Mannheim & Materialism as Ideology vs Social Consciousness

There is an universal consensus among scientists that human beings are first and last social animals. IT would stand to reason then that relationships - and social consciousness - would be pivotal. In this complex society human beings simply would not be able to function is they didn't have some form of functional social consciousness. Hinduism has had the pivotal concept of Dharma – social order and roles for almost two thousand years Confucianism had the central concept of self as others. The Filipino culture has the “Kapwa [shared identity] norm and value which si embedded in Filipino culture. Widespread in ancient African culture is the concept of Ubuntu – not advocated by Anglican bishop Tutu Ubuntu is a Nguni Bantu term meaning "humanity". It is sometimes translated as "I am because we are" (also "I am because you are"), or "humanity towards others"
There are some truths which are self-evident. As evident from the pictures below social consciousness would be one of those self-evident truths. Yet, for nearly one hundred years, materialists have argued that

1) “There is no psychology of groups” (Allport’s Taboo – 1927) and/or

2) human consciousness is restricted to the firing of neurons in the brain and so there cannot be any social consciousness. That is an absurd argument.

It does not follow from the fact that neurons fire in the brain that there is no social consciousness!

Contrast the pictures above - of crowds gathered for rock concerts, protests, and folkdances with the prevalent academic norm and abstraction that “There is no psychology of the group” (i.e., Allport’s taboo 1927). Even a precursory glance at those pictures clearly and vividly conveys the reality that – actually – yes, there are psychologies of groups (more than one probably

**Preface: Historical Social Consciousness**

A. Confucianism

“For the early Confucians there can be no me in isolation, to be considered abstractly: I am the totality of roles I live in relation to specific others. [...] The relations in which I stand to some people affect directly the relations in which I stand with others, to the extent that it would be misleading to say that I, play’ or, perform’ these roles; on the contrary, for Confucius, I am my roles. Taken collectively, they weave, for each of us, a unique pattern of personal identity, such that if some of my roles change, others will of necessity change also, literally making me a different person.5” perhaps best exemplified by Marion Eggert’s illustration in quoting “the following lines by Henry Rosemont: 5 Rosemont 2016: 52 f.

Confucianism, Hinduism, with the concept of Dharma, as well as Filipino and Irish early culture had some very sophisticated ideas of social consciousness.

B. Dharma – Concept of Social Consciousness roughly two thousand years old

Dharma, a Hindu concept, is likely the first concept of social consciousness dates back to between 500 B.C. and 500 A.D. during the Epic, Puranic and Classic Periods in India. It is an excellent illustration of real world social consciousness so I try to fairly describe it

“Dharma is a concept of social order and duty that sustains the whole universe. A person’s placement in a caste (varna) and birth group (jati) is one element of dharma. Jati is historically also used to determine social interactions and marriages, as dharma guides every aspect of daily life. For Hindus as for religious people of other traditions, “religion” cannot be understood as one segment of life. The term dharma may be translated as “religion,” “law,” “order,” “duty” or “ethics.” It is far more encompassing than any of the particular activities that might be described as “religion.” Dharma is what centers, upholds, and makes meaningful all activities, not just those done at certain times and certain places. Indeed, the word
dharma comes from a word root that means “to uphold, support, bear.” It is that order which supports the whole world, from the laws of nature to the inner workings of conscience.

Dharma is also social order. In India, this traditionally included one’s duty as part of a particular stratum of society, a caste (varna) or birth-group (jati). In Rig Veda X.90, a creation hymn, the four broad varnas emerge from parts of the body of the divine being from whom the universe was created. From his head the priests and scholars (brahmins) arose; from his arms the kings and warriors (kshatriyas) arose; from his thighs the farmers and merchants (vaishyas) came to be; and from his feet came the servants and laborers (shudras). The hierarchy and stratification of society is thus written into the blueprint of the universe. At the same time, the interdependence of the castes is recognized, for they are parts of a body, a whole organism.” (https://pluralism.org/dharma-the-social-order The Pluralism Project by Harvard University

C. Kapwa-loob ethics, mindset (norms) & psychology- J Reyes and V Enriquez)

Karina Lagdameo-Santillan did an excellent job explaining the reality of "social consciousness in terms of Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino branch of psychology), “Kapwa is a recognition of a shared identity, an inner self, shared with others. This Filipino linguistic unity of the self and the other is unique and unlike in most modern languages. Why? Because implied in such inclusiveness is the moral obligation to treat one another as equal fellow human beings. If we can do this – even starting in our own family or our circle of friends – we are on the way to practice peace. We are Kapwa People.” — Professor Virgilio Enriquez, founder of Sikolohiyang Pilipino.” I would add that while many Filipinos I speak with are not fully aware of Virgilio Enriquez it is clear that the Kapwa concept is indeed a “norm” prevalent in Filipino culture.

Commentary and Reflections:

For more perspective - I would highlight a comment from Moitreyee who happens to be an Indian poet, artist, and “story teller”. Half my FB connections are poets. I include this because perspective is very important.

Moitreyee said "Charlie Peck yes the one thing that really strikes me in this write (this essay about social consciousness) is the mentioning of the fact that religion is a way of life, and is not something that has to be performed at certain times or in certain places. I believe in this and support this whole heartedly. My religion lives in my work. 🌹. Thank you once again for sharing." Similar to Moitreyee’s observation, Karina Lagdameo-Santillan states, “We are Kapwa People.” A lot of reality devolves onto “orientation” and direction.

**Materialist dogma - There is no psychology of groups**

Hazel Markus, Shinobu Kitayama, Rachel Heiman, the authors of the chapter Culture and “Basic” Psychological Principles, of the Social Psychology Handbook of Basic Principles, state rather boldly – and unequivocally - that currently,
“Psychologists who study groups approach the idea of a group as an entity only very gingerly. The field, or members of the field, apparently still feel the sting of Allport’s (1927) remonstration of those who were attracted to McDougall’s idea of “group mind.”

Floyd Allport, in 1927 stated unequivocally that

“Only within the individual can we find the behavior mechanisms and the consciousness which are fundamental in the interactions between people . . . . . . . There is no psychology of groups which is not essentially and entirely a psychology of individuals.”

The materialist argument that there is no "psychology of groups" – incredibly – according to materialists (and widely accepted) is based on the principle that "neurons fire in the brain and so consciousness is restricted to the human brain" Mossbridge and Baruss highlight and emphasize the limited and restricted understanding of the "materialist" viewpoint of consciousness as being solely and entirely – and only - a “byproduct of the neurology and biochemistry of the brain” (p. 24) That perspective, when viewed in a wider viewpoint, is clearly an incredibly narrow and limited perspective – really an extreme tunnel vision view of human consciousness.

It does not follow that because neurons fire in the brain that there is no social consciousness. - that is the materialist argument believe it or not. I got thrown out of a Neil de Grasse Tyson FB science group for arguing that the unspoken bond between soldiers in the esprit de corps of the marines/army for example during the battle for Chosin reservoir is an illustration of a reality outside the brain

**Extreme Individualism**

David Hay emphasizes that as a result of the Enlightenment movement’s emphasis on rational individualism – especially Hobbes “the cultural construction of an extreme individualism which is particularly evident in the Western world, there has been a ‘forgetting’ of relational consciousness/spirituality resulting in damaging effects to the texture of human community.” David Hay (Spirituality versus Individualism: Why we should nurture relational consciousness, International Journal of Children's Spirituality)

K Lagdameo-Santillan observes that “According to Professor Enriquez, Kapwa is the “unity of the one-of-us-and-the-other” . . . . . . He maintained that “Kapwa implied moral and normative aspects that obliged a person to treat one another as fellow human being and therefore as equal.” . . . . . . But he also foresaw that this Filipino core value was threatened by spreading Western influences. “...once AKO (the I) starts thinking of himself as separate from KAPWA, the Filipino ‘self’ gets to be individuated as in the Western sense...” Professor Virgilio Enriquez, founder of Sikolohiyang Pilipino.

It would seem the recent research into the “epidemic” rise of the mental illness of narcissism (Twenge, etc) may support David Hay’s argument. I might briefly mention that narcissism is complex and controversial. While social media such as FB clearly seems to play a role in the increase in narcissism, the cause fo narcissism is a separate issue with one psychologist arguing narcissism is caused by anxiety. Ye, if materialism is an ideology then that would clearly also contribute to the narcissism problem. Aline Vater in his article “Narcissism in Western Culture” states that “Narcissism scores are higher in individualistic cultures compared with more collectivistic cultures.

Geertz’s Flawed Definition of Religion
Geertz’s Universally Accepted Definition of Religion is missing two important aspects and characteristics "Spirit" and "Community"! Ironically, "The top word millennials used to describe their ideal environment for worship is "community," followed closely by "sanctuary." That means, then, that the absence of the concept of "community" in academic theories of religion is Not a trivial question! (Collective-consciousness as in Durkheim is not the same thing). As Buddha says, "We become what we believe" and I would add that - to a large degree -we believe what we are taught

Geertz’s Definition of Religion: In his essay, Religion as a Cultural System: The Theory of Clifford Geertz, the prominent religious scholar Ira Chernus states: “One of the most influential figures in this social-scientific approach to religion is the anthropologist, Clifford Geertz. In an essay titled "Religion as a Cultural System" (1965) he [Geertz] spelled out a definition of religion that many others have borrowed, adapted, and employed in studying religion.”

Chernus goes on to say that according to Geertz, religion is "(1) a system of symbols (2) which acts to establish powerful, pervasive and long-lasting moods and motivations in men (3) by formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and (4) clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that (5) the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic."

Brian Hayden, the author of Shamans, Sorcerers, and Saints and anthropologist (whose book I happened to be reading at the time), "agreed" with my "assessment" of Geertz’s definition of religion - in spite of the fact that in his book he cites Geertz's definition of religion and "agrees" with Geertz's definition of religion. Basically, Hayden said that "Yes, Geertz's definition of religion is flawed and off-track in leaving spirit out. Now, in light of the fact that much of his writing dealt with spiritual rituals, it would seem offhand that Geertz, of all people, would definitely not have left "spirit" out of a definition of religion.

Clifford Geertz’s definition of religion has effectively been THE Accepted Definition of Religion in the humanities! However, Geertz’s definition is missing any concept or idea of "spirit" in Geertz’s definition. It appeared rather evident, in light of the fact that humans have believed in spirits and spirituality for tens of thousands of years and spirit or spirituality plays a prominent part in all religions, to my knowledge, (Even Buddhism has Buddha nature).

The conspicuous absence of both community and spirituality would seem substantial evidence that Mannheim was correct: Academic materialism is a mindset! Probably the most salient aspect of religions is that they are groups – or communities. Such a blatant disregard of obvious evidence would indicate some deeper internal problems with academia.

Buddha said, “We become what we think!”

Self-fulfilling prophecies are realities - and should be considered in context of materialism and reductionism. As Buddha observed long ago, “We become what we think!”

The term self-fulfilling prophecies refers to the observation that sometimes our beliefs about others can lead us to treat them in such a way that they subsequently become what we expect them to be. Originally, the effect was demonstrated in the classroom and called the 'pygmalion effect.'

Self-fulfilling prophecy, also known as interpersonal expectancy effect, refers to the phenomenon whereby a person’s or a group’s expectation for the behavior of another person or group serves actually
to bring about the prophesied or expected behavior. The history and diversity of this area of inquiry shows that the expectations of psychological researchers, classroom teachers, judges in the courtroom, business executives, and health care providers can unintentionally affect the responses of their research participants, pupils, jurors, employees, and patients. Meta-analytic procedures are used to evaluate the social importance of the magnitudes of the obtained effects. (Self-Fulfilling Prophecy R. Rosenthal, in Encyclopedia of Human Behavior (Second Edition), 2012)

Self-Fulfilling Prophecies

The term self-fulfilling prophecies refers to the observation that sometimes our beliefs about others can lead us to treat them in such a way that they subsequently become what we expect them to be. Originally, the effect was demonstrated in the classroom and called the ‘pygmalion effect.’ In a seminal study, teachers were told at the beginning of a school year that certain of their students were potential late bloomers, who would be expected to excel during the school year under proper guidance. Even though there was nothing in actual fact that set those students apart from their colleagues, several months later their schoolwork had improved considerably. Since this initial observation, numerous similar investigations have testified to the robustness of the effect with regard to both, positive and negative expectations. Follow-up studies also demonstrated that perceivers sometimes unintentionally transmit their expectations through nonverbal signals. In a mock interview situation, for instance, it has been shown that when an interviewer's negative expectation about another person was reflected in his or her nonverbal behavior (i.e., keeping more physical distance), the interviewee actually performed more poorly (Impression Formation C.N. Macrae, S. Quadflieg, in Encyclopedia of Human Behavior (Second Edition), 2012)

Narcissism in Western Culture by Aline Vater

“Narcissism scores are higher in individualistic cultures compared with more collectivistic cultures.” Germany was formerly divided into two different social systems, each with distinct economic, political and national cultures, and was reunified in 1989/90. Between 1949 and 1989/90, West Germany had an individualistic culture, whereas East Germany had a more collectivistic culture."

In contrast, it is remarkable that – in light of the unique “kapwa (“self as others” cultural psychology” and the documented fact that the Philippines though politically a very violent country has a very low rate of shooting sprees. As Buddha said, “We become what we think!”

Point of order: I would highlight that - academics never really considered how the materialist quantification principle – a “Rigid adherence to arbitrary quantification” as McGilChrist put it – which most everyone assumes is science – could create a mode of thought or mindset much like communism or capitalism or any other mode of thought – which drastically alters one’s orientation and approach. – A case of Colossal Researcher Bias.

Comparative Analysis: social cognition theory vs Social Consciousness

Preface: I have been talking about social consciousness for over five years. I have had two academia.edu discussions on social consciousness. Recently, I asked an American psychology student if she had heard of social consciousness. She said no. Yet, though western academia has nothing about social consciousness, when you look at eastern societies social consciousness is
a very salient aspect of eastern societies millennia ago. Confucianism is clearly social consciousness – with "self as others" being a central concept. The same for the concept of Dharma in Hinduism (and Buddhism to an extent) - duty, roles and social consciousness. Then of course there is Kapwa psychology "shared identity" and Filipino ethics as Jeremiah Reyes points out.

Wikipedia: “Social consciousness is linked to the collective self-awareness and experience of collectively shared social identity.[2] From this viewpoint, social consciousness denotes conscious awareness of being part of an interrelated community of others. The “we feeling” or the “sense of us” may be experienced in members of various cultures and social groups. By the experience of collectively shared social identity, individuals may experience social unity. Social consciousness may also stimulate working towards a common goal.”

There are only three references under social consciousness and the only major theorists noted is Karl Marx – no anthropologists – or sociologists for that matter.

**Social Cognitive Theory falls short of a theory of social consciousness.**

**Social Cognitive Theory**

Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) started as the Social Learning Theory (SLT) in the 1960s by Albert Bandura. It developed into the SCT in 1986 and posits that learning occurs in a social context with a dynamic and reciprocal interaction of the person, environment, and behavior. The unique feature of SCT is the emphasis on social influence and its emphasis on external and internal social reinforcement. SCT considers the unique way in which individuals acquire and maintain behavior, while also considering the social environment in which individuals perform the behavior. The theory takes into account a person's past experiences, which factor into whether behavioral action will occur.

**Limitations of Social Cognitive Theory**

1. There are several limitations of SCT, which should be considered when using this theory in public health. Limitations of the model include the following:

2. The theory assumes that changes in the environment will automatically lead to changes in the person, when this may not always be true.

3. The theory is loosely organized, based solely on the dynamic interplay between person, behavior, and environment. It is unclear the extent to which each of these factors into actual behavior and if one is more influential than another.

4. The theory heavily focuses on processes of learning and in doing so disregards biological and hormonal predispositions that may influence behaviors, regardless of past experience and expectations.

5. **The theory does not focus on emotion or motivation, other than through reference to past experience. There is minimal attention on these factors.**

6. The theory can be broad-reaching, so can be difficult to operationalize in entirety.

(The Social Cognitive Theory - SPH - Boston University [https://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu](https://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu))
This problem of Social Cognitive Theory is not a trivial problem but a very profound and serious methodology problem for the social sciences, “The theory does not focus on emotion or motivation, other than through reference to past experience. There is minimal attention on these factors. I should mention briefly that an inherent problem with emotions is that a well-known characteristic of emotions is that they tend to have and unmeasurable subjective.

Eric Klinger states that a “primary function of several emotions is to direct attention to concern-related stimuli. (p.42) Carl Jung and William James said pretty much the same thing – that emotions are what make things important and significant for human consciousness the same thing. In light of that, it would stand to reason in light of the function of emotions in directing attention, that an underlying function for spiritual beliefs in animal spirits, for example, would is so that human beings give full attention to animals - upon which the survival of the species depended during the hunter-gatherer stage. I would argue that from a “psychological perspective” – the supercharged emotions of the supernatural function to put hunting gathering at the top of the food chain as far as survival goes – making from that persp43ective the spiritual beliefs in animal spirits an evolutionary adaptive trait.

Motivation is a such an important factor, that lacking a realistic assessment of motivation would seriously skews the picture or model of the human being. Bargh emphasizes that “Genes primarily drive our behavior through motivations (Tomassello et al., 2005). The active goal or motive is the local agent by which the genetic influence from the distant past finds expression. Evolution works through motives and strategies—the desired end states that we seek from whatever starting point in history and geographical location the cards of fate have dealt us (Tomassello et al., 2005). (The Unconscious Mind John A. Bargh and Ezequiel Morsella Perspect Psychol Sci. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2008 Jun 26. Perspect Psychol Sci. 2008 Jan; 3(1): 73–79. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00064.x PMCID: PMC2440575 NIHMSID: NIHMS49128)

Reductionism is not a philosophical question – it is a serious methodological issue

As Rappaport explains, “The empirical and logical rationality that now only discovers and ascertains facts but that defines knowledge as knowledge of fact is not hospitable to the authority of either sanctity or value. Ultimate sacred postulates are no longer even counted as knowledge but are mere beliefs, if not superstitions. Values are defined by preference and as such become no more than matters of taste or of the arithmetic of economizing. .................It is rationality that has no room for the insights of art, religion, fantasy, or dream. The evaluative capabilities of such a dispassionate but impoverished reason are limited, to say the least, and hardly trustworthy.” (Rappaport p. 130 Ecology, Meaning, & Religion) In the case of Social Cognitive Theory, materialist reductionism produces a theory which falls short of a comprehensive theory of people, as well as falling way short of a theory of social consciousness.

AS Rupert Sheldrake correctly observes, “The atheist ideology found a powerful ally in materialist science, which by the end of the nineteenth century, portrayed a purposeless, unconscious, mechanical universe where humans, like all life, had evolved without purpose or guidance. In this godless world [devoid of spirituality], humanity would take charge of its own evolution, bringing economic development, brotherhood, health, and prosperity to all mankind through progress.” (p.157) It is my argument that that is exactly what academia conveys – primarily through norms and stereotypes like any other teaching or ideology.
Jeremiah Lasquetty-Reyes, in an email reply to me, “Hi Charles, I completely agree with you that this extreme adherence to materialism is too restrictive and limiting, and frankly fails to capture so many richer aspects of human experience and psychology. It leaves the field of psychology all the poorer. I am myself looking for a framework that helps me confront it. Partly, I think an alternative metaphysics is needed, one that respects the reality and meaning of things like love, relationships, and the profound reality of other people as people and not just as a compound of atoms, chemicals, and neurons firing. Glad that we're on the same page!”

When I asked my niece, who is a biology PhD, what she thought the meaning of life is, she replied, "There is no meaning of life! In science there is no purpose." That is false. As Baumeister points out the meaning of life is a holistic synthesis of various "meanings" - the meaning of parents, children family, religion, educational institutions, law, police, ethnicity, and so on. It does not follow from the fact that the ultimate purpose of the universe is beyond human comprehension that there is no meaning to life. Personally I have never considered that the meaning of my subjective life is in any way intimately tied to the ultimate meaning of the universe. You know that "Materialist Psychology" is a very real and pressing issue in mainstream, when you read a 700 plus page comprehensive 'History of Psychology' - titled “The Story of psychology” - by Morton Hull, and find there is not have one single reference to meaning, spirit, spirituality, or even religion. So, yes, "no meaning - no purpose to life" is a very real unconscious stereotype - which happens to be false.

Part II: **Social consciousness – a self evident truth (if ever there was one) – a picture is worth 1,000 words – protests of social injustice in Iran – and America,**
A brief glance at those pictures clearly indicates that the proposition that “There is no psychology of groups” is absurd – should exist at all in any real scientific society. I write about spirituality and transcendental spirituality quite a bit – but I probably write more about social consciousness than anything else – probably because in my experience transcendental spirituality is more about “relational consciousness” (Hay and Nye) – or, in my perspective - social consciousness, since historically spirituality is more about others and community.

On Academia I have had two discussions on academia.edu focused on social consciousness. In one there were five anthropology professors. I questioned each of them individually on social consciousness. The only answer I got from one is that social consciousness is an ontology – nature of being. Social consciousness as a force is easy to prove – piece of cake. Throughout history, perceptions of social injustice – seen in ongoing protests of racism in America – or the protests in Iran about social injustice there. In fact, there is a historically documented protest/rebellion in a Sumerian city thousands of years ago.

**Excerpts from Social Injustice by SUSAN OPOTOW**

Social justice, the fair distribution of resources and benefits to all members of a society, is an abstract ideal that applies the concept of justice broadly. Social injustice, its opposite, is the discrepancy between what is and what should be. Edmond Cahn (1949) describes social injustice as an emotionally laden construct provoking the “outrage, horror, shock, resenting, and anger ... that prepare the human animal to resist attack” (p. 24). Social injustice, motivated by emotions evoked by morally laden cognitions about right and wrong, can motivate individuals, groups, and nations to take action, including violence and war, in order to right perceived wrongs.

Social injustice is not a discrete, isolated, or rare occurrence. It can be common, hidden, and persist. Change is a long process that can be characterized by backsliding and slow gains. Increasing social justice
can be fostered by acknowledging how society is structured so that some groups get less than they need or deserve because those with power, accustomed to advantages, resist societal change. Bystanders, too, can support an unjust status quo when they adopt prevailing stereotypes and prejudices that locate deficits and pathology in those who are disadvantaged rather than in the system that institutionalizes disadvantage. (See system justification theory)

Social Sciences without a proper theory of social consciousness is like having a cart without wheels - which minimally would include a concept of social consciousness as a somewhat autonomous force - which is not included in social cognition or social identity theory. A local student of psychology said she had never heard of social consciousness. Movements of all types have recurrently occurred throughout history - which cannot be properly understood without social consciousness as a somewhat autonomous force. Geertz spoke about religious, nationalist, ethnic, and other ideologies as primal forces in emerging nations - social consciousness by another name. In Hinduism and Confucianism in terms of social consciousness have existed for at least two thousand years. However, as Hay remarks western social sciences are advocates of the ideology of extreme individualism. The consistent periodic mass protests of social injustice would clearly suggest that social consciousness can be viewed to have a semi-autonomous “being” at times.

**Mannheim, Maimones, Materialist Ideology and Mindset**

Arthur Mullins in his article, Truth and Ideology: Reflections on Mannheim's Paradox, describes-defines the Mannheim Paradox in saying, “**Nevertheless, with these few exceptions, Mannheim holds that historical and political thought is determined by the socio-historical location of the thinker and the political aspirations and material ambitions of the group or groups to which he belongs. Such thought is inherently value-laden, one-sided, distorted, and therefore false.** In short, all systems of historical-social-political thought are ideologies. And this leads to Mannheim’s famous paradox: if all such perspectives are ideologies, an objective and valid social science is impossible, and Mannheim's own reflections on the historical process are "self-refuting" - for his perspective can claim no more objective validity than can other perspectives.8 (p.143 Truth and Ideology: Reflections on Mannheim's Paradox by Willard A. Mullins, History and Theory, Vol. 18, No. 2 (May, 1979), pp. 141-154)

Mannheim’s argument is that academics and ideologies are a reflection of political-social structure (+ Nietzsche and Voltaire). Christina Maimone observes, “Ideology is, as Mannheim uses the term, a mode of thought that obscures the real condition of society to the group holding the thought, thereby stabilizing the shared social reality of the mode of thought. Groups are simply unable to see particular facts that would undermine their conception of the world!” That describes numerous Materialist Academics!

Mannheim was correct. **Maimone’s Assessment hit the nail on the head when she said “Groups are simply unable to see particular facts that would undermine their conception of the world!” Academic Materialism is an ideology – which when it comes to spirituality – academia – as an institution - is horrifically repressive about spirituality.** That describes a large part of academia I have encountered. In fact, it would seem readily apparent that when it comes to “There is no psychology of groups” vs social consciousness – especially Kapwa psychology, that since Allport’s Taboo in 1927 that materialism is an ideology and mindset – far removed form anything scientific in reality.
Essentially, academics never thought or considered that the materialist quantifications – which all assume was science – could be a quantification mindset – just like communism or capitalism or any other mode of thought. As Rumi observed “Why stay in prison when the door is open!”

**Succinct description of “materialism” by S. Farra:**

**Seeking an End to Academic Materialism:**

An Essay Challenging the Prevailing View of Human Nature and the Observable Universe – as Presented in our Public Schools and Universities

© Stephen H. Farra, PhD, LP, 2022. All right reserved.

"Popular materialism is annoying, troubling, de-personalizing enough: “The clothes make the man”; “You can tell who we should appoint to the Board of our non-profit organization by the car she drives up in”; “We need more people in our church from the ‘right’ subdivisions”; etc. But, academic materialism is often much worse in that it a priori (ahead of time, before experience or encounter) closes off meaningful discussions and substantially darkens our view of the world and the people around us. Further, within the human being, the living person right in front of us, academic materialism tells us there is no soul, let alone a self-transcendent and intentional spirit. What we observe are just physical/material bodies moved by reinforcement and physical forces. This view of the world is the human equivalent to mere “matter in motion.” B. F. Skinner went out of his way to try to convince us in Beyond Freedom and Dignity (1971) that there is no ghost in the machine. The net effect of all this reductionism has been a radical de-valuing of human life and experience. And, this is not just a conceptual/academic problem! For many individuals, it has literally become a matter of life and death."

(An Essay Challenging the Prevailing View of Human Nature and the Observable Universe – as Presented in our Public Schools and Universities © Stephen H. Farra, PhD, LP, 2022. All right reserved.)

All the greats basically are in agreement with Buddha when he says "We become what we think" To me it is obvious that materialism has had a detrimental influence on how people - and scholars think in many ways. Academic materialism has spawned several maladaptive stereotypes such as "You have to prove god or Spirit before your beliefs are valid" (I have come across a number of college graduates who believe that and as a result have told me they refuse to read studies of spirituality (i.e., Dr Koenig’s medical research)- though it is a fallacy.

**Xenophanes Paradox & Frame of reference vs. Mannheim's Paradox**

Xenophanes (believed to have been born roughly 570-560 BC.) did advocate that a “truth of reality” did exist but - like St Augustine, St Gregory of Nyssa, and many other Christian spiritual leaders – held that absolute truth is beyond mortal human capabilities. It is said that Xenophanes was the first philosopher to distinguish between belief and knowledge. I should highlight in my research I came across an article
which emphasized how the rational bias of Greek Philosophy had altered the original understanding of “knowledge” as being up close and personal – as opposed to a rational argument.

Xenophanes argument - human ways of thinking can unduly shape conclusions arrived at.

But if horses or oxen or lions had hands
or could draw with their hands and accomplish such works as men,
horses would draw the figures of the gods as similar to horses,
and the oxen as similar to oxen,
and they would make the bodies of the sort
which each of them had. — Fragment 15

Roughly 800 years later, St Augustine of Hippo, - Saint Augustine, (354 AD - 430 AD), a theologian and philosopher, made the same observation that people - human beings tend to view God in terms of their own human frame of reference. Hume made the same exact observation. Of course, now modern science has identified the Default Mode Network – which functions to envision others and derive their intentions from observations. It is also called the “Theory of Mind” process. It is well known that most autistics (not all) – who have a deficit in social skills and the Default mode Network processes have difficulty envisioning God as a being.

Xenophanes observation that a person’s frame of reference can at times unduly shape their worldviews is a precursor several millennia before Mannheim. Mannheim’s paradox basically says that every system of thought is a frame of reference which has limits because every system has assumptions of one sort or another.

The stereotype that "quantification" unequivocally equates to "science" is widespread. Strict quantification excludes art, music, hope, dreaming, dancing, creativity, poetry, true love, idealism, freedom, as well as justice and even imagination. Long ago William James observed paying attention and focusing necessarily requires excluding and ignoring a great deal (confirmed by modern neuroscience) On top of that Materialism has assimilated the norm of "extreme individualism - a maladaptive development from rational individualism.

The Absolute Truth [God - Transcendental Intelligence] is beyond human comprehension Early Christian Mystics, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Augustine - Humility & Wisdom without Arrogance

"According to the true words of the Lord [Mt 5.8], the pure of heart will see God. They will receive as much as their minds can comprehend. However, the unbounded, incomprehensible divinity remains beyond all comprehension." (St Gregory of Nyssa p.161 Song of songs)

Insights from Xenophanes from “Thought Itself: The History of Philosophy, Logic & The Mind” with Eric Gerlach Greek Philosophy Xenophanes

“Many have argued that in modern times, since the 1800s, the growth of technology has changed human thought such that we now understand our world and ourselves metaphorically in terms of mechanics rather than living spirits. Rational is understood to be a series of operations rather than balance and justice, and truth is said to be objective, like an object without purpose or intention. Some such as the French philosopher and sociologist Bruno Latour, have argued that it is our tribe, the Moderns, who are the most mythological and the least aware of our metaphors. Because we
increasingly view our reality through machines, much as we have always heard about it from the voices and writings of others, we forget that we construct our reality. We believe that the ancients carved their beliefs in wood and stone, much as Xenophanes says oxen and horses would if they could, but that we Moderns find rather than build our beliefs. As Xenophanes says, we give reality, truth and meaning the same shape as ourselves, as we are increasingly shaped by technology.” That is not a bad “overview” of Mannheim’s views as well.

**Academic norms & stereotypes**

To my knowledge, no one has yet applied the concepts of norms and stereotypes to academia (at least with the scholars I checked with). That is long overdue – especially in light of the new unconscious research in stereotypes and norms by Bargh and others. First, I should highlight that Bargh observes that there is a consensus of unconscious researchers that the Unconscious is the work horse of the human mind.

Furthermore, Bargh summarizes the concept of social perception: “The idea that social perception is a largely automated psychological phenomenon is now widely accepted. Many years of research have demonstrated the variety of ways in which behaviors are encoded spontaneously and without intention in terms of relevant trait concepts . . . . . and how stereotypes of social groups become activated automatically on the mere perception of the distinguishing features of a group member (e.g., Bargh, 1994, 1999; Brewer, 1988; Devine, 1989).

I would point out that “stereotypes of social groups” would apply to the teachings of academia which would have norms and stereotypes as any other teaching or ideology. For instance, the theory [social cognitive theory] “does not focus on emotion or motivation, other than through reference to past experience. There is minimal attention on these factors.” (The Social Cognitive Theory - SPH - Boston University) I would say presenting a human being without motivation or ideals would be like describing the ideal man - as a man without testicles

**The Anatomy of a Materialist Fallacy: Firing of Neurons in the Brain vs Social Consciousness**

It does not follow that because neurons fire in the brain that there is no social consciousness

Modern psychology does not have a theory of social consciousness. The materialist model of human consciousness – as one neuroscientist put it is that consciousness is confined to the firing of neurons in the brain. Mossbridge and Baruss highlight and emphasize the limited and restricted understanding of the "materialist" viewpoint of consciousness as being solely and entirely – and only - a “byproduct of the neurology and biochemistry of the brain” (p. 24) That perspective, when viewed in a wider viewpoint, is clearly an incredibly narrow and limited perspective – really an extreme tunnel vision view of human consciousness. Another expression of this idea is what a scientist told me in Neil de Grasse Tyson FB group – that human consciousness is confined and restricted to the firing of neurons in the brain.

This society has developed Quantum Physics, Quantum Entanglement, Particle Accelerators, every conceivable type and variety of telescopes, taken men to the moon more than once, interplanetary
space exploration vehicles, and we are planning a trip to Mars. Yet there are scientists and academics as well as countless psychology students who believe that the Materialist Doctrine is “hard-science” and therefore believe that there is "No Social Consciousness" ???? And it is rather evident – obvious – in fact that it does not follow that because neurons fire in the brain that there is no social consciousness. Yet this argument has been used for nearly one years without challenge. I believe it is an inevitable conclusion that the “There is no psychology of groups” materialist argument demonstrates convincingly that Mannheim was absolutely correct and materialism – especially – is an ideology – a sick and destructive one at that.

Modern Research clearly indicates the reality of a “social consciousness”

The core or nucleus of new research in unconscious research and research into social perception might be best expressed when Bargh observes: “Within each of these is stored ingrained, implicit knowledge about appropriate values and behavior, likes and dislikes. Ways of Being.” (p.82) (John Bargh: “Before You Know It”) From a certain perspective the roles that people fulfill in their lives could be viewed as forms of social consciousness. For instance, there are the roles as parents, or roles as educators, and so on.

Furthermore, Bargh goes on to summarize the concept of social perception by stating “The idea that social perception is a largely automated psychological phenomenon is now widely accepted. Perceptual interpretations of behavior, as well as assumptions about an individual’s behavior based on identified group membership, become automated like any other representation if they are frequently and consistently made in the presence of the behavioral or group membership features.” (The Unconscious Mind John A. Bargh and Ezequiel Morsella) IN a parallel way, Jung spoke about archetypes and symbols in the unconscious.

Dharma, Confucianism, and Kapwa Psychology

Kapwa – Loob Psychology of Virgilio Enriquez and Jeremiah Reyes

There are two unique aspects to culture in the Philippines.

1. Jeremiah Reyes begins his article with these words: “This is an introduction to a Filipino virtue ethics which is a relationship-oriented virtue ethics.” That is Kapwa-loob psychology is a mindset and mode of thought much like the “spiritual court” of Dharma as Moitreyee so aptly describes that very pivotal aspect of Dharma which in religious beliefs is a cosmic order above all.

2. Compared with school shootings in the U.S. from 2009 to 2018, the Philippines had – form my research next to none. “The CNN research identified 288 school shootings between January 2009 and May 2018 in the U.S.”

3. On top of that there is widespread agreement among psychologists that since 2000 there has been an “epidemic” in narcissism as well as a dramatic 25% increase in suicide in the US since roughly 2000 as well.

Preface: “Loób and Kapwa: An Introduction to a Filipino Virtue Ethics” - Jeremiah Reyes
A significant fact for us is that the words we are going to discuss (e.g., loób and kapwa) were present in the Tagalog language before the Spanish arrived and were words used in a tribal and animist context. The basic structure of society was the barangay, a group of people ruled by one datu or chief (Scott, 1994), and the animist religion was led by a priestess class called babaylan who served as bridges to the spirit world and also as the prime culture bearers (Salazar, 1999). The word kapwa in this older context would have naturally referred to someone from the tribe. Someone outside the tribe would not have been considered kapwa. The idea of loób meanwhile was woven into a spiritual animist worldview. Benedict Anderson has described the concept of power in Javanese culture as an ‘intangible, mysterious, and divine energy which animates the universe’ (Anderson, 1972, p. 7). Reynaldo Ileto has drawn parallels with this and the notion of loób (Ileto, 1979, p. 32).

But when the Spanish missionaries arrived, the concept kapwa was impregnated and enlarged by the Christian precept ‘love your fellow man just like your own body’. Tribal boundaries were stretched outward towards humanity in general. Vicente Rafael describes how the Spanish chose to adopt a different strategy from what they implemented in South America (Rafael, 1993). Instead of forcing the native population to learn Spanish, they retained the native language and translated the Christian doctrine into those languages. Rafael contends that many Filipino words and concepts (e.g., utang-na-loób) were exploited as mechanisms for control, and other meanings were simply lost in translation. This may be true to a certain degree; but on the other hand, it was advantageous for the concepts per se because they were preserved rather than discarded, and then they were conceptually enlarged. The two traditions, Southeast Asian and Spanish, interacted, warred and mixed in various ways for more than 300 years.

Two Unique Aspects of Culture in the Philippines

When I asked Mylah, a Filipina connection how she viewed Kapwa, her response was, “Kapwa means to embrace our shared identity and to care for our fellow beings.” What Mylah says mirrors what K Lagdameo-Santillan says in her article, Roots of Filipino Humanism observes that “Kapwa is a recognition of a shared identity, an inner self, shared with others. This Filipino linguistic unity of the self and the other is unique and unlike in most modern languages. The second unique aspect is that while the Philippines suffers from an extreme violence politically, school shooting sprees, though commonplace in America, and many other western cultures – including China which has had a sudden emergence of school attacks with knives since 2010, are almost nonexistent in the Philippines. -

K Lagdameo-Santillan, in her article, goes on to say, “Why? Because implied in such inclusiveness is the moral obligation to treat one another as equal fellow human beings.” Professor Virgilio Enriquez Later K Lagdameo-Santillan adds: “According to Professor Enriquez, Kapwa is the “unity of the one-of-us-and-the-other” .... He maintained that “Kapwa implied moral and normative aspects that obliged a person to treat one another as fellow human being and therefore as equal.”

From my research Sikolohiyang Pilipino/Filipino psychology is very complex. Reyes a scholar from the Philippines and his article on Kapwa emphasizes Kapwa-loób mode of thought or mindset as a system of ethics parallel and similar to Dharma as a “spiritual court” as Moitreyee describes Dharma. Leny Strobel observes that the concept of “Ginhawa, as a concept about wellness and wellbeing, intersects with and connects to the conceptualization of Filipino personhood in Sikolohiyang Pilipino/Filipino psychology. Ginhawa is always embedded in culture and community. Ginhawa is manifest in the body’s vitality (sigla),
ease in dealing with life (gaan), life potency (gana), joy (ligaya) — and all of these are embedded in intra and interpersonal relationships as explained in the psychology of Kapwa. In talking with a few of my Filipina contacts they confirmed that in general they did view Ginhawa in terms of “wellbeing and vitality”

Leny goes on to say that “The concept of Ginhawa has a spiritual dimension as well. Prof. Bautista notes the potential of addressing the spiritual dimension in Ginhawa because Filipinos are generally a spiritual people. She says that bringing in the spiritual dimension should not be doctrinaire and instead can focus on the experience of spirituality. Prof. Bautista often talks about forgiveness, ethics, devotion, vows, witness, prayer, pilgrimage to sacred places, burden-bearing and sharing as aspects of Filipino spirituality that are important in achieving Ginhawa.” Of course, in reading this what struck me is that it si an excellent illustration of “relational consciousness-spirituality

Low rate of school. Shootings in the Philippines

Ryan General – in his article – observes, “However, the school shootings that occur in the U.S. has never happened in the Philippines. The only reported case of gun violence in a Philippines school involved a cop with a grievance towards a teacher. While he did fatally shoot four teachers, this incident just so happened to take place at school instead of the school being the main target.” (Why the Philippines, With No History of School Shootings, Wants to Put Police on Campuses Ryan General August 21, 2019 https://nextshark.com/philippines-school-shootings-police-campus)

One exception was the Ateneo de Manila University shooting – which occurred after Ryan General’s article. “On July 24, 2022, a mass shooting took place at the Ateneo de Manila University in Quezon City, Metro Manila, Philippines, leaving three people dead and three others injured, including the assailant. The attacker, identified as Chao-Tiao Yumol, successfully targeted former Mayor Rose Furigay of Lamitan, Basilan, who was at the university to attend her daughter’s graduation.” An important point of information is that the motive of the attacker was definitely political. The article goes on to say, “While homicide rates are high in the Philippines, mass shootings – particularly school shootings – are not common. However, politically-motivated crimes are prevalent.” (Wikipedia)

It would seem readily apparent that the low rate of school shootings and mass murders of innocent people would be even more relevant and striking because of the high rate of political violence in the Philippines. In complete contrast, the Yobe Massacre was carried out by a political militant. “On 6 July 2013, Boko Haram gunmen attacked the Government Secondary School in the village of Mamudo, Yobe State, Nigeria, killing at least 42 people. Most of the dead were students, with some staff members also killed.” Wikipedia

. As a point of information, I would highlight the statistics about school shootings. “The CNN research identified 288 school shootings between January 2009 and May 2018 in the U.S. By comparison, CNN found Canada and France each had two, Germany had one, and Japan, Italy and the United Kingdom had none. Based on those numbers, the U.S. had 57 times more school shootings in that time period than the other G7 countries combined.” The article goes on to say that when you bring in other sources, the number of shootings could be construed as being as high as 2,000. (Fact check: Comparison of school shootings in the US, other countries use old data BrieAnna J. Frank USA TODAY)

Inter-Cultural Perspective! Wisdom, Insight, Righteousness & Morals,
The Muslim cleric Muhammad Baqir Majlisi from al-Durr al-Manthur says about spirit. Muhammad Baqir Majlisi observes on the question of the creation of Adam: "God created Adam as He wills...He created his flesh and blood, his bones, hair, and his body from soil and water; this is the beginning of the creation of Adam. Then He put the soul into his body. Then by the soul man can stand and sit, listen and see, learn and know what animals can know and beware of dangers. Then God put the spirit into the body. By the spirit Adam knows right from wrong and guidance from error and he camouflages and learns and manages all of his affairs." So, what Majlisi says, “By the spirit Adam knows right from wrong and guidance.”

Ezekiel 36:27 states "I shall give you a new heart and put a new spirit in you... I shall put my spirit in you, and make you keep my laws and sincerely respect my observances." So, from the perspective of “respecting observances” that would seem to have the same orientation as a cosmic – or social – order Isaiah 11:2 states, "On him the spirit of the Lord rests, a spirit of wisdom and insight, a spirit of counsel and power, a spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord." Spirit of wisdom and insight would imply a socially balanced perspective. When one goes deeper than the outer religious clothing into the body and spirit of human beings, often one finds remarkably similar beliefs Personally, I see spirituality as a potential bridge between religions!

Brief Commentary: Common sense would clearly indicate that psychology would incorporate prosocial values. So, they – No! Furthermore – in my view - the statement that there is “no psychology of groups” is just plain stupid to be blunt. Modern day materialists are no better than flat-earth believers.

Dharma – Moitreyee, Stephen Schindler, Dharma by Syama Allard

A form of social consciousness – Dharma - as social roles, duties and obligations has been active in Hinduism dating back at least to the 3rd century. That is also true of Confucianism. In Judaism the concept of “community has taken on specific conceptual contexts which clearly indicates the importance of community in Judaism. Of course, there is, as we have seen the Kapwa-loob ethics of Jeremiah Reyes and the kapwa (shared identity) psychology of Virgilio Enriquez.

“Dictionary” defines Dharma 1. (In Indian religion) the eternal and inherent nature of reality, regarded in Hinduism as a cosmic law underlying right behavior and social order. 2. (in Buddhism) the nature of reality regarded as a universal truth taught by the Buddha; the teaching of Buddhism.

From the Sanskrit root dhri (which means “to support,” “to hold,” or “to maintain”), dharma is described in early Vedic texts as laws that bring order to a universe that would otherwise be in chaos. Sacred texts and stories further espouse dharma as actions most conducive to maintaining family and society, both of which would also otherwise fall into chaos. It should therefore come as no surprise that the attempted one-word English translations of dharma provided by scholars are numerous, including words like “law,” “duty,” “custom,” and “model,” all of which ultimately serve in preserving or holding together the structure of an organized system.

Of course, laws, duties, and customs shift and change from person to person, culture to culture, place to place, and time period to time period, making it difficult to ascertain when someone is actually acting in accord with dharma and when someone is not. (5 things to know about dharma By Syama Allard October 29, 2020 https://www.hinduamerican.org/blog/5-things-to-know-about-dharma)
Stephen Schindler, award winning author and religious scholar.

Many parallels indeed. Buddha somewhat changes the meaning of dharma. In orthodox Hinduism (Brahmanism), dharma is duty. Do your duty as befits your place in the class-and-caste system. Buddha undermines that system, and speaks of dharma more in a Socratic sense (make your Soul happy) and Shakespearlean: "To think own self be true." Which in Buddhism entails wisdom and compassion (prajna and karuna) and upaya ("skillful means"). That trinity always goes together (practiced and cultivated in The 8-Fold Path). Buddhism does retain a sense of karma (fate, destiny), but that is always a set of teaching lessons on the way to Buddhism's main point, which is Freedom. We created that karma, and the lesson is always that we are free to create better karma, because true wisdom always opens into greater opportunities for creative service to the well-being of all (Jesus, Buddha, Eckhart, Emerson, Rumi, Tolstoy, Jung, Assagioli, Marx, etc.)

Moitreyee

Dharma is like a spiritual court of justice or justice by itself which is ingrained or inbuilt within us that should act as a deterrent from doing the wrong thing. In other words, dharma is the conscience or the God that resides within the body. That is why it's said Karma is dharma. When your karma is right you are following dharma. Moitreyee Raj, an Indian poet and artist. Moitreyee later added this comment, “Charlie Peck yes, the one thing that really strikes me in this write (this essay about social consciousness) is the mentioning of the fact that religion is a way of life, and is not something that has to be performed at certain times or in certain places. I believe in this and support this whole heartedly. My religion lives in my work.🌹 Thank you once again for sharing.” As a point of order, I would add that Christ often highlighted in his teachings the aspects of life, truth, spirit of truth (making sense of the world).

Confucianism

Similarly, “Confucianism is often characterized as a system of social and ethical philosophy rather than a religion. In fact, Confucianism built on an ancient religious foundation to establish the social values, institutions, and transcendent ideals of traditional Chinese society. It was what sociologist Robert Bellah called a "civil religion," (Confucianism, Asia Society) In fact it is believed that “Asian cultures .... define self in terms of interdependence” – likely due to the social consciousness integrated into the social-religious beliefs. (p. 781 Social Psychology Handbook of basic Principles edited by Higgins and Kruglanski)

Marion Eggert, in her article, Dreaming about the Dead in Premodern Korea (17th-19th Century) in which she analyzes dreams in the context of being expressions of culture, observes: “One of the intentions behind this research is to put to test statements on Confucian subjectivity as found in role-ethical interpretations of Confucianism, such as the following lines by Henry Rosemont: 5 Rosemont 2016: 52 f.

“For the early Confucians there can be no me in isolation, to be considered abstractly: I am the totality of roles I live in relation to specific others. [...] [T]he relations in which I stand to some people affect directly the relations in which I stand with others, to the extent that it would be misleading to say that I, play' or, perform’ these roles; on the contrary, for Confucius, I am my roles. Taken collectively, they weave, for each of us, a unique pattern of personal identity, such that if some of my roles change, others will of necessity change also, literally making me a different person.5" (Henry Rosemont: 5 Rosemont 2016: 52 f.)
Commentary and reflections

“Why stay in prison when the door is open!” Rumi

: “The way you look at things is the most powerful force in shaping your life!” Irish poet theologian John O’Donohue

“I saw the angel in the marble and carved until I set him free.”

Michelangelo

Michelangelo emphasized - in a different way - that, what you “envision” is essential to what you can accomplish.

“Materialism is a form of philosophical monism” vs Stereotypes and norms (i.e., Bargh)

A response I got from, M.L., one of my Filipina connections was this: “Materialism is a form of philosophical monism which holds matter to be the fundamental substance in nature, and all things, including mental states and consciousness, are results of material interactions. Everything that truly exists is matter; everything is material, thus all phenomena we see are a result of material interactions.” Which is basically correct

I pointed out that when you apply that principle to human consciousness, the problem is that a very large portion of human consciousness is not strictly quantifiable or directly correlated with physiological measurements - true love for example. Then there, is art, music, dancing, hope, dreams and much of idealism - not to mention kapwa psychology “self as others.” AS Rupert Sheldrake observes, “The trouble is that the sciences give us vast amounts of data, but it is devoid of personal or spiritual meaning.” (p.169) From a certain perspective it could be said that the rigid adherence to quantification as McGilChrist put it has castrated human consciousness.

The Proof is in the Pudding:

starting with the conclusion should indicate there is substance – and significance - to these questions

Preface – a summary of this has been on my academia-edu profile and had over 80,000 views – with zero criticisms. Social consciousness does not exist. "Social cognition" is not social consciousness - neither is social identity theory - nor is social consciousness as ontology - nature of being. A student of psychology locally said she had never heard of social consciousness.

As a point of order I would highlight that - Essentially, academics never thought or considered that the materialist quantification principle – a “Rigid adherence to arbitrary quantification” as McGilChrist put
it – which most everyone assumes is science – could create a quantification mode of thought or mindset – just like communism or capitalism or any other mode of thought – which changes one’s orientation and approach.

We have already examined social consciousness. First – For nearly one hundred years, materialist have argued that human consciousness is restricted to the firing of neurons in the brain and so there cannot be any social consciousness. That is an absurd argument. It does not follow from the fact that neurons fire in the brain that there is no social consciousness.

Furthermore, social sciences without a proper concept of social consciousness are pretty useless to be quite blunt. One cannot properly analyze protests of social injustice, movement such as the Enlightenment, not to mention spiritual or religious beliefs as described for example by Erica Hill. In Erica Hill’s very detailed and thorough article, Animals as Agents: Hunting Ritual and Relational Ontologies in Prehistoric Alaska and Chukotka, Erica Hill clearly highlights the fact that the issue in the spiritual beliefs in animal spirits, “human relationships with the natural world” is the pivotal issue. Hill observes, “Human hunters engaged with prey animals on a regular, perhaps daily, basis. Hunting ritual and observance of taboos were the responsibility of the individual hunter and his family members, whose duty it was to properly approach, take, butcher and dispose of the animal and its remains.” That is a form of social consciousness.

Besides social consciousness, here are some more MAJOR Flaws, Errors and Omissions

1. Geertz’s “universal definition” of religion (Chernus) has no "spirit" & no concept of community
2. No role for the "Teachings of Religion" in the psychology of religion such as forming a sense of community
3. No concept of spirituality and religious beliefs as major drive or motivation
4. Extreme forms of violence historically evidenced by genocides, atrocities and racism left out of social identity theory As Kay Deaux points out the Academic Materialist fixation with experiments excludes this factor.
5. Dr. Neal, a psychiatrist, trained at Johns Hopkins, states she has no education/training in people who have spiritual-psychic experiences. In the DSM there is NOTHING about spirituality. Furthermore, J. E Kennedy states “Very little research” has been done on people. That appears true from my research
6. On top of that, in my personal experience as well, from my forty years of experience with psychiatrists and psychologists I can tell you flat out they never heard a single word I said. In fact, in forty years whenever I told my “What a nightmare – Mustard seed story” which is documented (notarized with a FOI/A stamp) not one said a single word – nothing – which si conditioning. They block – or filter - it out. The psychologists and psychiatrists I encountered were simply not objective – at all.

From forty years of experience, it is clear psychologists filter out and exclude any “spirituality.” In my forty years of experience, I would Maimone’s Assessment hit the nail on the head when she said “Groups are simply unable to see particular facts that would undermine their conception of the world!”
Mannheim’s argument is that academics and ideologies are a reflection of political-social structure (+ Nietzsche and Voltaire). Christina Maimone observes, “Ideology is, as Mannheim uses the term, a mode of thought that obscures the real condition of society to the group holding the thought, thereby stabilizing the shared social reality of the mode of thought. Groups are simply unable to see particular facts that would undermine their conception of the world!” That describes numerous Materialist Academics!

Mannheim was correct and Maimone’s Assessment hit the nail on the head when she said “Groups are simply unable to see particular facts that would undermine their conception of the world!”

Essentially, academics never thought or considered that the materialist quantification principle – a “Rigid adherence to arbitrary quantification” as McGillChrist put it – which most everyone assumes is science – could create a quantification mode of thought or mindset – just like communism or capitalism or any other mode of thought – which changes one’s orientation and approach.

Unconscious Processes

In that - as Bargh there is a consensus that the unconscious is the work horse of the human mind – academic materialist stereotypes are easily unconsciously assimilated without conscious awareness - which skews peoples thinking and worldview. Furthermore, as the maverick scientist Rupert Sheldrake observes, “[S]ome people have made science into a kind of religion and are often exceptionally dogmatic. They accept the scientific worldview on faith, impressed by the authority and prestige of scientists....” (p.161)

K Lagdameo-Santillan adds: “According to Professor Enriquez, Kapwa is the “unity of the one-of-us-and-the-other” ....... He maintained that “Kapwa implied moral and normative aspects that obliged a person to treat one another as fellow human being and therefore as equal.” ....... But he also foresaw that this Filipino core value was threatened by spreading Western influences. “...once AKO (the I) starts thinking of himself as separate from KAPWA, the Filipino ‘self’ gets to be individuated as in the Western sense...” Professor Virgilio Enriquez, founder of Sikolohiyang Pilipino. I agree with Professor Virgilio Enriquez’s assessment though I feel it is grossly understated.

As a personal reflection, I would observe that because I focus on social consciousness, I often find Hindus because of their understanding of Dharma and Filipinos because of kapwa (self as others) psychology easier to talk to, to be honest. Conversely Anglo-Americans, too often, seem rather unreceptive to social consciousness and at times even hostile. I spoke with a psychology student recently and she told me she had never even hear of the idea of social consciousness.

Orientation – filters, attention, stereotypes and norms

Many scholars highlight “orientation” as an important aspect of human consciousness. It is really not a well-defined concept but clearly emphasizes approach, direction and purpose. Most I speak with feel materialism in the emphasis on quantifiable information is a harmless philosophy. When you look at underlying unconscious processes that is not true. Needs and desires, and attention, of course are pivotal in shaping orientation.
William James in the chapter Perception of Reality in his iconic treatise Principles of Psychology “makes the still startling assertion that “Will and Belief…. are two names for one and the same phenomenon.” Even more fundamental and challenging is the formula he put in the note, saying “belief and attention are the same fact.”” (P. 46 Heart of William James) That is very similar to Viktor Frankl’s “Will to meaning – where motivation, drive and meaning are intimately intertwined the contemporary psychologist, Eric Klinger, whose expertise is in personality psychology and motivation theory, focuses on the influences of motivation and emotion on cognition. Klinger suggests a “primary function of several emotions is to direct attention to concern-related stimuli. (p.42)

Among neuroscientists there appears to be a consensus that “attention” is absolutely pivotal and further that while numerous regions of the brain are involved in attention, the parietal cortex is pivotal in that function. Furthermore, many neuroscientists argue that “attention” when taken in context of “selectivity” is a primary evolutionary adaptive trait.

From, “No one knows what attention is” Bernhard Hommel & Craig S. Chapman & Paul Cisek & Heather F. Neyedli & Joo-Hyun Song & Timothy N. Welsh

“It is argued that selectivity in processing has emerged through evolution as a design feature of a complex multi-channel sensorimotor system, which generates selective phenomena of “attention” as one of many by-products. The present paper reaffirms and expands this position by placing particular and new emphasis on the interconnected and integrative nature of the human sensorimotor information processing systems. This emphasis on integrated sensoricognitive-motor processes takes inspiration from the synthetic approach to understanding “cognition” (Hommel & Colzato, 2015) and a proposed phylogenetic refinement of the scientific approach to understanding behavior (Cisek, 2019 [this issue]). (p. 2288)”

John Bargh, a researcher and psychologist of the unconscious, observes, “When I was about twelve years old, we had a big family reunion and I decided to bring a tape recorder so we’d have a recording of our grandparents and uncles and aunts and cousins for posterity. I come from a large extended family so it was a really noisy room. During the gathering, our grandma sat on the couch and told some great stories in the middle of all other conversations. We listened and enjoyed all of them, and a few days after the reunion, we went back to listen to it again. What a disappointment! Just noise, noise, noise, a million people talking at once and no way to pick out her voice from the other people talking, even though we heard her so clearly at the time. We quickly figured out that we hadn’t noticed the background noise because we had been so captivated by our grandmother’s stories. We’d filtered out what everyone else was saying. The actual, physical sounds in that room at the time, without the mind’s built-in filters, were there on the tape recording.” (p. 111 Before you know it)

In light of the “attention” process then the focus on quantifiable information would limit one’s awareness – and thus understanding. To my knowledge no theologians have tackled academic unconscious stereotypes and norms as of yet – thought they should have.

Reflections and Commentary:

“We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them.” - Albert Einstein
With 366 school shootings since the Columbine shooting – when “on April 20, 1999 at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado...two teens went on a shooting spree, killing 13 people and wounding more than 20 others, before turning their guns on themselves and committing suicide.” (Columbine Shooting History.com Editors https://www.history.com/topics/1990s/columbine-high-school-shootings) Just in 2022 there have been 46 school shootings alone! "We" truly need to seriously rethink our thinking! My argument is that much of "Our" thinking today originates to a degree from the teachings of universities. University and academia "teachings" are like any other teaching - or ideology – and academic teachings has norms and stereotypes like any other teaching or ideology.

As a point of information, during the same time period roughly – in spite of the fact the Philippines have a very violent political culture, for all practical purposes in the Philippines there were next to no school shootings – thank God!

A Point of Order: Delusions, perhaps?

As a point of order, I would briefly highlight the fact that I have not been able to load an essay in academia.edu for a discussion for something like 6 months. Academia support said the premium discussion feature has not been fixed. Recently, I reviewed FB psychology groups I (used to participate in) and discovered three FB groups which had roughly 30 "pending posts" which were not being posted - in spite of the fact that many are recommended by PhD's (Dr Farra, and Dr Wong). My questions are legitimate and valid. I have been singled out - I believe - because I call into question the underlying assumptions of materialism - which means I call into question the entire materialist system - which is - at the moment - the foundation of the social sciences. Carl Sagan said science welcomes any and all questions! “Delusions” is the word that comes to mind!

Addendum: Social Identity Theory by Dr. Saul McLeod, updated 2019

Henri Tajfel's greatest contribution to psychology was social identity theory. Social identity is a person's sense of who they are based on their group membership(s). Tajfel (1979) proposed that the groups (e.g., social class, family, football team etc.) which people belonged to were an important source of pride and self-esteem. Groups give us a sense of social identity: a sense of belonging to the social world. We divided the world into “them” and “us” based through a process of social categorization (i.e., we put people into social groups). We categorize people in the same way. We see the group to which we belong (the in-group) as being different from the others (the out-group), and members of the same group as being more similar than they are. Social categorization is one explanation for prejudice attitudes (i.e., “them” and “us” mentality) which leads to in-groups and out-groups.

Just to reiterate, in social identity theory the group membership is not something foreign or artificial which is attached onto the person, it is a real, true and vital part of the person. Again, it is crucial to remember in-groups are groups you identify with, and out-groups are ones that we don’t identify with, and may discriminate against.
