

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Being as a Way of Doing:
An Inquiry into the Spirituality of Being

by

Paul Duncan Crawford
B. Mus., McGill University, 1971
B.A., University of Victoria, 1993
M.A., University of Victoria, 1995

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Interdisciplinary Studies

We accept this dissertation as conforming
to the required standard

Dr. Laurie Rae Baxter, Primary Supervisor (Department of Communication and
Social Foundations)

Dr. Carol Gibson-Wood, Co-supervisor (Department of History in Art)

Dr. Harold Coward, Committee Member (Centre for Studies in Religion and Society)

Dr. Charles Tolman, Committee Member (Emeritus Fellow, Centre for Studies in
Religion and Society)

Dr. David Loy, External Examiner (Faculty of International Studies, Bunkyo
University, Chigasaki, Japan)

©Paul Crawford, 1998
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This dissertation may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by
photocopying or other means, without the permission of the author.

Abstract

This dissertation is a multidisciplinary exploration of the relationship between ‘being’ and ‘doing’. Because life in contemporary Western societies is overwhelmingly characterized by individualism and the use of instrumentalistic rationality, there is a naturalized tendency in the West to conceive ‘being’ as the product of personal actions and ‘doing’ as an instrument of becoming a particular self. The ideas put forward here suggest that this orientation towards defining ‘being’ in terms of observable action is, in reality, a dis-orientation and the source of personal, societal, and planetary fragmentation and suffering. Central to the view proposed here is the belief that ‘being’ is the source and not the product of actions, and that this source, although ultimately ineffable, is best understood not as a discernible self but as a display of consciousness that participates in an integral way with all of reality, which implies that all life-affirming forms of ‘doing’ are embodiments of wholeness and participatory consciousness. I elaborate this idea in two major discussions. In Part One, I explore the suggestion that what is fundamental to ‘being’ is not a certain place within a hierarchy of increasingly conscious levels of being but a participation in the fullness of life expressed in and through a wholeness of interdependent beings. In Part Two, I explore how this wholeness view of reality implies an orientation towards ‘doing’ that is rooted in a present-centered time-consciousness and how the current hegemony of past and future orientations towards time inhibit the kind of reflective awareness that facilitates ‘being’ as a way of doing. The Taoist concept *wu wei*, which refers to not interfering with the way of ultimate reality, reflects the kind of

relationship between 'being' and 'doing' I am advocating, namely, one that expresses a present-centered experience of self-surrendering to an ideal of ultimate significance in which a person's sense of uniqueness is fused with a sense of unity with all beings. By embodying this quality of being 'all in all', actions that flow from such an experience affirm the spiritual nature of reality.

Examiners:

Dr. Laurie Rae Baxter, Primary Supervisor (Department of Communication and Social Foundations)

Dr. Carol Gibson-Wood, Co-supervisor (Department of History in Art)

Dr. Harold Coward, Committee Member (Centre for Studies in Religion and Society)

Dr. Charles Tolman, Committee Member (Emeritus Fellow, Centre for Studies in Religion and Society)

Dr. David Loy, External Examiner (Faculty of International Studies, Bunkyo University, Chigasaki, Japan)

Table of Contents

***BEING AS A WAY OF DOING:
AN INQUIRY INTO THE SPIRITUALITY OF BEING***

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iv

Introduction

Chapter 1. Being, Time, and Deep-Listening 1

Part One

WHAT DOES IT MEAN 'TO BELONG', TO BE PART OF A WHOLE?
IS 'BEING' BEST UNDERSTOOD
IN THE CONTEXT OF HIERARCHY OR WHOLENESS?

- Preface - 15

Chapter 2.	A New Horizon: Encounters at the Junction of Reason and Mysticism	18
	- The Cognitive Revolution: A New Look, Perhaps, But Not a Change of Mind	25
	- Diversity-in-Unity: A New Worldview	34
	- On the Spiritual Nature of Reality	54
Chapter 3.	Pondering the Meaning of the ‘Particular’: A Consideration of Hierarchy as a Paradigm for Reality	56
	- The ‘Great Chain of Being’ in Western Thought: Footnotes to Plato	62
	- Hierarchy: The Vision of the Three Eyes	76
	- Exploring the Confusion of Means and Ends	88
Chapter 4.	Wholeness	98
	- Notes About the Fundamental Significance of Meaning	110
	- Participatory Consciousness and the Importance of Living in the Light of the Present	116
	- Self-Abandonment: The Way To Be and To Belong	130

Part Two

IN WHAT SENSE IS TIME A MEDIUM FOR DOING SOMETHING?
IS 'DOING' BEST UNDERSTOOD AS A WAY OF BECOMING,
OR IS 'BEING' A WAY OF DOING?

- Preface -	146
Chapter 5. Images of Time and Timelessness	152
- Cyclical Time	154
- Time in the Western Tradition: Exploring the Question 'Is Time More Apparent than Real'?	164
- Ancient Greek Philosophy	164
- Late Roman and Medieval Philosophy	168
- The Modern Age	176
- Consciousness and the Spacetime Concept	189
- Time-consciousness, Freedom, and Creativity: Exploring the Links Between Time and Timelessness	196
Chapter 6. Past, Future, and Present as Temporal Focal Points	204
- Past-Directed Time-Consciousness	206
- Future-Oriented Time-Consciousness	214
- Humanism	216
- Transcendentalism	217
- Scientism	220
- Exploring the Meaning of 'Questing'	221
- Present-Centered Time-Consciousness	231
- The Present As a Moment of Liberating Self-Surrender	233
Chapter 7. Living in the 'Here and Now': A Comparison of Pragmatism and Contemplative Experience	243
- Moral Pragmatism as a Search for 'Something Better'	244
- The Contemplative Experience as a 'Call to Centering'	251
- What is Instrumentality? Notes About the Contemplative Experience as a Matrix for Human Action	263
Epilogue	
Chapter 8. <i>Music</i> as the Spirituality of Being	278
Notes	288
Bibliography	335
Appendix: Brief Notes About People Mentioned in the Text	350
Appendix B: Poetry	389

Chapter One

Introduction: Being, Time, and Deep-Listening

Flow with whatever may happen and let your mind be free. Stay centered by accepting whatever you are doing. This is the ultimate.
(Chuang-tzu)¹

All my life I have known how wonderful it is to listen intently to something. As a music lover and performer from a very early age, and later as a composer and music teacher, I have been able to appreciate again and again how 'deep listening' is a way of sensing that truly creative and nurturing activity flows from an awareness of being connected with the *wholeness* of reality. This awareness of belonging to a reality infinitely beyond the edges of an individual 'self', and, therefore, infinitely significant, also engenders an experience that is intensely personal, and, it is this blending of unity, ultimacy, and uniqueness that gives certain musical experiences, as well as other present-centered activities, their *spiritual* quality. Exploring this spirituality of being is the aim of this dissertation.

Perhaps because of my musical background, the organization of this dissertation displays a certain similarity to musical composition. This similarity is simply that many of the ideas I put forward tend to appear and reappear in a number of different discussions, just as in many kinds of music important themes recur in different contexts. Although this style of composition is not always associated with academic work, which is often characterized by an avoidance of repetition rather than a deliberate use of it, my rationale for embracing such a style here is that it reflects a basic animating principle that underlies the content of this inquiry, namely, that every part of an integrated whole is capable of expressing, and, in reality, does express the whole.

Elaborating this idea - that to be a 'part' of something is to *belong* to it in an integral way - is the theme of Part One of this dissertation. This theme is developed in three major sections. In chapter two, my purpose is to situate the entire inquiry in the context of recent developments in several academic disciplines which suggest that there is a new worldview emerging within the Western cultural tradition, a worldview

no longer oriented towards the values of science and technology but towards values that are more attuned to the *spiritual* nature of reality. As used in this study, the term 'worldview' refers to an overarching theory or 'conceptual lens' which an entire civilization uses as a way of organizing and guiding its thinking, feeling, valuing, and doing. Central to this emerging worldview is the idea that reality is a network of relationships with many centers of intelligibility. Accordingly, my discussion of this idea focuses on how a number of different fields of inquiry are not only recognizing the *interrelatedness* of all phenomena but also acknowledging that any viable understanding of reality entails an acceptance and appreciation for the *plurality* of interests dispersed throughout nature.

The importance of understanding and nurturing the growth of this worldview cannot be overstated given the current dominance of the scientific-technical worldview which is characterized by its efforts to control and manipulate all aspects of the known and knowable universe, efforts that have produced an abundance of commodities and services for some but which have seriously undermined the moral and creative capacities of human nature and produced what is, in effect, a fragmented world. As depicted in this study, the great importance of the emerging worldview is that it brings to light the *spiritual* nature of reality and, thereby, awakens human consciousness to the fundamental significance of everyday experiences. This 'awakening' brings our collective contemporary consciousness into more intimate contact with the wisdom of mysticism, a wisdom that highlights our deep underlying kinship with everything, that is, our sense of belonging to the whole of reality.

There are scholars who suggest that the various traditions of mysticism throughout history indicate that reality is best understood in terms of an evolving hierarchy of consciousness, or graded levels of being, with those who experience mystical states of 'at-one-ness' with the universe near the top of this hierarchy and inanimate entities, such as stones, at the bottom. I disagree with this view, and throughout this study I propose that the truly significant aspect of any 'being', that which *explains* its basic nature, is its participation in the wholeness of reality rather

than its respective 'lowness' or 'highness' within a hierarchy of conscious life. This 'wholeness' point of view suggests that the hierarchical differences apparent in nature are basically *descriptions* of particular kinds of relationships and developmental experiences, in much the same way that different qualitative experiences throughout a person's life depict but do not explain the underlying meaning of her or his overall life experiences, because, ultimately, this meaning is embedded within a realm of consciousness that encompasses all of reality.

My preference for a 'wholeness' view of reality rather than a hierarchical one is outlined in chapters three and four. In chapter three I focus mainly on a consideration of hierarchy as a paradigm for reality, first of all, by briefly exploring the history of ideas in Western thought pertaining to the concept of 'the great chain of being', and subsequently by examining contemporary perspectives to hierarchy, principally those of Ken Wilber and Arthur Koestler. In brief, this discussion points out that the hierarchical point of view requires *two* ultimate signifiers of reality, the hierarchical structure itself and the immanence of an all-pervading Absolute Spirit. This kind of 'propositional' dualism, I suggest, is problematic because, in reality, all levels of transcendence within a hierarchy are subsumed by the immanence of Absolute Spirit. Moreover, because the structural integrity of a hierarchy requires that any individual at a particular level of consciousness achieve a *balance* between *integrative* tendencies to function as part of the larger whole and *self-assertive* tendencies to preserve its own distinctiveness (much like the yin-yang balance idealized in Taoism), different expressions of consciousness are best understood in terms of an interplay between these two tendencies. The important implication here is that this interplay is essentially the 'means' with which individuals move towards or away from an experience of 'fullness of being' *within* their particular level of consciousness, and it is also the means with which the various forms of relationship *between* the different levels of an overall hierarchy are expressed. However, if the hierarchical structure itself is accepted as basic and the different expressions of consciousness are viewed in terms of a 'ladder-like' ascent towards Absolute Spirit, at

various times, either integrative or self-assertive tendencies must become developmental ‘ends’ in themselves. In effect, this confusion between ‘means’ and ‘ends’ perpetuates a belief system that entrenches domination and separateness as basic attributes of reality, and in the final section of chapter three I discuss the implications of accepting such a belief system.

As an alternative to the hierarchical model of reality, in chapter four I outline a point of view which I believe offers a more adequate way of understanding how all beings express an essential *belonginess* to the *wholeness* of reality. This discussion centers on the ideas of David Bohm, ideas which originate in his work within the fields of Relativity Theory and Quantum Physics but which have basic significance in terms of understanding the nature of reality as fundamentally spiritual. Bohm suggests that there is a universal, unbroken field of ‘enfolded potential’, an *implicate order*, out of which ‘implicit potentials’ unfold into the ‘explicit phenomena’ of an *explicate order* before being re-enfolded. The holograph phenomenon is often used to illustrate these principles of enfoldment and unfoldment, the major point of comparison being that, just as each part of a holograph is an image of the whole object it depicts, each expression of being (in the explicate order) carries with it information about the whole implicate order out of which it unfolds and into which it enfolds.

Exploring the implications of Bohm’s ideas makes it clear that the cause-and-effect (mechanistic) associations that characterize many everyday experiences and natural events in the physical world do not adequately explain the nature of the implicate order which is an order of being that expresses a threefold relationship between *matter*, *energy*, and *meaning*, with ‘meaning’ expressing the fundamental aspect of reality. This suggestion, that reality is fundamentally what it ‘means’, carries with it the profound implication that interactions of any kind are essentially experiences of *dialogue* in which meanings emerge as expressions of inter-relating. What this implies, in turn, is that to be connected with the wholeness of reality is to experience a *participatory display of consciousness* in which individual beings *surrender* the pretence that any particular expression of consciousness belongs to a

self-contained entity rather than to the wholeness of reality. Thus, in the final sections of chapter four, I examine the nature of participatory consciousness as well as explore various religious expressions of *self-abandonment* which exemplify the idea that the way of ultimate ‘being’ expresses a way of belonging to everything.

Given the individualism that characterizes much of contemporary life, the idea that self-abandonment is the ‘way of ultimate being’ is a revolutionary one. However, in the context of the perennial philosophy, that is, in the context of those traditions of culture and philosophy that embody belief in a Divine or Absolute ‘Ground of all being’,² it is a basic principle. One way of conceiving the difference between adopting an individualistic rather than a participatory (self-abandoning) orientation towards being is to consider what it means ‘to do something’ in the context of, on the one hand, the pursuit of ‘becoming’ a particular ‘self’, and on the other hand, the experience of ‘being’ a participant within an unfoldment of life. Considering this difference is the major focus of Part Two of this dissertation.

As soon as one focuses on what it means ‘to do something’, understanding the nature of *time* emerges as a central concern, for time is the medium within which ‘things’ are done. If the aim of existence is thought to be the construction of an individualistic or collectivistic ‘identity’, time is essentially a medium for ‘becoming’, but if the meaning of existence is thought to be experiencing a particular or collective expression of participation in the wholeness of reality, time is essentially a medium for ‘being’. The important implication here is that these different orientations suggest distinctive relationships between time and ‘actions’. If time is a medium for becoming, individuals or collective groups are defined in terms of their actions, that is, they are what they do. By contrast, if time is a medium for being, actions *flow from* an experience of participatory consciousness, and, accordingly, individuals or collective groups perform actions because of who they are, that is, their doing expresses their being. Thus, by exploring the question ‘In what sense time is a medium for doing something?’, Part Two of this dissertation is essentially a profile of the relationship between ‘being’ and ‘action’ that accords with the spiritual reality of wholeness depicted in Part One.

Because understanding time as a 'phenomenon' is important for understanding in what sense it is a medium for action, the first chapter of Part Two (chapter five) is a survey of various images of time throughout history and across different cultures. This survey is presented not only as a way of providing an historical perspective for the ideas presented in this inquiry but also as a way of supporting my view that time is best understood not as an objective entity but as a 'point-of view', that is, in terms of time-consciousness. As suggested in this survey, the idea that time is objectively real emerges with full force only with the onset of the modern period of domination by the scientific-technical worldview. The view of time that predominates before the modern period and which is receiving increasing support throughout the twentieth century is that time is best understood in the context of a more encompassing reality of timelessness.

This connection between time and timelessness suggests that the activities of everyday living (that is, time-bound issues and concerns) are rooted in comprehensive experiences of time-consciousness or worldviews which orient individuals and/or collective groups towards particular beliefs which, in turn, influence the conduct of living in significant ways. The suggestion here is that the three major perspectives towards time, which I refer to as *past-directed*, *future-oriented*, and *present-centered* time-consciousness, have particular ramifications with respect to organizing and guiding the various affairs of life, and I explore these ramifications in chapter six, often centering my discussion around the ideas of Paul Tillich and/or Raimon Panikkar. The importance of this exploration is twofold. In the first place, the current dominance of the scientific-technical worldview creates the impression that time has an objective existence, and this impression obscures the significance of time-consciousness as a basic orienting principle of daily activities. Secondly, there are a number of indications which suggest that contemporary technocultures are overwhelmingly influenced by both past-directed and future-oriented temporal perspectives, with the impact of present-centered time-consciousness either minimal or marginalized. This situation creates a cultural atmosphere in which the 'horizontal' dimension of life, that is, the dimension concerned primarily with 'becoming', is

privileged over the ‘vertical’ or depth dimension of life, which is concerned primarily with ‘being’. Given the importance of responding effectively to a present circumstance in terms of cultivating the kind of participatory consciousness required for deeply meaningful interaction (an importance that is emphasized in all the major traditions of spirituality), this diminishment of present-centered time-consciousness is a serious concern. Accordingly, the main idea I am exploring in chapter six is that there is a critical need in contemporary societies to reanimate an awareness of and appreciation for ourselves as temporal beings capable of experiencing the present as a ‘centering’ perspective for ordering the affairs of daily living.

The final chapter of Part Two (chapter seven) focuses on exploring the efficacy of this experience of ‘living in the here and now’ as a way of being ‘in tune with’ the transcendent reality which animates and gives ultimate meaning to all expressions of being. However, because a present-centered time-consciousness does not necessarily imply an orientation towards a transcendent reality, a major part of chapter seven deals with a comparison of two ways of understanding what it means to live attuned to the present. I refer to the first way as a *pragmatic-instrumentalistic* approach to the present because it focuses on ‘processes of enactment’ within the world of time and space (rather than ‘experiences of consciousness’) as the primary means of understanding and constructing the conditions of life. According to this view, beliefs, principles, and ideas, no less than physical objects, are essentially ‘tools’ used to build a ‘better future’, and the use of these tools is guided primarily by knowledge of their ‘effects’. As a major illustration of this approach, I discuss John Dewey’s ideas about morality. The contrasting view to living attuned to the present, the one which animates this dissertation, is described as a *contemplative ‘call to centering’*, and my discussion of it centers on the ideas of Raimon Panikkar. In contrast to the pragmatic approach, a person who responds to the present in a contemplative way does not actively seek to change the external conditions of life, rather, he or she seeks to be ‘centered’ within an experience of ultimate significance which is, in reality, a matrix for genuinely creative and nurturing action. I describe this experience of ‘centering’ as one which expresses the *unity* of all beings, the

uniqueness of each being, and the *ultimacy* of the relationships that constitute the wholeness of reality. Accordingly, by suggesting that this ‘call to centering’ is an experience of ultimate significance, I am offering a trinitarian image as a way of evoking the basic nature of reality, as far as we can understand it at the present time.

To suggest that this contemplative experience is a matrix for genuinely creative, nurturing action is to suggest that ‘being’ is, in effect, a kind of instrument, but the instrumentality implied is not that of a ‘tool’ acting on an external condition of one kind or another, rather, it is that of a person’s ‘way-of-being’ responding to a condition of which he or she is an integral part. There are, then, two connotations to the word ‘instrument’ which require careful differentiation. On the one hand, an instrument can be considered as something external to its user, as when someone uses a device or procedure to accomplish a task. On the other hand, an instrument can be considered as something intrinsically connected with a user, as when we use our eyes to see, ears to hear, or consciousness to ‘attend to’ something in some way. Distinguishing between these two conceptions of instrumentality is important because, under the impact of the scientific-technical worldview, human persons are often treated by other persons and/or interest groups as instruments in the objective sense and also tend to consider their own thoughts and feelings merely as ‘tools’ for accomplishing particular tasks rather than as a personal means of interacting with their environments in a participatory way. Throughout this inquiry I refer to the objective connotation of instrumentality as ‘instrumentalistic’ and to the tendency to use it pervasively as ‘instrumentalism’. The concluding discussion in chapter seven focuses on the question ‘What is instrumentality?’ in order to illustrate the inadequacy of instrumentalistic thinking when trying to understand the nature of those structures and processes that are deeply rooted in human consciousness.

The wonder of human consciousness is its ability to coordinate a vast array of physical movements, knowledge, insight, feelings, and intuitions in a way that integrates unique personal qualities, shared experiences, and, ultimately, a sense of belonging to the whole world of living beings. This ability to express uniqueness, unity, and ultimacy is what I mean by the ‘instrumentality of being’, and because this

trinitarian display of life embodies 'all in all', I suggest that it is best understood as an expression of the *spirituality of being*.

A person expresses this spiritual instrumentality when he or she incorporates the so-called external world into her or his conscious way of being, that is, when the so-called boundaries that separate 'inside' from 'outside' are recognized for what they are - illusions. Examples of this kind of spiritual-integrating experience abound. Consider, for example, how children are able to interact with their environments in a way that permits any block of wood to become a ship or an airplane, or a piece of cloth to become a symbol for warmth and security. It is often said that one of the developmental tasks of childhood is learning to differentiate one's 'self' from the external world. However, it must be remembered that, by recognizing a personal difference between a so-called 'self' and others, children are, in reality, expressing a 'relationship'. Difference and relationship always 'go together', otherwise, there could be no awareness of either.

Another everyday illustration of the permeability of so-called 'insides' and 'outsides' is music, for the experience of music is a wonderful example of how human consciousness integrates a broad spectrum of awareness and capacities with an immediate action or experience. Accordingly, in the epilogue of this dissertation, I discuss how music expresses the spirituality of being, with particular reference to a contemporary composer whose work is an explicit articulation of the spiritual nature of reality: Arvo Pärt. As a preview of this discussion and as a way of pointing to both the rationale underlying the entire dissertation and its principal theme, I conclude these introductory remarks by commenting on the significance of an activity central to both music and, I believe, to the experience of being in touch with the spirituality of being. I call this activity 'deep-listening'.

In my work as a piano teacher, I often encounter the strange phenomenon of people 'hearing-but-not-listening'. As odd as it might seem to some, 'not-listening' is one of the biggest and most common obstacles to successful music-making. One of my most important activities as a piano teacher, then, is helping my students listen intently to the sounds they make as they progress through the many and varied stages

of learning and eventually performing a piece of music. For a musician, 'good listening' involves not just hearing something but actually using one's whole being - senses, intellect, and emotions - as an instrument of immediate awareness. Just as visual artists train themselves to be attuned to the art of seeing, the art of not just looking 'at' an object but seeing 'into' it, seeing and appreciating it for what it might be in-and-of-itself, musicians train themselves to be intimately involved with the sounds they generate, for it is with these sounds that they mould the palpable images which project whatever it is that the music they are performing contains, be it an idea, an emotion, or an all-encompassing impression that is beyond description. To listen in this way is to be immersed in a multifaceted activity that consumes one's whole attention. It entails not only objectively hearing certain sounds and relating them to the physical movements that produce them but also subjectively interpreting these sounds and movements in the context of a musical script. Moreover, none of this would be possible without an ability to filter out extraneous influences, to 'let-go' of all else but the act of listening deeply 'into' something at a particular moment. For a musician, then, this deep-listening is a way of *merging* a complex series of physical actions with an awareness of a specific musical context, and when this happens, when there is an 'effective *merging of action and awareness*', the result for both performers and listeners is a sense that the music is occurring spontaneously, without effort, and with this sense comes, invariably, a feeling of sheer enjoyment.³

A similar merging of action and awareness exists, at least potentially, in a vast range of activities: artistic, scientific, recreational, or job-related. Normally, such experiences are thought of as exceptional, reserved for special occasions or for so-called 'gifted' individuals, however, I suggest that this assumption of exceptionality and exclusivity stems from a widespread cultural lack-of-emphasis on experiencing the present as a mode of time-consciousness. As mentioned above, current cultural perspectives towards time over-emphasize the importance of either past events which condition behaviour or future possibilities which motivate human action towards progress, defined in modern technocultures in terms of material or quantitative increase. This preoccupation with either past or future (or both, to varying degrees

and in various circumstances) creates an imbalanced perception of time, a perception without a center. By contrast, to activate the present as a primary mode of time-consciousness is to provide oneself with a centralizing support for experiencing the unfolding of life, a kind of temporal fulcrum. Without such a center, life-experiences remain focused on activities with which there can be no immediate personal involvement, that is, with past events and future possibilities. But without immediate and meaningful personal contact with the constituents of life-events, how is it possible to cultivate any 'depth' to our experiences? The underlying rationale for this dissertation, then, is to respond to this need to consider the issues and concerns of daily living in depth, and I can think of no more fundamental issue and concern than the relationship between 'being' and 'doing'.

Doing any task with fervour, or simply experiencing a captivating event of one kind or another, involves 'attending to' the task or event in a way that involves a person's whole being. This aptitude for attuning oneself to an activity or event in such a way that extraneous stimuli are inconsequential and time seems to disappear is what I mean by 'deep-listening'. Some people, like myself, are fortunate enough that job-related activities generate such experiences, and others are able to find them in various kinds of recreation. However, in the context of living in the over-stimulated environments of our contemporary technocultures, and given the weight attached to the pursuit of self-interest in modern value-systems, it is becoming increasingly difficult to step outside of the various 'grooves' which condition our lives and to practice what Krishnamurti refers to in the following quotation as 'listening with all of one's being'.

I feel it is dreadfully simply somehow. *If one could listen with all of one's being*, the brain would not be caught in the groove...So we come to the point - is pure observation, which is actually listening, love? I think it is...Pure perception is love. And in that perception love is intelligence. They are not three things, they are all one thing.⁴

As understood here, deep-listening is related to 'being' and to time-consciousness because it involves abandoning our attachments to past and future issues and concerns, including those associated with our sense of 'self'. It is also a *vital*

experience because, by relinquishing the various ‘things’ that we use to define ourselves, we relinquish that which tends to separate us from everything considered ‘other’ and open ourselves to the possibility of being connected with that which underlies and animates the *wholeness* of reality. When ‘listening’ is an experience of paying complete attention to a present situation, a deepened sense of ‘self-other unity’ is created and this experience generates a more encompassing field of perception, empathy, and intelligence than previously available, and within this field of *participatory consciousness*, the activity of knowing is not only one of simplifying, it is also one of love because it removes any barriers that separate knower and known.⁵

There is a concept in Taoist philosophy that beautifully expresses the nature of deep-listening: *wu wei*. Normally, this concept is translated as ‘non-doing’ or ‘active inactivity’,⁶ but the interpretation I prefer is depicted in a short phrase: *The way to do is to be*.⁷ My preference for this interpretation is well-grounded for it expresses in seven words what I am seeking to express throughout the seven chapters that constitute the main body of this inquiry into the spirituality of being. As I understand it, then, the underlying meaning of ‘wu wei’ is that, when a person is in touch with the ‘way of ultimate reality’, which is *Tao*, there is an embodiment of ‘being and action’ that is truly nurturing and creative because it springs from the deepest source of meaning in a person’s life. In effect, ‘wu wei’ is an experience of *self-surrendering* to an Ideal of ultimate significance, such as *Tao*, or, for those who profess a theistic spirituality, to God. Huston Smith refers to this experience as ‘pure effectiveness, or creative quietude’ and calls it ‘the supreme action, the precious simplicity, suppleness, and freedom that flows from us, or rather through us, when our egos and conscious efforts yield to a power not their own’.⁸ Here is how the concept of ‘wu wei’ is described in the foundation text of Taoism, *Tao-te Ching*.

[Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 48.⁹ See Appendix B, # 1.]

The abandonment of self-oriented concerns and self-reliant effort that characterizes 'wu wei' implies that a deeply meaningful personal experience is not objectified in any way because it is an experience of being fully attentive to and involved with a present situation. Living in the light of 'wu wei' means that a person's unique 'being' does not express any fixed characteristics or patterns of behaviour apart from what is expressed within an experience of participatory consciousness. Such self-abandonment and 'attunement' with the present differs significantly from the individualism and future-oriented instrumentalism of contemporary technocultures. However, the suggestion put forward throughout this dissertation is that it is through such present-centered and participatory experiences that people remain in contact with the deep processes and structures of consciousness, and, therefore, with that which animates authentic human action. Thus, a major focus of concern in this inquiry is the pervasive use of the objectifying rationality that sustains individualism and instrumentalism, for such rationality restricts conscious awareness to what might be called the surface processes and structures of consciousness, that is, to that which can be objectified.

As a consequence of living under the influence of this objectifying rationality, a person's sense of 'self' tends to be perceived as an object because it is something that is constructed out of an accumulation of experiences. In such a context, 'being' is conceived as a product of actions. However, when personal experience is a 'self-surrendering to' or 'not interfering with' the natural or ultimate 'way of reality', as in an experience infused with 'wu wei', actions do not determine a person's sense of being, rather, they flow from it, which means that *being is a way of doing*. This dissertation, then, is a discussion of what it means 'to be' and 'to do', offered here in the light of this underlying theme of 'being as a way of doing'. Throughout this discussion I explore and draw upon the insights of people from many different historical periods, cultural and academic backgrounds, and with a wide variety of

opinion about the issues under study. Brief biographical notes about these people are given at the conclusion of the dissertation. My hope is that, as a document that integrates my own observations, reflections, and experiences with those of a varied collection of scholars and 'seekers' as well as with those of its readers, this dissertation expresses a way of 'attending to' reality that is in keeping with the spirit of the following words.

The truth that can be spoken
is not the Ultimate Truth.
Ultimate Truth is wordless,
the silence within the silence.
More than the absence of words,
Ultimate Truth is the seamless being-in-place
that comes with attending to Reality.¹⁰

Part One

WHAT DOES IT MEAN 'TO BELONG', TO BE PART OF A WHOLE? IS *BEING* BEST UNDERSTOOD IN THE CONTEXT OF HIERARCHY OR WHOLENESS?

- Preface -

Everything in nature contains all the powers of nature...Under all this running sea of circumstance, whose waters ebb and flow with perfect balance, lies the aboriginal abyss of real Being. Essence, or God, is not a relation or a part, but the whole. Being is the vast affirmative, excluding negation, self-balanced, and swallowing up all relations, parts and times within itself...*In the nature of the soul is the compensation for the inequalities of condition...*the distinction of More and Less...But see the facts nearly and these mountainous inequalities vanish. Love reduces them as the sun melts the iceberg in the sea.
(Ralph Waldo Emerson)¹¹

Assuming that the term 'reality' encompasses whatever it is possible to believe and understand given the capacities and potential of human consciousness, the observation that there are distinct orders of complexity with respect to 'being' within this reality, that some have more and others have less, seems beyond doubt. However, the way these diverse orders are interrelated remains an open question, because there are different ways of conceiving what it means for a being *to belong*; that is, there are different ways of conceiving in what sense individual phenomena are parts of the whole of reality.

'There is no division between the physical and the spiritual,' asserts the Taoist philosopher; 'It is all of a whole'.¹²

Not so, declares a Christian authority on comparative religions: 'One of the reasons a hierarchical view of reality is indispensable is that Spirit, the human spirit included, is nonspatial and thereby belongs perforce to an order of existence distinct in kind from nature'.¹³

However, as one of this century's leading physicists remarks, 'in the nonmanifest order, all is one...there is no separation in space and time...If we are separate it is because we are sticking largely to the manifest world as the basic reality, where the whole point of the manifest world is to *have* separate units...Now,

in the nonmanifest reality', a domain which encompasses subatomic as well as mystical phenomena, 'it's all interpenetrating, interconnected in one'.¹⁴

Nevertheless, cautions an acknowledged authority on theories of human consciousness, the knowledge of physics and the wisdom of mysticism 'are different approaches to two quite different levels of reality, the latter of which transcends but includes the former'. To view the worldviews of physics and mysticism as similar, he adds, is a 'wild overgeneralization' based on 'accidental similarities' of language rather than on deeply rooted connections.¹⁵

As these contrasting viewpoints indicate, the presence of various orders of complexity within reality can be conceived in (at least) two fundamentally different ways. One viewpoint depicts reality as follows: 'The stuff of the universe, woven in a single piece according to one and the same system, but never repeating itself from one point to another, represents a single figure...a Whole.'¹⁶ According to this view, there is a unifying pattern of organization, an animating power or 'Spirit', underlying the whole of reality, and this underlying power suggests that there is a basic *relationship of interdependence* among all phenomena. From the alternate viewpoint, the significant differences in complexity observed throughout nature imply a *tiered reality* in which the more complex phenomena express increasingly superior and autonomous levels of being (and, therefore, of reality), and these superior levels are connected to inferior ones primarily in the sense that all levels take part in an evolutionary movement. As alternatives, these two perspectives suggest the following question: Given that human consciousness and understanding encompasses both manifest and nonmanifest levels of reality, are the different orders of complexity evident throughout reality best understood as separate, graded levels-of-being within an evolving *hierarchy* of consciousness, or as distinctive but interdependent conditions-of-being within an unfolding *wholeness* of conscious life?

As stated in the introductory chapter, my response to this question favours the 'wholeness' perspective, and in the following remarks I organize this response in terms of three main discussions. The first discussion, in Chapter Two, suggests that

there is an emerging worldview that emphasizes the spiritual nature of reality, and, accordingly, it provides a recent historical framework for considering specific issues related to the hierarchy and wholeness viewpoints which are discussed in the third and fourth chapters respectively.

Chapter Two

A New Horizon: Encounters at the Junction of Reason and Mysticism

As we think ultimate reality to be, so we behave. Vision and action go together.

(Sarvepali Radhakrishnan)¹⁷

In the modern concept...there is no possibility of a detached, self-contained existence.

(Alfred North Whitehead)¹⁸

In December of 1980 a group of scientists met with Pope John Paul II and presented him with a short paper dealing with the relations between science and religion. One member of this group, Ilya Prigogine, writes that this paper spoke of the necessity of the 'coming together of science, culture, and spiritual activity' in order to fulfil the human needs of our time, a time which it described as 'a difficult period of adjustment'. He adds that, as a scientist, his own response to this situation is to emphasize that scientific work ought to be part of a widespread 'convergence of interest' in which science is considered 'as a creative and ethical activity which is embedded in culture as a whole'.¹⁹

What I find most striking about these comments is their implication of a widespread belief that science is not necessarily either an ethical activity or embedded in a particular culture. Tragically, this implication testifies to the all too obvious *fragmentation* that characterizes much of our contemporary world. But Prigogine's comments also suggest that we are in a time of change - in fact, a time of momentous change - in which it is a vital necessity to seek out ways to overcome the collective mindset that equates the gathering of knowledge and understanding with deliberate efforts to keep the various fields of inquiry and human experience separate.

Although change is an ever-present aspect of both individual and societal experience, there are times when circumstances combine to provoke what amounts to a fundamental transformation that affects entire civilizations. In *The Transformations of Man*, Lewis Mumford claims that there have been only a handful of such changes

in the history of our Western civilization, the most recent one coming at the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the modern scientific era. He describes the intellectual character of such transformations as centering around a new conceptual base, that is, around 'deeper stirrings and intuitions whose rationalized expression takes the form of a new picture of the cosmos'. With respect to the prospects for such a transformation in our own time, he notes that our 'world culture may bring about a fresh release of *spiritual energy* that will unveil new potentialities, no more visible in the human self today than radium was in the physical world a century ago, though always present'.²⁰

Mumford's comments were made in 1956. However, more than a decade earlier, in 1941, Pitirim Sorokin completed a massive, four volume historical and sociological study entitled *Social and Cultural Dynamics* which also anticipates a transformation towards a more spiritually oriented worldview.²¹ Sorokin's comprehensive synthesis suggests that there is a cyclical pattern of three basic value systems evident throughout the history of Western societies: the *sensate*, the *ideational*, and the *idealistic*. In the *sensate* value system, matter is considered to be the fundamental reality and spiritual phenomena are understood as manifestations of matter. In keeping with this materialist orientation, sensory perception is regarded as the primary source of knowledge and all ethical values are relative. As the polar opposite of this system, the chief characteristics of the *ideational* value system are its belief in the supremacy of the spiritual realm, its reliance on knowledge obtained through inner experience, and its assumption of absolute ethical values. Sorokin conceives the *idealistic* value system as a kind of intermediate, synthesizing point of view, that is, one which holds that reality has both sensory and suprasensory aspects coexisting in an integrated and balanced expression of cultural life. The latest example of this idealistic culture was the European Renaissance, and in accordance with Sorokin's scheme, it was preceded by the ideational culture of the Christian Middle Ages and followed by the sensate culture of the modern age with its emphasis on rationalism, mechanistic science, and industrial technology.

The major implication of Sorokin's analysis is that the values and ideas associated with our current sensate culture will decline and a new idealistic culture, with an emphasis on the ecological values of balance and integration, will emerge. In the last half of the twentieth century, many scholars have attempted to show that this transformation is already under way.

Henryk Skolimowski is one of these scholars. In *The Participatory Mind: A New Theory of Knowledge and of the Universe*, this philosopher suggests that a new worldview is emerging which has three major characteristics: (a) an emphasis on *holism*, that is, on a belief in the unity of all things, (b) a *spiritual* inclination, but without necessarily invoking traditional religions, and (c) an *ecological* orientation, specifically in terms of the 'healing of the world and ourselves'.²² Like Sorokin, Skolimowski supports his reading of our contemporary world by drawing on historical examples of worldview transformations. He observes, for instance, that the history of western civilization can be viewed in terms of four great organizing 'cosmologies'.

The first of these cosmologies emerged (around the sixth century BCE) as a movement away from the 'mythico-poetic' rationality of archaic Greek culture and towards a new form of understanding based on the concept of *logos*. This *logos*-concept implies that there is a 'coherent and harmonious order' in the universe and that 'to be intelligent and rational' means to decipher the meaning of this order and express it in some way, such as through art, architecture, or philosophy. The second great western cosmology emerged after the collapse of the 'Graeco-Roman' civilization (around the fifth century CE) and centered around a concept of *theos* which depicted reason as inspired and guided by the monotheistic Judaeo-Christian God. According to Skolimowski, this cosmology emphasized the 'transient nature of physical reality' and a hierarchical, though inherently coherent, social order. The third major cosmology on Skolimowski's list is that of the modern age. This cosmology, identified as *mechanos*, emerged in the seventeenth century and focused on the idea that scientific knowledge is power and this power can transform nature for the benefit of humanity. However, in our own time, Skolimowski suggests that this

cosmology has ‘denuded our emotions and our spiritual life’ and that a new cosmology is emerging to take its place, one which is in the process of reclaiming both meaning and spirituality as indispensable aspects of human life and which is characterized by a sense of wholeness and a belief that we live in an open, non-deterministic universe. He calls this new worldview the *evolutionary telos*.²³

To articulate the changing metaphysical climate of contemporary Western societies, Skolimowski proposes a new ‘grand theory’ which he explains in terms of a ‘participatory philosophy’ and which I discuss at some length in a subsequent part of this study that deals with my own understanding of *participatory consciousness* (in chapter four). Here, I simply wish to record the overall impression that Skolimowski’s vision of how people acquire an understanding of reality is a radically dynamic one which privileges ‘becoming’ over being and creativity (which he understands as ‘reality-making’) over analysis. To my mind, this approach is an excessively future-oriented and anti-rational vision that neglects to place sufficient emphasis on the virtue of *balancing* contrasting views and on the spiritual significance of living in the present moment.

The idea of balance is central to the Taoist tradition of spirituality and one of the most widely read scholars with regard to an emerging new worldview is Fritjof Capra whose work is intimately associated with this idea. His first book *The Tao of Physics* (1977) claims that there are significant connections between modern physics and Eastern mysticism, and in a subsequent work, *The Turning Point* (1983), he builds on insights derived from this previous research and outlines in considerable detail what he calls a ‘crisis of perception’ in our Western and Westernizing societies. This crisis, he maintains, derives from the fact that we continue to apply the concepts of an outdated mechanistic worldview to a reality in which they do not fit. Because ‘we live in a globally interconnected world, in which biological, psychological, social, and environmental phenomena are all interdependent’, such a framework is simply inadequate. What we need, in Capra’s view, is a new and genuinely ecological paradigm that is sensitive towards what is needed for both human and planetary well-

being. Such a paradigm encourages a 'vision of reality' that emphasizes the importance of maintaining an effective balance between the self-assertive tendencies of the scientific-technical worldview and the integrative tendencies aroused by an awareness of the interdependence of all phenomena. Moreover, this vision is one that integrates many streams of contemporary thought, from a 'systems view of life, mind, consciousness and evolution' to 'an ecological and feminist perspective which is spiritual in its ultimate nature'.²⁴

In concert with the major theme that flows throughout this study, Capra uses the Taoist concept *wu wei* to suggest the philosophical underpinning of his ecological view of reality. As mentioned previously, this concept is often translated as 'non-doing' or 'non-action', however, Capra notes that 'the distinguished sinologist Joseph Needham defines *wu wei* as "refraining from action contrary to nature" and justifies his translation with a quotation from Chuang-tzu, one of the founders of philosophical Taoism: 'Nonaction does not mean doing nothing and keeping silent. Let everything be allowed to do what it naturally does, so that its nature will be satisfied'.²⁵ What is implied here is an attitude of mind that believes all phenomena can interact in harmony if people do nothing that is against 'the natural flow of things'. In practice, this mentality involves maintaining a balance between the two major contrasting tendencies in nature, depicted in Taoism as 'yin' and 'yang'. The yin-aspect of nature consists of the ecologically sensitive and, therefore, integrative capacities of intuition and synthesis, whereas the self-assertive yang-aspect of nature embodies rational knowledge and analysis. Capra believes that Western culture is dangerously imbalanced because of its overemphasis on yang-like qualities. He summarizes this opinion in the following passage.

It is now becoming apparent that overemphasis on the scientific method and on rational, analytic thinking has led to attitudes that are profoundly antiecological. In truth, the understanding of ecosystems is hindered by the very nature of the rational mind. Rational thinking is linear, whereas ecological awareness arises from an intuition of nonlinear systems. One of the most difficult things for people in our culture to understand is the fact that if you do something that is good, then more of the same will not necessarily be better...Ecological awareness, then, will arise only when we combine our

rational knowledge with an intuition for the nonlinear nature of our environment.²⁶

In keeping with Taoist philosophy, Capra's remarks suggest that a balanced way of life is a healthy, life-affirming one. They also suggest, in concert with the ideas put forward throughout this study, that maintaining a balanced way of life entails a deep awareness of the spiritual nature of reality and a deep appreciation for the importance of living fully in tune with the present moment.

Capra's emphasis on developing an ecologically sensitive view of the world is reflected in another notable contribution to mapping out the terrain of new ways of thinking about reality, namely, Marilyn Ferguson's *The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980's*. As Ferguson notes in her introduction to this book, the word conspiracy normally has negative connotations, but in its literal sense it means *to breathe together* and it is in this benign sense that she uses the word to refer to the *network* of people from different social and professional backgrounds engaged in promoting a new 'spirit' within American society. She describes this new spirit and its networking character in numerous ways, but perhaps most succinctly as a new perspective which 'respects the ecology of everything'.

What I find especially noteworthy about Ferguson's book is that it honours this ecological ideal not only in its content but also in the manner of its production. For example, in order to check her own assessment of the kinds of social transformations currently taking place, she sent out questionnaires to people 'from many different fields and walks of life', and she received one hundred and eighty-five replies which, presumably, were used in conjunction with her own ideas. As part of this questionnaire, she asked respondents to name 'individuals whose ideas had influenced them, either through personal contact or through their writings'. Significantly, the three individuals named most often are writers whose works express an intimate sensitivity for and knowledge of the spiritual nature of reality: Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Carl Jung, and Abraham Maslow. Moreover, among the list of other frequently mentioned influential people, there are many whose work is largely oriented towards spirituality: for instance, J. Krishnamurti, Paul Tillich, Martin

Buber, Alan Watts, Sri Aurobindo, D.T. Suzuki, and Thomas Merton.²⁷

Another name appearing on Ferguson's list is Willis Harman whose far-reaching scholarship pertaining to the changing worldview is contained in his book *Global Mind Change* (1988). In this book, Harman not only supports the view that the 'basic ways of perceiving, thinking, valuing, and doing' in Western societies are changing but also suggests that the nature of this change is away from a worldview dominated by a scientific-materialist outlook that considers consciousness a product of a material universe and towards one centered on consciousness itself '*as a causal reality*' - a suggestion very much in keeping with Sorokin's ideas about shifting from a sensate to an idealistic culture.²⁸

One of Harman's major conclusions is that there is no conflict between a science based on the emerging new worldview and the 'perennial wisdom' of the world's spiritual traditions.²⁹ A writer who has written extensively about this issue, specifically in the context of the relationship between spirituality, religion, psychology, and science, is Ken Wilber. Wilber brings together his ideas on the emerging new worldview in *Eye to Eye: The Quest for the New Paradigm* (1996). His main observation is that, although a new genuinely comprehensive paradigm that transcends materialism remains very much 'an alluring notion', there are still a number of 'major obstacles...blocking its emergence'.³⁰ Wilber's book is essentially a critical examination of these obstacles, but because he is a staunch supporter of the hierarchical vision of reality, I discuss his views in the chapter of this inquiry that focuses on that point of view (chapter three). What I wish to emphasize here is an observation he makes that reflects my own opinion, namely, that much of what purports to be a transcendence of the existing materialist paradigm is actually a remodelling of it.

'Pseudo-change' of one kind or another is perhaps one of the inevitabilities of our time, given the societal and intellectual ferment of the twentieth century, and given that it is reasonable to expect an arousal of conservative tendencies during a period of fundamental cultural transformation. Accordingly, to clarify what does and what does not constitute movement towards a genuine paradigm shift that

acknowledges the significance of spirituality, a concrete illustration is in order, and one is readily available by considering a relatively recent theory that attempts to refashion the relationship between psychology and religion, Roger Sperry's theory of 'emergent mentalism'. Sperry's ideas, I suggest, are a good illustration of their larger theoretical context, the so-called 'cognitive revolution' in psychology, and my purpose in examining them in the following remarks is to point out how the term 'revolution', in this instance, does not refer to 'a sudden and dramatic change in a situation' but to its other meaning, namely, revolving around a certain fixed point, in this instance, the materialist paradigm of the current scientific-technical worldview.

The Cognitive Revolution: A New Look, Perhaps, But Not a Change of Mind

As a result of winning the Nobel prize in 1981 for his research in human split-brain studies, Roger Sperry wrote a lead article in the 1981 *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. This article, entitled 'Changing Priorities', ostensibly reflected a departure from scientific orthodoxy inasmuch as it outlined the importance of considering subjective experience as an aspect of scientific investigation. 'Current concepts of the mind-brain relation', observed Sperry, 'involve a direct break with the long-established materialist and behaviorist doctrine that has dominated neuroscience for many decades'. He added, 'instead of renouncing or ignoring consciousness, the new interpretation gives full recognition to the primacy of inner conscious awareness as a causal reality'.³¹ In later years, Sperry elaborated this idea in an attempt to forge a philosophic position that not only 'integrates positivistic thought with phenomenology' but also 'opens the way for a consistent naturalistic foundation for both scientific and religious thought'.³² This attempt is examined here in order to highlight the difference between what has been called the 'cognitive revolution' in psychology and genuinely postmaterialistic inquiry and scholarship, for it can be shown that Sperry's theory of 'emergent mentalism' is an extension of rather than a direct break from the materialist paradigm that continues to dominate American psychology.

In writing about the origins of this materialist paradigm, Kurt Danziger notes that 'the ascendancy of positivist philosophies of science' during the critical formative

period of the discipline of psychology meant that 'its struggle for legitimacy had to be fought in an intellectual climate that was hostile to conceptions of reality that went beyond the phenomenal level'. He concludes that 'the worldly success of modern psychology was built on a narrow social basis', one 'that entailed a very considerable narrowing of epistemic access to the variety of psychological realities'. This narrow epistemological framework produced a disciplinary ethos that effectively eliminated much of what constitutes the domain of the real, for by focusing mainly on 'overt regularities of behavior established in investigative situations', mainstream psychologists largely disregarded those 'generative mechanisms that are not observable in themselves and that exist independently of any investigative intervention'.³³ By adopting a materialistic perspective as virtually the exclusive source of psychological knowledge, modern American psychology effectively disregarded the fact that value generating processes underlie observable human behaviour and thereby amputated an essential source of information about how people construct ways of knowing and acting.

This dismissal of underlying value-related experiences raises a twofold barrier: first, to uncovering the subjective, interpretive experiences of persons, and second, to understanding the interactive, societal processes that engender them. Although Sperry's claim that consciousness must be taken as a causal reality appears to attack these barriers by asserting that subjective experiences play an important role in scientific inquiry, it must be pointed out that scientists have always incorporated their own subjective experiences into their work, whether consciously or not, and that the crucial point is *how* they conceive that which is described as subjective and how that understanding affects their investigations of psychological phenomena.³⁴ Do they conceive a person as a self-contained 'individual', a 'manageable entity with clear-cut boundaries', or as a being that 'encompasses the whole complex web of the constitutive relationships' of people 'with no limits other than those which spontaneously appear in each case'?³⁵ Sperry's theoretical position clearly suggests that all subjective mental states ought to be considered solely in terms of their emergent material objectivity within each individual being, a position which supports

the view that persons are essentially self-contained individuals and which is also essentially a reformulation of the materialistic determinism that has characterized science since the so-called Copernican revolution. Here is how Willis Harman describes this materialist paradigm.

The basic stuff of the universe is matter-energy. We learn about reality from studying the measurable world. (The positivist assumption is that that is the only way we learn.) Whatever consciousness is, it emerges out of matter (that is, the brain) when the evolutionary process has progressed sufficiently far. Whatever we can learn about consciousness must ultimately be reconciled with the kind of knowledge we get from studying the physical brain, for consciousness apart from a living physical organism is not only unknown, it is inconceivable.³⁶

In the traditional application of materialistic determinism, causation is a matter of 'upward' progression; as Sperry notes, 'everything is determined exclusively from below upward' as when bodily chemical changes induce various subjective states. In Sperry's emergentist-mentalistic reformulation, a 'reciprocal downward determinism' is also posited so that causation is perceived as bi-directional, or 'doubly-determined', meaning that a subjective state, once it has 'emerged' in the material evolution of the brain, can exercise a downward influence on physiological activity. Sperry calls the traditional view a 'materialist *microdeterministic* view of nature' and describes his new explanation for causal explanation in terms of a *macromentalist* philosophy. It is important to note that, in outlining this bidirectional, macromentalist position, Sperry insists on its non-dualistic character. For example, he writes that mental states are 'inextricably interfused with their generating brain processes', which means that they 'cannot exist apart from the active brain'.

To summarize: Sperry maintains that, in keeping with psychology's so-called cognitive revolution, his emergent-mentalistic philosophy 'accepts mental and spiritual qualities as causal realities'.³⁷ However, what must be emphasized here is that, in Sperry's view, the causality of these qualities emerges only *after* they have emerged as products of brain activity.

As part of the explanation of his theory of *emergent mentalism*, Sperry identifies three 'conceptual consequences' with special bearing on the so-called

‘religion-science controversy’.³⁸ The first of these is that ‘the free will-determinism paradox is resolved in mentalist theory by preserving both free will and determinism and integrating the two’. This assertion implies that, because of the downward control of their subjective mental states, people can exercise a certain freedom of choice, yet this freedom is not ‘uncaused’ inasmuch as it exists as an emergent property of the brain.

Sperry’s second conceptual consequence is that the new macromentalist perspective he proposes has the capacity to overcome ‘the traditional fact-value dichotomy’, by which he means to suggest that ethical values can be derived ‘from the factual knowledge of science’. The reason for this assertion apparently stems from his belief in the bi-directional influence of mental and physiological processes. For example, he writes, ‘if conscious mental values not only arise from but also influence physical brain action, it then becomes possible to integrate subjective values with objective brain function and its physical consequences’. From this observation, Sperry concludes that scientific knowledge can be imbued with value, in contrast with the past materialist-behaviorist conception of ‘a cosmos lacking in values and higher meaning’. Thus, according to Sperry, because it is possible to derive values from science, previous value-generating systems based on assumptions of a supernatural power ought to be reconsidered in favour of ‘a science-based moral code’. Furthermore, Sperry claims that, in contrast with ‘currently prevailing schemes for ordering human priorities’ (presumably, religion-based morality), his science-based morality ‘holds promising prospects as the key to quality survival and a sustainable civilization’.

Sperry attaches particular importance to what he calls the third major implication of his emergent-mentalist philosophy, namely, its capacity to act as an ‘ideological base for world justice’. His belief in this capacity rests on the assumption that, despite the many cultural differences in the world, ‘an effective majority might be willing to compromise, for purposes of international law, on a new, relatively neutral value-belief system founded in the truths and worldview of science’. Such personal faith in the ability of science to generate a ‘philosophy for world

government' has much in common with religious fervour, as Sperry demonstrates in the following remark: 'We can now look to science to save the world, not through new improved technology, green revolutions, and the like (which only stave off and thereby magnify the eventual downfall) but instead by providing more realistic and sustainable beliefs and values to live and govern by'. By way of summarizing his views, Sperry puts forward the following question.

A crucial issue brought into new focus by the macromentalist outlook can be stated as follows: In ideologic or religious belief, is it any longer necessary or desirable to go beyond the limits of present knowledge and empirical verification? In other words, should humankind put its faith in the kind of truth within which scientific and religious belief are in accord, or should we continue to reach beyond this realm into others of less certainty.³⁹

Considering these comments, it can be assumed that Sperry rejects a metaphysical perspective that posits a *spiritual* reality, that is, a reality which, although not separate from, is not limited by the material expressions of the known and knowable physical world. In Sperry's view, 'consciousness...cannot exist apart from the functioning brain',⁴⁰ and, therefore, that which people refer to as spiritual, and from which they derive moral authority and guidance, is an emergent property of the brain. This view suggests that spirituality is a *product* of evolution and that the causative properties of states of consciousness reflect a *secondary order of causation*, not a primary one. Essentially, this is the metaphysical outlook of materialistic determinism (matter giving rise to mind) of which positivism is a prime example.⁴¹ As such, it is strikingly different from a metaphysical outlook that views reality as fundamentally spiritual, that is, as a realm of being in which some form of consciousness is the primordial basis for all that there is - a view which, as Harman observes, for thousands of year has been a central aspect of most of the world's spiritual traditions.⁴²

Inasmuch as Sperry's theory fails to consider spirituality in terms that express the way people have experienced it for millenia, its claim to theoretical comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness is suspect on the grounds that it has not adequately understood potential rival explanations of what it is seeking to describe and

explain. Wilber highlights the strength of this rival perspective by describing the perennial philosophy as 'either the single greatest intellectual error ever to appear in humankind's history - an error so colossally widespread as to literally stagger the mind - or it is the single most accurate reflection of reality yet to appear'.⁴³ Sperry's claim that his theory of 'emergent mentalism' is 'a shift in science to a different and more valid form of causal determinism' is accurate *only* in the context of an overarching materialistic paradigm, because his description of consciousness as a causal reality focuses on second-order as compared with primary causation. Thus, his theory rejects the fundamentally spiritual nature of reality, and may be described, perhaps, as a 'new look' for the science of psychology but not really a 'change of mind', and certainly not a 'revolution', cognitive or otherwise.

In a critical overview of the practice of contemporary psychology published in 1991, William Bevan observes that 'although much has been made of the alleged cognitive revolution', psychologists continue to be 'stubbornly reductionistic and mechanistic in the way that physics was mechanistic before the advent of relativity theory'. He also notes that psychology has become 'a proliferation of narrowly focused and compulsively insular camps' which is in urgent need of 'an architectonic sense for the larger questions', that is, a sensitivity for and competence in dealing with metaphysical issues.⁴⁴

Perhaps the most glaring limitation of the materialistic propensities exemplified by Sperry's theory and by the discipline of psychology itself is the suggestion that the essence of human subjectivity resides inside a person's skull. Far from being a new idea, this notion of an 'interiorized' autonomous thinking-self is scarcely distinguishable from the seventeenth century views of Rene Descartes. As Charles Tolman reminds us, for Descartes, the essential self 'is something with a location inside the body', the so-called *res cogitans*, and 'from its position within the physical body, it is related to the world by causal relations'. Fortunately, the untenability of this notion is becoming increasingly obvious as many contemporary scholars from a number of disciplines draw attention to the *discursive* nature of human experience and the *societal* nature of persons. As Tolman observes, 'an individual does not become a

person in a private space, but only in a public one'. At the heart of human subjectivity is not 'I think, therefore I am' (Cogito ergo sum), rather, 'We are, therefore I am' (Sumus ergo sum), which means that 'the burden of psychological explanation...is born by features not of the intracranial, Cartesian space, but of interpersonal, historical, societal, moral space'.⁴⁵

Tolman's comments suggest that what it means to be a person emerges within an environmental network of meaningful human relationships. The concept of space implied by this view is one that is fundamentally dynamic and connective rather than one that focuses on the separation of distinct bodies. 'Space doesn't separate us', observes David Bohm, 'it unites us'.⁴⁶ What we think of as 'empty space' is really the only place where either 'we' or 'I' exist. Consider, for example, a blind person, tapping with a stick to get information about the space he or she is in. Where is the division he or she makes between body and room? In a way that is particularly meaningful for the blind person, the body extends to the loose end of the stick. However, let go of the stick, and the so-called boundary between body-self and non-self shifts to the fingers, ears, nose, and skin, and let go of these body-sensations and the boundary shifts yet again, towards whatever ideas and feelings with which a person *identifies*. This identification may be experienced 'inwardly', perhaps as a cherished personality trait, a conditioned pattern of behaviour, a repressed impulse, or a deep conviction, or it may be experienced 'outwardly', as an idea of oneself in the context of something else, such as a sudden powerful emotion or a long-standing commitment of some sort, perhaps to love for another person, a nation, a community, or a religious ideal. The point here is that all these divisions between self and non-self are pragmatic, born of the transitory conditions of our being. They are fluid, and in no sense fixed.

Raimon Panikkar refers to a person as 'a knot in a net of relationships'.⁴⁷ However, given the veneration of individualism in contemporary consumer-oriented societies, this idea of the intrinsic interconnectedness of persons must contend with powerful assumptions about the supposed inviolability of the individual person. One of the strongest of these assumptions is that a person's body constitutes an immutable

boundary between what is 'self' and what is 'not-self': What is outside the skin is 'something else' and what is inside the skin is 'me'. The important point here is that the unreflective acceptance of this assumption reinforces a materialistic understanding of mental activity that is inappropriate for understanding the nature of *meaningful* human interaction. For example, the materialist explanation for how people experience thoughts and/or emotions is that such experiences occur essentially within a person's brain as part of an individualistic sense-of-self. According to this explanation, human experience is somehow equivalent to the physical events propagated in the body, that is, to the series of physical and chemical changes that propel an impulse to the brain, there to be deciphered and rendered into a meaningful image, idea, or sensation. But what is it that 'reads' this information and transforms these physical and chemical phenomena into the 'stuff' of everyday experience? The only concept we have to help us understand this miraculous happening is that of the 'mind', and clearly, 'mind-stuff' is impossible to conceive apart from the idea of relating with others: as Arthur Eddington reminds us, mind-stuff is 'world-stuff'.⁴⁸

Thus, to equate 'mind' with individual consciousness is to suggest that thoughts and feelings can arise without acts of relating with others, clearly an untenable notion, given that the awareness of existence itself can only be an awareness of a relationship of some kind, for without an 'other' with which to relate, there can be no meaning to a state of existence. In the following passage, Panikkar elaborates on the intrinsically interpersonal nature of a person by suggesting a differentiation between the terms 'person' and 'individual'.

By individual I understand that which results from the expedient of cutting off a sizeable and useful part of the human being, generally coextensive with his or her gross body...An individual is a manageable entity with clear-cut boundaries. It is an identifiable piece standing on its own, isolated. It responds to an "identification card" (wrongly called "identity") and has a social security number...The person, on the other hand, encompasses the complex web of the constitutive relationships of Man with no limits other than those which spontaneously appear in each case. An *I* is a person only to the extent that it does not isolate itself: a *thou* is needed, precisely in order to be an *I*. And vice-versa...To be a person...means to be a living center of the whole of reality...An individual is a closed system. Its boundaries are clear-cut. The

mine and thine cannot be mixed. A person is an open system. Its limits depend wholly on the power of the center. Each person is an expanding universe. You need not keep anything for yourself because the real self is not a private substance of your own.⁴⁹

As these comments suggest, when a person is affected by a sensation, an idea, or an emotion, he or she displays the reality of relatedness. Images of all kinds - whether rational, narrative, metaphoric, or sensual - move us because, in some basic sense, they reflect something that *belongs* to us as much as to the source from which they came. Even when our response is to move away rather than towards, or our awareness of being moved is vague or our actions conditioned, we are connected to whatever affects us because we are part of what 'it' is. Ralph Waldo Emerson describes this sense of kinship with everything as an attribute of the human soul; 'It is the nature of the soul to appropriate all things', he writes.⁵⁰ Reflecting a similar point of view but expressing it in terms of our physical bodies, David Bohm observes that 'there is no boundary between me and the universe because there is nothing but the universe' and 'my body is just part of it'.⁵¹ Taken together, these two comments, one from a nineteenth century philosopher and one from a twentieth century physicist, attest to a basic insight of mystics throughout history, namely, that body and soul are one, just as 'yours' and 'mine' and subject and object are one. Although one's experience of this kinship with the universe may not be as penetrating or intense as that of the mystics among us, nevertheless, in this study I wish to encourage the idea that the activities of everyday living express the same reality as that of the mystic. 'If people could understand the nature of ordinary experience better', observes David Bohm, 'they would see that mystical experience is really a heightening, and intensification, a deepening, of something they participate in'.⁵²

Reflecting on Bohm's comment reminds me that there is a significant body of inquiry about contemporary cultural life that can be understood as a multifaceted attempt to understand the nature of ordinary experience, and there is much about this attempt which points towards the spiritual nature of reality. For instance, I can think of nothing more characteristic of everyday living than the tenor of a person's relationships with others and with her or his normal everyday environments, and

many current avenues of inquiry, both academic and non-academic, as well as many spiritual traditions, revolve around the belief that reality is fundamentally *relational*. The major implication of this belief is that all forms of knowing have a communicative or dialogical nature, for if reality is fundamentally relational, communicating is also fundamental. That which we call 'truth', then, is an expression of a *communing* with others and cannot be reduced to an individualistic or single center of intelligibility. This idea is fraught with significance given the multicultural environments of many contemporary societies and world-wide institutions, for to accept the non-necessity of a single absolute center of intelligibility is to accept *pluralism* as a way of being human.⁵³

In the following section, I explore how the concepts of 'relatedness' and 'pluralism' characterize recent developments in several fields of inquiry and, accordingly, depict the emerging worldview as one that emphasizes both the importance of everyday experiences and the spiritual nature of reality. The suggestion here is that these two concepts have both descriptive and explanatory power, and that their interaction can be likened to different but equally important threads within a tapestry, or to the interweaving of distinctive yet complementary themes within a musical composition.

Diversity-in-Unity: A New Worldview

Just as a striking idea or metaphor often acts as the hub around which a person organizes an understanding of life, and just as its character normally changes with age, the history of Western civilization is characterized by a succession of worldviews which have exerted prevailing influences on the way whole societies understand the nature of reality and on the way distinctive ways of life are organized around that understanding. At the opening of the closing chapter of her book *The Quantum Self*, Danah Zohar draws attention to the 'naturalized' quality of worldviews, that is, to the way they provide a tacit underlying 'vision' of reality. She writes: 'in some very meaningful way, each of us, by the very nature of our consciousness and the need of that consciousness to integrate its experience, is a visionary on at least some small scale'. To illustrate her meaning she notes that each time a child makes a clay pot or

a person makes a decision, he or she in some sense 'creatively discovers some element of the vision that unites us all - our world-view'.⁵⁴ This use of the term 'worldview' implies that it is a way of understanding reality that integrates personal and societal experience so as to provide an often unacknowledged source for the values and motivations that animate everyday life within a given cultural setting.

Capra describes the current worldview dominating Western and westernized societies as emanating from three principal historical sources: the Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment, and the Industrial Revolution. Accordingly, he associates three principal ideas with this worldview: (a) the belief that the universe is essentially a mechanical system composed of elementary material building blocks, and that, given such a universe, the scientific method is the only valid approach to knowledge; (b) the view that life in society is 'a competitive struggle for existence'; and (c) the belief that unlimited material progress can be achieved through economic and technological growth.⁵⁵

In a similar description of the modern worldview, Bohm highlights its mechanistic character by contrasting it with the earlier 'organismic' understanding of reality prevailing throughout the Middle Ages. He points out that the mechanistic view suggests that the individual elements of any structural system (its 'particles' or fields of force) are discrete entities, fundamentally independent of one another. This independency of structural elements means that the different parts of a system or structure influence one another 'externally' by means of 'forces of interaction that do not deeply affect' the inner nature of each of the parts. By contrast, an organismic view of structure and of reality is one that suggests the nature of any part can be profoundly affected both by changes of activity in other parts and by the general state of the whole. According to this view, then, parts are 'internally' related to each other 'as well as to the whole'.⁵⁶

The current mechanistic worldview obtained its most complete development in physics during the nineteenth century and, as many writers have noted, the methodology of physics was widely adopted as a prototype for acquiring a truthful account of reality. However, since the beginning of the twentieth century, a 'new

physics' has emerged which has transformed the whole conceptual structure of mechanism, although in Bohm's opinion, 'the majority of physicists' have not yet realized how radical the implications of this transformation are.⁵⁷ The most important aspects of this transformation can be summarized, on the one hand, in terms of Relativity Theory, and on the other hand, in terms of contributions from Quantum Mechanics.⁵⁸

As Bohm explains it, Relativity Theory introduced a number of fundamentally new concepts regarding space, time, and matter, the principal one being that 'the notion of separate and independent particles as basic constituents of the universe had to be given up' in favor of Einstein's idea of 'a set of continuous *fields* pervading all space, in which particles would be treated as relatively stable and independent structures in limited regions in which the field was strong'. In some ways, this view of the physical world retained mechanistic features, for at different points the fields were regarded as 'separately existent, and not internally related in their basic nature, and not related to the whole'.⁵⁹

By definition, Quantum Mechanics is the study of the motion (mechanics) of quantities (quanta). It makes three fundamental propositions: (a) that all action is in the form of discrete and indivisible 'quanta', which implies that the universe itself is an interconnecting network of quantities or packets of energy, that is, an indivisible web of relations; (b) that all matter and energy at the subatomic level have a 'dual nature, in the sense that they can behave either like a particle or like a field - or a wave - according to how they are treated', which implies that the particular character of any subatomic phenomenon is dependent on its environment; and (c) that particles and/or events at the subatomic level exhibit a 'non-locality of connection', that is, there can be a connection between particles at considerable distances, which implies that the universe appears to be 'indifferent to exactly where the parts are'.⁶⁰ As a composite depiction of our universe, these three major propositions of Quantum Mechanics constitute a fundamental challenge to the logic of mechanism. Mechanism assumes that there is a local 'cause-and-effect' relationship between discrete entities and that individual parts have an 'independent' existence from a whole. Thus, to

suggest that entities can affect one another in a condition of separation and that phenomena are actually dependent on their environments is clearly a non-mechanistic portrayal of reality. However, the quantum-view is compatible with an organismic conception of reality, because organisms are naturally dependent on their contexts and naturally exhibit non-local influences insofar as the state of a whole organism affects and even ‘organizes’ the parts.⁶¹

As implied in the above remarks, there are differences between Relativity Theory and Quantum Mechanics. Relativity, for instance, ‘requires strict continuity, strict determinism, and strict locality’, whereas the quantum-view posits ‘discontinuity, non-determinism, and non-locality’.⁶² However, there is a major supposition that is common to both theories, namely, the *unbroken wholeness of the universe*, and it is upon this idea that Bohm constructs a new approach to understanding the nature of reality, based on the concept of an *implicate order*.

Bohm’s concept of an implicate order refers to a universal, unbroken field of ‘enfolded potential’. All manifest phenomena ‘unfold’ from this implicate order and ‘enfold’ back into it. As an illustration of this process of unfoldment and enfoldment, consider the way a television image is ‘enfolded’ as information in a radio wave and ‘unfolded’ by a television set as an image on a screen. A mechanistic interpretation of this sequence of recorded-image-to-displayed-image would maintain that the individual elements of the process, that is, the particles and fields involved, are the essential aspects of reality. What Bohm suggests is that the *process of enfolding and unfolding* constitutes the primary reality. He calls this process a *holomovement* because of its similarity to the way a holograph enfolds information about the object it depicts and unfolds it given the proper conditions. The crucial implication of this holographic analogy is that, just as each part of a holograph contains information about the whole object it depicts, each part of reality, each expression of being, in some way expresses the whole of reality. This idea, that the whole is contained in each part and that each part expresses the whole, is expressed again and again in the wisdom of mysticism and in the work of such transcendentalist philosophers as Emerson, who

writes that 'the universe is represented in every one of its particles' and 'every thing in nature contains all the powers of nature'.⁶³ Thus, to suggest that we live in a holographic universe, as Bohm does, is to affirm that the reality described by science and mysticism is one and the same.

Bohm's ideas are extremely fertile and have influenced recent scholarship in many fields. However, because they are highlighted in the chapter dealing with the 'wholeness' view of reality (chapter four), my intention here is simply to point out how his work elaborates a vision of the 'new physics' that focuses directly on the *relatedness* of all phenomena.

Following the publication of his book *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* in 1980, Bohm increasingly discussed the implications of his ideas in terms of deepening our understanding of the significance of everyday phenomena. In one of these discussions he explores how the so-called 'tacit' or 'taken-for-granted' dimensions of experience indicate that reality may be organized in terms of an implicate order. 'Tacit knowing' refers to the coordination of physical and mental operations required for the effective and automatic execution of particular skills, and riding a bicycle is often used as an example.⁶⁴ Bohm suggests that such tacit knowing is a pervasive aspect of everyday life - when we talk, and even when we think, it is largely a form of tacit knowing, for we do not have to stop and consider how we talk or think, we simply do it.

This understanding of tacit knowing suggests that, as individual acts are performed, the requisite coordinating procedures 'unfold' from the implicate into the explicate order, and when not in use, these same procedures are enfolded back into the implicate order. For example, language displays the reality of an implicate order insofar as the totality of a given language can be thought of as 'an undivided whole from which the various words and their potential meanings all unfold'.⁶⁵ This suggestion points to a major emphasis across many fields of contemporary scholarship on the importance of language as a non-mechanistic but intrinsically relational paradigm for reality. In the following passage, Kenneth Gergen describes this relational view of language as a major feature of the broad spectrum of contemporary

thought that has come to be known as postmodernism.⁶⁶

If one were to select from the substantial corpus of postmodern writings a single line of argument that (a) generates broad agreement within these ranks and (b) serves as a critical divide between what we roughly distinguish as the modern versus the postmodern, it would be the abandonment of the traditional commitment to *representationalism*. By representationalism I mean here the assumption that there is (or can be) a determinant (fixed or intrinsic) relationship between words and world...As the dialogue on representation has advanced, an alternative conception of language has gained ascendance. And as this alternative becomes progressively articulated, the postmodern literature turns from its nihilistic posture to more promising possibilities. This departure into what I shall term *a relational view of language* will apprise us more fully of the dangers inherent in the traditional views of science and morality.⁶⁷

Gergen maintains that the relational view of language espoused by many postmodern writers stems largely from the later work of Ludwig Wittgenstein, in particular, his *Philosophical Investigations* (1953). As Gergen explains, for Wittgenstein, 'language acquires its meaning not through a referential base but through its use in social practices'. In contrast to the representationalistic assumptions of modern scientific inquiry, this 'relational' idea implies that our language reflects a world not 'as it is' in an absolute sense but as it exists in the 'relationships in which we participate'. Thus, according to the postmodernist view, when scientists and moralists assume that the key words they use in their work are sufficient descriptors of reality irrespective of a recipient's interpretation, they are deluding themselves with respect to the nature of human communication.⁶⁸ To the many critics of postmodernism, this suggestion is at best excessively 'relative' and, therefore, excessively oppositional; at worst it is an endorsement of intellectual and moral anarchy. However, what may be anarchy to one may be an opportunity for personal and societal growth to another. Consider, for example, the following words of Michel Foucault, a postmodernist writer often associated with excessive 'oppositionalism', but who describes himself during a 1983 interview (the year before his death) in terms that suggest a radical *commitment* to concrete, local issues within contemporary life.

I am attempting...apart from any *totalization* - which would be at once

*abstract and limiting - to open up problems that are as concrete and general as possible, problems that approach politics from behind and cut across societies on the diagonal, problems that are at once constituents of our history and constituted by that history...And it has been necessary to try to raise them both as present-day questions and as historical ones, as moral, epistemological, and political problems.*⁶⁹

Foucault's work in general suggests a need for scholarly research geared towards issues of local cultural importance. If true to its purpose, this type of research is fundamentally concerned with the *effective communication* of its observations, explanations, and suggestions to those individuals most closely associated with the topic of inquiry in their daily lives. However, in the context of the materialist (scientific-technical) paradigm that continues to dominate the social sciences, research findings and their implications are often comprehensible only to experts in particular fields. As science advanced in the precision of its measurements and in the sophistication of its theories, its language acquired an aura of exclusivity, and only the initiated (the experts) could or were expected to understand it. The resulting situation is one in which the process of generating knowledge is geared largely towards advancing the interests of elite groups of scientists, that is, towards a mechanism of societal fragmentation. Insofar as postmodern relativism seeks to undo this mechanism by calling for research that is more ecologically sensitive to local concerns, it can be understood as a move to reorient academia towards an understanding of and appreciation for the relational quality of human experience.

My suggestion, then, is that the importance of open (non-elitist) dialogue as a key to unearthing localized needs is one way of conceiving a postmodern vision of reality. In the last half century, this vision has penetrated many different academic disciplines and provoked often passionate debate as it confronted universalist positions. One field of inquiry where this debate has been particularly intense is Feminist Theory.

Some feminist theorists embrace universalistic (essentialist) ideas and suggest that there is a 'unified' notion of female subjectivity. For example, Nancy Chodorow suggests that 'mothering' is a specifically feminine activity that has cross-cultural

validity and therefore can serve as a theoretical focal point for female 'gender identity'. Contrary to the theme I am developing here about the relational quality of reality, Chodorow's suggestion is that this quality is specifically feminine, for she maintains that 'female mothering produces women whose deep sense of self is relational and men whose deep sense of self is not'.⁷⁰ Another feminist viewpoint, one that reflects a remarkably different understanding of feminine identity than Chodorow's and yet is equally universalistic, is Adrienne Rich's notion of 'compulsory heterosexuality'. Rich's proposal is that lesbianism is 'natural' for women and that heterosexuality is the 'unnatural' outcome of powerful social constraints.⁷¹ Carol Gilligan's 'feminized' theory of moral reasoning is yet another example of feminist 'essentialism' insofar as it suggests that there are qualitative differences in the way men and women make moral decisions, with men focusing on ideals of justice, duty, and individual rights, and women focusing on caring, relationships, contextuality, and a concern for consequences.⁷²

The major difficulty with essentialist feminist theories, as Terry Lovell points out, is that the *diversity* of women's positions in society and representations in culture is beyond question. Lovell supports this observation by referring to the 'black' feminist critique of 'white' feminism which emerged in the late 1970's and to postcolonial research which contends that local gender roles were rendered 'invisible' by the gender and sexual ideologies of colonial powers. This body of research strongly suggests that issues of gender, race, and class cannot be properly understood apart from their mutual interdependence, which implies that 'any generalization about all women is likely to be either false or trivial',⁷³ and that gender 'always bears multiple, conflicting, and shifting meanings; it is a site of on-going social conflict'.⁷⁴

In contrast to essentialist positions, postmodern feminists forsake unitary images of female identity in favour of images that are historically situated and socially composite. For example, Donna Haraway suggests that because identities are 'contradictory, partial, and strategic', the search for an 'essential unity' among all women ought to be abandoned in favour of a response to women's issues centered on 'coalition' and 'affinity' rather than on identity.⁷⁵ In a related approach, Judith

Butler contends that all social identities are no more than their own repetitive performance, which means that gender is a learned, situational performance, that is, we learn to be men or women through social practices, and according to Butler, these practices produce the illusion of an inner gendered self.⁷⁶ Steven Seidman comments on these and other postmodern feminist authors by noting that their more relativist approach does not aim 'to give up all appeals to gender identity but to abandon ahistorical or universalistic ideas of womanhood as necessary for feminist theory or practice'.⁷⁷

My reason for drawing attention to this polarized debate within feminist theory is twofold: first, to suggest that it reflects a larger (society-wide) conceptual tug-of-war between essentialism and relativism; and second, to illustrate how a potential resolution of the tensions involved in this tug-of-war involves the acceptance of multiple ways of knowing and, accordingly, the fostering of an *ethic of pluralism*. The suggestion here is that, inasmuch as major ideas and events within feminist scholarship attempt to balance an awareness of localized issues and concerns within a wider context of a fundamental network of relationships, feminist theory is a microcosm of a society-wide shift towards an ecologically sensitive worldview animated by the values of relatedness and pluralism.

In an influential paper dating from the late 1980's, Nancy Fraser and Linda Nicholson propose a general framework for reconciling essentialist and relativist views within feminist theory.⁷⁸ Their proposal combines a rejection of what might be called hard-core (universalistic) essentialism with a commitment to general social knowledge attained through culturally specific, politically oriented, and 'historically attuned' research. The advantage of this approach, they suggest, is that it retains the large-scale narrative position of essentialist theories but at the same time focuses on comparative studies of 'the cultural specificity of different societies and periods' and on 'different groups within societies and periods', as opposed to focusing on abstract, ahistorical, functionalist categories such as 'mothering'. What is particularly noteworthy about this approach is its commitment to 'the practice of *feminisms*', that is, to a pluralist conception of feminist theory as 'a tapestry...of overlapping

alliances' rather than as a single theoretical perspective. By recognising the *diversity* of women's needs and experiences, this perspective has considerable relevance for everyday life because it suggests that no single solution on issues such as child care, social security, and housing, can be adequate for all.⁷⁹ Moreover, by situating issues and concerns within specific cultural and historical conditions, this 'tapestry-like' approach also avoids the pitfalls of an 'anything-goes' type of relativism by contextualizing thought and action within a 'general' understanding that embodies 'particular' broadly-based values and practices.

In practical terms, the ideas of Fraser and Nicholson recognize that every 'particular' voice speaks in a language that carries with it presuppositions about the nature of reality, and this insight, I believe, provides a key to understanding pluralism, for it recognizes reality as an expression of *diversity-in-unity*. In turn, this recognition fosters an ethic of pluralism conceived more in terms of an *aptitude for living among others* than as a theoretical proposition about the nature of truth. Truth itself can never be plural, because any individual who proclaims it must do so in a language, and every language is a generalizing context that expresses a particular way of understanding and experiencing reality. However, the fact remains that there are many languages, and also, many points of view within any given language. An ethic of pluralism honours this plurality by acknowledging that, although nobody *is* a pluralist (because each of us speaks from within a particular historical and cultural context), everyone *lives* in a condition of pluralism, because it can hardly be denied that there are different historical and cultural ways of being human. Accordingly, the concept of pluralism advocated here is one that understands it as *an image of the structure and processes of reality itself*. Panikkar expresses this understanding as follows: 'Pluralism is precisely the recognition that there may be several centers of intelligibility, that the world in which we live is not only a world of concepts but of subjects as well - and subjects cannot be co-opted into objects, much less into concepts, without ceasing to be subjects'.⁸⁰

The ethic of pluralism implied by the above comments enacts itself in

everyday life through effective communication, which I take to be a genuinely *participatory* form of dialogue. Such dialogue entails a twofold assumption, namely, that an individual participant may be committed to the 'truth' of her or his point of view in an absolute normative sense but this commitment does not imply that this particular 'truth' is, in fact, the absolute, universal 'Truth'. The important point here is that this assumption involves no self-contradiction because the nature of reality is fundamentally *relational* and, therefore, in some sense, plural. Thus, borrowing the words of Harold Coward, the suggestion here is that, when one is engaged in a dialogue that is infused with an ethic of pluralism, one is 'able to honor one's own commitment as absolute for oneself and at the same time respect the different absolute commitments of others'.⁸¹ Panikkar expresses a similar idea when he suggests that the 'truth' each of us proclaims in dialogue with others is that of 'a particular language speaking about the general realm of Being'. He refers to this idea as a *pars pro toto* effect which he defines as 'a non-universal way of approaching from one particular perspective the universality we all intend'.⁸²

Given that contemporary societies are becoming increasingly multicultural, the understanding of pluralism as outlined here is an important aspect of allaying the fears of those who mistrust the postmodern endorsement of 'situated knowledges', seeing in it only an invitation to conceptual anarchy or triviality rather than a means of creating the possibility for new kinds of knowledge and societal practices through effective dialogue. Accepting pluralism as an intrinsic quality of life does not necessarily lead to either anarchic or trivial forms of relativism, but it does imply that ambiguity and even conceptual turmoil are often important aspects of learning processes. However, this realization is no cause for alarm, for the often chaotic character of human creativity and the often serendipitous manner in which new knowledge appears remind us that a readiness to accept contradictions and even supposedly irrational ideas is often a precondition for cultivating new and deeper insights. Werner Heisenberg notes that he can conceive of no more 'pointless philosophy' than one which views the world in terms of 'that which we can say clearly' and passes over the rest in silence, adding that 'if we omitted all that is unclear, we would probably be left with

completely uninteresting and trivial tautologies'.⁸³

The idea that development often follows a path of order-arising-out-of-chaos is certainly not new,⁸⁴ but it has been given a vivid contemporary exposition by the theory of dissipative structures of Ilya Prigogine. Prigogine first articulated his theory in the microworld of chemistry and physics, however, when he received the Nobel prize for his work in 1977, the Nobel Committee noted how his ideas helped 'to bridge the gap between biological and social scientific fields of inquiry'.⁸⁵ Briefly, Prigogine's theory outlines how new and higher levels of structural organization emerge out of the perturbations which characterize all evolving states of being. It suggests that, as a result of internal pressures of one kind or another, all evolving structural systems undergo a series of 'bifurcation processes', that is, they enter into a 'far-from-equilibrium' condition and divide into two branches (bifurcate), successively giving rise to more complex patterns which are, in effect, new systems. An important characteristic of these new systems is that they are very sensitive to outside conditions. In Prigogine's words, 'non-equilibrium systems permit matter to "feel" much more in detail the various fields in which it is embedded, be they gravitational, electrical or magnetic'.⁸⁶ As increasingly complex associations occur, 'regions' or 'periods' of chaos become interspersed with regions or periods of order. Somewhat ironically, then, the theory of dissipative structures suggests that it is the internal perturbation within a system that gives rise to its evolution into a higher level of functioning.

Perhaps the most startling and challenging aspect of Prigogine's theory is its broad applicability, for it proposes that certain principles of behaviour are basic to the functioning of molecular, personal, and societal processes, a proposal that boldly confronts the prevailing scientific orthodoxy of keeping matters pertaining to the natural world separate from the world of human beings. As an example relating to human experience, the medical practice of immunization displays the basic principles of dissipative structure theory insofar as it deliberately introduces a disturbance into an organism in order to induce a higher order of biological functioning that is resistant to a particular disease.⁸⁷ At the societal level, a town may be considered a

dissipative structure which evolves towards higher states of organization through processes of responding to its own internal agitation. Other examples abound at all levels of nature. In fact, Joseph Earley suggests that Prigogine's ideas provide a more appropriate framework for considering 'process thought' than any previous type of scientific discourse, and in support of his remark, he lists the following kinds of significant 'unicities' that can be considered dissipative structures: (a) the 'unifications of submicroscopic entities of particle physics that yield stable aggregates', (b) the 'combinations of genes that correspond to viable organisms', and (c) the 'networks of behavior patterns that specify evolutionary stable strategies'.⁸⁸

There is a twofold significance to this wide applicability of dissipative structure theory that is central to the unfolding of ideas in this study: first, it reinforces the idea of the *unity and relatedness* of all phenomena, and second, it reinforces the suggestion that *diversity* within natural systems and the internal disturbances provoked by such diversity generate developmental processes that lead to more advanced levels of organization and functioning. In the light of this twofold suggestion, unity and diversity are not mutually exclusive categories but aspects of the *wholeness* of a reality conceived as an unfolding network of relationships. Accordingly, the epistemological skepticism and the celebration of multiple, unstable, and diffuse identities advocated by many postmodern writers can be understood in terms of perturbations that are a natural aspect of the process of transforming fundamental ideas and values. Furthermore, although much of what is implied by the term postmodernism remains ambiguous and complex, in the context of dissipative structure theory, this ambiguous complexity signifies a movement towards a new unified and more sensitive matrix for thought and action. Consider, for example, how the concept of postmodernism brings together, under a single conceptual roof, a number of ideas, approaches-to-knowing, and behaviours previously considered disparate: how it bridges the chasms not only between academic fields of inquiry that traditionally have little if anything to say to each other but also between academia and popular culture. What other notion, save postmodernism, can be used to refer to 'the decor of a room...a television commercial...the layout of a page in a fashion

magazine or critical journal', as well as to the de-centering of a subject, a general 'attenuation of feeling', a 'fascination for images, codes, and styles, or the 'replacement of unitary power axes by a plurality of power-discourse formations', or the 'collapse of cultural hierarchies'? This enormous range of usage prompts one writer to label postmodernism a 'buzzword'.⁸⁹ However, it prompts others, including myself, to think of it as a 'sensitizing concept'.⁹⁰

In keeping with Jean-Francois Lyotard's famous description of postmodernism as an 'incredulity towards metanarratives' and 'the obsolescence of the metanarrative apparatus of legitimation',⁹¹ the sensibility associated with postmodern thought and action normally has a strong negative flavour. John Storey, for instance refers to the origins of postmodernism in the 1960's as 'a sensibility in revolt against the normalizing function of modernism',⁹² and Norman Denzin writes about 'the postmodern sensibility' in terms of 'doubt that any discourse has a privileged place, any method or theory a universal and general claim to authoritative knowledge'.⁹³ However, there is a positive aspect to this postmodern questioning of cultural hegemonies and denial of universal knowledge claims insofar as these acts *alert* people to the *efficacy of self-reflection*.

In a brief essay, *What is Enlightenment?*, Foucault uses Kant's essay of the same name as a focal point for discussing the importance of sustaining a philosophical 'attitude' of critical reflection on significant contemporary issues and concerns, such as identity, the limits of experience, and the possibility of going beyond these limits. His point is that an 'ethos' of self-reflection is necessary in order to understand 'today' in terms of 'a difference in history and as motive for a particular philosophical task' which, in practice, is an investigation of the relations of power involved in the production of knowledge, what he calls 'the modes of problematization' of how we constitute our subjectivity. Foucault envisions this investigation, or 'genealogy', as he calls it, in terms of three 'axes' of subjectivity: the axis of *knowledge* (how we are constituted as subjects of our own knowledge), the axis of *power* (how we are constituted as subjects who exercise or submit to power relations), and the axis of

ethics (how we are constituted as moral subjects of our own actions).

What is particularly relevant and illuminating about Foucault's discussion of this genealogical method of inquiry is that he describes it as one in which inquirers are 'always in the position of beginning again', in the sense that there is no possibility of a 'complete and definitive knowledge of what may constitute our historical limits'.⁹⁴ This observation harmonizes not only with the ethos of pluralism mentioned earlier but also with a profound spiritual insight, an insight recognized explicitly in Zen Buddhism as *beginner's mind*. In the following passage, Shunryu Suzuki describes a 'beginner's mind' as one that is open to everything because it is not attached to anything, and he associates this condition of being with what he calls the most important aspect of Zen Buddhism, non-dualism.

In Japan we have the phrase *shoshin*, which means 'beginner's mind.' The goal of practice is always to keep our beginner's mind...For Zen students the most important thing is not to be dualistic. Our "original mind" includes everything within itself. It is always rich and sufficient within itself. You should not lose your self-sufficient state of mind. This does not mean a closed mind, but actually an empty mind and a ready mind. If your mind is empty, it is always ready for anything; it is open to everything. In the beginner's mind there are many possibilities; in the expert's mind there are few...The beginner's mind is the mind of compassion. When our mind is compassionate, it is boundless. Dogen-zenji, the founder of our school, always emphasized how important it is to resume our boundless original mind. Then we are always true to ourselves, in sympathy with all beings, and can actually practice...This is also the real secret of the arts: always be a beginner.⁹⁵

Cultivating the kind of open mind Suzuki mentions implies cultivating an aptitude for *non-attachment* to the conditions of everyday life which amounts to an attitude of *self-forgetting*, and 'forgetting ourselves', observes David Loy, 'is how we lose our sense of separation and realize that we are not other than the world'. The Buddhist term *sunyata*, usually translated as 'emptiness', embodies this idea of 'non-separation'. Loy emphasizes, however, that this idea is not merely a 'cognitive notion'. It is, rather, a 'guiding' concept whose aim 'is to deconstruct the self-existence of things' so that a person abandons the struggle to forge an autonomous identity by using the 'things' of life and instead gives her-or-himself up to the

experience of being actualized by them.⁹⁶

In theistic traditions, to be in a state of non-attachment and self-abandonment is to be 'in tune with God', but whether a person's ultimate relationship is with the world (the universe) or with God, to achieve this state requires a commitment to live fully in the present moment. Aldous Huxley refers to this commitment to live in 'the timeless now of the divine Spirit' as the universal 'ground' of the Perennial Philosophy,⁹⁷ for throughout history mystics and religious leaders, as well as poets and philosophers from many different backgrounds and historical periods, have drawn attention to the dangers to our spiritual well-being of becoming overly attached to thoughts and actions related to the passage of time, to both past events and future possibilities. 'He rejoices all the time who rejoices above time and free from time', observes the thirteenth century Christian mystic, Meister Eckhart,⁹⁸ and over a thousand years earlier, a Jewish sage offers similar advice by pointing out the importance of living fully attuned to a present situation: 'Better a single moment of awakening in this world', he observes, 'than eternity in the world to come', because 'the inner peace of the world to come is living in this world with full attention'.⁹⁹

In the present century, trying to understand the nature of time is a focal point not only for many poets, mystics, and philosophers, but also for many scientists, and this situation prompts Arthur Eddington to write that 'in any attempt to bridge the domains of experience belonging to the spiritual and physical sides of our nature, time occupies the key position'.¹⁰⁰ Although Eddington's comment reflects the kind of dualistic language I wish to avoid (inasmuch as it implies, unintentionally I believe, that the spiritual and physical 'sides' of our nature are somehow 'separate'), it draws attention to what I believe is a crucial issue with respect to understanding the nature of being, namely, the relationship between time-consciousness and action. Accordingly, Part Two of this study is devoted entirely to this topic and to my suggestion that living in the 'here and now' of a present situation is the quality or 'way of being' that best nurtures a creative unfolding of human life. Here, my purpose is simply to point out that the efficacy of a present-centered time-consciousness, as embodied in the idea of 'beginner's mind', is supported, on the one

hand, by many spiritual traditions which emphasize the importance of 'non-attachment', and on the other hand, by the postmodern predilection for self-reflective scholarship that is 'alert' to the 'historical sedimentation' of previous thought.¹⁰¹

A particular sample of this historical sedimentation which has significant implications for understanding the postmodern shift away from the conceptual categories of modernism is the notion of the 'autonomous individual'. In practice, it is impossible to be both an autonomous individual and someone who lives with a 'beginner's mind', and in this sense, I suggest that the 'way of being' implied by the idea of 'beginner's mind' provides a spiritual 'grounding' for those aspects of postmodern thought which oppose fixed and stable categorizations, such as autonomy, and instead, celebrate the efficacy of multiple, diffuse, and vulnerable attitudes towards knowing and acting.

'Autonomy', as Iris Marion Young observes, 'is a closed concept, which emphasizes primarily exclusion'. In both the micro politics of everyday life and at the broader societal level, the concept of autonomy suggests that individuals have an inherent 'right to keep others out and to prevent them from interfering in decisions and actions'.¹⁰² To be autonomous, then, is to be independent: self-contained and self-governing. Such independence implies that a person brings to any action a 'concrete' form of identity with specific capabilities and expectations. This understanding of identity is becoming increasingly untenable in the context of recent developments in cultural politics, developments which are unprecedented in terms of pace and scope and which are fuelled primarily by new forms of electronic communication.

In a cogent analysis of these developments, Mark Poster observes that electronically mediated forms of communication, such as computer writing, databases, and television advertising, enact 'a radical reconfiguration of language' and this reconfiguration 'constitutes subjects outside the pattern of the rational, autonomous individual' mediated by print in Western culture. In this new 'mode of information', the familiar modern subject is displaced by one that is 'multiplied, disseminated and decentered, continuously interpellated as an unstable identity'. Moreover, the

emergence of these new expressions of identity coincides with the emergence of political movements associated with the emancipation of the disenfranchised 'others' of Western culture, primarily women, ethnic minorities, gays, and lesbians. Thus, Poster suggests that this confluence of historical, technological, and political influences 'may lead to a fundamental challenge to modern social institutions and structures', and responding to this challenge implies a need 'to understand the forms of agency appropriate to a dispersed, multiple subject'.¹⁰³ My suggestion here is that cultivating an open, beginner's mind is a way of satisfying this need that brings with it the wisdom of many spiritual traditions.

In contrast to the independency implied by the notion of the autonomous individual, to be infused with the quality of a beginner's mind is to act as a person who is *interdependent*. Such a person is someone for whom 'identity' (if it has any meaning at all) depends on an ongoing process of interaction, someone who brings to each interaction a kind of *readiness of mind* to understand and to accept things 'as they are' at a present moment. Shunryu Suzuki refers to this form of mindfulness as 'soft' and 'imperturbable' thinking, and to those who might think of it as weak or, at best, overly vulnerable, he points out that 'this kind of thinking is always stable' because it does not 'divide' thought according to preconceived patterns but remains open and boundless, potentially able to interact with everything that can be known, with all of reality.¹⁰⁴ Such mindfulness is similar to the notion of 'poverty of spirit' highlighted in Christ's 'Sermon on the Mount' and much celebrated by Christian writers. Johannes Metz, for instance, suggests that 'every *genuine human encounter* must be inspired by poverty of spirit', and in such encounters 'we must forget ourselves in order to let the other person approach us'. It is only by risking 'the poverty of openness', he adds, that our lives can be 'graced with the warm fullness of human existence'.¹⁰⁵

'Risking the poverty of openness' implies a willingness to subject established patterns of thought and action to the needs of a given moment. Postmodern writers express such willingness in their work when they point out how entrenched categories of modern theory and practice place serious limitations on personal and collective

behaviour and when they advocate a kind of 'radical reflexivity' as a way of undermining the 'totalizing effect' of these entrenched positions.¹⁰⁶ *'It is not theory but life that matters'*, observes Foucault, *'not knowledge, but reality'*.¹⁰⁷ By honouring the fragility and vulnerability of knowledge claims in this way, postmodern writers honour 'the amazing efficacy of discontinuous, particular and local criticism',¹⁰⁸ which means that they celebrate the pluralistic character of human societies.

In commenting on the work of Gianni Vattimo, Barry Smart reinforces this observation by noting that postmodern philosophy represents a weakening of traditional metaphysics and, therefore, an emancipation from the principle of a universal reality, an emancipation that takes the form of a 'liberation of differences'. However, the important issue here is how to nurture the 'ethics of interpretation' that inevitably accompanies this liberation of differences. As Vattimo points out, a major unanswered question posed by postmodern philosophy is whether individuals and societies can overcome their 'deep-seated nostalgia for the reassuring' (that is, the traditional concepts and modes of action of the past) and respond positively to contingency 'as an opportunity to a new way of being (finally, perhaps) human'.¹⁰⁹

Responding positively to contingency is, of course, a moral question, and as such, pertains to how a person self-reflectively understands her or his relationship with others and with the world in general. Throughout this study I refer to a concept of *participatory consciousness* which I believe provides a viable framework for understanding morality in the context of today's multicultural societies. The point I wish to emphasize here is that actualizing a morality based on a participatory 'way of being' involves overcoming the intense individualism engrained in Western culture. This individualism derives to a large extent from the objectifying tendencies of the scientific-technical worldview, and it generates a culturally sanctioned apathy and in many cases an aversion towards those considered as 'other'. However, as suggested by the observations and comments presented here, a new worldview is emerging, one that uproots this individualism by recognizing the efficacy of conceiving reality in terms of a 'diversity-in-unity'. What this worldview implies, then, is that, because all

phenomena are interrelated, there is no such 'thing' as a self-contained, autonomous individual, and accordingly, there is nothing - no thing - that is completely 'other'.

As the familiarity of John Donne's observation that 'no man is an island' suggests, Western culture has not lacked expressions of this insight about the participatory nature of reality. In fact, such expressions are probably among the oldest in all of human history, for what can be more fundamentally human than the sense that one is part of a *communion of persons*? It is even likely that this feeling of communion with others is the underlying experience that gives rise to the different world religions and traditions of spirituality. The word 'spirit' means 'life breath' and implies an experience of being 'fully alive', and the word 'religio' means either 'to gather' or 'to bind' things together, which implies that people come together to celebrate common practices and beliefs. At the core of the religious experience, then, is the intrinsically spiritual insight that life is fundamentally a coming-together, a communing with others.

Thus, when a contemporary mystic looks out into the world and sees that 'all is one, united in a simple vision of being', and when a renowned physicist looks into his own feelings and discovers that, contrary to 'ordinary reason', all conscious beings 'are all in all', and when postmodern philosophers assert that there can be no completely independent 'author' and that 'any piece of writing, any author, is "filled" with the writings of others' because 'all of us are indebted to others...all of us are "in" others', each is reflecting a spiritual insight, probably older than the earliest records of human activity.¹¹⁰

The significant point here is that these expressions of interdependency emanate not only from religious sources but also from secular bodies of inquiry, which suggests that there is a recognizable opening in the wall erected by the materialistic worldview of the modern age between matter and spirit. As we look through this opening, I suggest we can see that *all* phenomena display a texture of diversity-in-unity that is spiritual in nature because it is this very texture that is the life-blood, the 'spirit' of reality. Thus, the idea proposed here, and which recurs throughout this dissertation as one of its major themes, is that *the nature of reality is spiritual*. As a

brief initial elaboration of this theme and as a way of bringing this chapter about the emerging worldview to a close, here are a few comments and observations on the spiritual nature of reality.

On the Spiritual Nature of Reality

To illustrate and explain his belief that reality is fundamentally spiritual, Arthur Eddington first asks the question, 'Is the ocean composed of water or of waves or of both?' He then responds to this question in the following manner:

At least if we declare our belief that the nature of the ocean is aqueous, it is not likely that anyone will challenge us and assert that on the contrary its nature is undulatory, or that it is a dualism part aqueous and part undulatory. Similarly, I assert that *the nature of all reality is spiritual*, not material nor a dualism of matter and spirit. The hypothesis that its nature can be, to any degree, material does not enter into my reckoning, because as we now understand matter, the putting together of the adjective "material" and the noun "nature" does not make sense.

Interpreting the term material (or more strictly, physical) in the broadest sense as that with which we can become acquainted through sensory experience of the external world, we recognise now that it corresponds to the waves, not to the water of the ocean of reality. My answer does not deny the existence of the physical world, any more than the answer that the ocean is made of water denies the existence of ocean waves.¹¹¹

Eddington's remarks suggest that to describe reality in terms of matter *and* spirit is like describing the ocean in terms of waves *and* water. The implication is clear: just as what is fundamental about the ocean is its water-nature, what is fundamental about reality is its spiritual nature. Moreover, just as whatever is part of the ocean 'behaves' in a water-like way, all expressions of being behave in a spiritual way, that is, as expressions of what might be called the spiritual 'energy' of the universe. Teilhard de Chardin describes this underlying spiritual energy by observing that 'right at its base, the living world is constituted by consciousness clothed in flesh and bone. From the biosphere to the species is nothing but an immense ramification of psychism seeking for itself through different forms'.¹¹² Larry Dossey makes a similar claim when discussing the medical implications of Prigogine's ideas about dissipative structures. 'We can now talk about a *human physics*', he writes, because

we can talk about a science in which ‘molecules and human beings behave in similar ways’.¹¹³

The idea that molecules and human beings behave in similar ways evokes a vision of reality which Danah Zohar describes as one which ‘transcends the dichotomy between mind and body, or between inner and outer, by showing us that the basic building blocks of mind...and the basic building blocks of matter...are engaged in a mutually creative dialogue whose roots can be traced back to the very heart of reality creation’.¹¹⁴ That this underlying unity of mind and matter appears in any way astonishing testifies to the impact of scientific materialism upon the collective consciousness of modern societies, specifically, to the way the objectifying methodology of science leads to a view of reality that is essentially fragmented. As David Bohm notes, ‘humans have attempted to live according to the notion that the fragments are separate, when in fact they are not’.¹¹⁵

Overcoming this tendency to fragment what is fundamentally whole is a concern that animates this entire dissertation, and in the following chapter this concern is presented in the context of suggesting that an allegiance to the hierarchical view of reality contributes significantly to the perpetuation of fragmented and fragmenting thought and action.

Chapter Three

Pondering the Meaning of the 'Particular': A Consideration of Hierarchy as a Paradigm for Reality

Ultimately, there are no parts at all. What we call a part is merely a pattern in an inseparable web of relationships.
(Fritjof Capra)¹¹⁶

After sunset, on the terraces of the palace, Marco Polo expounded to the sovereign the results of his missions...Dawn had broken when he said: "Sire, now I have told you about all the cities I know."

"There is still one of which you never speak."

Marco Polo bowed his head.

"Venice," the Khan said.

Marco smiled. "What else do you think I have been talking to you about?"

The emperor did not turn a hair. "And yet I have never heard you mention that name."

"And Polo said: "Every time I describe a city I am saying something about Venice."

(Italo Calvino)¹¹⁷

Invisible Cities, a book by Italo Calvino that defies literary classification, is a remarkable collection of metaphysical anecdotes, images, and meditations that unfolds a metaphor for what it means to be different, to be 'particular' in the context of an all-encompassing and multifaceted whole. If you imagine the world of human experience as a vast empire of conquered lands and peoples, presided over by a warrior-emperor of consummate, unequivocal authority, and if you imagine exploring that world as a merchant-traveller-adventurer who lives by visiting many different cities and territories, partaking of the various ways and wares of life and ultimately connecting them all through the business of buying and selling and the delight of telling stories, and if you then imagine a meeting between this emperor and this traveller, in a garden, late in the day, at a time when it seems as if this empire, which had once seemed to be 'the sum of all wonders', is now 'an endless, formless ruin', you have the framework for Calvino's metaphorical vision, a vision that brings together the proto-typical warrior-king, Kublai Khan, and the proto-typical merchant-traveller, Marco Polo.

My interpretation of Calvino's metaphor is that it is mainly a reflection of the

tenor of late twentieth century life, but in that reflection can be seen those times or moments in the lives of any society or individual when, after a seemingly boundless expansion of horizons, feelings of pride give way to a more reflective awareness that 'conquered territories', be they of mind or matter, bring with them not only new insights and potential for growth, but also, mysteries of unimaginable scope, new complexities, and new possibilities for decay. Thus, the emperor in this metaphor is an aged conqueror and ruler, burdened with 'the melancholy and relief of knowing' he shall soon 'give up any thought of knowing and understanding' the complexities of his empire. But there is something about the many tales of remarkable cities that Marco Polo describes to him which suggests that, perhaps, there is a pattern, a meaningful thread of understanding, that can provide a sense of hopefulness in the midst of his growing disenchantment.¹¹⁸

This pattern, I suggest, conveys an understanding of how the various expressions of being exist within and are sustained by an overarching and unfolding relationship of interdependence. At one point Marco Polo says to Kublai Khan, 'travelling, you realize that differences are lost: each city takes to resembling all cities, places exchange their form, order, distances, a shapeless dust cloud invades the continents'. However, he adds immediately that, in the emperor's atlas, in the official reckoning of how things are, the differences are preserved intact.¹¹⁹ If one sees the emperor's atlas as a symbol for the rational, scientific mind of the modern era, the implication here is that what appears to be different to the eye of the rational intellect, is, in reality, only a kind of 'abstraction', a form of understanding that gives expression to one aspect of a multifaceted underlying matrix of relationships. David Bohm expresses this idea succinctly when he observes that 'one must have difference to have relationship', which means, in effect, that 'difference is an abstraction which allows you to express relationship'.¹²⁰ Thus, in Calvino's metaphor, the different cities and people that Polo describes are particular expressions of a larger interconnected whole. In the following excerpt, both the world-weary emperor and world-intoxicated merchant-traveller consider the ramifications of this idea as they begin to sense the difficulty of distinguishing between that which is 'inside' and that

which is 'outside' the realm of particular experiences.

KUBLAI: I do not know when you have had time to visit all the countries you describe to me. It seems to me you have never moved from this garden.

POLO: Everything I see and do assumes meaning in a mental space where the same calm reigns as here, the same penumbra, the same silence streaked by the rustling of leaves. At the moment when I concentrate and reflect, I find myself again, always, in this garden, at this hour of the evening, in your august presence, though I continue, without a moment's pause, moving up a river green with crocodiles or counting the barrels of salted fish being lowered into the hold.

KUBLAI: I, too, am not sure I am here, strolling among the porphyry fountains, listening to the plashing echo, and not riding, caked with sweat and blood, at the head of my army, conquering the lands you will have to describe, or cutting off the fingers of the attackers scaling the walls of a besieged fortress.

POLO: Perhaps this garden exists only in the shadow of our lowered eyelids, and we have never stopped: you, from raising dust on the fields of battle; and I from bargaining for sacks of pepper in distant bazaars. But each time we half close our eyes, in the midst of the din and the throng, we are allowed to withdraw here, dressed in silk kimonos, to ponder what we are seeing and living, to draw conclusions, to contemplate from the distance.

KUBLAI: Perhaps this dialogue of ours is taking place between two beggars nicknamed Kublai Khan and Marco Polo; as they sift through a rubbish heap, piling up rusted flotsam, scraps of cloth, wastepaper, while drunk on the few sips of bad wine, they see all the treasure of the East shine around them.

POLO: Perhaps all that is left of the world is a wasteland covered with rubbish heaps, and the hanging garden of the Great Khan's palace. It is our eyelids that separate them, but we cannot know which is inside and which is outside.¹²¹

To not know which is inside and which is outside is to experience non-duality. As recorded for many centuries by mystics, poets, philosophers, and spiritual leaders, this experience of 'oneness with the universe' is treasured for its capacity to generate meaning, purpose, and creativity in everyday living, but in the context of present-day societies, it receives little significant nurturance given the dominating influence of the scientific-technical worldview and its propensity for categorizing everything in terms

of objective, separate, and autonomous entities. However, as suggested in the previous chapter, the recent emergence of ecologically sensitive insight within and across many fields of inquiry suggests that the prospect of infusing the whole spectrum of human understanding with a nondualistic vision of reality is becoming increasingly tangible. Wolfgang Pauli refers to the actualizing of this prospect as the 'mythos' of our time. He writes:

Warned by the miscarriage of all premature endeavors after unity in the history of human thought, I shall not venture to make predictions about the future. But, contrary to the strict division of the activity of the human spirit into separate departments...I consider the ambition of overcoming opposites, including also a synthesis embracing both rational understanding and the mystical experience of unity, to be the mythos, spoken or unspoken, of our present day and age'.¹²²

Overcoming opposites is also at the heart of Panikkar's vision of human wisdom as the *art and science of life* which converts 'lethal tensions' into 'creative polarities' without wanting 'to reduce everything to one'.¹²³ In the light of this understanding, differences (polarities) - such as those between masculine and feminine, rich and poor, good and bad, body and soul, thinking and doing, God and me - are conceived and experienced not as independent and opposing forces seeking self-expression but as particular and *interdependent* aspects of a creative relationship. The reality suggested by this idea of interdependency is one in which all phenomena express individuality by expressing relationship, that is, each expression of being is an expression of the larger whole of which it is a part: each being *actualizes* the presence of the whole.

This idea - that 'being' is an actualizing presence of the whole of reality - suggests that the nature of 'being' can be understood in terms of an *icon*. The symbolism of an icon 'is held to effect the presence of the saint or mystery depicted'.¹²⁴ In theistic terms, an icon reflects an interpenetration of God (as Creator) and the world of created beings. Just as an object is infused with and illumined by light, an icon is infused with and illumined by God, understood here as *the source of light*, the source of the spirit that animates all life. The implication here

is that each being is an incarnation of spiritual life that expresses what might be called an 'iconic quality of being', a quality which implies that each being is a particular illumination of 'creative life' that unfolds within a created reality that is a sometimes splendid, sometimes horrific, but always meaningful 'diversity-in-unity'.

Before exploring this conception of being in greater detail, it is important to make a crucial preliminary clarification, for what I am proposing here implies that it is misleading to think of the relationship between individual expressions of being and the whole of reality in terms of a *hierarchy* of interrelated but essentially nonequivalent parts, that is, in terms of 'higher' and 'lower' manifestations. The etymology of the word 'hierarchy' (from the ancient Greek words 'heiros', meaning holy, and 'arkhos', meaning leader) suggests that its original meaning did not relate primarily to an ascending scale of excellence but to the idea of governing individual and/or collective understanding and action according to sacred principles, that is, according to principles emanating or 'descending' from a source of ultimate goodness or value. Such was the meaning of hierarchy as conceived by the pseudo-Dionysius, the author who first highlighted the term in Western thought by using it in connection with his attempt to reconcile neoplatonism with early Christianity, most probably in the later years of the fifth century.¹²⁵ In subsequent years, the idea of being governed by holy principles obviously became associated with being governed by the authority of the Catholic Church as organized into a system of ecclesiastical orders or ranks, and it was this association which undoubtedly led to the current meaning of hierarchy as a classification according to authority or rank.

Under the impact of our current scientific-technical worldview, which

legitimizes human efforts to exert control over nature, to conceive the immense variety and diversity of life in terms of a hierarchy of increasingly authoritative orders of being implies that superior orders have a greater claim to existence than inferior ones because they possess more of what nature has to offer. However, in the history of Western thought, the diversity of life, often referred to as ‘the great chain of being’, was not always interpreted in this hierarchical manner, that is, it was not always conceived in terms of superiority and inferiority, of ‘more’ and ‘less’, for there are many indications that diversity has often been understood in the context of universal completeness or ‘plenitude’. The point of view I am supporting here draws on this long tradition of belief in the plenitude of life, a belief which affirms that reality is truly an intact wholeness. Given such a reality, to use concepts such as ‘superior’ and ‘inferior’ (‘more’ and ‘less’) as a foundational context for understanding reality is to ground one’s understanding in a way of thinking geared towards division and, ultimately, fragmentation.

Emerson calls the ‘distinction between More and Less’ the ‘radical tragedy of nature’.¹²⁶ Nevertheless, belief in the hierarchical view of reality has been and continues to be intense and widespread. Indeed, some scholars, such as Huston Smith, regard the idea of ‘reality as consisting of graded levels of being’, that is, *a tiered reality*, as ‘the central surmise’ of human thought when the full range of experience is ‘legitimated and pondered profoundly’.¹²⁷ Because of its prominence, then, the concept of hierarchy as a paradigmatic expression of reality ought to be considered before the contrasting view proposed in this study is elaborated, and presenting such a

consideration is the purpose of this chapter.

To begin this discussion I offer a brief summary of a work by Arthur O. Lovejoy that traces major themes in Western thought relating to the great chain of being. This work is important because it illustrates that there are many examples of significant contributions to Western thought which do not equate the structural diversity of life with hierarchy, that is, which do not understand reality primarily as comprised of beings who partake of either a greater or lesser share of the 'fullness of being'. On the contrary, in keeping with the ideas expressed in this dissertation, these contributions emphasize that 'one thing alone is needful: Everything. The rest is vanity of vanities'.¹²⁸ Following this historical introduction, I explore influential contemporary expositions of hierarchy, principally those of Ken Wilber and Arthur Koestler, and subsequently highlight what I consider the major limitation of the hierarchical viewpoint, namely, its confusion of means and ends.

The 'Great Chain of Being' in Western Thought: Footnotes to Plato

Of systems possible if 'tis confest
That wisdom infinite must form the best,

...all must full or not coherent be,
And all that rises, rise in due degree.

...Vast chain of being! which from God began,
Natures aethereal, human, angel, man,
Beast, bird, fish, insect, what no eye can see,
No glass can reach; from Infinite to thee,
From thee to nothing. - On superior pow'rs
Were we to press, inferior might on ours;
Or in the full creation leave a void,
Where, one step broken, the great scale's destroy'd;
From Nature's chain whatever link you strike,
Tenth, or ten thousandth, breaks the chain alike. (Alexander Pope)¹²⁹

Arthur Lovejoy's *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* is a record of the William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1932-33. The focus of these lectures is the history of Western concepts related to the issue of 'the one and the many', or more precisely, the issue of how the vast display of 'differentness' manifested throughout the universe can be understood in the context of an intelligible unity.

Lovejoy organizes his historical treatment of this issue in a way that illustrates Alfred North Whitehead's remark that 'the safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato', and Plato's role in Western thought is best understood, according to Lovejoy, in the light of two 'irreconcilable' propositions, namely, an 'antithesis of other-worldliness and this-worldliness'. The 'other-worldly' aspect of this antithesis equates the idea of an Absolute 'good', or God, with a being who is self-sufficient and eternal, whereas the 'this-worldly' aspect understands God as a being 'whose essential nature' required the existence of all kinds of other beings 'which could find a place in the descending scale of the possibilities of reality'. Taken together, these two aspects of a divine Absolute, or 'two-gods-in-one', represent what Lovejoy refers to as Plato's principle of *plenitude*. Essentially, this principle suggests that 'a timeless and incorporeal One' is the 'logical ground' and 'the dynamic source of the existence of a temporal and material and extremely multiple and variegated universe'.¹³⁰ In the words of the *Timaeus*, this principle of plenitude is summarized as follows:

Let us therefore state the reason why the framer of this universe of change framed it all. He was good, and what is good has no particle of envy in it; being therefore without envy he wished all things to be as like himself as possible...For god's purpose was to use as his model the highest and most completely perfect of intelligible things, and so he created a single visible living being, containing within itself all living beings of the same natural order. Are we then right to speak of one universe, or would it be more correct to speak of a plurality or infinity? ONE is right...for that which comprises all intelligible beings cannot have a double. There would have to be another being comprising them both, of which both were parts, and it would be correct to call our world a copy not of them but of the being which comprised them. In order therefore that our universe should resemble the perfect living creature in being unique, the maker did not make two universes or an infinite number, but

our universe was and is and will continue to be his only creation.¹³¹

As developed throughout the history of Western thought, this principle of plenitude refers to the idea that 'everything that logically can be must and will be', that is, our world, as far as we can know it, must be conceived as a totality that encompasses all possible beings and all possible experiences in one unbroken chain of being. In the light of the principle of plenitude, the image of the great chain of being is an image of an organic wholeness, of a living expression of 'diversity-in-unity', and accordingly, it ought not to be equated with a structural hierarchy in which the relationship between the parts and the whole is one of inequality, some parts possessing more of the fullness of the whole than others. Thus, plenitude, which emphasizes wholeness, differs significantly from hierarchy, which emphasizes gradation. Furthermore, the concept of plenitude *includes* the reality of 'differentness', that is, it incorporates the immense diversity of all *actual* and all *possible* life, whereas hierarchical perspectives towards reality normally *exclude* the possibility of anything existing that is not actual, as Aristotle does when he comments in the *Metaphysics* that 'it is not necessary that everything that is possible should exist in actuality', that is, 'it is possible for that which has a potency not to realize it'.¹³²

In spite of these basic differences, both plenitude and hierarchy have been associated with the great chain of being because both pertain to the issue of 'the one and the many'. My intention here, then, is to use Lovejoy's historical survey of the idea of the great chain of being as a means of sorting out and identifying several major interpretations of it which emphasize either plenitude or hierarchy.

A note of clarification, however, seems warranted, because in his concluding analysis of this history, Lovejoy, unlike myself, rejects the principle of plenitude. In opposition to philosophical positions emanating directly from Plato's doctrine of Ideas - positions which suggest that the world of concrete experience is, in some sense, the reflection of a more encompassing world of absolute and eternal essence - Lovejoy maintains that, because our world is in essence a *temporal* one, our experiences within it cannot be rendered intelligible by modelling it on a realm of *eternal*

essence.¹³³ However, he adds that, although he cannot accept the validity of Plato's vision of reality, this vision has had 'many happy consequences in the history of Western thought', consequences which he associates with the 'polemic against the whole conception of the Chain of Being',¹³⁴ but which I associate with those positions that support and expand upon Plato's seminal insight with respect to the plenitude of life.

The first major exploration and expansion of Plato's thought is contained, of course, in the work of Aristotle. As Lovejoy points out, the graded or hierarchical arrangement of all beings 'remains in Plato only a vague tendency, not a definitely formulated doctrine', but for Aristotle, the universe is characterized fundamentally in terms of both *gradation*, inasmuch as all individual things can be understood in the context of a graded scale of nature (*scala naturae*), and *continuity*, inasmuch as there is considerable overlap between different orders of being within this scale and, therefore, no clear lines of demarcation, that is, 'nature makes no leaps'.¹³⁵ It is the work of Aristotle, then, that specifically adds the hierarchical dimensions of gradation and continuity to Plato's interpretation of the great chain of being in terms of plenitude.

In the works of the neoplatonists of the late Roman and early Christian period, this threefold understanding of reality in terms of plenitude, gradation, and continuity becomes, according to Lovejoy, 'fully organized into a coherent scheme of things'. Writing in the early fifth century of the common era, Macrobius offers a succinct reflection of the philosophy of Plotinus in the following passage which Lovejoy maintains 'was probably one of the chief vehicles' through which the image of the great chain of being was transmitted to medieval writers.¹³⁶

Since, from the Supreme God Mind arises, and from Mind, Soul, and since this in turn creates all subsequent things and fills them all with life, and since this single radiance illumines all and is reflected in each, as a single face might be reflected in many mirrors placed in a series; and since all things follow in continuous succession, degenerating in sequence to the very bottom of the series, the attentive observer will discover a connection of parts, from the Supreme God down to the last dregs of things, mutually linked together and without a break.¹³⁷

Lovejoy contends that this multi-levelled understanding of reality contains two irreconcilable conceptions of the 'good'. On the one hand, the good can be conceived in terms of an 'ascending process' towards assimilation or unity with God as the one supreme and self-sufficient Good. On the other hand, the good can be conceived in terms of a 'descending' or emanating process in which God is a supreme being of self-transcending and generative Goodness as well as the 'source and informing energy of that descending process by which being flows through all levels of possibility down to the very lowest'. The main implication of emphasizing the ascending aspect of the chain of being is that 'the lower grades of being' have only 'the use that belongs to steps', namely, 'things to be spurned and transcended'. Accordingly, this orientation emphasizes a graded or hierarchical conception of reality. In contrast, the main implication of emphasizing the descending or emanating aspect of the chain of being is that 'the existence of each of these grades is a thing so good on its own account that God himself had been, so to say, constrained...to engender every one of them', clearly a point of view that expresses a wholeness orientation towards reality.¹³⁸

In Lovejoy's opinion, these two conceptions of the good compete with one another in the works of the major medieval theologians, with the idea of the 'good' as a ladder-like ascent towards the perfection of God achieving, in the end, precedence over the idea of 'goodness' as an emanation from God. In his view, then, it was primarily an 'otherworldly' and hierarchical orientation towards the great chain of being that 'determined the ethical teaching of the Church' and 'shaped the assumptions concerning man's chief end' in the Middle Ages. Nevertheless, Lovejoy also maintains that throughout this period 'there were at least kept alive...certain roots of an essentially 'this-worldly' philosophy', namely, 'the assumption that there is a true and intrinsic multiplicity in the divine nature' and that 'the very essence of the good consists in the maximal actualization of variety', which implies that the world of temporal and sensible experience is not merely 'good' but, in reality, 'the supreme manifestation of the divine'.¹³⁹

In the sixteenth century, Giordano Bruno was perhaps the principal

philosopher who kept alive this view of an infinitely diverse universe emanating from the supreme goodness or fecundity of God - although he was executed as a heretic for his beliefs. In the following century, Leibniz and Spinoza advocated a similar endorsement of this principle of plenitude, and as Lovejoy points out, Spinoza's treatment of this idea was perhaps the most uncompromising. Spinoza taught that 'everything shared in the same completely sufficient reason for being that the existence of God was by most philosophers conceived to possess', that is, 'everything that logically can be must, by the eternal logical nature of things, have been, and have been precisely as it is'. In contrast to this view, the opinion of perhaps the most influential philosopher of the age, René Descartes, was that the existence of things depends not on the necessary generative goodness of God but on the divine 'will' to create them. For Descartes, 'there is nothing is the essence or 'nature' of something which makes it 'intrinsically necessary' to be the way it is, for all things are 'determined solely by the will of God, who, as sovereign legislator, has ordained and established them from all eternity'. This view of a supreme being at the summit of a hierarchy of beings is reiterated by a contemporary of Descartes, the poet John Milton. In *Paradise Lost* Milton writes that God's 'goodness was free to act or not' - words which emphasize the absolute supremacy of God by drawing attention to the 'motivelessness of the deity's creative power'.¹⁴⁰

This idea that the existence of things depends solely on God's will highlights the question of whether each link in the great chain of being has an equal claim to existence, that is, whether each level of being, whether high, medium, or low, exists for its own sake or primarily for the benefit of the so-called superior levels of being. Closely associated with this question is the issue of what place humanity occupies in the grand scheme of things. Because these concerns were a major occupation of eighteenth century thinkers, Lovejoy suggests that it was throughout the 1700's that the three major aspects of the great chain of being - plenitude, gradation, and continuity - received 'their widest diffusion and acceptance'.¹⁴¹

For example: In keeping with the principle of plenitude, which implies that 'the completeness of the cosmic scheme as a whole' is the 'true *raison d'être* of the

universe', many eighteenth century writers echo the observation of Leibniz that the 'inequality of conditions is not to be counted among evils', that is, all links in the great chain of being make an essential contribution to the 'cosmic spectacle' of 'infinite richness and diversity'. As Lovejoy remarks, an important ethical and political consequence of this point of view is that any demand for equality among persons may be considered 'contrary to nature' because each person has her or his 'independent reason for being', and thus, 'in the final account, none was more important than any other' because each has a particular 'claim to respect and consideration'.¹⁴² By implication, this principle of 'subordination without subservience' can be extended throughout the great of being. However, in contrast to this principle, but in keeping with the hierarchical ideas of gradation and continuity developed during the Middle Ages and Renaissance, there was also a tendency in eighteenth century thought which considered the levels of being which are 'lower' than humanity to be subservient in the sense that they existed 'for the sake of' humanity. The following passage from a Protestant theological work first published in 1684, which Lovejoy notes was much admired in the eighteenth century, typifies this tendency.

If we consider closely what constitutes the excellence of the fairest parts of the Universe, we shall find that they have value only in their relation to us, only in so far as our soul attaches value to them; that the esteem of men is what constitutes the chief dignity of rocks and metals, that men's use and pleasure gives their value to plants, trees, and fruits.¹⁴³

It is informative to compare this attitude of superiority towards levels of being considered inferior to humanity with attitudes which accompanied developments in eighteenth century biology and microbiology. Lovejoy observes that, from the end of the sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth centuries, naturalists made it their chief scientific task to organize 'all living beings, animal or vegetable, into a hierarchy of collective units'. In his discussion of this scientific endeavour, Lovejoy draws attention to certain distinctive ideas which pertain directly to eighteenth century attitudes towards understanding the place humanity occupies within the great chain of being. One of these ideas can be illustrated by noting a remark by John Locke: 'Our

distinguishing substances into species by names', writes Locke, 'is not at all founded on their real essences; nor can we pretend to range and determine them exactly into species, according to essential internal differences'. What Locke means here is that because there are no 'precise and unmovable boundaries set by nature', the organization of various species is an arbitrary project, that is, the boundaries that define particular species are products of human investigation and are not in nature as particular essences. Another closely related idea that Lovejoy identifies with developments in eighteenth century biology is that 'the gradation from one order of beings to another, is so imperceptible, that it is impossible to lay the line that shall distinctly mark the boundaries of each'. The implication here is that, because all classifications 'are the work, not of nature, but of ourselves', there are 'in the scale of our world as many steps as there are individuals'.¹⁴⁴ To summarize his thoughts about the influence of eighteenth century biology on attitudes towards the great chain of being, Lovejoy notes the following:

Thus the general habit of thinking in terms of species, as well as the sense of the separation of man from the rest of the animal creation, was beginning to break down in the eighteenth century. In an age in which, more than in any preceding period, the principle of continuity was reckoned among the first and fundamental truths, it could not have been otherwise. And the change was a pregnant one for science and for other provinces of thought.¹⁴⁵

One of the chief indications that the eighteenth century was indeed an age preoccupied with affirming continuity in nature was the interest among both professional scientists and the general public in searching for the so-called 'missing links' within the great chain of being. In the light of this pursuit, with its discovery of various strands of life that have either ceased to be or remain to be observed and its supposition that many more may arise in the future, it is not surprising that for some the ongoing effort to fathom the 'completeness' (or plenitude) of nature came to be conceived, as Lovejoy points out, 'not as the inventory but as the program of nature', that is, as a process 'which is being carried out gradually and exceedingly slowly in the cosmic history'. Thus, one of the most significant developments in eighteenth century thought is the *temporalization* of the great chain of being, and one of the

major aspects of this development is the attempt to reconcile the idea of an *eternal* plenitude (that is, the necessary and complete realization of all possible beings) with the fact that 'the concrete world *is* temporal' and, therefore, apparently not eternal.¹⁴⁶ This attempt brings to the fore the antithesis of 'otherworldly' and 'thisworldly' perspectives which Lovejoy identifies as the main characteristic of Plato's philosophy that has dominated Western thought about the great chain of being.

For Lovejoy, a particularly clear illustration of this antithesis is embodied in the philosophy of Leibniz. On the one hand, Leibniz adopts an 'otherworldly' perspective towards reality that is characterized not by hierarchy (as is the case with the otherworldly perspective of the Middle Ages) but by plenitude, for in his theory of monads (which he conceives as the basic individual soul-like substances that make up the universe) and in his study of embryology, he affirms that 'in a certain sense, every being which ever exists in nature has always existed in it', which is an affirmation that can be viewed as belonging to the same stream of thought as Plato's eternal order of Ideas. Moreover, because he maintains that the number of individual monads or 'substances' is constant, Leibniz contends that 'the soul of every animal has pre-existed', and, therefore, every individual birth is essentially a 'transformation' from a previous ancestor, normally within the same species, but occasionally from one species to another. In contrast to this vision of universal plenitude, Lovejoy maintains that Leibniz also adopts a 'thisworldly' and hierarchical perspective towards reality insofar as he teaches that it is with the increase of empirical knowledge that 'we attain to the most important truths of metaphysics and of natural theology', the truth here being 'that of the general *progressiveness* of the universe'. In Lovejoy's opinion, this 'doctrine of universal and personal progress' implies that, for Leibniz, the process of time is, in effect, 'a continuous augmentation of realized values' that constitutes 'the *most* significant aspect of reality', and, accordingly, it reflects a hierarchical view that is contrary to that implied by the eternal order of Ideas, for if all of nature advanced, the lower levels of the great chain of being are destined to be left vacant, and, therefore, must be of less value.¹⁴⁷

Lovejoy's depiction of internal inconsistency in the work of Leibniz is, of

course, open to question. However, my purpose here is not to engage in a critical discussion of Lovejoy's philosophical opinions. Rather, it is simply to draw upon the wealth of historical detail he offers as a means of tracking certain strands of Western thought pertaining to either a wholeness or hierarchical orientation towards the diversity of life. Accordingly, the important point here is that his evaluation of Leibniz mirrors his evaluation of Plato inasmuch as he contends that both philosophers espouse otherworldly and thisworldly perspectives, and, therefore, endorse ideas relating to both universal plenitude and hierarchy. Furthermore, in his examination of the relationship between Romanticism and the great chain of being, Lovejoy projects a similar juxtaposition of contrasting orientations towards the nature of reality. For instance, in commenting on the work of Friedrich von Schiller, he points out that it portrays human nature as partaking of two 'opposing' characteristics of the divine nature: The first characteristic can be called a demand for *unity* and for *form* as conceived in the context of an eternal order of abstract, universal ideals. A pure form, observes Schiller, 'can never exact at one time anything but what it exacts and requires forever'. The second characteristic can be called a demand for *diversity* and for the 'fullness of concrete, particularized content'. The implication here is that these two aspects of the nature of reality are 'equally indispensable to the attainment of excellence, in character and in art', and yet they are 'forever at war' with one another.¹⁴⁸

In his discussion of how these contrasting orientations manifest themselves in Romanticism, Lovejoy suggests that 'more than any other *one* thing', what has distinguished the prevailing assumptions 'of the nineteenth and of our own century from those of the preceding period' is the idea that 'diversity itself is of the essence of excellence'. One way of interpreting this idea metaphysically implies universal plenitude inasmuch as it suggests that the Absolute is displayed in terms of 'concrete universals', that is, each and every individual being mirrors in some unique way the entire realm of being.¹⁴⁹ This is, in fact, how Friedrich Schleiermacher characterizes the essential aspect of his philosophical position, as expressed in the following words.

My powers have long been striving to draw nearer to the All; when shall I embrace it in action and in contemplation, and achieve an inner union with the All which is within me?...So there came to me what is now my highest insight. It became clear to me that every man should exemplify humanity in his own way, in a unique mixture of elements, so that humanity may be manifested in *all* ways and everything become actual which in the fullness of infinity can proceed from its womb.¹⁵⁰

However, Schleiermacher's orientation towards fullness or plenitude is by no means the only interpretation of diversity characteristic of Romanticism. As Lovejoy points out, the idea that the world is a better place the more 'it manifests the possibilities of differentness in human nature' can also imply that it is the 'duty' of each individual 'to cherish and intensify' her or his particular differentness from others. Friedrich von Schlegel exemplifies this orientation when he writes that 'it is precisely individuality that is the original and eternal thing in men'.¹⁵¹ Thus, 'diversitarianism' can lead 'to a conscious pursuit of idiosyncrasy' in personal, racial, and national fields of action,¹⁵² which in turn can lead to the adoption of a strictly hierarchical point of view.

There are, then, as Lovejoy maintains, at least two major interpretations of the romanticist's idealization of diversity: the first emphasizes plenitude and the importance of entering as fully as possible 'into the immensely various range of thought and feeling' in order to enrich one's inner life through ongoing efforts to understand and value *all* possible experiences, and the second emphasizes individuality and the importance of cultivating one's own uniqueness within a hierarchy of actual beings. These two orientations of Romanticism, then, are essentially part of the long series of reenactments of Plato's attempt to understand reality in terms of both eternal or otherworldly ideals and concrete or thisworldly observations. As mentioned previously, Lovejoy's final pronouncement on this major endeavour of Western thought is to contend that, insofar as it presupposes that a complete rational intelligibility of the world is possible, the history of ideas about the great chain of being 'is the history of a failure', or more precisely, 'it is the record of an experiment in thought carried on for many centuries by many great and lesser minds, which can now be seen to have had an instructive negative outcome'.¹⁵³

In support of this reaction, Lovejoy maintains that the history of the great chain of being demonstrates that the 'the hypothesis of the absolute rationality of the cosmos' is simply unbelievable, because a world of time and change 'is a world which can neither be deduced from nor reconciled with the postulate that existence is the expression and consequence of a system of "eternal" and "necessary" truths inherent in the very logic of being'. In Lovejoy's view, such eternal and necessary truths could only be manifested in a 'static and constant world', and the world of time and change which constitutes our 'empirical reality' is not static and constant. The world of 'becoming and change', he writes, 'simply do not fit into an eternal rational order' because the temporal world is one that displays 'at every point an abrupt passage to something different, and there is no purely logical principle determining - out of the infinitely various "possible" kinds of differentness - which shall come next'.¹⁵⁴

Lovejoy's main point here appears to be that the lack of 'predictability' within our infinitely diverse world of time and change means that it is impossible to have a 'logical principle' with which to comprehend temporal phenomena, and, therefore, it is impossible to have a perfectly logical order of eternal and necessary truths as the generative matrix for the world of time and change. The problem here, I suggest, lies with the powerful but misleading impression that identifies 'logic' with a mode of intelligibility characterized by contiguous cause-and-effect-like linkages between observations and/or conceptual formulations. Although supported by a massive philosophical tradition flowing from the work of Aristotle, this identification of logic with a specific method of investigating that privileges predictability as the sole or at least the primary criterion for validity, does not reflect the core meaning of 'logic' as revealed through its derivation from 'logos', the term used in Greek philosophy to refer to a 'universal' ordering principle. What is important to note here is that a universal ordering principle does not require a 'static and constant' universe, as Lovejoy's comments imply. On the contrary, the reality suggested by the concept of 'logos' is a dynamic one because, as a universal ordering principle, it encompasses the *totality of all possible occurrences*, which means that it encompasses both the

relative stability of phenomena, which is accessible to our rational intellects, and the infinitely diverse realm of ‘possible kinds of differentness’ apparent in the universe, which may or may not be accessible to our rational intellects but which is accessible to our consciousness, provided that we understand consciousness as that which includes *all* of the faculties (perceptual, rational, emotional, and evaluative) through which we become aware of our existence.

This dynamic concept of logos is clearly evident in its first major exposition in Western thought, that is, in the philosophy of Heraclitus, who used the concept of logos to refer to ‘the universal law immanent in all things, binding all things into a unity and determining the constant change in the universe according to universal law’.¹⁵⁵ In the context of this view of reality, human reason or logic is, in effect, ‘a contraction and canalisation’ of the universal logos,¹⁵⁶ and accordingly, insofar as it expresses the fullness of its own nature, it includes the phenomena of change and diversity as part of the *unity* or wholeness of all that is, and this idea is essentially what is at the heart of the principle of plenitude.¹⁵⁷ Thus, Lovejoy’s contention that plenitude is incompatible with the temporal order is based on a concept of logic that is restricted to a form of intellectual activity that seeks to establish predictable relationships, and although such activity plays an important part in understanding the relative stability of physical systems and organizing the everyday affairs of societal and communal living, it is certainly not the only mode of intelligibility available to consciousness and, arguably, not the most fundamental. For instance, the phenomenon of human intuition, inasmuch as it is able to make ‘leaps’ of intelligence or fathom the wholeness of something before the parts of that something are manifest, implies that there is, as the principle of plenitude suggests, an infinite matrix of possibility out of which concrete experiences emerge. In a subsequent section of this dissertation, I explore this idea at greater length in connection with an examination of David Bohm’s concept of an ‘implicate order’. However, here my purpose is simply to point out that there is no incompatibility between eternal and temporal orders of being because there is a great deal of information available which suggests that *the temporal emanates from and is included within the eternal*. The concept of eternity is incompatible with

temporality only when time is conceived in objective terms as a context for *primary* creative activity, that is, only when it is assumed that reality is something that is continually being made rather than something that *unfolds* from an infinitely various generative matrix.

Such objectification of time is a requirement of systems of thought that privilege 'becoming' over 'being', and it is also characteristic of the hierarchical orientation towards the great chain of being because this orientation relies on the fact that development and progress involve an upward movement through increasingly more complete levels of being, a movement which requires time as a medium for 'becoming': as Ken Wilber, a contemporary advocate of hierarchy, remarks, 'each step up in the great chain of being is an increase in unity and wider identities'.¹⁵⁸ In contrast, the principle of plenitude suggests that any particular being is complete inasmuch as it experiences its full potential, and the experience of this full potential does not 'require' time for its realization because it already exists in the eternal order of being. What is required for this experience of fullness is best understood not a progression through stages of hierarchical attainment but as an awareness of being that manifests itself as part of the wholeness of reality.

The hierarchical point of view, then, tends to diminish the importance of wholeness by privileging the temporal processes of 'becoming', and as a consequence, it tends to highlight the significance of 'differentness' in terms of levels of being that are progressively either 'more' or 'less' equivalent to the apex of the hierarchy. In our modern age of science and technology, notions such as 'more' or 'less' and 'equivalence' or 'nonequivalence' are inextricably linked with the scientific notions of quantification and classification, and, accordingly, linked with the activities of prediction and control. In spite of the relevance and success these activities have with respect to manipulating the physical conditions of life, their use as a means of exploring the workings of consciousness is inappropriate and potentially harmful, because the kind of fragmenting manipulations they entail may produce and perpetuate fragmented conditions of living, and such conditions lead inevitably towards violence. The suggestion developed throughout this dissertation is that human consciousness

affirms a reality that is truly an intact wholeness, and given such a reality, to use concepts such as 'more' and 'less' or 'equivalence' and 'nonequivalence' as a foundational context for understanding reality is to ground one's understanding in conceptual soil that is not, ultimately, life-affirming, and may even contribute to producing living conditions that perpetuate fragmentation, violence, and suffering.

As Lovejoy's historical survey of ideas pertaining to the great chain clearly illustrates, there have been many significant expositions of a similar orientation towards reality in Western thought, namely, those which in some way emanate from the principle of plenitude as first outlined by Plato. However, this survey also points out that the hierarchical orientation towards the great chain of being has a long and influential history, and in the following sections I explore certain contemporary manifestations of this tradition and discuss what I consider its major limitations.

Hierarchy: The Vision of the Three Eyes

In his book *Eye to Eye: The Quest for the New Paradigm*, Ken Wilber portrays himself as a firm supporter of the hierarchical vision of reality which he claims is 'the most striking feature of the perennial philosophy/psychology'. He describes this feature as a depiction of 'being and consciousness as a hierarchy of dimensional levels, moving from the lowest, densest, and most fragmentary realms' of physical phenomena 'to the highest, subtlest, and most unitary' realms of mental and spiritual phenomena. Each of these levels, as Wilber describes them, 'transcends but includes its predecessor', which means that 'the lower levels do not and cannot embrace the higher levels', that is, 'the higher cannot be explained by the lower or derived from the lower'. Thus, according to this hierarchical view, the various levels of reality are interrelated but not in an equivalent fashion: all of the so-called 'lower' is in the so-called higher, 'but not all of the higher is in the lower',¹⁵⁹ which implies that it is a reductionistic mistake to try to explain the greater in terms of the lesser.

In another ardent defence of the hierarchical view, Huston Smith emphasizes this reductionist fallacy by observing that, although the 'traditional view' espoused by human societies prior to the modern age was to 'explain the lesser in terms of the greater' (in accordance with the hierarchical view), many attempts by modern

intellectuals to conceptualize comprehensive patterns of activity ‘explain the greater in terms of the lesser’ and thereby commit the mistake of reductionism. For example, Marx reduced truth to ideology, Freud reduced the human psyche to sex drives, and Darwinism reduced spirit to metamorphosed matter.¹⁶⁰ In a similar way, Wilber is highly critical of using recent developments in ‘the new physics’ to suggest that they are speaking about the same reality that mystics have spoken and written about for centuries. He suggests, rather, that ‘the new physics has simply discovered the one-dimensional interpenetration of its own level (nonsentient mass/energy)’, and he considers it ‘a wild overgeneralization’ to say that ‘the world view of physics and mysticism are similar’. For Wilber, physics and mysticism are ‘two quite different levels of reality, the latter of which transcends but includes the former’.¹⁶¹

As Wilber points out, the hierarchical view of reality implies that there are three major methods of human knowing: the empirical, rational, and transcendental modes, often referred to by their more evocative labels, the eye of the flesh, the eye of the mind, and the eye of contemplation.¹⁶² He notes further that each of these ‘three eyes’ of knowing ‘has its own specific and quite valid set of referents’ which carry with them the *injunction* that ‘if you want to *know* this, you must *do* this’. This correlation of knowledge acquisition with a particular practice suggests, for example, that ‘*we cannot solve the absolute/relative problem using the eye of flesh or the eye of mind*’, because ‘this deepest of problems and mysteries directly yields its resolution only to the eye of contemplation’ and, therefore, requires ‘questioners’ to take up the practice of meditation and contemplation so that they ‘can see for themselves’. Wilber emphasizes, then, that ‘a new and integral paradigm would ideally and ultimately be a synthesis and integration of empiricism, rationalism, and transcendentalism’, but at the same time he warns that inquirers commit what he calls a ‘category error’ when their work suggests that one of the eyes of knowing usurps the role of either or both of the other two.¹⁶³

To illustrate a category error, Wilber uses the notion of ‘scientism’, the belief that all knowledge is valid only if it can be verified through the empirical-analytical method of science. He suggests that the modern scientific age is dominated by the

methodology of the eye of the flesh which he equates with 'empiricism', a term he uses in its restricted sense of acquiring knowledge through *sense* experience. He suggests further that this domination by empiricism is the result of a 'revolt against the rational systems of the scholastic age' dominated by the eye of the mind.¹⁶⁴ Clearly, Wilber views the work of the eye of the flesh and the eye of the mind as fundamentally distinct functions, and views scientism as a fallacy which reduces all valid ways of knowing to empiricism, that is, to the way of the eye of the flesh.

Equally distinct in kind, according to Wilber, is the way of knowing particular to the eye of contemplation. He refers to this way of knowing as a 'transcendental methodology' and suggests that it provides abundant 'proof' of the existence of Absolute Spirit or Godhead. This proof comes in the form of the *experience* of contemplatives, in a direct awareness of the Godhead revealed not through rational or sense-based operations but through the 'instrument' of contemplation. He writes:

At its summit...transcendental methodology constitutes an experimental, verifiable, repeatable proof for the existence of Godhead, *as a fact*, as a penultimate Datum, but that proof is not-indeed, could not be-merely rational or logical...there *is* an instrumental proof for the existence of God, but the instrument is contemplation, not reason...Spiritual *data* themselves are transmental and transconceptual, and thus they resist, even defy, conceptual, rational, theoretical mapping and codification...when the *mind* attempts to look at or think about spirit, it produces paradoxical results. The mind can adequately look at and map sensibilia [i.e., data pertaining to the eye of the flesh] because it transcends sensibilia; it can adequately look at and map intelligibilia [i.e., data pertaining to the eye of the mind] because that is its own backyard; but it cannot adequately look at or map spirit because spirit transcends *it*...Understand that spiritual knowledge itself...is the most direct, clearcut, impactful knowledge imaginable - it simply transcends conceptualization and therefore resists neat hypothetical categorizations and mental mappings.¹⁶⁵

Wilber's observation that spirit 'resists neat hypothetical categorizations' and that Absolute Spirit simply cannot be classified because 'there is nothing outside of It and so nowhere to draw the classifying line',¹⁶⁶ is a curious one given that his own prolific intellectual output is saturated with the effort to classify the entire 'spectrum of consciousness'. Taken as a whole, his work, consisting of over a dozen books and

numerous journal articles, is, I suggest, an attempt to build an all-encompassing model, a 'comprehensive-transcendental paradigm' that synthesizes information from 'anthropology and history, developmental psychology, sociology, and psychotherapies' with the wisdom of the perennial philosophy.¹⁶⁷ Accordingly, it not only synthesizes various systems of philosophical and psychological classifications of levels of consciousness and stages of its development but also extends the methodology of classification into the realms of spirit, into the very realms he claims resist such efforts. It is, perhaps, this predilection for constructing a synthesizing, comprehensive theoretical model that induces him, ironically, to use language and adopt viewpoints that reflect the fragmented and fragmenting practices - that is, the *instrumentalism* - of the modern scientific-technological worldview he overtly opposes.

My suggestion here is that this effort to categorize and synthesize virtually everything is an inescapable consequence of hierarchical thinking because such thinking presupposes a condition of fragmentation, and this presupposition is problematic because fragmentation is not the fundamental condition of being - wholeness is. As David Loy points out in a discussion of Buddhist philosophy (and as suggested throughout this study), the experience of reality as fragmented is the source of suffering, and the way towards a rejuvenation of wholeness and joy is not through the instrumentality of 'things', be these things physical events, mental concepts, or spiritual practices, rather, it is through an awakening of consciousness to the awareness that all phenomena, including a person's sense of 'self', are *already* 'grounded in the totality'.¹⁶⁸ The idea here is that being fully 'awake' to one's own nature is essentially a consciousness of the spiritual nature of reality, a direct, experiential understanding of the wholeness and interconnectedness of all phenomena, an awareness of 'always-being-all'.

This awareness of 'always-being-all' does not require any instrumentalistic means to be achieved, because 'being' is its own instrument. However, although nothing is required for a full experience of being, to experience this condition of 'requiring nothing' involves shedding or relinquishing all forms of 'objective'

instrumentality, which in terms of human behaviour includes *surrendering* those thoughts, feelings, or practices that reinforce the sense of a separate, autonomous 'self'. This surrendering, I suggest, is what constitutes a person's free, intentional, and creative acceptance of her or his 'being-ness' and it is at the heart of all that I am trying to express about the spirituality of being. Accordingly, the theme of 'self-surrendering' recurs at various points throughout this study. Here, my twofold purpose in referring to it is to emphasize that 'being' requires no instrumentality other than itself to interact with the world, and that a full experience of being is one that is *permeated* by an awareness of the spiritual nature of reality.

To understand the 'fullness' of being as an experience that is permeated with an awareness of the 'spirituality' of being is to suggest that spirit infuses everything, that is, spirit is an 'immanent' presence throughout reality. In keeping with the tradition of thought emanating from Plato's principle of plenitude, what I am suggesting here is that there is no distinction between the *immanence of spirit* and the *fullness of being*: to experience a 'fullness of being' is to experience the 'immanence of spirit'. The reality of 'fullness' is not something that pertains to 'degrees'. A small glass filled with water is just as full as a large glass filled with water. To know that the large glass contains more water than the small glass tells us nothing about the meaning of 'fullness', only that the two glasses differ in terms of size. Furthermore, in terms of human experience, who is to say that one person's joy and sense of 'oneness with the universe' when experiencing a morning sunrise is 'more' or 'less' fulfilling than another person's feeling of joy and amazement when gazing into a star-filled night sky or across a vast ocean expanse? The implication here is that 'fullness' pertains to the *experience* of being and not to the specific properties of particular beings: there are many different kinds of being but there are no different kinds of fullness. Yet, in the hierarchical view of reality, the various 'kinds' of being are distinguished precisely in terms of their degrees of fullness of consciousness, which means that some beings are 'more full' of spirit than others, a view Wilber articulates in the following passage.

"All things are God, but some things are more God than others"...The stage-levels of evolution show increasing structural organization, increasing complexity and integration and unity, increasing awareness and consciousness...each higher level is more real, or has more reality, because it is more saturated with Being. In any event, evolution is hierarchical-rocks are at one end of that scale, God the Omega is at the other, and plants, reptiles, mammals, humans, and *bodhitsattvas* fill up the middle, in that order. *And*, God is the very stuff, the actual essence, of *each* stage-level-God is not the highest level, nor a different level itself, but the reality of all levels.¹⁶⁹

As Wilber's comments indicate, from the hierarchical point of view, it is necessary to depict reality in terms of *both* a system of transcendental levels of being and the immanence of an all-permeating Absolute Spirit. Although this depiction of reality is not dualistic in the philosophical sense of suggesting a fundamental distinction between mental and physical phenomena (because the hierarchical view does not deny the immanence of Spirit), it is dualistic in the ordinary sense of term, that is, in the sense of suggesting that reality is a state or condition that is 'twofold' and can only be explained in terms of two propositions.

I suggest that Wilber's elaboration of the hierarchical model of reality illustrates this ordinary or what might be called 'propositional' dualism. For example, on the one hand, he writes eloquently and passionately about the immanence of Absolute Spirit by focusing on the central significance of 'nonduality', observing that 'to attain union with the Absolute implies bringing together two things, and yet in all reality there is only One without a second', and, therefore, 'the attempt to bring the soul and God together merely perpetuates the illusion that the two are separate'. On the other hand, as discussed earlier, much of his work is devoted to categorizing the different levels of being (or levels of consciousness) - physical, biological, mental, subtle, causal, and ultimate - in such a way as to emphasize what he calls their 'multidimensional interpenetration of *nonequivalence*', that is, the fact that 'the more highly evolved...always contains in itself the attributes of the earlier, yet always develops as a *new entity*'. Thus, it appears that Wilber's perception of nonduality does not *permeate* his vision of reality because he requires two propositions to portray this vision, as he states explicitly when he observes that 'the Absolute is both the highest

state of being and the ground of all being; it is both the goal of evolution and the ground of evolution...the highest rung of the ladder *and* the wood out of which the entire ladder is made'. 'If Spirit is completely transcendent', he adds, 'it is also completely immanent'.¹⁷⁰ The use of the word 'also' is significant here because it implies that, for Wilber, as for all those who espouse hierarchical notions, the ideas of transcendent levels of being and the immanence of Absolute Spirit are co-signifiers of reality: *Both* ideas are necessary in order to depict reality in an appropriate manner. Huston Smith puts this view succinctly when he writes that, according to the hierarchical view, 'transcendence *and* immanence' coexist 'in absolute tension' and 'if we lose our grip on either, the tone in our spiritual life collapses'.¹⁷¹

In contrast to this hierarchical perspective, to believe that reality is a wholeness suggests that transcendence is subsumed by the immanence of Absolute Spirit. Just as the distinguishing contours of objects merge and ultimately disappear in the presence of great light, distinctions among the various manifestations of being become meaningless when infused with Absolute Spirit.¹⁷² In this view, it is because of the immanence of the whole - because of the all-permeating presence of Absolute Spirit - that all phenomena can be understood as fundamentally spiritual in nature and not merely interconnected but interdependent, for to partake of the Absolute is to partake of that upon which everything depends. The idea of *interdependency*, then, provides a way of understanding the difference between wholeness and hierarchical views of reality.

In the hierarchical view, the different intermediate levels of being are understood in terms of both dependency and independency: dependency with respect to higher and independency with respect to lower levels. This perspective suggests that each level within a hierarchy, except the highest, has a dual nature. Only the all-encompassing, downward-looking eye of contemplation at the apex of the hierarchy is capable of apprehending and interpenetrating *all* of reality: the eye of the body cannot apprehend the life of the mind or spirit and the eye of the mind cannot comprehend the life of spirit.

Taken in its totality, the hierarchical view of reality is a fragmented one, as illustrated by Wilber's observation that 'the body as body is merely self-referential...[it] is merely subjective; the mind is intersubjective; spirit is transsubjective - and the lower you go on that ladder, the more narcissistic and self-centric you become'.¹⁷³ However, in the wholeness view, everything exists in relation, so there is no-thing that is 'merely subjective', in the sense of displaying a self-contained (autonomous) state of being. On the contrary, the distinctions between subjectivity, intersubjectivity, and transsubjectivity are best understood as *descriptions of different ways of perceiving relationship*, for the different levels of being, although distinct, function interdependently, and the three eyes of knowing work in harmony, much like the three notes of a musical triad, each with a necessary but particular function to fulfil: *contemplation* provides a context of awareness for energizing the life to the *body*, which incorporates reality in all its diversity, and the life of the *mind*, which imparts understanding and meaning.

This metaphor of a musical triad suggests that what is important about the way parts are related to a whole is a matter of relationship and balance, and one writer who has written extensively about the concept of hierarchy in ways which suggest that the viability of hierarchical structures depends on balance is Arthur Koestler. Although Koestler's overall intellectual orientation leads him (eventually) to a profoundly pessimistic view of humanity and to disturbing notions about how to cope with human weaknesses, his remarks about hierarchy are particularly insightful and illustrate how hierarchical ideas can be used to *describe* rather than to explain the interplay of relationships among different expressions of being.¹⁷⁴

To facilitate his discussion of the nature and function of distinct levels (subsystems or parts) of a hierarchy, Koestler coined the term *holon*. He describes holons as 'Janus-faced entities' that function as relatively 'autonomous wholes in their own right' at the same time as they function 'as dependent parts of a larger whole': 'the face turned upward, toward the higher levels, is that of a dependent part, the face turned downward, towards its own constituents, is that of a whole of remarkable self-

sufficiency'. With respect to the kinds of activity organized or regulated in a holon, Koestler notes that 'every holon is possessed of two opposite tendencies or potentials: an *integrative tendency* to function as part of the larger whole, and a *self-assertive tendency* to preserve its individual autonomy', with the overall stability of a hierarchical order depending 'on the equilibration of the two opposite tendencies of its holons'.¹⁷⁵ In a functionally healthy holon, then, self-assertive and integrative tendencies work together in a balanced relationship, much like the balance of *yin-yang* advocated in Taoist philosophy.

The Taoist concept of balance between yin and yang energies implies a *dynamic condition* of 'interaction and fluctuation' in which 'the universe and its diverse forms emerge'. As such, the yin-yang balance describes an ideal unified-and-unifying expression of being, as symbolized by the yin-yang symbol with its two distinct sides, each containing spots of the same colour as its opposite (a white spot in the dark side, and a dark spot in the white side) indicating that each of the basic energies 'contains the seed of the other and is about to produce the replication of its opposite in interaction'.¹⁷⁶

It is important to note, however, that in Western psychophilosophical systems of thought, the interplay of integrative (yin) and self-assertive (yang) tendencies is not used primarily to describe a condition of being, rather, this interplay is used to depict and account for incremental stages of hierarchical development. For instance, Wilber summarizes his thoughts about the development of consciousness from a nonliving (physical) to an ultimate level in a way that is essentially similar to Western psychological theories of development. He writes: 'at each stage of development, a higher-order structure - more complex and therefore more unified - emerges through a differentiation of the preceding, lower-order level' (that is, through self-assertive, yang-like energies), and 'this higher-order structure is introduced to consciousness, and eventually the self *identifies* with that emergent structure' (through integrative, yin-like energies).¹⁷⁷ The implication here is that the Western view of development, as expressed by Wilber and those who accept his views, conceives hierarchy as

inextricably linked with the evolution of increasingly more advanced, transcendent, and therefore, more complete and more real manifestations of being. In Koestler's discussion of hierarchy, this link with a progressive conception of evolution is certainly present, but he also emphasizes that hierarchical manifestations of consciousness pertain to modes of behaviour not only *between* but also *within* levels of development. He writes:

It is essential to realize that these gradations in the "structuring, vividness and precision" of consciousness are found not only along the evolutionary ladder, and in members of the same species at different stages of their ontogeny, but also within adult individuals when confronted with different situations. I am referring to the deceptively trivial fact that one and the same activity - driving a car - can be either performed *automatically*, without conscious awareness of one's own actions, or accompanied by varying *degrees of awareness*'.¹⁷⁸

Koestler's remark suggests that different expressions of complexity with regard to thought and awareness are part of everyday experience, and, therefore, that developmentally early and late formations of consciousness coexist within a single individual. This 'deceptively trivial' observation is vitally important because it suggests that different hierarchical levels can be understood in terms of *options for action*, that is, as different opportunities for organizing and regulating personal behaviour according to particular circumstances. In the field of psychology, the work of Lev Vygotsky on the development of conceptual thinking illustrates how the coexistence of younger and more mature expressions of developmental processes in a person's behavioural repertoire suggests that human behaviour is best understood in terms of selecting among a number of viable options for action rather than in terms of classifying actions according to developmental stages. In *Thought and Language* (1986), Vygotsky compares the presence of developmentally different forms of intellectual activity in an individual to the presence of different rock formations in the earth's crust and observes that 'even after an adolescent has learned to produce concepts', he or she 'does not abandon the more elementary forms' of thinking', such as 'trial and error thinking' or 'thinking in complexes', which involves thinking in terms of concrete, factual bonds between objects rather than by using the abstract

formulations of concepts.¹⁷⁹

This belief - that developmentally different levels of cognitive activity coexist in an individual - is contrary to what is proposed by most stage-theorists. For example, Lawrence Kohlberg claims that moral reasoning develops in a universal, hierarchical series of stages, that is, invariably in an 'upward' direction.¹⁸⁰ However, there are numerous challenges to this claim.¹⁸¹ In my own research into adolescent moral decision-making, I found many descriptions of moral activity exhibiting a 'multi-levelled' approach to moral reasoning within individuals.¹⁸² Furthermore, from a philosophical perspective, D.C. Phillips comments on the hierarchical approach of Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning in the following passage in a way that reflects not only my own view on the topic of moral development but also the view presented in this dissertation about the nature of hierarchy as a descriptive feature of reality rather than an explanatory principle.

A researcher interested in moral behavior, or in how people think about moral issues (these two matters, of course, need not be the same), is not necessarily committed to a developmental orientation, much less to the view that there are clearcut stages of development. It is a hard fact of life that there are many conceptions of the nature of morality and about how humans should act in particular moral situations. It is at least debatable that these rival positions are on a par, each with their own strengths and weaknesses, rather than being located in a hierarchy of increasing adequacy. Instead of conceiving of individuals as moving up a hierarchy, then, one could view them as perhaps randomly distributed between a number of relatively viable alternative positions, among which they move as they find reason to abandon one and adopt another. And it may even be the case that most individuals have come to adopt a stance endorsed by some "significant other"-a parent, or other significant relative, or an influential teacher or minister of religion, or a key peer. Another alternative conception...is that there are several levels of abstraction in moral thinking, and everyone uses all of these levels, adopting in a particular case the level of thought that seems most appropriate given the specific circumstances.¹⁸³

My suggestion here is that, insofar as a person's consciousness remains open to multiple levels of being, he or she remains open to an experience of 'fullness of being' because of the immanence of Absolute Spirit. Moreover, insofar as all phenomena express in some way a form of consciousness, every expression of being

is potentially able to experience this 'fullness'. Huxley articulates this idea in his discussion of the perennial philosophy by observing that 'every individual being, from the atom up to the most highly organized of living bodies and the most exalted of finite minds may be thought of...as a point where a ray of the primordial Godhead meets one of the differentiated, creaturely emanations of that same Godhead's creative energy'.¹⁸⁴ A major implication here is that, because individual beings do partake of Absolute Spirit, everyday actions can become occasions for experiences that transcend the ordinary. Transcendence, in this sense, is an attribute of being because being is fundamentally spiritual, and like any attribute, it exists as a potential that can manifest itself at any moment, given appropriate conditions.

Taoist philosophy expresses this pervasive quality of spirituality and the potential for transcendence that exists in everyday life in a particularly straightforward and beautiful manner. 'There is no division between the physical and the spiritual, between the natural and the divine,' writes Deng Ming-Dao, 'it is all of a whole'. He continues:

To embrace one is to embrace all. If the rain comes down, if the mud fills our shoes, or if we kneel down in the fields to light incense and pray - the very act of being fully *present* in our lives is spirituality enough, for being *present* is to acknowledge that everything is spiritual.

Those who follow Tao feel that our human society, and even each of us individually, is a microcosm of the universe...Everything we do is Tao. Spirituality is not just "out there." It is also all around us and in us. If we understand that, no matter where we look, spiritual revelations abound'.¹⁸⁵

This perspective on the connection between spirituality and the immense diversity and fecundity of life can be summarized by saying that the so-called hierarchical levels of consciousness are best understood as *describing the potential forms of relationship within reality* and do not *explain* the underlying *nature* of reality itself, which, according to the view proposed in this study, is best understood in terms of the 'wholeness' or plenitude expressed by the immanence of Absolute Spirit. In terms of a simple formula, the view proposed here is that transcendence is an attribute of being, whereas immanence is basic. A major implication of this idea is

that to identify transcendental phenomena with the nature of reality as such is to confuse that which is an attribute or 'part' with the whole - it is to confuse what are essentially 'means' (the interplay of integrative and self-assertive tendencies) with absolute ends, and this confusion exerts a potentially devastating impact on human action, as discussed in the following section.

Exploring the Confusion of Means and Ends

To accept that reality is an evolving hierarchy means that, at various times, either integrative or self-assertive movements must be absolute developmental goals, that is, they must be ends that exclude the opposite possibility or, at least, render it ineffectual. How can a higher order of being emerge if not by integrating its strengths and advantages and asserting them as a superior identity, and how can a lower order of being survive except by either asserting its own identity as a subservient class or by integrating itself within a dominant order? What is important to note here is that, in both instances, acts of self-assertion and integration come *at the expense of* the opposite kind of activity and, therefore, *require* acts that *exert a dominating force* on what is considered 'other-than-onself' or on one's so-called 'own-self'. Maintaining a hierarchical order, then, involves maintaining a system that *naturalizes* acts of domination as a means of development.

It is, however, a very different matter to consider integrative and self-assertive tendencies in terms of *balancing* alternate modes of interaction, that is, in terms of making choices about various kinds of relationship that may be appropriate given particular conditions. In such instances, the goal is an appropriate balance that serves a common interest: forms of self-assertion or integration are the 'means' of achieving this balance rather than ends in themselves, and are, therefore, *on behalf of*, that is, *for* rather than against something.

As Koestler emphasizes, the matter of balance within holons is crucial for understanding the internal dynamics of healthy hierarchies. The concept of balance, of course, implies that the contrasting polarities involved do not have an absolute, inherent value apart from how they serve a relationship. Integrative and self-assertive

tendencies are neither 'good' nor 'bad' in themselves, and a serious internal disturbance within any holon could result from either an excess of one tendency over the other continued over a significant period of time, or an inappropriate relationship between the two tendencies with respect to environmental conditions. Examples of such disturbances are not difficult to find, for they constitute much of the common lot of humankind. For instance, it is obvious that self-assertive tendencies can and often do serve merely selfish goals in both individual and societal contexts and so perpetuate fragmented societies sustained through violence. But as Koestler reminds us, the integrative motivations of humanity - the human need to self-transcend and be a part of some larger whole, be it 'a social group, a personal bond, a belief-system, Nature, or the *anima mundi*' - have occasioned not only 'the glories of art and science' but also 'the holocausts of history caused by misguided devotion'. Indeed, 'it is *the integrative tendency acting as a vehicle or catalyst*' which often induces 'changes of morality, the abrogation of personal responsibility, the replacement of the individual's code of behaviour by the code of the 'higher component' in the hierarchy'. He observes further:

The crimes of Caligula shrink to insignificance compared to the havoc wrought by Torquemada. The number of people killed by robbers, highwaymen, gangsters and other asocial elements is negligible compared to the masses cheerfully slain in the name of the true religion, the righteous cause'... throughout human history, the ravages caused by excesses of individual self-assertion are quantitatively negligible compared to the numbers slain *ad maiorem gloriam* out of a self-transcending devotion to a flag, a leader, a religious faith or political conviction.¹⁸⁶

Koestler's remarks about the atrocities perpetrated throughout history *ad maiorem gloriam* include an account of Stanley Milgram's notorious experiments at the Psychology Department of Yale University. In these experiments, a high percentage of subjects (over 60%) administered tortuous levels of electric shock to supposed 'victims' at the request of an experimenter functioning as an authority figure. When repeated in laboratories in other countries, similar or even more alarming results were obtained, suggesting, as Milgram himself noted, that 'when individuals enter a condition of hierarchic control, the mechanism which ordinarily

regulates individual impulses is suppressed and ceded to the higher-level component...the disappearance of a sense of responsibility [being] the most far-reaching consequence of submission to authority'. 'It is ironic,' he added 'that the virtues of loyalty, discipline, and self-sacrifice that we value so highly in the individual are the very properties that create destructive organizational engines of war and bind men to malevolent systems of authority'.¹⁸⁷

As these observations indicate, the integrative or 'yin' side of nature is not without its negative aspects. However, as Fritjof Capra points out and as environmentally-minded people continually remind us, Western culture significantly overemphasizes the 'yang' (self-assertive) side of nature, the side pertaining to rational knowledge, analysis, and expansion, much to the neglect of the 'yin' side of nature that pertains to intuition, synthesis, and ecological awareness. Although this yang-energy has generated unparalleled advances in technology and enormous increases in material commodities and services, these advances and increases have produced an extravagant life-style filled with dangerous ironies - ironies which have reached almost 'insane' proportions, as Capra points out in the following remarks.

Our progress, then, has been largely a rational and intellectual affair, and this one-sided evolution has now reached a highly alarming stage, a situation so paradoxical that it borders insanity. We can control the soft landings of space craft on distant planets, but we are unable to control the polluting fumes emanating from our cars and factories. We propose Utopian communities in gigantic space colonies, but cannot manage our cities. The business world makes us believe that huge industries producing pet foods and cosmetics are a sign of our high standard of living, while economists try to tell us that we cannot "afford" adequate health care, education, or public transport.¹⁸⁸

The disturbing ironies depicted in Capra's comment suggest that the social system dominated by Western technology is precariously out of balance and that restoring a healthy balance is a matter of responding to values related to the yin side of nature, values that engender empathy rather than self-interest. This restoration is, in practice, a moral undertaking, and there is much about the overall tenor of life in contemporary technocultures that points to a serious emasculation of moral capacity. It is not that Western societies are technically unable to control the polluting fumes

they generate in an incessant quest for increased production, or technically incapable of devising methods of living together that promote mutual rather than individualistic well-being, rather, it is that Western societies have become morally feeble and, as a consequence, scarcely able to resist the self-assertive energies of Western technoculture, energies that *control people (a) by providing an elite with an excess of material comfort and security and (b) by promoting the impossible idea that such excess is potentially available to everyone.*

I can think of no more basic issue with respect to promoting the well-being of people and their environments than alleviating this moral poverty. Indeed, my motivation for considering the questions addressed in this dissertation, questions relating to the fundamental nature of being and what it means 'to do something', flow largely from perceiving a need to reanimate the craft of moral understanding within contemporary life, for, in concert with Paul Tillich, I believe that the 'collective we' who live in the material abundance of Western societies have 'lost the courage to ask questions with an infinite seriousness - as former generations did - and...lost courage to receive answers to questions, wherever they may come from'.¹⁸⁹

Part of the effort to invigorate ourselves morally involves examining the sources of the values that motivate our beliefs and actions. Worldviews, such as conceiving reality in terms of hierarchy or wholeness, are among the most powerful of these motivational sources. What I wish to emphasize here is this: given that integrative and self-assertive tendencies are an inevitable aspect of hierarchical structures, to turn either of them into a developmental end that is right and good *in and of itself*, is to turn what is actually an aspect of balance into a dominating force, and to do that requires some kind of violence to the opposite tendency. Thus, insofar as notions about hierarchy are notions about absolute developmental ends rather than ongoing conditions of relationship, the so-called progress they generate is more like the endless swinging of a pendulum than a movement towards something, more like the amorality of tearing apart than the morality of coming together in mutual support, and it need hardly be said that with each swing of the pendulum the violence at the extremes becomes increasingly intense.

My belief, then, is that there is a significant danger in using the concept of hierarchy as a model of reality rather than as a description of the interplay of relationships that sustain and nourish interdependent living systems, and that danger is that hierarchical thinking sanctions a view of human life and history in which *separation* rather than wholeness is the key to knowing and acting, and in a world that uses such a 'key' there will always be masters and victims, the privileged and the oppressed, the chosen ones and the alienated.

Lest anyone doubt that the use of the hierarchical model of reality promotes the belief that a condition of separation is a constitutive aspect of nature and experience, consider these remarks by Wilber about a so-called state of 'original alienation'.

Original alienation, or the high point of alienation, starts with material nature. Nature, or the prepersonal world, is *already* self-alienated Spirit, without any help whatsoever from the ego; and further, nature is the *greatest* point of alienation from Spirit...What happened in the historical Garden of Eden (some hundreds of thousands of years ago) was not the instigation of original sin (or original separation from Spirit) but the original apprehension of an already original separation...Nature is asleep in sin, and God is awake without sin-but human beings are caught in the middle: awake *with* sin. Or: Nature is unconscious imperfection, God is conscious perfection, but poor humanity is conscious imperfection. Now human beings can indeed act "sinfully," by choosing against Spirit, or they can act "morally," by choosing Spirit, but that choice, however, crucial, still rests upon a sea of already prior alienation. It is not that by choosing wrongly men and women introduce alienation; it is that by choosing correctly they are helping to overcome it.¹⁹⁰

As these remarks suggest, for Wilber, human sinfulness stems from a condition of original alienation from Spirit, a condition that is expressed in nature unconsciously (inasmuch as it is 'asleep in sin') but becomes conscious in the human species as it awakens to an apprehension of the fact that it occupies a kind of 'half-way' position between Spirit and Nature. The implication here is that, in spite of originating in a condition of separation from Spirit, humanity is capable of choosing to become integrated with Spirit through correct moral choices. In contrast to this view, what is suggested throughout this study and examined in detail in the next chapter, is that reality is an 'original wholeness', and, in the context of this

wholeness, the sense of alienation or separation experienced by any person, or indeed any being in the natural world, is best understood as a consequence of trying to do the impossible, namely, function as an independent being.

In the following sonnet, George Santayana poignantly depicts the situation of a person caught in what Wilber calls the conscious imperfection of 'poor humanity', that is, its so-called middle position between nature (matter) and spirit. Also, in the poem's opening line, Santayana alludes to a condition of consciousness, which, in keeping with the ideas offered in this dissertation, can alleviate the inevitable suffering engendered by this middle position.

[George Santayana, 'Sonnet VII'.¹⁹¹ See Appendix B, # 3.]

As implied by Santayana's poem, to conceive our humanity solely in terms of its middle position within a hierarchy of Nature, Humanity, and Spirit is to be 'doomed' to know a perpetually aching heart, a heart that feels itself to be fundamentally separated from the rest of reality. But this sense of separation, this sense of being an autonomous category of being, is the product of an illusion, because, in a world that is fundamentally a 'web of relationships', it is impossible to function as an autonomous entity. To act as if such functioning is possible, normal, or desirable is, therefore, to act contrary to nature, to go 'against the grain': In Taoist terms, it is to interfere with the ways things are meant to be. The suggestion here, then, is that to perceive oneself or the social group to which one belongs as separate, as not simply different but actually alienated from others and from world of nature, is

like trying to walk on a leg that is broken or like trying to ignore that a person one loves is in pain: It is like trying to function normally while being wounded.

Inevitably, such actions produce suffering, and in the light of this understanding, the idea of an 'original sin' is not, as Wilber implies, the apprehension of a condition of original 'separation' from Spirit, but the apprehension that there is something that is 'broken', something that interferes with the wholeness, the health of that of which we are a part. In the following passage, David Steindl-Rast equates this understanding of original sin with the basic Buddhist idea of *dukkha*, often translated as 'suffering', but referring essentially to any expression of not functioning properly or 'dis-ease'.

When an educated person in the West asks me, "What is original sin?" I answer that it is the Christian term for the universal phenomenon the Buddhists call *dukkha*. The original meaning of that term refers to a wheel that grinds on its axle: Something is out of order. I choose the Buddhist notion of *dukkha* because even in the West many people have a better understanding of *dukkha* than of "original sin." Both concepts arise from the acknowledgement that something is wrong with existence. Human life "grinds on its axle," as it were. Not only the Buddhist and the Christian but every religious tradition starts with this recognition that something is out of order with us, that we are lost and have to find our way home.¹⁹²

Why is so much of humanity engulfed by suffering at a time when its capacity to manipulate the physical conditions of nature through science and technology is significantly greater than ever before if not because something that is happening is misguided, something is out of tune with reality, out of balance? And further: Why is it that the perpetual violence that has plagued natural and human history failed to destroy life and that which makes it worthwhile if not because the interests of *all* aspects of nature *are* interrelated, and at a deep level, at the fundamental level of reality, there *is* an unbroken wholeness?

As suggested previously, the restoration of balance within our experience of reality is a moral undertaking and moral actions are normally guided by powerful symbols that reflect a basic orientation towards reality. Although earlier I compared the dangers of the hierarchical model to the dangers of a pendulum swinging endlessly back and forth between opposing conditions, the commonly used symbol for

hierarchical systems, including those meant to depict progress towards increased levels of consciousness (that is, towards a greater participation in Absolute Spirit), is the ladder. It is appropriate, then, that this examination of the impact of hierarchical thinking include at least a brief discussion of this important symbol.

Matthew Fox observes that in spite of 'all its hoopla about being a secularized culture and a secularized city, our modern society runs on the basic dynamic of a mystical symbol, that of climbing Jacob's ladder'. He suggests that, in the Christian tradition, this upward oriented image of the spiritual journey originates in the hellenistic idea that 'perfection is upward' and not in Christianity's Jewish heritage which maintains that 'a spiritual person grows ever more sensitive to those *around* one', so that 'amongness, not upness is the dynamic of the spiritual journey'.¹⁹³ But whatever its origin, the idea of 'upness' clearly dominates conceptions of progress and success in Western societies, as demonstrated by the prevalence of such commonly used phrases as 'reaching for the stars', 'higher education', and 'climbing the corporate ladder'.

This idea that a spiritual symbol furnishes values for a secular culture is reminiscent of Max Weber's thesis that the origins of capitalism are in the Protestant work ethic.¹⁹⁴ Weber's thesis proposes that motivation for the entrepreneurial risks and for the disciplined, specialized labour needed to develop the capitalist economic system derived from a Protestant culture which associated salvation from this world with the exercise of puritan values, such as hard work, discipline, frugality, and the accumulation of wealth without ostentation. Weber also suggests that, once capitalism was well established, these religious motivations gave way to secular, utilitarian ones. Although this new 'secularized' version of capitalism retained the Protestant orientation towards future rewards, it replaced the 'substantive rationality' of Protestantism (a rationality based on the value of ends firmly rooted in belief), with the 'instrumentalistic rationality' of the scientific-technical worldview, based on the value of the means used to achieve material results, that is, based on *production as such*.

In commenting on Weber's thesis, David Loy suggests that the

instrumentalistic values associated with capitalism have become naturalized, that is, largely unconscious and routinized within everyday activities, so that they constitute 'not so much an alternative to religion as a particularly heretical - and perhaps demonic - form of it'.¹⁹⁵ The significant point here is that the future-oriented instrumentalism that drives contemporary capitalism is not that far removed from a 'ladder-like' view of spiritual progress towards increasingly higher stages of development in a hierarchy of consciousness. This similarity is reason enough, I believe, to concur with Matthew Fox when he claims that the value-laden image of climbing Jacob's ladder 'legitimizes and reinforces some of the most obvious violence in our society',¹⁹⁶ for how can it be denied that capitalism is culpable not only with respect to sustaining world-wide violence through the production of weapons but also with respect to coupling the values of competitiveness, consumerism, and individualism, thereby fostering a largely anti-empathic society, which is, by definition, a violent society, for nothing occasions violence more readily than a lack of empathy.

Although I regard the connection between acts of violence and a lack of empathy as self-evident, images are often more compelling than words. Accordingly, here is an image that depicts the connection between violence and an inability or unwillingness to relate empathically with others. This image is in the form of the following brief anecdote: 'A 13-year-old boy convicted of violently mugging a number of elderly people, when asked about the pain he had caused one blind woman, said "What do I care? I'm not her"'.¹⁹⁷

As this anecdote suggests, a lack of empathy signifies a sense of separation from others as well as a focus on self-interest, and by implication, an indifference with respect to the means used to attain one's goals. In contrast, a person infused with empathy is one who is unable to distinguish between her or his own needs and those of others because he or she is fused within a communal or participatory consciousness that gives a sense of belonging everywhere at any time. To be completely empathic, then, not only with one's fellow human beings but with all of nature, is to experience that condition of 'at-one-ness' described by mystics, poets, and philosophers

throughout history. If those who espouse the hierarchical vision of reality are to be believed, this experience is reserved for beings at or near the apex of the hierarchy of consciousness, for beings who have reached the upper rungs of the ladder that ascends towards perfection and completeness and, thereby, have attained the higher levels of existence, the truly 'spiritual' levels. A stone, a cabbage, or even a purely rational human being does not and cannot experience the 'Spirit' that animates all. But if one acknowledges that reality is an 'unfolding wholeness', the capacity to partake of the spiritual is the natural condition of all expressions of being because what is 'whole' is the immanence of Absolute Spirit.

In the following chapter, my purpose is to outline in greater detail this wholeness view of reality which, up until now, has been presented in snap-shot fashion as an alternative to the hierarchical view. But to conclude this chapter, here is an excerpt from a short poem dating from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century which provides a snap-shot view of what has been examined up to now and what remains to be explored.

Every particle of the world is a mirror,
In each atom lies the blazing light
of a thousand suns.
Cleave the heart of a rain-drop,
a hundred pure oceans will flow forth.
Look closely at a grain of sand,
the seed of a thousand beings can be seen...
In essence, a drop of water
is no different than the Nile.
In the heart of a barley-corn
lies the fruit of a hundred harvests;
Within the pulp of a millet seed
an entire universe can be found.
In the wing of a fly, an ocean of wonder;
In the pupil of the eye, an endless heaven.
(Mahmud Shabestari)¹⁹⁸

Chapter Four

Wholeness

It is not possible that this unity of knowledge, feeling, and choice which you call *your own* should have sprung into being from nothingness at a given moment not so long ago; rather this knowledge, feeling, and choice are essentially eternal and unchangeable and numerically *one* in all men, nay in all sensitive beings. But not in *this* sense-that *you* are a part, a piece, of an eternal, infinite being, an aspect or modification of it...No, but, inconceivable as it seems to ordinary reason, you-and all other conscious beings as such-are all in all. Hence this life of yours which you are living is not merely a piece of the entire existence, but is, in a certain sense the *whole*;...Thus you can throw yourself flat on the ground, stretched out upon Mother Earth, with the certain conviction that you are one with her and she with you.
(Edwin Schroedinger)¹⁹⁹

My dictionary informs me that the word 'whole' is derived from the Old English term 'hal', meaning 'unharm'd'. This derivation suggests that the concept of wholeness is rooted in the idea of having the various parts of one's mind and body intact and behaving in the proper way, that is, in the idea of being healthy ('hale and hardy'). To conceive reality as a wholeness, then, implies that all phenomena within the scope of human awareness - whether seen or unseen, expressible or inexpressible - are parts of a living organism, and these parts interact in multiple but always interdependent ways, for what affects one part of an organism ultimately affects all parts as well as the general condition of the whole. In this chapter my purpose is to illustrate how a person's ultimate experience of 'being' affirms this organismic quality of reality by expressing an awareness of belonging to everything, an awareness that engenders the kind of 'at-one-ness' experience described by Schroedinger in the above passage.

In contrast to the interdependency of parts implied by a wholeness or organismic view of reality, a mechanical conception of reality suggests that elements within any structural system are discrete, independent entities. Obviously, an allegiance to either of these positions as a worldview entails a different understanding of the place of humanity with regard to the physical universe. David Bohm suggests

that, because a mechanistic conception of reality implies that the entire earth is 'a mere grain of dust in an immense universe of material bodies' interacting 'blindly through forces that they exert on each other', adopting such a conception promotes the view that humanity is 'basically insignificant', that is, the inner aspirations, goals, moral and aesthetic values of humanity are of little importance in terms of the functioning of the universe as a whole. In contrast, he notes that an organismic view of reality suggests that humanity is 'of central importance in the whole system' and that proper human conduct is necessary 'for the over-all harmony of the universe'.²⁰⁰

At first glance, Bohm's comment about the insignificance of humanity implied by the mechanistic worldview might seem incongruous given that the modern science-and-technology complex is geared towards lavishing commodities and services on people. However, upon reflection, it is readily apparent that many, if not most, of these commodities and services do not *respond to* the needs and inner aspirations of people, rather, they are *manufactured as products designed to sustain the technocultural complex itself*, and sustaining such a system may, in fact, be a way of compensating for a collective sense of humanity's insignificance in the context of the overwhelming vastness and complexity of the cosmos. I suggest that it would be difficult to deny that many of the products and services available to people in contemporary technocultures are not manufactured needs. For example: Twenty years ago, certain professionals, such as doctors and real-estate sales-people, did not need telephones in their cars, but now, for many of these professionals car phones are a necessity, and to suggest otherwise (as I have done on a number of occasions) is to invite incredulous stares or accusations of being 'totally unrealistic'. Similar examples of created needs and the materialistic nature of motivational values abound and what they indicate is that the consumer culture of the contemporary world is largely a 'culture of compliance', that is, a culture dominated by patterns of conformity that are generated by a 'dehumanizing' submission to the ideals of a technology of production.

The issue of the cultural submission to technology in Western and Westernizing societies has spawned numerous studies throughout the twentieth

century. In *The Spiritual Situation in our Technical Society*, Paul Tillich refers to the crisis in twentieth century societies as one in which the rationality of technology (technical reason) has become a 'totalitarian rationality',²⁰¹ and Neil Postman makes a similar observation in his book *Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology* by suggesting that America has become a 'totalitarian technocracy', that is, a society characterized by the 'deification of technology': a society which 'seeks its authorization in technology, finds its satisfactions in technology, and takes its orders from technology'.²⁰² Also, in a study dating from 1944 and titled *Eclipse of Reason*, Max Horkheimer suggests that instrumentalistic rationality releases a destructive dialectic in which the collective attempt to dominate nature by technical means rebounds on humanity itself. In Horkheimer's view, under the impact of rampant instrumentalism, both individuals and the societies they create internalize the functions of domination, command, and organization resulting in a tendency to repress internal instincts and the imaginative potential of the unconscious.²⁰³

The major implication of Horkheimer's remarks is that, to the extent that cultures actively suppress the internal and unpredictable vigour of human freedom, imagination, and creativity, the ethical and moral aspects of life are reduced to issues of *compliance*. In a series of lectures published as *The Real World of Technology*, Ursula Franklin comments insightfully on this point by observing that, in contemporary Western societies, *prescriptive* technologies, in which workers have little or no control in the work process, overwhelm *holistic* technologies, in which they do, thus creating a collective mind-set that accepts as normal the imposition of external control and management and leads to the creation of a 'culture of compliance'.²⁰⁴ The ethical and moral atmosphere generated by such a culture of compliance is, inevitably, a dehumanizing one because it perpetuates a self-enclosed and self-perpetuating system of production that limits and ultimately corrodes personal freedom because of its hostility towards alternatives other than those generated within the system.

The significant point here, which Bohm's observation about the dehumanizing

impact of mechanism as a worldview invites us to consider, is that perhaps, as citizens-turned-consumers, we tolerate and even encourage the dehumanizing force of our modern technocultures because, under the influence of this mechanistic view of reality, we share a collective belief that humanity really is insignificant in terms of the cosmic order and, in the face of the existential anguish this realization arouses, we seek to deny it by perpetuating a system of production geared to providing us with increasingly more extravagant and alluring commodities to satisfy our self-assertive egos. Thus, the hedonistic consumerism evident in contemporary Western societies may reflect powerful underlying feelings of alienation and separation, feelings generated by a worldview that points away from a sense of *belonging* to the universe in a meaningful way and towards the possibility of being merely a tiny speck of insignificant cosmic stuff.

To view reality as a wholeness engenders a very different understanding of humanity's place in the cosmos. As indicated above, wholeness implies health, and health is an organismic concept which suggests that all parts of an organism contribute in a significant way to its life. Thus, to consider the cosmos itself as an organism is to give humanity a truly significant role, for the phenomenon of human consciousness requires not only the most complex physical system known to exist - the human brain - but also introduces into organismic life a capacity *to contemplate*, that is, a capacity to observe, reflect, and wonder. 'The consciousness of each of us', observes Teilhard de Chardin, 'is evolution looking at itself and reflecting upon itself', and 'there is no more decisive moment for a thinking being' than the realization that he or she 'is not an isolated unit lost in the cosmic solitudes', but, as a human person, is part of 'the axis and leading shoot of evolution', part of 'the arrow pointing the way to the final unification of the world in terms of life'.²⁰⁵

Whether a person believes in the vision of life depicted by these words of Teilhard de Chardin or in a mechanistic worldview is essentially a matter of faith, an assumption. Faith, in the sense used here, is not associated with religious belief and/or dogma, it is simply a basic aspect of human understanding, a holding of one's intelligence to a certain fundamental point of view. But faith of any kind rests on a

foundation built from experience, intelligence, and insight, and because all of these expressions of life are subject to transformation, faith too is subject to change, although only in the context of considerable pressure to do so. As Bohm observes, 'we have to have enough faith in our world-view to work from it, but not that much faith that we think it's the final answer'.²⁰⁶ In the light of this understanding of faith about particular ideas, Bohm elaborates a 'wholeness' vision of reality which I interpret as a passionate and courageous effort to deal with the inherent limitations and dangers of the modern faith in mechanism *as an underlying principle of reality*, and being a professional physicist, he articulates this vision primarily in the context of recent developments in relativity theory and quantum physics.

As discussed earlier, there are a number of differences between the theories of relativity and quantum physics, chief among them being that relativity 'requires strict continuity, strict determinism, and strict locality' whereas quantum theory posits 'discontinuity, non-determinism, and non-locality'.²⁰⁷ However, the major supposition these two approaches share is that, given current knowledge, the universe is best understood as an immense *unbroken wholeness*, and it is upon this idea that Bohm constructs his approach to understanding reality in terms of an *unfolding and enfolding implicate order*, that is, in terms of an unbroken field of 'enfolded potential' out of which 'implicit potentials' unfold into 'explicit phenomena' before being re-enfolded into the whole. In the following passage, Bohm compares the implicate order to an immense 'ocean of energy'.

The present state of theoretical physics implies that empty space has all this energy and matter is a slight increase of the energy, and therefore matter is like a small ripple on this tremendous ocean of energy, having some relative stability, and being manifest. Now, therefore, my suggestion is that this implicate order implies a reality immensely beyond what we call matter. Matter itself is merely a ripple in this background... And the ocean of energy is not primarily in space and time at all... And in fact beyond that ocean may be still a bigger ocean because, after all, our knowledge just simply fades out at that point... It is implied that the ultimate source is immeasurable and cannot be captured within our knowledge.²⁰⁸

As suggested by this image of the manifest world of matter as a small ripple

on an immense ocean of energy, Bohm's core idea is this: that all the entities and objects we encounter in everyday living are best understood as relatively independent, recurrent, and stable manifestations of the motion or flux between the *totality* of an 'undefinable and immeasurable' *implicate order* (the ocean) and the *sub-totality* of all the particular expressions of this totality which constitute the *explicate order* (the wave) of our common everyday experiences, including our scientific probings and extensions of these experiences. The principal implication here is that, just as a wave unfolds from and returns again and again to the ocean and is, accordingly, related to the ocean and to all of its parts, each expression of being, each part of reality, is related to the wholeness of reality and to all of its so-called 'other' parts. Thus, the realm of being in which we tend to view things as external to ourselves and as related mechanistically to other things - the unfolded order - is not the *fundamental* realm of being. As Bohm notes, 'the world as a structure of things that are basically external to each other comes out as secondary and emerges from the deeper implicate order', an order in which 'there is no separation in space and time' because it is an unbroken field of enfolded energy or potential. 'If we are separate', he writes, 'it is because we are sticking largely to the manifest world', that is, the world of space and time, 'as the basic reality'. What is important to understand, he adds, is that 'the whole point' of the manifest world 'is to *have* separate units...separate but interacting', whereas 'in nonmanifest reality it's all interpenetrating, interconnected in one'.²⁰⁹

To emphasize: In terms of understanding human nature, the major implication of Bohm's concept of an 'enfolding-unfolding universe', which is a revolutionary implication with respect to the modern mechanistic paradigm but a corroborative one with respect to the wisdom of the perennial philosophy and artistic insights throughout history, is that 'deep down', at the basic level of reality, '*the consciousness of mankind is one*'. For evidence of this deep underlying unity, Bohm could have drawn attention to the universality of mysticism, poetry, philosophy, art, music, or the simple pursuit of knowledge, but instead he points toward another expression of the universality of human experience, namely, the 'problems of mankind'. 'You see, they

are all the same', he observes: 'fear, jealousy, hope, confusion...the problem of isolation and so on...deep down all the problems are the same'. How could this be if not because, in the basic order of reality, the consciousness or mind of humankind is one? 'These problems originate in the consciousness of mankind and manifest in each individual' because '*each individual manifests the consciousness of mankind*'.²¹⁰

This last observation illustrates the holographic quality of the implicate order, that is, the capacity of each of its parts to carry information about what is enfolded within the whole. Because of the widespread association of Bohm's ideas with a holographic model of the universe, a few words about holography are in order. Essentially, holography is a process of reproducing a three-dimensional image of an object by using light-wave patterns recorded on a photographic plate or film. If any piece of this recorded image (called a hologram or holograph) is illuminated with coherent light (that is, with light whose waves are approximately of the same frequency, such as light generated by a laser), it provides a depiction of the entire image or hologram, and the more of the hologram you use, 'the more of the object you can see, and the more accurately you can see it'.²¹¹ The mathematical principles underlying holography were initially developed in the 1940's but holograms were not actually constructed until after the invention of the laser in 1960. The following passage briefly summarizes the holographic process.

Holography is a method of lensless photography in which the wave field of light scattered by an object is recorded on a plate as an interference pattern. When the photographic record - the hologram - is placed in a coherent light beam like a laser, the original wave pattern is regenerated. A three-dimensional image appears.

Because there is no focusing lens, the plate appears as a meaningless pattern of swirls. *Any piece of the hologram will reconstruct the entire image.*²¹²

Although brief, this description of the holographic process is sufficient to illustrate that the pattern on the holographic plate reflects Bohm's idea of an implicate order because it is an enfolded image stored everywhere on the plate. As a metaphor for understanding how knowledge about reality is acquired, this similarity between holography and the implicate order suggests that, just as the information contained in

any piece of a hologram is capable of reconstructing the image enfolded in the whole holographic plate, any phenomenon carries information about the whole of reality. The important implication here is that obtaining knowledge about reality does not always depend on determining the contiguous connections characteristic of mechanical systems, any more than reconstructing the image on a holographic plate depends on retaining point-to-point connections.

It is important to emphasize here that the concept of a hologram *as such* is static, whereas the reality implied by an implicate order is essentially dynamic because it is a 'ground' or fundamental order of being within which the process of enfolding and unfolding particular expressions of being occurs. The correspondence between Bohm's ideas and holography, then, is best described in terms of a *holomovement*, that is, in terms of *flow*.²¹³ For Bohm, it is the holomovement which is the 'basic reality', and 'all entities, objects, forms, as ordinarily seen, are relatively stable, independent and autonomous features of the holomovement'.²¹⁴

The relationship between 'being' and 'becoming' implied by this depiction of reality as a holomovement is one in which becoming is understood in the light of the wholeness of reality, that is, in the light of a fundamental ground of being that is essentially dynamic. Because of its nature as a 'ground', the wholeness of the implicate order is an expression of being, but what this being *is* must be understood as a *movement* or *flow* that expresses each and encompasses all particular processes of 'becoming'. Bohm compares this idea (that '*what is* is the process of becoming itself') to a flowing stream. He writes: 'On this stream, one may see an ever-changing pattern of vortices, ripples, waves, splashes, etc., which evidently have no independent existence as such', rather, 'they are abstracted from the flowing movement, arising and vanishing in the total process of the flow'.²¹⁵ Thus, what Bohm suggests is that, just as the nature of the stream - its being - constitutes a dynamic wholeness that underlies all of its manifest parts, the nature of reality is to be a dynamic wholeness in which each expression of 'becoming' arises from, interacts with, and is essentially encompassed within an underlying ground of 'being', the

implicate order. This dynamic understanding of being contrasts with some depictions of being as 'static', that is, an unchanging essence insofar as it *incorporates the movement of relationality* as an intrinsic quality of being, and it contrasts with some depictions of 'becoming' insofar as it conceives the processes of becoming not as processes of 'making' reality but as particular unfoldments of what is implied in the wholeness of reality', unfoldments which are only 'relatively stable, independent and autonomous' features of the wholeness that is the holomovement.

The words 'relatively stable, independent and autonomous' imply mechanistic connections, and by using them to describe the entities manifested in the explicate (unfolded) order, Bohm draws attention to the fact that the principles of mechanism are not denied by considering reality in terms of a holomovement, that is, he is not suggesting that various parts of the explicate order do not function mechanistically. Rather, his point is that mechanistic explanations do not provide an understanding of reality at a 'deep level'. He writes: 'If we are trying to see the thing deeply - the nature of what is - we have got to look differently, and I am proposing that if you begin with enfoldment you get a feeling of what is most basic, and you can then explain mechanism as an approximation to unfoldment'.²¹⁶

There are many types of experiences which support this idea that at a deep level of understanding the holomovement is an apt description of what occurs as life unfolds in its many and varied expressions. One kind of experience of deep significance for me personally is listening to music. Bohm suggests that the sense of movement, continuity, and meaning which occurs when listening to music stems from the 'active transformation' in a person's consciousness of a set of 'reverberations'. These reverberations combine not only immediately perceived and previous sounds but also 'various emotional responses, bodily sensations, incipient muscular movements, and the evocation of a wide range of yet further meanings, often of great subtlety', and, accordingly, they reflect how the music is 'enfolded' within 'many levels of consciousness'. The various transformations flowing out of these reverberations 'interpenetrate and intermingle to give rise to an immediate and primary feeling of movement'. Thus, when people respond to music, they are directly

involved in a 'holomovement' because their emotional, physical, and other responses, which exist in the explicate order, are inseparable from the various 'transformations' out of which they are constituted, which originate within the implicate order.²¹⁷

In addition to music, other kinds of artistic experience clearly reflect the idea of holomovement. For instance, in the following passage, Ken Dychtwald compares the act of reading a poem with the way the holographic phenomenon depicts a 'particular aspect of life as a whole unto itself as well as a storehouse of information of some grander, larger whole'.

We may experience this same event [i.e., the holomovement] while reading a poem. In the poem, the poet has endeavored to capture a key aspect of life in a word. When we read this word, we not only experience it, but as we enter into the context of the poem, we begin to also experience the poet who offers this word to us. In addition, we can travel along this word through the poet who is acting as the medium between us and some spectrum of universal experience. Through this word, we enter into a holographic relationship with a culture, an era, an energetic dynamic, a spectrum of life.²¹⁸

Dychtwald's comments about reading a poem can easily be extended to include other kinds of literary and visual artistic experiences. Moreover, because the kind of holographic 'reasoning' implied by his comments suggests that people naturally respond to any provocative idea or image with a 'curious blend of deduction, induction, intuition, sensation and insight',²¹⁹ his words remind us that even when engaged in strictly regulated areas of thought, such as in the natural and mechanical sciences, the 'borders' between particular fields of inquiry and the larger life experiences of inquirers remain permeable. Can any thought be separated from an emotional context? Moreover, what emotional context does not connect us with a larger framework for action and ultimately with an underlying worldview? The implication is clear. Einstein expresses it well when he writes that 'all means prove but a blunt instrument if they have not behind them a living spirit'.²²⁰ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, as well, gives voice to this insight in these words from his Nobel Prize acceptance speech: 'It is vain to affirm that which the heart does not confirm'.²²¹ Thus, because of its capacity to transcend the distinctions so often made between thought and emotion, the holographic paradigm is a valuable conceptual tool for

communicating across various academic disciplines as well as between various kinds of everyday experiences.

A particular kind of everyday experience which reflects the idea of holomovement is the experience of having a 'felt-sense' or 'felt meaning' of something as described by Eugene Gendlin in his book *Focusing*.²²² Gendlin uses the concept of 'felt meaning' as a general way of describing how people normally interact in their everyday lives. What this concept implies is that people ordinarily experience ideas and/or events in a general or 'global' way before articulating them in detail. John Welwood discusses this connection between Gendlin's work and the holographic paradigm by noting that 'felt meaning can be seen as an experiential manifestation of holographic compression, where many bits of information function all together as a whole'. For example: A person can only have a felt sense of someone or something by 'including' all impressions of that person and/or thing and 'excluding' particular ones. Thus, the felt sense of the person and/or thing can be described as 'infolded' or 'implicated' within our experience, and it is 'blurry' because it is 'implicit'. However, 'when we attempt to focus or pinpoint' some impression, 'then we begin to make aspects of it *explicit*' - using Bohm's terminology, the impression unfolds from the implicate to the explicate order.²²³

As Welwood points out, a 'felt sense' of something is normally implicit or 'blurry', whereas a 'direct' impression of something is unfolded and explicit. There are occasions, however, when the felt sense of something may be particularly vivid, as in a sudden flash of insight or in the midst of a creative process when, suddenly, the whole of a work takes shape in the mind of a creator. William James draws attention to this kind of experience when he notes that 'great thinkers have vast premonitory glimpses of schemes of relation between terms, which hardly even as verbal images enter the mind, so rapid is the whole process'.²²⁴ In a fascinating footnote, James illustrates his observation by providing the following summary of Mozart's description of his manner of composing.

First bits and crumbs of the piece come and gradually join together in his mind; then the soul getting warmed to the work, the thing grows more and

more, 'and I spread it out broader and clearer, and at last it gets almost finished in my head, even when it is a long piece, so that I can see the whole of it at a single glance in my mind, as if it were a beautiful painting or a handsome human being: in which way I do not hear it in my imagination at all as a succession - the way it must come later - but all at once, as it were. It is a rare feast! All the inventing and making goes on in me as in a beautiful strong dream. But the best of all is the *hearing of it all at once*.' ²²⁵

Although Mozart's manner of composition is often cited as evidence of his unique creative skills, the kind of intuitive vision it entails is perhaps best understood, in the light of the holographic paradigm, as an innate capacity of consciousness. Intuition is an integral part of everyday experience and what is it if not an ability to gain access to what is implied, to the implicit order of reality? As Welwood observes, intuition 'operates by scanning a holographic-type blur with a diffuse attention that does not impose preconceived notions on it', which suggests that what is referred to as 'the unconscious' may be best understood not in terms of 'a set of autonomous or explicit contents' but rather in terms of 'holistic patternings, which may be explicated in many different ways and many different levels of the organism/environment interrelationship'. Different kinds of psychotherapy, for example, may be described as attempts to stimulate images, memories, or stuck patterns of behaviour that are implicit or 'enfolded' within a person's psychic make-up in a way that allows them to emerge or unfold in ways that are beneficial rather than harmful. ²²⁶

As implied by the above reference to the unconscious, the holographic paradigm invites inquirers to delve into the question of what is meant by the notion of 'objective reality' and its relation to everyday experience. For instance, the ostensibly solid objects which we rely on every day to help us through our daily tasks - such as floors, desks, chairs, books - are, in reality, changing (unfolding) continually, but in such an extremely subtle way that these changes are unimportant in terms of immediate practicality. It is readily apparent that technology functions at this practical level of reality, the level of mechanistic interaction. However, it is questionable that mechanistic associations are adequate for understanding human experiences related to the mind, that is, to the sphere of thoughts and emotions, to mental presuppositions, intuitions, aesthetics, ethics, and morality, because the subject-object differentiation at

the level of everyday interaction with the physical world cannot be applied to human consciousness. Is one an object to oneself or is another person with whom one interacts an object in the same sense as a chair is an object? Bohm suggests that understanding the reason for the inadequacy or incompleteness of mechanistic explanations involves delving into the question of 'meaning', which implies examining the relationship between the mental and the physical.

Notes About the Fundamental Significance of Meaning

One way of considering the issue of meaning and the relationship of the mental and the physical is to ask the question, is there a 'bottom level' reality: Is there a fundamental reality that is, in principle, unambiguous, complete, and most importantly, independent of what it means to an observer? Another way of framing this question is to ask whether the process of making-meaning is itself part of reality or is there a level of reality that is independent of meaning-making activity?

Bohm's response to this question is 'no', and part of his support for it comes not specifically from his own ideas about the implicate order but directly from quantum mechanics. He writes: 'It is not commonly realized...that the quantum theory implies that no such "bottom level" of unambiguous reality is possible'. The crucial insight, he explains, comes from the thought of Niels Bohr which suggests that quantum theory 'introduces no new concepts at all', rather, 'what it does is to require that concepts such as position and momentum, which are in principle unambiguous in classical physics, must become ambiguous in quantum mechanics'. Thus, the issue of meaning is 'crucial to the understanding of the content of the theory', and this inclusion of meaning as part of reality constitutes 'a radically new step' in understanding the relationship of mind and matter because it implies that content, context, and meaning are inextricably linked as aspects of reality.²²⁷ The major implication here is that, just as mind-related phenomena and context are related through meaning, quantum theory suggests that matter itself exhibits a similar kind of context-dependency that involves an unfolding of meaning, as outlined in the following passage.

[The] mathematics which so successfully predict the quantum properties of

matter...[give] only statistical predictions. It not only fails to predict what will happen in a single measurement, it cannot even provide an unambiguous concept or picture of what sort of process is supposed to take place. So...the concepts are ambiguous, and the meaning of the concepts depends on the whole context of the experimental arrangement. The meaning of the result depends on the large scale behaviour which was supposed to be explained by the particles themselves... [Thus], the meaning of these particles has the same sort of ambiguity that we find in mental phenomena when we are looking at meaning. This kind of situation is what is pervasively characteristic of mind and meaning. Indeed the whole field of meaning can be described as subject to a distinction between content and context...Content and context are two aspects that are inevitably present in any attempt to discuss the meaning of a given situation... The significance of any particular level of content is therefore critically dependent on its appropriate context, which may include indefinitely higher and more subtle levels of meaning - such as whether a given form seen in the night means a shadow or an assailant depends on what one has heard about prowlers, what one has had to eat and drink, and so on. So you see, this sort of context-dependence is just what is found in physics with regard to matter, as well as in considerations of mind or meaning.²²⁸

In the light of this quantum-theory-generated assumption that meaning is implicated in both physical and mental phenomena, Bohm's suggestion that reality is an unfoldment from an implicit to an explicit order can be understood as 'a way of illustrating the way meaning is organized', that is, *the way meaning unfolds*. Bohm employs two theoretical concepts to describe the 'energy' involved in this process of unfoldment. On the one hand, there is a kind of *inward* flow of meaning from the physical to the mental which results in increasingly higher levels of meaningful awareness. For example, light striking the retina of the eye forms an image which is then transformed chemically and transmitted to the brain for further processing. Bohm refers to this kind of energy as *soma-significance*, a term which can be understood as *the flow of significance from matter to meaning*. On the other hand, there is a kind of *outward* flow of meaning from the mental to the physical in which meanings induce physiological responses that are directed 'toward ever more manifestly somatic levels'. For example, 'normally the heart will beat faster when something means danger'. Bohm refers to this kind of energy as *signa-significance*, which can be understood as *the flow of significance from meaning to matter*.²²⁹

When combined with the principles of enfoldment and unfoldment, the concepts of soma-significance and signa-significance explain how the holomovement, as a basic conceptual tool for understanding reality, can be understood as a threefold *relationship between matter, energy, and meaning*. Soma-significance, for example, involves the enfoldment of energy and meaning in matter and the unfoldment of this energy from matter towards meaning. Essentially, it describes how matter becomes significant to increasingly higher levels of perception and awareness. In a related way, signa-significance involves the enfoldment of matter and meaning in energy and the unfoldment of meaning towards matter, which essentially describes how meaning ‘acts somatically toward a more manifest level’, that is, how the significance of something is manifested physically. Finally, it is apparent that, in keeping with the conceptual implications involved in these ideas, both matter and energy are enfolded in meaning, for understanding both matter and energy depends on what they mean. This enfoldment by meaning, according to Bohm, ‘seems to be more fundamental than the enfoldment of the other types’ because it is possible to discuss ‘the meanings of meaning’, and, therefore, ‘in some sense meanings enfold meanings’. However, it is not possible to discuss ‘the matter of matter’ or the ‘energy of energy’. Thus, the idea that ‘meaning refers to itself directly’ suggests that meaning is the basic aspect of reality.²³⁰

To believe that meaning is the basic aspect of reality is to believe that the mental and physical are essentially one. As an illustration of what might be for some the radical implication of this observation, here is how Bohm responds to a question about whether he believes there is a definite link between ‘higher, self-reflective organisms’, such as ourselves, and such things as ‘a leaf, a rock, a tree’.

Yes, with the entire material universe. To my mind, this view would produce a much better civilization than that which emphasizes a graded hierarchy of conscious life, in which that which is "above" has the greater degree of reality. If we say that all matter is in some way holy, then we rid ourselves of the special sacredness we have imputed to certain things, such as the temple or the church.²³¹

Bohm also expresses agreement with Spinoza’s suggestion that ‘matter is God

as extension' adding that 'one of the weaknesses of some of the religions is that they have exalted spirituality and devalued matter'. He continues: 'Brotherhood exists not only in spirit but also in matter, confirming the ancient hermetic view: "As above, so below." One of the earlier forms of mysticism would have stated it: "As in spirit, so in matter," a position which can also be developed from modern physics'.²³²

Bohm's opinion here clearly reflects the perspective of Teilhard de Chardin whose provocative 'Hymn to Matter' passionately describes a confluence between spirit and matter, an idea which permeates his work. Here are excerpts from this remarkable prose-poem.

Blessed be you, mighty matter, irresistible march of evolution, reality ever new-born; you who, by constantly shattering our mental categories, force us to go ever further and further in our pursuit of the truth.

Blessed be you, universal matter, immeasurable time, boundless ether, triple abyss of stars and atoms and generations: you who by overflowing and dissolving our narrow standards or measurement reveal to us the dimensions of God...

I acclaim you [i.e., matter] as the universal power which brings together and unites, through which the multitudinous monads are bound together and in which they all converge on the way of the Spirit...

I acclaim you as the divine *milieu*, charged with creative power, as the ocean stirred by the Spirit, as the clay moulded and infused with life by the incarnate Word...

Your realm comprises those serene heights where saints think to avoid you - but where your flesh is so transparent and so agile as to be no longer distinguishable from Spirit.²³³

In terms of human action, belief in the confluence of spirit, mind, and matter implies, as Bohm observes, that 'a change in the mental is a change in the physical and a change in the physical is a change in the mental'. This point is 'crucially significant for understanding psychological and social change' because it suggests that 'each perception of a new meaning by human beings actually changes the over-all reality in which we live and have our existence'.²³⁴ Thus, just as an individual is an ongoing expression of what the various experiences of life mean to her or him,

'society is the result of what it means to us'. For example, once modern Western societies adopted a scientific worldview and 'the world came to mean a set of disjointed mechanical fragments', it was inevitable that people would act collectively in accordance with this worldview and engage in the kind of objectifying activities it implies.²³⁵

Bohm's vision of reality draws attention to the limitations of these objectifying activities largely by pointing out the limitations of the 'planning mentality' so characteristic of scientific methodology. What Bohm suggests is that the most skilful and sophisticated plans to change either society or oneself will have little, if any, lasting effect unless there is a genuine change of meaning in the individual and collective minds of people and societies. He writes, 'we can't *produce* the change that is really needed to change the future of mankind' because such change emerges naturally as an unfoldment of new meaning. Thus, 'a change of meaning is necessary to change this world politically and economically and socially', and before such meaning unfolds as a collective experience, it must unfold as the experience of individuals.²³⁶

Implicit in the idea that significant change comes about through activities that generate meaning rather than through the application of specific plans and/or techniques is the assumption that there is some form of interior or interpersonal *dialogue* happening, for without an engagement between different sides of an issue or concern there can be no movement towards new understanding. Bohm compares what transpires in dialogue to 'a stream running between two banks...the two banks merely give form to the stream - the stream is common to the two banks...a stream of thought or perception, or some sort of energy flowing...unfolding, and that would be the meaning of the dialogue'.²³⁷

Because of this embeddedness within dialogue, it is misleading to think of meaning as an individual rational experience, for its nature is to be an expression of *participatory consciousness*. Even when new meaning appears to originate within an individual - as, for instance, when a person immediately resonates with a certain idea

or work of art - it always involves, as Bohm's metaphor suggests, *a flow of energy that connects different viewpoints*. How could it be otherwise? We are people who live by sharing experiences. Ours is a world where individual and collective life-experiences are created and sustained by what we receive from and pass on to others, and what allows us to do this is a capacity to create meaning. The origin of the word 'meaning' reflects this idea that it is something that is *shared intentionally* with others, for it stems from the Old English word *maenen* which means 'to recite, tell, intend, wish'. As Larry Dossey observes, meaning is 'the path of our humanness'.²³⁸ Bohm expresses this insight even more simply by suggesting that 'meaning is being'.²³⁹

At the end of *Unfolding Meaning* Bohm offers a few 'remarks on the process of dialogue' which not only describe how the book was created but also illustrate how meaningful change comes about as a kind of surrender to the efficacy of a participatory form of consciousness. The book is a record of three lectures given by Bohm and the discussions following them which occurred during a weekend meeting in a small English country hotel sponsored by 'The Foundation of Universal Unity'. A group of forty four people of varying ages, nationalities and professional backgrounds took part in this event, and here is how Bohm summarizes what happened.

As mentioned...the weekend began with the expectation that there would be a series of lectures and informative discussions with emphasis on content. It gradually emerged that something more important was actually involved - the awakening of the process of dialogue itself as a free flow of meaning among all the participants. In the beginning, people were expressing fixed positions, which they were tending to defend, but later it became clear that to maintain the feeling of friendship in the group was much more important than to hold any position. Such friendship has an impersonal quality in the sense that its establishment does not depend on a close personal relationship between participants. *A new kind of mind thus begins to come into being which is based on the development of a common meaning that is constantly transforming in the process of the dialogue.* People are no longer primarily in opposition, nor can they be said to be interacting, rather they are *participating* in this pool of common meaning which is capable of constant development and change. In this development the group has no pre-established purpose, though at each

moment a purpose that is free to change may reveal itself. The group thus begins to engage in a new dynamic relationship in which no speaker is excluded, and in which no particular content is excluded. Thus far we have only begun to explore the possibilities of dialogue in the sense indicated here, but going further along these lines would open up the possibility of transforming not only the relationship between people, but even more, the very nature of consciousness in which these relationships arise.²⁴⁰

What these words imply is that, when dialogue is a genuinely participatory experience, there is something much more significant happening than an exchange of ideas or a negotiation between contrasting or opposing opinions, because the participants are not merely willing to be affected by the process but *willfully let go of the pretence that one's consciousness is one's own*. Moreover, what I am emphasizing in this study is that this letting-go, this surrendering to participatory consciousness, is not just another technique for achieving the goal of social integration or personal fulfilment, rather, it is *the natural way to be*, it is *the way things are meant to be*, and accordingly, it is the basis for all technique, the matrix out of which genuinely meaningful, creative energy flows. Because of the importance of understanding participatory consciousness as an interaction in which 'the way to do is to be', the following section focuses specifically on this kind experience.

Participatory Consciousness and the Importance of Living in the Light of the Present

As described throughout this dissertation, the concept of participatory consciousness refers to a particular context for unfolding meaning and inspiring action which draws attention to the importance of learning to live fully attuned to what is happening in each and every given situation. This present-centered connection between awareness and action is so vital to the ideas I am supporting here that it constitutes the major theme developed in Part Two of this study. However, by itself, the concept of 'participation' does not necessarily imply this orientation to the present moment. As mentioned earlier (in Chapter Two), the 'participatory philosophy' advanced by Henryk Skolimowski is radically oriented towards the future, and accordingly, it provides a contrasting perspective to the one advocated here.

In one sense, Skolimowski's philosophical theory is itself 'participatory' insofar as it is constructed as a mosaic of different 'sub-theories' or participatory

themes, but in another sense, it contradicts the idea of participation because of what I would call its 'extremism', for it places an absolute emphasis on the importance of 'synthesis' rather than analysis and is exclusively devoted to future-oriented creativity and 'becoming', *as opposed to* rather than in conjunction with continuity and being. In the light of the wisdom in the perennial philosophy pertaining to the efficacy of *simply being in touch with the 'timeless now' of a Divine Spirit*, this extremism concerns me, but before outlining this concern, here is an outline of Skolimowski's position.

There are five distinct but interconnected theories or components in Skolimowski's overall 'participatory philosophy' or theory of the 'participatory mind'. According to the first of these, the *theory of sensitivities*, 'all evolution is articulation' and 'all articulation occurs via sensitivities'. As described by Skolimowski, human sensitivities are simply the capacities through which people are able to interact with their environments, that is, capacities such as sensing, seeing, intuition, instinct, emotion, intellect, talent, moral sense, aesthetic sense, empathy: the whole orchestra of human consciousness and potential. His point is that these sensitivities *articulate* life: they express, apprehend, and sculpt it. Thus, this theory makes explicit the idea that 'the shape of the world is acquired through distinctive articulation', and its major implication with respect to understanding reality is that it suggests the fundamental importance of *understanding differences* at both individual and sociocultural levels.²⁴¹

Skolimowski calls the second distinctive theme of participatory philosophy *the theory of the three minds*. Beginning with the premise that 'the architecture of life is the architecture of mind', the purpose of this sub-theory is to present a coherent way of explaining the extraordinary diversity of the phenomenon 'mind'. 'We should aim at such a theory of mind', Skolimowski writes, 'as is able to explain the mind of the amoeba and the mind of the Buddha'. Accordingly, the 'theory of the three minds' suggests the following: Mind-1 is 'the discursive mind' which coordinates and integrates sensitivities (that is, interaction with one's surroundings); Mind-2 is 'the

sum total of all sensitivities representing an enlarged mind', which suggests that it refers to 'the sum total of all the sensitivities that evolution has developed in us'; Mind-3 is equivalent to 'reality' as such, for, in Skolimowski's words, it corresponds to 'the sum-total of the interactions of our sensitivities with the stuff outside'. Skolimowski likens Mind-1 to the neo-cortex and Mind-2 to the so-called 'old brain' (but only roughly), emphasizing that the two minds are not separated from each other, rather, 'they are parts of each other', and just as the neo-cortex is an extension and a specific refinement of the "old" brain', he suggests that Mind-1 is 'a form of crystallization' of Mind-2. To integrate the ideas put forward in this sub-theory, Skolimowski suggests that the result of the 'dialogue' between Minds 1 & 2 with Mind-3 is *reality-making*, and this is an important point because it highlights Skolimowski's assertion that mind is coextensive with reality.²⁴²

The third theme of participatory philosophy reiterates in more overtly philosophical language what the first two themes imply, namely, that there is one unitary reality and that reality is essentially 'noetic', that is, mind-full. For Skolimowski, 'what exists is only that which is comprehensible to the mind', for 'mind shapes all' and 'mind unites all', and because of this 'reality-making' nature of mind-fullness, the term noetic also suggests that reality is essentially an expression of becoming rather than being. This unified vision of an evolving reality Skolimowski calls *noetic monism*. In contrast to materialist monism, which claims that whatever exists is essentially matter (a 'body') of some kind, and idealist monism, which claims that ideas (spirit) are what exist in a primary sense, Skolimowski's version of monism suggests that 'both bodies and ideas (spirit) exist' but their existence 'takes different forms' according to their place within evolution: that is, 'all forms of being come from the same evolutionary barrel' - hence the unitary nature of reality - but 'they represent different stages of the transformation of evolution' - hence the great variety within the underlying unity.

It is clear from Skolimowski's explanation of noetic monism that he considers its evolutionary perspective *basic* to our understanding of reality, for he proposes that 'structure and being are to be considered special cases of the process of becoming'.

However, it is important to observe here that, by *privileging* a condition of becoming over being (rather than consider each an expression of reality), Skolimowski's notion of the 'participatory mind' is one in which '*reality is not given to us...at all*', but is something that is continually in the process of *being made*. Thus, the concept of 'what reality is' is a meaningless one for Skolimowski - in fact, he calls it a 'misnomer' - because what is essential, in his view, is not something that has a form of 'is-ness' that can be 'explored', rather, reality is essentially 'an aspect of mind', an ever-changing product of a process of 'reality-making'.²⁴³ This view of reality as a process of 'reality-making' is very different from the view proposed in this study which suggests that reality is a wholeness from which the potentials within it unfold in myriad processes of 'meaning-making', a view which implies that *everything about reality is given*.

Skolimowski describes the fourth major component of his participatory philosophy as *the theory of the spiral of understanding*, the purpose of which is to articulate *why* reality manifests itself in such a variety of ways. Essentially, this sub-theory deals with the issue of individual and/or collective agency and posits that the dimensions of the universe correspond to the dimensions of a particular understanding of it, which is to say that 'the amoeba and the fox' do not possess 'the same sort of knowledge and the same sense of the universe': as Skolimowski puts it, 'to know is to constitute the world'. To express the dynamic relationship between 'knowing' and 'being' implied here, the 'spiral of understanding' concept envisions the 'known and the knowable' universe as an inverted cone in which the 'always conservative' forces of ontology (being) and the 'always revolutionary' forces of epistemology (our ways of acquiring knowledge) coexist in a creative tension that propels evolution. Thus, according to this concept, 'evolution spells out revolution', because 'as long as we allow knowledge to grow, we are, by this very act, revolutionaries, for we allow the universe...to grow and change'. One way of expressing the core suggestion of this 'spiral of understanding' idea is to say that 'the universe is always given to us with our mind contained in it' because 'we are woven into the universe we explore'.

Another formulation of it states that 'in order to be alive we must unfold', and in order to unfold 'we have to articulate the spiral of understanding, which is at the same time the unfolding of the universe and life itself'.²⁴⁴

The dialectical nature of the spiral of understanding (that is, its depiction of a creative tension between knowing and being) leads directly into Skolimowski's fifth theoretical component of participatory philosophy, *the thesis of simplicity/comprehension*, which suggests that the process of understanding is a dialectical one that leads 'from the simple to the complex and then back to the simple'. In effect, this thesis posits that 'to comprehend is to simplify' which means that 'simplicity is the methodology of the mind'. The purpose of this sub-theory, then, is to specify 'what happens during the act of understanding' and why individuals are not 'overwhelmed by the growing complexity of the world'.²⁴⁵ Skolimowski's proposal is that the act of simplifying is a way of 'coping with' complexity and reducing its deleterious effects. He writes:

When the complexity of the ontological order becomes unmanageable, the mind 'simplifies' reality by imposing a new order on it... With the emergence of the self-conscious mind, which creates knowledge as the vehicle of its understanding, the story of complexity/consciousness is punctuated by the stages of simplicity/comprehension... The human mind cannot cope with too many complexities, especially with infinite complexity. If the cosmos is infinitely complex, and there is no reason to assume that it isn't, the mind does not have the capacity to deal with that complexity. Thus it must simplify - in order to comprehend. Understanding is simplifying.²⁴⁶

In a significant variation of what Skolimowski proposes, my view is that 'understanding is simplifying' not because a mind *cannot* cope with complexity but because it *can* cope with it and does so by an act which brings it closer to an awareness of the wholeness from which it and everything else unfolds, an awareness that can be, and often is, symbolized as a 'center'. The act of simplifying, in my view, is not merely a means of reducing the anxiety of having to deal with complexity, rather, it is an intrinsically positive, integrating act, one that testifies to having attained a new level of understanding that 'sees' what was previously complex in a new light and draws consciousness increasingly towards its source. This

movement of consciousness towards complexity followed by a reflection back upon itself and culminating in a center of 'supreme consciousness' describes the nature of evolution as envisioned in the work of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.

It is important to draw attention here to Skolimowski's claim that Teilhard de Chardin's depiction of evolution in terms of an all-pervading tendency towards complexification accompanied by an increase in consciousness is 'essentially incomplete' and that his own theory of simplicity/comprehension complements it. He writes that, for Teilhard de Chardin '*complexity emerges as the crucial concept of evolution - the hidden spring that guides the process of growth; as well as the overall concept that enables us to understand the unfolding of evolution*'.²⁴⁷ However, to state merely that evolution is a matter of complexification implies that evolutionary progress may be in the direction of a 'diffusion' of material and/or psychic energy, and nothing could be further from the way Teilhard de Chardin envisions evolution. What Skolimowski neglects to clarify is how Teilhard de Chardin's thesis of 'complexity/consciousness' is, in essence, a theory of evolutionary *convergence*. For Teilhard de Chardin, the evolutionary relationship between complexity and consciousness depicts 'a world in involution', that is, a world which is 'in a continual tension of organic doubling-back upon itself', as described in the following passage.

If the universe...is in process of spatial expansion (from the infinitesimal to the immense), in the same way...it presents itself to us...as in process of organic *involution* upon itself (from the extremely simple to the extremely complex) - and, moreover, this particular involution 'of complexity' is experimentally bound up with a correlative increase in interiorisation, that is to say in the psyche or consciousness.²⁴⁸

Unlike Skolimowski's vision of evolution in terms of stages of incomprehensible-complexity 'punctuated' by stages of comprehending-simplicity, Teilhard de Chardin's work suggests that evolutionary complexification *is* a form of simplification inasmuch as it involves an ascent of consciousness by means of 'convergent integration' towards a supreme consciousness, called an *Omega* point.²⁴⁹

Skolimowski's simplicity/comprehension thesis is the last of the five theoretical

components of his participatory philosophy. In the final chapter of *The Participatory Mind*, he discusses several implications of this philosophical position and in the process situates it within one of two major traditions of Western philosophical thought. He identifies the first of these traditions as a *philosophy of justification* which searches for rational explanations by means of analytical methods in an attempt to serve rather than change an existing order. The second tradition he identifies is a *philosophy of creation* which he describes as a philosophy that combines 'exemplary courage with exemplary imagination' in an attempt 'to redesign reality'.²⁵⁰ Unquestionably, Skolimowski identifies with creative philosophy, as is clear from his continual celebration of 'becoming' over 'being' and of 'reality-making' over 'reality', and as mentioned earlier, my principal concern with his theory of the participatory mind is its extremism, its tendency to adopt its own position to the exclusion of any other.

The term 'theory' is derived from Greek and Latin words meaning 'spectator' and 'to observe', which suggests that a theory is essentially a 'point-of-view', a perspective, a set of assumptions that orient and organize a person's perception and understanding of a relatively large collection of circumstances and/or experiences. According to this understanding of the term, a theory is a way of integrating information in a meaningful way, but when a theory embodies an exclusionary perspective, it ceases to be an instrument of integration and becomes instead an instrument of fragmentation. Thus, exclusionary theories, perpetuate dualistic thinking because their conceptual mode is one of establishing dichotomies. The important point here is that, when positions become entrenched *in opposition to* rather than *as an alternative to* another position, genuine participation is inhibited and this in turn inhibits meaningful change, an outcome that is particularly ironic with respect to Skolimowski's theory which actually focuses on participation and reality-making.

In contrast to Skolimowski's theory of the participatory mind, Bohm's theory of the implicate order is based on an understanding of reality as a wholeness and is, therefore, inherently 'inclusionary', for it recognizes that all manifestations of being,

including itself, are expressions of the manifold potential inherent in reality. By implication, an 'inclusionary' frame of mind is one which accepts that every idea about reality is, in some sense, a limited one, and it is this acceptance of its own vulnerability which gives it a capacity to be truly participatory, truly capable of engaging in interaction that can generate meaningful change. Meaningful change is, of course, a revolutionary activity, but revolution is not just about assertiveness, breaking with tradition, and forging new systems of action. It is also about 'giving-up', letting-go of comfortable patterns of activity and submitting to the uncertainty of unfamiliar ones.

There can be no doubt that Skolimowski considers his participatory philosophy a revolutionary one, as the subtitle of *The Participatory Mind* makes abundantly clear: 'A new way theory of knowledge and of the universe'. Moreover, the exclusionary fervour with which he celebrates becoming over being is evident throughout this book, especially in its final two chapters where he states explicitly not only that 'the path of becoming is all-important' but also that 'becoming is a benevolent god that devours being and transforms it into ever more effervescent forms'.²⁵¹ Clearly, in Skolimowski's participatory theory, the act of becoming is virtually deified, and lest anyone think this deification is merely a metaphor, consider the following passage in which he summarizes his 'participatory/evolutionary' model of the 'integrated self' in terms of a 'mandala of the life of continuous becoming'.

Meaningful life, in the evolutionary model, is the life of continuous becoming. Continuous becoming signifies continuous creativity; it also signifies continuous liberation from the shackles of old being, which wants to hold us back. Thus meaning=becoming=liberation=creativity. And conversely, creativity signifies liberation; and also signifies becoming and ultimately the attainment of meaning. The four concepts co-define each other; they form a mandala pattern.

These four concepts outline a new theology. The name of this theology is: 'We are God in the making', through our creative potential, through the process of continuous becoming.²⁵²

As implied in the above words, Skolimowski presents his views in a way that is permeated with an intensity that can be readily compared to religious zeal,²⁵³ and

like any religious perspective, his ideas carry with them ethical implications. He describes these ethical implications in the final section of *The Participatory Mind* as having three levels: the interpersonal, the interspecies, and the God-man or cosmic level. All of these levels focus on reverence for and responsibility towards life. In the following passage, Skolimowski summarizes his notion of participatory ethics and at the same time provides another unmistakable expression of the religious tenor of his overall remarks.

To participate is to be responsible. The larger the reach of our participation the larger the scope of our responsibility. Thus participatory ethics should be seen as an integral aspect of the participatory mind; both its consequences and its articulation.

Participatory philosophy is an act of courage: to live as if you were God, for what else is left to man if he takes his destiny seriously? To live as if you were God is both a principle of participatory ethics and a principle of human understanding...For the mind has become the eye through which the universe can look at itself. This is one of those rare truths: *through the human mind, the universe appreciates itself*. Without the mind, all the glory of the universe would be mute. When there is no mind to comprehend, there is no universe to behold. What a marvel it was when the universe created the mind to celebrate itself!²⁵⁴

Given remarks such as these, it is reasonable to assume that Skolimowski not only privileges the process through which individuals strive to realize the potential within them, but actually deifies it. 'We can indeed conceive of ourselves as God-in-the-process-of-becoming', he writes, 'without feeling sacrilegious or unduly arrogant'.²⁵⁵ The problem with enshrining the *process* of becoming God as a foundational belief - rather than, for example, the idea that all phenomena, all expressions of being, partake *of* God's nature - is that it enshrines a future-orientation towards time and God as a basis for understanding what *is* and the nature of a Supreme *Being*, and there is much about the nature of time, time-consciousness, and being which suggests that such an approach is inadequate. However, because the second part of this study is devoted entirely to the topic of the relationship of being and time, a full discussion of the problems associated with a future-oriented time-consciousness is presented there. Here I simply wish to point out that, although

Skolimowski often invokes the perennial philosophy to support his own views, the future-oriented ethos of his participatory philosophy is more 'out of tune' than 'in tune' with the wisdom of this tradition which unmistakably suggests that a preoccupation with future-oriented time is what *prevents* people from releasing the divine potential within them.

For example: After noting that in the Jewish Bible God revealed his name as 'I am that I am' (Exodus 3:14), the Buddhist scholar Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki observes that 'this is a most profound utterance, for all our religious or spiritual or metaphysical experiences start from it', that is, from the revelation that God and eternity are indistinguishable and that eternity is an 'absolute present'. The implication he draws from this revelation is that 'those who live in the light of eternity *always are* and are never subjected to the becoming of "was" and "will be"'.²⁵⁶ As mentioned previously, the spiritual significance of the present is also highlighted by Huxley in *The Perennial Philosophy*. Although 'the universe is an everlasting succession of events', he observes, its 'ground', according to the Perennial Philosophy, is 'the *timeless now* of the divine Spirit'.²⁵⁷

The thirteenth century mystic poet of Islam and founder of the Mawlawiy(y)a Sufi order, Jalal al-Din Rumi, evokes this 'timeless now' in a particularly robust way: 'Past and future veil God from our sight', he writes, 'burn up both of them with fire'. From about the same time, Meister Eckhart, a Christian mystic often cited by Skolimowski, makes a similar declaration: 'Time is what keeps the light from reaching us', he writes, adding that 'there is no greater obstacle to God than time'.²⁵⁸ In our own era, J. Krishnamurti is even more succinct: 'Becoming is strife', he writes, 'it is a constant struggle: I am this, and I want to become that'.²⁵⁹ In the context of contemporary views about health and wellness - a context not usually thought of as spiritual but which, according to the views presented in this study, most certainly is - Larry Dossey observes not only that 'time-related anxiety can kill' but also that techniques for reducing such anxiety 'are potent factors in extending life in seriously ill patients'.²⁶⁰ My point here is that if we listen to mystics, religious teachers, and healers from across time and from across a variety of traditions and

cultures, it is clear that a preoccupation with future-oriented time is considered a profound hindrance to a healthy, spirit-filled life. Huxley sums up this observation beautifully in the following comment.

The present moment is the only aperture through which the soul can pass out of time into eternity, through which grace can pass out of eternity into the soul, and through which charity can pass from one soul in time to another soul in time. That is why the Sufi and...every other practising exponent of the Perennial Philosophy is, or tries to be, a son of time present.²⁶¹

Given these observations about the significance of the present, and given that contemporary societies are geared towards the future in so many ways, Skolimowski's future-oriented participatory philosophy appears to be more in keeping with the ethos of modern progress than with the insights of the world's major traditions of spirituality. Basically, the idea of progress simply means 'stepping ahead from a less satisfactory to a more satisfactory situation',²⁶² but with the development of modern science and the entrenchment of a mechanistic worldview, progress became associated with technological advancements that provide individuals, institutions, and governments with increased mastery over the physical world. Thus, in the context of the modern scientific era, progress has very little, if anything, to do with participation, and everything to do with individualistic striving and societal fragmentation, because the knowledge generating process associated with this striving is essentially objectifying, that is, it relies on a *separation* of the knower (observer) from the object to be known, and as such, this process inhibits the experience of participatory consciousness.

In an article entitled 'Freeing Ourselves from Objectivity', Lous Heshusius offers a wealth of insight about the nature of participatory consciousness and how to encourage it as a way of living. She defines the concept of 'participatory consciousness' as the awareness of a deep 'level of kinship between the knower and the known' which eliminates 'perceived boundaries' that constitute both 'self' and 'the perception of distance between self and other'.²⁶³ Although her discussion of this concept is framed within the context of doing qualitative research in Education, my suggestion is that it pertains to a much larger, in fact, a foundational domain of

inquiry because it contributes significantly towards understanding the nature of human relationships, and according to the views presented here, this means that it helps discern the spiritual nature of being.

Of particular value is the way Heshusius draws attention to how the objectifying procedures of the mechanistic paradigm obscure the reality of participatory consciousness as a basic form of knowing. For instance, she observes that 'before the scientific revolution the act of knowing had always been understood as a form of participation' and had always included forms of embodied knowing, that is, 'direct somatic, psychic, and emotional' involvement with the topic of inquiry.²⁶⁴ Furthermore, she observes that, in spite of the criterion of objectivity in scientific work, many contemporary scientists attest to this kind of somatic knowing when discussing their work. For example, Barbara McClintock, 'a Nobel laureate for her work on how genetic forces in corn plants interact with the whole organism', describes her work in terms that can be described as both 'visceral' and 'participatory', for she uses phrases such as 'one must have a *feeling* for the organism' and one must 'hear what the material has to say to you'.²⁶⁵

Heshusius draws attention to another important way of looking at participatory consciousness, and that is to observe that the contemporary ecological crisis vividly illustrates the dangers of not adopting a participatory mode of consciousness as a way of living. Because not only our social structures and processes but also the physical environments we create for ourselves are the results of what they actually *mean* to us, to embrace the mechanistic paradigm of modern science is to embrace a form of consciousness that honours a constant striving to increase human mastery over the physical world, and in the context of such striving, a sense of alienation from nature is inevitable. Whether this sense of alienation stems from feelings of superiority or from more deeply-rooted feelings of inferiority masquerading as technological bravado, as discussed earlier, it is reasonable to suppose that an attitude of mind that considers humanity and nature as essentially separate entities helps legitimize social and economic practices that contribute to the present ecological crisis.

For example: one of the major institutions of Western societies, capitalism,

enshrines a relentless quest for profit which in turn fosters a consumerist society in which social status, security, and even feelings of individual self-worth are often associated with a process of accumulating material possessions and services, and to perpetuate this process of accumulation, a vast techno-industrial complex exists which assumes it has a 'right' to exploit natural resources rather than balance its own needs with those of the natural environment. In a world permeated by a sense of wholeness and infused with participatory consciousness, the concept of justice would not be so one-sided.²⁶⁶ The suggestion here is that a new worldview oriented towards wholeness, one which recognizes that there is no real separation between humanity and nature, is a necessary condition for healing the wounds that have been inflicted on our planetary environment.

Although Heshusius does not specifically draw attention to the spiritual nature of participatory consciousness, her description of it clearly resonates with the ageless idea expressed in the perennial philosophy of 'letting-go' and abandoning one's 'self' to an ultimate spiritual ideal. She observes, for example, that what is most characteristic of participatory consciousness is a person's 'ability to temporarily let go of all preoccupation with self and move into a state of complete attention'. Moreover, although this state of complete attention is one of 'temporary self-forgetfulness', it is in no way similar to a *loss* of self, for, if anything, it involves a much heightened sense of self because it creates a new 'self-other unity': It involves 'a merging into a larger and more complex reality in which reality is seen in ways invisible before'.²⁶⁷ Such words are certainly in keeping with many traditions of spirituality, although it is not a 'temporary' state of self-forgetfulness that they encourage but an ongoing one. David Loy describes this state as one that ultimately involves a consciousness that 'unlearns trying to grasp itself, real-ize itself, objectify itself' and instead discovers that by letting-go of one's sense of an autonomous 'self' a person becomes grounded 'in the whole network of interdependent relations that constitutes the world'.²⁶⁸

There is a significant affinity here between what Heshusius and Loy are saying with respect to human relationships and the ideas of Teilhard de Chardin with respect to all phenomena. My suggestion here is that to move towards 'a self-other unity' that

expresses a more complex reality and to be grounded in 'the whole network of interdependent relations' is to express what Teilhard de Chardin refers to as an evolutionary convergence towards an Omega point, that is, towards a final condition of unified personal and universal consciousness. To clarify: In the 'Foreword' of *The Phenomenon of Man* Teilhard de Chardin states that his aim is to describe the experience of humankind in the context of 'a *whole* which unfolds',²⁶⁹ and he refers to the culmination of this unfoldment as *Omega*, a condition of universal convergence which he describes as one in which each particular consciousness becomes 'more itself and thus more clearly distinct from others the closer it gets to them in Omega'. What this Omega-concept implies, then, is that individual elements of a whole fulfil themselves (achieve perfection) by converging with all other elements in the unified experience of the whole. The following passage summarizes this idea and also draws attention to its 'non-pantheistic' character.

In any domain - whether it be the cells of a body, the members of a society or the elements of a spiritual synthesis - *union differentiates*. In every organised whole, the parts perfect themselves and fulfil themselves. Through neglect of this universal rule many a system of pantheism has led us astray to the cult of a great All in which individuals were supposed to be merged like a drop in the ocean or like a dissolving grain of salt. Applied to the case of the summation of consciousness, the law of union rids us of this perilous and recurrent illusion. No, following the confluent orbits of their centres, the grains of consciousness do not tend to lose their outlines and blend...The more 'other' they become in conjunction, the more they find themselves as 'self'.²⁷⁰

Thus, for Teilhard de Chardin, as for Heshusius, and as spiritual teachers have observed for ages, to be fully ourselves, we must incorporate and be incorporated with all 'others', which means that personal fulfilment comes by animating our lives with participatory consciousness. At a time when individualism is a pervasive and dominating feature of cultural life, such as ours, this is certainly not an easy task, but it is the task that the major traditions of spirituality have recognized as being of ultimate significance. As Huxley observes, 'the ultimate reason for human existence' as expressed in the perennial philosophy is a 'unitive knowledge of the divine Ground' (that is, knowledge of some form of 'spiritual Absolute') which comes 'only

to those who are prepared to "die to self" and so make room, as it were, for God', or for whatever is experienced as Absolute, whatever gives a person's life its deepest meaning.²⁷¹

It is important to emphasize here that what I am suggesting is that self-surrendering to an Absolute is a fundamental *quality of being* that transcends specific conceptualizations of the Absolute. Thus, although Teilhard de Chardin understands the absolute significance of 'Omega' specifically from a Christian theistic perspective (inasmuch as he identifies Omega with the divine nature of Christ), other spiritual perspectives understand and experience the Absolute in their own unique ways, which may or may not be expressed in theistic terms but which do express the kind of participatory consciousness that animates spiritual life. Accordingly, because self-abandonment is a key aspect of both spirituality and participatory consciousness, and because it articulates the way individual beings *belong* to the wholeness of reality, this chapter concludes with a closer examination of this vital quality of being.

Self-Abandonment: The Way to Be and To Belong

And this is the true end set before the soul...to see the Supreme which is also the means to the vision; for that which illumines the Soul is that which it is to see, just as it is by the sun's own light that we see the sun. But how is this to be accomplished? Cut away everything.
(Plotinus)²⁷²

Perfection, in the art of swordsmanship is reached, according to Takuan, when the heart is troubled by no more thought of I and You, of the opponent and his sword, of one's own sword and how to wield it - no more thought even of life and death. "All is emptiness: your own self, the flashing sword, and the arms that wield it. Even the thought of emptiness is no longer there." From this absolute emptiness...comes the most wondrous unfoldment of doing.
(Eugen Herrigel)²⁷³

Self-abandonment to God or to an Absolute is certainly one of the major themes in the literature of the world's great spiritual traditions, but it is a theme with many variations. Perhaps the most explicit rendering of this theme is in Islam, for the word 'Islam' itself is derived from an Arabic root meaning primarily 'peace' and secondarily 'surrender', which suggests that an appropriate understanding of 'Islam' is to think of it as an expression of 'the peace that comes from surrendering one's life to

God'.²⁷⁴

For Muslims, the sublime expression of this peace-in-surrender-to-God flows from allegiance to the Qur'an, the holy scripture of Islam, believed to be the direct speech of God (Allah) as revealed to Muhammad. Fazlur Rahman suggests that 'the most intense impression' that the Qur'an leaves upon a reader is one of a God whose 'unitary and purposive will' creates 'order' in the universe by communicating to every created thing its own 'order' or 'law of being' as a command of God. Humankind, however, is a special case. Because of its 'moral dualism', that is, its capacity for both good and evil, order is something that must be brought about within humanity and the Qur'an embodies 'the moral command' required to do this. 'The centre of the Qur'an's interest', then, 'is the betterment of humankind' which is achieved by living in accordance with the 'absolute supremacy' of its moral command. As Fazlur Rahman emphasizes, according to Islamic belief, it is a 'suicidal conclusion' to suggest that people can make and unmake moral law according to their 'heart's desire', for the 'obvious fact' that this law is already there *for* them.²⁷⁵

The inner moral quality which the Qur'an identifies as that which enables people to avoid self-deception when making and evaluating their actions is *taqwa*. Although 'taqwa' is often translated as 'fear of God', Fazlur Rahman notes that its actual meaning is 'to guard against danger', and the principal danger referred to is acting in self-interest rather than for the good of others and, ultimately, of all humanity. According to the Qur'an, this selfishness arises out the basic timidity of human nature. When people encounter evil, they panic, and when good things come, they do not reach out to others because they fear that charity and sacrificing for others will result in their own impoverishment. Thus, the Qur'an insists that 'individuals transcend their pettiness and enlarge themselves', and the way to do this is by developing the moral quality of 'taqwa' which allows people to evaluate their actions on the basis of 'the ultimate benefit of humanity' rather than on 'the immediate pleasures or ambitions of the self'.²⁷⁶

Curbing the desires of a human nature prone to good and evil is also a key aspect of Hinduism. However, in this spiritual tradition, the 'path of renunciation' is

not understood as conformity to a particular religious and/or moral principle, rather, it expresses itself in the form of various practices capable of bringing about a release from earthly desires and ultimately union with God. The word 'yoga' - derived from the same root as the English word 'yoke' and implying the double connotation of 'yoking together' and 'placing under discipline' - refers to the various methods for achieving this transformation of consciousness, liberation, and integration with the Divine. Recognizing that different personality types require different orientations towards spiritual practice, Hinduism specifies four principal kinds of yoga, each being a distinct but not necessarily exclusive 'pathway' to God: *jnana yoga*, the path to God through knowledge, *bhakti yoga*, the path to God through love and devotion, *karma yoga*, the path to God through cultivation of a detached attitude towards work, and *raja yoga*, the path to God through psychophysical exercises. Of these four main types of yoga, karma yoga most clearly reflects the idea put forward here concerning the efficacy of self-abandonment to an Absolute through participatory consciousness. In Hinduism, actions directed at the external world invariably react on the doer. Accordingly, when such actions are directed towards a person's private benefit, they tend to separate the person from God, but when personal benefit is sacrificed to God and actions are performed with detachment, self-centredness decreases and persons are free to move closer towards union with God. Thus, as described in the following passage from the *Bhagavad-gita* 3, karma yoga consists in detachment from the fruits of action and is perhaps best understood as 'desireless action'.

Not by refraining from action does a man attain freedom from action. Not by mere renunciation does he attain supreme perfection. For not even for a moment can a man be without action. Helplessly are all driven to action by the forces born of Nature. He who withdraws himself from actions, but ponders on their pleasures in his heart, he is under a delusion and is a false follower of the Path. But great is the man who, free from attachments, and with a mind ruling its powers in harmony, works on the path of Karma Yoga, the path of consecrated action...The world is in the bonds of action, unless the action is consecration. Let thy action then be pure, free from the bonds of desire...In liberty from the bonds of attachment, do thou therefore the work to be done: for the man whose work is pure attains indeed the Supreme.²⁷⁷

In contrast to the active nature of karma yoga, *jnana yoga* is essentially a

reflective practice that realizes its goal of union with God through successive efforts to attend to the wisdom of sages and scriptures, to think deeply about the implications of various aspects of life, and to shift one's sense of identification from what might be called the 'surface self' of everyday reality to the 'larger self' that is latent within each person.

Raja yoga is also a practice wherein an individual seeker is led away from the so-called ordinary self and towards a direct personal experience of 'the Beyond within' by means of a series of specific steps or stages, eight in number: restraint (*abstention from injury, lying, stealing, sensuality, and greed*); discipline (observing cleanliness, contentment, self-control, studiousness, and contemplation of the Divine); posture (keeping the body from disturbing the mind by assuming the 'lotus position'); breath-control (in order to calm the mind); sense-withdrawal (in order to facilitate perfect concentration); concentration on a single object (in order to bring stillness to the mind); meditation (in which self-awareness is lost in the concentration of the object); entasy (in which awareness of the object vanishes and there is an experience of 'total being').

Just as raja yoga entails a number of different practices in a person's journey towards union with God, bhakti yoga embraces many ways in which a person can realize the aim of directing towards God 'the love that lies at the base of every heart'.²⁷⁸ However, in contrast with jnana yoga and raja yoga, the devotee of bhakti yoga does not seek identification with the Divinity as much as he or she seeks to adore God in any and every way possible, such as by repeating God's name during everyday activities so as to infuse one's soul with the love of God, by recognizing that the love of God can be realized through different kinds of human relationships (such as the love of parent and child, conjugal love, friendship, and the relationship between teacher and student and/or worker and employer), and by worshipping God in the form of devotion to one of the numerous images or manifestations of the Divine in Hindiusm.

The fact that these four types of yoga vary considerably testifies to a fundamental characteristic of Hinduism, namely, its recognition 'that there are

multiple paths to God' because people begin their spiritual journey from different starting points.²⁷⁹ However, all of these paths together constitute a single 'Path of Renunciation'. As Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan observes, in contrast with the historicism and 'self-sufficient humanism' of modern Western societies which encourage paying attention to the world of space and time, in Hindu thought 'the meaning of man's life is to be found not in this world but in more than historical reality', for the highest aim of humankind 'is release from the historical succession denoted by birth and death'.²⁸⁰ In the words of the *Bhagavad-gita*, 'a man attains perfection when his work is worship of God, from whom all things come and who is in all' and the way to reach this perfection is to heed the simple call of God to man, 'Leave all things behind, and come to me for thy salvation'.²⁸¹

In Buddhism, the call to self-abandonment is also a central message, but it is one that does not center on a specific understanding of an Absolute Being. In fact, Buddha did not identify 'ultimate reality' by giving it a name of any kind, for he taught that the true state of the world is 'empty' of any defining characteristics and, therefore, unclassifiable. 'If you want to understand Buddhism', observes Shunryu Suzuki, 'it is necessary for you to forget all about your preconceived ideas', which includes 'the idea of substantiality or existence', for Buddhists believe that 'true existence comes from emptiness and goes back again to emptiness'.²⁸²

Sunyata is the term for the Buddhist doctrine of 'emptiness', and as David Loy explains, its basic purpose is to 'deconstruct' the apparent self-existence of things, that is, the apparent objectivity of the many factors that constitute experience, for, in reality, all factors are interdependent. Thus, from a Buddhist perspective, the most problematic duality that must be overcome in order to extinguish suffering ('*dukkha*') is that of 'self versus nonself', and the way to overcome this dualism is through meditation, which is, in reality, a way of 'learning how to become nothing by learning to forget the sense-of-self'. As Loy observes, 'meditation techniques decondition the mind from its tendency to secure itself by circling in familiar ruts, thus enabling its freedom to become anything'.²⁸³

When considered in the context of everyday living, the connection between the

emptiness that characterizes all things and the self-forgetfulness that characterizes an enlightened person can be illustrated by the famous (and possibly historical) story that tells of an exchange between Bodhidharma, the first Zen Buddhist patriarch in China (5th. century CE), and the Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty. The Emperor asks the great teacher 'what is the highest and holiest truth?', and he receives this reply: 'A vast emptiness and no holiness in it'. This reply puzzles the Emperor who remarks, 'Who are you then who stand before me if there is nothing holy, nothing high in the vast emptiness of ultimate truth?' Bodhidharma answers, 'I do not know, your majesty', a response which left the Emperor bewildered and disappointed because he did not understand that this apparent lack of knowing was actually an expression of abandonment to 'divine knowing'. As Daisetz Suzuki explains, what the great teacher meant was that as long 'as the mind tarries on the plane of relativity', that is, on the plane of division, the plane of separate expressions of knowing and being, 'it forever remains in the dark', but 'the moment it loses itself in the Emptiness, it ascends the throne of Enlightenment'.²⁸⁴

Christianity also places redemptive value on the abandonment of self to an Absolute, but in this case, the Absolute is conceived in terms of a Supreme Being. The importance of this self-abandonment is evident from the fact that the most widely used Christian prayer - The Lord's Prayer - contains, as its central phrase, the words 'Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven', words which unmistakably situate the act of surrendering one's will to a Divine purpose at the center of Christian life. A new translation of this prayer by Neil Douglas-Klotz offers several versions of this familiar phrase which vividly depict the idea of this self-surrender as an interpenetration of human and Divine wills. Here are three examples:

Your one desire then acts with ours, as in all light, so in all forms...
 Let all wills move together in your vortex, as stars and planets swirl through the sky...
 Create in me a divine cooperation - from many selves, one voice, one action...²⁸⁵

Abandonment to a divine will is often expressed within the Christian tradition in terms of cultivating a sense of 'detachment'. For instance, Meister Eckhart refers

to 'absolute detachment' as 'the best and highest virtue whereby man may come most closely to God',²⁸⁶ and Teilhard de Chardin writes that 'anyone who devotes himself to human duty according to the christian formula, though outwardly he may seem to be immersed in the concerns of the earth, is in fact, down to the depths of his being, a man of great detachment'.²⁸⁷

It is important to emphasize that the detachment implied here is far from being a form of inactivity. In a spiritual treatise devoted entirely to the idea of self-abandonment to Divine Providence, Jean-Pierre de Caussade writes that 'sanctity consists in fidelity to the order established by God and in self-abandonment to his *action*...Perfection does not consist in understanding God's designs, but in submitting to them...Perfection is nothing else than the faithful co-operation of the soul with the work of God'.²⁸⁸ Teilhard de Chardin reinforces this idea in the following passage by pointing out how authentic Christian life is permeated by the realization that it is through action, through 'work', be it of the most humble or the most exalted sort, that the divine *milieu* is realized. He writes:

The Christian...is at once the most attached and the most detached of men. Convinced in a way in which the 'worldly' cannot be of the unfathomable importance and value concealed beneath the humblest worldly successes, the Christian is at the same time as convinced as the hermit of the worthlessness of any success which is envisaged only as a benefit to himself (or even a general one) without reference to God. It is God and God alone whom he pursues through the reality of created things. For him, interest lies truly *in* things, but in absolute dependence upon God's presence in them. The light of heaven becomes perceptible and attainable to him in the crystalline transparency of beings...within himself and his most personal development, it is not himself that he is seeking, but that which is greater than he, to which he knows that he is destined. In his own view he himself no longer counts, no longer exists; he has forgotten and lost himself in the very endeavour which is making him perfect. It is no longer the atom which lives, but the universe within it.²⁸⁹

Living in a condition of self-surrender to an Absolute implies the belief that it is our destiny to live for something that is greater than ourselves. Although this belief can only be actualized through service to others, it is often conceived in terms of an *individual's* personal relationship with a Supreme Being or an Ultimate Ideal. In

Judaism, however, the *societal* nature of the ideal of self-abandonment is brought to the forefront, because, as Abraham Heschel explains, 'Jewish existence is not only the adherence to particular doctrines and observances, but primarily living *in* the spiritual order of the Jewish people'. A particular person's 'share in holiness', he points out, is acquired 'by living in the Jewish community'. Self-abandonment, then, in the light of the Jewish tradition, includes the idea that the ultimate meaning of any human action is not restricted to the life of the individual who does it or to the particular moment in which it is done, because fundamentally 'religious living is not only a private concern'. In Heschel's words, as Jews, people act 'both as individuals and as the community of Israel,' and 'all generations are present, as it were, in every moment'. One's own life is 'a movement in the symphony of ages'.²⁹⁰ In the context of such a societal orientation towards spirituality, it is hardly surprising that the Jewish tradition abounds in texts that speak about holiness in terms of service to others and about the importance of social justice. When taken to its full implication, this passion for service and justice expresses itself as a compassion that virtually obliterates distinctions between self and other, as beautifully portrayed in the following words.

As a river empties into the ocean,
empty yourself into Reality.
When you are emptied into Reality,
you are filled with compassion,
desiring only justice,
the will of Reality becomes your will.
When you are filled with compassion,
there is no self to oppose another
and no other to stand against oneself.²⁹¹

Just as Judaism affirms the ideal of self-abandonment through its passion for social justice, followers of the Taoist philosophical tradition have their own distinctive way of expressing this pervasive theme of spirituality, and it is a gentle way: the wisdom of 'letting things run their course', of not interfering.²⁹² As discussed earlier, the concept 'wu wei' is the clearest embodiment of this ideal, and although the English term often used to depict this concept is 'non-doing', 'wu-wei' must not be confused with the Western notion of passivity. My understanding of this concept is

that it refers to an experience of self-surrendering to an Ideal of ultimate significance, such as *Tao* (or, for those who profess a theistic spirituality, to God).

The literal meaning of the word 'Tao' is 'the way', and Taoists use it to refer to that which is the source and animating principle of the universe. Taoism, then, strongly emphasizes 'the union of the individual and nature, suggesting that one controls the environment not by fighting it but by cooperating with it as a sailor uses the wind when tacking against it'.²⁹³ Thus, for Taoists, 'to empty oneself' means to return to one's own source, to 'the way of nature', and through this return to the constancy of nature, a person's mind and heart is opened and he or she acts in accordance with 'the divine' and thus attains union with Tao. This connection between an 'emptiness' of being, action, and experiencing ultimate fulfilment is expressed in the following poem from *Tao-te Ching*.

[Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 16.²⁹⁴ See Appendix B, # 4.]

Inasmuch as the wholeness view of reality suggests that every 'part' is an unfoldment of the 'whole', it reflects the Taoist insight that the way of the universe is the way of each individual expression of being. The ultimate and intimate kinship between humanity and nature depicted by both these perspectives is simply but powerfully evoked by the ancient Chinese character for the word 'Tao' which depicts 'a person running along a path'. Deng Ming-Dao explains this image as representing 'the organic movement of the cosmos as a great, balanced, and dynamic body in motion, just as it represents the path each of us follows through life'.²⁹⁵ The sense

of belonging to the universe engendered by this image offers a sharp contrast to the mentality of dominance over nature fostered in modern techno-industrial societies, a mentality which has legitimized a production imperative geared towards the exploitation and not the celebration of the earth's resources.

However, the wholeness and Taoist vision of reality resonates well with the spiritual vision of the First Peoples of the Earth, a vision described by Andrew Harvey as one which draws attention to the 'arrogance of modern materialism' by reminding us 'of our essential "inter-being" with nature' and of the 'necessity' for furthering 'a profound respect for everything that lives and happens'. In the words of an Ojibway prayer, it is 'the human family' which is divided and 'must come back together to walk in the Sacred Way'. Accordingly, this prayer concludes with a petition to the 'Sacred One' as 'Grandfather' to 'teach us love, compassion, and honor, that we may heal the earth and heal each other'.²⁹⁶

It is relevant here to reflect on how the hierarchical model of reality might contribute in a significant and largely unacknowledged way to promoting an attitude of mind that alienates humanity from nature. Compare, for instance, the aloofness implied by Wilber's comment that 'nature, or the prepersonal world' is the '*greatest* point of alienation from Spirit'²⁹⁷ and the way spiritual writers from different traditions often use descriptions of natural phenomena to convey the wisdom of spiritual life: as when Jesus points out the potential for good inherent in the people of God by comparing them to 'the salt of the earth' and the 'light of the world' (Matthew 5: 13-16); or when Lao-tzu seeks to convey the idea that truth often sounds paradoxical by observing that 'nothing is more soft and yielding than water, yet for attacking the solid and strong, nothing is better' (from *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 78); or when the Navaho give eloquent testimony to the wholeness of the universe by *identifying* with all the manifestations of nature they see around them, as in the following chant.

Hozhoni, hozhoni, hozhoni
Hozhoni, hozhoni, hozhoni
 The Earth, its life am I, *hozhoni, hozhoni*

The Earth, its feet are my feet, *hozhoni, hozhoni*
 The Earth, its legs are my legs, *hozhoni, hozhoni*
 The Earth, its body is my body, *hozhoni, hozhoni*
 The Earth, its thoughts are my thoughts, *hozhoni, hozhoni*
 The Earth, its speech is my speech, *hozhoni, hozhoni*
 The sky, its life am I -
 The mountains, its life am I -
 White corn, its life and I -
 Yellow corn, its life am I -
 The corn beetle, its life am I -
Hozhoni, hozhoni, hozhoni
Hozhoni, hozhoni, hozhoni ²⁹⁸

The experience of wholeness reflected in this Navaho chant is an experience of self-surrendering because it erects no 'borders' between a person's so-called 'self' and any 'other' manifestation of being.

Like the previous examples, this unity-with-nature version of the theme of self-surrendering emanates from a major tradition of spirituality, but my purpose here is not merely to suggest that the idea of self-abandonment is at the core - and perhaps is *the* core - of the world's great traditions of spirituality, rather, it is to suggest that *self-abandonment is an expression of faith in the wholeness of reality*, which, by implication, means that reality *is* fundamentally spiritual.

When a person abandons her or his individualistic sense of self (the sense of being an autonomous self-sufficient being), that person acknowledges and *trusts* that he or she is by nature a part of everything that is, because in a condition of participatory consciousness there is no individual self to hold on to, there is only a self-in-relation-with another or others. The same affirmation of wholeness occurs when identifiable groups abandon their claims to collectivistic identities, that is, their sense of being self-contained units possessing an inherent capacity and right to act autonomously. Because it is the nature of nature to be a network of relationships - as suggested throughout recorded history by the great spiritual traditions and reaffirmed by many streams of contemporary inquiry, including science - all expressions of being are interconnected, and the only true 'unit' we can understand *as a unity* is the wholeness of which each of us and each collective expression of being is a part.

It is important to emphasize here that the sense of '*belonging-with*' that flows from the experience of participatory consciousness actually intensifies a person's or a group's awareness and appreciation of their own particular qualities of being, not only because these qualities are perceived in relation to others but also because they are perceived as having a meaningful impact on nurturing a relationship. This sense-of-belonging, then, is in no way similar to the diminishment of personality occasioned by the merging of individual identities within a collectivity. Self-abandonment is not self-negation, it is an ongoing and creative affirmation of self within a larger context that is itself part of the most all-encompassing context of all, the enfolding-unfolding wholeness of reality. In stark contrast to the individualistic ethos of our contemporary technocultures, the suggestion here is that when individuals and/or groups separate themselves from others in an attempt to assert particular and fixed identities they set in motion the forces of self-negation. Ultimately, *this movement away from others is suicidal*, for to be a self is to be a self-in-relation-with-others, and what is suicide if not the ultimate expression of not-being-with-others, of sensing oneself to be essentially 'different'?

However, the perception of being 'essentially' different must be carefully distinguished from the experience of simply being different. Each expression of being is different in the sense that it is a particular form (or unfolding) of being-among-others, which suggests, as mentioned previously, that difference and relationship 'go together' because they are mutually constituted. But to believe that a being is essentially different is to believe that there is some basic 'self-stuff' that can be isolated and observed as a separate, self-sustaining entity. This belief in an autonomous self implies that there is a need to act in accordance with 'self-interest' engrained in the patterns of life, and when I use the terms 'individualism' and 'collectivism' I am referring to this underlying assumption that it is 'natural', and, therefore, 'right' for individuals or collectivities to act exclusively in their own interest, if not in all circumstances, at least in major and important ways. Although such assumptions are capable of generating an abundance of commodities and services in particular instances, the 'under-side' of this abundance is a continuing domination

and/or exploitation of anyone or anything considered 'other'.

The consequences of ignoring this denigration of the other, I believe, are as devastating as they are clear: at the level of planetary ecology, it leads to a continuing exploitation and dangerous erosion of life-sustaining resources; at the level of international and inter-cultural relations, it leads to an acceptance of wars and massacres as an inevitable aspect of life; at the level of personal and institutional relations, it leads to social fragmentation, violence, and the perpetuation of human suffering; in all cases, it leads to a sacrifice of the limitless potential available through participatory consciousness.

I have often heard and occasionally taken part in conversations in which the movie 'Whose Life is it Anyway?' was discussed as a way of illustrating the idea that, because one's life is one's own, a person who considers her or his life 'meaningless' has a right to commit suicide. But the only way that a life can be considered 'one's own' is from a vantage point of separation and the only kind of separation that exists is in the 'perception' of reality. *In reality, there is no separation.* How could there be? Could there be anything that exists or has existed or will exist that is not connected with something else and through that connection linked with everything? 'If you cut a blade of grass', an ancient Chinese proverb tells us, 'you shake the Universe',²⁹⁹ and this message of interconnectedness has been reiterated throughout history in countless ways. The poet, Walt Whitman exclaims it when he writes, 'A vast similitude interlocks all'.³⁰⁰ The mystic, Angelus Silesius exclaims it when he declares 'there is nothing in the world, O Miracle, that can shut me up in myself'.³⁰¹ In our own time, the physicist, John A. Wheeler exclaims it when he observes that there is nothing in this world that is merely 'sitting out there' for people to observe, for ours is a 'participatory universe'.³⁰²

The way to be is to belong, and the way to belong is to abandon one's individualistic sense of 'self' in the experience of truly participating in the wholeness of life.

Concluding Remarks: At the beginning of Part One of this study, I ask the question, 'What does it mean to belong, to be part of a whole?', and in the

question, 'What does it mean to belong, to be part of a whole?', and in the subsequent discussions, I outline my answer to this question by proposing that *being* is best understood not as the articulation of a particular position somewhere within a hierarchy of consciousness but as a particular expression of the wholeness of reality. What is fundamental to being, I suggest, is not a *place* in the hierarchy of consciousness but a *participation* in the fullness of life expressed in and through this hierarchy. The implication here is that the breath-of-life, the Spirit that animates each being, *is* the breath-of-all-life, the Spirit that animates all of reality.

In the context of human experience, what I am suggesting is this: whenever a person is aware of something, whether it is an object, an idea, another person, or an indescribable sense of something, that 'something' is part of what he or she is. 'All seemed a world in flower', exclaims the poet Joan Maragall, 'and I was the soul of this world'.³⁰³ Accordingly, when a person perceives herself or himself as a separate being, the 'way of reality', the way things are meant to be, is distorted and personal disorientation ensues. As life unfolds, then, actions may breed either fragmentation and sorrow or wholeness and joy: fragmentation and sadness if they enact an individualistic mode of being, wholeness and joy if they engender self-abandonment, that letting-go of the sense of self which is the heart of participatory consciousness, just as it is the heart of the spirituality of being. Jalal al-Din Rumi gives us a wonderful evocation of this idea.

That moment you are drunk on yourself,
You are withered, withered like autumn leaves.
That moment you leap free of yourself,
Winter to you appears in the dazzling robes of spring.³⁰⁴

As these words of Rumi imply, in the world of self-abandonment, there are no preconceptions, no fixed ideas that channel experience into predetermined grooves. 'The whole world could be choked with thorns', Rumi declares, but 'a lover's heart will stay a rose garden'.³⁰⁵ Most importantly, because an experience of self-abandonment is one in which there are no fixed notions about a so-called 'self' to interfere with the *freedom* of a genuinely participatory mode of interaction, it entails

aware of and open to the experience of a present moment. *Freedom and necessity, then, are indistinguishable when I give up the false hope of creating my 'own' identity, my own future.*

In the context of the individualism and planning mentality of modern technocultures, this idea of giving up the 'search for self' and the need to make definite plans for the future is a radical suggestion, for if anything is central to the ethos of the modern era it is belief in the efficacy of individual effort as the driving force of progress (with progress defined, as mentioned previously, in terms of a constant striving to increase human mastery over the physical world). However, faith in this kind of progress forges an uncompromising link between 'hope' and future rewards, and the danger of adhering too rigidly to this connection is that it tends to characterize the present in terms of a perpetual inadequacy.

But suppose that hope is not primarily concerned with the future. Suppose that hope is also, and perhaps fundamentally, an experience of connecting with the 'invisible', with the unmanifest, with that vast potential for action that is present in every moment because of the interconnectedness of all phenomena.³⁰⁶ In the light of this understanding of hope, the meaning of any course of action involves considering the immediate relationships, the immediate context with which one is involved, and insofar as our preconceptions and plans for the future interfere with this meaning-of-the-moment experience, they limit participation and increase separation. The suggestion I wish to emphasize here is that, without the self-abandonment of participatory consciousness, plans and techniques for 'building a better future' do not have access to the animating power of the wholeness of reality, which is the only power that gives them 'pure effectiveness' (*wu wei*), that is, genuinely nurturing and creative energy. As Panikkar reminds us, 'the activity of building a better world is not a mere technique of manipulating or programming the future, but the very art of the present'.³⁰⁷ In Part Two of this study, my purpose is to explore more fully this idea of the 'art of the present'.

As a summary and evocation of the ideas presented thus far about the spirituality of being, I invite readers to reflect on the following poem, and in

particular, to note how it depicts the act of participating in the wholeness of reality as the significant quality of all manifestations of being, rather than the 'lowness' or 'highness' of particular manifestations.

Low in earth
 I lived in realms of ore and stone;
 And then I smiled in many-tinted flowers;
 Then roving with the wild and wandering hours,
 O'er earth and air and ocean's zone,
 In a new birth,
 I dived and flew,
 And crept and ran,
 And all the secret of my essence drew
 Within a form that brought them all to view -
 And lo, a Man!
 And then my goal,
 Beyond the clouds, beyond the sky,
 In realms where none may change or die -
 In angel form; and then away
 Beyond the bounds of night and day,
 And Life and Death, unseen or seen,
 Where all that is hath ever been,
 As One and Whole

Jalal al-Din Rumi.³⁰⁸

Part Two

IN WHAT SENSE IS TIME A MEDIUM FOR DOING SOMETHING?
IS 'DOING' BEST UNDERSTOOD AS A WAY OF BECOMING,
OR IS 'BEING' A WAY OF DOING?

- Preface -

In the middle of things we are born, we live, and we die.

(Nakai, from *Earth Spirit*)³⁰⁹

As I begin to record these ideas about time, I am listening to a recording of native American flute music. One of the selections is an improvisation entitled *In Media Res*, in the middle of things, and its description is a simple one: 'we are born, we live, we die'. I find in this title and its description a symbol for the understanding of time offered in the following remarks, for they evoke in me an image of time surrounded by timelessness. In the light of this image, time is a life-cycle of experiences for each and every being, for beyond-and-around the world of 'things', beyond-and-around the past-to-future flow of time, in the middle of things, there is an unfathomable wholeness.

At the beginning of an essay about the time perspectives of the indigenous people of Algeria, the Kabyle, Pierre Bourdieu relates the following comment: 'An old Kabyle once said 'the French act as if they would never die', they act as if there was 'an immense and open future' in which 'innumerable possibilities' are available for them 'to explore and dominate'. Such an attempt 'to secure a hold over the future' is entirely alien to the Kabyle, according to Bourdieu, for theirs is a way of life that cannot perceive time apart from the 'duration and space' required to perform an immediate act.'³¹⁰

The ideas put forward in Part Two of this study reflect a point-of-view similar to that of the Kabyle, for they suggest that modern Western societies, driven by an obsession with past events and future possibilities and fuelled by values aimed at controlling everything, act 'as if they would never die', and, accordingly, act in a way that diminishes involvement with life. My main purpose here is to respond to this situation by drawing attention to the efficacy of a human aptitude that is significantly

undernourished in modern cultural life in spite of its presence as a core aspect of many spiritual and philosophical traditions, namely, the capacity to be deeply attuned to a present situation. What is proposed here is that, when a person lives as if her or his primary purpose is to complete or in some way cope with projects originating in the past, or as if the principal meaning of everyday living is to ensure a trouble-free future, he or she lives a life of diminished capacity because such preoccupations interfere with or even block access to the meanings and energies that underlie *all* experiences. By contrast, when a person cultivates the ability to center her or his awareness within a present condition, he or she learns how *to connect* with this deep underlying source of meaning and energy and, thereby, learns how to be an instrument of truly nurturing and creative action.

One of the major assumptions implied by past-directed and future-oriented time perspectives is that life is something that must be *made*. This assumption carries with it the idea that time is not a conception of the mind as much as it is something that exists apart from our consciousness of it, and because it is an observable 'fact', it can be considered both as a medium for and a means of creating life. In the words of a famous contemporary scientist, 'time *is* creation'. 'The future is not just *there*', he asserts: 'we are living in a world which is not given to us. It is not like an open book which we can read and open at this chapter or that'.³¹¹

The phrase 'arrow-of-time' is often used to symbolize this linear temporal perspective because it suggests that events move irrevocably in one direction, forward, towards the 'not-yet', towards that which must be built.³¹² Evolution, according to this view, is the result of a cause-and-effect-like succession of events propelled by the energies of living organisms and systems rather than a rhythmic unfolding of life in accordance with an overarching design or towards a meaningful center. A contemporary philosopher summarizes this view by claiming that 'conceptual analysis and all available empirical evidence' point to the conclusion that 'future events are neither real nor determined' because they are '*intrinsically unobservable*'.³¹³

However, in the words of a contemporary psychologist, the idea that our concept of reality runs parallel with the arrow-of-time point of view 'is acceptable only as it applies to our conscious psyche', for when we explore phenomena emanating from the unconscious - from dreams, premonitions, visions, fantasies, synchronistic events - 'the regularity, "speed" and distinct discernability of time become uncertain or even questionable'.³¹⁴ This challenge to the arrow-of-time view has support from a variety of sources, many of which are examined in the subsequent three chapters of this study. In contrast to the view that life is something that must be made, these sources indicate that *life is given* and that the creativity associated with the passage of time is fundamentally an act of unfolding or making actual what is already present as potential.

Although few concepts appear at first glance to be as self-evident as those of the past, present, and future, only the briefest reflection is required to realize that the concept of *physical time* used to organize or measure phenomena in order to render them comprehensible and/or manageable for human purposes is not the same as the *experiential time* which expresses the meaningful interaction of phenomena with their environments. 'The tree bears its thousand years as one large majestic moment' declares one poet-philosopher of our century,³¹⁵ suggesting that the various rhythmic fluctuations of life lose their subjective relevance if they are translated into the limiting structures of humanized objective time. The point here is that there is a basic difference between objective and subjective conceptions of time, and this difference, this relativity of time, suggests that time-consciousness is an attribute of being that is embedded within a more comprehensive timeless reality.

The world of contemporary physics is an important source of support for the idea that time is best understood as 'time-consciousness' and not as an objective phenomenon. Einstein's Relativity Theory, for instance, suggests that events which are perceived as the past in one frame of reference may be perceived as the future in other frames, which implies that the distinction between past and future is dependent on a particular frame of reference. As one prominent physicist explains, 'Einstein's analysis of the meaning of time in physics made it clear that time enters physics only

through the content of observations that say nothing at all about the order in which things become fixed and settled'.³¹⁶

Although the speed-of-light context of Relativity Theory is not the context of everyday human activity, many commentaries on time throughout history indicate that the meanings of temporal experiences are relative to a person's point of view. For example, in a famous meditation on time, Saint Augustine suggests that past, present, and future are three functions of the *present mind*. 'What now is clear and plain', he writes, 'is that neither things to come nor past are', because *memory* is 'the present of things past', *sight* or *perception* is the 'present of things present', and *expectation* is the 'present of things future'.³¹⁷ In a similar way, other accounts of experiences related to time attest to the ability of human consciousness to transcend the normal past-to-future flow of time. A contemporary mystic speaks of a 'window' in his consciousness through which he can see beyond the world of sensations and rationality into a world where 'all the long evolution of matter and life' as well as all of his own history and that of all human beings are 'brought to a point'.³¹⁸ In addition, there are a number of notable poetic expressions that evoke a comparable 'all-at-onceness' kind of experience, perhaps none more familiar to contemporary readers than the following passage by T. S. Eliot.

Time present and time past
Are both perhaps present in time future,
And time future contained in time past...
Time past and time future
What might have been and what has been
Point to one end, which is always present...
And the end and the beginning were always there
Before the beginning and after the end.
And all is always now.³¹⁹

To those for whom the validity of knowledge depends on observability, the suggestion that 'the end and the beginning were always there' is probably nonsensical. However, this idea that all-of-time is an ever present phenomenon (in spite of being one that is unobservable) is an idea that is often affirmed by the professed experiences of many creative artists who describe their work in terms of 'releasing' the form of an

idea or image, or of being merely the instrument through which already existing ideas and images are given form. This perspective towards creativity is often depicted by the image of a sculptor who ‘frees’ a statue by ‘chipping away what’s already there’,³²⁰ and I consider this image to be a reflection of my own experiences as a music composer, teacher, academic researcher, and writer. From my perspective, then, Gustav Mahler expresses a deep insight into the creative process when he declares that ‘I don’t choose what I compose. It chooses me’. Igor Stravinsky makes a similar statement about being an ‘instrument’ through which his compositions appear. In writing about his masterpiece, *Le Sacre du Printemps*, he notes ‘I heard and I wrote what I heard. I am the vessel through which *Le Sacre* passed’.³²¹ Also of particular interest to me as a composer is the fact that Beethoven, in spite of his unorthodox views towards organized religions, was drawn towards what one commentator calls ‘a mystical apprehension of life’ which sees past, present, and future as one. This mysticism is particularly evident in Beethoven’s later years when he kept a framed hand-written ‘creed’ on his desk which included the words ‘I am that which is. I am all that was, that is, and that shall be’.³²²

Because we live with the natural rhythms of life and the constructed rhythms of socialized activity from conception until death, it is clear that the experience of time is a constituent aspect of being. However, as these introductory remarks and the following three chapters propose, it is also clear that the experience of ‘being’ is not limited by its temporality, for human consciousness is capable of reaching beyond the limits of particular events, even the ‘event’ of time itself. As David Bohm reminds us, present events are invariably ‘ambiguous and overlapping’ to some extent, and so their extension and duration within time can be properly understood ‘only in some broader context in which they are embedded’,³²³ which is why Nicholas of Cusa tells us that we cannot understand time ‘except from the standpoint of eternity’,³²⁴ that is, from the standpoint of a timeless order of being. This insight is of central importance because it is this embeddedness of time within a larger timeless context which affirms the spiritual nature of reality.

Thus, the purpose of Part Two of this study is to profile a way of

conceptualizing time that accords with the spiritual reality of wholeness depicted in Part One. In brief, this profile can be summarized in terms of a twofold proposal: first, that a genuinely nurturing and creative unfolding of life comes about through an active engagement with present circumstances, and second, that the capacity to be in tune with the present entails a sensitivity towards the timelessness within which temporal phenomena are embedded. Chapter Five is a survey of various conceptions of time throughout history. This survey is presented both as a way of contextualizing the entire discussion of time and timelessness and as a way of supporting the view that time is best understood as a point-of-view, that is, as 'time-consciousness' rather than as an objective entity. In Chapter Six, I explore important ramifications of adopting each of the three major perspectives towards time as a primary temporal focal point, that is, I discuss the significance of past-directed, future-oriented, or present-centered time consciousness. Chapter Seven offers a more concentrated focus on the importance of cultivating the human aptitude for living in the present. Accordingly, it compares two orientations towards the relationship between being and action: a pragmatic approach that emphasizes the use of individualistic (or collectivistic) rationality within time, and a contemplative orientation that embodies an experience of 'centering' which entails a participatory surrendering to a transcendent, timeless ideal of ultimate significance.

Chapter Five

Images of Time and Timelessness

Time is clothed in a different garment for each role it plays in our thinking. (John Wheeler)³²⁵

When nuclear fission became a reality in the 1930's, the search for a primary and permanent element, begun by ancient Greek philosophers and continued by scientists in our modern period, came to an end in the realization that what had been presumed indivisible and indestructible is actually divisible and destructible. This realization is horrifically depicted by what is perhaps the most assertive image of the twentieth century, the mushroom cloud generated by an atomic explosion, an image that needs no words to describe it as a major turning point in human history. However, the splitting of the atom symbolizes another kind of explosion and another kind of turning point, for it compels us to consider the possibility that all ideas about the universe we inhabit, even those we consider fundamental, are inherently vulnerable, and this implies that they are embedded within a reality that is unimaginably more encompassing than what we can discern with our space-and-time-bound intelligence. The important realization here is that such vulnerability is not anything like a 'weakness'. To be aware that we are not bounded, are not limited by what we are capable of understanding with our senses and intellect is potentially our greatest strength, for to embrace it is to be incorporated into an *unbounded energy of consciousness* that is essentially *spiritual* because it demolishes the illusion of the separateness of things and affirms the interpenetration of all phenomena.

Throughout history, the capacity to view space-and-time-bound experiences as part of a spaceless and timeless reality has been associated primarily with the mystical experience of 'letting go' of the self, but with the advent of quantum mechanics and knowledge about the instability of the atom, it is apparent that this kind of non-attachment to a self-focused identity also exists at the micro-level of the physical world. In the following passage, Renée Weber comments on this remarkable similarity.

In splitting the atom, as we know, the physicist releases vast amounts of

energy that was needed to hold the core of the atom together, its "binding power"...By analogy...the mystic is engaged in splitting his self-centered ego and the three-dimensional thinker that sustains it. The ego, like the atom, coheres in time through its "binding power"...huge amounts of binding energy are needed to create and sustain the ego and its illusion that it is an independent, ultimate entity...The sage...no longer fragments and exhausts himself trying to hold his bounded self together, but lets go of the ego and releases its energy, opening a channel to the limitless universal energy...In this process, he aligns himself with the deep-structure of nature, where flux and transformation are the rule. As quantum mechanics teaches, this is how matter operates on the micro-level, by contrast with the macro-level, where we function mostly as isolated, separate units stuck in our Cartesian space-time grids and inflexibly hanging on to our patterns and time-bound personalities. We do not let go and transform ourselves afresh each moment in the manner of the quanta, in the manner the mystics have urged - living in what Buddha called the ceaseless flux. The mystic, a true alchemist, brings micro-level and macro-level together. He lives psychologically in the mode of creation...He can let go of and die each moment, and therefore be constantly reborn. In short, he lives in the timeless present.³²⁶

Although it is undeniable that this experience of 'living in the timeless present' has been considered an exceptional mode of consciousness, a mode reserved for individuals of high spiritual attainment, the idea I wish to encourage is that this has been the case only because the other modes of time-consciousness have been dominant, that is, because human societies have placed an excessive emphasis on either past-time or future-time at the expense of present-time. The ability to live attuned to the present, I suggest, is as readily available to human experience as is the ability to love, for both are aptitudes that entail a willingness to surrender oneself completely to involvement with a more encompassing self/other unity. But as the records of human history show all too clearly, the capacity for love has never achieved dominance, and the capacity for living in the 'timeless present' has never been the primary mode of time-consciousness.

One of the major obstacles to living a life deeply attuned to the present is the assumption that time is an objective phenomenon apart from human consciousness. This assumption is a mainstay of the 'arrow-of-time' point of view mentioned earlier and is entrenched in many scientific and everyday notions about time as something that can be measured precisely and that moves inevitably in one past-to-future

direction. However, in keeping with ideas discussed previously, my view is that time, like any phenomenon, emerges as a relationship between matter, energy, and meaning, and this relational aspect implies that time is not an objective phenomenon in the usual sense of having an independent self-contained existence. Rather, as David Bohm observes, ‘time is an abstraction from movement, becoming, and process’, which means that it is a way of conceptualizing phenomena in terms of their flow or *succession*.³²⁷ This idea of time as a conceptualization of ‘the order of successive existence’ links the experience of time with consciousness because the perception of succession *is* an act of consciousness rather than an absolute measurable entity. It is reported that Einstein once remarked that holding a loved one’s hand for an hour can seem like a second, but touching a stovetop for a brief moment might seem like a hour,³²⁸ which implies that, for all intents and purposes, that is, in any *meaningful* sense, events happen in experiential not clock time.

What, then, is clock-time?

As commonly understood, clock-time is a measurement of duration that is concrete in the sense that it does not depend on external conditions. A span of two minutes for an event on Mars is the same as a two minute span anywhere on earth, or indeed, anywhere in the universe. Clock-time, therefore, is a means of applying the *same* time-frame for *all* phenomena, which implies that it is an absolute universal phenomenon and can be used to organize or control events because of its inherent predictability. This objective view of time, I suggest, is primarily a product of the mechanistic worldview of modern Western societies, and in the following remarks my purpose is to support this suggestion by surveying a number of prominent beliefs and opinions about time expressed throughout history. What this survey indicates is that time is best understood not as an objective reality but as a phenomenon of human consciousness, which means that clock-time is best understood as a *convention* rather than as something absolute.

Cyclical Time

As strange as it might seem in the context of our modern progress-oriented

and clock-time dominated technocultures, before the modern age, ‘running like a common thread through the history of human thought’ is a belief that time is ‘but an elaborate product of the human mind’ and that ‘the entire paradigm of human temporality is rooted in some sort of monstrous illusion’.³²⁹ The most prominent indication of this belief is the importance many societies have attached to *cyclical time*. In his book *The Myth of the Eternal Return* (1949), Mircea Eliade suggests that many early civilizations manifested a belief in a kind of ‘eternal return’ which means that they expressed a culturally explicit longing for ‘a periodical return to the mythical time of the beginning of things’, to that nontemporal moment when the archetypal models that provide meaning to life came into existence, a time that Eliade refers to as *illud tempus* (literally, ‘that time’). Eliade’s suggestion is that, because these archetypal models tend to deteriorate and decay with the flow of time, the symbols, rituals, and myths of ancient cultures are essentially attempts to escape from the ravages of historical, linear time to the security and comfort of original, sacred archetypal patterns of life. Summarizing the concept of time implied by this idea of an ‘eternal return’, Eliade notes the following:

This eternal return reveals an ontology uncontaminated by time and becoming.

In a certain sense, it is even possible to say that nothing new happens in the world...this repetition constantly maintains the world in the same auroral instant of beginnings. Time makes possible the appearance and existence of things. It has no final influence upon their existence, since it is itself constantly regenerated.³³⁰

Many present-day traditions of Native spirituality throughout the world express a similar understanding of ‘regenerating time’ through their celebrations of the numerous manifestations of cycles and rhythms in nature. As described by Peter Knudsten and David Suzuki, to Native eyes the universe is ‘temporally unified by a vast continuity of personal glimpses...into the sacred whirlpool of timeless cosmic, or mythic time’, glimpses attained through such cultural practices as ‘vision quests, songs, and ceremonies’ as well as ‘by dreams and creation stories’.³³¹ The Navajo in the southwestern United States have a particularly vivid way of picturing cyclic time in terms of a pulsating rhythmic movement on a vast cosmic scale. In this

Navajo vision of time, the creation of heaven and earth involved a stretching outward from an original center, and this outward movement will be followed by an opposite phase 'when the world springs back to this cosmic center of creation', culminating in a '*perfectly symmetrical, pulsating movement over the whole period*'.³³²

Given that a sensitivity towards Native concepts of reality is an essential aspect of participating with indigenous peoples in mutual efforts to correct the wrongs inflicted on them through Western colonization, it is particularly important for non-native people to try to understand and appreciate the notion of cyclical time. Although present in some Western cultural traditions, an appreciation for the wisdom of cyclic concepts of time has not been emphasized, and this important cultural difference was a central concern for the Gitksan and Wetsúwetén people of British Columbia when their hereditary chiefs presented a statement to the Supreme Court of British Columbia on May 11, 1987, in support of their territorial claims. Knudsen and Suzuki summarize this statement in the following passage.

In the dominant Western worldview, the hereditary chiefs testified, time is linear. An event gives rise to another event only as time moves forward along a unidirectional time line. But in the traditional Gitksan and Wetsúwetén cosmos, time must serve as the medium not only for mundane events and natural phenomena but for visionary dreams, shamanic journeys, and other such rapturous, linear-time-defying experiences, and so forms a closed circle. As a result, traditional Gitksan and Wetsúwetén believe causality is curved and follows a correspondingly circular path...In their circular conception of cause and effect, the seasonal pulsations of nature, the lives of ancestors long dead, and the world-shaping transformations of the mythic era of creation have a continuous, powerful influence upon the present. *Events of the "past" are not simply history but are something that directly affects the present and future.* This places a heavy ethical responsibility for "right action" on the Gitksan and Wetsúwetén, in much the same way that Buddhists and Hindus view the effects of one's actions as reverberating far beyond the boundaries of a single life or generation.³³³

As noted in the final sentence of this passage, the idea that life is a continuing cycle of regeneration is a primary aspect of Asian cultures. In an essay that compares Indian and Japanese thoughts about time, Hajime Nakamura points out that a 'static conception of time permeates Indian thought', for although it recognizes that worldly things are always changing, it also recognizes that the substance of something is

basically unchanging, that is, the underlying reality of things is basically 'unaffected by the ceaseless flux'. This tendency to comprehend things through their static rather than through their changing aspects is a notable feature of classical Indian languages. In these languages 'the dynamic is seen as a phase of the static'. For instance, the idea of 'becoming' is expressed in terms of 'being', and nouns and adjectives are more likely to be used than verbs and adverbs. Furthermore, in Sanskrit, 'the adverb itself is not even acknowledged as a part of speech'. Summarizing the differences between Sanskrit and Western languages, Nakamura observes that to express the idea of a sense of flux, Western expressions would commonly center on a verb, as in 'all things flow', but in Sanskrit, the corresponding idea would emphasize a substantive quality and most likely be expressed as 'sarvam anityam' which means 'all existences are impermanent'.³³⁴

Nakamura also points out that there are similar linguistic indications in modern Hindustani of a disinclination to focus on the dynamic aspects of time. Accordingly, the meaning of certain Hindustani words pertaining to time must be determined through specific contexts. For example, the adverb 'kal' means both 'yesterday' and 'tomorrow', and the word 'parson' means both 'the day after tomorrow' as well as 'the day before yesterday'. In addition, Nakamura observes that 'Indians have not exerted themselves to grasp the concept of time quantitatively', and to illustrate this observation he notes that the three most important dates in the life of the Buddha - when he was born, when he attained Enlightenment and when he entered Nirvana - are celebrated on the same day in May, a practice which contrasts sharply with the Westerner's sensitivity towards celebrating outstanding events in terms of a succession of dates. This lack of emphasis on specific historical dates is understandable in the light of the Indian worldview which sees the universe, world, and social order as eternal and the lives of individuals as a succession 'existing repeatedly in limitless time'. Indian books of history exemplify this worldview inasmuch as they are often best considered not as 'products of historical science but rather works of art'.³³⁵

With regard to Indian philosophy, Nakamura explains that 'the Absolute' is generally regarded as 'a Being beyond all temporal appearance', and that the concept

of 'becoming' is generally discussed in terms of 'three aspects of temporal existence', that is, as three states of 'being', namely, 'appearance, extinction, and continuance'. This implies that Indian thought 'places a high value on universality' and Nakamura suggests that this Indian 'concentration on the universality behind and beyond the variety of concrete phenomena of our experience' is essentially *contemplative*. To support this suggestion he points out that the Sanskrit language depicts causality in a way that contemplatively 'erases time', because the term it uses, 'phalahetu', means 'effect and cause' which implies that one can speak of a 'cause' only if an 'effect' is already known. What this suggests is that effect and cause are present only to the 'contemplative mind' as part of an eternal order. Thus, in contrast to the Western understanding of causality in terms of 'becoming', the classical Indian notion of causality reflects a condition of 'being'.³³⁶

In a recent article in my local newspaper about the visit of an Indian Dance company, the contrast between Indian and Western notions of time is made especially clear. The article is entitled 'Dance out of Time: Indian troupe expresses timeless quality of eternity' and it contains the following words:

While time marches on in Western culture, cluttering our lives with deadlines to meet and appointments to keep, in India, time exists as a whole different - and stress-free - dimension.

"In our culture, we see time as without beginning, without end, like a serpent with a tail in its mouth," says...Indian choreographer Chandralekha..."I would like to make a dialogue with the Western audiences who see time as linear," says Chandralekha. "My statement would be that time, for us, is not linear, not clocks and calendars, which produce fear of life and fear of death...For us, there is no fear of death, because whatever you haven't achieved in this life...life continues, and [you] will do it in the next life. It's not based on fatalism but on a positive way of seeing life without fear'.³³⁷

In contrast to the Indian rejection of the linear world of change in favour of an eternal reality of regeneration, the Japanese orientation towards change is 'to accept, even to welcome' fluidity and impermanence. Nakamura points out that 'this way of thinking, far from positing a changeless Absolute, regards the phenomenal world itself as the Absolute and explicitly rejects the recognition of any ultimate reality beyond or

above it'. For example, with regard to Buddhist thought in Japan, the thirteenth century founder of the Sōtō Zen sect, Master Dōgen, asserts the transience of things in a positive rather than a negative light. 'We ought to love and respect this life and this body', he advises, 'since it is through this life and this body that we have the opportunity to practice the Law and make known the power of the Buddha'. Furthermore, Master Dōgen teaches that 'death and life are the very life of the Buddha'. Thus, in contrast to Indian Buddhists, Dōgen's philosophy of time is that 'all being is time' and the 'ever-changing, incessant temporal flux is identified with ultimate Being itself', so that the 'true reality is not static but dynamic'. 'It is a heretical doctrine', he writes, 'to think the mind mobile and the essence of things static'.³³⁸

Nakamura also points out that Shinto, the indigenous Japanese religious tradition, displays a similar 'willingness to accept the phenomenal world as given and to live contentedly in it'. Nakamura links this recognition of the absolute significance of the temporal, phenomenal world to the traditional Japanese love of nature, a love emanating from 'the mildness of the weather, the benign character of the landscape, and the rapid and conspicuous change of seasons'. In the following poem, the poet expresses the intensity of this love for nature by suggesting that there can be no better memento of his own existence than 'flowers', 'cuckoos', and 'maple leaves in the autumn'.³³⁹

For a memento of my existence
What shall I leave (I need not leave anything)?
Flowers in the spring, cuckoos in the summer
And maple leaves
In the autumn.
(Ryōkan)³⁴⁰

It is important to note here that the characteristic Japanese notion of time as something that is intimately 'felt' suggests that Japanese culture lacks an awareness of and appreciation for *transcendence*, but as David Loy points out, this does not mean that it lacks a 'sacral dimension'. Although sacred principles are often understood as derived from a transcendental or 'higher world' and manifested as religious authority,

Loy points out that, in certain cultures, notably those of Japan and China as well as ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt, the religious dimension or sacred authority was 'appropriated by secular rulers'. This appropriation means that 'an authority outside institutionalized offices and structures' never became established in Japan and China as it did in the cultures of India, Judea, and Greece, where a 'transcendental/secular bifurcation' occurred because of the influence of 'world renouncers, prophets, and intellectuals'. Thus, because of its distinctive 'this-worldly' character and its 'sacralization' of socio-political structures, Japanese culture lacks an effective sense of 'transcendence'.³⁴¹

However, in Chinese culture, Taoism is a powerful illustration of how a cultural philosophy rooted in an explicitly 'this-worldly' ethos can express spirituality in a way that overlaps with religious traditions that have an 'other-worldly' orientation. Joseph Needham describes one major expression of this overlap by observing how the Taoist celebration of cyclical time combines features of both Indian and Japanese cultural attitudes. He writes: 'Nothing could be more striking than the appreciation of cyclical change, the cycle-mindedness, of the Taoists', yet, in contrast with the idealized (transcendental) understanding of cyclical time in India, ancient Chinese thought emphasizes the 'inescapably real' character of time, more in keeping with Japanese ideas. Needham summarizes the attitude towards time in ancient China as follows: 'For the ancient Chinese, time was not an abstract parameter, a succession of homogeneous moments, but was divided into concrete separate seasons and their subdivisions'. Thus, for Taoists, the idea of succession as such is subordinated to that of 'alternation and interdependence', in accordance with ideas contained in *Tao-te Ching* which claim that 'returning is the characteristic movement of the Tao' and accordingly, 'the whole of Nature...could be analogized with the life cycles of living organisms'.³⁴²

This Taoist conception of time as concrete and organismic (rather than objective) is also a preeminent feature of Confucianism, and perhaps the finest example of the Chinese attitude towards temporality is embodied in the practice of *I Ching*, the 'scripture of changes', a book of divination to which Confucius may have

contributed an important philosophical commentary called the 'Ten Wings'. As Marie-Louise von Franz explains, time according to the *I Ching* consists of the 'ordered phases of transformation' of a 'cosmic whole'. What this means is that 'all existence is a cosmic continuum' which is, in itself, without manifestation, but which differentiates itself in certain images or structures 'on account of its immanent dynamics'. These images or structures 'follow each other in time, and...can be explained by arithmetical procedures'. Thus, in Chinese culture, numbers are also time indicators which reveal something about the reality of each moment, and accordingly, the *I Ching* makes predictions through the use of a numerical code. In the wisdom of this numerical code, a so-called 'chance event' has a very different connotation than it does in Western societies. In the West, chance is taken into account, but only as something that is best eliminated in the effort to organize life around what is most probable. In contrast, the *I Ching* suggests that chance is a 'center of attention', that is, every event is a chance event insofar as it sets aside averages and repetitions.³⁴³ Carl Gustav Jung describes this distinction as follows.

The manner in which the *I Ching* tends to look upon reality seems to disfavor our causalistic procedures. The moment under actual observation appears to the ancient Chinese view more of a chance hit than a clearly defined result of concurring causal chain processes. The matter of interest seems to be the configuration formed by chance events in the moment of observation, and not at all the hypothetical reasons that seemingly account for the coincidence. While the Western mind carefully sifts, weighs, selects, classifies, isolates, the Chinese picture of the moment encompasses everything down to the minutest nonsensical detail, because all of the ingredients make up the observed moment.³⁴⁴

Given these remarks, it is clear that the concept of time which emerges from the Chinese tradition is one that is concrete rather than abstract insofar as an event is considered in terms of a multifaceted coincidence of factors, all meeting at a certain moment within the flow of time. As von Franz observes, 'the whole universe' in the light of Chinese tradition has 'a temporal rhythmic structure', the most striking feature of which is 'the alternating...of Yang and Yin', that is, the tendencies towards self-assertion and integration.³⁴⁵

As implied by this realism towards time, it is not surprising that Chinese culture possesses what Needham calls 'perhaps the greatest of all ancient historical traditions'. Needham suggests that 'one can say without hesitation that the Chinese were the most historically minded of all ancient peoples', because 'no other culture has given us so great a mass of historical writing as that constituted by the twenty-five official dynastic histories'. Needham also points out that, in China, 'good history was considered a) objective, b) official and c) normative', and he concludes that 'it would really be true to say that in Chinese culture, history was the "queen of the sciences," not theology or metaphysics of any kind, never physics or mathematics'. Furthermore, the Chinese paid close attention to recording and honouring ancient inventors and innovators. Needham speculates that this emphasis on history in ancient Chinese culture stems from a profound faith in what might be called an 'analogical method', that is, a mentality that views reality in terms of 'like causes bring like effects, as it was then so it is now, and so it will be forever'.³⁴⁶

Needham's suggestion that a predilection for analogies in Chinese culture is linked with its conception of time as cyclical invites consideration of a parallel proposition, namely, that the current preeminence of a linear time perspective in Western civilizations may stem from a tendency to avoid the less than clear-cut boundaries of analogy in favour of the more definite outlines of analytical and categorizing thought. Consider, for instance, the distinction between two ancient Greek words for time, *chronos* and *kairos*, and their relative influence in the history of Western ideas. Elliott Jacques points out that, in the strict dictionary sense, 'chronos' refers to measurable or scientific time, 'the time that can be numbered on a clock by making it a discontinuous succession of points on a line', whereas 'kairos' refers to the time 'of human activity' and 'of opportunity', which suggests that it denotes the kind of time that is associated with change, 'with the emergence of the new and with active innovation'. The difference between these terms, then, can be described broadly as a difference between objective and subjective time, and the relevant point here is that *chronos* 'has come down via Latin into all the Roman-based languages' and spawned numerous words and images related to time, whereas *kairos*

‘somehow became stuck and remained in classical Greek only’. Jacques proposes that this linguistic history reflects the ‘the greater ease’ which Westerners feel with ‘emotionally unencumbered chronology as compared with the more anxiety-filled experience of the time which brings human intentions and purposes into sharp focus, with their consequent oscillations between success and failure, catastrophe and renewal, and between life and death’.³⁴⁷

The implication of Jacques’ proposal is that a preference for linear time in the West is linked with a predilection for the rational and analytical methods of science, and although it is certainly reasonable to suggest that the history of Western ideas displays a propensity towards scientific endeavour, it should not be forgotten that it also expresses a significant aptitude for idealist, interpretive, and synthesizing forms of inquiry. My belief is that it is only with the onset of the modern scientific-technological-industrial period that analytical rationality achieves actual dominance in the West, principally because of the naturalization of objectivity, that is, because of the entrenchment of the scientific method as the principal means of acquiring knowledge about the world. But this recent historical dominance of objectivity over subjectivity is simply that, a recent historical dominance of one point-of-view over another, and like all points-of-view, dominant or otherwise, it is vulnerable to the creative energy of new or revitalized insights into the nature of reality.

Such new insights invariably have deep roots in the wisdom of previous ages, and I believe this is certainly the case with respect to the attitude towards time in the West. Since the beginning of the twentieth century there have been significant challenges to the objective-linear concept of time characteristic of the scientific model of time, and these challenges reflect a long-standing theme in Western thought, namely, that time is more ‘apparent’ than ‘real’, in the sense that it is essentially a conventional way organizing successive events and not an objective, universal phenomenon. This theme is outlined in the following section.

Time in the Western Tradition: Exploring the Question 'Is Time More Apparent than Real?'

Ancient Greek Philosophy

Issues and concerns about time in ancient Greek philosophy are often discussed in the context of attempts to understand reality in terms of either 'being' or 'becoming', with proponents of 'being' emphasizing permanence and proponents of 'becoming' emphasizing change as a conceptual foundation for reality. The time-perspective of those philosophers who focus on permanence is normally (but unfortunately, in my opinion) called 'static', whereas the time-perspective of those who focus on change is called 'dynamic'.³⁴⁸

In the pre-Socratic period, Parmenides is often mentioned as the major advocate of the view that only the permanent and enduring are real, and Heraclitus is often associated with the opposing view that reality is fundamentally flux and change. However, as Frederick Copleston observes, it is important to consider that Heraclitus 'did not assert Becoming to the total exclusion of Being', for he believed that the principle of change was embedded within a reality that is 'One', a reality symbolized by fire. 'It is wise to hearken, not to me', writes Heraclitus, 'but to my Word, and to confess that *all things are one*'. The important point here is that, for Heraclitus, reality is both 'one' and 'many' at the same time insofar as it expresses 'difference' as well as unity. Thus, although the philosophy of Heraclitus is often depicted as an unqualified celebration of becoming, it is more accurately described as a 'conception of unity in diversity'.

The difference between Parmenides and Heraclitus, then, is that Parmenides asserts the supremacy of being 'to the exclusion of Becoming', whereas Heraclitus asserts that becoming is an essential aspect of being. In practical terms, this difference involves the relative importance given to obtaining knowledge by means of reason and thought as compared with sense impressions. For Parmenides, ultimate truth-value comes through reason and thought, which means that the 'appearance' of change is basically illusory, but for Heraclitus, the knowledge derived from sense-experience is an essential part of true knowledge, and, therefore, becoming must be considered as

an aspect of being. But the suggestion I wish to emphasize here is that, for both philosophers, *being* is a *fundamental* expression of reality.³⁴⁹

The philosophies of Plato and Aristotle are often considered as elaborations of ideas derived from Parmenides and Heraclitus respectively. Accordingly, they are also often distinguished in terms of an emphasis on either 'being' or 'becoming', but in keeping with the above remarks, I suggest that this distinction is better understood in terms of the issue of 'the one and the many' and the relative emphasis each philosopher places on the importance of considering the perspectives of the 'many' as essential to understanding the nature of the 'one'.

For Plato, the preeminence of the 'one' is clear, for he regards the perspectives of the 'many', insofar as they reflect knowledge obtained via sense-impressions, as insufficiently stable to generate true knowledge. Plato's philosophy proposes that an ordinary object of everyday experience has two parts: a *form* (also called an 'idea' or an 'essence'), and *matter* (also called 'individuality' or 'sensible manifestation'). The world of forms, according to Plato, is 'outside of time, never exhibits change, and endures forever', whereas, the world of sensible objects (which 'exemplify the forms') is within time and 'manifests the characteristic changes of the temporal process'. Thus, Plato considers the intellectual world to be real and permanent while the world of everyday objects is a 'world of mere appearance and change'.³⁵⁰ In the light of this understanding of form and matter, Plato describes time as 'a moving image of eternity', and in the following excerpt from *Timaeus*, he explains this idea by stating that, because it was impossible for the Creator to bestow 'eternity' on the created universe, he resolved to make 'a moving image of eternity' which turns out to be 'motion according to number' which is what we call time.

The nature of the Living Being was eternal, and it was not possible to bestow this attribute fully on the created universe; but he determined to make a moving image of eternity, and so when he ordered the heavens he made in that which we call time an eternal moving image of the eternity which remains for ever at one. For before the heavens came into being there were no days or nights or months or years, but he devised and brought them into being at the same time that the heavens were put together, for they are all parts of time, just as past and future are also forms of it, which we wrongly attribute,

without thinking, to the Eternal Being....As a result of this plan and purpose of god for the birth of time, the sun and moon and the five planets as they are called came into being to define and preserve the measures of time.³⁵¹

As this passage indicates, for Plato, time does not share the permanency of the eternal but is, rather, an imperfect model of it, a model that can be understood through 'a knowledge of number',³⁵² that is, through a mathematical understanding of the movements of the heavenly bodies which were put in place as a means of fashioning an 'image' of the eternal order of 'Living Being'. Thus, his view is one that considers time more apparent than real because, essentially, it suggests that time is a reflection of eternity - a conventional way of understanding the absolute reality of being.

Aristotle's view of time also implies that it is fundamentally a way of understanding the eternal or unchanging reality of being, but because of his emphasis on the concrete nature and properties of time rather than on the more abstract question of whether time is real or apparent, his position is often used exclusively to bolster the 'becoming' model of time and the idea that time is 'intrinsic and fundamental to the universe'.³⁵³ My suggestion here is that Aristotle's belief in the reality of becoming must be considered in conjunction with his belief in the relative stability of things.

Aristotle's formal definition of time as 'the number of motion in respect of "before" and "after"' suggests that he associates time with the measurement of motion or of being moved.³⁵⁴ This association with measurement accounts for the suggestions that his view of time is (a) 'real' rather than apparent, because only something that is real can be measured, and (b) directional (arrow-like), because the measurement of motion implies that a 'unit of time must be in the form of a vector whose direction is fixed and whose length indicates lapse of time'. However, Aristotle's association of time with movement or change does not mean that he unequivocally *identifies* time with movement or change, for his discussion of time suggests, rather, that 'time is a combination of change and permanence'.³⁵⁵

Consider, for instance, that Aristotle's definition of time assumes the existence

of a mind that is capable of measuring. Without a mind, there is no ability to measure and, therefore, no time. Furthermore, Aristotle's understanding of movement is similar to the spatial idea of a *continuum*, that is, he does not consider movement in terms of a series of discrete points, for in a continuum 'there are no actual parts, but only *potential* parts', and the idea that time is a continuum suggests that 'the "nows" within duration are brought into actual existence by a mind which distinguishes the "nows" within that duration'.³⁵⁶ What is implied here is that, in order for there to be a process of change, there must be some 'thing' that undergoes it and a mind to perceive it, that is, there must be an unchanging order of reality. Thus, because there must be a 'first term' in any series of changes, Aristotle's ideas about time suggest belief in the 'ultimacy of some sort of permanence'.³⁵⁷

In this context of the reality of permanent being, Aristotle's understanding of time can be thought of in terms of events within a time-continuum that are rendered 'knowable' through acts of consciousness. Thus, when Aristotle asserts that time is movement that is counted, he is asserting that the awareness of time is an integral aspect of reality, but, like Heraclitus, he is also asserting that the perspectives of the 'many' must be considered as integral aspects of the reality of the 'one'. This perspective on time differs from Plato's *mainly* in its emphasis on the intrinsic importance of temporal measurement and direction. For Plato, the perception of time via measurement, that is, the time-perspective of the 'many', is an imperfect model of the eternal order of Being, the 'one'. In contrast, because Aristotle believes that 'Plato's Forms or Ideas' are 'concrete, formal principles in the objects of this world',³⁵⁸ his philosophy suggests that the world of the 'many' is essential for understanding the nature of reality itself as consisting of both permanence and change.

As in the discussion of Parmenides and Heraclitus, the point I wish to emphasize here is that, for both Plato and Aristotle, the notion of permanent being is a fundamental aspect of understanding reality. My preferred way of characterizing the difference between Plato and Aristotle with respect to 'being' is to say that Plato's philosophy rests on belief in a '*transcendental essence*', whereas Aristotle's is

grounded in the idea of an *'immanent essence'*.³⁵⁹ Moreover, although Aristotle's notion of time, in contrast to Plato's, is concrete, that is, he believes that time is 'real' rather than apparent, his belief that time exists along a continuum suggests that his perception of time is best understood in terms of varying 'points-of-view' which are 'real', not in an objective (modern-scientific) sense, but in the sense of a subjective realization of 'potential'.

Late Roman and Medieval Philosophy

Further indications that a full-fledged objective understanding of time does not arise until the modern scientific era comes from the work of major philosophical and theological figures in the periods dominated by Roman and Medieval cultures. For instance, the Roman poet and Epicurean philosopher, Lucretius, makes the following comment about time in his poetic treatise *De Rerum Natura (On the Nature of Things)* which can be considered as a summary of prevailing scientific concepts just before the beginning of the Christian era.

And likewise time cannot exist,
But from the flight of things we get a sense of time...
No man, we must confess, feels time itself,
But only knows of time from flight or rest of things.³⁶⁰

Underlying the work of Lucretius is the Epicurean belief that 'material things...cannot survive the destruction of their physical bodies', and, therefore, any religious doctrine that suggests otherwise ought to be considered as 'damaging superstition'.³⁶¹ However, his view that time does not exist in any real sense is shared by another philosopher of the Roman period who espouses a profoundly spiritual point of view, Plotinus. Plotinus, who lived in the third century, is normally referred to as both a mystic and the founder of what came to be known (in the mid-nineteenth century) as 'neoplatonism', and in view of this characterization it should be noted (a) that he teaches that religious rites in themselves are of little value in achieving the contemplative goal of union with the supreme (divine) principle (called the Good or One), and (b) that his work has significant Aristotelian overtones inasmuch as it attempts to refashion Plato's ideas in the light of Aristotle's objections to them.³⁶² With regard to time, Plotinus, like Plato before him, believes that to live

in time is to live imperfectly, that is, in an image of the 'real' world which exists outside of time. One commentator writes that, for Plotinus, 'time represents a prison for human beings, separating us from the divine realm - the true and absolute reality'.³⁶³

Writing from a Christian perspective infused with neoplatonist ideas, Saint Augustine's view of time is also one that is grounded in the idea that ultimate reality - which for Augustine is God, the Supreme Being - exists outside time.³⁶⁴ Augustine devotes a lengthy section in Book Eleven of his *Confessions* to a meditation on the nature of time, and one of the most often quoted passages about time comes from this work. 'What then is time?', Augustine writes: 'If no one asks me, I know: if I wish to explain it to one that asketh, I know not'.³⁶⁵ Mention has already been made of Augustine's emphasis on time as a function of the 'present mind', with the past being present as memory and the future being present as expectation. However, it is important to note that Augustine's idea of present-time as an 'experience of the soul' entails a distinctive contribution to the understanding of time in the Christian tradition because it introduces what might be called a contemplative or psychological complement to the more linear-cosmological understanding of time predominating in the early years of Christianity, an understanding occasioned both by the uniqueness of Christ's incarnation as the central and 'unrepeatable' act within time and by the expectation of Christ's triumphant return in the 'fullness of time'. In the following passage, Marie-Louise von Franz situates this Augustinian contribution within the Judaeo-Christian understanding of time.

In contrast to...myths in which God Himself *is* time...our own Judaeo-Christian tradition sees God as purely outside time, as having created time together with the universe...And though we believe that material nature obeys laws, which make certain events recur in time, there are also recurrent miracles...which are caused by the direct intervention of the creator God...The most radical of these events, which disrupted time into a completely different Before and After, is the incarnation of Christ...Thus the development of history is governed and oriented by a unique fact which can never be repeated. On account of Christ's promise to return, the early Christian congregations were oriented much more to the future than to the past, hoping for Christ's return in glory. In a similar way the Jews expect the coming of the Messiah at

the end of time.

With St. Augustine a new aspect of this idea of time entered into our tradition: the idea that God is present not only in the cosmos but also in man's innermost soul. Thus time too, being a 'working' of God, acquires a psychological nuance. The present is nothing if not an experience in the soul; the past is a memory image in the soul; and the future exists only as our psychic expectations. But ordinary time is transient and meaningless: it disappears when the soul unites with God.³⁶⁶

Throughout his famous meditation on time, Augustine wrestles passionately with his own thoughts and emotions. 'My soul is on fire to know this most intricate enigma', he declares. Essentially, the focus of this intense, soul-full effort is on whether or not there is an objective reality to time, for he writes that his desire is 'to know the force and nature of time, by which we measure the motions of bodies, and say (for example) this motion is twice as long as that'. His conclusion is that time exists only in the mind of 'created being', as summarized in the following remark.³⁶⁷

What then is it I measure?...It is in thee, my mind, that I measure times...In thee I measure times; the impression, which things as they pass by cause in thee, remains even when they are gone; this it is which still present, I measure, not the things which pass by to make this impression. This I measure, when I measure times. Either then this is time, or I do not measure times.³⁶⁸

For Augustine, like Plato and Plotinus before him, time exists in the imperfect world of created beings, whereas the Supreme Being, God, exists outside of time, in eternity. This idea suggests that, if a created being were able to see and know the world from the timeless perspective of God, past, present, and future could be seen and known all at once, much like a long procession could be known as a unified whole if observed from a vantage point high above it. This image of time as something that can be seen and known as a unity of successive elements if viewed from an order of timelessness is used explicitly by another major figure in the Christian tradition, Saint Thomas Aquinas. Here is how Aquinas compares the experience of being in time with the timeless perspective of eternity.

In appreciating what happens in time, we should remark that a mind bound up

in it is differently placed from a mind entirely outside its series. When many are travelling the same road, each of the company knows those ahead and those behind; he sees his immediate companion, he has seen those who have gone ahead, but those well behind he cannot see. But he who is no part of the throng but watches from high above is in a position to take in the whole convoy. He is able to see simultaneously all who are on the march, not as met before and after, but as all together in their order.

Because our knowledge is enclosed in the order of time, either directly or indirectly, the time-factor enters into our calculations, and our knowledge reckons things as past, present, or future. Past, in memory; present, in experience; future, by anticipation in present causes...

God, however, is entirely above the order of time. He is at the peak of eternity, surmounting everything all at once. Thence the stream of time can be seen in one simple glance.³⁶⁹

In the light of this image of time as part of a 'created' order, an obvious but important question springs to mind: 'Is it possible for created beings to transcend their temporal "boundedness" and to see and know from the perspective of a timeless reality?'. Essentially, this question asks whether mystical experience is possible, for mysticism is generally understood as either a 'direct intuition or experience of God' or, in non-theistic spiritual traditions, as 'a freedom from time's fury and anxiety, and a growing revelation of a far larger and more marvelous universe...than anything we could begin to intuit with our ordinary senses and consciousness'.³⁷⁰

The work of Thomas Aquinas contains a clear expression of the affirmation of mysticism in the Christian tradition. In the first place, Aquinas defines the human *soul* as a 'principle of intellectual activity', which means that he views a person's soul as a human mind acting 'without the body having an intrinsic part in the activity'. Secondly, he teaches that 'the soul is part of time existing above time in eternity', which means that, although the soul 'contains nature', it 'surpasses the physical principle of motion measured by time'.³⁷¹ These observations suggest that time is objective only insofar as it pertains to sense-experiences, that is (in terms of the metaphor cited above), to the experiences of persons as they 'march along' the ordinary road of life. But because persons have souls, they are capable of transcending the ordinary experiences of life and, therefore, have the potential to see

and know from a perspective of timeless reality: to see and know with what the fourteenth century Christian mystic John Ruusbroec calls 'that simple eye which dwells above reason in the ground of our understanding'.³⁷²

This human capacity to transcend ordinary experience - this aptitude for mystical feeling - is normally thought to be available only to special persons, to those endowed with an intense appreciation and knowledge of the so-called 'higher realms' of thought and experience. As noted previously, I consider this an unfortunate belief because there is much in our traditions of philosophy and theology that tells us 'mystical experience is always available...to any who really want it'.³⁷³ My suggestion is that the difficulty in believing that everyone is potentially capable of receiving mystical intuition stems from the fragmented way people are taught to think: fragmented in the sense that the categories used to understand complex phenomena are thought to be distinct and exclusive rather than interrelated and complementary. With regard to human nature and its capacity for mystical experience, the fragmented view declares that those capacities which incline persons towards mysticism are intrinsically different from those capacities with which a person meets the mundane challenges and opportunities of daily life. I strongly disagree with this view, and throughout this study one of my major concerns is to encourage a recognition of and appreciation for *the permeability of conceptual and experiential borders* and, thereby, to encourage the kind of knowledge and experience that testifies to the *wholeness of reality*.

Thomas Aquinas supports this integrated and interpenetrating view of human nature and reality by invoking Aristotle: 'As Aristotle says, the theoretical mind by extension becomes practical. But one faculty does not become another...*the speculative and the practical reasons are not different faculties*'.³⁷⁴ In one of his comments about time, Aquinas describes this intrinsic 'unity of knowledge' by using the idea of time to illustrate how the so-called 'higher reason' which is attuned to the eternal is 'in no wise distinct' from the so-called 'lower reason' that deals with everyday matters. He writes:

Now these two, namely eternity and time, are so related that one is the medium in which the other is known. For in the order of discovery, we come

to the knowledge of things eternal through things temporal...On the other hand, in the order of interpretation, we judge of temporal things in the light of eternity and dispose of temporal matters according to eternal laws. The higher and the lower reason, then, are one and the same faculty, distinguished only by different habits and active functions. Wisdom is attributed to the higher reason, scientific knowledge to the lower.³⁷⁵

The idea proposed here, namely, that mystical and scientific capacities coexist in the human mind within a single confluence of discovery and interpretation, implies that time is something that is best understood in the light of timelessness, and this idea, I suggest, constitutes a basic understanding of time as conceived in Western civilizations up to the beginning of the modern scientific period. As illustrated in previous remarks, many of the most prominent figures in the philosophical and religious traditions of the West regard time as something primarily pertaining to the way objects and/or events are perceived rather than to an objective reality, and this suggests that their basic conception of time is in terms of something more apparent than objectively real. Even Aristotle, a philosopher dedicated to acquiring knowledge through direct observation and who regards time as a fundamental aspect of nature, frames his understanding of time in the context of an eternal order of being. As J.L. Russell explains, 'all generation and decay' are linked, in Aristotle's view, 'with solar and, to a lesser extent, other planetary movements', and because, like Plato, he believes that the celestial spheres are everlasting and incorruptible, Aristotle's view of time implies that 'corruptible terrestrial matter shares in the everlastingness of the heavenly bodies and is thus assimilated to the eternity of God'.³⁷⁶

A classic definition of eternity comes from the sixth century philosopher, Boethius, who writes that eternal existence is 'the perfect possession all at the same time of endless life'.³⁷⁷ In the light of this understanding of eternity, the time-within-timelessness idea implies that *all* temporal phenomena - past, present, and future - exist in the wholeness of reality. However, it is important to emphasize that this perception of the wholeness of time does not negate the experience of time unfolding as a succession of events in the physical world of everyday interaction, anymore than the being able to see the whole of a procession from a high vantage

point negates the more restricted and linear perspectives of those in the procession. My suggestion here is that, in Western philosophical and religious traditions pre-dating the modern scientific era, there is a recognizable stream of thought that considers time in this comprehensive way, that is, as a phenomenon that encompasses both the wholeness of a transcendent perspective of time and the immediacy of linear or objective experiences of time. In practice, this comprehensive or wholeness view of time is one that blends objectivity with an understanding of reality that is fundamentally spiritual in nature. Moreover, this blending reflects the cyclical time-perspective of non-Western cultures insofar as it conceives the recurring patterns of human life and the ongoing and orderly fluctuations of energy throughout the physical world as images of an ultimate and timeless order of being.

According to this comprehensive or wholeness view of time, every created being, every phenomenon, partakes of the abiding patterns of life and is, therefore, a 'living mirror' of the source of life. John Ruusbroec writes about the human soul in this way, as a 'living mirror' on which is impressed the image of God, the Creator. The Creator, he writes, 'lives imaged forth in us and we in him, for our created life is one, without intermediary, with this image and life which we have eternally in God'.³⁷⁸ But mystical insight does not limit 'soul' to humanity, as numerous mystics from many different religious traditions have affirmed. In the words of Thomas Traherne, for example, the world itself 'is a mirror of infinite beauty', and a person's 'enjoyment of the world is never right' until every morning 'you awake in Heaven...and look upon the skies, the earth, and the air as Celestial Joys...till the Sea itself floweth in your veins, till you are clothed with the heavens, and crowned with the stars...till your Spirit filleth the whole world'.³⁷⁹

I hope it is clear that my intent is not to suggest that, prior to the modern scientific era, conceptions of time in the West were exclusively linked with eternity and, therefore, with circular-rhythmic patterns of life. Unquestionably, the linear view of time occupies an important place in the Judaeo-Christian tradition of Western culture, due principally to the idea of time as a 'history' of God's involvement with creation. This history is in many ways an 'event-oriented' history in which one-time

occurrences play a decisive role. For example, creation itself, the first moment of time, is thought of as an unrepeatable event that instigates the unfolding of a 'redemptive history' that culminates in a specified end involving 'final salvation and judgment'.³⁸⁰ In Christianity, history itself is centered around an event of singular importance: the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. However, because time is by definition a succession of events, any understanding of it has a linear component. My point here is simply to make a twofold suggestion: first, that the linear component of time does not refer to the *basic* reality of time as a phenomenon embedded within a more encompassing reality, that of a timeless whole which is mirrored in the cyclical patterns of nature, and secondly, that there is much in the history of Western civilizations to suggest that searching for a synthesis of linear and cyclical time-perspectives constitutes an ongoing and significant cultural endeavour.

In addition to the material already discussed, a good illustration of this time-within-timelessness theme is the study of Christian scriptures, for it shows that these writings contain many references to events in the life of Jesus that were prefigured by earlier events, suggesting that the history of God's involvement with humanity is not a straightforward linear unfolding but one which occurs in accordance with a divine plan, and because this plan is divine, it is timeless. Marie-Louise von Franz comments on this idea of a divine plan as follows.

The idea that God had a timeless plan of the world in His mind before its realization in matter is consistent with what has been called the Christian sacramental view of history; it is related to Plato's idea of all things developing out of seeds or primordial archetypes (Ideas)...The clock was looked upon in the fifteenth century, as a model of such a divine plan. In 1453, in his *Vision of God*, Nicolas Cusanus writes: 'Let then the concept of the clock represent eternity's self; then motion in the clock representeth succession. Eternity therefore both enfoldeth and unfoldeth succession, since the concept of the clock which is eternity doth alike enfold and unfold things'. Only gradually did this idea of a clockwork universe become desacramentalized-in the eighteenth century the clock became an automaton that had no connection with God.³⁸¹

As implied in the above passage, it was not until Newton's discovery of mathematical expressions for the movement of bodies in space, that a framework

materialised for understanding time and the universe not in the light of eternity but in terms of an enormous mechanism governed by laws which can be used to predict physical events. This ability to make reliable predictions about the physical world coincided with major advances in the technology of time-keeping, a great concern for European nations because of its importance for navigation and trade.³⁸² Consequently, the image of a *mechanistic* and totally 'this-worldly' clockwork-universe emerged and eventually came to symbolize the ethos of the modern scientific period.

The Modern Age

Thomas Traherne was a seventeenth century Anglican priest and mystic poet whose manuscripts, *Poetical Works* and *Centuries of Meditation*, came to light at the beginning of the twentieth century. I mention this because his obscurity is particularly expressive of historical events, for it coincided with a period of scientific hegemony that dislodged mysticism as a viable way of acquiring knowledge about reality. A mere six years after Traherne's birth in 1636, Isaac Newton was born, and perhaps more than any other single influence, the ideas of Newtonian physics were responsible for producing a major shift in the conception of time in Western societies, a shift which tended to obscure the significance of mystical insights into the spiritual nature of reality. Furthermore, the publication dates of Traherne's work, in 1903 and 1908, surrounded the 1905 publication date of three papers by another great physicist, Albert Einstein, whose work displaced Newton's concept of time as a fundamental tenet of the physical world and released a set of ideas within the scientific community which were recognized eventually as being compatible with the major spiritual traditions of the past.

Thus, the historical fortune of Traherne's work mirrors the attitude towards mysticism prevailing in Western societies during the modern scientific period. This attitude can be summarized in two observations: In the first place, with the entrenchment of the scientific paradigm in the West, the worth of the mystical capacities and aspirations of human nature became subject to an immense challenge, and a significant aspect of this challenge had to do with understanding the nature of

time not as an 'image of eternity' but as a concrete phenomenon constitutive of reality itself; secondly, the significant challenges which this scientific paradigm is undergoing in this century, from both within and outside the scientific community, is concurrent with a resurgence in awareness of the viability of the mystical point of view, and no small part of this resurgence is due to a rejection of the image of the universe as an immense 'clockwork' mechanism.

This image of a mechanical clockwork-universe is often used to describe the worldview of the modern period of science and technology. It suggests not only that the physical universe is a gigantic machine predictable in all its operations but also, because clock-time is independent of human events, that time can be considered as something which exists as a 'fact' of the physical world apart from the complexities of human activity.³⁸³ However, it is important to note that the objectivity of time in Newtonian mechanics implies no specific *direction*. The universe described in Newton's mathematics is one in which a single instant of time is able 'to provide all possible information about the past and future of the universe', which means that it is basically a universe which is indifferent to the passage of time. Moving forwards or backwards in time makes no difference in the laws of Newtonian mechanics.³⁸⁴ Thus, although the laws of physics according to Newton give time an objective status, they do not give it the irreversible-unidirectional objectivity implied by the arrow-of-time view.

This arrow-of-time view (that time moves irreversibly in a past-to-future reality-making flow) received perhaps its greatest scientific expression in the nineteenth century when the development of steam power gave rise to the scientific study of thermodynamics and scientists began to formulate laws which attempted to 'set out the relationship between heat and work, spelling out how heat can be converted into or exchanged with other forms of energy'.³⁸⁵ The second law of thermodynamics specifically addresses the concept of time by linking the common observation that all things are subject to physical deterioration with the fact that, in any closed system of interacting physical entities, heat naturally flows from a hotter body to a cooler one, which means that it dissipates or uses up energy. This

dissipation of energy increases the amount of 'disorder' (technically referred to as 'entropy') within the system because it moves that system closer to a condition of total degeneration. A relatively large-scale example of this process of physical decline is the way the sun burns up its nuclear fuel and spreads heat and light throughout space, thereby moving the entire universe of which it is a part closer to disintegration. Of course, numerous examples of this process confront us every day, for we inhabit a world in which snow melts, statues crumble, and bodies age, die, and eventually disintegrate. Because the flow of physical events according to the second law of thermodynamics is irreversibly one-way, namely, in the direction of an increase in entropy (disorder), proponents of the arrow-of-time hypothesis suggest that this law of 'increasing entropy is a signpost indicating the direction of time'.³⁸⁶

There are, however, a great many signposts - scientific and otherwise - which provide information about how to understand time, and not all of them point towards the inevitable physical decline of the universe implied by thermodynamics. For example, there is a mathematical theorem developed by Henri Poincaré which suggests that, given an enormous span of time, any closed system, including the universe itself, will return to its original state. This theorem appeared shortly after one of the developers of thermodynamic theory, Ludwig Boltzmann, proposed a mathematical way of explaining the flow of heat from hot to cold in terms of molecular motion. The mathematical quantity discovered by Boltzmann is defined in terms of the motions of molecules in a gas and provides a measure for the degree of chaos in the gas. Because this quantity always increases in magnitude as a result of molecular collisions, it appears to support not only the increase-in-entropy hypothesis of thermodynamics but also Newton's ideas about the interaction of bodies in space. As Paul Davies observes, 'Boltzmann's calculation amounted to a derivation of the second law of thermodynamics from Newton's laws'. However, Poincaré's theorem contradicts this idea by suggesting that any 'finite collection of particles...subject to Newton's laws of motion must always return to its initial state (or at least very close thereto) after a sufficiently long period of time', which means that 'the behavior of gas over a long time scale is cyclic' (!), not irreversible.³⁸⁷

Perhaps the most prominent nineteenth-century signpost with regard to understanding time is the theory of evolution and it also refutes a basic premise of thermodynamics. Although as generally understood, the concept of organic evolution, like thermodynamics, proposes that time is unidirectional, it also suggests that this direction is not towards degeneration, as it is in thermodynamics, but towards increasingly sophisticated patterns of organization. In his celebrated work, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, Charles Darwin affirms his belief that evolution moves innately towards improvement by observing that 'as natural selection works solely by and for the good of each being, all corporeal and mental endowments will tend to progress towards perfection'.³⁸⁸ In the following passage, Paul Davies characterizes the difference between the theories of evolution and thermodynamics in terms of time-perspectives which are, respectively, 'uphill' and 'downhill'.

The second law of thermodynamics introduces an arrow of time into the world because the rise of entropy seems to be an irreversible, "downhill" process. By an odd coincidence...[Darwin's theory of] biological evolution also introduces an arrow of time into nature, but it points in the opposite direction to that of the second law of thermodynamics - evolution seems to be an "uphill" process. Life on Earth began in the form of primitive micro-organisms; over time, it has advanced to produce a biosphere of staggering organizational complexity, with millions of intricately structured organisms superbly adapted to their ecological niches. Whereas thermodynamics predicts degeneration and chaos, biological processes tend to be progressive, producing order out of chaos. Here was optimistic time, popping up in science just as pessimistic time was about to sow its seeds of despair.³⁸⁹

The theory of evolution continues to be one of the most fertile intellectual products of the nineteenth century, but with this fertility comes an abundance of conflicting opinions about what evolution actually means and how it works. This wide variety of opinion is particularly evident when comparing thermodynamics and evolution. On the one hand, there are those who question the significance of the second law of thermodynamics by claiming that it 'might not be as universally valid as is sometimes claimed' or that 'biological systems' might be 'privileged' systems where entropy actually decreases, which suggests that 'in the universe as a whole

energy degeneration is being counteracted by creative processes'.³⁹⁰ On the other hand, there are those who maintain that there is no intrinsic conflict between evolutionary theory and the second law of thermodynamics, and, in fact, claim that 'evolutionary time' *is* the 'self-same arrow as is indicated by the Second Law of Thermodynamics'. According to this view, 'the apparently decaying, randomising tendency of the universe' provides a 'necessary and essential matrix for the birth of new forms - new life through death and decay of the old'.³⁹¹ Accordingly, time has an arrow-like direction *and* conforms to the time-irreversible principles of thermodynamics.

A strong advocate of this arrow-of-time view is Stephen Gould. In his examination of fossil records, Gould interprets 'bottom heavy' branches of the 'evolutionary tree' as indicating that a marked increase in the diversity of species leads to a decrease in the kinds of organic designs that survive, suggesting that new orders of relative stability emerge out of conditions of relative chaos. In his words: 'This theme imparts a direction to time that is more clear and reliable than any statement we can make about change within lineages' and 'probably reflects a more general and basic law about the history of change in natural systems'.³⁹²

The idea that evolution is driven by a creative process of 'order arising from chaos' is central to the work of Ilya Prigogine. Although this work is described briefly in my discussion of the emerging new worldview in Chapter Two, it is important to review it once again in this discussion of perspectives towards time because, among present-day scientists, Prigogine stands out not only as a theorist whose influence spans a number of disciplines but also as an ardent supporter of the view that time is a basic 'empirical fact'. For Prigogine, the irreversible processes in nature, such as those described in the second law of thermodynamics, are the 'basic' processes of the natural world. 'More and more physicists', he writes, 'think that the fundamental laws of nature are irreversible and stochastic' and that 'deterministic and reversible laws are applicable only in limiting situations'.³⁹³ Moreover, far from seeing such processes as destructive, he views them as the primary mechanism of a creatively evolving universe. 'Time [i.e., the irreversible time of the second law of

thermodynamics] does not oppose us to the universe', he observes, 'it expresses our participation in an evolving universe'. In support of this observation, he notes that, the more scientists become involved with understanding the dissipative temporal processes that occur throughout nature, the more their work testifies to the presence of 'unifying elements which connect science and culture more closely'.³⁹⁴

Prigogine's own work in chemistry illustrates this connection between time, science, and culture. It posits that 'what really characterizes biological or social evolution is that new elements appear, new molecules appear, new inventions appear, and with them new types of behavior', and the story of how these new elements appear is the story of *dissipative structures*. As expressed in the language of chemistry, this story involves observing and tracing a bifurcation process in which molecular structures enter a far-from-equilibrium condition and divide into two branches (bifurcate) and continue to do so giving rise to successively more complex patterns which are, in effect, new systems that are increasingly sensitive to outside conditions. As an example from the field of experimental biology, Prigogine notes how a colony of ants initially chooses randomly between alternate routes to food, but beyond a critical population, only one path is chosen.³⁹⁵ With regard to theories about evolution, Prigogine observes that, 'in a non-trivial sense', evolution requires a continued interaction between the microscopic and the macroscopic levels of living systems, and this aspect is obvious on both the ecological and sociological levels where individuals and macroscopic features (such as institutions...) are engaged in a complex dialectical process.³⁹⁶ The implication here is that, although the increasingly complex associations which occur in the evolutionary process produce periods of chaos, these perturbations result in more sensitive living systems which, in turn, produce periods of order at a higher level of overall functioning. Thus, according to Prigogine, the story of dissipative structures is essentially the story of a creatively evolving universe.

In his explanations of temporal phenomena, Prigogine distinguishes between 'ordinary' or measured time and *internal time*. His conception of 'internal time' is particularly important because he equates it with the process of undergoing change

and describes it as the 'time generated within an organism'. He likens this idea of 'internal time' to Aristotle's notion that 'there must be a soul which counts', which he interprets as implying that real time does not exist for an inert object, such as a clock, but only to 'highly unstable dynamical systems'. Thus, for Prigogine, real or 'internal time corresponds precisely to a qualitative change, which is then expressed by "ordinary" time'. Accordingly, he asserts that a prerequisite for the use of clock-time is that whatever it refers to 'could be generated by internal time', an observation which he believes testifies to the objective reality of time.³⁹⁷ This objective view of time leads Prigogine to propose that 'internal time' constitutes the creative power of evolution. 'Time is creation', he asserts, 'the future is not just *there*...the past is there, the present has a finite duration, and the future is not yet there'.³⁹⁸

The major implication of Prigogine's linkage of the so-called 'internal time' of the universe and creativity is that 'the universe is something that is creating itself as it goes along'.³⁹⁹ A major problem with this view stems from the fact that, as defined by Prigogine, the 'internal time' that supposedly constitutes the creativity of the universe is roughly equivalent to the aging process of natural phenomena, and while it is undeniable that things are born, exist for awhile and eventually die, this process itself cannot account for its own emergence, its ongoing regeneration, and for the sense of purpose and direction that arise as part of being consciously aware of life processes. In short, it cannot answer the question 'What animates temporal life?'. Theorists may be able to push back a description of the development of life processes to just seconds before a presumed 'big bang', but, as Renée Weber remarks, 'in pushing back the universe to its first moment, does science seek the beginning of time or does it seek the timeless?'.⁴⁰⁰ Just as the birth of every child reminds us that the capacity to live within time as a specific human being is something that is *given*, the birth of the universe itself tells us nothing if not that all temporal expressions of life receive their 'capacity-to-be' from an order of reality outside of time.

Thus, the main concern I have with Prigogine's idea of time's creative 'arrow' as an *explanatory principle* of the universe is that it does not account for or even address the possibility that the ongoing cycles of destruction and creation throughout

nature are embedded within a larger context which accounts for the regenerative and meaning-making aspects of life, aspects which have been recognized throughout history as indicative of a wider spiritual reality encompassing the world of temporal experience. To me, Prigogine's theory of dissipative structures is a beautiful *description* of the *unity* that underlies temporal processes and, as such, it is an extremely valuable tool for tearing down the conceptual borders that exist between the various ways of interpreting 'how' life-processes work, but it is not an explanation of what *animates* these processes, in the sense of what brings them into being, sustains them, and gives them meaning. The idea I wish to endorse here is that understanding the animating principle of life involves understanding not only how life-processes work but also what makes us aware of them, that is, understanding the nature of *consciousness*.

One notable twentieth-century philosopher who shares Prigogine's belief in the irreversibility of time and the fundamentally creative nature of reality but whose work does attempt to account for what animates life processes (although problematically in my opinion) is Alfred North Whitehead. According to David Griffin, Whitehead's 'process philosophy', like Prigogine's scientific exposition of the process of becoming, proposes that 'process *is* the concrete reality of things and, conversely, that concrete things *are* processes'.⁴⁰¹ However, Whitehead discusses the nature of process in terms of *experiential events*, or 'actual entities', which are essentially *patterns of unifying relations* that involve consciousness in a central way and are not merely environmental variables as in Prigogine's model of dissipative structures. For Whitehead, 'the occasions of experience are not permanently existing "things", but are self-creating strivings towards the realization of some value'.⁴⁰² His analysis of this process of self-creation involves differentiating each momentary event in terms of 'two modes of existence': (a) a preliminary 'subject' mode, which is a very brief period of 'being only to its self', and (b) an 'object' or consequent mode, in which the event becomes objectified for others, that is, it becomes a 'cause' capable of influencing later events.⁴⁰³ Thus, Whitehead distinguishes 'time-as-process' from

‘pure succession’, as summarized in the following passage.

Time is known to us as the succession of our acts of experience...But this succession is not pure succession: it is the derivation of state from state, with the later state exhibiting conformity to the antecedent. Time in the concrete is the conformation of state to state, the later to the earlier; and the pure succession is an abstraction from the irreversible relationship of settled past to derivative present.⁴⁰⁴

From statements such as this, it is clear that, like Prigogine, Whitehead insists on the ‘irreversibility of time’, but unlike Prigogine, he does not reify time. On the contrary, he considers time to be a function of the process of becoming which suggests that there is nothing that can be called time apart from what connects a succession of events from ‘state to state’. Furthermore, Whitehead includes the future as an aspect of temporal relations. ‘Cut away the future’, he writes, ‘and the present collapses, emptied of its proper content’, for ‘immediate existence requires the insertion of the future in the crannies of the present...The future is there in the present, as a general fact belonging to the nature of things’.⁴⁰⁵ Whitehead’s suggestion, then, is that the future is immanent in the present because the present contains the relationships which it will express in the future, that is, the future is part of the ‘appropriating relations’ of actual entities.

To understand the nature of these appropriating relations further, it is necessary to understand Whitehead’s concept of God as the ultimate expression of life-processes. According to Whitehead, God provides both the initial aim of the process of becoming and becomes the totality of all occasions, that is, all temporal occasions become ‘embedded in the experience...of God forever’.⁴⁰⁶ This is a God, then, who ‘has autonomous power to influence the world *and* the capacity to be influenced by it’.⁴⁰⁷ On the one hand, this God is ‘necessary to every becoming’ because, in the ‘primordial nature’ of God, all possibilities are ordered so as ‘to make them relevant’ to every ‘becoming’. On the other hand, every ‘becoming’ influences the so-called ‘consequent nature’ of this God, because God ‘preserves the immediacies of all past actual entities’ and unites them with a divine vision of the primordial unity of all eternal objects. Thus, for Whitehead, God is a process of becoming, just like

any actual entity,⁴⁰⁸ and because God is also the 'eternal primordial character' of creativity, the world out of which each moment emerges is constantly changing, hence its inherent creativity.⁴⁰⁹

Because it relies on God as a foundation for understanding experience and because it explains the nature of God as an amalgam of two opposing concepts, eternity and process, to my mind Whitehead's process philosophy contains a significant incongruity. A process is inherently temporal: it begins and ends. Eternity, however, has no beginning or end, and conceptually can only be thought of as a kind of timeless context within which temporal events occur. Accordingly, how can God be both an eternal, non-derived embodiment of creativity as well as a process of becoming, that is, a being subject to derivation within time? Insofar as Whitehead's philosophy suggests that 'temporal process characterizes all levels of reality',⁴¹⁰ even the ultimate level of God, it suggests that change is 'eternally' constant, and this position is untenable because in order for there to be change there must be something that undergoes it, there must be some 'being' that embodies in itself the quality of permanence. As suggested previously, Heraclitus affirmed the importance of becoming by emphasizing its embeddedness in 'the One', and Aristotle recognized that time involves both permanence and change. However, Whitehead's confusing idea of an eternally-becoming God appears to preclude the possibility of any genuine expression of 'timeless being', pure and simple.

The point I wish to emphasize here, and which constitutes the basic theme of this chapter, is that time is best understood in the context of a timeless order of reality within which it is embedded. Paradoxically, Whitehead's own insight that time does not exist *apart from* the relations present in actual occurrences tends to affirm this suggestion by pointing out that time itself is not a fundamental reality but an 'abstraction' from a succession of events, that is, a *relational function of consciousness*. To situate time *within* consciousness in this way suggests that it is part of what consciousness itself is part of, namely, a *wholeness* that encompasses both manifest and nonmanifest reality.

The suggestion that time exists as a relational function of consciousness is

important because it associates time with a specific way of being human, a specific way of perceiving reality in terms of an 'environment' of experiences or events. This idea is, in effect, an amalgam of two well-known philosophical descriptions of time: on the one hand, the idea of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz that time is essentially the relations between events, and on the other hand, Immanuel Kant's idea that time is essentially a property of the human mind. In a much quoted passage, Leibniz distinguishes space from time by proposing that space is the order of 'coexistence' and time is the order of 'succession'. His proposal is that both space and time, in themselves, are imaginary, and exist as 'potential orders which may or may not be exemplified in actual occasions'. In this view, *time inheres in things* as 'an ideal relational structure which is presupposed whenever we observe them', that is, time is essentially the *phenomenon* of 'succession', the relations between events. My only reservation about this idea is that it focuses primarily on the 'externality' of time rather than on the *temporal aptitude of the mind* as an *interpreter* of temporal experiences.

Kant's understanding of time emphasizes this interpretive function of the mind, for he calls time a form of 'intuition' that is 'built into us' because its essential characteristics (coexistence and succession) 'cannot be perceived by us unless we have some prior notion of time in our minds'. Viewed from Kant's point-of-view, we are temporal beings because our minds work in a temporal way, that is, 'we *must* see phenomena as temporal very much as we *must* see things as red when we are wearing red glasses'.⁴¹¹ However, in reacting to this position, I wish to emphasize that human consciousness is not limited by its capacity to interpret events temporally, any more than it is limited by any of its other capacities, such as its ability to interpret structures and processes according to numerical patterns or its ability to contemplate the nature of 'things' symbolically. The significant aspect of these various capacities, in my view, is that they function as *aptitudes* for experiencing and interpreting life situations. Accordingly, human consciousness is capable of viewing life experiences in a temporal way, but it is also capable of viewing them in a way that transcends time,

and it is this ability to participate in a timeless order of reality which expresses the ultimate context for 'being'.

Among twentieth-century philosophers, Martin Heidegger is most clearly associated with exploring the connection between being and time, but in contrast to the 'time-in-timelessness' idea advocated in this study, his analysis is normally identified as an existentialist one. This existentialist association suggests that Heidegger's basic philosophical orientation focuses on the idea that the essence of 'being' is what a person makes of her or his life, that is, 'the essence of man is his existence'.⁴¹² The main implication here for understanding 'time' is that our minds *impose* a temporal structure on the phenomenal world: Past, present, and future are 'not given in existence' but are 'projected onto existence in the form of remembered pasts, experienced presents, and imagined futures'. However, Heidegger's concept of time includes four rather than three dimensions. In addition to past, present, and future, he distinguishes a dimension of 'nearhood' or 'nearing nearness', which is a sense of connecting past or future events to the present with respect to their nearness or remoteness to what is taken as the present. Hence, the present 'reaches out', as it were, in both directions 'to embrace the past and the future' not as 'an instantaneous razor's edge on which we are perched' but as a *temporal context or environment*. As an example, consider the feeling of 'panic'. According to Heidegger's thought, it can be described as an event that approaches faster than a person's ability to assimilate it.⁴¹³

Heidegger's understanding of time is overwhelmingly flavoured by his understanding of being, and crucial to his account of being is the notion of *dasein*. Heidegger uses the term 'dasein' to designate the idea of 'being-there' because it is a neutral term insofar as it refers to no determinate essence other than the possibilities inherent in something. Thus, 'dasein' has no fixed nature. Its essence is its existence, its 'being-in-the-world, and this world is the world of everyday life, not the world of science'.⁴¹⁴ For Heidegger, this everyday world is disclosed to us 'not by scientific knowledge, but by pre-scientific experiences, by care and by moods', and the most significant aspect of this everyday life is its finitude. Thus, to understand 'dasein'

requires an account of how human existence displays itself not only in concrete circumstances but also in its attitude towards death, for 'dasein' is 'individualized by death': death is a 'criterion' of its authenticity.⁴¹⁵ But it must be emphasized that Heidegger writes about death in a very positive way, and does so without relying on the concept of eternity. Wholeness, he believes, is attainable within a person's finite life-span, as noted by John Macquarrie in the following comment on Heidegger's existentialism.

All possibilities are evaluated in the light of death as the capital possibility, and when one lives in the anticipation of death, one lives with a resoluteness which brings unity and wholeness to the scattered self. Eternity does not come into this picture, for wholeness is attainable within man's finite temporality itself, and he lays hold on each unique unrepeatable possibility in the light of the master possibility of death. When man ceases to run away from the disclosure of anxiety that he is thrown into death, and when he resolutely anticipates death as his supreme possibility, he reaches an unshakable joy and equanimity.⁴¹⁶

Another noteworthy feature of Heidegger's understanding of time is its distinction between public and private time, although in the opinion of Christopher Gosden, 'his distaste for modern forms of public life prevented him from painting a full picture of what public time is or could be'. It is clear, however, that Heidegger emphasizes that 'a caring attitude to ourselves and material things may save us from the bland and formless time of the modern public world where measurement and calculation is all'.⁴¹⁷

In contrast to Heidegger's predilection for framing his ideas about time around the interpretation of individual consciousness, Emile Durkheim emphasizes the importance of time as a collective phenomenon. In *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Durkheim observes that 'the rhythm of collective life dominates and encompasses the varied rhythms of all the elementary lives from which it results; consequently, the time expressed dominates and encompasses all particular durations'.⁴¹⁸ For Durkheim, then, time is conceived not only 'as a product of collective unconscious' but also as 'a macro-level exposition of the concept of social rhythm'.⁴¹⁹

In a recent elaboration of Durkheim's line of thought from an archaeological perspective, Christopher Gosden suggests that time is essentially a product of the social use of material things (such as landscapes, settlements, and monuments), which implies that time and social action are synonymous. 'Instead of seeing acts as taking place in time', Gosden writes, 'we can see action as creating time'. For Gosden, because society is 'a flux of forces which are both human and material', knowledge derives from forms of involvement between people and things. Thus, reflecting Heidegger's thought in a way that intensifies social rather than individual consciousness, he views time as 'an aspect of bodily involvement with the world': 'We do not pass through time', he writes, 'time passes through us'.⁴²⁰

This idea that time is a product of the interaction of material things and social relationships suggests that the important issues relating to time are those relating to the concrete meanings people give to time-experiences, that is, to the interpretive aspects of cultural time-*consciousness*. The following comments focus on conceptualizing time in this context.

Consciousness and the Spacetime Concept

Given the role cultural activity plays in evolution, it is wise to consider time-consciousness as a kind of 'agent' in the evolutionary process.⁴²¹ Because the advantage of possessing a time-sense is a well known aspect of biology, it is reasonable to suggest that the various modes of time-consciousness which play such an important role in human cultural life also play a significant and perhaps a dominant role in the evolution of humankind. This idea, that *consciousness* is the impetus - in fact, the *heart* - of evolutionary progress, permeates the work of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. However, it is important to observe that, for Teilhard de Chardin, the 'within' of life, that is, consciousness, is to be found not in humankind alone but in *all* of life. 'At its base' he observes, 'the living world is constituted by consciousness clothed in flesh and bone', such that 'to write the true history of the natural world' is to follow 'an ascension of inner sap spreading out in a forest of consolidated instincts. From the biosphere to the species is nothing but an immense ramification of psychism seeking for itself through different forms'.

According to Teilhard de Chardin's view of evolution, when the capacity for human thought emerges, it is as if the earth itself 'gets a new skin' or 'better still...finds its soul', because 'outside and above the biosphere there is the *noosphere*', the 'thinking layer', and the major significance of this development is the realization that *evolution is a movement towards the act of becoming conscious of itself*. As Teilhard de Chardin observes: 'The consciousness of each of us is evolution looking at itself and reflecting upon itself'. Unquestionably, then, this view of evolution is one that moves in a specific and irreversible direction - it is an arrow in that sense - but the arrow of evolution, according to Teilhard de Chardin, is not time but humanity, or more exactly, the self-reflective consciousness of humankind acting as a living evolutionary energy. 'Man is not the centre of the universe as once we thought', he writes, 'but something much more wonderful - the arrow pointing the way to the final unification of the world in terms of life'. For Teilhard de Chardin, time itself is best understood as part of a 'biological space-time' matrix for evolutionary development. 'Time and space are organically joined', he writes, 'so as to weave, together, the stuff of the universe'.⁴²²

As a young seminarian, Teilhard de Chardin read Henri Bergson's influential book *Creative Evolution*, and although he rejected Bergson's notion of a 'vital impulse' (which depicts the cosmos originating from a central source and developing in divergent directions), in his own work he expresses a view of time similar to Bergson's notion of 'duration', namely, time as experienced by consciousness. By emphasizing the experiential context of time-perception, this idea of duration contrasts sharply with the idea of objective time, which measures duration in terms of a series of individual moments. The point here is that the objective view of time implies that space and time are separate dimensions of experience, whereas the time-as-experienced-by-consciousness view suggests that space and time constitute a unified field of experience, the so-called spacetime continuum.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, this spacetime concept received major scientific reinforcement through the work of Albert Einstein which demonstrated that temporal indications are *relative* to the point of view of an

observer. In brief, Einstein's Relativity Theory states that if an observer could move at the speed of light or faster, 'the time span between the event and its observation becomes a problem for establishing a sequence of events', that is, two events which appear to be simultaneous to one observer may not be for another observer. Although we can ignore this fact in everyday life, in high energy physics, where objects move almost at the speed of light, Einstein's theory means that 'time is completely relative' - it is not an objective event, but instead 'a tool used by an observer to describe' a special environment.⁴²³ Einstein-time, then, in contrast to Newtonian-time, is affected by motion through space (the faster a clock travels, the slower it ticks), and, therefore, its reality *is* its relativity.⁴²⁴

It is important to understand that Relativity Theory implies that *all* specifications of spatial and temporal phenomena are inseparably related, in spite of the fact that everyday interactions *appear* to be unaffected by this relativity because events are communicated to observers at the speed of light (three hundred thousand kilometres per second). Because it takes a certain amount of time for light to travel to our eyes from an external event, we know the physical world around us because of the way we construct it through our own sense impressions, and Relativity Theory reminds us that these impressions are a product of a relationship between space and time. This inseparability of space and time in the workings of the physical world suggests that the universe ought to be conceived as a four-dimensional *wholeness* of *spacetime*, rather than in terms of a universe in which space and time are considered distinct and independent aspects.

This 'spacetime-wholeness' is usually referred to as the Minkowski-Einstein 'block universe' because it was Hermann Minkowski, a former mathematics tutor of Einstein's, who first proposed the unified spacetime idea.⁴²⁵ With this conceptual understanding of the universe in place, it is possible to conceive time in terms analogous to space, that is, in terms of geometry. Just as the perception of a three dimensional object in space is relative to the point of view of an observer, the perception of an event also depends on an observer's experience and not on an

objective 'lapse of time'. Thus, the idea of a *timescape* emerges in which *all* of time, like all of space, exists *all-at-once* within a spacetime continuum. Here is how Louis de Broglie describes this idea.

Space and time cease to possess an absolute nature...In space-time, everything which for each of us constitutes the past, the present, and the future is given in block, and the entire collection of events, successive for us, which form the existence of a material particle is represented by a line, the world-line of the particle.

Each observer, as his time passes, discovers, so to speak, new slices of space-time which appear to him as successive aspects of the material world, though in reality the ensemble of events constituting space-time exist prior to his knowledge of them.⁴²⁶

This scientific idea of past, present, and future coexisting in a block universe as 'slices' of spacetime is reflected in several revolutionary artistic movements in the early twentieth century. It comes vividly to life, for instance, in the work of the cubists. Led by Pablo Picasso and Georges Braque in the early twentieth century, the cubist movement in art 'fractured the space-time barrier itself, providing simultaneous images of the same moment from different points in space and multiple views of a single scene at various points in time'.⁴²⁷

In a similar way, Arnold Schoenberg's influential serial technique of musical composition (so-called 'twelve-tone music'), brings a new level of intensity to the idea of 'simultaneity' in music at the same time as it emphasizes the 'spatial' character of musical ideas. It accomplishes this by organizing all aspects of a piece of music according to a predetermined series or 'row' of musical events (patterns of pitches, rhythm, and dynamics), each of which may be used either alone or simultaneously in either an original, inverted, or retrograde (that is, backwards) version.

In the field of literature, several major works focus on what Gianni Vattimo calls 'the problem of time and on ways of experiencing temporality outside its supposedly natural linearity',⁴²⁸ obvious examples being Marcel Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past* and James Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake* and *Ulysses*. Elliott Jacques describes the fusion of time perspectives achieved in Proust's monumental work as a 'detailed accumulation of events from the past, working out the way in

which they remain alive and enter into the present through the minds of each individual actor in the drama' he presents.⁴²⁹ Something similar occurs in the work of William Faulkner, which Jacques describes in the following passage.

There is in Faulkner the disorganising impact upon the reader of the way in which past and present flow back and forth into each other, all seemingly contemporaneous, so that the present chronology takes on the sense of predestined future which heightens the vividness and poignancy of the tragedy and grief which hang so heavily over the characters in his novels. Everything seems ominously fated - the future being tied to the accumulating active past.⁴³⁰

Not surprisingly, given the cause-and-effect mentality embedded in the modern mechanistic worldview, twentieth-century philosophical responses to the block-universe idea (and the linkage of space and time it implies) tend to focus on the idea of causation, with opponents arguing that its 'deterministic' character fails to account adequately for human freedom and creativity. The flavour of this philosophical discourse can be illustrated by comparing two important and contrasting positions described by Andrew G. Bjelland. The first of these positions supports the idea of a spacetime continuum and Bjelland describes it as a 'necessitarian' point of view which welds together past, present, and future and 'absorbs causation into timeless, static identity'. The second position, which challenges the spacetime continuum as a basic model for reality, is described as a 'creative evolutionist' point of view which suggests that 'genuine novelties' do emerge in the 'actual dynamic universe' both as 'the syntheses of past antecedents *and* as the resolutions of an objectively indeterminate future'.⁴³¹

To illustrate the so-called necessitarian or deterministic position, Bjelland reiterates the well known passage about time from the work of Pierre-Simon, Marquis de Laplace, which suggests that if it were possible to have complete knowledge of the state of the universe and the laws of nature, every detail of the future could be determined. He points out that this position reduces cause and effect relations to a 'relation of logical equivalence', and quotes the following passage from a work by Bertrand Russell as a twentieth-century expression of the same point of view.

Causes, we have seen, do not *compel* their effects, any more than effects

compel their causes. There is a mutual relation, so that either can be inferred from the other...The apparent indeterminateness of the future...is merely a result of our ignorance...Now, quite apart from any assumption as to causality, it is obvious that complete knowledge would embrace the future as well as the past. Our knowledge of the past is not wholly based upon causal inferences, but is partly derived from memory. *It is a mere accident that we have no memory of the future.* We might - as in the pretended visions of seers - see future events immediately, in the way in which we see past events. They certainly will be, and are in this sense just as determined as the past.⁴³²

To illustrate the contrasting, creative evolutionist view, Bjelland relies heavily on the work of Milič Čapek, in particular, on Čapek's explication of Bergson's evolutionary philosophy. He points out that Čapek challenges those who suggest that time is not equivalent to 'qualitative, irreversible becoming' by posing the following question: 'How can timeless reality be transformed or unrolled into its illusory successive manifestations?' In keeping with an attitude of incredulity towards the idea of eternity, an attitude that recalls Lovejoy's negative reaction to the principle of plenitude discussed in Chapter Three, Čapek believes that it is logically impossible for a timeless relation to be also a temporal relation, and, therefore, it is logically impossible for the obvious cause and effect relations of everyday temporal activities to be *already* in a timeless state of existence. 'In...a growing world', Čapek writes, 'every present event is undoubtedly caused, though not necessitated by its own past', and, therefore, 'every present event is by its own nature *an act of selection* ending the hesitation of reality between various possibilities'. The future, according to Čapek, is not 'a disguised and hidden present as in the necessitarian scheme' but emerges 'from a particular present state' which means that 'its general *direction* is outlined' but not its actuality.⁴³³ As Bjelland notes, Čapek's interpretation of Bergson suggests that 'the general direction of the future is predictable', but only 'at the level of statistical complexes', not 'at the level of individual elementary physical events'. Such a view, then, affirms both 'the reality of objective potencies inherent to nature' *and* the 'objective indetermination of an open future'.⁴³⁴

Bjelland's use of the word 'objective' in the preceding sentence to describe both *inherent potential* and *future openness* is a remarkable illustration of the modern

appetite for objectifying everything. Because potentiality and openness are attributes of subjective consciousness and entail such experiential qualities as uncertainty, ambiguity, and vulnerability, they lack the materiality, actuality, and concrete observability associated with an objective awareness of something. Accordingly, it is confusing, to say the least, to describe a 'potency' or the 'indetermination of an open future' as objective. .

My reading of Bjelland's discussion of the time and causation issue in twentieth-century philosophy, and, more generally, of related attempts to objectify the unobjectifiable, is that it reflects the underlying assumption of the modern scientific paradigm that everything can and, therefore, ought to be understood in terms of causation, and this assumption, I suggest, is fuelled by a cultural value-system geared towards the prediction and control of events as a means of attaining future individualistic and/or collectivistic goals. Given such a context, the objectification of everything, including time, is perhaps not surprising because objects can be readily used as instruments for achieving specific goals. Moreover, it is perhaps not surprising, given the progress-oriented ethos of our modern technocultures, that the idea of a spacetime continuum, with its suggestion that past, present, and future events coexist, is disconcerting for individuals and societies with a vested interest in creating a future *according to their own plans*.

However, the consequences of conceiving the future in terms of implementing self-serving 'master plans' are overwhelmingly more disconcerting and carry with them a far greater threat to human freedom than the suggestion that the future may be something we discover rather than make, as only a momentary reflection on the impact of totalitarian ideology on events in the twentieth century makes clear.

My suggestion here, and the last idea to be discussed in this survey of images of time and timelessness, is that the concept of spacetime implies no threat to human freedom and no lessening in the importance of human creativity. On the contrary, when viewed in conjunction with contemporary ideas about how minds and environments are linked through the operation of 'fields' of influence and with Bohm's ideas about an implicate order beyond space and time, the spacetime concept

becomes an integral aspect of understanding how freedom, creativity, and time-consciousness function in the dynamic field of influence that exists between the manifest world of temporal phenomena and the timeless world from which it springs.

Time-Consciousness, Freedom, and Creativity: Exploring the Links Between Time and Timelessness

The feeling of ‘being threatened’ is a product of fragmentation, of feeling separate from that which is threatening, but the individual human person is not separate from the totality, from the wholeness of the universe. What I hope to illustrate in the following remarks is that to be free is to experience this wholeness, and to be creative is to experience how this wholeness is expressed through the myriad forms of our interdependent relationships, which include expressions of time-consciousness. As David Bohm observes, ‘everything is participating creatively in the action of the totality’.⁴³⁵

When discussing basic ideas (such as causation) during a time of significant sociocultural change, it is perhaps inevitable that those who adhere to well entrenched concepts might feel threatened by those who propose novel approaches to old issues and concerns. The publication, in 1981, of Rupert Sheldrake’s *A New Science of Life: The Hypothesis of Morphic Resonance*, illustrates this observation, for it was labelled by the prestigious scientific journal *Nature* as ‘the best candidate for burning there has been for many years’.⁴³⁶ The hypothesis that prompted this scathing (and I think defensive) reaction is centered around the concept of *morphogenetic fields*. As described by Sheldrake, morphogenetic fields are invisible structures in nature that account for the emergence and development of all forms of life in terms of the principles of ‘formative causation’, that is, in terms of a non-energetic manner of causation similar to the way a ‘plan’ designates the form of a building and operates as a non-energetic ‘cause’ for its construction. Because such fields operate across space and are detectable ‘only through their morphogenetic effects on material systems’, Sheldrake notes that they are ‘analogous to the known fields of physics in that they are capable of ordering physical changes, even though they themselves cannot be observed directly’.⁴³⁷

The essential idea of formative causation is that 'the form of an organism depends on a pre-existing archetype which moulds or shapes the developing organism'. The interaction between a developing organism and this pre-existing archetype occurs as the result of a process Sheldrake calls 'morphic resonance', a process which he compares to the transmission and reception of a radio or TV signal. Just as a particular radio set has the necessary wiring for tuning into a particular transmission, a developing organism has the necessary genetic material for tuning into the particular morphogenetic field of its own species. The important point here, and what distinguishes Sheldrake's idea from Plato's concept of pre-existing archetypal forms, is that because morphic resonance is an interpenetration of both 'sending' and 'receiving' activities, the morphogenetic fields which shape and mould forms are not fixed, rather, 'they are affected by what happens in time, and past forms have a cumulative influence on them'; that is, 'it's a two-way process...the morphogenetic field itself undergoes evolutionary development'.⁴³⁸ What this idea implies, then, is that organic forms emerge within a creatively evolving process of interaction that is sensitive to both predispositions and environmental conditions, and not as the output of a mechanistic cause-and-effect chain of events.

The apparently 'revolutionary' aspect of 'formative causation' can be described as the suggestion that 'the form of things and the behaviour of organisms is influenced by "morphic resonance" emanating from past events', a suggestion that challenges the prevailing views of scientific causation inasmuch as it proposes that organisms actually benefit or suffer directly on account of the actions of *other* organisms across time and space through influences transmitted by morphic resonance within a particular morphogenetic field, rather than by direct cause-and-effect associations.⁴³⁹ In the opinion of Joseph Chilton Pearce, this idea displays a similarity with the ancient Vedic theory of *samskara*, which he describes in the following passage.

Biologist Rupert Sheldrake describes "morpho-genetic" fields that shape physical form...Similar is the ancient Vedic theory of *samskara*, formative fields inherited from our predecessors and created continually by our present actions. Our personal ego reflects our major *samskara* and is where our various minor ones are toted about. Every action or even thoughts sets up

feedback between our action and the fields from which we draw our experience. Samskaras are not localized but give rise to localization; they are residues of previous actions that can act on our present situation rather as extended "phantom limb pains." Any chance stimuli can activate samskaras and they unfold as part of our general world. *Every category of "structural-coupling" between mind and environment operates out of or sets up such a field effect.* Enough participation by enough people over enough time can stabilize any field effect by shifting it from personal to social to species-wide and finally universal.⁴⁴⁰

Although, given the implication of Pearce's final comment, it must be remembered that, in Hinduism, *samskaras* arise 'not from the collective history of mankind' but from the individual history of a person's past lives,⁴⁴¹ the important point here is to illustrate the operation of non-localized field-effects. In a universe characterized by such 'field effects', everything can be traced back to a particular morphic field, and in that sense, everything is given. As Sheldrake notes, 'life is always coming from another living organism. You don't get spontaneous generation'.⁴⁴² By analogy, this interactive-field idea resonates with a great many common everyday experiences: for example, feeling drawn to certain people, events, or ideas and not to others, or recognizing that what we do reflects some combination of habit and impulse, or realizing that learning is not simply acquiring new information but, more fundamentally, discovering connections among different bits of information, past, present, and potential. Moreover, because morphic resonance is essentially a field effect, it can account for a wide variety of influences which occur at-a-distance, that is, without spatial and/or temporal proximity. Morphogenetic fields, then are very much 'at home' in the so-called 'block universe' of a spacetime continuum and in the world of quantum physics, and the relationships they depict are anything but 'static' and 'determined' (two adjectives often used to describe the block universe), for their nature is to be dynamic.

The dynamism of morphogenetic fields is not 'creative' in the strict sense of the word, that is, in the sense of initiating something completely new, something completely without reference to a past, but in the more general sense of the word, it is creative inasmuch as it accounts for developmental inventiveness and ingenuity.

Thus, although Sheldrake's theory says nothing about how any given kind of morphogenetic field originated, it does offer a more comprehensive explanation for patterns of biological causation and for the interplay of repetitiveness and variety in developing organisms than does the mechanistic model of modern science with its linear and time-bound 'laws'.⁴⁴³

One way of understanding causative action within morphogenetic fields is to view it as the creativity of developing organisms as they interact with their environments. This creative interaction is a kind of 'dialogue' between, on the one hand, the 'given' attributes or qualities of an individual organism, and on the other hand, the morphogenetic field or field of potential from which these qualities arise. The important point here with respect to time is that, although organisms function within environments that can be described as time-bound, morphogenetic fields exist in an order of reality that is not bound by time, that is, in a kind of 'implicate order'. Accordingly, the theory of morphogenetic fields sheds light on the ideas developed in this dissertation in two principal ways: in the first place, it provides an illustration from the world of biological science of the major theme of this survey of perspectives towards time, namely, that time is best understood in the context of a more encompassing timeless order of reality; and secondly, it provides support for the wholeness view of reality depicted in Bohm's theory of an implicate order.

The link between the ideas of Sheldrake and Bohm is evident by considering Bohm's assertion that 'the implicate order can be thought of as a *ground beyond time*'.⁴⁴⁴ In his elaboration of this idea, Bohm explains that each moment of time is both 'projected' from the implicate into the explicate order and subsequently 'introjected' back from the explicate into the implicate order. This process of projection and introjection sets up a kind of 'dialogue' between the world of time (the manifest order of reality) and the reality of a timeless order of being, and Bohm proposes that this dialogue generates a kind of causality similar to the kind depicted by morphogenetic fields, because a fairly constant series of projections and introjections would establish a kind of 'fixed disposition' similar to morphic resonance. Thus, what Bohm suggests is that the phenomenon of causality is best

understood in terms of specific manifestations of being that are 'mediated' by the totality (the 'ocean') of the implicate order, just as biological causation is mediated by a morphogenetic field. Bohm summarizes this idea in the following passage.

For every moment that is projected out into the explicate there would be another movement in which that moment would be injected or "introjected" back into the implicate order. Now, if you have a large number of repetitions of this process, you'll start to build up a fairly constant component to this series of projections and injections. That is, a fixed disposition would become established. The point is that, via this process, past forms would tend to be repeated or replicated in the present, and that is very similar to what Sheldrake calls a morphogenetic field and morphic resonance. When it projects back into the totality (the implicate order), since no space and time are relevant there, all things of a similar nature might get connected together or resonate in the totality. You see, when the explicate order enfolds into the implicate order, which does not have any special place, all places and all times are, we might say, merged, so that what happens in one place will interpenetrate with what happens in another place...All basically similar things will be especially closely related inside the totality in the implicate order.⁴⁴⁵

Bohm's ideas evoke an image of the vast world of matter - the world of space and time - as a 'small ripple' on an enormously greater 'ocean' of reality, the world of an implicate order that exists beyond space and time. This image, with its suggestion of ongoing connectivity between the manifest order of reality (the 'waves' on the ocean) and its unmanifest or implicate timeless ground (the ocean itself), is in tune with insights derived not only from twentieth-century physics but also from many traditions of spirituality. Accordingly, it provides an especially reliable and fruitful basis for understanding systems of causation and how they relate to freedom and creativity.

With respect to causation, Bohm's image of the material world as a ripple in the ocean of an implicate order suggests that the mechanisms of materiality are *surface structures* and that, as one's understanding of matter penetrates more deeply into the implicate order, matter becomes more subtle, so subtle, in fact, that it becomes indistinguishable from consciousness. The important implication here is that the concept of spacetime as a kind of closed arena in which certain laws describe necessary relationships is an inadequate depiction of the material world of space and

time, because 'each law *is* a structure that interpenetrates and pervades the totality of the implicate order'. Bohm prefers to think of the so-called 'laws' that describe causal relationships as attempts to paint a 'whole picture', rather than attempts to 'to find a set of dynamical equations for determining how one event follows another'. In Bohm's view, such equations 'will appear only as approximations and limiting cases valid in explicate contexts', whereas 'the principles from which the law flows will involve qualities like harmony, order, symmetry, beauty, etc.',⁴⁴⁶ and such qualities exist in consciousness as aspects of the 'whole picture' of reality.

This idea that causation involves the interpenetration of all phenomena within an implicate order suggests that deterministic, that is, mechanical activity is limited to the explicate order, and, therefore, limited to the surface structures of being in time and space. When consciousness moves into the implicate order, a kind of awareness is opened up that enables a person to see her or his involvement with these surface structures in the context of the wholeness that *is* the implicate order, and the deeper the penetration into this wholeness, the more profound and all-encompassing is this awareness. Because past experiences are enfolded within the depths of the implicate order, this awareness enables a person to be directly conscious of whatever bondage, conditioning, or active confusion is implied by past activities, and it is in this sense that a mind is 'free' of the links-of-determination that characterize involvement with the order of material existence. 'Without freedom of this kind', Bohm observes, 'there is little meaning even in raising the question as to whether human beings are free, in the deeper sense of being capable of a creative act that is not determined mechanically by unknown conditions in the untraceably complex interconnections and unplumbable depths of the overall reality in which we are embedded'.⁴⁴⁷

As Bohm implies in the preceding remark, freedom is linked to creativity in the sense that to act creatively is to act without determination and with a consciousness deeply attuned to the wholeness of reality. In the light of this idea, human creativity can be understood as a moving or dynamic image of an initial act of creation - ultimately, it is 'the action of the *infinite* in the sphere of the finite'.⁴⁴⁸ The important implication here is that freedom and creativity are not intrinsically

linked with 'independent' behaviour; that is, a person is not free or creative because he or she acts independently, for, as Bohm points out in the following comment, the freedom to act is inseparable from the act of participation.

Given that a human being may be creative when his or her consciousness arises directly from the "timeless" holomovement, we come to another question: is the creative human being merely an instrument or a projection of the creative action of totality? or does one act from one's own being independently? I suggest that this is a wrong question [!], as it presupposes a separation of the human being from the totality...A better question is: can we be free to participate in the creativity of the totality at a level appropriate to our true potential?

The need for this question becomes clear if we note that ultimately *everything is participating creatively in the action of the totality*.⁴⁴⁹

Bohm's ideas regarding causation, freedom, and creativity clearly harmonize with and intensify the principal theme of this chapter, namely, that time is best understood as something nested within a timeless order of being. Whether time is taken to refer to either an actual physical quantity or a conventional form of psychological reckoning, it exists within the explicate or manifest order of being. Consciousness, however, is organized by and operates from the timeless implicate order; using Bohm's terminology, 'it acts from the holomovement'. Thus, as Bohm observes, 'time can be seen in its proper meaning only in the context of that which is beyond time', and 'any attempt to treat the whole meaning of existence in terms of time alone will lead to arbitrary and chaotic limitation of this existence, which then takes on the quality of being rather mechanical'.⁴⁵⁰

Time, then, does not have an ultimate significance because it pertains to the order of manifestation, the order of 'grosser mechanical existence', which is contained *within* a more comprehensive order of being. But because time is used as a conventional means of understanding events in the natural world and of organizing routine social activities, time-perspectives do constitute a significant part of what is enfolded as past experiences within the world of implicate-consciousness, and, therefore, they constitute a potential source of confusion if they are interpreted consciously as indicative of the ultimate order of reality. The crucial point here is that

to identify some aspect of temporality as being essential to what one is limits a person's creative participation in the wholeness of the implicate order. As previous comments in this study illustrate, philosophers and mystics from many different traditions and historical periods have recognized the value of this observation by consistently emphasizing the efficacy of freeing one's consciousness from attachments to time-bound concepts and ideas, essentially because the view from within time is both a limited and conditioned one, and the way to do this - the way to respond creatively to the condition of temporality - is to become as fully aware as possible of one's present experience.

This, then, is the concluding observation of this survey of images of time and timelessness; that time is best understood as 'time-consciousness', that is, as a point-of-view rather than an objective entity, and because time-consciousness is a way of connecting manifest and non-manifest orders of reality, its expression in daily life is a deeply-rooted reflection of what it means to be human and the orientation towards freedom and creativity which that meaning implies.

In the following chapter, the concept of time-consciousness is the central focus. My intention is to explore how different expressions of time-consciousness influence the way people and societies conduct their lives and to highlight the importance of a *present-centered* temporal focus.

Chapter Six

Past, Future, and Present as Temporal Focal Points

Human life is...a present made up of a past and future brought into the moment...Human life is never fixed but is always emergent as the past and future become horizons of present. (Dwayne E. Huebner)⁴⁵¹

People are not always aware of their awareness of time. Nevertheless, 'real' or experiential time, in contrast to clock-time, is deeply expressive of how a person probes and responds to various conditions and, in general, conducts the ongoing affairs of daily living. Real time can expand (move more slowly), contract (move more quickly), stand still, or even seem to disappear altogether. Whether influenced by different kinds of past-oriented memories or future-oriented expectations or different kinds of engagement with the present, a person's time-consciousness is *meaningful* because it expresses a particular way of being human, and this is what I am exploring in these remarks: how different modes of time-consciousness affect human behaviour.

Before considering the specific ramifications of past-directed, future-oriented, and present-centered time-consciousness respectively, it is important to emphasize that the ideas discussed in this chapter make two general assumptions about the perception of time as a medium for human action. First of all, it is assumed that, in any temporal experience, past, present, and future perspectives coexist in some form of relationship, that is, they form a kind of temporal 'triad' in human consciousness, with each perspective functioning as a distinct but interconnected component of the whole, usually with one predominating over the others, just as in a musical triad, one note functions as the 'root' or fundamental note to which the others are related. The second assumption is that the various modes of time-consciousness are expressed collectively as well as individually.

The principal thrust of the ideas presented here is that current individual and cultural perspectives towards time are excessively influenced either by past events which condition behaviour or future possibilities which motivate action toward material rewards or quantitative increases of one kind or another. Because these

associations with the past or future tend to canalize behaviour, they constitute a restriction of a person's ability to be consciously engaged with a present situation, and this restriction, I suggest, creates a disoriented perception of time because it is a perception without a center, that is, without the significance that a person's present-centered consciousness gives to both past events and future possibilities.

George Herbert Mead calls the present the 'seat of reality',⁴⁵² and this phrase draws attention to the fact that, when people do not engage with the present as the primary temporal focal point, their actions are rooted in mental activities with which there is no immediate personal involvement. But without an immediate and meaningful personal contact with the constituents of life-events, how is it possible to cultivate any 'depth' to our experiences? Without opportunities to live in a genuinely present moment, the 'vertical' dimension of life, the dimension that connects us with the deep underlying matrix of personal, social, and ultimately universal life, is neglected in favour of the 'horizontal' dimension, the dimension that organizes life in terms of succession rather than coexistence.

Many twentieth-century writers have expressed concern, even alarm, at this loss of a significant cultural dimension of depth in contemporary life. Here, for example, is how Paul Tillich describes this situation.

Indeed our daily life in office and home, in cars and airplanes, at parties and conferences, reading magazines and watching television, while looking at advertisements and hearing radio, are in themselves continuous examples of a life that has lost the dimension of depth. It runs ahead; every moment is filled with something that must be done or seen or said or planned. But no one can experience depth without stopping and becoming aware of himself. Only if he has moments in which he does not care about what comes next can he experience the meaning of this moment here and now and ask himself about the meaning of his life. As long as the preliminary, transitory concerns are not silenced, no matter how interesting and valuable and important they may be, the voice of the ultimate concern cannot be heard. This is the deepest root of the loss of the dimension of depth in our period - the loss of religion in its basic and universal meaning.⁴⁵³

As Tillich implies, to cultivate a dimension of depth is to turn towards a center of ultimate concern through a kind of silencing of the mind, an emptying of concerns about what has happened in the past and what might happen in the future, but to do

this in the context of the busy-ness and noise of contemporary life is not easy. However, to live in intimate contact with a present moment is not in itself an extraordinary feat, for it is part of what it means to be human - it is part of our nature as temporal beings to be able to live 'here and now'. The idea I am putting forward in this chapter is that at least part of what makes it difficult for people to be fully in tune with the present is a lack of understanding of time as a mode of consciousness, as a way of being human, and this inattention to real or experiential time stems from attempts to objectify time, to perceive it as something separate from the beings who experience it. Thus, because the modern scientific revolution and the technological and economic processes and structures it spawned involve the objectification of time in a major way, it is now a crucial human task to reanimate an awareness of ourselves as temporal beings, that is, as people who create our temporal environments, both individually and collectively. The following observations and comments about the implications of various time perspectives are offered in response to the urgency of this task.

Past-Directed Time-Consciousness

When individuals and/or societies are attuned to a past experience or to a set of past experiences in such a way that they provide the principal authority for action, that is, when 'memory is power' or when the criterion for truth is 'what was and ever shall be', it can be said that the past is acting as the primary temporal focal point. Because this orientation towards time reflects the prevalent form of human self-understanding in the oral cultures of pre-historical times, Raimon Panikkar refers to it as 'nonhistorical consciousness'.⁴⁵⁴ Elaborating on this suggestion, he notes that, with the invention of script 'past events acquire independent reality' because they can be 'stored, frozen, so to speak' and do not need to be accumulated in memory in order to permeate the present. Moreover, as independently embodied facts, scripted knowledge of past events can be manipulated and used for the attainment of various social and political goals in the future. In contrast, for pre-scriptural societies, the past is a living and abiding presence and is in no way independent of current activities, for 'tradition is the very life of the present'. To live in a pre-scriptural

environment, then, is to live in a world in which the patterns of daily life are sustained by an active and authoritative memory: As Panikkar describes it, ‘the sense of life does not lie in what I still have to live, but in what I have already lived, and especially in what I am living’. In such an environment, ‘the meaning of life does not consist in building a Great Society on Earth, a powerful organization, but rather in enjoying life in the best possible way’.⁴⁵⁵

Although most of his comments about nonhistorical consciousness focus on its expression in our pre-historical past, Panikkar notes that ‘another type of the same consciousness has existed in far more recent cultures, like most of the major traditions of Asia’, and it persists in our modern cosmopolitan societies as the ‘strong traces of primordial Man’ which are to be found ‘in each of us’.⁴⁵⁶ Unfortunately, he does not elaborate on either of these observations. However, his description of nonhistorical consciousness suggests that it is an orientation that can be linked with societies that express an inclination towards a ‘cyclical’ understanding of time. For instance, he describes ‘the supreme principle’ guiding pre-historical societies as the belief that ‘the meaning of life consists both in entering into harmony with nature and in enhancing it’, which suggests that time is understood not as a ‘construct of culture’ but as ‘the rhythm of nature’, that is, as cyclical time.⁴⁵⁷ Because various cultural expressions of cyclical time are discussed in the previous chapter, my comments here focus on Panikkar’s other passing reference, that is, to the presence of a so-called primordial mode of consciousness in our contemporary technocultures.

In pre-historical societies, the past exercised its authority over behaviour in the form of oral traditions. It has been noted, for example, that epic poetry acted as a kind of ‘tribal encyclopedia’ in which rhymed narratives might expound on anything ‘from shipbuilding to table manners’. In effect, the people of pre-historical oral societies were ‘being instructed while they were being entertained’. The important point here is that the ‘orality’ of their cultures ‘was the vehicle for absolutely untrammelled *groupthink*’, that is, oral traditions provided a matrix for sustaining a collectivistic mentality committed to preserving the past as the chief source of cultural nourishment for the present. In a fascinating and insightful account of the influence of

electronic media on the moral climate of late twentieth century societies, John M. Phelan discusses the emergence of new forms of collectivistic behaviour which imply modes of consciousness not unlike the undifferentiated-mass-groupthink 'orality' of these early societies.⁴⁵⁸

Phelan proposes that the manifold character of contemporary media experiences coupled with a profound lack of moral guidance have reproduced 'in a higher key' the mental stresses that accompanied the transition from oral to script-based societies. In consequence, these stresses have led to 'a quest for the comforting simplicity of primary tribalism'. This observation is similar to Marshall McLuhan's notion of a return to 'tribalism' which Phelan describes as follows: 'the central tendency of McLuhan's observations is to show that the invention of print was the ultimate triumph of the written over the spoken and that the development of audiovisual electronic media was the returning revenge of the oral over the written'. However, Phelan contends that McLuhan's analysis of the tribalism of contemporary culture is limited by its assumption that 'media replace one another'. A more accurate depiction of the current situation, he suggests, is provided by Walter Ong's 'layered' view of cultural transformations. In this view, 'media, like the levels of ancient cities, are layered over with successive new developments that adopt and adapt many characteristics of the previous means of communications'. For Phelan, a kind of overlap-and-blending occurs along the edges of cultural transformations: a kind of cultural imbrication. The implication here is that today's electronic media do not reflect a simple return to an 'oralized' cultural mentality, as McLuhan suggests, because they create something that is both new and old, that is, they create a *secondary orality*. The following comments summarize what Phelan means by this concept of secondary orality.⁴⁵⁹

Modern electronics are the keystone of the much touted "information society"... Multinational conglomerates, instant global credit, teleconferencing, data processing, paperless offices with video display terminals and electronic storage in place of files, and cashless electronic transfer of money in place of primitive paper-and-ink checks, all these characteristics of modern business society which many find dehumanizing and arctically impersonal are the children of electronic aural-oral, audiovisual media... [This] secondary orality,

as a factor of social organization, has...not merely layered over the secular rationality of print-oriented man with a simple reversion to the earlier sensibility of the tribe; it has rather presented socialized urban man with renewed opportunities for privacy, a new kind of privacy with profound political consequences... Secondary orality, with its vivid imagery and sound, presents *the illusion of social contact without its reality*. Unlike primary reality and primary orality, it is not warmly supported; it is solipsistic.⁴⁶⁰

Although Phelan acknowledges that 'secondary tribalism' exhibits the same kind of non-critical enthusiasm typical of actual tribal societies, he notes that it differs fundamentally from a 'global village' (to use McLuhan's terminology). This difference stems from the fact that secondary tribalism does not engage 'the total mind and heart' of group members in forms of immediate, that is, *un-mediated* person-to-person contact. On the contrary, contemporary electronic media tend to construct not a global village but a 'global theatre' in which each person has 'a private box'. In such a theatre, interaction is a matter of flicking a switch, tuning in or tuning out. Such a theatre creates a 'take-it-or-leave-it' kind of world that is totally packaged and, therefore, limited by the technology that embodies it.⁴⁶¹ The Internet's 'world-wide-web' actualizes this kind of a 'global theatre', but Phelan's observations were made over a decade before the Internet existed in its present form. Accordingly, to illustrate his ideas, he discusses the impact of what he calls the 'characteristic utterance' of our electronic media age, the *cassette*.

Phelan describes the cassette as a 'programmed, plug-in module of context-free thought'. In his view, communication via cassette technology (cassetication) 'provides us with a sort of secondary consciousness to match secondary tribalism' inasmuch as it embodies a kind of 'automatization' of authority. As an illustration of the authority of 'cassetication', consider the fact that radio and televised newscasts are essentially collections of 'cassetized' material and these newscasts are the chief, if not the only source of the average person's information about the world at large and about relevant public issues and concerns. The impact of cassetication, however, extends well beyond the radio and television industries. Political and commercial organizations and interest groups of all types use pre-packaged material regularly for literally thousands of reasons - from disseminating information about public events or particular

ideologies to instructing people in various skills and promoting products or services of every kind. In fact, Phelan suggests that the craze for 'making an effective presentation' via cassette transcends even the 'need' to convey a particular message and becomes instead 'a symbol of caring' or an expression of 'faith' in a product or idea.⁴⁶²

This overwhelming use of cassetication implies that life in contemporary technocultures is to a large extent programmed and conditioned by a perceived (but entirely manufactured) need to pre-package experiences of all sorts. Even the so-called 'live' coverage of a news event usually follows the dictates of cassetication, for, under normal circumstances, such coverage must be accommodated in time-slots provided by broadcast networks that are primarily oriented towards generating advertising revenue. Moreover, they are invariably tailored according to the well-established formats of entertainment-style presentations which also reflect commercial interests. The point here is that, insofar as cassetication results in a cultural life that is dominated by procedures aimed at conditioning and controlling the behaviour of large numbers of people, it reflects conditions prevalent in pre-historical oral societies when certain practices (such as epic poetry, rituals, and social customs of all sorts) were used as ways of 'managing' consciousness in accordance with specific cultural traditions.

However, as Phelan emphasizes, our contemporary situation is a kind of 'secondary' tribalism, and should not be considered as a parallel or equivalent situation to pre-historical times. For example, there is a major difference between the two situations in terms of the *morality* involved in trying to manage a group's collective consciousness. In oral societies, morality pertaining to both ethical and legal issues is entwined with the preservation of traditions by means of collectivistic practices, but there is no such moral focus involved in cassetication.⁴⁶³ On the contrary, as a product of the scientific-technical worldview, cassetication embodies the 'amoral technical rationality' of that worldview, that is, it encourages the belief that technology in and of itself has no moral significance, and as Phelan observes, 'when the show is a simple matter of tourism or a bit of fun for the boys and girls at

the buyer's convention, there is no harm done', but when 'cassetization impinges on the world where policy decisions are made' or, I would add, on the way people receive information about the important moral issues and concerns of the day, 'this invasion of amoral technical rationality is ominous'.⁴⁶⁴

The reason for Phelan's concern, as I understand it, is this: In 'cassetized' environments, having as many options as possible is virtually a fundamental human right, but such environments provide little if any incentive for persons to think for themselves and assess situations in the light of their own consciences or in meaningful interaction with others. Rather, in such environments, individuals consume information in handy cassetized form and then perform some kind of 'limited act', such as voting for a particular person, buying or not buying a particular item, agreeing or disagreeing with a particular viewpoint. Such limited acts reflect either 'total acceptance or total rejection of a message of large units' and convey 'gross perceptions' that confine the complexity of human response within the boundaries of either-or conceptualizations. In such a context, decision-making is cunningly controlled by providing the illusion of free choice, but there is really no genuine locus for moral judgement. As Phelan accurately observes, such freedom is merely a kind of 'taking it or leaving it'.⁴⁶⁵ This hardly reflects the situation in pre-historical societies, when not abiding by a traditional practice constituted a significant transgression.

There is another important difference with regard to the way pre-historical and contemporary societies condition and control behaviour, and this difference involves cultivating the kind of *creativity* that sustains meaningful cultural life.⁴⁶⁶ In oral societies, creativity, no less than morality, was embedded in the activity of passing on traditions. Because the transmission of knowledge had this 'performative character' and every performance was, in a literal sense, 'unique and not reproducible', it is reasonable to suggest that oral culture gave rise to 'a sensuous, richly imagined, emotional, and dynamic language', a language that standardized writing would be hard pressed to reproduce.⁴⁶⁷ For Western civilizations, there is probably no more obvious illustration of the creativity of oral traditions than the two great epic poems of

ancient Greece attributed to Homer, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, poems which have exerted a continuous and potent influence on Western culture since their origins in the remote past, 'centuries before the invention of the Greek alphabet'. In his massive survey of the cultural and artistic history of the West, Daniel Boorstin observes that these works 'remain as the first and greatest epics of Western civilization', and even today 'the best American poets...test themselves as translators of Homer'.⁴⁶⁸

In contrast to the atmosphere of creativity fostered by the preservation of oral traditions, the profusion of cultural options available in contemporary technocultures creates an atmosphere that is fraught with liability in terms of the creative and emotion-enhancing aspects of life. As Phelan points out with regard to cassette-tape, once the choice of a particular cassette is made, an individual is more than likely 'on a ready-made track with little chance to improvise',⁴⁶⁹ that is, with little (or no) chance to influence the course of what he or she is experiencing other than in ways dictated by the producers of the cassette. Thus, although the cassette reflects the capacity of technology to extend the range of human experience enormously, this extension is accompanied by decreases in the potential for people to extemporize, as Phelan makes abundantly clear in the following remarks.

The modern [person] has a breathtakingly broad palette of colors, but he more than likely paints by the numbers. The walker can control his pace and direction with almost infinite room for improvisation, but he cannot go very far or very long and he is contained by the natural boundaries of cliff and ocean, thicket and swamp. The man on horseback can go a bit further but with slightly less room for improvisation. The automobile, jet, and interplanetary rocket offer successive increments in power and range to the traveller who must submit at each stage to reductions in his freedom to act impulsively...

No individuals went to the moon; a system did. Thousands of leagues from water and soft grass, the space travellers were not free to make interesting mistakes. So it is with the increase in power and range of communications technology. One can stumble and be brilliant by turns of chance or mood by the fireside with a few friends. One had best follow prepared notes in the lecture hall; one is taken in hand by technicians for telecasts.⁴⁷⁰

What these remarks suggest is that, although more advanced technologies require intense acts of participation, they inhibit the spontaneous expression of

individual idiosyncracies. However, it must be noted that contemporary electronic media also create atmospheres in which 'private life' can flourish as never before, for in keeping with the developmental trajectory of previous forms of communication technologies (that is, the movement from the communal orality of epic poetry to the individualism of writing and reading books), modern media experiences decrease dependence on space-time co-presence and increase the space-time independence of communicators, thereby intensifying the world of private lives.⁴⁷¹ Thus, the overall environment of our contemporary technocultures is one that pulls people in two directions, one towards increased collectivity and one towards increased privacy. Consider, for instance, the quality of experience generated by communication via the Internet. In one sense, the Internet potentially connects every person on the globe who has access to a computer, but in another sense, it emphasizes the vast power of technology *to isolate* persons from one another, for, at the same time as it seems to promote participation among people, its method for doing so actually disengages people from unmediated access to one another.⁴⁷²

What is the effect of a form of communication that promotes such intense privacy and participation simultaneously, as part of the *same* communicative act? Unlike the experience of writing and/or reading books which is a form of private activity that potentially stimulates expressions of participation in a wider, larger context, the use of electronic media *compresses* both individualizing and centralizing aspects of human communication into a format that is, essentially, a technological one. I suggest that such a compression of fundamentally important human experiences, insofar as it is entrenched as a cultural norm, tends to legitimate the rationality of technology as a dominant influence, which, in effect, produces an impoverished cultural atmosphere within which to nurture the moral and creative capacities of human nature. Moreover, it is important to note here that the dominant role technology plays in maintaining this impoverished cultural atmosphere is largely masked by the illusion that technocultures create environments that foster cultural heterogeneity and freedom. Although technology does generate a staggering number of options for us, this multiplicity camouflages the fact that a great deal of what

constitutes the substance of our cultural life comes in the form of ‘packages’ especially designed to manipulate and control opinions and emotional responses rather than stimulate them in a genuinely creative manner.

This, then, is the principal observation arising from the preceding remarks: that there is much about life in our contemporary technocultures that tends to keep people in a condition of ongoing compliance with prevailing interests, interests which are predominantly, if not totally, those of a ‘technologized’ capitalistic economy that is becoming an increasingly global phenomenon. Just as people in the oral societies of pre-historical periods lived under the authority of traditions that were kept alive by performative practices that sustained a collective mentality oriented towards preserving the past, contemporary persons live under the authority of a modern techno-capitalist economy that transcends national borders and exerts a globalizing pressure to conform to its own values by sustaining a compliant and collectivistic culture of consumerism. In our various cultural environments, we may have a vast array of options but all (or nearly all) of them function in the same environment of economic determinism. Furthermore, in most aspects of contemporary life, the chief measure of success is the proverbial ‘bottom line’ of ‘economic reality’, and this attitude has become so ‘naturalized’, so engrained in the fabric of daily life, that to suggest that this need not be the case is tantamount to challenging ‘the way things have always been and ever will be’, that is, challenging a basic aspect of our collective orientation to the past.

My response to this cultural acquiescence to the past is to cultivate the human capacity to be deeply attuned to a present situation, and I discuss this response in the final section of this chapter. But before that discussion, there is much that needs to be said about what is perhaps the most prominent kind of time-consciousness in Western societies, namely, an orientation towards the future.

Future-Oriented Time-Consciousness

One of the first observations made by Robert M. Torrance in his book *The Spiritual Quest: Transcendence in Myth, Religion, and Science* is that ‘questing’, that is, the act of ‘setting off in determined pursuit of what we are lacking and may never

attain' is a 'fundamental activity that contributes in no small measure towards defining existence *as human*'. To make his meaning perfectly clear, he adds that 'all life is continually going beyond its given condition', but the human quest is 'pre-eminently a *conscious* transcendence, a deliberate reaching toward a posited - if by no means an unalterable - goal'. When individuals and/or societies adopt this attitude toward 'questing' as the defining act of being human, the basis of 'our essential humanity', it can be said that the future is acting as the primary temporal focal point.⁴⁷³

Panikkar refers to a temporal orientation towards the future as 'historical consciousness', and, like Torrance, he characterizes it in terms of a felt need for transcendence, in contrast to nonhistorical (past-oriented) consciousness which is characterized by a felt need for immanence.⁴⁷⁴ He describes this need for transcendence as a 'dialectical opposition' between individuals and nature, in the sense that people experience an incessant need 'to go beyond and ahead', to conquer nature, to surpass present conditions. Historical or future-focused individuals and cultures use education not as a means of simply conveying traditional belief, but as a means of acquiring knowledge that can be used for creating new and increasingly sophisticated possibilities for action. Knowledge, according to this mind-set, involves purposefulness, ambition, and freedom, for if we are 'historical' beings, 'we are marching towards an eschatology which is the fruit of our deeds' and not the result of some pre-determined destiny or the 'whims of the gods'. In the light of historical consciousness, then, 'the meaning of life is not to be found in the cosmic cycle' (as it is for nonhistorical consciousness) but 'in the human one, in society, which is a human creation'. Thus, as described by Panikkar, the emergence of historical consciousness as a dominant worldview coincided with concerted efforts 'to control empirical causality', that is, with efforts to know how things will happen in order to control them. At first such efforts were 'magical' but eventually they became 'scientific' (governed by strict laws of observation and verification) and reached maturity during the period of modern Western Science.⁴⁷⁵

Panikkar's description of historical consciousness invites consideration of the concept of 'progress' - a concept with many connotations. As Paul Tillich notes, the

word 'progress' is derived from *greassus*, which means step, and, therefore, its essential meaning is 'stepping ahead from a less satisfactory situation to a more satisfactory situation'. There is, then, an element of 'progressivism' in every purposeful human action, in every expression of the human *telos*, that is, 'the inner aim' of individuals and/or societies.⁴⁷⁶ With respect to the history of Western civilizations, Tillich identifies three major 'answers' to the overarching question 'what is the inner aim, the telos, of humankind?', and these 'answers' provide a useful framework for discussing some of the most prominent ways societies and individual persons have expressed and continue to express a future-oriented temporality. To begin this discussion, here are brief summaries of these three major expressions of the human 'telos' which I have organized under the following headings: humanism, transcendentalism, and scientism.

Humanism

Tillich refers to the first major historical expression in the West of the 'inner aim' of humanity as the *classical-humanist* definition of telos, and although he associates it primarily with ancient Greek thought, he notes that it is 'still alive in all those who could be called "humanists" in the modern world'. According to this view, humanity's inner aim is the actualization of its own potentialities and the conquest of those distortions of nature that are caused by bondage to error and passions.⁴⁷⁷ Such a view takes human experience as the locus of authoritative knowledge about the world. Consequently, humanists are often associated with a fundamentally practical orientation towards the meaning of human life, and this practicality may be derived from a variety of sources and expressed in a number of different life-styles: Religious and philosophical insights as well as scientific discoveries may be considered as viable sources for understanding the nature of reality. It has been suggested that the modern association of humanism with atheism and agnosticism came about as a result of the conflict between science and religion in the wake of Darwin's theory of evolution in the nineteenth century.⁴⁷⁸ Be that as it may, the point I wish to emphasize here is that the humanist point-of-view is one that expresses a future-oriented temporal perspective insofar as its ideological centrepiece is the realization of human

potentiality through the effort of understanding human experience.

As many scholars have noted, the culture of ancient Greece epitomizes the ideals of humanism, and as a way of illustrating this observation, they often summarize this culture in a single word, '*paideia*'. The word '*paideia*' literally means education and it is normally used to describe the ideal society as one of lifelong learning, that is, one in which 'learning, fulfilment, and becoming human are the primary goals'.⁴⁷⁹ Willis Harman describes this ideal society of the Greeks, and by extension, all humanistic approaches to understanding the 'inner aim' of humanity, as follows:

Education was not a segregated activity, conducted for certain hours, in certain places, at a certain time of life. It was the aim of the society...*Paideia* was the educating matrix of the society; its highest and central theme...*Paideia* was education looked upon as a lifelong transformation of the human personality, in which every aspect of life plays a part. It did not limit itself to the conscious learning process, or to inducting the young into the social heritage of the community. *Paideia* meant the task of making life itself an art form, with the *person* the work of art.⁴⁸⁰

It is important to note here that, in addition to promoting life-long learning, humanism fosters a *pragmatic* approach to the concerns of everyday living, which suggests that it expresses not only an orientation towards the future (its 'creative function') but also an active engagement with the present (its 'critical function'). This present-centered aspect of humanism is discussed in Chapter Seven, in conjunction with a discussion of John Dewey's philosophical pragmatism.

Transcendentalism

The second major expression in Western civilizations of the human 'telos' which Tillich discusses is one he associates primarily with 'the late ancient and early Christian' era. He refers to this orientation as a *transcendental-religious* telos and identifies it with the belief that humanity's inner aim is 'the elevation from the universe of finitude and guilt to the reunion with ultimate reality, the transcendent ground and abyss of everything that is'. Although the word 'transcend' is sometimes used as a synonym for 'surpassing' or simply 'going beyond' normal limits (as when a scientist seeks to transcend the borders of a certain field of study, or a person seeks

to transcend the confines of a mundane existence by exploring new avenues of experience), the transcendentalism implied by this worldview involves seeking to surpass *all* the limitations associated with human existence, including its materiality and any idea or activity that ties the mind inextricably to the material world. Ultimately, to embrace this transcendental-religious worldview is to accept the reality of an ineffable ground or source of everything, that is, a Supreme Being or God who exists at the apex of a hierarchical order of being. Thus, an individual or society which adopts a transcendental-religious perspective is one that privileges a so-called 'supernatural' order over the natural or material world.⁴⁸¹

Given that the transcendent-religious worldview hinges on beliefs and practices directed towards a Divinity, it is important to note that a 'transcendent' Divinity is also an 'immanent' presence, in fact, *the* immanent presence that permeates both individual and societal life. Without this immanence there would be no context for a relationship between the Divine and the human. Thus, to understand the implications of the transcendent-religious worldview for daily living, it is necessary to consider how persons or societies comprehend the transcendent and immanent qualities of the Divinity to which they dedicate their lives. For instance, Aldous Huxley notes that if people have an idea of God that is excessively transcendental, they might conceive God as 'an unapproachable potentate out there giving mysterious orders' and, accordingly, run the risk of becoming entangled in a 'religion of rites', or in a worst case scenario, of becoming a religion limited to 'legalistic observances'. On the other hand, if people adopt the opposite position of considering God as excessively immanent, the opposite problem ensues, a problem which Huxley identifies as 'quietism'. When this orientation is adopted, 'legalism and external practices are abandoned' and there is the danger of slipping into a form of religious lethargy in which there is only a 'partial modification of consciousness' which fails to engender the full transformation of character required by a complete dedication to religious worship and practice.⁴⁸² In between these extreme positions, various combinations of transcendental and immanent orientations towards God are possible, and, therefore, various orientations towards the meaning of 'transcendence' are possible.

In discussing pre-modern orientations towards transcendence, Tillich claims (and I agree) that what we call the 'medieval view' of humanity is an amalgamation of the transcendental-religious orientation with the earlier humanistic worldview, an amalgamation that is expressed powerfully in the works of Thomas Aquinas. However, many writers describe medieval culture itself in a way that reflects a transcendental-religious perspective. Henryk Skolimowski, for instance, writes about what he calls the 'medieval Theos' as a worldview 'inspired and guided by the monotheistic Judaeo-Christian God' and characterized by the way it 'emphasizes the transient nature of physical reality and of earthly existence'. In his view, the medieval ethos is one which requires individuals to 'submit to the preordained plan of God'. He writes: 'God-inspired energy drives people onward and upward: from the Gregorian chant to Chartres Cathedral, from the poetry of the medieval troubadours to the subtlety of scholastic arguments of the fourteenth-century philosophers, we witness the flowering of a new form of logos, medieval Theos'.⁴⁸³

The important point here, however, is not whether the transcendental-religious worldview characterizes a particular period in human history but that it embodies an aspect of human nature that expresses itself in terms of a growth or 'ascent' towards increasing participation in a divine or transcendent order of being. The writings of Gregory of Nyssa illustrate this worldview in a particularly memorable way because of their evocation of the 'darkness' which envelops God 'due primarily to the utter transcendence of the divine essence'.⁴⁸⁴ In the following passage, Gregory of Nyssa portrays the 'soul's ascent' in a way that clearly highlights the goal-directed future temporality of transcendentalism, that is, in terms of a never-ending quest to reach 'the Transcendent'.

For those who are rising in perfection, the limit of the good that is attained becomes the beginning of the discovery of higher goods. Thus they never stop rising, moving from one new beginning to the next, and the beginning of ever greater graces is never limited of itself. For the desire of those who thus rise never rests in what they can already understand; but by an ever greater and greater desire, the soul keeps rising constantly to another which lies ahead, and thus it makes its way through ever higher regions towards the Transcendent.⁴⁸⁵

Scientism

In his description of the third major historical expression of the human telos in Western societies, Tillich proposes that it emerged as an outcome of significant historical reformulations of the previous two worldviews. His suggestion is that what he calls the modern *scientific-technical* definition of telos has its roots in (a) Renaissance humanism, which he depicts as ‘politically and technically oriented’, and (b) Reformation piety, which he describes as a transcendentalist ‘subjection of world and mankind to the kingdom of God’. With these two major historical influences as a matrix, the modern scientific worldview embodies the belief that humanity’s inner aim is ‘the active subjection and transformation of nature and man’.

Implicit in the scientific-technical worldview is the idea that the human person is essentially a rational and active instrument of transformation, someone continually ‘analyzing, controlling, and changing’ her or his environment and self according to various purposes.⁴⁸⁶ Also implied in this worldview is the understanding that the methodology for this transforming activity is that of the natural sciences. Thus, the term ‘scientific’, as used here, refers specifically to the experimental/technical investigation and theoretical explanation of natural phenomena and not to some broader conceptual context, such as ‘effective thinking’.⁴⁸⁷ Accordingly, the term ‘scientism’ refers to the ‘naturalization’ of this scientific mentality as the primary model for acquiring knowledge about the world. In an insightful study of ‘the scientific standing of the research enterprise in the social sciences and related applied fields’ throughout the twentieth century, D.C. Phillips draws attention to this assumption that the methods of science should be applied in all fields of inquiry.

During the last few centuries of Western intellectual history, educated people typically have held an exalted view of science. Together with mathematics, it has stood as the model of what a body of knowledge ought to be. In epistemological discussions of philosophy, it has been taken as an important case of “justified true belief”...Researchers in a variety of fields, ranging from history to psychology and sociology, have felt apologetic if their disciplines have fallen short of the ideals derived from physical science; they have engaged in the quest for laws and theories with vigour but without resounding success.⁴⁸⁸

Exploring the Meaning of 'Questing'

As examples of the 'inner aim' of humanity, it is clear from the above comments that humanism, transcendentalism, and scientism differ insofar as they are oriented towards different objectives: humanism, towards achieving full human potential; transcendentalism, towards achieving union with a Divine Being; and scientism, towards achieving knowledge of and eventually mastery over the physical universe. However, all three perspectives share the common attribute of *seeking to surpass a current condition*.

Throughout history, and in the context of different worldviews, this effort to surpass a current condition has often manifested itself in the form a 'spiritual quest' because of its orientation towards a goal of deep, if not ultimate, significance. Moreover, this quest was often conceived in terms of a life-long or future-oriented task. In the following comments, I explore the suggestion that an excessive emphasis on the 'horizontal' dimension of the spiritual quest, that is, on its orientation towards a future goal and the use of instrumentalistic methods to reach this goal, limit a person's ability to cultivate the 'vertical' or depth dimension of her or his involvement with the circumstances of everyday living.

Robert Torrance describes the spiritual quest as 'the *creative* process par excellence, the process by which human beings continually remake themselves in accord with goals forever beyond them'. He claims that human beings are essentially 'questing animals' who incessantly pursue goals that they hope will provide them with answers to their 'questions', that is, to the various 'impasses' they encounter as they live out their lives. For some, the answers come as part of an ongoing and ardent allegiance to a specific set of religious beliefs and practices, but for others, answers come as part of a no less fervent participation in other cultural activities, such as artistic, scientific, economic, or political endeavour. Torrance proposes that, in spite of having different goals and using different means to achieve them, all of these experiences are examples of a 'spiritual quest' because all of them express what he calls 'transcendence'. His understanding of transcendence, then, is an extremely broad one which encompasses virtually any effort 'to discover and actualize an objective

reality surpassing the limitations' of a particular existence. Here, for example, is one passage where he links his idea of transcendence with a spiritual quest.⁴⁸⁹

The spiritual quest, as a continual interrelation between the individual and a larger reality in which she transcends her personal existence-"transcends" not by leaving it behind for some separate realm of existence but by realization of its enlarging and transformative potentiality-is no less characteristic of tribal visionary experience than of scientific inquiry, or any creative endeavour. The shamanistic quest for knowledge differs, of course, from scientific research in fundamental respects, most fundamentally, perhaps, in the unquestioning credence it generally grants to visionary injunctions whose authority lies beyond question, though not beyond repeated probing through renewal of the never completed quest...Yet striking as their differences are, the affinities between them are no less important, for each is a strenuous search for an *objective* knowledge-knowledge of reality beyond yet inseparable from the perceiving self-that enlarges both the individual seeker and those with whom she shares the results of her exploration.⁴⁹⁰

Because Torrance apparently understands the spiritual quest in terms of reaching an objective understanding that enlarges the individual seeker, his view of transcendence is significantly different from the transcendental-religious perspective outlined earlier. In the religious view of transcendence, the goal of the spiritual quest is not an 'objective reality', as Torrance suggests, because it is a condition of unity with a Divine Being, a condition totally beyond the perceptual limitations imposed by objectivity. Moreover, far from being an experience that 'enlarges the self', unity with a Divine Being is an experience in which the individualistic sense of self is obliterated.

One way of clarifying what transcendence means in terms of the religious view is to consider how instrumentality is related to transcendence. For instance: A person might use an instrumental means, such as a prayer, ritual, or meditative technique, in order to instigate or maintain a 'questing' experience, but when the experience attains a condition of transcendence, all instrumentality vanishes in a 'surrendering of self' to the reality of the experience. The only instrument that remains in a religious experience of transcendence is the instrumentality of being. In *The Perennial Philosophy*, Huxley comments on how a 'submissive' rather than an overly instrumentalistic attitude towards worshipping God characterizes the religious

'seeker'. If people 'are not too stubborn in their ready-made beliefs,' he writes, 'if they submit with docility to what happens to them in the process of worshipping, the God who is both immanent and transcendent, personal and more than personal', may be revealed to them.⁴⁹¹ However, even in a non-religious context, I suggest that an experience of genuine transcendence involves an *abandonment* of any instrumentality apart from being. Artists who reach a 'peak-of-performance', for example, invariably comment about how such experiences reflect the transcendence of mere technique.

What Torrance describes in his elaboration of transcendence is essentially the human impulse to overcome obstacles. 'The quest', he writes, 'is the active mind's response to recognition of impasse'.⁴⁹² In my opinion, this broad instrumentalistic understanding of the spiritual quest reflects the current hegemony of the scientific-technical worldview and the naturalization of its methodology. Under the impact of this worldview, any pursuit of goals tends to imply searching for an *objective reality*, which implies, in turn, that transcendence is something that can be attained by the use of certain procedures or instruments. For example, one prolific and successful scientist-author, Stephen Jay Gould, exemplifies this link between instrumentalism, questing, and transcendence by claiming that 'to recognize a potential limit is to think about tools of possible transcendence',⁴⁹³ and in a particularly ironic expression of this pervasive instrumentalism, a promotional quotation on the cover of a book that is specifically concerned with exposing the dangers of our cultural surrender to technology describes the book as 'a tool for fighting back against the tools that run our lives'!⁴⁹⁴

What I wish to emphasize here is that, as a consequence of this naturalization of instrumentalistic rationality, contemporary societies are fraught with cultural 'production systems' which have as their aim, their telos, 'the endless production of means without an end'.⁴⁹⁵

In keeping with this suggestion, Tillich observes that the major consequence of what he calls the scientific-technical telos and what I call scientism is actually 'the surrender of a telos altogether',⁴⁹⁶ for when the aim of a system is the production of tools designed to achieve certain ends, there is, in reality, no 'end', no aim that exists

apart from the internal mechanics of the system itself. The logic of such a system implies that 'ends' must be understood only in objective terms. Consider, for instance, Torrance's description of the experience of overcoming a specific impasse or limitation as the 'objective reality of transcendence',⁴⁹⁷ or consider the way human impulses are treated as objects and manipulated in order to manufacture the illusory 'needs' which feed the mechanisms of consumerism and saturate our cultural environments with the values of materialism. To understand 'ends' or goals only in this way, that is, in objective terms, is to limit, severely limit, the freedom and creative capacity of human persons, for among the most cherished and nourishing of human experiences are those in which a person is *immersed in mystery and wonder*, and to be in such a state is to experience not an impulse 'to seek' but a joy in remaining silent, in resting, in being at peace with what is present. Such experiences connect us with the wholeness to which we belong.

In an article about the 'means/ends problem in modern culture', David Loy expresses a similar idea to the one proposed here, namely, that instrumentalistic rationality has become, in our modern era, an end in itself, and because it is by nature a means, 'it can never rest anywhere'; hence, the 'peculiarly modern feeling of tension...our perpetual anticipation of something essential yet to occur', an 'inability to be satisfied' which Loy identifies with what a Buddhist would call our *dukkha*, our suffering, our 'out-of-tuneness' with reality.⁴⁹⁸

My intention here is not to downplay the importance of objectifying. Indeed, how could I? Objectifying is a natural, pervasive, and indispensable aspect of human knowing and communicating, a method of observing, abstracting, and correlating observations with both past experience and a present situation. But as Tillich reminds us, the objective world is a world that is *constructed* by human cognitive power and is not the world 'as we *encounter* it in every moment'.⁴⁹⁹ An object is an entity or phenomenon that exists in the mind of an observer, first of all, because it is perceptible, and secondly, because it can be classified in relation to other entities or phenomena on the basis of having certain commonly recognized characteristics. But that which is called an object is not limited by these characteristics. What a so-called

object is in-and-of-itself cannot be reduced to its objective properties, because its fundamental nature is to be a part of the wholeness of reality.

When something *is* reduced to its 'objectiveness', it becomes either a 'tool' to exert control or a 'mere object' to be controlled. Of course, for much of what constitutes everyday living, the control afforded by the use of both material and ideational 'tools' as well as a willingness for people to be controlled in certain circumstances are undeniably necessary. To construct a comprehensible sentence, for example, a person must be able to control the use of concepts, words, and syntax; and to live in communal harmony, objective standards of conduct must be accepted and administered in some way. However, in our modern technocultures, the rationality of objectification is used not simply as a means of facilitating everyday human interaction but as an instrument of mass-fragmentation and control, that is, as a way of transforming both our natural and cultural environments into masses of 'mere objects' that can be readily managed in accordance with the future-oriented goals of particular interest groups.

What I wish to emphasize is that the objectifying capacity of the human mind is only a single aspect of its overall capacity to understand the intricate relationships that make up our various environments. Objectifying itself does not provide us with the whole picture of what we need to know and understand in order to be effective *participants* in these environments, any more than merely studying an object and noting all of its physical attributes enables an artist to render it in a meaningful way.

In a penetrating inquiry into the nature of 'thought and language', Lev Vygotsky explores this idea that there is much more to human interaction than what is implied by objectifying. 'To understand another's speech', he writes, 'it is not sufficient to understand his words - we must understand his thought. But even that is not enough - we must also know its motivation'. Vygotsky's twofold insight here is that motivation engenders thought and that there is no one-to-one correspondence between thought and speech. This is a most significant insight because it implies that thought is a different process from the activities which give rise to and express it. Although 'every thought creates a connection, fulfils a function, solves a problem',

Vygotsky's point is that 'the flow of thought is not accompanied by a simultaneous unfolding of speech...and there is no rigid correspondence between the units of thought and speech'.

Thus, as Vygotsky points out, 'thought has its own structure', and this is a significant observation because it carries with it a profound implication for human interaction, namely, that 'in our speech, there is always the hidden thought, the subtext'.⁵⁰⁰ From a personal perspective, discovering and responding to one's own subtext is a process of understanding one's motives, and this process provides essential information for an ongoing experience of one's personal being. From the perspective of someone interacting with another, attempting to understand the subtext of another's experience is a process of trying to understand the nature of a particular experience of interpersonal relating. The important implication here is that, in order to understand that which is expressed in thoughts and words through language, one must be able to experience that which is beyond thoughts and words, that is, one must be able to intuit and to empathize: in a word, to imagine.

Normally, the idea of seeking, of questing, is associated with the future and with efforts to overcome or surpass a current condition, but to consider that intuiting and empathizing are also meaningful avenues of knowing suggests that they may also be understood as ways of 'questing' in the sense of 'deepening' one's awareness of a current condition. My suggestion here is that this experience of deep awareness is actually an expression of *fervent inquiry* and, therefore, a kind of 'search', although its 'end' is not further away in time but abides deep within a present moment. In the light of this suggestion, interpretive and participatory ways of knowing, which can be understood collectively as *imagining*, constitute a form of inquiry that is a necessary complement to the objectifying methods of the rational intellect. To separate these imagining and rationalizing aspects of knowing is like treating the human heart and brain as autonomous organs within the body, but it is exactly that kind of fragmented thinking that characterizes the instrumentalistic rationality that pervades our contemporary technocultures.

One of the benefits of encouraging our capacity to imagine (that is, to interpret

and participate fully in an experience) is that it relieves the overwhelming 'seriousness' that often accompanies the use of instrumentalistic rationality. The person who is open to 'imagining' as a way of knowing is one who is not restricted by and, therefore, not burdened by obligatory methods. For such a person, everything that happens in an experience is potentially meaningful, potentially full of significance and wonder. As David Loy points out, 'when everything that happens is of consequence - not because of its causal consequences, but because we are open to it - the world becomes *re-enchanted*'.⁵⁰¹ In discussing the impact of 'critical theory' on contemporary theology, Frederick Dallmayr reiterates this insight and makes an appeal for modes of thinking that may be described (imaginatively) as purposefully nonpurposive. He notes that most contemporary 'speech-act' theories of socio-cultural processes retain a strong orientation toward a rationalistic 'intentional performance', and, therefore, perpetuate an orientation toward an instrumentalism that limits access to the realm of the imagination.⁵⁰²

Dallmayr's comments are directed at perhaps the most prominent 'speech-act' theory in contemporary social philosophy, Discourse Ethics, as enunciated primarily by Jürgen Habermas. Because of its enormous influence in the academic community, I would like to make a few general remarks about this theoretical position with regard to its use of rationalism (more specifically, dialogical rationalism) as an instrument of moral justification.

In the first place, Habermas himself points out that the theory of Discourse Ethics is more accurately described as a 'discourse theory of *morality*' because of a distinction he makes between 'communicative' and 'discourse' levels of social interaction: the communicative level being the level of normal everyday interaction based on mutually accepted meanings and shared norms, and the discourse level being the level at which consensual interaction is disrupted and factual and normative positions must be 'subjected to critical scrutiny in a process of argumentation freed from the imperatives of action'.⁵⁰³ In keeping with this distinction between communicative and discourse levels of interaction, Habermas associates ethicality with custom or convention and morality with principled reflection. He writes: 'Within the

horizon of the lifeworld, practical judgments derive both their concreteness and their power to motivate action from their inner connection to unquestioningly accepted ideas of the good life, in short, to ethical life and its institutions'. By contrast, on the level of morality, 'moral judgment becomes dissociated from the local conventions and historical coloration of a particular form of life' and 'can no longer appeal to the naive validity of the context of the lifeworld'.⁵⁰⁴ The crucial implication of this separation of ethics and morality is that it situates 'the moral' within a context of abstract deliberations about justice. 'Justice is not something material,' writes Habermas; it is 'not a determinate "value", but a dimension of validity'.⁵⁰⁵

For me, the significant aspect of Habermas's contribution to moral theory is that it puts forth a view of rationality that is essentially 'communicative'; that is, it demonstrates convincingly that rationality is associated with the raising of validity claims in communication. This essentially dialogical understanding of rationality contrasts with traditional (Kantian) monological conceptions of rational processes and draws attention not only to the pluralistic character of human societies (that is, to the fact that there are multiple modes of understanding) but also to the inadequacy and dangers of relying too heavily on individualistic claims to authority. I believe this expanded view of rationality is an essential aspect of understanding the intrinsically social nature of humanity and the only viable context within which worthwhile intercultural exchanges can take place.

However, I have a problem with Discourse Ethics insofar as it separates ethics and morality and holds that moral concerns must ultimately be justified by *rational* means. Although Habermas admits that 'moral feelings initially sensitize us to moral phenomena', he specifies that 'they cannot be the *final* reference point for judging the phenomena they bring to light'.⁵⁰⁶ Such a position effectively minimizes much of what animates and constitutes the moral life of individuals and distinctive cultural groups, namely, religious, aesthetic, and emotional experiences. For instance, religious traditions invariably integrate matters pertaining to the good life with those pertaining to justice, yet Habermas dismisses a religious foundation for morality on the assumption that religious beliefs are 'antiquated worldviews' which rely on

traditional forms of authority and, therefore, do not lend themselves to public discussion and critique. But who among us enters any discussion without certain prejudices and without particular likes and dislikes or preferred and/or conditioned ways of interacting? Of course, in a dialogue that is an expression of *participatory consciousness*, these prejudices and assumptions do not control behaviour, but who among us could or would want to exclude our own beliefs, idiosyncracies, aesthetic and emotional experiences from moral discussions and the decisions emanating from them? To attempt to do so amounts to using a kind of rational filtering technique which privileges technical procedure over experiential content. Given a context of mutual respect, the exercise of 'deliberative virtues' does not exclude participants in moral discussions from having and promoting their own points of view, perspectives which almost certainly involve feeling as well as thought: It does not even exclude the possibility of holding these views as absolute moral principles. However, what a context of genuine participation and mutual respect does exclude is a pre-established deliberative format rooted in rationalism (of the kind suggested in Habermas's theory), for to have a genuine dialogue is to be open and responsive to whatever happens within it.

In words that articulate the ideas I am putting forward here, Dallmayr notes in particular how 'speech-act' theories such as Discourse Ethics pay too little attention to the important language-related activity of *listening*. He writes.

Every word spoken or written evokes or carries in its wake a whole host of other words or phrases, that is, a whole range of synonyms, antonyms, and close and distant allusions. Thus, every speech act or communication resonates with the whole dense web of ordinary language-which accounts for the difficulties of interpretation. Moreover, every spoken or written word conjures up the unspoken and unwritten-what might have been and what has not been (perhaps never can be) spoken or written; thus, *language or speech reverberates with its own silence*- with what Horkheimer called the 'silent testimonies of language'-to which he exhorted philosophy to become attentive.⁵⁰⁷

This unrestricted view of language finds another powerful advocate in Hans-Georg Gadamer who observes in the final section of *Truth and Method* that language

is best understood as an 'experience of the world'. 'It is from *language as a medium*', he writes, 'that our whole experience of the world, and especially hermeneutical experience, unfolds'. This observation implies that words are not only signs, in the sense of conveying the kind of factual/abstract information associated with science, but also convey *experiential content*, and, accordingly, there is always something speculative about thoughts as they arise in language. A thought is speculative, according to Gadamer, 'if the relationship it asserts is not conceived as a quality unambiguously assigned to a subject', that is, if it recognizes that what something is 'in-itself' is not exactly the same as what it is 'for me', the thinking subject. Thus, in a genuine conversation the participants do not abandon themselves to what Gadamer calls 'the tangibility of appearances or to the fixed determinateness of the meant'. Rather, a genuine conversation has 'a spirit of its own' and 'the language in which it is conducted bears its own truth within it', that is, 'it allows something to "emerge" which henceforth exists'. The important point here, which highlights the danger of the excessive instrumentalism of contemporary technocultures, is that the so-called 'certainty achieved by using scientific methods does not suffice to guarantee truth'.⁵⁰⁸

As implied in the above comments, because the act of knowing is one that unites 'what is said with an infinity of the unsaid',⁵⁰⁹ it entails an effective partnership between the rationalizing (objectifying) and imagining capacities of the human mind, and, therefore, requires an ability to be deeply attentive to a present situation because it is through such attentiveness that an active engagement with other persons or events remains open, responsive, and creative.

In the light of this significance of the present moment for engendering a nurturing involvement with the circumstances of everyday living, I believe it is unrealistic to conceive the human 'quest' for surpassing a current condition, whether embodied in humanistic, religious, or scientific ideals, exclusively in terms of future-oriented goals or instrumentalistic methods. Because, in a fundamental sense, we learn by interpreting experience and because the capacity to interpret arises from the world of the implicit, the world of the invisible implicate order which unites all

phenomena, whenever we seek to understand something we need to be connected with the timeless order of reality that underlies all historical happenings. The excessive preoccupation with attaining future goals that is such a conspicuous feature of the scientific-technical worldview is a serious obstacle to achieving this 'connectedness'. As Tillich reminds us, the power of the 'world of scientific-technical means' drives the collective mind of humanity into a predominantly *horizontal* direction, 'to the neglect not only of the vertical elevation, symbolizing the religious aim, but also the circular enlargement symbolizing the classical aim'.⁵¹⁰ What we need, in the light of this insight, is to conceive the 'spiritual quest' not so much as the task of achieving a goal in the future but as the possibility of achieving transcendence in the 'here and now'.

In a further elaboration of this proposal, the following section explores the third major temporal perspective: present-centered time-consciousness.

Present-Centered Time-Consciousness

I have been reading all day, confined to my room, and feel tired. I raise the screen and face the broad daylight. I move the chair on the veranda and look at the blue mountains. I draw a long breath, fill my lungs with fresh air and feel entirely refreshed. I make tea and drink a cup or two of it. Who would say that I am not living in the light of eternity? We must, however, remember that all these are events of one's inner life as it comes in touch with eternity or as it is awakened to the meaning of "the now moment" which is eternity, and further that things or events making up one's outer life are no problems here. (Daisetz T. Suzuki)⁵¹¹

To recognize and appreciate the experience Daisetz Suzuki describes in the above passage is to sense what is meant by a present-centered time-consciousness. Although 'living in the light of eternity' might suggest, for some, an exceptional and exclusively pious experience that has little relation to living in the midst of practical issues and concerns, Suzuki's comment reminds us that it is a possibility that radiates from the ordinary qualities of everyday life, from feelings like being tired and perceptions like looking at sunlit mountains, or from sensations such as feeling fresh air fill one's lungs or activities such as making a cup of tea. Suzuki also reminds us that the concept of eternity does not refer to an experience of 'endless time' but to

a condition of 'being-in-touch' with a 'timeless-now', that is, with an awareness that what is happening now is connected with everything else.

The faculty for merging present activity with this sense of belonging with everything is the major attribute of present-centered time-consciousness. Panikkar calls this type of human temporality 'transhistorical consciousness', because it acknowledges that 'human life is more than just an accretion from the past and a projection into the future', and because it engenders the belief that 'each moment is its own beginning and end' such that 'only the present has full ontological weight'. Unlike nonhistorical (past-directed) consciousness which 'sees life mainly in the interplay between the past and the present', and unlike historical (future-oriented) consciousness which views the present merely as a kind of 'intersection' between past and future, transhistorical (present-centered) consciousness sees past and future as abstractions and attempts to integrate them into a life focused on present circumstances.⁵¹²

As suggested previously, there is a noteworthy similarity between present-centered temporality and mysticism. Just as mystics emphasize that one's personal life is intimately connected with the life of nature and with the life of whatever is considered Ultimate, those who express a present-centered time-consciousness believe that all human life 'is linked with the life of the Earth and with the entire fate of reality, the divine not excluded'. Panikkar suggests that, in the light of this integrated vision of reality, 'love is the supreme principle, the linking force which brings everything together'.⁵¹³ What gives this particular virtue its role as the 'heart' of present-centered time-consciousness is its all-embracing capacity to interact with everything 'other' in a way that does not differentiate any exclusive self-interest.

To experience this connection between love and present-centered time-consciousness is to experience what Panikkar refers to as an integral *liberation*, 'not only from the chains of an unjust social order but equally from the limitations of a confining, selfish ego'.⁵¹⁴ The liberation implied here embodies the belief that the 'fullness of life' is expressed in an experience of *interpersonal being* that does not distinguish between the good of others and the good of one's personal being.

Although this connection between love and a present-centered time-consciousness has always been present in human experience ‘in the shape of metaphysical insights and mystical experiences’, Panikkar suggests that today ‘it is gathering momentum’. ‘More and more’, he writes, ‘the conviction dawns upon the human spirit that the meaning of life does not lie in the future or in shaping society or transforming Nature, but in life itself, lived in its present and actual depth’.⁵¹⁵

To suggest that the meaning of life does not lie in the ‘future’ or in ‘shaping society’ or in ‘transforming Nature’ is a direct challenge to the ethos of the modern scientific-technical era which deifies progress, humanism, and the instrumentalistic rationality of science. Accordingly, the main proposal of this chapter is that to cultivate the human capacity for present-centered time-consciousness is to participate in a *revolutionary* response to the control and disorientation of human consciousness occasioned by allegiance to the authority of past-directed and future-oriented temporal perspectives, and because living deeply attuned to the present is an expression of participatory consciousness, the revolution suggested here is not one of conquest but of *surrender*.

In an earlier section of this study (Chapter Four), I highlighted the importance of ‘self-surrendering’ as a key aspect of spirituality and participatory consciousness. Here, my intent is to discuss the idea of self-surrendering not only as a vital aspect of present-centered time-consciousness but also as a *liberating-revolutionary activity* given the context of contemporary economic and cultural environments that enslave or disorient human consciousness by extolling and encouraging the virtues of self-serving activity and attachment.

The Present as a Moment of Liberating Self-Surrender

To connect present-centered time-consciousness with a liberating experience does not imply that past events or future expectations should be eliminated from a person’s experience of the present, but it does imply that they receive their proper temporal *alignment* when centered on a present situation. The proposal here is that, when persons, communities, or societies conduct the affairs of life primarily or exclusively influenced by past or future temporal perspectives, they are limiting their

opportunities to be engaged with the 'fullness of life'. This limitation is most severe when the relationship between time-consciousness and behaviour is one of *control*: for example, when strongly held religious convictions, authoritarian political regimes, or certain economic or cultural ideologies *compel* action rather than invite it. In other instances, conditioned behaviour arising from past experiences and motivational impulses derived from future expectations produce different mixtures of temporal influence and, therefore, different kinds of temporal *disorientation* which affect behaviour in various ways.

The point here is that the ability of human time-consciousness to accept, adjust, or reject different temporal influences depends on being able to engage with a present situation in an unclouded and unfettered manner, which means that a *freely* functioning human time-consciousness is one that aligns past experience and future motivation with a *present* situation. Present-centered time-consciousness does not reject or negate the influence of past and future, rather, it acts like a temporal fulcrum that balances such influence in a way that unfolds the possibility of participating fully in all that life has to offer.

The work of George Herbert Mead contains a philosophical analysis of time which is partly in tune with what I am suggesting here. In keeping with the proposal just outlined, Mead's analysis of time suggests that reality reaches us through 'events' which are always social in nature and which integrate certain perceptions of past experience and future possibility in the context of a present situation. Accordingly, for Mead, the past and future are always defined by a present event. 'All of the past', he writes, 'is in the present as the conditioning nature of passage, and all of the future arises out of the present as the unique events that transpire'. In further articulating what he means by the 'temporal spread' of a present event, Mead observes that people extend the boundaries of present events by conceiving the past as 'memory and history' and the future as 'anticipation and forecast', and he suggests (in concert with Whitehead) that the 'uniqueness which is responsible for a present' must be a period long enough to enable it to be what it is.

However, Mead's interpretation of time differs significantly from my own inasmuch as it treats the *perspective* of present-time as an objective reality. In Mead's view, any expression of 'mind' as it appears in 'the mechanism of social conduct' is the 'organization of perspectives in nature', and as such, it is 'a phase of the creative advance of nature', which implies that nature itself 'is a perspective that is *there*', and social and psychological processes are instances 'of what takes place in nature'. Thus, for Mead, a present-centered time perspective is an 'objective perspective': In fact, he refers to the present as 'the seat of reality' and to the past and future as ideational aspects of that reality.⁵¹⁶

In contrast to Mead's view of the present, I suggest that to conceive the present as an objective reality is to limit the potential for involvement with a present situation by investing it with specific pragmatic concerns, namely, the concerns of the personal (or collective) consciousness doing the objectifying. The alternate idea suggested here (and recurring as a major theme throughout this dissertation) is that a full participation in life entails a surrendering of these self-focused concerns as part of a genuinely *dialogical* interaction, that is, as part of an experience of participatory consciousness. In this kind of surrendering experience, the particular issues and concerns of a person do not disappear, but they are 'liberated' in the sense that a person ceases to be attached to them: He or she no longer 'identifies' with them. In this way, the influences brought into a situation do not necessarily lead to either behavioural control or self-serving pragmatism, because, when they are surrendered as part of an expression of participatory consciousness, they cease to belong exclusively to an individual 'self' and become part of a 'larger' consciousness capable of animating new and creative *response-abilities*.

This last observation reminds me that one of the beautiful ironies of participatory self-surrendering is that it transforms acts of 'letting-go' into acts of deepening involvement, for to be unattached to the assumptions, expectations, and conditioned techniques that normally direct our actions is to be free to witness and consider the implications of what we are feeling, thinking, and doing within a given context. This experience of witnessing and reflecting on the feelings and thoughts

aroused in particular situations begins by suspending immediate impulses, and it is this conscious and wilful act that draws persons into deep contact with a present moment.

Bohm discusses the connection between the suspension of impulses and the cultivation of reflective self-awareness by borrowing a concept from neurophysiology, *proprioception*. This concept refers to the body's ability to be aware of stimuli originating within it. The suggestion here is that this concept can also be applied - in fact, it *ought* to be applied - to thought processes as well as neurophysiological ones. When we move our bodies in particular ways there is an immediate connection between an intent to move and actually seeing the intended movement, but with our thoughts, all too often there is no such connection: All too often we are unaware of how our own thoughts influence our actions. The point here is that a suspension of immediate impulses is needed to help make the 'proprioception of thought' possible, that is, to help us become aware of the results of our thoughts, to raise up a kind of 'mirror' to our thought process which allows us to see the link between our thoughts and actions.⁵¹⁷

In his discussion of the 'proprioception of thought' Bohm illustrates the neurophysiological meaning of the term 'proprioception' by recounting the following story. I record it here because I think it can be read as an allegory for the kind of 'non-proprioceptive thinking' that characterizes much of contemporary consciousness, individual and collective.

We know of a woman who apparently had a stroke in the middle of the night. She woke up and she was hitting herself. People came in and turned on the light and that's what they found. What happened was that her motor nerves were working, but her sensory nerves were no longer working. So, she probably touched herself, but she didn't know that she'd touched herself, and, therefore she assumed that somebody else was touching her and interpreted that as an attack. The more she defended, the worse the attack got. The proprioception had broken down. She no longer saw the relation between the intention to move and the result. When the light was turned on, proprioception was established in a new way, by sight.⁵¹⁸

As an allegory, the implication I draw from this story is that we need to turn on the lights that illuminate our individual and collective lives, which means that we

need to maintain contact with our spiritual resources - which are the inestimable resources of the whole of reality - by cultivating our innate capacity to suspend impulses as a way of deepening our awareness of a present situation.

It is important to note here that suspending an impulse is not the same as suppressing it. To suppress something is to lose sight of it, but the whole point of suspending an impulse is to expose it, to bring it into the light of consciousness. Because all human behaviour contains a varied mixture of socialized behaviour patterns and idiosyncratic behavioural reflexes, the suppression of impulses is a common part of everyday life: We are deliberately taught to suppress certain impulses as part of acceptable group behaviour and are conditioned to react in particular ways to certain situations because of various individual life-experiences. However, the suspension of an impulse is a deliberate, wilful act, and this is not such a common aspect of daily life, especially with regard to thinking. Indeed, given the pervasive mental control needed to sustain the 'product promotion' that dominates our lives as 'consumers', and given the predominantly prescriptive methods of education in contemporary societies, it is not unreasonable to suggest that our 'socialized' thinking patterns are largely patterns of suppressing certain ideas and/or kinds of thinking in favour of others.

For example: the so-called informational media in our contemporary technocultures (such as magazines, newspapers, radio and television broadcasts, and brochures of all kinds) are dominated by the methods and mentality of product promotion. These promotional efforts are only minimally concerned with conveying information, for their main purpose is to establish a link between a certain product and a desired effect and then to induce that effect by *disinhibiting* whatever behavioural restraints might exist in a consumer-observer. Whether the product is a tube of toothpaste, a plan for a better retirement, a movie, or a political agenda, the effect of this inundation of promotional activity is a cultural climate that accepts as 'normal' the disinhibition of behaviour. The ramifications of this acceptance are as vast as they are profound, for this submission to mental manipulation, on the one hand, provides for an unprecedented increase in material commodities and services,

but on the other hand, has a devastating impact on creative and moral thinking. In fact, one scholar suggests that there is a direct connection between condoning disinhibited behaviour in the market place and creating cultural environments that breed physical violence. In the following passage, B.Z. Friedlander makes this point when he links the many inducements for buying commodities that permeate everyday life and the violent behaviour (mental and physical) of young people in large North American cities.

When this consumerist belief system collides with the transgenerational poverty and hopelessness associated with structural unemployment, school failure, and virtual unemployability, the violent affiliative network of gang membership and the lucrative drug trade offers itself as the only apparent path of escape from a desperate life. The vivid, continuous, exquisitely seductive, and high-energy mass media imagery of abandoned impulsivity and disinhibition combines with equally vivid, equally continuous, and equally seductive mass media images of effortless affluence. When these floods of images engulf energetic youths and young adults trapped on islands of poverty and hopelessness, it should be no surprise that the consequences take the form of seemingly pervasive acts of violence.⁵¹⁹

Mainstream education is another major illustration of cultural activity that promotes thinking that is not fully aware of its own consequences. Most educational practices today center on training students to pass examinations that perpetuate rigidly differentiated disciplinary categories. Accordingly, students are taught to use the thinking process in prescribed ways in order to achieve prescribed results, not as a way of observing a phenomenon as it appears in the context of its whole environment, which includes its interaction with an observer. Because these prescriptive methods of thinking involve the suppression of more integrating and interpretive methods of thinking, students learn to accept the suppression of thoughts as a normal aspect of the learning process. In such a context, the ability to suspend a thought in order to give oneself an opportunity to observe it deeply becomes something of a 'lost art', or at best, a marginalized one. When this educational environment is viewed in combination with political, economic, and cultural environments that also emphasize a prescriptive mentality (the scientific-technical rationality), the need for educational practices that give priority to the arts and humanities becomes extremely clear, for it

is through them that students can learn to feel comfortable and competent with observing the thinking process in a manner that exposes its implications, its realm of impact.

The main implication of not fostering a self-reflective awareness of our own thinking process is that human activity becomes enmeshed in *fragmented thinking and confused behaviour*, which makes people extremely vulnerable to behavioural control and manipulation. Just as the human body cannot function properly when there is a failure of proprioception, that is, when its ability to be aware of itself is impaired, human consciousness cannot function properly when its ability to perceive the connections between thought and action is weakened or obscured altogether. In the following passage, Bohm outlines his observations about recognizing the importance of the proprioception of thought.

I suggest that there is a possibility for self-awareness of thought - that the concrete, real process of the movement of thought could be self-aware, without bringing in a [psychological] "self" who is aware of it.

"Proprioception" is a technical term - you could also say "self-perception of thought," "self-awareness of thought," or "thought is aware of itself in action." Whatever terms we use, I am saying: thought should be able to perceive its own movement, be aware of its own movement. In the process of thought there should be awareness of that *movement*, of the *intention* to think, and of the *result* which that thinking produces. By being more attentive, we can be aware of how thought produces a result outside ourselves. And then maybe we could also be attentive to the results it produces within ourselves. Perhaps we could even be immediately aware of how it affects perception.⁵²⁰

The main significance of these remarks is the suggestion that there may be a 'natural potential for spontaneous proprioception of thought' (as is implied by the 'self-awareness' exhibited in 'tacit knowing') but this potential is often inhibited or blocked by the interference of patterns of psychological conditioning, that is, by a non-reflective behavioural system which, is all too often identified with a person's psychological 'self'. Bohm compares the effect of this psychological conditioning to the brilliant lights of Las Vegas that block one's awareness of the night sky,⁵²¹ the implication being that, just as these brilliant lights overwhelm perception, the

tremendously powerful system of conditioned behaviour that is identified with a particular 'self' overwhelms and totally fills a person's consciousness. When this happens, it is difficult to observe a thought as simply a particular process or 'movement' with a beginning, a middle and an end, because each thought is enmeshed within a complex system of conditioned behavioural patterns. However, if there is proprioception of thought, a person can explore a thought as it exists on its own, without the impulsive side-effects that normally arise with it. In such an 'atmosphere', the task of thinking becomes, in the words of Martin Heidegger, '*the surrender of previous thinking to the determination of the matter for thinking*'.⁵²²

The 'surrender of previous thinking' required for the self-perception of thought and for the determination of what is the appropriate matter 'for' thinking applies not only to instances of an individual's 'inner dialogue' but also to group interactions. For example, group work emanating from genuine participation, rather than from various types of control and manipulation, expresses what can be called a 'common consciousness'. Such consciousness emerges when group members are able to suspend their own assumptions and agendas, thereby creating a condition in which everyone is in the same condition of participatory consciousness, a condition that focuses first and foremost on whatever happens within an interaction.

Given the obsession with self-serving interests in contemporary technocultures, and given the dangers of this obsession in terms of promoting muddled and fragmented thinking, there is a compelling need for the kind of self-perceptive thinking that encourages the growth of participatory consciousness. As suggested throughout this chapter, encouraging such growth requires a widespread recognition of the efficacy of being deeply in touch with a present moment, but the point I wish to emphasize here is that, in order to recognize this efficacy, people need to be convinced of the *liberating* potential inherent in surrendering self-serving thoughts and impulses.

One way of drawing attention to this 'liberating potential' is to note how the experience of participatory self-surrendering is a way of overcoming the dualistic thinking that pervades rational thought. Whether it occurs as part of a person's inner

activity or as part a group experience, the self-surrendering involved in being deeply in touch with a present situation is a 'merger of consciousness' that dissolves the antagonism between different ideas and impulses which create and sustain the many dichotomies we so often use to regulate our behaviour but which actually condemn us to act within either-or conceptual environments. It is not that conceptions of mind and body, right and wrong, good and bad, active and passive, masculine and feminine, thinking and doing, and other dualistic categories of thought and feeling actually disappear. Rather, the conceptual energies of these 'dualisms' cease to be antagonistic when they are no longer part of a mechanistic cause-and-effect association between opposing parties but aspects of a larger unified field of consciousness in which different propensities work in a participatory, complementing fashion in response to a particular situation - just as the yin and yang energies associated with Taoist philosophy work in a complementary, balancing way when they are in tune with 'Tao', with the way of reality.

Overcoming the burden of conflictive thinking, then, is one way of conceiving the liberation inherent in a present-centered time-consciousness.

I doubt that recognition and belief in the efficacy of living in tune with a present moment can be achieved through planned educational and/or cultural programmes, for it requires an attitude of mind that is radically different from the 'planning mentality' embodied in the prevailing scientific-technical worldview. My belief is that a sensitivity towards present-centered time-consciousness is embodied in an emerging worldview, one that not only acknowledges the severe limitations of our current technocultures in terms of fostering genuinely creative and mutually enriching human and planetary life, but also directly challenges the future-oriented idea of material-based progress perpetuated by the modern economic-scientific-and-technology complex. As mentioned previously, Panikkar refers to this new worldview as an expression of 'transhistorical consciousness' and notes that already humanity 'is embarking on a new venture, about which we know only that we shall act more freely the more we allow the internal dynamism of our deepest being to express itself, without projecting beforehand what we are to do and to be'.⁵²³

But how, in the midst of the flood of scientific-technical rationality that engulfs modern cultural life, can we recognize those qualities of living that display a propensity towards releasing our dependency on a future-oriented pursuit of self-interests; and how, in keeping with a felt-need to deepen the experiences of life, can we create opportunities for these qualities to grow? In response to these questions, the following chapter explores in more detail what it means 'to live in the light of the present' in the hope that this exploration might shed some light on what is and what is not part of the 'inferno' of living under the dominating influence of past-directed or future-oriented time-consciousness. My purpose at this point, then, reflects the observation Italo Calvino makes at the close of his remarkable fable about time and civilizations, *Invisible Cities*. He writes:

The inferno of the living is not something that will be; if there is one, it is what is already here, the inferno where we live every day, that we form by being together. There are two ways to escape suffering it. The first is easy for many: accept the inferno and become such a part of it that you can no longer see it. The second is risky and demands constant vigilance and apprehension: seek and learn to recognize who and what, in the midst of the inferno, are not inferno, then make them endure, give them space.⁵²⁴

Chapter Seven

Living in the 'Here and Now': A Comparison of Pragmatism and Contemplative Experience

Live 'in the here and now'. Take things 'as they come'. 'Don't worry about tomorrow'. 'Take time to smell the roses'. 'What lies behind us and what lies before us are tiny matters compared to what lies within us'.⁵²⁵ These familiar expressions are often part of advice given and received at times when the frenzy of everyday life seems overwhelming, for they acknowledge the simple yet often overlooked wisdom that anxiety is bred from preoccupation with either the past or the future and that a person who 'rejoices' is a person who is 'above time and free from time'.⁵²⁶

In stark contrast to the advice 'to be still and know', the tenor of life in modern societies more often than not advises us 'to take control' of situations by overcoming past and present obstacles and, above all, by 'planning for the future'. Such advice inundates the world of everyday interaction in the form of various self-help programmes that systematize the natural activities of human life into technical methods or formulas for 'success'. At the level of societal interaction, such advice comes to us as the instrumentalistic ideology underlying our economic, educational, cultural, medical, and political institutions. One leading psychologist expresses this ideology by declaring that the 'central task for humankind in the next millennium' is nothing less than 'to control the direction of evolution', and a prominent philosopher adds a supportive voice by comparing the 'new liberating philosophy' of our time with the courage of flying 'in control': 'Flying in control', he writes, 'is living in freedom and in dignity', and it is 'a precondition of following a spiritual path, a path to Enlightenment'.⁵²⁷

As noted by many concerned writers throughout this century and as discussed at various points in this inquiry, the problem with this passion for control, this obsession with instrumentalism, is that it entrenches a methodology for understanding and managing the mechanisms of physical life as a basis for understanding and regulating the deeper processes of consciousness. My intention in this chapter is to discuss the issue of instrumentalism in the context of present-centered time-

consciousness, and my main suggestion is a twofold one: first, because instrumentalistic rationality is oriented towards the future, there is a certain incongruity in using it in conjunction with a present-centered temporal focus, as some scholars do; secondly, in the context of the 'epidemic' of instrumentalism in contemporary technocultures, this same incongruity is precisely what gives importance and urgency to understanding and incorporating as an integral aspect of daily living a *contemplative* experience of being deeply in touch with a present moment.

I call a non-instrumentalistic involvement with the present a 'contemplative' experience because I understand it as an articulation of personal 'centering' around an ideal of ultimate significance, as outlined in subsequent comments. What is proposed here is that a contemplative orientation to the present is an urgently needed antidote to instrumentalism because it connects us not only with the deeper life processes shared by all humanity but also with the life of the entire universe and ultimately with what exists beyond that, in the timeless and spaceless realm of what Bohm calls the implicate order and what various religious traditions refer to as 'infinity' or 'eternity'.

Among scholars who acknowledge the importance of learning to live in the light of the present but who, nevertheless, adopt an instrumentalistic orientation, John Dewey is remarkable because of the scope of his interests and his far-reaching influence. His ideas about morality (moral pragmatism) are particularly noteworthy here because they draw together his insights as a psychologist, philosopher, educational innovator, and social commentator at the same time as they illustrate his approach to living in touch with present circumstances.

Moral Pragmatism as a Search for 'Something Better'

John MacQuarrie describes John Dewey's pragmatic philosophical orientation as the belief that 'just as the various organs of the body are adapted for dealing with the environment, so the function of mind is to provide us with ideal tools or instruments for coping with the situations in which we find ourselves'.⁵²⁸ In keeping with this belief, Dewey adopts an instrumentalistic view of the moral process and regards a moral ideal as a specific means to achieve a specific purpose within a specific situation. With regard to 'present activity', Dewey is equally pragmatic,

referring to it as a '*moral moment*' because it offers an opportunity to make a practical decision, that is, 'it marks a transition in the direction of breadth and clarity of action or in that of triviality and confusion'. Thus, for Dewey, the present moment is conceived as a very *active* engagement with life concerns, and the result of this engagement is either moral progress or moral regress. Moral retrogression is viewed as a 'slipping away of significance, determinations, grasp', whereas moral progress means an 'increase of present meaning' which involves 'a multiplication of sense distinctions' as well as 'harmony' and 'unification'.⁵²⁹

The main implication of Dewey's pragmatic approach to morality and the present moment is that specific moral positions as well as the moral process itself are inextricably connected with the 'actualities of existence' and not with 'ideals, ends and obligations independent of concrete actualities'. In discussing the similarities and differences of this pragmatic view of morality and other perspectives, Dewey notes, first of all, that *idealist* philosophies (such as those of Plato, Aristotle, and Spinoza) locate 'the good', as he does, in a conscious life of reason, but they also rely on a transcendental meaning and reason remote from present experience, a reliance which he rejects on the grounds of its lack of relevance for immediate moral issues and concerns. Secondly, Dewey observes that, although *utilitarian* philosophers bring the 'good' down to earth as he suggests must be done if morality is to have any worthwhile purpose, they tend to locate the good in the 'not present', that is, in the future, and thereby support a kind of utopianism which he objects to on the basis of his fundamentally pragmatic orientation. In discussing a third moral perspective, Dewey notes that, like himself, *epicureans* find the good in the present, but theirs is a 'limited' present, he suggests - it is not a present of 'active participation'.⁵³⁰

Dewey is particularly critical of the fixed values and dogmas of traditional religions, including belief 'in a God in whom the union of the actual and the ideal is eternally realized'.⁵³¹ Since morals are concerned with conduct, he contends that they grow out of 'specific empirical facts'. In fact, he suggests that morality is 'the most humane of all subjects' precisely because 'it is that which is closest to human

nature; it is ineradicably empirical, not theological nor metaphysical nor mathematical'.⁵³² In the light of this belief, he calls on 'all' human sciences to be a part of 'moral science'. The following comments elaborate this view:

Moral science is not something with a separate province. It is physical, biological and historic knowledge placed in a human context where it will illuminate and guide the activities of men... Morality begins at this point of use of knowledge of natural law, a use varying with the active system of dispositions and desires. Intelligent action is not concerned with the bare consequences of the thing known, but with consequences *to be* brought into existence by action conditioned on the knowledge... The quality of these consequences determines the question of better or worse... In fact as civilization advances the physical environment gets itself more and more humanized, for the meaning of physical energies and events becomes involved with the part they play in human activities. Our conduct *is* socially conditioned whether we perceive the fact or not... Morals is as much a matter of interaction of a person with his social environment as walking is an interaction of legs with a physical environment.⁵³³

Although Dewey's pragmatic morality rejects the dogmatism of formal religions, it embraces what he calls a 'religious attitude'. In a series of lectures delivered at Yale University and later compiled in book form as *A Common Faith*, Dewey makes a distinction between 'religion' as a system of 'beliefs, practices and modes of organization' and 'religious elements in experience' which exist independently of specific expressions. According to Dewey, any activity is 'religious' if it contributes to the ongoing process of the 'disclosing of truth through directed cooperative human endeavour', and he makes an impassioned plea for the 'emancipation of the religious quality from accretions that have grown up about it and that limit the credibility and the influence of religion'. The 'accretions' to which Dewey refers are beliefs which identify 'the religious' with the 'supernatural', that is, with a Supreme Being or immortality 'that is beyond the power of nature'. For Dewey, people 'need no external criterion and guarantee' for goodness. On the contrary, because our own idealizing imaginations are capable of seizing upon 'the most precious things found in the climacteric moments of experience' and projecting them onto concrete situations, all we need to be effective moral persons exists as a function of our own intelligence and experiences. Thus, when Dewey calls for the

emancipation of the 'religious quality of experience' from religions, he is affirming his belief that a person's 'faith' in a particular ideal is enhanced when it is freed from the need to call upon ideals that are 'bound up' with some form of contact with the 'supernatural'.⁵³⁴

In spite of these objections to organized religions, Dewey concedes that there is a use for a 'God-concept'. He writes: 'Use of the words "God" or "divine" to convey the union of actual with ideal may protect man from a sense of isolation and from consequent despair, or defiance'. However, he remains unequivocal about his desire to 'rescue' the 'religious attitude', which is one that directs people towards a 'better adjustment in life and its conditions', from 'dependence on specific types of beliefs and practices', that is, from religions as such. For Dewey, 'faith in the continued disclosing of truth through directed cooperative human endeavour is more religious in quality than is faith in a completed revelation'.⁵³⁵

A key conceptual aspect of Dewey's faith in 'directed cooperative human endeavour' as a basis for moral living is a convergence of the concepts of the 'good' and the 'better', a convergence which implies that moral living is fundamentally a matter of concretizing, or putting into effect, the results of moral decision-making. He makes this point explicitly in the following passage.

Reflection upon action means uncertainty and consequent need for decision as to which course is better. The better is the good; the best is not better than the good but is simply the discovered good. Comparative and superlative degrees are only paths to the positive degree of action. The worse or evil is a rejected good. In deliberation and before choice no evil presents itself as evil. Until it is rejected it is a compelling good. After rejection, it figures not as a lesser good, but as the bad of that situation.⁵³⁶

In effect, this conceptual convergence of the 'good' and the 'better' means that ideals pertaining to the 'good' emerge as products of human action. Thus, Dewey situates the moral process firmly within the domain of human activity and equates 'faith' in that process with the 'religious function' of human nature. In the closing pages of *A Common Faith*, he solidifies this idea of 'the human abode of the religious function' by identifying the universe itself as 'the matrix within which our ideal aspirations are born and bred'. He describes the universe as a 'community of causes

and consequences in which we, together with those not born, are enmeshed', and he suggests that 'it is the source of the values that the moral imagination projects as directive criteria and as shaping purposes'. Consequently, the principal focus of Dewey's moral philosophy is that there is nothing 'beyond' that which can be ascertained by human intelligence, and, therefore, the 'ideal ends' in which human beings ought to have 'faith' are those which 'assume concrete form in our understanding of our relations to one another and the values contained in these relations'.⁵³⁷

Although Dewey's moral philosophy appears to be rooted in the present because of its emphasis on making moral decisions that are immediately practical, like all functionalist philosophies, it is built on the assumption that explanations are derived primarily, if not exclusively, from a knowledge of consequences, and, therefore, it implicates the past and future in an integral way. On the one hand, knowledge of past outcomes are needed in order to place opposing actions in a decision-making context, and on the other hand, without motivational input that is geared towards attaining some future goal, the relative merits of these opposing actions cannot be determined. My suggestion here is that Dewey's moral pragmatism, like all expressions of humanism, emphasizes the motivational aspect of decision-making, and, therefore, is primarily a future-oriented philosophical perspective. This future-orientation is evident insofar as Dewey identifies the moral process with an evaluation of consequences aimed at determining something 'better', which assumes that particular actions are judged in the light of ongoing or historically resonant social practices which inform and/or direct social as well as individual action. Any particular moral decision may be in accord with or dissent from these practices, but the fact remains that, in Dewey's view, the causes and consequences of moral action constitute a mechanism for moving society towards a more humane existence and are, therefore, firmly rooted in a future-oriented (or, to use Panikkar's terminology, an historical) time-consciousness.

In keeping with this future-orientation, Dewey's moral philosophy focuses directly on *processes of enactment* (rather than on what I refer to later as 'experiences

of consciousness'), and, therefore, its underlying rationality is instrumentalistic. For Dewey, the mental aspects of morality, the moral principles and ideals that either inform or are formed by the moral process, are essentially 'mental tools' that are used in the production of moral results, and because these tools are always products of the moral process itself, his approach presupposes a self-contained reality-system, that is, a system in which moral claims have no need to invoke or implicate a supernatural or transcendental order of reality.

In my view, this instrumentalistic approach to morality is inadequate because it reduces the moral process to a link between thought and action, that is, to a cause-and-effect relationship. Although a concrete link between thought and action is often an important aspect of the moral process, knowledge of such links does not provide an adequate basis for understanding morality, or, indeed, for understanding any process involving human consciousness, because an action, in and of itself, does not always display its underlying *meaning*, and a thought, in and of itself, is not always aware of the *motivational forces* acting on it or is not always in tune with the vast field of intuitive resources available to it through its connection with the *whole* realm of human consciousness. The suggestion here, which is in concert with Bohm's ideas about an implicate order of reality, is that the concrete aspects of everyday experience, including the specific thoughts and actions implicated in moral processes, reflect only a portion of what, in reality, they are. In this view, every individual human consciousness is embedded in a larger order of reality that embraces *all* phenomena, which means that specific human capacities, such as those for perception, for belonging to a social group, for language, and for morality, are rooted in a field of consciousness that exists beyond the temporal and spatial limitations of socialization processes.

This view of morality as emanating from an implicate order of being, rather than from the manifest order of space-time (the physical universe) suggests that moral life is fundamentally a matter of 'being' someone rather than merely 'doing' certain actions prescribed as moral. Although morality is concerned with nurturing, modifying, or changing a person's orientation towards being a part of particular

environments, this orientation is not determined merely by manipulating external conditions, because moral power does not flow from action itself. Rather, moral power is that which affects these external conditions in a manner that harmonizes with a deep personal commitment to an ideal of ultimate significance. Moral life, then, is an expression of a free and willful choice that flows from an inner motivational source. As Viktor Frankl reminds us, 'Man is never driven to moral behaviour; in each instance he decides to behave morally', and this decision is not made 'in order to satisfy a moral drive and to have a good conscience' but 'for the sake of a cause to which he commits himself, or for a person whom he loves, or for the sake of his God'.⁵³⁸ For example: If a person gives to a beggar in order to be charitable, or lives with someone in order to be faithful, or eats with someone from a less privileged background in order to be unprejudiced, he or she is acting in response to definite moral principles and may go to sleep at night with a 'good conscience', but unless these various enactments are accompanied by a willful, self-surrendering commitment to the ideal they signify, they do not display genuine moral power, that is, they do not have the ability to affect and, if need be, transform persons and situations.

The point I wish to emphasize here is that the efficacy of a moral act is not a 'product': It is not the outcome of a process of enactment and, therefore, cannot be evaluated on the basis of particular consequences, as functionalist or instrumentalist moral theory suggests. Rather, the efficacy of a moral act is the life-blood, not the result, of the moral process, and it arises and flows from the inner motivation of a moral agent. Thus, morality is fundamentally an expression of a person's awareness of the world, and this awareness is deepest and most penetrating when it is fully engaged with a present circumstance, when it is fully open to the transformative possibilities of participatory consciousness.

Given the incessant, often mind-numbing 'busy-ness' of contemporary technocultures, people have far too few opportunities, and even fewer inducements, to nurture their innate capacity to be in touch with the present. Even such present-centered activities as listening to music, going for a walk, or meditating, are often

perceived as ‘doing something’ and are used as a means of achieving a desired result, such as relaxation, inspiration, insight, and (perhaps eventually) enlightenment. However, being deeply in touch with the present involves giving up this need to do and/or to accomplish something: It means, simply, to be aware, to be awake within an experience of consciousness. Because such an experience is one of self-surrendering participation, it has no specific attributes apart from what arises within it, and, therefore, it cannot be described objectively.

I am aware of the apparent contradiction in describing a present-centered experience, on the one hand, as being without attributes, and on the other hand, as being characterized by ‘self-surrendering participation’. However, this contradiction stems from an attempt to describe what is non-describable, and any discomfort with this attempt, I suggest, flows from the present-day addiction to objectivity as the sole reliable avenue to knowledge. In fact, I do not believe that an unfettered human mind has any difficulty in knowing what is meant by ‘self-surrendering participation’ even though such a state does not have an objective existence. Such a state does exist as a field of *potential* experiences, and the human mind is certainly capable of exploring this field imaginatively. Consequently, in my opinion, it is foolish to quibble over contradictions and paradoxes which result from an inability to objectify something but which offer no obstacles for the imaginative and intuitive resources of the human mind.

Besides, there is a ‘living model’ for the kind of present-centered experience I am referring to and it is embodied in the contemplative practices of the monastic way of living. In a discussion of these practices, Raimon Panikkar calls a monastic involvement with the present an experience of ‘centering’ and suggests that it reflects a ‘constitutive dimension of human life’.⁵³⁹ The following section explores this idea.

The Contemplative Experience as a ‘Call to Centering’

Like Dewey, Panikkar invokes the power of the present moment when speaking about the need for a strong moral response to the problems generated by contemporary societies. However, in contrast to Dewey’s moral pragmatism (but in concert with what is proposed in this inquiry), Panikkar suggests that ‘the activity of

building a better world is not a mere technique of manipulating or programming the future, but the very art of the present'. 'Authentic work', he writes, 'is not a means to an end, but a basic form of human activity', and 'modern technological society cries out to be redeemed from the enslavement into which it has fallen'.⁵⁴⁰

Given this enslavement to instrumentalistic rationality, Panikkar suggests that the contemporary monk withdraws from society not to abandon it 'but to incarnate the authentically human'. He refers to the authentic core of human life as an 'integral praxis' and describes it as a way of living that unites a human psyche not only with the surrounding world but also with a Divine Being or, in non-theistic language, with the ground of all being. To express the 'trinitarian' nature of this way of living, Panikkar coins the term 'cosmotheandric experience', and because of its integrating and unifying nature, he likens this experience to 'a search for the center'. However, it is important to note that the 'search' implied here is not one which involves striving for an end that is distant in time, rather, it involves ongoing efforts to actualize the cosmotheandric experience as part of a person's present engagement with life. It is also important to emphasize that the 'center' implied here is not a fixed condition but a *relational* experience.

As the authentic core, the center of human life, the cosmotheandric experience is an expression of relating that unites a particular person with the whole universe of beings and with the ultimate source of being. As Panikkar observes, each person has her or his own way of 'realizing the perfection' of humanity. Accordingly, inasmuch as any person tries to unify her or his life around a way of living that expresses a participatory relationship with the universe and with whatever is considered ultimate, he or she is also 'searching for a center', although perhaps not with the 'singlemindedness' that is characteristic of 'monkhood'.⁵⁴¹

Because of its crucial significance for understanding the nature of what I am designating 'a call to centering', it is important to emphasize that Panikkar's 'cosmotheandric insight' articulates a radical interpretation of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, one which both affirms and transcends its own tradition. In Christian orthodoxy, the Trinity refers to an understanding of the nature of God, and this

understanding is primarily revealed. However, it also derives from the belief that there is an analogical relationship between God as the Supreme Being and the world of humanity as created beings. Because human beings are understood as persons, that is, in terms of 'selves' (I's, you's, and we's), the doctrine of the Trinity infers that the nature of God can also be understood in terms of these personal relational experiences. In writing about the Trinity, Panikkar adopts the traditional trinitarian terminology of Father, Son, and Spirit to describe the relationship between the three distinct but inseparable persons of the Godhead. He writes: 'Everything that the Father *is* he transmits to the Son. Everything that the Son *receives* he *gives* to the Father in return. This gift (of the Father, in the final analysis) is the Spirit'.⁵⁴² However, in contrast to this orthodox view, Panikkar's vision of the Trinity is not merely an attempt to fathom the nature of God, for it reaches into the heart of humanity and the universe by suggesting that the trinitarian experience of the Godhead 'reveals the most fundamental character of Reality'.⁵⁴³

Ewert H. Cousins delineates this 'radical' trinitarian perspective by outlining three characteristics that distinguish Panikkar's understanding of the Trinity from perspectives taken by other Christian theologians. In the first place, Panikkar 'sees the Trinity in relation to religions which most earlier Christian theologians had no contact with or knowledge of'.⁵⁴⁴ In fact, Panikkar believes that the Trinity is not an exclusively Christian idea and refers to it as a 'junction where the authentic spiritual dimensions of all religions meet'. For instance, in his book *The Trinity and the Religious Experience of Man*, he identifies three forms of spirituality that are both common to many different religions and 'reconciled' in a trinitarian understanding of reality: (a) *Iconolatry*, or 'the way of sacred action' in which a sacred image or idea inspires and directs a person's action; (b) *Personalism*, or 'the way of devotion and love' in which someone's personal relationship with God is the essential experience that orient's her or his life; and (c) *Mysticism*, or 'the way of sacred knowing' in which knowledge 'seeks to penetrate to the ultimate analysis of being and to find there a vision which enables man to live while accepting to the full his own humanness'.

Thus, in Panikkar's view, the Trinity epitomises the 'relativity of all that there is' and constitutes 'the ultimate paradigm of personal relationships'. Consequently, the Trinity is also 'the ultimate model' of the 'mystery of unity and diversity' which is expressed in the 'human experience of the person'.⁵⁴⁵

The second distinctive feature of Panikkar's view of the Trinity is that it brings to light an aspect of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity which Cousins claims 'has remained submerged in Christian history' and which he calls '*advaitic Trinitarianism*', because of its connection with the advaitic tradition of Hinduism. This tradition expresses the idea that reality is 'not dual' and proclaims that there is only 'whatever there is', without any differentiation, and that all appearances of distinction (such as subject and object) are products of inadequate understanding. The main implication of this advaitic insight is that reality is not expressible by any of the concepts required for rational thinking, and Panikkar's view of the Trinity underscores this insight by conceiving its indivisibility as an expression of being 'not one, not two', which implies (emphatically) that the Trinity is not a 'monistic' expression of being. 'The negation of both a dualistic and a monistic structure of reality', writes Panikkar, 'is the very core of *advaita*', and because 'being has no predicate', *advaita* makes no objective statement about reality.

Thus, Panikkar's advaitic trinitarianism asserts that 'the *is* of our rational thinking does not need to be identical with the Being of our awareness'.⁵⁴⁶ This assertion acknowledges that human awareness is not limited by what can be contained and expressed in human language and/or thought (an idea encountered in the previous chapter in conjunction with my discussion of 'questing' and 'transcendence'). I believe that this acknowledgement expresses something of profound significance for people today because it brings to light a fundamental human intuition that has been buried by the avalanche of instrumentalistic rationality that overruns modern societies, namely, that *there are ways of knowing, feeling, and simply 'being' that cannot be expressed adequately in words, and this inadequacy is not a limitation but a source of enormous creative power*. As Panikkar's interpretation of the Trinity implies, we live

in a world that is 'radically relational' and, therefore, we live in a world that is virtually limitless in its potential for creating meaning through language and 'language-like' behaviour, provided we do not limit language to its objectifying function and provided we explore its capacity for arousing interpretive or symbolic consciousness. In the following passage, Panikkar expresses this connection between the Trinity and the intrinsically relational character of symbolic language.

The moment that words say only exactly what you mean and do not leave room for what I may also mean, the moment that they become only signs and cease to be symbols, the moment that they only signal something else and are no longer the expression, the manifestation and with it the veil itself of that 'else', in that moment they degenerate even as words...*Real words are not mere instruments in your hands or mine, they are part of the human, cosmic, and also divine interplay* and they mean what we all agree that they mean in the very act of the dialogical interchange. Otherwise, they are no longer living words; they are dead.⁵⁴⁷

When the unlimited breadth and depth of relatedness implied by this advaitic perspective to the Trinity is viewed in conjunction with the multicultural trinitarian quality mentioned earlier, it is not surprising that Cousins identifies the third distinctive aspect of Panikkar's understanding of the Trinity as one which asserts that the Trinity is a universal expression of 'the structure of reality'. In a more explicit way than is found in the work of other Christian theologians, Panikkar declares that the Trinity reveals the most fundamental character of reality. 'Every bit of reality', he writes, has the 'trinitarian imprint'. Expressed as simply as possible, what Panikkar is saying is that 'being is trinitarian'.⁵⁴⁸

This insight, that reality bears the 'imprint' of the Trinity in every aspect of its being, suggests that the Trinity is the fundamental symbol of reality that is *pressed into* the fabric of universal life. The implication here is that what reality is in-and-of-itself exists beyond rational description but not beyond the power of awareness, the power of consciousness, for symbols are the life-blood of consciousness - they impart meaning to life experiences. The word 'symbol' is used here in a particularly intense way, namely, as a way of designating a sign that signifies what it effects, what it actually brings into being. In the Christian tradition, this notion of symbol is more

clearly understood as a 'sacrament' or 'icon. Saint Augustine defines a sacrament as the 'visible form of invisible grace', and in the Greek Orthodox tradition, 'the symbolism of an icon is held to effect the presence of the saint or mystery depicted'.⁵⁴⁹ Here is how Panikkar expresses this 'sacramental' or 'iconic' quality of symbol.

The symbol, is the true appearance of reality; it is the form in which, in each case, reality discloses itself to our consciousness, or rather, it is that particular consciousness of reality. It is in the symbol, that the real appears to us....The symbol is not another 'thing', but the epiphany of that 'thing; which is-not without some symbol - because ultimately Being itself is the final symbol. Any real symbol encompasses and unites both the symbolised 'thing' and the consciousness of it.⁵⁵⁰

The suggestion I wish to underline here is this: As a symbol or *sacrament of being*, the trinitarian experience expresses the authentic core of human life by manifesting the unity existing between a person, whatever he or she believes to be ultimate, and the universe within which he or she lives in partnership with all other beings. To be fully alive to one's own being, then, is to participate in divine or ultimate life as well as the life of the universe, which is why the trinitarian or cosmotheandric experience can be likened to an experience of 'centering'. To be at the center of something suggests not merely that one is connected to everything pertaining to that something but, more fundamentally, that one is 'central' to it, that one belongs to it in an integral and essential way. When this 'something' is the wholeness of reality, to be 'centered' in this way is to be connected with everything without ceasing to be unique.

It is in this experience of centering, I suggest, that a person achieves an awareness of the meaning of *simplicity*, for it is an experience that is completely without 'needs' of any kind apart from simply being. Thus, in and through its simplicity, centering is an experience of *ultimacy and unity*.

Yet, it is also in and through this experience of centering that a person awakens to an awareness of the breathtaking *complexity* of life, expressed by the unique quality of each and every particle of life. Centering, then, is also an

experience of *ultimacy and uniqueness*.

The important point here, as Panikkar reminds us, is that '*simplicity and complexity are not dialectically opposed*, because the ultimate structure of the universe does not need to be conceived as dialectical'. Like all the 'dualisms' that permeate rational thinking, simplicity and complexity have meaning 'not in opposing and contradicting each other so as to generate some "higher" synthetic amalgam, but as a mutually constitutive relation, so that the one does not make sense without the other and each mutually supports the other'.⁵⁵¹ The world of complexity and uniqueness - the vast and intricate domain of science and the even more labyrinthine world human relations - and the world of simplicity and unity - the simple experience of being in touch with the core of one's own being which is also the core of reality - are not two separate worlds, for both express the ultimacy of being. Thus, insofar as a person enters into a centering experience that is truly a 'sacrament of being', he or she enters into an experience of trinitarian life, that is, a life of *ultimacy, uniqueness, and unity*.

By describing the trinitarian or cosmotheandric experience as one of 'ultimacy, uniqueness, and unity', my purpose is to depict what I believe to be the basic animating experience of 'being' (the 'sacrament' of being) in a way that avoids the overtones of intellectualism and paternalism conveyed by the language of traditional theological (theistic) and/or philosophical explanations of the Trinity. Every person knows what it means to sense that something, an idea or an experience, has ultimate value, and every person understands what it means to feel 'unique' and to feel 'at one' with others. These understandings and feelings are part of the world of *archetypes*, the world of the basic patterns of human life, and although we may be less familiar with them when they are joined in the singular experience of a 'call to centering', I suggest that this is due largely to cultural factors which obscure or inhibit our awareness and understanding of archetypal processes.

As Jung recognized in his later formulations of the archetype-concept, at the level of archetypal understanding, the usual 'rigorous separation of psyche and world

is abolished',⁵⁵² which means that an archetype is a structuring aspect of reality that exists apart from the temporal and spatial qualities of life that give expression to specific archetypal images. Because access to this timeless and spaceless world of archetypes is through present-centered time-consciousness, and because this mode of temporality receives little encouragement in contemporary societies, it is not surprising that the 'call to centering', the call to *the* fundamental archetypal experience of trinitarian life, is heard faintly, if at all. As noted earlier, we live in wildly overstimulated environments in which individualistic goals and instrumentalistic methods are paraded before us as ideals with a god-like character, and given such a context, future-oriented time-consciousness is paramount. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the 'call to centering' *is present and available to us at all times* because it flows from the core of being itself, from that 'center' towards which all beings orient themselves when moved or animated by their life-source, and the urgent task of our time, I submit, is to give ourselves opportunities to hear it, to listen.

In monastic traditions, deep-listening is a way of life, for although monastic practices vary, a monk is invariably a person whose life is organized around creating opportunities for being in touch with ultimate reality, for listening to her or his 'call to centering'. In 1980, a group dedicated to supporting and helping monastic groups in developing countries invited Raimon Panikkar to a symposium focused on the subject of 'the Monk as Universal Archetype'. The records of Panikkar's presentations to this symposium and his dialogue with other participants are contained in the book *Blessed Simplicity*, and in these records, Panikkar develops the idea that there is 'a primordial monastic dimension' to human life (a monastic archetype) out of which specific expressions of monastic life emerge. As mentioned earlier, he describes this monastic dimension in terms of 'searching for a center' and proposes that, inasmuch as any person tries to unify her or his life around its center, he or she expresses the universal archetype of the monk. Thus, although not everyone can or should enter a monastery, Panikkar suggests that 'everybody has a monastic dimension that ought to be cultivated'.⁵⁵³

Like any basic pattern of human life, this monastic dimension, or 'call to

centering' as I prefer to name it, emerges within many different kinds of environments, some more nourishing than others. Normally, the most fruitful environments for any human archetype are those which encourage its growth in a way that actualizes the unique qualities of the person who gives it life. However, the 'call to centering' is an experience in which a person realizes her or his essential qualities of being by 'letting go' of self-focused concerns, and, accordingly, its growth is nourished when environments create opportunities for *releasing* people from the desires that arise from past experiences and/or future expectations and from the need to be preoccupied with plans for achieving these desires. The 'call to centering', then, develops and matures in environments which cultivate the *contemplative* power of the human mind, that is, the capacity to transcend discursive activity and know by direct experience.

Panikkar defines contemplation as 'the overcoming of the spacio-temporal categories as the only possible way of being consciously in the world and of participating in the ongoing process of existence',⁵⁵⁴ and this definition is important because it emphasizes the participatory or experiential nature of contemplation. Contemplative understanding is neither a rational nor an imaginative mode of consciousness, rather it articulates a participatory experience, a 'being-in-touch-with' the reality of what one is contemplating. Thus, in keeping with previous comments in this inquiry about participatory consciousness, contemplation is a self-surrendering and liberating experience that is centered within a profound openness to a present moment.

Although monastic life reflects a concerted and concentrated dedication to contemplative experiences, contemplation itself, is an innate capacity of human consciousness. All persons have a natural talent for contemplation, just as all persons have a natural talent for relating with others or for appreciating and expressing beauty, but such talents are not always nurtured effectively and people vary considerably in their abilities and opportunities to use them. Thus, although every person understands what it means to look at or to listen deeply to something in such a way that self-focused concerns seem to vanish, along with feelings of separateness and

the experience of time itself, hardly a moment's reflection is necessary to realize that such experiences are relegated to the margins of contemporary life and receive little, if any, substantial encouragement. As suggested earlier, the principal reason for this marginalization is the exalted position relegated to instrumentalistic rationality by our major societal institutions and the serious imbalance this creates in terms of harmonizing the various aspects of everyday living. Correcting this alarming 'off-centredness' requires a way of living that not only acknowledges the danger of always thinking in the instrumentalistic mode but also honours the efficacy and importance of experience in the 'contemplative mood'. In the following passage from a commentary on Panikkar's 'cosmotheandric intuition', Frank Podgorski describes this 'contemplative mood' in terms of a 'cutting off' of rational (instrumentalistic) thinking.

Buried within the word *contemplation* is the root *tem*, which means "to cut." Of what severance, separation or *cutting off* do contemplatives speak? Recall, for a moment, the wonder and awe experienced at an especially meaningful moment of life, while at the same time *cutting off* your natural instinct to name, label, or categorize such a moment. Recall the initial moment of "just looking" at a Pacific sunset, the astonishment of "seeing" more than a mere panorama from a mountain peak, the incredible moment of recognizing "infinity" in the eyes of another. Although everyday language might call these actions "just looking," contemplative "eyes" sometimes recognize a far more profound *vision*. At times they may even describe this as a moment of "profound Oneness."⁵⁵⁵

Because of the dominating influence of instrumentalistic rationality, experiencing the world with our contemplative eyes and ears, as depicted by Podgorski, is all too often considered a marginal activity associated with a sentimental or overly emotional attitude towards life. At worst, it is considered a waste of time. It must be emphasized, however, that contemplation is an experience that transcends both rational thought and emotion, both of which tend to delineate an experience in specific terms, thereby creating an element of separation. Whether a context is one of logic and rationality or intuition and emotionality, the act of separating, of creating definite boundaries (as between a subject and object), is the methodology of the instrumentalistic mind. As such, it is the methodology for obtaining a desired result or

for testing a certain hypothesis, which is to say that it is the methodology of control, and in a world that operates by such a method, change comes about by the influence of one 'thing' on another 'thing'. In contrast, there is no separation in contemplative experiences, for there is only a 'communion' that is pure awareness, and the important point here is that there is no methodology of pure awareness apart from simply being.

Furthermore, because there is no control, whatever change occurs as part of a contemplative experience flows directly from participatory consciousness, that is, when a person's awareness is fully in concert with her or his surroundings, change expresses a new awareness of how different 'beings' relate within a 'unified realm of being'. Ultimately, this unified realm of being is best understood as the trinitarian or cosmotheandric experience of 'ultimacy, uniqueness, and unity'. Thus, whereas instrumentalistic action is concerned with controlling the influence of one 'body' on another, contemplative experience engenders an awareness that everything partakes of trinitarian life.

A major implication of these remarks about contemplation is that it is not possible to say exactly what contemplation is because it displays itself simply as an experience of being fully in touch with a present moment. In one of his descriptions of the 'contemplative mood' or 'attitude', Panikkar augments his ideas with certain images, all of which suggest that contemplation expresses this intimate involvement with a particular 'moment'.

The Contemplative Mood calls forth certain images: Socrates eagerly learning a new tune on his flute the night before he was to die; Luther deciding to plant an apple tree in the morning of the day on which the world would come to an end; St. Louis Gonzaga continuing to play during recreation time even if he learned his death would come that very night; the delight of the Zen Master in watching the struggle of an ant in spite of the fact that he's hanging over an abyss, tied by a rope that is soon to be cut. These are examples of the contemplative attitude, whether it is called mindfulness, awareness, enlightenment, concentration, or contemplation.⁵⁵⁶

As these comments suggest, the contemplative experience implies a very different orientation towards conducting the affairs of everyday living than Dewey's

moral pragmatism. From the moral-pragmatic perspective, responding to moral issues and concerns involves making direct changes to external conditions, but from the perspective of contemplative experience, moral power is evoked through a personal transformation of consciousness, and because this transformation is a ‘centering’ experience, it is one that ‘reverberates in its benefits unto the entire reality’.⁵⁵⁷ The true contemplative is a person who is awake to the limitless possibilities of participatory consciousness, and, therefore, tremendously ‘charged’ with a power that is capable of transforming the inner sensibilities and understandings of persons in a way that also transforms the *meaning* of the external conditions of life. Although the pragmatic approach to morality can create changes in the external conditions of life, these external conditions alone do not testify to the conscious life that gives them meaning and maintains them, anymore than the trappings of material prosperity indicate happiness or external behaviour alone indicates the depth of one person’s love for another. The principal difference here is between an instrumentalistic focus on ‘doing as a way of becoming’ and a contemplative focus on *being as a way of doing*.

Although the phrase ‘being as a way of doing’ conveys a certain instrumental resonance by suggesting that ‘being’ is an instrument (a means of doing something), it is important to understand that, just as there is a significant difference between ‘production’ and ‘growth’, there is a significant difference between an instrumentalistic mentality that operates by objectifying and an *instrumental attitude* that expresses a *way of being*. Accordingly, in the following remarks, my purpose is to elaborate on the meaning of this idea that ‘being is a way of doing’ by exploring the concept of instrumentality. The main suggestion offered is that the contemplative experience can be understood in terms of the ‘instrumentality of being’, that is, as a kind of matrix or ‘breeding ground’ for authentic, nurturing action. Moreover, by focusing on the connection between ‘being’ and ‘doing’, the following remarks also constitute a summary of all that has been proposed thus far in this dissertation about the significance of ‘being’ and ‘time’ for understanding the spiritual nature of reality.

What is Instrumentality? Notes About the Contemplative Experience as a Matrix for Human Action

To suggest that the contemplative experience is a matrix for authentic, nurturing action is to suggest that personal consciousness is a kind of instrument, in reality, a kind of womb, an environment where the sources of a person's life meet, unite, and grow to fruition. The implication here is that, as a conscious embodiment of trinitarian life, the contemplative experience integrates the transcendent or divine ground of being with the rhythms of personal and universal life and this integration is the wellspring of action that is truly healthful because it flows from the *wholeness* of reality. The popular prayer of Saint Francis of Assisi vividly depicts this idea by suggesting that, when a person is an 'instrument' of divine life, there is no distinction between one's own well-being and the well-being of others, and furthermore, that this fully empathic *way of being* is what constitutes personal fulfilment and joy. By expressing this intimate, integral relationship between ultimacy, uniqueness, and unity, this prayer is an exemplary expression of trinitarian life as depicted earlier, and, therefore, it epitomizes a way of being that is born from the contemplative experience of living in the light of the present.

Lord make me an instrument of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console, to be understood as to understand, to be loved, as to love; For it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; it is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

Because this prayer suggests that a person reaches her or his 'fullness of being' by letting-go of the illusion that one's 'self' is an autonomous entity, capable of independent action, it is in tune with all major traditions of spirituality which emphasize the importance of 'self-abandonment' to an ideal of ultimate significance. As discussed previously, to conceive the 'self' as an independent entity is to conceive it as something that is constructed and that functions in a relatively predictable manner, very much like an implement or tool that acts upon external conditions in

order to achieve certain results. However, the human person is not a 'self' in this individualistic sense, for he or she lives and grows continually in environments of interaction and is, at least potentially, in touch with the wholeness of reality through her or his consciousness. In the light of this understanding, particular persons are 'instruments' only in the sense that they are active and integral parts of the whole of reality, much like a person's hands, eyes, ears, feet, talents, ideas, or any other personal feature might be considered 'instruments' of her or his body or mind. As integral aspects of a unified living organism, the instrumental capacities of persons are, in effect, ways of expressing certain qualities of being.

Thus, the word 'instrument' has two possible connotations which require careful differentiation. On the one hand, in terms of scientific-technical work, an instrument is a constructed (manufactured) tool, implement, or device designed and used to accomplish a specific task, and I suggest that what is generally understood as instrumentalism (and what I refer to as instrumentalistic rationality) refers to any situation in which such a view predominates, especially when it induces people to regard themselves or other human persons or any of the workings of human consciousness as merely objects or products of observation. On the other hand, in terms of conscious experience, an instrument is a way of being which is, in effect, a way of doing something in response to an immediate circumstance. In this context, the idea of instrumentality suggests the ongoing relationship between integral parts and a whole, a relationship that functions harmoniously when expressing its intrinsic nature but which induces suffering when it is 'broken', when it is 'off-center' and out-of-tune with the reality of interdependent life.

The first of the 'Four Noble Truths' which Buddha taught, 'life is difficult', draws attention to the brokenness of reality in a compelling manner. Huston Smith notes that the word translated here as 'difficult', *dukkha* (often translated as 'suffering'), was used 'in Buddha's day to refer to wheels whose axles were off-center, and bones that had slipped from their sockets'. Accordingly, he describes the meaning of this Buddhist assertion as follows: 'Life as typically lived is out of joint. Something is awry. Its pivot is not true. This restricts movements (blocks creativity),

and causes undue friction (interpersonal conflict)'.⁵⁵⁸ As the fragmentation and violence that pervade much of our contemporary world suggests, ours is a time that is particularly 'out of joint', not so much because the 'wheels' of our societies are broken, for technology has given us wheels of unparalleled capacity and efficiency, but because (as implied throughout this inquiry and in many social commentaries throughout the twentieth century) these wheels are moving at such a rapid and commanding pace that they have utterly transformed traditional notions of space and time, and in the throes of this immense flood of so-called progress, ceaseless becoming, and tireless devotion to instrumentalism, our spiritual 'bones' have slipped from their sockets.

In view of this all too obvious brokenness of contemporary life, reanimating human consciousness with its own life-force is the compelling task of our time, and because this task involves responding to the 'call to centering' of the contemplative experience, I suggest it is best understood as a *spiritual* undertaking. That this undertaking is fundamentally a call to live in the light of the present moment is beautifully illustrated in Taoist philosophy by the depiction of Tao, the 'way of ultimate reality', as an 'empty vessel', a vessel that is always used but never filled because it is 'ever present' and as deep as the source of all that exists.

[Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 4.⁵⁵⁹ See Appendix B, # 6.]

This image of Tao as an 'empty vessel' is steeped in a present-centered time-consciousness because it suggests that the way of ultimate reality is a way that is without any firm attachments to what has already passed or to what may come to pass. In the light of this 'emptiness', Taoist philosophy suggests that all action comes from 'non-action', that is, from a condition of being deeply in touch with Tao, the

empty vessel that responds to each moment in accord with the nature of that moment. The Taoist term used to describe this idea of action emanating from non-action is *wu wei*, and as mentioned at the outset of this inquiry, it refers to an experience of self-surrendering and, as such, it reflects an experience that cannot be objectified in any way, it can only be lived. The implication here is that, when a person's time-consciousness is focused on either maintaining past conditions or facilitating future attainments, that is, when it is focused on pre-conceived objective notions about what was and what will be, personal being is 'off-center' and not fully able to respond to the nature of the present moment which is the way of ultimate reality.

The contrast between this contemplative idea of action emanating from non-action and the way humanist philosophers and instrumentalistic thinkers attach great importance to deriving the ideals of human action from 'the hard stuff of the world of physical and social experience'⁵⁶⁰ is striking. In the humanist-instrumentalistic view, there is virtually no distinction between the 'ideal' and the 'actual': What is considered 'ideal' is a function of the actual, what has already been actualized and what ought to be actualized as determined by human intelligence and experience. John Dewey expresses this view when he observes that 'the ideal itself has its roots in natural conditions; it emerges when the imagination idealizes existence by laying hold of the possibilities offered to thought and action'.⁵⁶¹ This identification of the ideal with the actual precludes associating one's sense of ultimate value (the ideal) with the non-actual, that is, with any experience that transcends the plane of physical action. Accordingly, the vast array of conscious experience that remains un-manifested is considered an unnecessary and perhaps an unworthy adjunct to determinations of the ideal by those who adopt this humanist-instrumentalistic viewpoint.

In contrast to this view, the contemplative focus on 'action from non-action', or *being as a way of doing*, suggests that whatever is considered 'ideal' emanates from an experience of trinitarian life, which means that it is rooted in an order of awareness that *transcends and encompasses* the entire order of material existence, including, of course, the entire realm of human action in the physical world. From this contemplative vantage point, there is a vital distinction between the actual and the

ideal because the actual cannot be *identified* with the ideal, just as a part cannot be identified with the whole. For the truly contemplative person, there is never a direct one-to-one correspondence between an action and the meaning underlying it, for when an act is part of an experience of self-surrendering to an ideal of transcendent importance, its ultimate meaning is embedded in a reality that transcends the actuality not only of the individual life or lives involved but also of all material life as we know it in the physical universe.

As mentioned previously, the phenomenon of language is a powerful example of how our everyday lives are embedded in this transcendent reality, for although we can never fully 'say what we mean', we have a power of understanding and communicating that is inestimably greater than what might be called the 'surface structures' or the 'actualities' of language, such as words, phrases, concepts, and syntax. As Panikkar reminds us, all persons have a capacity to know or to sense what lies 'beyond' these surface structures and somehow to be aware of 'the silent component of the word, of the unspeakable side of the spoken'.⁵⁶²

Perhaps an even more robust expression of our capacity to experience a reality beyond the actualities of physical existence is our ability to appreciate beauty combined with our inability to express adequately what it is, and I refer here not only to the beauty we perceive in nature and in works of art but also, and perhaps more powerfully, to the beauty we sense in the people around us whom we admire and love.

Undoubtedly, the most unequivocal expression of a transcendent reality is a *freely accepted belief* in an Absolute Essence, Divinity, or, in the words of Aldous Huxley, 'a divine Reality substantial to the world of things and lives and minds...an immanent and transcendent Ground of all being'. Such belief is at the heart of the 'perennial philosophy' which Huxley notes is a 'metaphysic', a 'psychology', and an 'ethic' that is 'immemorial and universal'.⁵⁶³ However, it is important to emphasize that this historical and multicultural presence of genuine, that is, freely accepted belief in a transcendent divinity is not the same as belief in a supernatural power which expresses an *instrumentalistic allegiance* to a particular creed or religion. Admittedly,

because instrumentalistic rationality is a pervasive aspect of human behaviour, particularly in the modern period dominated by the scientific-technical worldview, the difference between freely accepted and instrumentalistic belief is not always easy to discern either in one's own experience or in the collective life of communities and societies. Nevertheless, this difference is a vital one, for it characterizes the way people understand themselves either as objects interacting among other objects in predictable and, therefore, controllable ways or as persons interacting with other persons in a free, participatory manner, which is, I suggest, the way that generates an authentically creative unfolding of life. In brief, the difference between an instrumentalistic and a freely accepted belief characterizes the whole tenor of moral life. It is important, therefore, to understand that the belief in a transcendent order of being that is embodied in the perennial philosophy is one that fosters a morality not based on instrumentalistic rationality but on human freedom.

Paul Tillich reminds us that 'morality is not a *subject*': it is life put to the test in dozens of moments...it's life affecting the views of people every day',⁵⁶⁴ and Karl-Heinz Ilting reinforces this view by pointing out the 'intellectualist fallacy' of confusing the kind of rules we must follow in order to gain knowledge (rationality) with those freely accepted norms which we must follow if we are to live in morally and legally ordered relationships.⁵⁶⁵ The implication here is that the primary issue with regard to establishing a basis for moral behaviour is not rationality but the relationship between human *freedom* and the legitimate limitations placed on it by society.

Highlighting this connection between freedom and morality is important for understanding the nature of belief in a transcendent order of reality because morality is, in effect, an expression of belief - it is belief in action. Thus, when belief reflects an instrumentalistic understanding of reality, as it does when allegiance to it is conceived merely as an instrument through which salvation is attained, moral behaviour is reduced to an instrumentalistic application of knowledge. In contrast, when a person's belief reflects an awareness of the trinitarian nature of reality, as it does in the wisdom of the perennial philosophy, moral behaviour emanates from an

all-inclusive and liberating experience of participatory consciousness, and in such a context (as discussed previously), there is no distinction between freedom and necessity because there is only one 'good' and it is a 'good' that is 'of-all-and-for-all'. The important point here is that, when belief in a transcendent order reflects this union of freedom and necessity, its expression in moral behaviour is fundamentally an expression of *willing* rather than a matter of applying certain rational precepts and/or 'social technologies' aimed at regulating behaviour.

Although the concept of 'willing' is often used in a way that presupposes that there is a particular self who 'wills', which suggests that the act of willing flows from and fosters a condition of personal independency, I suggest that this concept of willing does not pertain to actions that are 'free'. The suggestion here is that, when the act of willing is genuinely free, it is not prescribed by any form of conditioning, such as that required to delineate an individual self. Accordingly, 'willing' is best conceived as an experience of choosing that springs from an awareness of *interdependency* that is indistinguishable from an experience of *liberation*. In the following passage, Ilting describes the connection between 'an ordered collective life', the acceptance of moral norms, and freedom in a way that reflects this understanding of 'willing' as an experience of non-conditioned, interrelational being.

The creation of an ordered collective life cannot therefore be the task of a social technology which seeks to create order by direct influence upon the behavior of individuals, in such a way as if the appropriate means for the realization of a desired state of affairs were to be found and made available...Rather, a universally justifiable order of human collective life can only be achieved if it rests upon the *will* of individuals to follow the limitation upon their freedom of action that is to be established by rules. Only in this case is the rule recognized as a *norm* that is to be followed. The free *recognition* of a norm, that is, one not enforced by application or threat of force, by those who are to follow it, is therefore a necessary precondition for a universally justifiable limitation upon the freedom of individuals.⁵⁶⁶

To view the acceptance of moral norms in the context of 'willing' rather than as a product of instrumentalistic rationality is to challenge those moral and political theorists who use consensus and consent as a basis for validating moral norms, because, just as actions alone do not always convey their underlying meanings (as

suggested earlier), agreement and consent alone do not always imply that the associated behaviour is willed.⁵⁶⁷ My suggestion here is that genuine belief in a transcendent order or reality (one that expresses a trinitarian or cosmotheandric experience) is also fundamentally an expression of willing rather than an application of knowledge (although, of course, knowing is always an aspect of willing). The main implication of this suggestion is that such belief is emphatically not an object, because its instrumentality is like that of freely working consciousness which expresses a way of being, a way of relating with others according to particular circumstances, not a tool-like capacity to cause a certain effect.

Thus, I suggest that it is a mistake to treat *all* belief in a divine, transcendent reality as an objective entity as many humanist and instrumentalist thinkers do. Such thinkers claim that the human sense of the ultimate or ideal can be explained solely in terms of psychological and social mechanisms that are rooted in the manifest world, and, therefore, they attempt to explain the occurrence of belief in a transcendent reality in terms of specific psychosocial functions, but in doing so, they ignore the essential difference between instrumentalistic and freely chosen belief.

For example: In the context of the human search for knowledge, Dewey suggests that belief in the 'supernatural' reflects a kind of 'laissez faire' reaction to ignorance: We do not know something, therefore, there must be a 'supernatural link' that accounts for what we cannot understand. The psychosocial function here, according to Dewey, is a defence mechanism which he describes as a 'denial', more often implicit than explicit, 'of the possibility of radical intervention of intelligence in the conduct of human life'. Thus, Dewey suggests that belief in the supernatural acts as a psychological defence against realizing the 'irrelevance and futility of human intervention in social events and interests', although he fails to add that this irrelevance and futility is something that his own philosophy of pragmatism also vehemently denies!⁵⁶⁸ Such thinking is clearly instrumentalistic, as indicated by its use of generalized cause-and-effect conceptualizations of human relationships. However, this kind of thinking is not appropriate when belief in a transcendental order of reality is freely chosen, because such belief does not express itself in terms

of a mechanistic association, rather, it responds in a participatory manner in accordance with the particular circumstances of a given situation. Moreover, contrary to what Dewey implies, genuine belief in a transcendental order of reality does not reflect a 'giving up' of effort to understand reality but an intensification of it, just as certain kinds of poetry reflect an intensification of effort to understand a particular phenomenon without implying that it is possible to reach anything like a complete understanding of it. To be in the presence of 'mystery' or to be overwhelmed with a feeling of transcendence does not necessarily anaesthetize our consciousness into a 'laissez-faire' attitude of acquiescence: more often than not it inspires us.

Certain aspects of Freud's understanding of religion also illustrate how instrumentalistic thinking distorts the nature of genuine belief by reducing it to a psychosocial function and by ignoring its capacity to engender a participatory and creative way of being. For instance, Freud suggests that the so-called 'oceanic feeling' of 'oneness with the universe' became associated with religion as a means of psychic 'consolation', that is, as a 'way of disclaiming the danger which the ego recognizes as threatening it from the external world'. The psychosocial function implied here is another defence mechanism (called, in technical Freudian terminology, 'reaction formation'). In this defensive technique, an anxiety-producing impulse (in this case, a feeling of alienation in the face of the incredible vastness of the universe) is supposedly replaced by its opposite (in this case, the so-called 'oceanic' feeling). With regard to how the wisdom of the perennial philosophy accounts for this mystical feeling of oneness with the universe, Freud implies that there is a 'physiological basis' for mysticism by referring to studies which suggest that mystical states are 'regressions to primordial states of mind which have long ago been overlaid'.⁵⁶⁹

As these comments imply, for Freud, belief in a transcendental order of reality is an objective phenomenon, and like all instrumentalistic thinkers, he believes that the meaning of objective phenomena can be ascertained by determining their relevant cause and effect relationships which in turn indicate their particular tool-like functions. However, as noted above, a belief that is freely chosen by someone is an expression of personal consciousness and, as such, is a way of being that functions in

a *responsive and participatory* rather than a predetermined manner. What Freud's treatment of the 'oceanic feeling' fails to consider is that the instrumentality of genuine or freely chosen belief is not a tool-like component for interacting in mechanistic environments, rather, it is a means of guidance, a kind of open channel that allows a meaning of ultimate significance, often symbolized as 'light', to infuse and inform conscious experience.

An observation by Freud about the Christian ideal of 'loving one's neighbour as oneself' provides an even clearer example of how the use of instrumentalistic rationality to explain a conscious 'way of being' can distort the nature of belief in an ideal of ultimate importance. In the closing pages of his book *Civilization and its Discontents*, Freud refers to this Christian ideal as a 'commandment' and calls it 'the strongest defence against human aggressiveness' available to the cultural 'super-ego' of Western civilizations (that is, to its collective conscience). However, he adds that this ideal of loving causes 'as much unhappiness as aggressiveness itself', and he substantiates this claim by suggesting that, because 'the commandment is impossible to fulfil', attempting to live by it causes 'an enormous inflation of love', which in turn lowers its value to such an extent that 'civilization' (as such) pays no attention to it, which means that anyone who tries to live by it is placed 'at a disadvantage *vis-a-vis* the person who disregards it'. After describing this (rather woeful) chain of causes and effects, he considers two contrasting ethical points of view towards adopting the ideal of loving one's neighbour in spite of the problems just enunciated. The first position, which he calls 'natural ethics', is dismissed as having 'nothing to offer...except the narcissistic satisfaction of being able to think oneself better than others'. Freud describes the second position as an 'ethics based on religion' and claims that its principal feature is the promise of a better after-life, but he dismisses this claim as well by maintaining that 'so long as virtue is not rewarded here on earth, ethics will...preach in vain'.⁵⁷⁰

Once again, the use of instrumentalistic rationality is evident in Freud's remarks, and once again, I suggest, it is evident that the application of this method of

inquiry is inappropriate. In the first place, Freud does not recognise that the phenomenon in question - loving one's neighbour - is not an object but a way of living. For instance, when used in conjunction with the ideal of Christian love, the word 'commandment' is not used in the same way that it is used when describing how governments or authority figures enact laws as a means of regulating communal life. In the context of Christian teaching, love is not merely an idealistic tool for establishing harmonious relations because it literally *encompasses everything that matters*. Given this context, calling love a 'commandment' is like saying that a person is obliged to breathe or to eat in order to live - it is an emphatic figure of speech. In one of the most memorable passages about love ever written, Saint Paul personifies this all-encompassing character of love in terms of his own life: 'If I have all the eloquence of men or of angels', he writes, 'but speak without love, I am simply a gong booming or a cymbal clashing...and if I have faith in all its fullness, to move mountains, but am without love, then I am nothing at all'. In another passage, Paul states the same idea in more straightforward language: 'All the commandments...are summed up in this single command: You must love your neighbour as yourself...It is the answer to every one of the commandments'. Of the many other passages in the Christian Bible affirming the central importance of love, none is more profound, in my opinion, than these words of Saint John which suggest that to love is to share in the divine nature of God: 'God is love and anyone who lives in love lives in God, and God lives in him'.⁵⁷¹

Given this understanding of love as the essence, the life-blood of human consciousness, it is clearly a mistake to think of it as an objective law used to regulate interactive life, as Freud and other instrumentalistic thinkers do. As suggested throughout this inquiry, human consciousness does not operate mechanistically and, therefore, cannot be understood in terms of cause and effect relationships. On the contrary, human consciousness is animated by a person's experiential sense of being a participant in the wholeness of reality, which is why I suggest that the matrix of human action is fundamentally a contemplative experience.

The purpose of these brief comments on certain ideas of Dewey and Freud is

to illustrate the inadequacy of instrumentalistic thinking in terms of understanding the nature of deeply rooted human processes. The gravity of this inadequacy is evident when one considers how the pervasive instrumentalism of contemporary societies creates the impression that the world of the observable, the world of cause and effect, is all that there is, when, in reality, so much of what we know and feel about the phenomena of life tells us that what is observable is but a thin layer of what constitutes the wholeness of reality.

For example: Is a human person ultimately reducible to the mechanical operations of a particular body? To believe so is to imply that our interpersonal relationships have no impact on our physical and emotional well-being and no ultimate meaning - and who among us would believe this to be a true statement about human nature? On the contrary, our deepest intuition, our deepest understanding of life, suggests that the *meaning* of what we perceive at the surface level of everyday living is connected with the well-being, the health, the *wholeness* of all the phenomena of life.

The suggestion here is this: To put our personal and collective 'faith' solely or even primarily in the use of instrumentalistic thinking to analyze and devise 'solutions' for human problems is to be deluded by the surface structures of life.

In terms of understanding and nurturing the actions of everyday living, to be deluded by the surface structures of reality is to be 'off-balance' and disoriented but not disconnected from that which animates life, from the depths of what constitutes the wholeness of reality. My suggestion here is that the contemplative experience, as outlined earlier, is a matrix for authentic, nurturing human action because it arouses or awakens human consciousness to its participation in trinitarian or cosmotheandric life, and this experience is readily available to every person by virtue of her or his capacity to be fully in touch with a present situation.

Because the trinitarian life awakened within the contemplative experience is an expression of ultimacy, uniqueness, and unity, it is the basis for understanding not only human experience but also the nature of reality, the wholeness of which all beings partake. The principal implication of this idea is that the contemplative

experience is, in reality, the underlying source of all human understanding because it is a kind of 'womb' or matrix in which contact with the wholeness of reality is realized. Just as conception unites particular elements of human life with the underlying pattern of recurring human life itself, the experience of contemplation unites a person's awareness or 'act of being' with the underlying pattern of reality which is trinitarian life.

Clearly, this understanding of 'contemplative being' as the source of understanding itself challenges contemporary notions about intelligibility derived mainly from the scientific-technical worldview. However, it is in tune with the wisdom of major traditions of mysticism and, as suggested throughout this inquiry, it is reaffirmed and nourished by many scientific developments in this century. In addition, I suggest that the idea of contemplation as a matrix for action is in tune with our deepest intuition about the meaning of the relationships that constitute human life, an intuition which connects persons with what they believe to be ultimate as well as with everything that constitutes their environments, both immediate and universal. I believe it is this intuition of a deep *personal* connection with everything that is supposedly 'other' that prompts the author of the following passage to suggest that what is needed to alleviate the obvious suffering of so many people throughout the world is not only genuine compassion towards others as revealed through good works but also genuine compassion towards ourselves as revealed through the healing power of the contemplative experience.

What have we to offer one another to alleviate suffering? It's obvious that a hungry belly we can fill with food, a frightened child we can comfort, a person blind with cataract we can help to see again, a homeless person we can assist in finding affordable housing, and a destitute farmer we can provide with seeds, tools, and water for growing food. We can bear witness to governments' acts of inhumanity toward their citizens and speak out, and we can console the sick and lonely, the dying, and the grieving.

But there is more that we can do even as we are performing these caring acts. We can honour the profound ancient wisdom that reminds us that *one of the roots of suffering lies deep within our own minds*. By remembering that and learning to work with these root causes within ourselves, even as we attempt to help others, we find that *our own inner work becomes part of our offering to*

*others.*⁵⁷²

Our own inner work, I suggest, is another way of describing the contemplative experience of being fully alive to a present moment. Such 'work' might involve retreating to a quiet place to rest and ponder, alone or with others, or it might involve engaging more vigorously in a particular task, once again, alone or with others, or it might involve simply paying more attention to the details of everyday living. A contemplative experience, like love, has no 'formula'. Its only requirement is to have no requirements apart from the self-surrendering of participatory consciousness.

As presented throughout this inquiry, participatory consciousness is a way of being among others that is radically non-instrumentalistic because participants are not treated as objects even though the differences among them are recognized and honoured. This participatory mode of interaction is seldom experienced in contemporary social environments which tend to reek with the objectifying practices typical of instrumentalistic thinking. In such environments, people tend to be treated according to what they are called, that is, according to the categories to which they are assigned. Such practices promote social fragmentation by isolating individuals and individual 'types' from one another, and this fragmentation in turn perpetuates thinking in terms of hierarchies rather than 'wholenesses'. This connection between treating people as objects (instrumentalism) and the creation of divisive social hierarchies because of a lack of participatory consciousness reflects the principal suggestions of both major sections of this dissertation insofar as it implies (a) that the differences among persons and among all beings are best understood in the context of the wholeness of reality rather than as a hierarchy, and (b) that genuinely nurturing and creative human action is not a product of instrumentalistic thinking but is engendered by a present-centered, contemplative experience of trinitarian life.

Near the end of the most commonly used Christian prayer ('The Lord's Prayer') are these words: 'And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil'. In a new translation of this prayer, Neil Douglas-Klotz renders these two phrases as follows: 'Don't let surface things delude us, but free us from what holds us back (from our true purpose)'.⁵⁷³ As implied by the ideas presented throughout this

dissertation, this translation is truly one that is appropriate to our time, for the pervasive influence of instrumentalism has deluded us into thinking that we can make what we need in order to be nurtured and nurturing human beings. However, the plans and techniques we devise for helping ourselves and others are meaningless unless they spring from the depths of universal spirit. The instruments we really need are not made at all because they are part of our very being: They are given. What we need is to open the eyes, ears, and heart of our personal and collective consciousness, and with these 'instruments of being' we can animate our lives with the inexhaustible resources of trinitarian life. *The way to do is to be.*

Chapter Eight

Epilogue:

Music as the Spirituality of Being

Our own life is a movement in the symphony of ages.
(Abraham Heschel)⁵⁷⁴

It is often said that music is a universal language, which suggests that it has a capacity to transcend personal and even cultural differences that might otherwise block or hinder communication. However, just as music often establishes common bonds between people, just as readily it often underscores significant dissimilarities.

All forms of artistic expression share this capacity to act universally and at the same time articulate differences, and what this implies is that, by exploring how and why we respond to phenomena such as music and art, we are delving into what it means to be a particular person not only within our immediate communities but also within the wider contexts of societies, humanity, and ultimately, the wholeness of reality. Because understanding what it means to be part of this ultimate, all-encompassing, that is, *spiritual* wholeness is also the central concern of this dissertation, the following brief reflection on music as an instance of the spirituality of being is offered as a way of summarizing and amplifying this concern.

By responding to any art form, a person orients herself or himself towards meaning by making connections between seemingly disparate aspects of human experience: A simple melody might evoke the memory of an intimate moment, a patch of vibrant colour might induce a feeling of excitement, or an engaging metaphor might urge a person to a new form of action or arouse vital emotions. It is important to note, however, that these connections do not always work in the same way and often they do not work at all, and that this is 'as it should be'! Why? Because artistic expressions, or any other emanations of deep consciousness, do not build networks of mechanical links between people, rather, they set in motion currents of influence that are dispersed within dynamic networks of human relationships.

If a piece of music, a painting, or a certain metaphor always worked in the same way, always made the same kind of connections, they would be functioning like

mechanical parts and be, in effect, artistic 'tools'. But works of art function in a different way than, for example, a filter that extracts certain particles from the air and channels them into specific parts of a machine. The connections formed through artistic expressions are such that physical sensations, their immediate interpretation, and their wider meaning in the context of a person's overall pattern of living do not coexist in a static configuration. On the contrary, art engenders a form of interacting that is responsive to a person's experience as it is at any given moment. In this way, the experience of art suggests that there is a matrix of relationships from which the distinctive aspects of living unfold. The major implication here is that the ideas of 'difference' and 'relationship' are inextricably joined. To be different does not mean that you have a separate, autonomous existence but that yours is an expression of being that relates to others in a certain way, at a certain time and in a certain place. Ultimately, art implies that 'to be' is to participate, that is, to be a particular expression of an unfolding matrix of relationships.

As I reflect on this participatory nature of personal being and on the immense diversity of being in general, I am reminded of advice I often give to my piano students about how to spend those moments just before they begin to perform a piece of music they have laboured long and hard to learn. 'Remember that the music begins in the silence before you begin to play', I say to them, 'and it ends in the silence after you have played the last note....So, just sit quietly and wait for the music to come to you'. The reason I say this to my students is not merely to cultivate an appropriate way of preparing to focus on an upcoming task, more importantly, it is to foster in them an awareness of the beauty and efficacy of stillness and silence, an awareness which I believe is a vital nutrient for all kinds of human activity, but one which is all too scarce in the hyper-stimulated environments of contemporary societies.

Why I am reminded of the importance of silence in the present context stems from my conviction that any expression of 'being', any manifestation of consciousness, can never be understood entirely in terms of its 'observable' activities and/or conditions. Raimon Panikkar reminds us that 'pure life escapes us when we identify ourselves with our roles', for 'we are prior to what we do', even 'prior to

what we are', hence, 'the experience of life *needs* the experience of silence'.⁵⁷⁵

Reflecting a similar insight, Max Planck notes that science, like music and art, is essentially an attempt 'to solve or at least express' the *mystery* of nature, and the more we progress in any of these fields of endeavour 'the more we are brought into harmony with all nature itself'.⁵⁷⁶ The point here is that any manifestation of being is an embodiment of what is expressible and what is inexpressible, and any understanding of its significance arises from sensing the coherence between these different orders of experience.

Music reflects this coherence between the manifest and the unmanifest, between the world of the explicate and implicate order (to borrow David Bohm's terminology), because the meaning of a musical experience is not determined merely by the production of certain sounds. In fact, once engendered in a person's consciousness, the meaning of a piece of music can be evoked even in the absence of the sounds that normally display it. Moreover, this meaning is never fixed. Whether much loved or loathed, familiar sounds might repeatedly arouse similar thoughts and feelings, but, given a relatively free and open consciousness, there is nothing about the actual sounds of a musical composition that guarantees a particular response. Aaron Copland observes that, if asked 'Is there a meaning to music?', his answer would be 'Yes', but if asked whether he can state 'in so many words what the meaning is', his response to that question would be 'No.'⁵⁷⁷

The point I wish to highlight here is that the meaning of a musical experience is woven into a person's involvement with a present moment and, therefore, with a temporary situation, which means that music pertains to not only the character of a particular experience but also to that which is the source and animating power of *all* experiences. Heinrich Heine calls music 'a sort of nebulous mediator' between spirit and matter and refers to its essence as 'revelation'.⁵⁷⁸ However, music does not mediate between spirit and matter as if between two different worlds, rather, it expresses the indistinguishability between matter, expressed as sound, and that which gives rise to and encompasses all matter, expressed as silence. *Silence*, then, is both the source and the completion of music, and through our perception of this source and

completion we can sense the wholeness of reality and our participation in it.

Paul Hillier begins a book that discusses the music of Arvo Pärt with a paragraph that draws attention to silence as the source and completion of musical experiences, and what is remarkable about this passage is that it compares the relationship between music and silence with the relationship between life and death. Just as music is created out of silence and inevitably returns to it, a person's life begins and ends in the mystery of a time-and-space-less or spiritual order of being; and just as silence is the true matrix for understanding the meaning of a piece of music, a person's orientation towards death is the true matrix for understanding the meaning of her or his life. Here is how Hillier describes this idea.

All music emerges from silence, to which sooner or later it must return. At its simplest we may conceive of music as the relationship between sounds and the silence that surrounds them. Yet silence is an imaginary state in which all sounds are absent, akin perhaps to the infinity of time and space that surrounds us. We cannot ever hear utter silence, nor can we fully imagine such concepts as infinity and eternity. When we create music, we express life. But the source of music is silence, which is the ground of our musical being, the fundamental note of life. How we live depends on our relationship with death; how we make music depends on our relationship with silence.⁵⁷⁹

As an introduction to the music of Arvo Pärt, these comments about music and silence as a symbolic expression of life and death are particularly appropriate given the compositional style of Pärt's music. Although this style differs from both the traditional practices of Western music used for the last four hundred years and the revolutionary techniques of musical composition devised and developed throughout the twentieth century, it is a style that explicitly articulates a vision of the immanence of Absolute Spirit, and, accordingly, it articulates much of what I am trying to convey in this dissertation about the spirituality of being.

Pärt calls his style of composition 'tintinnabulation' in recognition of its affinity with the nature of 'ringing bells'. As Hillier points out, 'when a bell is struck, it continues to sound indefinitely: the ear cannot detect the point at which it ceases to vibrate'.⁵⁸⁰ The sound of bells, then, evokes an image of *sound within infinity*, and it is this image that Pärt embodies in his music through the use of specific compositional

procedures which he devised after many years of experimentation with other twentieth-century techniques of musical composition (most notably the serial techniques of Arnold Schoenberg mentioned briefly in chapter five). Pärt's method of composition centers on the use of a simple consonant musical triad (that is, a major or minor chord of three notes) as a kind of 'bell-like' medium within which or around which to articulate a musical experience. Essentially, the *tinntinnabuli* style derives from an interplay between two musical voices or melodic lines: one voice is derived from the fundamental triad being used and the other is derived from an abstract musical procedure of one kind or another, often, one of the eight medieval or ancient modes.⁵⁸¹ The relationship between these two voices is expressed in some specific way throughout a composition, and it is this specific and constant relationship which gives each piece of music its unique character. For example, the notes of the central triad may remain consistently above or below the notes of the adjoining voice, or there may be some pattern of alternation or inter-weaving between the voices.

Although extremely condensed, this description of Pärt's *tinntinnabuli* style of composition is sufficient to illustrate how it expresses the 'spirituality of being' that is depicted throughout this dissertation, for it is clear that Pärt considers the voice of the central triad or 'tonality' resonating throughout the composition to be a symbol for the presence of God as Absolute Spirit resonating throughout reality. Moreover, the symbolism implied here is not that of a mere representation of Spirit but that of an actual manifestation of Spirit, in keeping with the sacramental or iconic understanding of symbol (discussed briefly at the beginning of chapter three).⁵⁸² In the light of this 'centering' musical experience of ultimate significance, the voice of the adjoining melody is a manifestation of the world of subjective consciousness, the world of the explicate order that unfolds from and enfolds back into the implicate order of timeless-and-spaceless being.

That this deeply spiritual interpretation of *tinntinnabuli* music reflects Pärt's own perspective towards his music is evident from the report of a conversation between Pärt and Hillier in which Pärt compares the 'adjoining voice' to 'the daily egoistic life of sin and suffering' and likens the central voice to 'the objective realm

of forgiveness'. Also in this conversation, Pärt makes it clear that 'the two voices are in reality one voice' by endorsing the short formula ' $1 + 1 = 1$ ' as a succinct description not only of 'the kernel' of the tinntinnabuli style but also of that which 'precedes and dominates the actual process that underwrites each individual tinntinnabuli composition'.⁵⁸³

By referring to a condition of consciousness that 'precedes and dominates' the actual process of composing but which is not essentially different from that process, Pärt draws attention to the 'spirituality of being' in an explicit way, for he implies that the everyday events and experiences in a person's life (which include what he or she chooses 'to do' as a principal occupation) are best understood as different images, or actualizations of an order of consciousness that underlies and animates all of reality - just as any part of a holograph is an image or actualization of the wholeness it depicts. Thus, whereas David Bohm refers to this confluence between the world of the manifest and the world of the unmanifest in terms of a holomovement, Arvo Pärt refers to it as an experience of 'tintinnabulation', an experience which he describes as 'an area' where he 'wanders into' when he is 'searching for answers' in his life, his music, and his work.⁵⁸⁴

I suggest that what Pärt refers to when he speaks of 'wandering into' a mode of consciousness that reflects his tinntinnabuli style of composing is the same as what is described in this dissertation as a contemplative experience of the present moment: It is an experience of attunement with the trinitarian life that animates reality. In the light of this kind of experience, life events, work and the products of work, and the so-called 'quest' for answers are all forms of a single experience: there is no boundary between them. A person's *way of being* is her or his *way of doing*.

To describe this contemplative experience as one that a person can 'wander into' implies that a person can also 'wander out' of it. However, it is important to note here that the words 'in' and 'out' do not refer to conditions of being either 'inside' or 'outside', rather, they refer to conditions of being either 'in focus' or 'out of focus', 'in tune with' or 'out of tune with'; that is, they refer to *fluctuations of orientation and awareness of the ongoing confluence between the manifest and*

nonmanifest realms of consciousness. In the wholeness of reality there is no inside or outside. But when a person perceives an object or event as ultimately 'fixed' rather as part of what Bohm calls the 'flowing movement' between the explicate and implicate order (the holomovement), he or she 'misreads' reality and erects the illusory borders that delineate an inside and an outside. Bohm expresses this idea as follows:

I have said that in music, and in visual and other sensory experience, the implicate order is primary in that the sense of flowing movement is experienced *before* we analyze it into the elements which express that movement or display it. You may listen to music and later break it down into notes which you can display either in imagination or on a piece of paper. Ultimately, the same thing is true in vision, but we have become so used to fixing our attention on objects that we don't perceive this. We tend to see each object as fixed and separate, because we return to the same object (this tree, this rock) again and again. Therefore the flowing movement regenerates the same thing over and over, causing us to lose sight of the movement itself, except perhaps in rare instances when we look at a stream or the sky, where there are no fixed objects which can be focused on. But all our experience, including thought, begins in immediate awareness of this flowing movement. When we carry metaphysical thought to the point where it reflects only itself, it too turns into a flowing movement between opposites, such as the finite and the infinite. And if we experience thought and feeling, instead of naming and fixing them, feelings will flow into thoughts, thoughts into feelings.⁵⁸⁵

To understand the idea that Bohm expresses in the final sentence of this passage, namely, that it is possible to experience thoughts and feelings *without* naming and 'fixing' them, is to understand what it means 'to listen deeply' to what occurs in a present circumstance, and, accordingly, to understand what it means to be aware of the confluence between the expressible and the inexpressible. The point I wish to emphasize here is that there is nothing extraordinary about this kind of experience: It happens whenever people 'let go' of the compulsion to objectify every aspect of an experience, including their own sense of an individualistic identity. Although there is no denying that an obsession with objectifying everything grips contemporary cultural life, there are instances in which this grip is relaxed, as when a person gazes out over the ocean, or as Bohm observes above, at a stream or the sky. Such experiences, I believe, are *needed* for the overall health of our consciousness just as sleep is needed for our physical, mental, and emotional health, and one of the

most readily available ways of generating these present-centered experiences is music.

‘Music is the sole domain in which man realizes the present’, writes Igor Stravinsky. He adds: ‘The phenomenon of music is given to us with the sole purpose of establishing an order in things, including, and particularly, the coordination between *man* and *time*’.⁵⁸⁶ What Stravinsky means by this comment, in my opinion, is that music provides an opportunity for composers, performers, and listeners to experience a passage of time from the *centering* perspective of deep involvement with the present, and such a perspective is one that is truly capable of establishing ‘an order in things’ because, freed from the encumbrances of past experiences and future expectations, a person is able to delve deeply into a present experience, and, thereby, draw upon the infinite resources of participatory consciousness: What he or she ‘does’ is then nourished from a deep inner realm of being.

As a personal example, I can say that I am never more fully involved in the present, or more exhilarated by an activity, than when performing a piece of music and sense that the music ‘is playing itself’, that is, when I have ‘let-go’ of concerns about technique and other distractions and am able to listen deeply to and experience the music itself. Moreover, as a music teacher and ‘professional listener’, I am never more thrilled than when I sense this kind of ‘self-surrendering’ involvement in a student’s performance or at a concert of some kind. It is this kind of ‘self-forgetfulness’, I believe, that allows artists to perform great music again and again, over long periods of time, with increasing rather than fading enthusiasm, and as long as they have the required technique and remain ‘open’ to being fully involved with the music, their performances are capable of generating new insights and feelings.⁵⁸⁷

Before concluding these remarks about music as an instance of the spirituality of being, here is one other example of how an intense involvement with the present, or ‘deep-listening’, is expressed not through performing or listening but through composing.

Arvo Pärt’s *tinntinnabuli* style of composing exemplifies a ‘centering’ involvement with the present not only in the context of personal experience but also in the larger context of a present *historical* situation. As in many fields of endeavour,

the Western musical tradition was shaken at its foundations during the first part of the twentieth century. I can think of no better way to describe this situation than to borrow from the work of William Butler Yeats whose poem *The Second Coming* begins with these words: 'Turning and turning in the widening gyre, The falcon cannot hear the falconer; Things fall apart; *the centre cannot hold*; Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world'.⁵⁸⁸ In musical terms, the center that fell apart was 'tonality', or more precisely, the conventions that were used to express tonality that had been in place for over three hundred years. In its broadest musical meaning, tonality refers to the use of a single tone (the 'tonic') as a center or focal point to which all other notes in a particular organization of tones are related. In our Western musical tradition, tonality is achieved by using either *melodic* tonal relationships (as in Gregorian Chant, which developed and flourished in the medieval period) or by using more complex *harmonic* relationships, that is, vertical arrangements of tones in 'chords' and in chord progressions (as in the music which developed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and which continues to dominate popular music). The revolution in music that erupted in the early part of the twentieth century was marked by conscious efforts to banish all compositional procedures aimed at expressing tonality: hence, the term most often used to describe these efforts is 'atonality'.

Composers experimented with various methods of creating a significant musical expression without a tonal center in the traditional sense, but as any examination of the best of contemporary music shows, no effective musical experience is achieved without creating a central or 'centering' tonal focus of some kind. Pärt's *tinntinnabuli* music is a striking illustration of this *need* for a recognizable tonal center inasmuch as it re-establishes a strong sense of tonality without using the stereotypical techniques associated with previous compositional methods. Moreover, because he evolved this compositional style 'intuitively', out of an intense involvement with *present* musical conditions and nourished by deeply rooted inner resources, namely, the Christian spirituality of the Russian Orthodox Church, Pärt's

tinntinnabuli music also illustrates how work that flows from an experience of deep personal 'being' is not only creative and nurturing for oneself but for others as well, for it is undeniable that Pärt's music has had a significant impact in the world of contemporary art music, as Hillier points out in the following passage.

Performers of Pärt's tinntinnabuli works stand a good chance of experiencing something not so very common these days, but which used to be an essential ingredient of musical life in earlier times: the excitement of presenting new music to a wide audience and discovering that the lines of communication are completely and appreciatively open. Of course, Pärt is not the only composer of whom this can be said. But he is undoubtedly one of the leading exponents of what I have called 'abstract tonality', and it is thanks to him and to composers like him that the world of 'art' music has been rejuvenated in recent years and occasionally even enjoys popular esteem.⁵⁸⁹

After listening to a recording of Pärt's music, a close friend of mine, who is not a musician and who had not previously heard of Arvo Pärt, commented: 'It's like a soul breathing...Like one note that never ends'. As a reflection of Pärt's music, these comments suggest that the soul that breathes in and through it, the Spirit out of which it springs and which sustains it, is indistinguishable from the procedure used by the composer to give this Spirit a presence in the world of sound, the one note that never ends, the bell-like triad that permeates the music. In these comments, as in Pärt's music, I find an expression of what I mean when I refer to 'being' as a 'way of doing', for they remind me that true 'being' is rooted in the Absolute Spirit that encompasses everything and that truly creative and nurturing action not only flows from an awareness of this Spirit, it *is* this Spirit.

Catch only what you've thrown yourself, all is
mere skill and little gain;
but when you're suddenly the catcher of a ball
thrown by an eternal partner
with accurate and measured swing
towards you, to your center, in an arch
from the great bridgebuilding of God:
why catching then becomes a power -
not yours, a world's.

Rainer Maria Rilke⁵⁹⁰

Notes

1. Chuang-tzu, cited in Ram Dass and Mirabai Bush, *Compassion in Action: Setting Out on the Path of Service* (New York: Bell Tower, 1992), p. 240.
2. Aldous Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1970), p. vii.
3. The phrase in quotation marks is from Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's book *The Evolving Self* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1964), p. 183. This book is a sequel to Csikszentmihalyi's popular book *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience* (New York: Harper & Row, 1990). Both books explore the kind of universal experience Csikszentmihalyi calls 'flow', which is, essentially, an experience of the *happiness* that comes with being involved in an activity that is highly meaningful and enjoyable.
4. J. Krishnamurti, in J. Krishnamurti and David Bohm, *The Ending of Time* (New York: HarperCollins, 1985), pp. 229-230. Italics added.
5. A similar idea is expressed in Lous Heshusius, 'Freeing Ourselves from Objectivity: Managing Subjectivity or Turning Toward a Participatory Mode of Consciousness?', *Educational Researcher*, 23-3 (1994).
6. See *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, ed. John Bowker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 1048.
7. This interpretation of 'wu wei' appears in the 'Epilogue' of Huston Smith, *Forgotten Truth: The Common Vision of the World's Religions* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), p. 149.
8. Huston Smith, *The Illustrated World Religions* (New York, HarperCollins, 1994), p. 135.
9. Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, trans. Gia-Fu Feng and Jane English (New York: Random House, 1972), poem #48.
10. Shimon ben Gamliel, cited in Andrew Harvey, *The Essential Mystics: Selections from the World's Great Wisdom Traditions* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997), p. 101.

The quoted passage is from *Pirkei Avot* (the 'Chapters of the Fathers'), a book of rabbinic sayings compiled between 250 and 275 CE and regularly studied as part of the Jewish tradition of spirituality. Although the names of the various sages represented in this treatise are preserved in the text, little is known about them individually. I find the similarity between this passage from *Pirkei Avot* and the opening poem of *Tao-te Ching* particularly striking. Here is the Taoist poem.

[Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 1. See Appendix B, # 2.]

11. Ralph Waldo Emerson, 'Compensation', in *The World's Great Thinkers: The Social Philosophers* (New York: Random House, 1947), pp. 432, 443, 444. Italics added.
12. Deng Ming-Dao, *Everyday Tao: Living with Balance and Harmony* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), p. 15.
13. Smith, *Forgotten Truth*, p. 20.
14. David Bohm, 'The Enfolding-Unfolding Universe: A Conversation with David Bohm, conducted by Renee Weber', in *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), p. 72.
15. Ken Wilber, *Eye to Eye: The Quest for the New Paradigm* (Boston: Shambhala, 1996), p. 133.
16. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Perennial Library, 1975), p. 45.
17. Sarvepali Radhakrishnan, 'Mysticism and Ethics in Hindu Thought', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), p. 490.
18. Alfred North Whitehead, *Nature and Life* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1934), p. 305.
19. Ilya Prigogine, 'Time and the Unity of Knowledge', in *Teilhard and the Unity of Knowledge: The Georgetown University Centennial Symposium*, eds. Thomas King and James Salmon (Ramsey, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1983), p. 42.
20. Lewis Mumford, *The Transformations of Man* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1956), cited in Willis Harman, *Global Mind Change: The New Age Revolution in the Way We Think* (New York: Warner Books, 1990), p. 9, 115.
21. Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, 4 vols. (New York: American Book Company, 1937-1941).
22. Henryk Skolimowski, *The Participatory Mind: A New Theory of Knowledge and of the Universe* (London: Arkana, 1994), p. 71.
23. Skolimowski outlines what he calls 'the four great cycles of the Western Mind' in Chapter 5 of *The Participatory Mind* (pp. 109-146). It is interesting to note that, according to Skolimowski, the *Renaissance* (around 1450-1600) did not produce its own form of 'logos' and therefore was a kind of budding cosmology 'that did not make it', that is, it was essentially an 'interlude' (p. 128). He implies that the main reason for this was that the Renaissance period was a time that extolled individual achievements to an extreme degree, a mentality that suggested 'man is the measure of all things' (p. 132). However, given the

obsession with individualistic concerns that emerged in the modern period as a result of the application of the scientific-technical worldview in most areas of societal life (political, economic, educational, and cultural), the humanistic tendencies of the Renaissance might be best understood not as an 'interlude' between two contrasting worldviews but as a 'prelude' to the sensate culture of the modern era.

24. Fritjof Capra, *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1983), pp. 47, 15-17.

25. Ibid., p. 37.

26. Ibid., p. 41.

27. Marilyn Ferguson, *The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980's* (Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher, 1980), pp. 19, 29, 420.

28. Harman, *Global Mind Change*, p. 11.

29. Ibid., p. 168.

30. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, p. 305.

31. Roger Sperry, 'Changing Priorities', *Annual Review of Neuroscience* (1981), cited in Harman, *Global Mind Change*, p. 11.

32. Roger W. Sperry, 'Psychology's Mentalist Paradigm and the Religion/Science Tension', *American Psychologist*, 43 (1988), 607.

33. Kurt Danziger, *Constructing the Subject: Historical Origins of Psychological Research* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 193, 197, 192.

34. For an interesting discussion of how psychologists have always incorporated their own subjective propensities in their work, see William O'Donohue, 'The (Even) Bolder Model: The Clinical Psychologist as Metaphysician-Scientist-Practitioner', *American Psychologist*, 44 (1989), 1460-1468.

As one illustration of how metaphysical assumptions are inevitably enfolded within the conceptual backgrounds of both psychological investigators and their subjects, O'Donohue uses the following historical anecdote. In the 1930's, behavioral researchers discovered that continuous reinforcement schedules extinguish more easily than intermittent reinforcement schedules and referred to this phenomenon as 'Humphrey's paradox', a reference which suggests that, at the very least, they were surprised by their findings. A reasonable conjecture is that this surprise stemmed from the assumption that learning consists fundamentally in the 'stamping in of neuronal connections', in which case continuous reinforcement ought to work more effectively than intermittent schedules. The point here is that some form of speculative belief operating in the conceptual background of the

researchers played an important role not only in the formation of the hypothesis being tested but also in the determination of the significance of the results achieved through experimentation (p. 1463).

35. I am indebted to Raimon Panikkar for this distinction between 'individual' and a 'person'. See Raimundo Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity: The Monk as Universal Archetype* (New York: Orbis Books, 1973), p. 69.

36. Harman, *Global Mind Change*, p. 34.

37. Quotations in this brief sketch of Sperry's theory are from the following sources:

- Roger W. Sperry, 'The Future of Psychology', *American Psychologist*, 50 (1995), 506.
- Roger W. Sperry, 'Psychology's Mentalist Paradigm', 606, 611.
- Roger W. Sperry, 'The Impact and Promise of the Cognitive Revolution', *American Psychologist*, 48 (1993), 880.
- Roger W. Sperry, 'Psychology's Mentalist Paradigm', 609.

38. With regard to the so-called 'science-religion controversy', it should be noted that in 1981 the National Academy of Science gave official sanction to the *separation* of psychology and religion by passing a resolution stating that 'religion and science are separate and mutually exclusive realms of human thought whose presentation in the same context leads to misunderstanding of both scientific theory and religious belief'. An overview of the history of the psychology of religion is provided by R.L. Gorsuch, 'Psychology of Religion', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 39 (1988), 201-221.

Apart from the historical details it recounts, Gorsuch's article is informative inasmuch as it illustrates the extent to which psychological studies about religion deliberately exhibit the mentality and methods of materialist research. For example, he writes that it is important for psychological research to exclude 'value-laden interpretive terms' which direct 'the discussion from psychology to philosophy' (p. 214). Unfortunately, from my point of view, this characterization of religion is typical of other major contributions to the psychology of religion, such as E.L. Worthington, 'Religious Faith Across the Life-Span: Implications for Counseling and Research', *The Counseling Psychologist*, 17 (1989), 555-612; and A.E. Bergin, 'Values and Religious Issues in Psychotherapy and Mental Health', *American Psychologist*, 46 (1991), 394-403.

On a brighter note, S.L. Jones draws attention to the fact that psychology's essentially inactive stance toward the phenomenon of religion is out of step with the contemporary philosophy of science which 'breaks down the radical demarcation between science and other forms of human knowing and action' (p. 184). Thus, he calls for 'a more explicit exploration' of the interface between psychology and religion, as suggested in the following passage.

We must not lose our understanding of how science and professional practice...are infused with metaphysical, moral, and religious belief. If psychological research and practice are going to be maximally effective in understanding and improving the human condition, psychologists would be well-advised to explicitly explore the connections of their work with the deepest levels of our human commitments. Even if we think about our religious beliefs as biases that we bring to psychological science and practice, we must come to realize first that such biases are intrinsic to our professional activities, in that it is our biases that allow us to perceive and understand anything at all, and second, that the most limiting and dangerous biases are those that are unexamined and hence exert their effect in an unreflective manner. (p. 197)

See S.L. Jones, 'A Constructive Relationship for Religion with the Science and Profession of Psychology: Perhaps the Boldest Model Yet', *American Psychologist*, 49 (1994), 184-199.

39. Quotations in this sketch of what Sperry views as the main conceptual consequences of his theory are from the following sources.

- Sperry, 'Psychology's Mentalist Paradigm', pp. 610-612.
- Sperry, 'The Impact and Promise of the Cognitive Revolution', p. 883.

40. Sperry, 'Psychology's Mentalist Paradigm', p. 879.

41. Although the term 'metaphysics' is often used to refer to anything 'supra-physical' or anything that transcends the limitations of ordinary thought, I am using it here in its traditional philosophical meaning of referring to human efforts aimed at understanding the nature of 'being as such' in contrast to the study of 'being under some particular aspect'. This use of the term, then, points towards processes of trying to understand 'first principles', that is, principles that are found 'in no higher or more complete generalizations available to the human intellect by means of its own natural powers'. See Dagobert D. Runes, ed., *Dictionary of Philosophy* (Totowa NJ: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1970), p. 196.

42. Harman, *Global Mind Change*, p. 37.

43. Ken Wilber, 'The Great Chain of Being', *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 33 (1993), 53.

44. William Bevan, 'Contemporary Psychology: A Tour Inside the Onion', *American Psychologist*, 46 (1991), pp. 476, 475.

45. Charles Tolman, 'Sumus Ergo Sum: The Ontology of Self and How Descartes Got it Wrong', in *Toward a Psychology of Persons*, (Mahway, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998), pp. 3-24.

46. Bohm, 'The Enfolding-Unfolding Universe', p. 94.

47. Raimon Panikkar (Speaker), *The Silence of Life: The John Main Seminar, 1996* (London: Cassette Recording, Medio Media - The World Community for Christian Meditation, 1996), Tape #6. Also, see Raimon Panikkar, 'A Self-Critical Dialogue', in *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar*, ed. Joseph Prabhu (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), p. 265.
48. Sir Arthur Eddington, cited in *Quantum Questions: Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), p. 184.
49. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, pp. 68-71.
50. Emerson, 'Compensation', p. 445.
51. David Bohm, *Fragmentation and Wholeness in Science and Society* (Transcript of a Seminar sponsored by the Science Council of Canada: Ottawa: Science Council of Canada, 1984), p. 12.
52. David Bohm, 'The Physicist and the Mystic - Is a Dialogue Between Them Possible? A Conversation with David Bohm Conducted by Renée Weber [and] Edited by Emily Sellon', in *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), p. 196.
53. As implied in my remarks, I understand 'pluralism' to mean 'a recognition that there may be several centres of intelligibility', as noted in Panikkar, 'A Self-Critical Dialogue', p. 252.
54. Danah Zohar, *The Quantum Self* (London: Flamingo, 1991), pp. 213-214.
55. Capra, *The Turning Point*, p. 31.
56. David Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning: A Weekend of Dialogue With David Bohm* (London: Routledge, 1985), p. 3.
57. Ibid., p. 7.
58. A popular overview of the 'new physics' is Fritjof Capra, *The Tao of Physics* (New York: Bantam, 1977). However, because its influence spreads throughout many disciplines of inquiry, expositions of how the insights of contemporary developments in physics apply to certain fields of interest abound. For instance: Larry Dossey, *Space, Time, and Medicine* (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), and Danah Zohar, *The Quantum Self*.
59. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, pp. 4-6.
60. Ibid., pp. 6-7.
61. Ibid., p. 7.

62. Ibid., p. 8.

63. Emerson, 'Compensation', p. 432.

64. The bicycle riding example Bohm uses derives from the work of Michael Polanyi: see Michael Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension* (New York: Doubleday, 1966).

65. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 17.

66. Useful summaries of postmodern scholarship include the following:

Thomas Docherty, ed. *Postmodernism: A Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 1-31.

William Pinar, William M. Reynolds, Patrick Slattery, and Peter M. Taubman, *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses* (New York: Peter Lang, 1995), pp. 450-514.

Barry Smart, 'Postmodern Social Theory', in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, ed. Byron Turner (Cambridge Mass & Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 396-428.

John Storey, *An Introductory Guide to Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (Athens Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1993), pp. 154-180.

67. Kenneth J. Gergen, 'Exploring the Postmodern: Perils or Potentials?', *American Psychologist*, 49 (1994), p. 412.

68. Ibid., p. 413.

69. Michel Foucault, 'Politics and Ethics: An Interview', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), pp. 375-376.

70. Nancy Fraser and Linda Nicholson, 'Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter between Feminism and Postmodernism', in *Feminism/Postmodernism*, ed. Linda Nicholson (New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 29. This paper is also presented in *Postmodernism: A Reader*, ed. T. Docherty, pp. 415-432. For information pertaining to Chodorow's ideas about mothering see Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).

71. Adrienne Rich, *Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence* (London: Onlywomen Press, 1980).

72. Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982).

73. Terry Lovell, 'Feminist Social Theory', *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, ed. Bryan Turner (Cambridge Mass., and Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 308-310.

74. Steven Seidman, *Contested Knowledge: Social Theory in the Postmodern Era* (Cambridge Mass., and Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), p. 245.

75. Ibid., p. 247.

76. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

77. Seidman, *Contested Knowledge*, p. 247.

78. Fraser and Nicholson, 'Social Criticism without Philosophy', pp. 34-35.

79. Ibid., p. 35.

80. Panikkar, 'A Self-Critical Dialogue', p. 252.

81. Harold Coward, *Pluralism: Challenge to World Religions* (Maryknoll NY.: Orbis Books, 1985), p. 107.

82. Panikkar, 'A Self-Critical Dialogue', p. 245.

83. Werner Heisenberg, cited in *Quantum Questions*, ed. K. Wilber, p. 37. The 'pointless philosophy' to which Heisenberg refers is Logical Positivism.

84. Chuang-tzu (ca. 370-286 BCE) clearly articulated an intrinsic relationship between order and chaos when he wrote the following words:

Consequently: he who wants to have right without wrong,
Order without disorder,
Does not understand the principles
Of heaven and earth.
He does not know how
Things hang together.

(Chuang-tzu, cited in Dossey, *Space, Time & Medicine*, p. 85.)

85. Cited in Dossey, *Space, Time & Medicine*, p. 82.

86. Prigogine, 'Time and the Unity of Knowledge', p. 35.

87. Dossey, *Space, Time, and Medicine*, p. 89.

88. Joseph E. Earley, 'Far-From-Equilibrium Thermodynamics and Process Thought', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY: State University of New York, 1986), p. 255.

89. Dick Hebdige, *Hiding in the Light* (London: Comedia, 1988), p. 181.

90. In a paper read at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society in 1953, Herbert Blumer introduced the idea of 'sensitizing concepts' to reflect his observation that 'definitive' concepts, such as those used in the natural sciences, are inappropriate to the study of our 'natural social world of everyday experience'. Because social phenomena appear 'in the form of distinctive and unique happenings or situations' rather than in the form of what is common to a class of objects, effective social inquiry requires the use of concepts which 'suggest' rather than predetermine the direction of inquiry. As Blumer notes, because what is 'inferred' through the use of any given concept 'shapes up in a different way in each empirical instance', inquirers 'are not able to rely on fixed objective expressions to make the inference'. Thus, the kind of concepts needed are sensitizing rather than prescriptive - concepts which provide 'a general sense of reference and guidance in approaching empirical instances'. See Chapter 8 in Herbert Blumer, *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method* (Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1969), pp. 140-152. Also, Herbert Blumer, 'What is Wrong with Social Theory', *The American Sociological Review*, XIX (1954), 140-152.

91. Jean-Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), p. xxiv.

92. John Storey, *An Introductory Guide to Cultural Theory and Popular Culture*, p. 155.

93. Norman K. Denzin, 'The Postmodern Sensibility', in *Studies in Symbolic Interaction 15*, ed. Norman K. Denzin (Greenwich Conn.: JAI Press, 1993), p. 179.

94. Michel Foucault, 'What is Enlightenment?', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), pp. 32-50.

95. Shunryu Suzuki, *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind: Informal Talks on Zen Meditation and Practice* (New York: Weatherhill, 1970/1980), pp. 21-22.

96. David Loy, 'Avoiding the Void: The Lack of Self in Psychotherapy and Buddhism', *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 24-2 (1992), pp. 173, 170. In commenting further on the idea of self-forgetting, Loy notes that 'what we fear as nothingness is not really nothingness, for that is the perspective of a sense-of-self anxious about losing its grip on itself. According to Buddhism, letting-go of myself and merging with that no-thing-ness leads to something else: when consciousness stops trying to catch its own tail, I become no-thing, and discover that I am everything - or, more precisely, that I can be anything' (pp. 173-174).

97. Aldous Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. 184.

98. *Ibid.*, p. 189.

99. Rabbi Jacob, from *Pirke Avot*. Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 102.

100. Arthur Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World* (Ann Arbor Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1968), p. 91.
101. See Jacques Derrida, 'Discussion: Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences', in *The Structuralist Controversy*, eds. R. Macksey and E. Donato (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p. 271.
102. Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1990), p. 251.
103. Mark Poster, *The Second Media Age* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), pp. 57, 93.
104. S. Suzuki, *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind*, p. 115.
105. Johannes B. Metz, *Poverty of Spirit*, trans. John Drury (Paramus NJ.: Newman Press, 1968), p. 45. The 'Sermon on the Mount' is found in *The New Testament*, Matthew, 5.
106. Barry Smart notes how postmodern writers such as Foucault, Derrida, Lyotard, Baudrillard, and Vattimo 'exemplify a radical reflexivity in their analytic practice,' submitting 'the complex assumptions, conceptions, and procedures intrinsic to modern forms of analysis to a process of unremitting critical reflection'. He notes further that, insofar as postmodern thought is a reflexive challenge to received ideas, it constitutes *part of modernity* - a point Lyotard insists on. (See Barry Smart, 'Postmodern Social Theory', p. 422.)

For a succinct and useful overview of the idea that modern theories and the practices they imply exert powerful and often undesirable forms of personal and social control, see Foucault's inaugural lecture to the College de France: Michel Foucault, 'The Discourse on Language', in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Pantheon, 1972), pp. 215-237. Foucault's principal thesis in this lecture is that the various discourses of modernity are forms of cognitive understanding that impose order within a field of knowledge by means of controls or systems of exclusion, in effect, through the operation of a will to power. He writes: 'In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its powers and its dangers, to cope with chance events, to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality' (p. 216). This thesis suggests that order is not inherent in discourses but rather comes about through the imposition of organizing principles and activities.

For example, Foucault discusses several 'external' constraints on discourse such as 'prohibition', 'rejection or division', and most notably, the 'opposition between true or false' as expressed in 'the will to truth'. By suggesting that the 'will to truth' operates as a form of discourse *control*, Foucault is suggesting, in line with Nietzschean thought, that there are many possible avenues to truth-as-such, which is to say that the knowledge which expresses truth is irrevocably a matter of interpretation rather than of direct correspondence. With regard to 'internal' discourse controls, Foucault discusses three: the proliferation of

‘commentaries’, the principle of ‘authorship’, and the organization of disciplines. With regard to philosophical themes that reinforce discourse controls, he also mentions three: subjectivity, experience, and mediation.

Perhaps the major implication Foucault draws from his discussion of philosophical themes that reinforce discourse control is that, in spite of appearances to the contrary, there is a kind of fear of genuine discourse in our contemporary Western society, a fear which he calls a ‘profound logophobia’ (p. 228). In his estimation, this fear gives rise to controls which remove discourse participants from experiencing the full impact of their thoughts and language, or as he puts it, the ‘disorderly buzzing of discourse’ (p. 229). The task Foucault sets for himself is to confront this fear of uninhibited discourse by analyzing it ‘in its conditions, its activity and its effects’, and to accomplish this goal, he puts forward three decisions which he claims resist prevailing intellectual assumptions about truth and discourse. These decisions amount to a manifesto of his own intellectual agenda and constitute a threefold resolve (a) to question our will to truth, (b) to restore to discourse its character as an *event*, and (c) to abolish the sovereignty of the signifier, that is, to invalidate the assumption that any formulation of knowledge can constitute an unassailable category of thought and/or action (p. 229).

107. Foucault, ‘Two Lectures’, in *Culture / Power / History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, eds. Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 81. Italics added.

108. Ibid., p. 80.

109. See Barry Smart, ‘Postmodern Social Theory’, pp. 415-418. The ideas of Vattimo sketched here in brief are outlined fully in Gianni Vattimo, *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Post-modern Culture* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), as well as in Gianni Vattimo, *The Transparent Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992).

110. The three citations in this sentence are from the following sources:

- Bede Griffiths, cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 216.
- Erwin Schroedinger, ‘The Mystic Vision’, in *Quantum Questions*, ed. Ken Wilber, p. 97.
- Pinar et. al., *Understanding Curriculum*, pp. 7-8.

111. Arthur Eddington, from ‘Beyond the Veil of Physics’, cited in *Quantum Questions*, ed. Ken Wilber, pp. 180-181. Italics added.

112. Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon and Man*, p. 151.

113. Dossey, *Space, Time, & Medicine*, p. 97.

114. Zohar, *The Quantum Self*, pp. 218-219.

115. Bohm, *Fragmentation and Wholeness*, p. 8.
116. Fritjof Capra, in F. Capra and D. Steindl-Rast with Thomas Matus, *Belonging to the Universe* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), p. xii.
117. Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, trans. William Weaver (San Diego CA: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1974), pp. 85-86.
118. Ibid., pp. 5-6.
119. Ibid., p. 137.
120. Bohm, 'Fragmentation and Wholeness', pp. 16-17.
121. Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, pp. 103-104.
122. Wolfgang Pauli, cited in *Quantum Questions*, ed. Ken Wilber, p. 163.
123. Panikkar, *The Silence of Life*, Tape # 6.
124. *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, ed. John Bowker, p. 461.
125. Wilber, 'The Great Chain of Being', p. 54.
126. Emerson, 'Compensation', p. 444.
127. Smith, *Forgotten Truth*, p. 18.
128. Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936/1966), p. 226. Lovejoy identifies the author of this quote simply as 'a highly Romantic and optimistic lover of paradox of our own day'.
129. Alexander Pope, from *Essay on Man* (1734), cited in Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', p. 60.
130. Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', pp. 24, 31, 315, 49.
131. Plato, *Timaeus*, trans. H.D.P. Lee (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1965), pp. 42-43.
132. Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', pp. 155, 55.
133. Ibid., p. 332. Lovejoy writes: 'The world of concrete existence, then, is no impartial transcript of the realm of essence; and it is no translation of pure logic into temporal terms - such terms being themselves, indeed, the negation of pure logic'. My comments concerning this observation are included at the end of this section.

134. Ibid., pp. 332-333.
135. Ibid., pp. 58-59, 55-56, 235.
136. Ibid., pp. 61, 63.
137. Macrobius, from a commentary on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, cited in Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', p. 63.
138. Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', pp. 83, 90.
139. Ibid., pp. 97-98.
140. Ibid., pp. 155, 158, 160.
141. Ibid., p. 183.
142. Ibid., pp. 189, 206-207.
143. Abbadie, from *Traité de la vérité de la religion chrétienne*, first published in 1684. Cited in Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', p. 187.
144. Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', pp. 228, 231.
145. Ibid., p. 231.
146. Ibid., pp. 231-236, 244, 255.
147. Ibid., pp. 257-258, 259 (*italics added*), 261-262.
148. Ibid., p. 302.
149. Ibid., pp. 293-294.
150. F. Schleiermacher, from *Monologen*. Cited in Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', p. 310.
151. F. von Schlegel, from *Athenaeum*. Cited in Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', p. 307.
152. Lovejoy, 'The Great Chain of Being', p. 307.
153. Ibid., pp. 304, 307, 329.
154. Ibid., pp. 329, 154, 332.

155. Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy, Volume 1, Greece and Rome, Part 1* (Garden City NY.: Image Books, 1962), p. 59.

156. Ibid., p. 59.

157. There is, of course, a striking similarity between the depiction of 'logos' as the universal law immanent in all things and the concept of 'Tao' in Taoism which refers to 'the source from which all appearance derives, the unproduced Producer of all that is, and the guarantor of its stability and regularity' (*The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, ed. John Bowker, p. 950).

158. Wilber, 'The Great Chain of Being', p. 54.

159. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, pp. 124, 126-127.

160. Smith, *Forgotten Truth*, pp. 41-42.

161. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, pp. 132-133.

162. Wilber's discussion of the idea of the three 'eyes' of knowing, or orientations towards the world, acknowledges that it is a prominent feature of the work of the thirteenth century Christian philosopher, mystic, and saint, Bonaventura (1221-1274 CE), who reiterated thoughts of an earlier theologian, Hugh of St. Victor (ca. 1096-1142 CE).

163. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, pp. xiii-xv, 7.

164. Ibid., pp. 21, 8.

165. Ibid., pp. 62-63, 71.

166. Ibid., p. 292.

167. Ibid., pp. 305, 313.

168. Loy, 'Avoiding the Void', p. 174.

169. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, p. 159.

170. Ibid., pp. 296, 127 (italics added), 289.

171. Smith, *Forgotten Truth*, p. 20.

172. As I ponder the idea of objects losing their definition when bathed in light, several paintings come to mind, most notably, several by J.M.W. Turner. See John Walker, *Turner* (New York: Abrams, 1976); in particular, 'Sunrise, With A Boat Between Headlands' (colorplate 27), 'Norham Castle, Sunrise' (colorplate 29), 'Val D'Aosta' (colorplate 30), 'A

Landscape With A River And A Bay In The Distance' (colorplate 31), and (my personal favourite) 'Boats At Sea' (colorplate 53).

173. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, p. 219.

174. A brief note about Koestler's pessimism is in order because it points towards a potentially negative aspect of adopting the hierarchical model of reality, namely, the excessive and inappropriate use of instrumentalistic rationality to deal with problems of human 'consciousness' (a topic which I address specifically at the end of Chapter 7.)

As outlined in *Janus: A Summing Up* (London: Pan Books, 1979), Koestler's pessimism about the prospects of humanity stems from his belief that within the human brain there is a chronic conflict between 'the new brain which endowed man with his reasoning powers, and the archaic old brain, governed by instinct and emotion.' As a result of this conflict between reason and emotion, he suggests, humankind is 'a mentally unbalanced species, with a built-in paranoid streak, mercilessly revealed by its past and present history' (p. 274). The only 'alternative to despair' that Koestler envisions is to try to create 'a society composed of autonomous individuals...immunized against the hypnotic effects of propaganda and thought-control, and protected against their own suggestibility as 'belief-accepting animals'. However, creating such a society 'can only be done by *tampering* with human nature', which, for Koestler, amounts to disseminating 'mental stabilizers' (that is, pills) which people would supposedly accept 'not by coercion but by enlightened self-interest' (pp. 104-105; italics added).

What most disturbs me about Koestler's 'alternative' is its reliance on instrumentalistic rationality, that is, its assumption that the 'solution' for the ills of humanity is a matter of maintaining proper cause-and-effect, that is, mechanistic connections. Although mechanism (which assumes relatively stable, one-to-one, linear-like connections) accounts for certain ways in which phenomena are related, the suggestion unfolded throughout this study is that it cannot account for *basic* forms of relationship because, in reality, *everything is related*, and therefore, specific expressions of relationship always involve *context*, that is, always involve an expression of consciousness that is unique to a given moment and a given situation.

175. Koestler, *Janus: A Summing Up*, pp. 301, 27, 57, 302. Koestler first introduced the concept of the holon in his book *The Ghost in the Machine* (London: Pan Books, 1967).

176. *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, ed. John Bowker, p. 1058.

177. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, p. 100. The idea of development consisting of a series of progressively autonomous stages driven by activities oriented toward either integration (inclusion) or independence (separation) is, of course, a prominent feature of psychological literature, characteristic not only of Piaget's theory of cognitive development and the many theories based on it, such as Kohlberg's theory of moral development, but also of psychoanalytic object relations theory. Any reputable text on developmental psychology

explains the work of Piaget and Kohlberg, and for an overview of Object Relations Theory, see N.G. Hamilton, *Self and Others: Object Relations Theory in Practice* (Northvale NJ.: Jason Aronson, 1990).

178. Koestler, *Janus*, p. 231.

179. Lev Vygotsky, *Thought and Language*, ed. A. Kozulin (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986) pp. 140, 113.

180. Lawrence Kohlberg, 'Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach', in *Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues* ed. T. Lickona (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), pp. 31-53.

181. In a 1973 study, Fishkin, Keniston, and MacKinnon report that 'not one of the subjects studied employed moral reasoning that was exclusively rated at any single level of development'. See Fishkin, J., Keniston, K., and MacKinnon, C., 'Moral Reasoning and Political Ideology', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27, (1973), 114. Any reputable textbook in Developmental Psychology contains a discussion of Kohlberg's work which includes a summary of critical responses to it.

182. Paul D. Crawford, 'How Do Adolescents Determine the Right Things to Do?', Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Victoria, 1995.

183. D.C. Phillips, *Philosophy, Science and Social Inquiry* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987), p. 182.

184. Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. 59.

185. Deng Ming-Dao, *Everyday Tao*, p. 15.

186. Koestler, *Janus*, pp. 304, 89-90, 77-78.

187. S. Milgram, *Obedience to Authority* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), pp. 131, 188.

188. Capra, *The Turning Point*, p. 42.

189. Paul Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation in Our Technical Society*, ed. J. M. Thomas (Macon GA.: Mercer University press, 1988), p. 42.

190. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, pp. 204-206.

191. Goerge Santayana, Sonnet VII, from *The Complete Poems of George Santayana: A Critical Edition*, ed. William G. Holzberger (London: Associated University Presses, 1979), p. 94.

192. David Steindl-Rast, in Capra, Steindl-Rast, & Matus, *Belonging to the Universe*, pp. 41-42.

193. Matthew Fox, *A Spirituality Named Compassion and the Healing of the Global Village, Humpty Dumpty and Us* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979), pp. 60-61, 41.

194. Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1976). Originally published 1904-5.

195. Loy, 'Preparing for Something that Never Happens: The Means/Ends Problem in Modern Culture', *International Studies in Philosophy* XXVI/4 (1994), p. 42.

196. Fox, *A Spirituality Named Compassion*, p. 61.

197. This anecdote derives from the research of William Damon as described in *The Moral Child* (New York: Free Press, 1988). It is cited in John W. Santrock, *Adolescence: An Introduction*, Fifth Edition (Dubuque IA: WCB: Brown & Benchmark, 1993), p. 450.

198. Mahmud Shabestari (ca. 1250-1320 CE). Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, pp. 163-164. The similarity between the insights of this poem, written around seven hundred years ago by an Islamic mystic, and those of the Christian poet and artist, William Blake (1757-1827), as expressed in the well-known words cited below, is remarkable. Both poems, I believe, beautifully illustrate that several of the major themes I am trying to elaborate in this study, such as the fundamental wholeness of reality, the interdependence of all beings, and the spiritual nature of reality, are really different ways of expressing the same idea.

To see a World in a Grain of Sand
And a Heaven in a Wild Flower,
Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand
And Eternity in an hour...

A Skylark wounded in the wing,
A Cherubim does cease to sing...
The Poison of the Honey Bee
Is the Artist's Jealousy...
The Bleat, the Bark, Bellow & Roar
Are Waves that Beat on Heaven's Shore...

William Blake, from 'Auguries of Innocence' (written about 1803).

199. Edwin Schroedinger, 'The Mystic Vision', in *Quantum Questions*, ed. Ken Wilber, p. 97.

200. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, pp. 1-3.

201. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, p. 7.
202. Neil Postman, *Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology* (New York: Vintage, 1993), p. 71.
203. Max Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* (New York: Seabury Press, 1974).
204. Ursula Franklin, *The Real World of Technology* (Concord Ont.: Anansi, 1990), p. 24.
205. Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*, pp. 221, 36, 224.
206. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 4.
207. Ibid., p. 8.
208. Bohm, 'The Enfolding-Unfolding Universe', pp. 56-57.
209. The quoted words in this paragraph are from the following sources: David Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (London: Routledge, 1980/1995), p. 151; Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 13; Bohm, 'The Enfolding-Unfolding Universe', p. 72.
210. Bohm, 'The Enfolding-Unfolding Universe', pp. 72-73. Italics added.
211. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 10.
212. Ken Wilber, ed., *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes* (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), p. 6.
213. In one interview ('The Physicist and the Mystic', *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes*) Bohm expresses a preference for the term 'holoflux' over holomovement because the word 'movement' implies motion from place to place and flux does not. He defines holoflux as that which 'includes the ultimately flowing nature of what is, and also of that which forms therein'. However, Bohm keeps using the term holomovement in spite of this stated preference. To avoid confusion, I am using only the term holomovement.
214. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 12.
215. Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, p. 48.
216. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 30.
217. Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, pp. 198-200.
218. Ken Dychtwald, 'Reflections on the Holographic Paradigm', in *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), p. 107.

219. Ibid., p. 108.
220. From Albert Einstein, '*Ideas and Opinions*' (New York: Crown Publishers, 1954). Cited in *Quantum Questions*, ed. Ken Wilber, p. 107.
221. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, 'Beauty Will Save the World', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), p. 625.
222. Eugene T. Gendlin, *Focusing* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1978).
223. John Welwood, 'The Holographic Paradigm and the Structure of Experience', in *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), pp. 128-129.
224. William James, *The Principles of Psychology* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), p. 247.
225. Ibid., p. 247.
226. Welwood, 'The Holographic Paradigm and the Structure of Experience', pp. 132, 134, 131-132.
227. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 84.
228. Ibid., pp. 84-85.
229. Ibid., pp. 75-78.
230. Ibid., pp. 87-91.
231. Bohm, 'The Physicist and the Mystic', p. 194.
232. Ibid., p. 194.
233. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Heart of Matter* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), pp. 75-76.
234. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, pp. 95, 94.
235. Ibid., pp. 94-95, 107.
236. Ibid., p. 107.
237. Ibid., p. 34.
238. Larry Dossey, *Meaning & Medicine* (New York: Bantam Books, 1992), p. 252.

239. David Bohm, 'Meaning and Information', in *The Search for Meaning*, ed. Paavo Pylkkanen (Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, England: Crucible, 1989), p. 51.
240. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 175. Italics added.
241. Skolimowski, *The Participatory Mind*, pp. 112, 9, 109.
242. Ibid., pp. 6, 32, 8-9, 32, 112. A schematic representation of Skolimowski's model of 'the three minds' appears on p. 32.
243. Ibid., pp. 26-38.
244. Ibid., pp. 114, 81, 85, 79, 88, 85.
245. Ibid., pp. 86, 115, 88-89, 103.
246. Ibid., pp. 103, 107.
247. Ibid., p. 101.
248. Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*, pp. 300-301.
249. Ibid., pp. 258-259. The term 'convergent integration' is used by Julian Huxley in his introduction to *The Phenomenon of Man* as a way of describing Teilhard de Chardin's idea that all phenomena ('world-stuff') 'rolls up' or 'folds in' upon itself 'both locally and in its entirety' (p. 15).
250. Skolimowski identifies the following philosophers as belonging to the category of 'philosophy as creation': the early Greek philosophers as well as Socrates and Plato, Berkeley, Descartes, Galileo, Kant, Hegel, and Marx. Those he identifies as belonging to the category of 'philosophy as justification' include Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, Locke 'and all the variety of empiricists' and 'present-day analytical philosophers'. See *The Participatory Mind*, pp. 366-368.
251. Ibid., p. 353.
252. Ibid., p. 251.
253. With regard to the religious-like fervour of Skolimowski's prose, it is informative to note that the closing words of *The Participatory Mind* are, in fact, 'a prayer to the universe' (p.383).
254. Ibid., p. 382.
255. Ibid., p. 378.

256. D.T. Suzuki, *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist* (New York: Perennial Library, 1971), p. 126.
257. Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. 184.
258. Ibid., pp. 188-189.
259. J. Krishnamurti, *The Book of Life: Daily Meditations with Krishnamurti* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995). There are no page numbers in this book. The quotation is found on the page identified as 'February 1'.
260. Dossey, *Space, Time, and Medicine*, pp. 54-55.
261. Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. 188.
262. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, p. 84.
263. Heshusius, 'Freeing Ourselves from Objectivity', p. 16.
264. The claim that a 'lack' of somatic knowing was considered 'strange and unreliable' prior to the Scientific Revolution is made and supported in another book, co-edited by Lous Heshusius and Keith Ballard. This book focuses directly on the efficacy of integrating bodily and emotive ways of knowing and contains essays by various scholars which describe 'the events and emotions associated with changing their fundamental beliefs about what it means to do research' from a positivist to an interpretive or qualitative orientation. In their concluding remarks, the editors offer the following observation: 'When emotive and somatic life were repressed to let reason and rationality reign, human reasoning was propelled into overdrive, rallying toward certainty in ways that have made us perhaps the most uncertain and chaotic civilization'. See Lous Heshusius, and Keith Ballard, eds., *From Positivism to Interpretivism and Beyond: Tales of Transformation in Educational and Social Research (The Mind-Body Connection)* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996), pp. 5, 171.
265. Heshusius, 'Freeing Ourselves from Objectivity', pp. 16-17.
266. In *The Real World of Technology*, Ursula Franklin writes that 'we badly need an expanded concept of justice and fairness that takes mortgaging the future into account' (p. 122). She observes further that decisions made on the basis of a 'pragmatic rationale' may 'hide the value judgments involved in particular technological stances' (p. 123). Thus, as a society we have to learn to explore issues more in terms of *principle* rather than sheer practicality. As an example she makes the following observation which supports the contention that the industrial-technological complex of modern societies, largely driven by the profit-motive of capitalism, is a significant contributor to the present ecological crisis.

Look at the size of North American newspapers. Look, for instance, at the *Toronto Star*. Its mere size is a question of justice for me. One needs to ask, "Who has given

anyone the right to cut down trees and destroy a habitat for the sake of a double-page advertisement for cars?" These are things that in a caring world cannot be condoned. (p. 121)

Franklin expands her call for a more principled awareness of everyday practices by drawing attention to the fact that '*language* is a fine barometer of values and priorities', and 'as such it deserves careful attention' when involved in discourse related to technology and culture, and, I would add, when trying to develop a sense of how a certain worldview influences action. Consider, for example, a hypothetical discussion about an oil drilling operation in arctic waters: depending on their value orientations, some individuals would speak of the need for technology to overcome the obstacle of 'ice-infested waters', while others would speak of the environmental havoc caused by 'rig-infested oceans' (p. 124). Each of these points of view clash with the other, and my point here is that there is an urgent need to develop a sensitivity toward the implications of the way we speak, for our words display our values and, at present, it is difficult to speak (and write) in a way that truly honours the wholeness of reality and does not reflect the fragmented and fragmenting worldview of science and technology.

267. Heshusius, 'Freeing Ourselves from Objectivity', pp. 17-18.

268. Loy, 'Avoiding the Void', pp. 173-175.

269. Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*, p. 35.

270. Ibid., p. 262.

271. Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. 21.

272. Plotinus. Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 135.

273. E. Herrigel, *Zen in the Art of Archery* (New York: Vintage, 1971), p. 85.

274. Huston Smith, *The Illustrated World's Religions*, pp. 146.

275. Fazlur Rahman, 'The Qur'an', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), pp. 260-271.

276. Fazlur Rahman, "Islam," Microsoft (R) Encarta. Copyright (c) 1994 Microsoft Corporation. Copyright (c) 1994 Funk & Wagnalls Corporation.

277. From the *Bhagavad-gita* 3, trans. Juan Mascaro (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962), pp. 56-57.

278. Smith, *The Illustrated World's Religions*, p. 28.

279. Smith, *The Illustrated World Religions*, p. 26.

280. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, 'Mysticism and Ethics in Hindu Thought', pp.490, 493.
281. *The Bhagavad-gita*, trans. Juan Mascaro, pp. 119, 121.
282. S. Suzuki, *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind*, p. 110.
283. David Loy, 'Avoiding the Void', pp. 171, 173, 176.
284. D.T. Suzuki, *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist*, pp. 24-27.
285. Neil Douglas-Klotz, *Prayers of the Cosmos: Meditations on the Aramaic Words of Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994), p. 22.
286. Meister Eckhart. Cited in D. Suzuki, *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist*, p. 15.
287. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Divine Milieu* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1968), p. 71.
288. Jean-Pierre de Caussade, *Self-Abandonment to Divine Providence* (Glasgow: Collins, 1974), pp. 31, 37.
289. Teilhard de Chardin, *The Divine Milieu*, pp. 72-73.
290. Abraham Heschel, 'The Spirit of Judaism', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), p. 564.
291. Rabban Gamliel, from *Pirke Avot* (2:4). Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p.101.
292. From Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 48.
293. See 'Religion', in Microsoft (R) Encarta. Copyright (c) 1994 Microsoft Corporation. Copyright (c) 1994 Funk & Wagnalls Corporation. This article was written by Alan Watts.
294. Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, # 16.
295. Deng Ming-Dao, *Everyday Tao*, p. 2.
296. Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, pp. 1, 14.
297. Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, p. 204.
298. Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, pp. 7-8.
299. Cited in Koestler, *Janus*, p. 256.

300. From Walt Whitman, 'Leaves of Grass', in *The Portable Walt Whitman* (New York: Viking, 1973), p. 169. The quotation is from a section entitled 'On the Beach at Night Alone', presented here in its entirety.

On the beach at night alone,
As the old mother sways her to and fro singing her
 husky song,
As I watch the bright stars shining, I think a thought of the clef of the
universes and of the future.

A vast similitude interlocks all,
All spheres, grown, ungrown, small, large, suns, moons,
 planets,
All distances of place however wide,
All distances of time, all inanimate forms,
All souls, all living bodies though they be ever so different,
 or in different worlds,
All gaseous, watery, vegetable, mineral processes, the
 fishes, the brutes,
All nations, colors, barbarisms, civilizations, languages,
All identities that have existed or may exist on this
 globe or any globe,
All lives and deaths, all of the past, present, future,
This vast similitude spans them, and always has spann'd,
And shall forever span them and compactly hold and
 enclose them.

301. Angelus Silesius. Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 208.

302. From John A. Wheeler, *The Physicist's Conception of Nature*. Cited in Dossey, *Space, Time, and Medicine*, p. 195.

303. Joan Maragall, cited in Juan Mascaro's 'Introduction' to *The Upanishads*, trans. Juan Mascaro (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), p. 15.

304. Jalal al-Din Rumi. Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 158.

305. *Ibid.*, p. 159.

306. In a taped lecture, Panikkar affirms this idea. 'Hope is not of the future', he remarks, rather, 'hope is of the invisible...Hope pierces the floor of time and reaches the invisible dimension present everywhere, in any moment'. See Panikkar, (Speaker) *The Silence of Life*, Tape 3.

307. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, p. 86.

308. Jalal al-Din Rumi. Cited in Muhammad Iqbal, 'The Reconstruction of Tradition', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little Brown, 1990), p. 323.
309. R. Carlos Nakai, *Earth Spirit: Native American Flute Music* (Phoenix, Arizona: Compact Disc, Canyon Records CR-612, Vol.4).
310. Pierre Bourdieu, 'Time Perspectives of the Kabyle', in *The Sociology of Time*, ed. John Hassard (London: MacMillan, 1990), pp. 219, 224.
311. Ilya Prigogine, 'The Reenchantment of Nature', in Renee Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages: The Search for Unity* (London: Arkana, 1990), pp. 190, 194. Italics added.
312. According to Peter Coveney and Roger Highfield, the phrase 'arrow of time' was first coined by Sir Arthur Eddington in his Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh in 1927. See Peter Coveney and Roger Highfield, *The Arrow of Time: The Quest To Solve Science's Greatest Mystery* (London: Flamingo, 1991), p. 24.
313. Milič Čapek, 'The Unreality and Indeterminacy of the Future in the Light of Contemporary Physics', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), p. 307.
314. Marie-Louise von Franz, 'Time and Synchronicity in Analytic Psychology', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), p. 220.
315. Rabindranath Tagore, *Fireflies* (New York: Collier Books, 1928-1955), p. 182.
316. Henry P. Stapp, 'Einstein Time and Process Time', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), p. 264.
317. Saint Augustine, *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, trans. Edward B. Pusey, D.D. (New York: Washington Square Press, 1960), pp. 228-229. Italics added.
318. From Bede Griffiths, 'Return to the Center'. Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, pp. 215-216.
319. T.S. Eliot, from 'Burnt Norton' in *Four Quartets* (London: Faber & Faber, 1944), p. 7.
320. Renée Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages: The Search for Unity* (London: Arkana, 1990), p. 193.
321. See John Amis and Michael Rose, *Words About Music* (London: Faber and Faber, 1989), pp. 74, 18.

322. J.W.N. Sullivan, *Beethoven: His Spiritual Development* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), pp. 141-142.
323. David Bohm, 'Time, the Implicate Order, and Pre-Space', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), p. 183.
324. Nicholas of Cusa. Cited in David Bohm, 'The Implicate Order and the Super-Implicate Order', in Renée Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages: The Search for Unity* (London: Arkana, 1990), p. 31.
325. John Wheeler. Cited in Paul Davies, *About Time: Einstein's Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Touchstone, 1996), p. 249.
326. Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages*, pp. 10-12.
327. David Bohm, 'Time, the Implicate Order, and Pre-Space', p. 177.
328. Reported in Norman Friedman, *Bridging Science and Spirit: Common Elements in David Bohm's Physics, The Perennial Philosophy and Seth* (St. Louis MO.: Living Lake Books, 1990), p. 75.
329. Davies, *About Time*, pp. 30, 23.
330. Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954), pp. 89-90.
331. Peter Knudtson and David Suzuki, *Wisdom of the Elders* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1993), p. 145.
332. Ibid., p. 150.
333. Ibid., pp. 152-153.
334. Hajime Nakamura, 'Time in Indian and Japanese Thought', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 77, 79, 78.
335. Ibid., pp. 81, 82.
336. Ibid., pp. 80, 77, 83.
337. Diane Dakers, 'Dance out of Time: Indian troupe expresses timeless quality of eternity', in *Times Colonist*, Victoria, B.C., Oct. 11th., 1997.

338. Nakamura, 'Time in Indian and Japanese Thought', pp. 85, 86. In commenting on the teachings of Dōgen, *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions* presents a view similar to Nakamura's, as indicated in the following passage (p. 289).

Dōgen denied the reality of the experience of time, since there never can be a before or after in that which is without exception the same buddha-nature: being is time and time is being. In all things and in all experiences, the buddha-nature can be realized, especially by not trying to realize it.

339. Ibid., pp. 87, 88, 90.

340. Ibid., p. 89.

341. David Loy, 'Transcendence East and West', *Man and World*, 26 (1993), pp. 404, 417-421.

342. Joseph Needham, 'Time and Knowledge in China and the West', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 98-99, 92.

343. Marie-Louise von Franz, *Time: Rhythm and Repose* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978), pp. 20, 26.

With regard to the actual procedures used in the *I Ching*, von Franz has this to say: 'According to it one can determine the meaning of a given moment by counting off by fours a randomly picked bundle of 49 yarrow stalks. The remainders constitute four types of line, two masculine (-) and two feminine (- -). Six such lines...constitute an oracle answer. There are 64 double-trigrams, depicting basic symbolic life situations within the moving on of Tao' (pp. 25-26).

344. Carl Gustav Jung, 'Foreword', in *The I Ching*, the Richard Wilhelm translation rendered into English by Cary F. Baynes (Princeton NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. xxiii.

345. von Franz, *Time*, p. 20.

It is relevant here to note that the rhythmic conception of time in Chinese thought parallels many descriptions of reality found in contemporary physics. For instance, in Fritjof Capra's *Tao of Physics*, the rhythmicity of matter is described as follows: 'All matter is involved in a continual cosmic dance...sing their song, producing rhythmic patterns of energy...every subatomic particle not only performs an energy dance but also *is* an energy dance, a pulsating process of creation and destruction. See, Capra, *The Tao of Physics*, pp. 241, 242, 244.

346. Needham, 'Time and Knowledge in China and in the West', pp. 101, 103-104, 118, 105.

Needham also discusses whether a difference in attitude towards time was influential in the development of modern science and technology in the West rather than in China. His response to this question is 'no'. For instance, he notes that ancient Chinese culture had aspects of both the linear irreversible time-perspective so characteristic of Western Christianity and the 'myth of eternal recurrence' which is a notable feature of Indian religion and philosophy. But of course, European culture also exhibited both time-perspectives. He concludes his comments by noting that 'on the whole China was a culture more of the Irano-Judaeo-Christian type than the Indo-Hellenic'. Thus, in Needham's view, the emergence of the modern scientific-industrial complex in the West had little, if anything to do with attitudes towards time and more to do with 'concrete geographical, social and economic conditions and structures' (p.135).

347. Elliott Jacques, 'The Enigma of Time', in *The Sociology of Time*, ed. John Hassard (London: MacMillan, 1990), p. 34.

348. See 'Time', *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted Honderich, pp. 875-876.

To my mind, the use of the terms 'static' and 'dynamic' to distinguish the two basic time-perspectives is problematic because, by any definition, time involves a *succession* of events and, therefore, any view of time is dynamic. Perhaps terms such as *inclusive*, *comprehensive*, or *whole time* could be used to refer to the idea that past, present, and future time are aspects of a single whole dimension of time. To reflect the other view of time, which suggests that temporal categories are ontologically distinct and 'additive' in nature, perhaps terms such as *exclusive*, *segmented*, *categorical*, or *additive time* could be used.

349. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy, Volume 1, Greece and Rome, Part 1*, pp. 69, 56, 69.

350. The phrases in quotation marks are from A. Cornelius Benjamin, 'Ideas of Time in the History of Philosophy', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 10-12.

351. Plato, *Timaeus*, pp. 50-51.

352. Ibid., p. 53.

353. See Coveney and Highfield, *The Arrow of Time*, p. 27. Also, 'Time', *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, p. 876.

354. This definition of time is contained in Aristotle's *Physics* and is cited in Benjamin's essay 'Ideas of Time in the History of Philosophy', p. 12.

355. Benjamin, 'Ideas of Time', p. 14.

356. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy, Volume 1, Greece and Rome, Part II*, p. 65.

357. Benjamin, 'Ideas of Time', p. 14.

358. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy, Volume 1, Greece and Rome, Part I*, p. 70.

359. A focused discussion of Plato and Aristotle with respect the emphasis each philosopher places on 'being' and 'becoming' is found in Copleston, *A History of Philosophy, Volume 1, Greece & Rome, Part II*, pp. 113-120. Initially, Copleston states that 'to characterise the philosophy of Plato by reference to the idea of Being and that of Aristotle by reference to the idea of Becoming is to be guilty of a generalisation, a generalisation which does not, of course, represent the whole truth' (p. 113). However, somewhat ambiguously, he then goes on 'to justify this generalisation' and eventually to suggest that only a 'synthesis' of the ideas of both philosophers does justice to their work. 'The truths contained in their respective philosophies', he writes, 'have to be integrated and harmoniously combined in a complete synthesis, a synthesis which must incorporate and build upon that cardinal tenet, which was held in common by both Plato and Aristotle, namely, the conviction that the fully real is the fully intelligible and the fully good...' (p. 118). My main concern here is simply to emphasize that the ideas of both philosophers are infused with belief in a *fundamental essence*, which for Plato is 'transcendent' and for Aristotle is 'immanent' (see p. 118). In the context of this essential order of being, the concept of time, in the work of both philosophers, ought to be understood as embedded within a timeless order of reality.

360. Lucretius, *The Roman Poet of Science Lucretius: De Rerum Natura*, set in English verse by A.D. Winspear (New York: Harbour Press, 1956), p. 22. Cited in Davies, *About Time*, p. 23.

361. See *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted Honderich, p. 514.

362. Ibid., pp. 689, 613.

363. Davies, *About Time*, p. 24.

364. In his *Confessions* Augustine acknowledges that God 'precedest all things past, by the sublimity of an ever-present eternity; and surpassest all future'...because God's 'To-day is Eternity'. See *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, pp. 223-224.

365. Augustine, *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, p. 224.

366. M-L von Franz, *Time*, p. 8.

367. Augustine, *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, pp. 229, 231, 238.

368. Ibid., p. 235.

369. Saint Thomas Aquinas, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: Philosophical Texts*, trans. Thomas Gilby (New York: Galaxy Books, 1960), pp. 84-85.

370. See *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, ed. John Bowker, p. 671. Also, Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. xi.

In *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, William James suggests that a mystical experience has four essential characteristics: (a) *ineffability*, because 'no adequate report of its contents can be given in words', which means that it is experienced 'directly'; (b) a *noetic quality*, because it imparts a depth of insight 'unplumbed by the discursive intellect'; (c) *transiency*, because it is a state that 'cannot be sustained for long'; and (d) *passivity*, because it puts a person's own will 'in abeyance'. At the conclusion of his discussion of mysticism, which abounds in wonderful examples, James observes that 'mystical states...wield no authority due simply to their being mystical states', which suggests that mysticism is 'essentially private and individualistic'. However, I do not think that James intends to undermine the significance of mystical experience by this remark, for his basic orientation towards 'religious' experiences of all types (including, of course, mystical ones) is towards an experience rooted primarily in 'feeling' rather than in 'philosophic or theological formulas'. Furthermore, this essential religious 'feeling' is one that he describes, in the closing essay of his book, as a sense of 'more' and of 'the meaning of our "union"' with this 'more'. In the light of this conclusion, the so-called 'individualism' of the mystical experience is more appropriately understood as an experience of *interpenetration* with the *all* of reality.

See Henry James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (Glasgow: Fountain Books, 1977), pp. 367-368, 412, 414-415, 486.

371. Aquinas, *Philosophical Texts*, pp. 196-197.

372. John Ruusbroec. Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 200.

373. Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. x.

374. Aquinas, *Philosophical Texts*, p. 251. Italics added.

375. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

376. J.L. Russell, 'Time in Christian Thought', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), p. 68.

377. See 'Boethius', *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, p. 97.

378. John Ruusbroec. Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 199.

379. Ibid., p. 206.

380. See 'Time', *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, p. 979. This account of time also points out that Islamic cosmology is also historical and eschatological in character.

381. M-L von Franz, *Time*, p. 17.

382. In the middle of the seventeenth century, Christian Huygens invented the first successful pendulum clock after which there was a progressive increase in the precision of time-keeping.

383. Newton's own description of time as an objective phenomenon is particularly clear. He writes: 'Absolute, true, and mathematical time, of itself, and from its own nature, flows equably without relation to anything external, and by another name is called duration: relative, apparent, and common time, is some sensible and external (whether accurate or unequable) measure of duration by means of motion, which is commonly used instead of true time; such as an hour, a day, a month, a year'. See *Sir Isaac Newton's Mathematical Principles (Principia Mathematica 1687)*, trans. A. Motte, revised by F. Cajori (Berkeley CA.: University of California Press, 1947), p. 6.

384. See Coveney and Highfield, *The Arrow of Time*, pp. 29-30.

385. Ibid., p. 32.

386. Ibid., p. 33.

387. Davies, *About Time*, pp. 36-37.

Of course, writers with an interest in maintaining the arrow-of-time view might be expected to deal with Poincaré's theorem (or 'Poincaré's return', as it is often called) as something of little practical relevance, given the incredibly huge time span it entails. For instance, Coveney and Highfield observe that 'for many systems of interest to us, there is such a large number of particles...present that the "recurrence time", as it is called, is many times the present age of the universe' - although they neglect to mention that this 'present age' is only an estimate. They proceed to call Poincaré's theorem 'one of the most potent soporifics in the minds of theoretical physicists', whose principal response [to the ideas of time's arrow and evolution]... has been to insist on a subjective explanation of irreversible time'. See Coveney & Highfield, *The Arrow of Time*, p. 65.

388. Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (London: John Murray, 2nd. edition, 1860), p. 486. Cited in Davies, *About Time*, p. 35.

389. Davies, *About Time*, p. 35.

390. Hans Kalmus, 'Organic Evolution and Time', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser Ed. (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), p. 349.
391. Coveney and Highfield, *The Arrow of Time*, pp. 254-255.
392. Stephen J. Gould, *The Flamingo's Smile* (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1988), p. 255.
393. Ilya Prigogine, 'Irreversibility and Space-Time Structure', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), p. 232.
394. Prigogine, 'Time and the Unity of Knowledge', pp. 25, 41.
395. Ilya Prigogine, 'Time and the Unity of Knowledge', pp. 31-34.
396. Ibid., p. 40.
397. Prigogine, 'Irreversibility and Space-Time Structure', pp. 248, 244, 248.
398. Prigogine, 'The Reenchantment of Nature', p. 190.
399. A comment made by Renée Weber. See Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages*, p. 195. This idea of the creative universe reflects Henryk Skolimowski's philosophy of becoming, and in my view is subject to the same criticisms I raise in my discussion of Skolimowski's viewpoint in Chapter Four.
400. Ibid., p. 16.
401. David Griffin, 'Introduction', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), p. 6.
402. See 'Process Theology', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Religions*, p. 768.
403. Griffin, 'Introduction', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, p. 12.
404. From Whitehead, *Symbolism: Its Meaning and Effect* (Capricorn), p. 35. Cited in Griffin, 'Introduction', p. 14.
405. From A. Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York: MacMillan, 1933). Cited in Pinar et al., *Understanding Curriculum*, p. 655.
406. See *The Oxford Dictionary of Religions*, p. 769.
407. David Griffin, 'Bohm and Whitehead on Wholeness, Freedom, Causality, and Time', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David Griffin (Albany NY.: State

University of New York Press, 1986), p. 139.

408. See *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, p. 910.

409. See Griffin, 'Bohm and Whitehead', pp. 137, 139.

410. Ian G. Barbour, 'Bohm and Process Philosophy: A Response to Griffin and Cobb', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), p. 168.

411. For a succinct discussion of the views of Leibniz and Kant on time, see Benjamin, 'Ideas of Time in the History of Philosophy', pp. 19-23.

412. This description of existentialist thought is from Paul Tillich, *The Courage To Be* (London: Fontana, 1962), p. 147.

It is important to point out here that, when writing about twentieth-century existentialism, Tillich notes that 'in the background of Heidegger's ontology' lies a *mystical* concept of being which other existentialists, most notably Jean-Paul Sartre, did not accept. However, he does not elaborate on this observation and emphasizes that Heidegger's principal influence as a philosopher is his existentialism, that is, his analysis of being as 'the courage to make of oneself what one wants to be' (pp. 145-147), and it is this influence that constitutes the focus for my own remarks.

413. J. David Lewis and Andrew J. Weigart, 'Social-time: Structures and Meanings', in *The Sociology of Time*, ed. John Hassard (London: MacMillan, 1990), pp. 80-81.

414. It should be noted here that Heidegger uses the term 'existence' to refer to a being that has some understanding of its being. Thus, a rock would simply have what Heidegger calls 'presence-at-hand'.

415. See *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, pp. 346-347.

416. John Macquarrie, *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought: The Frontiers of Philosophy and Theology, 1900-1960* (London: SCM Press, 1963), p. 354.

417. Christopher Gosden, *Social Being and Time* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 125, 114.

418. From Emile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (Glencoe Ill.: Free Press, 1947/1960), p. 69. Cited in John Hassard, 'Introduction', in *The Sociology of Time* (London: MacMillan, 1980), pp. 2-3.

419. Hassard, 'Introduction', p. 3.

420. Gosden, *Social Being and Time*, pp. 192, 7, 1.

421. J.T. Fraser makes this point in his 'Comment Concerning Evolution', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), p. 355.

422. Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*, pp. 151, 182-183, 221, 224, 218.

423. Marie-Louise von Franz, *Time*, p. 9.

424. For succinct accounts of Einstein's ideas involving time, see Davies, *About Time*, pp.44-77, and Coveney & Highfield, *The Arrow of Time*, pp.70-107.

425. In 1908 Minkowski gave a lecture in Cologne about his former student's 'remarkable new theory of relativity' which began with the following dramatic remark: 'Henceforth space by itself, and time by itself, are doomed to fade away into mere shadows, and only a kind of union of the two will preserve an independent reality'. See Davies, *About Time*, p. 72. Also, Coveney and Highfield, *The Arrow of Time*, p. 82.

426. Louis de Broglie, in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, ed. P.A. Schilipp (La Salle, Ill.: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1949), p. 113. Cited in Dossey, *Space, Time and Medicine*, p. 32.

427. Roger Friedland & Deirdre Boden, 'NowHere: An Introduction to Space, Time, and Modernity', in *NowHere: Space, Time and Modernity*, eds. Roger Friedland & Deirdre Boden (Berkeley CA.: University of California Press, 1994), p. 2.

428. Gianni Vattimo, 'The Structure of Artistic Revolutions', in *Postmodernism: A Reader*, ed. Thomas Docherty (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 118.

429. Jacques, 'The Enigma of Time', p. 24.

430. Ibid., p. 24.

431. Andrew Bjelland, 'Evolutionary Epistemology, Durational Metaphysics, and Theoretical Physics: Capek and the Bergsonian Tradition', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), p. 67.

432. Bertrand Russell, *Our Knowledge of the External World* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1921), pp. 234-235. Cited in Bjelland, 'Evolutionary Epistemology', p.66. Italics added.

433. Milič Čapek, *The Philosophical Impact of Contemporary Physics* (New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold, 1961), pp. 363-364, 339-340. Cited in Bjelland, 'Evolutionary Epistemology', p. 67.

434. Bjelland, 'Evolutionary Epistemology', p. 76.

435. Bohm, 'Time, the Implicate Order, and Pre-Space', p. 207.

An important implication of the point-of-view presented here is that, just a person is free and creative insofar as he or she gives up the pursuit of individualistic goals, *no single being is completely free until all beings are free*.

436. Rupert Sheldrake, *A New Science of Life: The Hypothesis of Morphic Resonance* (Rochester, Vermont: Park Street Press, 1981/1995), p. 221.

In the appendix of the 1995 edition of Sheldrake's book there is a fascinating collection of reactions to its publication, which includes reviews, editorials, correspondence from readers, and of particular interest in the context of the present study, a summary of a discussion between Sheldrake and Bohm.

437. Ibid., pp. 71-72.

438. Sheldrake, 'Morphogenetic Fields: Nature's Habits', in Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages*, p. 82.

439. Sheldrake, *A New Science of Life*, p. 250.

440. Joseph Chilton Pearce, *Evolution's End: Claiming the Potential of Our Intelligence* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), p. 86. Italics added.

441. Harold Coward, *Jung and Eastern Thought* (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1985), p.66.

442. Sheldrake, 'Morphogenetic Fields', p. 76.

443. It should be noted here that, after delineating his theory and admitting that the question of original causation cannot be addressed adequately by science alone, Sheldrake discusses (in the last chapter of *A New Science of Life*) four possible ways of accounting for genuine creativity, all of which he believes are compatible with his theory. (a) He refers to the first suggestion as a kind of *sophisticated or 'modified materialism'* which asserts 'only the reality of the physical world'. The following remark by Stephen Hawking can be considered an example of this position: 'I think the universe is completely self-contained. It doesn't have any beginning or end, it doesn't have any creation or destruction' (cited in Weber, *Dialogues with Scientists and Sages*, p. 89). (b) The second possible explanation of genuine originality Sheldrake mentions is *the conscious self*, that is, the belief that 'in human consciousness there is something that can give rise to new fields and patterns'. (c) The third position Sheldrake discusses, which he refers to as *'the creative universe'*, incorporates the previous two and suggests that there is an immanent consciousness in nature which accounts for creativity. (d) Sheldrake's fourth proposal, *transcendent reality*, is the one he adopts personally. It suggests that 'nature itself has a source *beyond* the natural world', in effect, a creator, a God who is 'beyond, above, and in nature'. [The quotations are from Sheldrake,

‘Morphogenetic Fields’, pp. 86-87.]

444. Bohm, David. ‘Creativity: The Signature of Nature’, in Renée Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages: The Search for Unity* (London: Arkana, 1990), p. 93.

445. Ibid., p. 93.

446. Bohm, ‘Time, the Implicate Order, and Pre-Space’, pp. 191-192.

447. Ibid., p. 205.

As I reflect on the idea of freedom arising from a deep implicate-order of awareness, I am reminded of the following well known poem by Rabindranath Tagore.

[R. Tagore, ‘Where the mind is without fear’. From *Gitanjali*, in *A Tagore Reader*, ed. Amiya Chakravarty (Boston: Beacon press, 1966), p.300. See Appendix B, # 5.]

448. Bohm, *Unfolding Meaning*, p. 99.

449. Bohm, ‘Time, the Implicate Order, and Pre-Space’, pp. 206-207. Italics added.

450. Ibid., p. 206.

451. Dwayne E. Huebner, ‘Curriculum as Concern for Man’s Temporality’, in *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, ed. W. Pinar (Berkeley CA.: McCutchan, 1975), p. 244. In the passage from which this quotation is taken, Huebner is discussing Heidegger’s understanding of time.

452. George Herbert Mead, ‘Time’, in *George Herbert Mead on Social Psychology: Selected papers, edited and with a revised introduction by Anselm Strauss* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), p. 337.

453. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, pp. 43-44.

454. It should be noted here that in another essay, ‘Is History the Measure of Man?’, contained in *Invisible Harmony* (Minneapolis MN.: Fortress Press, 1995), Panikkar uses the term ‘pre-historical’ rather than ‘nonhistorical’ to describe a past-oriented temporal focus (see p. 135). This essay is an abridged and ‘modified’ version of the previous essay which I am using and in which he specifically rejects the term ‘pre-historical’ (because it does not ‘do justice to the a-historical moments’). Thus, there is some ambiguity as to which term he actually prefers.

Personally, I prefer to label the three modes of human time-consciousness without reference to ‘history’ at all, largely because this term has become inextricably associated with a specific academic discipline and, thereby, acquired a host of often conflicting theoretical definitions. For example, is history best understood as a focus on the ‘conditions of

understanding' a particular phenomenon (as Foucault's work suggests) or as a focus on 'reencountering lived experiences' (as implied in the work of E.P. Thompson) - or both? Moreover, is historical investigation best undertaken as a science or as a work of art (in the sense of a work of meaningful narration)? As these questions indicate, the term history is susceptible to a number of interpretations, which makes its use as a descriptor of modes of human consciousness particularly problematic. (The ideas regarding the nature of history stem from Michel de Certeau's work, in particular, *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 35-36, 43.)

455. Panikkar, *The Cosmotheandric Experience: Emerging Religious Consciousness* (Maryknoll NY.: Orbis Books, 1993), pp. 91, 94, 97. The same essay is also found in R. Panikkar, 'The End of History: The Threefold Structure of Human Time-Consciousness', in *Teilhard and the Unity of Knowledge: The Georgetown University Centennial Symposium*, eds. Thomas King and James Salman (Ramsey, NJ.: Paulist press, 1983), pp. 93, 95, 97.

With regard to the transformation from pre-scriptural to script-based societies, the work of Harold Adams Innis is informative. In *The Bias of Communications* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964) and in *Empire and Communications* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), Innis discusses how the invention of the alphabet became a force for cultural change and social reorganization in the Ancient Middle East. He describes how this change consisted of a movement away from localized/tribal cultures based on oral traditions to wide-ranging empires based on writing and reading, with political and commercial interests regulated by relatively stable and reliable records. He notes further that this change also entailed a shift from societies centered around religion and myth toward societies which became increasingly secular, history-minded, and oriented towards business and trade. These comments are significant as an illustration of how a particular communication technology, in this case, writing, exerts a powerful influence on how societies develop. In the context of the current 'explosion' of various modes of electronic communication, this issue is a vital concern, for it suggests that today's technology-complex may not be merely responding to needs as they develop but may be actively creating needs and thereby directly influencing the formation of new and the destruction of old patterns of social and individual behaviour.

456. Panikkar, *The Cosmotheandric Experience*, pp. 98, 93, and 'The End of History', pp. 98, 94-95.

457. *Ibid.*, p. 96, and *ibid.*, p. 96.

458. John M. Phelan, *Disenchantment: Meaning and Morality in the Media* (New York: Hastings House, 1980), pp. 113, 119. Italics added.

Phelan points out that the people of ancient oral cultures may not have experienced the kind of individualistic or private consciousness we now take for granted, and that, with the emergence of writing, the dominance of oral epic poetry was replaced by 'the private written word' which led 'to the development of the self, to critical independence', and 'to the

defiant "I" of Luther'. He notes further that, in the context of this shift from the collectivity of an oral tradition to the individualism of a writing-culture, Plato's 'seemingly strange prohibition of poetry' in the *Republic* can be understood not as a condemnation of poetry as we know it today but rather as an attempt to promote the benefits of a culture wherein people could think for themselves, that is, be 'conscious' in our modern sense of that term. (See, p.119 & p.113.)

In another discussion of oral culture, Gunter Gebauer and Christoph Wulf comment on Plato's 'skepticism' towards oral poetry in a way that emphasizes the collectivistic mentality engendered by ancient oral traditions. They claim that Plato was the first major figure in ancient Greece to express publicly a concern about the 'epidemic quality of mimesis' provoked by presentations of oral poetry. What they suggest is that the immediate effect of participation in a presentation of oral poetry was a kind of 'contagion' in which an audience took up 'the rhythm of speech' of a presenter and became 'involved in the recitation emotionally and physically', resulting in 'a series of elementary mimetic processes by which listeners achieve a *sameness* with one another and which spreads epidemically'. See Gunter Gebauer and Christoph Wulf, *Mimesis: Culture-Art-Society*, trans. Don Reneau (Berkeley CA.: University of California Press, 1995), p.47. Italics added.

459. Phelan, *Disenchantment*, pp. 134, 115, 118. The work by Walter J. Ong to which Phelan refers is *Interfaces of the World* (Ithaca NY.: Cornell University Press, 1977).

460. Ibid., p. 119. Italics added.

461. Ibid., pp. 120-121.

462. Ibid., pp. 126, 135-136, 142.

463. In the following passage, Gebauer and Wulf comment on the oral culture of ancient Greece in a way that illustrates how it exerted a pedagogical function that had implications for both ethical and legal behaviour.

In the oral culture of Greece, language, precisely because it lives through its power to incorporate other people, fulfils a direct pedagogical function by declaring what should be done in a given situation. Poets constitute cultural memory: poetry displays ritual paradigms; it can be regarded as the "encyclopedia" of a social disposition, of customary rights and conventions prevailing in Greece at the time of its performance. In addition to fostering continuity, poetry also shapes identity; paradigms show the members of the community who they are and how they should behave. In this view, poetry is a "cultural storehouse," a "preserved communication."

Not only the epic but also the theatre entertains and instructs; it is a means by which a "shared communication" is developed. It selects historically, ethically, and politically meaningful material for its objects...The chorus of a Greek tragedy lends the clearest expression to this didactic function; Havelock characterizes it as "a

continual rehearsal (mimesis) of the lawful side of Greek life," as a mimetic repetition of and training in the legalities of early Greek life.

See Gebauer & Wulf, *Mimesis*, p. 49. The quotation is from Eric Havelock, *Preface to Plato* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 93.

464. Phelan, *Disenchantment*, p. 143.

465. *Ibid.*, p. 152.

466. The use of the term 'creativity' here refers to the world of human inventiveness within the context of 'what has gone before' and not to practices which constitute deliberate attempts to break with an established tradition. The English language lacks words to differentiate the various forms of creativity expressed in human behaviour. Often, creativity that breaks with tradition is called 'original', but this term can also imply a reworking of established practices rather than a direct opposition to them. (Who would deny, for instance, that Mozart was an 'original', and yet he worked well within established traditions of composition.) Ultimately (and it is in this sense that I use the term in the main body of this study), I believe that creativity is a deeply *personal* phenomenon that generates those activities which persons use in their everyday lives to connect with one another at a level of deep meaning, which is why I also believe that creativity and morality are such closely related phenomena.

467. Gebauer & Wulf, *Mimesis*, p. 48.

468. Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Creators: A History of Heroes of the Imagination* (New York: Random House, 1992), pp. 28, 26.

469. Phelan, *Disenchantment*, p. 124.

470. *Ibid.*, pp. 124-125.

471. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

472. In connection with the isolating tendencies of contemporary media experiences, it may be of some interest to observe that the continued popularity of attending movie theatres in spite of the burgeoning home-video market may be an expression of a collective desire to maintain the 'physicality' of theatre-going as an expression of community culture.

473. Robert M. Torrance, *The Spiritual Quest: Transcendence in Myth, Religion, and Science* (Berkeley CA.: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 3, 57.

474. Because the term history is normally associated with efforts to reconstruct and-or reinterpret the past, Panikkar's use of it to describe a future-oriented worldview may be an uncomfortable correlation for some. His principal reason for using this term (along with 'nonhistorical' and 'transhistorical' to describe past-directed and present-centered forms of

time-consciousness) appears to be because he wishes to acknowledge the fact that he is speaking from 'within the historical myth', that is, the myth of 'progress' which arose as a result of the invention of writing. Accordingly, he believes that 'history must be the central point of reference'. See Panikkar, *The Cosmotheandric Experience*, pp. 80, 82, and 'The End of History', pp. 84-85.

475. Ibid., pp. 100-101, 91, 105, and ibid., 98-99, 93, 102.

476. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, p. 84.

477. Ibid., p. 78.

478. See 'Humanism', *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, p. 376.

479. Willis Harman, *Global Mind Change*, p. 129.

480. Ibid., pp. 129, 147.

In his book *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), Gilbert Highet also draws attention to the centrality of 'paideia' in ancient Greek culture, noting that 'the Greeks believed that all civilization and *all progress* were based on education, lifelong education, enjoyment and improvement of all the highest powers of the mind' (p. 18, italics added). Highet also points out (as does Willis Harman) that perhaps the most valuable reference on this topic is Werner Jaeger's book *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939-44).

481. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, pp. 78-79.

482. Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. 23.

483. Skolimowski, *The Participatory Mind*, p. 124.

484. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. 2, *Medieval Philosophy, Part 1: Augustine to Bonaventure*, p. 50.

485. Gregory of Nyssa. Cited in Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 187.

486. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, p. 79.

487. It is perhaps worthwhile to note here that the word 'science' in English and other Romance languages tends to be used in the 'narrower sense' described here, whereas in Germanic and Slavonic languages the words for science tend to be applied 'to any systematic scholarly inquiry'. See William Outhwaite, 'The Philosophy of Social Science', in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, ed. Bryan S. Turner (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), p.85.

488. D.C. Phillips, *Philosophy, Science, and Social Inquiry*, p. 2.

As part of a passionate critique of our contemporary technocultures, Neil Postman also discusses the concept of 'scientism' in his book *Technopoly*. He writes:

Scientism...is the desperate hope, and wish, and ultimately the illusory belief that some standardized set of procedures called "science" can provide us with an unimpeachable source of moral authority, a suprahuman basis for answers to questions like "What is life, and when, and why?...What is right and wrong to do?...How ought we to think and feel and behave?...To ask of science, or expect of science, or accept unchallenged from science the answers to such questions is Scientism. And it is Technopoly's grand illusion. (p. 162)

According to Postman, the concept of 'Scientism' originates in the work of the early social scientists, Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon, Prosper Enfantin, and August Comte. Theoretically, he describes this concept in terms of three interrelated ideas: (a) 'that the methods of the natural sciences can be applied to the study of human behavior', (b) 'that social science generates specific principles which can be used to organize society on a rational and humane basis', and (c) that 'faith in science can serve as a comprehensive belief system' (p. 147).

489. Torrance, *The Spiritual Quest*, pp. 50-57, 279-280.

490. Torrance, *The Spiritual Quest*, pp. 283-284.

491. Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. 23.

492. Torrance, *The Spiritual Quest*, p. 293.

493. Stephen Jay Gould, *Eight Little Piggies: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Norton, 1993), p. 270. It is significant, I think, that Torrance uses this remark in the final paragraph of his book about the spiritual quest.

494. The quote is from the *Dallas Morning News* and appears on the cover of Neil Postman's book *Technopoly*.

495. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, p. 80.

496. Ibid., p. 79.

497. Torrance, *The Spiritual Quest*, p. 285.

498. David Loy, 'Preparing for Something that Never Happens', p. 62.

499. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, p. 100.

500. Vygotsky, *Thought and Language*, pp. 253, 249, 250, 251.
501. Loy, 'Preparing for Something that Never Happens', p. 65. Italics added.
502. Frederick Dallmayr, 'Critical Theory and Reconciliation', *Habermas, Modernity, and Public Theology*, eds. D.S. Browning and F. S. Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1992), pp. 140, 143.
503. Jürgen Habermas, *Justification and Application: Remarks on Discourse Ethics*, trans. Ciaran Cronin (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1993), pp. vii, xv. Italics added.
504. Jürgen Habermas, 'Discourse Ethics: Notes on a Program of Philosophical Justification', *The Communicative Ethics Controversy*, eds. S. Benhabib and F. Dallmayr (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1990), p. 106.
505. Habermas, *Justification and Application*, p. 152.
506. Ibid., p. 175.
507. Dallmayr, 'Critical Theory and Reconciliation', pp. 140, 143.
508. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, second revised edition, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (New York: Continuum, 1996) pp. 457, 456, 466, 383, 490-491.
509. Dallmayr, 'Critical Theory and Reconciliation', p. 144.
510. Tillich, *The Spiritual Situation*, p. 79
511. D.T. Suzuki, *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist*, pp. 124-125.
512. Panikkar, *The Cosmotheandric Experience*, pp. 124, 91, 124, and 'The End of History', pp. 115, 93, 114.
513. Ibid., pp. 128-129, and *ibid.*, p. 118.
514. Ibid., p. 130, and *ibid.*, p. 120.
515. Ibid., p. 119, and *ibid.*, p. 111.
516. George Herbert Mead, 'Time', pp. 339, 333, 335-337. Also, George Herbert Mead, 'The Objective Reality of Perspectives', in *George Herbert Mead on Social Psychology: Selected papers, edited and with a revised introduction by Anselm Strauss* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), p. 351.
517. Bohm, *On Dialogue* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 24-25. Also, pp. 73-83.

518. Ibid., pp. 24-25.

519. B.Z. Friedlander, 'Community Violence, Children's Development, and Mass Media: In Pursuit of New Insights, New Goals, and New Strategies', *Psychiatry*, 56 (1993), p. 76.

520. Bohm, *On Dialogue*, p. 79.

521. Ibid., p. 81.

522. Martin Heidegger, 'The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking', in *Basic Writings* (Revised and Expanded Edition) ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: HarperCollins, 1977/1993), p. 449. Italics added.

523. Panikkar, *The Cosmotheandric Experience*, p. 131, and 'The End of History', p. 120.

524. Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, p. 165.

525. The final quotation is by Ralph Waldo Emerson.

526. Meister Eckhart. Cited in Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. 189.

527. The psychologist referred to is Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (see *The Evolving Self*, p. 150), and the philosopher is Henryk Skolimowski (see *The Participatory Mind*, pp. 380-381).

Skolimowski's use of a vocabulary that reflects instrumentalism is particularly ironic and puzzling. On the one hand, he writes passionately about 'the ogre of instrumentalization' and condemns philosophers such as Habermas and Foucault for depicting knowledge as 'power' (rather than as 'liberation'), thereby contributing to a 'pathology of power' which creates an 'existential Hell on earth'. However, on the other hand, he often uses the same rationalistic and instrumentalistic language he supposedly opposes (as when he defends his use of a 'grand theory' by noting that 'our frameworks *do* determine the nature of facts we examine'), and compares the act of participating to 'flying in control', apparently ignoring the inherent incongruity between the mutuality of participation and the individualism of being in control or exercising it. (See, *The Participatory Mind*, pp. 348-350, 327, 381.)

528. MacQuarrie, *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought*, p. 179.

529. John Dewey, 'Morals and Conduct', from *Human Nature and Conduct*, in *The World's Great Thinkers: The Social Philosophers* (New York: Random House, 1947), pp. 451-452.

530. Ibid., pp. 483, 457-459.

531. MacQuarrie, *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought*, p. 180.

532. Dewey, 'Morals and Conduct', p. 461.

533. Ibid., pp. 461, 464, 475-476.
534. John Dewey, *A Common Faith* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934), pp. 84, 10, 26, 1-2, 48, 85.
535. Ibid., pp. 53, 13-14, 26.
536. Dewey, 'Morals and Conduct', p. 449.
537. Ibid., pp. 85, 87.
538. Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning: An Introduction to Logotherapy* (New York: Pocket Books, 1959), p. 158.
539. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, p. 11.
540. Ibid., p. 86.
541. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, pp. 86, 131, 10-16.
542. R. Panikkar, *The Trinity and the Religious Experience of Man* (New York: Orbis Books, 1973), p. 46.
543. R. Panikkar, 'Program for the Gifford Lectures'. Cited in Ewert H. Cousins, 'Panikkar's Advaitic Trinitarianism', in *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar*, ed. Joseph Prabhu (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), p. 130.
544. Ibid., p. 120.
545. Panikkar, *The Trinity and the Religious Experience of Man*, pp. 42, 10, xv.
546. Panikkar, 'A Self-Critical Dialogue', p. 275.
547. Panikkar, *The Trinity and the Religious Experience of Man*, pp. ix-x. Italics added.
548. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, p. 128, and cited in Cousins, 'Panikkar's Advaitic Trinitarianism', p. 130.
549. *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, ed. John Bowker, p. 461.
550. Panikkar, *The Trinity and the Religious Experience of Man*, p. ix.
551. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, p. 127.
552. Aniela Jaffé, *The Myth of Meaning in the Work of C.G. Jung* (Zurich: Daimon, 1984), p. 23.

553. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, pp. ix, 14-16.
554. R. Panikkar, *Invisible Harmony*, pp. 26-27.
555. Frank Podgorski, 'The Cosmotheandric Intuition: The Contemplative Catalyst of Raimon Panikkar', in *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar*, ed. Joseph Prabhu (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), p. 108.
556. Panikkar, *Invisible Harmony*, p. 4.
557. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, p. 69.
558. Smith, *The Illustrated World's Religions*, p. 71.
559. Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 4.
560. Dewey, *A Common Faith*, p. 49.
561. Ibid., p. 48.
562. Panikkar, *Blessed Simplicity*, pp. 128-129.
563. Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, p. vii.
564. Tillich, cited in Robert Coles, *The Moral Life of Children* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1986), p. 16.
565. Karl-Heinz Ilting, 'The Basis of the Validity of Moral Norms', *The Communicative Ethics Controversy*, eds. S. Benhabib and F. Dallmayr (Cambridge MA.: MIT Press, 1990), p. 238.
566. Ibid., p. 238.
567. Probably the most conspicuous of moral theories that use consensus as a basis for validating moral norms is the theory of Discourse Ethics of Jurgen Habermas, which differs significantly from the understanding of morality present here insofar as it is cognitivist, rather than interpretive, and universalistic, rather than context-oriented.
568. Dewey, *A Common Faith*, pp. 76-79.
569. Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, trans. James Strachey (New York: W.W. Norton, 1962), pp. 11, 19.
570. Ibid., p. 90.
571. The Jerusalem Bible; 1 Corinthians, 13:1-2; Romans, 13:9-10; 1 John, 4:16.

572. Ramm Dass, *Compassion in Action*, pp. 12-13.

573. Douglas-Klotz, *Prayers of the Cosmos*, p. 34.

574. Abraham Heschel, 'The Spirit of Judaism', p. 564.

575. Panikkar, *The Silence of Life*, Tape 1a.

576. Max Planck, in *Quantum Questions: Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), p. 153.

577. Aaron Copland, *What to Listen for in Music* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939). Cited in Amis and Rose, *Words About Music*, p. 17.

578. Heinrich Heine, *Letters on the French Stage* 1837. Cited in Amis and Rose, *Words About Music*, p. 2.

579. Paul Hillier, *Arvo Pärt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 1.

580. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

581. In musical language a 'mode' is equivalent to a scale, that is, to a certain sequential ordering of musical intervals. The medieval or ancient modes can be readily demonstrated on a piano simply by playing all the white notes from one note of the same name to another, that is, from C to C, D to D, E to E, etc. Because the intervals between successive white notes on the piano are either 'tones' or 'semitones', each mode results in a different pattern of tones and semitones. For tonal variety, the various modes can be 'transposed' to different areas of the keyboard by using a combination of white and black notes that reproduce the unique pattern of tones and semitones for each mode. The technical names of these modes are as follows.

C-C: Ionian (equivalent to what we call the 'major scale').

D-D: Dorian

E-E: Phrygian

F-F: Lydian

G-G: Mixolydian

A-A: Aeolian (equivalent to what we call the 'natural minor scale').

B-B: Locrian

582. Hillier makes the same suggestion in a slightly different manner when he writes that 'we may regard 'tonality', embodied in the constant presence of a major or minor triad, not as a symbol, but rather as a manifestation of God'. See, Hillier, *Arvo Part*, p. 92.

583. Hillier, *Arvo Pärt*, pp. 96-97. Apparently the formula ' $1+1=1$ ' was proposed by Pärt's wife, Nora.

584. This sentence is a paraphrase of a statement by Pärt from the notes included in the CD of his work *Fratres*, performed by I Fiamminghi: The Orchestra of Flanders, Rudolf Werthen, cond. (Telarc Digital: CD-80387).

585. Bohm, 'The Physicist and the Mystic', p. 209.

586. Igor Stravinsky, *An Autobiography* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1936). Cited in Amis and Rose, *Words About Music*, p. 16.

587. I have had the great good fortune in my life of meeting several pre-eminent musicians, and as I reflect on this experience of 'self-surrendering' to a present activity, I am reminded of a particularly moving interview I conducted once with the great pianist of the Beaux Arts Trio, Manaheim Pressler. In an exited, captivating voice that radiated vitality, Pressler observed that, although he has played literally thousands of performances of a certain Beethoven Trio, each time he approaches a certain passage, he is 'moved to tears'.

588. William Butler Yeats, from 'Michael Robartes and the Dancer' (1921), in *W. B. Yeats: Selected Poetry*, ed. A. Norman Jeffares (London: Macmillan Papermac, 1967), p. 99. Italics added.

589. Hillier, *Arvo Pärt*, p. 206.

590. Rainer Maria Rilke. Cited at the beginning of H-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*.

Bibliography

Amis, John, and Michael Rose, *Words About Music* (London: Faber & Faber, 1989).

Barbour, Ian G., 'Bohm and Process Philosophy: A Response to Griffin and Cobb', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), pp. 167-171.

Benjamin, A. Cornelius, 'Ideas of Time in the History of Philosophy', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 3-30.

Bergin, A.E., 'Values and Religious Issues in Psychotherapy and Mental Health', *American Psychologist*, 46 (1991), 394-403.

Bevan, William. 'Contemporary Psychology: A Tour Inside the Onion', *American Psychologist*, 46 (1991), 475-483.

Bjelland, Andrew G, 'Evolutionary Epistemology, Durational Metaphysics, and Theoretical Physics: Čapek and the Bergsonian Tradition', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), pp. 51-80.

Blumer, Herbert, 'What is Wrong with Social Theory', *The American Sociological Review*, XIX (1954), 140-152.

Blumer, Herbert, *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method* (Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1969).

Bohm, David, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (London: Routledge, 1980/1995).

Bohm, David, *Fragmentation and Wholeness in Science and Society* (Transcript of a Seminar sponsored by the Science Council of Canada: Ottawa: Science Council of Canada, 1984).

Bohm, David, *Unfolding Meaning: A Weekend of Dialogue with David Bohm* (London: Routledge, 1985).

Bohm, David, 'The Enfolding-Unfolding Universe: A Conversation with David Bohm, conducted by Renée Weber', *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), pp. 44-104.

Bohm, David, 'The Physicist and the Mystic - Is a Dialogue Between Them Possible? A Conversation with David Bohm Conducted by Renée Weber [and] Edited by Emily Sellon', in *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), pp. 187-214.

Bohm, David, 'Time, the Implicate Order, and Pre-Space', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), pp. 177-208.

Bohm, David, 'Meaning and Information', in *The Search for Meaning*, ed. Paavo Pyllkanen (Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, England: Crucible, 1989).

Bohm, David, 'The Implicate Order and the Super-Implicate Order', in Renée Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages: The Search for Unity* (London: Arkana, 1990), pp. 23-49.

Bohm, David, 'Creativity: The Signature of Nature', in Renée Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages: The Search for Unity* (London: Arkana, 1990), pp. 91-101.

Bohm, David, *On Dialogue* (London: Routledge, 1996).

Boorstin, Daniel J., *The Creators: A History of Heroes of the Imagination* (New York: Random House, 1992).

Bourdieu, Pierre, 'Time Perspectives of the Kabyle', in *The Sociology of Time*, ed. John Hassard (London: MacMillan, 1990), pp. 219-237.

Bowker, John, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Butler, Judith, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

Calvino, Italo, *Invisible Cities* (San Diego CA: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1974).

Čapek, Milč, 'The Unreality and Indeterminacy of the Future in the Light of Contemporary Physics', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), pp. 297-308.

Capra, Fritjof, *The Tao of Physics* (New York: Bantam, 1977).

Capra, Fritjof, *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1983).

Capra, Fritjof, and David Steindl-Rast with Thomas Matus, *Belonging to the Universe* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992).

de Caussade, Jean-Pierre, *Self-Abandonment to Divine Providence* (Glasgow: Collins, 1974).

de Certeau, Michel, *The Writing of History*, trans. Tom Conley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

Chodorow, Nancy, *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).

Coles, Robert, *The Moral Life of Children* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1986).

Copleston, Frederick, *A History of Philosophy* (New York: Image Books, 1962).

Cousins, Ewert H., 'Panikkar's Advaitic Trinitarianism', in *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar*, ed. Joseph Prabhu (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), pp. 119-130.

Coveney, Peter, and Roger Highfield, *The Arrow of Time: The Quest To Solve Science's Greatest Mystery* (London: Flamingo, 1991).

Coward, Harold, *Pluralism: Challenge to World Religions* (Maryknoll NY.: Orbis Books, 1985).

Coward, Harold. *Jung and Eastern Thought* (Albany NY.: State University of New York, 1985).

Crawford, Paul D., 'How Do Adolescents Determine the Right Things to Do?', Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Victoria, 1995.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly, *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience* (New York: Harper & Row, 1990).

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly, *The Evolving Self* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1964).

Dakers, Diane, 'Dance out of Time: Indian troupe expresses timeless quality of eternity', in *Times Colonist*, Victoria, B.C., Oct. 11th., 1997.

Dallmayr, Frederick, 'Critical Theory and Reconciliation', in *Habermas, Modernity, and Public Theology*, eds. D.S. Browning and F. S. Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1992), pp. 119-151.

Danzinger, Kurt, *Constructing the Subject: Historical Origins of Psychological Research* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Dass, Ram and Mirabai Bush, *Compassion in Action: Setting Out on the Path of Service* (New York: Bell Tower, 1992).

Davies, Paul, *About Time: Einstein's Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Touchstone, 1996).

Deng Ming-Dao, *Everyday Tao: Living with Balance and Harmony* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996).

Denzin, Norman K., 'The Postmodern Sensibility', in *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* 15, ed. Norman K. Denzin (Greenwich Conn.: JAI Press, 1993), pp. 179-188.

Derrida, Jacques, 'Discussion: Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences', in *The Structuralist Controversy*, eds. R. Macksey and E. Donato (Baltimore MD.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), pp. 247-272.

Dewey, John, *A Common Faith* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934).

Dewey, John, 'Morals and Conduct', from *Human Nature and Conduct*, in *The World's Great Thinkers: The Social Philosophers* (New York: Random House, 1947), pp. 448-485.

Docherty, Thomas, ed., *Postmodernism: A Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

Dossey, Larry, *Space, Time & Medicine* (Boston: New Science Library, 1985).

Dossey, Larry, *Meaning and Medicine* (New York: Bantam Books, 1992).

Douglas-Klotz, Neil, *Prayers of the Cosmos: Meditations on the Aramaic Words of Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994).

Dychtwald, Ken, 'Reflections on the Holographic Paradigm', in *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science*, ed. Ken Wilber, (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), pp. 105-113.

Earley, Joseph E., 'Far-From-Equilibrium Thermodynamics and Process Thought', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY: State University of New York, 1986), pp. 215-255.

Eddington, Arthur, *The Nature of the Physical World* (Ann Arbor Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1968).

Eliade, Mircea, *The Myth of the Eternal Return* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954).

Eliot, T.S., *Four Quartets* (London: Faber & Faber, 1944).

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 'Compensation', in *The World's Great Thinkers: The Social Philosophers* (New York: Random House, 1947), pp. 427-446.

Ferguson, Marilyn, *The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980's* (Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher, 1980).

Fishkin, J., Keniston, K., and MacKinnon, C., 'Moral Reasoning and Political Ideology', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27 (1973), 109-119.

Fox, Matthew, *A Spirituality Named Compassion and the Healing of the Global Village, Humpty Dumpty and Us* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979).

Foucault, Michel, 'The Discourse on Language', in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Pantheon, 1972), pp. 215-237.

Foucault, Michel, 'Two Lectures', in *Culture / Power / History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, eds. Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 200-221.

Foucault, Michel, 'What is Enlightenment?', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), pp. 32-50.

Foucault, Michel, 'Politics and Ethics: An Interview', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), pp. 373-390.

Frankl, Viktor, *Man's Search for Meaning: An Introduction to Logotherapy* (New York: Pocket Books, 1959).

Franklin, Ursula, *The Real World of Technology* (Concord Ontario: Anansi, 1990).

von Franz, Marie-Louise, 'Time and Synchronicity in Analytic Psychology', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 218-232.

von Franz, Marie-Louise, *Time: Rhythm and Repose* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978).

Fraser, J. T., ed. *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities* (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966).

Fraser, Nancy, and Linda Nicholson, 'Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter between Feminism and Postmodernism', in *Feminism/Postmodernism*, ed. Linda Nicholson (New York: Routledge, 1990), pp. 19-38.

Freud, Sigmund, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, trans. James Strachey (New York: W.W. Norton, 1962).

Friedland, Roger, and Deirdre Boden, eds., *NowHere: Space, Time and Modernity*, (Berkeley CA.: University of California Press, 1994).

Friedlander, B.Z., 'Community Violence, Children's Development, and Mass Media: In Pursuit of New Insights, New Goals, and New Strategies', *Psychiatry*, 56 (1993), 66-81.

Friedman, Norman, *Bridging Science and Spirit: Common Elements in David Bohm's Physics, The Perennial Philosophy and Seth* (St. Louis MO.: Living Lake Books, 1990).

Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, second, revised edition, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (New York: Continuum, 1996).

Gebauer, Gunter, and Christoph Wulf, *Mimesis: Culture-Art-Society*, trans. Don Reneau (Berkeley CA.: University of California Press, 1995).

Gendlin, Eugene T., *Focusing* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1978).

Gergen, Kenneth J., 'Exploring the Postmodern: Perils or Potentials?', *American Psychologist*, 49 (1994), 412-416.

Gilligan, Carol, *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982).

Gorsuch, R.L., 'Psychology of Religion', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 39 (1988), 201-221.

Gosden, Christopher, *Social Being and Time* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).

Gould, Stephen J., *The Flamingo's Smile* (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1988).

Gould, Stephen J., *Eight Little Piggies: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Norton, 1993).

Griffin, David R., ed., *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time* (Albany NY.: State University of New York, 1986).

Griffin, David R., 'Bohm and Whitehead on Wholeness, Freedom, Causality, and Time', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), pp. 127-153.

Habermas, Jürgen, 'Discourse Ethics: Notes on a Program of Philosophical Justification', in *The Communicative Ethics Controversy*, eds. S. Benhabib and F. Dallmayr (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1990), pp. 60-110.

Habermas, Jürgen, *Justification and Application: Remarks on Discourse Ethics*, trans. Ciaran Cronin (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1993).

Harman, Willis, *Global Mind Change: The New Age Revolution in the Way We Think* (New York: Warner Books, 1990).

Harvey, Andrew, *The Essential Mystics: Selections from the World's Great Wisdom Traditions* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1997).

Hassard, John, ed. *The Sociology of Time* (London: MacMillan, 1990).

Hebdige, Dick, *Hiding in the Light* (London: Comedia, 1988).

Heidegger, Martin, *Basic Writings* (Revised and Expanded Edition) ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: HarperCollins, 1977/1993).

Herigel, Eugen, *Zen in the Art of Archery* (New York: Vintage, 1971).

Heschel, Abraham, 'The Spirit of Judaism', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), pp. 557-566.

Heshusius, Lous, 'Freeing Ourselves from Objectivity: Managing Subjectivity or Turning Toward a Participatory Mode of Consciousness?', *Educational Researcher*, 23-3 (1994), 15-22.

Heshusius, Lous and Keith Ballard, eds., *From Positivism to Interpretivism and Beyond: Tales of Transformation in Educational and Social Research (The Mind-Body*

Connection) (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996).

Highet, Gilbert, *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954).

Hillier, Paul, *Arvo Pärt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Honderich, Ted, ed., *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

Horkheimer, Max, *Eclipse of Reason* (New York: Seabury Press, 1974).

Huebner, Dwayne E., 'Curriculum as Concern for Man's Temporality', in *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, ed. W. Pinar (Berkeley CA.: McCutchan, 1975), pp. 237-249.

Huxley, Aldous, *The Perennial Philosophy* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1970).

Ilting, Karl-Heinz, 'The Basis of the Validity of Moral Norms', in *The Communicative Ethics Controversy*, eds. S. Benhabib and F. Dallmayr (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 1990), pp. 220-255.

Innis, Harold Adams, *The Bias of Communications*, 2nd. ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964).

Innis, Harold Adams, *Empire and Communications*, revised by Mary Q. Innis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972).

Iqbal, Muhammad, 'The Reconstruction of Tradition', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little Brown, 1990), pp. 319-332.

Jacques, Elliott, 'The Enigma of Time', in *The Sociology of Time*, ed. John Hassard (London: MacMillan, 1990), pp. 21-34.

Jaeger, Werner, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939-44).

Jaffe, Aniela, *The Myth of Meaning in the Work of C.G. Jung* (Zurich: Daimon, 1984).

James, William, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (Glasgow: Fountain Books, 1977).

James, William, *The Principles of Psychology* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981).

Jones, Stanton L., 'A Constructive Relationship for Religion with the Science and Profession of Psychology: Perhaps the Boldest Model Yet', *American Psychologist*, 49 (1994), 184-199.

Jung, Carl Gustav, 'Foreword', in *The I Ching*, the Richard Wilhelm translation rendered into English by Cary F. Baynes (Princeton NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. xxi-xxxix.

Kalmus, Hans, 'Organic Evolution and Time', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 330-352.

Knudtson, Peter, and David Suzuki, *Wisdom of the Elders* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1993).

Koestler, Arthur, *Janus: A Summing Up* (London: Pan Books, 1979).

Kohlberg, L., 'Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach', in *Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues*, ed. T. Lickona (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), pp. 31-53.

Krishnamurti, J. and David Bohm, *The Ending of Time* (New York: HarperCollins, 1985).

Krishnamurti, J. *The Book of Life: Daily Meditations with Krishnamurti* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995).

Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, trans. Gia-Fu Feng and Jane English (New York: Random House, 1972).

Lewis, J. David, and Andrew J. Weigart, 'Social-time: Structures and Meanings', in *The Sociology of Time*, ed. John Hassard (London: MacMillan, 1990), pp. 77-101.

Lovejoy, Arthur O., *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936/1966).

Lovell, Terry, 'Feminist Social Theory', in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, ed. Bryan Turner (Cambridge Mass., and Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 307-339.

Loy, David, 'Avoiding the Void: The Lack of Self in Psychotherapy and Buddhism', *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 24-2 (1992), 151-179.

Loy, David. 'Transcendence East and West', *Man and World*, 26 (1993), 403-427.

Loy, David, 'Preparing for Something that Never Happens: The Means/Ends Problem in Modern Culture', *International Studies in Philosophy* XXVI/4 (1994), 47-68.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984).

Macquarrie, John, *Twentieth-Century Religious Thought: The Frontiers of Philosophy and Theology, 1900-1960* (London: SCM Press, 1963).

Mead, George Herbert, *George Herbert Mead on Social Psychology: Selected papers, edited and with a revised introduction by Anselm Strauss* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

Metz, Johannes B., *Poverty of Spirit*, trans. John Drury (Paramus N.J.: Newman Press, 1968).

Milgram, S., *Obedience to Authority* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).

Mumford, Lewis, *The Transformations of Man* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1956).

Nakai, R. Carlos, *Earth Spirit: Native American Flute Music* (Phoenix, Arizona: Compact Disc, Canyon Records CR-612, Vol.4).

Nakamura, Hajime, 'Time in Indian and Japanese Thought', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 77-91.

Needham, Joseph, 'Time and Knowledge in China and the West', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 92-135.

O'Donahue, William., 'The (Even) Bolder Model: The Clinical Psychologist as Metaphysician-Scientist-Practitioner', *American Psychologist*, 44 (1989), 1460-1468.

Ong, Walter J., *Interfaces of the World* (Ithaca NY.: Cornell University Press, 1977).

Panikkar, Raimundo, *The Trinity and the Religious Experience of Man* (New York: Orbis Books, 1973).

Panikkar, Raimundo, *Blessed Simplicity: The Monk as Universal Archetype* (New York: Seabury Press, 1982).

Panikkar, Raimundo, 'The End of History: The Threefold Structure of Human Time-Consciousness', in *Teilhard and the Unity of Knowledge: The Georgetown University Centennial Symposium*, eds. Thomas King and James Salmon (Ramsey, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1983), pp. 83-141.

Panikkar, Raimon, *The Cosmotheandric Experience: Emerging Religious Consciousness* (Maryknoll NY.: Orbis Books, 1993).

Panikkar, Raimon, *Invisible Harmony: Essays on Contemplation and Responsibility*, ed. Harry James Cargas (Minneapolis, MN.: Fortress Press, 1995).

Panikkar, Raimon (Speaker), *The Silence of Life: The John Main Seminar, 1996* (London: Cassette Recording, Medio Media - The World Community for Christian Meditation, 1996).

Panikkar, Raimon, 'A Self-Critical Dialogue', in *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar*, ed. Joseph Prabhu (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), pp. 227-291.

Pearce, Joseph Chilton, *Evolution's End* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992).

Pelikan, J., ed., *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990).

Phelan, John M., *Disenchantment: Meaning and Morality in the Media* (New York: Hastings House, 1980).

Phillips, D.C. *Philosophy, Science and Social Inquiry* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987).

Pinar, William, William M. Reynolds, Patrick Slattery, and Peter M. Taubman, *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses* (New York: Peter Lang, 1995).

Plato. *Timaeus*, trans. H.D.P. Lee (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1965).

Podgorski, Frank, 'The Cosmotheandric Intuition: The Contemplative Catalyst of Raimon Panikkar', in *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar*, ed. Joseph Prabhu (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis Books, 1996), pp. 106-118.

Polanyi, Michael, *The Tacit Dimension* (New York: Doubleday, 1966).

Postman, Neil, *Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology* (New York: Vintage, 1993).

Poster, Mark, *The Second Media Age* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995).

Prabhu, Joseph, ed., *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar* (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis Books, 1996).

Prigogine, Ilya, 'Time and the Unity of Knowledge', in *Teilhard and the Unity of Knowledge: The Georgetown University Centennial Symposium*, eds. Thomas King and James Salmon (Ramsey, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1983), pp. 21-45.

Prigogine, Ilya, 'Irreversibility and Space-Time Structure', in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), pp. 232-250.

Prigogine, Ilya, 'The Reenchantment of Nature', in Renée Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages: The Search for Unity* (London: Arkana, 1990), pp. 181-197.

Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli, 'Mysticism and Ethics in Hindu Thought', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), pp. 490-497.

Rahman, Fazlur, 'The Qur'an', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), pp. 260-271.

Rich, Adrienne, *Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence* (London: Onlywomen Press, 1980).

Russell, J.L., 'Time in Christian Thought', in *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, ed. J.T. Fraser (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1966), pp. 59-91.

Saint Augustine, *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, trans. Edward B. Pusey (New York: Washington Square Press, 1960).

Saint Thomas Aquinas, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: Philosophical Texts*, trans. Thomas Gilby (New York: Galaxy Books, 1960).

Santayana, George, *The Complete Poems of George Santayana: A Critical Edition*, ed. William G. Holzberger (London: Associated University Presses, 1979).

Santrock, John W. *Adolescence: An Introduction*, Fifth Edition (Dubuque IA: WCB: Brown & Benchmark, 1993).

Seidman, Steven, *Contested Knowledge: Social Theory in the Postmodern Era* (Cambridge Mass., and Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).

Sheldrake, Rupert, *A New Science of Life: The Hypothesis of Morphic Resonance* (Rochester, Vermont: Park Street Press, 1981/1995).

Sheldrake, Rupert, 'Morphogenetic Fields: Nature's Habits', in Renée Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages* (London: Arkana, 1990), pp. 71-88.

Skolimowski, Henryk, *The Participatory Mind: A New Theory of Knowledge and of the Universe* (London: Arkana, 1994).

Smart, Barry, 'Postmodern Social Theory', in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, ed. Byron Turner (Cambridge Mass & Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 396-428.

Smith, Huston, *Forgotten Truth: The Common Vision of the World's Religions* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992).

Smith, Huston, *The Illustrated World's Religions: A Guide To Our Wisdom Traditions* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995).

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr, 'Beauty Will Save the World', in *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), pp. 623-630.

Sorokin, Pitirim A., *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, 4 vols. (New York: American Book Company, 1937-1941).

Sperry, Roger W., 'Psychology's Mentalist Paradigm and the Religion/Science Tension', *American Psychologist*, 43 (1988), 607-613.

Sperry, Roger W., 'The Impact and Promise of the Cognitive Revolution', *American Psychologist*, 48 (1993), 878-885.

Sperry, Roger W., 'The Future of Psychology', *American Psychologist*, 50 (1995), 505-506.

Stapp, Henry P., 'Einstein Time and Process Time, in *Physics and the Ultimate Significance of Time*, ed. David R. Griffin (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1986), pp. 264-270.

Storey, John, *An Introductory Guide to Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (Athens Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1993).

Sullivan, J.W.N., *Beethoven: His Spiritual Development* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960).

Suzuki, Daisetz T., *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist* (New York: Perennial Library, 1971).

Suzuki, Shunryu., *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind: Informal Talks on Zen Meditation and Practice* (New York: Weatherhill, 1970/1980).

Tagore, Rabindranath, *Fireflies* (New York: Collier Books, 1928/1955).

Tagore, Rabindranath, *A Tagore Reader*, ed. Amiya Chakravarty (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, *The Divine Milieu* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1968).

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, *The Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Perennial Library, 1975).

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, *The Heart of Matter* (New York: Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich, 1979).

Tillich, Paul, *The Courage To Be* (London: Fontana Library, 1962).

Tillich, Paul, *The Spiritual Situation in Our Technical Society*, ed. J.M. Thomas (Macon GA.: Mercer University Press, 1988).

Tolman, Charles W., 'Sumus Ergo Sum: The Ontology of Self and How Descartes Got it Wrong', in *Toward a Psychology of Persons*, ed. W. Smythe (Mahway NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998), pp. 3-24.

Torrance, Robert M., *The Spiritual Quest: Transcendence in Myth, Religion, and Science* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

Vattimo, Gianni, *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Post-modern Culture* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988).

Vattimo, Gianni, *The Transparent Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992).

Vattimo, Gianni, 'The Structure of Artistic Revolutions', in *Postmodernism: A Reader*, ed. Thomas Docherty (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 110-119.

Vygotsky, L.S., *Thought and Language*, ed. A. Kozulin (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986).

Walker, John, *Turner* (New York: Abrams, 1976).

Weber, Max, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1976). [Originally published 1904-5.]

Weber, Renée, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages: The Search for Unity* (London: Arkana, 1990).

Welwood, John, 'The Holographic Paradigm and the Structure of Experience', in *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science*, ed. Ken Wilber (Boston: Shambhala, 1985), pp. 127-135.

Whitehead, Alfred North, *Nature and Life* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1934).

Whitman, Walt, *The Portable Walt Whitman* (New York: Viking, 1973).

Wilber, Ken, 'The Great Chain of Being', *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 33-3 (1983), 52-65.

Wilber, Ken, ed., *Quantum Questions: Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists* (Boston: Shambhala, 1985).

Wilber, Ken, ed., *The Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes: Exploring the Leading Edge of Science* (Boston: Shambhala, 1985).

Wilber, Ken, *Eye to Eye: The Quest for the New Paradigm* (Boston: Shambhala, 1996).

Worthington, E.L., 'Religious Faith Across the Life-Span: Implications for Counseling and Research', *The Counseling Psychologist*, 17 (1989), 555-612.

Yeats, William Butler, *W. B. Yeats: Selected Poetry*, ed. A. Norman Jeffares (London: Macmillan Papermac, 1967).

Young, Iris Marion, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1990).

Zohar, Danah, *The Quantum Self* (London: Flamingo, 1991).

Appendix

Brief Notes

About People Mentioned in the Text

ARISTOTLE (384-322 BCE): Aristotle was born at Stagira in northern Greece, the son of a doctor. At seventeen he travelled to Athens to study with Plato. He remained at Plato's Academy for twenty years. After Plato's death, Aristotle travelled briefly before becoming tutor to the young Alexander of Macedon (later to become Alexander the Great). In 335 he returned to Athens where he established his own school. After Alexander died, strong anti-Macedonian feelings in Athens led to a charge of 'impiety' against Aristotle. Although he escaped, he died the following year at age 62.

ANGELUS SILESIUS [Johannes Scheffler] (1624-1677): The Christian mystic, Johannes Scheffler, adopted the name Angelus Silesius when he converted to Catholicism at the age of 29. He was born to Lutheran parents in the Silesian capital of Breslau and studied at the University of Padua. He was ordained a priest in 1661.

BARBOUR, IAN G.: Ian Barbour teaches in the Departments of Religion and Physics at Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota. His Gifford Lectures at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland (1989-1991) were published in two volumes as *Religion in an Age of Science*, and *Ethics in an Age of Technology*. Other books include *Issues in Science and Religion*, and *Science and Secularity*.

BEETHOVEN, LUDWIG (1770-1827): Although his musical gifts were recognized at an early age, the childhood of Ludwig van Beethoven was characterized by poverty and severe family difficulties. However, after he moved to Vienna in 1792, his brilliance as an innovative composer and his virtuosity as a pianist earned him the generous support of the Viennese aristocracy. His position at the pinnacle of musical life in Europe remained throughout his life in spite of the onset of deafness in 1801, which became progressively worse and was total by 1817. His work, which embraces virtually all musical genres, can be regarded as the culmination of the 'classical' musical tradition (roughly 1750-1827) and the beginning of the Romantic period.

BERGSON, HENRI (1859-1941): Henri Bergson became a professor of philosophy at the College de France in 1900. Bergson's philosophical position suggests that the world contains two opposing forces, a 'life force', which is perceived through a person's intuition, and the resistance of matter against the life force, which a person knows intellectually. He conceives time in terms of a personal experience of 'duration'. In 1927 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature. Among his major works are *Time and Free Will*, and *The Creative Mind*.

BEVAN, WILLIAM: William Bevan is a psychologist associated with the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation in Chicago. In 1990 he received a Distinguished Contributions to Psychology award from the American Psychological Association.

BJELLAND, ANDREW. Andrew Bjelland teaches at the Department of Philosophy at Seattle University, Seattle University.

BODEN, DEIRDRE: Deirdre Boden teaches sociology at Lancaster University.

BOETHIUS, ANUCIUS MANLIUS SEVERINUS (ca. 480-526 CE): Boethius was a Roman patrician who held the post of Master of the Offices under the Italian King Theodoric. He was eventually accused of treason and magic, imprisoned, tortured, and executed. While in prison he wrote his famous *Consolation of Philosophy* which contains the often quoted definition of eternity (as the 'perfect possession all at the same time of endless life'). His works, often Platonist in character, include commentaries on Cicero, Porphyry, and Aristotle, as well as essays on logic, the Trinity, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music.

BOHM, DAVID (1917-1993): The publication, in 1980, of David Bohm's *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* was the culmination of forty years of research into physics and philosophy. Bohm received his doctorate in physics from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1943, and since that time worked at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley, Princeton University, the University of Sao Paulo, and Haifa, and finally at Birbeck College of the University of London as a professor of Theoretical Physics. His work focuses on the fundamentals of Quantum Theory and Relativity Theory and (especially in later years) on their philosophical implications. He became a friend of J. Krishnamurti and two of their extended dialogues are published as *Truth and Actuality* and *The Ending of Time*. Bohm's ideas emphasize the need to overcome the fragmentation that characterizes both personal and collective life in modern societies.

BOHR, NIELS HENRIK DAVID (1885-1962): Niels Bohr was a professor of theoretical physics at the University of Copenhagen. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for his work on atomic structure. This work explained the apparent stability of the nuclear model of the atom in terms of the orbiting of electrons and the way an atom emits and absorbs energy.

BOLTZMANN, LUDWIG (1844-1906): Ludwig Boltzmann was an Austrian physicist known for his contribution to the Kinetic-Molecular Theory of Gases which accounts for the relationship between the temperature and the energy distribution of molecules in a gas.

BOORSTIN, DANIEL J. (b. 1914): Daniel J. Boorstin taught American history for twenty-five years at the University of Chicago, was the director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History, and for twelve years served as the Librarian of Congress in Washington D.C. He won the Pulitzer Prize for his trilogy *The Americans*. Other books include *The Creators*, and *The Discoverers*.

BOURDIEU, PIERRE: French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu, teaches at the Collège de France in Paris. He is also the director of studies at L'Ecole de hautes études. His books include *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, *Homo Academicus*, *Distinctions*, *Language and Symbolic Power*, *Sociology in Question*, and *In Other Words: Towards a Reflexive Sociology*.

BRAQUE, GEORGES (1882-1963): The French painter, Georges Braque, was associated with a number of different styles in the first half of the twentieth century, such as Fauvism (an expressionistic style characterized by distortion of forms and exuberant colour), Cubism (an analytical style that fragmented three-dimensional objects and redefined them from different points of view), and Collage (the use of natural or manufactured materials pasted onto painted or unpainted surfaces).

BROGLIE, LOUIS VICTOR (1892-1987): Prince Louis de Broglie was a French physicist, best known for his theory of wave mechanics. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in physics in 1929.

BRUNO, GIORDANO (1548-1600): The Italian philosopher, Giordano Bruno, was a member of the Dominican Order. However, his unorthodox views led to an accusation of heresy and he left this order in 1576 to become a wandering scholar. Eventually he was excommunicated by the Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist Churches and finally burned at the stake by the Inquisition. Bruno's philosophy combined Copernican astronomy, the metaphysics of Nicholas of Cusa, and the atomism of Lucretius. It held that there are many ways of viewing the world, and, therefore, it is not possible to postulate absolute truth. It also held that the universe is infinite, comprised of irreducible elements and containing an infinite number of inhabited worlds. One of his most celebrated depictions of the universe is as follows: 'Since in it centre does not differ from circumference, we may safely affirm that the universe is all centre, or that the centre of the Universe is everywhere and the circumference nowhere, in so far as it differs from the centre; or contrariwise, that the circumference is everywhere and the centre nowhere' (cited in Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*, p. 120). His ideas are noticeably reflected in the works of Leibniz and Spinoza.

BUTLER, JUDITH: Feminist scholar, Judith Butler, teaches in the Department of Rhetoric and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Berkeley. She draws on psychoanalytic theory and poststructural French theorists in support of her view that gender is a 'learned, situational performance', and, accordingly, that social

practices create the illusion of an inner gendered self. Thus, a central idea in her work is that feminism ought to abandon its claim of 'gender identity' as a basis for feminist theory and politics in order to open up new possibilities for sexual and gender choice and political action. She is the co-editor (with Joan W. Scott) of *Feminists Theorize the Political*, and her major publications include *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, and *Bodies that Matter*.

CALVINO, ITALO (1923-1985): Italo Calvino is widely recognized as one of Italy's leading literary figures. His books include *The Baron in the Trees*, *Invisible Cities*, *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller...*, *Marcovaldo, or the Seasons of the City*, *Mr. Palomar*, and *Under the Jaguar Sun*.

ČAPEK, MILIČ (b. 1909): Milič Čapek has taught both physics and philosophy: physics, at the University of Nebraska (1944-1946) and at the University of Olmutz, Czechoslovakia (1946-1947), and philosophy, at Boston University, from 1962 until his retirement. He is the editor of *The Concepts of Space and Time: Their Structure and Their Development*, and the author of books such as *Bergson and the Trends of Contemporary Physics*, and *The Philosophical Impact of Contemporary Physics*, and *New Aspects of Time: Its Continuity and Novelty*.

CAPRA, FRITJOF: Fritjof Capra has done research in high-energy physics at several European and American Universities, including, the Universities of Vienna and Paris, and the University of California, Santa Cruz and Berkeley. Also, he lectures extensively about the philosophical implications of modern science. Major books are *The Tao of Physics* (an international 'bestseller') and *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture*.

de CAUSSADE, JEAN-PIERRE (1675-1751): Jean-Pierre de Caussade was a French Jesuit and ascetic writer. In his major work, *Self-Abandonment to Divine Providence*, he teaches that the action of love flows directly from a person's submission to the will of God in each and every moment, as reflected in the phrase 'the sacrament of the present moment'. He writes: 'the presence of God which sanctifies our souls is that indwelling of the Holy Trinity which is established in the depths of our hearts when they submit to the divine will'; moreover, 'the doctrine of pure love can only be learned through the action of God, and not as the result of our own activity of mind' (see pp. 13 & 16).

CHODOROW, NANCY: Feminist scholar, Nancy Chodorow, is noted for her adoption of a psychoanalytic approach in her sociological analysis of mothering. According to this analysis, it is essentially a mother's relationship with her child that lays the groundwork for differentiated sexed selves in later life, not biological sexual differences *per se*. Chodorow suggests further that the mother-daughter relationship centers on the process of 'identification': girls become mothers because it is a socially acquired feminine gender identity. Moreover, she explains the mother-son relationship

as an 'anacritic' one, that is, males tend to choose a person to love in later life modeled on a mother or mother-substitute. Her major publication is *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*.

CHUANG-TZU (ca. 370-286 BCE): Along with Lao-tzu, Chuang-tzu is considered one of the founders of philosophical Taoism. Although little is known of his life, it is believed that he held a minor administrative post, and that he was a fierce critic of Confucianism. The major book associated with him bears his name, *Chuang-tzu*. This book contains thirty-three chapters, of which seven were probably written by him, the rest, probably by his pupils. [See *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, p. 220.] The works of Chuang-tzu are characterized by the use of parable, anecdote, allegory, and paradox.

COPLAND, AARON (1900): The American composer, Aaron Copland, was born in Brooklyn, New York. He studied in Paris with the renowned teacher Nadia Boulanger and throughout his career his music reflected the dominant trends of the time, including the use of popular musical styles such as jazz and folk music, as well as neoclassicism (epitomized in Stravinsky's music) and (briefly) serialism (epitomized in the music of Arnold Schoenberg). Some of Copland's concert music and ballet scores have achieved particularly wide fame, such as *El Salon Mexico*, *Billy the Kid*, *Rodeo*, and *Appalachian Spring*. He also wrote a number of film scores, in particular, *Quiet City*, *Of Mice and Men*, *Our Town*, and *The Red Pony*.

COPLESTON, FREDERICK S.J. (b. 1907): Frederick Copleston, a Jesuit priest, was a professor of the history of philosophy at the University of London. He is the author of a nine volume *History of Philosophy*, as well as books on Thomas Aquinas, Arthur Schopenhauer, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Russian philosophy. Other publications include *Contemporary Philosophy*, *Religion and the One: Philosophies East and West*, and *Philosophers and Philosophies*.

CORNELIUS, BENJAMIN A. (b. 1897): Benjamin Cornelius taught philosophy at Baylor University and the University of Missouri. In addition to his contributions to scientific, philosophical, and educational journals, his publications include *Logical Structure of Science*, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*, and *Science, Technology and Human Values*.

COUSINS, EWERT H.: Ewert Cousins is a professor of theology and director of a program in Cross-Cultural Spirituality at Fordham University. He is also the editor of the Crossroad Books Series, *Classics in World Spirituality*. His scholarly publications include *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, and *Christ of the Twenty-First Century*.

COVENEY, PETER: Peter Coveney has worked as a lecturer in physical chemistry at the University of Wales, as a research Fellow at Oxford University, as a programme

leader in the Rock and Fluid Physics Department at the Schlumberger Cambridge Research Laboratory, and with the renowned chemist, Ilya Prigogine.

COWARD, HAROLD: Harold Coward is the director of the Centre for Studies in Religion and Society at the University of Victoria. Previously, he was a professor and head of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Calgary. He is also the founding editor of *The Hindu-Christian Studies Bulletin*, one of the founders of the Society for Hindu-Christian Studies, and a member of the Royal Society of Canada. His many scholarly publications include *Pluralism: Challenge to World Religions*, *Sacred Word and Sacred Text: Scripture in World Religions*, and (with K. Kunjnni Raja) *The Philosophy of the Grammarians*.

CSIKSZENTMIHALYI, MIHALYI: Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi teaches psychology at the University of Chicago and is a member of the National Academy of Education and the National Academy of Leisure Sciences. He is the author of many scholarly publications, including *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*, *Beyond Boredom and Anxiety*, *Being Adolescent* (with Reed Larson), *The Art of Seeing* (with Rick Robinson), and *The Evolving Self: A Psychology for the Third Millennium*.

DALLMAYR, FRED R. (b. 1928): Fred Dallmayr is a political philosopher who teaches at the University of Notre Dame. He is known as one of the foremost exponents of phenomenology in the United States.

DAMON, WILLIAM: William Damon is a professor of psychology at Clark University. He is the founding editor of *New Directions for Child Development* and his scholarly publications include *The Social World of the Child*, *Social and Personality development*, *Self-Understanding in Childhood and Adolescence*, and *The Moral Child*.

DANZINGER, KURT: Kurt Danzinger is a professor of psychology at York University, in Toronto.

DARWIN, CHARLES ROBERT (1809-1882): As the official naturalist aboard a ship voyaging around the world (the H.M.S. Beagle), Charles Darwin accumulated the data which eventually led him to formulate the theory of evolution. His major works are the *Origin of Species*, and *The Descent of Man*.

DAVIES, PAUL: Paul Davies is a professor of natural philosophy at the University of Adelaide in Australia. He has written over twenty books on scientific topics, many pertaining to the meaning of 'time' and the relationship between science and religion, including *The Edge of Infinity*, *God and the New Physics*, *The Cosmic Blueprint*, *The Mind of God*, and *About Time: Einstein's Unfinished Revolution*.

DENG MING-DAO: Deng Ming-Dao studied with Taoist master Kwan Saihung. He is the author of *365 Tao*, *The Chronicles of Tao*, and *Everyday Tao: Living With Balance and Harmony*.

DENZIN, NORMAN: Norman Denzin is a professor of sociology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Over the years, according to one commentator, Denzin has attempted to synthesize a 'symbolic interaction' approach (which emphasizes the centrality of human *intersubjectivity*) with a variety of other theoretical approaches, such as mainstream positivism, ethnomethodology, postmodernism, and cultural studies. [See Robert Prus, *Symbolic Interaction and Ethnographic Research* (Albany NY.: State University of New York Press, 1996), p. 241.] In Denzin's own words, he is committed to 'theorizing within the present'. [See Denzin, *Interpretive Interactionism*, (Newbury Park CA.: Sage, 1989), pp. 138-139.]

DERRIDA, JACQUES (b. 1930): The French philosopher, Jacques Derrida, was born in Algeria. His work was influenced by Husserl (the founder of phenomenology) as well as by Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Freud. It is largely identified with 'deconstructionism', an intellectual orientation which is concerned with discovering the unacknowledged assumptions underlying expressions of rational thought. Derrida's work challenges the primacy given to spoken language in the work of linguists such as de Saussure by claiming that the written word has the ability to alter speech and thought rather than merely transmit meaning. His major publications include *Writing and Difference*, and *On Grammatology*.

DESCARTES, RENÉ (1596-1650): Often considered the principal philosopher bridging the philosophy of medieval and renaissance scholasticism with that of the modern period, René Descartes was born in Touraine of a well-to-do family, and throughout his life lived comfortably without financial worries. He received much of his early education at the Jesuit college, La Fleche, in Anjou, and later studied law at the University of Poitiers, taking his degree in 1616. During his twenties he travelled extensively, serving for a time as a gentleman volunteer in both the Dutch and Bavarian armies. As he relates in Part II of his *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One's Reason and Seeking Truth in the Sciences*, Descartes experienced a pivotal event in 1619 when, during a period of meditation in a Bavarian farmhouse, he conceived a vast project of developing a system of scientific investigation that could be applied to all aspects of the human quest for knowledge. Apart from his early work *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, which was written while living in Paris, Descartes wrote all his major work while living in Holland between 1628 and 1649, the year before his death. The enormous scope of his work includes the founding the analytic geometry, major contributions to algebra, optics, physiology, psychology, and philosophy. Essentially, his philosophy is founded on an assertion of universal doubt, that is, on the idea that the only thing that cannot be doubted is the existence of the doubter. From this core idea, Descartes deduces his understanding of both the physical world and the nature of God as 'first cause'. The overriding

characteristic of this philosophy is its dualism, that is, its belief in an absolute distinction between physical matter and mind.

DEWEY, JOHN (1859-1952): John Dewey was born in Burlington, Vermont. After receiving his PhD from Johns Hopkins University (for a thesis about the psychology of Kant), he taught philosophy at the University of Michigan, and later at the University of Chicago, which he left in 1905 to go to Columbia University in New York City. His contribution to American philosophy covers a wide range of interests, chiefly in psychology, pedagogy, ethics and morality, and sociology. His essentially 'pragmatic' philosophical orientation is generally understood as 'Instrumentalism' (the belief that ideas are instruments that function as guides for action, their validity being determined by a consideration of their consequences). Some of his major works include *Human Nature and Conduct*, *Experience and Nature*, *Democracy and Education*, and *A Common Faith*.

DOSSEY, LARRY: Larry Dossey is an author and physician (specializing in internal medicine), and a former Chief of Staff at Medical City Dallas Hospital. His books explore the connection between 'mind, meaning, and healing', and include *Space, Time, and Medicine*, and *Meaning and Medicine*.

DOUGLAS-KLOTZ, NEIL: The primary interests of Neil Douglas-Klotz are 'movement, music, voice, and body awareness'. He is on the faculty of the Institute for Culture and Creation Spirituality in Oakland California and is codirector of the Center for the Dances of Universal Peace.

DURKHEIM, EMILE (1858-1917): French sociologist, Emile Durkheim, was born into a rabbinical family. In his early career he taught both philosophy and sociology at the Universities of Bordeaux and Paris. A major characteristic of Durkheim's sociology is the twofold belief that societies are irreducible entities and that the collective social mind is the source of religion and morality. Moreover, because common values are the source of social bonds, the loss of such values leads to both social and individual instability. His major works include *The Rules of Sociological Method*, *Suicide*, and *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*.

DYCHTOWALD, KEN (b. 1950): Ken Dychtwald is a psychologist. He is also the founding president of the National Association for Humanistic Gerontology, and serves as a consultant and instructor in psychology at several universities. His scholarly publications pertain to issues of health, growth, and human transformation. He is the author of *Bodymind*, *Revisioning Human Potential: Glimpses into the 21st Century*.

EARLEY, JOSEPH E: Joseph Earley teaches in the Department of Chemistry at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

ECKART, MEISTER (1260-1327): The medieval Christian mystic, Meister Eckhart, was born at Hochheim in Thuringia and entered the Dominican Order as a youth, completing his studies in Paris in 1302. He taught theology for awhile in Paris but returned to Germany where he became a renowned preacher. In 1326 he was accused of heresy (mainly pantheism) and died during the proceedings against him. In spite of this condemnation by the Catholic Church, Meister Eckhart's mystical writings were embraced by some of the great Catholic mystics, such as Saint Teresa of Avila and Saint John of the Cross.

EDDINGTON, ARTHUR (1882-1944): English astronomer and physicist, Sir Arthur Eddington, made important contributions towards our knowledge of the motion, evolution, and internal constitution of stellar systems. He taught at Cambridge University and led the famous expedition that photographed the solar eclipse which offered the first proof of Einstein's Relativity Theory. He was a prolific writer whose books include *Mathematical Theory of Relativity*, *The Internal Constitution of the Stars*, *Science and the Unseen World*, *New Pathways in Science*, and *The Nature of the Physical World*.

EINSTEIN, ALBERT (1879-1955): Albert Einstein was born in Germany. He published his special and general theories of relativity in 1905 and 1916, and in 1921 was awarded the Nobel Prize for his work in theoretical physics, in particular for his work on the photoelectric effect. He was a professor of Physics at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin from 1914 until 1934 when the Nazi government confiscated his property and revoked his German citizenship because he was Jewish. He moved to the United States and worked at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton from 1933 until his death, becoming an American citizen in 1940.

ELIADE, MIRCEA (1907-1986): Mircea Eliade was born in Romania. His interest in religious thought, mystical experiences, and myths led him to produce over 50 books, including a multi-volume *History of Religious Ideas* completed in 1985, *The Sacred and the Profane*, as well as short stories, plays, and novels, such as *The Forbidden Forest*. He taught at the University of Chicago and was editor of an *Encyclopedia of Religion and Religious Belief*.

ELIOT, THOMAS STEARNS (1888-1965): The poet, playwright, and literary critic, T.S. Eliot, was born in America (St. Louis) and educated at Harvard University, the Sorbonne, and Oxford University. He became a British subject in 1927 and had a career in publishing, principally with two periodicals, *The Egoist* (1917-1930) and his own *Criterion* (1922-1939). In 1948 he received the Nobel Prize for literature. Among his plays (written in verse) are *Murder in the Cathedral*, and *The Cocktail Party*. His major works of poetry include *Prufrock and Other Observations*, *The Wasteland*, *Ash Wednesday*, and *The Four Quartets*.

EMERSON, RALPH WALDO (1803-1882): Ralph Waldo Emerson was born in Boston. He became a Unitarian minister but left this ministry because of doctrinal disputes. Chiefly known for his idealism and his advocacy of 'transcendentalism' (belief in the mystical unity of nature), his essays and lectures established him as one of America's most influential authors and thinkers. Among his best known essays are 'The Over-Soul', 'Compensation', and 'Self-Reliance'.

FAULKNER, WILLIAM (1897-1962): The American essayist, poet, and novelist, William Faulkner, was born in New Albany Mississippi and wrote primarily about life in the post-Civil War American South, largely about the loss of traditional values. He received the Nobel Prize for literature in 1949 and the Pulitzer Prize twice. Among his major novels are *The Sound and the Fury*, *The Hamlet*, *A Fable*, *The Reivers*.

FERGUSON, MARILYN: Marilyn Ferguson's contribution to contemporary scholarship includes her work as the editor of the *Brain/Mind Bulletin* and as an advisor to *ReVision Journal*. Also, she is the author of *The Brain Revolution*, and *The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980's*.

FOUCAULT, MICHEL (1926-1984): Michel Foucault was born in Poitiers, France, the son of a well-established surgeon. His education was predominantly in philosophy, with an emphasis on Hegel, Heidegger, and the phenomenologist Merleau-Ponty. However, he also studied psychology and worked for a time as both a technician and an intern in a mental hospital. For a time he was a cultural official for the French Institutes at Uppsala, Warsaw, and Hamburg. By 1970, his scholarly reputation was such that he obtained a chair at the Collège de France as a professor of the 'history of systems of ideas'. From time to time throughout his life, Foucault was involved in various political causes, such as establishing, in 1971, an 'information group' in the wake of prison revolts in France. His major works include *Madness and Civilization*, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, and *The History of Sexuality*.

FOX, MATTHEW (b.1940): Theologian, educator, and former Dominican priest, Matthew Fox, is noted as the author of a number of popular books on spirituality and theological topics, such as *Original Blessing*, *The Coming of the Cosmic Christ*, and *A Spirituality Named Compassion*. He is also the director of the Institute in Culture and Creation Spirituality, in Oakland California.

FRANKL, VIKTOR E.: Viktor Frankl was a professor of psychiatry and neurology at the University of Vienna Medical School and also taught at the United States International University and at Stanford University in California. He founded the method of existential psycho-analysis known as 'logotherapy' which centers on the belief that the 'search for meaning' is the primary force in a person's life as opposed to a 'secondary rationalization' of instinctual drives. His most famous book, *Man's*

Search for Meaning, gives an account of his experience in a Nazi concentration camp and also provides a brief account of the basic principles of logotherapy.

FRANKLIN, URSULA (b. 1921): Ursula Franklin, an officer of the Order of Canada, taught at the University of Toronto as an experimental physicist. She has also served on the board of the National Research Council of Canada and the Science Council of Canada. Her book *The Real World of Technology* is based on a series of lectures (the Massey Lectures) sponsored by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in 1989.

von FRANZ. MARIE-LOUISE (b. 1915): Marie-Louise von Franz is a psychoanalyst who worked closely with Carl Gustav Jung. She is also a scholar of medieval Latin and has published widely on subjects ranging from alchemy, fairy tales, and time.

FRASER, JULIUS THOMAS (b. 1923): J.T. Fraser, a specialist in engineering physics, has been a Research Associate at the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Michigan State University, and has held senior research positions at General Precision, Inc., Westinghouse Electric, and Mackay Radio and Telegraph Corporations. He holds several patents relating to solid-state microwave components, nuclear gyroscopes, and industrial instrumentation and control.

FRASER, NANCY: Feminist scholar, Nancy Fraser, is the co-editor (with Sandra Lee Bartky) of *Revaluing French Feminism: Critical Essays on Difference, Agency, and Culture*, and the author of *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*.

FREUD, SIGMUND (1856-1939): Sigmund Freud, universally recognized as the founder of psychoanalysis, was born in Vienna. His early career focused on the use of hypnosis for the treatment of hysteria, but he soon turned to the analytical method of 'free association' as a more effective way to bring into conscious awareness the unconscious repressions thought to be the cause of the disease. His use of this method led him to further investigations which eventually produced a systematic view of human behaviour and development based on the premise that a set of intrinsic drives, or underlying instinctual forces, influence all aspects of human life. In 1938 Freud moved to England to escape from the Nazi occupation of Austria.

FRIEDLAND, ROGER: Roger Friedland is a professor of sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

FRIEDLANDER, BERNARD Z.: Bernard Friedland teaches at the Department of Psychology at the University of Hartford, West Hartford Connecticut.

GADAMER, HANS-GEORG (b.1900): Hans-Georg Gadamer was a pupil of Martin Heidegger. As a philosopher, he is regarded as a leading exponent of hermeneutics (the 'art of interpretation'), and many of his works are devoted to the interpretation of other philosophers, most notably, Heidegger, Hegel, and Plato. In his major book, *Truth and Method*, he focuses on clarifying the nature of 'understanding', distinguishing between understanding as an 'experiential' phenomenon and the kind of 'explanation' that characterizes the scientific method.

GEBAUER, GUNTER: Gunter Gebauer is a professor at the Center for Historical Anthropology at the Free University of Berlin and the author of several works of literary and cultural criticism.

GENDLIN, EUGENE T. (b. 1926): Eugene Gendlin is a professor of psychology at the University of Chicago who has written books and articles on philosophical as well as psychological topics. For many years, he was the editor of *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice*, and in 1970 he was chosen by the Psychotherapy Division of the American Psychological Association for their first 'Distinguished Professional Psychologist of the Year' Award. His therapeutic (self-help) technique of 'focusing' has been adapted as a way of interpreting dreams. [See Eugene T. Gendlin, *Let Your Body Interpret Your Dreams* (Wilmette Ill.: Chiron, 1986).]

GERGEN, KENNETH J.: Kenneth J. Gergen teaches psychology at Swarthmore College, Swarthmore Pennsylvania. Among his scholarly publications are *Toward Transformation in Social Knowledge* and *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life*. Also, he is the co-editor (with John Shotter) of the series *Inquiries In Social Construction* (SAGE publications), which is designed 'to facilitate, across discipline and national boundaries, an emergent dialogue within the social sciences which many believe presages a major shift in the western intellectual tradition'.

GILLIGAN, CAROL (b. 1936): Carol Gilligan is an American psychologist who teaches at Harvard University. She is known especially for her research with regard to moral reasoning, in particular, her critical response to the prominent theory of moral cognitive development of Lawrence Kohlberg. According to Gilligan, and in contrast with Kohlberg, there are two major types of moral reasoning that express an important gender-based difference in emphasis: more common among males is the type that focuses on analytical considerations of justice, rights and duties; more common among females is the type that focuses on relational and contextualized concerns about 'caring'. Her major publication is *In a Different Voice*.

GOSDEN, CHRISTOPHER: Christopher Gosden has taught in the Department of Archaeology at La Trobe University and at Oxford University.

GOULD, STEPHEN JAY: Stephen Gould is a professor of zoology and geology at Harvard University, and the curator for Invertebrate Paleontology at the university's Museum of Comparative Zoology. Among his numerous books are *The Mismeasure of Man*, *Wonderful Life*, *Eight Little Piggies*, *The Flamingo Smile*, *Bully for Brontosaurus*, *Dinosaur in a Haystack*, and *Full House*.

GRIFFIN, DAVID RAY (b. 1939): David Griffin teaches at the School of Theology at Claremont and at Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California. He is also the Executive Director of the Center for Process Studies, Claremont, California and the founding president of the Center for a Postmodern World. His publications include *God and Religion in the Postmodern World*, *Varieties of Postmodern Theology* (with W. A. Beardslee and Joe Holland), and *Primordial Truth and Postmodern Theology* (with Huston Smith).

GRIFFITHS, BEDE (1906-1993): Bede Griffiths was born in England and educated at Oxford University. He became a Benedictine monk in the early 1930's, and after twenty years of living as a Western monk and scholar, he went to India where he lived the last four decades of his life as a Hindu *sannyasin* (one who renounces all formal ties with the world) and, in the words of one commentator 'working on a profound synthesis between Eastern and Christian mysticism'. (See Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 232.)

HABERMAS, JÜRGEN (b. 1929): As a philosopher, principally associated with the University of Frankfurt, Jürgen Habermas's aim might be described as a desire 'to integrate philosophy and empirical science for the purpose of moral critique and social change' [see Steven Seidman, *Contested Knowledge: Social Theory in the Postmodern Era* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), p. 174]. This aim receives its clearest articulation in his theory of 'communicative action', derived largely from speech-act philosophy. This theory attempts to reformulate the so-called Enlightenment project (that is, the use of reason as the primary human capacity) in terms of 'transcendental pragmatics'. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* describes this theoretical approach as one 'that retains the commitment to values of truth, critique, and rational consensus [associated with the Enlightenment] but which pins its faith to the regulative precept of an "ideal speech situation", a public sphere of uncoerced participant debate wherein those values might achieve their fullest expression'.

HARAWAY, DONNA: Donna Haraway is a professor in the History of Consciousness program at the University of California, Santa Cruz. She teaches feminist theory, technoscience studies, and women's studies. Her publications include *Crystals, Fabrics, and Fields: Metaphors or Organicism in Twentieth-Century Developmental Biology*, *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*, and *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*.

HARMAN, WILLIS (b. 1918): Willis Harman has had a particularly varied career: as a professor of engineering-economic systems at Stanford University, as a consultant at SRI International of Menlo Park, California (a so-called 'think-tank' institution), as a consultant of the Commerce Technical Advisory Board serving the US Department of Commerce, as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, as a member of the Executive Board and Editorial Board of the *Journal for Humanistic Psychology*, and as president of the Institute of Noetic Sciences, in Sausalito, California. His books include *An Incomplete Guide to the Future*, *Changing Images of Man* (with O.W. Markley), *Higher Creativity* (with Howard Rheinhold, and Jeremy Tarcher), *Paths to Peace* (with Richard Smoke), and *Global Mind Change: The New Age Revolution in the Way We Think*.

HARVEY, ANDREW: In addition to editing *The Essential Mystics: Selections from the World's Great Wisdom Traditions*, Andrew Harvey has edited *The Mystic Vision: Daily Encounters with the Divine* (with Anne Baring). He is also the author of *A Journey in Ladakh*, *Hidden Journey*, and *The Essential Gay Mystics*.

HASSARD, JOHN: John Hassard is a sociologist and the director for Graduate Management Studies at the University of Keele.

HEBDIGE, DICK: Dick Hebdige has taught in the communications department at Goldsmiths College in the University of London and in the critical studies department at the California Institute of the Arts. His scholarly publications include *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, *Cut 'n' Mix: Culture, Identity, and Caribbean Music*, and *Hiding in the Light: On Images and Things*.

HEIDEGGER, MARTIN (1889-1976): Martin Heidegger was a German philosopher, a student of Edmund Husserl (the founder of Phenomenology), whom he succeeded as Professor of Philosophy at the University of Freiburg. Heidegger is generally regarded as a leading exponent of Existentialism (a system of thought that emphasizes the uniqueness of individual experience), although he himself rejected this label, preferring to think of his work as an investigation of the 'nature of being' in which the analysis of human existence is only a first step. In his major work, *Being and Time*, he examines such concepts as 'care', 'mood', and the individual's attitude towards death as a means of exploring the nature of 'being' as well as the relationship between modern societal life and how individuals confront their own temporality.

HEINE, HEINRICH (1797-1856): The German Romantic poet, Heinrich Heine, provided the lyrics for some of the world's finest music for voice, music written by Franz Schubert and Robert Schumann. He was an ardent supporter of the ideals of the French Revolution, and in 1831 he left Germany to live and work in Paris as a correspondent for German newspapers and a leading figure in the literary movement Young Germany.

HEISENBERG, WERNER (1901-1976): Werner Heisenberg was a German physicist and a recognized founder of Quantum Theory. He is perhaps most famous for his 'uncertainty principle' which states that it is impossible to determine both the position and the momentum of a subatomic particle with a sufficiently high degree of accuracy. The major implication of this principle is that the laws of physics are, in reality, statements about relative, as opposed to absolute, certainties. He received the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1932.

HERACLITUS OF EPHESUS (fl. ca. 500 BCE): The pre-Socratic philosopher, Heraclitus, belonged to an eminent family, but little is known of his life. What is known, however, is that during his lifetime Ephesus was part of the Achaemenid dynasty of Persia. His writings (about 100 'sentences' or 'fragments') earned him the nickname 'the Obscure' and 'the Riddler'. Nevertheless, in the words of one commentator, the ideas of Heraclitus 'reveal a spiritual intellect of the deepest richness and brilliance'. (See Andrew Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 224.)

HERRIGEL, EUGEN (1884-1955): Eugen Herigel is a German philosopher who taught at the University of Tokyo between the two World Wars. He wrote his book *Zen and the Art of Archery* after six years of training with a Zen master. He is also the author of *The Method of Zen*.

HESCHEL, ABRAHAM JOSHUA (1907-1972): Abraham Heschel, a philosopher of religion, was born in Poland. He was a close associate of Martin Buber and taught in Germany and England before emigrating to the United States where he taught at the Hebrew Union College and at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City. His works emphasize that the mystical and social dimensions of religion are inseparable. Major works include *Man is Not Alone* and *God in Search of Man*.

HESHUSIUS, LOUS: Lous Heshusius is a professor in the Faculty of Education at York University in Toronto. Her work focuses on critiques of special education and on qualitative research practices in ways that reflect questions of ideological, gendered, and cultural ways of knowing. She publishes in journals such as *Exceptional Children*, *Educational Researcher*, and the *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. A major work of scholarship is her participant observation study, *Meaning in Life*, which focuses on the perceptions of people labelled 'retarded'.

HIGHET, GILBERT (1906-1978): The classical scholar, Gilbert Highet, was born in Glasgow, Scotland. He taught at Oxford University from 1933 until 1937 and at Columbia University in New York City for 35 years, beginning in 1937. He was a prolific writer whose scholarly contributions number close to a thousand items, primarily in the fields of literary criticism, pedagogy, and various topics related to Classical scholarship. Among his major works are *The Art of Teaching*, *The Immortal Profession*, *The Classical Tradition*, *The Anatomy of Satire*, and *Poets in a Landscape*.

HIGHFIELD, ROGER: Roger Highfield is the science editor of the *Daily Telegraph* (London, England). In 1987 he received a Medical Journalist of the Year award, and in 1989, a Special Correspondent of the Year award.

HILLIER, PAUL: Paul Hillier's many musical activities include singing, conducting, composing, and writing, and his many interests and recordings range from medieval to contemporary music. In 1974 he co-founded the highly successful Hilliard Ensemble, and, in the early 1990's, the Theatre of Voices. He has held several University positions, including professorships at the University of California at Davis (1990-1996) and the Indiana University School of Music, Bloomington. His scholarly publications include several anthologies of choral music as well as a book about Arvo Pärt.

HORKHEIMER, MAX (1895-1973): The German social philosopher, Max Horkheimer, was a founding member (and later director) of the Frankfurt School of critical social theorists established in 1923 at the Institute for Social Research at Frankfurt University. When this institute closed in 1934, Horkheimer, along with fellow critical theorists Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse emigrated to America and established the New School for Social Research in New York. In the 1950's, Horkheimer and Adorno returned to Frankfurt. As expounded by Horkheimer, the aim of critical theory is to subject every one-sided doctrine to intensive, socially-minded scrutiny, that is, a scrutiny that recognizes that all theory and practice are products of social processes.

HUEBNER, DWAYNE: As a scholar in the field of curriculum studies, Dwayne Huebner's work has been largely influenced by theology and philosophy (chiefly phenomenology).

HUXLEY, ALDOUS LEONARD (1894-1963): Aldous Huxley was an English author and grandson of the famed biologist and educator, T.H. Huxley. He published critical essays and poetry before turning to the novel. In his later years, he became intensely interested in mysticism and Eastern philosophy. His major novels include *Crome Yellow*, *Antic Hay*, *Point Counter Point*, and *Brave New World*. Other works include *Eyeless in Gaza*, *The Perennial Philosophy*, and *Ape and Essence*.

ILTING, KARL-HEINZ: Karl-Heinz Ilting was a professor of philosophy at the University of Saarbrücken, and a renowned scholar of Hegel's philosophy.

INNIS, HAROLD ADAMS (d. 1952): Harold Adams Innis was an economic historian who taught at the University of Toronto, where he also served as the Head of the Department of Political Economy and the Dean of Graduate School.

JACQUES, ELLIOTT: Jacques Elliott was a professor of sociology at Brunel University, England.

JAFFÉ, ANIELA: Aniela Jaffé was born in Berlin and studied psychology at the University of Hamburg. At the outbreak of World War II she moved to Zurich and studied analytic psychology with C.G. Jung. In addition to her work as a psychoanalyst in Zurich, she worked with Jung on his autobiographical work *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, edited his *Letters*, and subsequently became one of the foremost interpreters of his ideas.

JAMES, WILLIAM (1842-1910): William James was born in New York City, the son of well-to-do parents and brother of Henry James, who became a renowned novelist. His main academic position was at Harvard University where he taught psychology and philosophy. The work of William James reflects his philosophical 'pragmatism', that is, his belief that the truth of a proposition is discerned by an examination of its consequences. He expressed this belief through what has been called his 'radical empiricism', which refers to the view that the ultimate 'stuff' of 'knowable' reality is 'pure experience'. Major works include *Principles of Psychology*, *The Will to Believe*, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, and *Pragmatism*.

JONES, STANTON L.: Stanton L. Jones teaches in the Department of Psychology at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois.

JOYCE, JAMES (1882-1941): Irish novelist James Joyce was educated in Dublin, but after 1902 he lived on the Continent. His major works include three volumes of poetry as well as the novels *Dubliners*, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegan's Wake*.

JUNG, CARL GUSTAV (1875-1961): Carl Gustav Jung was a Swiss psychiatrist and founder of what is known as 'analytic psychology'. For a time (from 1907 until 1912), he worked closely with Sigmund Freud, but his ideas differ significantly from Freud's, chiefly with respect to the nature of the unconscious, the aetiology of neurosis, and infantile sexuality. In *Psychology of the Unconscious*, Jung postulates that there are two dimensions of the unconscious, the personal and the collective. Also, he suggests that the most significant task for any person is achieving harmony between conscious and unconscious life. Although not a supporter of organized religions, Jung believed that people are 'naturally religious'.

KALMUS, HANS: Hans Kalmus is a medical doctor who has worked at the University of London and at McGill University as a professor of genetics. In addition, he has held visiting professorships at Indiana and Jerusalem Universities and was the co-founder of the International Society for the Study of Biological Rhythm. His scholarly publications include *Paramecium*, *Genetics*, *Simple Experiments with Insects*, *Variation and Heredity in Man*, and *The Chemical Senses*.

KANT, IMMANUEL (1724-1804): The German idealist philosopher, Immanuel Kant, lived his entire life in Königsberg, scarcely travelling more than 40 miles from it. After 1755 he taught philosophy at the University of Königsburg. Among his numerous philosophical insights are the following: only objects of experience can be known, and the existence of so-called 'noumena' (or things lying beyond experience) cannot be affirmed or denied, although we assume 'a priori' knowledge of them in some cases; although metaphysical issues (such as the existence of God, freedom, and immortality) cannot be proven by scientific thought, they are required for moral living. Kant's moral philosophy is best summarized by his famous 'categorical imperative' or absolute moral law, namely, 'Act as if the maxim from which you act were to become through your will a universal law' (see Kant, *The Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*, 1785).

KOESTLER, ARTHUR (1905-1983): Arthur Koestler was born in Hungary and attended the University of Vienna. During the Spanish Civil War he was a foreign correspondent for German and British publications and was captured by the Fascists, condemned to death, and eventually released as a result of British protests. During the 1930's he espoused Communism but left the Communist Party out of disgust for the so-called Stalin 'purge trials', brilliantly portrayed in his novel *Darkness at Noon*. He lived in Britain since the early 1940's and produced a number of books on philosophical, cultural, and sociopolitical themes, among them *The Roots of Coincidence*, *The Act of Creation*, *The Ghost in the Machine*, *The Heel of Achilles*, and *Janus: A Summing Up*.

KOHLBERG, LAWRENCE: The work of Harvard University psychology professor Lawrence Kohlberg is an outgrowth of ideas put forward by the French developmental psychologist Jean Piaget. Kohlberg is known primarily for his theory of the development of moral reasoning in terms of three basic levels (Preconventional, Conventional, and Postconventional or Principled morality), each level having two distinct stages. Kohlberg's theory has spawned a vast amount of research that both supports and challenges it. Major critical responses to it include (a) its use of hypothetical moral situations as an investigative tool, which suggests that moral thought can be considered apart from *actual* moral situations, and (b) its neglect of the role of emotions and other non-rational influences on moral behaviour.

KNUDTSON, PETER & DAVID SUZUKI: In addition to *Wisdom of the Elders*, Peter Knudtson and David Suzuki have co-authored *Genetics: The Clash Between the New genetics and Human Values*. Peter Knudtson's publications also include *A Mirror to Nature: Reflections on Science, Scientists, and Society* and *The Wintun Indians of California*. David Suzuki's published works include *It's a Matter of Survival* (with Anita Gordon), *Inventing the Future: Reflections on Science, Technology, and Nature*, and *Metamorphosis: Stages in a Life*.

KRISHNAMURTI, JIDDU (1895-1986): When the Indian religious figure and acclaimed 'guru' Krishnamurti was fourteen years old (in 1909), he was proclaimed a 'world teacher-to-be' (actually the eventual incarnation of Lord Maitre, the bodhisattva of compassion who is manifest in human form every 2,000 years) by two leaders of the Theosophical Society, a movement that combines Buddhist and Hindu teachings with Western occult philosophy. However, in 1920, he renounced this particular role and began a life of lecturing, writing, and holding discussions around the world. These activities have led to the creation of various Krishnamurti Foundations (in India, England, America, and Canada) as well as schools ranging from elementary to high schools. His teachings center on the idea that 'truth is within, and it can and must be discovered by each person alone'. (See Renee Weber, *Dialogues With Scientists and Sages*, p. 218.)

LAPLACE, PIERRE-SIMON, Marquis de (1749-1827): Pierre-Simon de Laplace was a French astronomer and mathematician whose mathematical studies of tides and the motions of comets, the moon, Saturn, and Jupiter helped to establish Newton's theory of gravity beyond doubt. Also, he is responsible for the nebular hypothesis of the origin of the solar system. His major work is *Celestial Mechanics* (5 volumes).

LAO-TZU: Lao-tzu is a perhaps a legendary figure (possibly born between 604 and 571 BCE). He is, nevertheless, revered as a renowned mystic and founding figure of Taoism, and there are many stories (or legends) about his life. Taoist tradition identifies him as the author of *Tao-te Ching*, although modern scholarship casts doubt on this belief by suggesting that this text 'did not come into its present form until the second half of the third century'. (See *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, p. 570, and Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 217.)

LEIBNIZ, GOTTFRIED WILHELM (1646-1716): Gottfried Leibniz (Baron von) was a German philosopher and mathematician whose career embraced the physical sciences, law, history, diplomacy, and logic. He was born in Leipzig and died in Hanover, and among his many achievements are the invention of the calculus (independently of Newton), and his philosophical idea suggesting that the basic constituents of the universe are simple substances called 'monads', infinite in number, nonmaterial, and hierarchically arranged. His major work was a treatise on the philosophy of John Locke called *New Essays on Human Understanding*.

LEWIS, J. DAVID: J. David Lewis is a professor of Sociology at the University of Notre Dame.

LOCKE, JOHN (1632-1704): As a philosopher, John Locke is often acknowledged as the founder of British empiricism. He was educated at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford, and in addition to teaching and writing on many philosophical topics, he contributed to the disciplines of education, economics, theology, and medicine. His interest in medicine resulted in a position with the Earl of Shaftesbury,

which in turn resulted in his involvement with Protestant politics and an exile in Holland from 1683 to 1689. His two most celebrated works, the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, and *Two Treatises on Civil Government*, were both published in 1690 and testify to his monumental influence in the fields of epistemology and political philosophy. His principal ideas with regard to knowledge theory propose that experience is the fundamental source of human understanding, a view which situates him in opposition to rationalist theories of innate ideas. In political theory, he is particularly noted for arguing against the theory of 'divine right' and in defense of a form of constitutional government based on a theory of 'natural rights', rights which guaranteed equality to all persons and the freedom to pursue 'life, health, liberty, and possessions'.

LOVEJOY, ARTHUR O: Arthur O. Lovejoy was a professor of philosophy at Johns Hopkins University. His major scholarly works include *The Revolt Against Dualism*, and *The Great Chain of Being*.

LOVELL, TERRY: Terry Lovell is a sociologist who lectures in women's studies and cultural studies at the Centre for the Study of Women and Gender at Warwick University. She is the editor of *British Feminist Thought*, and *Feminist Cultural Studies*. Her publications include *Pictures of Reality: Politics, Aesthetics and Pleasure*, and *Consuming Fiction*.

LOY, DAVID (b. 1947): The Buddhist philosopher, David Loy, teaches at the Faculty of International Studies at Bunkyo University, Chigasaki, Japan. In addition to scholarly articles his work includes *Nonduality: A Study in Comparative Philosophy*.

LUCRETIUS (CA. 95-52 BCE): Lucretius was a Roman poet and epicurean philosopher whose major work was *De Rerum Natura* (On the Nature of Things). The essential belief presented in this work is that nothing infringes the autonomy of persons in securing happiness.

LYOTARD, JEAN-FRANCOIS (b. 1924): Jean-Francois Lyotard obtained his doctorate in 1971. Like many French intellectuals, he was involved with the so-called politics of the 'left'. However, as he began to articulate his own intellectual vision, he rejected all formal expressions of a theoretical nature and adopted a point of view that came to exemplify the postmodern orientation. This point of view has been described as one that 'dismantles foundations, disrupts hierarchy, and speaks on behalf of oppressed peoples' (see Steven Seidman, *Contested Knowledge*, p. 205). The publication for which he is most widely known is *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*.

MACQUARRIE, JOHN: John Macquarrie was a professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. His Hensley Henson Lectures at the University of Oxford (1993-1994) were published as *Heidegger and Christianity*. Other scholarly works include a study of Rudolf Bultmann titled *An Existentialist Theology*, as well as *Studies in Christian Existentialism*, *Twentieth Century Religious Thought*, and *Principles of Christian Theology*. He also edited *A Dictionary of Christian Ethics*.

MACROBIUS (ca. 400 CE): The works of Macrobius are considered part of the body of neoplatonist works which (a) helped to spread the study of philosophy throughout the Roman world in the fourth and fifth centuries, and (b) served as a vehicle for the transmission of ancient Greek philosophy to the scholars of the Middle Ages. His works include the *Saturnalia* and a commentary on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*.

MAHLER, GUSTAV (1860-1911): Gustav Mahler was an Austrian composer and conductor. He served as the director of the Vienna Opera from 1897 to 1907 and conductor of the New York Philharmonic Society from 1909 to 1911. His works are monumental expressions of the late Romantic era and include nine symphonies, songs, and songs cycles, notably *Songs of a Wayfarer*, *Kindertotenlieder*, and *Songs of the Earth*.

MARAGALL, JOAN (1860-1911): Joan Maragall was a renowned Spanish poet from Catalonia.

MCLUHAN, HERBERT MARSHALL (1911-1980): The Canadian communications theorist and educator, Marshall McLuhan, was born in Edmonton, Alberta. He received his PhD. from Cambridge University in 1943, and subsequently taught at several universities, including the University of Wisconsin, St. Louis University, the University of Windsor, and finally the University of Toronto (St. Michael's College). In the 1960's and 1970's he achieved widespread fame for his studies of the effects of mass media on thought and social behaviour. Several phrases he used in his work have become part of our everyday language, such as the term 'global village' and the phrase 'the medium is the message'. His books include *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*, and *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*.

MEAD, GEORGE HERBERT (1863-1931): George Herbert Mead was an American philosopher and sociologist who taught at the University of Chicago. Although he published a number of journal articles and book reviews, he did not publish any books. It was only after his death that many of his papers and unfinished manuscripts were compiled into book form. Mead's social pragmatism centers on the idea that the 'self' arises in the context of social processes in which language, as a form of 'reflexive communication', plays the key role. Writing about the social construction of the self, Mead observes that 'it is in addressing himself in the role of an other that his self arises in experience'. (See *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, 540).

METZ, JOHANNES B. (b. 1928): Johannes B. Metz is a German Christian theologian whose work is associated primarily with 'political theology'. In his view, the major task of political theology is the 'deprivatising' of theology, that is, promoting the belief that issues such as justice, reconciliation, and peace, are not and can never be private matters because they pertain essentially to the relationship between 'free' individuals and their various social groups.

MILGRAM, STANLEY: In the 1960's, Yale University psychologist Stanley Milgram set out to learn about the effects of an experimenter's 'authority' vis-a-vis a participant in an experiment. What he 'discovered' has shocked people ever since, namely, that in certain instances, people are willing to inflict life-threatening harm on others because of 'orders' given to them by an authority figure. In the words of one commentator: 'The Milgram studies can be criticized [and often are on account of their use of deception as a methodological tool], but they cannot be dismissed: they testify that ordinary, normal human beings can become torturers and killers under conditions created with remarkable ease'. (See Walter Mischel, *Introduction to Personality: A New Look*, Fourth edition (Orlando: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.: 1986), p. 477.)

MILTON, JOHN (1608-1674): The English poet, John Milton, was born in London and studied at Cambridge University. He abandoned his early ambition to become an Anglican clergyman and, instead, pursued a career as a poet and writer whose works were often devoted to a defense of civil and religious liberty. In the confrontation between Parliamentarians and Royalists that witnessed the imprisonment of King Charles I, Milton wrote in defense of the Parliamentarians and, as a consequence, in 1649 he was given a position in Cromwell's Commonwealth government which he held until the restoration of King Charles II in 1660. In 1652 he became totally blind and had to carry on his literary work with the assistance of secretaries. His works are generally identified as belonging to three periods: the first, from 1625 to 1640, includes his early poetry as well as the masques *Arcades* and *Comus* and the famous elegy *Lycidas*; the second period, from 1640 to 1660, was devoted primarily to writing prose and includes his most famous prose work, *Areopagitica*, an ardent defense of freedom of the press; in his third period, from 1660 to 1674, Milton completed his masterpiece, the epic poem *Paradise Lost*, and also wrote its companion, *Paradise Regained*, as well as the poetic drama *Samson Agonistes*.

MOZART, WOLFGANG AMADEUS (1756-1791): Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was born in Salzburg, Austria, the son of a prominent local musician, Leopold Mozart. As a child, he showed such a prodigious musical talent that his father devoted himself almost entirely to educating his son. Between the ages of six and fifteen, the young Mozart performed as a pianist and violinist throughout Europe, and at the same time developed his skills as a composer. From 1771 until 1781 he worked as a court

musician for the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg, but this position was often a source of frustration for him. After he moved to Vienna in 1781, he married and worked as a composer, eventually obtaining a position at the court of Joseph II. Although well paid for his commissions, he died in poverty at the age of 35 and was buried in a pauper's grave. His many works express virtually every musical genre.

MUMFORD, LEWIS (b.1895): The American social philosopher, educator, and prolific author, Lewis Mumford, was born in Flushing New York. His social criticism centers on the idea that people in our contemporary societies need to respond to the dehumanizing impact of modern technology by emphasizing human feelings and moral values in their daily lives. He was noted as a critic of architecture and city planning. In 1972 he received the National Medal for Literature, and in 1986 the National medal of Arts. Also, in 1975 he was made an honorary Knight Commander of the British Empire.

NAKAI, R. CARLOS (b. 1946): R. Carlos Nakai is of Navajo-Ute heritage. He studied classical trumpet at Northern Arizona University and afterwards turned to Native American flute music. His work is characterized by its allegiance to traditional Native American methods of making music while at the same time adapting these methods to his own innovative musical ideas, which include using the flute with both synthesized musical sounds and sounds from nature. Selections from one of his compositions, *Cycles*, have been choreographed and premiered by the Martha Graham Dance Company.

NAKAMURA, HAJIME (b. 1912): Hajime Nakamura was a professor of Indian and Buddhist philosophy at the University of Tokyo (beginning in 1943) and has also taught at Stanford University (1951-1952), the University of Florida (1961), the University of Hawaii (1959, 1962, 1964), and Harvard University (1963-1964). His works include *Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples, Japan and Indian Asia*, and a four volume *History of Early Vendata Philosophy* (in Japanese).

NEEDHAM, JOSEPH (b. 1900): Joseph Needham has taught biochemistry, physiology, and the history and philosophy of science at various universities, including Cambridge and Oxford Universities in England, and Stanford, Yale, and Cornell Universities in America. Also he is a recognized authority on Chinese culture. His many books include *Man and Machine*, *Chemical Embryology* (3 vols.), *Time*, *The Refreshing River*, *History is on Our Side*, *The Development of Iron and Steel Technology in China*, and *Heavenly Clockwork*.

NEWTON, ISAAC (1642-1727): Sir Isaac Newton was a professor of mathematics at Cambridge University. His scientific achievements were many and monumental. For instance: He formulated the law of universal gravitation between 1664 and 1666; he discovered that white light is composed of every colour in the spectrum of light; he built the first reflecting telescope; and he anticipated the calculus of variations. In

addition, he inquired extensively into alchemy, theology, and history.

NICHOLAS of CUSA (1401-1464): Nicholas of Cusa was a German theologian and philosopher who was also active in the political activities of the Roman Catholic Church. He acted as a papal representative on several embassies and was made a Cardinal in 1440 (or 1448). Philosophically, he is associated with neoplatonism and is famous for his doctrine of 'educated ignorance', an idea that focuses on the 'ineffability of God' and on the suggestion that those who believe they have affirmative knowledge of God are truly ignorant.

NICHOLSON, LINDA: Feminist scholar, Linda Nicholson, is the editor of *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory, Feminism/Postmodernism*, and the co-editor (with Steven Seidman) of *Social Postmodernism: Beyond Identity Politics*.

ONG, WALTER J. (b. 1912): Walter Ong is a Jesuit priest and a scholar of medieval and renaissance culture who was University Professor of Humanities, as well as the William E. Haren Professor of English and Professor of Humanities in Psychiatry at St. Louis University in Missouri. Among his many scholarly publications are *Orality and Literacy*, *Interfaces of the World*, *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture*, *The Barbarian Within*, *The Human Grain*, *Darwin's Vision and Christian Perspectives*, and *Hopkins, the Self, and God*.

PANIKKAR, RAIMON (b. 1918): Raimon Panikkar was born in Barcelona, Spain, of a Roman Catholic Spanish mother and an Indian father, and describes himself as 'fully Indian and fully Spanish'. He is a Catholic priest who holds three doctorates: one in philosophy from the University of Madrid (1946), another in chemistry from the same University (1958), and a third in theology from the Lateran University of Rome (1961). He has lectured worldwide and been a faculty member at numerous academic institutions, including Harvard University, Union Theological Seminary, the International University of Social Studies in Rome, and from 1971 until 1987, the University of California at Santa Barbara. The range of his scholarship is vast, ranging from 'the history and phenomenology of religions, philosophy and theology, through cosmology and the philosophy of science, comparative studies, indology, scriptural exegesis, mysticism and spirituality, to peace studies and ecology, cross-cultural hermeneutics and interreligious dialogue'. (See Joseph Prabhu, *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar*, p. ix.)

PARMENIDES (fl. ca. 480 BCE): Parmenides was a citizen of Elea (in southern Italy) and the leading figure of the so-called Eleatic School of Greek philosophy. It has been reported that he drew up laws for his native city and that at the age of 65 he conversed with the young Socrates in Athens. Although his early philosophical orientation may have been Pythagorean, he abandoned that philosophy for his own, which he outlined in a poem, much of which has survived. The title of this poem may mean 'On truth' or 'On Reality', and its essential message is that, because thinking is

possible and must have an object that exists and because 'what is not' cannot be an object of thought, it is reasonable to suggest that 'being' *is* and 'becoming' is an illusion.

PÄRT, ARVO (b. 1935): The composer, Arvo Pärt was born in Estonia and was active in the musical life of the Soviet Union until his emigration to Austria in 1980. Since 1982 he has lived in Berlin. During the 1970's he developed his distinctive 'tintinnabuli' style of composition which reflects his personal devotion to the spirituality of the Eastern Orthodox Christian Church as well as his interest in medieval and renaissance musical practices.

PAULI, WOLFGANG (1900-1958): The Austro-American physicist, Wolfgang Pauli, was born in Vienna. He taught at the Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich before becoming a member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey, in 1935. He won the 1945 Nobel Prize in physics for his 'exclusion principle', which posits that no two electrons in an atom can be in the same quantum state (that is, have the same 'properties' or quantum numbers). Also, in 1930 he predicted the existence of the neutrino (an elementary particle emitted during the decay of certain other particles) over two decades before it was actually discovered (in 1956).

PEARCE, JOSEPH CHILTON. Joseph Chilton Pearce lectures worldwide on human intelligence, creativity, and learning. His books include *The Crack in the Cosmic Egg*, *Magical Child*, *Bond of Power*, and *Evolution's End: Claiming the Potential of Our Intelligence*.

PELIKAN, JAROSLAV (b. 1923): Jaroslav Pelikan is the author of many books on religious topics, including *The Melody of Theology*, *The Excellent Empire*, *Jesus Through the Centuries*, and the five volume *Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. At the time of editing *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, he was Sterling Professor of History at Yale University.

PHELAN, JOHN M.: John Phelan is a professor of communications and director of the Donald McGannon Communication Research Center at Fordham University in New York City. Also, he has served on the national committee for communications media of the American Civil Liberties Union and has written several books on media and culture, including *Disenchantment: Meaning and Morality in the Media*, and *Apartheid Media: Disinformation and Dissent in South Africa*.

PHILLIPS, D.C. (b. 1938): D.C. Phillips teaches the philosophy of science at Stanford University. Among his scholarly publications are *The Social Scientist's Bestiary* and *Philosophy, Science, and Social Inquiry: Contemporary Methodological Controversies in Social Science and Related Applied Fields of Research*.

PICASSO, PABLO (1881-1973): Pablo Picasso was a Spanish painter, sculptor, graphic artist, and ceramist. He was admitted to the Royal Academy of Barcelona at fifteen. During his early professional life he lived in Paris, but in his later years he lived in southern France. His work is often discussed in the context of overlapping periods: the 'blue period', the 'rose period', cubism and collage [see previous note on Braque], and finally, works of fantasy and comic invention (in sculpture, ceramics, and the graphic arts).

PINAR, WILLIAM F. William Pinar teaches curriculum theory at Louisiana State University.

PLANCK, MAX (1858-1947): In 1900, Max Planck, a German physicist, proposed that atoms emit and absorb energy in discrete bundles (or quanta), and this idea launched the quantum revolution in contemporary physics. He taught at the University of Berlin from 1889 until 1928, and afterwards (from 1930 until 1935) was president of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society for the Advancement of Science, Berlin. In 1918 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for physics. Albert Einstein once said of Planck that it was 'the longing to behold harmony' that provided him with the 'inexhaustible patience and perseverance' to probe 'the most general problems of our science'. (Cited in Wilber, *Quantum Questions*, p. 148.)

PLATO (ca. 428-347 BCE): Plato was born into a noble Athenian family. Under the influence of Socrates, his passion for philosophy kept him from a career as a politician. After the death of Socrates in 399, Plato left Athens in disgust, but he returned and eventually founded his famous Academy just outside the city (which perhaps can be considered the first 'university'). The influence of Plato's philosophy on the Western cultural tradition can hardly be over-stated. It is noted chiefly for its suggestion that all visible 'created' things are images of eternal perfect 'ideas'. However, his philosophy also contains an evocation of the world as permeated by 'soul'.

PLOTINUS (ca. 204-270 CE.): Although little is known about his early life, Plotinus studied in Alexandria for eleven years before joining a Roman military expedition to the East in order to study Persian and Indian philosophy. The planned expedition never materialised and Plotinus, at age 40, went to Rome, where he earned 'court patronage' and taught for the remainder of his life. After his death, his student and editor-biographer, Porphyry, compiled his essays and shorter articles into six groups of nine items, which we now know as the *Enneads*. The writings of Plotinus bring together the philosophy of Plato, certain influences from Christianity, and his own intense mysticism.

PODGORSKI, FRANK (1939-1995): Frank Podgorski was the director of the Asian Studies Department at Seton Hall University. He was a priest of the Archdiocese of Newark, New Jersey, and the author of many works on yoga and interpretations of

Eastern spiritualities for Westerners.

POINCARÉ, JULES HENRI (1854-1912): Jules Poincaré was a French mathematician, physicist, and author who significantly enlarged the field of mathematical physics. His research encompassed differential equations, celestial mechanics, and various topics related to the Philosophy of Science.

POPE, ALEXANDER (1688-1744): Regarded as one of the greatest of eighteenth century English poets, Alexander Pope was a child prodigy who was largely self-taught. His works are generally categorized according to three major periods: (a) an early period which includes love and descriptive poetry (such as the *Pastorals*) as well as the famous *Essay on Criticism*, which outlines the doctrine of classicism, (b) a second period in which he translated the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and edited the works of Shakespeare, and, as a consequence, became rich, and (c) a final period in which he wrote moral poems, satires, and the famous *Essay on Man* which summarized current philosophical thought.

POSTER, MARK: Mark Poster is a professor of history at the University of California, at Irvine. In addition to *The Second Media Age*, his publications include *The Mode of Information: Poststructuralism and Social Context*.

POSTMAN, NEIL: Neil Postman is chairman of the Department of Communication Arts at New York University where he founded a program in Media Ecology. He is a prolific writer on topics related to communications theory and social criticism. His many books include *Conscientious Objections*, *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, *Teaching as a Conserving Activity*, *The Disappearance of Childhood*, *Amusing Ourselves to Death*, and *Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology*.

PRIGOGINE, ILYA (b. 1917): Ilya Prigogine was born in Moscow and raised in Belgium. Although his chief interest was chemistry, he studied history, philosophy, and classical music (piano). His work centers on the interface between chemistry and physics (thermodynamics) and is largely concerned with the concept of time. He is a major supporter of the 'arrow-of-time' concept, which asserts that time is an actual physical process in nature that flows in an irreversible past-to-future direction, and he believes that 'we have to face the fact that we live in a dual universe, whose description involves both laws and events, certitudes and probabilities' (see 'Foreword' in Coveney and Highland, *The Arrow of Time*, p. 16). In 1977 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for chemistry. His principal academic associations are with the Free University of Brussels and the Ilya Prigogine Center for Statistical Mechanics and Thermodynamics at the University of Texas, in Austin Texas. Major works include *From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences*, and *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature* (co-authored with Isabelle Stengers).

PROUST, MARCEL (1871-1922): French novelist, Marcel Proust, lived in Paris and, as time passed, became increasingly withdrawn from society. His major work is the seven volume cyclic novel *Remembrance of Things Past*.

PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS (ca. 500 CE): Pseudo-Dionysius is the name given to a theologian who authored (under the pseudonym 'Dionysius') a number of influential works which synthesized neoplatonic and early Christian thought. During the Middle Ages, these works were mistakenly attributed to St. Paul's Athenian convert, Dionysius the Areopagite, and were highly esteemed both by mystics, such as Meister Eckhart, and by professional theologians, such as St. Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas. His major works include *The Celestial Hierarchy*, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, *The Divine Names*, and *The Mystical Theology*.

RADHAKRISHNAN, SARVEPALLI (1888-1975): Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan was a Hindu philosopher, born in India. After various educational positions in that country, he moved to England where he taught Eastern religions and ethics at Oxford University (from 1936 until 1952). He returned to India and held various academic and government positions, among them, professorships in Benares and New Delhi, Vice-President of India (1952-1962), and President of India from 1962 until 1967. His writings express a strong belief in the underlying unity of all religious expressions, as is evident from his comment that 'the signpost is not to be confused with that to which it points'.

RAHMAN, FAZLUR (b. 1905): The Islamic scholar, Fazlur Rahman, was the director of the Islamic Research Institute in Karachi, Pakistan and also taught at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. As he notes in its preface, his book *Islam* is directed 'equally for Western and Muslim readers'.

RAM DASS [Richard Alpert]: Ram Dass has a PhD. from Stanford University and has taught at that university as well as at the University of California and Harvard University. In the early 1960's he conducted research on the use of psychedelic chemicals with Timothy Leary. Subsequently (in the late 1960's), he met his guru, Neem Karoli Baba, and eventually changed his name from Richard Alpert to Ram Dass, which means 'servant of God'. Although he earns a living through lecturing and writing, his principal occupation is doing volunteer work with the dying, prisoners, teenagers, AIDS patients, the homeless, ecological groups, and refugees. His books include *Be Here Now*, *The Only Dance There Is*, *Journey of Awakening*, *How Can I Help?* (with Paul Gorman), and *Compassion in Action: Setting Out on the Path of Service* (with Mirabai Bush).

REYNOLDS, WILLIAM M. (b. 1953): William Reynolds teaches curriculum theory at Oklahoma State University.

RICH, ADRIENNE (b. 1929): Adrienne Rich is an American feminist scholar and poet who lives in California. She was awarded the first annual Ruth Lilly Poetry Prize and a Brandeis University Creative Arts medal. Her suggestion that female heterosexuality is the outcome of powerful social constraints is rooted in a psychoanalytic perspective towards human development. Because the first love-object of every child is (normally) a woman, heterosexuality must be, in some sense, forced upon girls as they mature. The implication here is that it is male dominance within societies that accounts for 'compulsive heterosexuality'. Her major prose publications include *Of Woman Born*, *Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Experience*, and *In Desire: The Politics of Sexuality*. Among her many books of poetry are *A Wild Patience Has Taken Me This Far*, *The Will to Change*, *Necessities of Life*, and *Leaflets*.

RILKE, RAINER MARIA (1875-1926): The German poet, Rainer Maria Rilke, was born in Prague. His first book of poetry appeared in 1894, however, the mystical quality of his writing emerged in full only 10 years later with the publication of *Stories of God*. This publication was followed by *Poems from the Book of Hours*, *New Poems*, and finally (in 1923), Rilke's own favourite work, *The Duino Elegies*.

RUMI [JALAL AL-DIN RUMI] (1207-1273): The Sufi mystic poet, Jalal al-Din Rumi, was born at Balkh, Afghanistan, but his family moved to Konya, in southern Turkey, where he became, during the first part of his life, a brilliant theologian and teacher. In 1244 he met a wandering dervish, Shams al-Din Tabrizi, and this meeting changed his life. The quality of this change is best described by Rumi's son, who wrote: 'After meeting Shams, my father danced all day and sang all night. He had been a scholar - he became a poet; he had been an ascetic - he became drunk with love'. (See Harvey, *The Essential Mystics*, p. 227.)

RUSSELL, BERTRAND ARTHUR WILLIAM RUSSELL (1872-1970): Bertrand Russell (3rd. Earl Russell) was born in Wales. He taught mathematics and philosophy at Cambridge University. In addition to his scholarly work, which includes *Principia Mathematica* (with A.N. Whitehead) and *A History of Philosophy*, he was known for his views on various matters of social concern, such as his pacifism during the First World War, and his liberal views on marriage, sex, adultery, and homosexuality during the 1930's. Although his abhorrence of Nazism led him to abandon his pacifist views for a time, after the Second World War he once again espoused them and became a leader of the 'ban the bomb' movement to halt the production of nuclear weapons. In 1950 he won the Nobel Prize in literature.

RUSSELL, JOHN: John Russell studied both natural science and philosophy at Cambridge University. He has also worked extensively in agriculture and for a time was associated with the Department of Soil Science at Oxford University. He entered the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) in 1937 and afterwards lectured at Heythrop Theological College on the philosophy of nature and on the history and philosophy of science. He

is the author of *Science and Metaphysics*.

RUUSBROEC, JOHN (1293-1381): The Flemish Christian mystic, John Ruusbroec (Jan van Ruysbroek), was educated in Brussels. From 1343 he lived in a hermitage in the forest of Groenendaal near Brussels. His writings display a 'clearly defined trinitarian framework' and outline an ascent to union with God through an 'active' purification of moral life (that is, through 'external work') and an 'interior' purification of life through simplicity.

RYŌKAN DAIGU (1758-1831): Ryōkan Daigu was a monk of the Sōtō school (one of the Japanese schools of Zen Buddhism). He lived a life of great simplicity, eventually becoming a hermit. About 1400 of his poems survive, many of which express the idea of total 'acceptance', that is, because everything is of the same nature, every occurrence is an intriguing instance of that nature. Thus: 'When you meet with misfortune, / It is good to meet with misfortune. / When you die, / It is good to die. / This is the wonderful way / To escape misfortune.'

SAINT AUGUSTINE (354-430 CE): One of Christianity's most influential theologians, Saint Augustine was born in Thagaste in Numidia (present-day Algeria) of a Pagan father, Patricius, and a Christian mother, Saint Monica. He formed a desire to dedicate his life to philosophy at a young age. Accordingly, he studied rhetoric in Carthage and later taught that subject in Carthage and subsequently in Rome and Milan. Before re-embracing the Christian faith he learned as a small child from his mother, Augustine was involved with manicheanism, scepticism, and neoplatonism. He became a priest in 391 and Bishop of Hippo (present-day Annaba, Algeria) in 395.

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI (1181/2-1226): Saint Francis was the son of a wealthy textile merchant, Francesco Bernardone. In his early twenties he underwent a religious conversion, adopted a life of poverty, and devoted his time to helping lepers and repairing ruined churches. In 1208 or 1209 he began to preach and soon attracted a group of companions which developed into what is now the Franciscan Order. As the Order grew, Francis resisted attempts to organize it more thoroughly, adopt a less extreme poverty, and accommodate academic learning more readily. However, in the definitive Rule of the Order, adopted in 1223, he was obliged to compromise. During his final years, he withdrew somewhat from the daily affairs of the Order and spent time in contemplative solitude. He was canonized two years after his death, in 1228. The spirituality of Saint Francis is characterized by a spontaneous, overflowing love for all of creation.

SAINT GREGORY OF NYSSA (ca. 330-394): Saint Gregory of Nyssa was born in Cappadocia. His older brother was Saint Basil the Great, an important organizer of early Christian monasteries. In his youth, Saint Gregory was influenced by pagan ideals, but after he embraced Christianity he became the Bishop of Nyssa and

eventually a close advisor to the Eastern Roman Emperor, Theodosius I. His writings are imbued with a mystic spirituality that views the universe 'as a symbol of the unseen reality of God, to whom the soul ascends, especially in the discernment of spiritual beauty'. (See *The Oxford Companion to World's Religions*, p. 389.)

SAINT JOHN: Saint John was one of the first twelve disciples of Jesus and the author of the fourth Gospel, three Epistles, and the Book of Revelation. Along with his brother, Saint James, and Saint Peter (the acknowledged leader of the early Christian Church), John was one of the closest companions of Jesus, and the one to whom Jesus entrusted the care of his mother, Mary. According to tradition, John settled eventually at Ephesus, was temporarily exiled to Patmos, and died as an old man of natural causes.

SAINT PAUL (d. ca. 65 CE): Saul of Tarsus, who later became known as Paul, was born in Asia minor, and although he was Jewish, he was also a Roman citizen. By profession he was a tentmaker, and by inclination he was a zealous nationalist and probably a Pharisee (that is, a member of an extremist Jewish religious sect known for its scrupulous adherence to oral and written traditions). In the earliest days of Christianity, Saul was commissioned by the chief priests of the Jewish people to help suppress the new Christian movement. However, he was converted to belief in Christ by a direct encounter with the risen Christ (described in Acts 9: 1-9), an encounter which blinded him. After his baptism into Christianity and regaining his sight, he spent from thirteen to seventeen years developing his new-found faith and, thereafter, began his great missionary journeys, establishing (largely Gentile) Christian congregations in south and central Asia Minor, Ephesus, and Greece. The thirteen letters to these congregations attributed to Saint Paul (some of which may not have been actually written by him) laid the foundations for much of Christian theology. During his last return visit to Jerusalem (between 57-59 CE), Paul was arrested, imprisoned, and eventually sent to Rome where he was again imprisoned. The actual circumstances of his death are uncertain.

SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS (1225-1274): Saint Thomas Aquinas was born at Roccasecca, near Naples, and at the age of five went to live at the Benedictine monastery, Monte Cassino, for nine years. He then studied at the University of Naples and, after deciding to enter the Dominican Order, he went to the University of Paris and studied under Saint Albert the Great. He taught theology at the University of Paris from 1256 to 1259 and then moved to Rome for several years of teaching (until 1268). Subsequent teaching positions were at the University of Paris once again and at the University of Naples. He was canonized in 1323 and declared a 'Doctor of the Church' in 1567.

SANTAYANA, GEORGE (1863-1952): The American philosopher, George Santayana, was born in Spain, but from the age of nine was educated in America. He received his Doctorate in philosophy from Harvard University in 1889 and, thereafter,

taught at that university until 1912, when, at the age of 48, he retired from teaching and began an independent career as a philosopher, literary critic, and writer, living primarily in Europe. His major philosophical works include *The Sense of Beauty*, *The Life of Reason*, *The Realms of Being*, and *Dominations and Powers*. He also wrote a great many poems and a single novel, *The Last Puritan*.

SCHILLER, (JOHANN CHRISTOPH) FRIEDRICH von (1759-1805): The German poet, dramatist, historian, and philosopher, Friedrich von Schiller was the son of an army officer and estate manager for the duke of Württemberg. Although his studies focused on law and medicine, his enthusiasm centered on drama and poetry. In fact, he was imprisoned for leaving Wurttemberg without permission in order to witness the production of his early play, *The Robbers*, and was also forbidden to publish further dramatic works. However, he escaped in 1782 and thereafter lived in various parts of Germany, including Mannheim, Leipzig, Dresden, and Weimar, often writing under assumed names to avoid discovery. In 1790 he was appointed professor of history at the University of Jena. He was a close friend of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, with whom he edited the literary periodicals *Horen* (1795-1797) and *Musenalmannach* (1796-1800). Philosophically, Schiller's roots are in Immanuel Kant's ideas about ethics and aesthetics, his main interest being the role of beauty and art in the rational life of humankind. His major plays include *Don Carlos*, *Maria Stuart*, *William Tell*, and the dramatic trilogy, *Wallenstein*. Also of historical interest is the fact that his 'Ode to Joy' was used in the final movement of Beethoven's ninth symphony.

SCHLEGEL, FRIEDRICH von (1772-1829): Although educated in law, Schlegel's primary interest was writing about philosophical, literary, and historical matters. He is widely regarded as one of the most prominent figures of German Romanticism, and founded, together with his brother, August Wilhelm von Schlegel, the influential periodical *Athenaeum* (published between 1798 and 1800). Among his scholarly works is a study of Sanskrit and Indian culture, *On the Language and Wisdom of India*. In his later years, Schlegel joined the Roman Catholic Church.

SCHLEIERMACHER, FRIEDRICH DANIEL ERNST (1768-1834): The German Protestant theologian and pastor, Friedrich Schleiermacher, taught and preached at Halle and Berlin. His work expresses the influence of both German romanticism and his pietist background inasmuch as it professes that true religion is reached through intuition, independently of dogma. True religion, for Schleiermacher is 'the immediate consciousness of the universal existence of all finite things in and through the infinite, and of all temporal things in and through the eternal', which implies that religion is a 'direct and unmediated sense of the totality of all there is bearing upon the individual' (see *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, ed. John Bowker, p. 866). Major works include *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers*, *Monologen*, and *The Christian Faith*.

SCHOENBERG, ARNOLD (1874-1951): The Austrian composer, Arnold Schoenberg, was born in Vienna. He was largely self-taught as a violinist and cellist and had only a brief period of formal training in music under the conductor, Alexander Zemlinsky, who encouraged his interest in composition. Schoenberg's early music continued the tradition of romantic composers such as Wagner and Mahler. However, in 1908 he abandoned the fundamental aspect of Western music, namely, tonality (a system of composition centered around a particular note). During a prolonged period in which he wrote no music (almost twelve years), he developed a revolutionary new compositional technique known as serialism (also called twelve-tone technique), which organizes a piece of music around a series of notes called a 'tone row'. This tone row can be used in either its original form or in its inverted, retrograde, or inverted retrograde forms, and any of these forms can be used simultaneously. This technique was first used in his *Suite for Piano* (1921). In 1933 he moved to the United States, settling first in Boston and later in California where he taught at the University of California, Los Angeles. In 1941 he became an American citizen. Early works include *Verklärte Nacht*, *Gurrelieder*, and two string quartets. Later works include the one-act opera *Erwartung*, as well as *Pierrot Lunaire*, *A Survivor from Warsaw*, and an unfinished opera *Moses and Aaron*.

SCHROEDINGER, ERWIN (1887-1961): Erwin Schroedinger was an Austrian physicist who was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics (shared with Paul Dirac) for his work on the mathematical development of 'wave mechanics'. Schroedinger's 'wave equation' became one of the most widely used mathematical 'tools' of modern quantum mechanics. His books include *What is Life?*, *Science and Humanism*, *Mind and Matter*, and *My View of the World*.

SEIDMAN, STEVEN: Steven Seidman teaches sociology at the State University of New York in Albany. He is the editor of *The Postmodern Turn*, and (with David Wagner) *Postmodernism and Social Theory*, and (with Jeffrey C. Alexander), *Culture and Society: Contemporary Debates*. He is also the author of *Contested Knowledge: Social Theory in the Postmodern Era*.

SHELDRAKE, RUPERT: Rupert Sheldrake studied natural sciences at Cambridge University, philosophy and the history of science at Harvard University, and biochemistry at Cambridge University, receiving his PhD. from Cambridge University in 1973. Between 1974 and 1978 he worked in India at the International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics at Hyderabad. His book *A New Science of Life: The Hypothesis of Formative Causation* proposes that biological development occurs as a result of the action of invisible morphogenetic fields which can operate across time and space, an idea that has significant implications in the social as well as the natural sciences. Other books include *The Presence of the Past*, *The Rebirth of Nature*, and *Seven Experiments That Could Change the World*.

SKOLIMOWSKI, HENRYK: Henryk Skolimowski received his PhD. from Oxford University in 1964. His principal interests are evolutionary epistemology, ecological philosophy, and ecological ethics. He taught philosophy at the University of Michigan, and in 1991, was appointed to the Chair of Ecological Philosophy at the Technical University of Lodz, in Poland. Among his numerous scholarly publications are *Living Philosophy*, *Eco-Philosophy: Designing New Tactics for Living*, and *The Participatory Mind: A New Theory of Knowledge and of the Universe*.

SLATTERY, PATRICK.: Patrick Slattery teaches curriculum theory at Ashland University (Ohio).

SMART, BARRY: Barry Smart has taught sociology at universities in Australia, England, Japan, and New Zealand. He has edited a series of monographs on *Social Futures*, and his publications include *Michel Foucault*, *Modern Conditions*, *Postmodern Controversies*, and *Postmodernity*.

SMITH, HUSTON (b. 1919): Huston Smith's work is concerned primarily with the history of religions. He has taught at Washington University, MIT, Syracuse University, and at the University of California at Berkeley. Major books include *The World's Religions*, and *Purposes of Higher Education*, *Condemned to Meaning*, *Beyond the Post-Modern Mind*, and *Forgotten Truth: The Common Vision of the World's Religions*.

SOLZHENITSYN, ALEKSANDR (b. 1918): Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn is a Russian writer of several major works of fiction, including *Cancer Ward*, *The First Circle*, and *August 1914*, as well as several works of historical documentary, such as *The Gulag Archipelago*. Because of his sustained criticism of Soviet life under Stalin, he was banned from the Union of Soviet Writers and from Moscow in 1969. In 1974 he was deported to West Germany and subsequently lived in Switzerland and the United States before returning to Russia. In 1970 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature.

SOROKIN, PITIRIM ALEXANDROVICH (1889-1968): The sociologist, Pitirim Sorokin, was banished from the Soviet Union for anti-Bolshevik activities. He emigrated to the United States in 1923 and taught at the Universities of Minnesota (1924-1930) and at Harvard University (1930-1955). His major work is the four-volume *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, produced between 1937 and 1941.

SPERRY, ROGER W.: When Roger Sperry was awarded the 1981 Nobel Prize in medicine/physiology, he was the first person trained in psychology to receive this honour. He has worked at Harvard University, the Yerkes Primate Laboratory in Florida, and finally at the California Institute of Technology. His research career of over fifty years included work in neurophysiology, brain research, and biology, but he describes the underlying motive this work as follows: 'It has really been

psychology all along and psychological questions about mind and brain, and behavior that, primarily, have steered my course from the start'. He received many awards and honours, among them honorary doctorates from the universities of Cambridge, Chicago, Oberlin College, and Rockefeller University. In 1993, the American Psychological Foundation honoured him with a Lifetime Achievement Award.

SPINOZA, BARUCH (1632-1677): The Dutch philosopher, Baruch Spinoza, was a member of the Sephardic Jewish community of Amsterdam until he was excommunicated from that community for heretical thought. After several moves, Spinoza finally settled in The Hague, earning a living as an optical lens grinder and receiving modest financial support from followers of his philosophy. He published only two works in his lifetime, *The Principles of Descartes's Philosophy*, and the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*.

STAPP, HENRY P.: Henry Stapp is a member of the Theoretical Physics Groups at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory at the University of California, Berkeley.

STEINDL-RAST, DAVID: David Steindl-Rast is a Benedictine Monk, author and lecturer who writes about spirituality, theology, and comparative religion. His books include *Gratefulness*, *The Listening Heart*, and *Belonging to the Universe* (with Fritjof Capra and Thomas Matus).

STOREY, JOHN: John Storey teaches social studies at the University of Sunderland in England.

STRAVINSKY, IGOR (1882-1971): Igor Stravinsky was born near St. Petersburg, the son of a prominent singer at the Imperial Opera. His career as one of the dominating figures in twentieth century music began as a young man when his first three ballets, *The Firebird*, *Petrouchka*, and *The Rite of Spring* were performed in Paris from 1909 to 1913. He experimented with a number of very different styles of composition throughout his career, beginning with a kind of exotic 'primitivism' (for example, the three ballets just mentioned), then moving on to a more austere 'neoclassicism' (for example, *The Symphony of Psalms*, and *Oedipus Rex*), and finally experimenting with serial techniques (for example, *Cantata*, *Septuor*, and *Agon*). He became an American citizen in 1945.

SULLIVAN, JOHN WILLIAM NAVIN (1886-1937): John Sullivan was educated at University College, London as a mathematician and philosopher of science. He worked as a reviewer for *The Times* (London) and was an amateur pianist. Among his numerous publications are *Aspects of Science*, *History of Mathematics in Europe*, *Three Men Discuss Relativity*, *Science: A New Outlook*, and *Beethoven: His Spiritual Development*.

SUZUKI, DAISSETZ TEITARU (1870-1966): Daisetz Suzuki was a professor of Buddhist Philosophy at Otani University, Kyoto Japan from 1921. He is widely acknowledged in the West as the scholar who 'almost singlehandedly' introduced Zen Buddhism to Western audiences. (See Jaroslav Pelikan, *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, p. 512).

SUZUKI, SHUNRYU (1905-1971): Shunryu Suzuki, a much respected Zen master in Japan and 'spiritual descendent' of the great thirteenth century Zen master Dōgen, came to America in 1958, intending to stay for only a short time. However, his visit became a permanent one. He settled in San Francisco where he established a Zen Center, which eventually expanded into three major locations, including Zen Mountain Center, the first Zen training monastery outside Asia. His book *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind* (1970) is based on a series of talks he gave to a small group of meditators in Los Altos, California.

TAGORE, RABINDRANATH (1861-1941): Sir Rabindranath Tagore was a Bengali poet and composer who received the Nobel prize for literature in 1913. In the words of Jaroslav Pelikan, 'Tagore interpreted the distinctive emphases of Hinduism in a manner that speaks to the human condition everywhere' (see *The World Treasury of Modern Religious Thought*, p. 149).

TAKUAN SŌHŌ (1573-1645): Takuan was a Japanese Zen Master and monk (of the Rinzaï School) who wrote an important treatise on the art of swordsmanship entitled 'The Unmoved Understanding', but he was also famous for his skill in calligraphy and the tea ceremony.

TAUBMAN, PETER M. Peter Taubman teaches English at Poly Prep Country Day School (New York).

TEILHARD DE CHARDIN, PIERRE (1881-1955): Pierre Teilhard de Chardin was born in France and became a Jesuit priest, paleontologist and philosopher-theologian. In 1923 he participated in the discovery of *Sinanthropus* (Peking Man) and lived primarily in China until 1946. He was a professor of geology at the Catholic Institute of Paris and held directorships at the National Geographic Survey of China and the National Research Center of France. In 1951 he moved to New York City to become a Fellow of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. Throughout his life, his religious superiors barred the publication of his philosophical and theological writings, although these works were distributed privately. The vision of reality portrayed in these writings emphasizes the spiritual nature of all phenomena and a convergent evolutionary movement towards an 'Omega Point' which is described as a 'Christified' cosmos in which God is 'all in all'. Major books include *The Phenomenon of Man*, *The Future of Man*, and *The Divine Milieu*.

TILLICH, PAUL (1886-1965): Paul Tillich was a professor of theology and then philosophy in Germany before coming to the United States to teach at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City as a professor of 'philosophical theology' (1933-1954) and subsequently at Harvard University (1954-1962) and at the University of Chicago (1962-1965). Major works include the three volumes of *Systematic Theology*, and *The Courage to Be*. One commentator (James Luther Adams, Professor Emeritus of Christian Ethics at Harvard Divinity School) has remarked that 'no theologian, indeed no one in any field, has even attempted as he did to examine and assess such a wide stretch of modern theory and practice in a technological culture, and at the depth dimension'.

TOLMAN, CHARLES: Charles Tolman was a professor of psychology at the University of Victoria. He is the editor of *Positivism in Psychology and Critical Psychology* (with Wolfgang Maiers). Among his many scholarly publications is *Psychology, Society, and Subjectivity: An Introduction to German Critical Psychology*.

TORRANCE, ROBERT M. (b. 1939): Robert Torrance is a professor of comparative literature at the University of California, Davis. In addition to *The Spiritual Quest*, his scholarly publications include *The Comic Hero*, a work that resulted from a series of lectures given at Harvard University in 1972.

TRAHERNE, THOMAS (ca. 1636-1674): Thomas Traherne was an Anglican clergyman and metaphysical poet. His main works, *Poetical Works*, and *Centuries of Meditation*, remained largely unknown until they were discovered in a London bookshop in 1895 and published in 1903 and 1908 respectively, edited by Bertram Dobell. The mystical vision depicted by of these works is remarkable for its consistently joyful character.

VATTIMO, GIANNI (b. 1936): Gianni Vattimo teaches at the University of Turin. He is a scholar of nineteenth and twentieth century German philosophy, but he is also known for his advocacy of the postmodern orientation towards theory.

VYGOTSKY, LEV SEMYONOVITCH (1896-1934): Russian psychologist and educator, Lev Vygotsky, was born in Byelorussia (in a town near Minsk). At Moscow University he specialized in literature and began his professional career as a teacher of both literature and psychology. His concentration on psychology came about after 1924 when he began working at the Moscow Institute of Psychology and later at the Institute of Defectology, which he founded. As his research in psychology progressed, he began to study medicine, and shortly before his death, he was invited to head the department of psychology in the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine.

WEBER, MAX (1864-1920): Max Weber was a German sociologist and political economist. His influential theories erected an opposing viewpoint to Marxism that emphasized the role of religious values, ideologies, and charismatic leaders as

significant forces that shape societies. His major works include *The Protestant Work Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, *Economy and Society*, *The Religion of China*, and *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*.

WEBER, RENÉE: Renée Weber is a professor of Oriental philosophy at Rutgers University. She has served as editor for the journal *ReVision*, and has published numerous interviews and articles on science and mysticism.

WELWOOD, JOHN: John Welwood is an editor for *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, and *ReVision*.

WEIGART, ANDREW J.: Andrew Weigart is a professor of sociology at the University of Notre Dame.

WHEELER, JOHN (b. 1911): John Wheeler is a theoretical physicist and cosmologist working at Princeton University. In 1967 he coined the term 'black hole' to refer to the final condition in the life history of a star when its gravitational field 'collapses' and light and other forms of energy and matter are permanently 'trapped' inside it. He also coined the term 'wormhole' to describe how distant parts of a single universe or even parts of different universes might be connected by a kind of 'shortcut' through space.

WHITEHEAD, ALFRED NORTH (1861-1947): Alfred North Whitehead was a British mathematician and philosopher. He taught mathematics at the University of London from 1911 until 1924, and philosophy at Harvard University after 1924. His work can be divided into three periods: (a) before 1914, when he concentrated on mathematics and logic and produced, in collaboration with his former student, Bertrand Russell, the monumental *Principia Mathematica*, a work that attempts to show that mathematics can be reduced to logic; (b) 1914-1924, when he concentrated on philosophy and physical science; (c) 1924-1947, when he concentrated on metaphysics and the historical role of metaphysical ideas in civilization. His influential work *Process and Reality* appeared in 1929. In this work, Whitehead advocates a 'philosophy of organism' which views the universe as consisting of processes of becoming.

WHITMAN, WALT (1819-1892): The American poet, Walt Whitman, was born in West Hills New York. In his early life he worked as a printer, teacher, newspaper editor, and carpenter, and during the American Civil War he worked as a nurse. After a stroke in 1873 he lived as a semi-invalid in Camden, New Jersey. He published the first version of his major work, *Leaves of Grass* in 1855, and continued to work on this monumental opus until his death. During his lifetime, only a few recognized the genius of this work: one of them was Ralph Waldo Emerson.

WILBER, KEN: Ken Wilber holds a graduate degree in biochemistry, but his books focus on the connections between philosophy, psychology, religion, science, and theology. He has served as editor for *ReVision Journal*, the *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, and Shambhala Publications. His many books include *The Atman Project: A Transpersonal View of Human Development*, *Up From Eden*, *A Sociable God*, and *Eye to Eye: The Quest for the New Paradigm*.

WITTGENSTEIN, LUDWIG (1889-1951): Ludwig Wittgenstein was born in Vienna, Austria, and studied engineering, first in Germany and later in England, before turning his attention to philosophy. He studied mathematical logic with Bertrand Russell at Cambridge (1912-13) but returned to Austria to fight for the Austrian army during the First World War. While a prisoner of war in Italy, he wrote his famous *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. In 1929 he returned to Cambridge University where he remained as a teacher of philosophy. After this return to Cambridge, his ideas underwent a significant change, and these ideas were given definitive expression in *Philosophical Investigations*, published two years after his death. His work emphasizes that language is a 'response to' as well as a reproduction of the 'real', and that all philosophical problems arise from the illusions created by the ambiguities of language. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* calls his impact on twentieth-century analytical philosophy 'second to none' (see p. 916).

WULF, CHRISTOPH: Christoph Wulf is a professor at the Center for Historical Anthropology at the Free University of Berlin and the author of several works of literary and cultural criticism.

YEATS, WILLIAM BUTLER (1865-1939): The Irish poet and playwright, William Butler Yeats, studied painting in Dublin before turning his creative energy towards literature. He moved his household several times between Dublin and London, and in 1898 he helped found the Irish Literary Theatre. Although he had a lifelong interest in religious and spiritual traditions, he remained forever a skeptic. In 1923 he received the Nobel prize for literature.

YOUNG, IRIS MARION (b. 1949): Iris Marion Young teaches public and international affairs at the University of Pittsburgh. She has published articles in journals such as *Ethics*, *Social Theory and Practice*, and *The Philosophical Forum*. Her books include *Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory*, and *Justice and the Politics of Difference*.

ZOHAR, DANAH (1945): Danah Zohar was born in the United States and studied philosophy and physics at MIT, and philosophy and religion at Harvard University. Her books include *Israel: the Land and Its People*, *Through the Time Barrier: a Study of Precognition and Modern Physics*, and *The Quantum Self*, a book that examines how developments in Quantum Physics suggest the need for a radical rethinking of twentieth-century theories of 'personality'.

Appendix B

1. In the pursuit of learning, every day something is acquired.
In the pursuit of Tao, every day something is dropped.
Less and less is done
Until non-action is achieved.
When nothing is done, nothing is left undone.
The world is ruled by letting things take their course.
It cannot be ruled by interfering.

Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, trans. Gia-Fu Feng and Jane English (New York: Random House, 1972), poem #48.

2. The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao.
The name that can be named is not the eternal name.
The nameless is the beginning of heaven and earth.
The named is the mother of ten thousand things.
Ever desireless, one can see the mystery.
Ever desiring, one can see the manifestations.
These two spring from the same source but differ in name;
 this appears as darkness.
Darkness within darkness.
The gate to all mystery.

Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem #1.

3. I would I might forget that I am I,
And break the heavy chain that binds me fast,
Whose links about myself my deeds have cast.
What in the body's tomb doth buried lie
Is boundless; 't is the spirit of the sky,
Lord of the future, guardian of the past,
And soon must forth, to know his own at last.
In this large life to live, I fain would die.
Happy the dumb beast, hungering for food,
But calling not his suffering his own;
Blessed the angel, gazing on all good,
But knowing not he sits upon a throne;
Wretched the mortal, pondering his mood,
And doomed to know his aching heart alone.

George Santayana, 'Sonnet VII'. From *The Complete Poems of George Santayana: A Critical Edition*, ed. William G. Holzberger (London: Associated University Presses, 1979), p. 94.

4. Empty yourself of everything.
 Let the mind rest at peace.
 The ten thousand things rise and fall while the Self watches their return,
 They grow and flourish and then return to the source.
 Returning to the source is stillness, which is the way of nature.
 The way of nature is unchanging.
 Knowing constancy is insight.
 Not knowing constancy leads to disaster.
 Knowing constancy, the mind is open.
 With an open mind, you will be openhearted.
 Being openhearted, you will act royally.
 Being royal, you will attain the divine.
 Being divine, you will be at one with the Tao.
 Being at one with the Tao is eternal.
 And though the body dies, the Tao will never pass away.
 Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 16.
5. Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
 Where knowledge is free;
 Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
 Where words come out from the depth of truth;
 Where tireless striving stretches its arms toward perfection;
 Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
 Where the mind is led forward by thee into ever-widening thought and action -
 Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake.
 From: Rabindranath Tagore, *Gitanjali*, in *A Tagore Reader*, ed. Amiya Chakravarty (Boston: Beacon press, 1966) p. 300.
6. The Tao is an empty vessel; it is used, but never filled.
 Oh, unfathomable source of ten thousand things!
 Blunt the sharpness,
 Untangle the knot,
 Soften the glare,
 Merge with dust.
 Oh, hidden deep but ever present!
 I do not know from whence it comes.
 It is the forefather of the emperors.
 Lao-tzu, *Tao-te Ching*, poem # 4.