs

The drugs of choice among the hippies are LSD for major mental excursions, and marihuana for casual mood manipulation. LSD plays a vital, and perhaps necessary role in shaping beliefs and values; marihuana is used frequently to produce a quiet euphoria which complements the overall philosophy.

LSD belongs to the family of strong hallucinogens whose major effect is to temporarily suspend the primacy of habitual perceptions of self, environment, beliefs, and values. A number of consequences follow from this basic property. First, the extent of this mind-loosening effect will depend on the strength and flexibility of the existing structure; it will generally be most effective among the young, and will also be related to personality characteristics. Second, the

readiness with which a person relinquishes his existing belief system depends on the degree of comfort with, and investment in, the status quo; discomfort and lack of investment supply motivation for change. Third, the suspension of the existing belief system results in a highly suggestible state, the consequences of which will depend on what alternative beliefs and values are offered; hallucinogens of various sorts have long been known to be effective agents for establishing cults in the hands of religious leaders. Fourth, the lasting quality of such LSD-induced changes depends heavily on the reinforcement obtained from the subculture; without such support, older belief systems tend to reassert their primacy.

Relating these implications more directly to the hippy movement, it is clear that converts will come very largely from the youth who do not have a strong commitment to a set of beliefs, values, and goals. An increasing number of adults are also using LSD, but for them to accept and practice the hippy ethic is analogous to the difficulty of the rich man accepting early Christianity. Conversion is a function not only of the promises of the future but of the ease of relinquishing the investment in the past.

On the other hand, by no means all youth are susceptible to the effects of LSD. We recently completed an experiment in which a more or less random sample of graduate students were given a series of three LSD sessions. Persons who were enthusiastic about participating, reacted intensely, and reported a lasting impact attributable to the LSD experience, evidenced a clearly defined personality pattern. These persons, in contrast with those who had no taste for the experience, were more susceptible to hypnosis, preferred an unstructured life, and were generally less conforming. They were more aesthetically inclined, introspective and passive, and less rigid, aggressive, and competitive.

Given the prerequisites of youth, appropriate personality characteristics, and an uneasiness about commitment to the materialistic value system, LSD can act as a potent agent to facilitate change. Its ability to suspend the primacy of habitual belief systems opens the door to previously excluded perspectives. When the validity of a heretofore unquestioned belief carries no more weight than its opposite alternative, the conditions are clearly favorable for radical shifts in beliefs. In particular, the seemingly arbitrary societal mores such as a stand for alcohol and against marihuana, or the assertion of the moral rightness of a particular political ideology, become completely ludicrous. Aldous Huxley perceived this potential of the psychedelics for "cutting holes in cultural fences" several years ago, and this is one of the characteristics that plays a vital role in the hippy movement.

The reason why the hippy movement has had such a sudden spurt in the last few months is that it has reached the point (particularly in California) where the subculture provides effective reinforcement of the drug-induced alterations of beliefs and values. The LSD trip provides a common ground on the experiential level which serves as the unifying principle for hippy communities, and for thousands of otherwise strangers at hippy gatherings. In turn, the subculture

both suggests and sustains the new beliefs, and acts as a buffer against the faith-eroding forces of the dominant culture. The advent of large-scale communities and gatherings has turned the phenomenon of isolated drug use into a full-fledged, self-reinforcing movement.

Another way in which the use of LSD tends to mold the individual into the hippy ethic is through an escape from the aforementioned ego hang-ups. As mentioned earlier, the hippy's ideal is to avoid not only the materialistic hang-up, but to be free from other ego needs which interfere with complete spontaneity. He feels that the drug experience aids in the transcending of these undesirable attributes, and in accurate self perception, leading ultimately to an ego loss and a mystical state of oneness with the universe which has a lasting carryover. LSD is also used for sheer enjoyment, but most hippies will claim that they have in some way benefitted from the experience.

There is some experimental evidence supporting LSD-induced semi-permanent change. Post-LSD disruption of conditioned responses for a few weeks to several months has been found in both cats and monkeys. In addition, one of the most consistent clinical observations in the LSD-using hippy group is a strong tendency toward diffuse magical thinking. It appears that a thin layer of rationality has been replaced by a regressed, primitive, magical thinking which uncritically accepts astrology, UFO's, ESP, or other nonrational phenomena. The tenacity with which these beliefs are held suggests that with the suppression of the rational mind these magical explanations fill a primitive or childlike need to relate cause and effect. This triumph of faith over reason has a parallel in the early Christians' belief in miracles.

Not all the effects of psychedelic drugs are considered good, even by hippy standards. Aside from the occasional psychotic reaction, there is a tendency by some individuals to fall into a pattern of continuous drug taking. Young persons who move into hippy communities can rapidly lose their existing controls without finding suitable substitutes. Living in a drug-taking subculture without the structure provided by parents, school, and work, they may find the path of least resistance is to stay "high" day-after-day on whatever drug is available. While there is virtually no evidence of heroin use among the hippies, the dangerous practice of injecting methamphetamine is not uncommon. Part of the problem is that the hippies, like all movements, attract a disproportionate number of followers who are genuine misfits -- persons who are poorly equipped to survive in any culture. In the somewhat insane world of the hippies, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the idealists from those suffering from the more traditional forms of psychopathology.

Social Factors

The advent of LSD is not the only factor in the birth of the hippy movement. Would the movement have developed without Leary and the news media? Possibly not. Why did peyote and mescaline (which have the same effects as LSD) fail to become popular at the beginning of the century? Peyotism rapidly became the dominant religion among the uprooted and sorely deprived American

Indians. Why is marihuana, which has in the past been confined to the lower socioeconomic minority groups, suddenly become popular in the dominant culture? Why is the hippy movement almost exclusively white? The Negro has always been at the center of the American drug-using subculture. Why did the beatniks, who used drugs of all types including peyote and mescaline, make so little headway?

Some insight may be gained by examining the interaction of drugs and cultures. Several authors have noted that cultural differences strongly influence the choice between the two most widely used mind-altering or mood-manipulating drugs, alcohol and cannabis (marihuana). Cannabis, a mild hallucinogen, is more popular in cultures that tolerate social inaction; alcohol in cultures that place a high value on action. Until very recently, marihuana use in this country has been almost entirely limited to the less achievement-oriented minority groups, while alcohol use has not generally been so limited. In most primitive cultures, alcohol has been found to release aggressive actions; cannabis typically results in quiet euphoria, and prolonged regular use leads to a more passive personality. The exceptionally harsh drug laws in this country represent attempts to legislate morality, rationalized on the grounds of preventing antisocial acts. In large measure, the laws themselves have created the associated criminality. Consciously, or unconsciously, the opiates and marihuana were seen as a threat to the achievement-oriented value system.

Now, suddenly, there is a sharp upsurge in the use of marihuana and LSD, not among the traditional drug-using minority groups, but among the younger members of the alcohol-using dominant culture. This would seem to argue for a growing discontent with the competitive society; and, indeed, the hippies have left little room for conjecture. They have proclaimed in no uncertain terms that, for them, the materialistic direction is a road to nowhere. It is not surprising that the mind-altering drugs of choice are the hallucinogens rather than alcohol. Of course, only a small portion of the young persons who use marihuana or LSD to some degree can properly be defined as hippies, but the remainder are certainly more in sympathy with the love ethos of the hippies than the administration's Vietnam policy.

What are the social factors which contribute to the increasing alienation among today's youth? Kenneth Keniston, in examining this question in The Uncommitted, concludes that such factors as historical unrelatedness, chronic social change, and the exacting demands of a technological age play a part. Increased leisure time, the prolonged period of dependence in college, and an affluent society are also cited. The highly unpopular Vietnam war is another crucial factor.

But discontent with the achievement-oriented society is not limited to youth. The major criticisms of adult society are the oppressive aspects of conformity, the dehumanizing effects of technology and materialism, the sacrifice of individualism to organizational efficiency and lack of a deeper meaning in

life. The Judeo-Christian ethic is very definitely losing ground, and pleasure is becoming more acceptable in its own right. There is a resurgence of humanism, not only in the search for individual values, but also in the areas of civil rights and poverty. Adult society has evolved its own mind-loosening methods in prolonged and intensive group interaction (sensitivity groups and marathon therapy) which are similar in aim for the use of hallucinogenic drugs.

Thus, there exists an undercurrent of public sympathy for the hippies; society is not so certain that there is not some merit to what they are saying. This is evident in the surprisingly favorable treatment they have received in the popular media. Feature writers have generally tended to overlook the more sordid aspects of excessive drug use in favor of their idealistic ethic.

On the other hand, the hippies have been seen by some as simply a negative protest of withdrawal; a retreat into the world of drug fantasy. I think this perception is in error; it is more applicable to the beatniks who patterned their withdrawal after the cool, detached attitude of the Negro drug culture. To regard the refusal to compete in a materialistic society only as withdrawal is to fail to see beneath the surface of hippy behavior. They are anything but pessimistic and detached; they are the most idealistic, optimistic source of primitive energy in America today. Why else would society be copying their styles, music, and dances?

This leads to an interesting speculation about the relation between culture and the choice of mind-altering drugs. As discussed above, the hallucinogens have traditionally been linked to a passive style of life. What happens when the children of an aggressive, achieving society turn to hallucinogens? Could the hippy movement be the manifestation of an inverted achievement drive, an attempt to stand society on its head and move just as energetically in the opposite direction? I believe this to be the case, and that it bears a striking similarity to the potency of early Christianity. In what F.L. Polak calls the "reversal of all signs," the Christian ethic called for a rejection of all the traditional values and goals, but the consequences were certainly not passive withdrawal. So it is with the hippies.

The Future

It is meaningless to ask whether the hippy movement, as it is presently perceived, is viable. By definition, a movement is dynamic, so the question becomes one of predicting the direction of evolvement and its ultimate significance. The hippy movement is especially volatile, constantly seeking new and spontaneous means of expression. The highly successful Be-In is already regarded as *passe'* in Haight Ashbury. To do the same thing twice results in a loss of appeal and spontaneity. In its present form, the hippy movement itself is only a few months old. What is the next turn?

The present hippy ethic is as impractical as the ethic of early Christianity. The latter was distinctly modified during the time of Paul, only a few years after Jesus' death. Troeltsch writes: "The childlikeness, breadth,

and height of the Gospel are already being expressed in the concrete and practical realm." The communism of love which was the foundation of the small Christian community proved unworkable in an urban setting, and when Christianity was carried to the Roman Empire, it proved impossible to ignore the existence of the State.

It is easy to point to the unrealistic nature of the hippy practices, and the hippies are already discovering some of them on their own. The beauty of the Be-In does not necessarily carry over to the routine of daily living. There is currently a large amount of panhandling in Haight Ashbury as well as in some other hippy communities. This begging is directed at fellow hippies as well as tourists, and those hippies who earn a small amount of money at some menial task are learning the unrealistic aspects of the communism of love in the larger setting. Other divisive elements relate to the older, established hippies versus the new arrivals, and to the practical difficulties of maintaining an open door to all comers. Also, there is dissension over hippy merchants who make personal profits by selling psychedelic paraphernalia or other goods to members of the community.

In addition to the basic economic unrealities, hippies display a disturbing lack of motivation to acquire skills for expressing themselves, beyond participation in the hippy movement. Hippy paintings or other crafts and activities show little evidence of discipline. Also, the preference for magical rather than rational thinking causes one to wonder if the group can exist in the real world. Probably the most consistent impression one receives from the hippies is their childlike nature; it constitutes both their charm and their unrealistic naiveté.

The lack of any plan of action is not limited to the rank-and-file hippies. Various psychedelic visions of the future were recently discussed by Timothy Leary, Allen Ginsberg, Gary Snyder, and Allan Watts (transcribed in the San Francisco Oracle). Leary would put the technology, and those persons who wished to be connected with it, underground; the psychedelic people would go back to nature on the surface of the earth, making their own arrowheads, and everything else needed for survival. Snyder would isolate the technology somewhere (e.g. Chicago) and the age of automation and abundance would allow the rest of the population to live in a tribal fashion and make their own arrowheads, etc., because they enjoyed doing it rather than from necessity; Watts was in general agreement with Snyder's position. Ginsberg took the position that the world wasn't so bad off in its present form if people would try to understand each other and be less hostile. Ginsberg observed that Leary's plan might work for 15 million Indians but not for 200 million people, not to mention the future of the world-wide population which seems to depend on increasing levels of technology. In addition to the issue of economics, no solution has been suggested for the traditional vulnerability of the passive society to aggressive outside forces.

Clearly, no political leader like Marx has emerged in the hippy movement. It is interesting to note that the "to each according to his needs" philosophy

and the "withering away of the State" of Marxism are in the same utopian vein as early Christianity and the present hippy movement. With Marxism, however, the ideal social order was to come after an intermediate realism, rather than initially as with Christianity. Nevertheless, it is this romantic aspect of Marxism that provided its appeal.

The hippy movement has one important condition in its favor that Marxism and other utopian plans have lacked; a realistic possibility of an economy of abundance rather than scarcity. It is an interesting paradox that the social philosophy that has created this advantage is so completely rejected by the hippies. Nothing would bring about the collapse of the present hippy position more quickly than its sudden acceptance by the remainder of society. It must be remembered, however, that the early stage of a movement serves to call attention to the issues rather than provide practical solutions.

In the final analysis, the hippy movement is appealing to the same need as did early Christianity and theoretical Marxism. The hippies are acting out a basic fantasy that man has always held. As Reinhold Niebuhr "Christianity and Communism" observed, "Through all the ages man has been a lion who devours the lamb; but he has been a curious kind of lion who dreams of the day when the lion and the lamb will lie down together." While this fantasy has never been realized on a large scale, it has nevertheless had a tremendous impact on the history of man. It is possible that we are now witnessing the beginning of another major attempt in this direction.