Integrative Explorations

Journal of Culture and Consciousness

Contents

Integrative Explorations

Journal of Culture and Consciousness

Manuscript Information

Three copies of articles should be send to:

Dr. Michael Purdy

Managing Editor, Integrative Explorations Journal

Division of Communication

Governors State University

University Park, IL 60430 USA.

The *Integrative Explorations Journal* (ISSN 1074–3618) will be published biannually in January and June (our goal), will be continuously paginated, and consist of articles up to 20 pages (longer manuscripts will be considered), single–spaced, and include a forum for discussion of issues, poetry, commentary, and book reviews. An author's agreement to publish in the journal may also mean publication on the journal website. Articles will be blind, peer reviewed by at least two members of the editorial board (papers should have the authors name and affiliation only on the first page so it may be removed for the blind/anonymous review process). No paper can be under consideration for publication in any other journal at the time of submission. The MLA style manual will be the basic guideline for submissions (APA style will also be accepted). These guidelines include the use of gender–inclusive language. Three copies of a work must be submitted for review with a 150–200 word abstract prior to the opening paragraphs of the paper, brief (100 words or so) biographical summary of author(s), and a list of key words for use in indexing.

Advertising: The journal will accept advertising. Inquiries should be directed to the managing editor.

Subscriptions: Subscription is included with membership in the Jean Gebser Society ($30.00/year, $20.00 student) which includes participation at the annual conference of the society. Individual issues of the *Integrative Explorations Journal* can be had for $7.00 for a printed copy and $5.00 for a digital copy on 3.5" disk or via email attachment, (please specify word processor or text viewer). Eventually, we expect to have the journal available on the Internet. Make checks payable to GSU/Jean Gebser Society. c/o Michael Purdy, Managing Editor, *Integrative Explorations Journal* and send to above address.

Reprint/Copy Requests: Permission to copy or reproduce individual articles in any manner should be directed to the author.

About Integrative Explorations Journal

Integrative Explorations Journal is the result of thirteen years of publication as the Gebser Network Newsletter. The newsletter and the journal are the result of the efforts of Algis Mickunas to spread the word about the works of Jean Gebser. The Gebser Network Newsletter was begun in 1980 by Elaine McCoy then a graduate student in the School of Interpersonal Communication at Ohio University. In 1983 Michael Purdy took over the editorship of the newsletter and published the newsletter from Governors State University.

The newsletter was originally developed to be an information–sharing vehicle for the Jean Gebser Society. The Gebser Society is patterned after European societies, or circles, pursuing the work of a particular philosopher. The philosopher here, Jean Gebser, was born in Posen, Germany in 1905 and died May 4, 1973. He studied and worked in Germany until the rise of the Nazi party in 1931. From Germany he fled to Spain where he wrote poetry (*Poesias de al Tarde*, 1936) and served in the Republican Ministry of Culture. When war over took the country in 1936 he fled to Paris where he associated with the circle of artists surrounding Picasso and Malraux. He finally fled Paris as the city fell in 1939 and went to Switzerland. He became a Swiss citizen in 1951 and he assumed the chair for the Study of Comparative Civilizations at the University of Salzburg.

It was in Switzerland that Gebser finished his monumental work on the comparative study of civilizations, *Ursprung und Gegenwart* (1949/53). The English translation was undertaken by Noel Barstad with Algis Mickunas and published as *The Ever Present Origin* in 1985 by Ohio University Press. This massive effort of over 500 pages is a phenomenology of civilization. From a vast collection of work covering many fields, historical and current, Gebser described the modalities of consciousness of historical cultures, as well as the extent and openness of human consciousness in general. His work is penetrating and offers an understanding useful to scholars from many fields of study.

Those wishing to pursue the study of Jean Gebser's work must read *Origin and Presence*, still published by Ohio University Press. This work is very accessible and eminently readable. Some of the authors represented in *Integrative Explorations* have published more extensive works on Gebser and provide an excellent basis for study of Gebser (e.g., see G. Feuerstein, *Structures of Consciousness,* Lower Lake, CA: Integral Publishing, 1995; also, A. combs, *The Radiance of Being,* St. Paul. MN: Paragon House, 1996). Back issues of the Gebser Network Newsletter also contain information about the Jean Gebser Society, short articles, poetry, translations of short works by Gebser, excerpts from longer works, poems of Gebser's with commentary, and reviews of books about Gebser's work. (All of the back issues of the Gebser Network Newsletter may be obtained from the editor on a PC compatible disk for a fee of $5.00.)✷

The Quest of Jean Gebser
The Ever–Present Origin

Hans Heimer
Cheshire, England

1. Introduction

When we read The Ever–Present Origin (EPO) and Gebser's other writings forming the seven volume Complete Edition (In German), we are staggered by the enormous investigation, learning, effort, difficulties and time which must have gone into this work, as well as the insight and wisdom which is displayed. It is a lifetime achievement by a polymath. He was a poet, writer, psychologist, historian and social philosopher who went outside academic philosophy, made himself familiar with most aspects of modern Western thought and to a much more limited extent in later life, with Eastern wisdom. As a courageous and true human being, Gebser was not interested in mere theory, but worked to applly it. He talked about and published his findings because of the urgent need to help humanity out of the catastrophic situations it had created for itself (and of which he himself was the victim).

2. The Biographical Background to Gebser's Writings

Unfortunately the biographical information we have is limited. It would have been intensely interesting to have more detailed data on his intellectual and spiritual quest, its motivation, its stages and growth and his final conclusions. In the Postscript to the Complete Edition (v7 p439), mention is made that in 1947, Gebser started work on an autobiographical reflection entitled 'To be a Human Being. After–sketches from a Life'. Five chapters were planned:

1.   The Sleeping Years (1905—1931)

2.   The Spanish Interlude (1931–1939)

3.   The Girl in the Snow (1954–1960)

4.   Asian Moons—Western Days (1961–?)

5.   ???

Only the first chapter was completed (v7 pp329–4Ol), for the others there are only designs and key words.

I have not had the time to study all Gebser's writings, but based on what I have read, I feel that the following biographical facts are significant in leading to the views expressed in EPO:

a) Gebser, born on the 20th August 1905, had a very difficult childhood during the first World War. He had a good relationship with his father, who may have been driven to suicide by his mother, when Gebser was 17 years old. At this time Gebser turned inward to protect himself, as well as his father and sister (to the limited extent possible).

c)   Gebser sought solace from his problems by reading books, by writing, poetry and the study of languages, principally German, but also Greek, Latin, French, Italian, later Spanish and English.

d)   Gebser left home aged 20 in 1925. He was thrown onto his own resources in a Europe that was barely recovering from the aftermath of the first World War. He passed through a severe depression, near suicide in 1928, when he was 23 years old.

e)   In 1929, Gebser had his first experience in Munich of observing the Nazi hordes. This caused him to decide to leave Germany and go to Spain, even though as an author he was leaving his mother–tongue and his home country and could not speak Spanish.

f)   In the winter of 1932/33 in Spain, in a lightning–like inspiration, he became aware of the concept of the development of a new consciousness, which was the basis for EPO.

g)   Gebser's experiences in the Latin countries (Italy, Spain and France) were crucial to his intellectual growth. He learned the Latin ways of thought, of action and of living, the Mediterranean clarity; this showed him the hidden possibilities as well as the negative ponderousness of the German language.

h)   The political circumstances in Europe were such that he had to flee from Spain during the Civil War in 1936, being nearly executed and losing all his possessions.

i)   The years 1937–39 Gebser describes as his "hunger years," which he spent mostly in Paris, in close association with the artistic circles there.

j)   At the start of World War 2 in 1939, he had to flee from France and reached Switzerland two hours before the frontiers closed. In Switzerland he returned to his native language, German, and the peacefulness that enabled him to write EPO, to lecture at academic institutions and on the radio.

Gebser's predispositions and the events of his life, turned him into a deep thinker, not a spinner of abstractions but facing the realities of the events in Europe during the inter—war years.

3.   Gebser's Final Views

With regard to Gebser's final conclusions however we are fortunate in that he set down his thoughts and these are recorded in the Complete Edition. The circumstances surrounding these are as follows.

In 1966, the second edition of EPO appeared and Gebser, who depended for his livelihood on his literary activities, went on a lecture tour of Germany. He wrote: "The whole of October I went on a lecture tour in Germany, then in November I wanted to take a small cure in (the spa of) Baden–Baden. There I had to undergo an emergency operation at night at the end of November: stomach perforation, for 10 days 95% more 'on the other side' than here (very cheerful and blissful); the surgeon managed to get me through. After five weeks another operation, this time a double operation; stomach wall and appendix, which was risky in view of the extremely weakened and reserveless condition. Well, fate had decreed that I had not yet reached the end, the doctors talked about a miracle and enigma, I am still not completely here (v 7 p442—43). After that near death experience, Gebser never completely recovered from this loss of health.

6½ years later, on the 26th April 1973, Gebser was this time really on his death bed. He had completed a book entitled 'Decline and Participation, Concerning Polarity, Duality, Identity and Origin'. This was a collection made by Gebser of some of his lectures on his masterpiece, EPO. Before he smilingly and fearlessly departed from this world on the 14th May 1973, he dictated a foreword to this book, to his wife Jo Gebser. This foreword is his

last piece of writing, his spiritual testament as it were. I have translated it and it forms an appendix to this paper. It needs to be referred to in order to understand my comments.

4. Comments on Gebser's Final Views

"In the end everything is simple". This astonishing statement, by someone who had spent years in developing and communicating complex ideas, including the 615 pages of EPO, shows that at his life's end, Gebser had achieved clarity, transparency and the desire to express this to his listeners.

"Of course to say this, appears foolish". At the end of one's life, our fears and inhibitions about appearing foolish and going against the ideas of the majority, drop away. Many great men have held back their innermost convictions, because to voice them would cause problems affecting their livelihood, status and in extreme cases like Galileo Galilei (1564–1642), even their life. A good example is the physicist Nobel Laureate Erwin Schroedinger (1887–1961), who in 1925 wrote a private personal account entitled 'My World View', subscribing to the philosophy of Vedanta, but not completing this account for publication till just before his death. He wrote:

"Now I shall not keep free of metaphysics, nor even of mysticism, they play a role in all that follows. In brief, the meaning of Vedanta is that we living beings all belong to one another, that we are actually members or aspects of a single being, which we may in Western terminology call God, while in the Upanishads it is called Brahman".

Gebser was similarly very hesitant to clearly and simply express his deepest convictions in the circumstances and environment in which he lived. There must have been many people who criticised his views. His lack of academic qualifications were an obstacle; his status as an authority and professor was not acknowledged till he was made an honorary professor for Comparative Culture Studies at the University of Salzburg in 1967, by which time he was too ill to take up the position.

"Because we sit in a self–constructed cage... our complicated cage–thinking.., cage–security.., the bars of the compulsive images etc." Now it is clear; the cage we construct is the particular structure of consciousness which is prevalent in our culture. 'Cage' is another word for 'structure' . Twenty years after the publication of Part 2 of EPO, Gebser is able to survey his own life's work and summarise it.

"Origin and the presence . . . are equal . . .the whole." The simple is in us, it is participation". This is the integral (whole) view. When we can see that our complex theories and concepts such as space, time, causality, the 'I', the world, are self–made cages, forms of awareness, then they become transparent and cease to be cages, giving us freedom from our own images and we live in the ever—present. Participation means that we are part of these concepts and images, we are not observers standing on the outside, but we need to look for clarity at and into ourselves.

It is quite astonishing how similar the metaphor of the cage is to the message of another teacher, Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895–1986). He taught that words and thought were the bars of the prison into which we have imprisoned ourselves, and freedom can only be obtained when we transcend this knowledge. In the July 1994/Volume 2 Number 1 issue of *Integrative Explorations Journal* (p. 36–44), William Miller gives a very useful comparison of Gebser s and Krishnamurti's views under the title 'A Krishnamurti Perspective on Integral Consciousness "A tiny seed in us . . . containing the transparent world . . . moving aside the bars of the cage". Un–illuminated and in the cage, the prospect of transparency

appears like a tiny seed, but if we allow it to grow, then it becomes the completely encompassing whole, leading to freedom and happiness.

At the end, it is the present origin, rather than the historical structures of consciousness, which Gebser wishes to emphasise. Let me quote from the contents of the book 'Decline and Participation', to which this foreword was Gebser's last pronouncement. I have added a few explanatory words in brackets.

"The realisation/awaring of the origin is only possible if, when we look backwards and into ourselves, neither the darkness of the magical, the twilight of the mythical or the current daylight of the mental–rational are obstacles (cage bars). Compared to the structure of simultaneity (the ever presence of the past and future in the present), darkness, twilight and daylight are impenetrable and non–transparent walls; where however the three grades of darkness and light of the consciousness structures have become transparent, there also the walls become illusory; a more powerful consciousness, the integral, which life and spirit supporting, transcends and is not overwhelmed by all previous consciousness structures, makes it possible to become aware of the origin, through darkness, twilight and perhaps dazzle, to see the original consciousness, or to use Sri Aurobindo's term, the universal consciousness. Where this happens, due to its partaking of the origin, our consciousness changes into the integral consciousness and gives up its bar–like compulsive images." (From the chapter entitled 'The Invisible Origin', v5/2 p113–114)

We can compare this with Gebser's mysterious opening statement made 24 years earlier in 1949 in the Preface to Part One of EPO, and see how much clearer he was able to express himself later in his life:

"Origin is ever present. It is not a beginning, since all beginning is bound to time, and the present is not the mere 'now', today, or the moment. It is not a time division, rather an achievement of wholeness, and this always original. Whoever is able to bring to effectiveness and reality, the wholeness of origin and the present, to make it concrete (as opposed to it remaining abstract), he overcomes beginning and end and the mere current time". (My translation, English EPO p xxvii)

5 My Own Background

I consider that in order to help the readers of this paper, I should give a little background information about myself.

I was born in Vienna in 1927 and came to England as a Jewish refugee from Nazi persecution in 1939. German is therefore my mother–tongue. I am a retired professional engineer. All my life I have taken an interest in Eastern philosophy, starting with Yoga and ending with Non–dualistic (Advaita) Vedanta. In Vedanta, my principal teachers mostly through their writings have been Adi Shankaracharya (circa 788–822), Ernest E Wood (1883–1965), John Levy (1910–1976), Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895—1986) and Ramana Maharshi (1879–1950).

Through the writings of Dr. Georg Feuerstein I came into contact with Jean Gebser's work in 1994, studying the German and English versions of EPO during a period of 17 months. I found it heavy going because of Gebser's style, which is conversational, making it more humanly interesting, but circuitous, taking a long time to get to the point. It is difficult German and very lengthy and repetitive, as well as very profound and very interesting. It was written before we in the West developed the mad haste of modern life brought about by the electronic age of TV, computers, E–mail, Cyberspace and the Internet.

References

The Gebser quotations are from the Complete Edition, 7 volume, Novalis Verlag 1986, translated by me. The brackets contain the volume number 'v' and the page number 'p'.

Appendix

Foreword to Gebser's 'Decline and Participation' (V5/2 P11–12)

In the end, everything is simple.

Of course to say this, appears foolish. Because we sit in a self–constructed cage and because events appear very complicated to us who are imprisoned and cut off; we sacrifice our limited powers to illusory things from which in the end there is no way out. At any rate, that is the present situation.

Only indirectly does this book concern itself with the simple. but it concludes with it (The last chapters deal with fearlessness, timelessness and the origin). Not that it goes towards it. There is no path to the ever–present. Sometimes it is deduced that origin and the present are simply and irrefutably neither duality nor sequence, but equal, but the whole.

All this appears to be endangered. And it is. Endangered by our own complicated cage– thinking, by our cage–security, in which we believe, gigantic events are occurring and being portrayed; on top of which; what grand life forms we are we believe they have been created, exclusively created by us. We have lost our inner security, we have gained cage–security.

The majority think this way. That is the decline. Even if one believes there is continuous advancement. Such discrepancies are part of the more complete, true picture.

The simple is in us. It is participation. Participation in what is to us unknown but evident. A tiny seed in us, containing all transparency, the transparent world, the most irradiated and most sober happiness. A so completely encompassing whole which cannot be even imagined by our sensible, over–clever cage–thinking, nor our complained of/complaining and poor/strong longing; what poverty is revealed by these and in spite of these, it is in us.

We have become conscious of it, because it is sufficiently near to us, illuminated we can as illusion move aside the bars of the cage. Nothing other than the power of inertia prevents the removal of the bars of the compulsive images. The tiny seed of participation empowers us to overcome.

However, because the simple is the nearest to us, it is also the most external. That's why we begin in the following pages with the two–three–and fourfold (the book starts with modern physics). They are already no longer recognised as such. That is why there is an increasing confusion in the cage. Let us make it transparent, then, because of the illuminated participation, the simple will become reality. It is the ever–present. The unreachable is the very near. And it is always present. In order to see it, the pictures and imaginations of the cage have to be moved aside, all the heaped up rubbish that with its highpoints chaotically threatens to asphyxiate humanity; in other words, the peaks of psychotic and mental– rational processes. Rightfully those who lack knowledge revolt against this, but with the wrong means, terror, anarchism, force—outgrowths which still carry the characteristics of the cage–life, from which they want to free themselves. However for this they must know the purpose, the aim and the reason.

Perhaps these pages can clarify something for those with keen hearing. Because of this, the emphasis in the first sections is placed on discrimination.

The long suppressed memory of the tiny seed to awaken participation; it might be worth trying (to read) a few pages. If only the remotest presentiment of this encompassing reality and always already present future could sprout in us because of these, then the two hours spent on these pages would be the gain of participation.

Zen and Gebser

Rick Muller, Ph.D.
Poudre Valley Health System
Fort Collins, CO 80524

Introduction

Before we begin I want to offer a broad framework from which to view this paper. The goals of the paper were to:

Assume the rational, linear perspective and explore how a mythic, circular approach might yield similar outcomes (very rational)

Explore the commonalities of Zen, a mythically dominant construct with the Gebserian exploration of human consciousness (a Western rational tradition)

Use a more practical, embodied structure rather than a traditional academic research model

Write in a more mythic, meandering, circular and seeming fragmented style

Explore personal, embodied experience in the context of the communal experience

Challenge the assumptions of Western rationality and the use of words like outcomes, options etc.

Shift the rational view by grounding the perceived outcomes in practical everyday experience

Ask unanswerable questions as a way to force readers to think, ponder and have emotional responses to various statements in the text

Move the discussion

Suggest that the rational and mythic forces are just different ways (rationally speaking) to achieve a wisdom that is more integral and to gesture at the possibility that the integral is common and not some differentiated new age, consciousness structure (for differentiation is rational) or spirituality although aspects of each are present

Suggest that integrality is not something we seek, but rather something we have and that rationality doesn't often allow for its recognition, experience and understanding because the very nature of understanding is rational

Reveal that this paper could be described in one word—self–creation—which is simultaneously mythic, mental, magic, and integral

Zen and Rational Consciousness

> Every existence in nature, every existence in the human world, every cultural work that we create, is something which was given, or is being given to us, relatively speaking. But as everything is originally one, we are, in actuality, giving out everything. Moment after moment we are creating something, and this is the joy of our life. (Suzuki, 1996)

This sounds almost like something a psychologist on the Oprah Winfrey show would say, or something preached by the latest new age philosophy. It is not. It is Zen Buddhism.

Zen and the Art of books attempt to encapsulate a belief, a way of being. But Zen practitioners would suggest those attempts to explain are not Zen at all. For Zen and the

Tao cannot be explained. This is the rational mind's nightmare. So I preface what comes after as a gesture, an impressionism of something that cannot be explained but must be fully experienced individually. This too is the insight and observation of Jean Gebser who's thought in *The Ever Present Origin* (1985) offers to the Western rational mind a structure in which to begin to comprehend the complexity of human existence. It is an observation of individual and collective experiences of discernment embodied by the human collective. It is written for the Western rational mind.

Gebser, like Zen doesn't seek goals or enlightenment, but rather a participation fully in life at every moment. For, in that presence, awareness and participation are revealed, but not just as a detached rational explanation. In some sense Zen suggests that just to continue, to live, that is our purpose. That is not an option for the Western rational tradition. Yet, life experiences suggest this may in fact be the case. Those who have lost loved ones or jobs often are thrown outside, into a world unexplainable to the Western mind. It is a world outside the realms of proof, logic and linearity. It is a world of trust, fear and patience. Those who survive often feel as though the chaos of contemporary life strips them of their protection and security. Continuing on is enough. That realization doesn't come to everyone and is not an insight present to the greater majority of Westerners.

Gebser alludes to this in his attempt to provide a framework for us to deconstruct the denseness of what is categorized as consciousness. He overlays a perspective that is beneficial for grasping the enormity of what life offers. We do him a disservice, I believe, if what we only see or judge him by concrete words, logic and linear perspectives. For such approaches are similar to the Zen perspective on duality. In a sense Zen duality is similar to Gebserian rationalism. Each is recognized by the need for an individual outcome. In this view there are varying degrees of value. Zen practitioners might suggest that to do something just because it is possible is not the issue. In a way Gebser's distinctions and the deficiencies of each consciousness structure, indirectly ask the same question. What is left is to improve self, whatever that might mean to the individual. Zen practitioners say that to be sincere and make a full effort at every moment is enough. Gebser's integration presupposes awareness and perhaps even an ability to differentiate and act without thinking, a sense of at–one–ment, which is also simultaneously *atonement*.

Essentially many new age philosophies are deficient modes——rationalized versions of aspects an individual already embodies. In fact, much seeking is finding what we already have—some describe it as the eternal return or in Gebserian philosophy the ever–present origin. What is latent becomes conscious, but if one does not know the possibilities, is it still latency? Perhaps latency is a catchall for that which we can never know. Thus, the sayings about accepting things as they are, whether they are agreeable or not, have profound insight.

If I am allowed a digression, the Myers Briggs personal typing research[1] suggests that the United States is approximately 75% extroverts—meaning they get their power and energy from being around and with other people. Introverts on the other hand comprise the

---

[1] Extroverts and Introverts are defined by where the individual gets energy. Extroverts, after being in a crowd, usually are excited and energized introverts are often drained. I used this resource merely to allude to the overall tendency of society to focus on external, group processes. This also affects what processes tend to be honored and acceptable and what is considered fringe.

remaining 25%. Extroverts get their energy from solitude and quietness. The point—contemplative traditions are not easily accepted or standard options for most individuals in the United States. Extroverts seek community; they would rather find their individuality in the presence of the group rather than taking the clichéd road less traveled. Extroverts and Introverts are defined by where the individual gets energy. Extroverts, after being in a crowd, usually are excited and energized introverts are often drained. I used this resource merely to allude to the overall tendency of society to focus on external, group processes. This also affects what processes tend to be honored and acceptable and what is considered fringe.

Gebser's writing and the Zen tradition provide insights that both extroverts and introverts are able to incorporate into their lives. This introvert/extrovert duality reminds us of our focus on technique, "what we do," and if we are doing it right. "Do" and "right" are characteristics and words Zen and Gebserian observation ask us to assess carefully. Zen cautions us to be careful of our words, to become cognizant of the way we say things. "It doesn't matter" is an excuse to do something in our own way, which Zen believes shows we are attached to some particular thing, way, outcome or viewpoint.

Zen/Gebser also seem to suggest that the way or Tao is to be present, fully present and participate in life each day, and each moment. That is not to define Tao, rather it is a direction, left totally in the hands and hearts of each individual. That is an integral reality. It doesn't mean we don't participate in integral moments; rather it is a matter of being more that way—Tao as direction and as being. As such, integrality recognizes and embodies totality and wholeness as fully as it embodies fragmentation, alienation and extremism.

Perhaps to be present, fully present and participate in life each day is not what Gebser was saying. Perhaps he was attempting to make sense of his world, to find common themes that made sense to him in his observations of everyday life, to discover that which had relevance to the Western rational tradition. Gebser offered himself, not just his observations. Yes he used philosophical techniques and assimilated knowledge and observation in new and different ways. Yet in the end it was really about individual and communal experience. It was about finding individuality in the collective and commonality in the individual. That is very Zen of Jean (Gebser).

Zen and Gebserian insights don't presuppose rational awareness. All individuals have integral moments. There are those who have never heard about Zen, or integral reality, yet, they live their lives in the moment. They live integral lives and have acute Zen awareness. They don't spend years studying, meditating, practicing zazen, going to conferences or debating the subtle distinctions of hermeneutics, techne, or ethnomethodology. They just live their lives.

There is an assumption by academics that education is always better than no education. That is a sociopolitical debate that will never be resolved. As Zen offers, in the end everything has the same value, fame, a successful best seller, working at a convenience store, mean little more than the smile of a child or a glass of fresh water. Our society believes that educational institutions, businesses and advertising and even educational degrees define results and success. This single–mindedness forgets that meaning, soul and insight are in the struggle. Failure only exists in a world of winners and losers. And no one wins all the time so everyone is a loser. Failure is not an end product or an end stage. It is an insight, an experience, for it is the effort that is important. What one gives of oneself to oneself and to others is what is important. It doesn't matter in the end whether that effort

was recognized by anyone else or not. Does Van Gogh care that his paintings are now selling for millions of dollars? He is dead, he died a pauper. His paintings are his expression, his giving of himself. He painted because he wanted to, that is what he did. Or consider the mother who was asked if she was glad to find out if it was her son in the tomb of the Unknown Soldier. She replied it wouldn't change much since she couldn't hold her or talk to him.

Zen asks an interesting question of which Gebser often alludes to in his descriptions of deficient modes of consciousness structures. Shunryu Suzuki says, "To think, because it is possible therefore we will do it, is not Buddhism. Even though it is impossible, we have to do it because our true nature wants us to." Possible or impossible is not the issue; it is more whether our true nature wants us to. That brings up an interesting insight, the West has a tendency to clone the processes of successful individuals and corporations. It's called quality management, systems theory and a variety of other variations on the same theme. What is often overlooked in reviewing the success of certain individuals or organizations is that success is a byproduct of the value and innermost drive of the individuals involved.

If that is true imagine the implications of cloning? Cloning is simply plastic surgery taken to the extreme. So we get look–alikes, does that really mean that because we have the genes of Einstein that we get another Einstein? I think the experience of twins show that is not the case. Cloning means every male can look like Tom Selleck, Michael Jordan, and every woman Whitney Houston or Cindy Crawford. Like anything else once the glut of sameness occurs then ugly is fashionable. Physical beauty and perfect genes does not guarantee outcomes as the movie *Gattaca* suggests. Individuals may look alike but there are too many intangibles that affect the nature of human development and human personality. After all, athletic advertising has been hawking individuality to the point that it has created sameness. People become walking billboards for Nike. People wear certain clothes; the right clothes to be cool and some get killed because of it. Physical cloning is merely the final step in the physiological cloning that has already taken place in the mind.

Isn't cloning the epitome of the separation of mind and body? What a wonderful opportunity to redefine the nature of humanity? Isn't it the natural byproduct, the biological equivalent of a mechanistic age that values mass production? So why all the concern? What are we really afraid of? Is humanity simply defined by how humans are conceived?

What better accomplishment? When our focus is on accomplishment, doing, being different, individuality, making something special—Zen suggests that in reality this is not doing anything. Rather, the goal is recognition and the way of recognition is often shallow and superficial. Look at the behaviors and attire of adolescents, musicians, and artists. They and others are trying to make a statement, to show difference, express individuality and to get noticed.

What happens when you surrender, when you no longer want something so badly it aches, or when you do not try to do anything special? In these instances Zen suggests that is when you do something (Suzuki, 1996, p.47). You become the process, space and time don't exist you are free of them, and as the poets say, the wind blows through you. Isn't this what most of the books, seminars and lectures on creativity are all about, unlocking the inner sense of at–one–ness? And how successful do you imagine people would be if they held onto the outcome rather than allow the process to unfold? It is like picking fruit before it is ripe because we are afraid the birds will come along and eat it first, so we spoil it through our

lack of faith in life and ourselves. We want the outcome and as a result undermine the process.

This is the Zen of Gebser. It's not etheric, or esoteric. It is practical. For those who practice the process and the form, like mimicking meditation, quality improvement, and organizational structures; Zen/Gebser suggest that as long as you are practicing (zazen) for the sake of something (outcome) that is not true practice. That is expecting the formula to yield a specific outcome. History is filled with battles lost because the process used did not fit the situation. Ask the British about the Revolutionary War or the United States about Viet Nam.

A more personal example is the act of giving. Giving is good, our government encourages it. And the bonus is we get a tax break. Change the tax breaks and the patterns of giving change. This approach to giving expects a return and is based on an outcome that is very rational. This applies to all sorts of giving which expects something back, whether that is a tax break, love, sex, affection, support, equality, or social recognition.

And what of all the problems and expectations this creates. We are left with a paradox, to *not do*, and in so doing we do something. A recent example is Mother Teresa—there are people everywhere who give without expectation and thus do something, and become and express something greater than themselves, and yet no one knows them.

Expression is present in words and deeds, but is also evident in the eyes, voice, demeanor and thoughts. The eye, voice, and mind are all symbolic of Gebserian consciousness structures. Integration occurs and is recognized when duality is overcome by expressing this nature, according to Zen, in the "simplest, most adequate way and appreciate it in the smallest existence" (49). The duality is overcome by valuing all things equally not "prioritizing." For only doing the most important things reinforces the separation and the arbitrary value of "important" which is an illusion. Ask anyone who has pursued a career single–mindedly only to lose his or her family. The cycle repeats itself because experience is how an individual gains wisdom. Knowledge and intellect are only handmaidens masquerading as the Queen.

What about the person who contemplates a divorce and then makes true on the choice? Mentally it seems easy but often a familiar statement is made after: "logically I understood what I was doing getting a divorce, but I didn't know until I went through it what it was all about." These words are also often spoken about jobs, careers, and crimes. The mind thinks it knows but only the emotional body can loosen the grip of intellectual fantasy. This insight also applies, as Gebser points out, to communities, societies, cultures and civilizations.

The Ferengi, of the popular series *Star Trek: Deep Space Nine*, are the epitome of the Western rational tradition. Their life, individuality and success are defined by how shrewd they are at living, applying and using the Ferengi Rules of Acquisition to their betterment. We laugh at Quark, the bar owner because he is always making a deal by which he can acquire something which increases his wealth and simultaneous his self–esteem and social standing. Quark is an excellent metaphor for American business and political expediency. However, there are small glimpses of another Quark, one in which Zen/Gebser students would say Quark expresses his true nature, when he forgoes the deal to help another on the intergalactic space station. It is this expression of true nature in which self–awareness and fullness are afforded the opportunity to shine through. All the Platinum in the universe cannot create the same sense of feeling or belonging.

One of the insights I have gained from Gebser/Zen is that it is all well and good to discuss the elements comprising human endeavors and the theories of existence, but the focus ultimately comes down to how each of us exists in this moment. As Nietzsche said, 'who are we when we are alone? Who are we at each moment in our lives?' Gebser and Zen seem to suggest that, when we do something that we also be observant, careful and alert to the obvious as well as that which is not known.

Both Zen and Gebser focus on the ordinary, the everyday. The focus keeps the individual present and alert—in the moment—to use a new age phrase. Gebser suggests that new manifestations of significant change can be spotted long before they are recognized by society at large. In this way emergence is manifest by becoming aware, beginning to recognize, beginning to observe, seeing patterns and usefulness and applications, and then consciously choosing or attempting to influence them, not as an outcome but rather as an embodiment. And the recognition becomes invisible and unconscious and becomes what is often called second nature. This effort, once manifest, creates the world, the physical reality. So in one view we hold before us a world created without mythical oneness, mental balance or magical unity. However we choose to "see" how the world provides us the opportunity to recognize/manifest deficient consciousness structures. We hold in our hands destruction and opportunity at each and every moment of our lives. Which is manifest depends on how we choose to assess and manifest our physical reality.

American history suggests that most of this century involved brinkmanship and self–destructive tendencies in international relations. But in recent years other opportunities and options have emerged, ones less bleak. And this discussion of options suggests a focus on attainment that is indicative of the dualistic nature of society. Dualism is not bad, but how society and individuals use or are influenced by it can lead to destructive consequences which result in annihilation or breakthrough.

Gebser's assertion that "all which is possible exists already" is reinforced in the Zen question of what is the sound of one hand clapping? To quote S. Suzuki:

> One hand is sound. If you clap with two hands, you can hear the sound. But, if sound did not already exist before you clapped, you could not make the sound. Before you make it, there is sound. Because there is sound, you can make it, and you can hear it. Sound is everywhere (p.60).

Gebserian scholars might describe Zen as a more mythically dominant approach to experiencing the world, however that is not necessarily the case. The assumption, it seems, in Zen and Gebser is that ultimately there is a moment where everything blends, transforms, returns, transmutes.. It is those moments when one and all are simultaneously present. Some would suggest that this is a reference to an underlying ultimate reality, which rationalists love to atomize and categorize as metaphysical. But that is to misrepresent experience by attempting to use words and logic that can only de–scribe. By attempting to structure the logic and the explanation rationalists are able to deny the experience and resort to Clintonesque arguments that suggest that if there is no proof, if a tree falls in the forest and no one is there, it didn't happen. It all makes for good argument but at what expense to truth and integrity.

As Zen and Gebser have observed, ultimate reality doesn't exist. However if ultimate reality is always present the word ultimately is unnecessary and perhaps so is reality. This is poof that we have dispensed with ultimate reality. What Zen and Gebser seem to suggest is let's not get too restrictive in descriptions, observations and detachment. Life must be

lived and experienced. No one ever lived their life solely by describing it, although many authors and philosophers have tried. Zen/Gebser suggests reality is always present and the distinctions made are helpful to some but in the end everyone has their own experiences of life.

What I have briefly attempted is to suggest, as has Zen/Gebser, is that there are many more "perspectives" (consciousness structures) which influence how we assess a situation and how we attempt to discount or support its stance. What we overlook is that when we feel strongly (notice the feeling) about a situation then we have a tendency to provide rational logic to achieve the outcome we desire. Other perspectives or views are neglected, squashed, strong–armed or paid off. Is it right, just? Who is to say? This vague scenario in microcosm describes the struggles present society deals with on a moment–to–moment basis.

And because of our strongly mental bias Gebser offered consciousness structures as buoys and reminders pointing to that which we as a society have neglected. We are seeking our way home. Like Odysseus our voyage is dependent on our choices. The markers and assistance are ever present. And a part of home or enlightenment is always one decision or experience away. Only by personal recognition and perception can each of us find what home means to us.

Gebser meticulously presented concrete evidence about how consciousness, recognized or not, can affect the development of art, music, education, religion, economic and social structures. His knowing affected and continues to affect the communal knowing, whether that knowing is recognized in concrete form or not. As Zen realization simply states, the alchemy of each of our experiences, understandings and achievements (great and small) results in this deeply embodied knowing, "you have everything in your own pure quality. If you understand this ultimate fact, there is no fear. There may be difficulty, but there is no abandonment or meaninglessness." It is finding community through individuality and individuality in the community and loss of self. It is Odysseus arriving home and we realizing we have always been there.

References

Briggs Myers, Isabel & McCaulley, Mary. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers–Briggs type indicator,* (p.151). Consulting Psychologists Press. Palo Alto, CA.

Gebser, Jean. (1985). *The ever–present origin.* (Noel Barstad with Algis Mickunas, Trans.). Ohio University Press. Athens, OH.

Suzuki, Shunryu. (1996). Zen mind, beginner's mind. Weatherhill. New York.

The Conception of the Internet
& Mathew Shepard as a Case Study

Rick Muller, Ph.D.
Poudre Valley Health System
Fort Collins, CO 80524

Introduction

To many, the world seems to be fragmented, soulless, without center. For some, technology and the new media, whose most visible progeny is the Internet, seems to further that experience and belief. This is natural for those assuming a linear/rational reality.

But, as we all know there are many ways to view experiences and some fall on the edges of linear reality. Is the Internet simply another business transaction technology, a communication medium or is it fundamentally different and as such transforming communications and reality simultaneously?

The Internet is viewed by some as bringing the universe into their particular lives, the proverbial grain of sand that is their world, their home. The messaging or hype surrounding the Internet is overwhelming. If we believe this crush of electronic speak, we are in the midst of a world village, a breakthrough that will transform the new millennium. The potential may be there but the reality is not. More than 40 percent of the world's population survives on less that two dollars a day, they are not part of the world village yet.

Does this mean we are continuing colonization or as others have defined it "ghettoization"? These are interesting word choices. Colonize is defined as acquiring, extending or retaining dependencies or as a desire to conquer and possess space. First, a lot of our personal problems, mental inadequacies even parenting can be considered colonization since we are often acquiring, extending and retaining dependencies that we may or may not be aware of. As for conquering and possessing space, that is a notion limited to the rational world, for the electronic realm time and space do not exist. Is the electronic emergence a revolution, and evolution or a transformation? Are we faced with a full view or a fleeting glance of something greater or sinister? Is it really a matter of perspective or are our concerns mostly cultural indoctrination?

I don't believe this is a semantic exercise because the stakes are too high. Viewing the Internet from the mental/rational perspective, one sees it only as technology, another type of medium to further the corporate message. It is simply a tool of progress—something to further the human goal of making nature and others subservient to the most clever and smartest. This view fragments, separates, isolates, atomizes and leaves others behind. There are winners and losers. Colonization or Ghettoization. In this view electronic development and the Internet would be responsible for creating a fourth or even fifth world. This is accomplished by expanding difference by invoking a linear perspective thus generating a gulf and hierarchy unmatched in human history—the maximization of a tool mentality—the extreme, as seen in *Dune* or *The Terminator*. And there are many who are chanting this mantra, not as a choice but as the inevitable evolution of technology and communication.

But, that approach is only one possibility and one reality among many. There are others, many others. What is often overlooked when significant upheaval occurs or fundamental

change reveals itself is the tendency to focus on what is lost. This is natural. What is overlooked in that perspective is the recognition of what is emerging. This is best illustrated by example. It involves Mozart, a harpsichord, Beethoven and a piano.

Metaphorically, Mozart represents traditional medium and established mindsets and Beethoven the "new medium"—or more explicitly in the current scene the Internet mindset.

Mozart was born 14 years before Beethoven. And his compositions, his training was for the harpsichord because the piano hadn't really made a mark yet. So his conception of composition and playing was based on the harpsichord rather than the piano. This early indoctrination colored Mozart's view of what the piano was and could be. Mozart's compositions are considered brilliant, but reminiscent of harpsichord interpretation and technique. This is not a judgment of the music or the composition, but rather to illustrate how time, place and circumstances can influence an ability to use a newly discovered technology.

For those unacquainted with a harpsichord, to play it requires a light touch and greater precision than a piano because the keys are physically, shorter and thinner. It requires the player to maintain finger strength and correct posture because the distance between the hands and the keys is minimal. The posture is best described as hands down, elbows at the side with wrists taut and controlled so the fingers hover over the keys.

And this style influenced Mozart's compositions for the piano, simply because Mozart was more influenced by the harpsichord than the piano and this, in a sense, limited his view of what the piano could do. Mozart's piano often serves as a quiet, fluid and delicate solo voice that is graceful and complex melodically yet unable to be on equal ground with the orchestra. Critics suggest Mozart's compositions are such that the piano is subservient to the orchestra. Carl Churning describes the piano playing of Mozart as "clear, witty, and brilliant with lively execution." The notes tend to be short and not sustained. It seems Mozart's conception of the piano does not allow him to fully engage the powerful voice that Beethoven is later able to generate.

On the other hand, Beethoven grew up with the piano, not the harpsichord. It's like someone growing up with a horse and buggy versus a car. The possibilities and view of the world are much different. Beethoven possessed a different attitude about what the piano was and how it could be used, which is precisely the emerging issues with the new media and the Internet, in particular, today.

Beethoven worked with an instrument—the piano—that was not as delicate as the harpsichord. It required arm strength not finger strength, which meant the player must press harder to generate a louder sound. The keys are physically wider and the foot pedal allows notes to be sustained for longer periods of time. The piano's physical presence and method of generating sound demanded a different approach to the keyboard. And that allowed Beethoven to push the piano's capabilities further and further. He was able to access the piano's dynamic capacity; he created different ways of coaxing sound out and engaging the piano's power especially through the ability to sustain notes. What Mozart's harpsichordists saw as novelties, Beethoven treated as a birthright—to engage more power, volume and the sustaining of notes. Essentially, Beethoven wrote, heard and played differently than Mozart from the start because Beethoven's conception of the piano was not based on a harpsichordist's view of the world.

More specifically, comparing the third movement of Mozart's Piano Concerto #25 K503 (1786) with the third movement of Beethoven's Piano Concerto #5 Opus 73 (1809). The

differences are easily illustrated. I apologize that the written word is not the most provocative manner in communicating the differences in these two concert masterworks, but it is what we are left with at present.

In the Mozart piece the listener has difficulty hearing the piano. The orchestra initiates all three movements. The piano is presented as a lyric instrument with a soprano voice. Mozart doesn't use the piano as an instrument that will introduce important themes. He saves the piano, brings it in later at more appropriate times, in quiet interludes.

Beethoven on the other hand leads with the piano, and the orchestra only enters the composition once the piano has outlined the theme's parameters. In the words of Robert Greenberg of the San Francisco Conservatory of Music "the piano establishes the pounding, heroic, sweeping, sonorous and marvelous mood," it is the piano which is the prime vehicle for the thematic material, a marked contrast from Mozart who has the orchestra introduce all new thematic material.

The music and the use of the piano are indicative of two very different visions of the piano. For Beethoven the piano is not just a soloist or a novelty, but is rather an equal to the orchestra. Greensburg says the "keyboard is capable of the sonority, power and heroism of the ensemble in front of which it sits." This is a different, contrasting view and vision of what the piano's role is compared to Mozart. Greenberg suggests the piano is "not the light, wimpy, nothing to be used in quiet moments," as does Mozart, but rather a high performance race car used when one needs to hear harmonic, accumulating chords dependent on a powerful instrument. Where Mozart is clear, witty and brilliant, Beethoven revs the piano, reveling a new persona, one with passionate strength, new and daring passages, and offering previously unimagined effects creating what Greenberg calls a "spirited, grandiose tonal painting of the highest order," conceived for a total effect, something with a depth of feeling. Mozart could not have called this forth because of his limited conception of what the piano could do.

This also parallels the difficulty of integrating scientific discovery or technological advance into concrete practical reality. It just takes time. In communication circles, it's true of the Internet. It seems our ability to create is colored by the conceptions we hold. These conceptions may produce artificial barriers and limitations that do not exist in reality but only in our perception of reality.

This brings us to a more direct assessment of the Internet. It is easy to spout statistics about the Internet's growth, how fast the medium has been assimilated into our lives, and even how it seems to change commerce and industry. But on one level that seems to miss the point. There is another aspect of the Internet—the experience, not only as technology or another thoroughbred medium for promotion. Rather it is fundamentally a different way of experiencing, connecting and communicating. It obliterates time and space. Traditional boundaries no longer exist. Linear reality begins to collapse within it. Is it merely a novelty? A harpsichord? Or is it a piano?

The Internet's acceptance is by far the fastest of any medium ever developed—faster than television, radio or the automobile. As a piano, it is a transformational opportunity. As a harpsichord it is a vehicle for promotion, another medium to maximize production, decrease cost and conduct business.

Marketing folks are fond of using examples of business faux pas that involve not having broader vision. Like the railroad barons at the turn of the century who were so narrowly focused on building and expanding railroad service that they missed the implications of the

introduction of the car and the airplane. Why? Because they were in the railroad business and did not understand the field had changed to transportation, not just railroads. This lack of awareness resulted in lost fortunes and missed opportunities as the car and airplane swept across the landscape——forever changing society and humanity.

It is said during times of fundamental change there are losers. It is true. With the advent of the car and electricity, buggy whip and candle makers went out of business. Who is to say if those people were better off then or even now? From the rationalistic perspective how does one quantify what is lost and what is gained? And for Whom?

Much depends on our perspective. The history of the United States shows a migration from an agrarian system to one where cities are most important. This change can be characterized as moving from a fragmented to a more communal society—from a natural to a human made world. The mythical/complementary view perceives this differently. There is a loss of community in the movement from country to the city—in essence to find individuality. And in the search for individuality, the self, our earlier nature was lost.

As the process evolved the city became a wasteland. This precipitated a move to the suburbs. But as in the Grail Legend the wasteland is created because Parasail didn't ask the question, didn't speak up, (too appropriate, stuck in societal, personal, religious and/or cultural norms), didn't understand himself, his relationship to his inner and outer world, or his inner and outer community of self. When he finally does ask the question renewal occurs. And so too in our cities we are seeing a rebirth and reintegration of nature and community centers. Except now the center is everywhere and nowhere. It becomes a Zen koan and a principle of quantum physics—the center is where you are and aren't simultaneously. So it is with the Internet.

It embodies the disintegration, renewal, reconfiguration, emergence, magic and passion for life. The technology has redefined community, city, center, body, space and communication. Some say this is a bad thing. Yes, there is danger—but a danger worth the risk. Ask any boy who tried to kiss a girl for the first time. So it is with the Internet. Those daring to dream will dictate the possibilities and the success.

Is it a harpsichord or a piano? Is it a technology or a fundamental shift in communication? Does it offer virtual experiences and yet provides opportunities for intimacy found nowhere else. Does it allow others to more fully experience life, to interact and attract opportunities that before were impossible? What about the company in New Delhi, India (Dakshinayan) which promotes "intercultural solidarity and an understanding of Third World poverty" via a development education program. People sign up and volunteer their time to assist needy villages. The Internet allowed this company to quadruple the number of volunteers in one year. The Internet provides this nonprofit organization the opportunity to fulfill its mission, and provide community and social benefit where it is needed most.

The Internet, like most religious doctrine offers one thing—hope—it allows these small companies with little in capital and even less for advertising a medium for accessing at a reduced cost many previously untapped markets and supporters. The technology allows for creative methods that previously could not have existed.

From this technology virtual companies are emerging with little in the way of capital, advertising or budgets that have been able to compete and change the landscape of future business relations. Amazon.com has effectively siphoned off millions of dollars from the likes of Barnes & Noble and Borders (ed., at least initially). These concrete blue chip organizations are now stuck with billions of dollars in real estate holdings that may limit

their ability to compete in the next millennium. Imagine the effects on planning and zoning commissions no longer competing for economic development dollars? Businesses can be anywhere; people can live anywhere and still conduct business. How will that affect the current societal assumption that you have to go to a specific place at a specific time to work.

What does all this have to do with the Internet? Plenty. This is about those who see applications and limitations and not the larger implications. It's about narrowness of vision, perspective and expertise—and how this can limit creativity because of their exactness. This is about transformation and transparency.

And in that flux concrete jobs and new business opportunities have emerged that offer some greater self–reflection, fullness and passion. The Internet and the new media have revealed an interesting commonality in the ambiguity and complementary nature of life.

There are those who fear further ghettoization or colonization with 4th, 5th or even 6th worlds. That is always a possibility, ask the buggy whip makers. It is an eventuality of change. Hopefully, greater opportunity is present and also greater understanding— understanding that success is not defined by material possession, money and the objective world. But in the struggles associated with significant change and the subsequent ambiguity, creativity emerges. New solutions, quantum leaps that once planted and nurtured, offer a bouquet of possibilities previously unknown to the process. The opportunity to leapfrog economic relativism presents itself.

But, there are those among us whose fear is so great that colonization and ghettoization are inevitable that it becomes a self–fulfilling prophecy. And the reality of change suggests those whose personal finances and success outweigh the communal need will always condemn some to the pains of unrealized potential. But, that is another story.

Life offers up every possibility. Each of us makes choices. Are we disappearing or becoming transparent, are we real or virtual? As the expansion of a concrete presence slows for many retail outlets, strip malls are being replaced with neighborhood retailing centers. The virtual space has allowed a redefinition of place, community and body.

Do we see the Internet as a harpsichord or a piano? Whatever view is taken in any new emergence a leader must move outside and challenge the given frameworks and foundations and allow destruction and chaos to find its own equilibrium. Our human tendency is to be paternal or maternal, to create a perceived safety net, to direct the unfoldment and outcome, to shepherd the process to a particular manifestation.

Matthew Shepard

Which brings me to Matthew Shepard. For those of you who don't know or don't remember what the series of events I will briefly outline them. Matthew Shepard was beaten and tied to an A frame fence just outside Laramie, Wyoming in 1998. He was discovered by a mountain biker approximately a day and a half later. He was taken to a local hospital and then transferred to Poudre Valley Health System in Fort Collins, Colorado. He was unconscious and on life support when he arrived. A team of medical professionals including ER, trauma and neurosurgeons examined him. He was moved to the neuro–surgical intensive care unit where he remained unconscious and on life support for four days. His parents were working in Saudi Arabia and arrived Friday night. Matthew died on the following Monday morning while on full life support.

Thursday night this was a local Wyoming story, much the same you would find in any small town or city, by Saturday this story was international in scope.

Once his sexual orientation was revealed and two simple words were used in tandem—hate and crime—Matthew Shepard ceased being a human being to many and became a cause, a symbol. Matthew Shepard the personal became Matthew Shepard, the universal. The beating victim became a symbol, a martyr, and a casualty of war.

I was in the eye of the hurricane, at the hospital helping provide information for the world to digest. Being on the inside of an international story, watching it unfold, one gets an odd view of how a communication process flows, is manipulated and meaning imparted, co–opted and even used for personal gain—sometimes deliberately and sometimes unconsciously. In this instance Matthew Shepard became a metaphor, almost not real. Anger and outrage were everywhere. Vigils of thousands happened in many major cities around the country, but how much genuine emotion was felt is hard to say? There was always some who where more interested in pushing agendas. Doing something, rather than being with the moment.

Hate and crime—two words—odd how two words together can cause so much outrage. It was not clear at the time whether this was or is a hate crime but the utterance of the words made it so, and guaranteed a media avalanche.

Matthew Shepard ignited a firestorm. It was not his conscious choice. It was an incident. Perhaps it will be the spark that creates national hate crime legislation. But while in the midst of thinking about this I wondered about other historical events that become reverent and mythical. Perhaps Joan of Arc, a little girl gets burned at the stake like so many others. There is no sense of historical significance in these situations, just death. We create the stories, the myths and add the meanings. And a generation later, we come back and change our mind or elevate an incident to mythical status. You pick the historical event closest to you. I think of Custer and the attempts to spin his demise into the folklore. Each culture, it seems, has its own stories. Truth, it can be argued, is more a mistress than a virgin.

But this talk isn't about that. It's about the Internet, Matthew Shepard, and how people responded to the incident.

Poudre Valley received calls from media outlets and concerned individuals from all over the country and the world. Our dilemma was how to accommodate the needs and wants for information given the family's reluctance to talk. Our first decision was to use our web site for updating Matthew's condition. Our goal was to decrease the number of phone calls, freeing up time, which allowed us to be more present for late–breaking issues. And we needed to provide consistent and timely information for all media, large or small, local and national.

All phone calls were triaged to the web site, which satisfied many of the second tier news outlets and local news organizations. This is significant because second tier media are usually left out of the process because they lack resources and the name recognition of the larger national media outlets.

We implemented a voice mail condition status to coincide with the web site update. This allowed those who didn't have web access the ability to call a specific number and get the update. Radio stations recorded the condition of Matthew from a primary source. The media didn't have to rely or wait on the wire services for information; they were able to get information from a variety of direct media. This included radio stations, community and/or university newspapers in Houston, New Orleans, small towns in Nevada and Iowa etc.—all could access the same information as the New York and Los Angeles Times, the Washington Post or the Chicago Tribune.

As the details emerged, the crush of media increased. So did the number of people, regular people wanting to know about Matthew's condition. The updates on the web site became a sub–story. It seems no hospital had ever used it's web site to post the condition of a patient for this kind of incident.

Our initial solution to address concerns for media timeliness ended up as a major source of information for the general public. Because of the newness we also asked those visiting the web site to complete our online survey. It was more focused on the web site but it was at least something with which we could monitor feedback. This allowed us to tweak and change the content or the focus of the information in real time.

An example was the inevitable interest from private individuals who wanted to donate money and send messages to the parents. To accommodate these requests we established and publicized a fund for Matthew Shepard on the web site and developed an email address on our internal computer system. The latter resulted in approximately 17,000 confidential email messages to the parents. Additionally, it also decreased the number of calls our switchboard needed to handle.

Our web site accesses went from 2,000 per day to 815,000 accesses for the five–day period surrounding Matthew Shepard's stay, with the high for one day being 200,000. We were running 30,000 accesses an hour, the day of Matthew's death. As a matter of perspective, that's more than three times the number the Denver Bronco's had when they won the Super Bowl for the first time in 30 years. This traffic increase was due to our web site address being published in the country's major newspapers and the direct links from news organizations like CNN, MSNBC, ABC News and The Miami Herald.

To get a flavor of the coverage the Shepard story was on the front page of almost every major newspaper in the country for several days. It was the lead story on the Today Show, on most major network news broadcasts, and was covered by many network news magazines like NPR, 20/20, Hard Copy, Time Magazine and the New York Times.

We received phone calls from the White House, Janet Reno and the offices of Ellen Degeneres, Farah Fawcett and Elton John. President Clinton and Attorney General Janet Reno mentioned the incident and called for national hate crime legislation as a result.

Behind the Scenes

The stories no one heard about were the countless individuals, young and old, male and female who used our feedback survey and email to express their grief. No other communication medium allows this to happen. Individuals became participants in the event and were not observers limited to the traditional media stories. The web site allowed them the opportunity to get all the information released about Matthew Shepard, uncensored, and in their own time, and whereever they wanted. Time and space were nonexistent.

The responses to the web survey were heart wrenching, young teenagers, grandmothers, mothers who lost their children, estranged fathers, and kind, gentle, concerned people. They used the web site to vent, to share, to express and participate in the event—something one can't do with the "objective" regular media. The media, by the nature of their technology and reliance on time and space, are required to make decisions about what and how much information to provide.

From our feedback responses one may discover a different understanding about humanity. All the talk about the culture of violence, racism, and hate was not evident in the information or comments we received. What we experienced was that people, if given the

opportunity and the medium to respond, do, and do so with obvious concern. Our web site allowed people to express grief, anger, outrage and just feel they participated in an event so far away from their home, but one they could access from home.

Before the Internet there was not a convenient and immediate way for people to know and respond to such stories. Letters have become too formal and time consuming. The email provides spontaneity and eloquence not found in the traditional avenues of communication. It becomes more immediate, more stream of consciousness, more emotional, more uninhibited and even more private.

The surveys offer a great deal of insight about the use of technology and the benefits created. Monitoring the responses I am left with the belief that web sites should become standard practice for tragedies and crisis situations. People want information and they want to participate in news events, supplementing their local media coverage. As communicators it is our job to provide the avenues and technology for people to get information that best expresses their emotions. As academics it is our job to speculate, to spin theories and monitor behaviors—in effect to study the effects of technology and theory.

As a practitioner the Internet cannot be dismissed as simply technology and a contributor to ghettoization. Ghettoization is probable when the larger vision is restricted, when the technology is misapplied, and the conception of what "new media" can be and do is lost in the limitations of a narrow worldview.

References

Gerstner, John. "The Other Side of Cyberspace: An Interview with Manuel Castells, cyber–scientist." Communication World. March 1999, pages 11–16, 43.

Greenberg, Robert. *Concert Masterworks Part 1*. The Teaching Company. 1998.

Manzar, Osama. Rural India on $19.95 a Month. *The Industry Standard*. October 5–12, 1998, page 12.

CONSCIOUSNESS IN TRANSITION

Algis Mickunas
Ohio University

Introduction

Current civilizations, and the various cultures within them, are both in confrontations and in transitions. Some civilizations, by way of their cultures, attempt to master both the confrontations and the transitions in various ways. Some cultures are used to reclaim the past. Other cultures trace the possibilities of constant transformations. Although it may seem that those two cultural modalities can live side by side, if we transform them as traces of civilizational consciousness it might turn out that they will be in confrontation which each other. The task of this venture is to investigate the contemporary events from political, mythical, economic, and technological cultures, yet cultures that trace incompatible civilizational modes of awareness. It might turn out to be the case that groups of peoples living in the same geographic regions and claiming to be of the same nationality, at the level of civilization they might belong to an entirely another civilizational consciousness morphology. For example, persons of scientific enlightenment and rationalism, although living in China, belong to Greco–Roman civilization while fundamentalist Christians, living in the west, might belong to Middle–Eastern civilization. In this sense, the civilizational phenomena as basic ways of awareness are neither derivable from nor reducible to particular nationality or geographical site.

We suspect that the research we propose is most relevant in face of the current globalization of various cultural exports and imports. It is the case that globalization and by extension universalization are claims made by every civilization. This is to say, at a very basic level of awareness, which we call civilizational there seem to be the phenomena that encompass everything. Greco–Roman materialism and rationalism, up to day, claims that all peoples must follow this mode of awareness in order to be realistic and open. But a Hindu claims the same universality and encompassment: the founding text of our civilization includes all humanity. In this sense, there appears to be no room for the Other. Each civilizational awareness will confront the Other with an effort to subsume the Other under its own logic. This is a moment of confrontation, since the Other will be regarded as irrational, immoral, primitive, or mystical. Each civilization, as consciousness morphology, will interpret the Others and attempt to locate them within its own parameters as inferior, less than human, and even demonic. If the civilizational modes of awareness are irreconcilable, there arise confrontations that may lead to mutual destruction. We have holy wars and racial genocide, we exert efforts to reeducate the Others, to make them sane, to convert them to true beliefs, and do so for the good, the salvation, the enlightenment of the Others. Thus, if we bring them better material life, medicine, etc., we are doing them a favor despite the fact that we are destroying their way of understanding. In turn if we bring them faith and salvation even if they resist, we can baptize them and send them to heaven.

Regardless of what cultural means or expressions are employed, such means will have to be regarded as traces of civilizational consciousness by which one civilization will elevate itself and demean the others. At one level there seems to be a transcultural and intercultural communication and even exchange of modes of thinking creating various technical, esthetic, and pedagogical uses, yet these very uses will not be regarded in the same way. One will regard these uses as traces of material, pragmatic, or rational civilization, while the other

will regarded them as implements for a holy war. By holy war we do not mean necessarily a religious war, but any claim to a position that has to be defended at any cost, such as nationalism, ethnocentrism, all the way to human rights. In this sense, Hitler as well as Stalin and just as well as Reagan can claim to have a holy war against those who are civilizationally different. Thus we declare Soviet Union as evil empire and also declare that we are on the side of the good and it is our duty to destroy this evil.

Methodology

The methodological problematic facing civilizational and cultural research is very old and very recent. Thus, for example, Foucault claims that we belong to a particular culture, namely, Western modern, and we cannot leave its parameters. It means that any method we propose will have to belong to a specific culture and therefore could not be applicable to other cultures. Yet all researches in this area overlook this methodological problem. Researches are bounded by their own claim of cultural immersion that defines everything, even the method, and at the same time claiming that the method they invent is universal, i.e. unbound by culture. In addition, such a definitory thesis does not allow the researcher to "get out" of her own culture to see its symbolic designs and their meaning. Given this, what we suggest as a methodology is the currently unavoidable phenomena of much broader and more pervasive civilizational awareness and civilizational shifts one across the other in order to make visible what each cultural mode of expression traces of the other at the level of civilization. This is to say, we are no longer capable of being restricted to one civilization since we have already incorporated the cultural means of the others that trace civilizational consciousness. In this sense, we do not deny that we belong to a civilization, but at the same time we recognize the facticity of civilizational intersections. This suggests that we shall not borrow a method from any civilization nor from the cultures of this civilizations because in the current transitions the cultures already trace their own and different civilizations–in transition. Whether we do or do not accept theoretically our own inherence in a civilization we are finding ourselves in an in–between domain. This means that the self–constitution of awareness of current civilizations, even if not recognized positionally, is in–between, in transition. Whether one belong to Islamic, Greco–Roman, Mayan, or Hindu civilizations one has already recognized, at the cultural level, ones being in transition between them. Our point is that this transition and at times confrontation is currently the unavoidable methodological consciousness. Any other way would be inadequate with respect to the phenomena of our current global encounters.

Given this methodological understanding, we still are in the dark with respect to the conception of civilizations and cultures. In the current popular mode, everything is regarded as culture, and academics are engaged in "critical" studies of cultures, without actually telling us what comprises a culture. Indeed, many writers of intellectual materials, inclusive of those who would argue against intellectual elitism, (such as Foucault) make identical claims with scientific anthropology that all human understanding is bound by "culture," or, in a more mystifying mode, by "cultural unconscious." This suggests that even if we design a methodology of critical cultural studies, such a methodology would be part of a given culture, and therefore any criticism would be circular. Yet, if one claims that one can observe various cultures, including one's own, without being reducible to the parameters of one's own culture, then one contradicts the claim that everything, including one's own position and methodology, is bound by one's own culture and hence cannot be relevant to any other culture. Moreover, one cannot even claim that the others are bound by

their "culture," since the very meaning of the term "culture" belongs to the writer's own cultural context. It is like claiming that all views are culturally relative, forgetting that this very view must also belong to a specific culture. Sloterdijk called this position "elitist cynicism." But if such cultural anthropologists, including Foucault as a Durkheimian ethnographer, objectify their own culture in order to see its limitations, then they posit a methodology as a transitional consciousness.

Given this methodological problematic, and yet given the current anthropological fact that most numerous modern and indeed postmodern writers are claiming cultural and social boundedness while transcendentally showing that they are freed from such boundedness due to their demonstration of a difference of other cultures from our own, then, either the cultural and social boundedness can be understood from a reflective transcendental position, or from another ground on which the cultures and social systems stand. If the former is the case, we could speak of cultural and social inter–reflexivity, such that each is recognized in its limitations by virtue of the others. In this case we would be faced with an awareness that reflects upon, and traces the limits of each with respect to others, without being bound by any. If the second option is taken, then we could speak of cultures and social systems as "the flowering" of civilizations and thus understood essentially from a much broader context. Thus cultures and societies could be reflected from civilizations and thus be accommodated in their variety as mutually interreflexive and reflected from a specific civilizational awareness. We shall explore this inter–reflexivity of cultures and societies as they are reflected by civilization and how civilization is reflected from another civilization, to the extent that such civilizational interreflexivity is supported by our mentioned methodological access as an awareness in transition. While it might seem that both awarenesses, the transcendental and the civilizational—are the same, we shall attempt to show that different civilizations comprise specific rules of transcendental awareness and that some rules are not compatible with others. Here our efforts will focus on the most fundamental modes of awareness in order to note how such modes either deny or attempt to subsume the other modes, and how both attempts fail, leading to global confrontations.

Civilizational Formations

In order to understand our contemporary global confrontations, it is advisable to discover the broadest, and in turn, the most pervasive compositions that, as modes of awareness, are traceable in and through cultural symbolic designs, and social relationships. Such compositions will comprise civilizational architectonic to the extent that the latter cannot be denied without circularity; in its very denial, it will affirm itself. Such architectonic, as will be seen, cannot be a generalization from cultural or social parts, since these, in their multiplicities and even oppositions, cannot be understood in any sensible way within their own parameters. This is to say, they trace their sense from a more pervasive composition of modes of awareness—the architectonic. No doubt, there are symbolic deviations from a given architectonic, but precisely such deviations indicate its significance. Whether members of societies or cultures think of their civilizational architectonic or not is irrelevant. They, nonetheless, adhere to its modes of awareness. We must note, at the outset, that "modes of awareness" at the most basic level are coextensive with "civilizational architectonic." In other words, whether we speak of civilizational formations as constituting the ways that cultures and societies are organized, or whether we speak of transcendental awareness, we are saying the same thing.

Our analyses, then, will attempt to trace through cultural symbolic designs the varieties of civilizational architectonics in order to show their mutual understanding and, at the same time, their radical divergences. Indeed, there is a strong possibility that contemporary global encounters among cultures and societies may have incompatible civilizational architectonics. In this sense the confrontations might call for, at least within some architectonics, holy wars or battles to the death. Indeed, such calls have been echoed across continents and from seemingly diverse social and cultural groups. What interests us are the modes of awareness that rule such calls. The tracing of these modes will allow us to understand the current breakdown of nations and even ethnicities, the antagonisms among groups that once shared the same temples and family tables.

Some of the more interesting elements in civilizational modes of awareness are mythological cultural formations and dramatically accentuated activities. Even when cultures speak in moralizing terms, they are usually framed in symbolic mythological designs and the dramas enacted in them. It ought to be clear that mythological symbolic designs and dramatic actions are only partial expressions of civilizational architectonics. It is possible to analyze such partial components, and even to find efforts to unify them with other components in order to offer a theory of civilizations. But what is of note is that such efforts and theories are equally symbolic designs and comprise another partial expression of a civilization. Thus, while respecting the works of such notables as Sorokin, Dumont, Eisenstadt, Weber, Gebser, Toynbee, Nelson, and others, we also should point to some reservations with respect to their theories. First, all are close adherents of the modern Western categories, used as a methodical network for the analyses of all civilizations, and second, each takes one civilization as a "norm" or a "standard," and regards others as abnormal deviations. What we shall contend is that even various theories, such as sociology, psychology, literature, economy, are symbolic designs and express a civilizational architectonic. We could suggest that even at a superficial level there are cross–disciplinary connections that might be relevant only to symbolic designs of one civilization. Thus the Freudian division of the human phenomenon into *id, ego, superego*, reflects the Western modern social division of humans into three classes: lower–working, middle–managing, and higher–ruling. Just as *id* strives toward *ego*, the working class strives toward the middle class. Yet through such theories and their connections, even civilizational theories that purport to unify other theories, there are traceable the phenomena of awareness as civilizational architectonic. Once again we must emphasize that civilizational architectonic is not an expression of either individual or intersubjective awareness. Rather such architectonic is awareness without which cultural symbolic designs and social events would cease to make sense.

Regardless in what language, in what symbolic cultural design, in what human social relationships, there appear two mutually exclusive and mutually indicative phenomena, composing distinct sense constituting modalities: frame and energy, form and power, law and love, organization and spirit, boundary and transgression, *li* and *ch'i*, all implicating the phenomena of structure and action, permanence and change. What sorts of relationships are available between these basic phenomena of awareness, comprising what Husserl called *the living present*, will appear in the analyses of cultural symbolic designs. Meanwhile, at whatever symbolic level and in whatever culture, whether in depictions of nature, metaphysical "realities," empirical givens, subjective constructs, it is deemed that structures are in principle definable. On the other hand, change and action do not yield themselves to full delimitation. In turn, there seem to be two "languages," the exoteric,

appropriate for structure, and esoteric, appropriate for action. If such languages become confused, for example if structural language were to be used to frame the awareness of flux, then one can expect an ironic consciousness. The same can occur in the opposite direction, where dynamic language may be used to depict an awareness of structure. What we are suggesting is that regardless of cultural variations, all trace the living present of structure and change as the basic modes of civilizational architectonic. Yet what makes for the differences among civilizations is the way that structure and change are related. In brief, the modes of awareness are these very relationships. Live awareness is the sense making composition, which as phenomena, are tacitly present through all cultural symbolic designs. This suggests, once more, that what phenomenology calls transcendental awareness at its most primordial level, is identical with civilizational architectonic. In this sense, our analyses are phenomenological.

For our purposes in the investigations of the contemporary civilizational confrontations and crises, we shall open four types of relationships between structure and change. First, any change can maintain and even enhance structure. Second, any change can disrupt or ruin structure, regardless how either is understood at the symbolic levels of culture. Third, structure can allow and even promote change. Fourth, structure can completely suppress change, rule change by inevitable laws. These four awareness compositions as civilizational architectonics, may appear synchronically as if they belonged to one civilization. The reason for such appearance is that at the cultural level there seems to be mutual acceptance of varieties as long as the varieties are not pushed to the limit and, finally reveal incompatible civilizational architectonics. Our following task is to reveal these confrontations and crises, even among members living presumably under the same national banner. Such members might have a greater civilizational affinity to groups of other nations and regions than to those living next door. Thus, certain Hebrew, Christian, and Hindu groups, living in the U.S. might be more akin to Islamic, Hindu, Christian, and Jewish fundamentalists than with groups that adhere to the humanism of enlightenment. Thus we may ask justifiably whether the contemporary West consists of one or more civilizations.

Tracing the Civilizational Architectonics

We could take some well–known cultural and social phenomena and demonstrate our case of contemporary civilizational clashes quite easily. But we do not wish to be accused of following the easy path. Hence, we shall select cultural symbolic designs that operate at the level of what currently would be regarded as irrelevant myths. We shall begin with the rebels found in the myths of evil. Such mythologies should also reveal the psychological states and social relationships of the rebels. Literate persons are familiar with the assertion that Western civilization is rooted in classical Greek thought. The latter was also rich with mythologies one among which was a depiction of a rebellion against the highest authority and thus a violation of the rules of action. This appears in the myth of Prometheus, who rebels against Zeus' edict that forbids fire to humans. Prometheus, moved by the unnecessary suffering of humans, steals fire from the gods and gives it to humans. Here we have practical assistance for which Prometheus does not ask anything. He does not wish to rule or to have others follow his way of life. What is interesting is that the Greeks accepted the action of such a rebel as a noble violation of bad laws. Although speaking formally, the act of Prometheus was "bad," his personal nobility and his positive attitude and qualities outweigh his formally bad act. Prometheus could be regarded as practically rational, and worldly "materialist." His aim was to help others, but with this help he changes the notion

of justice. Even Zeus accepts this change by admitting that his edict prohibiting fire to humans was a bad law. The worldliness—secularism—of Prometheus appears in his personality, which is independent from any authority. He has his own views and is capable of planning his own future based on his own knowledge and choices. If he makes mistakes, he admits them and corrects them. After all, Prometheus had decided to support Zeus in the battle against the Titans, but after the battle he recognized that Zeus had become a tyrant. Thus he decides to correct his mistake by rebelling against Zeus' laws simply because he decides that such laws are practically unjust. Here the highest authority is negated as unacceptable in principle without any question concerning one's own benefits. In this classical Greek mythology one develops the notion of personal responsibility for one's own action. Although one can make mistakes, one takes full responsibility for such mistakes and deems it one's duty to correct them.

This mythological depiction suggests something unique about the Greek civilization. Yet this uniqueness seems to be accessible to everyone. This accessibility depends on our success of deciphering the civilizational architectonic by showing what sort of relationship obtains between permanence and change, structure and action. In Promethean mythology Zeus is the highest cultural symbol of permanence—as authority. Prometheus, in turn, is a cultural symbol of action. As an initial supporter of Zeus, he reveals an awareness of *permanence maintenance and enhancement*. Yet by becoming a rebel, he reveals awareness, which is *disruption and/or destruction of permanence*. Such a disruption in the myth of Prometheus reveals, in the final outcome, a very specific relationship between permanence and change: the highest symbol of permanence—Zeus—agrees with Prometheus and thus changes his position. In this sense, permanence can be open to the requirements of change. This means that at the cultural level, there arises a possibility to challenge any authority, law, to interrogate them sensibly, and thus to change them. In other words, there emerges a dialogical relationship between permanence and change. Given this composition of awareness, classical Greek understanding could not escape democracy and philosophy. Every position, tradition, even the thinking of the highest figures, can be interrogated openly and reasonably, can be investigated, analyzed, and requested to justify themselves in a full light of public and political debate. If a given position, and even an accepted tradition cannot be justified by reason and by the well being of humans, then they can be openly rejected. This is the reason that classical Greece comprised an arena of intellectual tension among multiple positions, views, all calling for an open public in whose context such a tension could be maintained. This open public space comprises a cultural symbol of permanence that tolerated and enhanced all creative flux. To speak at the architectonic level of civilizational awareness, this classical thinking unfolded *permanence as flux enhancing*. This composition of awareness comprises the ground of every person's rationality and responsibility. It must be noted that this architectonic also founds the modern Western democratic understanding, although articulated by different cultural symbolic designs.

The West also includes another civilizational architectonic: it stems from Middle East, and is expressed at the symbolic levels by Hebraic, Christian, and Islamic cultures. This architectonic could also be understood from mythological depictions of rebellion against authority. In these cultures, the rebel is, initially, Lucifer. His rebellion is presented in various guises. First, being the first born, he cannot accept the thought that his father–creator has turned his love toward a younger sibling. Second, he cannot accept that he was created by another, and hence does not possess his own personality. He wants to be the

author of his own being. Third, Lucifer's revolution is absolute: he wants to negate the order of his father and replace it by his own empire. In the latter, he would be the sole ruler. This does not mean that he can take over the throne of his father. In this architectonic, such a replacement is in principle impossible. Lucifer can only have a temporary empire that can mock and at times disrupt the empire of his father. In this tradition, the personality of the rebel is formed by envy, hate, and destruction. Since the rule of the father is absolute and changeless, it is regarded as good, while the disruptive rebellion of Lucifer is deemed to be evil. Symbolically, he is a negative being, and is not interested in helping anyone, in alleviating the suffering of others. Even if he fulfills some wishes of others, he does so to corrupt and thus to disrupt the order of his father.

At the beginning, Lucifer was created to serve the father, to maintain the father's order by discovering the transgressors of paternal edicts and thus deserving of punishment. In this sense, Lucifer cannot have a personal identity of his own. His entire being coincides with his service to his father, with his maintenance of father's laws. To speak metaphorically, Lucifer is the chairman of the board of unheavenly activities, charged with suppressing all who defy his father. Indeed, those who defy the father will be regarded as evil. At the level of civilizational architectonic, the awareness here is *activity that maintains permanence.* In other words, Lucifer is a cultural symbol of this architectonic of awareness. Lucifer's rebellion constitutes another moment of this civilization: *actions that are disruptive of permanence.* Yet this disruption and its purpose is radically different from the one depicted in the myth of Prometheus. The latter did not wish to establish a counter empire to that of Zeus. His rebellion was born of personal responsibility and ethical decision, which, in the final analysis, was capable of changing the order at the highest symbolic level. Lucifer's rebellion has no possibility of changing the paternal rules; the latter are absolute and omnipotent. There is nothing in the world that is not a subject to this symbol of permanence. In this sense the activity of rebellion against this permanence, its disruption, is a caricature of action—it cannot make any impact on such permanence. All disruptive activity is destined to extinction, damnation and evil as a sign of non–being.

The father–creator and Lucifer symbolism reveals an awareness as a civilizational architectonic that is irreconcilable with the one revealed by the Zeus and Promethean symbolism. The first awareness does not permit an establishment of institutions that would promote the changing of laws and even the changing of such institutions for the sake of human well–being. Moreover, this awareness would preclude any interrogation, analyses, and changes in the symbolically expressed permanence of this awareness, and thus to change the very notion of truth and ethics. This architectonic cannot tolerate independent personalities who would be capable of an autonomous and rational decision whether a given permanence is adequate or inadequate for human needs, and whether such a structure should be modified. Such an interrogation would be regarded as human pride, and any proposal to change such permanence would be judged as bad conscience that introduces chaos and evil, based on human inadequate thinking. After all, Lucifer cannot know more than his father–creator, and cannot decide what he wishes to be—apart from sitting on a tyrannical throne as his father—a pure imitation. This civilizational architectonic does not imply democratic and open institutions where rational and responsible persons can decide common issues—without appeals to "highest authority." Democracy and its open dialogue concerning human ways of living and working together, cannot equate with father–creator and Luciferine symbolism and its underlying civilizational architectonic. In the latter, one acquires a personhood and value from the obedience to another, and if need be, to join a

holy war for the sake of the ultimate order and truth. Such a person finds himself in the first phase of Luciferine symbolism: he must act to enhance the absolute permanence and destroy everything that poses any threat to such permanence. Obviously, this also provides the logic for "holy wars" where everything is mobilized, subjected, and sacrificed for the victory against evil. In this architectonic there is no permission for open dialogue or choice. One either fights for, or is the enemy of, the one true truth.

The classical Greek civilizational architectonic, where permanence enhances change, and allows itself to be changed, endures through the Western modern thought and comprises the ground from which originate democratic, open public institutions. As permanent, they allow most diverse activities and tolerate various positions—even the symbolic design of father–creator and son Lucifer. Within the Promethean civilization, the Luciferine is regarded as one among others and accorded equal status. Its followers can discuss and critique openly other symbolic designs, and in turn can be evaluated by others. Everything can be accepted, rejected, challenged, and questioned. Yet the Luciferine awareness defines everything as a creation of a changeless structure that cannot be moved by any questioning and dissatisfaction. If there are wrongs in the world, they are wrong only due to the shortness and inadequacy of human vision. Seen from the symbolic design of father–creator, all is absolutely right and changeless truth. Everyone must be obedient to this truth and right. Those who fail to serve or have other truths, are, by definition, wrong and evil. Moreover, since this civilizational architectonic is militaristic, requiring mobilization for war against all falsehoods and evils, the followers of this awareness cannot tolerate others who think otherwise. If one's consciousness belongs to absolute truth and good, then such a consciousness will regard those who think otherwise as absolutely deviant and evil.

This civilizational architectonic appears in contemporary world in the guise of various fundamentalisms and their activities, specifically those that have and continue to originate in Middle East. These movements also include various fascistic and Marxistic trends. The latter two have an affinity with theological symbols, although expressed in a secular guise. Just like the Hebraic, Christian and Islamic fundamentalisms, they too are called to a holy war—until a total destruction—against all the deviant and evil others. All these trends have a dictatorial hierarchy of rulerships. Regardless of the symbolisms that reveal this mode of awareness, one thing is clear: in its militaristic phase, it has a task of establishing its absolute truth and changeless good, and at the same time to destroy all that does not comply with such truth and good, all who doubt, interrogate, or reject this mode of awareness. Given the latter, it cannot tolerate, above all, the Promethean mode and its civilizational architectonic. After all, such a mode tolerates various truths and numerous goods, and thus in accord with the Luciferine mode, tolerates falsehoods and evils. In this sense, the first task of father–creator and Lucifer son is the destruction of Zeus–Prometheus mode of awareness and all that flows from it, including democratic institutions, and rationally, autonomously and responsibly thinking persons. The most urgent task is to destroy such persons, since they maintain the permanence of open and changing institutions that allow flux and require tolerance.

The basic divergence of these two modes of awareness forms, in the West, the cultural crises, social tensions and confrontations (and due to the global influence of the West, forms some of the global confrontations). Although in the medieval period it was claimed that these two civilizational architectonics—at least at the symbolic level—formed a synthesis, such synthesis turned out to be impossible as soon as modern democracies established *flux–enhancing institutions*. In other words, the pretended synthesis lasted until the

reemergence of the Promethean awareness that contrasted with the medieval acceptance of the Middle–Eastern civilizational architectonic. Meanwhile, the Promethean awareness extended to political and scientific enlightenments whose basis was open institutions promoting a rational public interrogation of all truth claims and tolerance of differences of opinions. Although our opinions may diverge, we shall not only allow, but also regard it as our duty to allow others, with whom we disagree, to speak. This duty is necessary to challenge and to test our own opinions in face of those presented by the others. This mode of awareness, at the level of scientific enlightenment, constitutes a serious component in the confrontation between the two civilizational architectonics. One of the founding conceptions of scientific enlightenment is, essentially, Promethean: sciences are to serve practical human concerns. At this level resides one of the main reasons why those, who are living and acting in accordance with the father–creator, Lucifer–son mode of awareness, call the modern West "the great Satan," calling for a holy war. Such calls come even from within the West in the form of clinic bombings, demands for a religious war against those who think and act differently etc. This simply indicates that modes of civilizational awareness are not geographically bounded.

To understand this demonization of Promethean "secularism," we shall suggest the way scientific enlightenment "transgresses" the rules established by the Luciferine mode of awareness. Scientific enlightenment is premised on practical assistance conception. In other words, in case of need, one can go counter to the will of divinities and their edicts, but also to change natural processes in favor of human practical needs. This practical conception, leading to technological mode of rationality, offers possibilities to transform nature in accordance with human requirements and even rules. In this sense, the human can become a creator of his/her own environment and even humanity, and to manage all affairs in a secular manner. Although claims may be advanced that there are "natural laws," even such laws can be used for human well–being and, given technical sophistication, can be changed.

In this context there appears a basic opposition to the father–creator symbolism. The latter must claim that nature is pervaded by and obeys the rules established by the creator. To speak metaphorically, nature is "imago dei." Thus any change of nature in accordance with humanly constructed rules suggests the transgression and violation of the divine rules. In other words, humans not only do not accept the rules, but can change them and thus disrupt the creator's permanent order. Moreover, humans take the place of the creator by establishing their own rules and by changing nature in accordance with such rules. Human action turns out to be the *absolute disruption of permanence*. Such a disruption is not allowable in the consciousness expressed symbolically by the father–creator imagery. For this imagery, the Promethean human is identical with Lucifer's revolution: total disruption of father's order. This is possible only if we fail to note that the Promethean mode is premised on assistance to humans, while the Luciferine mode is designed to subject all in order to rule and to mock his father. We can extend this comparison even further. The secular human not only disrupts the order of the father–creator, but also creates the rules "as if out of nothing" and restructures the world and herself by such rules. In this sense the Promethean human becomes the creator of itself and its world. But this means that such a human becomes identical with the father creator and, at the same time with Lucifer's revolution. After all, Lucifer had to establish his own rules "out of nothing," in order to establish his counter empire. Obviously, Lucifer's empire is radically distinct from the

Promethean world. The latter allows others to create their own lives and to be responsible for them. In Lucifer's world, all has to be used for the intentional battle against the father.

All that the modern Promethean and secular humans achieve will be regarded as evil (in principle) and is destined for destruction. After all, it is an *absolute disruption of an absolute order*. For the modern human of scientific enlightenment such symbolic designs as the natural plan of the father–creator are completely irrelevant. Modern humans are interested in mastering nature for their own purposes. Seen from the active followers of father–creator, such human mastery and transformation of the world are an intent to destroy the order of the creator. This is one major reason why the modern Promethean humans are regarded by various Hebraic, Islamic, and Christian fundamentalists as the Great Satan. In other words, such humans, in their invention of rules and in their technical changes of the world, are also interrogating the inadequacies, partial evils, and imperfections of the world and, by implication, the inadequacies and perhaps evils of the creator. Those who maintain the father–creator as an unconditional permanence in their actions, and nature as the image of permanence, cannot avoid regarding the secular, Promethean modern human as full of pride, self–assurance, and eager to challenge the highest structure of Being in order to make it one among many options in a democracy. This type of awareness is impossible for the followers of the father–creator. Since there is, for them, only one and changeless truth, then any interrogation of "ultimate grounds" is in itself an ultimate falsehood and evil; the only way of dealing with such interrogators is a call to holy war.

Contemporary crisis (parting of the ways) in the West and, due to the Western presence, perhaps a global crisis, between two modes of awareness, two civilizational architectonics, cannot be resolved at the level of cultural or social changes. Although in the West both, the scientific and political enlightenments have softened the Middle–Eastern mode of awareness, the latter has reborn in its most virulent form, specifically in face of the globalization of the secular, Promethean mode of awareness. The virulence is expressed in the efforts to reestablish fascist dictatorships, communist utopias, various theocracies, and even capitalist "market" orders. This maintenance of permanence will be seen in its limits solely when it shows up in its final, anarchistic mode of awareness. Yet this mode will have to be left for a further study, since it is not yet fully manifest at the cultural level of symbolic designs.

Postscript

Our focus on the two modes of awareness that are coextensive with civilizational architectonics does not exhaust all of the transcendental modifications. We selected the two modifications due to their contemporary relevance. What is significant to note is the difference and correlation we maintained between cultural symbolic designs, and their status as traces of modes of awareness as civilizational architectonics. When such traces are pushed to the limit, when their cultural imagery is stripped, then the awareness that pervades them becomes apparent. Once such an awareness is cognizant of itself—even tacitly—then the differences between civilizations also become visible. But in this case, the differences that cannot be reconciled also become obvious. But the differences that we articulated are transcendental and cannot be avoided; they belong to the very constitution of the sense of all other—symbolic—cultural levels.

The Thirteenth Hermeneutic: Destruction and the Borrowed Power

Algis Mickunas
Ohio University

Introduction

The phrase "thirteenth hermeneutic" suggests the possibility of twelve other hermeneutical designs that have been and/or are in vogue in scholarly research. I shall not attempt to elucidate them all, since each would require volumes. Yet it is proper to indicate some of the differences among hermeneutical conceptions:

1. The most common understanding is the function of language, known by some figure, such as *Hermes*, who translates the "elevated" speaking of the higher regions into daily terms. Theological proclamations belong here, but also scientific journalism is part of this hermeneutics; legal codes that are constantly translated into specific applications appear in every courtroom.

2. Methodical hermeneutics, wherein every text must be understood from its own context and the part must be understood through the whole, while the whole must be understood through the parts. This rule is articulated into four different whole–part relationships and can be ordered hierarchically. The first whole, of which the text and parts of the text is a part, is the *language* in which the text is written (deconstructive hermeneutics belongs here). The second whole, to which the text and parts of the text belong, is the historical context of the text. We have to understand the events to which the text refers, other texts, their terminologies, etc., in the framework of this context. The third whole is the totality of the works written by an author, the *oeuvre*, in its temporal and historical unfolding. This whole is represented first, by a style, (the specific use of language, characteristic of an individual or a "school" of individuals), and changes in the style in the texts belonging to the same author or school. Fourth, is the whole as the text itself, and the parts are the parts of the text. The first level is called the "grammatical level," the second is the "historical level," the third is the "individual level," and the fourth is called the "generic level." Dilthey called the first two levels, the technical preparation that guides the way to the context of the text. In a way, this includes historical–philological methods.

3. Philosophical hermeneutics whose focus is the way *Being* is understood indirectly, i.e. the preunderstanding we assume in order to speak of all other things. Thus Western philosophical hermeneutics set up Being whose presence could be accessed from a limit (*peras*), leading to numerous texts that were framed within this interpretation, e.g. Platonic forms, Aristotelian substances, space and time, not to speak of stability and reiteration. This hermeneutic reached its completion and dissolution—in the West—with Hegel's identification of Being and Nothing (for classicism Nothing was the limit of Being)

4. Apophantic hermeneutics that depends on but is not identical with philosophical hermeneutics. Apophantic reading of the world is framed by a specific selection of grammar and syntax that allow one to formulate everything into essentializing propositions—the *specific whatness* of all events, leading to *definitory* answers. The very notion of *definition* is *de–finis*—giving finality and hence presuming that the defined can be safely tucked away as known forever: what is human, what is an atom, what is science, what is myth, etc., each

requiring definitory answers in terms of characteristics, presented in the propositional structure S is P.

5. Hermeneutics of *arche*, claiming that prior to definitory quest, there is a preunderstanding that is *poiesis* whose speaking is always excessive although much clearer that the apophantic. This suggests that prior to our efforts to define, we already have an arche that stakes out a region of preunderstanding whose denial would be included in the very understanding of the apophantic and the events so staked out. Regional ontologies belong here such that any argument for or against a particular domain, such as materialism, would depend on our *archaic* preunderstanding of this domain, just as much as our dealing with the formal region cannot be denied without its inclusion.

6. Transitional hermeneutics is one that emerges when a text from one tradition has to be transmitted to another tradition—when Roman legal codes (*jus gentium*) had to be transmitted to Judeo–Christian codes of *jus–patriam*. This also includes numerous literary figures that play a role between two historical periods: Don Quijote is both, a knight that attempts to recoup the past, and a man of the modern age.

7. Interrogative hermeneutics (nothing to do with the artificiality of being critical) wherein methodically articulated texts, with their context and the questions and answers raised and answered in the texts and their context, comprise an answer to a question that has to be understood if the texts and the context are to be understood. This may be the case of Mahabharata that leads to a plethora of views, questions and controversies; what is needed is the question that guides us through this text.

8. Perspectival hermeneutics, claiming that every understanding is positional and hence cannot be granted universality; this includes multi–culturalisms, multi–vocalisms, in part modern Western postmodernities, and multi–disciplinary understanding—world views provided by each discipline that differ from other disciplines.

9. Eideational hermeneutics, purporting the continuous inadequacy of anything phenomenal, yet capable of being recognized as a standard for emulation. The truth is ideal, but our grasping of it is an approximation. Statistical research takes on this hermeneutic in both senses of the word: there is a standard, but we can only measure its distributive approximation; then there is a supervening quantitative method as an ideal for science. Other modifications might appear in utopian imagery and eschatological aims.

10. Perspectival hermeneutics claiming that with the syntheses of all perspectives, there will arise a pure objective truth. This trend may belong to rationalists such as Chladenius.

11. There are no perspectives on anything; any claim is an interpretation, and any interpretation of another claim is simply a new interpretation. There are neither objective nor subjective standards, since both, what is objective and what is subjective are also interpretations.

I am certain that the twelfth hermeneutic is easily decipherable from the ones already depicted.

The Thirteenth

The task of explicating this hermeneutic can be aided by some well known terminological markers, such as "historically effective consciousness," or "efficient history," in which every interpreter stands and into which the interpreter converges. Moreover, such efficient history, in most general terms, comprises a tradition, and in still more general terms, a

tradition is a theory, regardless of how many theories are within it. This claim is not made lightly: it rests on the arguments that there is no such fortune as to allow us to access "the reality" and that all claims to such an access are interpretations; there are no phenomena that are not interpreted. In this sense to be imbedded in a tradition is to be converged into a theory. Given this state of affairs, the first question that the thirteenth hermeneutic asks is this: when does a tradition end or, shall we say, when the tradition of a particular text ends? The following numerous answers fit within this hermeneutic.

1. A tradition ends, in the simplest sense, with the last person who refers to the text, or in the present in which the question is raised. Any other position, which in any way refers to the text, such as reading someone else's work about it stands, at the present, in the efficient history. If this is the case, then there will never be a "true" or final interpretation, unless all references to the text cease. Methodological hermeneutics could only point out some errors, but cannot say that the interpretation is a correct one. This is to say, methodical hermeneutics can only "falsify" by showing that the lower cases of this hermeneutic, such as the grammatical and the historical levels, resist the addition of readings to the text that these levels do not permit. Thus a mistake in grammar, or a meaning of a term in its context, is a wrong reading; but there is no final say about the right reading. Most hermeneutics, at this level, usually regard a tradition that contains "eminent" texts to which other texts refer. It is to be emphasized that the term "true" or correct has no trans–textual meaning. It is simply stated that a text about another text can be falsified, but never verified once and for all. What is significant, is that other peoples of the same tradition might claim that there are other eminent texts that the first eminent texts and their interpretation would regard as unfit, evil, unwarranted, completely false: De Sade, Hitler, etc. Yet no doubt, some literary traditions will consider such texts as eminent and true. Two such traditions can coexist, and they may coexist by mutual references to each other as false. In this case, there might not be a convergence of a horizon, unless another interpretation attempts to unify them: historical–philological method might attempt such a feat by claiming neutrality.

Speaking more concretely, some of the traditional texts tend to fade out, cease to function as "significant" in a given context, and thus the only preservation that is accorded to them is done by philological method. The latter can be a catalyst for various renaissances of texts—a sort of archaization movement that proclaims the genuine truths that have been forgotten and neglected. New ageisms have this tendency, yet such tendencies are always destructive—as one modification of the thirteenth hermeneutic—to the extent that the "dead languages," although preserved by philological method in archival depositories, are framed in the current living languages and hence are taken out of their own contexts. They are a species that have vanished, and reappear only in a dramatically reconstructed genetic pool. For example, after the Renaissance, Scientific and Political Enlightenments, and Reformation, medieval literature virtually vanished. What sealed its fate in the past and in the libraries of the monasteries was that the art of printing became the means of communication. The literature of the Renaissance was correlated to and had a direct access to this new technology. The rest were consigned to manuscripts, which, apart from being written in a peculiar Latin, also contained numerous abbreviations and other peculiarities, and was nigh impossible to decipher. What we have as "neoscholasticism" is a concoction of parts into a whole that belongs to our reading.

This might become clearer if we compare another tradition similar to the one above. The cultic reformist and mystical dervish movement entered a region and dominated cultural

life. The literary tradition, which belonged to that region, was suppressed as false, godless, evil; it was the tradition of *Falsafa*, the philosophers. Algazzali's eminent text, *The Destruction Of The Philosophers*, marks the beginning of the end. The literature of the philosophers survived and was influential only in Latin translation in Europe. The texts in Arabic are still there, packed away, but until very recently only Western scholars had a philological interest in them. There were in the 19th, and first half of the 20th century, no Arabic Arabists interested in a systematic edition of the *Falsafa*. In this sense, the basis for a revival of *Falsafa* is still missing, and even if it occurs, the intersection of modern philosophical literature will frame the questions of that tradition in different wholes.

Here, we can formulate the first cannon of the thirteenth hermeneutic: a suppressed tradition fades out and its revival spells the death of its unity, since a context alien to it will frame it. In brief, the power for its survival will be borrowed.

1. There is a death of a tradition by violence: one culture conquers another and suppresses it completely, specifically if the conquering culture has a monopoly of text production. One example is what happened to Mediterranean culture after Doric invasion. Worldviews, values, truths here belong to the sphere of myths. What we know about the old culture comes from archeology, such as the palaces of Crete, or the ruins of Troy. But the contents of their way of life are given us in Greek mythology. We have to guess, surmise, infer by indirection to get some diffused notion of the *chthonic* goddesses and gods. It is of note that the very term *chthonic* is already a demeaning word: goddesses and gods of the dead, of the world of shades, of the underworld. It is a world that we can imagine, dream about, but not access. The maternal, as the underworld, is regarded here, as conquered. It lives in shapes of monsters and Minotaurs. This life, nonetheless exercises a power that the conquering tradition cannot help but borrow in order to preserve its own vitality. This borrowing appears in numerous revitalizing rituals, wherein the conquering tradition must increase and invest energies in maintaining the vigilance against those powerful foes, the demons to be suppressed, expiated, and yet demons that inhabit every image and dominate the recesses of the psyche.

2. Another, and perhaps more dramatic example of the conquering culture appears in the confrontation of Rome with the Celtic and Druidic traditions. Rome tolerated the myths of others, as long as the others obeyed the secular goddess—Rome itself. Yet this tolerance had a limit. Britain was conquered by Claudius, well educated and most tolerant emperor— at least in comparison to others, such as Nero or Caligula. Thus what happened is not a result of excesses of a power hungry and deranged personality, but one that expressed the best in the character of Roman culture. Claudius' edicts were simple: myths, which promoted the practice of human sacrifice, and promoted head hunting, have to be eradicated, because they are inhuman, false to the nature of persons, and to the laws of peoples (*jus–gentium*). Thus the eradication of the Druids began, ending with their destruction. After Rome accepted the cult of Christianity, the latter completed the task; it was better equipped than the Romans at extermination. Except for few archeological traces and few medieval *sagas*, which are less than what is left of pre–Doric world, we know nothing apart from the *Mists Of Avalon*. These examples allow us to formulate the second rule of the thirteenth hermeneutic:

What is the principle issue of this type of hermeneutic is this: in case of the confrontation of the Doric with the early Mediterranean, the Doric culture had only a rudimentary literary culture. Thus a partial merger of motifs was possible in the medium of more tolerant and

less controllable oral tradition. But in the case of the clash between Rome and the Celts, the latter had no literary tradition, while Rome had a highly developed one, which had a grammatical and syntactical permanence that allowed what is possible and what is not. Second rule: *A complete and irrevocable suppression, leaving almost no traces, presupposes that the new tradition has a total control of the production and preservation of texts*. The same happens if the suppression is done by conquest, specifically in conquered places. Nothing was left after the conquest of Byzantium by the Turks, i.e. by Islam, although the literatures survived outside the region, some in Russia, some in the West. A similar case could be made for the *reconquista* in Spain, whose literatures survived in Islam outside of Spain. Yet the suppression of the culture locally was as radical as it could be. The suppressed tradition denied the power to the other—the death of self–identity.

3. A more complex case, where the other retains power in very fascinating ways, is present in the confrontation of cultures that possess literary traditions. One main example, in the Western world, is the case of Christianity: first by the breakdown and a conquest of Rome by a mid–eastern cultures, and then the rejection in Rome of its own literary tradition, and that means of the Hellenic tradition, Christianity rejects and suppresses paganism, and more precisely the literary traditions of Hellenism which were more than pagan. That this literary tradition was subsumed under the title "paganism" shows the virulence of this suppression. We surmise that large amount of texts, of which we know only the titles, are lost forever.

The suppression was well defined by the apologists, the early church fathers and the early councils before Christianity became a secular power. The acts of destruction followed—most significant among which was the burning of the library of Alexandria. This is to say, in order to root out Hellenism, it was not enough to destroy the temples. A literary tradition had to be destroyed. Therefore the burning of libraries, books, and the producers of books became an enduring tradition. The forced expulsion of philosophers and Hellenistic scholars from Athens and other capitals of Justinian mark the end of this destruction. They went to Persia, and via this exodus the cultural heritage of Helas could have its renaissance in medieval scholasticism and later in European renaissance. Plato was back on the scene. The suppression of other literary traditions—at times called heretical—is a characteristic Christian attitude toward other literary traditions. This attitude, having become a tradition, can be adopted and extended by cultural influences. Thus in the twentieth century the Russian Revolution engaged in the destruction of texts as well as the writers of them; Nazis did the same, and Chinese cultural revolution repeated this Christian tradition. In this sense, 20th century has seen some of the most archaic methods to deal with literary traditions that are regarded as condemnable.

Let us return to the other modification, i.e. a confrontation of two traditions that are literary, yet incapable of complete destruction. This is the case at another level when Christian efforts to destroy completely the Greco–Roman tradition had to "internalize" some of the latter. How does the supervening tradition "stores" suppressed texts, or what is suppressed in texts, for further use? This is possible due to the fact that in a given literary tradition there is a split up into rivals among texts. Thus in the West, the initial rivalry is between cultic texts and philosophy/science. Here, Plato called the poet the *hermeneus* of the gods and the *rhapsode* the hermeneus of the poet. In *Epinomis* Plato speaks of the hermeneutical art as necessary to interpret signs as portents of the future, and also to interpret the laws of the first lawgivers. Since the poet, as a producer of myths among Greeks is also a prophet, there is a claim that hermeneus combines a literary and legal

traditions. This articulation is given by a philosopher and is immediately followed by partial, yet basic suppression. The hermeneus does not know the word and the truth that is revealed to him; the lawgivers might be deceitful or hermeneus might be inadequate to the task of revealing *the true* meaning of law or divine edicts. But then who knows the truth? — the philosopher. The critique of mythology assumed its radical finality by Stoics and Epicureans. Not only that myths do not have a place in philosophy, but that they are false and immoral.

This was the Hellenistic culture that also dominated the Roman Empire. Here, (1) political and legal tradition and power separated itself from other literary traditions. Thus in the Roman empire one could follow any literary tradition as long as one recognized that the political and juridical tradition existed separately and needed no justification from any other tradition. (2) The literary tradition of philosophy internalized mutual rejection, although not suppression of other truths. We love Plato and Aristotle, but we love wisdom more, and hence can argue against either or both. (3) A new morphology emerged: uncommitted reports of all kinds of facts, events, and opinions. The Hellenistic tradition, and through it the Roman Empire, internalized diverse literary traditions which became a topic of "histories." What these histories required is a new "art" to manage them, and thus to have a unified literary tradition; the latter became philology. The modern renaissance, as universal wisdom, originates with the ancient art of grammar—the philological hermeneutics. Here, the ideal of humanity and empire became identical and Claudius, who went after the Celts, was its exemplary expression.

Having become mid–eastern, Rome's church fathers rejected the Hellenistic tradition, although they were educated in it. By winning, they had to use the techniques of the conquered, and the technique was the art of grammar to be applied to the scriptures. The second move was determined by the principle of *hairesis*. But to identify a heresy one needs logic to show the difference between true and false. Technology for this was offered by classical philosophy—such as modified Aristotelian categories. The result: rigid system of dogmas. In this context, most of the philosophical heritage, that found its way into Christian heritage, appears in disguise. What happens to this heritage is well exemplified in Slavic literature; there no sources were available to make comparisons, and hence all the traces of Hellenistic tradition were regarded as authentic ideas of church fathers. Yet these very ideas had the power to initiate Renaissance.

Here, a new system was developed that became a tradition. Highly educated persons developed a set of texts in writing. These texts were also designed to eliminate heresies and thus to determine rigid standards for all aspects of life. Compared to Helas, this was archaic, since its center had one eminent text, purportedly reporting an eminent event: The New Testament. Eminent text is constantly appealed to as the final arbiter of all other claims. This means that the text becomes dominating and exclusive. Yet, as just pointed out, it already incorporated the logics of the philosophers both as rigorous means of thinking and as heresy. And this arrangement lends power to the suppressed tradition, leading the oppressive tradition into a crisis.

We can now formulate the third rule of the thirteenth hermeneutic: If a conquering literary tradition suppresses another strong literary tradition, then it is forced to incorporate the conquered tradition and attempt to use it against the conquered tradition. Yet the very use can turn against the conquering tradition and thus create a crisis.

The first crisis in this new tradition appeared in medieval times. One began to sense the temporal distance between various accumulating interpretations of the eminent text. As noted, the clergy and the councils developed their dogmas by using the philosophical techniques. In turn, the efforts to get back to the "original text" involved the same philosophical techniques that supposedly were capable of showing which interpretations were true and which were not. Hence, Abelard's *sic et non* (this and not that) shows that some of the church fathers' interpretations contained contradictions either within their own texts, or in contrast with other churchly texts. This is a fascinating power of the suppressed. The philosophical texts were false, evil, to be burned, they are in excess of the truths of the father and the son, yet these very "excessive" truths were used by the church fathers to establish their position, and thus were built into their texts. Lo and behold, medievals are using the same philosophical truths to realign their own texts and find them in excess in terms of what they suppose to possess: concordance. Yet in either case, it is the philosophical residuum that reveals the excess of itself and any text that will be involved in using it. No concordia was possible when faced with a double access; hence, following their own interests, the Averroists developed a theory of a double truth: there are truths of reason and science, and there are divine truths that are based on will and should be accepted on faith by will. The two do not coincide, indeed they contradict. The double truth is a recognition that either side is too much for the other and their intermixing will continuously lead to crises. Barring that, one could solve the confrontation if one divided the world into two domains: philosophy–science may deal with the world as it is, while the state, the law, ethics, will be the provenance of the divine will. This stretches into modernity through Descartes and Hobbes.

This could be stated as follows: the Hellenic tradition could tolerate contradictions, and was under no obligation to avoid them; indeed, to produce contradictions belongs to the structure of this literature. Thus, any authority could be abandoned in favor of open debate concerning any subject matter, and it was abandoned. On the other side, the side of the will, reformation had no choice but to proclaim that divine will is a matter of individual will and its faith. Hence, there are no supervening rules that would determine the encounter between two wills. Seen on this ground, the tradition that attempted to mix philosophical literature with the eminent Christian text was false and evil—one more time. What Luther did not realize is that this move would itself create a tradition; thus reformation soon had its fathers, but the act that created this tradition could be repeated and turned against itself, revealing its own excess and superfluity in two ways: first, any effort to limit the interpretation of will encountering another will by some "authority" would be immediately discarded: Protestantism split and split... Thus each individual's will is a final arbiter, and therefore the eminent text can be in excess over itself: there are as many eminent texts as there are readers—creating, what Dilthey called, a "universal falsehood." It is to be recalled that this tradition of the *will* was once supposed to be the basis of juridical state and morality, but with the endless schisms, each person is her own moral criterion and a criterion of the reading of the eminent text.

The Circle

It has been said that hermeneutical thinking in general constitutes a circle. Each text in a context implies the context and the latter implies the text. Regardless how far we stretch the hermeneutical understanding, we shall have to admit this rule. Parts imply the whole and the whole is given through the parts. Yet what we noticed in our suggestions so far is

the feature of the thirteenth hermeneutic: efforts to suppress a text, a culture, and a tradition by another. This suppression can be absolute—the destruction of the tradition and the people and hence all the readings about the tradition will be presented by the victorious literatures. In short, such a reading includes the other in its own circle without residua. We also noticed that in another modification, the residua remains and is relegated to a site which is designated to be lower, yet having an overwhelming vitality to challenge and threaten the suppressing tradition. This agonal component lends strength to the victor by being within the rules, but not quite controllable by them. Trojan women, Clytaimnestra, the Sirens, and the Nymphs, constantly are included in the circle of literary texts written by the suppressing patriarchs, but the inclusion is never complete. The women are more cunning and form secret and unpredictable conspiracies that lurk through entire texts of the patriarchs. With all the power at their disposal to control events by textual inscriptions, such events are reproduced consistently as not completely controllable. Then we found still another modification wherein the suppressed tradition and its developed literatures become necessary aspects of the suppressing tradition. The latter must use the former in order to demonstrate its truths and in this sense borrows the power of the literatures that are being condemned. In this sense the condemning literature, in its presumed supremacy, proves the presence of the other and its superiority, and indeed to such an extent that the suppressing tradition begins to write its texts in terms of the suppressed. This is the encounter between Greco–Roman and one version of Mid–Eastern traditions: the episteme of Hellenic Athene and the word of the Father. As was noted, she constantly resumed her power by being incorporated as a necessity for the very survival and, at the same time, constant self–abolition of the suppressing tradition. Here the circle of the suppressing tradition gets transformed into the circle of the suppressed till finally, as we saw, the suppressed tradition acquires complete emancipation and forces the other to fragment itself and to become excessive to itself. The father can no longer maintain its power and the mothers show up as priests.

Yet there is another tradition, that of India, which adds another level to the thirteenth hermeneutic. No doubt, this tradition includes the modifications we have noted, but apart from such modifications, it contains its own uniqueness. It has two fully developed hermeneutical circles in its literatures, and hence two theories. We recall that tradition is essentially a theory. What is radical about this tradition is its demonstration that the presumably oppressed literature is found to be an inextricable and integral part of the oppressing tradition. Indeed, I hope to show that it is the "transcendental" condition for the possibility of that tradition. This is to say, while the oppressive aspect constantly maintained itself as the "transcendental" ground, what is the actual case is the reverse. Another aspect of this tradition is this: it includes the previously mentioned major hermeneutic—the interrogative. The eminent text, the Mahabharata, comprises an answer to a silent question.

One central claim referring to this eminent text is that of Vedantism: the eternal presence of the absolute (*Purusha*), that lies behind and beyond all phenomena. Here one regards Mahabharata as a tracing of liberation (*mukti*) from *maya*. This liberation forms its own hermeneutical circle that attempts to subsume everything under itself. At the first level, it is a theory of transcendence, of going beyond the merely phenomenal to reach the ultimate one. At this transcendent level there is formed a circle of texts each mutually supporting the others, and each becoming a part of the whole. The latter is centered in one text of *Mahabharata*, the *Bhaghavad–Gita*, as the eminent text. It purportedly unifies the entire

story and has no contradictions. (Radhakrishnan—different views in Hinduism are complementary and not contradictory). This text is regarded as the jewel and center of the entire Indian tradition, and it teaches the way that all parts are connected to form a transcendent hermeneutical circle. One can readily see this in the titles such as *Bhaghavad–Gita As It Is*, by His Divine Grace, A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada. Regardless of the impossibility to use terms such *as it is*, what is relevant for our investigations are the terms that form this circle. Lord *Krsna* as the *supreme personality of godhead,* supreme cause of all causes, and a supreme object of worship. *Arjuna* who glimpses the supreme, transcendent unlimited cosmic form of *Krsna*, the *Virataroopa*, is made to realize the inconsequentiality of his actions—*Bhakti***,** as a pure devotional service. *Purushotaman*, the supreme soul/being, *Sat***,** that is equally Brahman. They are also coextensive with *Dharma***,** law, that is permanent and transcends the phenomenal vicissitudes. *Jnana***,** as pure knowledge that is liberated from the mayaic, lilaic, pracritic (maternal) immersion in the polluted world. Other aspects could be added, including yogic practices of purification to reach and merge into the transcendent. All that had to be pointed out is the Vedantic hermeneutical circle as the mutually affirming texts of transcendence.

A note aside should be added for understanding of one of the hermeneutics: reading texts in their contexts. What one notices in reading the *Bhaghavad–Gita As It Is*, is the emphasis on law and duty, on purity and devotion, on submission and obedience, and on pure "objectivity" of the transcendent terms. This hermeneutical circle seems to be coextensive with the British imperial context and hence the proclaimed Vedantic tradition may well be read from the context of colonialism. The question that could be raised is this: is the reading of *Gita* even by his Divine Grace Swami Prabhupada a hermeneutic of suppression of the Hindu *Gita*? This would call for a special and protracted investigation.

Meanwhile, let us turn to another matter; from our brief delimitation of the Vedantic hermeneutical circle as transcendent and beyond any materiality, there appeared hints of multiplicity that breaks up the one, and pollution of the pure terms, such as Krsna. After all, his *virataroopa*, the cosmic form, is *maya, a magic* designed to get Arjuna to commit himself to war, and thus to engage in *karma*, activity and mayaic attachment. Given that this transcendent hermeneutic circle cannot escape the attachments, the move is made to reach beyond the transcendent, to the ultimate ground that is neither this nor that, neither one nor many, and thus is purely transcendental condition for all else. All the characterizations of the one and the many must be detracted from the transcendental; it has nothing that one could recognize, and hence it would be impossible to say that IT is hidden by the world of maya–shakti, or kama–lila, or even maga–kala. To use common parlance, the transcendental ground is *ineffable***.** Indeed, it is not only not this or not that, but *neti–neti*. It is an absolute transcendental epoche that abolishes the epoche. What does this move accomplish and what claims does it want to make? It wants to say that the transcendental source is bereft of any aspects, even those of the transcendent hermeneutical circle, and that it is the ground of all—it creates the highest figures and the *cosmic* aspects of *maya, shakti, lila, kama, kali***.** And this is the moment of truth: the transcendental, as the condition of all, borrows the conditions from another source in order to claim to be the very transcendental condition.

The moment of truth, the torpedo fish effect, reveals the effort by one aspect of a tradition to form an all encompassing universality by complete suppression of the other, i.e. by proclaiming that the other is completely outside, cannot touch or reach the Vedantic

transcendental, and yet by a reversed move, it also claims that the multiplicity and the cosmic dimensions are its own powers. This reversal shows that the conditions of the very possibility of the transcendental are the cosmic, such that the cosmic domains of *maya, shakti*, etc., are the transcendental conditions for the possibility of all events, entities, and encounters. But what is obvious is that these conditions are *pracritic, maternal.* The unavoidable reversal of the Vedantic transcendental move grants also the unavoidability of the maternal as the transcendental. What does this mean: the efforts to suppress the maternal tradition had to use constantly the means and powers of the maternal as the very conditions for the suppression. This is to say, such efforts were and are within the maternal hermeneutical circle as the all pervasive, inescapable, transcendental. While striving to encompass the cosmos by positing total transcendence of the cosmic, the Vedantic transcendental posture becomes completely absorbed in the excessive cosmic powers on which it is premised. Hence the maternal dimensions of *maya, lila, shakti, kama, kala,* form a hermeneutical circle that has always been the transcendental and founded both the Vedantic transcending and transcendental moves. In brief, the maternal excess is what allows the transcendental Vedantism to struggle as a power against other powers. The liberation from the cosmic makes sense only because the simplicity of the absolute is constantly overdetermined by the maternal, the plus–ultra. The latter is not a denial of an absence that can be made present once maya is unveiled, but what is stubbornly co–present, even in the active play of Brahman itself. It is also the *shakti* of Siva without which Siva is *sava*, a dead corpse; s/he exists only through her.

Self–Initiation

Perhaps now it is possible to flow one more time with the eminent text *Mahabharata* and, on the grounds of the maternal transcendental, to note more precisely the inextricable inherence of this maternal in all events, such that it needs no extrinsic legitimation. This also refocuses the eminent text on another aspect apart from *Bhaghavad–Gita*: it is the disrobing of the main figure—*Draupadi*—that concentrates all events and reveals the maternal as borrowed power and yet as the genuine transcendental condition for the Hindu tradition. The poet *Veda Vyasa* sets a tone for the interrogative hermeneutics, suggesting that the entire texts can be understood if it is to be regarded as an answer to a question: not what or why, but *how did it all come about?* Here we encounter text: while the king is expecting a birth of a son, Draupadi is born in full blossom from her own fire (*agni*), and thus is self–birthing, and gives no deference to any of the patriarchal figures. She is the irresistible *kama* for whose hand numerous warriors strife; she mocks them and plays with their passions, and thus she is *lila*; she has power over their desires and thus she is *shakti*; she promises and withholds, and thus she is *maya*. What is to be noted is that the Satrya— the warrior cast, as the very essence of patriarchy—are not effects of her as a cause of their actions. They too are swayed by these maternal dimensions in ways that they do not recognize. She marries five brothers. Thus the question *why* will not do; these all–pervasive dimensions are how all things are and happen, whether human or transcendent. They are not external causes but the maternal given in the *all*.

The patriarchal side is, nonetheless, the upholder of the transcendent domain, including *dharma*, the law. Yet for her Kamic, Lilaic, etc. presence, and because they too are immersed in the passions, the warriors break their laws, ending in a dice game where finally Arjuna, one of her five husbands, having lost everything, wages Draupadi. Instead of being her protectors as demanded by law, they degrade her in a passionate strife for pride

and power. In brief, while *dharma* is transcendence and belongs to the Vedantic hermeneutical circle, it is absorbed into the maternal powers and hence demonstrates the all presence of this transcendental condition. She is to be disrobed, her sari unwound. Yet no matter how much the sari is unwound, it continues to be inexhaustible by virtue of the presence of Krsna who upholds the Dharma. At this moment it would seem that Krsna, as the transcending presence is on the side of other transcending terms, including Dharma, yet the same Krsna, during the battle, advises the breaking of laws in order to win the battle as a way of enhancing the maternal power. Krsna's actions thus are subject to her pervasive presence. He too is engaged in the activities that are lilaic, mayaic, and kamic. It would make no sense within the Vedantic context to convince Arjuna to go into battle if the destiny of life were to transcend all worldly engagements. And he convinces Arjuna not by revealing his total purity, absolute distance without power, attraction, or passion, but as *vishwaroopa*, as terrifying and awe–inspiring cosmic presence. This is what compels Arjuna to join the blood feud to fertilize the maternal.

Meanwhile, back in the royal hall where the disrobing is taking place Draupadi's sole voice silences the patriarchal assembly. She speaks of law, *dharma* and its breaking, *adharma*. She is, thus in charge of both, the ground of both, and her voice is the power over the Vedantic hermeneutical circle—indeed to such an extent that she demonstrates the pervasiveness of the cosmic dimensions that cannot be set aside. The patriarchical assembly knows well that it too is caught and cannot escape the maternal transcendental. In brief, the disrobing scene is the central revelation of the entire *Mahabharata* of the maternal as the transcendental. And thus this is how things came about. The epic is the tracing of the maternal all the way to the Vedantic transcendental and its self–abolition as the ultimate Maya, i.e. an effort to hide emptiness by the denial of the very power that does the revealing and the hiding. Here the thirteenth hermeneutic reveals the failure of suppression while pushing it to the ultimate limit—the suppression without qualifications of the maternal. The more one wanted to extricate from this cosmic transcendental domain, the more one got entangled in it. Thus the great war was not for the negation of the maternal, but in fact submersion in it completely.

We can now formulate the fourth rule of the thirteenth hermeneutic: a tradition may be founded on an eminent text that reveals a tension between two hermeneutical circles: one comprises a transcendent, trans–cosmic movement, the other a rescendent, cosmic submersion. While the former aims to be the transcendental, it must submerge into the latter as cosmic–transcendental.

Draupadi is the narrative of the maternal transcendental as cosmic and not as ontological or metaphysical circle of transcendence. Draupadi, as a pervasive narrative of *Mahabharata* reverses the Vedantic circle yet in another way. She demonstrates that the transcendent domain into which the singular dissolves and vanishes makes no sense, to the extent that the Vedantic transcendental is regarded as neither one nor the many, and hence the singular, as one among the many cannot dissolve into the *One.* In turn, if one sheds all the material parts and hence dissolves into the cosmic dimensions, then indeed there was never a given permanent self to be achieved by purification. Purification means, then, that if every living aspect of one's being is discarded all the way to the "pure," then there is nothing left and all that one was has dissolved into the maternal domain. This seems to be a reading of the Vedantic text wherein all the transcending terms and images are constantly interested to dissolve themselves, including those of whom they are in charge, back into the maternal. Indeed, the Vedantic ultimate, the transcendental, beyond

the beyonds, is posited as one more Mayaic aspect to attract and to inspire devotion and commitment. And it is Draupadi, in all of her dimensionality, that attracts, enlivens, and dissolves in her *kala, maya, shakti, lila, kama* sway in which she too is immersed and dissolved. In this sense we cannot take her as a representation of a female, but as a multi–faceted trace of the maternal. After all, toward the end of the epic she too is told, "it is not for you that these events are happening."

This rule of the thirteenth hermeneutic shows that the suppressed circle has inevitably possessed the requisite functions without which the suppressing could not function even within its own circle. The latter is constantly overdetermined by an excess that it cannot contain, and indeed from which it cannot extricate. Given sufficient interest and acumen, it would be important to note whether this Hindu maternal transcendental condition is all encompassing, i.e. can subsume all other modifications of the thirteenth hermeneutic dealt with above. Moreover, is it sufficiently broad also to include Zen and Tao? Such a task is still outstanding.

Remarks

No doubt, the thirteenth hermeneutic, comprising an access to textual–cultural morphologies, can help articulate one major domain of interpretive encounters. The latter provide a serious background for the understanding of current debates concerning discursive power and its shifting vicissitudes. But it must be clear that such discursive battles already presume literary traditions with well developed means to both subject and resist, destroy, incorporate, and to be absorbed by alternative discourses. Yet I suspect that some of the modifications of the thirteenth hermeneutic have also shown that most textual encounters do not destroy the other without residua, superfluity, and hence may acquire a power within or over the destructive texts.

Leibnitz and Space—The Final Frontier

Tony Thorstenson
Ohio University

Space—The Final Frontier. This notion has been with American culture since the inception of *Star Trek*, and Hollywood has produced its antithesis, at least to the lay population, in *Innerspace*, a movie about a microscopic submarine manned by microscopic people and injected into a normal person's bloodstream. Psychologists talk about personal space: a measurable distance around a person that they need to feel comfortable in a social situation. This, of course, gives rise to the social space talked about by sociologists, which in its turn, becomes a public space. We need look no farther than our current President to see the importance of separating social and public space from private and personal space, which can be of a different variety from the personal space noted by the psychologists. Webster's New World College Dictionary's first entry on *space* states, "The three–dimensional continuous expanse extending in all directions and containing all matter: variously thought of as boundless or indeterminately finite." This is not counting the nine other definitions given or the twenty–six other definitions listed behind it that are derivatives of the word. When the *Theory of Relativity* was introduced Webster's inextricably intertwined space with the notion of time, thus producing a four–dimensional space–time, rather than the commonly accepted three–dimensional one suggested.

For the purposes of this paper, however, we will not be specifically concerned with *the final frontier*, although, ultimately, it will be related, but rather with the *last frontier to arrive on the scene*, namely, cyber–space. The arrival of virtual reality, real–time chat, instant messaging and the construction of a virtual–world is having a significant impact on our society and culture. Science fiction movies such as *The Matrix* can give rise to a multitude of interpretations and arguments about the reality of cyber–space. Indeed, it is at this juncture that cyber–space becomes a philosophically interesting phenomenon. While *The Matrix* is a fun and exciting way to think about cyber–space, I think that a better–suited parallel may be found in Leibnitz's *Monadology*, specifically number 17.

> Supposing that there were a machine whose structure produced thought, sensation, and perception, we could conceive of it as increased in size with the same proportions until one was able to enter into its interior, as he would into a mill. Now, on going into it he would find only pieces working upon one another, but never would he find anything to explain perception. It is accordingly in the simple substance, and not in the composite nor in a machine that the Perception is to be sought.

If we replace each instance of "perception" with "space" we can immediately intuit the absurdity of attempting to make something take up more space to find the smaller space, but even if we follow this analogy, we would not "see" the cyber–world. We might see a string of one's and zero's that are coded into electrical currents that speed by us. Space, like perception, doesn't grant us access to it via quantifying methodologies, but one might reasonably suggest that we could fruitfully follow Leibnitz's methods in attempting to articulate the parameters of cyber–space, and, as we will see, the very use of the notion of parameters is a telling indication that cyber–space is not space qua space, (in the Kantian sense of a condition for possibility), but rather, a *kind*, (of the personal, public and social variety indicated earlier). It may be helpful to think back to Aristotle's *Physics*; his principles of matter, form and contrariness are not "kinds" insofar as they cannot be adequately accounted for in a "thing" ontology. To be a kind is to be a "kind of" something,

and space, as a condition, is not a thing, or a kind. The use of the *in*–metaphor misleads us into thinking of space as something categorical or quantifiable, but we will get to this later in the paper.

This long preamble is merely a means of showing the complexities involved in the investigation that we are about to embark upon. We will start by drawing parallels between Leibnitzian monadic–space and cyber–space, as this seems a fruitful way of exploring the theoretical aspects. We will then contrast it with the Kantian conception and finally evaluate both from the transcendental perspective of cosmic–space and the use/misuse of the IN–metaphor for describing space. Having set the agenda, we will turn our attention to Leibnitz, the *Monadology*, and a few of the commentators.

 As Rescher (1967) notes, "Space and time are thus not prior to the existence of the entities which are supposed to be embedded within them. They are (well founded) phenomena, and as such their existence is secondary, since it is derivative from the monads and their properties"(89). This appears to be the case also for cyber–space, that is, one can conceive of it through pragmatic considerations as a well–founded phenomenon. Thus, "for Leibnitz, space is a relationship among all the monads inherent in the contemporaneous mutual perceptions, this general universal ordering throughout time (i.e., at any given time). The general order obtaining among the monads of this world in virtue of the pre–established harmony, and thus resting ultimately on the Principle of Perfection, is the basis for the well founding of the phenomenon of space"(89). Rescher's interpretation of Leibnitz is a direct contrast with the Kantian idea of space as a condition for the possibility of outer relations (developed later in this paper). Rescher's interpretation makes it appear as if Leibnitz derives space and time from the monad, and thus, that the monad is merely another "thing" in space. We will develop the idea of the monad as a manifold of space–time unfolding which will, in turn, make the second quote appear overly restrictive insofar as it imposes a time (now) and insists on the consideration of this world (here). This idea will be further developed at the end of the paper with the consideration of the cosmic perspective.

As we will see in the development of the notion of necessary contingency, this interpretation of Leibnitz leads to a conception of the monad that is a permanent, static "thing," rather than, as we will argue, a dynamic awareness of space–time unfolding. By exchanging the static interpretation for the dynamic we are able to avoid many of the problems traditionally associated with Leibnitz, viz. determinism. The dynamic interpretation also provides us with a link to our exploration of cyber–space. As one "surfs the web" we can see the contingent unfolding as we choose a path through the cyber–space, in much the same way as a monad would move through its spatial/temporal existence. The metaphors are telling, we move "through" cyber–space from a web site to another web site, leaving a track, or trace, that can be followed. This is analogous to the possibility of monadic choosing as space–time contingently unfolds upon a horizon of possibility that the monad can survey, and reflectively consider from multiple perspectives.

Leibnitz, in the *Monadology*, produces another useful analogy that promises to be fruitful for our examination of cyber–space.

> 64. Thus the organic body of each living being is a kind of divine machine or natural automaton, which infinitely surpasses all artificial automata. For a machine made by the skill of man is not a machine in each of its parts. For instance, the tooth of a brass wheel has parts or fragments which for us are not artificial products, and which do not have the special characteristics of the machine, for they give no

indication of the use for which the wheel was intended. But the machines of nature,
namely, living bodies, are still machines in their smallest parts ad infinitum. It is
this that constitutes the difference between nature and art, that is to say, between
the divine art and ours.

Indeed, is this not another useful description of the cyber–world (leaving aside organic
desiderata), the relationships of many different computers, databases, etc., into a
preestablished harmony? Is not the construction of cyber–space constituted by the inter–
relational/connectivity of many "little machines," down to the smallest parts? An article in
the New York Times recently reported the breakthrough in chemically synthesizing
microprocessors at the chemical level, enabling them to produce microscopic chips. Each
chip, as its own positioning is continuously repositioned, offers the dynamics that recreates
the awareness of "all the positions and repositions" that lead to a "world" that has no
position. Is the difference between divine art and ours becoming smaller? That will have to
be a topic for a separate paper.

There is another important concept brought into play at this point, and that is the notion of
a preestablished harmony. This is a Leibnitzian answer to Occasionalism, but here, it
serves us well as another point of similarity. For Leibnitz this saved God from having to
constantly interact with the world, he just set up the rational laws of nature and put the
whole works into motion. The construction of cyber–space is, once again, analogous.
Computers, mainframes, telephone lines, etc., were all pre–existing and the harmonizing
and adaptation of these to fit into a system, governed by rules, was the creation of cyber–
space. All of you familiar with cyber–space are well aware of the frustration that results
when the harmony is disrupted. One might argue that there is a distinct difference here.
That in one case it is the construction of a system out of preexisting materials, while in the
other case, the materials are predetermined prior to their creation. This seems to be a form
of the argument from design. That is, that the materials of the universe were created to
perform a specific function, but this is also the case with the cyber world. Something is
needed so the design of the thing, from nothing, is created to provide for that function, in
much the same way as God designed the parts of the universe.

For our purposes, if one sees this kind of parallelism between cyber–space and Leibnitz,
then perhaps one can gain access to the cyber–world through Leibnitzian glasses. In this
way, if we take cyber–space as a given, in the Husserlian sense, and bracket the question of
existence, the question becomes one of access. How are we to know anything about the
cyber–space, if not through some kind of parallelism? Having said this, we should direct
our attention to the *Monadology*.

Monads are substances, for Leibnitz, and comprise all that is around us. Therefore, we
must be able to account for change, and since each monad is independent of other monads,

11. It follows from what has just been said, that the natural changes of the Monads
come from an internal principle, since an external cause can have no influence upon
their inner being. (*Theod*. 396, 400.)

12. But, besides the principle of the change, there must be a particular series of
changes [un detail de ce qui change], which constitutes, so to speak, the specific
nature and variety of the simple substances.

George Montgomery and Albert R. Chandler[2] translate the "particular series of changes" in number 12 as "manifoldness," and this manifold is further elaborated upon in number 13.

> 13. This particular series of changes should involve a multiplicity in the unit [unite] or in that which is simple. For, as every natural change takes place gradually, something changes and something remains unchanged; and consequently a simple substance must be affected and related in many ways, although it has no parts.

Space would become, as Rescher suggested, a conception given to the monad from a perspectival awareness of other monadic existences that are separate from it. That is, space is relational, represented by the one–next–to–the–other. Or, as Martial Gueroult[3] has put it, "The notion of relation of distance is precisely what is brought to us a priori by the idea of space. But a relation, . . . is not only not divisible into parts, but is absolutely heterogeneous to such a divisibility. Each relation, even if it is comparable to another relation, even if we can enumerate the results from this comparison, is some *sui generis* that constitutes an irrefutable intellectual unity"(287). If we combine this with number 22 of the *Monadology*, "And as every present state of a simple substance is naturally a consequence of its preceding state, in such a way that its present is big with its future"; and we see that time is also relational, i.e., that time arises out of a sequential arrangement, or a one–after–the–other awareness, then Leibnitz is, in this sense, contemporaneous with the modern conception of space and time, i.e., that they are relational and interconnected.

That " . . . its present is big with its future" returns us to the manifold/horizonal/field conception. First we will have to unpack the notion of the manifold. Leibnitz, in the Monadology, spells this out for us.

> 56. Now this connexion or adaptation of all created things to each and of each to all, means that each simple substance has relations which express all the others, and, consequently, that it is a perpetual living mirror of the universe.
>
> 57. And as the same town, looked at from various sides, appears quite different and becomes as it were numerous in aspects [perspectivement]; even so, as a result of the infinite number of simple substances, it is as if there were so many different universes, which, nevertheless are nothing but aspects [perspectives] of a single universe, according to the special point of view of each Monad.
>
> 58. And by this means there is obtained as great variety as possible, along with the greatest possible order; that is to say, it is the way to get as much perfection as possible.

Again, deferring to Gueroult,

> We understand that space (and time) appears truly like a frame (that of possibility in God) within which relations of real coexistence between things extended (actually) are established, as if it were a form independent of its contents. And we could even conceive (for other universes that could have been called into existence) real extensions different from those we know to exists in our universe (geometries with more or less than three dimensions), as Leibnitz seems to have conceived in some of his letters, space as the pure possibility of relation of coexistences being in itself

---

2Montgomery, George, and Chandler, Albert R. The Rationalists. Doubleday & Company, Inc. New York. 1974

3Gueroult, Martial. Leibniz: Critical and Interpretive Essays. Edited by Michael Hooker. University of Minnesota Press. Minnesota. 1982

indifferent to the number of dimensions, meaning to the modalities of this relation of coexistence (286)[4].

This is the manifold revisited, or if one prefers, a horizon of possibility that spreads out before a monad temporally, and while the horizon is open, the choices that it contains are contingent. The unfolding of space–time before the monadic "eye" allows for the freedom of choice arising from the frame/horizon that is only limited by the number of possible contingencies, and contingencies as necessary do not preclude "freedom."

What I mean by this is that the horizon is an open field of possible contingencies that are necessary in constituting a field. Each contingency is thus necessary for the constitution of a field awareness that gives rise to free choices. The perspective from one contingent possibility is necessary as it allows for the reflective moment that will reveal the horizon of possibilities. Take, for example, Descartes' "I think, therefore I am." The "I" that is asserting existence must recognize that the "I" it is referring to is not identical with itself. The "I" that exists already admits to a difference as it reflects on the "I" that was doing the thinking.

Another idea that we find in the Monadology, which is important for our analogy, is that of a "nested" representative universal awareness.

> 60. ...each Monad, whose nature being to represent, nothing can confine it to the representing of only one part of things;

> 61. Wherefore it follows that this inter–communication of things extends to any distance, however great. And consequently every body feels the effect of all that takes place in the universe, so that he who sees all might read in each what is happening everywhere, and even what has happened or shall happen, observing in the present that which is far off as well in time as in place:

> 62. Thus, although each created Monad represents the whole universe, it represents more distinctly the body which specially pertains to it.

Again, the individual Monad is comparable to our home PC that is, for all intents and purposes, representative of the entirety of cyber–space. Cyber–space is the relationship of all of its networks to all the others via circuitry and wires, which just so happens to be the kind of relationship that the computer has with itself, independent of whether it has a modem in it or not. What is more important, each PC is a representation of cyberspace as a whole. Its basic logic is that of interconnected representations. The monad, then, seems to be relevantly similar in many ways to those accessing cyber–space.

Mechanistically, the descriptions that Leibnitz has for the Monad are very similar to descriptions that may be used in describing cyber–space, but mechanism is generally associated with at least a soft–determinism and Leibnitz worked hard at trying to provide a spot for freedom in his metaphysics. Cyber–space itself is contingent upon many different things, and is a–positional. If we were to divide cyber–space up into regions, then we would have already assigned it to a constructivist *this or that space*, in the Kantian sense. The question here is one of access, and insofar as the access to all areas remains the same,

---

4While "space as indifference" might be a useful metaphor, it is also misleading to assign it a state of being. As we will see when we consider Kantian and cosmic understandings, space is a condition for the possibility of relations, and as such not a propertied "thing," but the point to be taken here is that space, as pure possibility, allows for multiple perspectives and infinite combinations.

cyber–space will not admit of regions. Separate regions imply different accesses, but all methods of access remain identical in cyber–space.

To be without a specifiable position seems to run against the idea of any form of determinism, so it seems worthwhile to unpack the notions of contingency and necessity elaborated in the *Discourse On Metaphysics*, and later in the *Monadology*, particularly with an eye to liberating Leibnitz from determinism and thus situating his thoughts in a closer proximity to those that have been elaborated as the parameters of cyber–space,

> 33. There are also two kinds of truths, those of reasoning and those of fact. Truths of reasoning are necessary and their opposite is impossible: truths of fact are contingent and their opposite is possible. When a truth is necessary, its reason can be found by analysis, resolving it into more simple ideas and truths, until we come to those that are primary. (Theod. 170, 174, 189, 280 282, 367. Abrege, Object. 3.)

Monads, as we have seen, are representative and perspectival. They represent the entire universe in much the same way as a PC represents cyber–space, from a necessary perspective that allows us access. This perspective is necessary insofar as it allows us to reflect and represent all other perspectives, but it is the reflective transcendental move, that allows us to represent all other perspectives, and simultaneously, it reveals our perspective as contingent and dependent upon all other perspectives. That is, without a recognition of other perspectives, how is a perspective possible? What are the conditions for perspectivalism? It is the recognition of multiplicity and the reflective move that attempts to replicate a view that is different from the way we view the universe. Our perspective is a necessary precondition for reflection, but becomes contingent due to that reflection. The recognition of a multiperspectival universe makes the original perspective contingent upon the existence of all the other perspectives. Thus, it appears that Monadic existence is one of necessary contingency from the representational perspective, if we are to follow the logic of self–inclusion.

Before moving onto the implications that this reading of necessity and contingency have for us, we will pause to consider some objections that might be raised regarding Leibnitz's *concept containment theory of truth.*

The vast majority of the literature has consigned Leibnitz to the determinist camp, but most of the examples that are given in favor of committing Leibnitz to determinism rest on a strange twist. That is, that Adam could not refuse the apple, even if it was in his power to do so, because then it would not be the same Adam that we refer to in the story of Eden, (likewise with Napoleon, Caesar, pick whatever example you like), or so goes the argument. This conception comes from *knowing facts* about history, and what these people did *in the past*. Why/how do we move from what has occurred to statements about what must be? Maybe we could tell the story that Adam did refuse the apple. Then the same thing would be true of Adam, i.e., his conception/essence would contain the concept of refusal rather than accepting the apple.

One might note that in a letter to Arnauld in February 1668, Leibnitz wrote: "Since the individual concept of each person contains once for all everything that will ever happen to him, one sees in it the proofs a priori or reasons for the truth of each event, or why one has occurred rather than another." To answer this objection we look back at the monad as a manifold containing all of the possibilities related to its a–positionality. I think that we can then make sense of this statement. The individual concept of each person *does* contain, once and for all, everything that will happen to the individual. How can it not? As the monad

unfolds temporally and spatially it contains all of the possibilities, including the one that will eventually be actualized from the potentiality of the contingent unfolding. Additionally, it does so contingently, not necessarily, since the monad contains all the possibilities insofar as it a reflection of the universe (like the computer chip is a reflection of cyber space). It remains possible for Adam's concept to contain refusal, because, even before it happened, his monadic existence contained both refusal and acceptance. The arguments just show the necessity for us, looking back on the past, insofar as we look to *fix a referent* and attempt to avoid ambiguity.

The future tense used in the letter to Arnauld might give one reason to doubt this kind of argumentation. Is there any textual support for interpreting Leibnitz in this fashion? In the *New Essays*[5] we find some:

> . . . for you can think of black, for example, without thinking of its cause; but it is by remaining within the limits of a knowledge which presents itself at first and which is confused or very distinct, but incomplete; the one when there is no resolution of the idea, the other when you limit it. Otherwise there is no term so absolute or so loose as not to include relations and the perfect analysis of which does not lead to other things and even to all others; so that you can say that *relative terms* indicate *expressly* the relation they contain. I here oppose the *absolute* to the *relative*, and it is in another sense that I have opposed it above to the *limited* (236).

Thus it seems that Leibnitz is saying much the same thing as I am proposing, namely, that monads are essentially relational, and that any fixed or distinct ideas, within the limits of knowledge, that make claims to absoluteness fail to properly understand the priority of the relational aspects. Can one square these two divergent opinions proposed by the same author? That is not a task I am prepared to explore here. For my purposes, it is enough to show that this is a possible interpretation.

Out of this necessary contingency arises the a–positionality of the monad. The representation required of the monad plus the reflective transcendental requirement allows for the differentiation of one from the other, and the recognition of the separations implies the observation of the distance separating the two objects of awareness. This, in turn, gives rise to the conceptions of distance, extension and spatial relations. What is not implied is a fixed position. In this way Leibnitz was ahead of his time in understanding the cosmic.

Astronomers attempt to establish our position in the universe by referencing *our* galaxy in relation to other galaxies, but certainly this must be inadequate to the task as *our* planet moves within *our* solar system that moves within *our* galaxy, that moves within the universe. While it may be possible to say that we are at point X, at a distance of Y, from galaxy Z, this is only useful if we want and have the means to get to galaxy Z. Without the means, what would be the point? Galaxy Z could be moving at a faster speed, relative to our own, and thus the distance will have changed by the time the means are invented, or it could have deviated due to some other force.

While these thoughts may, at first, appear tangential, I think they are relevant to our exploration of cyber–space. When we access cyber–space we are also a–positional. Concept

---

[5]Leibnitz, Gottfried. New Essays concerning Human Understanding. Translated by Alfred Gideon Langley. The MacMillan Company. New York. 1896. (Original italics).

pairings such as left/right, up/down have no spatial signification. One does not take a left at Yahoo to get to the Philosophical Gourmet, nor does one go up a flight of stairs to see the next page. Uploading and downloading are spatial metaphors that, while useful in a pragmatic language game, do not define positionality. Do I download from Canada and upload from Mexico, or vice versa? The attractive feature about cyber–space is that it makes geographic location, as well as single system orientations, irrelevant.

This is the same with the representative monad. As a transcendental entity with a universal perspective, it too interacts with all of the other perspectives as spatialized perspectives, and can reflectively assume any of the other positions. This seems to be the nature of cyber–space. It allows one to effectively interact across diverse and unfolding spatializations.

Up to this point we have been working to stress the similarities between the Leibnitzian conception of space and cyber–space. We have found that access to this space can only be gained via similar routes, that both are a–positional, representative, and contingent and that each contains a diagram of the whole in a "nested" pattern. One could conclude either that Leibnitz was ahead of his time, or, that we have not progressed much since Leibnitz. In either case, at this point, we will look to see if there is anything wrong with conceiving of space qua space, in this fashion.

Kant[6] seems to think there is and conceives of space a little differently. He differs from the Leibnitzian perspective insofar as, "space is no discursive or, as we say, general conception of the relations of things, but a pure intuition"(24). For Kant, "[space] must, therefore, be considered as the condition of the possibility of phenomena, and by no means as a determination dependent on them, and is a representation *a priori*, which necessarily supplies the basis for external phenomena"(24).

This conception arises out of a view shared with Leibnitz, that of representation. Space is the condition of possibility for any phenomena, and as such, a conception of space cannot be built from thoughts upon relational criteria in an a priori manner. This is because space is that which allows us to conceive of relationships in the first place. This is not a chicken and egg debate, for Kant space is obviously prior to outer relations and as such space cannot be grounded upon relational aspects. As he puts it,

> Space is not a conception which has been derived from outward experiences. For, in order that certain sensations may relate to something without me (that is, to something which occupies a different part of space from that in which I am); in order that I may represent them not merely as without of and near to each other, but also in separate places, the representation of space must already exist as a foundation. Consequently, the representation of space cannot be borrowed from the relations of external phenomena through experience; but, on the contrary, this external experience is itself only possible through the said antecedent representation (23–24).

From this, arises the usual Kantian interpretation of the Leibnitzian relational one–next–to–the–other. For Kant, this is only a means of conceptualizing space. It seems that, for Kant, representations of space require a relational aspect, but Kant failed to recognize the positionality implied by the space "in which I am." If I can only represent space from the space I currently occupy, then I am locked into a position. As one's position changes it can

6Kant, Immanuel. Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by J. M. D. Meiklejohn. Prometheus Books. New York. 1990.

become the thing–behind–the–other, or on–top–of–the–other, thus the position that one has dictates the relation that objects have to other objects. The Kantian perspective fails to include itself in its theory of space. The Leibnitzian perspectival/relational space can handle this positionality problem arising out of the Kantian transcendental position by using the multi–perspectivity of the monad and its reflective ability. The monad recognizes the contingency of its position through reflection, and that there is no one privileged position from which space can be viewed. Unfortunately, the Leibnitzian conception fails to recognize space as the condition for any possible metaphysics. Thus, a conception of space qua space would require a synthesis of these two theories that would, in turn, lead us to a multi–perspectival interpretation of the cosmos, with space and time as cosmic conditions for any existence.

In this sense both Kant and Leibnitz fall prey to the IN–metaphor due to linguistic and historical circumstances. As Mickunas[7] writes,

> Within this metaphor, all are locked IN a positional consciousness, resulting in relativization of their claims, and in the assumption of perspectivity expressed by the mannerisms of "world–view." Nonetheless, the latter [theology and science] fail to extricate themselves from the positionality of IN and the HERE and the NOW (3).

Space qua space is not a container that holds relations or sensations. It is not "some thing" that other things reside "in," but is the condition for the spatial being of anything. Similarly, we are not "in" time, but rather, we (and all events) are temporal. Kant appears to have recognized this when he writes, " . . . the general notions of spaces, of this or that space, depends solely upon limitations"(24). That is, if one remembers the personal, social, private, public, etc., spaces mentioned at the beginning of this paper, then it is striking to note that each is defined by its limits. This is a revealing point when it comes to thinking about cyber–space, which is conceived of as accessible only through some artificial means. That is, one cannot access cyber–space without the use of computers, of some sort (PC's, web–TV, mainframe terminals, etc.), and the limits of cyber–space are rigidly defined. Interestingly, the definition of cyber–space, and the language it uses, includes the use of the "in" metaphor, but this breaks down rapidly with the introduction of time. The interwovenness of time and space would mean, by extension, that we are in *cyber–time* when we "enter" cyber–space, but it seems unlikely that anyone would want to defend the notion that time changes qualitatively while surfing the web.

The chain of thought representing Western philosophy has carried with it various sentiments and predispositions that place a premium on metaphysical considerations that would produce a theory of permanent and eternal positions and/or truths. This preoccupation with the metaphysical has lead philosophers to ignore the cosmic, as Mickunas puts it,

> The constant effort to give preeminence to the metaphysical, reduces change to the inessential and thus excludes the cosmic. At the end of the tradition Kant is compelled to reduce the cosmic to the internal and the external modes of perception, resulting in the notion that the cosmos depends on a transcendental construct of a particular entity . . . These formal requirements are, of course, an improvement on the given THING prejudgments, nonetheless they do not escape the ontology of BEING IN. (4).

7Mickunas, Algis. "Tracing the Cosmic Phenomena"

Kant continues this tradition insofar as he makes the cosmic dependent upon the transcendental construction and adheres to an internal/external dichotomy. "This is to say, in principle we are offered inner worldly spaces, times and movements, but not the understanding of cosmic space, time and movement" (Mickunas 4).

Another way of laying open the notion of the cosmic, as distinct from a metaphysically derived universe, is supplied by Mickunas,

> ...If there is nothing apart from the universe, then IN what space–time–movement is the universe as a whole unfolding? This image traces another, a cosmic space, time and movement IN which the universe unfolds and thus the former are different from the ontologically and metaphysically derived universe. If there is nothing apart from the universe, then the space–time–movement of the cosmos cannot be regarded in terms of the IN metaphor.... but cosmos, not being anything, cannot be created. Space–time–movement, not being things cannot be made and remade (5).

Here we can see the ways in which both Kant and Leibnitz (and thus the conception of cyber–space as space) fail, but it is also revealing to note where they have not succeeded. From the cosmic perspective there is an unfolding manifold of space–time, very much similar to the dynamic interpretation of Leibnitzian monad propounded above. The Kantian contribution is the freeing of space and time from the ontologizing process and pointing us in the direction of space and time as conditions, regardless of the given limitations of historically given linguistic meanings.

In this way, Kant offers us an important criticism of Leibnitz and cyber–space by pointing out that space is a condition fro the possibility of relations, but in failing to recognize the importance of an a–positional theory capable of multiple perspectives, that falls short of a cosmic understanding (that space is a condition and not a propertied Here and Now) and finds himself trapped IN space, from the single transcendental perspective (IN space) that refuses to recognize other perspectives.

In addition to pointing out that space is a condition, he offers us a second critique of cyber–space, namely, that cyber–space is defined by its limits. This, in conjunction with a conception of the cosmic, leaves cyber–space on the fringes, as is the case with the other *kinds* of space that admit of a) limits and b) properties.

Thus, the synthesis of Kantian and Leibnitzian theories of space result in the cosmic understanding, but what does this mean for cyber–space? That it is inadequate to fulfill all of the demands of space qua space (in the grand scheme of things), and accordingly must find itself lumped with the other *kinds* of space that have meaning only insofar as they fulfill a linguistic function in a pragmatic language–game, with the latter becoming bound interpretations.

References

Rescher, Nicholas. *The Philosophy of Leibnitz.* Prentice–Hall, Inc. New Jersey. 1967

Baptist Origins and Summons

John Dotson
author, artist, educator, consultant

On April 30, I was in Mount Carmel, Tennessee, at Oak Grove Baptist Church, the shaping institution of my *spiritual* journey and *religious imagination*. So many calls for "professions of faith" at "times of decision," in the Baptist manner, inform my childhood that such would be truly beyond counting. My father, 84, a Freemason and Knights Templar Commander, has taught the Men's Bible Study Class, largely octogenarians, for more than a decade. Whenever I am in town, I am expected to teach the class in his stead. The elders in this class were the leaders of the church in my childhood, in a small, rural, wooden church building located in Sawmill Hollow, or Holler.

Now many of elders have died, and more are dying quickly now. On this occasion, those of the Women's Bible Study Class suggested combining classes. I asked if this had ever happened before. No one remembered such an occurrence, and since the collective memory there goes back about eight decades, it seems to be a reliable fact.

The lesson, in the Southern Baptist "quarterly" sequence, was the first chapter of the Book of Judges in the Old Testament. As usual, I opened my heart for <inspiration> to somehow find in the text some <veritioning>. Rather quickly the lesson, concerning the "idolatries" of the children of Israel after the death of Joshua, emerged this way:

> Whenever we are stuck, whenever we are at an edge of consciousness and fixated with a "problem," we have a tendency to experience that problem as an <idol>. The image of the problem, the neurotic complex, then is equivalent to a "graven image." [Standing humbly before them, I was acutely aware of how such "graven images" are so imbued in the mythic consciousness that prevails, in agonizing fusion with the mental and mental–rational, in that congregation.] Indeed, I suggested, based on the Hebrew scripture, that the arrival of "disturbances" [mutations] signals the possibility and necessity for ongoing <spiritual> growth, to undo the pull of regression and welcome the force fields of ongoing divine processes, or, the emergent actuality of <spiritual> growth.

Of course, I didn't use this language, and the lesson seems to have been well enough received. A few seemed to be made uncomfortable with the idea that idols might be found within everyday habituated behaviors.

Here is a poem I wrote after returning to California, having also visited my 82–year–old mother, suffering after hip surgery, plagued with dementia, in the nursing home:

_____

profession of faith

times of decision

progressions of faith

transgressions

could not have predicted

it would happen this way
not this way
the sacred thing strikes me
is not who we have been
who we are who we may be
it is what we are right now
paying attention to
what we are noticing
algorithms properties
bodies of water
a heart shattered in light beams
is whole and is at home
everywhere
we arise
in cloud forests
we walk snake paths
our cells go up in flames
and this is how loves grow
and burn away
and then remain
******

SUMMONS

1
time melts and stretches taut
across the bronze horizon

time floats freely about

three Figures shine
through the sea–gate

waves and particles

and see their writhes
Old Eyes and Tongue

dear serpent

savoring the gold reeds
of august lost

as dust gowns the sun

tide rushing out
signaling

how to begin

to begin again
just to pay

attention

2
damp smoke entwines
asymmetrical

registers of

the earnest aims
and soul sacrifices

known and unknown

in the summons of night
pounding surf

3
the North Star
is kind of an eye

it is an eye

Orion's elegant stance
hints encouragement

BODY IS WORLD

he and she are Thee
in saltwater shifting

the sands of my face

over the bone
as barely can be

4
tell me now
do you scream

have you ever shouted

Fire on the water
after last thoughts

wrenching flying raging

plunge crackling molecules
through Body's arch

falling near and away

playing it all out
while you can

as i am right now

quietly alongside
you

5
morning magma
gushes upwards

welling between

the submarine fissures
where dreams

swell and emerge

into volcanic
islands of Day

on contact

6
the holy place
is secret

because it is
this close

7
Moon
        Moon

   Moon

i have rushed
the telescope out

to love

just past full
that silver world

those peaks

valleys in my eye
unresolving

in silver fog

as the solitary finch
sustains

one minor chord

two measures of
three notes

lavender streaks

Dawn's soft
   arrival

Poetry from a Gebserian

John Kadela

Borrowed Time

The Book is laid open upon the table
its pages palimpsests of multiple tales,
written in the manner as the ox plows,
or grasses standing yoked and girdled,
houses with doors flung, roof inclined
toward heaven, hands unfolded as an
open prayer book, arched buttresses and
spiral stairs of your going and coming, the
way a shadow is the hollow of the wood,
a candle lit in the temple sanctuary,
the brush stroke as sure a hummingbird's flutter,
the way a deva lights a pinion pine.
The Book is laid open on your lap, its
stories made of "subtle electric fires"
borrowed from the mind of God, inscriptions
made in the flesh of space and time, where
art is made physic among columned light,
spiraled hands moving right and left, golden
white fire silently crackles as your scanning eyes,
for there in folds are dimensional waves, an
interweaving of a tale Unknown.
Now we are the dancing grass, oracles made
of invisible winds passing through houses
that have not–yet been, a laughter of a home
on a distant hill, the flash of light in the midnight
blue dreaming, we are the holiness of knowing
that what is read is who is reading.

A wave makes landfall.

Moments Come

I loved you when stars being born now
will millions of years into today collapse,
light waves racing into the Creator's heart,
erasing all memory and karma of the play
that with sterner shadow ourselves keep apart.
You know when it was and when it wasn't,
this deep knowledge you bear on your face
the certainty of what will and will not do,
the ache of a sadness of blue sand
or that distant mountainside which was the place.
Now moments come as like ancient vases
figures fashioned on a turning horizon of clay
mysteries played around an empty vessel
dawn and dusk in the play of dance and doubt,
these things to you part of our archaic play.
I come with no argument or legal brief
and will not dissuade you from your belief,
for memory lives with you seamless and secure
which only now from your hand is slipped,
as breath and perception return these thousand
faces with which you I have shared.
You are the precious laughter in my heart
the voice in my head, the old soul holding
my hand in distant places of golden light,
and behind and in there with us is He
by whose grace we are able to be at all.

Joy is not human and never fails truth,
it is to this we have disputed with action
sublime and stupid or how old souls get old.
Check again these eyes that within you live
feel the fountain of love in you rising.
With this kiss then know that all sin is forgiven,
all illusion and doubt dispersed,
for the two–made–one you so fiercely dreamt
century after century with aching heart

beyond all surcease with soul's fiery light
a love supreme to you eternally given.

Map Reading

Let the hours within require learning and play
as if you are at home on a raining afternoon,
skies are bruised with black, yellow and gray,
the intermittent light and wind scurry across
alighting another's face, the cherry dining table
become a solid thing.
Listen to the pencil's sound silently arcing across
the white horizon, tracings here and there, inner
bodies come alive, perhaps there through the trees
a green mansion stands, or yonder the shape of
her body among leaves and shadows precursors
made. Look now into these eyes and the farther
mountains call, where you will lightfall and guardian
Spirits know. Remember your hands are for touching,
caressing, knowing and speaking, yet let healing with
primary colors your first priority be. Sense now
the stream between house and wood, where oak
stands and leaves softly in autumn smoke, know
the line carries itself, traces the traces of vibrations
archaic, holy and mysterious ways. Go within the
doors and find who you must, for there in a dream
within a dream your teacher shall be.
Allow great things to stand in solid light. Fear not
even the darkened streets, for there your singing shall
laughter bring. Take knowledge as root and this eye
ever watching over you, no doubt reign among your
work. Serve then in the main house, those who would
even your greatest love steal, show dignity in all things.
Grace is not an idea but this energy clean, with which
all things you can manifest, paint with joy, speak with
God's Light, love honestly and never, ever forget that
you will forget all that we have said, but know yet once
more that "the deeds are done again and again in
watermelon sugar." Awaken now.

****

We are such who bear cuneiforms whose origins
escape us, memories whose traces heave shadows
and shudders within, forgetting, always forgetting
we are also that which we fear.
The gestured ciphers of word and image shatter,
our mouths agape, soundless before the fury,
we know this power as "other," separate, but we
are hardly ever its equal.
Know then you are the heft all the universes
left and right, spiral and elipse, a moving
thought ever coming upon itself, ever catching itself
In the act.
Time and infirmity are not your enemy,
they are allies true and firm, stalwartly there,
living too among the silent ruins, guarding
you against yourself, for it is not they who
held you back, but for fear and ignorance,
denial and rage, mute refusal its own
sturm und drang.
These are old stories being told anew.
Seek dignity then in the integral truths,
Live among the new columns of light,
built of your renewed senses, sciences
of the electromagnetic and holy breath united.
Seek no more the coiling oppressive sleep,
awaken gently to this one lying next to you,
whose flesh filled with opalescence and mystery
alike, gazes in your eyes and whispers love's
hidden names.
Touch now silence's shadowless cheek,
ever having held the promise, "be here
when i wake?"

Edges of the Soul

And tones rise up from the center of the Earth,
softly deft, they praise the lines of your form,

ever so lovingly, as a mother would, holding
you in place.
Energy conspires against theory and might
responding only to that spoken light,
consciousness will not cooperate tonight
as vibration and light to you give rise.
The dance is begun, the matrix spun,
Wingspans alighting everyone everywhere,
as you feel the vertical rush of memory
released, free to fly into the morning sun.
Remember when you were bird, horse,
Starwalker, or when I pulled you close
against the Baltic Storms. See how you
rode without fear, fording streams and
mountain paths, amber was the game,
Southern routes the rage.
History is no linear thing, but all
up and synchronized time,
rolling deja–vus passing you by,
running ahead to meet you, there
in Egypt, Spain or the rabbinical thing.
The scaled seasons pass, wind and rain
ever remain, reminders of forgetfulness
and earthly pain, the round of emperors,
kings and vertical things.
Always in the horizon coming,
you there waiting, pausing to recollect
at Jerusalem's Gate, your fingers tracing
a steled fate. Low toned epochs of
word and slave, language and bondage,
rivers run to know God's will as we
run to know our own. Such is the
separation of our scanning eyes, ever
reading between tomed lines, dimmer vision
ruled by shadowed fears, God's word
our only shawl.
Trains came in and trains went out,

I a digger still, worming time
a haven hole or two to pull you through.
Living in the ruins of great thought
and don't even know it, said I, let us from
this place fly. The smoke like gray blood
filled the sky adding unknowing to the mystery,
an bruising of the soul.
But trust me now when I say,
it was you eyes I saw from the train,
made me smile an idiot's smile,
a loving mother became I,
for while I would from gravity's rainbow fly
you held fast the place and page.
I loved you and your brown eyes for that.
Oh, exquisite God! How you bring me to
my knees in love, time and time and time.
There is always and already, now and forever,
you bring to them me one by one,
I a sickened Kingfisher;
and it is I who must bow and
scrape for divine honor's sake, this the
Master's light all embraced.
Their songs sing in my heart
a lesson book for me to share
The Book, we call It, simple enough,
where you and I sat and read aloud
one into one, two into two, Aleph,
Aleph, nought, nought, One.
A scheme so simple, a river
runs through it.
Precious ones, this is a song
a long time coming, for it was
you and you, and you who
the Baal Shem Tov was, be now
the singer and the song.
You were my sister in Jerusalem
when the Master came,

and you were my wife.
When he spoke to us
this Light shone in his eyes and this
Love in His voice claimed you and I
from far above all these dusty places.
a Father's distances gapped in that gaze,
the templed walls falling without moving
the law washed with loving replaced.

We are freed now, the likes of us.
Watching scenes as if from a train,
the landscape accommodates our journey,
Nature freed from fearsome worry,
gives us scene after scene, time travels
to greet us, and there, just ahead,
and all around the next bend, tall and
shining they descend to grace and greet,
arms and hands and embraces,
memory is no more.
Breathe gently now, great one,
take in the golden air. Look
before you now the All Around,
mirror and pretense gone fast,
for now you are here at last.

Tarakumari

When we meet we stare into each others eyes,
that stillness within that yields nothing
eludes shade and dimension also participates,
as the sun reddens and the mountains wave
there is born a kind of seeing freed from sight,
and there with its unseen warmth harvests us
all the tantalizing colors transparently merging
I see your eyes and face infinite among angels,
there the always unavowed seeing moves
flutters perhaps a blink and whispers a vibration.
A smile breaks an inescapable sunset

and somewhere we are dancing under a harvest moon.
My feet may make clod sounds on rocky sand,
the labors of mourning missed days and loves
and other things never really meant to be,
like glimpses of sepia toned photographs,
gravestones centuries old found under pinion pine
it matters little not what or where,
for the song you sing about rainbows and things
makes even the clutter of who I am shine a brighter light
as we dance under the harvest moon.
We stand in moonlight bright and wild
impetuous giggling silences still as midnight,
and I know as we deepen the silvered look
the comings and goings of heavenly things
appearing across flesh now so light
names and faces of a thousand years freed,
such is what on any day through hand s and eyes plays.
Yet too a devoted knowing this breathing completes,
irony never lost among the smell of hay and apple cider,
that we know that touch announces distances,
revelations ache in a flesh filled with time
so many impermanent things
and there the light sparkles the mix of knowing and love
your eyes orbs of risk and talent,
arms open wide, worlds within, you smile
and an embrace that flickered the moon,
ripened the fruits of labors yet conceived,
with dancing heart is born.
****

Allow then yourself a voice with which to speak
practice with its sonorities full and deep,
your time to step forward and be heard is near
speech which lovingly creates is a song of oration
the body glows radiant light from unseen to unseen
worlds into worlds ten thousand fears dissolving
a single resonant voice all conflict resolving

in you all that negative has been.
Take then this voice, use it as craft, or adze,
plow, chisel or lightwand. Use it with certainty,
yes, for that is the way of tools, and their range
and domain only by imagination limited, but
know beyond all reason and pay, that duality
which have worlds and great peoples undone,
only loving speech the pathway alights,
where we with you forever stand.
Now your world has been super–charged,
helixes spun into play as galaxies gates
life and joy of electron twins dancing through
wormholes and fates, the place within you
spoken as an afterthought at the end of Creation,
for the way in is the way out, lovers still
believe that this is the moment they have
waited lifetimes before, teachers square circles
through geomantic rays lent to them by
master builders on the scaffolds of their dreams,
artists practice a dance by right and left spin
worlds exploding in the place just where a
second before no space could get in, the
impossible marriage of angel and man has
re–begun, and in your voice comes the sound
of ten thousands suns, a roaring love so
refined that the simple hello of the morning
kiss, the touch of a word that flowers chakras
opening surpasses all that is alluring, knowing
one into other divine love and light is flowing,
as easily as dust dancing across the late afternoon
light revealing a persian rug's intricate fabled
story, it is you who speak the voice of angel.

There is no time for fear or uncertainty,
such the shadow play of your own spinning
and turning, whirling spinning giggling child,
all that you have seen and made, a distance

and overarching shade, the outline of your
play, the lengths of the shadow now shortening
as loving Source draws nearer to you the
shame and guilt forgive and forget.
We to you are the central sun, emissary
of the great and glorious Divine One,
we are sparking your world and its waters,
the love you find in your voice is the
consensus of dimensions pristine in origin,
open ending to you as a poet of Earth,
each and all of you having the same freedom
as fate, this place, this date to sing the
song of Earth, less as part, but that who
makes whole of all.
Take this day as a lover, husband or wife.
Be loyal and loving with your words, for
courtship is past and now ardor and integrity
must be the works of the day.
Know within and all you who encounter
bear this voice as a measure for dispelling
strife, that government long since is
heaven decreed, one for all and all for one,
dilemma released from the prison of
ideology and semantics, the loving heart
rules as a moving capital of grace from face
to shining face.
Know your world is overturned now,
in a single modulation of wave and intonation,
this voice is resonant and clear, yours
to have and to hold forth in the name of
a new human race completing its creations.
Soar to your soul and retrieve all that was
meant to be.

The Dresser Speaks

Let us speak the loving of the divine heart
put aside rough speech and manner,
releasing all pretense of ever having been wise
for now in this harvest time
we race to the attic and basement of time
seeking counsel among rags and riches
lifetimes worn in blood and ache, vanities
and lessons unending emanating from God's
endless seeking.
Now we dress a vizier, rabbi, guru, healer
and teacher. We have our books thrown open
to find memory's correct page, there to quote
what puzzles us. Comes the teacher anon,
sandled and simple, one query only on any
given day. Without formality in simple tones
asks, "Who are You?" No magic or metaphysic
made, no superstitious geometry to trace, ontologies
erased, for the question resists your complex and raises a
sweat. You stutter for voice, apprenticed to time,
never quite knowing, but yes perhaps it could
have been, you are the one now come, that question
on your galaxied lips.
The Earth spins on axes unseen, folds of loving
beyond time's span and rhythmic depths breathing
you, all that you are, all that you've been
is a blessing again for the first time forever.
Knowing that knowing was never the test to a new
insight fresh, like ripened apples or pears, fall to us.
We pretend we are simple folk, but God lurks about
and we are never quite sure how or when or in
whom He appears at all. In refuses out, left sidereals
right, and He's out the door without a flash and we
are left to ponder imponderables of a night. No
wonder angels counsel the likes of us.
Know then this breath, this Light, this Love now come,
hear too this voice within and awe at it being you,

for once it was said there is little distance between church
and asylum door, but communion you seek, and such shall
you know, who you have become happened in a blink,
not even asleep, for no text or metaphysical map, could
near or far or any measure make, of the infinite sea of
of your divine re–take.
Such loving heart as this is still beyond your ken,
some mysteries depths transparent with your skin,
yet know, eternal one, this is your crown of creation
day, and that heaven conspired to make unknowing
a central sun, around and through which all things
can inside–out, upside–down be, unmirrored, silent,
surprise! The sea shall still offer waves as grammatical
stops, winds shall scurry across breathless moments
come upon in their play at pastness, while you wander
yet in dreaming vastness.
Play no more the fool, nor fear to inspire, but
breathe in joy and all the light, tell the shadows
to side–step and wiggle away, "Away, away now
the Lord is in play!" Such love as God's day, among
all things dwelling, even among such paradox as
these will be found in the newfangled telling.
This then is your loving on stage, all
cued and readied of the heart, spot Now
then, she comes anon, enter, enter, enter!
****

This loving fire in my heart, passion soared
in the name of "the other," or what vain
self–bemused ruse and folly, where I full
pride and gloried, my humility and grace
threw away in sensation and worry, this
could not extinct; not with seduction bribing
thought, raids on archetypes all, assumed
voices and guises, postures held in secret
hates, midnight vices running a day, losing
and gaining love in a thousand faces, living

life a match head on fire, desires false illumination
flickering shared in the others stare, never
once avowing you, there.
This me that speaks, this one who knows the
truth and can no more escape than he can your
bright burning suns, who knows the angel's
gate and devil's fate, whose got two mirrors
in his hand, this realization of light unreflected,
freed through sorrow's rueful stellar orbits,
this me before you comes hearing your voice
singing shame not myself before, nor after,
but speak the word of grace into every face,
that bondage of sight, sound, dually by image
and memory as nerve and quanta ground,
with loving embrace release.
This peace that pervades mercurial dream waters
and destiny's legibly writ book, an energy sublime
neither here nor there, shines forth from such
sweet countenance that traverses flesh's round of
birth and death, a light that seeks me this day, and
this, and this, for no matter where I stand, or
what condition or fate, shines that light that I have
seen others take, or myself, or a thousand beliefs
pulped into a million trees, no less blotting out
with words serving as a eclipsing sun, that which
rises before your breath, holds the sun and stars
as its apogee, and on release, knows your heart's
lives and loves before the ascent may ever play
to re–start.

This creation blinks and where once stood flowing
river and willow trees, temples and skyscrapers
etherically side by side, history's fashion sculpted in time's
yielding holons, how grids became cathedrals and
congresses great, windows reflecting cloudy shifting
scenes while impermanence reigned, is in eyelid
shudder, utterly transformed comes color and lights

shining as if never having been anywhere else but
here, and here, and finally here. This voice that is
now a thought once was silently conveyed, then heard
in echoed ways and is re–born into communal sway,
is now so sweetly embraced, for tomorrow is today
and yesterday a jeweled aura of perfection, speaks
through a fiery heart living now in your breast,
opening your throat to speak, and silent becomes
as your greatness comes.

Consciousness Structures and Modern Communication: Oral, Literate, or What?

Michael Purdy
Governors State University

Abstract

Jean Gebser has described five structures of consciousness: archaic, magic, mythic, mental, and the currently emerging integral. Each of these structures correlates with "historical" *and* current styles of communication operating in human communication relationships. The archaic and magical are alien styles of communication from the perspective of modern communication scholars. The mythic and rational are best known as modes of communication in Eastern (including most of Africa) and Western culture, respectively. Most interesting, perhaps, is the description of communication within the presently emerging integral consciousness structure which some say is literate while others say it is a new orality. Is the emerging integral communication style oral, literate, or what?

Introduction

The natural human being is not a writer or a reader, but a speaker and a listener. This must be as true of us today . . . as it was 7,000 years ago. Literacy at any stage of its development is in terms of evolutionary time a mere upstart, and to this day it is in our spoken communication with each other that we reveal and operate our biological inheritance. (Havelock)

This paper was conceived in a consideration of the nature of what Jean Gebser called the emerging integral consciousness. I was presenting at a conference where the theme was the proposition that our present culture is an oral culture. My main concern was the consciousness structure of oral/literate culture and how the consciousness of our present culture fit the bill. My tack was to refer to scholars of culture and consciousness to describe the mythic consciousness, which is the "model" of oral/aural culture and compare that "model" with our present problematic situation which is perhaps oral, but more than oral (though not necessarily aural). The ground for this paper was built upon the premise of the work of Marshall McLuhan, Walter Ong, and Jack Goody, that "the history of *mentalites* and the evolution of modes of thought are linked to the evolution and types of modes and means of communication" (Ferrarotti 7). That earlier paper lead me to consider the question of the current consciousness as oral, literate, or what? In the process, however, I will give consideration to the communication correlate of each of the modes of consciousness.

What is an Oral Culture? Eric Havelock quoted at the beginning of this paper suggests that it is speaking and listening which "reveal and operate our biological inheritance." This may be true, we had a long heritage before literacy. On the other hand we are strongly typed by our *cultural history*. Since the advent of writing several thousand years ago we have been gradually succumbing to the spell of literacy. If Havelock emphasizes our biological heritage, other scholars lean toward acculturation.

Current models set up dichotomies with oral culture over against literate culture. Marshall McLuhan, building on the work of Harold Innis, describes how the printed word eventually brought about privacy, the individuated self, and the nation state. In *Understanding Media*,

Marshall McLuhan concludes "The spoken word does not afford the extension and amplification or the visual power needed for habits of individualism and privacy" (82). Today we can look to comparisons between literate cultures and oral cultures for the obvious differences. Marshall McLuhan says when the impact of the literate is not present "there occurs another form of sensuous involvement" (82). This sensuous involvement, of feeling and emotions and tactile extension, is detached from our literate experience.

In *Explorations In Communication*, Marshall McLuhan and Edmund Carpenter associate oral culture with hearing and literate culture with the visual field of experience. "In our society, however, to be real, a thing must be visible, and preferably constant. We trust the eye, not the ear" (65). The ear doesn't need any solid object for our attention, it operates equally well in light or dark and senses no solid boundaries. The eye depends on light for its orientation and is, by the very nature of its fixation on objects, directed. We can *hear* from any orientation, we can only *see* what is present before us. So with the work of Marshall McLuhan we have the preliterate and the literate, the oral and the visual, two different experiences of sensory balance. Marshall McLuhan would initially *seem* to be saying we are presently in a visual/literate culture.

We have been in a visual/literate culture, literacy having come to full flower in the eighteenth century. But we have in the last century entered an age of electricity and electronics where Marshall McLuhan says the medium is the message—or the massage. This is a more complex relationship among the senses, or at least a different balance. As Marshall McLuhan says in his film "The Medium is the Message," we are reentering the tribal world, but this time with our eyes wide open. This provides the challenge for labeling our age as oral. Is this a genuinely oral age or something else? Before we tackle that conundrum, however, there are other aspects of the oral/literate relationship to explore.

Walter Ong is another author who says this is an oral age, but also something else. In *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology*, he notes how our present culture is more oral than say culture of 30 years ago (measured from 1971), but is something different than preliterate orality; he calls the new orality "secondary orality" (284–85). "Sound always tends to socialize," he says, but modern socialization is planned "with all the inner–directedness we can muster" as opposed to the participatory "happenings which occurred in preliterate society" (284–85). In *Interfaces of the Word,* Walter Ong states that secondary orality is "superficially identical with primary orality but in depth utterly contrary" (298). So, Walter Ong is also saying that ours is something of an oral culture, but different and in contrast with primary orality.

Another approach to the "problem of oral and literate is to redefine the concepts. Don Rubin in his 1989 paper delivered at the research preconference of the International Listening Association, suggests that models of listening until recently had put listening into the straight–jacket of a literate model: "listeners are treated essentially as people who are reading with their ears" (1). Current models of listening arising out of scholarship in discourse analysis, linguistics, ethnography and psycholinguistics look to the distinction between literacy and orality for a liberating model that is not tied to the literate experience. Just when we thought that the difference between literacy and orality would lead to an oral model of listening which would enrich our research, Rubin proposes that perceiving writing and speaking (listening) as distinct channels "is hardly informative, and may actually

occlude important similarities between certain written and oral communication events (e.g., notes exchanged between lovers and whispered 'sweet nothings')" (2).

Essentially, Don Rubin is telling us that some literate discourse may be oral and some oral discourse may be literate. It is not the communication channel, oral/aural or written, which determines if communication is oral or literate. The issue is rather if communication functions in an oral–based style or in a literate–based style:

> Prototypical (i.e., conversational) oral discourse is grounded in proximity to a tangible audience and situation, issues from a tangible ego, can be flexibly modified, and rapidly produced with little self–consciousness. Oral–based discourse (whether in the written or spoken channel) thus conveys involvement, spontaneity, tentativeness, solidarity.

> [P]rototypical (i.e., edited essayist) written discourse presumes a universal, inchoate audience and situation, alienates the speaker from the utterance, fixes meaning in time, and is produced deliberately and free from the tyranny of real–time fragmentation. Literate–based discourse (whether in the written or spoken channel) thus conveys detachment, planfulness, conclusiveness, and authority (2–3).

Thus, whether discourse is oral or literate is a matter of the situational relationship between speaker and listener. De Kerckhove argues that

> oral listening tends to be global and comprehensive, while literate listening is specialized and selective. One is attending to concrete situations and to persons, while the other is interested in words and verbal meanings. One is context–bound, while the other is relatively context–free. The first is cosmo–centric and spatial, while the other is linear, temporal and logocentric (6).

But as Marshall McLuhan suggests the difference is also a matter of sensory balance. Oral/aural is more engaged, as the audial channel surrounds and engulfs us. The written channel is a visual mode, abstract and directed.

Marshall McLuhan describes the Eskimo culture as oral where "the ocularly visible apparition is not nearly as common as the purely auditory one; *hearer* would be a better term than *seer* for their holy men" (*Explorations*, 66). Western culture, being literate, has assumed that "the Euclidean space created by the visual sense in isolation from the other senses is space itself" (*From Cliche*, 83). But he also suggests that modern electronic technology and its concomitant environment has created new 'spaces' confusing those who are wedded to visual metaphor. He notes that "Much modern poetry today is written to be sung. The boundaries between the written and the oral are becoming very elusive" (*From Cliche*, 83).

Rubin illustrates the limitations of a strict dichotomy between oral and literate communication, opting for a functional approach that operates from a prototypical pattern for each form of communication. Marshall McLuhan who begins with what appears to be a dichotomous approach, when challenged with the present culture of information technology, moves to a more complex consciousness. Walter Ong talks of a secondary orality which is quite in contrast with preliterate orality. Each, although offering a number of clues, fall short of being able to give us a complete understanding of our present era. Each leads us to consider a more encompassing model to help express the needs of contemporary culture, (particularly with respect to listening which is what orality is all about—without listeners there would be no speaker/storyteller).

To better grasp the consciousness of our times I have consulted *The Ever–Present Origin* (EPO), the work of an insightful cultural philosopher. The work of Jean Gebser, the Swiss–German philosopher of culture, will be our guiding light and reference point for this exploration of consciousness, and I will use his broad, encompassing approach as an organizing structure for the thoughts of other scholars such as Marshall McLuhan, Don Rubin, and Walter Ong; but also scholars who have expanded upon Jean Gebser's work. In terms of historical relationship there are those who claim that Marshall McLuhan borrowed some of his ideas about culture and consciousness from Jean Gebser[8] .

Culture and Consciousness

The problem of understanding the communication of our own times is not just one of two channels of communication or two modes of culture, but rather one of entering a new era of culture—or even civilization—and hence, a new mode of integral consciousness, according to Jean Gebser. The approach of the study of consciousness is not a clear–cut model which categorizes according to dichotomies, or other schemes. When we examine the premises of this paper from the approach of consciousness we enter a much larger realm. The study of consciousness is the study of the way we conceive of reality, but more it provides an understanding of the way we structure all of our experience whether conceived to be real or otherwise.

So we have a problem about how to describe the times in which we live. In approaching this problem, I will first need to digress to discuss the structures of consciousness which preceded our current state namely, the magic and mythic structures of consciousness. The magic structure is an auditory consciousness, but in its original state it is not what we would today call oral; it does, however, give us a clearer understanding of mythic consciousness and oral culture. The mythic consciousness is the originary model of oral consciousness (culture), but what we today call oral culture overlaps both contemporary magic and mythic cultures; because, according to Georg Feuerstein in *Structures of Consciousness* the magic cultures of today are not true magic cultures. The modern magic culture, what we call "primitive" culture, is "evidently capable of very complex symbolic thought" (66).

Understanding the consciousness of oral culture we can then consider the currently emerging integral structure of consciousness, to explore how it differs from a "straight" oral culture. Between the mythic and the integral is the mental–rational which has been predominate, and is still strong, but is gradually "decaying" and losing ground to the emerging integral. We will need to describe the mental–rational which is currently dominant to better understand the emerging integral[9]. (I will ignore the archaic consciousness because in the identity of the archaic consciousness communication is irrelevant.)

---

[8] Correspondence with Eric M. Kramer, Radford University, who is presently researching the relationship of McLuhan's work to that of Jean Gebser.

[9] We must also be clear about how consciousness is transformed from one structure to another, for example, from the present mental–rational to the emerging integral. This shift of consciousness is not an "evolutionary" process. The model of evolutionary change is a product of the mental–rational structure of consciousness and we need a meta–term to describe non–rational, pre–rational, and a–rational processes, hence the term "mutation" developed by Jean Gebser to describe this shift.

Magic Consciousness: Pre–Oral Culture

Jean Gebser's depiction of modes of consciousness derives from a strict phenomenological description of historical cultures (civilizations). The magical structure of consciousness is obviously depicted in statues with no mouth. No mouth, no myth—no orality. The lack of mouth in the magic structure "indicates to what extent magic man placed significance on what he heard, that is, on the sounds of *nature* [my emphasis], and not on what was spoken" (EPO 57). This can "be experienced today, as will be evident to anyone who has ever felt utterly spellbound by music, especially in a large audience whose members have become one with the music, with the performer, with one another" (Behnke, *Toward Integral*, 7).

Magic consciousness does not as yet indicate an individuated ego so "Communication between members of the group–ego, the 'We,' does not as yet require language. . . . The egolessness of the individual . . . demands participation and communication on the basis of the collective and vital intentions; the inseparable bonds of the clan are the dominant principle" (EPO 58). The group "communicates" in a "celebration" of its unitary action and is vitally intermeshed and in harmony with nature. But since there is not individuated ego the relationship of members of the group ego is one which would not even single out a phenomenon called communication (as we define the term today). Indeed, there are a number of cultures yet today which have no word for communication, i.e., no need to differentiate or label a process which joins *separate individuals*.

If individuals experience no separateness, no differentiation from others as is typical of magic consciousness (just the opposite is experienced in the rational consciousness), there is no need to communicate to reduce the distance or uncertainty. A para–magical communication experience is described today in the area of nonverbal communication, as for example, in John Steven's term "confluence." "Confluence means 'flowing together,' as two streams joining together into a single stream" (121–22)[10].

Magic man possesses a vital potency by which "the entire body . . . forms a seamless transition to the flux of things and nature with which he is merged" (EPO 64). His mergence with nature is also an auditory awareness and attunement. Although magic consciousness was auditory and placed emphasis on what was heard, that hearing was not "oral" as we are discussing it in this paper, and was not listening by most current definitions of listening, but rather, hearing. As de Kerckhove writes "Listening is a product of selective attention, as opposed to hearing, which is not inner but outer–controlled" (6). There is no *individual* selective attention, or interpretation in the auditory experience of magic consciousness; the process of magic communication is not a process, but an identification—Gebser says it is telepathic. The ends of this identification must have extended only to the boundaries of the clan, for the most part. There was little or no identification with unrelated clans. The psychic attunement was correlated with the unitary world of the clan ego.

Hearing for the magic consciousness is the hearing of a human without ego or responsibility (EPO 60). "The vital," the operative principle of the magic structure of consciousness, "though lucidly receptive, is blind, and due to its blindness is destructive" (EPO 60). Today, when magic operates in this way it is destructively deficient, as when crowds are emotionally swept up in the rhetoric of a Hitler, a Mussolini or other demagogue. With the

---

[10] See also Purdy, "Styles of Listening and Structures of Consciousness" for examples of receptive communication for each structure of consciousness.

mythic structure of consciousness man becomes "sighted" or awake, and emerges from this dormant magic consciousness to an articulate myth–producing, verbal era. The Greek word *mythos* originally meant to speak or discourse, and the telling of myths is the epitome of oral culture—myth articulates the world.

There is still today a magical force operating in the phenomenon of story–telling. The *trance*–like state of the listener involved is probably not as all–encompassing and impermeable as that of magic man. The original Latin meaning for the word trance means to die, or literally "to go across." Audiences today operating from an integral consciousness allow themselves to enter a trance in complicity with the speaker. (A "rational" audience would typically not want to be submerged "unwillingly" in a magical, less–conscious state.) Generally, we are not very aware of the magical consciousness at work today. It functions at less consciousness levels, as when a group (such as a sport, or debate team) communicates in such synchrony that they don't stop to think about the correlation of their communication/listening with others, it just happens. There is also magic consciousness at work in the use of communication in advertising or political campaigns to "make" (i.e. "based on sympathetic effect" as suggested in EPO, 106 n43) people buy products or vote for a candidate.

Magical consciousness is an identification with nature, and the mutation to mythic consciousness is a transition from "the rhythm of nature with its conspicuous auditory emphasis [which] becomes, in a purely natural way, temporal" (EPO 61). The mutational shift from one consciousness structure to another should not be understood as a biological mutation which leads to a specialization of function, but as a qualitative shift which leads toward "structural enrichment and dimensional increment" (EPO 38). The magic and the mythic overlap around the third millennium B.C. according to Jean Gebser (EPO 57) bringing about new aspects of human consciousness.

Mythic Consciousness: Oral Culture

Whereas the magic structure of consciousness is "an expression of one–dimensional unity and man's merging with nature," (EPO 66) the expression of the mythic consciousness is a two–dimensional, polar relationship between sound and silence, speaking and muteness. Because of the polar tension in the mythic consciousness there cannot be speaking without silence or listening. This is the polarity of the yin and the yang, "where each gives way to the other, yet each already calls forth the other as its complement—like night and day, female and male, listener and speaker" (Purdy, "Styles of Listening," 51). At the same time each can become its complement, meaning listener and speaker are interchangeable.

In mythic India when a student (or disciple) comes to a teacher (or guru) to learn, a long period of time elapses (perhaps many years) where the student listens to the teacher without speaking. This first stage of the learning relationship is that of the "muni," one who is silent and listens. (All of us in the teaching profession are still enthralled by Indian, or other Asian students who respectfully listen in class.)

Myth is the closing of mouth and eyes; since it is a silent, inward–directed contemplation, it renders the soul visible so that it may be visualized, represented, heard, and made audible. Myth is this representing and making audible: the articulation, the announcement, the report . . . of what has been seen and heard (EPO 67).

By soul, Jean Gebser means the psyche or self–consciousness, the coming into awareness of the individual. Myth—orality—is the expression of the individual's thoughts so they may be heard[11]. What any individual (not yet an individuated per–sona or ego) has made a part of his or her experience can be reported for others to share. The sharing is consummated through listening or empathy, as opposed to the sympathy or bodily attunement of the magic consciousness. Imagination developed with the emergence of the mythic consciousness, and empathy is the imaginative attunement of our own world to the world of another. Through empathic listening we can understand the soul of another speaking human being. In our rationally dominated worldview, however, we need to allow ourselves release from the grip of the cognitive (i.e., to know, as in visual perception) so we can enter into polar attunement with the other.

In light of the above we can understand why discussions of empathy have become problematic in current communication literature. Rational theorists (Greek, *theoria,* from *Thea*, goddess of spectacle; a view or perspective) say we aren't sure empathy exists, since we can't measure it. When rational thinkers describe empathy it is more in terms of a "figuring out" what is on the mind of the other, rather than a mythic allowing oneself to imaginatively come into harmony with the other. The primary problem is that we have several notions of what empathy is; and it is difficult to know what empathy is unless we allow for research that considers the psychic polarity inherent in the mythic.

For the most part Jean Gebser refers to speaking when he discusses mythic (oral) culture. The articulation of mouth is the articulation of myth. He is still, in some ways, a product of his times (1905–1973) reflecting the emphasis on the importance of the speaker as the focus of power in relationships. One passage where Jean Gebser recognizes the importance of the listener is in the following passage:

> [Words] become decisive . . . only when understood in conjunction with what was left *unsaid*. Only when the unspoken communicates its silent message does the spoken word convey the depth and polarity that constitute the tension of real life. Silence by itself is magical spell, and speech by itself mere rational babble. The word has value, apart from (magical) power or (rational) formula only where the speaker takes this interdependence into account. The attentive listener, moreover, will discern the affinity—perhaps not demonstrable—between "word" (Wort) and "value" (Wert) (EPO 68).

Since the mythic consciousness is by its very nature polar the *speaker* of myth is balanced or complemented by the one who *listens* to myth—one cannot be considered without the other. In the same polar sense the attentive listener will be discerning of both the said and the unsaid, the verbal and the nonverbal, the word and the value (in both the sense of "worth" and "principles"). As Algis Mickunas writes, "The polar rhythm is also manifest in that the hearer not only listens to the word but above all to that which remains silent—unspoken and merely hinted at. The word is thus a mirror of the inner mystery" (181).

The articulation of mystery, the art of storytelling, is another way to affiliate our modern selves with the mythic world present in our everyday actions. Myths of journey, of great discoveries and adventures (Odysseus to Star Wars) are as Gebser says "the collective

---

[11] Jean Gebser is definitely talking about "silence" in the sense that each of us may withdraw into contemplation; there is also the polar concept of silence which allows openness for listening.

dreams of the nations formed into words" (EPO 68). We are rediscovering the telling of (and listening to) myth and the symbolic value of storytelling and narrative in communication as well as many other fields of study. We find symbolic projections of the mythic psyche arising everywhere. We are studying (and listening to) not only our own personal narratives, but the stories of every segment of society and culture. Black (African) Americans are listening to their mythic heritage—their polar, psychic mode of communication—in the consciousness raising integration of the mythic into their modern world.

There has also been research in communication which takes the polar relationship of the listener/speaker into account. Consider the extensive study of turn taking, the tendency for speakers and listeners to alternate roles. Many of the clues as to how this process happens occur at the "level" of empathy and magical sympathy which merges listeners and speakers into a tightly woven relationship (as in a tapestry or quilt). There is an inherent reciprocity at work in all communication, usually lurking in the unsaid, just below the surface of the rational exchange of information.

Mental–Rational Consciousness: Literate Culture

Mythic consciousness mutated into the mental structure of consciousness: "the transition to the mental structure suggests a *fall from time into space*," (EPO 77) a move from the temporal action of oral communication to the visual space of literate communication.. The Mental structure emerged, perhaps around 8,000 B.C. with the rise of cities (Feuerstein 92), came into full flower during two periods in Western culture, 500 B. C. and 1500 A.D., and has held sway into contemporary times. *Rational* consciousness refers to the one–sided development and distancing of man from his world through materialism and deficient scientism. I will use "rational" to refer to the latest and deficient transformation of the mental structure of consciousness, at its zenith by the seventeen hundreds (1790) (EPO 84). I will use "mental" to refer to the whole mental structure of consciousness (from, roughly, 8000 B. C. to the present).

Jean Gebser criticized the rational development of the mental consciousness (*Verstand*) as Georg Feuerstein points out. "*Verstand . . .* denotes abstract analytical thinking as typically exercised in logic and mathematics;" *Verstand* is often today rendered as "understanding" which doesn't "quite capture the original meaning" (Feuerstein 119). The mental structure of consciousness "*Vernunft*, derived from the verb *vernehmen* ('to take in'), signifies a mode of thinking in which there is a marked degree of *receptivity* [my emphasis] to the 'gut' level of our being. It keeps in purview feelings, values, meanings, contexts, and so on" (Feuerstein 119). This originary sense of the mental structure of consciousness is typically lost in the conceptualization of the currently dominant rational structure; modern communication theory (and Western consciousness, in general) needs the receptivity and the fullness of the mental consciousness (described by Feuerstein) as a prelude and transition to the emergent integral structure of consciousness.

In the mental structure Jean Gebser notes how "Man steps out of the sheltering, two–dimensional circle and its confines into three dimensional space" (EPO 77). With three dimensional space comes an attendant externalization of communication in the material medium of the text. An abstract alphabet and literacy, as Marshall McLuhan suggests, were no doubt catalysts for the development of mental consciousness, although the first glimmer of rational consciousness was shining forth long before literacy was a significant force. It is,

however, no chance event that the first rational, formal codifications of (rational) law were written.

Rational consciousness is first of all rational. It is three–dimensional, and with it arises perspectivity, the domination of visual perception, and "*directed* or *discursive thought*" (EPO 75) as well as, measurement, abstraction, anthropocentrism, and temporality. Literacy, as sequential development of thought would not be thinkable without the visual, directed, goal–oriented nature of rational consciousness.

Whereas magical consciousness is unitary, and mythic is a polar tension of complements which call each other (listener/speaker), rational consciousness is dualistic, i.e., constructed in opposites: up–down, right–wrong, mind–body, rational–emotional, self–other, speaker–listener, etc. The duality of the mental is such that one side automatically excludes and is opposite to its paired term. Speaker and listener are separate and exclusive components of communication; there is an abyss, or gap, a distance between listener and speaker which could be considered part of the modern crisis. This gap is indicative of the mental–rational consciousness which experiences communication as problematic. (There is, however, no problem of communication in the magic or mythic consciousness, the thought never arises.) Communication is today defined as interaction (to act between), or transaction (to act across). Communication is problematic in that one must "figure out" how to identify with the other. Identification came naturally for magical speakers and was assumed for mythic com*mu*nication (the root *mu* has the mythic polarity of declaration and silence). Rational speakers confront an audience and must analyze how to bridge the distance between them (audience analysis). We must give responsibility back to the listener in order to provide balance to the communication act and to help heal the rift.

In terms of rational consciousness, listening would be thought of as a sequential, literate process like reading, as suggested by Don Rubin (see above). Listening in fact is perceived as a "passive activity" (strange contradiction). Rational consciousness is indeed a speaker–dominated world. It is the speaker who has power, who can direct and control a situation. The polar identity of the mythic is not seen as an important element of communication. The rhetor is the one who speaks, who gives direction to the world. I have coined the phrase "missionary zeal" to represent the generalizable action of many individual communicators I see in my listening and interpersonal communication classes. In exercises where they are to simply listen and understand the speaker, they have difficulty staying quiet. They cannot listen without expressing an opinion. Like a deficient missionary they must speak and broadcast their view of the world to all. In this action everyone seems to need converting; no one escapes being told how the world must be.

Scholars tell us that the culture of our present time has *not* been primarily an oral culture—or at least wasn't construed to be so until recently—and literacy with its visual–linear orientation has predominated. This is not to say that other cultures in the contemporary world, or parts of our own culture do not have oral characteristics. Indeed, subcultures and regional cultures thick with orality exist as an undercurrent to the primary wave of literacy in our time. However, as Marshall McLuhan and others have suggested our times have been awakened to a new orality by the electronic media—Marshall McLuhan would say by electricity, itself. These scholars of the "new" or "second" orality, are offering signs of the integral world, but co–present with the emerging integral is the deficient underside of rational consciousness, namely, progress and high–tech.

Other elements of the mental structure of consciousness such as time (expressed in future–orientation, and deficiently as an obsessive preoccupation with progress), and three–dimensional, linear space, leading to perspectivity and the separation of the subjective ego from an opposite objective, material world (discussed above in terms of the listener/speaker duality) demonstrate the underside of high–tech and electronic media when driven by rational consciousness. These elements along with the other characteristics of the mental–rational consciousness are evident in our technological civilization that dominates nature and other cultures (missionary zeal). The current predominance of the rational makes the emergence of the integral tentative.

Integral Consciousness: Oral?, Literate?

As Jean Gebser says none of these antecedent structures of consciousness ever reaches an end (EPO 96). Previous modes of consciousness are not historical relics, rather, each is still operative now (Feuerstein 9). Each of us still moves and expresses ourselves in magical and mythical ways, as I have shown in examples above. Furthermore, as Feuerstein explains: "just as the unborn *in utero* recapitulates the phylogenesis at least in principle, so the growing individual traverses the ancestral structures of consciousness, gradually adding them to his or her repertoire of responsiveness to self and world" (54). Or as Walter Ong explains,

> the child of today probably passes through a stage something like that of the old oral culture. . . . But the stage is only something like the old, for it remains a child's stage and cannot be protracted into adulthood. The old oral world was not a world of children but of adults, who had children of their own (*Interfaces*, 299).

The integral consciousness is not then, a transcending of the previous structures, but rather an integration of the possibilities of the previous structures and "a liberation from the exclusive validity of any previous form" (Behnke 6). "[A] truly integral perception cannot dispense with the foundation of the mental structure any more than the mental structure can dispense with the mythical, and the mythical with the magic; that is, if we are to be 'whole' or integral human beings" (EPO 299). "By integration we mean a fully completed and realized wholeness . . ." (EPO 99).

The integral consciousness is then encompassing of the other structures of consciousness and at the same time more than their sum. It is also not fully developed. The foundations of its inception as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century have been generally outlined but integral consciousness is still emerging and yet to be completely defined. From the integral foundations we have been able to describe, we know that it is four–dimensional and aperspectival (free from perspective), with time as "intensity" or "quality," and as different from the time of previous consciousness structures. This is not a freedom *from* previous time forms, since they are co–constituents of every one of us; it is to begin with a freedom *for* all time forms (EPO 289)

We come into the integral world as we come into awareness of time, and of the possibility of time–freedom which in turn is the precondition for the realization of the integral consciousness structure that enables us to perceive the aperspectival world. The whole can be perceived only aperspectivally; when we view things in a perspectival way we see only segments (EPO 289).

In becoming consciousness of intensified time we also come into the possibility of perceiving transparently the working of each of the previous modes of consciousness in the present. Only with this awareness can we integrate ourselves and our world.

The aperspectival perception of the integral surpasses the segmented perspectives of the rational. From a rational communication perspective we have the subject–object, speaker–listener dichotomies, and constructivist perspective–taking theory attempting to bridge the chasm between the two opposites. It reminds me of the Indian student I met in Delhi, India. Indians are generally a mythic–oral culture. He had been reading the Western existentialists and was beginning to "see" the chasm that separated people and understood that communication was not possible. The shift from oral to rational culture was made by inserting himself into rational, literate consciousness; the result being a perspective which created an unbridgeable duality. We must avoid the pitfalls of extreme literacy which can create an abyss between people, and adopt a co–created experience of listener and speaker which is free from the duality of the rational if we are find an integral approach to communication.

The Present Age

What can we say then about the communication nature of this emerging age? Is it oral? Literate? We can say with certainty based on Jean Gebser's descriptions of the foundations of the integral consciousness that integral consciousness subsumes both oracy and literacy, and is openness to both. Our age is not, despite the predominance of the electronic media and the global village, heading toward a new oracy—at least not in the traditional sense of the term. We, if anything, are as visually dominant as ever. The terms and relationships between oral/aural and visual/literate are themselves problematic. We are not after all doing away with the *text* in this age of computers, fiber optics and satellite networks. If anything we have more texts being created and communicated than ever—both on paper and electronically. Publishing has become a huge global enterprise. What we *do* perceive is a balancing of the senses. Not only is the auditory coming back into the mix, but our bodily kinesthetic sense is no longer being denied[12]. Still, we are yet in the early morning of the new consciousness and transitions from one mode of consciousness to the next brings with it a shattering of old traditions and the upsetting introduction of totally new ways of being–in–the–world.

As Feuerstein says in concluding the chapter "The Emergent Consciousness" in his book, *Structures of Consciousness*: "It should have become evident by now that contemporary culture is not so much an inchoate mass of contradictory elements as a pluralistic field that is highly tensed under the impact of the emergent mode of consciousness" (150). Our times are indeed "highly–tensed," a characteristic of the chaotic period during mutational shifts. We are obviously not home free. Jean Gebser makes it clear that the integral consciousness, if it is to be concretized within us, must be accomplished by working upon ourselves, by becoming an integration of the magical, mythic, and rational ("The Integral Consciousness"); by balancing the oral and the literate. This integration assumes, therefore, that we can "transcend" the deficient elements of ourselves and our communication environment.

---

[12] See Elizabeth Behnke's work on the body, particularly The Newsletter of the Study Project in the Phenomenology of the Body, Betsy Behnke, editor, P.O. Box O–2, Felton CA 95018.

The period encompassed by the shift from the rational to the integral is indeed a time of dis–integration, a time often difficult to characterize. Franco Ferrarotti in *The End of Conversation: The Impact of Mass Media on Modern Society*, seems to be pointing to the disintegration of conversation, the oral, and at the same time intimating that there are conscious movements at work that will restore interpersonal communication. In his criticism mass media is the degrading force. He relates how

> Telling a story is monotonous. It is tiring. It requires time, a taste for details . . . patience in describing the scene . . . openness and availability to what is new and unexpected. These are qualities antithetical to the technological imperatives of a mass society and the mental habits prevailing in an age dominated by instantaneous images, unable to cope with meaningful discontinuities (2).

He continues to assert that "Like conversation, face–to–face dialogue between people has been drastically reduced by mass television. . . ." (4) Yet he also talks of oral history, the recording of day–to–day interactions and interviews as "the guarantee, the prophecy of a new world which is with difficulty coming to light. . . . it appears as a specific means of the everyday listening to itself. . . ." (8). Oral history is latently " the rediscovery of the direct contact, resistance to the process of massification . . ." (12). So, in a period of several pages, Franco Ferrarotti decries the passing of conversation and also indicates hope, in a new movement of communication between interviewer and interviewee, for resistance to a deficient, mediated world. The paradox of oral history, however, is that "to be preserved and communicated" it must be written" (7).

The evils of our age are the predominance of visual, and particularly, mediated communication. Television, technological imperatives, and massification, in general, are killing the interpersonal relationship; conversation is being lost. This doesn't sound like a formula for a new oracy. I think the point that makes sense out of this discrepancy is Jean Gebser's assertion that during the shifts of consciousness we find the old consciousness, here the rational, in its most deficient form (massification, the technological imperative, the loss of conversation), is continuing alongside the undercurrent of the new integral consciousness, which is indicated by movements like that of oral history and listening, and which is fostering self–awareness and growth through integration. So, at the same time that the deficient rational, dominated by the visual/literate and the speaker, is denigrating the oral/aural, the emerging integral consciousness is reviving it and integrating it into a new and more balanced sense distribution giving a new importance to listening and the aware presence co–created in interpersonal communication.

We may also assess the transition, and the problems, of the transition to the integral consciousness in the realm of global communications—the global village. There is a struggle underway between the techo–giants of the northern hemisphere and the "second" and "third" world countries, mostly of the southern hemisphere. The struggle is over a new world information order as described in the book *Communication for All*, edited by Philipe Lee. Here we can again see the tension in the shift of consciousness from rational to integral. Critics point to the control of media sources, channels and programs by the first world countries, and by multinational corporations. They point to resulting dilution of indigenous cultures as a result of satellite networks which can leapfrog over local control.

The first world's race to link the globe through a common digital highway for all forms of communication is very disturbing to less (communication) powerful nations. For them the

rational Western tendency to see the world in spatial terms means that Western nations are in the center of the communication world, and second and third world nations are on the periphery and hence less important. These nations feel that they are losing control of their cultures.

Indeed, we should all be concerned with the loss of cultural diversity resulting from a global village. In an integral world the need is for an awake, conscious, and critical individual, but integral consciousness does not mean integration in the sense that everyone will become the same. The health of the integral consciousness is in the preservation of alive and conscious diversity. From a Gebserian perspective, the integral consciousness will come into being as each individual—and nation—assumes responsibility to fulfill their human needs for growth and mutation into awareness. In order to do this each needs the right to communicate, hence the ability to create, produce, and distribute their own brand of media. To be fully human each needs to be able to communicate her or his own experience. An integral approach would give each the power and control over their own cultural center—the ability to manage their own information order—perhaps protecting them during a transition to a state where each has equal access to the world network. Right now the hope for such a harmonious transition looks rather bleak, the rational control and use of media would seem to have the upper hand.

The essence of human society from a communication perspective, at least, would seem to be connectivity or community. With the increase of speed of technology, however, there is a multiplication of the transfer and stimulation of information. James Carey has expressed a grave concern with the ability of human communication to keep pace with the "high–speed" of modern technology which is not only fast but bleaches knowledge into information (5). The technology makes possible the connections for facilitating an increased flow of communication between individuals, but what then happens to human action which depends on understanding (listening). Are there limits to our abilities?

Carey suggests that interpretation and understanding require "wide learning and experience and attentive listening. It involves a long, patient process of acquiring an understanding of how people in different cultures characteristically act, how they view things, of what life feels like to another person." He says high–speed technology

> must be matched . . . by the maintenance and refurbishing of these other patterns of communication that are slower, which are based upon conversation, discussion, and interrogation, and which attempt to cultivate different and deeper forms of understanding (Carey 5).

In the integral consciousness it is the awareness and transparent perception of the nature and effect of technology which can bring about a qualitative leap for human development. But can we keep pace. The technology will reach still more frantic speeds while we become conscious of its nature and impact. As Heidegger has said technology reveals the truth, and our continual shaping of technology is telling us something about ourselves. It brings us to the realization that regardless of the amount of information we must sift through, process, and think about in our decision–making, what is important is still *human* decision–making and *human* action. Do our decisions and actions have soul? Do they uplift the human spirit? These are the criteria, and they must drive our use of technology, high–speed, globally connected networks and all. And yet there are serious questions as to the viability of the integral consciousness and its ability to flourish.

Still, the integral world is emerging even in the midst of modern, mediated technology. In *Understanding Media* Marshall McLuhan forecasts a new oral world where Rubin's definition of "oral–based" as involved and cohesive, and Jean Gebser's notion of open, "spiritual" integration, will be realized. "Today computers hold out the promise of a means of instant translation of any code or language. The computer, in short, promises by technology a Pentecostal condition of universal understanding and unity" (*Understanding Media*, 84).

Don Rubin is correct, in his distinction of oral–based and literate–based discourse, with regard to the new modes of interactive communication; we are still dealing with both oral and literate communication, and neither seems to be diminishing. In fact, our media, even text–based media, are becoming increasingly interactive and more immediate (we currently have birthday cards that play music). We can talk back to our television—not just watch passively. A variety of interactive services will put us more in control of our mediated lives. We will eventually be able to use phone, cable lines, and satellite links to interact in a variety of ways only imagined today. The texts of visual media will be interactive and we will instantaneously receive feedback to make text–based, literate discourse more oral. On the other hand, techniques like voice mail and computers that can "talk" and "listen" will help to expand the auditory dimension of modern networks of communication.

Montaigne wrote that "the book is an open letter sent to an unknown recipient." Today literate or text–based communication need no longer be an open, visual letter, it can be an instantaneous (even oral/aural) network message to one or many; it can be sent to a few friends or addressed to a multitude. There are still many limitations on literate communication, but more and more it has the potential to be interactive, the ability to allow listener and speaker to co–create their roles rather than be at opposite ends of a mediated channel with no timely feedback. Perhaps, we can develop a new storytelling culture around the campfire of the electronic network. It needs to resemble the characteristics Franco Ferrarotti described for oral history (storytelling) where "narrators and listeners spoke face–to–face" (6).

Between storytellers and listeners the relation is direct, unforeseeable, and problematic. In other words, it is a truly human relation, a dramatic one, without foreseen results. Not only words but gestures, facial expressions, hand movements, even glances spoke. A direct relation, with immediate feedback, personal reactions, dialogue as a polyphonic moment in which no one present is excluded, as whoever was silent entered the general economy of the collective discourse: his silence [listening] permitted the others to speak. This is the gift of the oral[\aural]: presences, sweat, faces, tone of voice, the meaning—the sound—of silence (my insertions, Ferrarotti 7).

We might approach this with interactive, holographic video and stereo sound, but without sweat and the other smells and tastes of immediacy, and the concrete primacy of human warmth and presence expressed through listening, mediated communication will always fall short. In any structure of consciousness human communication and community will always be the touchstone of what is "real". This transition period is witnessing at least a temporary loss of our human moorings, but with time and human growth many new experiences are possible. That really is the challenge, isn't it.

References

Behnke, Elizabeth A., ed. *Toward Integral Consciousness For An Integral World*. Gebser Studies, Vol. 1. Felton, CA: California Center for Jean Gebser Studies, 1987.

Carey, James. Is Anybody Listening? *Illiniweek*. 16 Dec. (1982): 5.

Carpenter, Edmund, and Marshall McLuhan. Acoustic Space. *Explorations in Communication*. Eds. Edmund Carpenter and Marshall McLuhan. Boston: Beacon, 1960. 65–70.

de Kerckhove, Derrick. Oral versus literate listening. Paper presented at the International Listening Association Summer conference, Toronto, 15 July 1987.

Ferrarotti, Franco. The End of Conversation: The Impact of Mass Media on Modern Society. New York: Greenwood, 1988.

Gebser, Jean. The Integral Consciousness. *Main Currents* 30.3 (Jan.—Feb.. 1974): 107–109.

Gebser, Jean. *The Ever–Present Origin*. Authorized translation by Noel Barstad with Algis Mickunas. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University, 1985. *Ursprung und Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags–Anstalt GmbH, 1949 and 1953.

Havelock, Eric. Interviewed by David Cayley for a CBC Radio series on Orality and Literacy, in *Listen: The Newsletter of the Listening Centre*, Winter 1989/90, Toronto, Ontario.

Haynes, W. Lance. Of That Which We Cannot Write: Some Notes on the Phenomenology of Media. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 74 (1988): 71–101.

Lee, Philipe (ed). Communication for All: New World Information and Communication Order. New York: Orbis, 1986.

Matalene, H. L. The Interactionism of the Ancien Regime: or, Why Does Anybody Ever Bother to Listen to Anybody Else? *College English*. 46.1 (January 1984) 23–31.

McLuhan, Marshall. *From Cliche to Archetype*. New York: Viking, 1970.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: Signet (New American Library), 1964.

Mickunas, Algis. Civilizations as Structures of Consciousness. *Main Currents*. 29.5 (1973): 179–85.

Ong, Walter J. *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell, 1977.

Ong, Walter J. *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell, 1971.

Purdy, Michael. Styles of Listening and Structures of Consciousness. *Journal of Communication Therapy*. 1.1 (1982): 46–58.

Rubin, Don. Orality, Considerate Text, and the Social Construction of Listening. Paper presented to the preconference on research of the International Listening Association, Atlanta, February 1989.

Stallings, Fran. The Web of Silence: Storytelling's Power to Hypnotize. *The National Storytelling Journal*. (Spring/Summer 1988): 6–19.

Stevens, John. *Awareness*. Lafayette, CA: Real People, 1971.

Expressions of Modernity:

New York as Perspectival Mental–Rationality

David Worth
University of Oklahoma

> New York lives by its checkerboard. Millions of beings act simply and easily within it.
> From the first hour, the stranger is oriented, sure of his course..
>
> .Le Corbusier, *When the Cathedrals Were White*[13]

Since the 1600s, New York has grown from a fortified town to the model of high modernity as expressed in cities. New York has been modeled by cities around the world and is, in many ways, a feat of technology. With its huge bridges, buildings, structures, and systems, the city is a huge machine in which millions live and work. One may travel over rivers on bridges or under them in tunnels. Cultures from around the world are represented there and each is a part of the uniquely New York City environment. It is a city of the massive and of the tiny, of wealth and poverty, and of the old and the new. Cultural icon and setting for innumerable works of fiction, New York is much larger than its physical size, giving it meaning for many more than the millions who live there. Yet it is its physicality that is so defining for it as a huge complex of activity and existence for those millions, and as an expression of rationalism, as in so many other areas, New York is difficult, if not impossible to top.

This essay is concerned with New York City and to some extent all mega–cities. Obviously, the suburban–city experience is much different. This essay will focus on the urban. The argument I will make is that, as an expression of space and as evidence of humanity's concern with space, the city is an expression of the perspectival mental–rational structure of consciousness. More specifically, sectorization and atomization are plainly product of and produced by the emphasis on space. These Gebserian concepts shed light on the major structural influences that affect millions every day. As such, an examination of atomization and sectorization in New York City is a useful and potentially revealing application of Gebser's ideas. Gebser's description of this structure is borne out by evidence that is detectable by even a cursory glance at the structure and systems of the city. This essay is based on just such a glance; it is intended as a preliminary exploration of evidence of Gebser's structures in that city. The importance of such an argument lies in the implication of atomization and sectorization for the lived experiences of millions who live in New York and similar cities.

The relationship between technology and humanity has been the focus of a great deal of study. Mumford,[14] for example presents a detailed study of the relationship between

---

[13]Reproduced in Norval White, <u>New York: A Physical History</u> (New York: Atheneum) 1987.

humanity, technology, and cities. Applying Gebser, Mickunas[15] argues that technological culture is expression of the magical structure of consciousness and writes that technological culture has profound implications for political systems and, accordingly, for the experience of human life. Additionally, the use of space in New York City has been discussed and historicized by White[16] and others. This essay seeks to add to the understanding of the human life, culture, and technology by making a contribution to the academic conversations on both humanity and technology and to the conversation on New York and other cities. Accordingly, this essay first reviews the basics of Gebser's structures of consciousness. Second, it explores evidence of the structures in New York, focusing on evidence of the mental structure and of sectorization. Third, implications for a better understanding of sectorization and the city are discussed.

Gebser's Structures of Consciousness

In *The Ever–Present Origin*, Jean Gebser[17] argues that the history of humanity is marked by periodic changes in fundamental structures of consciousness. Changes in technology, Adiscoveries≅ of various sorts, and insights achieved by humans drive and are driven by shifts in the fundamental ways of knowing and conceptualizing experience. These structures are the Archaic, Magic, Mythic, Mental, and the emerging Integral. While this is not the place for an in–depth description of these structures, one might summarize these structures as describing a development (in the sense of development as change not and necessarily as evolution) of human consciousness along the lines of conceptualization of space and time, sign, essence, and potentiality.[18] For Gebser, these changes are shifts in emphasis in consciousness structure and are not argued for as evolution, progression, or advancement. They are simply changes in experience. As shifts occur, and new structures of consciousness irrupt, previous structures remain, influencing and interacting with the new structure. Thus, for Gebser, the past is not past, but is always present. It is important to note that these are not linear progressions, but rather mutations of human consciousness. Since Gebser does not write a great deal about the archaic, this section will start with the magic structure. Additionally, the integral is not discussed, since this essay focuses on the evidence of the mental with some reference to the magical and mythical.

---

[14]Mumford, Lewis. *Technics and Civilization*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1934; Mumford, Lewis. *The City in History*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1961.

[15]Algis Mickunas, Magic and Technological Culture, *Consciousness and Culture : An Introduction to the Thought of Jean Gebser*, Eric Kramer, ed. (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1992).

[16] Norval White. *New York: A Physical History*. New York: Athenium, 1987.

[17]Jean Gebser. *The Ever–Present Origin* (1949; trans. Noel Barstad and Algis Mickunas, (Athens: Ohio UP, 1991).

[18]For more discussion of Gebser's ideas, see Eric Kramer, ed. *Consciousness and Culture : An Introduction to the Thought of Jean Gebser* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1992).

The magic structure

The magic structure is characterized by the change from zero–dimensional identity to one–dimensional unity. Humans move from harmony or identity with the whole of the world and begin to experience the first signs of separation from the world and from nature. Gebser characterizes this as a change from being in the world to having the world. With this change comes the initial emergence of will, the exercise of power over the world. The world separates into parts and whole. The magic Structure is characterized by *pars pro toto* arts stand for whole and whole stands for parts. Humans grapple with their separation from, and essential part in, their world.

Gebser argues that there are five characteristics of the magic structure of consciousness. First, the egolessness of the magic structure is noted. Ego is scattered over the world. Responsibility, motive, and action all are attributable not only to the individual, but to the world as a whole. Both are implicated, but neither and both are responsible. This is because both and neither exist as separate entities yet. Part is whole and whole is part.

This demonstrates the second characteristic of the magic structure: Its point–like unity. All things in the magic world are interchangeable. Everything is interconnected. Real and symbolic are interchangeable. Everything is part of the same vital nexus. This is closely related to the third characteristic, which is the spacelessness and timelessness of the magic structure. This lack of direction and duration accounts for the point–like unity of the structure. Only in this kind of world can such unity exist, can symbol be interchangeable with the real. Without space there can be no differentiation. There is no *here* without a *there*, no *now* without a *then*.

Fourth, Gebser writes that the magic structure is characterized by a merging with nature. This merging reflects an emerging polarity that will become important in the mythical structure. Humans are separate from nature but are also merged with nature. Humans and nature are interwoven, separate but intertwined. This contradiction is an important part of the magic structure since it accounts for interchangeability and for the part–for–whole and whole–for–part qualities of the magic structure.

Finally, the fifth characteristic of the magic structure is the magic reaction. The reaction to the world is a drive for power. This drive for power must be for power over something, and so humans develop a need to be against something. This constant need is behind our Aconquering≅ of nature as well as our ongoing need to conquer other humans. Polarization results in merger and opposition.

The mythical structure

Gebser notes that the mythical structure of consciousness reflects our consciousness before time. Gebser links an understanding of time to an awareness of soul. Humans begin to become aware, at some level, of both. Accordingly, a main characteristic of the structure is the emerging awareness of soul. Having been separated from the outside world of nature in the magical structure, humans in the mythical structure begin to conceptualize the inner

space of the soul. This idea of inner space gives humans the "decisive step. . . out of. . . interlacing with nature."[19]

This step out of nature is shown in a two–dimensional polar world imagined by the mythical. Polarity characterizes the mythical's understanding of the world and the emerging, but not fully emergent, "I." The mouth gains importance in the mythical world as a source of words and wisdom. The word reflects humanity's inner silence while myth reflects soul. Thus words gain increasing importance in the mythical structure of consciousness.

Also gaining importance is imagination. No longer acting out of impulse and instinct, mythical humans have an imaginatory consciousness. The image of human and world as a polar relationship begins to shape consciousness. An imagined world inside is related as a pole to the world. This idea of imagination is important because it reveals humanity's latent perspectivity. As Gebser writes, in the mythical structure humanity is on the verge of time. Time begins to become conceptualizable as mythical humans conceptualize cycles in nature. The emerging imagined world, where images (as human construction) become important, is important for the eventual emergence of the constructed world of the mental structure. Imagination—imaging—is a form of abstraction. It is a construction. Here we see evidence of emerging abstraction in humanity. As we will see in the next section, abstraction is a key concept for the mental structure. The mythical structure has important implications for the study of humans. Gebser writes that the "interpretation of myth always brings about the illumination of life."[20] Understanding the words and imagination of humanity can shed light on its soul, since myth is, for Gebser, a reflection of soul.

The mental structure

Space is a key concept in Gebser's conceptualization of the mental structure. Gebser notes the increasing importance of space in the mental structure. In fact, space is not even a concept until the mental structure arises. Gebser refers to the rise of the mental structure of consciousness as a "fall from time into space."[21] This emphasis on space comes as a result of humanity's increased emphasis on measurement and abstraction. Humans make (literally) their world with thought. Thinking becomes being. Direction creates space and directed thought creates the world. Gebser eventually argues, near the end of the section introducing the mental structure, that obsession with measurement, with quantification, leads ultimately to disintegration.

Gebser notes early in the section that the emergence of the mental structure of consciousness is marked by the emergence of directed, discursive thought. This thought is "not polar–related. . . but rather is directed toward objects and duality, creating and directing this duality, and drawing its energy from the ego." [22]   This quality of directed, discursive conceptualization, the emergence of logos as a way of being, is the most basic level

---

[19]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 61.

[20]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 68.

[21]Gebser*, The Ever–Present Origin*, 77.

[22]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin*, 75

of the mental structure. Directed thought comes to define both self and world by demarking space and separating that space from self. That something (god, for example) may be in a different space than humans, creates this duality. No longer polar, no longer related without direction, without space, duality between humans and world is born. The emergence of ego is a hallmark of the mental for Gebser. The duality creates ego in opposition to world and then creates world as an object to conquer. These ideas are summed up nicely by Gebser:

> Even if we recall only the most important of the words and ignore any additional examples, we can circumscribe the essence of this mental structure: *it is a world of man*, that is, a predominantly human world where "man is the measure of all things" (Protagoras), where man himself thinks and directs his thought. And the world which he measures, to which he aspires, is a material world—a world of objects outside himself with which he is confronted. Here lie the rudiments of the great formative concepts, the mental abstractions, which take the place of the mythical images and are, in a certain sense, formulae or patterns of gods, i.e., idols: anthropomorphism, dualism, rationalism, finalism, utilitarianism, materialism—in other words, *the rational components of the perspectival world.*[23]

The fall into space leads to the creation of all these concepts, the basic structure of the world in which we live today. Thinking and being are placed on equal, but separate, ground.

From directionality comes not only creation of world and self, but also the rightness of directionality and judgment. To be directional is to be "right" to make sense (literally); it is the thing that should be done. This idea of the rightness of directionality again recalls the importance, indeed the centrality of directionality to the mental–rational perspectival world. Without directionality, there is no "should." Without "should," there is no mental rational perspectival world. Only in a world where humans can make their own future, as Gebser argues is another quality of the mental structure, can the concept of "should" arise and have meaning. Gebser argues that mental–rational humans set their sights on the future, partly negate the past, and become makers of their future. The duality of future and past gives the mental structure's approach to time. Duality is for Gebser an important quality of the mental. Duality, Gebser writes, is the "tearing apart of polarity, and, from the correspondences of polarity, duality abstracts and quantifies the oppositions or antitheses."[24] Duality is unstable because it is oppositional, rather than complementary, as is polarity.

The duality of human and world, as created by humans, is the product of increasing abstraction. "Abstraction is the identifying characteristic of the mental structure. It corresponds to the relation of this structure to man, inasmuch as everything is in relationship to human measuring thought. . ."[25] Measurement (rationalization) provides the mental with its abstract world. It creates the world according to the quantified, artificial, scalar abstractions imagined in the newly emergent individual ego. This quantification leads to a crucial aspect of mental–rational humans for Gebser: Atomization. The presence

---

[23]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin*, 77.

[24]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 86.

[25]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 87.

of individuality within mass collectivity, is a key characteristic of the mental and also, for Gebser, one of its most significant consequences. Quantification leads to atomization and to chaos, as Gebser writes:

Apart from the fact that an isolating perspectivization leads to sectorization (whereby the phenomena, be they real in a mental or material sense, are not only divided and made measurable, but also quantified by a progressive subdividing and subsectoring), both abstraction and quantification ultimately lead to emptiness, indeed to chaos.[26]

This atomization and sectorization is, for Gebser a sad result of the mental structure. Eventually, Gebser argues that atomization is one of the worst things that the mental structure has brought us:

> These consequences of the perspectivization of the world evident in the isolation and mass–phenomena of our day are patently characteristic of our time. Isolation is visible everywhere: isolation of individuals, of entire nations and continents; isolation in the physical realm in the form of tuberculosis, in the political in the form of ideological or monopolistic dictatorship, in every–day life in the form of immoderate, Abusy≅ activity devoid of any sense–direction or relationship to the world as a whole; isolation in thinking in the form of the deceptive dazzle of premature judgments or hypertrophied abstraction devoid of any connection to the world. And it is the same with mass–phenomena: overproduction, inflation, the proliferation of political parties, rampant technology, atomization in all forms.[27]

Important to note in this passage is that atomization is disconnection to, while remaining within, world. Abstraction and atomization lead to numbing alienation that further separates human from world. Thus the world created by humans' abstraction fuels their separation from it. The mental–rational structure divorces the world–maker from made world.

Atomization of the Individual: Inner Space

It is this rampant technology, busy–ness, and numbing isolation that may be found in the modern city, particularly New York City. As a sectored, created place, this city is a clear example of the perspectival mental–rational emphasis on measurement and space. Space becomes the key issue for this world–renowned expression of high modernity. The mental–rational finds expression in this machine of people and structures, with existence and travel stacked and dispersed above, below, and in all directions. Here we find humans living in a world they have created through measurement (rationalization). World has been opposed, recreated, and re–opposed by humans, as the place they have created becomes yet more space, more world, to overcome.

Sensory sectorization and atomization of the individual

The modern city presents not a feast for the senses, but rather an assault on them. Experience in the city is over–filled by input of every kind. One is likely to encounter visual input in the form of not just the general visual field of experience, but also in the form of

---

[26]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 88.

[27]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 95.

advertising in every conceivable way. Billboards of huge size on buildings and on buses, electronic visual input in the form of huge video screens as well as huge neon signs, in addition to graffiti, street signs, streetlights, the presence of innumerable automobiles, the presence of innumerable people, storefronts, trash, workers, street performers, and street vendors are all likely parts of the visual field of someone walking down a street. All of these visual phenomena have corresponding aural inputs as well. Combined with smell and other physical sensation, one is overwhelmed trying to take it all in. Focused attention becomes necessary in order to function. One must selectively attend to specific sectors of experience in order to avoid becoming overloaded. Accordingly, one experiences a numbing of the other sectors of experience not being attended to.

Magical egolessness in the experience of the city

Perception of these areas does not occur in a conscious manner. As a part of the city and as someone who exists apart from the city, the city–dweller sacrifices some consciousness to the overall machine world that is the city. This egolessness is clear evidence of the presence of the magic structure of consciousness active in the city. Gebser comments on egolessness:

> All magic, even today occurs in the natural–vital egoless, spaceless and timeless sphere. This requires—as far as present–day man is concerned—a sacrifice of consciousness; it occurs in the state of trance, or when the consciousness dissolves as a result of mass reactions, slogans, or "isms." If we are not aware of this sphere in ourselves, it remains an entry for all kinds of magic influences. It does not matter whether such magic influences emanate knowingly from people or unknowingly from things which, in this sphere, have a vital magic knowledge of their own, or are linked with such vital knowledge.[28]

Gebser also notes that the magic structure links our vital psychic energy to people or concepts. Evidence for this linking may be found in the identification of New Yorkers with the city. Pride in the city marks the merging of the individual with the city. New Yorkers are proud of their city, life, and culture. This identification points up the merging with nature that also demonstrates the presence of the magic structure. Gebser argues that the "merging" with nature (world) points out the emerging of distinct consciousness. A merger is only possible between two separate phenomena. Thus humans begin to be able to conceptualize themselves as separate from nature, yet are linked (merged) with nature. This merging leads to a contradiction, as Gebser points out, between the points and the unity. This contradiction may be plainly seen in the phenomenon of being alone in a crowd.

This numbing sectorization of attention can be a major part of achieving the important, yet seemingly paradoxical experience of being alone in a crowd. Such an experiential quality seems necessary in an environment in which one is never far from other human beings, as is the case in New York. Psychological distance plays a key role in creating privacy in restaurants, trains, subways, on the street, and even in living quarters. A city dweller may not notice a conversation occurring even a few feet away. The advice given to a newcomer to a city against making eye contact is an introduction to not only safety, but to the culture of atomized, psychological space. This is sectorization on the interpersonal level. A person is

---

[28]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 49.

forced to sectorize himself or herself to create private space as well as to cope with the sensory assault that is the modern city.

This sectorization is accompanied by a perceived need to remain a part of the crowd and also the rarity of being away from the crowd. Sectorization and atomization are marked by disconnectedness within collectivity. This is very much the case in the city. Another common piece of advice given to the newcomer is that he or she should always be "where there are people." One is advised, for example, that if he or she finds himself or herself alone in a subway car he or she should move to an occupied, preferably full, car. This advice is based on the assumption that one is less likely to be a victim of a crime if witnesses are around. Thus a need to be surrounded by people arises, even while the presence of so many demands psychological space and demands atomization.

Sectorization also occurs in the communicative experience of the city dweller. The use of electronic paging devices and cellular phones in cities is in some cases nearly essential. Working far away from home necessitates different communication strategies. This sectorization of communication also shares the paradoxical quality of individualization coupled with collectivity. While city dwellers make extensive use of the atomizing communicative devices of pagers and cell phones, they rely on television, a medium that both atomizes and collectivizes for news and entertainment. In this we find evidence of the magic structure of consciousness in that consciousness is to some extent, "in the world" as Gebser says. It is scattered over the city as different media of communication of information.

Atomization of the individual has roots in the magical in structure. New Yorkers identify with the city and move as part of it. Yet there are distinct needs to be alone, even, and especially, among the crowd. This demonstrates the evidence of both the mental and magic structures of consciousness. Rooted in the magical and manifested in the mental, atomization and sectorization affect people on the individual level.

Sectorization of the City: Outer Space

New York City is a grid. It is a grid of streets that form a grid of areas or spaces defined by names known the world over. Brooklyn, the East Village, Harlem, Upper West Side, the Bronx, and SoHo are just a few of these "places" that exist as demarcated spaces within the overall space of the city. Even Central Park, the primary green space for the city, where one may find "nature," is a rectangle of eight hundred forty three acres. Below the grid lies the "sub–way," a space system below the city that aids those traveling around the city. Above the grid are buildings, and on the tops of the buildings, one finds rooftop terraces, small green spaces literally stacked atop the city. This grid extends for miles and one's daily travels may take her to many points on the grid. In this section some aspects of the city as measured space are discussed.

Working in different places in the city creates a need to stay in a part of the city that is perhaps far from home for most of the day. One might live in Brooklyn but work in Manhattan. Both places are part of the same "city" but where one lives or works within each of those places may be quite far apart. This means that the forty–minute subway ride becomes both bridge to work and barrier to return, often preventing one from returning home until ready to stay home for the night.

Still, the "sub–ways," ways or roads that are at another measured height, below the main interaction–plane that is the street and the higher stacked levels of activity of the buildings, provide a rapid method for moving from place to place within the city. They are often the cheapest and fastest mode of transportation. The richness of availability—the hyper–availability of goods, services, and people in the city—means that subways take people from possibility to possibility or from choice to choice.

As a grid, each choice–possibility lies at a designated co–ordinate on the grid. Addresses tell you at what point a "place" lies on the grid. In addition, all other space in the city is defined according to the grid. "Skyscrapers" or "high–rises" are named by such a relation. Subways are below the grid: "sub" "ways" take you along a "way" that is "below." Here we see evidence of the polarity of the mythical structure of consciousness. Though Gebser notes that mythical humans had not yet fully conceptualized space,[29] Kramer[30] interprets the mythical as including the polarity of high and low. High and low elevations have an interrelationship in the city. Space above on the street is overcome by using space below in the subway. These spaces are related, but different. Each defines that other and is also part of the space that is the city. To know the grid above and the sub–grid below is to overcome the space above. Even the created place of the city (itself a rational use of space) is further rationalized. Perspectival mental–rationality, along with the magical separation of human and nature has created a need for further rational measurement and overcoming of space. This complex relationship between nature and human recreates and continually evidences the blurry line between "nature" and the human that is supposedly overcoming it. This blurring and the artificiality of the duality has also been discussed by Latour[31] who argues that nature and culture are interrelated and part of the same human expression. Human creation becomes the "nature" to be overcome. In overcoming nature, the mental has extended ?nature≅ that must be overcome. Rational space begets rational space. In overcoming space, the mental creates another "harsh environment" a "concrete jungle" to be overcome or coped with. The grids of the street and the subway, measurements of space and creation of "places" are now nature. The mental–rational requires that now one must use rationality to overcome even the nature it has created. One must think and plan about how to navigate the city. Finding the best route, one that will be fast and safe, requires thought.

This overcoming of space is part of the overcoming of time. City dwellers need to overcome space in order to overcome time. Moving about the city rapidly is valuable only because of the measurement of time. Clock–time sets the "time" for "events" whether they are work events or entertainment events. Choice–possibility runs according to the clock. Of course, even this becomes complicated by double possibility. More choice–possibility means that "overcoming" or failing to arrive "on time" is not disastrous because there are choice–possibilities at all times. Since the city "never sleeps" and the density of culture, commerce, and people is so great, one may find other choice–possibilities easily.

---

[29]Gebser, The Ever–Present Origin 67.

[30]Eric Kramer, *Consciousness and Culture : An Introduction to the Thought of Jean Gebser,* Eric Kramer, ed. (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1992).

[31]Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993.

This overcoming of both space and time, this need for measurement, is rooted in the magic structure, and in its manifestation in the city we find evidence of the magic structure. Gebser argues that the separation of humans and nature, the dawning consciousness of each as distinct but related, leads humans to "stand up to" the world, to begin to conquer and control it. The constant need to be against "something"[32] has motivated the creation of the concrete jungle in a very real sense. The release from nature that is behind all power drives, as Gebser writes, has, along with its mental–rational companion, created more nature to be opposed. Gebser writes and Mickunas[33] develops the idea that even machines and technology have their roots in the magic structure, and in the creation of a new nature we can see these roots clearly.

Implications of Atomization/Sectorization

Gebser argues that there are several important consequences for emphasis on rationality and atomization. Drawing on the passage cited earlier in this essay,[34] as well as the surrounding text, we find several qualities of atomization that present a danger for humanity. First, Gebser argues that atomization leads to ideological or monopolistic dictatorship. Atomization results in vulnerability to such dangers because it deters disagreement. Gebser writes that:

> Only the very few summon the courage to speak their own mind and not the rationally circumscribed and mass–produced attitude or viewpoint, against philosophical authorities or popular opinion. It is easy to speak one's own mind only after the particular opinion has become common currency; beforehand it is a distinctly thankless undertaking, unless of course what must be said is plainly visible to the open mind and can be hinted at or suggested. Regrettably, open minds have seemingly become rare in our age of perspectivistic tunnel vision.[35]

Atomized and suffering from tunnel–vision, the individual loses connection to the world as a whole and is discouraged from speaking his or her own mind. The link between chilling speech and chilling ideas is an intuitive one. Thus the implication of discouraging speech seems clear: Blocking relation to the world as a whole through atomization disconnects one from the world. It renders his or her life as one full of busy activity that is, as Gebser says, disconnected from the world. Thus, for Gebser atomization has the disadvantage of affecting our critical abilities.

Presumably, this harm to our critical abilities will have the effect of allowing us to fall under the influence of the mass–produced opinions Gebser writes about, and also probably has effects in terms of numbing us to our created world. This puts us in danger of being controlled by the nature we have created. The sectorized concrete world of the city numbs the city dweller to humanity. The machine technologizes the individual. Life in the city holds the possibility of crushing the vitality of humanity by atomizing individuals. Gebser

---

[32]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 51.

[33] See note 3.

[34]Gebser, *The Ever–Present Origin* 95

[35]Gebser, *The Ever Present Origin* 95–96.

writes that rationalism inherently divides. Division may prevent critical reflection and action.

In the cities, the result of this technologizing is plain to see. In New York, the city is sectored by heritage, by race, and by economic status. Sectorization, the creation of difference based on space isolates individuals and groups of individuals. Perhaps this isolation leads, through the kind of reduction in critical ability described by Gebser, to a perpetuation of social problems such as racism and inner–city violence. This guess is offered tentatively here as an avenue for possible research. Such a project would seek to discover the relationship between sectorization and perception of social issues. Clearly, perspectival rationalization has divided people in the modern city. This essay has explored that division in Gebserian terms explicating some potential underlying structures of that division. Perhaps this examination of New York, a model city emulated around the world, from a Gebserian perspective can contribute to a more extensive understanding of sectorization and atomization in cities in general and to an understanding of the mental structure as it has measured out life for the many who live in cities.