

If we only had an author with the poetic and dramatic genius of a Shakespeare or a Richard Wagner to do full justice to some of the new possibilities of modern science fiction! It is a shame that our methods of higher education are so uncompromisingly determined to train (I would almost call it "to brainwash") all students of science ⁱⁿ to forget ^{fully} all poetic licenses and to suppress any abilities to dramatize. To a certain degree it is understandable that the more incredible the world of lasers becomes and the more mysterious the discoveries of neutrinos or quarks make our formerly simple matter to appear and in general, the more fantastic recent theories in biology and other sciences become the more the ruling institutes and establishments have to insist on unembellished, playing safe, methods of presentation. It all has to be made independent from instincts, intuitions and dreamlike qualities in order to be acceptable, in order to be science, although without indefinable instincts, inexplicable intuitions and almost prophetic dreaming probably none of the epoch making theories and sensational breakthroughs would have been possible. That includes the work of the greatest names we have produced from Newton to Gauss, Einstein, Planck or Freud, Jung and others.

It was perhaps one of the strangest coincidences that two of those giants crossed my path while I was in Holland. We can probably orient all our enlargement of our scientific horizon according to two names and what they stand for. The one was Einstein who personifies the great revolution in the concepts of matter, space-time and energy. Sigmund Freud stands for equally profound changes in our search for the understanding of man's unconscious life and powers.

In 1920 Einstein was invited to the University of Leyden, one of the oldest Universities in Europe. There he gave the speech which I have already referred to in this book at different occasions. Although I am not a trained mathematician or physicist this speech has haunted me ever since. I have tried to indicate some of the reasons why, especially the last paragraph of that speech, kept occupying my mind. It was a very crucial statement and yet I never noticed any particular attention given to it by the science world. It was the statement that was dealing with the ether. Any idea of an ether had been officially discredited after the Michelson-Morley experiment and also after the appearance of the theory of special relativity. How many years have I spent waiting for Einstein to do something about that last statement of the Leyden speech or to find a way of some continuation of that unfinished question. However, it was not only the ether problem which bothered me. From the beginning my artistic sense of style which I could not silence in the face of science ideas bothered me no end in connection with the "C" phenomenon. I feel like confessing here

that for 48 years (since 1920) something inside of me protested and molested me. I just was unable to include the speed of light (180,000 miles per second) as a "constant" which represents the final limit of all velocities possible in this here world." I felt since my Roumanian experience unable to chew and digest any picture with a definite limitation and a final barrier into the TOTALITY of my "Weltanschauung". For 48 years the forces behind my coincidences seemed to be rather kind. They made me meet great and leading representatives of the science world. Yet during all those years I never was able to discuss that problem with any one of them, not with any of my less prominent friends until I met three years ago a young girl of 14 years of age. She was present when in a conversation with people of an older generation the topic moved into the realm of relativity and of the speed of light. To all the mature listeners that speed represented the ultimate limit, the unshakable barrier. Science said so, didn't it? Only the young girl whose mind had not ^{yet} been paralyzed into imaoability by our education burst out enthusiastically and said, "Of course, we have to have a breakthrough beyond this ideal!" Then and there I realized that all the older participants in that discussion were born with a mental picture or they were conditioned to a concept which would make them fit to ^{live} life in their generation or period. The girl had an equally efficient endowment to make her fit into the now coming generation. I started to calculate that if I, who could be her grandfather, belonged to, let us say, the 30th generation then her parents would represent the 31st generation while she would be a member of the 32nd generation. In other words, that young lady would be TWO generations older than I and, therefore, I simply called her ever since "Grandma". I was also ever since looking for other young people whose natural prophetic equipment had not been ruined yet for the coming generation and whom I could include into my collection of "Grandmas" and "Grandpas". Only by realizing what exorbitant efforts of energy, ingenuity and patience I had to use in order to explain simple facts in art, in thinking and in life and how utterly frustrating many of those attempts have been, only then one can imagine the shock of recognition which penetrated me when I heard that "breakthrough" mentioned and I did not have to crawl, apologise and explain.

Still more exciting than this encounter was the New York Times of Sunday, January 28, 1968. There I found, not in the science section, but somewhere one certainly would not look for such matters, there I found an article by Walter Sullivan, the regular science editor of the New York Times. The title of this article was "Speed Exceeding Light's is Hinted". Subtitle, "Physicist's Particle

Theory a Challenge to Einstein". The article starts: "A revolutionary hypothesis, which says that the universe may be filled with particles traveling faster than light and, in some cases, at almost infinite speed, is being assessed by theoretical physicists."

"A search by a Princeton University team has failed to find such particles. However the originator of the theory, Dr. Gerald Feinberg, professor of physics at Columbia University, believes this may mean only that the particles are not electrically charged."

"His theory contradicts the dictum stated by Einstein in his first presentation of the special theory of relativity in 1905 that velocities greater than that of light "have no possibility of existence."

"Nevertheless, Dr. Feinberg's formulation is tailored to the equations forming the basis of Einstein's theory. Hence, his views appear plausible to at least some physicists and have been presented at length in The Physical Review, Journal of the American Physical Society."

"The proposal calls to mind one made in the nineteen-twenties by P.A.M. Dirac that, on the ground of mathematical reasoning, the electron should exist in states opposite, energetically, to its usually observed form."

"In this way he anticipated the discovery of the positron and all the other particles of "antimatter." Such particles resemble those of matter except that they are opposite in electric charge or other properties."

"The particles proposed by Dr. Feinberg also behave to some extent in a manner opposite to that of ordinary particles. As they gain speed, they lose energy, whereas ordinary matter gains energy as it increases in speed."

"As the postulated particles slow toward the speed of light they gain rapidly in mass until, if they reached the speed of light, their mass would be infinite. The speed of light is 186,000 miles a second."

The rest of the article speaks of experiments which could not be discussed before their "publication." It still disturbs me somewhat that Dr. Feinberg speaks of "particles" which reach beyond the speed of light. If now he includes an invisible world beyond the speed of light why limit it to a world of particles? Of course, particles no matter how hard to conceive still seem to have some contact with this world of material particles.

I personally was struck by a paragraph in this article which says, "in fact, he explained in an interview last week, it was his feeling of being "hemmed in" by Einstein's speed limit that led him, some seven years ago, to begin exploring its validity." I wonder who else besides me and him felt "hemmed in"

by that idea. Such vagrant ideas often seem to reach home in several or many ready brain receivers. Anyhow, to a miserable scientific nonentity of official rank "0" like myself it is a very important and encouraging event when, finally, a real professor of physics at Columbia University gives the official stamp of validity to an idea under which my helpless mind ^{had been} was suffering for 48 years.

~~The other very important~~
The other very important event took place also in Leyden. I already mentioned my visits to the Egyptian section in the "Museum Van Oudheden" and the resulting adventures in connection with the tomb of Achet-Hetep^{Mer}. As I explained before, my visits there were never disturbed by the presence of other visitors! Only in very bad weather some desperate fishermen might drift in to seek shelter.

It was on a bright sunny day when I paid another visit to my Egyptian friends and I suddenly heard footsteps coming towards me. When I turned around there was Dr. Sigmund Freud and his daughter Anna coming in my direction. We had casually met before in Vienna at the time of my meteoric success when I used to meet most people worth meeting. That, of course, made me neither a pupil nor ^{what} I would call a friend. To put it more accurately, I was still a long distance admirer of this great pioneer genius who at least had made many of my subconscious experiences "respectable". I had read as much as I could of his publications and I was particularly interested in his discovery that Greek mythology and art had ^{not} ^{revealed} ~~been discovered~~ but ^{also} masterfully expressed and dramatized some of his newly studied subconscious complexes; therefore the Greek mythological names in Freudian psychoanalysis.

It did not take long ^{Freud recognized} and he discovered our mutual enthusiasm about Egyptian art. It became quite clear to me that Freud had switched from his old interest in ^{classical} Greek mythology to the study of Egyptian religion and culture. This again was significant to me to find that someone else was deeply interested in the same object matter at a time when I had found so painfully little response to my interest in Egyptian art.

It was the last time I saw Freud. The last book he wrote (if I am not mistaken it was published posthumously) was about Moses, the Egyptian (Moses and Monotheism"). I was glad that he had added Egyptian religion to his studies. Later I was equally relieved when I found that Jung had made very important discoveries of similarities between modern psychological problems and far eastern ideas in Chinese, Hindu and Tibetan philosophical and religious teachings. The real relief, in a more individual way, came when I discovered that Jung had con-

9071
196

ducted actual experiments with gifted patients which were practically identical with drawings made by members of a group under my supervision in the Art Center School in Los Angeles. Those drawings seemed so revealing that I felt a strong need to publish it. Yet at that time I was writing a book, teaching at an art school and working on a mural. It was out of the question to find the time for any other additional activity, therefore, it was like a big weight of responsibility removed from my shoulders when I discovered practically identical drawings used by C.G. Jung as illustrations in his remarkable book, "The Secret of the Golden Flower".

In later years I had to relieve my frustration with an attempt to revive "Astrological ^{mythological} Psychology" because by then I had recognized that the voluminous literature on mythological psychology or psycho-mythology had been an amputation. The great leaders in research of psychoanalytical problems had been interested, naturally, in the psychological and therapeutic angles. The fact that mythologies were inescapably connected with the study of astronomy was just an item to be overlooked. In antiquity mythology was such a phenomenal vehicle for knowledge because it gave almost equal consideration to the cosmic, to the conscious as well as to the unconscious life of man. The questions which inevitably come up now on so many interviews on the radio and the television, especially when young people are participating, usually boils down to: "Who am I, What am I, Where did I come from, Where are we going, What is life all about, What is the meaning of this?" Our present day specialized sciences of astronomy, psychology, philosophy, etc. do not give any explanations or answers in a modern science sense. We only get, as I indicated before, religions imported from far away and borrowed or stolen from distant cultures.