

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE:  
"STRUCTURAL INTEGRATION AND THE OPEN UNIVERSE"

UCLA EXTENSION  
SEPTEMBER 24, 1974

WRITTEN AND PRESENTED BY  
IDA P. ROLF, Ph.D.

There are those who say that the universal neurosis of the last 20th century is the frustration, the sense of lack of meaning in our lives. For me, I'd say that meaning is a far way along the road. Before we can understand meaning, we must come to it through an understanding of order and it's place in our life. This course is designed to increase the sense of order, of meaning, in the lives of those of us who are living in the eighth decade of the 20th century. For we all suffer from a confusion, at times overwhelming, as the mass of information in our media pours over us -- drowns us. And this can be likened to all our daily experience -- we can get out of our personal daily confusion by adding to the order in our daily projections: our desks, our library, our wardrobe, our emotions, our ideas. This course is designed to assist us in adding to the order in our lives -- in the language of the physicist, in lessening the entropy, the tendency to confusion, to disorder, to breakdown. In the language of the philosopher, in enhancing the spiritual (or if you prefer it, the mental) manifestation of individual man -- in order to reach collective or group 'man'. To me the key word at this moment in time is order; the key need, the creation of order. Order is not necessarily compulsive. At this point in time there are among us those who claim that natural order in the mind, order in the spirit, order in general, even order in the bank account, is a projection, or at least an accompaniment of order within the physical personality -- the body -- of the individual. As you realize

this is a somewhat heretical idea - and I seem to have found my place as a chief of Heretics who talks about the value of Structural Body Intégration, who expects through integration of this structure to create an integrity of function and of purpose in the individual. Many of you here have been exposed to the physical technique of Structural Integration which is, as you know, a method of creating order in the body, but at this point, and in this class, we propose to look not only at the world of physical flesh which your "rolfing" represented, but also at the world of ideas, in which we, that is man, have been living. We will look particularly at the establishment, from which we have recognized a need for escape-- versus the world of fringe ideas, of burgeoning expansion of ideas. We have called these talks Structural Integration and the Open Universe. Perhaps we should have called it Structural Integration and the OPENING Universe.

Perhaps we need to define some of our terms. First of all the term Open Universe -- and its inevitable running mate Closed Universe. A scientist, by name Bragg, has said "The important thing in science is not so much to obtain new facts as to obtain new ways of thinking about them." This is the crux of our confusion -- of our perception of the revolution which is being presented to the layman as "The Aquarian Age", for we are in the midst of revolution and we tend to try to measure our new world

by our old standards. Seen in the new perspective, the old order was limited and a limiting view point. Its critics have called the scientific order from which we are emerging "reductionism" -- to quote Arthur Koestler's definition, it is characterized by the phrase "nothing but" . "Life is nothing but a group of chemical reactions -- the brain is nothing but a computer --." This point of view is obviously describing a closed universe -- a universe defined by hard boundaries -- boundaries designed to exclude. Such thinking automatically limits a world irrespective of what kind of metaphor follows the " nothing but" -- certainly if you or a scientist accepts such a cosmology you are accepting a closed universe. You are defining a man as a "nothing but --", a closed system. One of the characteristics of this kind of universe was its linearity. The world of Aristotle, grandfather of this old world (Newton was its father) was a world of logic -- and characteristically the world of logic is a world of straight lines, a linear world. It is understandable that in an attempt to study and define his world, western man should throw over it a grid of straight lines, because in projecting his measures at that time, he could only project lines -- linearity probably arose originally as a projection of man himself because man speaks linearly -- one word after another -- he tends to think linearly, one idea after another. Taught by Aristotle he reasons linearly. At this point life is a linear chain of frag-

ments, not a continuum. Basically this was the frame on which the physico-mechanical revolution of the seventeenth century was constructed. And for that time it was fine. When I was a "scientist" fifty years ago, my credo was that given time, this type of science of logical, linear thinking would describe and comprehend life and all that is within our universe. Life and time have uncovered the limitations of the notion. What I have been describing is, as you realize, a closed universe -- a limited system. The life sciences and the sciences of life can not be fitted on this Procrustean bed -- for life is a continuum -- certainly not a one dimensional continuum -- its multidimensions have not been explored -- not even guessed at - as yet, although I hear that Dr. Beck proposes to look at some little known dimensions. It is truly an Open Universe, and in the 1970's one hears of the 'field', the 'system', the manifold rather than "the cause". The universe is opening - its "nothing but" hard boundaries are disappearing. It is becoming defined by the position of its center rather than by the hard boundaries of margins - borders. This is a characteristic of an open universe - but we need further to relate, to understand, the open vs. the closed universe. A closed universe can be seen as a projection of - a higher abstraction of - an Open Universe. Within historical time there have always been men who tried to fit ideas, maps if you will, over the phenomena of life - to answer the question : 'What is Life?' -

'What is man?'. This is still going on - we're doing it right here - and these answers seem to alternate - cycles of Open Universe concepts - cycles of closed. - Since the days of the Renaissance, especially since the physico-mechanical revolution of the 17th century men have tried to understand themselves and their world by analysis. The analytic method by definition reduces the dimensions of the object which it examines. Thus it becomes by definition a Closed Universe, a limited universe. A closed universe is a projection of -- a higher abstraction -- an Open Universe -- and like all higher order abstractions it lacks richness, it lacks the continuity of the lower experiential orders. It is a projection, not the experience, in the language of general semantics, it's a map, not the territory. The open vs. closed order can be simplified into a metaphor. Suppose we have here a mug -- a handleless mug -- we put light to one side of it -- the shadow projection, two dimensional you see, is a rectangle, is it not? Suppose we turn the mug on its side -- the shadow projection the higher order abstraction of our 3 dimensional mug - is a 2 dimensional circle. Only if you know it's a mug do these projections suggest a mug. A higher order projection that is a closed universe divests the experience of dimensionality -- therefore to us it divests it of reality. In doing so it tells us that the world we live in - ourselves, are not high order abstractions - they are low order many dimensional systems.

Open and closed universes have certain other qualities significant to us. Open systems tend toward a minimum entropy situation, minimum disorder, minimum disintegration, they are complicated structures. This complex structure requires that energy be added or put in constantly to maintain its greater complication. An open universe can be maintained at a distance from equilibrium, in what physicists call a improbable state. None of this is true of the Closed Universe. Man is not a closed order - even in purely biological terms. The biological man must be looked at as a collection of systems, not of atomistic aggregates; this in itself takes him out of a closed universe. The characteristic of systems is that relationship is the determinant of the final figure. Described in these words life is process, not substance, and the determinant is relationship.

This is the stuff with which we deal in Structural Integration - process, relationship, in our case relationship of body systems. That additional dimension of relationship has become important in the thinking of man only since the work of Korzypski. You will be hearing more about this in a later lecture -- the fifth, I think. In integrating body structure we find that it is the relation of the man, the smaller energy field, to gravity, the greater energy field of the earth, that determines the man's well being. So the problem becomes - is that physical body of his related in terms of its own internal systems so that it can accept the support of gravity?

To be so related its mass must be balanced around a vertical line. Later in this course Bob Hinds will take an average young body and demonstrate how the body, the myofacial body, is a plastic medium, and can, by appropriate skill, be balanced around a vertical. This is where Structural Integration takes its place on the experiential level, and it is on this level, apparently only this level, where humans can create for themselves a new man -- more energetic-- more economical of energy, less stressful -- less restricted. That is, on this level one can change relationships, for the body is a plastic medium. This is the level of Structural Integration and here is where we begin to look at the phenomena of life from a different viewpoint. We begin to apply Bragg's dictum -- that what is needed in science is not new facts but new ways of thinking about them. This is what we try to offer in Structural Integration.

But at this point I have asked Bob Beck -- master in his field of bio-electronics, to talk to you about the history of Man's ideas about himself -- man's understanding about man as demonstrated in a historical overview, including some of the "far out" notions of man current today in small but significant numbers of people. Man has not always down through the centuries tried to explore himself as a closed system. In fact it has only been relatively recently in time, within the last hundred years or so, that he has labeled his closed system view of himself as 'progress'. We can, I think and believe, understand the newer views of man better by recognizing this historical background development of man's ideas about himself. When did he

recognize that cultural transitions create stress and confusion?  
When did he recognize that stress and confusion manifest as physical stress as basic as the more apparent mental stress. We moderns have found that physical stress accompanies our impatience with the limited world of the closed universe and with our unbelief in it at this time. But only a few of us realize that physical stress is a distortion of fascial planes which are the structural units of the body -- but, because fascia bodies are plastic, it is possible to lessen this strain - to build a new body - a different consciousness. To exchange this artificial closed universe for the lower order, open universe of the experiential world. In this world we have many options.