

PLATO'S PROGRAM FOR THE INSTRUCTION OF THE YOUNG  
OF ALL AGES

MANLY PALMER HALL

The story of education is one of the most fascinating of the developments of human culture. To briefly summarize the background we can say that all education began from the child learning from the parent. In the animal kingdom and the most primitive forms of life we know education is almost exclusively by example. The young watch and do that which the older indicate and in this way survive. Primitive human society was of course tribal and the tribe began with the family or clan. Education at that time consisted of being instructed in the lore of the clan or the tribe. This was in the keeping of the Elders and the young were brought to the state of membership in their clan by becoming informed in the various forms of knowledge necessary to citizenship. This included their history, religion and the practical survival problems of the people. As time went on education became more and more identified with the Elders, and it is from the concept of the Elder that the priestly cast seemed to have originated. The Priests were the Old Ones who had the wisdom of experience, and while their book learning may have been slight or possibly completely lacking they had the knowledge that came to those who faced problems in a certain situation or environment and gradually became sufficient to their own needs. As time went on and the clan and the tribe unfolded into the nation and groups were brought together in social relationship, communities came into existence and education remained in the keeping of the religious part of the cultural level.

Religion was of course the custodian of the will of the Gods, and to know the will of the Gods was to be informed, and to practice the will of the Gods was to be enlightened. Thus information and enlightened both were grounded in the religious concept. We know from our Old Testament story that the old religious writings were partly historical, telling the story of the tribe, inclined to create pride in membership and to emphasize a special or particular destiny for that people. The Old Scriptures were also symbolical, setting forth moral and ethical requirements; cosmological, explaining the universe and how it came into being; psychological, studying the problems of human life; mystical, relating to the salvation or perfection of man and his state after death.

All of these elements together constituted a sufficient knowledge. After a time, perhaps after a very long time, the oral tradition was reduced to written form. With this change the significance of the Old or the Elder rapidly changed. He was no longer the repository of the tribal lore. It was now entrusted to books and the old historians now emerged as the new interpreters, and with the coming of books and written languages education had to extend itself to accomplish the power to read and write, and to make available the accumulated wisdom of the tribe or nation. During the great period of classical culture, the sciences, the arts, the crafts were united in the great sacerdotal systems which we know as the mysteries. These were the schools, the colleges, the universities, the clinics of antiquity, and here the individual was instructed in all the accumulated and rapidly enlarging knowledge of his time, because then as now man was an individual who had his own taste, preferences, inclinations, limitations and abilities. The educational system rapidly broke up into a number of sections or parts, each of which was suitable to the requirements of someone. After the beginning of the period of the reformers and enlighteners, which began about six hundred years B.C., we find the breaking up of the great sacerdotal knowledge and its development through guilds, trades and crafts, and the appearance of schools of special knowledge, such as schools of medicine, law, philosophy, and the guilds to cover the various arts and trades and crafts.

Originally all this knowledge had been part of one knowledge, but as human taste and favor changed the knowledge was broken up and was held

in the keeping of special individuals renowned for particular ability. The great rise in Greece of the schools, as they are called, began with the great Academy or School of Pythagoras of Crotona. Here was one of the earliest examples of a formal education system. Because this system was still deeply immersed in the mysticism of the Near East and Asia, it has not been given the credit it deserves in the modern history of education. But it was the Academy or School of Pythagoras that finally made possible the emergence nearly three centuries later of the School of Plato in Athens. The Academy of Plato is regarded as the first modern educational system structure. This was a formal university. However, it differed from existing schools in certain particulars which we want to emphasize, because many of them should have been preserved and may yet have to be revived if we are to give balance and proper dimension to our modern educational life.

Between the periods of Pythagoras and Plato we should also mention the rise of a group of professional educators. These professional educators also survived and have been a problem with the world ever since. They were not grounded in the systems of the mysteries, nor did they maintain certain patterns of the Academy or University of Pythagoras. In the beginning they were persons formally schooled, capable therefore of bestowing upon society a schooling apart from the great concept of the mysteries. The professional educator began by being called a Sophist, and a Sophist in the early days of the cult was a person of distinction, reputation and importance. But gradually because of a trend which Sophistry created it has now to be regarded as a sign of superficial learning, and a Sophist is a false claimant to knowledge, or one who is wise only in his own conceit. Sophistry is false learning today, but it was not so in the beginning of the system as we know. The Sophist formed a sort of liaison officer between the mysteries and the people. In his original position he taught the arts and sciences, reading, writing and arithmetic, and other forms of essential knowledge, but he taught them to individuals not otherwise qualified for learning. He taught them to the sons of merchants, to those who were engaged in various arts and crafts who had no particular interest in the enlargement of philosophical insight. He gave to the people a knowledge of arts and sciences, but pointed this knowledge toward mercantile pursuits, toward the carrying on of professions and business, toward industry and economics, barter and exchange.

Out of this group came an increasing number of persons who were schooled but not enlightened. They possessed the outer forms of knowledge, but had no concept of its inner meaning. They became masters of the Euclidian system without ever understanding what Euclid attempted to tell. Thus, knowledge through the Sophists broke away from the great philosophical systems and became a separate end in itself, so the individual could choose a career of knowledge without in the end becoming enlightened. He could only become informed. He could become skillful in the development of memory, but not of creative thought. The result of this rise of Sophistry was that many learned to read and write who did not understand what they read and had nothing worth while to write. They were simply reducing knowledge to a level of practical or popular utility without carrying with it any of the responsibility of ancient learning. Knowledge thus became an opportunity without responsibility, it became a means of reading the words of the wise and remaining without knowledge of the meaning of those words.

The Sophists gradually deteriorated until they became merely professional tutors of the rich, making it possible for young men and women to have a formal education without assuming the obligations of the Temple. This in itself was not a successful motion, but it became an ever-increasing one, and by means of it the ancient mystery system lost all control of knowledge; that is, all control of so-called profane knowledge, knowledge that relates only to the externals of living. It was no longer to discipline, test or check the qualifications of students. Any one who had the price of the tutor could go to school. This situation probably resulted in the rise of the Platonic

Academy. Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Diogenes, and many others of the Greeks, were bitterly opposed to Sophistry. They believed it would ultimately cause the world a great deal of trouble, and how right they were we cannot even appreciate yet, but we are beginning to know what it means for an individual to be highly skillful and highly informed intellectually without the ethical or moral character sufficient to prevent the misuse of knowledge. That was the problem Plato was fighting against in the third and fourth centuries B.C., and it is the problem we are fighting today in this age of grace 1951 A.D. We are still plagued with this strange and mysterious escape of knowledge out of the esoteric systems into the hands of Sophists and professional educators.

Plato in the creation of his Academy functioned on a premise of education that it seems to me is worth a great deal of thought. The University or Academy was of course a miniature of the world. The individual, therefore, approached a University or College as he would a laboratory, it was a place in which to test knowledge, not merely a place in which to listen. The Academy having within itself a complete social, political, religious, economic structure, was also to a degree an extension of the Mystery Schools. It was a legitimate extension, whereas the Sophists were not essentially legitimate. It was legitimate because it maintained certain standards, demanded certain understanding, but at the same time moved from a very autocratic to a semi-democratic foundation. In the ancient rites and mysteries the requirements for initiation were so severe that only a small percentage of the public was able to actually participate in higher knowledge. This was the cry in India against the Brahmins, who were so exclusive in their caste system that they were unable to carry enlightenment to the masses without breaking their obligations and oaths, which they would not do.

Plato, then, established an Academy which was to become a model of a new way of life. The Academy was not only a miniature of the universe, it was the nucleus or capital city of the Empire of the Philosophic Elect. It was the beginning of a new kind of human being, the Greek Hero, who was suspended between heaven and earth, partaking of the nature of the Gods through wisdom, and the nature of the animal kingdom below through the physical propensities. Out of this new order of life, this new way of life, was to come the enlightened race which was ultimately to fulfill the human purpose. The Academy was the beginning of the cultural empire, the great plan that was to spread throughout the world and finally absorb into itself all the more enlightened peoples of the world, transforming the world itself into a school of learning and experience. Plato approached this subject with a very simple thought and basic concept. He said, "We are here to learn." That is the reason for life. The reason for life is not to maintain merely physical comfort, not to be successful in economic terms, not to build temporal empires, not to enjoy more luxuries than our ancestors, not that we shall be proud or strong or dictatorial or successful wrestler. It is something more than that, and that something more was that we were here and are here to learn. Every day of life is significant only in terms of self-improvement. Consequently, it is perfectly reasonable and proper to regard the world itself as a school, a magnificent academy, a wonderful place made up of laboratories of great and wonderful classrooms, schoolrooms, clinics and places where we can learn. Plato on one occasion when asked his profession replied, "I am an observer." We are here to learn through observation and experience. Higher education, truly, therefore, as Plato understood it, is merely the organization of observation and experience, the making of it scientific, the integrating of all the elements, and the presentation to the individual of the fruits of the past, which are tradition, the works of the moment, which are examination or investigation, and the test and proof of these works into the future, which is called experimentation.

Being here primarily for only one purpose, the enlargement of consciousness or essential learning, we then fulfill that purpose through enlargement, and fail in that purpose through failure to enlarge knowledge and understand

ing. If we are true to the reason for our existence the world improves and increases, and in this great laboratory of human society we make successful experiments. If, however, we have not studied well, if we have not observed thoughtfully, if we have not examined carefully, then our experiments are unscientific and lead us into further complications and disasters. Plato was convinced there is available to all men at all times all the knowledge necessary for right living. No one can say actually and factually that it is impossible for him to find the answers to the problems that confront him. It may be that he can mentally devise problems about which he does not yet have sufficient knowledge to come to proper answers. The most classic example of the problem which cannot yet be properly solved is the problem of the intrinsic and essential nature of Diety. We can assume the problem but we cannot solve it because it is beyond our experience. Therefore, we may surround ourselves with problems which we cannot answer, but if that is true, any problem for which we cannot find the solution does not at the moment advance our destiny. The problems we face every day and for which we must find solutions are within our means of solution. It is only when our minds drift off into abstractions and formulate problems not practical in daily living that we find ourselves out of our depth.

Plato carrying on the great concept of his Academy also began to study the essential nature of knowledge and the essential nature of man's power to know, and this is where the ancient and the modern reached the parting of the ways. Unless we are able to explain the essential nature of knowledge and the essential nature of the Knower within man himself, by which it is possible for him to attain knowledge, all other purposes are frustrated. Is the essential nature of knowledge unknowable?? What is knowledge? Knowledge according to Socrates is a term applicable to both an absolute and relative condition of fact. Absolute knowledge is not within the possibility of the human being at the present time, inasmuch as absolute knowledge is rooted in the solution of one problem, a full comprehension of the nature of First Cause, and the human being does not possess the faculties and powers, as yet, by which he can define to the general satisfaction of all his kind the essential nature of First Cause. He may have theories about it, he may have concepts of it, he may develop hypothetical explanations, but the absolute factual knowledge of First Cause he does not have.

Thus, absolute knowledge is one thing and assumes an absolute state of knowing. Relative knowledge is always within the reach of individuals, for relative knowledge is in substance the knowledge of the next necessary thing. Relative knowledge expands constantly toward absolute knowledge, but cannot reach it in the experience of the individual. Common knowledge, therefore, knowledge as we know the term, means the individual is possessed of a sufficient amount of knowing to enable him to live well in the world in which he finds himself, and to make his positive contribution toward the improvement of that world for others who come after him. Therefore, relative knowledge is the knowledge of the next thing that we should do, or the knowledge of the solution to the imminent problem. And it is also the power to leave this world better than we find it when we come. These two elements, within moderate scope, are possible to all human beings. We can all live better than we do, we can all build more substantially toward the future than we are inclined to build. Knowledge is consequently the skill of these things, and understanding is the impulse to do these things through inner enlightenment. We may all know it is possible, for example, for us to make a contribution to the future, but only understanding or enlightenment impels us to do this as a primary consideration. Those, therefore, who are deficient in understanding, do not extend their spheres of usefulness, but are content to learn and to die. It is only when the individual feels social consciousness or is inspired by his own inner conviction to devote knowledge to the improvement of others that he actually enters into a state of conscious social existence.

Now, as to the nature of the Knower, the power within man himself by

which it is possible for him to know, at least within the range of his present faculties, - both Plato and Socrates, who is his foil in the Dialogue, have a number of pertinent ideas. In the first place, the Knower is the internal power of the individual. Actually, knowledge is a series of reminiscences, recollections, it is a power within man which remembers out of itself as a result of certain association mechanisms. Plato therefore said, "Learning is remembering." The external stimulates the internal. We are not enlightened by an equation written with chalk on a board, but we are enlightened by a power within ourselves which comes out or forth to accept that equation, to rejoice in the discovery of fact. Small children, particularly, reveal this inclination, this tremendous delight at the discovery of a new idea. We are inclined to believe the new idea is something we have seen outside ourselves. But all education is essentially pneumatic. It all comes from within the individual by stimulation. We are not informed by the things around us, but by what they remind us of inside our own natures, the thoughtfulness which they incline us to. Thus for example, a world which is in a constant state of confusion, insecurity and insufficiency, is forever reminding us of that difficulty. And from this constant reminder we are impelled to search within ourselves for solutions. We are impelled to say this problem can be solved in this way. Nature is eternally presenting us with problems and man is eternally thinking out these problems from the most elementary to the most advanced.

The solution of problems, therefore, is drawing on the human resource to meet the external emergency. All knowledge is from within, and each individual sees the world as a mirror in which his own thoughts are reflected. All knowledge comes from within the Knower, and all knowing is an internal experience, not an external one. Memory simply enriches the instruments of the Knower, making available further materials for further thought, also making available previous information to be applied to a present problem or case. Then memory assumes its proper position. Memory is the servant of thought, it should never be the master of thinking. We are not learned because we can remember, but we remember in order that all knowledge not gained by our thoughts may be available to ourselves through having been memorized. Memory is then the handmaiden of the thought processes, part of the criticism, part of the rules, part of the category formula by which learning is censored. Memory censors knowledge, directs it, but never creates it.

Out of the same problem of searching within the individual for the source of his own enlightenment, we come upon other factors. How is it that the person can know? Plato and Socrates both reasoned in much the same way, that First Cause, which is the ultimate above which we may have no adequate comprehension, is the state of perfect knowledge, or is the fact, the reality, the completeness which we are all questing on the plane of mind. If, therefore, the First Cause is the ultimate of that which can be or is to be known, this becomes the negative pole of a polarized fact or truth. That which can be known is negative; that which knows is positive. Knowledge and that which can be known are therefore polarities of one inevitable reality. If, therefore Deity is objectively on the outside world the ultimate of things to be known Deity is internally and subjectively the ultimate of the power to know. In other words, one is the visible and the other is the invisible correspondent of the same thing. The fact there is something to know in nature implies there is something to know about that, or to know what is or can be known.

So the Knower and the Known become the poles of one fact, and the fact itself is never absolutely and abstractly attainable until the Knower and the Known are one in quality. Only The One can understand The One, said Pythagoras, and only the perfect Knower can apperceive the Perfect Knowledge. So inside man there is an ascending power to know, even as in nature on the outside of man there is an extending power or area of things to be known. Man as the knower and the thing to be known form a tremendous polarity, and this polarity is the source and cause of education, it is the solution of this mystery that

has brought all quest for knowledge into existence.

If man internally possesses the impulse to know, this impulse must in itself be the manifestation of the power to know, and the power to know is a manifestation of God or of the First Cause, which is the substance of the Known and the Knower. Thus God in man, or the Divine Power in man, or the Universal Capacity within man, makes possible the individual shall know. Knowledge is the emergence from within of the positive power to know, and this is challenged and drawn forth by the desperate need to know. The individual finding himself in one dilemma after another is forced to call more and more upon his own resources in order to perfect his world, and civilization at any given time, now or any other time, is always a monument of the present achievement of man in his effort to conquer the unknown. The existence within man, therefore, of the Knower, makes the Knower equivalent with consciousness, or for the moment we may consider it as such.

Now consciousness, according to classic as well as modern philosophers, is a very mysterious term. Some consider it simply an irritation of the cerebral structure, and in a good many cases that is probably all it is, but the consciousness factor in man has a very interesting possible definition. Consciousness in itself does not imply particulars. In other words, we can have a very high degree of consciousness without being able to build an automobile or make a beautiful painting or play the piano well. Consciousness does not perfect us in particulars. The particular power of consciousness is limited only to the extending of conscious light, or light consciousness, from the center toward the circumference. Consciousness may give us the integrity to learn to play the piano, it may give us the resolution to conquer the unknown, it may give us a better general apperception of the present state of ourselves, but consciousness enlightens in general not in particular. Consciousness makes it perfectly possible for the individual to accept all particulars without actually desiring to experience them. Consequently, consciousness, per se, is simply like the light of the sun shining in any kind of a dark area, but not necessarily changing the substance of that area, other than perhaps to give it a healthier, better ventilated condition.

It is consciousness descending through the human mind and breaking up in the faculties of the brain that becomes consciousness of particulars. And the moment consciousness is interpreted on the level of mind, and from the mind descends to the level of body, at that point consciousness as a general apperception is lost, and consciousness as a series of particular pressures comes into existence. It is there that consciousness ceases to be a sensing of all and becomes focussed on the activities of the individual. In one case consciousness manifests as inclination to art, in another to music, and in a third to politics or science. In each of these cases we no longer have the consciousness of wholeness, now only interest in a particular. But consciousness is a kind of seed also, and the mysterious power of it is a tincture, we may call it with Virgil "The Golden Bough", by means of which we are able to enter into any world carrying with us this golden branch, and the peoples of that world must receive us. It is the universal passport of this world and the world to come, the Golden Bough of Virgil. This Golden Bough, this growing thing, means that wherever the seed of consciousness is placed in a particular, such as in medicine, art, literature, science, mathematics, it immediately begins to grow back toward the general again. The unfoldment of any particular art or science finally brings us back to the universal art or universal science. It immediately stamps eternal processes within the particular structure and causes the insurance company or the brokerage office or the manufacturing firm or the inventor or the artist to fulfill his particular by making a structure that resembles the universe. He has to do it that way, there is no other way.

So wherever consciousness begins to unfold, it grows like the Tree of Life and impresses all the forms through which it operates with the universal seal or stamp of Divine Pressure. Consciousness, then, coming out through

organism is to a degree limited and restrained by that organism, directed by it, and subject to whatever <sup>the</sup> conditions of that organism may be. That was one of the reasons why Plato placed so much attention upon the doctrine of rebirth. He believed definitely that the educational capacities of the individual are determined not by this present life, but by the degree of conscious development which the entity has attained. It is the degree of accord or sympathy which consciousness is able to cause in body that determines the degree to which the intellect can ascend. The consciousness cannot be released more than the body has been mastered. So Plato and all the School included discipline as one of the beginning of learning, that it is utterly useless to attempt to educate the individual unless at the same time we impose upon the life of that person certain means for enlarging the power of consciousness within him, and the enlargement of consciousness is in this case, of course, the release of consciousness. It cannot be enlarged in substance, but it can be enlarged in the manifestation of itself.

Discipline, therefore, was the subjugation of the faculties and powers of the mind to purpose, to reason, to motivation, to some just cause by which they were justified. Unless the individual brings his faculties and resources within the control of a project or purpose, he will never be able to intensify his achievement in any one field of learning. He must therefore always have not only the adding of something from the outside, but he must have improvement of the person if he would increase knowledge. One of the Greek masters said, "There can be no enlargement of knowledge apart from the improvement of self." Now the improvement of self is not by knowledge. The individual does not improve because he masters calculus, but if he is to understand calculus in its real purpose he must first unfold understanding within himself, creating the capacity to make a positive use of calculus. He must, in other words, need from within in order to use that which he accumulates in the form of knowledge. Plato therefore insisted on the establishment of purposes, discipline, that the individual consecrate and dedicate his resources to worthy ends, that these ends might justify the resources, so that the disciple in the end would not be like Alcibiades, the lead dagger in the jeweled sheaf. That is so often the case. We develop a great deal of polish, but the instrument behind the polish is itself unpolished. We mistake accomplishments on the outside for attainments from within, and as a result education has gradually drifted from a process of bringing enlightenment to merely another instrument for the perpetuation of our innumerable complications.

Having established the concept of the Academy, Plato then decided how to pattern it, what to do with it. Perhaps he was thinking of the world when he bought the land upon which it stood, for he bought an area which was almost worthless because it was fever ridden. It was so unhealthful where he built the Academy that no one wanted to live there. He got the land for very little as a result, and promptly took the fever himself. His disciples then recommended that he move to another location, but he said, No, he was going to stay right there and prove to himself and to them that philosophy would overcome fever, and he did. He lived to a very ripe old age and died simply from fulness of years and of no infirmity whatever. So perhaps Plato chose for his Academy a place symbolical of the fever ridden bog that we call our present social system. He chose a most unhealthful place to build his Academy, and there could be scarcely less healthful resort at the moment than contemporary culture, and it was probably just as unhealthful in his time, perhaps even more so. Having decided upon this he placed the various facilities according to his needs and requirements. He had proper buildings, but preferred to teach out of doors. Later Aristotle added a cafeteria to make the place a little more self-sustaining. Up to that time the students brought their lunches. There were many teachers, all of them part of this one Academy or academic theory. There were not only mental processes, but there were crafts and trades, there was the eternal and inevitable gymnasium where the individual not only learned to chin the bar, but also learned to be able to lead with his chin without too

much trouble afterwards. The gymnasium was a place of mental and physical exercise, in order that the sound mind might function through the sound body. Plato imposed very strict discipline of qualification, he would accept no one who had not accomplished a certain amount before entering the Academy. He required astronomy, mathematics and music, and over the portals of the Academy was the phrase, "Let no one ignorant of geometry enter here." That might have seemed to be a very unkind thing to do. In other words, perhaps there were people who did not understand geometry who really ought to know other things. But Plato figured very definitely this: No one will ever get anywhere in the search for Truth who is not willing to sacrifice and work for his ideas. If the young man walking by the Academy and longing to come in could not enter because he did not have the geometry, and really wanted to enter, he would go away for a year or two, get the geometry and come back. If he did not want it badly enough to do that, then he was a poor risk to start with. So Plato did not open his arms and tell all the foolish people to flock in. He made a certain sifting of those who were willing to make some effort themselves first because he felt quite certain that after a couple of years if the enthusiasm was only passing, if the individual really did not want to work, if he was only hoping to improve himself socially or to get a better job without trying too hard, he would undoubtedly in the course of time meet other interesting opportunities, less cultural but more practical, and would drift into other places. Only those who stayed, who worked it through, who were willing to remain and sacrifice if necessary for this end, only they were the ones Plato wanted later. So he placed that simple rule first and it eliminated a great deal of trouble within the Academy. Those that came in, as he expressed it, though they might now know, had enough formal learning to learn how to learn, to reduce knowledge to system, and to learn how to study, and when to study, and to prevent interruptions, and to organize their resources. All they had accomplished was merely a foundation for what he wanted to give them, but if they had the foundation solidly the next would not be so difficult.

Both Pythagoras and Plato declared that the real qualification of a good student was an indomitable determination to know. That no other motivation was worth while. One man would come and say, "I wish to study mathematics in order that I may take care of my father's herds and count his sheep." The Master would say, "Just down the street a little ways is a Sophist who can teach you the multiplication tables more quickly than I can, you will be able to count sheep with it for the rest of your life, that is all you will ever be able to do with it, but then that may be all you will want to do, so that is it." Another man would say, "I am going to be an apothecary -- and incidentally Aristotle started life being an apothecary -- and I wish to know enough chemistry in order to fill prescriptions." "All right," says the philosopher, "you wish to study chemistry in order to make a living. Go down to one of the Sophists. He will teach you all the rudimentary chemistry you want. You will make a good living and you will probably ultimately die from one of the compositions of some other chemist, but that is what you want and that is what you shall have." In that way the ancients were very strict on their motivations. They were not interested in people who wanted to get rich or powerful or accumulate estates through learning. They were interested in those who wanted to know, simply because of the natural impulse that Aristotle so well defined when he said, "All mankind naturally desires to know." And that is the real cause of the impulse toward learning.

The Academy continued for some time teaching a balanced structure of both a metaphysical and physical learning. To Plato and even to Aristotle physics without metaphysics was an abomination. There was absolutely no use learning what we call world knowledge unless we orient it in a larger universal concept. Certainly we have to live here. We need to be bookkeepers and accountants and storekeepers, but we will remain in this strange confusion as long as utility establishes the ceilings of knowledge. As long as we study mechanics only to be mechanics we will live and die mechanics, and we will



never have achieved that which is necessary, overtone. For overtone is progress and culture. Out of a greatness of learning we may choose to become mechanics, but then every day we work in our shop the work we do with our machines is instructing us in universal laws, and we know it. We are able to understand and appreciate it, and everything we do has a fuller meaning, because consciousness has ensouled it, and all progress is through consciousness ensouled knowledge, not merely the technical knowledge itself.

This does not make us impractical, it does not make us visionary, but it fulfills the reason for life. We are here to learn and even in the simple daily tasks there are unrecognized forms of essential learning which we do not see and understand because we have no overtone or imponderable content within ourselves. So Aristotle and Plato both insisted that we cannot unfold civilization, we cannot perfect ourselves as individuals, or justify the purposes of our own existence until we function from ensouled knowledge, which means we have to have an internal enlightenment, as well as an external, intellectual ability. The internal enlightenment came, according to Plato, from the arrangement of the curriculum, from the emphasis made upon certain principles, and from educating the individual to the love for Truth, and this introduced a new dimension in the system of philosophy. The love of Truth is even more important than the intellectual desire to attain Truth. Love is an emotional reaction to the reality of knowledge. It is an addiction from adoration, from devotion, from admiration, from veneration, and it transforms all knowledge from something profane to something sacred. It ends forever the division between sacred and profane knowledge and makes all knowledge one great and sacred tradition which must be served by use. We serve knowledge by using it well.

In the internal structure of the Academy, Plato followed the most primitive form there is, the family. The College or University was the family, and the family is the first college to which the human being comes in attendance. Plato in a strange way during his life time was naturally the Patriarch, the Grandfather, the final source of all hope and judgment and decision on the part of his family. His disciples were his children, his School was his home, and he extended his natural love of man into a paternal devotion for the students, and as they unfolded they grew up as his sons and to the paternal was added the fraternal factor, and they in turn increasing in natural regard for him enriched their own lives in a very simple way. There were no lessons appointed, as we give home work today. It was not told to any disciple what he should read, when he should study, it was assumed that one of two things would happen. Either he would naturally select what he needed, or else he would ultimately eliminate himself from the group. He knew what he wanted, he knew what opportunity was offered, he knew that he was privileged to be in a place of learning where it was his right to take the most and make the most of this opportunity. If he failed it was his own fault. No one criticised him, no one condemned him, but he ultimately condemned himself.

There was very little dogmatism in the Platonic method. Plato never argued. He never forced his conclusions upon anyone. He never required obedience. He never asked any person to change his mind or accept something that persons did not believe. He was a very strange teacher in this respect, that he taught himself and others could observe if they so pleased. He was forever teaching himself, he was forever learning himself. He was the center of the School in the symbolical sense that he was always the one who was learning, never the one who was teaching, and that was a very important element. Those around him never saw a teacher, they only saw another student, but they saw another student who so excelled, and so magnificently portrayed and revealed the process of study that they learned most by observing his own studentship. He would frequently halt a discourse to tell them that in the midst of it he had learned something himself. He inspired them to think likewise, that after all he was only showing them by growing with them. The fact that he was several grades ahead was not important, because all knowledge is relevant. He

was revealing to them the noncombative, noncompetitive method of attaining and distributing knowledge. He created the foil of Socrates to represent the irritability method, which Socrates did very definitely. He used Socrates as an example of the normal or usual method of teaching and differentiated it from himself in order to again create a dramatic contrast. He seldom if ever debated or took part in debate. He simply stated the things he believed and left it to the students to find out for themselves or to discard if they so desired. He held nothing against them if they differed with him, but he despised them heartily if they imitated him. If they came to the same conclusion by their own means then it was satisfactory. If by the same means they came to a different conclusion, then it could be examined and if there were error it could be corrected, and if the teacher were wrong he could be corrected. But for the copyist to merely memorize, or do the famous apple polishing for the teacher, there was no patience with that. It was quite impossible to crib or cheat or copy each other's papers at the Platonic Academy, because each individual did his own thinking and no two patterns were alike. Very often there was no set answer to any question. The consideration and excellence went to the individual who made the largest individual contribution out of his own intelligence, and not to the one who achieved the same answer the teacher required. The purpose was to draw forth, to educate, to release, and Plato constantly watched the aptitude of his various students and advised and counseled them in the selection of their careers.

Just as we go to college today to learn a trade or profession, so in the academic system of Plato the college revealed naturally the aptitude of the individual, and while on his level of thinking it would naturally be a life of learning, the disciple soon discovered for himself whether he would be a mathematician, an astronomer, a musician, or would go into diplomacy, or whether he would become a councillor in government, or whatever his choice or decision was he would find it in himself. Thus, gradually, the School unfolded and had one of the most remarkable reputations of any body of learning the world has ever known. Recognizing the probability, in fact the inevitability of the individual's potential, Plato put the entire subject entirely away from the modern theory of grading and classing. To Plato it was utterly impossible for a group of human beings to be graded by any external rule whatever. In the first place, the persons are different; capacities are different; incarnations are different, and that which has been brought forward out of the past makes it impossible to come to any absolute conclusion in a relative universe.

Therefore, grading was not upon whether the individual was better or less than another person, the grading was upon the consistency of the development of the individual himself. If he unfolded his own potential within his capacity and that potential was small and another man had a larger capacity and unfolded only half of it, perhaps the substance of the unfoldment was much greater, but the man who had unfolded all of himself had a higher grade than a greater man who had unfolded only half of himself. It was the degree of the individual making use of his own capacity. Growth is the fulfillment of capacity and where this is done with discipline added, discipline increases capacity and growth fills the capacity so created, and the discipline and enlightenment and information working together allow each individual to extend his consciousness within reason to the fulfillment of any necessary knowledge that he may require.

After the development of the School and it had passed on through several generations of teachers, it languished and disappeared under the great political unrest of Asia Minor and the Mediterranean countries. It was revived later in North Africa by Plotinus and a little later by Proclus in Athens. These schools had to do with the problems of education, and the education of younger persons, older persons, and all who had need of knowledge. An individual is uneducated if his knowledge is not sufficient to his needs, whatever it may be. An individual is educated whose knowledge is sufficient

to his needs. If his needs are not as great as they should be, then it is still a problem of increasing need. Nature does this. The moment we become placid, the moment we sit back and say, "Well, thank goodness, now I know it all", the universe begins to move against us in a most astonishing way, and he who thinketh he standeth must take heed lest he fall. Nature will never permit us to remain long in a state of complacency. Consequently, what we are concerned with is to meet the challenge, and the challenge being met brings with it all the security, the relative security, in this world or any other world, that we may achieve at the present time.

We call, therefore, that individual educated whose knowledge is sufficient to his needs, and the needs of the individual are threefold: bodily, intellectual, spiritual. An individual who knows every bit of physical knowledge that can possibly be assembled, but is deficient, mentally, morally and spiritually, is not educated. An individual who does not know why he should keep the great Universal Pattern, who does not know the beginning of wisdom is to obey nature, the individual who does not have the consolation of an enduring and enlightened faith within himself, is not educated regardless of his technical accomplishments. Where there is fear there is ignorance, no matter how much learning may go with it. Where the individual rebels, criticizes, finds fault, where the universe is regarded as an infirmity and an adversary, there is ignorance regardless of other intellectual attainment.

In this material world it is almost certain that each individual will attain some prominence in something, but will remain ignorant in other matters. As the particulars of knowledge are represented through the specializing of consciousness into faculties and functions, so the generalization of consciousness is manifested through a generalization which we call appreciation. It is perfectly possible for us to accept the good or the reality of good in the Unknown. This constitutes the beginning of appreciation. We approach the generals of unknown things by accepting their importance, per se. We can say to ourselves, "I am a musician, I do not understand art." If we are a bigoted musician we will say, "Music is the Great Art, painting is just something for daubers." The painter will say, of course, "Painting is the Great Art, music is just something for individuals who could not be successful painters." We have those competitive instincts, but appreciation bestowed by the conscious enlightenment of living means we shall recognize and accept the good, recognize the equality of values, and simply say, "I love it but I do not understand it. I can see that it is beautiful, but I do not know why. But at least I accept it."

In this general sense of appreciation we must complement in daily living those innumerable branches of knowledge which we cannot hope to master at any one time. But where we accept beauty, receive it as a benediction, enjoy it even though we have not solved it, we are then using appreciation with which we must supplement attainment in particular fields.

After the public school system of Plato had long been forgotten, and we had fallen into the Middle Ages and those dark eras in which universal ignorance descended upon Western civilization, it was necessary to restore the whole theory of learning, to bring it back again, and this great restoration was accomplished by the school men and the various scholastic groups of Europe. The first great impetus to the restoration of learning came through Charlemagne and the formation of the great Carolingian system of thinking and education. He was the one who made it compulsory for the Cloisters, Monasteries and Churches to maintain schools for the education of the young or any who sought education. Books were chained at that time, literacy was at such a low ebb that out of over two-hundred reigning princes in Europe only three could write their names, and most of them made a boast of the fact they were illiterate, and it was considered a proof of gentility if they were rich enough and ignorant enough to hire a professional scribe. In those days there was almost no knowledge, and Charlemagne recognizing the importance of liberating the human mind from bondage to this condition of ignorance, attached

schools to the Cloisters and made it necessary for the monks who were otherwise unemployed to become teachers. This began a completely new system, and from it sprang most of the great universities of Europe, such as the Sapienza and the Roman colleges and the great schools of Florence and Verona. These were originally cloister schools and they grew and increased. The curriculum was exceedingly sterile at that time because everything was dominated by the clergy, and nothing that was not ecclesiastically accepted could be taught. It was a long time, not until the last years of the Eighteenth Century that the larger part of education escaped from under the control of clerics of one denomination or another.

The clerical side could have been very helpful and could have been the saving grace, but it was not, because the average theologian was not a philosopher, he was merely a theologian, and in the indoctrination with theology the knowledge itself and essential learning was held back for hundreds of years. Witness the problem of Copernicus who would have been killed by the inquisition if natural death had not taken him first, Galileo forced to repent, Bruno burned at the stake, -- every effort at knowledge blocked, not by evil in men, but by determination to keep knowledge in conformity with theology. Thus we had very little educational advantage through these long periods of time. But the human consciousness was the thing that brought it through, it cannot be held, and the modern school system was begun and unfolded by a man by the name of Komensky, who has later been called Comenius, the founder and father of the public school theory. This Seventeenth Century intellectual found it possible as a result of the Protestant Reformation to begin a process of education which was finally centered in the Scandinavian countries. Comenius created, definitely, a restoration of the Platonic Academy. He created a school which was to fulfill all the natural requirements of life. Again, it was a miniature of the universe, for he recognized the school as a combination of the home, which gave us the first essential form of instruction, instruction by experience. In home teaching the faculties of the young, who are not yet sufficiently strengthened to bear rational weight, are stimulated by mimicry, by the reproduction of the action of the older person. This is a continuance from the life of the animal kingdom, where the rabbit and the cat and the buffalo and the cow all learn by watching. Human beings are the only ones who can watch a great deal and learn very little.

In learning by watching we imitate, little by little, the policies of those around us. Very often we can see without understanding why a mistake will lead to a disastrous result. We learn why we should do things in certain ways, because of efficiency, ultimately, but also because the older person does them, primarily. In the schooling system, therefore, the education of the very young must always be by experience, by observation, and by being gradually included in the pattern, doing little by little things ourselves until in the very pride of our accomplishment we are becoming grown up by doing those things which are our share of a family life. There is no substitute for family life, as far as observational instruction is concerned. The moment it is shifted to an institution, like a boarding school or something of that nature, the entire pattern is distorted. The moment the state establishes schools or takes children away from their parents there will be trouble, because the initial experience is a recapitulation of the whole history of the earth, the history of the human being growing under the dominance and guidance of attentive persons, escaping out of experience back into the home again when disaster strikes, seeking consolation, gaining a confidence and copying step by step the processes of society.

Comenius recognizing this as the beginning said that all primary education, to be effective, must be a combination of observation and experience. The Montessori method and other things of that nature are amplification of the early instinct of the child to express, reveal and release. More and more this release technique is being used in kindergarten work and things of that nature. The child observes and does, and having done observes what it has

done. In the early stages anything it does is so remarkable that the child is in constant awe. Later the child begins to discover that some of the things it does do not please the child itself, and the development of instinct, inspiration and impulse will prevent frustration, which is very common in children, because the child lives in a very limited world and can become neurotic even before it learns how to talk. All the problems of pressure worked out through the experimental observational method, the experience technique, is the perfect method of reaching the small child, as it was of reaching the infant human being in the great philosophical system. It is also through the family that the child relives citizenship in the clan, the tribe, receives the tribal lore, is indoctrinated into the tribal religion, accepts the tribal heritage of purpose and motive, and comes down through several hundred thousand years of <sup>human</sup> evolution recapitulated into eight or ten years of child life.

As the tribe moves into the nation the individual becomes initiated into the tribe, and in primitive people this took place at around the twelfth to fourteenth year. Initiation into the tribe, then, corresponds to High School. That is the part that is going to level off and produce the average member of society. Initiation into the tribe is now equivalent to learning a trade, becoming able to be self-sustaining, gaining a sufficient general knowledge of living and thinking to be a citizen, to vote, to have one's share in civic life, and to be qualified to establish a home and build a family. These things correspond to early classical and preclassical civilization, in which citizenship into the tribe or nation was gained by a ceremony of indicating fitness, of dedication to the service of the people. The child at that time was forced to go through vigil, to fast, and to prove in some way he could make a positive contribution to society. That would constitute the second-grade type of education as we have it in this country today.

Then the third degree of education would be consistent with our university education, which is on the physical plane the restoration of the great classical institutions of learning. The university is the long and somewhat thin shadow of Plato's Academy. It is the restoration of that body of learning which was to produce leadership, or inform the individual beyond the needs of economic or industrial living, achieving specialization in the professions, in the sciences, and in those forms of life which were essentially part of the old Brahmin Code, and part of the old Greek Code of the Eleusinians. After having passed through this the individual received his Doctorate, received the symbols given to him in the early initiation rituals, although those symbols no longer had meaning, that is, essential meaning. And at the time of his graduation from the university, the ancient disciple receiving the full degrees in the Mysteries, was told to go forth as a consecrated servant of the needs of his fellow men, and to dedicate his life to the improvement of his world. There was no discussion of how rich he was going to be, or how influential he was going to be, it was simply that he had received something the others did not have. This was not only an opportunity, but a responsibility, and each bit of knowledge must be preserved as a sacred trust, and the ethics and integrity must be preserved to the letter; otherwise you have a loss of confidence in knowledge and a gradual disintegration of cultural systems, leading us back into those great cycles of savagery we are so anxious to avoid in the future.

So the three systems come forward out of the past to create what might be termed the modern educational theory, which is a three-fold system, the three degrees of the ancient Mysteries, but entirely on the objective plane. The ensoulment of these three degrees must come through their release of consciousness in the individual. Each of the steps is not only a physical achievement measured in time, but an achievement in consciousness, measured in internal experience. Until it is such it has failed to fulfill itself. It is the building of the bridges across from the objective to the subjective, and from the subjective to the objective, that constitutes true education,

from the Latin, *Educo*, meaning to draw out or release from within, not to cram in from the outside.

In the first degree of education we have the experience observation technique. In the second degree, which would constitute the equivalent of the High School, we have the acceptance of social responsibility. The individual under that theory must be educated to the fact that it is his natural privilege and actual duty to become a self-sufficient unit within society, capable of carrying responsibility, and in a democratic system capable of the intelligent administration of his own elective power. The individual graduating from High School should be a good citizen on the level of the great social structure, capable of standing with his principles in the presence of all things. It is the degree of social obligation to be true, to keep the law, to keep the faith, and to keep the principle. The degree which might be termed the higher degree in learning carries much further beyond that, for the individual from the secondary school is supposed to administer himself and maintain his own integrity. So it is the duty of those graduated from the higher groups to make the dynamic, forward contribution to progress. They are the ones who must be dedicated to the building of the great Philosophic Commonwealth. In their keeping is democracy, the racial leadership and the ideal, and they are responsible to keep progress moving forward, not only on the physical plane, but on the internal life plane of the individual. They have the responsibility of further example as leadership. These responsibilities must be met or the educational theory fails, and the failure of education to emphasize these responsibilities, and to qualify the individual to carry them, is responsible for a general disillusionment on the part of student bodies, general dissatisfaction in faculties, and general disorder in civilization. Unless we are able to rescue the ideology of education, restore it to its Platonic footing, we will never be able to use knowledge to rescue ourselves from practical dilemma. In order to gain such a recognition the individual may have to take himself at some part of his present life and ask, "How old are you?" Your age is determined by your degree of conscious responsibility for conduct. It has nothing to do with your schooling. If you are only capable of observing and copying, then you are the small child. If you are only capable of sustaining yourself on your own level and trying desperately to meet the responsibilities of living, then you are on the intermediate level, which means also a degree of age term. An individual who has no internal resources other than the experience of his race is under twelve to fourteen years of age. The individual who depends for his survival on what he learns from others, as in school, or is building his philosophy and culture from the words and works of others, and is leaning upon faiths that are not factual experiences of his own, but are part of the traditional life of his people, he is in the period from fourteen to twenty-one. If he is from within himself a self-sustaining source of strength and progress, and if his life is dedicated to revelation and fulfillment of his own internal potential, then he has reached maturity, and it depends entirely on how we approach this how our educational processes will go.

The lower third of humanity, the so-called lesser cultured group, learns by observing its masters. The middle classes learn by observing each other. The so-called minority of entirely illumined persons learns by contemplating the Universal Reality. But having so absorbed certain knowledge they apply it immediately to its legitimate ends, the formation of a cosmos out of the social chaos. Education for all ages can be determined by study and psychology and in educational adaptation, and education for us, if we are to face the next half of this century, must be enriched in overtones, in dominance, in values. We must recognize education as the handmaiden for the release of consciousness, but that it cannot be released unless we recognize it and are willing to accept the level on which it exists. All permanent education must be idealistic, there can be no such a thing as a sufficient materialism. All internal life must be faced, which is the apperception of cause, and we

must build in a three-fold universe, a universe of Gods, men and nature, orient ourselves therein, function therein, and overcome the inferior thoughts of that universe in ourselves. In so doing we accomplish education, and we become part of higher education the moment our inspiration, our light, our courage, comes from these deep, hidden places within ourselves. Who depends upon the world is ignorant. Who has the strength of an internal contact with God or Truth is indestructible, immortal and enlightened, and each one of us in our own way must struggle forward toward and aspire to this state, which we obtain by observation, discrimination, and conscious contemplation of the wonder of life. In this way we fulfill the great fact that the world is a school and we are here to learn, and those are happy here who are made happy by learning. If we love to learn we will be happy. Happiness is, therefore, a byproduct of obedience, and we are here to grow through effort.

Notes by Virginia B. Pomeroy  
241 Orizaba Ave., Long Beach 3, California.