

2. A Story of Consciousness

*Wer nicht von dreitausend Jahren
Sich weiss Rechenschaft zu geben,
Bleib im Dunkeln unerfahren,
Mag von Tag zu Tag leben.
Goethe¹⁴*

2.1. The Model

The basic idea or postulation of the above displayed, and by Dietrich developed Diagram of Transrational Peace, is that a *persona*¹⁵ can be described as consisting of several intra-personal dimensions or layers, where closest to the material surface of the *persona* lies the sexual layer, followed by the socio-emotional layer, the mental layer, the spiritual layer, the awareness layer and finally the epicenter (see above and cf. Dietrich 2011, 355-356). Following the tantric principle of correspondence “as within so without” each of these intra-personal layers is further described as corresponding to an inter-personal dimension in a coherent way, where every layer deeper within corresponds to a continuous wider without (or exterior). The material surface of the *persona* thus corresponds to the immediate episode on the contact border (the direct interaction), while the sexual layer corresponds to the family as the next wider inter-personal dimension, the socio-emotional to community, mental to society, spiritual to policity, awareness to global, and finally the intra-personal epicenter to a complementary inter-personal epicenter.

By relating intra-personal structures to inter-personal structures, the diagram has already imported a part of the phylogenetic and ontogenetic parallelism, of which I simply will add another dimension. That is, inter-personal structures as families, communities and societies are not only contemporary 'building blocks' in a more or less existing and emerging post-modern, globalized world, but constitute structures which historically and contemporary have been and still are inter-personal wholes in themselves¹⁶. Hence and more particularly, my

¹⁴ Cited after Neumann 1949, 1. A literal translation would be, “who cannot account for three thousand years, will remain inexperienced in the dark, only survive from day to day (my translation).”

¹⁵ A *persona* (plural *personae* or *personas*), in the word's everyday usage, is a social role or a character played by an actor. The word is derived from Latin, where it originally referred to a theatrical mask. The Latin word probably derived from the Etruscan word “phersu”, with the same meaning, and that from the Greek πρόσωπον (*prosōpon*). In the here presented context *persona* denotes the totality of the Apollonian material and visible form, the “mask” through which the Dionysian energy shines through and highlights thus the realization that there is something behind the “mask” (Cf. Dietrich 2008, 350).

¹⁶ Wilber would here surely speak of 'holons', which expresses the idea that everything is a whole

argument is that every one of those inter-personal structures also corresponds to a specific way of social organization. The family as inter-personal structure corresponds thus to the social organization which I term clan society, and denotes people united and organized by kin-ship and common ancestry, generally without also forming part of larger social units such as tribes or chiefdoms. Community then corresponds to those next larger social organizations, which are built up by family-clans and typically are called tribes or chiefdoms. Here the family-clan still plays an all-important social role, but is organized with other clans into larger tribes or bands typically based on common mythology. Tribes and chiefdoms can become quite large organizations, even empires; however, defining are the logics of inclusion and exclusion procedures, which will be discussed in greater detail later on. Meanwhile and consequently, society corresponds to the organization of tribes and chiefdoms into again wider social units, of which the modern nation-state is the contemporary prime example. The artificial term *policity* corresponds in this logic then to the organization of nation-states into an again wider frame of social organization, for which the United Nations provide an example of an intent in that direction. Given that hypothetically a functioning and integrated governing UN systems would be a global encompassing phenomena, the question in how far the global layer of the Diagram would correspond to an inter-planetary organization guided by exo-politics, remains open at this point¹⁷. The result of this argument is that in addition to the earlier correspondence between for instance sexuality and family, I now also have another inter-personal dimension, which in this case is the clan. For all layers this means – sexual-family-clan, socio-emotional-community-tribe, mental-society-state, spiritual-policity-global government, and awareness- global – inter-planetary organization.

With the correspondence between inter-personal structures and ways of social organization, the first half of the additional dimension I want to import to the diagram of transrational peace is mentioned. The second half consist in the by Habermas (1979) and Wilber (2000) argued correspondence between (historical) ways of social organization and ways of reasoning – or what I term modes of consciousness. According to classical development psychology develops the mental capacity of a child over certain stages, which following Jean Piaget's well-known four-stage model are called the sensorimotor (0 – 2 years old), the preoperational (2 – 7 years), the concrete operational (7 – 11 years) and the formal operational (11 years onward) (Wilber 2000, 294). Sensorimotor terms

in itself and simultaneously part of something greater. For instance, my liver is made up of molecules, where every molecule is a whole in itself but also part of something greater, which is my liver. The liver again is whole in itself but also part of a system, which is my body, etc.

¹⁷ That this seemingly absurd proposition probably not is too far-fetched becomes evident when considering that the intra-personally corresponding layer of awareness actually is described as communication with planetary systems (Dietrich 2008, 366).

the early stage where the child practically develops its physical senses, while concrete operational is marked by magic cognition, formal operational by mythic cognition and formal operational by the capacity for abstract and rational reasoning. In Wilber's and Habermas' evolutionary narrative humans have developed the actualization of their cognitive potential in correspondence with the development of their social organization. This means that these ontogenetic stages of a child's cognitive development are set in correlation with the way of social organization within a phylogenetic narrative. People living in kin-ship based clans are thus correlated with preoperational reasoning, tribes and chiefdoms with concrete operational, and states and federations stand in a relationship with formal operational reasoning. In the following, Jean Gebser's terminology for phylogenetic consciousness development, Wilber terms the child's ontogenetic stages archaic, magic, mythic and mental in the postulated phylogenetic parallel, which I in the following will do as well. When I import this further correlation to the earlier outline, I now have four sets of corresponding pairs, each containing two intra-personal two inter-personal dimensions. The intra-personal layer of sexuality corresponds then to intra-personal magic cognition, which again corresponds to family and clan as inter-personal layers; socio-emotional corresponds to mythic cognition and tribe and community, while the intra-personal mental layer corresponds to an equally termed mental form of cognition, and inter-personally to society and a state-form of social organization¹⁸. Important and of interest for my work are especially these modes of cognition or consciousness, which now are brought in relation to the diagram of transrational peace. Before I can continue to outline these modes and their correspondence with the other layers and dimensions, I have to make two important distinctions and demarcations in relation to Habermas' and Wilber's evolutionary parallelism between ontogenetic and phylogenetic consciousness development.

The first distinction concerns a linear reading of development, where evolution is understood to develop towards increasing complexity and consequently to 'higher order' states. In this line of reasoning the nation-state is for instance perceived as a more complex (and thus 'better') arrangement than a tribal society – necessitating more complex cognitive processes to navigate within (formal operational reasoning in contrast to concrete operational). I do not share this reading, but am much more under the impression that tribal societies and kin-ship based organizations tend to be far more complex and demanding in terms of the social skills, interaction as well as cognitive performance they necessitate.

¹⁸ There are more intra-personal layers and modes of consciousness which I in reference to Gebser and Wilber term *integral* and *causal*, and which correspond intra-personally to the spiritual and the awareness and inter-personal to policy and the global layer, which I for the convenience of the reader however only will introduce later.

Not only tend the range of significant persons to whom close bonds are entertained to be much greater than in modern nation-states, but the social-cognitive performance in mastering and overviewing all the relations and interrelations the kin-group is entertaining is seemingly equally astonishing. Accordingly, many generations of anthropologist have been stunned by the intricate line-age systems many so-called 'primitive' societies entertain. Many famous examples are collected among the Australian aborigines. These people who traditionally are hunters and gatherers have the most rudimentary technology, often solely based on wood. Simultaneously, they entertain line-age systems, which are so complex that it takes years for an outsider to understand (Eriksen 2007, 113). One anecdote states that when two Aborigines meet randomly in the outback, it is no question whether they are related, but how they are related and by figuring this out, they will know whether to continue together, fight each other, or just part ways (Ibid.). Family shows to be a very relative dimension, which easily can fill the size of a humans cognitive potential for social complexity. Likewise is the world a hunter and gatherer moves within not at all less complex, but on the contrary the achievement to get food on the table by walking to the super-market fades into nothing compared to the not only cognitive task which it is to hunt it down oneself. What a nation-state as social structure gains in numbers of its members, and the thereby implied benefits in case they manage to cooperate, takes its toll in other ways. This means I do not understand one form of social organization to be better or more developed than another in itself, but rather remain a marked relativist in my evaluation of these categories and strategies. Furthermore, I do not understand these categories to develop in a linear way. This will become evident when I later argue how the spiritual layer also relates to the socio-emotional and ends come to meet. This, then, will also imply that a potential global government as the UN in many ways would be a mythic construct.

Yet more important is the second distinction concerning the modes of consciousness and their alleged phylogenetic and ontogenetic parallelism. I agree with Habermas and Wilber that different forms of social organization correspond to, and are interrelated with different structures of consciousness, and the thereby implied different Cosmo-visions and predominant cognitive processes. I further agree that these collective human modes of consciousness have their parallel in the ontogeny. However, due to Habermas' and Wilber's reduction of the collective structures onto their ontogenetic correspondence, and the thereby implied projection of a child's cognitive development onto collective modes of consciousness, again within an evolutionary reading, I do have to make objections and important differentiations. First of all, I do not understand these developments as teleological guided processes. A child does not 'develop' all modes of consciousness, but rather touches upon all modes of consciousness in its development, so to speak in a fast track procedure. Which mode(s) of consciousness it eventually really develops and brings to flourish later on

depends then on its individual biography – and not a collective phylogenetic process. Hence it is possible to find grown up individuals who predominantly live in a mythological form of consciousness guided by their socio-emotional layer, and inter-personally predominantly are occupied with people they share a form of community with, which could be a church or a sports club, even though they live in a nation-state society and potentially are able to engage and be guided by more abstract principles. This means that I agree to the existence of correspondence between cognitive states in the individual development and collective forms of consciousness in their correspondence with social organization, but object to reduce or elevate either one onto the other. Just because the German basic right or Einstein's relativity-theory or Judith Butler's gender-theory build on abstract reasoning does that not imply that every twelve year old capable of abstract thought also is able to produce these constructs or even understand them. In other words, the child's or adolescents capacity for formal operational reasoning might give access to the world of abstract thought, but it does not deliver the whole abstract world or just assure a correct use of this ability. Hence, just as it would be absurd to reduce relativity-theory or Butler's work to be equal to the cognitive achievement of a twelve year old, it is equally absurd to reduce Paleolithic cultures or tribal communities who operate with magic in their reference frame to the cognitive abilities of a five-year old child. Developed magic and mythic cosmologies relate to the magic cognitions of a child just about as much as astrophysics relate to the average mathematical abilities of ten to twelve years old.

Nevertheless, studying a child's cognitive development can inform and enhance the knowledge about basic pattern in the greater collective modes of consciousness without reducing one to the other, or importing an evolutionist reading, besides demonstrating and widening the astonishing insights into correspondences already inherent in the diagram of transrational peace. My aim is to align structures of consciousness to the diagram of transrational peace, by which this theoretical tool expands and gets even more applicable. As will become evident, I am simply unpacking the existing correspondences further – and not forwarding an evolutionist agenda. Much to the contrary, my research will delve into synchronicity evidence that magic and mythic cosmologies constitute valid interpretation systems in their own right. Finally, it has to be noted that 'the map is not the territory.' This means I do not understand the diagram and the categories I apply as objective or fixed entities describing an equally objective world. I understand them as quite subjective and culturally biased 'thought supports,' which might serve as markers for navigating in a spectrum, which defies clear boundaries.

2.2. Structures of Consciousness

In his work “Ursprung und Gegenwart” (1973) Jean Gebser differentiates between five different structures of consciousness, which he assumes that humanity has gone through and still is going through in its phylogenesis. At the 'bottom,' or as the first structure of consciousness development, Gebser identifies what he terms the archaic consciousness, followed by the magic, mythic and the mental consciousness, which, according to Gebser, is in its deficient rational phase and constitutes the current mental state. The fifth structure, which he terms integral, is according to Gebser currently emerging (Gebser 1973, 60). Once again, while I appreciate Gebser's identification and description of different consciousness structures, which I understand as essential outlines of fundamental, historically evidenced human experiences and frames of reference, I do not share the chronological narrative onto which Gebser projects those structures. I do understand these structures as simultaneously existing areas in the latent and potential spectrum of consciousness, which historically all have been activated and fully developed in different circumstances. What I will do is to simply connect Gebser's consciousness structures to the diagram of transrational peace, because I believe that they fit. In the following outline of the thus expanded diagram of transrational peace, I will begin every section with Gebser's consciousness structures, before aligning them with their ontogenetic parallel and Dietrich's layers of the diagram. In regard to terminology I will refer to the by Dietrich identified layers in their relation to the yogic chakra-model, as outlined in the first volume of Dietrich's “Variationen über die vielen Frieden” (2008).

2.2.1. Archaic

Following Gebser the archaic structure is characterized by its pre-spatiality and pre-temporality – it is a zero-dimensional consciousness structure. As such, this zero-dimensional structure is unconscious and ego-less. There is no subject-object polarity (let alone duality), no differentiation between self and other, soul and nature, between the individual and the universe. It is a time where the soul is still dormant, and the human in complete identity with the all (Gebser 1973, 83). As a key clue towards this time, Gebser identifies a phrase of Dschuan Dsi, that in Richard Wilhelms translation says: “*Die wahrhaften Menschen der früheren Zeit schliefen traumlos*”¹⁹ (Gebser 1973, 84). For Gebser, this is not a primitive state in the degenerative sense. Indeed, this unconscious complete identity with

¹⁹ “The true humans of former time slept dreamless”, my translation. The idea Gebser here expresses, is that the archaic consciousness structure is equivalent with deep, dreamless sleep.

the all seems to be a mirror image of the goal of yogic and spiritual development termed non-duality – a point I will come back to.

2.2.1.1. Sensorimotor

In its ontogenetic correlation, this stage of consciousness relates to the period of sensorimotor intelligence, which is where the newborn learns first habits, conditioning and circular reactions, such as sucking its thumb (Piaget 1972, 54). In terms of consciousness, this stage is by development psychologists described as primary indissociation, 'oceanic adualism' (Arieti), or 'primary narcissism' (Wilber 2000, 295). The infant's self is not differentiated in relation to its surroundings (complete identity with the surroundings), and only by for instance biting itself and feeling pain, and biting a blanket without feeling pain, it slowly learns to differentiate the physical self from the physical other. It is in Piaget's terms a stage of pure autism, where no objective observation or reasoning is possible: there is only a perpetual play which transforms perceptions and creates situations in accordance with the subject's pleasure (for Wilber the reason the Romantics search back to this original state – and indeed a description of heaven) (Ibid., 301).

From an ontological viewpoint, what corresponds to this manner of thinking is primitive psychological causality, probably a form that implies magic proper: the belief that any desire whatsoever can influence objects, the belief in the obedience of external things. Magic and autism are therefore two different sides of one and the same phenomenon – the confusion between the self and the world... (Piaget 1977, 151-152).

2.2.1.2. Muladhara

In the chakra-psychology this stage correlates to *muladhara*, the first chakra, which intra-personally relates to the physical body and its material functions such as nutrition, metabolism and excretion, birth and reproduction, breath and death (Dietrich 2008, 362). Fittingly, Dietrich describes the egoic aspect of this stage as overindulgence (Dietrich uses the more fitting German word "Maßlosigkeit") (Ibid.). This 'lack of measurement' corresponds to Gebser's term of zero-dimensional, as there is no sense of dimensions at this stage. A later imbalance on this stage expresses itself thus as greed, which is a hindrance for the experience of peace. Dietrich remarks in this regard that for a conscious person the opposite of have is not not-have, but not-wanting-to-have (Dietrich 2008, 363). Hence, from a peace-psychological viewpoint, a materially rich person can suffer as much as a materially poor person, when the attitude is set on

have - something no material wealth ever can satisfy. Consequently, the yogic chakra-psychology recommend moderation in regard to material consumption, not because it is morally wrong, but since overindulgence is a psychological hindrance towards the development of a sense of self and the experience of peace (Cf. Ibid.).

On an interpersonal level, this stage conforms to what Gestalt therapy calls the episode on the contact-border. By Contact-border is meant this physical border that the infant slowly experiences and learns to differentiate, and that readily can be experienced by the senses. It is the world of the five senses, and the only valid reality for positivists, who consequently get in trouble as soon as it gets a little bit deeper and wider, as on the next level. Since the contact-border marks the physical surface of the episode, the contact between different parties and agents in peace-work is here marked by superficial *role* and *cliché*, which expresses itself in professional distance (Cf. Dietrich 2011, 363). Peace-work solely operating on this level is consequently concerned with the physical survival as in disaster operations, and similar first aid emergencies. As soon as the contact goes beyond the mere episode, static adherence to the professional distance and role would gradually question personal authenticity, and thus become a blockage on the contact-border, where for a realization of a peace-process in a transrational sense, the life-energy of the whole being has to flow (Ibid.).

2.2.2. *Magic*

According to Gebser, the magic consciousness steps out of the zero-dimensional structure of the archaic *identity* into one-dimensional *unity*. The one-dimensional unity is still characterized by unconscious space- and timelessness, I-world-god are experienced as energetic points, which are in an interrelationship, and interchangeable (Gebser 1973, 87). The symbol of this structure is the point, it is a point-consciousness with the *pars pro toto* as its motto, in which one entity can represent other entities. An example could be the cow as representation of the great mother, which simultaneous is the world. These points can be interchanged at will. It is a world of pure, but meaningful chance – in other words the world of synchronicity; a world in which all things and persons are interrelated, but the not-yet centered ego is dispersed over the world of phenomena (Ibid., 88). In a sense one may say that in this structure consciousness was not yet in the human, but still resting in the world. Habermas explains:

Apparently the magical-animistic representational world of paleolithic societies was very particularistic and not very coherent. The ordering representations of mythology (i.e., early mythology and not the complex mythology that is the next stage <A/N>.) first made possible the construction of a complex of analogies in which natural and social phenomena were intervoven and could be transformed into one another. In the egocentric world conception of the child at the

preoperational level of thought, these phenomena are made relative to the center of the child's ego; similarly, in sociomorphic worldviews they are made relative to the center of the tribal group (Habermas 1979, 104).

An example of how the interchangeability of points practically functions, the transformation and interrelation between social and natural phenomena, and how the ego is dispersed over the world of phenomena is provided in the following case. In his book "Unknown Africa," Leo Frobenius describes a hunting rite, which he observed in the Congo jungle:

[M]embers of the hunting tribe of Pygmies (three men and a woman) drew a picture of an antelope in the sand before they started out at dawn to hunt antelopes. With the first ray of sunlight that fell on the sand, they intended to "kill" the antelope. Their first arrow hit the drawing unerringly in the neck. Then they went out to hunt and returned with a slain antelope. Their death-dealing arrow hit the animal in exactly the same spot, where hours before, the other arrow had hit the drawing... [H]aving fulfilled its magic purpose... this arrow was then removed from the drawing with an accompanying ritual designed to ward off any evil consequences of the murder from the hunters. After that was done, the drawing itself was erased. (Cited after Gebser 1973, 89).

Gebser identifies several characteristics of the magic structure illustrated by this scene. The egolessness is expressed first of all in the fact that the responsibility for the murder, committed by the group-ego against a part of nature, is attributed to a power already felt to be 'standing outside,' which is the sun. It is not the pygmies' arrow that kills, but the first arrow of the sun that falls on the animal, and of which the real arrow is only a symbol (nowadays, of course, one would interpret it just the other way around and say: the sun's ray is a symbol of the arrow). In this linking of the responsibility of the hunters' group-ego (assuming the form of four human beings performing the rite) with the sun — which, because of its brightness, must be considered a symbol of consciousness — it is clear to what extent the capacity for consciousness of these human beings is still on the outside or connected with the out-side (Gebser 1973, 91). With the Pygmies in their egolessness, the moral consciousness that they must bear responsibly, deriving from a clearly conscious ego (in the sense of I or self-awareness), is still attributed to the sun. Their ego (and with it an essential part of their soul) is still scattered over the world, like the light of the sun. This leads directly to the second characteristic: point-like unity. This is expressed in the visible interchangeability of the real and the symbolic causative element; that is, in equating the ray of sunlight and the arrow. According to Gebser, at the basis of this point-like unity lies a natural vital nexus, and not a rational causal one (Gebser 1973, 92). This point-related unity in which each and every thing intertwines and is interchangeable, becomes apparent when the symbolic murder in a rite, performed before a hunt, coincides exactly with the actual one committed by the hunter. In the spaceless and timeless world of the magic structure, this constitutes a working unity, which operates without a causal nexus, and for Gebser constitutes an effective reality (Gebser 1973, 48).

Spacelessness and timelessness are thus further characteristics of the magic structure, and it is according to Gebser only in a world of space- and timelessness that the point-like unity has effective reality character (Ibid.). They are the reason why every point (a thing, event, or action) can be symbolically and effectively interchanged with another point, independently of time and place, and of any rational causal connection. Apparently, every point can not only be linked with any other point, but is rather identified with it - one can substitute for the other completely (the *pars pro toto*) (Cf. Ibid., 92). It is the lack of spatial and temporal separation that allows things, events, or actions to be effectively correlated or to influence each other in a non-causal or pre-causal manner. Gebser notes that this unifying connection must seem unreal from a modern, rational perspective, since this connecting proceeds in the vegetative psychic energetic, while it loses its effect as soon as rational 'causalisation' sets in, since the activation of consciousness disrupts the unconsciously connecting psychic energetic and dismantles its effectivity (Ibid.). I have to partly disagree with Gebser on this latter point; since synchronistic phenomena show that rational 'causalisation' does not lose the effect of this truly 'magic' connecting. What rational 'causalisation' does, is to interpret and emphasize the same happenings on the contact-border of the episode differently - and consequently reacts differently and breaks with the inherent logic of the magic causality. Following is an example to illustrate what I mean. Lucien Levy-Bruhl relates a paradigmatic historical incident from former German West Africa, where a chief named Kanime from the Ovambi tribe was having an ox prepared for work. Just as they were about to pierce its nostrils, the animal tossed its horns and put out someones eye.

They said at once that the man who had lost his eye had been bewitched. They consulted the wizard, and as he had to discover who had woven the spell, he indicated one of Kanime's servants as the guilty party. When condemned to death, this man ran away, but Kanime pursued him on horseback, overtook him and killed him (Levy-Bruhl 1923, 47-48).

Rational 'causalisation', which is marked by its enlightened ruling out of 'supernatural forces,' would see several causal chains over time that have come to meet, the most important ones being the party of men who, as men used to do, prepare oxen and pierce their nostrils, and the other one being the life of the ox which, as oxen do, more often than not when they get domesticated they have their nostrils pierced and - also - toss their horns. The putting out of the eye would in this perspective be interpreted as unfortunate, but in itself a rather meaningless accident, and if at all going deeper in its analysis, attribute the incident to the ill-will of the ox, and rather carelessness on part of the man. The interpretation would keep within those chronological causal lines, while the logical consequences in a rational perspective would be to either kill this particular ox, or to alter the practice of piercing in the future - and most likely both. In the magical perspective, there is evidently a different reason for the

particular meeting of those causal lines that culminate in the putting out of the eye. Here, the visible episode on the contact-border is *a priori* ordered by an *invisible* intention or background. The reaction following the incident reveals that the tribesmen are solely interested in this presumed invisible background, the meaning-connections in the moment, with no regard for the causal chains over time – a regard, which if Gebser is right about the space- and timelessness of this structure, also would be impossible. The relation between the invisible background/intention and the visible episode on the contact-border is thus one of quality or form – or in another word; meaning. The true incident here is the ill will of Kanime's servant, which finds its symbolical reflection in the putting out of the eye by the ox in the visible episode. The violent and paradigmatic killing of the presumed perpetrator might further illustrate how vulnerable magic consciousness is to invisible intentions and ill-will. The danger of getting bewitched is ever present and feared in this consciousness, and since there is no safeguard against bewitchment from within this consciousness; perpetrators, whether real or not, usually were killed to prevent further accidents from this source (Cf. Levy-Bruhl 1923, 50). It should be noted that witchcraft not necessarily denotes a conscious casting of spells or other ritual action – but mostly unconscious 'evil' intentions, which potentially every human can produce. What Gebser describes as the disruptive effect of consciousness on magic has thus rather to be understood as an ignoring of the unifying connections of the vegetative psychic energetic. Since consciousness has to do with differentiating in time and space, while these unifying connections proceed in a pre-spatial and pre-temporal manner, it is quite understandable that rational 'causalisation' is ignorant of these connections. I again agree with Gebser when he attributes the phenomena studied by parapsychology to this spaceless and timeless structure, which, like all previous structures, remains active in the psyche, and is capable of being accessed. This merging with nature, which in its spacelessness and timelessness also connotes a remarkable boundlessness, explains for Gebser the well-founded powers of the magic man — powers which survive today in the form of human mediums. It is explained in part by an elimination of consciousness, which obscures or blacks out the ego, and causes it to revert to a spaceless-timeless 'unconscious participation- in the group soul. All magic, even today, occurs according to Gebser in this natural-vital, egoless, spaceless and timeless sphere (Ibid. 101).

2.2.2.1. Preoperational

I would at this point like to emphasize that Gebser, contrary to Wilber and (development) psychology generally, accredits the magic consciousness validity and reality within its own range – which is an assessment I share, and a circumstance that also Jung’s findings in relation to synchronicity underscore, and shall therefore be discussed in greater detail later on. Wilber, who writes and reasons from a strict mental/rational three-dimensional perspective, exemplary for a modern rational mode of reasoning where the Aristotelian “*tertium non datur*” is the rule, therefore correctly criticizes from his perspective this magical thinking for confusing different *holons*, either because they share similar agency (the law of similarity) or because they share similar communions (the law of contact) (Wilber 2000, 304). In Wilber’s own words:

[M]agical cognition is not yet capable of grasping the notion of a *holon*. It does not set whole and part in a rich network of *mutual* relationships, but short-circuits the process by merely collapsing or confusing various wholes and parts – what Piaget calls syncretism and juxtaposition (again, similarity and contiguity). Magical cognition, then, is of fused and confused wholes and parts, and not mutually related wholes and parts. These “fused networks” of “syncretic wholes” *appear* very holistic (or “holographic”), but are actually not very coherent, and do not even match the already available sensorimotor evidence (Ibid.).

What Wilber does here is basically being 'mental-centric,' when he evaluates the ontogenetic development, which at this stage is termed preoperational. In this stage or phase the child slowly learns to differentiate its emotional self from emotional objects. In the beginning, there is no differentiation between the child's own emotions and especially the motherly one(s) (point-like unity). Wilber refers to this phase as the “separation-individuation phase,” or the integration of a stable emotional self (whereas the former phase was the stabilization and integration of the physical self), because the infant emerges from its emotional fusion with the (m)other (Wilber, 302). By around age three, if all has gone well, the young child has a stable and coherent physical and emotional self and language has begun to emerge – but magical cognitions continue to dominate the entire early preoperational period (2 – 4 years). During this period, the newly emerging images and symbols do not merely represent objects; they are thought to be concretely part of the things they represent.

Up to the age 4-5, [the child] thinks that he is “forcing” or compelling the moon to move; the relation takes on an aspect of dynamic participation or of magic. From 4 to 5 he is more inclined to think that the moon is trying to follow him: the relation is animistic. Closely akin to this participation is *magical causality*, magic being in many respects simple participation: the subject regards his gestures, his thoughts, or the objects he handles, as charged with efficacy, thanks to the very participations which he establishes between those gestures, etc, and the things around him. Thus a certain word acts upon a certain thing; a certain gesture will protect one from a certain danger; a certain white pebble will bring about the growth of water lilies, and so on... (Piaget, quoted after Wilber 2000, 303-304).

Wilber compares this magical thinking to Freud's notions of *displacement* and *condensation*, explaining that in displacement, two different objects are equated or linked because they share similar parts or predicates (a relation of similarity), while condensation relates different aspects because they exist in the same space (a relation of contiguity: a lock of hair of a great warrior contains in condensed form the power of the warrior) (Ibid., 304). Notwithstanding what Freud actually meant by those terms, Wilber does here indeed describe the fundamentals of so-called *sympathetic magic* as outlined by Sir James George Frazer in "The Golden Bough" (1994):

If we analyze the principles of thought on which magic is based, they will probably be found to resolve themselves into two: first, that like produces like, or that an effect resembles its cause; and, second, that things which have once been in contact with each other continue to act on each other at a distance after the physical contact has been severed. The former principle may be called the Law of Similarity, the latter the Law of Contact or Contagion. From the first of these principles, namely the Law of Similarity, the magician infers that he can produce any effect he desires merely by imitating it: from the second he infers that whatever he does to a material object will affect equally the person with whom the object was once in contact, whether it formed part of his body or not (Frazer 1994 [1889], 35).

This by Frazer described form of magical reason is strikingly similar to Gebser's magical consciousness, where the interchangeability of points relates to the law of similarity and the *pars pro toto* to the law of contact. As Gebser pointed out, these connections seem to work prior to space and time, and seem thus not causally connected but by what Gebser termed the 'vital connex' in the vegetative psychic energetic. That this 'vital connex' also appears as an emotional factor is indicated by the circumstance that the child here is differentiating its emotional self from the physical self, for which reason this 'vital connex' also could be termed emotional connections. That these emotional connections often constitute literal or real emotional fusions and participations – and not simply cognitive confusions as Wilber suggests – is underscored by Jung's theory of synchronicity, which I will treat later on.

Again, because I assume that space and time transcending emotional connections exist and pattern events into meaningful episodes, and that the by many pre-modern people claimed connections, such as those between hunting rituals and the actual hunt, often constitute valid interpretations within their own logic, I do not assume that every claim in this direction is correct, just as every mathematical calculation does not reach correct results, albeit basic mathematical skills are mastered. What I assume is that, very roughly put, magic consciousness can be described as a pre-egoic, pre-spatial and pre-temporal state of emotional fusion (not confusion) with the surroundings, for which reason it does not interpret events in a three-dimensional space and time frame of reference, but in a one-dimensional unitary fashion, where phenomena are set in inter-relationship according to their emotional quality and analogy in the

moment. I further assume that this constitutes an experienceable reality plane, which not only is characteristic for Paleolithic and Neolithic as well as more recent people typically living in kinship-based family clans with shamanism as religious institution, but also exists as latent or active layer in every human and has its ontogenetic parallel in the preoperational phase. Furthermore, do I find reason to suggest that pre-egoic, emotional fusion, in many ways also is characteristic for any functioning family.

2.2.2.2. Svadisthana

After the discussion above, it is no wonder that the second chakra, *svadisthana*, inter-personally is associated with the family and intra-personally with sexuality, feelings and emotions (Dietrich 2011, 364-368). Dietrich describes it as the place where memories are converted into emotions. In this perspective, emotions are energetically charged memory-structures in the present. Fear and physical pain are incentives for egoical actions, while bravery is not the opposite of fear, but just a different appearance of the same *energy* – as virtually all emotions are. To this belongs especially also the wish to reproduce (past) experiences of lust and pleasure. Sexual energy reproduces itself, as long as it remains unbalanced and unconscious, and with this desire that can lead to aggression and adherence to violence (Dietrich 2008, 363). However, emotions and (sexual) energy can do more than blur the perception of the here and now, and reproduce it self and biologically reproduce physical bodies. As Dietrich points out, this is the level in which elicitive peace-work corresponds to (shamanic) *healing* (Cf. Dietrich 2011, 364). Traditional healing on this level has everything to do with 'vitality' and energy, but not so much with the sexual aspect of this energy, as with the effects that emotions and vitality magically manifest in their surroundings through the 'vital connex' in the vegetative psychic energetic - e.g. *synchronicity*. It should further be noticed that Gebser's 'magical human' and the associated societies are the same which Dietrich terms *energetic* societies, presumably often matriarchally organized and characterized by (energetic) peace out of fertility/harmony (Cf. Dietrich 2008). The term *energetic* fits very well in this developed perspective, since *energy* in this context means exactly what Gebser terms the 'vegetative psychic energetic' responsible for the vital connex. This vitality is exactly the *energy* which Dietrich invokes again and again as the Dionysian counterpart to Apollonian form, and which humans experience as feelings and emotions – and especially also sexuality, with its search for lustful unification. How this relates to the family probably needs no mention. In this perspective, the sexual act reveals itself as the magic act per se.

Since also matter and form are forms of energy, I could state that the 'primal' energy, which at the archaic level or first chakra is differentiated form-wise (the

physical body, form and not-form), at this second level is further differentiated into the polarity of form and feeling. Feelings and emotions then, and the better word is probably vitality or *energy*, appears to be the decisive factor in magic (and the better word here is probably 'synchronistic') connections as already indicated. This circumstance is not a new idea, and for instance Avicenna (980 – 1037) and Albertus Magnus (1200 – 1280) have already written on the connection between magic and emotion.

I found (in relation to magic) a plausible explanation in the sixth book of Avicenna's *Naturalia*, that the soul holds a certain power (virtus) to change things, and that the other things are subdued to the soul; this is, when the soul is raptured in a great excess of love or hate or similar (*quando ipsa fertur in magnum amoris excessum aut odii aut alicuius talium*). So, when the soul of a human gets in to a great excess of any form of passion, one can experimentally determine, that it (the excess) (magically) binds things together and changes them into that very direction towards which it strives (*fertur in grandem excessum alicuius passionis invenitur experimento manifesto quod ipse ligat res et alterat ad idem quod desiderat et diu non credidi illud*), and I have for a long time not believed it, but after studying nigromantic books and such about magic symbols (*imaginum*) and magic, I found that (really) the emotionality (*affecto*) of the human soul is the main root of all these things, be it either, that it through great emotions alters its body and other things for which it strives, or that through its inherent dignity the other things are subdued (to the soul), or be it that with such a great excess the fitting sidereal hour coincides or the astrological situation or another power runs parallel, and we (thus) believe that it really is the power of the soul which causes these things... who thus wants to know the secret about this, and how to cause that, has to know that everyone can magically influence everything, when he gets into a great excess... (Albertus Magnus, ca 1488, cited and translated after Jung 1952, 36-37).

Albertus Magnus here speculates whether it actually is the human soul, which is another term for the emotional self, that causes these 'magic' patterning of events into the direction it strives for, or whether the soul rather coincides with the macrocosmic situation, as for instance the astrological hour, and thus in reality only is a pawn in the hands of greater constellations, while it then only from the ego-perspective seems to be oneself that is the root of these patterns²⁰. This question would also occupy C. G. Jung about five hundred years later. Interesting and relevant at this point is to note that the fact that Albertus Magnus speculations on these questions indicates that he himself not dwells in a magic consciousness, but in virtue of these abstract reflections is emancipated from its spell and settled in a mental ego-consciousness. Magic consciousness is in its pre-egoic state unconscious of itself being enchanted by the emotional forces. As just pointed out above, this is a problematic condition from a peace philosophical perspective, since the unconsciously re-produced desire leads to aggression and violence. The necessary abstraction and transcendence of the magic structure occurs in the next layer, which I following Gebser term *mythic*.

²⁰ While this reminds of the joke about training cats, who actually follow commands, as long as the commands follow what the cat already is doing by itself – what Albertus Magnus here really speculates about is the question of free will.

2.2.2.3. The Shift from Preoperational to Concrete Operational

As the child moves from early preoperational (2-4 years: magic) to late preoperational (4-7 years: magic/mythic) similar types of magic cognition dominate awareness, while typically one major shift occurs; continued interaction with the world and rising awareness eventually lead the child to realize that his or her thoughts do not egocentrically control, create, or govern the world alone. Piaget describes this shift accordingly:

During the first stage [early preoperational] all the explanations given are psychological, phenomenistic, finalistic and magical. During the second stage [magic-mythic] the explanations are artificialist, animistic and dynamic, and the magical forms tends to diminish (Piaget 1977, 143).

Wilber describes this shift pointedly:

The first stage is magical: we make the clouds move by walking. The clouds obey us at a distance. The average age of this stage is 5. The second stage is both artificialist and animistic. Clouds move because God or men make them move. The average age of this stage is 6 (Wilber 2000, 306-307).

This means the omnipotent magic of the child is transferred to other subjects – maybe I cannot make the world cater for my needs, but Mummy (or God or Santa Claus) can – and mythology according to developmental psychology is born. Philip Cowan points out,

During the [late preoperational] stage, there is still confusion between physical and personal causality; the physical world appears to operate much the way people do. All of these examples [show that late preoperational] children have already developed elaborate mythologies about cosmic questions such as the nature of life (and death) and the cause of wind... Further, these mythologies show many similarities from child to child across cultures and do not seem to have been directly taught by adults (Cowan 1978, 168).

The circumstance, that similar mythologies arise in separate cultures and people, and also later on in life and not only in children, shall be investigated further later on, when dealing with Jungian psychology. Relevant at this point is to note that magical cognition is altered and diminished in the late preoperational stage, but continues to influence and exist (in the forming of symbols and mental images), just as mythological cognition diminishes but continues to exist in other cognitive structures. The important point here, however, which Wilber tries to make and Gebser also made in his model, regards the correlating ego-awareness development. When infants and young children by development psychologists are described as narcissistic and egocentric, this does not mean that they selfishly only think about themselves, but to the contrary, that they are unable to think about themselves.

The egocentric child is unable to differentiate himself from the rest of the world; he has not separated himself out from others or from objects. Thus he feels that others share his pain or his pleasure, that his mumblings will inevitably be understood, that his perspective is shared by all persons, that even animals and plants partake of his consciousness. In playing hide-and-seek he will "hide" in broad view of other persons, because his egocentrism prevents him from recognizing that others are aware of his location. The whole course of human development can be viewed as a continuing decline in egocentrism... (Gardner 1972, 63).

What Gebser correspondingly terms egolessness does thus not denote altruistic selflessness, but the lack of stable ego-awareness. I here agree with Wilber on the point that human consciousness and psychological development can be described as a decline in egocentrism through continued decentering, differentiation and integration. The egocentrism characteristic for the child in the sensorimotor and preoperational stage continues to decline during accomplished development. While the sensorimotor stage is characterized by a differentiation of the physical self from the physical surroundings, the preoperational stage can be described as a differentiation of the biological and emotional self from the surroundings. The next phase then, concrete operational, has to do with belonging and community – it is the differentiation of the social self from other social selves and social *role* awareness.

In regard to the collective shift from magic to mythic, it is an undecided question whether the mythic representational system followed societal organization or vice versa – or whether both just stand in a meaningful relationship. Habermas and his collaborators argue evolutionary that ecologically conditioned problems such as land scarcity and population density, or problems of social distribution of wealth, have overloaded the adaptive capacity limited by the kinship principle of organization (magic-consciousness) and forced some neolithic societies to use cognitive potentials in their worldviews and institutionalize an administration of justice on a conventional level (Habermas 1979, 162). Thus, for example, the war chief was empowered to adjudicate cases of conflict no longer only according to the distribution of power, but according to socially recognized norms grounded in tradition. Law was no longer only that on which the parties could agree (Ibid.). What is certain is that the emergence of complex mythologies also enabled humans to organize societies beyond blood lineage, and gain a wider integrative capacity. While the preconventional/magic communities centered around common ancestor (kinship), these emerging societies center around a common ruler and/or mythology. Wilber follows this understanding, when he states:

The transition to *societies organized through a state* required the relativization of tribal identities and the construction of a more abstract [meaning less bodybound] identity that no longer based the membership of individuals on common descent but on belonging in common to a territorial organization. This took place first through identification with the figure of a ruler who could claim close connection and privileged access to the mythological originary powers. In the framework of mythological worldviews the integration of different tribal traditions was

accomplished through a large-scale, syncretic expansion of the world of the gods – a solution that proved to be rather unstable. It wasn't that magical-animistic societies had no mythologies, for they did. It was simply that, as Joseph Campbell explained, the rise of the first early states was marked by an explosion of codified mythologies – an enormous differentiation/integration of mythic motifs – and Habermas's point is that these mythologies became a large part of the integrating structures for society (i.e., providing both cultural meaning and social integration). As we saw, in the previous or magical structure, personal identity was *natural* or body-based, and collective identity was likewise kinship or blood-bound, particularly through a common ancestor. Without a common ancestor (or kinship lineage), there was no way to socially integrate various interests. With the rise of the mythological structure, however, personal identity switched to a *role* identity in a society of a common *political* (not genetically related) ruler, and this ruler was given legitimacy not because of blood ties but because of his (or sometimes her) special relation to mythological gods/goddesses - “mythic membership.” (Wilber 2000, 242-243).

If I cut away Wilber's functionalist implications, where he seemingly believes a Mastermind wanted to implement a state and thus invented mythology in order to integrate the masses, what I see and find plausible is a correspondence between mythological representative systems and wider tribal federations, which necessitates and activates the always already latently existing mythic layer.

2.2.3. *Mythic*

Jean Gebser describes the transition from the magic to the mythical consciousness-structure as the development of a sense of time, which has a natural quality. Closely connected to this sense of time is the 'soul.' Time and soul are for Gebser expressions of psychic energy, which constitute the preforms of matter. Where magic consciousness becomes conscious of nature, the mythical consciousness becomes conscious of the soul. Gebser recognizes the mythical structure in the seasonal-rites of the old civilizations. In astronomy and calendars of those cultures comes the preceding magic consciousness to an end. The rhythms of nature are now experienced as temporal phenomena (Gebser 1973, 105). The magical consciousness freed itself from nature, and through this deliverance from nature distanced also the yet unconscious ego itself from nature, and consciously realized nature as an “other.” The mythical structure now discovers in an opposite movement the world within the human, which is the soul. The scattered point of the *pars pro toto* gains a two-dimensional structure, which can be expressed in the self-enclosing circle or the ouroboros, the symbol of the soul. The circle encompasses all polarities and binds them balancing together: thus returns in an eternal circle the year over its polar manifestations of summer and winter back onto itself, just as the course of the sun through midnight and noon encompasses light and dark. The mythical structure recognizes the opposite poles in nature, and places heaven and sun as opposite poles to the earth, and heaven as opposite to the underworld, so that the

in the magical fight realized earth is enfolded by the two polar realities of the soul: the underworldly Hades and the overworldly Olympus. Since the soul has this mirror-quality, it does not only contain natural temporality, but implies also the non-temporal, the Eternal, which is related to either heaven or hell (Gebser 1973, 107). The conduct of the god or the human in the mythical consciousness-structure is characterized by the closing of the senses, the silent look-within and the listening within. The result is the mythos, the word as the expression of the inner vision. Thus is the word always the mirror of silence, the myth the mirror of the soul. Only the blind side enables the seeing. And since everything that belongs to the soul has this mirror-character, it is not only marked by natural temporality, but also always related to the heaven; the soul is a mirror of heaven – and hell. Thus closes the mythical circle of time – soul – myth – heaven and hell myth – soul – time (Ibid. 104-105).

2.2.3.1. Concrete Operational

In the concrete operational stage (which Wilber terms “mythic/rational”) a differentiation of body, emotion and mind sets in, and a beginning ego-awareness increases, which thus means a decline of egocentrism. Piaget considered the concrete stage a major turning point in the child's cognitive development, because it marks the beginning of logical or operational thought. The child is now mature enough to use logical thought or operations (i.e. rules) but can only apply logic to physical objects (hence *concrete* operational) (McLeod 2009). Children become better at conservation tasks. This means that the child understands that although the appearance of something changes, the thing itself does not. They gain the abilities of conservation (number, area, volume, orientation) and reversibility. Their thinking is more organized and rational. They can solve problems in a logical fashion, but are typically not able to think abstractly or hypothetically. In terms of identity formation a shift from egocentrism towards sociocentrism is evident, which means that the child learns to understand and differentiate its own and others social *roles* (i.e. mythic membership). This then is the proper mythic stage, which for Wilber and Habermas structurally correlates to the mental processes found among native people around the world at the early stages of colonialism by missionaries and anthropologists. That this, seen from their ethnocentric perspective, is not too far-fetched seems empirically evident. Lucien Levy-Bruhl quotes in this regard Jesuit missionaries, who were the first to see the Indians dwelling in the eastern parts of Northern America, and stated:

We are forced to the conclusion that the Iroquois are incapable of reasoning like the Chinese and other civilized races to whom we set forth the belief in God and His truth... The Iroquois is not influenced by reason. His direct perception of things is the only light which guides him. The

incentives to belief which theology is accustomed to use in order to convince the most hardened free-thinkers are not listened to here, where our most profound truths are declared to be lies. They usually believe only what they see. (Levy-Bruhl 1923, 21).

After attesting the same dynamics for the Greenlanders, Levy-Bruhl states that:

It is not to be doubted that the Greenlanders, when following the avocations necessary to their existence, do reason, and that they employ means which are sometimes complicated, in order to arrive at the ends they are seeking. But these mental processes are not independent of the material objects, which induce them, and they come to an end as soon as their aim has been attained. They are never exercised on their own account, and that is why they do not seem to us to rise to the level of what we properly term "thought" (Levy-Bruhl 1923, 22-23).

This mental habit, which rules out abstract thought and reasoning, seems to be met with in a large number of what back then was termed 'uncivilized communities,' and constitutes according to Levy-Bruhl a characteristic and essential trait of 'primitive mentality' (Ibid, 29). As Levy-Bruhl later points out, and which in Gebser's logic would constitute the inevitable mythical opposite of this adherence on concrete circumstances, is that the reason for incidents and accidents always are interpreted as due to mystical, invisible forces such as witchcraft, and even when causal connections are pointed out are they considered of minor importance, and at best as instrument for the occult powers (Ibid. 37).

2.2.3.2. A Note on Freedom

Since the mythological stage no longer is the world of magic unity, but in Gebser's sense one of mythological polar enclosedness, it is only consequential that the concept of freedom at this stage begins to be increasingly differentiated and abstracted from its earlier unity with sexuality, love and fertility towards (and here the closeness and smooth transition of what here is described as stages once more becomes visible) a person from one's own clan or tribe, a familiar friend and beloved person - as opposed to a stranger, war prisoner or slave (Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen 1993, 102). The focus shifts (Wilber would say elevated – but that is as argued a matter of taste and I do rather regard it as a horizontal expansion) from the unity of freedom with Frej and Freja, denoting romantic love, fertility and vitality towards a societal context, a question of social role and who is inside and who is outside the mythologically argued social circle – who is friend and who is foe. Mythologically, this shift is expressed in Nordic mythology by the Æsir – Vanir War(s), where eventually the Vanir twins Frej and Freja in a trickery exchange

are incorporated into the Æsir group living in Asgard. Significantly, the Vanir, a godly race who seem much closer connected to the earth, have more undifferentiated archaic/magic matriarchal levels as indicated by for instance the incestuous relationship between Frej and Freja (which as well denotes a beginning differentiation of a form of archaic androgyny), and besides their obvious connection to fertility and unity, they (the Vanir) are not defeated or extinct by the now from a human perspective dominating Asir, but incorporated and embedded into the Asir agenda. This dynamic is also based on all different levels here described, and could also not be different – as for instance, to take a parallel example, the earth could survive without humans on it, while the relatively newcomers on this planet, humans, could not survive without the supporting and much older earth. Equally, each consciousness-structure and chakra builds on, incorporates and differentiates the preceding ones, without making extinct or dissolving the functions and meanings of those earlier structures – but to the contrary, remains in a vital, meaningful and necessary interrelation. Thus Odin, the mythic father of the gods and symbol of patriarchal domination, frequently visits the Norns (old women sitting at the roots of the world tree Yggdrasil weaving humans life-threads) for counsel, and applies magic - especially to cunningly outlive his virility. In terms of freedom, the literally vital and pivotal point in its meaning of fertility and (magic) unity remains active, but another layer of meaning, another pivotal point is added and differentiated towards which here the focus of awareness now turns, and which is the mythological polar opposite of Us and Them – and in other variations of the binary mythic circle day and night, man and woman, heaven and hell, life and death. However, these categories are in the mytho-logic not dualistic opposites, but polarities and as such intimately connected – as for instance visible in the constant struggle but also intermarriage between the Jötir and Æsir in Nordic mythology, and the relation between Odin and Loki – where the latter seems to be a sort of shadow or 'evil twin' of the former, and thus together form two sides of one character (...). Interesting, albeit somewhat rhetorically, is the similarity to the popular notion of the “free world” during the Cold War era, where the “free world” were the US and its allies (friends and them at peace with) vs. the Communist Bloc. The old Game repeated, where both “sides” performed as the shadow aspect of the other within the mythologically closed circle.

With increased differentiation, abstraction, and internal distance in historical societies the sociogenesis of the term freedom changes accordingly. Thus, in ancient Greek and ancient Rome the act of *manumissio* (literally: to sent away from ones hand) describes a slave-owner freeing his slave into a freedman – or *libertus* in Roman terms (Bauman 1988, 46). But their social status was completely negative – they were not slaves anymore, neither full-born citizens, and still obliged towards their former master (Ibid.). While I do not want to neglect that the *manumittere* more often than not might have involved affection,

erotic love and friendship, what we do see is the transformation of free-dom into a more juridical term, meaning the attainment of more rights and privileges contrasted to slaves. While this still has the connotation of taking an outsider (the slave) into the in-group, though not as an equal, it also seems closer to a more contemporary understanding of free as the opposite of legal restrictions.

2.2.3.3. Manipura

Since the chakra-psychology indeed seems correlative with the ontogenetic and collective consciousness structures as I claimed at the beginning, the third chakra, *manipura*, fittingly relates to community/social competence and intellect (Cf. Dietrich 2008, 363). Social competence or communality has exactly everything to do with knowing the roles, narratives, conducts, hierarchies and who is in and who is out of the different groups – and at the least to know the own place and expectations towards the personal role. In regard to intellect, it has to be noted that this term as used here relates to mental tasks performed by using time – by this I mean to stop and withdraw from the immediate and direct engagement with the episode on the contact-border in order to perform mental tasks – which at this stage are concrete operational, as outlined above meaning that they orientate along concrete objects. This is different than the 'emotional intelligence'²¹ operating at the magical level, which is of immediate result and character, and in its more pure form establishes immediate, energetic connections between different points, mentally as well as operating with symbols and images. The modern claim that mythological reasoning is more intelligent than magical, albeit still less intelligent than modern rationality (as for instance Wilber does) believes (quite mythologically) that the own standpoint and measure is the (only) right and true one. It would be more correct to state that the different forms and states of intelligence can and do different things. Intelligence is here concretely measured by their degree in which they withdraw from the concrete episode and by this accumulate time – which at some point, when the withdrawal goes too far, as well becomes a deficit – as currently is the case in the contemporary state of the art (and topic in the next level). However, when intelligence is used as denoting the ability and degree of mental abstraction, then this is indeed the structure where intelligence attains momentum and has everything to do with the awareness and interplay of polar opposites and

²¹ My usage of the term 'emotional intelligence' has not to be confused with the meaning it has in development psychology, as especially developed by Howard Gardner, where it denotes the ability to differentiate and recognize own and others feelings and also influence others feelings. In the magic consciousness this is exactly contrary.

symbolic correspondences – Claude Levi-Strauss’ grit to analyze myth - and Gebser’s birth of the soul, which simultaneously is the birth of time.

As this chakra intrapersonally relates to (social) intelligence and interpersonally to communality, the aspects at this level which lead to violent behavior and conflicts on the surface of the episode are egoistical striving for power and appreciation, as well as suppression and exclusion of others, in other words; the strive for dominance (Dietrich 2011, 369). Dietrich mentions fear of own exclusion and domination, as well as compensation for doubts about personal social competence rooted in traumatic social experiences as reason for mistrust and consequential strive for dominance (Ibid.). Peace-work at this level is relatively complex, because imbalances and blockages in the previous structures, which are embedded in this one, also interfere and influence here. Thus, material greed (archaic) and sexual aspiration (magic) can for instance be incentives and amplifiers for the strive towards social dominance, as a higher social status in a feedback-loop enhances the prospects for material wealth and sexual partners – by which a mutually amplifying circle of potentially violence-enhancing conduct is set in motion and interferes with a harmonious flow on the contact-border of the episode. Peace-work solely focused on this layer will have to work with narratives – the personal and social mythologies – while elicitive oriented peace-work also here additionally will try to facilitate a space for consciousness raising, which moves beyond mythic rationality. Thus, the first step in transforming mythic narratives and egoistical striving is found on the next level.

2.2.4. *Mental*

In Gebser’s perspective the mental consciousness steps out of the concealment of the two-dimensional circle into the three-dimensional space; the necessity for a perspective. There is no being-in-the-polar-oneness anymore, only the alien opposite, the dualism, which through a mental synthesis is sought bridged as trinity (Gebser 1973, 132). It is a world of the human; in other words it is a human world, where “man is the measure of all things” (Protagoras); where human thinks self and adjust and judges (with) his/her thoughts; it is a world which is measured and objectified, a material world, which stands opposite the human. The detachment of the ego from nature is as already mentioned also an awakening of the human to itself, and a realization of itself as human, corresponding to the inscription in the Apollon-temple in Delphi: *gnothi seauton*. With this awakening the mental thinking practice gains a superior relevance, and especially so the judging thought, with which the human steps out of the hazy mythical consciousness. The human gives itself order, by stating rules and laws:

thus mediated Moses at the mountain Sinai the divine law to the people, Lykurg wrote the Spartan law, and later Solon the Athenian. With “Law” the right side gains emphasis, which does not only stand for awakened consciousness, but also for the masculine principle (Gebser 1973, 133 – 135)?

The term *mental* implies *mentality* in the sense of moral setup or mindset. Gebser traces the etymological root of *mental* to “*menos*,” which according to Gebser denotes the complex of: “*Intention, rage, courage, thinking, thought, mind, mentality, imagination*” (Ibid. 127). The basis for the mutation into the mental consciousness Gebser thus sees in “rage” and “thought,” which at first is experienced mythically as “wrath of the gods,” the rage of Zeus or the fury of Jahwe, but later is transferred unto the human I (Ibid.). The rage, not as blind, but as thinking rage, gives direction to reason and action. It is ruthless in the German sense of *Rücksichtslos*, which means it does not look back, but turns the human away from the preceding mythical world of enclosedness and embeddedness, and directs it forward, as the aiming spear – as Achilles plunges into the fight. The rage isolates the human from the preceding valid world – the emphasis here lies on human – and enables the I-consciousness (Cf. Ibid., 129). While the mythical reasoning was an imaginative picture conceiving, which was enclosed in the polarity-encompassing circle, the directed thought is an object-related reasoning and consequently marked by duality. The mental human sees itself as subject facing an object. Erich Neumann writes in this regard, that man in the mental consciousness always sees himself as man facing an opposite not-I. This not-I is experienced as feminine, which unconsciously associated with the Great Mother of ancient times gains demonic characteristics (Neumann 1949, 137). The Sanskrit root of mother “Ma(t)” contains terms as *matar*, from which mother and matter derive, but also meter and measure. Meter and measure belongs to the mental system, by which the masculine I seeks to dominate the mother and the matter (Ibid.). Gebser would agree with this etymological reasoning, and add that the original root “ma: me” latently and complementary also contains the feminine principle, because the Greek word for “moon,” *men*, also goes back to this root, implying the association between the moon and the feminine principle. Towards the secondary root “ma(t)”, Gebser notes on the same page that the contemporary patriarchal world experiences a glorification, which expresses itself in the obsession of rational man through matter and materialism. While the moon was formerly a measure for natural temporality, today matter is as measure for spatiality (Gebser 1973, 131).

One leading theme Gebser points out as characteristic for the mental stage is dualism (Ibid.). It is, however, not only the mentally realized ego-awareness that necessarily and simultaneously creates an opposite and outside “not-I,” and thus the dualism between subject and object – the ego-awareness simultaneously also creates an internal dualism through its self-reflection. This is necessarily so, since the one (the ego) realizing, and the realized (the prior layers) are at least

two. This dualism then, is the great source of conflict on this stage. Internally, it is the struggle Freud described as the antagonistic forces of the Id and the super-ego, which the ego has to balance. The Id corresponds here to the first three chakras (especially sexuality and emotions), while the fourth chakra in the here presented systematic creates the ego openly towards the potentials of the super-ego, while the latter especially describes the wider societal necessities and the corresponding ethical and aesthetic reasoning. Goethe expressed this split dramatically, in the famous statement *“Zwei Seelen wohnen, ach! In meiner Brust. Die eine will sich von der anderen trennen; die eine hält in derber Liebeslust, sich an die Welt mit klammernden Organen; Die andre hebt gewaltsam sich vom Dust zu den Gefilden hoher Ahnen.”*²² (Goethe 1994, sentence 1112). In physiological terms, this dualism has historically been related to two different parts of the brain, on one side the limbic system which were considered responsible for the processing of emotions and drive- and instinctual behavior, and on the other hand the cerebral cortex, considered responsible for higher order reasoning and especially the ego-awareness (Bloomfield et al. 1975, 63). Arthur Koestler was of the opinion that the human urge for self-destruction, its capability of becoming addicted to drugs, and to wage wars, can be explained as a pathological split between emotions and reason, based in the imperfect coordination between those two brain-structures, which he interpreted as an error of evolution (Koestler 1967, 296).

2.2.4.1. Formal operational

In the ontogenetic consciousness-development the so-called formal operational stage corresponds to the fourth chakra, and begins at about age 11. As children/adolescents enter this stage, they gain the ability to think in an abstract manner, the ability to combine and classify items in a more sophisticated way, and the capacity for higher-order reasoning. The child can now do mathematical calculations, think creatively, use abstract reasoning, and imagine the outcome of particular actions (McLeod 2009). An example of the distinction between concrete and formal operational stages is the answer to the question “If Kelly is taller than Ali and Ali is taller than Jo, who is tallest?” This is an example of inferential reasoning, which is the ability to think about things which the child has not actually experienced, and to draw conclusions from its thinking. The child who needs to draw a picture or use objects is still in the concrete opera-

²² Two souls live, ah! in my chest. The one seeks to free itself from the other; the one sticks in sturdy lust, to the world with clinging organs: the other elevates violently from the dust, to the realms of great forefathers.” (My translation).

tional stage, whereas children who can reason the answer in their heads are using formal operational thinking.

With the ability for abstract reasoning comes the ability to reflect upon the own social role and personal conduct, as well as to emphatically place oneself in the perspective of others. The transcendence from concrete operational/mythic to formal operational/mental Wilber hence describes as a transformation from a role identity to an *ego* identity – and I could also say role-awareness to ego-awareness (Cf. Wilber 2000, 317). Again, ego (in the sense of I) does here not mean egocentric, but on the contrary it interpersonally means moving from a *sociocentric* to a *worldcentric* capacity, which means a capacity to distance oneself from one's own egocentric and socio-centric embeddedness, and consider what would be fair for all people and not merely one's own (Ibid.). In other words, the capacity to form concepts that go beyond the concrete episode, and enables one to have an idea about affiliations with 'imagined communities', termed society, based on abstract formulated ethical and aesthetic principles, and wider inclusion and expulsion proceedings (Cf. Dietrich 2011, 373).

2.2.4.2. Anahata

The fourth – or “heart”- chakra is called *anahata* and fits coherently with the logic of the here presented systematic, and is intra-personally related to mental activity and inter-personally to society (Cf. Dietrich 2008, 372). As Dietrich remarks, it can at first sight seem surprising that metaphorical heart qualities such as love, compassion and devotion should have something to do with mind and society (Ibid.). That this indeed makes sense already became apparent in the prior outline regarding the ontogenetic characteristics. The intra-personal capacity for mental abstraction opens up for the possibility to become aware and conscious of the personal/social role in the episode, with its sexual/energetic and family aspects, through mental self-reflection. It is this mental abstraction, which realizes the own persona and its energy – and through this, in a sense, creates the ego as further differentiation. As such, Nietzsche is right in stating that the ego is nothing but a grammatical (or rather mental) fiction, that there is no doer behind the deed. The doer is in this perspective indeed rather a fictive (mental) abstraction that *follows* the deed (in this case the abstraction) – and indeed a powerful one. At the same time that the ego stabilizes by acquiring a conscious awareness of its own constitution (archaic form, sexual energetic and social role) it also begins to *own* this constitution and can judge and correct it (at least that is the idea) (Cf. Dietrich 2011, 372). This, then, is the disruptive effect of consciousness on the vegetative psychic energetic/magic Gebser has in mind, and how the ego frees itself from magic unity and mythic polarity.

Connected to a realized ego-perspective is the potential realization that other people as well have a personal perspective, and the consequential potential to consciously try to grasp this perspective - which is called empathy. Empathy, which I understand as a prerequisite for compassion, is in regard to emotions probably only possible because of the magic/energetic unity (and correlative mirror neurons) – however, in order to not egocentrically fuse with the other or project own emotions, but exactly appreciate the other as the other, mental differentiation between I and Other is necessary²³. This again presupposes that the personal and mental capacity actually is applied for interpersonal purposes, and thus balances the intra-personal ego-awareness. Inner ego-consciousness unbalanced by outer societal-consciousness distorts the potential heart-qualities love, compassion and devotion into power-obsession, passion and greed – through simultaneously distorting the preceding layers towards its (only then common connoted) egoistical aspects (Cf. Dietrich 2011, 374). It follows by implication that a person, who applies mental capacities for inter-personal purposes only, without self-awareness, will remain a pawn in the hands of (the then still unconscious) pre-personal collective influences.

Dietrich remarks in my view correctly that mental categories and qualities due to its dual character also always are adhesive (Dietrich 2011, 374). Love as heart-quality is inter-personally thus bound on concrete persons, while others are excluded (Ibid.). This is consequently so, since the ego as described here is a product of mental abstraction, and thus by its very nature only exist in its adhesiveness to, and identification with, its thoughts and emotions (or rather, the ego *is* the duality of thoughts and emotions) – which subsequently are set in a reflective interrelationship with other (so perceived) egos. The dualism born out of this mental process can be realized (or come into awareness) through mental reflection – however, it can logically not be solved by further mental reflection. Following the chakra-psychology of yoga, the transrational peace-philosophy thus recommend a (meditative) conscious awareness and observation of mental and emotional processes, without judging or categorizing thoughts (which would be mental), in order to transcend and integrate the mental process in an again wider and deeper understanding – which no longer is mental, but trans-mental, and the entrance to the spiritual (Ibid. 377). This particular reflection leads me straight into the next layer; however, before going there, I shall make another quick note on the term freedom.

Webster's first definition of the adjective free is: "not bound by restrictions, physical, governmental, or moral; exempt from arbitrary domination or

²³ The circumstance that empathy to certain degrees also is found among most mammals underpins that the here described layers not have to be understood as strict categories and that all forms of human societies also had and applied mental capabilities – while I argue the different emphasize of structures according to societal organization.

distinction; independent” (Webster’s Comprehensive Dictionary 2004, 503). The meaning of this contemporary interpretation goes in a clear direction; “freedom” at this time and stage concerns the ego, its alleged individuality, and its right to unfold as an individual according to its own will, and in opposition and relation to societal necessities. In “On Liberty,” John Stuart Mill sought to define the “...nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual,” and as such, he describes an inherent and continuous antagonism between liberty and authority, and thus, the prevailing political question becomes “how to make the fitting adjustment between individual independence and social control” (Mill 1869, 2). From a transrational perspective, this continuous antagonistic dualism between egoistic wants and societal needs on the one hand, and the corresponding intra-personal antagonism on the other hand is, if at all, first transcended in the next structure, where freedom intra-personally no longer denotes the freedom *of* the ego, but the freedom *from* the ego, and inter-personally encompasses a global perspective.

2.2.4.3. The Further Reaches of Human Consciousness

From here on the three models outlined by Dietrich, Gebser and Wilber cease to correlate with each other, while all three theorists continue to formulate further possible stages of consciousness.

If Wilber’s next stage, “vision-logic,” is disregarded as a stage of its own, because, as Wilber himself almost admits, this structure actually is a variation of the overall mental and formal operational structure (Cf. Wilber 2000, 361), then his next four transpersonal stages termed *psychic*, *subtle*, *causal* and *non-dual* do more or less correlate to the next chakras as outlined by Dietrich, which are *vishudda*, *anja* and *sahasrar*. The exact correlation and quantity of those stages are at this point not important, as this modeling, especially in Wilber’s case, also is a question of convention. Relevant is eventually the qualitative correlation between the last stages: non-dual and sahasrar – and their correlation to Gebser’s integral consciousness and the archaic state. Gebser, being more concerned with the phylogenetic development, identifies solely one next possible stage in relation to the preceding structures, which he termed integral consciousness, respectively a-rational or aperspectival, without implying that this should be the last possible stage of consciousness, whatsoever. However, I believe that Wilber, who correlates Gebser’s integral consciousness structure with what he terms “vision-logic,” is decidedly wrong. “Vision-logic,” which describes a form of post-modern globalism, is in its rationalism not at all where Gebser wanted to go. For instance, Wilber states that the academically linguistic turn would be something Gebser would approve of as further manifestation of the integral consciousness (Wilber 2000, 268). If the linguistic turn is understood as a regard

of language as autonomous entity, where the signifier has nothing to do with the signified – where there even is no reality (signified) 'behind' or beyond the structuring of language – then this is definitively not where Gebser was headed, who following the principle *nomen est omen* was very interested in etymological roots in order to uncover deeper “truths” about words and circumstances, and exactly did not regard language as only reality in the constructionist sense, but intimately interwoven with reality, in line with tantric principles. Gebser points in the opposite direction from Wilber, in order to manifest the next consciousness structure. It is here, in the different evaluations of the preceding and still active structures of consciousness - the archaic, magic and mythic – that the crucial difference for this work between Gebser and Wilber is to be found. The evolutionist Wilber does not accredit these earlier structures with much validity on their own, except from being necessary, in a try-and-error fashion, to bring humanity to where it is now. Gebser on the contrary acknowledges and attest these same earlier structures much more validity, inherent coherence, and meaningfulness than Wilber. The evidence of synchronicity is in favor of Gebser's understanding. The magic is real and mythologies woven out of real, living fabric. This has far-reaching consequences, but not necessarily decisive ones. My goal in the following is to align these different models and show how they are mutually agreeable. I believe this is possible, because Gebser's integral consciousness indeed corresponds to Dietrich's description of the next consciousness structure, in chakra-theory *vishudda*, which further corresponds to what Wilber terms *psychic*. What Dietrich further on describes as the sixth chakra, called *anja*, corresponds to Wilber's *causal* while the seventh chakra, *sahasrar*, fittingly corresponds to Wilber's description of the *non-dual*. At this point Wilber's linear understanding of evolution moving from Alpha to Omega turns into a circular. Why and how this concretely looks, will become evident once the basic structures are outlined. In the following I will thus outline the further reaches of consciousness according to transrational peace-psychology in its reference to yogic chakra-philosophy, Gebser's a-perspectivity and Wilber's terminology.

2.2.5. *Integral*

Integral consciousness means for Gebser 'wholeness,' the restoration of the unharmed original state under the enriching implementation of all proceeding structures of consciousness. For the integral human all the prior developed structures become transparent and conscious. Also, their influences on his/her own life and fate become apparent. The deficient aspects are neutralized through insight and mastered, so that the degree of maturity and balance is achieved, which is necessary for the concretization. Concretization is the key word for

Gebser, since only the concrete can be integrated; never the abstract (Gebser 1973, 167). According to Gebser, Jacopo da Pontormo, a student of Leonardo da Vinci, made the leap from mental to integral consciousness, because in the “doctrine of the conic sections” (1639), he leaves the three-dimensional space into the fulfilled spherical globe. He thereby leaves the emptiness of the only linear space and touches upon a dimension, which as fulfillment, at least presupposes the latent presence of time (Gebser 1973, 168-169). The globe (or sphere) is then the meaningful symbol for the integral structure, since the moving globe constitutes a four-dimensional structure (Ibid.). What Gebser has in mind when he uses 'existential emptiness' as characteristic of the (mental) linear, three-dimensional space, is exactly time and the temporal emptiness of the present moment – the famous here and now - when it becomes a sole gap between past and future (Ibid. 258). It is the concretization of the moment, the here and now, which for Gebser constitutes the fourth dimension and means to make time, and the ever-present origin, concrete. Time as conscious experience manifests in the mythical structure together with the soul and for Gebser due to a reason, for him time and soul are two different terms for the same thing. Hence, when someone says, “I don’t have time,” amounts to saying “I don’t have soul” (Ibid.). The temporary modern experience of a “lack of time” is for Gebser the indication that this collective stage of consciousness is in its deficient phase – with the overarching characteristic being a “ratio” which rationalizes (in the sense of dividing) time into past and future, by which the present moment is emptied and squashed into almost non-existence - and necessitates a mutation of conscious awareness.

Crucial for Gebser’s notion of integral consciousness, which he terms a-rational and a-perspectival, is that it constitutes a transparency and simultaneous diaphaneity of *all* consciousness structures - archaic, magic, mythical and mental – while the awareness of this then in itself constitutes the integral consciousness (Cf. Gebser 1973, 175). This 'mutation' has not to be understood as an *expansion* of consciousness, since this in its time and space relatedness would be a mental phenomenon, but much more as an *intensification* of consciousness – a realization of spirit – or spiritual realization. In Gebser’s own words:

The origin is always present. It is not a beginning, since every beginning is time-bound. And the present is not just the now, the today or the moment. The present is not a piece of time, but a holistic (integral) achievement, and thus always also original. Whoever is capable, of bringing origin and present into effect and actuality as a wholeness, to realize and concretize, he/she transcends beginning and end and just today’s time (Gebser 1973, 15, my translation).

Gebser’s strategy for transcending mental dualism and the hypertrophied ego lies thus in an integrating self-awareness. It is the diaphaneity of the whole being, which here means the preceding consciousness structures, which is brought into effect through realization and concretization, which brings origin and present

into an actualized wholeness. This then is in agreement with Dietrich's outline of transrational practice and spirituality.

2.2.5.1. Vishudda

The self-reflective ability of the mental layer opens not only for the possibility of ego-consciousness, and thus for consciousness in the common sense in the first place, but in further consequence also for those desirable qualities such as compassion, love and altruism. However, the dualistic character of the ego and its adhesiveness to other egos also creates considerable problems in a peace perspective. Love is still projected on individual persons and the mythic polarities inside and outside, good and bad, true and wrong, continue to work and gain the quality of dualities. The loosening, transcendence and integration of duality and adhesiveness, which consequently is desirable (not only) in a peace-philosophical perspective, occurs in the transrational systematic on this next potential layer which I term integral, and Dietrich relates to the fifth chakra, called *Vishudda* (Dietrich 2008, 364-365). Equally, Gebser suggests transrational practice as well as self-awareness as the key to accessing this consciousness structure.

Conscious awareness and observation of mental and emotional processes, without judging or categorizing thoughts (which would be mental), can transcend and integrate the mental process in an again wider and deeper understanding – which then no longer is mental, but trans-rational and the entrance to the spiritual (Cf. Dietrich 2008, 366). The Cartesian subject, which believes to be because it thinks, and thus identifies with its thoughts, comes here to its end and is transcended and suspended in an again wider and deeper self, when the person begins to observe its thoughts and emotions (Ibid., 364). This *Internal Observer* is no longer identified with the observed thoughts and emotions, because it is *this* that observes – without reflection. What is this *this*? Safe to say, it is a part of consciousness now freed from the entrapment in thoughts and emotions. Dietrich describes this freed part of consciousness as the opening through which the deeper self can emerge from the shadows of the ego, formerly lost in thoughts and chased by emotions (Ibid., 365). Wilber calls it the soul, in reference to Emerson's notion of the Over-Soul, which here begins to shine through the opening of consciousness, no longer obscured by the ego. In this regard Wilber quotes Emerson's attempt to describe the characteristic of the soul:

All goes to show that the soul in man is not an organ, but animates and exercises all the organs; is not a function, like the power of memory, of calculation, of comparison, but uses these as hands and feet; is not a faculty, but a light; is not the intellect or will, but the master of the intellect and the will; is the background of our being, in which they lie, - an immensity not

possessed and that cannot be possessed. From within or from behind, a light shines through us upon things and makes us aware that we are nothing, but the light is all (Emerson, quoted after Wilber 2000, 390).

Wilber goes on explaining:

The observer in you, the Witness in you, transcends the isolated person in you and opens instead – from within or from behind, as Emerson said – onto a vast expanse of awareness no longer obsessed with the individual bodymind, no longer a respecter or abuser of persons, no longer fascinated by the passing joys and setapart sorrows of the lonely self, but standing still in silence as an opening or clearing through which light shines, not from the world but into it... That which observes or witnesses the self, the person, is precisely to that degree free of the self, the person, and through that opening comes pouring the light and power of a Self, a Soul, that, as Emerson puts it, would make our knees bend (Ibid.).

While Wilber in this passage masterfully explains the Internal Observer and its role as gateway for the trans-personal self, it also becomes comprehensible why this is a peace-relevant development. While the light, soul, or self that Emerson, Wilber and Dietrich formulate can only be experienced personally (more correctly trans-personally), it is logically understandable that controversies and conflicts at this stage decrease dramatically. A controversy presupposes that the conflicting parties are identified with their respective stance, which reacts and fights the position of the opposition, through which those oppositions are enforced, and conflicts, which in themselves are nothing but expressions of social vitality and activity, are overcharged with energy (Dietrich 2008, 366). The Internal Observer, which no longer is identified with thoughts and emotions and consequently any position, and through this 'unconditionedness' enables the flow of unconditioned love and self, no longer forms part of this mechanism.

Dietrich remarks that what intra-personally is the Internal Observer is inter-personally the External Observer, which means the same form of detached observation only for what goes on outside the person. For peace-work this consequently means that action orientation here is transcended with detached, loving observation (Dietrich 2011, 379). This then comes close to the taoistic concept of *wuwei*, which means as much as “non-action” or “abstention from actions against the workings of nature” (Fischer 2005, 5). This does not mean to become inactive or passive, but instead of unconsciously letting the *person* act out of mental dualism, mythic power-struggle or magic emotionality, it denotes a *letting happen*, where the Soul or Self, taoistic terminology would say the *Tao*, gets its way through the person. This experience then, it seems, is also what Paul refers to when he preaches to the church in Galatia and states: “I have been crucified with Christ and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me.” (Galatians 2:20). Somewhat paradoxically, the idea is that it is only from this form of non-action that genuine action can spring, while what from an ego-perspective seemed to be action at this level is unmasked as continuous reaction.

Wilber, again in reference to Emerson's Over-Soul, would add that while internal observation allows "light to shine through" the person, external observation equally opens for the experience that the same light, the same Soul or Self, shines through everything – thus the term Over-Soul or also World-Soul (Wilber 2000, 396). Witnesses to this light-show as for instance Emerson, tell us that this is a most fulfilling and peaceful experience.

In terms of identity, the preceding mental consciousness is once again embedded in a deeper and wider identity, intra-personally the soul or self, which integrates and transcends the ego and inter-personally the same Self or World-Soul, which integrates and transcends the former abstract *idea* of globality into a direct *experience*. As a result of the detached observation and since it is one and the same deeper Self, which unconditioned shines through everything the experience is marked by non-duality. The surface on the contact-border has here become permeable or transparent ("the light shines through"), however, it is not suspended, and for the subjective experience there is more potential for being and peace present, and the goal of the yogic spiritual way is not reached yet. What Wilber here terms soul, I would like to differentiate from spirit, since I earlier mentioned that the person here is entering spiritual realms – and those two terms often are confused and used interchangeably in the debate. What follows is thus a (rather mythological) note on terminology in regard to the concepts of spirit and soul.

2.2.5.2. A Note on Spirit and Soul

It was earlier noted that the term soul in Gebser's sense denotes *this* that awakes (to consciousness) with the mythic dream-picture production, and constitutes the symbolical (and mysterious) pre-form and background of matter and form, closely connected to meaning (intelligence) and feeling. This notion fits very well with Wilber's and Emerson's use of the same term, where soul denotes "the background of our being, in which they lie...". This "background" then, reminiscent of the platonic forms and Jung's archetypes, would indeed be compatible as preform and background of matter and form, constituting a sort of global 'dream-time.' Gebser would then have to be credited for pointing out that this soul within the human awakes to consciousness in the mythological structure – and, as by now should be clear, that consciousness at this stage does not mean a reflective self-awareness, but that the consciousness is enchanted in soul – seeing the inner pictures and being in complete identity with them, while it is first with the mental capacity that it becomes possible to differentiate and integrate this identity with the soul's inner picture-production in a dualistic ego-perspective. The ego thus becomes a necessary transition stage in a further differentiation of consciousness, necessary for a wider self-awareness – or self-

realization - of soul and spirit. If one regards this as a teleological process, one would possibly be labeled Hegelian – with the difference that Hegel saw mental ego-consciousness as the final expression - or self-realization - of spirit.

To differentiate between spirit and soul on this level is highly speculative and difficult, and of course also a question of convention – and eventually even unnecessary. I understand the difference to be tantric, which symbolically and mythologically speaking means to associate spirit with consciousness, the passive, contemplative principle called *Shiva*, and on the other hand the soul with the unconscious, active and energetic principle called *Shakti*. Life is in this cosmology is the interplay between those two only apparent opposites, which in the end are one – two sides of the same coin - and the reason tantric symbolism is filled with sexual allegories (Cf. Dietrich 2008, 52-53). Another allegory could be the relation between light and matter, where for instance plants only take form and bloom, as expression of life, through the meeting (or tantric mating) of light and matter – spirit and soul – while for instance plants that grow under the earth, as potatoes, are rather unshapely. But also the physical light itself shows this characteristic complementary. In the here presented systematic of the *human* development of consciousness, which in the here presented logic moves from unconsciousness to consciousness, this would simultaneously be a movement from *Shakti* to *Shiva*, from the feminine to the masculine principle, which then would have its historic correspondence in the development from matriarchy to patriarchy, while the latter presumably and fittingly sets in at the time mental consciousness became activated and dominant, and which I would place roughly at the Jasperian axis age (around 800 - 200 BC). What Gebser thus terms the awakening of the soul in mythology, or the third chakra, is in this perspective then simultaneously an awakening of spirit, albeit still enchanted in soul. Fittingly, spirit as masculine principle, which as earlier argued in the form of mental ego-consciousness at the fourth chakra, searches to dominate and subdue soul and thus interferes with the 'natural' flow of events, equivalent to a suppression of the feminine by the masculine, has now at the fifth chakra to step back (Internal/External Observer) in order to let the soul, the feminine principle, once more 'shine through.' The terms feminine and masculine as I use them here are not gender-bound, but describe cosmic principles operating (among other things) in every human, male and female alike. In as far as the here described dynamics are reflected in wider society by a stepping back of male domination superseded by equality between men and women and everything in between – and where the feminine principle is the active – this would in this perspective indeed be a welcomed development. However, where the societal developments are born out of, and moving within mental rationalism, and simultaneously are gender-bound, there can be no transformation of the basic dynamic.

Meanwhile, and without having to make associations towards gender-related concepts, it is important for the further discussion to distinguish between soul and spirit, because they imply two different understandings of the self, which

otherwise will be confused. In the tradition of humanistic and later transpersonal psychology, especially where it builds on Jungian psychology, follows an understanding of the self as a central, unifying archetype, where the self is the center of the whole psyche (which does not have to be confused with the ego, which simply constitutes a reflective abstraction and is the center of that which is conscious). This particular self, I understand as equivalent with the soul, belonging to the energetic aspect of life, closely connected to form and meaning. In this understanding the self epitomizes (a pantheistic) God (or vice versa). The 'other' self, which Dietrich's outline implies, as far as it follows Samkya-Yoga philosophy and which becomes relevant in the following structures, is described as completely attribute-less and without any relation. In Samkya Philosophy this self is called *purusha* (Eliade 1977, 24). The only thing that can be said about *purusha* is that it is and that it apprehends (and this apprehension has to be understood as a meta-physical apprehension which roots in the contemplation of the own being) (Ibid.). This particular self, which means a pre-reflexive, conscious and subject-less being-there, I understand as equivalent with spirit.

However, before losing myself (which in the here developed sense albeit could be a great thing) in philosophical problems about mind and matter, which have been debated for at least 5000 years, I keep my above stance and suggest to understand these two selves as complementary and practically inseparable. This stance is further argued and underscored, and the more exact modalities of the relation between those two selves are outlined in the chapter on synchronicity. In spite of the inseparability of soul and spirit, what can be done is to consciously differentiate them, which is exactly what the integral describes. The Internal Observer, which I would describe as a further differentiation of spirit, enables the integration and wholesome emergence of the soul, which means nothing else than a harmonious, interrelated flow of the preceding layers.

Since spirit and soul thus are further differentiated in the integral structure, but still form a complementary pair that never comes alone, it is consequently a question of perspective which aspect one sees at the here discussed fifth chakra. Focus on the awareness will find spirit, while focus on what awareness is aware of will see and feel soul. This dualism, however, is practically solved at this stage, since awareness of having awareness, only is possible through mental reflection (ego-consciousness). 'Pure' awareness detached from mental reflection can never be aware of itself. Mystics make this point by asking: "how can a knife cut itself?" while also Wittgenstein makes the same point with his famous aphorism:

Where *in* the world is a metaphysical subject to be noted? You say that this case is altogether like that of the eye and the field of sight. But you do *not* really see the eye. And from nothing *in the field of sight* can it be concluded that it is seen from an eye (Wittgenstein 1955, 5.633).

The observer dissolves in the observation. According to Dietrich and yogic chakra-psychology, consciousness moves from *vishuddha* on to the sixth chakra,

anja, before it is concluded in non-dual awareness at the seventh chakra, *sahasrar* (Dietrich 2008, 367). Equally, Wilber formulates further stages of consciousness – while both authors remain rather unclear on what dynamics exactly accomplish this further process. I believe one core dynamic, which causes the further movement and transformation of consciousness, is what in the literature is known as the 'burning of karma.' Karma, as I understand it, denotes an extended cause-effect principle, which not only includes the physical realm, but the psychological as well. Once consciousness is settled in observation and detached from form (archaic), feelings (magic), sociality (mythic) and thoughts (mental), karma – or psychological cause and effects – which formerly were reinforced and kept at work through identity, do now slowly come to nothing. This “burning up of karmic seeds” is practically the same process known as the ego-death, because the freedom from thoughts includes the freedom from imaginations and past memories, while the identity of the ego is constituted by memories of who this ego was in the past. When consciousness is settled in an awareness of what is real in the present, detached from thoughts and imaginations concerning the past, the ego ceases to exist (Cf. Dietrich 2008, 365). Presumably, once this process is finished, consciousness development has reached the next stage.

2.2.6. *Witness-awareness*

In the logic of the chakra-system the next 'stage' is called *anja*. Wilber terms this level causal, probably in reference to a divine 'first cause,' while transrational terminology here also speaks of the Witness-awareness. In reference to Krishnamurti's interpretation of yoga-philosophy, Dietrich characterizes and differentiates the witness-awareness from the observing-awareness by its resolving of perspective (Dietrich 2011, 381). The perspective, which was gained proper in the mental structure, is dissolved in the immediate and formless awareness, which is without self, other or God. The contact-border on the surface of the episode, which became permeable in the previous stage, is here suspended. Dietrich remarks that, “through the dissolution of the contact-border the intrapersonal and interpersonal layers flow into each other in a paradoxical way” (my translation of Dietrich 2011, 382). Consequently, the formless and immediate awareness of the Witness sees not the world, because he/she is the world, and apprehends it subjectively as self-sense or self-felt and not as outer object (Ibid.). Wilber remarks in the same line that the Witness cannot be seen, for the simple reason that he is the Seer (Cf. Wittgenstein 5.633) and “the Seer itself is pure Emptiness, the pure opening or clearing in which all objects, experiences, things and events arise, but which itself merely abides” (Wilber 2000, 421). The Christian sage and mystic Eckhart von Hochheim (c. 1260 – c.

1328), better known as Meister Eckhart, describes this suspension of the contact-border, which he terms breakthrough, in following words:

In the breakthrough, where I stand free of my own will and the will of God and of all his works and of God himself, there I am above all creatures and am neither God nor creature. Rather, I am what I was and what I shall remain now and forever. Then I receive an impulse, which shall bring me above all the angels. In this impulse I receive wealth so vast that God cannot be enough for me in all that makes him God, and with all his divine works. For in this breakthrough I discover that I and God are one. There I am what I was, and I grow neither smaller nor bigger, for I am an immovable cause that moves all things... Therefore also I am unborn, and following the way of my unborn being I can never die. Following the way of my unborn being I have always been, I am now, and shall remain eternally (Eckhart 1980, 217-218).

The experience Meister Eckhart here describes could probably also be termed the experience of Being-as-such, the ultimate peace without opposite, unborn and immovable. “It is Being-as-such which makes peace experienceable and worth striving for” (Dietrich 2011, 382). As Dietrich further remarks, and in consequence with the here applied logic of consciousness development so far, this Being pervades and comprises all the prior described layers, from the surface of the episode to the mental and spiritual levels – and thus gives meaning to peace-work on the pre-egoic and egoic levels and beyond (Ibid.). Important for my work to note is that 'meaning' or 'significance' (in German one would say “*Sinn*”) is a category only relevant on the prior discussed consciousness structures – from the archaic to the integral – while meaning is meaningless in the non-dual Being of the Witness. Meister Eckhart again:

It is free of all names and barren of all forms, totally free and void, just as God is void and free in himself. It is totally one and simple, just as God is one and simple, so that we can in no manner gaze upon it (Eckhart 1980, 294).

Meaning as a meaningful category is subject to duality and presupposes something meaningless, while in the non-dual immediate and formless Being, free of all names and void, there is no meaning or significance, as Eckhart says, it is simple and one - the famous all-one. This circumstance shall be a guiding point when accessing synchronicity, where 'meaning' is a decisive factor.

2.2.7. Non-dual

On a first glance Wilber and Dietrich diverges from each other in the assessment of what lies beyond the witness-awareness. For Dietrich, as pointed out, the witness describes non-dual awareness, Being-as-such without difference, basically indescribable, since every description necessitates a perceiving subject and an objectifying language – exactly what the witness-awareness is not (Dietrich 2011, 383). Awareness is, simple and one, without illusions or

constructions. Hence, beyond the global witness-awareness vanishes not only the subject with its borders, but also Being-as-such. What Dietrich in reference to Lederach terms the epicenter means accordingly the Nothing, the Emptiness or void, which stands behind Being (Ibid.). If one might assume that Nothing not only stands behind Being, but also before – meaning that original Being springs from Nothing - then a circle is closed and Being can once more spring from Nothing. This is just about what Wilber formulates. According to Wilber, what lies beyond the Witness-awareness is not Nothing, but the rise of a new universal (awareness), which he now in turn terms *non-dual*. The move from what Wilber calls causal (the Witness-awareness) to what he calls non-dual he sees reflected in the old Shankara quote:

The world is illusory;
Brahman alone is Real;
Brahman is the world.

The first two lines represent in Wilber's reading causal, e.g. Witness awareness, or unmanifest absorption in formless Spirit (Wilber 2000, 418). "The world is illusory; Brahman alone is Real" means thus that everything seen is object, ephemeral, symbol or vision – which is exactly what the Seer is not, but as Brahman, the Witness as formless awareness, Being-as-such alone is real. The third line, according to Wilber, describes in a further movement the ultimate completion, the union of the Formless with the entire world of Form (Ibid.). In Wilber's words:

When one breaks through the causal absorption in pure unmanifest and unborn Spirit, the entire manifest world (or worlds) arises once again, but this time as a perfect expression of Spirit and as Spirit. The Formless and the entire world of manifest Form – pure Emptiness and the whole Kosmos – are seen to be not-two (or non-dual). The Witness is seen to be everything that is witnessed, so that... the object to be witnessed and the Witness finally merge together and Absolute consciousness alone reigns supreme... This non-dual consciousness is not other to the world: "Brahman is the World" (Ibid.).

When the ego died in the previous stages, here something is reborn. Once again, I-World-God are one, or rather, there is no I, World or God – only Being. As Wilber points out, this "state" is the ultimate *decentering* of the Self – the end of all egocentrism, sociocentrism, worldcentrism etc. (Ibid. 428). Confined to nothing it embraces everything. Whether this description of Wilber not only sounds like, but also means exactly the same as Dietrich's description of the prior Witness-awareness, and thus constitutes a flawed differentiation, or whether it is a rightfully observed further development beyond the Witness before an eventual epicenter in Nothingness – or whether Dietrich is 'wrong' and beyond the Witness is not Nothing, but an even greater merging of Being and Nothing as Wilber then correctly would state – is an interesting, albeit not

relevant question, since both authors agree on the fundamental circumstances. Ultimate, experienceable or apprehensible reality, and here such superlatives seem allowed, is non-dual and characterized by the All-One. These terms are revealing. Why not simply one – but always non-dual or not-two? The mystical authors of old and new seem unable to completely let go of ambiguity. Not-two means not One either. Also the All-One is ambiguous, when the all in its great gathering and cuddling gets quite all-one. This rest of ambiguity, somewhere between one and not-two, seems to be a basic voltage necessary for life – where there is something, there is also something more. If someone ever should get beyond this ambiguity, he or she will probably not be able to come back and tell about it. Then, non-duality seems indeed the deepest truth about life expressible. From the highest spiritual insight, non-duality, when the Witness is seen to be everything that is witnessed, it derives that there must be perfect correspondence between inner and outer world, above and below, Witness and witnessed. This principle of correspondence has probably been the guiding line for philosophy and cosmology, and every thereby guided activity for the greatest period of human written history. Through 'underground' practice in the so-called Western world, first with the alchemical and hermetic traditions – in opposition to the Christian church – such thinking was introduced. In this particular line of succession it dates back to the famous *tabula smaragdina* ascribed to the mythic Hermes Trismegistos, who allegedly was a fellow of Moses, but more likely was written in Alexandria around 6th to 8th Century by Arabic magicians²⁴. In Isaac Newton's translation the second paragraph of the tabula reads: "That which is below is like that which is above & that which is above is like that which is below to do the miracles of one only thing"²⁵. This principle was long before Newton not only the guideline for a great spirit like Paracelsus, but is for instance also the principle underlying astrology and all sorts of divination in general. Hence, when transrational peace-study takes this principle on board again, this is not a new science at all, but means to tie in where the thread was lost, roughly at the end of the Renaissance. The avant-garde and hyper-modern sounding term 'transrational peace-philosophy' reveals itself thus as a sort of neo-conservative renaissance, a label which also Jung could claim, as soon shall become evident.

²⁴ As such its appearance coincide time-wise with the emerging of tantrism in the northern parts of India.

²⁵ Source: <http://www.sacred-texts.com/alc/emerald.htm> retrieved latest 25.03. 2015.

2.2.7.1. The Principle of Correspondence

Before finishing this first part of the thesis and turning to Jung's work, I shall make two points, where the first is a quick remark concerning the relation between synchronicity and the principle of correspondence, and in further consequence non-duality. The point is that synchronicity also can be defined in terms of correspondence. Synchronicity, as Jung used the term and I as well use it, is an umbrella term for all instances of seemingly *meaningful* coincidence, correlation or *correspondence* between an inner psychic event and an outer event – in other words observer and observed – not connected by any known causal chains. The term 'meaning' has here the double function of both constituting the reference axis, meaning that a correspondence in meaning connects the two causally unrelated events or processes, and in later consequence as well in the sense of 'intention' somehow literally establishing the connection in the first place, by which random events of coincidence are ruled out (Jung considered the archetypes responsible for synchronistic events). A banal example is to think of an old friend the minute before the phone rings and the friend is giving a call. This could be a random, in other words meaningless, coincidence, but it could also be a decent instance of synchronicity organized by a transpersonal agency – as for instance the intention of the friend. However, when the Seer and the Seen are one, as allegedly is the case for the Witness or non-dual awareness, when *the intrapersonal and interpersonal layers flow into each other in a paradoxical way*, then this is a full-blown synchronistic experience (Cf. Surprise 2012, 105). A subtle point to be made here, though, is that for the Witness or non-dual awareness, this is *not* experienced as synchronicity, since the experience of synchronicity presupposes an analytic mind (an awareness separating inner and outer and thus an awareness marked by duality) in order to see the coincidence of inner and outer, which the Witness exactly does not. This is a paradox equal to the saint, who stops being a saint the moment he/she realizes that he/she is a saint. This is a relevant observation, when later placing the experience of synchronicity within the here outlined development of consciousness.

A last point in this part of the writing concerns the relation and structural correspondence, respectively differences, between the first and the last layers of consciousness development, here especially some profound resemblances between archaic and non-dual awareness. Hence, in the following I will sum up the discussion so far, and discuss the resemblance respectively between the first and the last consciousness structure, and in this way finish up this part of the thesis.

2.3. On the Correlation of the First and the Last Layers

The spectrum of consciousness from archaic to non-dual as here outlined is described as a continuous, or in Gebser's terms erratic, movement and increase in consciousness, from un-conscious instinct-based agency in the archaic state to, seen from a mental perspective, a form of super-consciousness or pure awareness in the non-dual. Another characteristic is the continuous (or erratic) widening and decentering (universalization) of the personal reference frame. From the archaic, which is characterized by a pre-personal and unconscious self-world fusion, where self and the immediate seen and experienced world are one (egocentric), to the (less) egocentric reference frame of the magic consciousness (family) to the sociocentrism of the mythic stage (tribe/community), ethic world-centrism on the mental stage (society), global reference at the integral (Policy) to the planetary reference of the Witness (global) and the final, conscious fusion of Seer and Seen, subject and object, where the personal Self dissolves and one spontaneously and synchronistic partakes as expression of the All-One (Universal).

This decentering and widening of the frame of reference is counterbalanced by a particularization and individualization (individuation) of the selfunderstanding/ knowledge or identity - in other words a deeper within. The archaic consciousness lives thus by instinctual agency and in pre-personal identity fusion with the episode on the surface of the contact border (physical self-physical world identity). Magic consciousness has differentiated the physical self from the physical world, living in emotional identity with the surrounding/collective. At the mythic stage are feelings and emotions differentiated and organized into complex mythological systems and the identity is here with the social role. First at the mental layer with its reflexive abilities, a stable ego-awareness can develop, which integrates and is mentally aware of its physical surroundings, feelings, emotions and its social role - and is in identity with its dualistic mental self-image. From here the transpersonal sphere opens up, where the mental ego-identity is integrated and transcended in an integral awareness or observation, by which the again deeper self or soul comes to the fore as the new center of identity and conscious experience. What is this self or soul? Consistent with the logic of this outline would be to describe the self as an again wider frame in which the whole person together with the mental ego-perspective is included and integrated. In Jungian terms, it is the organizing center for the whole psyche, which always already was there, but operated in the unconscious. Consistent with Gebser's argument is also to assume, that it is the same self or soul which awoke to dream-like consciousness in the mythic structure, and gave rise to the worlds mythologies, albeit, in terms of consciousness, in enchanted fusion and identity, and not as the self-conscious state of the integral. If it is the same self, or in Emerson's terms the same World-Soul, which expressed itself

unconsciously and intuitively in the mythic structure, and now once again comes to the fore, and due to the meanwhile gained and integrated ego-consciousness this time as self-conscious structure, then this is agreeing with the transrational peace-philosophy's self-description as consciously taking *energetic* (here differentiated into archaic, magic and mythic) notions of peace on board again, without thereby renouncing rationality or *mental* achievements such as ego, democracy or human rights (Cf. Dietrich 2011, 14). This arguably being the case, I could add the description 'trans-mythic' to the term integral, and thereby point to its relation with the mythic structure, of which the integral structure arguably looks like a conscious mirror image. Following this logic, it shows that the next layer, the global Witness-awareness, indeed can be described as 'trans-magic.' The self as soul is here transcended. In terms of going within,' one could probably also say that the self here has been followed to its source – arriving at the famous Being-as-such. As mentioned, it is the magic structure characterized by its rather egalitarian pre-personal and pre-temporal frame of reference, where processes in the episode are linked in immediate meaningful or magic (Jung would say synchronistic) relations to various present agents, which consequently stand in a meaningful (symbolical) and immediate, contrary to a causal, relation with each other. The power to magically/synchronistically 'cause' events can reside in the various present agents (witchcraft - which can be conducted by both visible and invisible entities). The move from magic to mythic means simultaneously the move from a rather flat structure to a more hierarchical structure, where the magical power is transferred from humans and animals to higher order gods and goddesses, where for instance the collapse of a roof or a bad harvest no longer is ascribed to the ill will of the neighbor, but to the ill will of a fellow god/goddess. The step from the integral to the Witness-awareness now has structural analogousness to the step from magic to mythic, just in reverse: while at the trans-mythic integral structure a god-image like self is at the fore, the 'trans-magic' Witness is characterized not by *pre*-personal but by *trans*-personal and *trans*-temporal (the famous here and now) *Self-less-ness*. That is because for the magic consciousness, just as for the formless awareness of the Witness, there exists no self, other or God. What for the magic structure is a hazy point-like unity seems for the Witness to be clear global oneness, while the "paradoxical flowing into each other of intrapersonal and interpersonal layers" is a fitting description of both states from a rational perspective. This, however, does not mean that the two states at any rate are the same, while pre-personal and trans-personal also mean two widely different things. Magic and trans-magic seem, if at all, complete inversions of each other. Of the Witness awareness it is said that it sees not the world, because it *is* the world; while of the magic consciousness it can be said it sees not the world, because it is scattered all over the world. The difference is similar to whether one is riding or getting ridden, or whether one is a mother nurturing its child, or one is a child nurtured by the mother (and while at the picture, remember that the modern/mental stage

structurally corresponds to an adolescent, typically believing not to need the parents and living in rebellion against them - while 'them' here means the system called world). More concretely, the Witness awareness has merged with the spirit of the planet (or even the planetary system) and when he/she moves, he/she moves as one with the whole system, which is why there is no other. Magic consciousness on the contrary, in its pre-personal inability to stand against the wider collective mind, is moved and often chased by these wider, transpersonal minds. This is at least how I read the respective passages. The evidence from both the magic structure as well as the Witness shows, that we are all one at a certain depth, and instantly connected and influencing the all locally and globally via our thoughts and emotions. The difference is whether we in magic pre-personality are owned and ruled by every hunch of thoughts and emotions, or in trans-personal awareness have taken responsibility and balancing ownership. However different they are, I believe these two states are united in the circumstance that they relate to, and respectively express, the same all-oneness. This leads me to the final within, which is the final beyond – the ultimate Omega point termed the epicenter, and its relation to the Alpha point in consciousness termed archaic.

On a first glance could it seem that these two Alpha and Omega points could not be more different; the one described as complete unconsciousness and the other as ultimate consciousness. However, the similarities they share in their respective descriptions, are in many ways also the greatest, which probably is why they often are confused or taken for the same – in one direction or the other. Hence, there are two general fallacies: one where both pre- and trans-personal experiences are understood as pre-personal states, and conversely one where every non-rational state of consciousness is understood as trans-rational (Wilber 1993, 125). The demarcation-line for Wilber, whether something is trans-personal or pre-personal, depends on whether the experience is a personal plus (integrating) – or a personal minus (resolution) (Wilber 2000, 389). The modern, scientific world has most of the time interpreted every kind of non-personal experience as regresses into infantile and schizoid states of consciousness, as for instance Freud, who explained trans-personal experiences as prenatal id-impulses and trans-subject/object Samadhi (Witness-awareness) as a regress to pre-subjective/objective-narcissism, while he interpreted trans-personal unity as pre-personal fusion (Wilber 2000, 179). In this Freudian view, which also is the orthodox and general scientific outlook, the normal ego-consciousness constitutes the peak of evolution, the end of history, and every other state of consciousness is consequently of inferior nature.

Conversely, the second type of fallacy elevates pre-personal experiences to transpersonal and does in the end see the cosmic development moving from some spiritual heights down to a culmination in a low point of self-alienation, the 'sinful' human, or the individual and personal ego (Wilber 1993, 125). God and nature, respectively spirit and nature, are seen as identical, and the respective

states of consciousness always superior to ego-consciousness. Exemplary are for Wilber the 'New Age movement' (whatever he specifically might have in mind by this rather broad term) and Jung (Wilber 2000, 291). Jung does, according to Wilber, often confuse pre-personal states with trans-personal, as when he interprets the infantile narcissism as an unconscious slumbering in the *unio mystico* (Wilber 2000, 290). The Jungian scholar Erich Neumann indeed made substantial corrections on the Freudian narcissism-concept. Freud's so called primary narcissism, which is his description of the archaic state, and where he formulates an intrauterine primal state of symbiotic fusion between an absolute pleasure-ego with its surroundings, is for Neumann a primal "*Sein in der Einheitswirklichkeit*"²⁶, the total *participation mystique* in which the self is all and all is the self, beyond a first later to be developed subject/object duality (Neumann 1955, 4). This phase termed Neumann *uroboric*, which is not - as Freud's doctrine supposed - devoid of relationship because it is devoid of any object, but as a *primary relation* of the child to the mother, it is the basis of further development. Neumann further remarks that Freud's nomination of this primary narcissism as being autoerotic is also misleading for this phase. The objectless self-love could indeed be interpreted as autoerotic, however, if one wants to speak about objectless self-love one also has to speak about subject-less all-love as well as of a subject/object-less all-being-loved (Ibid. 5). Clearly, Neumann following Jung does not only do justice to the unborn infant, but by implication also describes the archaic state as an unconscious form of pre-subject/object Samadhi. Hence, Wilber, who as seen earlier in regard to the archaic is in line with Freud, laments that Jung and his followers do not understand development moving from unconscious pre-personal to personal to conscious trans-personal, but rather from unconscious trans-personal to personal to conscious trans-personal (Wilber 1993, 128). I agree with Wilber's assessment that Jungians tend to see development moving from unconscious slumbering in the self to the ego (this is understood as extrovert 'initiation into the outside world' and belonging to the first half of the life) and then back again to the self (in Jungian terminology the introspective 'initiation into the inside world' belonging to the second half of life - while the latter process also is called individuation) (Cf. Jacobi 1971, 129). That they thereby theoretically often confuse mythic and magic aspects with integral and trans-personal modalities, as well as the direction of development - seen from a transrational perspective - is not a logical consequence, however, as I shall argue, Jung and Jungian psychology practically often move toward pre-personal resolution as Wilber claims, especially when it comes to synchronicity. At the same time I agree with Jung and his successors that the archaic state in fact constitutes an unconscious slumbering in the All-One, which means that Wilber's linear understanding of

²⁶ In English: Being in the reality of Oneness. My translation.

evolution rather has to be seen as circular when it comes to spirituality. Exactly because pre-modern and pre-rational societies were and are highly spiritual can a trans-rational approach twist their wisdom and take up the thread of spirituality, and transcend the contradictions of the modern age without giving up its achievements (Cf. Dietrich 2011, 14).

2.3.1. *Closing the Circle*

Following the tantric principle of *Shiva* and *Shakti*, where *Shakti* stands for the unconscious, active energetic principle and *Shiva* for the conscious, contemplating principle, both being two aspects of a non-dual oneness, I propose, in order to settle this conflict between the Jungian school and Wilber's rather Freudian inspired outlook, to understand the primal archaic state and the non-dual awareness as corresponding to, or even 'embodying,' these principles. Obviously, the archaic state then relates to *Shakti*, while the non-dual awareness relates to *Shiva*, while both Alpha and Omega points simply are two different aspects of the same original Being-as-such, by which any difference in value is excluded. To completely close this mythological circle, it should be added that in tantric philosophy the world is born from the mating of *Shiva* and *Shakti* (Alpha point), while the ultimate spiritual goal (Omega) is to realize this unification once again in the here termed non-dual epicenter, the background of Being, which in terms of sex would be androgyny (the unification of *Shiva* and *Shakti*) and in the transrational understanding equivalent to peace. "I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, "who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty." (Revelation 1:8)²⁷. Thus having arguably given in to the Jungian interpretation, I also have to agree with Wilber, that the direction of development cannot be confused. There are worlds apart between integrating and transcending the physical, ego and self, and growing into a trans-personal awareness of the All-One on the one hand – and consciously trying to regress back into the pre-personal helpless peace of the motherly womb, which however, was not what Jung and his followers sought to do.

²⁷ That there actually are two epicenters and that this is of central importance has recently also been introduced into the transrational discourse (Cf. Dietrich 2015, 43 and 47-48).

Synchronicity as Transpersonal Modality

An Exploration of Jungian Spirituality in the Frame of
Transrational Philosophy

Frederiksen, M.

2016, VI, 143 p. 5 illus., 1 illus. in color., Softcover

ISBN: 978-3-658-14227-8