

RADIX PURPOSE WORK ¹

Charles R. Kelley

A description of the history and technique of Radix Purpose Work from its inception until 1983, when this article first appeared.

It was 1966 when I discovered the nature and purpose of the muscular armor. The discovery placed me at cross-purposes with the Reichian movement, which I saw myself as part of, and indeed, at cross purposes with the major part of the human potential movement, which I saw the Reichian movement as part of. Freeing blocks to feeling, loosening body armor, these were the objectives of Reichian work as I understood it. I was a believer in the Reichian program, a student of Reich's scientific theory, a long-term participant.

I had put in 15 years on the Reichian couch between 1950 and 1966. During the last years of that period, beginning in 1960, I had founded and operated the Interscience Research Institute, publishing through it *The Creative Process*, then America's only journal dealing with Reich's theories and concepts. In 1974 the Interscience Research Institute changed its name to the Radix Institute.

But in 1966, at the end of more than 15 years' exposure to Reich's work at every level, I had made a discovery that removed me from the mainstream of Reichian thought as effectively as the original discovery of the body armor by Reich removed him from the mainstream of psychoanalysis and launched him on a path that could only diverge from that of Freud and Freud's followers of the '20's and '30's.

If the muscular armor was the mechanism of the human will -- and it is, for observations now covering 17 years confirm the correctness of this germinal insight again and again -- then the whole attitude towards the armor and the work done on the armor in Reichian work is turned upside down. Is the Reichian therapist, the technologist hired to break down the armor, rid our bodies of its noxious effects, then the enemy of the human will? Had I undergone 15 years of Reichian work pushing me in a "wrong direction, a direction that hurt rather than expanded my human potential? - For on this one point I was clear: my capacity to act according to my own individual thought and will I valued above my feelings. Feelings came second, no matter how intense, how deep the longing, how desperate and agonizing the pain.

Desperate and agonizing the feelings were at the end of 1965 when, as I said in Part One of this article, my life seemed such a shambles personally and professionally. I was unhappily married, failing in my objectives with my Institute, overworking, overeating, overdrinking, in need of regular exercise, afraid to make a commitment to Erica, the woman I loved.

I was afraid for my two children because I loved them, for their mother - although I did not love her I respected and cared about her, and her life was so dependent on mine --and most of all, I was afraid for myself. It was my experience of life in 1965 that commitment led to heartbreak -- witness now my children, ages seven and four, in the home I had provided and shared with them and their mother, the home which I now felt called on to abandon.

There was little in 15 years of Reichian work that prepared me for the difficult decision, the tough move, dealing effectively with the harsh and painful realities of my life. I had opened my feelings, become able to cry and to love, deepened my sexual experience, become better able

¹ In THE RADIX VOL. I: RADIX PERSONAL GROWTH WORK, 1992, pp. 193-226. First published in *Chuck Kelley's Radix Journal*, Vol. III No. 2, Summer 1983 as Part 3 of a series "About Reich and Radix: A Memoir."

© Charles R. Kelley 1983, 1992

to contact myself and others, to relate. I was in so many ways a different person than the man taking his first Reichian session 15 years before. I did and I do think these are objectives of enormous importance, and that they are promoted most effectively by skilled Reichian work. But there was another set of objectives I had of a different sort. Work that developed the capacity for toughness, self-discipline, denial, taking the hard path, was either smuggled into my Reichian sessions, as when we talked, before the "real" feeling work began, or was learned from another source in my life. These other objectives were, by and large, *not* taught effectively in my Reichian work.

The work of Ayn Rand was important to me at this time. Her heroic figures took the hard path through the years of their lives. They were armored, no question about that, and their armor was a virtue, their achievements triumphs of mind and will over feelings.

Looking back now I realize that I studied Ayn Rand's works before I discovered the origin of the armor. My personal need to develop toughness to deal with the difficult decisions in my life expressed itself first in my choice of reading material. *WE THE LIVING* and *THE FOUNTAINHEAD* were most important books for me. I referred to Ayn Rand in the final issue of *The Creative Process* in 1965. Discovery of the origin of armor came early the following year.

As I struggled with the concept of a life force in the 1950's, I struggled with a new view of the armor, of the human will, of purpose in the 1960's. My first task was to put my own will to work in the most difficult crossroads of my life.

And as I have said before, I made every difficult decision my life called for in 1965 and 1966. I moved out on my family, divorced my wife, committed myself to the woman I loved, stopped publishing *The Creative Process*, finished the book I had been struggling with, quit drinking more than I should, lost 20 pounds, formed and followed an exercise program, did what I thought was right for my children and ex-wife, balanced against what Erica and I needed for our life together. And I launched a struggle to understand the ramifications of my discovery of the origin of the armor, a struggle that has played such a central role in the development of Radix, a struggle that is in progress today. Discovering that the armor is the mechanism of the will raised far more difficult, serious, and profound questions than I could hope to answer in one lifetime.

The basic theory came relatively easily. Once the initial insight hit me, so many things fell into place. The most difficult thing to understand was the destructiveness of the armor. How an evolutionary invention of enormous power the human mind and its organ of execution, the human will could be so destructive of human health and happiness; that was the mystery. That it was enormously destructive Reich has shown to all with eyes, by letter, chapter, and verse, beyond any reasonable question. And my position was, had to be, that the positive value, the benefit of the human will with the armor as its mechanism matched the cost. Reich had shown that the armor produced profoundly irrational and destructive religious and political systems, biopathic diseases so widespread and catastrophic in their social consequences as to overshadow the plagues of the middle ages, incredible misery of hundreds of millions of suffering human beings. This was the price the human race was paying for its evolving capacity to think independently and act autonomously from a process of thought.

A decision I had to make early was on the term *muscular armor*. I had always used it in Reich's sense of chronic unconscious patterns of muscular contraction which have the function of blocking and controlling the activity of the life force. The armor is most obvious with the

blocking of strong emotion, but I don't believe Reich or other knowledgeable Reichians believed it was limited to strong emotion. Those I discussed the issue with thought it functioned more widely, being involved in repression of thought as well as feeling.

With the discovery of the origin and function of the armor, the positive aspect of the armor was made clear. The armor was more than a defense, a protection against unwanted, threatening feelings and thoughts. It was also the function by which the life force was directed in the body in the service of mind and will. The life force flowed through the body in channels formed by the patterns of muscular contraction that were the armoring process. But as the channeling function of the process is stressed more and more the word *armor* becomes less appropriate.

I've stayed with the word now, rather than coin a new word for what we know and understand so well in Radix work. Perhaps I will yet make a change. For the present, at least, I use the term *armor* to mean the building material, not only of blocks to feeling in Reich's sense, but also the building material of walls, channels, boundaries, structures controlling the life force in the body. As such, it is the basis of individuation in the child and containment in the adult. The armor is not, however, a static structure but a dynamic process, a learned pattern residing not so much in the muscles of the body as in the brain and nervous system, from which the corresponding muscle contractions in the body are triggered when called for.

It is now, in the transition, before the new stage of purpose is yet achieved, that the awful price of the muscular armor is paid. And for the human race caught in the transition it is too late to return. There is no choice, no road back. Like the student of Radix work when the long-range risk he has been cautioned about comes to pass. He no longer fits in the life he built for himself, but has not built another. That student cannot go back to a younger, easier, less troubled life; it is already too late. So with the human race. We cannot go back to an earlier simpler less polluted less technologically developed less political less war-threatened stage of history. We cannot become the childlike, happy loving primitive idolized by Reich and Rousseau and millions reading the Old Testament who have dreamed about life in the Garden of Eden. We are here, and we are required by circumstance to move from where we are right now, in this world, at this time. Some would wish it no other way.

If the theory of Radix purpose work came rather easily after the initial process of discovery, the practice came hard. There is a "downhill" quality about Radix feeling work. Freeing the armor and opening the feelings tends to flow, develop momentum, progress like water down a slope. The process is often frightening, angry, painful, but nonetheless moves more readily that way than in the reverse direction. Feeling work is dismantling structure. Tearing down a building or unwrapping a package is much easier than building the building or wrapping the package. Appreciating the function of and need for the armor came out of the theory and later out of experience; but learning how to build the armor and build it right takes a technology that in the '60's was not there, and in the '80's is still in an early developmental stage.

I believed that the armor was built by tough processes of life, in which strong feelings combined with difficult decisions and choices. The armor, in the form of patterns of muscular contraction, had to block, channel, control feelings by forming barriers to the radix flow in the body. These barriers first dammed or slowed the radix. In time they diverted and redirected it, shaped and patterned it in accord with thought and will. At first the blocks forming the armor are massive and crude, damming the major radix flows which underlie pain, anger, fear, and sexuality. But muscular patterns are learned and take less effort as they become more subtle, differentiated, and specific.

Thought itself involves subtle implicit patterns of muscle contraction in the body. The control of emotion involves larger, more powerful contractions. These things I knew as a well-schooled psychologist. I felt sure such contractions expressed and served the function of muscular armor. It might even be appropriate to say they *were* the muscular armor, though there was too little known about radix processes, muscle tension, and consciousness to be dogmatic on this point.. All radix and Reichian theory regarding muscular armor, feelings, and life force is built on an incomplete theory and data that can be interpreted in many ways.

But strong emotion, together with strongly conscious thought, seemed to me to characterize the formation of armor in life. These should be present, I reasoned, in a program designed to develop the capacity for purpose. I set about an active search for programs that moved their participants in the direction of increased purpose. I knew that such programs were more likely to have developed as a "therapy" than under an educational or growth framework. The growth movement was new at that time, and programs labeled "educational" were almost invariably either head oriented and unemotional, or body mechanic oriented and unemotional. Of the former type were general semantics, psychoanalysis, and the vast bulk of academic psychology. Bates training, Yoga body work, Alexander work, Rolfing and Feldenkrais work were of the second type, body oriented but unemotional. I was confident that as useful as good programs of both kinds were, all were specifically skirting the emotional. But emotion, strong emotion, had to play a central role in building, as it did with dismantling, the muscular armor. Good body work and good intellectual programs could be fine adjuncts to Radix purpose work, as they were with Radix feeling work. They could not *be* Radix purpose work, which whatever else, would have strong emotion as a hallmark.

I began a process of search. The search had begun unconsciously when I experienced the need for more personal toughness in making and implementing the difficult decisions my life called for in the early and mid- '60's. Though I found what I needed, it was by a slow, painful, haphazard, inefficient process. There was far too much lost time, too many false starts and wrong directions for me. I had needed - and did not have - a technology of building purpose. I could have used some assistance in clarifying my goals, though that was the easier part of it. Where I needed help was in the development of the armor, the structure to build, channel, direct my life toward the goals I knew I wanted. It was much less a matter of knowing where I wanted to go, and much more a process of developing the motivation, the will, the determination, the movement needed to go there.

So the search began. I would discover and teach education in purpose as well as education in feeling through my Institute. Were the tools and techniques for building purpose in existence? The language used by others might be different, the stated objectives foreign, the context strange. I knew I would recognize what I was looking for once I experienced it, but the experience had to be genuine. I had to enter the programs I sought in good faith, participate genuinely, find for myself what it did for me and for others in it with me. The skills of purpose developed slowly I was sure, and I would need to experience the effect of the work over time.

In 1969/70, I began teaching the skills of purpose as part of the Institute's three subject programs in feeling, purpose, and vision improvement: At the time I had been a regular participant at Synanon for perhaps a year. The first purpose groups I taught were based largely on the model of the Synanon "game."

Synanon

Many local residents in Santa Monica were scared stiff of Synanon, the drug rehabilitation center run by ex-addicts and ex-alcoholics. Chuck Dederich, Synanon's founder, had been an alcoholic, but his center had never had the appeal for drinkers it had for drug addicts dope fiends, as they insisted on calling them at Synanon. The City bureaucrats raised every obstacle to Synanon -- no permits, wrong zoning, no license for this or that, but Dederich and his people hung in, and eventually outlasted them.

What interested me first and foremost about Synanon was that it worked. An impressively large number of drug abusers of the most serious, extreme types went to Synanon and reformed, went off drugs entirely. They acquired the toughness and discipline for a decision that in the short run, "felt" terrible, and they stayed with it.

People coming in to take Radix or other human potential work are more likely to have problems with their blocks to feelings than with direction and discipline in their lives. Lots of armor, lots of inhibitions and not much feeling is a frequent problem. But among drug abusers discipline, self control and purpose are less in evidence. The effective building of armor was, I was sure, a central achievement at Synanon. I was out to discover how they did it.

The primary factor effecting change at Synanon was said to be the "Synanon Game," a confrontation encounter members were required to attend many hours each week. In the late '60's, membership was not exclusively "dope fiend" residents of Synanon, but was open to interested "squares" in the community, people like myself who viewed Synanon as an interesting social experiment, and wanted to participate, play the Synanon game, and see how the process of change Synanon promoted affected our own lives, and the lives of others.

The members of Synanon were divided into groups, "tribes," as they called them. My tribe of 50 Synanon residents and community "squares" further divided into three "games" on its meeting nights. Rosters for the game were put together by our chief, with some help from senior tribesmen, and were read to us when we assembled for the short tribe meeting that preceded the game.

What happened at games varied a lot. Sometimes they were funny, sometimes (often) angry, sometimes moving, sometimes just boring. The central rule was that there could be no violence or threat of violence. Break that rule and you were out the door, and could not expect to be allowed back.

It's strange to me how confrontation encounters run by mental health professionals often lack a clear, enforced stricture against violence or the threat of violence. I've been to many. Such groups are often led by good "liberals" who form the majority of the mental health establishment, and their groups are frequently dominated emotionally by one or two aggressive short-fused bullies and the fear their threats engender. Deep rage is never safe to express in such groups.

Synanon was not like that. The violence rules were kept. Groups containing many violent men, convicted felons, were common at Synanon. Yet in the game one could escalate rage to the highest levels with safety. In hundreds of hours of work I never saw the rule broken.

An unwritten rule at Synanon was to "get" the person the game was on, the focus of the group's attention. Find the person's dirty little secret; expose, ventilate, accuse, embarrass. Accusers were expected to exaggerate, and no one was expected to defend anyone else. There were no holds barred, no area of life protected from exposure. Anyone holding back information about another in the group was called down for having a protective "contract" that hurt the game and the person they were trying to protect.

I found the Synanon game stimulating, a challenge emotionally and intellectually. Nights I played the game I came home charged, excited, wanting to talk and talk. It was my way of integrating and understanding the experience. Personally it was challenging, and I gained confidence and assertiveness from it. Technically I saw it as building armor, developing a capacity for purpose.

After a few months of regular participation in Synanon I could say with confidence that their process did produce change in people, change in the direction of more control, better behavior, less acting out. I asked a Synanon chief who was also a professional what he saw as the difference between Synanon groups and outside psychotherapy and encounter groups run by professionals. He told me:

"Our groups deal with a different strata of society. Most of the dope fiends crawl in here off the streets, never having learned how to live with people at all. Lots of them don't know the simplest, most basic things. They don't know how to take a bath, change their underwear, empty their ashtrays, turn down their radio when someone is trying to sleep. They don't know not to steal from their neighbors, much less strangers. They haven't learned to do an honest day's work for a day's pay, nor that they need to be able to apply themselves day after day, learn a trade, build some kind of future for themselves. We have to pound it in to them. We make them look at themselves and become aware and ashamed when they're jerks, and when they aren't thinking. At least we make them uncomfortable enough that they change their behavior, so that we can live with them. - And we have a big advantage over academic professional types. There's no one who can teach them like the person who's been there, who grew up like they did, and made their life into something better."

Self-awareness and self-responsibility seemed central to the Synanon process. A long quotation from Emerson's essay on self-reliance was posted on the wall. There was something that didn't quite fit going on about this, but it was many many months before I began to get a handle on the contradictions in Synanon on the self-responsibility issue. In my first months, I had to take in, observe, reserve my opinion about things I didn't yet have enough first hand experience to judge.

I went to Synanon two or three times a week for more than a year. When my tribe wasn't meeting to play the game I would hang out in the "living room," the huge lobby of the Beach Club that was Synanon's home, loaf on their private beach, or have coffee or a meal in the dining area. I learned almost as much talking to people about how Synanon had affected their lives as I did playing the game.

In the living room on a typical evening there would be 3 or 4 newcomers half sacked out on couches, with their "baby-sitters" alongside. New arrivals usually came in the door stoned on heroin, and after a shower and haircut, settled into the first item of business -- withdrawal from heroin.

Withdrawal was cold-turkey, and not a fraction as painful as media hype has made it out to be. Most who had been through both thought giving up smoking was as hard or harder. But in the first couple of days there was anxiety and there were physiological withdrawal symptoms. That's why they each had a baby sitter who had been a heroin addict, and so had been through it. The baby sitter would get them a milk shake, sit with them, talk, help them through the bad parts. A couple of days and it was over, and they were ready to start life without drugs at Synanon.

One evening I had coffee with Judy, a young woman I'd often seen in previous weeks sitting in the living room holding hands with Robert, another young Synanon resident. She told me their story - A Synanon romance.

Judy had been a whore for 8 years, since the age of 16, "turning tricks," as prostitutes called it, to pay for her drug habit. Prostitution was the typical way Synanon women had paid for drug habits, burglary the way men had paid. She was drunk or stoned virtually every trick she had turned, Judy told me. Then one day she made a decision to try for something more with her life, and seven months before entered Synanon. Four months before she had met Robert in the "stew," an ongoing (for a time, "perpetual) Synanon game. Robert was an ex-burglar and ex-junkie and like herself, relatively new to life off the street.

Something special in their chemistries responded from the first meeting but, being relative Synanon newcomers, their behavior was strictly supervised 24 hours each day. In the first weeks they saw each other only in group, and on brief occasions a few odd times their paths crossed living and working at Synanon. Then their Synanon "parents" conferred, and Robert and Judy were given permission to sit together in the living room for an hour most evenings, where the permitted level of intimacy for them for the next two months was to talk and hold hands. Judy told me she needed those restrictions; they made it safe to be with Robert, and to let herself learn to care more deeply without having to deal with the new and frightening issue of sex with a man she cared about.

A month before I met her, Judy and Robert's enforced courtship period had served its purpose. They were given permission to consummate their relationship. Like a virginal bride, with gifts of flowers and heart-felt good wishes from members of their new-found family and, after a suitable ceremony, Robert took his blushing beloved to the room that was their bower. She told me she should have been dressed in white; she felt like a virginal bride. And in an emotional sense she was. It was the first real emotional relationship with a man she had ever had.

I was deeply touched by Judy's story. There was something so right about what was done with and for the two young lovers. Someone could write a play about it.

But it left me with a question. How much of the change that took place in Synanon was due to the game, the group process residents were exposed to 8-12 hours each week, and how much was due to the life-style, the structure and rules, the surrogate family Synanon provided outside of and apart from the game? Surely both were important. Other institutions, drug rehabilitation centers for example, could provide the structure, rules, and the chance for a surrogate family to develop. But the game forged the family, confronted the members with what was required of them to grow, monitored their progress, dealt with backsliding, kept their eyes open to reality.

In those months I pondered the relationship of the Reichian work such as I did in my practice to what I saw at Synanon. Synanon needed what I could have given it. Drug addicts are, as a group, repressed in their feelings. The times were rare in the game that their feelings were accessible for effective work to take place. I saw massive, crude, primitive muscular armor that I had the skills to dismantle and they didn't even know existed. The process of growth was, as I saw it, a progressive breaking down of old armor, old structure, early and no longer appropriate blocks to feeling, replacing it with a more articulated, differentiated armor pattern. It was not a stripping away, a destroying of the armor, but a continual softening and rebuilding of structure into a more flexible adaptable form. With the rebuilding the armor was not less effective but more so, yet the person had more freedom, not less. Because of the greater conscious-participation in the armoring process and the new flexibility and gradations of response, the power of the will expanded, the individual gained choice. Where the early massive primitive armor could only say "yes" or "no" to, e.g., the radix flow expressive of anger or fear or sexuality, the more developed, flexible armor could provide a wide variety of responses between these extremes, a range of choice adaptable to a range of situations. The contradiction between feeling and purpose softened a little in practice as the armor damming the feeling in the service

of purpose began to be seen less as a barrier. It was better described as a channeling structure that enabled an appropriate, differentiated feeling response.

There was no place for my work in Synanon. The senior staff (with the exception of Al Bauman, who directed their school for children) had no concept of or feeling for Reichian work for opening the feelings. And like many proud and pioneering organizations, Synanon had a serious "NIH complex." The term "NIH" as used by inventors and technical innovators in the business field is an acronym for "Not Invented Here." - For NIH thinkers the attitude is, "if it was not invented here, how could it be really good?"

Synanon people were justifiably defensive in the face of continual put-down and attempts to discredit them from establishment professionals. They almost prided themselves on their ignorance of group therapy and human potential developments and techniques, even when they used methods and techniques done before and better by others. They were "years ahead" of all the others, they imagined. In many ways they were. But their insular and defensive attitude led to their undoing.

"Self-reliance!" The Emerson quotation on the wall outside the door where our tribe met bugged me more and more. The contradiction grew. At the one end addicts were brought in. They were verbally battered and beaten into consciousness in the game, exposed, disciplined, taught. And they were also nurtured. Like Judy and Robert, they responded, grew and changed, achieved development as human beings they never before knew, in the best family they had ever had.

And then? My inquiries about the success their "graduates" had after they left Synanon made Synanoners uncomfortable. What were they not telling me? I couldn't believe that the process wasn't effective, far more effective than the rehabilitation schemes of bureaucrats and government funded professionals of the medical and mental health establishment. But why weren't they doing follow-ups, gathering and publishing data? They should be trumpeting their achievements, and here, a knowledgeable sympathetic participating professional couldn't even find out what was going on.

I asked, what kind of program did they have to transition people back to the community, get housing and jobs, find compatible organizations to join, make friends, develop the support system they needed for their life. Synanon provided a support system ready-made for its residents, but the autonomous adult living in the community had to find or create his own. The Synanon "graduate" clearly would need help with this process.

The ugly truth I put together, one fact at a time, over a period of months. There was no such program. There were no studies of Synanon "graduates." Synanon residents did not "graduate" for a simple reason. They were never supposed to get out! They were supposed to stay with Synanon, work at Synanon industries, build the organization, bring in money, make Synanon their way of life, and help Synanon become a big important successful social movement. They were supposed to become permanent disciples in the service of the Synanon cause.

The game abounded in a kind of threat to residents whenever they brought up anything suggesting they might be leaving. "You'll never make it. You'll be shooting dope in a week." "I'll buy an insurance policy on you; in six months you'll be dead." "You haven't a chance; you know that, don't you?" At first I took such remarks as cautionary advice, in customary Synanon overstatement. I presumed that they were really saying, "Don't go too soon." "You aren't ready yet." "It takes longer than you've given it." But some of the threats couldn't be interpreted that way. "A dope fiend is a cripple, and don't forget it." "This, right here, is your only chance to stay alive." "Maury was your friend, wasn't he. He was here 5 years, and he O.D.'d three months after he skipped. Did you go to his funeral?" "Walk out that door and you can never come back. You

know that." "You can't make a cripple into a whole person. Don't kid yourself, you need us."
"We're the only decent family you've ever had. We've diapered you and taken care of you for six years. Now you're going to walk out. Fuck you, I hope you do croak."

I didn't mind people being "beaten up" verbally in the game for not thinking, for being inconsiderate, bad friends or neighbors, not carrying their weight. They needed to learn that. But it was something else to continually attack the adequacy, the potency, the sense of self. My every instinct said you *never* attack the essential self-concept. To damage the self-concept is to damage the person. Attack bad behavior, confront unconsciousness, but the sense of self is, for me, sacred.

I lost respect for Synanon over this issue. I became more critical, then, over other, related matters. Their authoritarianism I came to see in a different way. It was not just assuming a parental role for a while, while their charges grew up; it went well beyond that. It was preempting decisions in order to establish and perpetuate a fixed authority relation. Synanon was not trying to create autonomous responsible adults but good obedient children, children who would do what they were told and believe what they were taught. Being "responsible" and self-reliant at Synanon really meant learning to do what was expected of you without argument, save for blowing off steam in the game.

In 1970 Synanon forbade smoking. I heard that the order came directly from Chuck Dederich. Henceforth there would be no smoking at Synanon. None.

It was interesting - especially for a non-smoker like myself, who could look at the conflict as a spectator. Ex-addicts agreed it was harder for most of them to quit smoking than it was to quit heroin. Lots of them left Synanon over this issue. Those staying bitched about the edict at the game. The reply from Synanon high-ups always focused on the evils of smoking. Smoking was a dirty habit. Smokers stunk. Smokers fouled up the environment for non-smokers. It cost Synanon thousands of dollars each month to keep members in cigarettes. - All true, and irrelevant. The issue, the only real issue that I could see, was, "Who decides? Who decides for *me*?"

The technology of education in purpose when practiced effectively, as it was at Synanon, is a tool of extraordinary power. Used to further the purposes of an authority or elite, it illustrates the stuff of successful political and religious sects, mystical and charismatic movements of all kinds. It shows with special clarity the tools from which such movements can be formed. I knew that when these same tools were used, as they could be, in the service of individual autonomy, the same power could be developed, but with a difference. The power would be placed in the hands of the individual undergoing the process, to be used by that person for good or bad, in the pursuit of that individual's own independent life. That was the objective of Radix education in purpose. Synanon had techniques that seemed appropriate, if I could adapt them to my own way of working.

Synanon went from bad to worse. In a few years it had given up its fine facility in Santa Monica, bringing its faithful to a site in Northern California at Tomales Bay. Synanon men had vasectomies (guess who decided) and the organization moved increasingly into paramilitary behavior. Newspapers reported the arrest of two Synanon "marines" for placing a rattlesnake in the mailbox of a Synanon "enemy" - an attorney who had successfully pressed litigation against them. This was allegedly done with the encouragement of Synanon's brass.

I don't know how it worked out from there. I guess I no longer care - Except when I think of Judy and Robert, and so many thousands like them, not just at Synanon but in the world. Think of what the power so effectively employed by Synanon might do if used, not to control and exploit, but to develop and free its participants.

At the Institute I was having problems applying the technique of the Synanon game in "Education in Purpose" groups. The Institute was organized on university lines, with course offerings in vision work, feeling work, and purpose work. Students flocked in to the feeling groups, but only trickled in to vision and purpose classes. The confrontation encounters scared people stiff. And in the purpose groups I did have, the process did not satisfy me. People didn't work enough. In one-at-a-time circle work, a 12-person group meeting 3 hours per week only gave each person an average of 15 minutes per week. I developed some good paired exercises lasting an hour that gave each group member 30 minutes of personal activity per week. These paired *co-confidant* exercises, some of which owed a lot to Gestalt Therapy, have been central to Radix groups through the years, but they don't do some of the things the group encounter did, and I could not monitor closely what went on in each pair. Then, paired and other all-at-once group techniques reduced the time for encounter. At Synanon, members spent hours each week in the game. Many played it almost every day. And they lived and worked in the Synanon environment. I tried to get students in 2 or 3 times per week at the Institute, but did not succeed. It was more expenditure of time and money than most of the busy working population that I drew students from would commit.

So I struggled for an effective overall format for the Radix program. Students poured in for feeling work. Professionals were eager for training in how to do it like I did, and like Erica did. Erica was becoming a powerful Reichian teacher in her own right. Teaching and training others to teach "education in feeling" work gave us a means of support. It has, in fact, been our primary livelihood since 1969.

But work with the feelings was only half of the job. With my format I couldn't have Radix purpose students for the hours each week Synanon residents spent in the game. – And I did not discover another format that gave me the time with purpose students that I needed. Instead, I sought ways of getting better use from the time I did spend. This meant looking elsewhere than the Synanon game for Education in Purpose techniques.

Nathaniel Branden and Objectivism

It was an exercise in frustration for Erica when Nathaniel Branden first came to dinner. It was in 1966. Erica was pregnant with our first child. She had prepared a beautiful dinner, she told me later. I really hadn't noticed. Our guest arrived promptly, and from the time he stepped through the door until he left hours later, the conversation was non-stop, and Erica, with her British reserve, didn't get in a word. Nathaniel and I paid barely enough attention to the food to get it from our plates to our mouths, unconscious of what we were consuming.

We were traveling the reaches of psychology and philosophy, seeking out those fascinating junctures where independent thinkers of similar values and beliefs discover that they diverge. Our last subject of the evening was instinct in man. He didn't believe man had instincts. He had written an article to that effect. I thought man did have them. We hammered away at that until he was ready to go out the door. He turned to Erica, thanked her, then said, "Erica, the problem with you is that you talk entirely too much." That left her even more speechless, if that were possible, and he disappeared.

The Nathaniel Branden Institute in New York was the organization through which Ayn Rand and Branden worked. It was the central, if not the only, organization then in existence to promote Objectivist thought. Ayn Rand's heroic figures, Kira Argounova, Howard Roark, John Galt, and the others, exhibited extraordinary purpose in their lives, and so interested me greatly. There was little in Rand's work, however, to indicate where this purpose came from. Her

characters seemed to be born with it. I did not believe they were. Genetics makes its contribution in providing a potential that could be developed in many ways. At some point in life the purposive person moving in the direction of autonomy takes charge of this process and directs the development of the potential that was carried by the genes. What training experience would help them?

Nathaniel Branden was as interested in this question as I, and had done a great deal to develop techniques of growth for his own practice. In 1968 there was a rupture in his relationship with Ayn Rand. He moved to California and opened a practice here. In my estimation he came into his own in the originality and power of his work after the break with Rand. In the 1970's we had several years of productive interchange in our respective ways of working. His is one of the three major technical contributions to Radix purpose work.

Nathaniel invited Erica and I to do a workshop in his home in 1972, and in the years following I took a series of his workshops, while Radix teachers trained at the Radix Institute taught regular weekly groups in his office. These were attended, on his recommendation, by clients in his practice. Other of his clients came in to the Institute to work, while Radix students and trainees were encouraged to take work with Nathaniel. At one time half of the students at the Radix Institute were in or had been in work with Nathaniel Branden.

Three aspects of this work had a strong impact on Radix work in general, and Radix purpose work in particular. They are 1) the largely unconscious attitudes and values Branden conveyed, 2) the concepts from Branden and from objectivism, and 3) the specific techniques adapted from Branden for use in Radix purpose work.

I. *Attitudes and Values.* Branden expresses in his life and in his practice respect and responsibility for himself, a self-respect that is not achieved at the expense of others. Consistent with the objectivist philosophy in which his work had its roots, he does not live for others nor expect them to live for him. He does not take care of people, but projects both the expectation that they will take care of themselves and the confidence that they can do this adequately. His practice is run efficiently and well, in a direct and businesslike way too often absent in the human potential movement.

I liked going to Branden groups. Branden is intelligent, values intelligence and purpose, and brings it out in his clients. He drew a variety of intelligent, talented clients. The atmosphere around Branden was of purposive thoughtful people, most of them in charge of their lives, seeking to become better integrated and more effective. This general atmosphere infected those coming in from different, less positive places.

With the interaction between his work and Radix, Nathaniel's style changed somewhat. He became less heady, more sensitive to body and feeling. This helped Radix students become able to feel more at home in his practice. The attitude conveyed was simultaneously supportive of the expression and acceptance of feeling and the development of the self concept.

As his success grew, Nathaniel began working in large workshop groups, 100-200 attendees or more, in cities around the country and the world. I must admit to mixed feelings about his large group workshops. On the one hand, they have enabled him to reach a great number of people at some level. Branden is a purveyor of health, and these workshops have a health-enhancing effect. I'm sure they start many people in the direction of personal growth and expansion. But for me, the truly interesting work is with the long-term students, seen regularly and over enough time to produce profound changes in their being. Perhaps that is my selfish interest, the narrower, deeper focus as opposed to the broader, more popular. That is where I

want to work, and I would like to see the Nathaniel Brandens of the world engaged in the same enterprise. Yet the world needs both directions of work.

2. *Concepts.* Branden has authored a series of books expressing the attitudes and values that make his work what it is. His concepts are congruent with the attitudes his practice expresses. I'll mention three of his books.

His first, and still central expression of his values, is THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SELF ESTEEM (1971). THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ROMANTIC LOVE (1980) is the most widely read, enough so to make the best seller lists. My personal favorite is THE DISOWNED SELF (1973). This is a slighter book than THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SELF ESTEEM, but is better written, and focuses on the issue of repression and how Branden understands and works with it. All of his books, however, convey Branden's life-positive self-affirming philosophy.

Self awareness, self acceptance, self assertion, self responsibility, these are Branden's central tenets. He sees their development as the primary task of psychotherapy, and, indeed, of living successfully. Ayn Rand expressed a philosophy of self esteem, while Branden analyzed its psychology and developed techniques to promote it in the context of group psychotherapy. He attracted to his practice intelligent, analytic clients, for many of whom books, concepts, the intellectual framework Branden created was a major factor supporting their growth process.

3. *Techniques.* In 1974 in one of a series of workshops I took with Nathaniel Branden, I worked on an area of my life I had never covered in previous years of work, the sexual rejection I had experienced as a teenager. My self-concept was fragile in that area and I had unconsciously managed to avoid dealing with it through the years.

"If my unshed tears could speak, they might tell you" I was to complete that sentence again and again with different endings each time. That sentence completion and that issue came up with a particular young woman in the workshop towards whom I felt simultaneously attracted and shy, afraid of rejection while wanting contact. Nathaniel soon had the two of us seated on the floor in the center of the group eye to eye. With consummate skill using the sentence completion technique he has developed to such a high art, Nathaniel led me through that mix of fear and attraction I felt, and the roots of the fear in years of adolescent sexual rejection that I could never understand. The rejection had been excruciatingly painful to me. I had repressed, not the memories of those years, but the burden of pain they carried. I cried more deeply in that young woman's arms that I had in a group before. The release of power, of potency in that experience changed me profoundly. I was more confident and self-assertive in my sexuality and in my whole being after that workshop than I had ever been in my life.

In the second edition of EDUCATION IN FEELING AND PURPOSE (1974) a detailed description of a Radix Purpose group session circa 1974 is given. The confrontation encounter had by then all but disappeared from Radix purpose work, replaced by more time-efficient exercises, primary among which were Radix co-confidant paired work and Branden sentence exercises, often done in pairs, triads and foursomes, i.e., with all the group working.

Branden sentence completions make it possible to explore a specific problem area deeply with greater efficiency and effectiveness than any other technique I have used or seen. One of its surprising virtues is that, used correctly, it gets around the head defenses that sabotage so much verbal work. The responses are required too fast for the censor to operate effectively. Again and

again, with the right choice of sentence, good timing, and proper attention to body expression, breathing and eye contact, repression is lifted and feelings pour through.

The problem of Radix purpose work in the mid '70's remained one of the depth of the long-range work. The deep restructuring of the armor and the profound changes in being that went with it happened with a few individuals, but that level of change too often eluded us. I was not getting the level of commitment and the time that kind of work needed. I was aware that people did not come in to work enough hours per week or stay in the work enough years.

It was true that with the development of my co-confidant technique and the extensive and increasingly skilled use of Branden's sentence work and other techniques from TA, EST, and other sources, Radix purpose work was more efficient than it had ever been. It was *much* more focused, concentrated, and efficient than the Synanon game. Yet I had sometimes seen deeper change at Synanon. At Synanon they were more committed. They used their less efficient technology to better effect by using it more hours per week more years on end, with a greater investment of the self than my students gave it. How could I get that level of commitment in Radix? I was unwilling to make of Radix a cult, to generate the commitment of mystical religious faith, or to infantilize Radix students to intensify the transference and create the heavy dependency that so often underlies commitment in psychotherapy. I could find no answer.

Transactional Analysis, Reevaluation Counseling, The Daniels Program

The late '70's were difficult for my work with purpose. My faith in the concepts developed in the '60's was never shaken. - In fact, it had been affirmed by all I had done and seen in the '70's. But I was not executing. I had not found the way to do what needed to be done.

Radix feeling work was growing apace. The training program stayed focused on feeling work. We had 10, then 24, then 35, then more than 50 graduates. (Now, in 1983, there are nearly 100.) Because the training program was good, it grew and became the primary focus of work in the Institute. Three years of Radix feeling work was required of each trainee. That, combined with the didactic work, the supervision, and the level of life commitment that our training required, made Radix training a committed in-depth over-time growth program. It provided some of the characteristics I missed in the Radix "purpose" program. Training became the principal focus of my energy.

In the late '70's, then, Radix purpose work was "on the back burner." I kept looking for methods and techniques, kept exploring a wide range of programs that promised to contribute. In each case I would enroll as a participant and experience a program's work with a workshop or two and/or an introductory group, class, or series of sessions. If I was impressed enough, I took more. I learned some things of significance for purpose work from TA, Reevaluation Counseling, and Ranette Daniel's "Successful Living." I'll describe briefly a few of the contributions.

Transactional Analysis (TA). I had never taken TA that seriously as a growth program. It was too heady for me, and not that analytically brilliant. The "parent-adult-child" (*PAC*) structure of the self described in TA seemed to me a great step backward from Freud. Then several Senior TA therapists came into Radix training. I had to take a second look, because they were *good*, some of the best we had in training. There were Lois Johnson, Bill Cornell, Ed Perkinson, Bill Thrash, to name just a few; all training members of ITAA, the International Transactional Analysis Association, all good Radix Trainees and then Teachers. Two of the four became Radix Trainers.

I should not have judged Eric Berne and TA by the popularizers. What soon became apparent was that TA was a purpose-type program that could be combined with Radix work effectively to provide "feeling and purpose" work that was quite closely related to my own objectives. In my opinion, TA groups generally lack the power for building armor provided by e.g., confrontation encounter or Bar-Levav work. That kind of power needed the combination of the use of thought and will under conditions of intense emotion that I have not often seen in TA. But TA proved far more interesting than I had first given it credit for being. The marriage of TA and Radix in the practices of those teaching both has been fruitful.

A certain amount of planning, setting objectives, making and monitoring decisions to support change was part of Radix purpose work from the first meeting. Some people always did this much more effectively than others. Understanding through TA how excessively parental objectives could be selected by one part of the personality (the "parent") and undermined by another (the "child") was most useful. I used techniques that allowed every goal set in Radix purpose work to be reviewed by the resistant "child" part of the personality, with the full power to veto plans in advance rather than sabotage them later. Goals in Radix work come to be more integral to the whole person. This has been illustrated in EDUCATION IN FEELING AND PURPOSE.

There were other contributions of value from TA. Though I prefer Freud's "id ego superego" description of the personality to Berne's PAC as more representative of internal structural psychobiological processes, Berne's "PAC" description is better in the area for which Berne developed it, e.g., transactions between people. Simply to learn to recognize students slipping into child or parent ego states during work with them was of value to the Radix teacher.

Reevaluation Counseling. Harvey Jackins' "RC" interested me as a sort of "populist" program, like Synanon, developed and operated entirely outside the framework of the mental health/human potential establishment. Once basic rules and techniques were learned, RC participants counseled each other (co-counseling). My RC group's weekly meetings included reports on our lives, our progress in co-counseling, and some group exercises. Periodic workshops and conferences brought in people higher up in RC. Jackins emphasized the importance of discharge, and taught co-counselors to respect and encourage the discharge of feelings. Discharge of the intensity and quality that typifies Radix work is, I learned, rare in co-counseling.

I like RC, which I found to be a useful if limited program. It is significant when professionals can be effectively by-passed in a growth program. It opens the program to so many more participants. However, in the year or so in which I had an involvement in RC (circa 1974) there was a decided growth in the opposite direction. RC was becoming more and more an acknowledged professional occupation requiring a high level of skill, training, and experience.

Radix "talk-listen" exercises owe something to co-counseling. They are more my own than Jackins', however, with the emphasis on eye contact and breathing that has characterized Radix from the outset. However, the technical feature of RC that I found most fascination and relevant for work on purpose was the emphasis on "validation."

The woman was embarrassed, flushing as she always did in a validation exercise:

"I'm a good dancer.

"I'm a loyal friend.

"I work hard to take care of my children.

"I'm a nice-looking woman. – I wish I believed that."

"Come on, Roxanne," said the leader.

"I'm responsible.

"I'm intelligent.

"I'm sexy." -----

"Let it in. – Now, give us two more," the leader intervened.

"I'm responsible."

"You said that."

"I – uh – I'm a good mother."

The first time I saw people in an RC group having to "validate" themselves, I was appalled, the procedure seemed so phony and superficial. And when I was first asked to do it myself, I *felt* phony and superficial. The leader said to me:

"You're embarrassed. – Try letting yourself feel your embarrassment more."

I gained more respect for validation as I saw how painful it was to so many people to say positive things about themselves, especially when they were asked to let themselves experience what they felt in doing it. For me it didn't do that much, perhaps because I'm too facile verbally. The exercise never found its way to the sensitive areas of my self concept. I needed a Nathaniel Branden to direct it. But I saw good work done with validation, and good positive changes in participants in RC, changes that validation had contributed to.

It was a paradox. In Synanon, the energy of the group focused mostly on negatives, on the faults, inadequacies, failures. In RC the focus was absolutely the reverse; the positive, validating atmosphere was central. Both "worked," in the sense that both brought about growth, positive changes, in the development of the purpose side of the character. I saw it happen. Why?

My conclusion is that growth in purpose reflects growth in the self-concept. The first requirement of this growth is self-awareness. Whether a person is dealing with praise, criticism, or value-free self-examination, looking hard at oneself, facing and working through barriers to seeing oneself is always an important step in the growth experience. Understanding this for me was the direct result of my RC experience, and the most important contribution of RC to Radix purpose work.

Ranette Daniels and Successful Living." Daniels called her organization "Successful Living" and later "Earthplay." The organization, I understand, is now defunct. It was an EST-type operation. Ranette's workshops were large-group "hotel meeting room" type affairs. There was a lot of ESTian hype and recruiting of volunteers to spread the word, pouring out a barrage of mail and phone calls to anyone showing a flicker of interest. A Radix Adjunct Teacher, David Sherman, joined the organization early, and became an important part of it, providing a Reichian dimension to Ranette's heady, Erhardt style.

David eventually rose to be president of "Successful Living," going through impressive personal development during the process. He lost his excess weight, learned to groom himself and dress well, came to function in a direct, business-like way. In Radix feeling work much had been done to open and free his feeling capacities. They laid a groundwork. The changes he underwent with "Successful Living" were changes along the dimension of purpose that he needed to become a well-rounded and effective human being. That kind of change, whenever I saw it as the result of a growth program, caught my interest. What was the dynamic at work?

"Create space in the tip of your ring finger." --- Interminable pause.

"Good." (Wait.) "Now create a space in the tip of your middle finger. " -----

The hotel meeting room chairs were uncomfortable. Ranette's nasal twang was piercing. The exercise was agonizing, designed to last for millennia. We were traversing our bodies, at the moment starting up the left hand, at a pace that assured that we would be there, glued to those hotel chairs, at the turn of the century, unless I were to give in to impulse and strangle Ranette at some point, perhaps as we made our way at glacial speed across clavicle or femur. Now what day of the week did we start this exercise?

I don't know what Ranette's exercise was intended to accomplish. I learned something from it for myself by requiring myself to stay in the room, present, aware, following instructions and feeling my feelings to the very best of my ability, throughout the 90 minutes that the exercise actually took. Sometimes I drifted briefly into daydream, sometimes dropped into half-conscious somnolence. Each time the monitoring ego noticed, figuratively tapped my shoulder, and I brought myself back into the room. At the start of the exercise it was absolutely excruciating. Tolerance of boredom was not my long suit. By the end, I could do it, I could be there, I could feel that boredom and survive. The lesson had something to do with learning purpose. I was not yet sure what.

Ranette's other exercises and procedures were less boring. Most required control and discipline. Some were interactive, in pairs or small groups. After an exercise (she called them "processes"), the group of 60 sat like a large class, offered up experiences of what had occurred, asked questions. Ranette was the lady with the answers, replying and making observations deftly and well. There was a Zen flavor to her philosophy, which must have come through Erhardt, with occasional references to "getting it" and "the sound of one hand clapping." I didn't expect to learn about one hand clapping from Ranette, but I did wonder how a tightly controlled, not greatly emotional 2½ day sequence of exercises of moderate interest could end with the group as expansive as it was. I could create euphoria in Radix workshops, higher highs, stronger expansions, but there was a different quality in Ranette's group. Was it that I mostly freed the feelings, loosened armor, while she mostly built it?

Ranette offered a group in postulating, a way of helping students bring about desired changes in their lives. It was 1977, I believe, when I enrolled. "Postulates" were images of the future as we wanted it to be, snap shots of our lives at a place and time to come. We were to imagine how it would be if it was the way we wanted it to be, fix our mind on it, and expect that it would be that way. Having postulated an important objective we then set priorities -- also in postulate form -- that would help us get there.

I had done many future-fantasy exercises in purpose groups, creating future possibilities in some detail as an aid to setting objectives, making decisions and choices. A striking initial difference between Ranette's procedure and mine was her speed. I had students carefully and slowly weighing and balancing the significant alternatives their lives offered; Ranette had them racing. In Ranette's groups we set more goals during 20 minutes of postulating than Radix purpose students set in weeks of work. Large things and small, easy choices and hard, we whisked through double time. "Write 10 postulates for next week's class," Ranette would say, and she'd give us no more than 5 minutes to put them down.

I felt pushed and frustrated. Always trying to take more time to picture and weigh alternatives, I was never finished in the time she allotted. But I came to like the way she did it. It was clearly good for me to be forced into quick choices. My tendency was to compulsively ponder and weigh decisions. Ranette loosened and speeded up the process for me. -- Writing this

in 1983, I realized I could use a refresher course. My decision-making has bogged down again in the past 2 or 3 years.

Ranette and I differed diametrically in our understanding as to how postulates might become reality. If you pictured it clearly and accepted it as true it would happen, she believed. Postulating properly was creating the future. Do it right and that's the way it would be. Conversely, if a postulate didn't work out, *ipso facto*, you didn't do it right. It sounded like religious fundamentalists talking about prayer.

The resemblance to some points of view on prayer is more than superficial. Ranette had this magical view of causality that left me incredulous. She postulated everything, she said. When she drove out shopping or to a show, as she got close to her destination she would postulate a parking place being there. It always worked, she claimed. Nonsense, Ranette, was and is my response. The world doesn't work that way.

But it is tempting to believe. Ranette's magical thinking permeated her organization. When you evolved far enough, you became aware that you were "at cause," and that you created everything that happened in your life. Erhardt? L. Ron Hubbard? Back to solipsism, the ultimate philosophy of magical purpose? They really believed it -- or tried to.

I remember one of Ranette's workshops where a lieutenant in her organization, an attractive young woman, had been to the LA airport. In the evening in the parking structure where she had left her car the woman was attacked by a stranger who tried to rape her. She screamed and fought her way free, but was deeply shaken by the experience. The problem afterward, she shared with me, was being unable to understand why she had done that to herself. It was accepted as beyond question that she had, in fact, done it to herself!

When postulating becomes a magical process instead of a reality-oriented technique to change the course of events, wish fulfillment supplants tough decisions and hard work. But postulating can be a fine tool of purpose, and I have used it in one form or another in many purpose groups and marathons. The student of purpose work needs to develop a view of his life across time. Where has it been, where does it seem to be going, where does he want it to go? My emphasis in postulating is on the process of translating long-range life goals into day-to-day and week-to-week activities that lead toward the goal. Postulates first help students to sort out and choose the long-range life goals. Work with shorter-range postulates (Ranette called them "priorities") that are consistent with the long-range goals help students establish and maintain a direction of their day-to-day life leading toward those long-range goals.

Bar-Levav Work (Crisis Mobilization Therapy)

"Face him Nora. See him. Breathe. Let yourself feel what you feel as you do the exercise. You know the procedure. Give Roger three reasons, three things about him that lead you to want him to be your partner for this marathon. Then tell him three things about yourself that make you a good choice for him. Finally, ask him. If you are one of Roger's two pre- selections, he can accept you as a partner. Otherwise, he will reject you. Now see if you can get through it all, seeing, breathing and staying conscious, without prompting from me."

"I hate these Bar-Levav exercises. They are torture."

"I know -- you feel like you'd rather stay unconscious and ease into some kind of partnership or other without effort, risk or pain. But that's not why you're here, and that's not the way for you to grow. You know that. You've been here long enough. Now, do the exercise."

"I know, I know. I just need to bitch about it."

Feeling challenged, Nora went through the exercise better than had any one of those who had gone before her. She told Roger clearly what it was about him that attracted her to him as a partner and, harder for her, what were the things about her that would make her a good choice for him. She asked him, then, if he would be her partner for the rest of the marathon. Then she stayed in contact with Roger's eyes as he pronounced the almost inevitable words, *"I reject you as my partner for the marathon."* She released a held breath, let the reply sink in and said,

"Thank you, Roger."

Nora stood up and returned to the cushion that was her seat in the Radix purpose marathon.

The most potent influence on Radix purpose work since the impact of Nathaniel Branden in the mid '70's has been the work of Dr. Reuven Bar-Levav, a psychiatrist and group psychotherapist practicing in Detroit. He refers to his form of work as "Crisis Mobilization Therapy." I often simplify it to "Bar-Levav Work."

I have been studying Bar-Levav's work for the past few years. In March of 1981 Bar-Levav and I co-led a 5-day workshop, half of the sessions of which were Crisis Mobilization Therapy, and half Radix feeling work. Since then I have traveled to Detroit for a week every two or three months to participate in Bar-Levav marathons, study training tapes, attend training-seminars, and to interchange with Bar-Levav and his staff. While in Detroit I usually give Radix intensives to some 18 patients referred to me from Bar-Levav's practice, and attend and participate in staff meetings and supervisions.

My level of interest in Bar-Levav's work has stayed high because it is the most effective purpose-type program I have seen. In my frame of reference it is a non-intellectual verbal way of doing purpose work. In it high levels of feeling are generated and expressed with the requirement that the participant exercise control at all times. The Synanon stricture against violence or threat of violence is carried a step further. There is no spontaneous behavior at all. There is no holding, no touching even, without permission.

Bar-Levav thinks of his practice as intensive reconstructive psychotherapy. People are seen at least 2 times per week in small ongoing groups. In addition there is a weekly individual session, and a large group marathon every few months. This level of exposure is continued for years. Most of the patients (he refers to them as patients) that I have been exposed to, and that is now about half of the practice, have been working there at least 4 or 5 years. Many have been there 5 to 8 years, and a few have been there 10.

The practice is large. There are four full time and two part time therapists on the staff, all working what are, in my opinion, absurdly long hours. Bar-Levav moves through the various groups in progress in his practice.

Later each day, with the staff, he reviews progress and problems. He keeps close track of what is going on with each patient in the practice. This is more than 100 people. Considering how many hours each person is seen, this is an extraordinarily large and busy practice. And because of the strength of Bar-Levav's personality and the nature of his control and supervision, it is Bar-Levav's practice, even though most of those in it do the great majority of their work with others on the staff. Bar-Levav is a dominating controlling presence, with his finger on everything happening in his offices.

Bar-Levav is committed to the medical model, which suits his humane but highly autocratic character. The patients are treated as sick, and he, the doctor, takes over responsibility for their treatment, and a great deal of responsibility for their lives. Since he is a psychiatrist, many of those coming to him are less functional than most of those coming in to Radix. This difference can easily be overstated, however. Those in Bar-Levav's practice, like those coming into Radix, are predominately job-holding functioning adults, with a high proportion of professionals.

Only rarely does Bar-Levav hospitalize a patient. A few in his practice are on medication, e.g., valium, but very few, and they are weaned from it - and from other drugs -- as soon as Bar-Levav believes they are ready to handle it. He uses medication sparingly.

Bar-Levav groups are heavily character-analytic in Reich's sense of the word. In fact, Bar-Levav goes considerably beyond Reich in dealing with patients character-analytically. One of the most interesting aspects of his work is the way in which Bar-Levav uses group work in character analysis. Good character analysis is not an intellectual process of analysis. It was not for Reich, and it is not for Bar-Levav. It is here-and-now process oriented. How a message is expressed is much more important than its content. Manner, voice, body, all the tools of expression, then, are the focus of Bar-Levav work. This emphasis, which has developed with Bar-Levav over the past 10 or 12 years, has led him, as it did Reich, to more and more emphasis on body and feeling.

The work of Bar-Levav differs from that of Reich in this important respect: Reich emphasized exposing the armor, freeing and discharging the associated feelings, while Bar-Levav emphasizes exposing the armor while intensifying and yet containing the feelings. There is discharge in both cases, but the direction of the work is, in a crucial respect, diametrically opposite. It is the same difference that exists between Radix feeling work and Radix purpose work. In Radix conceptual terms, the primary task of Reichian work, including Radix feeling work, is loosening armor and opening the feelings. The primary task of Bar-Levav work and Radix purpose work is building armor, channeling and containing the feelings. From a practical point of view, every Radix feeling work teacher and every Bar-Levav therapist works to some extent with both. Understanding the difference in objective, direction and emphasis is crucial to understanding the two kinds of work and their relationship.

Consider the Bar-Levav exercise at the start of this section. Bar-Levav does not use many exercises, but the one illustrated typifies his style. Nora is required to seek a partner under tightly specified conditions that virtually guarantee a high level of feeling. She must expose her feelings about Roger in front of the group, telling Roger what she likes about him, and worse, what she has to offer him. It is likely that she is not one of Roger's pre-selected choices, so she will probably be rejected for her efforts. It may be equally hard for Roger, who probably likes her. He must take in her solicitation, see her struggle, then stay in contact with her as he pronounces the hurtful words, "I reject you."

If this exercise were done with feeling emphasis, it would be changed to promote discharge of the feelings generated. Nora might overflow with tears and be encouraged to cry over the pain of rejection. Roger might do the same over inflicting the pain of rejection of a person he cared about. A Radix feeling work teacher might work to loosen and free the blocks to feeling in one or both participants. But that is not the emphasis of a purpose exercise.

Nora indeed might have cried doing the purpose exercise, but she would have gone ahead anyway. Someone would have pushed her the kleenex, and the exercise would have continued as soon as she was able. *The objective of feeling work is to free and open the feelings, but the objective of purpose work is to do difficult things in the face of and in spite of the feelings.* Some

people have found it hard to distinguish between feeling and purpose work because both are done best in the presence of high levels of feeling. Yet they opposite directions of work.

In Bar-Levav work, strong feelings are often mobilized. That's why he calls it "Crisis Mobilization Therapy." The patient frequently feels emotionally as if the issue is really survival. But, whatever the level of feeling, the patient is required to keep the "observing ego" active at all costs, as that provides the guide to behavior in the crisis, and assures that control will not be lost, despite emotions that seem close to being overwhelming.

Sometimes the "crisis level" feelings are generated by an exercise, as I have indicated. Most frequently they come out of the work itself, which involves scrupulous attention to expression. And all of the work cannot be at crisis level. An ordinary happening in his therapy may give a better picture of how Bar-Levav actually works than a more dramatic episode.

"I'm having a hard time this afternoon," Jim spoke up, "and I want to do something about it." Jim was a rather heady, slim thirty-eight year old attorney, brunette with tight curly hair.¹

"I've been coming to you for seven years, Dr. Bar-Levav. I've been in more than twenty marathons, and it doesn't get any easier."

"Who said it's supposed to get easier," asked Bar-Levav. "How about sitting forward. Take your hands away from your face. Now take a breath and talk about it."

"I've been talking about it for seven damn years. I want something more to happen."

"What do you want to have happen?" asked Bar-Levav with provocative reasonableness. "Maybe for you it takes fourteen years."

(Escalating) "I WON'T PUT IN SEVEN MORE DAMN YEARS!" Jim spoke now in an aggrieved way: "I've been coming here three times every week, going to marathons, last year to Salzburg, two years before to France. I've spent an absolute fortune in this place."²

"Notice the little whining quality trying to creep into your voice. How about coming over here and telling me. Come on."

Jim got up and walked over to where Bar-Levav was sitting. He stood directly in front of him. As he worked he leaned forward, thrusting his face directly in front of Bar-Levav's.

"Get a good stance. Make fists. Now tell me whatever you have to say."

"YOU DON'T DO ENOUGH FOR ME."

"Breathe," said Mr. Hook, another of the four therapists working the marathon with Dr. Bar-Levav. "Loosen the shoulders. Push them forward a little. Open your mouth and speak up. Stay with his eyes. Now say it loud and clear -- ten times."

"YOU DON'T DO ENOUGH FOR ME," Jim repeated, louder and louder, eye to eye with Bar-Levav, frustration and fury building. Mr. Hook interceded, and sometimes spoke a word of instruction or encouragement to facilitate the interchange, so that Bar-Levav was more fully available to meet Jim's eyes than he would have been if he were focused on observing Jim's expression and instructing him in what to do.

¹ All identities of patients have been disguised.

² Jim is referring to trips taking place most years in Bar-Levav's practice in which intensive psychotherapy is done with a group of patients in an overseas setting.

After a moment Jim was subsiding a little.

"Why don't you sit down now and talk for a little about what's going on with you."

Jim slowly unwound and went back to his chair. He began to talk about the considerable difficulties and frustrations of his job during the previous week.

Did Jim's loud and angry-sounding outburst do anything for him? I wasn't sure that it did, in this instance, though I've seen the same sequence used in Bar-Levav's work when I was sure it was effective. In Jim's case I wasn't quite convinced by his anger. There was so often a subtle heady sucking quality in Jim's work, a character attitude that in his case is especially hard to expose so that he can see it. It seemed to me he imitated or ran through the motions of the exercise without either opening significant feeling or building containment and individuation. His feeling processes were so well defended they didn't break through.

Bar-Levav had sent Jim to me twice for Radix feeling sessions, hoping I might find a point of access. No great breakthrough occurred, though I felt I had made a good start on his heavy eye and throat blocks. "If he could do six months of regular work with me, we could accomplish something," I told Bar-Levav. Of course, that was not an available alternative. In my judgment, it is Radix eye work that could free up Jim's progress, but not in two or three, and maybe not in twenty or thirty sessions. But I'm digressing.

Radix is better than Bar-Levav work at unearthing defenses, finding and freeing the body armor in which the defense expressions and character attitudes are anchored, but Bar-Levav is better at restructuring, building boundaries, individuation, containment. As a result Bar-Levav does a generally better job with soft structures, where building armor is the central problem, while we at Radix do a generally better job with rigid structures, where freeing the blocks is the major task. Yet actually all structures need both directions of work. That's why my work has always tried to address feeling *and* purpose. That's why Bar-Levav sought out Radix work, and why I have been going to Detroit. We have needed to learn from each other.

Of central interest to me are the changes in Bar-Levav's patients. Some of them I've seen for long enough period to judge the change process first hand. And I have lots of additional information to help me infer what long-range changes take place, including video tapes of many of Bar-Levav's patients from several years ago, patients that I see and work with now.

Bar-Levav's patients change, and change a lot. Sometimes they go through sudden, dramatic changes, with long periods of integration, while with others change is more gradual. In either case, it is clear that the work is an exceedingly powerful agent of purposive change. It has the kind of power Synanon had for building armor, control, structure into patients' lives. Bar-Levav's work is even more potent than was Synanon, considering that his people are seen fewer hours per week, and without the residential control Synanon had over its regular members. Bar-Levav is much more effective with his practice than was Synanon with the non-resident "squares" that I observed in my time there.

Bar-Levav patients get over their crazinesses. They develop impulse control where this was lacking. Soft structures, especially, individuate, become more aware, establish better boundaries. These are all indications of the development of more effective armor. Most of his patients also do much to straighten out their lives. They become better organized, more responsible. I have seen some become more intelligent in speech and behavior. They come to dress better, take better care of their health and appearance. They become more effective in their

work. These are not claims Bar-Levav has made; they are my observations. They are changes reflecting good purpose work.

Do they also become more feeling? better able to trust? to give of themselves? Do they become able to cry more fully, to experience their pain and fear? to give and take? center and expand? assert and express anger? allow spontaneous feeling when it is appropriate? orgasm more fully and deeply, and achieve more sexual pleasure in life? The answer here is more qualified. These are changes reflecting successful feeling rather than purpose work, and the primary requirement for progress in these areas is that the armor be systematically and skillfully loosened. There has been increased attention to this direction of work in Bar-Levav's practice in recent years, and I have seen real changes take place in patients along these dimensions. There is not, however, anything like the same level of skill on the part of Bar-Levav's staff in these areas of work. Bar-Levav patients of six, eight, and ten years often have body armor in the form of blocks to anger, fear, pain and sexuality that I would not expect to be present after one or two years of Radix work. I'm not speaking of the deepest, but of the relatively accessible armor. No-one on Bar-Levav's staff has been trained in Radix work, and none has taken a significant amount. Their understanding of feeling work is therefore of necessity superficial.

But the most serious shortcoming of the work of Bar-Levav from my standpoint is in the area of self-reliance/independence/autonomy. Here is where his authoritarian personality plays havoc with his work. This important area of growth is not developed effectively in his patients. Instead it is hurt, stunted, damaged in my point of view, by his procedures. One cannot gain autonomy and self-reliance by years of submission to a benevolent despot. The very benevolence of his despotism disarms the impulse to rebel in those seeking independence. Again, I speak from my observations of his practice, not from a theoretical position, though I freely acknowledge that autonomy and self-reliance are values of the highest importance in my view of the world.

By comparison, Radix is somewhat effective in this area, more so than other programs I have experienced, with the possible exception of Nathaniel Branden's. I don't know Branden's long-range results well enough to make a judgment. But for me, progress towards an adult level of autonomy is more than a key area in the progress of participants in programs of growth or "therapy." It is a primary criterion of the positive value of the program itself to those taking it. Even though in Radix we are toward the front of the field in this respect, I think the best of us are just beginning to learn about the growth of high levels of autonomy in those who take our work.

There are deep-seated differences in beliefs and values between Bar-Levav and myself in this area, differences that I am not sure can be reconciled. The medical model to which Bar-Levav is committed and the educational model used in Radix work are expressive of these differences, which are all in the area of authority/dependence/autonomy. These differences are, in my point of view, rooted in the deeper reaches of sexuality.

The feeling, the underlying atmosphere in the Bar-Levav practice is much more like that of Synanon than it is like either Radix or Branden groups. Bar-Levav's patients, like those at Synanon, are required to assume a dependent role. Bar-Levav assumes authoritarian control over patients. He pronounces edicts and he and his staff make unilateral decisions of all kinds affecting the patient's therapy. If a patient is late or if (God forbid) he misses a session, he is called on the carpet and forced to account for his misbehavior, not as one responsible adult to another, but as an errant child to a parent. The patient *must* maintain this dependent posture on pain of being thrown out of therapy. A woman had to ask permission to attend her mother's funeral, which conflicted with a group session -- not *tell* them she was going, but *ask permission*

to go. From my point of view, patients are infantilized outrageously in order to press home their inferior status. This feeds and sustains the child-parent relationship to their Bar-Levav therapists. Being infantilized psychologically creates in them dependent behavior and a dependent psychology that is, in my opinion, profoundly anti-therapeutic, damaging to the self-concept, sense of potency and (hence) to autonomy. With psychotics, near-psychotics and serious character disorders, one can argue a case for such dependence. I disagree for the most part, but there is a case. But when mature adults leading responsible lives come in to therapy and are forced to assume a child-like dependent role as a fixed matter of procedure, it reflects, in my view, something seriously amiss in the practice.

Bar-Levav claims that dependency is an essential ingredient of deep-reaching therapy, necessary for the patient to re-experience the terror of infantile experience in which the baby was helpless and dependent. He claims that the deepest feeling experiences require that such dependency be present, and justifies the cultivation of dependency in his practice on these grounds.

I consider this argument specious. What is needed for deep over-time work is trust and mutual commitment, not dependency. Radix feeling work, without cultivating dependency, brings students frequently, almost regularly, to depths and intensities of feeling seen less often in Bar-Levav's work. There is one special situation where I agree with Bar-Levav that dependency is necessary, but for different reasons than his.

In Radix feeling work there are some defenses, patterns of armor, so integral to the student's functioning that as one of them dissolves the student feels he is facing annihilation. It is often experienced as impending insanity or death. The schizoid head defense is an example where this is apt to occur. The student's relationship with the Radix teacher is the anchor for working this fear through, and for integrating the character changes in progress. While going through such a terrifying period of disorganization in his character, the student is likely to become temporarily highly dependent. He feels himself coming unglued in the foundations of his being. A solid dependable committed relationship with the Radix teacher sustains him through this difficult period.

This dependency is the result of, not the necessary condition for, deep work of a certain kind. It is not typical of the Radix teacher-student relationship. It occurs only with certain students, and with them for only a limited period of time. It lasts from a few weeks to at most a very few months in the course of ongoing work of much longer duration. Unlike dependency in Dr. Bar-Levav's practice, this dependency is not created or cultivated. It is neither sought after nor avoided. It is, simply, a sometime necessary stage in the progress of Radix work.

The harm I see resulting from the cultivated, extended and extreme dependency of Bar-Levav's patients takes place in long-range aspects of the work. Long-range character changes away from autonomy develop from the prolonged dependency, while the therapy itself goes on far too long. This point requires some elaboration.

The problem I observed at Synanon was that autonomy was not truly developed or encouraged, and that a member hardly ever got out with Synanon approval. Bar-Levav's practice is not so very different in this respect. Leaving therapy is talked about repeatedly in the group, but only rarely actually happens. As far as I can determine, there are no objective criteria of progress. Patients there for seven, eight, ten years set deadlines, name their last group or marathon months and months in advance. Bar-Levav tells them that if they leave they can't return for one, two or more years. And they then cancel or postpone leaving when some new problem or setback in their lives happens. In the time I've spent in Detroit I've seen only one

patient reach termination date and leave with Bar-Levav's blessing. The average time that patients have been in the practice continues to go up year after year.

And the level of conflict and confrontation in the practice goes down. This is due in part, I believe, to the increased level of experience of the group and the more passive acceptance of authority from the long exposure. In fairness, it is also because of technical changes in Bar-Levav's practice. He is using different and less heavily confrontive techniques, techniques that are too new as yet for me to evaluate. But my impression is that patients are becoming more controlled, more contained, more armored, more conforming.

In conclusion, as I believe that the most advanced work done anywhere on freeing and opening the feelings is done in Radix "education in feeling," the most advanced work on "education in purpose" I have discovered in fifteen years of searching takes place in the practice of Dr. Reuven Bar-Levav. His technology for building in his patients armor, structure, boundaries, the capacity for containment, is unsurpassed. Yet for all his power and brilliance, Bar-Levav fails badly in a central task of purpose work. This is the development of self-confidence and self-responsibility -- autonomy and the potency and independence that are part of autonomy. As a result, in the end, Bar-Levav's patients after seven, eight, ten years of his therapy are not strong autonomous adults but responsible, obedient, well-behaved children.

Autonomy and Purpose in Radix Education

Bar-Levav is the strong father figure to the "children" in his practice. While firm and autocratic, he is fair, responsible, and humane. He sees them and listens to them. He helps them build structure, armor, controls that they need to live in the world effectively.

But he's the father who does not let go of his "children." He knows well how to forge umbilical connections to each patient, connections that are not weakened but strengthened over the years. And as his patients become fixated in their dependency they begin to show signs of weakened capacity for self-reliance and regressed sexual maturity. These are the badges of the chronically dependent adult. Years of prolonged dependency of the adult human animal inhibit and begin to reverse the process of growth, of sexual maturation, of progress of the individual toward autonomous mature existence.

Adult dependency is cultivated in many, perhaps most religions, even more than by psychotherapy. The religious sects often tell the individual to "believe," to become like a child. This really means abandon autonomy for membership in a group that will tell a person what is "true." It is easy to give up one's autonomy to a group. Millions do so. The path to autonomy is much more difficult, however. It requires the individual to have faith, not in some external "authority," doctrine, or creed, but in him or herself, knowing how imperfect and fallible the self is. There is no group, no authority, no other person or person's belief for the autonomous person to have absolute faith in. Autonomy requires that one accept the lonely responsibility for discovering what to believe about his own fundamental nature and the nature of the universe. This profoundly personal activity cannot by its nature be delegated, *ever* by any autonomous person. The autonomous individual cannot "believe in Jesus" or one of his many proxies or in another leader or psychotherapist, and abandon his adult ego to "become like a little child." The autonomous individual instead is required by the nature of reality to believe in himself, strive to learn for himself what is true, and in so doing become an adult.

It is not only Christian sects who exhort their faithful to become like little children. It is the hallmark of groups of any kind which cultivate dependent faithful followers. I have known

well a number of disciples of Bhagwan Sri Rajneesh, a Hindu Yoga cult figure who has drawn many of his flock from the ranks of the human potential movement. Followers are encouraged into spiritual dependence on Rajneesh. They are told to surrender their egos and give up everything for him. They wear his picture on a "mala" a wooden locket, around their neck, and he gives them a new Hindu name. He tells them what to believe and to be, while they worship him as their "enlightened master."

For a time I wondered whether the free sexuality encouraged among Rajneesh followers in the early phases of their indoctrination would compensate for or reverse the damaging effect of chronic dependency on sexual maturation. The results in my eyes are clear; - it does not. My close acquaintances, after years with Rajneesh, have not matured. By contrast, deep bodily changes toward maturity are the usual result of intensive, extended Radix work. And such changes have not occurred in the women I have known well who became deeply involved with Bhagwan. (I have known few men well who have had a continuing involvement with Bhagwan.) After 6, 8, or 10 years I observe them to be, not mature or maturing women, but immature girls in their 30's or 40's, looking to their adopted father to give them an identity and a sense of meaning in their lives. Autonomy and full sexual maturity go together. Full adult sexuality is the privilege and responsibility of the fully autonomous adult, the man or woman who lives for him/her self, who has no master, "enlightened" or otherwise, no parent surrogate, no external authority defining who he/she is and what he/she is to believe and to value.

Nor does the fully sexual autonomous adult need to cultivate dependency in others, to create adult children and the parental sense of power over (and often responsibility for) them. Power of this kind over others is not an expression of but a substitute for autonomy and sexual maturity. It is but the other side of the coin of the society that is so teeming with permanently dependent adult "children." Perpetual parents are needed to take care of them. And so society is also replete with parent figures, - doctors, priests, therapists, as well as cult leaders, who support and justify their existence by developing a "family" of adult children dependent upon them. These "parents," the leaders of dependent groups, are as I have said, as far from true autonomy as the "children" they parent. And they are even farther from being understood technically. *The autonomous adult strives to relate to other adults as a peer, and does not seek to make either leaders or followers of them.*

Autonomy is an individual achievement. It cannot be achieved by either allegiance to a strong leader or by becoming a leader of others. Nor can it be reached by adopting a belief in autonomy, joining a group professing autonomy as its creed, or by forming a group with such a creed, gathering followers that give one a sense of importance and power. Autonomy can only be earned by a tough individual process of growth. Radix education in feeling and purpose has the greatest promise for helping those interested in undergoing that process of growth to evolve in the direction of autonomy.

As yet the reality falls short of the promise of Radix work. If the promise is ever to be fulfilled, it means that the problems and difficulties in Radix education must be looked at with the kind of objectivity and candor I have been able to bring to my observation of programs like Synanon, Branden, and Bar-Levav work. What is the problem in Radix that interferes with the development of its full potential? In particular, since the promotion of autonomy has been my stated objective for Radix education throughout its history, why hasn't the objective been attained more effectively? Why am I not more satisfied with what those I have trained and I myself have done in this respect?

I have written of the "down-hill" quality of Radix feeling work, and the "uphill" quality of work with purpose. Because it is easier to break down structure than build it, the battle

between feeling impulse and blocking impulse seems again and again to favor the former. The short-range consideration favors the spontaneous, the impulse of the moment, the expression of feeling. Voluntary attention requires effort, spontaneous attention requires none. Purpose work goes against the grain of the feelings. Growing up is harder than staying a child. It is only when long-range considerations exert sufficient pressure that the difficult, often painful long-range requirements of life are met. The child goes to school because the system has evolved to force it. The child's father probably goes to work for the same reason -- to pay the mortgage, to meet the expectations of others, to feed his family. The person is unusual who takes the most difficult steps in life, not because of social coercion, not because the choice is forced, but because he/she makes autonomous decisions to do so, placing long-range objectives ahead of short-range impulses.

And at another level, the level of group leadership, again and again a leader sees the long-range requirement and tries in his group through persuasion and/or coercion to bring about the short-range steps to meet it with the family, the organization, the country. And again and again the powerful resistance forms, rooted in the potency of short-range impulses, but often rationalized by doctrines or sets of beliefs that seem to free people from difficult and painful long-range realities.

When I originated Radix Education, I had learned through the difficult lessons of my life to lead my life long-range, and to face the hard choices day by day that leading my life long-range requires. I involved myself in purpose work in Synanon, Branden's work, Bar-Levav and the other tough, reality-oriented programs, through an autonomous decision process. I wanted my students at Radix to understand the nature of both feeling and purpose work, and to involve themselves in Radix purpose work by a similar free choice. I did not understand how few would. There has never been enough demand for training in purpose work to support this branch of the Radix Training Program. All Radix teachers are certified only in Radix Feeling work.

I confronted the problem too slowly. The excitement and success of Radix feeling work filled my waking days. I maintained my own personal purpose work and continued to develop and grow in this dimension of my life, but I lacked either the knowledge or the strength of will or both to force a balance between feeling and purpose work into the Radix program. I believe that my friend Reuven Bar-Levav would say that because I lacked strong fathering myself as a child, I found it hard to exercise a strong father role in the face of strong resistance in my organization. Whatever the dynamic reason, Radix work grew out of balance. Radix teachers are required to obtain some of the skills of purpose in learning Radix feeling work. Some of them have, in addition, purpose skills learned elsewhere, e.g., Branden, T A, Gestalt. In my opinion, however, many Radix practices are as out of balance in the "feeling" direction as Bar-Levav's is in the "purpose" direction. Few Radix feeling work teachers see their own imbalance because of their lack of in-depth experience with truly potent purpose programs, and even more, because of unconscious factors in the character structure of those drawn strongly to feeling programs. These factors predispose most Radix trainees and teachers to overemphasize feeling work and to neglect effective purpose work, even when they acknowledge the importance of purpose work intellectually and try to incorporate it into their practices.

Feeling work by itself is chronologically regressive by its nature, which is to say that the progressive breaking down of armor moves the student toward a simpler, less differentiated, less bounded, less individuated character, typical of a less mature stage of character development. When the proper balance of purpose work exists, as the structure is broken down it is rebuilt less rigidly into a form characteristic of a more flexibly differentiated, mature, more highly evolved structure, more effective in both the feeling and purpose dimensions of life. When there is an imbalance in the other direction, when purpose work overbalances feeling work, as in Synanon and Bar-Levav's practice, structure, block, inhibition, and armor build without sufficient

loosening and freeing. The well-behaved, over-trained individual results, the Synanon or Bar-Levav old-timer unable to leave, the "good child," lacking the force of character to strike out in life without the support of the "family" to lean on in time of stress.

Radix teachers often have an imbalance in the feeling work direction. When there is too much breaking down of structure and not enough building it back, too many students then find their lives working less well than they should. They may have more and more trouble applying themselves to difficult tasks, exercising discipline, leading their lives long-range. Though they are capable of more intimate contact their relationship may flounder on problems of commitment, sharing, or money. Some will have more problems containing feelings, maintaining separation and boundaries even as they find themselves more and more open, expressive, and in contact with their feelings. This happened to me with my first dozen years of Reichian work, before I took charge of my life with a huge effort of will some 20 years ago and required myself to get my life in order. I would not have given up the gains I had made in my life through Reichian feeling work to break down the armor. The increased spontaneity, capacity for discharge and for contact meant too much to me. But the imbalance had developed in my structure that required steps different from, and in important respects opposite to, Reichian feeling work. The redevelopment of armor was a necessity for me in order that balance be restored. The restoration process I went through as I got my life in order marked the birth of Radix purpose work, and *Radix education in feeling and purpose* dates from that time.

I wish that I had been more effective in incorporating purpose work into Radix from the outset, as I have said, but Radix work is still young. The first graduates of the Institute Training program were certified less than 10 years ago; Understanding of the technique of purpose work has evolved significantly with Bar-Levav. My hope continues to be to use this knowledge to build a truly effective purpose program into Radix Education. Radix theory has called for such a program from the outset.

References

- Bar-Levav, Reuven. "The treatment of preverbal hunger and rage in a group." *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 27/4. New York: International Universities Press, 1977.
- Bar-Levav, Reuven. " Behavior change -- insignificant and significant, apparent and real." In: Burton, A. (Ed.). *WHAT MAKES BEHAVIOR CHANGE POSSIBLE*. New York: Bruner/Mazel, 1976.
- Branden, Nathaniel. *THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ROMANTIC LOVE*, New York: Bantam, 1981,
- Branden, Nathaniel. *THE DISOWNED SELF*. New York: Bantam, 1973.
- Branden, Nathaniel. *THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SELF ESTEEM*. New York: Bantam, 1971.
- Kelley, C.R. "About Reich and Radix: A Memoir," *The Radix Journal*, Vol. III, No. I, Winter/Spring 1982.
- Kelley, C.R. "The Conflict of Feeling and Purpose," *The Radix Journal*, Vol. II, Nos. 3 &4, Spring/Summer, 1980.
- Kelley, C.R. "What is the Matter with Man? The Origin of Muscular Armor," *The Radix Journal*, Vol. II, Nos. 1 & 2, Fall 1979/ Winter 1980.
- Kelley, C.R. *EDUCATION IN FEELING AND PURPOSE.*, 1974.
- Rand, Ayn. *WE THE LIVING*. New York: Random House, 1959. Rand, Ayn. *THE FOUNTAINHEAD*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1943.