**GLOBAL MIND CHANGE**

***Whole Brain Harmony***

***and***

***The Re-Enchantment of The World***

I’d like to begin with four observations:

*1*: More people died in wars in the 20th century than in any other

century in recorded history.

*2*: Ecologically, we are committing collective, planetary suicide.

*3*: Due to a catastrophic failure in political leadership, nuclear war in

the 21st century is now almost certain, guaranteed, inevitable.

 *4*:America has the largest empire in world history; yet most American citizens don’t even know there *is* such a thing as the American empire, *even though they’re paying for it*. This is mind-control on a massive scale; Plato’s cave in fact; an ethical formula for the *undoing* of democracy.

*The question is*: Is this progress?

 Is it not clear that something has gone terribly, terribly wrong?

*And the next question is:* Is there any hope? And if so, what can we hope for?

And now for some opening quotes:

Reporter: “Mr. Gandhi, what do you think of Western civilization?”

*Gandhi*: “I think it would be a good idea.”

*Karl Kraus*: “How do wars start?

 Politicians lie to journalists, then believe what they read.”

*Nagarjuna*: “Do not build 50 palaces, your highness;

 after all, you can only be in one room at a time.”

*Mike Marqusee*: “The battles of the ‘60s may someday come to seem merely an

early skirmish in a conflict whose dimensions we have yet to grasp.”

*Jean-Paul Sartre*: “A writer has a place in his age.

Each word has an echo, as does each silence.”

*Michael Parenti*:

“It is better to swim *against* the current, than to be swept *over* the cliff.”

“Most institutions of higher learning in America

 owe more to Sparta than to Athens.”

“Third world nations are not under-developed. They’re over-exploited.”

“Most third world nations are rich; only their people are poor.”

*Walter Anderson*:

“Everyday I-centered [ego-consciousness] is only one way of

 organizing cognition. … Other ways are available to us at all times.”

Ego-consciousness “may be … adequately adjusted to society, but it is [normally] out of touch with the universe, [and, indeed, with] the larger dimensions of our [own] being.”

 “Language is a tool that uses us as much as we use it.”

*Carl Sagan*:

“There is no reason to think that the evolutionary process has stopped.

 [Humans, as presently understood, are] transitional animal[s] …

 not the climax of creation.”

*Schindlerian maxims*:

1. The primary function of American education is: to ignorate.
2. Individual innocence is no protection against collective responsibility.
3. The truth will set you free; but first it will break your heart.
4. You can’t be a peacemaker if you’re walking in around in a rage all the time.

*Nietzsche*, quoting Pindar: “Become who you are.”

*Walt Whitman*: “I contain multitudes.”

*David Hume*: “The identity which we ascribe to [ourselves] is a fiction.”

*Noam Chomsky*: “The problem is not that people don’t know; it’s that they

 don’t know they don’t know.”

*Howard Zinn*: “The truth is so often the opposite of what we are told

 that we can no longer turn our heads around

 far enough to see it.”

*Plato*: The prisoners are chained by the neck, and cannot turn their heads around to see the puppeteers who cast the shadows

on the wall, and whose voices echo in the cave.

*Erich Fromm*: “Chains of illusion.”

*Mike Marqusee*: “The ‘mind-forged manacles’ that Blake heard clanging

 as he walked the streets of London in 1792.”

*Mark Twain*: “The truth barely has its boots on

 before the lie is half-way around the world.”

*Dostoyevsky*: “It was not you who ate the idea,

 but the idea that ate you.”

*Karl Marx:* “The demand to abandon illusions about our condition

 is a demand to abandon the conditions which require illusion.”

*Immanuel Kant*: “Enlightenment is humanity’s liberation from

 self-imposed immaturity.”

*William Blake:* “All men partake of [paranormal] abilities –

 but [these abilities] are lost by not being cultivated.”

*Nitin Trasi*:

“The day is not far off when … Enlightenment and Liberation may be found included in the standard medical texts of psychology – and a Liberated or Enlightened person is seen not as a freak of Nature, but as the most normal, sane, uncomplicated human being that there can be.”

*Meister Eckhart*: “If I spend enough time with this caterpillar,

 I’ll never have to write another sermon.”

*Chuang Tzu:* “Am I a butterfly dreaming I’m a man?”

*Chief Seattle*” “What we do to the earth, we do to ourselves.”

*Emerson*: “I am God in nature. I am a weed by the wall.”

*John Lennon*: “I am the walrus.”

*Buddha*: “In each atom of … the universe, there exist

 vast oceans of world systems.”

*Alan Watts*: “Nothingness is uncommonly frisky.”

*Julian Jaynes*: “It is as if life evolved to a certain point,

 and then in ourselves turned at a right angle

 and simply exploded in a different direction.”

*F. M. Cornford*: “Oh wise and gentle humanist, … in a world that sometimes

seems to have forgotten more than it has learnt since Athens fell, the spirit of Socrates can live again.”

*Richard Rorty*: “I don’t know whether democracy can survive [the corporate-military-political] gangsterism that now controls America. …

The return of the Republicans to the White House [in 2001 was] a true disaster, for

the U.S. and the world. … The religious right … is a … dangerous, potentially

fascist movement. … There is a crisis coming.”

In a provisional and introductory way, this lecture attempts to make sense out of the times in which we live. It takes a broad view, engaging in a philosophy of history. Conclusion? We are living in what I call “The Renaissance of The Renaissance.” An opportunity to rediscover the spirit of The Renaissance, tempered by the lessons we, collectively, still need to learn. These lessons – frugality, compassion, psychic exploration, interbeing – are crucial to the contemporary paradigm shift; to what Willis Harman calls our necessary “Global Mind Change.”

 My launching point is Princeton psychologist Julian Jaynes’ 1976 *magnum opus*: *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*.

My thesis is: *Ego’s emergence was necessary;*

*but ego’s destiny is to transcend itself.*

 My argument is: Human evolution is best understood in terms of three essential epochs: *prepersonal, personal, and transpersonal*. We are on the cusp of the third.

George Orwell, Aldous Huxley and H. G. Wells were prophetic: History is now a race between education and catastrophe.

To respond successfully to the challenge of our time, we need a paradigm shift that includes commitment to the enlightenment adventure. This entails a reawakening of bicameral abilities, lost in the West around the time of the later prophets and Socrates.

“Bicameral” signifies here the two sides of the brain. “Bicameral mind” signifies their interaction in humanity’s long history of preconscious, prepersonal civilizations.

In *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*, Julian Jaynes offers a novel interpretation of split-brain theory. He asserts that what we call consciousness emerged from the breakdown of pre-subjective, bicameral mentality.

This breakdown of pre-subjective human experience was a process which lasted centuries, from about 2200 to 800 BC, consciousness emerging clearly at last in, for example, the birth of Western philosophy in the sixth century BC.

The breakdown-breakthrough event is manifest in the difference between the voice-hearing, god-speaking early Hebrew prophets and the poetizing, angst-haunted later prophets.

It is manifest in the difference between *mythologizing Hesiod* and *philosophizing Thales*.

It is also present in the evolution from *Iliad* to *Odyssey*, where the petulant, explosive Achilles gives way to a new kind of hero: the sly, strategic Odysseus.

Jaynes tracks the trajectory of the breakdown-breakthrough process. But what exactly is bicameral mind? What is human experience before the emergence of the self-conscious moral agent?

According to Jaynes, humans – from about 9000 to 1000 B.C. – were essentially automata, responding to neurologically generated voices. These voices are heard in the bicameral mind-space.

Bicameral experience is rooted in the auditory. One part of the brain speaks; the other part of the brain hears, obeys, behaves. There is no sense of self, no self-conscious subject in the bicameral cosmos of ancient civilizations. There are, however, degrees of collective awareness; what Rupert Sheldrake calls pre-subjective fields of “morphic resonance.”

In the artifacts and myths of ancient cultures, hearing has primacy over seeing – as befits bicameral experience. Then a change occurs. The voices retreat.

To survive the ensuing silence, the ego-subject must emerge: must see the world in a new way; must extend and spatialize time in order to plan and remember.

This new being is now more than ever a becoming; a self-conscious agent who must survey, evaluate, decide, act – with all the anguish that comes with freedom, choice and responsibility.

The breakdown of bicameral mind signifies the increasing absence of voice-directed behavior and the consequent emergence of subjectivity as a new mode of human being-in-the-world. Auditory-based bicamerality gives way to a spatialization of time and a correspondingly visual and newly narratizing mind-space.

This new mode of experience is reflected in language most especially, where seeing now assumes primacy over hearing, and new words appear: words for mind and self; words for knowing and understanding. Even today we express sudden realization with the words, “Now I see.” In bicameral civilizations, seeing was secondary, and there simply was no “I”.

Jaynes attempts a neurological account of bicameral experience.

He then shows the breakdown of that experiential paradigm, and the consequent emergence of consciousness: not as a biological event, but *as* the *socio-linguistic* *construction* of a unified mind-space.

This unified, temporalizing mind-space, this radically *new* sense of personal identity, is based on a new capacity for metaphor, symbolism, and interior story-telling.

In short: memory and imagination.

Jaynes’ argument for the origin of self-awareness – for the emergence of a narratizing, visual, angst-haunted, ethical, explosively *creative* subjectivity – parallels Ernst Cassirer’s *philosophy of symbolic forms*, where the axial-age transition from mythic space-time to philosophy and science signified a quantum leap in consciousness and culture.

The neuro-anatomical articulation of bicameral mind is one thing; the emergence of consciousness is quite another. *Resisting* a neuro-anatomical *reductionism* of *subjectivity*, Jaynes is inclined to agree with Kierkegaard:

“*You’ll never find consciousness at the other end of a microscope*.”

Let us be clear. The Jaynesean hypothesis exhibits a *postmodern* sensibility. For Jaynes, subjectivity is a *cultural* and *linguistic* construction. It is not innate. It does not emerge from biological evolution. Consciousness is a socio-linguistically constructed sense of personal identity, based on new and necessary capacities for: metaphor, symbolism, introspection, narration, freedom, choice and deception. That is to say, yet again: memory and imagination.

Jaynes invites us to picture his hypothesis.

He says:

 *Early civilizations had a profoundly different mentality than our own. …*

*Men and women were not conscious as we are, were not responsible for their actions, and therefore cannot be given credit or blame for anything that was done over these vast millennia; … instead each person had a part of his nervous system which was divine, by which he was ordered about like any slave, a voice or voices which indeed were what we call volition, and empowered what they commanded and were related to the hallucinated voices of others in a carefully established hierarchy.*

*It would be an error … to regard the bicameral mind as a static thing. True, it developed from the ninth millennium B.C. to the second millennium B.C. with the slowness that makes any single century seem as static as its ziggurats and temples.*

*Millennia are its units of time. But the tempo of development at least in the Near East picks up as we reach the second millennium B.C.*

*The gods of Akkad, like the ka’s of Egypt, have multiplied in complexity. And as this complexity develops there is the first unsureness, the first need for personal gods to intercede with the higher gods, who seem to be receding into the heavens where in one brief millennium they will have disappeared.*

*The gods were in no sense ‘figments of the imagination’ of anyone. They were man’s volition. They occupied his nervous system, probably [the] right hemisphere [of the brain].*

*Writing could allow a civil structure such as that of Hammurabi to remain stable. But … [writing] was gradually eroding the auditory authority of the bicameral mind.*

(*The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*;

Houghton Mifflin; 1976; p. 201-208)

 To illustrate the Jaynesean hypothesis, let us glance at the difference between *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*.

Jaynes invites us to appreciate Homer’s contrast between the perpetually bicameral Achilles and the agonistic Odysseus on his long journey to subjectivity. Jaynes interprets *The Odyssey* as a pilgrim’s progress to consciousness. He writes:

*After The Iliad, The Odyssey … a gigantic vault in mentality …. Odysseus of the many devises is the hero of a new mentality of how to get along in a ruined and god-weakened world. … The contrast with The Iliad is astonishing. …*

*In word and deed and character, The Odyssey describes a new and different world inhabited by new and different beings.*

*The Odyssey shows an increased spatialization of time in its use of time words, such as begin, hesitate, quickly, endure, etc., and the more frequent references to the future. … Both the frequency and manner with which Odysseus refers to himself is on a different level altogether from instances of self-reference in The Iliad.*

*[The] series of stories [in* The Odyssey*] sweeps from its lost hero sobbing on an alien shore in bicameral thrall to his beautiful goddess Calypso, to his defiant war hoops in a rival-touted home, from trance through disguise to recognition, from sea to land, east to west, defeat to prerogative, the whole long song is an odyssey toward subjective identity and its triumphant acknowledgment out of the hallucinatory enslavements of the past.*

*From a will-less gigolo of divinity to the gore-spattered lion on his own hearth, Odysseus has become ‘Odysseus.’ (273-277)*

 To illustrate further, we observe that the Achilles/Odysseus distinction is comparable to that between Amos and Ecclesiastes.

Amos is an 8th century BC, mostly bicameral, early Hebrew prophet, giving voice to a god who speaks. It is doubtful that Amos comprehends the words.

Ecclesiastes, a 2nd century BC, late Hebrew prophet, speaks his own words. He exhibits the inwardly alone, self-conscious subject emerging from bicameral breakdown.

Ecclesiastes’ sense of the tragic, his fullness of compassion, his experiential spatializing of time, his poetic and reflective pondering – all contrast dramatically with the voice-hearing bluster and immediacy of Amos.

Jaynes elaborates:

*Amos is an almost pure bicameral speech, heard by an illiterate desert herdsman, and dictated to a scribe.*

*In Ecclesiastes, in contrast, god is rarely mentioned, let alone ever speaking to its educated author. …*

*In Amos there are no words for mind or think or feel or understand or anything similar whatever; Amos never ponders anything in his heart; he can’t; he would not know what it meant. … His thought is done for him. He feels his bicameral voice about to speak and shushes those about him with a “Thus speaks the Lord!” and follows with an angry forceful speech which he probably does not understand himself.*

*Ecclesiastes is the opposite. … He ponders things …. Who but a very subjective man could say ‘Vanity of vanities, all is vanity,” (1:2), or say that he sees that wisdom exceeds folly (2:13). …*

*And the famous third chapter, “To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven …” is precisely the spatialization of time, its spreading out in mind-space, so characteristic of consciousness. … Amos is fiercely righteous, absolutely assured, nobly rude, speaking a blustering god-speech with the unconscious rhetoric of an Achilles or a Hammurabi.*

*Ecclesiastes would be an excellent fireside friend, mellow, kindly, concerned, hesitant, surveying all of life in a way that would have been impossible for Amos. (296)*

Let’s revisit a salient sentence. Jaynes asserts, “the famous third chapter, ‘To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven…’ is precisely the spatialization of time, its spreading out in mind-space, so characteristic of consciousness.”

Jaynes unwittingly touches here on a major theme in Heidegger’s *Being and Time*. For Heidegger, human reality – which he calls *Dasein*, “being-there” – is always a time-horizoning being-in-the-world; a thrown, projective, worlding becoming.

Heidegger’s view of temporality as key to Dasein’s worldhood – thrown toward futurity – foreshadows Jaynes’ insistence on the temporality of consciousness. Jayne’s refers to this narratizing “spatialization of time” as a spreading out in mind-space, making room for memory and imagination. The ego-cogito is constructed from this internal *self-distancing*, which Heidegger’s calls *ecstasis*, Sartre calls *self-transcendence*, and Kierkegaard calls the root of our *anxiety*.

The breakdown of the bicameral mind “throws” Dasein into what Heidegger calls *lichtung:* a “lighting/clearing,” a there-being, which is projective, death-bound, anguished, and Promethean; an existential dance of teleology and nostalgia.

Although Jaynes was apparently unfamiliar with Heidegger’s *Being and Time*, he was quite familiar with Freudian depth psychology, and with the writings of William James and Henri Bergson.

He was influenced by William James’s notion of “the stream of consciousness” – combining both depth and flux. He was also influenced by Bergson’s notion of “durational time”; i.e., non-Newtonian flow.

In both William James and Henri Bergson, we see the implicit influence of Heraclitus, the first Western process philosopher. We also see anticipations of Alfred North Whitehead, the founder of *modern* process philosophy.

Julian Jaynes ranges across the millennia like a Renaissance scholar to illustrate and argue for his thesis.

He thus builds a foundation for the Schindlerian innovation: *transpersonal bicamerality*. By which I mean: *meta*personal rather than *pre*personal awareness.

Here we touch on the heart of the philosophy of history I wish to elaborate:

*Ego’s emergence was necessary; but ego’s destiny is to transcend itself.* The emergence of the personal from the prepersonal is preparation for the transpersonal.

Allow me to borrow from two of our most famous poets:

The time is out of joint; but the times, they are a changin’.

*The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* is one of the most provocative works of scholarship to have appeared in the Western world since Freud’s *The Interpretation of Dreams* in 1900*.*

Jaynes defines religion as nostalgia, offers a corresponding hermeneutic of the Fall, reinterprets Jesus, and comments on the neo-bicameral endurance of Greek oracles. He also defines consciousness linguistically, and language as an organ of perception. He writes:

*Nostalgic anguish for … lost bicamerality … this is what religion is. ...*

 *A further observation could be made upon the story of the Fall and how it is possible to look upon it as a myth of the breakdown of the bicameral mind. … The ability to deceive .. is one of the hallmarks of consciousness. (297, 299)*

*The attempted reformation of Judaism by Jesus can be construed as a necessarily new religion for conscious men rather than bicameral men.*

*Behavior now must be changed from within the new consciousness rather than from Mosaic laws carving behavior from without. … The divine kingdom to be regained is psychological not physical. It is metaphorical not literal. It is ‘within’ not in extensor. (318)*

*Greek oracles were the central method of making important decisions for over a thousand years after the breakdown of the bicameral mind. This fact is usually obscured by the strident rationalism of modern historians. Oracles were subjectivity’s umbilical cord reaching back into the sustaining unsubjective past. (321)*

*Preceding consciousness there was a different mentality based on verbal hallucinations. … The concept of the bicameral mind … sets an astonishingly recent date for the introduction into the world of [the remarkably private] covert [mind-space] we call consciousness.*

*The date is slightly different in different parts of the world, but in the Middle East, where bicameral civilization began, the date [for the emergence of consciousness out of the breakdown of bicameral mind] is roughly 1000 B.C. (453)*

*The evidence for all this [bicameral and neo-bicameral experience] would be much more obvious today had not Constantine in the fourth century, even like King Josiah in Israel one millennium earlier, sent his armies of Christian converts out with sledge hammers through the once bicameral world to smash all its physical vestiges in sight. (336)*

*Consciousness is based on language. (447)*

*Language is an organ of perception, not simply a means of communication. (50)*

*The two hemispheres of the brain are not the bicameral mind but its present neurological model. (456)*

Jaynes argues that the emergence and development of writing signifies, and is therefore roughly contemporaneous with, the emergence of the self-conscious subject out of the wreckage of bicameral cultures, giving birth in time to our visually obsessed, memo-writing modernity.

The emergence of subjectivity is a long, developmental process. It is also *agonistic*: thwarted and oppressed by social institutions.

For example: The Church closed Plato’s Academy and Aristotle’s Lyceum – the first two Western universities – in 529. This was followed by a thousand years of terror, tyranny and superstition, climaxing in a centuries-long Inquisition. Giordano Bruno was burned at the stake in 1600, simply for postulating a multiverse. Galileo was threatened with torture in 1633 if he refused to repudiate his Copernican-inspired scientific discoveries about inertia and the moon.

This monotheistically engendered, anti-philosophical dogmatism and terror is also mirrored in the third Abrahamic tradition. The Muslim invasion of India, about 1000 C.E., resulted in the burning of the great Buddhist University of Nalanda. Nalanda’s monastic-temple-pedagogical campus was a thousand times the size of Plato’s Academy. It was perhaps the greatest garden of wisdom the world has ever seen.

Its burning to the ground was the work of Mohammed Al Ghuari.

Al Ghuari’s sweep across India in 1192 also destroyed other Buddhist communities, which, like Nalanda, included a monastery, library and debating centers. By the end of the 12th century, Buddhism had all but disappeared from the land of its birth. Al Ghuari’s destruction of the University of Nalanda mirrors the Christian burning of the great library at Alexandria.

History, however, is not without a sense of irony. The Muslims are inspired to build their own gardens of wisdom – their own philosophic and scientific institutions, adorned with fountains, flowers, poets, calligraphers and alchemists; the accumulated learning of which is discovered by the West in the Christian re-conquest of Spain, the capture of Toledo’s libraries in 1089 sparking the emergence of Western culture from its long dark night of the soul.

Plato and Aristotle come alive again in the Western imagination. Socratic dialogue, scientific exploration, artistic creativity re-blossom in The Renaissance, progressing through The Enlightenment toward the modern triumph of the self-consciously free individual.

But even this modern “triumph” is ironic, being at best a tender and provisional achievement, barely present in large parts of the world, and still opposed by potent forces in even the freest societies.

This is why Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, echoing the Stoics and Rousseau, were so insistent on calling our attention to “herd mentality.” They were prophets of today’s post-modern Matrix.

Today, bicameral mentality is largely the rule. America is a high-tech version of Plato’s cave. Citizens are *socialized into ignorance*. Their consent is manufactured by the artful deployment of WMDs: Weapons of Mass Dysfunction. The puppeteers are experts at deception, distortion and distraction.

This is why I invented the verb “*to ignorate”...*

why William Blake refers to our “*mind-forged manacles*”…

why Erich Fromm coined the phrase “*chains of illusion*”…

why Herbert Marcuse critiques Western culture as “*one-dimensional*”…

why Kant refers to our “*self-imposed immaturity*” …

why Parenti says our schools “*owe more to Sparta than to Athens*” …

why Chomsky says *we don’t even know that we don’t know* …

why Frank Baum wrote *The Wizard of Oz* … and

why Gore Vidal has given us a new name: “*The United States of Amnesia*.”

None of this would surprise Julian Jaynes. The emergence of consciousness is not the same as the emergence of a *fully developed* consciousness.

Marcel Kuijsten notes: “Jaynes maintained that we are still deep in the midst of [the] transition from bicamerality to consciousness …. Vestiges of the bicameral mind – our longing for … guidance and external control – make us susceptible to charismatic leaders … and persuasive rhetoric that relies on slogans to bypass logic.” (*Reflections on the Dawn of Consciousness*; p. 132)

For example, think of the slogan, “United We Stand,” effectively used after 9/11 to launch another Vietnam War, this time in the Middle East, while Wall Street bankers prepared to perpetrate the worst stock market crash since 1929.

I ask you: Who was standing with whom? Why are *we* still paying, while the war-makers and the bankers are walking around free, and astronomically rich, instead of rotting in prison where they belong?

A government no longer *by* the people

is no longer a government *for* the people.

Martin Luther King risked his life to inform us of *this fact*: wealth, poverty, racism and war – these four *always* go together; and we cannot solve one without solving the others.

Robert Thurman – America’s own, homegrown *bodhisattva* – articulates a simple fact: “We are led by lunatics.” Perhaps Michael Parenti says it best:

“*The rich are never satisfied. They want it all. If you know that, and nothing else, you still know more than all those people who know everything else, but not that*.”

A functioning democracy cannot be sustained if its citizens are sleepwalking through history. It is time to wake up. Parenti shows the way out of Plato’s cave:

*“Not only must we love social justice more than personal gain, we also must realize that our greatest personal gain comes in the struggle for social justice. …*

*We are most in touch with our own individual humanity when we stand close to all of humanity.”*

We are, I suggest, in the midst of a radical civilizational transformation; a global metamorphosis which offers opportunities for recovering what I like to call: *Greco-Buddhist wisdom*.

The problem is: Humans went from one extreme to the other. From selfless automata to isolated moral agents alienated from their own interbeing. In a sense: from bicameral bumpkins to egomaniacs.

Socrates and Buddha illustrate the exception: a Golden Mean, a balance, a Middle Way. Socrates and Buddha were fully conscious moral agents who were also voice-hearers, synthesizing moral agency and bicameral ability. They were whole-brain functioning.

The Renaissance offered the West a chance to regain its balance. Alas, the time remained out of joint. Today we have another opportunity. The spirit of The Renaissance rises anew. We can see it in The Transpersonal Paradigm Shift in philosophy, psychology, physics, biology, ecology and spirituality.

In its broadest terms, the philosophy of history I want to sketch is dialectical:

Thesis: prepersonal = bicameral.

Antithesis: personal = ego subject.

Synthesis: transpersonal = holistic neo-bicameral.

Bicameral mind – thesis – broke down, giving birth to three millennia of developing subjectivism – antithesis – climaxing in Descartes’ *cogito* and Newtonian, atomistic psychology. Progress was accomplished. Subjectivity was achieved.

However, sanity was lost in ego’s Faustian bargain with calculation, accumulation, and the power of technology. We need to recover that sanity now; a balance, a *synthesis*, of subjective centering and neo-bicameral adventure.

Max Weber was right. The disenchantment of the world leads to nightmare.

The transpersonal *re-enchantment of the world* offers hope that history now opens into possibilities for peace, rooted in a worldview of interbeing.

Alas, war prevails; the battle for the soul of humanity is writ large in the news.

History repeats itself. The Renaissance was opposed with brutal force. The Renaissance of The Renaissance is likewise opposed. With the exception of the Buddhist emperor Ashoka in 3rd century B.C. India, when in history did those with power ever gently give it up for the common good?

Though the times increasingly try men’s souls, this trial is another breakdown-breakthrough event; an opportunity, as Chogyam Trungpa would say, “to recover the sanity we were born with,” fusing personal authenticity with global awareness.

Julian Jaynes, the late Princeton psychologist, argues, in *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*, for the second millennium B.C. *as* human history’s major pivot point since coming down from the trees.

He contends that the breakdown-breakthrough event – the emergence of consciousness – occurred over the course of a thousand years, roughly contemporaneous with the Indo-European invasions from about 2200 to 800 BC.

The death of Socrates in 399 exhibits the last Western public breath of dialectical life, the last gasp of subjective responsibility balanced by multimodal ability.

In Plato’s *Phaedrus*, Socrates says, ‘I thought I heard a voice. My divine sign comes to me. You see, I am a seer.’ The father of Western rationality is also a mystic. His bicameral windows are still open, and the voices still speak.

Those voices are more than just neurological events. Also, they speak less frequently; and they suggest rather than command. This is psychosynthesis; whole-brain balance; a multimodal Middle May.

Socrates, like Buddha, embodied what Jean Huston calls “the possible human.” The recovery of that possibility is now our brightest beacon of hope. It calls for an educational revolution.

My argument is inspired by Nietzsche’s critique of The Enlightenment. He shows how theology was forced to make room for a new god: science.

But science was just inverted metaphysics, the worship of another absolute, reason once again run amok, divorced from Dionysian interbeing.

Nietzsche shows how the promise of The Renaissance was strangled in the cradle.

The rebirth of that promise is history’s gift, assuming form now in various disciplines: quantum physics, process philosophy, field theory, biology, ecology, cognitive, noetic and transpersonal psychology, and Creation Spirituality.

Let us turn to what is perhaps the most intriguing moment in Jaynes’ remarkable text. He narrates his own startling flash of neo-bicameral experience. He writes:

*Living alone on Beacon Hill in Boston, I had for about a week been studying … some of the problems in this book, particularly the question of what knowledge is and how we can know anything at all. … One afternoon I lay down in intellectual despair on a couch.*

*Suddenly, out of an absolute quiet, there came a firm, distinct loud voice from my upper right which said, “Include the knower in the known!”*

*It lugged me to my feet absurdly exclaiming, “Hello?” looking for whoever was in the room. The voice had had an exact location. No one was there! (86)*

Jaynes’ neo-bicameral moment is one of many such stories which, I argue, exhibit the contemporary *reawakening* of bicameral mind.

Revealed is a holistic worldview which shatters the subjective/objective dualistic dream.

Einstein said, “Separation is optical delusion.” Hence the voice heard by Jaynes – “Include the knower in the known!” – echoing Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*.

The heart of the transpersonal paradigm is Buddha’s notion that reality is energetic, holographic, heart-mind interbeing.

This notion – this *Dharma-teaching*, or *Buddhist* *Logos –* offers a parallel to progress in Western physics, from Isaac Newton through Albert Einstein to David Bohm.

Utilizing Thomas Kuhn’s idea, let us glance at the *paradigm shifts* from *matter* to *energy* to *information*.

If we put gravity and thermodynamics in creative limbo for a moment, we note that Newton, echoing Democritus, says *reality is matter*.

Einstein, developing relativity theory, then shows that *matter is energy*.

Bohm, extrapolating from quantum theory, then shows that *energy is information*.

The Bohmean paradigm shift opens into a tantalizing possibility:

Might “information” require “cognition”?

Alfred North Whitehead’s 1926 *Process and Reality* shows that this might, even must, be the case. Whitehead’s “process philosophy” is a philosophy of interbeing. He calls it a “philosophy of organism.” Here science, psychology and spirituality overlap.

Buddha lights the way 2500 years ago. Plato does the same in post-Socratic Athens, if we view Plato as he was: a mythologizing philosopher, engaged in *contingent metaphysics*.

In the symbolism of Plato’s Cave Parable, we see prisoners caught by what Erich Fromm calls “*chains of illusion*.” The prisoners in Plato’s cave are *enraptured* by their *enchantment* with shadows on the wall – *mistaking* shadows for reality.

This is an epistemological error; a mistake in perception and belief which conditions and frames their *Weltanschauung*, their worldview.

I introduce this notion of *Weltanschauung* in order to highlight the fundamental difference between East and West.

In Western theology, humans need to be redeemed; in Eastern spirituality, humans need to wake up.

The Church asserts a fall from grace.

Buddha says we are born in Original Bliss.

In this contrast between East and West, Socrates and Plato stand next to Buddha: The problem is not that we fall into sin, but that we fall into forgetfulness.

The best modern philosophic treatment of “forgetfulness” is found in Martin Heidegger’s 1927 *magnum opus*, *Being and Time*.

The free, now awake, pilgrim, the Socratic pioneer, returns to Plato’s cave to liberate his friends – to turn them around, show them the path, lead them to the light. Socrates now asks, and I hope you’ll indulge my Nietzschean paraphrase:

‘The prisoners – in their *ressentiment* and rage at this “free spirit” who dares disrupt their guessing games – would they not, if they could get their hands on him, kill him?’

‘Yes, indeed,’ says Glaucon, Socrates’ dialogue partner in the parable that opens Book 7 of Plato’s *Republic*.

The question then becomes: How to avoid this tragedy? How to persuade the prisoners to break their enchantment, fixation, habit-energies – and so be free to turn around? Free to engage in The Socratic Turn: the turn inward; finding truth in the psyche.

To discover this truth, says Buddha in *The Lotus Sutra*, one must stop *monkey-mind*; stop the incessant, internal chatter-habit.

Meditation – Indian *Dhyana*, Chinese *Ch’an*, Japanese *Zen* – is the most skillful means for achieving quiescence opening into enlightenment.

Stopping the internal dialogue is key to stopping the *whirl* of the world long enough to *remember* who and what we are.

For Socrates and Siddhartha, the turn inward makes possible a *second inner turning* that leads to epiphany: *Moksha, Mukti, Kensho, Satori, Nirvana*.

The turning around of *habit-consciousness* – *ethe* in Greek, *vashana* in Sanskrit – *and* the turning around of “the eye of the soul” – this *double* turn occurs in Plato’s *Republic* and Buddha’s *Lankavatara Sutra*. This is a *fruitful* parallel.

Consider: In *The Republic* and *The Lankavatara*, the turning around of the “eye-soul” (Plato) in the “deepest seat of consciousness” (Buddha) ignites the “recollection” – *anamnesis* – of what was always known: the bliss that we are.

Plato’s thesis – “Knowledge is recollection” – is quintessentially Buddhist: “We are already enlightened.” This is the paradox of The Path of Knowledge.

Now, having declared frequently and emphatically that truth is beyond language, Siddhartha Gautama consents to teach, turning the Dharma Wheel.

He unveils a cosmic pulsation, a Taoist dialectic mediating microcosm and macrocosm. Buddha’s Dharma-teaching foreshadows the synthesis of physics and metaphysics in Whitehead and Bohm. Gautama says in *The Lankavatara Sutra*:

*The memory of … discriminations, desires, attachments and deeds is stored in Universal Mind since beginningless time, and is still being accumulated where it conditions the appearance of personality and its environment and brings about constant change … from moment to moment.*

(Suzuki and Goddard; 37)

 The “Universal Mind” *stores* and *conditions*. Allowing for the limits of language, we might say Universal Mind *absorbs* all experiential moments in the cosmos, *processes* the information, then *conditions* the succeeding moments.

Absorb, process, condition – this triadic, rhythmic process is mirrored in Whitehead’s organic metaphysics.

In Whitehead’s cosmology, an organism – an “actual occasion,” the briefest flash of reality/experience – inherits, integrates, and influences. This is holographic pulsation at the microcosmic level. Our Newtonian experience of the world is built from quantum pulses, organized into societies of occasions.

At the macrocosmic, Whitehead argues for God-as-process; God with a “primordial nature” and “consequent nature” – preserving while influencing.

Likewise in David Bohm’s holographic physics, where reality is construed as an “enfolding” and “unfolding” holographic continuum.

In Bohm’s paradigm, the universe yinfully *enfolds* all moments into what Bohm calls the unified “implicate order,” which yangfuflly *unfolds* into the multifarious “explicate order” – the diverse universe of observation and experience – in a continuous rhythm.

Whitehead’s organic, animistic cosmology provides a bio-metaphysical bridge to Bohm’s quantum holographic post-Einsteinean revolution.

Combine their insights with contemporary cognitive psychology, and with Buddhism’s influence on Western culture in the last hundred years, and a paradigm shift emerges with ever greater clarity and force. We can, for example, trace the increasing fusion of physics and philosophy from Fritjof Capra’s *The Tao of Physics* in the 1970s to Danah Zohar’s *The Quantum* Self in 1990, the Dalai Lama’s *The Universe in a Single Atom* in 2005, and Graham Smetham’s *Quantum Buddhism* in 2010.

The new paradigm suggests that we live in a multiverse; also that we *are* a multiverse.

More precisely, we *inter-are*. Identity is woven from the fabric of interbeing. Interbeing is another name for universal brother-sisterhood.

Heidegger said, “Humans are walking question marks.” Heidegger borrows this notion from Kierkegaard’s analysis of anxiety.

Kierkegaard is extrapolating from St. Augustine’s declaration: “*Questio mihi factus sum, coeur est inquietum*” – “My existence is a question to itself; hence my heart is troubled.”

Augustine, of course, is building on the conundrum at the heart of Socrates.

What is the defining feature of Socratic wisdom? He knows that he doesn’t know.

Questioning is questing.

But are we any longer on the quest?

Kierkegaard asserts that “paradox is the passion of thought. … [And a] thinker without paradox is like [a] lover without passion: a mediocre fellow.”

What, then, is the paradoxical passion of thought, according to Kierkegaard?

It is thought’s ineluctable urge to think the unthinkable, to encompass the absolute, to throw a rope around infinity, to *eff* the ineffable.

Thought’s paradoxical passion is echoed in Carlos Castaneda’s *The Eagle’s Gift*, and brings us near to the conclusion of this hermeneutic journey.

Castaneda’s teacher articulates what is called “The Rule” in Toltec shamanism:

*“The first precept of the rule is that everything that surrounds us is an unfathomable mystery.*

*The second precept of the rule is that we must try to unravel these mysteries, but without ever hoping to accomplish this.*

 *The third [precept]is that a warrior, aware of the unfathomable mystery that surrounds him and aware of his duty to try to unravel it, takes his rightful place among mysteries and regards himself as one.*

*Consequently, for a warrior there is no end to the mystery of being, whether being means being a pebble, or an ant, or oneself. That is a warrior’s humbleness. One is equal to everything.”* (p. 281-282)

We might note, here, what cognitive psychology calls The Computational Paradox: The more that neuro-scientists and cognitive psychologists discover that the mind is *like* a computer, the more they discover that the mind is *not* like a computer.

Transpersonal psychology begins with the insight that Freud’s so-called “unconscious” is in fact, as Jung suspected, a consciousness.

In his critique of Freud in *Being and Nothingness*, Jean-Paul Sartre convincingly shows that Freud’s so-called “unconscious” is, and must be, a consciousness.

Freud is forced to invent the crucial notion of “the censor” – his intra-psychic metaphoric homunculus – to guard the gates at the intersection of ego and id, engaged in astonishingly cognitive and creative activities: recognition, suppression, repression, displacement, compensation, sublimation, symptom formation, and – especially in dreams – symbolism and disguise.

If the unconscious is a consciousness, then the transpersonal paradigm shift points to a quantum leap in human adventure. History can thus be seen in three stages: prepersonal, personal, and transpersonal. That is to say: bicameral, egoic, and metapersonal. We are on the cusp of the third.

Allow me to conclude by repeating the opening quote from Nitin Trasi:

*“The day is not far off when … Enlightenment and Liberation may be found included in the standard medical texts of psychology – and a Liberated or Enlightened person is seen not as a freak of Nature, but as the most normal, sane, uncomplicated human being that there can be.”*

More and more individuals are escaping the culture of capitalism, materialism, ego-centricity and greed. They are embracing *voluntary simplicity*, and rediscovering *the sanity they were born with*. These individuals are, if you will, *psychic pioneers*: recollecting – to use Plato’s word – what was known by Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Socrates, Jesus, Buddha, Zoroaster, Lao Tzu, Meister Eckhart, George Fox, William Blake, and Emerson and Wordsworth.

In sum: The supernatural is in fact natural; the paranormal is normal; and it is *we* who have locked ourselves in a scientific box, drenched in a culture of distraction, refusing – at our peril – to cleanse “the doors of perception.”

So, yes, we live in perilous times. But we also live on the cusp of an epoch of remarkable opportunity and transformation.

In 1981, Julian Jaynes published, in a magazine called *Art/World*, an essay on the “Visions of William Blake.”

Jaynes argues that Blake’s ‘hallucinations’ were authentic, and that he did, in the most shamanic sense, ‘hear’ his poetry and ‘see’ his paintings. Jaynes concludes:

*“Blake was not [schizophrenic or] insane. … [Rather], he was indeed what one of his friends called him, ‘a new kind of man,’ one who had both consciousness and a bicameral mind.”*

*(Reflections on the Dawn of Consciousness: Julian Jaynes Bicameral Mind Theory Revisited*; edited by Marcel Kuijsten; 2006; Julian Jaynes Society publishers)

Abraham Maslow rightly argues that self-actualization leads to self-transcendence.

Individuals on the self-actualizing path are tapping into their perfectly natural, multi-modal, multi-dimensional reality: a subjective reality woven from the pulse and fabric of universal brother-sisterhood.

Allow me, then, to suggest a new version of “The Pledge;” a version more appropriate to the transpersonal epoch:

*I pledge allegiance to the planet, and to all the people and creatures on her; one ecosystem, universally sacred, with nourishment and beauty for all.*

The secret meaning of relativity theory is that we are, in fact, all related.

Quantum theory has known this for a hundred years.

It is time now for our culture to transform itself accordingly.

I believe we can.

I believe we will.

“You may say I’m a dreamer; but I’m not the only one.”

***Stefan Schindler***
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