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I rest not from my great task!
...open the Eternal Worlds, to open the immortal Eyes
...inwards into the Worlds of Thought, into Eternity
...expanding in the Bosom of God, the Human Imagination.

-- W. Blake

Happy the man who fails to stifle his vision.

-- P. Teilhard de Chardin
ABSTRACT

THINGS OLD AND NEW:
Eukaryosis, Incarnation and Metanoia

By virtue of a physical and psychic eukaryosis consciousness approximates a threshold condition which when surpassed and included creates a metanoia or change of state. Tendencies toward this metanoia (called by Fuller ephemeralization, and by Jung the transcendent function, by Toynbee etherealization, and considered under such different idioms as Sufic tradition and "catastrophe" mathematics) conduce to an emergence in, of and through consciousness which is analogous to religious intuitions of incarnation whereby the identity of mankind and godkind is experienced in generosity and precision of cognition and action.

The incarnative intuition can be taken as a complement and corrective to seemingly external and incomplete notions of Self which have arisen from conventional views of "salvationism."
Although not a theologian or a scientist, I think I can discern major themes in religion which have colored our thinking and thus our science and philosophy for a considerable period of time. The two themes I am singling out for consideration are the themes of salvationism and incarnation. While these orchestrations of belief and intuition are not at all exclusive of one another, I am coming to feel that we have exalted and dwelt on the aspect of salvationism and left ourselves somewhat unbalanced by the influences of the notion of incarnation. It seems that the doctrines of salvation have weighed increasingly heavily upon our social ethic because they admit of rational cause/effect analysis and confirm our social prejudices concerning expectation and reward. In turn, these doctrines may have limited the range and depth we permit ourselves in the paradigms of our personal metaphysics. If, as LeShan has suggested, our metaphysic determines our ability, then I would think that it is a complement to a salvationist mentality that we are now seeking and realizing in the West -- and around the world.
The belief in salvation by virtue of the appearance of a divine incarnation in human form was inevitably reduced to the denominator of social mimesis. The mystery of the cosmic man became a deliberation over the relative merits of works and faiths. Persons like myself brought up in a comparatively pragmatic and result/reward oriented society have become, I believe, either tired of or confused by the complications of the episcopacy, the papacy, the mother of god, his father, the multitudes of teachings, saints, heresies and doctrines. And I think that much of what is sensed is a vague and generalized antipathy for what are often seen to be shallow and incomplete implications in the notions of salvationism as these notions usually appear in our public forum. We are wary, especially, of the attendant ideology concerning the sinner. It is found wanting because it seems to reduce mystery to a matter of behavior. And there is in us some intuition, a feeling, that there is and was more to the advent of higher religion than the image of an alternately wan or overbearing anthropomorphic god who meted out reward according to whether or not we played by the rules. The rules, increasingly interpreted and manufactured by the hierophants, had supplanted the mystery, the personal mystery, and were in the contemporary era found to be specious and ungenerous — a thinned and
watered hint of the original experience, watered and polluted by scandal, false piety and an abstruse canon of theological debate, intellectuality and, in frequent cases, legalism.

Perhaps because the curates and priests had not the faith, or perhaps because they were aware of an apparent intellectual or meditative incapacity in the general population, they were finally obliged to put the matter in the simplest and most conventional forms possible. Rite, spectacle and commandment stood in place of personal experience, vision and inner certitude. Today, while we like to feel that we are more capable of subtlety and depth in our experience of the world, we are still surrounded by what seem to be either irrelevant or simplistic traditions from an earlier day. These traditions we seek not so much to disavow as to extend and to refine.

Whether or not that was in fact the case, it does appear that in the effort to retain and to extend their vision and their ethic the earlier ministrators of religious systems and polities took to seeking out and combatting heresies and heathen and got lost in the apparatus of their argumentation. In the meantime, science was proving more mysterious than catechism and more ostensibly efficient than grace in improving
the condition of men and women.

In embracing with a fervor that amounts almost to exclusivity the salvationist teachings, we have erected about ourselves a steep and vast legism of behaviors of mind and body; and in so doing we have vitiated our intuitive, mystical intimations and placed the godhead atop an adamant altar and ourselves as supplicants far below, bound in and by the toil by which we had hoped to elevate ourselves to the supreme vision. Since that vision was so long in forthcoming, save for the occasional (and hypothetically aberrant) saint and mystic, we finally became disillusioned and then resentful and then indifferent to the church, first, and then to the very experience of which the church was covenant and memory.

The consequence is that now, by and large, we have no sense of or interest in our mythic legacy, and we take somewhat ill any serious notions of a personal and personalizing god. We prefer a random creation and a materialism of electricity and aldehydes to a dying and reviving god and archetype. Or perhaps we admit, with varying degrees of clarity and persuasion, to a deistic idea of an intelligent and all-pervasive spirit the essence of which is to permeate and to vitalize all things yet which seems to have no intimate
interest in the universe save to abide and to be realized occasionally by those who, through their own designs, discover it.

Yet the circle of binding whose last perihelion was scholastic machination may be coming around again, driven, in good part, by the very methods of those clerks who helped forge the flywheel of contemporary thought. Carl Sagan is an example: a planetary astronomer and exobiologist who has been speaking and writing of the philosophical and religious aspects of space research and of the horizons it opens before us. He appreciates, like all persons in love with knowledge, that the enduring benefit in scientific research, beyond its material benefits and its acumen, is its ability to quicken and to sustain our sense of mystery. We enjoy it not only for the satisfaction of pitting our resources, mental and physical, against the unknown; we enjoy it not alone for the fact that it is in the unknown that we discover ourselves; but it is for this too: along the axis of the mysterious we find the unimpeded vector and realm of our unique genius, imagination. Whether we liken imagination to intuition, "tacit knowledge," grace, insight or the psychobiological infrastructure of evolution, it is alone in this expanse, this varying
configuration of dream, theory and reflective practice, that we find a pure and unlimited play of consciousness.

Mystery induces consciousness; it is the bone upon which are exercised the teeth of the mind. This was said by Robert of Sorbonne and it was typified severally by the Chaldeans, the scholastics, Copernicus and Paul Dirac. Mystery, in this sense, is the source of knowledge and knowledge is the visible nimbus of mystery.

In this way we may say that the mind -- an organ, if not the only organ of knowing -- is an incarnation of mystery. Life is a mystery. The fact that we can manipulate matter or consciousness to produce predicted results does not mean that we know what we are doing. The most that we can deduce is that we have familiarity with the things of the world within the framework and tapestry of our assumptions. But events may take place in many realms at once, have multiple significances. We may not, in fact, "know" a great deal about anything because in knowing a thing utterly we would be obliged to know everything. We cannot completely comprehend an orange or a swallowtail catastrophe without in the process knowing all the antecedents, relations and evolutions of those events. Mystery takes consciousness beyond the package of its assumptions and frees it anew, renews it. The awareness of the mysterious gives us new
life; we are reborn with a new vision, dimension and
dispensation.

Since the organ that knows, the mind, is a mystery
to us, we are in the position of a mystery, the mind,
within a mystery, the universe. Whether the conscious
mind came into being as a byproduct of the evolving
organization of matter and energy, and if it was or was
not also sponsored by a special act of god, the effect was
the same: we woke to find ourselves outside the garden
of thoughtless Eden, woke to the consciousness of mystery.
If the mind partakes of the nature and morphology of the
universe and is exponential of it, then it seems to be
that mind is that by which the mystery of life knows and
realizes itself; the mind of man is the mind of creation.
Since there seems to be no necessary and sufficient reason
why mind would exist solely in consciousness and in
men and women, we may better say that the mind of man
is a localization of the mind of creation. Furthermore,
it would seem, if mind is taken to include all potential
modes of comprehension -- emotional, intuitive and
surrational -- and if its fundamental and ultimate
resonance and matrix is coterminous with the universal
event (and there is more reason to believe that it is
than that it is not) then mind and universe are a mutual
polarity and relativity that savors of Vedanta, gnosis, sufism and returns to us the informing vitality of the theme of incarnation.

If this is seen to follow, rationally or intuitively, then one of the conclusions to be drawn is this: to know the mystery of the mind (accepting the possible contradiction in that) and to know the relations, to experience the relations of imagination and consciousness with the universe, is to know all as Self and Self as All. The Vedantist may call this atman, self-knowledge; Socrates will say, gnòthi seauton; and Christ will iterate, "the kingdom of heaven is within." It will be seen that this form of knowing is not the strictly discursive rationality characteristic of intellectualism, but the full and perhaps conscious integration of the human functions of thinking, sensating, feeling and intuiting and whatever others there may be of which we are ostensibly ignorant. Self-knowledge thus takes on the characteristics not so much of a parcel of known data but of an attitude, an ambience, a response and a relation with and a cultivated experience of the mystery of life.

One sees, first, not only that one is alive but that one is Life itself. One "knows" that each person, thing and event partakes of and is the mystery of all others. In this wise the Vedantist states, tat tvam asi.
Such knowledge, Self-knowledge, is in such terms a matter of yoga, if we are of Eastern persuasion, or incarnation if we are of Western. In any case, the further term in this sequence of development is that Self-knowledge leads to Self-love, if love means the acknowledgment, acceptance, incorporation and delight of all the aspects of Self, which includes and is not limited to personality and consciousness. Since the mystery of life is the mystery of Self, Self-knowledge tending to Self-love tends further to a love for life and all the things of life. The Buddhas laid it down such that we would show charity "for all things whether born of womb or egg or moisture, whether real or unreal." And the Christ had it such that we would love our neighbors as our selves. The Sufi may state tersely that however many knots we tie "the string remains one." In esoteric terms, as we think in our hearts so are we.

If the salvationist doctrine was the goad and promise which put the West on the road we now travel and which thereby exerts an increasing influence on the planetary culture, then the recreation of the incarnational mystique may be the natural corrective to our externalized conceptions of progress, redemption and growth. Expressed in the idiom of our time, one tinged with a fear that tutelage means tyranny, the many ideologies and movements
of this and other nations are implicitly efforts at what Toynbee might have called self-determination, and which Dubos may have spoken of as a form of the search for the god within. If what takes place in the streets and academies is indicative of our interior psychic climate, then perhaps we are witnessing, from para-psychology to feminism, a palingenesis of an innate myth of rebirth coupled with the locomotion of a complex and comprehensive technology. The unconsciously sensed vigor of incarnation rectified and communicated under the aegis of reason and contemporary science and graced with a vision of a more enriched version of our actualized selves might well be the friendly tutor of many of the re-visioning, re-assessing and consciousness-expanding efforts of this historical moment. Mindful of the fact that this vigor is not the special property of any one culture and that its implications are likely to be, in essence, invariant with respect to time and place, we may agree with Albert Schweitzer that "the problem of our time is a problem of the human spirit." Thus, too, the responsibility.

Men and women of science, as well as poets and prophets, have gone a long way in their fashion towards satisfying in themselves and quickening in others the sense of cosmicity which an incarnational intuition induces and which
we perhaps denied ourselves under an earlier religious paradigm. Science has articulated a principle of biology that in my mind tallies by analogy with the pre-Christian and pre-historic mysteries of incarnation. The fact that science did not intend to do so, certainly not since the days of the Thomists, might give us pause to reflect that it is not impossible that certain intellectual constellating and enucleating principles obtain differing disciplines and ages. Given such a consideration, we might speculate further that all forms of knowing in all times may be as facets and phases of a fundamental awareness which to be fully realized requires of us not only ideation but experiential identification.

If the mystery of creation and of mind in/of creation is all of a piece -- that is to say, if god is not playing dice with the world and if the world is not playing dice with itself, introducing random variables from quaqua-versal sources -- then it would seem that at a point in human development (maybe roughly coincident with the development of consciousness and allowing for indeterminacy in perspective) knowledge and realization through the mind would begin to take the form of some coherence, conscious coherence, with regard to the universal event. That, of course, is the presupposition of science and esoteric practice -- that we can know with reasonable clarity the essential
principles and archetypes of the universe. Hopefully, whether scientists or not, we may steer clear of the "cargo cult" varieties of investigation.

I would like to suggest that if the principles of such seemingly disparate realms as those of biology and religious intuition show analogous themes, and if such themes seem to show, let us say, parallel development in different planes, then we may be able to effect some kind of translation between the two. Perhaps, given more research and consideration, a field theory or a more elaborate episteme would be desirable.

I am wondering that if something in the allegedly supernatural realm ordinarily left to questions of religion, namely incarnation, and if something in the natural realm ordinarily left to science, namely eukaryosis, share a common dynamic and, in their different modes, import, then perhaps what is called the supernatural is not without natural significance and the natural is not without supernatural significance. The implication is that natural and supernatural phenomena form a continuum. We can defuse the issue a little by expressing it in terms of metaphysics; but there are considerations which will be brought forth to indicate that, however theoretical these considerations may be, there is good reason to believe that we are talking about a real event
in the marrow of our being which is profound, cosmic, intimate and relevant. Exotic as they may be, and assuming this is not a chimera of speculation, these considerations may prove to be initial and awkward steps across the threshold of understanding into another order of comprehension. And rather than be alarmed that the suggestion of such a threshold is tainted with arcane, obscurantist or silly-minded fantasies, let us try to regard it as a feature of that same process of enrichment which transformed gummy coacervates into homo sapiens, which led from fire to fusion and which could conceivably trigger in us the scope and precision we require to navigate a renascent starship planet. It was common lore among the alchemists that, "as above, so below." Perhaps today in the guise of our contemporary transmutations, psychic and atomic, it wants articulation through the combined voices of our sciences and our religious intuitions. Before taking up these considerations it would be a good idea to learn something of the meaning of eukaryosis. If I in any way traduce the consensus of biological or theological opinion in what follows I hope it will be borne in mind that this is a most tentative essay and that my sincere wish is to encourage reasoned discourse and not to muddle, meddle or mystify.

Eukaryosis, loosely translated from Greek, means
"good nut" or, more appropriately, good seed. It is the principle and process whereby little things get together in making bigger things. The usual kind of animal cell we might run into is made up of a membrane enclosing a cytoplasm which is punctuated by vacuoles, reticula, mitochondria, odds and ends and, most importantly, a nucleus. That nucleus is especially significant in this essay, though all the parts work together and it would not be much of a cell without, say, a membrane to keep it from dissolving into salt water altogether. It is a system. However, there is paleobiological evidence (still debated) from people like Barghoorn, Shklovskii and Sagan, Margulis and Oparin, that that may not have been the case originally when life was porridge and intelligence meant not eating poison. In the old days, those parts may have been separate from one another; we might find that what was to become a membrane was then just a gummy or stringy composition more a chain of molecules than the refined instrument we now see it to be. And we might find a pair of these proto-organelles joined together in some kind of unsophisticated symbiosis. The state in which these elements were floating around unorganized is called prokaryotic. It resembles speculations by such writers as Jung and Neumann about the nature of the
nascent psyche. The eukaryotic initiation began when, seemingly, that which we call the nucleus provided an organizing influence and impetus for these disparate units to work together in a functioning arrangement recognizable as a cell. Order, in this fashion, emerged from a hypothetical chaos. And the story became familiar to us: cells made tissues and tissues made organs and the hip-bone's connected to the thigh-bone until, and while, the complex organization of matter tended to produce, to transduce, consciousness.

Eukaryosis made possible and demonstrated a physical and meta-physical incarnation of the universe, in conscious man and woman. From an anthropocentric point of view, we are a summation and synopsis of creation. If we are teleologists we are, for the moment, the fulfilment of creation. Since our social order indicates that our future development is our own responsibility, and since our researches intimate that we are not exactly what we thought we were, certain ancient questions like "what is truth?" and "who am I?" are evoking in many minds surprisingly deep and contiguous responses.

Comparing this process with religious thinking, we may see that eukaryosis in its physical stead serves as the same enucleating principle and attainment of
critical mass that the "incarnation" of any transfigurative personality does in the anagogic realm. To go just a little further, the enucleating principle in biology is analogous to the appearance of any higher mentality connoted socially or religiously that constellates through and around itself energies, enthusiasms, transcendent or recreational impulses and intuitions. A more thorough treatment of this appears in Toynbee's Study of History; and I would think that it might be profitable with this eukaryotic/incarnative analogy in mind to reconsider the relations of the internal and external proletariats and the creative/dominant minorities over time, particularly as they might be regarded through the lens of the higher religions of human development.

From a certain point of view of science and from a point of view of religious intuition, there is a movement they both share -- call it incarnation or enucleation -- and working from that I think we can see that the "natural" world of biology and the "supernatural" world of religion are not so exclusive of one another.

For that matter, unless we are to scrap one mode or the other as being totally false, we may provisionally conclude that they are different views of the same truth, complementary hues in the spectrum of mystery.
Eukaryosis is a process whereby organization and complexification find a centering principle in and through a transducing and concentrating nucleus. If an increase in conscious capacity is a concommitant of the organized complexity of matter/energy (and I am thinking of papers edited by Ornstein and some of the writings of Koestler, Jung and Teilhard de Chardin) we might couple this possibility with the gleanings of the mental and amental strategies reported to us by various individuals and cults which through the years have discovered and trained in themselves concentrative, transcendent and state-specific techniques. It is not necessarily so that the higher evolutionary endowments of life were dependent on centration; but it does seem to be so that conscious life as we know it passed first through the narrow gate of centration and in-gathering before and while diversifying and de-centrating itself at a higher level of development.

There is a hint of an analogous process in the concept of "critical mass" in nuclear physics; only in this case the raw stuff reaches a climax of energetic density throughout its mass without a corresponding focus of energy. It stands as leaven to loaf rather than as acorn to oak. However, the abiologic and infrapsychic connotation of critical mass may be re-
garded as the prelude to enucleation in that it provides the density, the proximity, whereby the diffuse many may become the organized one. (We might surmise that centration is a property of matter/energy relations and apply ourselves with some facet to the theoretical implications of nuclear physics.)

If transfigurative centration and the corollary threshold-emergence are perceived as being operative in the physical world and in the human psyche, then it may stand as the process which induces metanoia, which can be taken to mean not only a conversion, a change of mind and heart, but also a change of state. We may ask to what extent change of state implies change of nature.

Looking now to the realm of religious intuition, let us see if we can adduce further evidences—admittedly by analogy—for a process of centration—enucleation—metanoia by which the mystery of man knows, realizes and becomes the mystery of the universal event, or God. But as we do so let us pause for a moment to consider an incidental but pregnant notion: If the process of centration can be consciously and deliberately configured, as greater and lesser traditions have understood that it could be—psychoanalysis, yoga, contemplative practice and sufism as well as alchemy and Norman
Vincent Peal -- then does not purpose become a genuine feature of the universal event? And if this process of transfiguration does in fact occur to the extent that one may live without further metaphysical assumptions in an experiential comprehensivity and abundance of what might be regarded as a new life, where, then, is the sting of death?

Rather than try to respond to these questions, perhaps we can turn to the ideas intimated earlier as being supportive of the thesis of this essay -- you are the final intelligence.

Epiktēsis is a word which evidently found a home among the early Christian fathers. It is a Greek word and it appears to mean a wandering and progression of the soul deeper into god. Between the words "wandering and progression" may lie the meaning and difference of "science and religion," for the contemporary world culture. And what objective observer is to state decisively who is the wanderer and who the progressor? Rather than dicker, let us try to bear in mind that progress is often accidental and wandering (pilgrimage?) often has its own subliminal itinerary, something that may be more clear after we reflect a little about the idea of the transcendent function and the circumambulation of the soul, further on.
I visualize epiktesis in different ways. The first way is to imagine a pencil point zig-zagging back and forth across the surface of the earth and through it. The longer it moved around the more area it would eventually cover. Slowly or quickly it would comprehend the sphere. Alternatively, I can imagine a light bulb, or a mind, which by degrees increased its voltage, and thus its radius and clarity, until it too had comprehended an increasingly vast terrain. Or again, I conceive of epiktesis as something like the water which evaporates from the earth to precipitate down again as rain, over and over, becoming more intimate, common and useful to the life of the earth and needing in turn solar energy to effect its transmutations. This is something reminiscent of baraka and grace.

In keeping with the image of water, there is still another metaphor for epiktesis; it is that of the sure if unconscious progress of the river to the sea. For if the movement of the soul, the psyche, deeper into the mystery of god and life is one's end, then any approach is bound to bring it there. As the Chinese told, even the wrong means in the right hands will be successful. A river need not explore every of its tributaries, for it is those tributaries. Likewise, the consciousness of mankind may skirt like a firefly up and down the
streams and sloughs of being, yet it is always that which it explores. And like a river increasingly broad and full so is the soul advancing in mystery able to bear more, to include more, until it finds itself mingled in the alpha and omega of the sea.

Sense of mystery need not mystify; it may, in fact, clarify. If the conscious sense of mystery is an inclusive state which subsumes a plethora of contradictions, it may be a necessary aspect of the training of discrimination. Unity differentiates, but not necessarily according to received assumptions. Also, in keeping with Jung, we must pay attention that we do not confuse individuation with individualization, the former is the fulfilment of the latter, as love to the lonely.

Eukaryosis was depicted as a spatial process whereby disparate elements grew together in a common system. Epiktēsis, in the image of the river, was a linear motion; it was to be regarded as a line of sight along one radian of the process of eukaryosis, enucleation, centration, eucharist and communion. In the case of a spiritually inclined human being, and we all are to some extent, the motion deeper into mystery is not only quantitative but qualitative as well; and it is manifold. We are not only opening consciousness outward from the focus of the ego, expanding; we are also binding and centering inward, through the Self, the life experience we undergo.
Thus too the eukaryote which accumulates and assimilates through itself the various elementals and energies of which it is comprised and at the same time, by virtue of its increasing "density" and resource, its improving intelligence of response, it becomes capable of opening and corresponding outward at another order of development and integration. Arthur Koestler has written of this binary-aspect of biological systems using the concept of the two-faced Janus, the holon, which is at once the whole of that which it includes and a part of that which includes it.

A symbol of this "individuation" may be found in the geometric depiction of the Hebrew Kogan David, the Star of David. I know little of Jewish tradition, but it seems that if the Buddhist mandala represents the panoply of creation in a timeless moment, all things constellated like a halo around Gautama the Tathagata, all things being implicitly objectifications of mind of the Buddha, then we can take the Star of David as an emblem for the same event as regarded within time, as history. Let us consider this for a moment.

Imagine a triangle such as this one, \( \triangle \), and say the base of this figure is the undifferentiated ylem of creation. From a materialist standpoint the apex of the triangle is an organized eukaryote and, by
extension, the conscious organ of humanity. From a spiritualist viewpoint, the apex is an image of god. In both cases the apex subsumes, completes, vivifies and is nourished by all that converges in it. In neither case is the apex a static condition. Materially speaking, consciousness is still developing; spiritually, we are clarifying the lineaments of god. Another triangle such as this, ▽, taken materially can represent consciousness opening outward in a different order; and spiritually it can mean the emergence of conscious man in the apeiron, the unbounded. Whether labeled as grace, evolution, or cultivation and Work (amal), some agent appears to work in mind when it reaches a critical threshold of subtle complexity and refinement. The organs of perception quicken and tune to previously unknown degrees of comprehension and experience. As William Blake wrote, "when the doors of perception are cleansed everything will appear as it is, infinite." Rational extrapolations from what we are now and from what we know thus bear a striking likeness to the affirmations of religious intuition. This is the more intriguing when we recall that not so long ago science and religion were undivided, and that according to such writers as Jung and Neumann, the higher religions, and all religion, have ever reflected and inaugurated
further advances in human consciousness. From Bachofen to Campbell to Foucault we have heard suggestions of this; and from Heisenberg and Schrödinger to LeShan and Koestler we hear reformulations of the same mystery.

If we superimpose the two triangles, \( \triangle \), we can regard the star either as an emblem of the spiritual world of incarnation-epiktesis; or we can regard it as an emblem of the material world of eukaryosis-holon. Finally, we can take the yantra as an emblem of the total phenomenon of the natural-cosmogenesis/supernatural-incarnation. The virtues of symbols allow our habitual thought patterns to loosen, interfuse and increase in reverie and intuition. Not only can they express inarticulable intimations and experiences, but they may also effect and educe from us more varied and subtle responses to the mystery of life.

To make one last allusion, if we place the two triangles as they approach union like this, \( \bigstar \), and consider the point where they meet to be the space occupied by consciousness, then we have a rude diagram of one of the seven fundamental "catastrophes" indicated by the French mathematician René Thom as being the essential topologic representations of discontinuity or change of state in the physical and, apparently, the social world. This allusion is germane because we
have been speaking about the relation of the natural scientific to supernatural religious instincts and perceptions -- are they different in kind or in degree; are they continuous or discontinuous, is there a space of resolution? My intuition is that contradictions can be sustained and incorporated and that in doing so we attain not fuzzy-minded misapprehension but clearer and more far-reaching subtly subtle understanding. Man may be that by which what we call god knows itself; man and god are identical, the same identity seen under different species, alike in kind, differing in degree.

As others have written, certain ideas may turn up throughout history and yet, though different in vocabulary, remain invariant with respect to culture and discipline. It is to be wondered if a complex of such ideas is not related to certain of the symbols which have existed for numberless generations -- symbols which well up unconsciously to express the inexpressible. The poets Blake and Yeats, for example, both invoked a gyre-vortex-triangle image; and we are familiar with the well published similarities of the pyramids of the Old and New worlds, with tipis and with Eskimo bath-houses. (As Frazer said quite clearly, similar problems call forth similar responses; I have no intention of ascribing esoteric design to a bath-house.)
But the symbolic plot does thicken. Buckminster Fuller expresses a hypothesis that a tetrahedonal form demonstrates a fundamental geometry of the universe, all the more tantalizing in light of recent speculation that memory and genetic endowment may be functions of geometric arrangement. Physicists researching the microworld deal with whorls and gyres and cloud-chamber after-images of minicyclones of energy while bio-mathematicians like Waddington and Thom reflect on the chreod, a conical affair. This is anecdote and beside the point.

The point is, symbols may "eff the ineffable" and a good symbol is transparent in that it allows us to see into and through it a trans-symbolic truth, lest we mistake "the finger for the moon to which it is pointing." This is equally true of rational hypothesis and religious and artistic intuition -- if we allow ourselves to see it so; "reality" may be similarly transparent.

Even if you are a "lumper" (as I am) and not a "splitter," we must admit that science and religion are different. But the fact that they are different, as Watts maintained, does not mean that they are separate or even mutually exclusive of one another. Both are "strategic manipulations of matter and consciousness." Both demonstrate a process that Fuller calls "ephemer-alization" and that Toynbee calls "etherialization."
Both demonstrate a function of the psyche that Jung called the "transcendent function." Relying on these terms, I would further reflect that the mind of man is an eye of god and express an idea that the phenomenon of eukaryosis -- physical and psychic -- and the phenomenon of incarnation are aspects of one another.

But I think it is time to consider two caveats. The first comes from the Diamond-Cutter Sutra. Its premise is that there are no individual personalities, things, ideas. If I understand the Buddha, it is saying that all distinctions are misapprehensions of the undivided. It also seems to be saying that all we loosely call reality is projected by our habitual, assumptive minds. Dons Juan and Genaro make like allegations; and Idries Shah in writing of the brujo of mediaeval Spain draws our attention to the likeness of the sufi experience of the world to that of the Mexican man of power. Christ, putting a little english on the matter, says that "as a man thinks in his heart so is he." And Carl Jung has made a convincing statement that reality is a psychic event. Further thinking along these lines is to be found in the work of LeShan and in Ornstein's work on the nature of consciousness. I am not going to try to deal with these reflections explicitly; but I will mention two other observations:
Thomas Aquinas states that things are "received according to the nature of the recipient." What you are is what you get. And William Blake, in connection with the last judgment or, if you will, threshold, writes that "it will be seen by each according to his situation."

Blake's indefatigable insight also led him to write, "the fool who persists in his folly will become wise."

I am very fond of Blake.

The next caveat is, I think, more subtle and of greater consequence because we feel its import more closely. The first expression of it that I recall, other than in the works of R.D. Laing, was in Time or Newsweek of three or four years ago. The gist of the article, and the caveat, was that there was wisdom in the Greek and Roman pantheon of divinities in that they allowed us a number of transpersonal archetypes to which we could relate and exalt our various passions and traits. Being able to indulge and to exalt the amours of Venus or the strengths and disruptions of Mars provided us with an outlet, a depth less likely to be found in the somewhat homogenizing and restricting influences of a monotheistic orthodoxy. The pantheon offered a more varied emotional calculus.

in a treatment of a book by Leo Bersani:

He is chiefly engaged in mounting an argument in favor of 'psychic mobility,' a condition in which we release ourselves from the rigidity enforced by a psychology of the coherently structured and significantly expressive self.

The reviewer, Denis Donoghue, went on to write:

He is now rebuking a society which assumes that stable centers of desire enable us to construct an integral, legible self; this assumption consoles us by offering not only a powerful ideology but strategies for containing and repressing our disorders within an orthodoxy of growth and development.

He wants us to become more skeptical, ridding ourselves of the illusions that we are selves, unified, coherent, according to a grammar of attributes and relations. Or if this is impossible, he wants us to exert our imaginations upon the congealed assumptions by which we live. The established social order finds it convenient to enforce an orthodoxy based upon such motives as these: self, personality, intention, character, name, structure and motive. These make a politics of idealism in which consciousness is trained to expect a coherent narrative of beginning, middle and end. Professor Bersani speaks for a rival psychology which deploys such terms as these: desire, mobility, dispersal, absence, discontinuity, diversity, risk, unpredictability.

If we are to hold discourse over whether or not there are or should be coherent selves or whether the events of life and psychology are stochastic, we will have, as Athena said, "two sides and but half the argument."

Therefore, let an effort be made to sustain the ambiguity and to try to resolve it by transposing it into another
key. Idries Shah has written that,

The individual out of personal control, believes himself to be a coherent personality, starts to learn that he, like all undeveloped individuals, has a multiple and changing personality.

As the individual passes through the several stages of recreation in the sufic purview, "before individuality is ready for its full function," he learns to see automatic thoughts and assumptions for what they are. This enables mental integration on a more refined and comprehensive plane than was previous "futile custom." This transmutative effect leads to balance and equilibrium and to the capacity for ranges of experience "not susceptible to description beyond approximate analogy."

"A new activity and function, including extra dimensions of the individuality" are brought into ken to assist and reflect the "completion of the task of reconstitution, possibility of teaching others, capacity for objective understanding."

I infer from both Shah and Bersani a subtle process of metanoia and rebirth. It is interesting that at the moment in conscious development when we most pride ourselves on having attained an apogee of understanding we also begin to feel the need to "die," to re-incarnate the holon, to loose that we may bind again -- "the net of heaven is woven wide, yet nothing escapes."
Humanistic psychology has observed that all behavior is purposeful, whether rational or irrational, conscious or not; everything we do has its own ethos, though perhaps myths would be a better word. The mythos need not be conventionally coherent or continuous; it may be in fact the raw impulse of life -- a form of epiktesis. As such it would have the basic integrity of being, all else would be assumption, artifact and superfluity.

Our psychologies have been, like various geometries, founded upon axioms which seem to be compatible with the systems which grow out of them. Do we now enter the phase of relativistic transformational psychologies, quantum psychologies, and psychologies of complex variables? It behooves us to think about the baby in the bathwater. We cannot evacuate, disperse and otherwise dissolve the self until we have attained it. And since (S)elf is correlate with the very fabric of creation, we must eventually come to a baseline recognition of what is, of the Real. That is, of course, unless we are prepared to enter a space which is not only a-personal and a-conscious but a-ontic as well. That is not inconceivable or ridiculous, but it is something for another essay, or the Heart Sutra.

If there never was such a thing or event as self, it would seem to follow that consciousness is adrift
in the ether and only seems to localize in human beings and elsewhere; in which case it might be said that personality is an artifact of the enucleation of consciousness. I wonder if Bersani’s encouragement to us to think more about absence and discontinuity will not make us reflect if we are not the broken shards of some unseen light -- as if to say, "we do not regard ourselves as whole, coherent and unified; we are the refracted members of that which is undivided." And would such an attitude instill in us a desire, now in evidence, to seek out our ultimate coherence?

The universe is a mystery as is the mind through, in and as which, at times, creation knows itself. If there is such a psychic organ as the mind which can produce and bind to itself an identity, then it could loose it too. This might be as creative panoply or neurosis, and it might show us that the mind-personality is an aspect and phase of the universal mystery.

We might find it worth our while to think more about cases like Sybil and the Aspect psychology which has grown out of the Seth material. In such light, the event we call personality may be the effect of psychic (or even transpsychic) emanations which produce the interference patterns we recognize as the elements of our reality. "Who knows but each bird that cuts the airy way
is an immense world of delight closed by your senses five."

I think too of the Eskimo and Indian shamen, the eremites of the East, whose occasional aim it was to induce what we would call a psychosis, to diffract, to vacate and to multiply the personality in order to transcend the attributes of personality -- even to experience that personality itself is an attribute, that it is a point of view, that reality is a point of view. Keeping in mind the holon, we may find that while identity is the apex of history and attribute, it may be too but the germinating fruit of a branch of the tree of life. While we believe that we live and so attempt to construct a world based on that premise, it may be also true that we are lived, lived through. There is "nobody home," "let not thy right hand know what they left hand is about"; "it is not I who speak but the spirit within me."

In the hierarchy of needs is the need to escape, to transcend and to transfigure the self, the world, even to obliterate and to annihilate. We create anew, we are created anew every day; and time may be an artifact of that recreation. There is no causal attachment to the consistency of personality that has gone before. But there is the fundamental continuity of the universe,
of being-it's-Self. And if we maintain that this comprehensive event we call life is an illusion (in the sense of incomplete and in the sense of non-extant) we still accede to the fact that within and through this realm of experience are to be found the means and configurations of awareness which enable us to transcend and thus to include this realm. In doing so we pass into and perhaps sustain a realization that our identity is implicit in the cosmic tissue and is an articulation of that entity. Our conception of this state, however, may not be congruent with conventional conceptions of being and identity.

Shah, writing of our need to, "...trace a historical phenomenon to definite beginnings..." may tell us something about Bersani's work and about the question of the one and the many. Strictly speaking, there are no such things as beginnings and endings. There are, at best, threshold fields of apparent discontinuity. Our habitual notion of begin-and-end, and thus our notions of things and events, take into account neither multiplicity of dimension nor multiplicity and integrity of significance. Do we really pretend to have an answer to a question like "when does life begin; when does it end?" Although not a devotee of the occult, theosophical or parapsychological, I do respect the evidence which suggest that built into
our thought and assumption is a bias to ex-plane the world in two dimensions: space and time. For that matter, given the intimacy of space and time, we may have to date conducted our researches not in what we have taken to be the four dimensions of space and time but in an essentially monopolar and monovalent environment, that of a single spacetime dimensionality.

Shah writes that the need "to trace a historical phenomenon [a personality, an event] to definite beginnings, so well marked in the present phase of learning, is undoubtedly bound up with the need of the ordinary mind to have a beginning and, if possible, an end for everything." Shah goes on to elaborate that:

Almost everything known to man through his ordinary senses has for him a beginning and an end. To know what something is gives a sensation of stability, a feeling of security.... There are various accepted methods of establishing beginnings and endings, or creating substitutes for them. They may be created by concocted myths and legends.... Another way is that of the Chinese emperor who decreed that history would start with him.... A third technique is to assume that some event, located in time and perhaps in space, represents a beginning.

If these myths and substitutes are analogous to the grammar of "attributes and relations," and the "congealed assumptions by which we live," then perhaps Bersani and Shah find common insight for us in this aphorism which we might apply to the question of Self: "Take the wheat, not the measure in which it is contained."
I would like to suggest that while there may be no "...stable centers of desire" or "unified, coherent" selves, there may well exist a unified, coherent, stable and flexibly centering faculty, a principle, one which may be in the world and yet not, according to our assumptions, altogether of it. It may be, like a rain of baraka or the circle of infinite centers, amenable alike to "mobility, dispersal, absence, discontinuity, diversity, risk and unpredictability," and to "self, personality, intention, character, name, structure and motive." The truth of personality, like truth in any case, must be "experimental" and experiential; it is a state of being more than it is an idea. Yet, since "everything possible to be believed is an image of truth," the combined and rectified ideas of Bersani, the annals of our shell-shocked societies, the visions of our madmen, poets and savants should reveal to us something of the nature of the mystery, something of the experiences of being and identity that supersede or stand at right angles to our orthodox postulates of what is real. Save in an ontological vacuum, no thing is self-definable. Many colors make a clear light.

We have detoured to discuss Bersani and Buddha. I hope it has not been boring or misleading. To maintain that there is a common denominator (highest or lowest)
in sciencemind and religionmind is to maintain some-
thing mystical. An equation of eukaryosis and incarnation
is an intuitive, religious feat, since science would feel
inequipped to test it out. But to leave it at that is to
misvalue and to misapply scientific method and mythos.

Science is knowledge, a means by which mystery realizes
mystery. Science takes the universe and all its manifesta-
tions for its province, given the assumption that there is
an objective universe. Science and religion alike share
certain elements I would now like to consider.

If the epiktesis of a religious mentality stands by
analogy as the equivalent of the horizontal axis of a
cartesian mentality, then let us take the transcendent
function treated by Jung as the analog of the vertical
axis. (In facile but hopefully not inappropriate terms,
let us say that the axes of science are a quantitative
estimation of the world, and the axes of religion a
qualitative.)

Jung was writing as a man of science: he made no
statement or hypothesis which was unsupported by his
research. His data were derived from the human psyche
with which he made himself intimate over the course of
eighty-odd years. The data revealed a process/phenom-
enon in human development which he labeled the transcend-
ent function. This function is, in my words, the impulse
to more comprehensive awareness and understanding; it is the integrating, balancing and elevating aspect of the Self, Self-recognition. There are many ways of speaking of this function; but all in all they amount to this: the salt of the earth. There is something in us which wants to include and to go beyond what we are and what we know. It is an impulse of actualization, transfiguration, homecoming and vitalization. It is through the transcendent function that we discover that the center and essence of our life-awareness is not in the attributes of space-timebound ego and persona but in the Self, coterminous with Life. It is not a static moment of discovery but an active principle of coalescence and concentration, unifying, releasing and uplifting.

More lyrically and no less meaningfully, it is the holy spirit, the philosopher’s stone, the honey, the grape and the wine; it is leaven. It is the *clinamen* of Epicurus, the Tao of Lao-Tzu, pneuma, ruach and prajna/prana; the active ingredient in cosmogenesis, logos, it is "a clean windshield, good gasoline and a shoeshine." Its presence and effect in the psyche is to gather, rectify, resolve, confirm and elevate. I submit that it is the psychic equivalent of biological eukaryosis -- a prolongation of eukaryosis into the transphysical -- and it is the modulation between eukaryosis and incarnation.
If epiktesis is a progression into god, the transcendent function tends to a densification and psychic articulation of the god within. Whereas traditionally incarnation has been regarded as a supernatural investiture from "above," the auspices of the transcendent function characterize it equally as the confluence and elevation of cosmic dynamic from "below"; the infra and supra-psychic interface is human consciousness and imagination. It appears to be a function whereby projections are withdrawn and realized as filaments of Self. This function is, and produces, a change of state which represents what the Hopi calls an emergence -- a change of nature. By such a principle the apparent contradiction between the natural and the supernatural is resolved. We may hear of this function elsewhere, in different garb.

For instance, Buckminster Fuller speaks of a process of ephemeralization at work in successive generations of technology, one which seems to be at work also in successive generations of reflective awareness. Ephemeralization means a half-ton satellite in space can do the work of one hundred thousand miles of copper wire on earth. It implies that the strategic configuration of matter (the body, technology), and of mind can encourage intellectual and transmental clarity, moral insight, forms of ecstasy and the power to heal the sick and to
raise the dead. It implies that there is an ecology of ideas and perceptions (reminiscent of Bateson); and it implies that the gradient of intelligent life is toward invisibility and indivisibility.

Ephemeralization in science means that technology and theory become more elegant, more erudite and more esoteric. In religion it means that dogma, rite and theology become more intimate and intuitive, less formal and thus less generalized, and more personal, and thus more particular and existentially authentic, precise and generous. It means that the religious experience and the experiencing of others in a spiritual way supersedes canonic mimesis: sacraments are to be lived as well as witnessed. Since ephemeralization also connotes the passage of time, of states of awareness, and since successive generations of ephemeralization would sublimate us more and more closely to the limits of time, we must consider that the process of ephemeralization has the effect of precipitating us beyond time. The ephemeralizing aspect of the transcendent function (an analog of eukaryosis) leads us to wonder if the dual species of enucleation/incarnation is not also a factor in a phenomenon of eternalization.

We might do well to bear in mind that the likeness of ephemeralization and enucleation resides in the fact
that each successive refinement of development and aptitude must build, incorporate and emerge from what has gone before. If we use Occam's razor we may see that ephemeralization in science means a process of gathering, rectifying, resolving, confirming and elevating. In religions and in the psyche, applied to the affirmations of religion, it will indicate by degrees of awareness the sacramentality and the divinization of life. The divinization of life and the communion of centers on the one hand, and the transcendent ephemeralization of mind on the other, both find a common foundation in the antecedent humanization of matter, an effect of eukaryosis and a preface to incarnation.

The idea of the transcendent function grew out of the scientific method of a psychologist. The concept of ephemeralization was developed by an engineer. Eukaryosis is a working hypothesis of biologists. And we might now review an idea which grew from a taxonomy of known civilizations by a historian. It is Toynbee's concept known as etherealization.*

* But let us pause for a moment and look at what science, not alone, is doing to itself and to us. Science admits to the ephemeral nature of the paradigm; we are aware of uncertainty and indeterminacy. LeShan points out that the mystics and physicists speak (if unintentionally)
A definition of etherealization, which is a symptom of growth, is "the evocation of a spiritual meaning out of a material one" -- an exercise of imagination and intuition. According to Toynbee, the critical element in growth is a process toward "self-determination. He writes:

Our illustrations suggest that the criterion of growth... which we failed to discover in the conquest of the external environment, either human or physical, lies rather in the progressive change of emphasis and shifting of the scene of action out of this field into another field.... In this other field, challenges do not impinge from outside but arise from within, and victorious responses do not take the form of surmounting external obstacles or of overcoming an external adversary.
sary, but manifest themselves in an inward self-articulation or self-determination....
Moral challenge supersedes physical.
Growth means that the growing personality or civilization tends to become its own environment and its own challenger and its own field of action... the criterion of growth is a progress towards self-determination... a prosaic formula by which life enters into its kingdom.

Self-articulation and self-determination depend upon Self-knowledge and, finally, on the identification of all things in and as Self -- at a consciously awake level as complemented by a hypothetical earlier unconscious uroboric condition. Toynbee warns against our trying to make a religion based on science. He quotes one Ambrose to the effect that God did not think it was a good idea to give his people salvation through dialectic. While I would like neither to interpret religion according to science nor to demonstrate that science is a form of religious intuition, I would like to suggest that science and religious intuition are of a piece and that the resolution of whatever dichotomy or "polychotomy" they represent is to be found in, among other places, such exercises as those of eter-

ionalization, ephemeralization and imagination. I think that as the event of history goes on within time, we are individually born into a new condition of existence and that the spoor of this birth and condition are to
be found in our world tradition, planetary and inter-disciplinary, in all stations and ranks, peoples and conditions; therein, I believe, lies a new testament. I acknowledge a condition which is beyond the denominations of science and religion, beyond concept and belief, yet which informs and incorporates these things -- it is a living experience of which our conventional institutions, philosophies, rites and kinds of mimesis are memory and approximation: true they are, but untrue because incomplete. Self-determination of an individual, a class, a planet, finds its exercise and expression in what may be conceived of as an "unbounded frontier." "Freedom" is not exclusively a political issue, it is an ontological and psychological one as well.

If we apply the hypothesis of etherealization to science, evoking spiritual meanings from the material, we will have no imaginative restriction on Toynbee's idea.

Observation is the foundation of science. Observation is for the contemplative an act and an end in itself. We not only know an event with the mind and through the senses, but we become what we behold. It is inevitable: first, because observation of the world, and thus the world, is a psychic event; second, because observation shows us that explicitly and implicitly
everything holds together. Science is an ecology of universal interrelation; it reveals the intimacy of correspondence of all things and their essential unity. This is, from the viewpoint of etherealization, a species of mysticism. We observe; we affect what we observe; the observer and the observed are in relation; the poles of relation are facets of a unity: science as knowledge of the universe is also knowledge of Self.

Observation for the "mechanist," in the idiom of W.I. Thompson, is a means to the end of the strategic manipulation of matter and consciousness. Science is a means to knowing and to making, it is a way of ordering and apprehending man and the universe. Since no certifiable limit is placed on this enterprise, science is a means to indefinite knowing and to indefinite or infinite creation. This too is an aspect and an effect of emergent godsmanship. Unless there is a brick wall at the limits of knowledge, the process is limitless. We may maintain that the human brain, even the mind, is limited in its capacity; but while we may be self-limiting with respect to the quantity of data we can hold and retrieve, we are also bound to keep in mind the holon and the transcendent function when considering the quality of conscious resource. Data, the gossip of life, may multiply incredibly; but
at the same time, as we gnaw on their fiber we gather them, rectify them, resolve, confirm and elevate them to more inclusive and subtle patterns of integration. Biology integrates into psychology while psychology and physics found parapsychology and metaphysics; it would seem that the right reason of human reflection in a process of tuned interdisciplinary and interexperiential integration would be obliged to evolve a "cosmic consciousness" in order to properly appreciate the mysteries of life. Multitudes of observations make possible principles and generalizations, laws. The further unification of these principles and generalizations produces other orders of knowledge and awareness. The cultivation of intuition, macrocosmic and microcosmic, may produce the same effect as the working out with reason and instrumentation of the decimal points of scientific observation. At the very least, and more significantly, rationality and intuition are complementary and synergetic. It must be acknowledged that even the most rigorous demonstrations of science and philosophy are axiomatic; those axioms are intuitive instruments based, perhaps, upon data and experiments which are surely necessary but which are not in themselves sufficient to account for the phenomena at hand.

To restate the question: if the universe is a
single event, the many and varied ideas and phenomena we behold may not be real -- in the sense that when taken independently of one another they have no self-sufficiency. They would have no self-definability and thus no self-determination either. Thus, self-determination and the self-transcendence implicit in it depend upon and activate themselves only in interdependence, correlation and unity of being.

We are still in awkward positions when it comes to regarding science, religion and the relations between forms of knowledge and cognition. For the time being we may say that to the attentive and unprejudiced a coherent universe will express itself in coherent understanding. Since all things are needful to us, I think we would do well to consider the complementarity of the modes of knowing -- not to exalt or to disparage among them but to accommodate ourselves to their different milieux and applications.

We have the opportunity of playing as virtuosi on a single instrument and as serving as conductors of a completed orchestration. To compliment ourselves on the precision and mastery of a single instrument and to say, "It is enough," is to do obeisance to the one-eyed man who in the land of the blind is king. Reason as we use the term conventionally is a refined
and competent instrument of expression and agreement; it is a method and not an epistemological guarantee. George Steiner has shown persuasively that language, a vehicle of reason, is not only an exclusive organism but also that its greatest value may be in what Gaston Bachelard calls its "surrational" quality and in what Steiner calls "the ability to reason upon a speculation." The idea that reason may etherealize is analogous to Bachelard's idea of the surrational and of the "philosophy of no," the trans- and metarational. If the transrational mode is also arational than we are in the neighborhood of intuition, irration-

ation and mysticism. We have no reason to believe that Lao-tzu and Plotinus were fools, nor nekulei, Einstein and Teilhard.

Etherealization and ephemeralization are mutual features of the process in time whereby consciousness incorporates and transfigures its input and, in doing so, itself. By other names this is alchemy, yoga, actualization and evolution. It is characteristic of religion, science, thought, and perhaps a definition of intelligence. For the sake of argument, (meta-) consciousness is the highest state attained by human life; and life may be characterized by its highest known manifestation: "watch the fruits, not the roots."
In subscribing to evolutionary transformism we are subscribing also to etherialization, ephemeralization and divinization. We find hereby that spirituality, mysticism and the whole range of generally undistinguished esoterica that informs our tradition is perhaps not so much arcane, occult or stupid as simply a subtle (or rude) statement about the fact of life. No matter how many knots we tie "the string remains one."

If we use the notion of etherialization with regard to religion, itself a system of etherialization, interesting things follow. Sacraments evoke the spiritual from the material; bread and wine are the body and blood of divine creation incarnate, the rising sun a cosmic eucharist. Sexuality, whether tantric, dionysian, osirian, hyperdulian or humanly romantic, is etherialized into a cosmic coincidentia oppositorum. Vishnu and his shakti, Christ and his church, Dante and Beatrice and millions upon millions of men and women in the flesh are emblems of and participants in a universal intercourse.

Taking religion as a state of mind or as a mimetic formulation, and taking a second derivative of religion, so to speak, we are left with the rarefied mystical intuition of personal revelation and imagination. A like resultant occurs if we are to etherialize reason, a
state of mind or formulation. If we evoke a spiritual meaning from enucleation/metanoia and couple with it the teachings that this is not a unique occurrence but a realization available to all men and women, a fact of life yet to be appreciated — an enlargement in self-knowing and self-determining — then we find that the willing individual is "in league with the stones."
"Everything that lives is holy"; "the universe is worthy of worship." In regarding etherealization as a natural development of reflective intelligence, as a method of clarification and not one of parochial dogmatism or obscurantism, we remember to "put off holiness and put on intellect." But if "holiness" is a word we regard with a perjorative jaundice, let us also bear in mind that "wholiness" is that which we have sought by all the means and efforts of our conscious and unconscious history: the healing of a dis-eased world.

We are the universe, life, and our option is to sleep or to honor one another and to cultivate our gifts, to worship ourselves and to become gods — to realize that we are all that the gods were held to be. We undergo a psychic implosion and explosion, realizing anew the unity of the diversity of life. "First there is a mountain, then there is no mountain, then there is a mountain."
Needless to say, we are creatures of air, light, water and earth. Pervasive and perfuse as these elements are, this fact alone should remind us that we do ill to try to deny this genesis and destiny. Such a denial is hubris and is, in any case, unnecessary. A newly awakened regard for the earth and her waters is indicative of a reintegration of our sensibilities and sensitivities. The things of this world are not unimportant or incidental, they are in-tact with all that we are and may prove to be essential to us in any state and condition. Furthermore, we will be trusted with greater things only if we can be trusted with lesser. Matter and spirit are equally mystery and though we may discern and transcend them, they are alike of life. In whatever relation things stand to one another, we work from where we are and incorporate all things in Self. Whether our bias is with Sri Aurobindo, Teilhard de Chardin, the materialists, the immanentists, the spiritualists, the transcendentalists, the atheists, New York Giants or the Blackstone P. Rangers, we must bear in mind that everything depends upon everything. We are, all things are by dint of this, in love with one another. If we do not have a sense or a hope of this in our work, however vague or clumsy, then what we do have is just so much talk. Knowledge, mastery and power are nothing
without the vitalizing intuition.

It is in view of this that we are brought to a consideration of noogenesis, eupyschian management and the mystical body of creation. From the point of view suggested by this essay, these ideas are synonymous and metonymous. As we pass through the world of time and space, as we attune ourselves to the conditions typified by spacetime perceptions, we meet and communicate with different things and experiences; the terrain changes. And we change and are changed. As we sail beneath and above the constellations of the skies and the seas, journeying through continents intellectual, physical and emotional, so do we effect with varying degrees of awareness and intent a circumambulation of the constellations of the Self. A Mohammed, a Christ incorporative attains by circumambulation of the soul a god-like state and it is attributed to god because it is so puissant, so other, and conforms to humanity's archetype of its completed Self. Physical eukaryosis becomes spiritual by gathering and elevating life. Salvationism by savior becomes in eukaryotic metanoia a salvation, a realization, of and by Self, identification of self with other; and so an interior realization fulfils and supplants an exterior goal.

From the void emerged light and life and glimmering in the fabric was consciousness. The con-fusion
of universal forces was purposeful in that it developed in concentration and evolution the abilities to create, to sustain and to enrich increasingly complex repertoires of behavior, thought and "developed intuition." The acknowledgment of the advantages of these repertoires, these ambiances, on the one hand, and the recognition that their foundations are implicit in the cosmic event -- definable or not -- was responsible for the emergence among men and women of the innumerable practices whose aim was to take a conscious hand in refining the development of mankind.

As we go through this world we are a summation of the cosmic event expressed through apparent local aspects of itself in relative states of awareness. It is in this sense that "you are," to quote from a mother's dream, "the final intelligence." We do not debate here whether life began by divine fiat or if "the universe is just one of those things which happen from time to time" because Life is to be known not by its origin but by its end. And if alpha and omega are the same, the end of all our striving to return to where we began, more will be the reason to chant "Aum, the jewel is in the lotus."
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Given such an attitude, Teilhard's idea of a noogenesis (and corollary Christogenesis) implicit in and emergent from cosmogenesis is reasonable and inevitable. It suggests the psychic and suprapyschic enrichment of conscious mind and the etherealization of consciousness. If mind undergoes such a change of state that it becomes indistinguishable from the quality known as spirit perhaps language -- metalinguage? -- will provide a "raft to a further shore." I recall that psyche originally meant things like "soul" and "butterfly." And is history a silken womb, the cocoon of our congealed assumptions?

Eukaryosis implies what Maslow called eupyschian management. Attention to and cultivation of the Self, in all forms and gradations, coterminous with life and beyond assumption and attribute, leads us to a sense of and identity with the mystical body of creation. This recognition of identity is according to best teaching a phase and not an end. It may be a phase and milieu which becomes very much a theme in our mundane routine; but it is only the extent to which it informs our routine that determines the extent to which we real-ize our-selves and one-as-other. Less a circular than a spiral
momentum, ever renewing as it completes the seasons and stages of life, such a realization may prove to be the most efficient and capacious approach to today’s plethora of concerns, knowledge and anxieties.

It appears inescapable that a universe whose major discernible axis follows a course of individuation and efflorescence, enfoldment and communion, resolution and enrichment, transcendence and transfiguration, a universe whose nature is nutritive and sustaining, a mystery of rapport, it is inevitable and inescapable that such a being and entity is a phenomenon of love.

It will seem farfetched and to the sympathetic it will appear literally "absurd" to suggest that the universe of life is a phenomenon of love; though our skepticism is also an indication of our want of imagination. Not only does this labor the verb and noun of love into almost unrecognizable form, but it seems to ignore and to evade all that has grown in our understanding through reason and science.

We can recapitulate:

Life and mind are interfusing mystery. Included within this complex are consciousness and the universe and the relations thereof articulate themselves in a centration/incarnation which demonstrates the processes of the transcendent function, etherealization and
ephemeralization which tend to gather and to elevate the elements of our world in an ongoing eschaton which approximates intuitive insight, surrationalism, mysticism and divinization... "expanding in the Bosom of God, the Human Imagination."

Life is a noumenon of events and awarenesses of events which, under the species of spacetime, go by such names as contrarity: creation and destruction, binding and loosing, entropy and negentropy, birth and death and love and hate and truth and falsity. All appearance, substance, contradiction and harmony, all beauty and disease and hope, imagination and doubt, are phases and manifestations of life. Unless we are to deny the essential dynamic of thought, reflection and meditation, all observation and analysis, we must continue to believe that all life is one, that everything touches in however subtle and rare a fashion, and that we are capable of experiencing that touch, identifying with that one. Stone, mind and god are implicit and compact with and in one another. Thus saying, the only word in this tongue which can begin to intimate the nature of this interrelation is love. Cloyed, simplistic, shopworn and much abused as it is, I can find no more basic equation. It is the ineffable, $1=\infty$, $1+1=1$. 
But it is not our need to say it; for we always know more, feel and understand more than we can say. Our need is to clarify and to vivify this in ourselves, in our lives. And a reason why we do this, simpler and more essential than questions of ontology and evolution, more humane and elementary than destiny, ethics and power, even more persuasive than our desire to comfort, aid and to honor one another, is this: It feels good, it feels whole and healthy and complete; it is more homecoming than apotheosis. And it accords with the best teaching of every era: the purpose of life on earth is to know and to love god, loving thy neighbor as thy very Self. So saying, we discover that the propensity of life is in the direction of joy and well-being. It is cosmogenesis following the gradient of life more abundant, more comprehensive, more aware. "Eternity is in love with the productions of time."

People, things, change and mind are one. The physical and transcendent are a continuum which appears in state-specific modulation. The realization of this, and the increasingly subtle and precise skills of compatibility, harmony, discernment and action which come with this realization are a natural consequence of our imaginative metanoia. It is fun. When we meet terrestrial and extraterrestrial intelligence, when
we realize and transcend paranormal states, when dreaming we wake and waking fulfil all desire we know, as we now but dream, that it is Self. Subtlety, mystery, delight, an active and cosmic love, universal paideia: history thus begins to reveal itself as a diverse and disjointed yoga, a crazed alchemy, an evolving being.

And if this is but the speech of a fool, is it not still the case for all qualities and nations that we need and long for a vision and a sensibility that will not only show us equal to the demand of our world but afford us too perceptive compassion for ourselves and for one another? Is it not so that the essential problem -- and potential -- of our time is that of a human spirit not fully awake to itself, riven, diffRACTed and scattered. This is not a bad thing if we do not persist in indulging it with acrimony, ideology and captious pretensions both intellectual and moral. This is the prelude to our further growth, the diffraction which precedes a purifying distillation: and the essence, dense and diffuse, is each of us. Hawser and thread, clay and ether, hook, ingot and light, the leaven, the loaf and the salt of the earth, this our Self.

In contrast with the carrot of salvation tantalizing the donkey of history's labor, the awareness expressed in this paper is like the good nutrition which
slowly and with undissuaded surety makes us strong and whole. As we eat this food we build a strong and supple body, the synapses and sinews of cognition, of intellect become more alert and integral, the heart grows rich, full and enduring; and the mind becomes clear, flexible in labor and play, generous and precise in scope and tolerance, illuminating, refreshing, coursing with life, love and the wind of spirit.

This is, after a fashion, what Paulo Freire calls a "pedagogy of the oppressed." This is not only for the dispossessed, the poor and forgotten, the scorned, hurt, sick and anxious. It is for all of us who encumbered by pride or greed, heavy with our own reflections and burdened with the assumptions we have received, for all of us freighted with cabbages of cant, who have forgotten who we truly are. Subject this to scrutiny, use your imagination. It is not in this clumsy and stilted paper nor in any book; it is the lamp of our being.
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