

## A DEVELOPMENTAL VIEW OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Ken Wilber  
*Lincoln, Nebraska*

### THE HOLISTIC EVOLUTION OF NATURE

According to philosopher Jan Smuts (1926), everywhere we look in nature we see nothing but wholes-not just simple wholes, but hierarchical ones: each whole is a part of a larger whole-fields within fields within fields, stretching through the cosmos, interlacing each and everything with each and every other.

Further, said Smuts, the universe is not a static whole, but energetically dynamic and even creative. It tends to produce higher and higher-level wholes, ever more inclusive and organized. This overall cosmic process, as it unfolds in time, is the process of evolution.

If this line of thinking is continued, it could be said that because the human mind or psyche is an aspect of the cosmos, we might expect to find, in the psyche itself, the same hierarchical arrangement of wholes within wholes, reaching from the simplest and most rudimentary to the most complex and inclusive (Welwood, 1977). In general, this is the discovery of many modern psychologists. As Werner (1957) put it, "Wherever development occurs, it proceeds from a state of relative globality and lack of differentiation to a state of increasing differentiation, articulation, and hierarchical integration." Jakobson (cited in Gardner, 1974) speaks of "those stratified phenomena which modern psychology uncovers in the different areas of the realm of the mind," where each stratified layer is more integrated and more encompassing than

*the  
hierarchical  
arrangement  
of  
wholes*

This is a condensed version of sections from a forthcoming book, *The Atman Project*; portions also are to appear in another version in the magazine, *American Theosophist*.

its predecessor. Bateson (1972) points out that even learning itself is hierarchical, involving several major levels, each of which is "meta-" to *its* predecessor. As a general approximation, then, it may be concluded that the psyche-like the cosmos at large-is many-layered ("pluridimensional"), composed of successively higher-ordered wholes and integrations.

The holistic evolution of nature-which produces everywhere higher and higher wholes-shows up in the human psyche as development or growth. A person's growth, from infancy to adulthood, is a miniature version of cosmic evolution; psychological growth or development in humans is a microcosmic reflection of universal growth on the whole, and has the same goal: the unfolding of ever higher-order unities and integrations. Very like the geological formation of the earth, psychological development proceeds stratum by stratum, level by level, stage by stage, with each successive level superimposed upon its predecessor in such a way that it includes but transcends it ("envelops it," as Werner would say).

In psychological development, the whole of any level becomes a part of the whole of the next level, which in turn becomes a part of the next whole, and so on throughout the evolution of consciousness. For example, in the development of language the child first learns babbling sounds, then wider vowel and consonant sounds, then simple words, then small phrases, then simple sentences, and then extended sentences. At each stage, simple parts (words) are integrated into higher wholes (sentences).

*the  
stages  
and  
strata  
of  
human  
constitution*

Modern developmental psychology has studied various levels, stages and strata of the human constitution-mind, personality, psychosexuality, character, consciousness. The cognitive studies of Piaget (Gruber & Voneche, 1977) and Werner (1957), the works of Loevinger (1976), Arieti (1967), Assagioli (1965), Maslow (1971), Jakobson (cited in Gardiner, 1974), and the moral development studies of Kohlberg scribe, in whole or in part, to the concept of stratified stages of increasing complexity and integration. Such concepts invite the inevitable question, "*What is the nature of the highest stages of development? What forms of integration are disclosed in the most developed souls of the human species?*"

If the lower stages and levels of the psyche are instinctual, impulsive, libidinous, and the middle stages are socially-adapted, mentally-adjusted, egocally-integrated, what about higher stages? The individual ego is a marvelously high-order unity, but compared with the unity of the cosmos, it is just a

slice of holistic reality. Is an "integrated ego" or "autonomous individual" the highest reach of consciousness in human beings?

An answer to this question requires a decision as to what constitutes a higher-order personality, followed by a search for examples of truly higher-order personalities. Perhaps if humanity continues its collective evolution, this question will become easier to answer, because more and more "enlightened" personalities may show up in samplings of various populations, and psychologists will be forced by their statistical analyses to include higher-order profiles in their developmental theories. Nonetheless, those few psychologists and philosophers who have looked at this problem-se.g., Bergson (1949), James (1928), Maslow (1971)-have suggested that the world's great mystics and sages represent some of the very highest, if not the highest, of all stages of human development, and therefore may constitute a population of extremely evolved and developed personalities.

*higher  
order  
personalities  
and  
developmental  
theories*

Some of the mystic-sages have left rather detailed records of the stages and steps of their own transformations. They reveal not only the highest *level* of consciousness, but also many intermediate levels leading up to it. If these higher stages are added to the lower and middle stages/levels which have so carefully been described and studied by Western psychology, the result would be a fairly well-balanced and comprehensive model of the spectrum of consciousness (Wilber, 1975; 1977; 1979, in-press).

### *The Lower Realms*

It is generally agreed, by Eastern and Western psychology alike, that the lowest levels of development involve simple biological functions and processes. In Piaget's system, these are the sensorimotor realms (Gruber & Voneche, 1977). They also comprise the lower three skandhas in the Hinayana Buddhist system of psychology (Gard, 1962)-the physical body, perception, and emotion-impulse-and Maslow's (1970) lowest two needs, physiological and safety needs. Or, as Freud (1927) said, "The ego is first and foremost a body-ego."

*levels  
of  
biological  
functions*

The body-ego or body-self tends to develop in the following way: It is generally agreed that the infant initially cannot distinguish self from not-self, subject from object, body from environment. In Freud's *words* (1930), "The ego-feeling we are aware of now is thus only a shrunken vestige of a far more

extensive feeling-sa feeling which embraced the universe and expressed an inseparable connection of the ego with the external world."

That initial stage of material oneness, which Piaget called "protoplasmic," is here termed *pleromatic* and *uroboric*. "Pleromatic" is an old gnostic (and Jungian) term meaning the material universe. "Uroboros" is a mythological motif of the serpent eating its own tail, and signifies "wholly self-contained" and "not able to recognize an other."

It is out of this primordial state of fusion that the separate self emerges, and, as Freud said, the self emerges first as a body, a body-self. The infant identifies with the newly-emergent body, with its sensations and emotions, and gradually learns to differentiate them from the material cosmos at large.

*emergence  
of  
the  
body-ego*

The body-ego, by differentiating itself from the material environment, actually transcends that primitive state of fusion and embeddedness. The body-ego transcends the material environment, and thus can perform physical operations upon that environment. Toward the end of the sensorimotor period, a child can coordinate the physical movement of various objects in the environment, something he could not easily do as long as he could not differentiate himself from those objects. In brief, by differentiating the self from an object, the self transcends that object and thus can operate upon it. At this body-ego stage, then, the self no longer is bound to the pleromatic environment. It is bound to, or identified with, the biological body. The self, as body-ego, is dominated by instinctual urges, impulsiveness, the pleasure principle, involuntary urges and discharges-all the primary processes and drives described so well by Freud. In physiological terms, the reptilian complex and the limbic system dominate the self at this stage.

Eventually, however, true mental or conceptual functions begin to emerge out of, and differentiate from, the body-ego. As language develops, the child is ushered into the world of symbols, ideas and concepts, and thus is gradually raised above the fluctuations of the simple, instinctual body-ego. Among other things, language carries the ability to picture things and events which are not immediately present to the body-senses.

By the same token, language is a means for transcending the simple present. Through language, one can anticipate the future, plan for it, and thus gear one's present activities in accordance with tomorrow. One can delay or control one's present bodily desires and activities. One is no longer totally dominated by instinctual demands, but can to a certain degree

transcend them. This means that the self is starting to differentiate from the body and emerge as a mental, verbal, or syntactical being.

As the mental-self emerges and differentiates from the body (with the help of language), it transcends the body and thus can operate upon it using its own mental structures as tools. At the same time, this allows a sublimation of the body's emotional-sexual energies into more subtle, complex, and evolved activities. This whole trend is consolidated with the emergence (usually around age seven) of what Piaget calls "concrete operational thinking," using concepts that operate on the world and the body.

*emergence  
of  
verbal  
ego-mind*

By the time of adolescence, another important differentiation begins to occur: the self starts to differentiate from the representational thought-process, transcending the thought process and therefore operating upon it Piaget calls this highest stage "formal operational," because one operates on one's own formal thought (I.e., work with linguistic objects as well as physical ones), a detailed operation which, among other things, results in the sixteen binary propositions of formal logic. This can occur because consciousness, in differentiating itself from syntactical-thought, transcends it, and hence operates upon it (something that it could not do when it *was* it). Actually, the process just begins at this stage, intensifying at the higher stages. But the overall point seems clear: consciousness, or the self, is starting to transcend the verbal ego-mind, becoming trans-verbal. (In Mahayana Buddhism this verbal ego-mind is known as the *manovijnana* [Gard, 1962], in Hinduism as the *manomayakosa* [Renou, 1962], in Hinayana Buddhism as the fourth and fifth *skandhas* [Gard, 1962]. It is Freud's ego and secondary process, and Maslow's self-esteem needs.)

As consciousness begins to transcend the verbal ego-mind, it can integrate the ego-mind with all the lower levels. Because consciousness is no longer identified with any of these elements to the exclusion of any others, all of them can be integrated: the body and mind can be brought into a higher-order holistic integration. This stage is referred to as one wherein "mind and body are both experiences of an integrated self" (Loevinger, 1976). This integrated self, wherein mind and body are harmoniously one, is here termed the "centaur," the great mythological being with animal-body and human-mind existing in a state of at-one-ment. At this level the person is becoming trans-verbal, but is not yet transpersonal.

*the  
integration  
of  
body  
and  
mind*

Generally speaking Eastern and Western psychology are in agreement as to the nature of these lower levels, from pleroma

to body to ego-mind. But the West has contributed a rather exact understanding of a phenomenon that is only vaguely understood in the East: namely, the process of dynamic repression. What Western psychology discovered is that as higher-order levels of consciousness emerge in development, they can repress the lower levels.

**In** order to take into account this process of dynamic repression, we will use the Jungian terms "shadow" and "persona." The shadow is the personal unconscious, a series of "feeling-toned complexes" which are split off from consciousness. This process simultaneously distorts the self-concept (the ego), and thus leaves the individual with a false or inaccurate self-image (the persona). If the persona and shadow can be re-united, then the higher-order integration of the total ego can be established. That, in general terms, is a major aim of many Western psychotherapies.

Thus far, the major levels of increasing integration and transcendence are: the primitive fusion-unity of the pleroma; the unity of the biological body-self; then the mental-persona which, if integrated with the shadow, yields the higher-order unity of the total ego; and finally the centaur, the higher-order integration of the total ego with all the preceding and lower levels of body, persona, and shadow.

#### *The Intermediate Realms*

*levels  
above  
the  
ego-mind*

With the exception of transpersonal psychology, the centaur is the highest level of consciousness seriously recognized by most systems of Western psychology. For indications as to the nature of any higher levels of consciousness, we have to turn to the great mystic-sages of the East and West. Their lives indicate that there are indeed higher levels of consciousness, as far above the ego-mind as the ego-mind is above the body-self.

Beginning with the sixth chakra (to use the terms of yogic chakra-psychology), the *ajna chakra*, consciousness starts to become transpersonal. It begins to enter what is called the "subtle sphere." This process intensifies as it reaches the highest chakra-s-the *sahasrara-cuui* then becomes supra-mental as it enters certain higher stages of consciousness, traditionally called *nada yoga*, beyond the *sahasrara*, The *ajna*, the *sahasrara*, and the higher (*nada*) levels are, on the whole, referred to as the subtle realm.

For convenience, however, we speak of the "low-subtle" and the "high-subtle." The "low-subtle" is epitomized by the *ajna*

*chakra-the* "third eye," which is said to include and dominate both astral and psychic events. Whether one believes in these levels or not, this is where they are said to exist. The astral level includes such phenomena as out-of-the-body experiences, some occult knowledge, the auras, and "astral travel." The psychic plane includes what we would call "psi" phenomena: ESP, precognition, clairvoyance, psychokinesis. Many individuals can occasionally "plug in" to this plane and apparently evidence psychic abilities. But to fully enter this plane is to more-or-less master psychic phenomena, or at least certain of them, such as teleportation or levitation (Mitchell, 1974). In the low-subtle or the astral-psychic plane, consciousness further differentiates itself from the mind and body and is able to transcend the normal capacities of the gross body-mind and operate upon the world and the organism in ways that appear, to the ordinary mind, quite fantastic and far-fetched. But psychic capacities seem to be a natural extension of the transcendent function of consciousness.

The "high-subtle" begins at the *sahasrara* and extends into specified levels of high-order transcendence, differentiation, and integration. These include such phenomena as symbolic visions, higher presences and spirit guides, high archetypal forms and subtle *nada* sounds.

### *The Ultimate Realms*

As the process of transcendence and integration continues, it discloses even higher-order unities, leading, consummately, to an ultimate unity. Beyond the high-subtle lies what is sometimes called the causal region, known variously as the *alaya-vijnana* (Gard, 1962), the *ananda-mayakosa* (Renou, 1962), or *pneuma* (Frey-Rohn, 1974). For convenience, we can divide it into the "low-causal" and the "high-causal."

*ultimate  
levels  
of  
transcendence  
and  
integration*

The "low-causal" is revealed in a state of consciousness known in Hinduism as *savikalpasamadhi*. At this point, all the preceding subtle-realm manifestations are seen as modifications of consciousness itself, so that one seems to become all that previously appeared as objective visions, lights, sounds, colors. In theistic traditions, one dissolves into deity, as deity, which, from the beginning, has been one's own deepest self.

Beyond that point, into the "high-causal," all manifest forms are so radically transcended that they no longer need even appear or arise in consciousness. This is total transcendence into formless consciousness, boundless sense of being. If in the high-subtle and low-causal the self is *felt* to dissolve into deity,

in the high-causal the deity-self dissolves into formlessness. The deity is reduced *to* its own formless ground. This state has been called in Hinduism *nirvikalpa samadhi*.

Passing through *nirvikalpa samadhi*, consciousness is said to totally awaken as its original condition and suchness (*tathata*), which is at the same time, the condition and suchness of all that is-gross, subtle, and causal. That which witnesses, and that which is witnessed, are only one and the same. The entire world process is then experienced, moment to moment, as one's own being.

As the center of the self may be experienced as divine, and as the center of the divine is seen to be formless, so the center of formlessness is seen to be not other than the entire world of form. "Form is not other than Void, Void is not other than Form," says the *Heart Sutra* (Conze, 1970). At that point, the extraordinary and the ordinary, the supernatural and the mundane, are precisely one and the same. This is the tenth Zen ox-herding picture, which reads:

The gate of his cottage is closed and even the wisest cannot find him. He goes his own way, making no attempt to follow the steps of earlier sages. Carrying a gourd, he strolls into the market; leaning on his staff, he returns home.

This has also been called *sahaja samadhi* in Hinduism, an ultimate integration, wherein all things and events, while remaining perfectly separate and discrete, are one. This is not a state apart from other states; it is not an altered state; it is not a special state-it is rather the suchness of all states, the water that forms itself in each and every wave of experience as all experience. This is a radical integration of all prior levels-gross, subtle, and causal-which continue to arise moment to moment in mutual interpenetration. Consciousness henceforth operates, not on the world, but as the entire world process, integrating and interpenetrating all levels, realms, and planes, high or low, sacred or profane. This, finally, is the ultimate unity towards which all evolution, human as well as cosmic, seems to point.

*a  
radical  
integration  
a/all  
prior  
levels*

#### THE FORM OF DEVELOPMENT

Overall, the process of psychological development-which is the operation, in humans, of evolution-proceeds in a most articulate fashion. At each stage, a higher-order structure-more complex and therefore more unified-emerges through a differentiation of the preceding, lower-order level. This

higher-order structure is introduced to consciousness.: and eventually the self identifies with that emergent structure. For example, as the body emerged from its fusion with the material world, consciousness became a body-self, identified with the body. As language emerged in awareness, the self began to shift from a solely biological body-self to a syntactical ego, and eventually identified itself with language and operated as a syntactical self. Likewise, in advanced evolution, a deity-form emerges and is introduced to consciousness directly (in the high-subtle), wherein the self identifies as the deity and operates from that identification. As each higher-order structure emerges, the self eventually identifies with that structure.

As evolution proceeds, however, each level in turn is differentiated from the self-sense, or peeled off, so to speak. The self eventually dis-identifies with that structure so as to identify with the next higher-order emergent structure. Or it might be said that the self detaches itself from its exclusive identification with that structure. Because the self is differentiated from the lower structure, it transcends that structure and can operate on that lower structure by using the tools of the newly emergent structure. Thus as the body-self is differentiated from the material environment, it can operate on the environment using the tools of the body-self (muscles). As the ego-mind is differentiated from the body, it can operate on the body and world with its tools (concepts, syntax). As the subtle-self is differentiated from the ego-mind, it can operate on mind, body, and world using its structures (*psi*, *siddhi*, and so on).

Thus, at each point in psychological growth, we find: 1) a higher-order structure emerges in consciousness; 2) the self identifies its being with that structure; 3) the next higher-order structure then eventually emerges, the self disidentifies with the lower structure and shifts its essential identity to the higher structure; 4) consciousness thereby transcends the lower structure and becomes capable of operating on that lower structure from the higher-order level; 5) all preceding levels can then be integrated in consciousness, and ultimately as consciousness. Each successively higher-order structure is more complex, more organized, and more unified-and evolution continues until it reaches a complete unity or integration.

A few technical points need to be introduced here. Using the terms of linguistics, it could be said that each level of consciousness consists of a "deep" structure and a "surface" structure. The deep structure is the defining form of a level, which embodies all of the potentials and limitations of that level. Surface structure is simply a particular manifestation of the

*the  
process  
of  
identification,  
disidentification,  
and  
integration*

deep structure. The surface structure is constrained by the form of the deep structure, but within that form it is free to select various contents. To use a simple example, take a ten-story building: each of the floors is a deep structure, whereas the various rooms and objects on each floor are surface structures. For instance, all body-selves would be on the second floor, and all verbal ego-minds on the fifth floor. Although all verbal egos are quite different, they are all on the fifth floor, and they all share the same deep structure.

*surface  
structures  
and  
deep  
structures*

The movement of surface structures is called "translation," and the movement of deep structures is called "transformation." Thus, if we move furniture around on the fourth floor, that is a translation; but if we move up to the seventh floor, that is transformation. Many egos try to think about Buddha, which is merely translation, whereas what is required is a transformation.

Two more technical terms: a "sign" is that which *points* to, or represents, any element within a given level; whereas a "symbol" points to, or represents, an element of a different level (either higher or lower). Therefore, it follows that translation operates with signs, whereas transformation operates with symbols. The word *is* merely a sign if, while on the fifth floor of verbal-ego deep structure, one simply thinks about "b-u-d-d-h-a" or philosophizes about what that word might mean, and refuses to identify it with anything higher than one's present state of adaptation. "B-u-d-d-h-a" is a symbol when it is understood, by the ego, to represent a transcendent being which cannot be fully understood without transformation to a higher state.

Each transformation upward marks the emergence in consciousness of a new and higher level, with a new deep structure, within which new translations or surface structures can unfold and operate. Evolution seems to be a series of such transformations, or changes in deep structure, mediated by symbols, or forms in consciousness (the lowest form being the body, the next being the mind, then the subtle, etc.). Most importantly, all deep structures are remembered, in the Platonic sense of anamnesis, whereas all surface structures are learned, in the sense studied by Western psychologists. A deep structure emerges in consciousness when it is remembered: a surface structure emerges when it is taught. It is generally agreed that one does not learn to become a Buddha, one simply discovers or remembers that one is already Buddha. Just so, no one learns any deep structure, but simply discovers or remembers it concomitant with the course of learning its surface structure.

One does not learn to have a body, but one does learn to play baseball with it—deep structures are discovered and surface structures are learned.

Every time one remembers a higher-order deep structure, the lower-order structure is subsumed under it. For example, initially the body is the whole of the self-sense. As the mind develops, the sense of identity shifts to the mind, and the body becomes merely one aspect, one part, of the total self. Similarly, as the subtle *level* emerges, the mind and body—which together had constituted the whole of the self-system—become merely aspects or parts of the new and more encompassing self. At each point in evolution or remembrance, a mode of self becomes merely a component of a higher-order self, a self that, in effect, includes but transcends its predecessors. Thus *development* is a process of continual transcendence. It seems that the two are essentially identical, and that evolution is indeed "self-realization through self-transcendence."

#### TYPES OF THE UNCONSCIOUS

Although the preceding model is complex, nothing simpler seems capable of grasping all the facts of the extraordinarily complex phenomenon of consciousness, or of unconsciousness. Accounts of "the unconscious" sometimes assume that it is there, either as process or as content, from the start, and then proceed to describe its layers, levels, grounds, modes or contents. But that approach could be supplemented by developmental or evolutionary concerns on the one hand, and dynamic factors on the other.

What exists in "the" unconscious appear!! to depend in large measure on developmental concerns. Some theorists, e.g. Fromm (1970), seem to assume that there is a "transpersonal unconscious" that is present but repressed from the beginning, whereas—if it is like verbal programming, character structure, mental capacity, abstract thinking, and higher structures in general—it is not yet repressed because it has not yet developmentally had the chance to emerge. It is not yet repressed from awareness because it has not yet even emerged in awareness in the first place.

*the  
unconscious  
and  
developmental  
concerns*

From a developmental and dynamic (as opposed to static and given) viewpoint, five basic types (not levels) of unconscious processes can be formulated. The following outline is meant to be neither exhaustive nor definitive, but does indicate processes of interest to a transpersonal conceptualization.

### *The Ground-Unconscious*

*deep  
structures  
as  
potentials*

By "ground" I intend an essentially neutral meaning; it is not to be confused with "ground of being" or "open ground" or "primal ground," but is basically a developmental concept. The ground-unconscious, in essence, is all the deep structures existing as potentials ready to emerge, via remembrance, at some future point. All the deep structures of mind pertaining to every level of consciousness are enfolded or enwrapped in the ground-unconscious. All of these structures are unconscious, but they are not repressed because they have not yet entered consciousness. Development-or evolution-consists of a series of hierarchical transformations or unfoldings of the deep structures out of the ground-unconscious, starting with the lowest (the body) and ending with the highest. When and if all of the ground-unconscious has emerged, then there is only consciousness: all is consciousness *as* the All.

*deep  
structures  
and  
learning*

Notice that the ground-unconscious is largely devoid of surface structures, for these are basically learned during the unfolding (remembrance) of deep structures. This is similar (but only similar) to Jung's idea of the archetypes as "forms devoid of content." As Jung put it, an archetype (deep structure) "is determined as to its content (surface structure) only when it becomes conscious and is therefore filled out with the material of conscious experience" (Frey-Rohn, 1974). Everyone "inherits" the same basic deep structures, but everybody learns individual surface structures, which can be quite similar or quite dissimilar from those of other individuals.

The following four types of the unconscious can be defined in relation to the ground-unconscious. This leads to a concept of unconscious processes that is at once structural and dynamic, layered and developmental.

### *The Archaic-Unconscious*

Freud's initial pioneering efforts in psychoanalysis led him to postulate two basically distinct psychic systems: the system-unconscious, as he called it, and the system-conscious. The unconscious was, he felt, generated by repression. "The unconscious" and "the repressed" were basically one and the same.

Eventually, however, Freud came to speak of the ego and the id, and these two formulations did not overlap. The ego was not the same as the system-conscious, and the id was not the same as the system-unconscious. Parts of the ego were un-

conscious, and parts of the id were unconscious but not repressed. In his words, "We recognize that the *Ucs.* does not coincide with the repressed; it is still true that all that is repressed is *Ucs.*, but not all that is *Ucs.* is repressed" (Freud, 1927).

As Freud came to see, some of the unconscious simply finds itself unconscious from the start. Freud had once thought that the symbols in dreams and fantasies could be traced back to real life personal experiences, but he came to see that many of these symbols could not possibly have been generated by personal experience.

"Whence comes the necessity for these phantasies, and the material for them? There can be no doubt about the instinctual sources; but how is it to be explained that the same phantasies are always formed with the same content? I have an answer to this which I know will seem to you very daring. I believe that these *primal phantasies* . . . are a phylogenetic possession. In them the individual . . . stretches out . . . to experiences of past ages" (Freud, 1911).

This phylogenetic or "archaic heritage" included, besides instincts, "abbreviated repetitions of the evolution undergone by the whole human race through long drawn-out periods and from prehistoric ages." Although Freud differed profoundly from Jung on the nature of this archaic heritage, he nevertheless stated that "I fully agree with Jung in recognizing the existence of this phylogenetic heritage" (Freud, 1918).

*archaic  
heritage  
and  
evolution*

For Jung, of course, the "phylogenetic heritage" consisted of the instincts and the mental-forms or images associated with the instincts, which he eventually termed the "archetypes." For Jung, instinct and archetype were intimately related—almost one. As Frey-Rohn (1974) explains it, "He saw the primordial image (the archetype) as the self-portrait of the instinct—in other words, the instinct's perception of itself." As for the archaic-images themselves:

*archetype,  
instincts,  
and  
archaic  
images*

Man inherits these images from his ancestral past, a past that includes all of his human ancestors as well as his prehuman or animal ancestors. These racial images are not inherited in the sense that a person consciously remembers or has images that his ancestor had. Rather they are predispositions or potentialities for experiencing and responding to the world in the same ways that his ancestors did [they are, that is, archaic deep structures] (Hall, 1973).

Such is the archaic-unconscious, which is the most primitive and least developed structure of the ground-unconscious—the

pleroma, the uroboros, and the body-self. They are initially unconscious but unrepressed, and some tend to remain unconscious, never clearly unfolded in awareness except as rudimentary deep structures with little or no surface content. Following both Freud and Jung, it can be said in general that the somatic side of the archaic-unconscious is the instinctual id. The psychic side is the phylogenetic fantasy heritage. On the whole, the archaic-unconscious is not the product of personal experience; it is initially unconscious but not repressed. It contains the earliest and the most primitive pre-verbal structures that unfold from the ground-unconscious.

### *The Submergent-Unconscious*

*the  
submergence  
of  
conscious  
deep  
structures*

Once a deep structure has emerged from the ground unconscious and taken on some sort of surface structure, it can for various reasons be submerged or returned to a state of unconsciousness. The total of such structures we call the "submergent-unconscious." The submergent unconscious is that which was once conscious, in the lifetime of the individual, but is now screened out of awareness.

The submergent-unconscious may include any structure that has emerged, whether collective, personal, archaic, subtle, etc. Jung has written extensively on this subject. Freud was also aware of the difference between the archaic-unconscious id and the submergent-unconscious id, the latter alone being the product of repression. But, as Freud (1940) says,

It is of little importance that we are not always able to draw a sharp line between these two categories of contents in the id. They coincide approximately with the distinction between what was innately present originally [the archaic-unconscious] and what was acquired in the course of the ego's development [the submergent-unconscious].

The submergent-unconscious becomes unconscious for various reasons which lie along a *continuum of inattention*. This continuum ranges from simple forgetting through selective forgetting to forceful/dynamic forgetting (the latter alone being repression proper). Of the *personal* submergent-unconscious, Jung (1920) states:

The personal unconscious ... includes all those psychic contents which have been forgotten during the course of the individual's life. Traces of them are still preserved in the unconscious, even if all conscious memory of them has been lost. In addition, it contains all subliminal impressions or perceptions which have too

little energy to reach consciousness. To these we must add unconscious combinations of ideas that are still too feeble and too indistinct to cross over the threshold. Finally, the personal unconscious contains all psychic contents that are incompatible with the conscious attitude.

Simple forgetting and lack of threshold response constitutes the subliminal submergent-unconscious. Dynamic or forceful forgetting, however, is repression proper, Freud's great discovery. The repressed submergent-unconscious is that aspect of the ground-unconscious which, upon emerging, and picking up surface structures, is then forcefully repressed or returned to unconsciousness due to an incompatibility with conscious structures. The personal aspect of the repressed submergent-unconscious is the "shadow,"

### *The Embedded-Unconscious*

We come now to that aspect of the unconscious which most puzzled Freud, but which is nonetheless one of his greatest discoveries. Besides the archaic-unconscious, which was not repressed, Freud (1920) found that "it is certain that much of the ego is itself unconscious." At the same time, he began to locate the origin of repression in the ego. But when Freud discovered that part of the ego was itself unconscious, yet not repressed, he concluded that the unrepressed part of the ego was the repressing part. This part he called the super-ego: it was unconscious, unrepressed, but repressing. How can this unconscious repressing be understood?

*unconscious  
aspects  
of  
the  
ego*

Previously it was shown that at each level of development, the self-sense identifies with the newly-emergent structures of that level. (When the body emerged from the pleroma, the self identified with it; when the verbal-mind emerged, the self identified with it; and so on.) Further, it is the nature of an exclusive identification that one does not and cannot realize that identification without breaking that identification. In other words, all exclusive identification is unconscious identification. At the moment the child realizes that he has a body, he no longer is just the body; he is aware of it; he transcends it; he is looking at it with his mind. At the point the adult realizes he has a mind, he is no longer just a mind—he is actually perceiving it from the subtle regions. In other words, at each level of development, one cannot totally see the seer. One uses the structures of that level as something with which to perceive and translate the world, but one cannot perceive and translate those structures themselves, not totally. That can occur only

from a higher level. Each translation process sees but is not seen; and it can repress, but is not itself repressed.

The Freudian super-ego, with the defenses and the character-structure, are those aspects of the ego level with which the self is unconsciously identified, so much so that they cannot be objectively perceived (as can the rest of the ego). They translate without being translated—they are repressing but unrepressed. This fits very well with Freud's own thoughts on the matter, because he himself felt that 1) the superego is created by an unconscious identification, and 2) one of the aims of therapy is to make the super-ego conscious, to see it as an object and thus cease using it as something through which to see and (mis)translate the world. This is simply an instance of the overall evolution process described earlier, where one becomes free of a level by disidentifying with it, later to integrate it in a higher-order unity.

*super-  
ego  
as  
embedded-  
unconscious*

In short, the super-ego is an instance of what we can call the embedded-unconscious. Because it is embedded *as* the self, the self cannot totally or accurately see it. It is unconscious, but not repressed. It is that aspect of the ground-unconscious which, upon emergence, emerges *as* the self-system and so remains essentially unconscious while repressing other elements. This can occur at any level of consciousness, although the specifics naturally vary considerably.

#### *The Emergent-Unconscious*

*emergence  
of  
unconscious  
lower  
structures*

Let us now examine someone who has evolved from the pleroma to the body-self to the ego-mind. There still remain in the ground-unconscious the deep structures of the subtle and causal realms. These structures have not yet emerged; they cannot, as a rule, emerge in consciousness until the lower structures have emerged. Thus one cannot realize the transpersonal until the personal has been formed.

At any point on the developmental cycle, those deep structures which have not yet emerged from the ground-unconscious are part of the emergent-unconscious. For someone at the ego level, the low-subtle, the high-subtle, the low-causal, and the high-causal are emergent-unconscious. They are unconscious, but not repressed.

Now supposing that development is not arrested at the ego or centauric realm (which is usually the case), the subtle may emerge from the ground-unconscious usually after adoles-

cence, but rarely before. However, the emergence of the subtle can be resisted and even, in a sense, repressed. The ego is strong enough to repress not only the lower realms but also the higher realms.

That part of the ground-unconscious whose emergence is resisted or repressed is termed the emergent-repressed unconscious. It is that part of the ground-unconscious which remains unconscious past the point at which it could just as well become conscious. This lack of emergence is due to a set of defenses against transcendence. They include rationalization ("Transcendence is impossible or pathological"); isolation or avoidance of relationship ("My consciousness is supposed to be skin-bounded!"); death-terror ("I'm afraid to die to my ego, what would be left?"); desacralizing (Maslow's term for refusing to see transcendent values anywhere); substitution (a lower structure is substituted for the intuited higher structure, with the pretense that the lower is the higher); contraction (into forms of previous knowledge or experience). These defenses become part of the ego's translation processes, such that the ego merely continues to translate whereas it should in fact begin transformation.

*emergence  
and  
defenses  
against  
transcendence*

Psychoanalysis and most personality psychologies have not adequately dealt with the nature of the emergent-unconscious in its higher forms. If subtle or causal phenomena emerge in awareness, perhaps as a peak experience or as subtle lights and bliss, they may be explained as a breakthrough of archaic material or past repressed impulses. This view does not see a higher structure emerging but a lower one re-emerging. For example, to trace *samadhi* back to infantile breast union is to reduce transpersonal unity to pre-personal fusion in the pleroma. The difficulty of this interpretation is that an enormous number of complex phenomena must be attributed to the infant's early life in order to account for everything that subsequently emerges.

The five unconscious processes described here—ground, archaic, submergent, embedded, emergent—operate within, and are affected by, the developmental stages of consciousness previously outlined. The dynamics of unconscious/conscious relations, up through the stage of the centaur, have been rather thoroughly explored in Western psychology through association, dream analysis, hypnosis, drugs, psychoanalysis, psychotherapy, projective techniques, and other psychological procedures. Until recently, meditation was not seen, at least in the West, as having much psychological impact. However, increasing information about its effects, and its central and tradition-

*dynamics  
of  
unconscious/  
conscious  
relations*

at role in the development of many mystic-sages, suggests that it may be especially relevant to the developmental view of consciousness being described here.

*Meditation and the Unconscious*

Meditation may be regarded as a sustained instrumental path of transcendence. If transcendence and development as described above are synonymous, it follows that meditation is sustained development.

*meditation  
and the  
stages  
of  
consciousness*

Meditation appears to follow a process similar to that of the arising of the stages of consciousness: one translation winds down and fails to exclusively dominate consciousness, and transformation to a higher-order occurs (a higher-order deep structure is remembered, which then underlies and creates new surface structures). There is differentiation, dis-identification, transcendence and integration. The same process of growth and emergence characterizes the whole sequence.

On occasion it may appear that the transpersonal the subtle and causal-are parts of the repressed submergent-unconscious, and that meditation only lifts the repression, halts filtering of perception, deautomizes cognition, or defocalizes attention. What is suggested here, however, is that the transpersonal realms are actually part of the emergent-unconscious, and meditation accelerates this emergence.

*the  
surrender  
of  
translations*

When a person-say a young adult-begins meditation, all sorts of different things may begin to happen, some of which are only incidentally related to the actual growth and transcendence process, and this greatly complicates the overall picture of meditation. To begin with, every transformation *in* development necessitates the surrendering of a particular translation. For the average person, who has already evolved from the pleroma to the ego, transformation into the subtle or causal realms requires that egoic-translation diminish. These egoic-translations are usually composed of verbal thoughts and concepts (and emotional reactions to those thoughts). Therefore, meditation consists, in the beginning, of a way to break conceptual translating.

The meditation practice begins to break egoic-translation by either halting it, as in Rinzai Zen (*koan*), or watching it, as in Soto Zen *tshikan-tazas*. Washburn (1978) has given a useful account of some of the specifics of this process (his "reduction of intensity threshold" and "immobilization of psychic operations" are two ways of describing the winding down of a level's

translations). As the present egoic-translation begins to loosen, the individual is first exposed to the subliminal-submergent unconscious, which includes, among other things, the "innumerable unnoticed aspects of experiences, aspects tuned out due to habit, conditioning, or the exigencies of the situation." All sorts of odd memories float up, screen memories, insignificant memories, memories that are not repressed, merely forgotten or preconscious. Months can be spent "at the movies" watching the subliminal-submergent re-emerge in awareness and dance before the inward eye.

As meditation progresses, however, the more resistant aspects of egoic-translation are slowly undermined and dismantled in their exclusiveness. That is, the embedded-unconscious is jarred loose from its unconscious identification with the self and thus tends either to emerge as an actual object of awareness or to at least lose its hold on awareness. Washburn states that psychic immobilization (the halting of the egoic-translation) "brings unconscious psychic operations into awareness by interfering with their normal functioning," so that "one can begin to look *at* it, rather than, as hitherto had been the case, merely looking *through* it." It could be added that his point applies basically to the embedded-unconscious. The emergent unconscious is not brought into awareness by "interfering with it" but rather by allowing it to emerge in the first place, just as mathematics is not brought into awareness by interfering with it but by first learning it.

*emergence  
of the  
embedded-  
unconscious*

So the embedded-unconscious, by being "interfered with," starts to shake loose its habitual hold. Recall that the embedded-unconscious translations were the repressing aspects of the self-system of a given level. Naturally then, as the repressor is relaxed, the repressed tends to emerge. That is to say, the repressed-submergent unconsciousness now tends to float-or sometimes erupt-into awareness. The individual confronts his shadow (and, on occasion, primal fantasies from the archaic-unconscious). An individual can spend months or even years wrestling with his shadow, and this is where orthodox therapy may be able to complement meditation.

What has happened up to this stage in meditation is that the individual has "relived" his life up to that point. He has opened himself to all the traumas, the fixations, the complexes, and the shadows of all of the prior levels of consciousness which have so far emerged in his life. All of that is up for review, in a sense, and especially up for review are the "sore spots"-fixations and repressions. From this point on in meditation, the emergent-unconscious begins to manifest in awareness. As the subtle level emerges from the ground-uri-

*reliving  
and  
reviewing*

meditation  
and  
final  
transformation

conscious into awareness, various archetypal visions, sounds, and illuminations occur. Although these subtle sounds and illuminations are the goal of some traditions of meditation, they are viewed as *makyo* (or inferior productions) by other traditions. Thus, if meditation continues into the causal realm, all previous forms, subtle or gross, are reduced to gestures of consciousness as such, until even the transcendent witness of the causal realm is broken in the "Great Death" of emptiness. This is called, "full and complete enlightenment." At this final transformation, there are no longer any exclusive translations occurring anywhere; the mirror and the reflections are one and the same.

#### REFERENCES

- ARIETI, S. *The intra-psychic self*. New York: Basic Books, 1967.
- ASSAGIOLI, R. *Psychosynthesis: A manual of principles and techniques*. New York: Hohles & Dorman, 1965.
- BATESON, G. *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine, 1972.
- BERGSON, H. *Introduction to metaphysics*. New York, 1949.
- CONZE, E. *Buddhist wisdom books*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1970.
- FREUD, S. From the history of an infantile neurosis. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 17). London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974 (originally published 1918).
- FREUD, S. Beyond the pleasure principle. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 18). London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974 (originally published 1920).
- FREUD, S. The ego and the id, In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19). London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974 (originally published 1927).
- FREUD, S. Civilization and its discontents. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 20). London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974 (originally published 1930).
- FREUD, S. Outlines of psychoanalysis. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 23). London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1974 (originally published 1940).
- FREUD, S. *A general introduction to psychoanalysis*. New York: Pocket Books, 1971.
- FREY-ROHN, L. *From Freud to Jung*. New York: Dell, 1974.
- FROMM, E., SUZUKI, D. T., & DEMARTINO, R. *Zen Buddhism and psychoanalysis*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

- GARDNER, R. *Buddhism*. New York: Braziller, 1962.
- GARDNER, H. *The quest for mind*. New York: Vintage, 1974.
- GRUBER, H. & VONECH, H. *The essential Piaget*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- HALL, C. *A primer of Jungian psychology*. New York: Mentor, 1973.
- JAMES, W. *The varieties of religious experience*. New York: Longmans, 1901, 1928.
- JUNG, C. G. The psychological foundations of belief in spirits. In H. Read, M. Fordham, & G. Adler (Eds.). *Collected works* (Vol. 8). New York: Pantheon, 1953-1971 (originally published, 1920).
- LOEVINGER, R. *Ego development*. San Francisco: Jessey-Bass, 1976.
- KOHLBERG, L. Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), *Review of child development research*. (Vol. I). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964).
- MASLOW, A. H. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970
- MASLOW, A. H. *The farther reaches of human nature*. New York: Viking-Compass, 1971.
- MITCHELL, E., et al. *Psychic exploration: A challenge for science*. New York: Putnam, 1974.
- RENOU, L. *Hinduism* (Great religions of modern man series). New York: Braziller, 1962.
- SMUTS, S. *Holism and evolution*. New York: Macmillan, 1926.
- WASHBURN, M. Observations relevant to a unified theory of meditation. *J. Transpersonal Psychol.*, 1978, 10, 1, 45-66.
- WELWOOD, J. Meditation and the unconscious. *J. Transpersonal Psychol.*, 1977, 9, 1, 1-26.
- WERNER, H. The concept of development from a comparative and organismic point of view. In D. Harris (Ed.), *The concept of development*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1957.
- WILBER, K. Psychologia perennis: The spectrum of consciousness. *J. Transpersonal Psychol.*, 1975, 7, 2, 105-32.
- WILBER, K. *The spectrum of consciousness*. Wheaton, Ill.: Quest, 1977.
- WILBER, K. *No-boundary*. Los Angeles: Center Publications, 1979, In press.

---

Communications with the author may be addressed to 4600 Briarpark Drive, #208, Lincoln, Nebraska 68516.

Consciousness, at its simplest, is "sentience or awareness of internal or external existence." Despite millennia of analyses, definitions, explanations and debates by philosophers and scientists, consciousness remains puzzling and controversial, being "at once the most familiar and most mysterious aspect of our lives." Perhaps the only widely agreed notion about the topic is the intuition that it exists. Opinions differ about what exactly needs to be studied and explained as consciousness. Sometimes Abstract Growth of ethnic consciousness of the people of Russia in the conditions of a modern paradigm of social development is characterised by a number of features which are shown also in cultural and educational spheres of a life. With change of a social, economic and ideological situation, an ethnographic picture of our life the place of our national culture and its ethnopedagogical orientation changes also. Category: Psychology. Ethnic self-consciousness and polycultural[1] education are considered to be a foundation of an international relations culture formation. That is why we've decided to scrutinize their problems. At the same time the national education development is a source, a reserve, a condition, a form and means of national culture development. A new dimension of consciousness has come in. Witnessing thoughts is different to our default mode of thinking we create them. If you can witness thoughts, you can see which ones are serving you and which ones are holding you back, or even lying to you. Higher levels of consciousness can help you gain back your vital energy again so you can use it for good. Thinking Is Only a Small Aspect of Consciousness. Thinking is only a small aspect of consciousness. Thought cannot exist without consciousness, but consciousness does not need thought. "No-mind" is consciousness without thought. He viewed consciousness as three planes of awareness we operate within: the conscious, preconscious, and the unconscious. 1. The Conscious State Of Awareness. This is the state of your present thoughts. Consciousness development is more about the journey of each level of consciousness, rather than a goal of attainment. Notice, feel, and become aware of where you are and enjoy every aspect of your journey. The 4 Levels Of Consciousness. This is a spectrum that can be broken down into some rather specific and progressive classifications for each level of consciousness . Allowing us to develop a rational understanding of applicable growth.