

PROTOSYMBOLS OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Algis Mickunas

Ohio University

Introduction.

Although in most diverse ways and modes of asking, the problem of consciousness remains the fundamental problem. It remains the fundamental problem not only for psychology, religion or philosophy but also for the sciences of nature such that physics orients itself to the possible structures of epistemological, theoretical and methodological consciousness. The left sociologists investigate the material conditions of consciousness, while the right sociologists are concerned with its immanent structure. No doubt, such undertakings have demonstrated their value. Yet it appears that these undertakings have left something out: consciousness itself.

The following undertaking is oriented toward the structure of consciousness which is unavoidably given and behind which we cannot ask. This kind of consciousness was called by Gebser "integral." The attainment of this consciousness requires a path which moves through diverse strata and byways. These byways include the systematic expressions of religions, mythologies, sciences and philosophies. In this undertaking the expressions will be taken as examples of a more fundamental and latently present consciousness. It will turn out that the expressions and symbols are temporary and limited signs of consciousness. Moreover, we shall not raise the question concerning the existence or non-existence of these signs. Although the mythological deities, demons, the material objects, etc., will function as signs, we shall not question whether such deities, such material objects exist. In brief, we shall not raise the ontological and metaphysical questions, although the structures of both can be revealed as signs of consciousness.

Expressions

The Hebraic-Christian mythology assumes the following morphology of heaven: the absolute divinity, comprising at the same time the origin of absolute law, becomes completed by the creation of Satan. Satan represents a dynamic figure whose function is to maintain the divine law. The dynamic activity of Satan is correlated to the divine permanence. Yet the same mythology expresses a reversed representation. Satan becomes a rebel whose aim is the disruption of the permanence of the absolute law and authority of God. Although correlated in various ways, there appear two components: permanence and dynamism. The permanence can be either enhanced or disrupted by the dynamism. It can be noted that this correlation was developed into morality. For example, the permanent order, the lawfulness and its maintenance was regarded as good, and its disruption as evil. It seems then that the morphological expressions, the permanence of the divine and the disruptiveness of the demonic can assume moral characteristics.

The same mythological morphology can be found in the social and political domain. The absolute law giver of the Persian empire demands that every activity should serve to maintain the permanence of the emperor. Any disruption of this permanence is characterized as a release of the evil and primordial chaos. The absolute law of the emperor and its active maintenance is regarded as good, and its disruption as evil. The same correlation of these two components stretches through the medieval and all the way

to Marxian conceptions. For example, the dynamic Marxian revolutions are characterized as the enhancements of the unavoidable permanence of historical dialectics. This dialectic and the revolutions which maintain it are regarded as good, while their hindrance is called evil. The diverse kinds of this correlation between permanence and activity constitute the mythological as well as the social morphologies.

The relationship between the streaming and the permanent assumes diverse forms in various cultures. In Confucian China the permanent and the streaming are understood harmoniously. As Wolfgang Bauer has suggested, in China the permanent *li* is characterized as "immanence" while the streaming, the energies, *ch'i* are regarded as "exteriority." Yet this correlation can assume variations: the spontaneity of life can belong to the immanent, the *li*, while the order, the lawfulness can characterize the *ch'i*. The permanence, and the spontaneity which maintains it and is correlated to it in a balanced way are natural and good. Yet the energies which flow from the immanence of man and disrupt the balance are regarded as evil (Bauer, 339-40).

The permanent and the streaming can assume a temporal relationship: at times the permanent and at times the streaming aspects can assume preeminence over the other. Hinduism can be regarded as a case of this relationship. These aspects can also be correlated into a hierarchy; this correlation can be exemplified by medieval and early modern Europe. They can also be regarded as a strife between them until finally one becomes victorious over the other. Some examples would be the modern revolutionary movements such as Marxism, anarchism, and the various Christian orientations such as prophetism, chillianism, and eschatolism. Other examples of this correlation are to be found in Buddhism and gnosticism. In the former, the permanence is merely a form of Maya which hides the dynamic processes, while in the latter, the streaming is so completely suppressed by the permanent component that the sole possibility of liberation consists of a complete emancipation from the permanent. These examples show that the most diverse expressions from various cultures reveal the correlation between permanence and flux. It must be emphasized that our undertaking does not raise the question whether the permanence and streaming are conceived as divine, natural, immanent, external, demonic, feminine or masculine; they are treated as cultural expressions which reveal something common.

Let us consider the main kinds of expressions of the streaming. The streaming is seen as (1) the life preserving energies, such as eros, development and impulse. These energies are grasped either as natural spontaneity or supernatural influences; (2) they can be characterized as destructive, demonic, thanatic—deadly, and also in Durkheimian sense as Faustian; (3) they can be regarded in Weberian sense as primordial, as a hurricane, revolution, as charisma and can appear as disruptive or vitalizing; (4) they can be understood as civilizing and will be recognized as an impulse for the creation of symbolic structures; (5) they are also conceived mechanistically as is the case in physics or associative psychology; (6) they can manifest themselves as ethereal spontaneity consisting of moral and aesthetic sensibilities; at times they are characterized as transcending movements longing for a transcendent home and (7) they can appear as free floating animistic energies which chose to enter various phenomena.

Throughout the diverse expressions and in various cultures, the streaming reveals two activities of consciousness; they are either preserving or disrupting. In historical China, the

Protosymbols of Consciousness

energies aim mainly toward the enhancement, the preserving of order and life. Although not for Taoism, for Confucianism they express the civilizing movement. The disruptive spontaneity of "selfishness" appears mainly only in humans. In China, the primordial energies in their animistic form develop toward the preservation of life or as transcending movements toward the highest spirituality (Hsu, 329-55). In Indian mythologies, although distinct, the preserving and the disruptive energies do not maintain a permanent position – and this in contrast to the medieval and early modern European traditions. In Indian mythologies, these energies flow one into the others. For example, the energies of a demon can appear at times as good and at other times as evil (Kinsley; also O'Flaherty). In Indian literature of spiritual direction the energies can appear either as leading to transcendence or to decadence.

A civilizational consciousness may contain a plethora of relationships among the most diverse dynamisms. These relationships require structures which either separate or unify the dynamisms. The caste structure of Hinduism is a permanent structure which separates between the pure dynamism leading to transcendence and the disruptive and decadent dynamisms. In the catholic tradition the main structure of the law is located between two streams: the first is the transcending stream of love, of *caritas*, regarded as lower than the law. In later Renaissance, everything flows through and is controlled by a second stream, a permanence, whether interpreted as an atomistic matter, spatio-temporal structure or as reason.

The expressions of the consciousness of permanence, or the standing, are also of various kinds. For our presentation we shall select only those which are the most fundamental: (1) a container which stabilizes and directs the streaming. The container can become an iron cage for the streams or can turn out to be an empty frame of an energyless mechanism; (2) permanence can be regarded as a mediating structure of energies. In this case, the mediated energies are regarded as too powerful, protean, too dangerous or too dumb to communicate without this mediation; (3) permanence can appear as a kernel, as a stable axis toward which the streams flow and in which they are separated, and finally (4) a momentary structure which is both established and dissolved by the conjunction of energies. This permanence can be called Gnostic, dramaturgic, Confucianistic and Buddhistic. Although the first two are partially found in Hinduism, they belong mainly to the West, while the last two are preeminently Confucianistic and Buddhistic.

What has been said does not mean that consciousness of permanence and streaming appears in every culture one dimensionally. The correlations between permanence and streaming intersect and permeate one another, not only in the cultural domain but also in theories about cultures. Freudian and Jungian psychologies can be offered as good examples of such theories. The consideration of Freudian psychology reveals a gradation of the permanent and the dynamic components. The primordial dynamism, the originary energy (ID) is related to nature. Subsequently this primordial dynamism is divided into two antagonistic powers, Eros and Thanatos which became correlated to Ego and Super-Ego. The Ego is regarded as a permanent structure of communication while the Super-Ego becomes the cultural dimension of ordaining rules. This interpretation includes the three Western conceptions of permanence; the ordaining structure of the Hebraic-Christian divinity, the tension between the two streams (*Caritas* and *Cupidas*) and the Ego which became preminent in the 18th century.

It would be redundant to adduce other theories stemming from other disciplines. One thing is clear: there is no culture, no theory about culture, no mythology, theology or an explanation of history without the consciousness of the permanent and the streaming. Thus even the Gebserian structures of consciousness, in the totality of their complexity, are excellent demonstrations of the indicated expressions of permanence and flux of conscious experience. Thus in the magical structure, the animistic and vital energies converge into permanent and equivalently exchangeable "puncti-forms." Each of these "puncti-forms" can assume the powers of any other (Gebser, 55ff). In the mythological structure, the permanent circling of the energetically-psychically laden polar images signify a different correlation between permanence and streaming. This eternal cycle reappeared in Nietzsche's mythologeme of the eternal recurrence of the same. What must be understood is that in this structure there are no permanent poles; they are established originally in a flux, and in this establishment the polar images return to and pervade one another in an eternal cycle (Gebser, 71ff). In this sense, the Chinese Tai Chi must be understood as follows. The light and the dark sides are characterized as a movement of one into the other. The dark point in the light side reveals the movement of light into darkness, and conversely, the light point in the dark side signifies the movement of darkness into light in an eternal circling of mutual interaction. It must be stressed that for Gebser the mythical consciousness does not manifest permanent polarities. The poles appear only in the cyclic movement which constantly shifts the polarities. But the movement is ordered by the permanence of the cycles.

Thus it is necessary to avoid a common error. When we think of the recurrence of the mutually changing images as a circle, we should not regard the manifesting polarities as successive appearances. On a cycle, the movement toward the future, turns back upon itself and includes the past. In this sense a movement toward the expected love is also a streaming toward the "previous" hate. Conversely, a movement on a cycle toward the "past" confronts itself as its own "future." Thus the eternal cycle comprises a permanence which has no direction either toward the future or toward the past.

The mutation toward the mental structure transforms at the same time the consciousness of what is permanent and what is streaming. Although the mental structure incorporates in itself diverse permanent and flowing expressions, we would like to suggest only the fundamental expressions. The mental structure includes a consciousness of direction and limit. Direction is understood as a condition of a temporal succession, while the limit is a condition of opposition. It is irrelevant whether the opposition is understood as subject-object, divinity-world, reason-matter, or as an exclusion of and separation of material things from one another. The limitation, which comprises as well the condition for the three dimensional spatiality, does not permit mutual influxes from one opposing component into another. The directed temporal flow is interpreted teleologically. Here *telos* is an expression of directed flow. In this sense the Aristotelian "unmoved-mover" and the Christian divinity are permanent signs of oriented flux. Without saying too much more, it would be appropriate to point out that direction and limitation comprise the conditions for the most varied phenomena. They underlie the consciousness of the atomistic matter as well as the highest conceptions of formal logic which comprise a system of signs next to and succeeding one another. All of these presuppose the directed flow and the permanent limitations.

The Signs of Consciousness

The cultural expressions delimited so far, and the consciousness structures traced out by Gebser will be explicated as signs of the first domain of consciousness. As already noted, the cultural expressions and Gebser's researches into consciousness, are founded on two unavoidable experiences: the streaming-flux and the permanent-static. It appears then that there is no consciousness without something permanent and in flux. Each consciousness must include both components.

The brief sketch of the cultural expressions and of the Gebserian consciousness structures point to the activities of consciousness without which the cultural expressions would remain meaningless. These expressions present the partial and momentary signs which reveal how consciousness signifies itself both through permanence and flux. This means that consciousness symbolizes itself through cultural and natural means. The culturally discovered expressions and the perceived things and processes of nature present the immediate activities of consciousness. When I perceive a stone as permanent through the numerous and changing appearances, the stone can function not only as an expression of the permanent component of consciousness, but also as a secondary symbol of permanent life, the background permanence of the lawfulness of all changing appearances and even the permanence of a divinity. In turn, when I discover a cultural expression of a permanent divinity, the divinity can function as an expression of the permanent component of consciousness. Both, the stone and the divinity, count as expressions of the permanent side of consciousness. Regardless of the strata, the expressions signify the permanence of consciousness.

The same can be said of flux. A river, which expresses the flow of consciousness, at another strata can be regarded as a symbol of the flux of life, the unavoidable passing of all things and the flow of time. When I learn from a culture about a dynamic figure of a divinity, such as Shiva, I discover this divinity as an expression of the flux of consciousness. These expressions constitute themselves as signs of the streaming side of consciousness. Their meaning and sense consists of their sign-function. As Gebser has taught us, the most diverse cultural and natural phenomena reveal the structures of consciousness. But this revelation points to what we called the primordial proto-symbols of consciousness. The proto-symbols, consisting of flux and permanence, are not identical with the expressions which we have surveyed. Our subsequent task is directed to the elicitation of the activities of consciousness which constitutes these proto-symbols. But it must be stressed that although unavoidable, this consciousness is not yet the ultimate one. What we have noticed so far reveals that cultures and their diverse expressions manifest the proto-symbols of consciousness. We have not yet interrogated how permanence and streaming constitute themselves in consciousness.

Permanence and Flux

What is in question is this constitution. There are various avenues to this constitutive consciousness, but for our purposes we shall take something which is well known in our culture. As Gebser has shown, our modern culture has revealed an Egoconsciousness. It is assumed that the diverse components and activities of our consciousness flow from and point to an Ego. It should be remarked that even in this case the various activities and

functions, the diverse psychic dynamisms, in brief, the flux, are correlated to a permanent Ego. Yet we must ask how are we conscious of the permanence, of the identity of the Ego. How does this permanence and identity of the ego arise for consciousness? These questions already point to a consciousness which can no longer be an Ego. It is a consciousness, or as Gebser says, a Self, for whom the Ego is something experienced.

The Ego is in a remarkable position. In order to become aware of itself, the Ego finds itself at a distance from itself, finds itself as something which constantly flows away. When the Ego observes itself, it finds an Ego which, in its identity flows away in a stream. This means that the Ego which flows away cannot be identical with the Self for which the Ego appears as something flowing away. The Ego is already something other than the Self which surveys the distancing Ego. In this sense the Self cannot be regarded as an Ego, cannot reveal itself as an identity and permanence of an Ego. If the Self attempts to experience itself as an Ego, it discovers that the Ego is always something other than the Self. This is the first sign which Gebser distinguishes between the Self and the Ego. The Ego appears only as one sign, as one expression of permanence in the stream in which it flows away. In this sense the Self, for which the Ego appears, can never and nowhere be grasped as a permanent identity. In the primordial sense whatever is permanent, an identity, is for the Self experienced as something which flows away in a stream. The Self cannot be identified with the flowing away, since it is aware of the flux and of the Ego which flows away. Thus a Self manifests itself which is neither a permanent Ego nor a flux. The Self constitutes a background consciousness for which the Ego and the flux, the permanence and the streaming come together to appearance. The attempt to capture the Self as an Ego reveals the Self as something which is already conscious of permanence and flux. This means that flux and permanence point at once to a Self. In this sense they do not function as components, but as proto-symbols of a conscious Self in which both are constituted primordially.

How are we to understand the Ego which is something other and at the same time something that points to the not yet named Self? Without doubt, the Self must constitute the stream and the Ego as something permanent in the stream as the proto-symbols of the Self. In this sense the Ego which points to the Self must be understood as one act, as an identifiable activity of the Self. This means that the Ego is a primordial indication of the activity of the Self; but it is an activity which flows away in a stream that is also constituted by the Self. By indicating the Self, the Ego reveals that its origin is something more than the Ego itself. The conscious Self establishes not only the Ego but also the stream in which the Ego flows away. Thus the permanent Ego and the stream are two immediate symbols of the Self. But in this sense the symbols are not equal to what they symbolize. Although both point to the Self, they reveal that the Self is something more and entirely other than the two symbols.

What has been here haltingly extricated must now be circumscribed. After all, this extrication is important not only for what Gebser called the integral, transparent and atemporal consciousness, but also for the way this consciousness maintains and reveals the divine. This Self, this background consciousness, which according to Ludwig Landgrebe, has not yet been named (Landgrebe, 200), is indicated by the Ego as an identifiable act and by the stream in which the Ego flows away. Through the experience of the Ego as an identifiable act of the Self, the Self acquires a sense of otherness, but in such a way that

Protosymbols of Consciousness

the otherness of the Ego is **primordially** and at the same time an indication of any possible Self. This means that the Self recognizes in the Ego not only its own act, as already something other from itself, but also the otherness of all possible other Selves. The meaning of another Self is **already given** in the symbol of the Ego. Through the Ego, the **primordial consciousness constitutes** a symbol, which can be a symbol for all other Selves. This means that the Self recognizes the Ego as an act of a Self and also as something **already different from the Self**. This difference is also a primordial sign which allows the conscious Self to **differentiate among various Selves**.

The Self, the constantly **escaping, uncaptured consciousness**, appears in the correlation of the **proto-symbols of permanence and flux**. At the same time, the tracing of these symbols, in our case of the Ego and the stream in which the Ego flows away, reveals that the correlation of these symbols **cannot be achieved** either by the flux or by the Ego. Only the Self can establish their differentiation and at the same time their correlation. This indication allows us now to **shift** to the primordial activity of the Self. When we take the Ego as a sign of the Self, we discover that in its flowing away the Ego has a place, a location in the stream. This place which is marked by the Ego, is at the same time a place of the Self in its modality of **something that has been**, as something that sinks away toward the past. Yet this **sinking away** toward the past also points to the future, the coming. In this sense the conscious Self must establish the **primordial temporal differentiations** in which the Ego marks the shifts from temporal to temporal phases.

The shifting of the temporal phases constitutes all at once the stream and the differentiations of the temporal locations for the manifestation of the identity of the Ego. Now we are in a position to **trace** what Gebser had called the integral consciousness. The constitution of the temporal phases of the stream indicated above cannot be located in an assumed and **pregiven time**. As already noted, the Self is the ground for the differentiation and correlation between the **streaming and the permanence**. Yet the same kind of differentiation and correlation must be taken for granted between the passing and the coming phases. In this sense the Self cannot be located in any temporal phase or place. But why not? First of all, any **identifiable, any permanent location**, is always found in the stream of passing away, and this location can only be grasped in its differentiation from and correlation to other locations. Secondly, the surveyal, the consciousness of the differentiation and correlation of temporal locations is an activity which cannot assume an identical or permanent location.

This result points to the **following**: the temporal dimensions of the present, the now, the future and the past, comprising the basis for the directedness of the mental-rational consciousness is no longer **adequate** for the understanding of the Self. The Self is no longer oriented but must be understood as correlating and differentiating co-presence. This means that the correlating and differentiating consciousness is what **primordially establishes the differentiation and the mutual pointing** to each other of the temporal dimensions. But the mutual pointing does not occur for this consciousness in a simplistic process. It must be **already clear** that the conscious Self is precisely something which constitutes the differentiation and correlation of temporal locations as a condition for any permanence and identity. Let us look closer at this remarkable phenomenon.

In order to become aware of the present as such, the past and the future must also be co-given. But how? The present must point of necessity to the past and the future. But it must

point to the other temporal phases not as something which are similar to it, but as something different from it. The meaning of one of these temporal dimensions points to the presence of the meaning of the other temporal dimensions. In this sense all three dimensions must be "present" in their meaning. But this presence is not a simple one. We should recall that Gebser speaks of a transparency of consciousness. Thus let us reflect upon what has been shown. The meaning of the present, the now points not only to the presence of the future and past, but also to their difference from one another and from the present. This can only mean that future and past are given transparently through the present. Although in the mental consciousness the future is not yet, in the integral consciousness the future, in its pointing to and differentiation from the present and past, is already present. This means that a consciousness of any of the temporal dimensions calls for the presence of all temporal dimensions. Thus the present has no meaning without pointing to and being transparent with the future and the past. But the transparency of the present not only points to the necessary presence of the future and the past, but also to their difference. This means that the integral consciousness bears in itself the presence of the differentiated time dimensions. In their differentiated presence the temporal dimensions are transparent one through the other.

If this is the case then, on the basis of this stratum of consciousness, then precisely on the basis of the explicated consciousness of integrating temporality, each phenomenon must be transparent. For example, a conscious hearing of a "high" tone calls for a conscious presence of a "low" tone. This means that in order to hear the "higher" tone as higher in the present, the consciousness of the "lower" tone, in their differentiation, must also be present. In their mutual pointing to one another, they must be given in their co-present transparency through, and their differentiation from one another. In this sense the phenomena are transparent, differentiated and integrated all at once. These phenomena do not appear "one after the other" but one through the other in their integrating wholeness.

We should recall Gebser's investigations of consciousness which is manifesting itself in our century. By correlating the most diverse expressions, Gebser reveals that the contemporary integral consciousness is no longer directed toward the future. The future is already present in the now. Indeed, the present is given transparently with the presence of the future as well as the past. The wholeness of the temporal dimensions is present. But it must be stressed that this wholeness is not a sterile and an undifferentiated structure. It is "systatic," i.e., it appears as integrating of the differentiated and mutually integrated components (Gebser, 301ff). What Gebser means is the following: the integral consciousness is not a sterile gazing or a pure immersion, but an event of transparent differentiation and integration. Before we turn to this event itself, we must avoid the psychologization of this consciousness.

Today the most preeminent are the Freudian and the associative psychologies. Association means that a psychic event is associated with another psychic event—points to and is related to the other event. This pointing is understood as a temporal succession of similar psychic events. But the integral consciousness reveals that something does not point to something similar, but to something that is integrated as different. In its differentiated and mutual pointing, consciousness maintains the components of the whole in their mutual transparency. This means that association not only presupposes this integral consciousness of temporality, but also that the associated psychic states are not given "one after the

other"; in their differentiated presence they are given transparently one through the other. Any direction or succession of psychic states presupposes their mutually differentiated and integrated presence. The same is true of Freudian psychology. For example, *Eros* and *Thanatos* are mutually transparent, one through the other, in their differentiated integration.

The Integral Consciousness

Now it is possible to explicate this consciousness in its uniqueness. It cannot be in time; after all, each temporal location is both differentiated from other temporal locations and simultaneously integrated by this consciousness. As Gebser says, it must be "atemporal." This should not mean that it is "eternal." Eternity already presupposes this consciousness. In order to be conscious of eternity as such, the latter must be differentiated from temporality. The permanence and staticity of eternity and the flux of temporality, in their differentiation, point to and are transparent one through the other. Thus the integral consciousness cannot be either a permanent eternity or a streaming temporality. It must be an event which is transparent through all which are integrated in their differentiation. As had been already shown, the stream, the changing, and the permanence are the proto-symbols of this consciousness. But the experience of permanence must now reveal its difference from the flux. In their differentiation they are given transparently one through the other. But the consciousness which differentiates them and relates them to one another in mutual transparency, must be different from them. This means that permanence and flux as proto-symbols of the integral consciousness must point to this consciousness which differentiates and integrates them transparently as something different from them.

Neither standing nor streaming, neither temporal nor eternal, this consciousness while creating their differentiated and transparent integration, becomes aware of its own Self transparently as different from and through what it creates. In this sense the permanence and flux, the standing and the streaming, regardless of how they are expressed in the most diverse cultures, are the proto-symbols of the integral consciousness. These symbols, while related to and seen through one another, trace the presence of the primordial consciousness which constitutes their differentiated integration. These mutually transparent, integrated and differentiated symbols, comprising the foundations of most diverse cultural expressions, are transparent with a consciousness which is different from them. Although it cannot be found anywhere or at any time, this consciousness is present everywhere and at all times. By constituting its own proto-symbols, it becomes transparently aware of itself as their differentiating integration. This consciousness, which is the Self, which we ourselves are, is too immediate to be grasped by us directly. Thus it must be traced through its proto-symbols. At the same time, these proto-symbols can be shown through the various cultural expressions.

Regardless of the strata, the world is experienced through the variously designed expressions of permanence and flux. Each culture signifies this experience differently. A divinity may be permanent, while the world may be regarded as a changing appearance of the divinity. The substance is permanent and is given through changing appearances. In order to rule over the fleeting phenomena, reason, either as an objective Logos or as a subjective capacity, becomes permanent. The cycle becomes permanent in order to enable the dynamism of the polarizing psychic powers and images, leading to mythological

consciousness. The puncti-formal identities become permanent in order to center the flow of the vital powers. All these cultural expressions are secondary indications of the permanent and the streaming, the standing and the flux, and are indications of a consciousness which constitutes itself as permanence-flux. But as Gebser has shown, our century traces another, a background consciousness for which permanence and flux appear as ordinary symbols. These symbols, capable of including the entire world, its eternity and its passing, its divinities and demons, turn out to be the protosymbols of a consciousness which is different from them. While transparent through its proto-symbols, this consciousness is neither avoidable nor can we stem behind it: It is that which each one of us is, the Self.

The Tracing of the Divine

With the breakdown of the mental world, with the announcement of the death of God, the question must be asked how can we experience the divine which is no longer accessible mentally. Gebser has indicated that in our times the divine can no longer be proven, but must be brought transparently to awareness. A proof is subsumed under the expressions of directed and limited mental consciousness. The integral is an indication of a differently manifesting consciousness and a new access must be opened to the divine. We must now dare to trace this access. Although the strata which we have penetrated to reach the integral consciousness may appear to be difficult, in comparison to the following undertaking they will appear as something effortless.

The mental consciousness takes divinity to be the *telos* of history. This *telos* is something in the future. Since the integral consciousness is the condition for the presence of the future as something which in its difference is integrated in the present, this consciousness must experience the divine no longer as something which is in a not-yet-present future. This means that this consciousness is not something toward which one must orient oneself. For the understanding of any direction the future, as well as the past, must be already present. Thus the divinity can no longer be understood in a traditional sense as a *telos*, as a horizontal direction of history. Since the experience of the teleological history and resultantly of others as teleologically oriented Selves in history, belong to the mental consciousness, it would be fruitful at first to regard history and the others as historical from the vantage point of the Self of integral consciousness.

It was shown that the Self, in order to experience itself, constitutes itself as an identical Ego flowing away in a stream. This Ego appears as something different, as another, but in this difference it also appears as a sign of the Self. In this case the Ego becomes a sign of any Self. At the same time, in the flowing away of the Ego, the Self experiences the Ego as temporally removed. In this sense the Ego is a sign of others as temporal and historical. This flowing away of the Ego constitutes not only the sign of the other Selves, but also the others as temporally and historically others. This experience is the origin of the others as historical Selves. In this sense the Self is experienced in correlation to temporally and historically different Selves. In brief, the Self is found to be in a historical horizon of "We." Through the sign of the Ego, the Self can sway between its own and other consciousness. Most fundamentally the Self appears as an inter-consciousness, as a differentiated and transparent relationship between the "We." This "We" constitutes a horizon of history; it is a horizon which enables the extension of the experiences of the Self through the "We." This

Protosymbols of Consciousness

horizon is an open extension of the Self through the other Selves, thus revealing the possibility for the experience of the entire world through all Selves.

Thus it appears that the given presence of the notion of the "We" includes the horizon and open history of the Self. It is a notion which at base includes the experience of the world in all of its possibilities. Those Selves which were before me, and those which will come after me are present to the conscious Self as an extension, as a horizon of the possible experiences of the Self. This consciousness, already and always constituted by the Self, bears not only the sign of the other Selves within itself, but also enables the consciousness of the historical and open humanity, a humanity which is a historical community and not a collectivity. Originarily, the Self recognizes itself as such in its differentiation from others, and thus basically the Self is conscious of itself as communal. But this means that the community is both present and a horizon. Yet it must be emphasized that this horizon is not yet the future or past of history, but rather a "We" consciousness from which the directions and repetitions of history emerge. Before raising the question of the historical past, we already have the presence of the others. For example, when we observe the ruins of some cultural monument, we assume silently that this monument was built by others. Moreover, the ruins as such are transparent with the wholeness of the monument in the previously depicted way. Thus we are already in a present horizon which is transparent with the other Selves and only this presence allows us to ask a subsequent question of historical "when." In this sense the other Selves are not present as objects, but as a background community which mutually symbolizes the world; through this symbolization the community becomes transparent to itself. Thus any cultural creation can become an expression of the consciousness which constitutes this creation. Each expression, found in historical cultures points back to this consciousness.

This understanding leads to the experience of *telos* which is always there for the Self as a horizon. The horizon, which includes the "We," reveals that the experiences of everyone given through their transparent differentiation is an integral understanding. The integration of the experiences of all Selves, although as a matter of fact not possessed completely by any Self, is always tacitly presupposed by any Self. The Self is clearly conscious of the necessity of the differentiated integration of the consciousness of all Selves, and yet the Self knows that this integration cannot be accomplished by any one. After all, the horizon of the Self and of the others can never be closed. Thus the experience of the necessary integration is a *telos* which is present, even if this presence cannot be established fully either by the Self or other Selves. While the horizon can never be limited, this openness is led necessarily by the *telos* of integratability. It appears then that the integration of the open horizon, an integration which is always and necessarily presupposed, cannot be reached by the activity of the Self and other Selves. This assumed, although unattainable integration is the presence of the *telos*.

Seen from the integral consciousness, the *telos* may be regarded as a "pre-form" of integration of the experiential horizons of the Self and the "We." This means that while no particular Self, and indeed no community are in a position to accomplish a complete integration, nonetheless they have a conscious presupposition of a presence of a "pre-form" of complete integration.

This "pre-form" is always evident, although unreachable. In this sense, the conscious Self is cognizant of the necessary integratability of all horizons and understands that its own

horizons are integrated with those of others. Although always remote, this "pre-form" is present intimately to the conscious Self. Since the integral consciousness is a never localizable event of differentiating integration, it must always maintain in its background the "preform" of integration of the differentiated wholeness. This "pre-form" can only be revealed by the integral consciousness. The "activity" of this consciousness traces a differentiating integration which can never be exhausted. Yet precisely this tracing is already transparent with the pregiven "pre-form" of integrality. In this case, the integral consciousness is a cipher of the endless integral consciousness of wholeness which is unreachable by the integral conscious Self. Our integral conscious Self is a cipher which points to something which is an already presumed integrating without a *telos*. In this context the Self can no longer function as a cipher of the difference between itself and the integral consciousness of wholeness which functions as a "pre-form" of this wholeness, but rather here the activity of the Self is a direct appearance of the "pre-form." This means that the Self is a transparent manifestation of the "pre-form" of integral consciousness of wholeness. At the strata of our integral consciousness, which as was shown is a nonlocalizable event of transparency, there also appears the always and everywhere present co-activity of an integrating consciousness of wholeness. The latter could be called "divine."

Postscript

We have traced a consciousness which cannot be equated with any of the traditional consciousness structures. For example, it is not the eastern sterile immersion into the unity of the one, since such an immersion does not permit any transparency. Rather, the integral consciousness bears within itself all of the "previous structures." The latter, of course, are not something past. As was shown, they are differentiated and integrated transparently by the Self. In this sense the origin, which is always present, cannot be a pure unity. It may be that various mystical expressions of diverse cultures regard the origin as unity, yet the unity presents only one, the permanent component of the origin. One thing must be obvious. The task of deciphering of the always present origin does not allow us to sink into a comfortable contemplation without the preliminary tracing of the cultural phenomena and their integration as signs of the origin. We already know that the path to the integral consciousness is not easily traversed. And thus we must also understand that the path through the integral consciousness to the origin and its transparency is still more difficult.

Reference

- Bauer, Wolfgang. *China and the Search for Happiness: Recurring Themes in Four Thousand Years of China's cultural History*. New York: seabury Press, 1976.
- Gebser, Jean. *Ursprung und Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1966.
- Hsu, Sung-Peng. Two Kinds of Changes in Lao Tzu's Thought, *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 4 (1977).
- Kinsley, David R. *The Sword and the Flute: Kali and Krsna, Dark Visions of the Terrible and the Sublime in Hindu Mythology*. Berkeley: U. Of California Press, 1975.

Protosymbols of Consciousness

Landgrebe, Ludwig. *Der Weg der Phaenomenologie*. Guetersloh: Guetersloher Verlaghaus, 1963.

O'Flaherty, Wendy Doniger. *The Origin of Evil in Hindu Mythology*. Berkeley: U. Of California Press, 1976.