This chapter offers an explanation of cultural dynamics. The theory presented is Dimensional Accrual and Dissociation (DAD). It is an analytical model developed over several years of multidisciplinary research. It has been tested against current and historical data and critical assessment. The theory has been presented in several contexts and forums to various artists, scholars, private and public sector leaders, and heads of profit and nonprofit organizations from around the world and from many cultures, disciplinary backgrounds, and industries. White House personnel from three administrations, CEOs, and military generals and commanders have read, studied, and discussed this theory with the author.

Over the last two decades, their responses to the theory have been overwhelmingly positive, uniformly agreeing that the theory has a strong ring of truth based on their assessments and their years of experience in intercultural relations and international affairs. At this point, several publications and doctoral dissertations have generated data testing the theory, finding it to be very heuristic, accurate, and useful. Here I offer a short and hopefully clear introduction to the theory.
PREFACE SUMMATION

The theory of dimensional accrual and dissociation synthesizes two powerful ideas: dissociation and consciousness structuration. The result is a new understanding of culture as a form of expression. Insofar as “Consciousness is really only a net of communication between human beings” and “the development of language and the development of consciousness go hand in hand,” then “knowledge,” as something verifiable, reliable, valid, and sharable, becomes, according to Friedrich Nietzsche, “nothing more than this: Something strange is to be reduced to something familiar…. What is familiar means what we are used to so that we no longer marvel at it, our everyday ... something that no longer disturbs us.”

Our world, the human world, is meaningful and shared.

DIMENSIONAL ACCRUAL: THE HERMENEUTIC NATURE OF HUMAN BEING AND BEING HUMAN

Culture is a symbol system that no one person owns or has complete knowledge of. It enables humans to sustain and transfer knowledge, beliefs, values, motives, meanings, and identities from one generation to the next—information that is not biologically inherent. It can be lost. It can change. In fact we are currently living through not only the greatest mass extinction of flora and fauna since the Cretaceous–Tertiary extinction event, the K-T extinction 65.5 million years ago, but simultaneously the greatest mass extinction of languages and cultures (worldviews) ever. These facts alone may suggest that there is something profoundly wrong or deficient with the overall global system as life tends to proliferate forms when things are going well rather than contract so suddenly. But that has been dealt with in other places.

Culture is a semantic field in which one lives. It constitutes shared memories and knowledge. If each generation had to learn how to farm or hunt from scratch, through pure trial and error, we as a species would have gone extinct long ago. Culture is a repository of competencies and wisdom that can be passed on via a shorthand process of linguistic and other forms of codexical communication, largely in the form of storytelling. Almost every communiqué has some pedagogical value.

The human too is a product of culture. The human mind, the physical brain, is not finished at birth. It must be “programmed” through interaction that stimulates the growth of networks of neurons. Making interaction
familiar, predictable, and normative is important as it saves energy for the organism through what Alfred Schutz called "scripted behavior"—patterns of interaction such as greetings, ritualized salutations, leaving-takings, or ritualized valedictions that require little thinking or effort. George Simmel claims that "Society exists whenever several individuals are in reciprocal relationship ... with-and-for-one-another." Simmel is describing *religio*, the binding aspect of group formation. But he over generalizes. And so too does Schutz and practically every social psychologist who believes that all people share a common psychology or set of instinctual motivations and urges or an even deeper Kantian constitutive architectonic of spatial and temporal structuration (which would be more plausible but still too much of a generalization). Different cultures interpret instinctual motivations and urges differently.

What compels people to behave in normative ways varies. In magic one-dimensional culture, this binding "we" is presumed and involves the magic fluids that are self-evident and therefore beyond question such as blood, semen, and milk. "We" are of one blood, often descended from a single common god-father or god-mother. Differently, in the mythic two-dimensional world, dissociation and fragmentation begin to creep in. What binds the group is no longer blood but sacred stories of origin—creation myths. Dissociation means increasing abstraction—a move from the self-evident identity of reality to symbolism. Mythic symbolic communication also exhibits this dissociation as a polar separation of the literal from the figural, a separation unknown in magic idolic communication.

![Figure 7.1. Dimensional accrual/dissociation (DAD).](image-url)
While it is impossible to change one's magic identity, it is possible but not likely for the mythic person to convert as that would involve a complete disintegration of the self. Because mythic identity is defined by sacred cosmological story, often told by Holy people and under ritual/ceremonial circumstances, mythic people are bound by intense emotional commitment, obligation, and reciprocity. In the modern world, dissociation intensifies, and mythic polar symbolism gives way to totally arbitrary signalic communication and individual choice. The individual emerges and religion, nationality, and other markers of identity (even sex) are increasingly a matter of personal choice.

The point is that groups sustained by different consciousness structures are very different in kind. Magic identity of the one and all "we" is very conservative. The individual, as the nexus of choice, does not exist. One cannot choose to be a "member." Membership, which implies contingency as such, does not exist in magic "communities." Identity is immutable. I am born a Brahman or an Untouchable, and no matter what I do as an individual, I will die a Brahman or an Untouchable. Revolution is unthinkable. Power distance between the elite and the minority is assumed by all to be natural, in fact supernatural, and therefore not merely "acceptable," which again implies individual choice, but as utterly appropriate.

Magic peoples are fatalistic. If change comes to a magic community, disrupting the order of things, total panic is the result. We have seen this many times in history. To give but two examples, one is the fall of the Aztec Empire to Hernán Cortés just 2 years after his landing in 1519 at Veracruz, despite the fact that Diego Velázquez de Cuéllar, representing the governor of Hispaniola, was against his expedition and tried to stop him by force, and the presence of thousands of fierce Aztec warriors. How could 500 fairly scurvy Spaniards who had no chance for reinforcements, in fact to the contrary, who were regarded as mutinous by their own governor, armed with a few one-shot (if lucky) cannon and 15 horses overthrow a vast empire? It was not their steel swords, horses, or cannon. And smallpox had not yet done its worst to the Aztec. Rather it was the total disruption of the cosmic order by Cortés, beginning with the incomprehensible (to the indigenous population) slaughtering of several unarmed royals at Cholula, the second largest city in Central America, followed by his forcible capture of god, the Aztec "emperor" Moctezuma II, the ninth tlahuana or ruler of Tenochtitlan. Once these things occurred the populace was in chaos. A similar hysteria swept through Japan after Commodore Matthew Perry ordered his "black ship" squadron to open fire without provocation targeting structures along Uraga Harbor in Edo (Tokyo) Bay, terrifying everyone from the Tokugawa Shogun to the serf.

To magic peoples, technology, such as cannon and black smoke-belching steam ships, are monstrous and powerful magic. And once God is toppled, all hell breaks loose.
The point here is that each structure of consciousness presents a perspective, a hermeneutic horizon that is different from each other. We can make sense of the world from only our own point of view, which can change but is still bounded. And how that change occurs, how it is felt, differs from the magic one-dimensional to the mythic two-dimensional and modern three-dimensional structures. As dimensions accrue, dissociation increases and emotional intensity and identification decreases, and so change becomes less traumatic (see Figure 7.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aperspectival world</th>
<th>Space + time free</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspectival signalic world</td>
<td>Empty + dead void</td>
<td>Instrumental rationality careless anonymity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mythic symbolic world</td>
<td>Thinning death anxiety</td>
<td>Emergent narrative/narrator dramatic intensifying symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magic idolic world</td>
<td>Thick alive</td>
<td>Affective attunement emotional identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic world</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td>Pre-reflective vital/active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.2. Types of world.**

For the Modern, progress, a form of change, is a virtue, and so technological innovation is promoted. But to a magic person, change is a disruption of all things as they are all interconnected and alive—what Moderns call animism. Consequently, magic people, who are just as physically and mentally capable of generating technologies as Moderns, tend to stick with the sacred ways. When change is forced on them, it is apocalyptic.

The binding force of two-dimensional mythic communities is very different. Compared with the magic worldview, the mythic is more ideological, more debatable, and more an issue of choice, although the sacred stories that mythic peoples live by and define who they are, are not at all perceived as contingent.

Any collection of human beings may be called a "society." But society is not the same thing as community. Society is an aggregate of individuals.
Schutz argued that members assume “reciprocity of perspectives,” meaning that each person assumes that if they were to trade places with one another, they would see what the other person sees, as they see. In a multicultural world, this assumption runs into the boundary conditions of group membership and differing consciousness structures. Understanding cannot be generalized or presumed to be rooted in a universal common sense.

The human mind is a cultural product. But as Fredric Jameson argues, this does not mean that language is a prison house. To be sure it biases our thinking, but it also enables us to think and communicate, and through communication we expand our horizons. Each new experience is a challenge to our biases in that each message prompts integration. A “challenge” means something that changes us. This includes not just threats to our way of seeing the world but also includes messages that reinforce our prior beliefs, leaving us not as we were before but with stronger convictions.

Just as when a child reaches up for something that is beyond their grasp and the parent holding the child continues the “same” motion, extending the “child’s” reach to pick up an object, so, too, when we read a book, watch a movie, or talk to another person, they extend us into the semantic field that is otherwise beyond our reach alone. Hence, a veteran of the U.S./Viet Nam conflict can share with me his experiences in 1960’s Saigon, a nurse can take me into a Halloween night emergency room, or my neighbor can offer to me an understanding of what it means to work on commission. Our lives, our styles of storytelling, the contents, our minds intermingle. My world is extended, enriched. I am extended, enriched by storytelling. I am a blending of all the people and stories I have heard. When two or more disagree, I may suffer dissonance. Other people’s stories and memories, hopes and fears, strengths and weaknesses become my stories, but with my accent, my limitations, my interpretations. This is how we learn, how we grow, how we commune.

The world as conversation is what I call semantically intercursive. We chain stories along into enduring culture, tradition, group identity—belonging. The semantic field envelops us, giving us identity as a member or an outsider. Either way, we are made meaningful. We are situated by and embody a horizon, a limit that we constantly expand until we die. We are all people of our time and place, our linguistic community, but knowing this itself exposes reality to contingency. Time is the open horizon. The human world is sustained through conversation, storytelling, conversion (morphogenic plasticity). The morphogenesis of a standing-streaming reality is ever-present. For the Modern, change is permanent.

Growth is not a zero-sum game. I need not unlearn some old knowledge in order to learn something new. I am not a tea cup that must empty a little in order to add more. Rather growth is an accrual and integral
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process. The new makes the old, old as such, and vice versa. Even facts, things "already done," are being constantly reevaluated. A crime is solved, a verdict rendered, a sentence issued, but then DNA changes everything, including the accused person's identity from being a convict, a "known" murder and rapist to being a victim of an overzealous prosecutor, of lies, racism, and mistaken identity. The results of one test, one little bit of information, transforms the defendant into a plaintiff who sues the state and those who falsely accused him.

According to simplistic positivism, a fact is something resolved, finished, already done, but hermeneutics teaches us that facts are always contingent, available for challenge, and integration never stops. This was Ludwig Wittgenstein's point in his famous book On Certainty, which concluded his writing and his challenge of the legacy of the logical positivists known as the Vienna Circle.8

Not only does my cup keep getting bigger, but as new brews are added the overall mixture changes its color, texture, and flavor. I am a verb, as Buck Minster Fuller and Joseph Agel famously put it.9 I am constantly under construction via patterns of interaction (communication). "I" am a constantly emerging moment, a co-constitutive phenomenon, a set of relationships between what I was and what I am becoming, in more conventional terms, between "me" and "my environment," a common but inadequate description for it is precisely both that are constantly adapting to each other. It is not me and the environment. I am part of the environment, and so as I change, so does it, and vice versa. This is what I call co-evolution, which is basically the same as what Alfred Radcliffe-Brown calls "coadaptation" (following from Alfred North Whitehead's influence), whereby practices and groups come to support each other within a system while not losing their unique identities.10 In fact mutual support presumes and depends on their enduring uniqueness.

CO-EVOLUTION AND PAN-EVOLUTION

Co-evolution is a consequence of co-constitutive structuration. This is not conventional social construction. For I construct the environment as it constructs me. Some, such as William Gudykunst and Young Yun Kim,11 posit a monolithic and stable "mainstream culture" to which individuals must conform or fail. They call this process of conformity "evolution." But this is wrong because human society is itself constantly changing, and even the weakest minority is part of it. In biology, evolution is not restricted to communication, which presumes reciprocity between two living things, but instead evolution also involves informatics, which is not reciprocal. In the
latter case, an individual or a species responds to abiotic factors, such as volcanism. It is a one-way process because the volcanoes are not alive.

Co-evolution, which is communication in the sense that reciprocity (genuine exchange) exists, involves mutuality as “each side” adjusts to the other as in host-symbiont and host-parasite co-evolution. In the complexity of ecology, diffuse co-evolution occurs, whereby one species responds to changes in multiple species, not just one. I have coined the term pan-evolution as an integral way to understand how all species are constantly adjusting to all others through complex patterns and chain reactions. This also happens in story chaining.

The entire environment is thus seen as a living process of integration between interaction with abiotic forces such as volcanoes and supernova and intra-action leading to synergies that transcend mere quantitative combinations. Gudykunst and Kim and others like them continue to presume an extremely conservative dualistic metaphysics, whereby the minority is not part of the system but must become part of it by disappearing, by what they call disintegration and deculturizing assimilation, a way of thinking that leads to demands for conformity that dictate the direction of change. They also characterize this conformity as progressive “evolution” in an “upward-forward” direction, enhancing “psychological health” and “maturity,” a positive evaluation first canonized in the works of the Victorian Social Darwinist Herbert Spencer in the late 1800’s. But such a process leads to stagnation because progress (if one wants to speak in positivistic terms) requires change. Once everyone has assimilated, there is nothing left to integrate. Perfect equilibrium achieved via assimilation means stagnation. “Political correctness” cast aside, this way of understanding is simply, empirically inaccurate. It has long been discredited in biological sciences and evolution studies, which see morphological change as dissipative structuration, as emergent self-organization. Also, even stable systems exhibit random mutation.

As soon as a single foreigner moves into a neighborhood, the neighborhood has changed, especially if she opens an ethnic restaurant or introduces new forms of fashion, music, literature, religion, and so forth. And she too will change. The “host system” implies a noun way of thinking. But a system is a verb. It evolves. This is especially the case in multicultural societies. “The host” is not monolithic. It is a mosaic of languages, religious practices, styles, fashions, games, sports; a complex living system, and I am always already an integral part of it. Even if I am a criminal, the society must take my existence into account one way or the other and respond accordingly.

Overall, the process of system is more than a dualistic co-evolution. It is a pan-evolutionary process of continual churning and integration among countless actors, abiotic and biotic. And because in one frame a cause (a
flat tire that causes me to be late), in another frame is an effect (is the consequence of me running over a broken bottle), all actors are simultaneously reactors. Without a “mainstream” notion of privilege and transcending power, what I have called a “god-concept,” then one must see the universe as all that there is, and therefore it is self-organizing. Society is both a causal power and also a consequence. Convergence and divergence co-exist.

According to simple cybernetics, as the temperature of a room changes and this change is detected by a thermostat (feedback), the thermostat controls the furnace, turning it on and off. This is basic feedback and control. But contrary to many in the artificial intelligence (AI) community, thermostats are not intelligent. They do not learn. Humans, what Martin Heidegger called Dasein, are hermeneutic (temporal) in nature. According to hermeneutics, feedback and additional information literally changes the shape and function of me (the thermostat). This is why applying cybernetics to humans is inappropriate and why, when social scientists latched onto Claude Shannon’s 1948 article published in a Bell Telephone technical journal on information processing, the author (along with his subsequent co-author and developer of the theory, Warren Weaver), protested, noting that they were writing a mathematical model about how machines communicate, not human beings. A similar point has been repeatedly made by Paul Ricoeur (especially in his debate with Jean-Pierre Changeux).

Hermeneutists argue that as a person matures, as experiences sediment, I change. Today programmers try to mimic this with computers, enabling them to “learn.” But computers cannot choose to stop the communication or change the topic altogether, which I can. I change the way I assess new information. This would mean that the structure of the thermostat itself changes over time. For instance, I learn from experience that I can no longer naively trust everything Joe tells me. Over time, I change my way of interpreting and processing Joe’s claims. I am not the same person Joe encountered 6 months ago. I have “wised up.” I have context which revealed to me Joe’s initially hidden ulterior motives and deceptions. Context and text are co-dependent phenomena. One cannot exist without the other and as one changes so too does the other.

According to information theory, which is not communication theory, noise and silence (an empty channel) convey no information. But to a human they do. Anyone subjected to the “silent treatment” understands this, and anyone struggling to get a sound system to work properly interprets noise as irritating and as communicating that it “is not working yet.” If strangers sharing an elevator with me say nothing I take little notice. It is a norm. But if my wife of 20 years in the elevator says nothing, the silence may be deafening. As the German communication theorist and
social constructivist Paul Watzlawick (borrowing from Gregory Bateson’s ideas about an “ecology of mind”\textsuperscript{20}) so succinctly put it: \textit{Man kann nicht nicht kommunizieren} (one cannot not communicate).\textsuperscript{21} As we shall see, even the void has meaning for us.

Channels of communication are tributaries that flow into, sustain, and change my current of thought and how I think (the structure of the thermostat changes with experience). As I learn new things, this enables me to reassess what I once was and what I thought I knew. Yesterday’s discovery is tomorrow’s presumption. Integration is thus a cascading process of continual change, of interacting meanings and interpretations. As an immigrant seeks to “fit in” the very thing she is adjusting to changes, what it means to her changes as she gains experience. She too becomes known, more familiar to her neighbors.

Language both limits and enables communication. Language differences can pose a profound obstacle to communication. But without language, gestures and words that convey conventional meanings—communication—is impossible. This is the basic fact of human existence. We manifest a hermeneutic, fundamentally temporal mode of being. Likewise, integration cannot occur without preserving differences to integrate. Once all difference is lost, homogenous assimilation occurs. If that happens, then there is nothing left to exchange. This ends communication because without the exchange of differences, identity, which is based on difference, cannot exist. Pure equilibrium is a zero-energy state, pure and inert homogeneity—death. It happens to relationships that have become “stale.” Only naive positivists and structural-functionalists presume that all communication can be made painless or satisfying. Such value judgments tend to motivate assimilationists seeking “efficiency” and who see uncertainty as (a) causing only anxiety, and (b) therefore something to be avoided via elimination. This is not realistic or even desirable if one does not want all tomorrows to be predictably identical to today.

As I explain the structures of consciousness, it must be kept in mind that they accrue or add up and they interact. Each worldview interprets the others according to its own criteria. Progress, except in the modernistic positivistic sense, does not mean losing the past—getting beyond it and abandoning “obsolete” ways. Progress is an idea of the age of ideology that spawned all kinds of utopian dreams of perfection and final salvation. Utopian positivistic thinking leads to total absurdity; progress defined as movement toward end times. The ambition for puritanical perfection is the source of much terror. It logically leads to the self-contradiction of “destroying the world to save it,” as the expert on cults, Robert Lifton, puts it.\textsuperscript{22}

Just as Einstein was not trying to correct the “anomalous” orbit of Mercury with his general theory of relativity, but simply trying to under-
stand it, so too the DAD theory is not a prescription for progress, perfection, or any kind of social engineering that presumes a set of value judgments and a final perfect solution. It is rather an explanation for how and why things are as they are, and it offers some guidelines for predicting outcomes given a set of known preconditions.

**DIMENSIONAL ACCRUAL AND DISSOCIATION**

Without a final goal, neither progress nor regress can be measured. As the dimensions of awareness accrue, no final goal or set of meta-criteria is presumed. Change, according to the DAD theory, cannot be evaluated as progressive or regressive. All that can be said is that some structures of awareness manifest more dimensions than others. History has shown that this is not necessarily “better” or more “evolved,” “mature,” “competent,” or even more cognitively complex. History has also shown that the process has at times reversed itself. A person or group can exhibit a decline in dimensions of awareness.

Just as one could argue that the first floor of a skyscraper is the most important, the foundational floor, and that removal of it would cause the entire structure, with all its “higher” contents, to collapse, so it is with our structures of consciousness. Anatomically, humans have not changed much for hundreds of thousands of years. For thousands of years, people just like me, by which I mean that if I could put them in a time machine and whisk them to the present, take them to a hospital, and run every test known on them, they would appear to be anatomically modern *Homo Sapiens sapiens* (because they are); small bands of such people just like me wandered savannas, semi-arid steppes, and coastal regions following migrating animals, fish, and birds for tens of thousands of years. We have lived through several glaciations. We did not know permanent shelter until perhaps 30,000 years ago. We did not know what “inside,” and by implication what “outside,” means. Nor did our ancestors have words for “culture,” and by implication, “nature,” or “domestic” and “wild.”

Today, as a Modern who is conveyed by massive machines, who sleeps in temperature-controlled comfort, and who has access to convenient sources of calories, I totally presume and rely on my physique, on the physical capabilities that evolved over millions of years. But I do not just presume a physical structure I have inherited. I presume linguistic-consciousness structuration too. Though I now may live in a teeming metropolis, this condition has prevailed for only a few hundred years—a mere moment in evolutionary terms. And there are signs that such a way of living may not be sustainable. Only a hundred years ago, horses still plied the streets of
Manhattan, London, and Tokyo. I am the same animal that stalked the wilderness for a million generations, and what sustained me were not just my physical abilities but my structure of conscious awareness. Because I could talk, I could coordinate, plan, and survive.

Culturally, linguistically, paleolinguistics demonstrates that I speak and think using words that are at least 10,000 years old, "linguistic fossils" that endure from Proto-Indo-European (PIE) or even older pre-PIE. As Indo-European broke up into daughter languages, its phonetic structure also splintered and with time diverged. However, there are many very old words that endure. For instance, we can find the same word for fish and sheep in ancient Sanskrit and Hindi and in modern English and Russian. One example of such an etymologic relationship is the common root of Sanskrit veda, Greek woída, and Gothic wīta, which in all cases means "I know." Another is the word ewe, meaning sheep or female sheep across many modern languages. "You" in Czech is beres, in Iranian is (mi)bori, in Celtic beirir, in German (du) (ge)berir. The word for a spiritual "medicine man," shaman, is Russian ______ from Tungus shaman, perhaps from Chinese __ sha men, via Prakrit __, and finally from Sanskrit ______ sramana-s. Fish in Sanskrit is piecha, and the word for fish in Russian is piskari. The word for salmon in Sanskrit is laksha, which is the same in Germanic languages, and salmon are found in locks and lakes and in French lacs, but not in India. The English word "lake" shares its root with Urdu __, Hindustani __ (lakh), and Sanskrit ______ (laksan). So when I talk about having lox and bagels for breakfast, I am participating in a phonetic pattern that is prehistoric.

It is through such genetic relatedness and internal reconstruction that language families and subfamilies, and therefore civilizational linguistic clusters such as Bantu under Niger-Congo, Finno-Permic under Uralic, Hellenic and Indo-Iranian and later Germanic and Balto-Slavic under Indo-European, Tibeto-Burman under Sino-Tibetan, and so forth, have been mapped forming the basis of modern comparative linguistics. Most comparisons today are based on vocabulary and morphology. Many modern languages have lost their strong relationship between sound and meaning, with Chinese being an exception because it is one of the oldest but continuously spoken languages still exhibiting tonal inflections.

PIE was an inflected language. The "same" word could have many different meanings, even conveying contradictory meanings such as good and evil expressed by the same word but with a different context, phonetic inflection, or suffix. Syntax and semantics were not yet separated, and often other distinctions such as tense difference, noun/verb, singular/plural, and male/female did not yet exist. An example is fish. You go fishing to catch a fish or many fish and you fish now, in the future you will fish and in the past you did fish. Grammatical and semantic relationships were combined. Grammatical relationships between words were signaled through
inflectional morphemes (usually endings). PIE roots are basic morphemes that carry lexical meaning.

Isolation of groups of people over long periods have led to changes in languages, but many geographically separated languages share many words and those are the oldest ones. They endure as new words and pronunciations that reflect local (isolated) conditions are invented and added. These old words are presumed and used.

Similarly, I presume magic and mythic structures of awareness that endure all over the world. They are not gone even though I pride myself on my modernistic, perspectival, rational mentality. Progress has not wiped out the past (the first floor) but presumes it. I still move daily through a world presuming instinctual reactions and emotional “feelings” that guide my movements. I study calculus and physics because I want to make more money and have more fun and security later in life. Magic emotion and mythic story-sharing constitute the majority of my living experience. No matter how high a building extends into the sky, it relies on the stability of its foundation. Similarly, without magic emotional strength and the communicative/mythic ability to empathize through story-sharing that enriches my understanding (learning), I could not endure.

Unlike most other animals, humans have to be taught how to think, talk, survive. There is no substitute for sharing experience. The ratio of calories needed to calories spent getting sustenance is precarious. I don’t have time to learn agriculture and how to fish and hunt by myself. Having teachers (self-sustaining culture) is essential. Communication/culture has been the key to human survival especially given our relatively weak physical abilities: poor eyesight, poor hearing, poor sense of smell, absence of claws, weak teeth, slow gate, and so forth. Cooperative coordination via complex communication (culture) has been our forte. As generations pass, we accrue knowledge that is sedimented in the very language that programs our cognition.

While other animals live in the here and now, communication gives us access to the virtual temporal dimension that allows us to reflect on past failures and successes and plan ahead. The semantic field transcends the here and now. We are master ambush hunters and agrarians. This is enabled by the semantic field, a complex system of icons, signs, and symbols that we sustain through conversations and that sustain us—even imprint as neuronal pathways. The engineers of the first space suits to be used on the moon studied the design and articulation of medieval suits of armor. Culture can be lost and revived, as when Renaissance artists paid laborers to dig up classical Roman statues that had been abandoned to sink into the mud as pagan objects and bring them to their studios for study. For about 1,300 years, no three-dimensional free-standing sculpture was made in Europe. The same time that other Modernistic modes of expression that
characterized classical antiquity such as universities and a vital public sphere that sustained deliberative bodies and forensic debate in courts disappeared, so too did three-dimensional art.

The first work conceived “in the round” was Donatello’s imitation of the ancients in his bronze David (c. 1440). Spherical thinking was erupting as the earth was reconceived as a globe available for exploratory circumnavigation. Europeans extricated themselves out of the two-dimensional mythic and one-dimensional magic worlds as they came to understand that as they stood looking up at the night sky, the stars were not just above them, but all around them. This constituted a mutation in the structure of reality. Everything changed. It was a revolution at the most profound levels of understanding, meaning, and identity. Even the term “revolution” came out of this new reality, this new structure of consciousness that saw movement in all directions.

The fall of the Greco-Roman modern world demonstrates that dimensions can accrue and also dwindle. Culture can change. Things can be “lost.” Knowledge is not an empirical object. It has no shape or color. It is a temporal, transcendental, semiotic phenomenon. If it is not sustained, it can disappear.

As a child becomes a linguistic being, the environment is transformed into a semantic field. Isomorphism involves how the virtual and the actual, the descendental and transcendent correspond and interact. What constitutes communicative competence depends on circumstance. Competence is an isomorphic phenomenon. It is not an inherent virtual property of an individual, a subjective ability rooted in trait psychology. Rather, it is a co-constitutive property based on interaction between the individual and her environment, which to humans is a semantic, cultural field. The outcomes of such interaction are then subject to judgment as to what is desirable or undesirable in cultural terms.

Any effort to describe competence as an inherent capacity, such as “talent” or innate personality traits, that does not take into account the emergent quality of context and text interaction is ethnocentric and, as such, highly prone to false predictions. Just because I am “good” at singing Italian opera does not mean I will also be “good” at singing Peking opera. Overemphasis on the individual and her inherent traits is a psychological, modernist approach that reduces our focus to the individual as the center of explanation. It has some value but also severe limitations. Smart is as smart does depending on the circumstance. What is an “inherent good” in one circumstance, being tall for a basketball player, is a decidedly unattractive trait if one wants to do gymnastics.

Competence is a co-constitutive quality that emerges out of text and context interaction. Competence, as a set of value judgments limited to each specific culture, is a thoroughly ethnocentric concept. For this reason,
it is not relevant to the discussion herein. But as noted shortly, efficient and deficient outcomes are relevant and objectively applicable to all cultures. A culture that proves unable to endure, to self-replicate, is what is called herein deficient.

Culture has often been equated with communication, but if there are fundamentally different structures to cultural reality, then there must be fundamentally different modes of communication and not just the extremely general notions of counting the number of words a person utters in an hour, as in high- versus low-context styles of communication/culture made famous by Edward T. Hall or the theory of elaborated versus restricted codes of Basil Bernstein. As we shall see in the magic structure, the utterance of certain words is profoundly meaningful. Because of their significance, they are rarely spoken. The same is true of certain images and gestures. The quantitative assumption that the more a word is spoken, the more important or meaningful it is, is a very modern perspectival bias. On the other extreme, if we cannot generalize at all, then cultural theory has no value.

By synthesizing the work of Jean Gebser and Lewis Mumford and interpreting consciousness structure as a communicative phenomenon, the theory of dimensional accrual and dissociation (DAD) offers a solid approach to understanding cultures and intercultural misunderstandings, including competing efforts to resocialize and enculturate the Other. In fact, some advice from writers of intercultural communication textbooks, if followed, would lead to intercultural conflict because it equates flexible adaptation and integration with assimilation. For instance, in introducing the theory of intercultural, cross-cultural, or interethnic (the authors unfortunately use the three interchangeably) adaptation theory, Gudykunst and Kim state that, “Cross-cultural adaptation process involves a continuous interplay of deculturation and acculturation that brings about change in strangers in the direction of assimilation, the highest degree of adaptation theoretically conceivable. It [adaptation] is that process by which strangers are resocialized into a new culture so as to attain an increasing compatibility and functional fitness” so that they will become “fit to live in the company of others.” This process of resocialization or enculturation, according to these authors, requires an equal amount of “deculturation” and “unlearning” of the original self. In modernist variable analytic style, they see all things as zero-sum processes so that growth, the accrual of various repertoires of thinking and behaving, is impossible. To them, there is just one right way and that is the way of the singular, monolithic “mainstream culture.”

This ignores the demonstrated value of pluralism within liberal democracies. Already in the 1960s, the consensus among experts who empirically studied the causes of intergroup conflict and interethnic relations such as
Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Nathan Glazer's *Beyond the Melting Pot*, and also the work of Robert Park and Milton Gordon, recognized the source of conflict to be coercive pressure on minorities to assimilate.

For instance, by the 1990s, Glazer was insisting that "we are all multiculturalists," like it or not. This is increasingly true in a world that is increasingly global in nature. These scholars clearly defined assimilation as not being the same thing as integration. Integration and cultural fusion presume that differences are not melted away into a homogenous mass culture but endure as subcultures within the larger social system. In more general terms, Milton Rokeach repeatedly demonstrated that forced conformity leads to resentment and resistance as well as depression, not "mature," "balanced," "psychologically healthy," and progressively evolved individuals or a stable social system as Gudykunst and Kim claim.

Gudykunst and Kim's notion of intercultural adaptation and evolution, which recommends that immigrants avoid their own language and media that deal with their original cultural identity, is quite the opposite of liberal pluralism in a democratic structure. One can forcibly achieve behavioral compliance, but this does not mean that the coerced person or group changes their core values and beliefs. In fact authoritarian coercion tends to have the opposite effect on individuals and groups. Even after "500 years under the yoke" of autocratic Ottoman rule, the Slavic and Greek peoples in the Balkans did not comfortable acquiesce and become Turks.

Furthermore, even as minorities comply with majority rules and norms, this does not mean the majority will accept them as equal. It is a fact that in many cultures, perhaps all, from urban blacks in the United States, the Osage, the Welsh, Hawaiians, and Zulu, to the Swiss, the more an outsider tries to act and look like a local, the stranger, even crazy, they are perceived to be by locals. In Japan they have a name for such a strange person who tries to be Japanese: *henna gaijin*. Such efforts tend to lead to what W. E. B. Du Bois back in 1897 called double-consciousness. The more one genuinely internalizes the majority's way of thinking, feeling, and behaving, if that includes contempt for your group, then the more you come to see yourself through the values and beliefs of the mainstream, and the more you struggle with the dissonance of self-hate. If assimilation means accepting as unreflective truth and reality a worldview that despises you, then it is not a viable or healthy way to exist.

Pride and prejudice cannot be socially engineered out of existence. They are fundamental to all human beings. The goal is to understand them and manage them, not to keep repeating the same old justifications for irrational prejudice and rational for forced conformity. The goal, as Desmond Morris put it, is to keep the pendulum between our innate need to compete and our equally strong need to cooperate in balance. From the criteria of
efficient and viable self-replication, the goal is to understand the relative strengths and weaknesses of various structures of consciousness as we integrate them and as different modalities rise to predominance and fade into the background of our daily projects.

Consciousness structuration is a product of communication/enculturation. The human brain becomes a cultured and socialized cultural product through symbolic interaction and magic interaction, which is not symbolic but idolically rooted in the primordial emotional bond of an infant and those who care for her. In turn consciousness structures are also self-sustaining, which means that as a communicative phenomenon, the human mind, working through a semantic field of symbolic interaction, is transcended by language and also transcends itself to reproduce its structure in others. At the same time it is constantly integrating new information.

The primary language, the first words an infant learns, and the way they are related to each other (syntax), are magic in quality, not abstract. They constitute what Patricia Kuhl and her colleagues call “native language neural commitment.” But while Kuhl and others speak of language acquisition, I argue that this is an integral, reciprocal text/context process, for as we acquire language, it enables us to acquire human consciousness. Another limitation is how language acquisition is regarded by a perspectival modernist as a matter of cognitive development. And it is. But it is also a matter of the formation of the nondirectional, preconceptual magic self; a somatic and olfactory/gustatory sense that is also culturally inflected (codified as normative ethnic practice). Some of our earliest memories are of the smell that is the smell of our world, including our mother’s skin and her cooking. When you walk into a building atmosphere filled with the smell of curry that means something to us before thinking, prior to conceptualization. Our earliest, most intimate aspects of identity are memories of prespatial touch, taste, and smell.

As the self becomes “public,” spatial, audial sensation becomes manifest. Gods speak out of the aerial space from all directions yet “from a distance.” As Robert Coles and others have explored, children live in magic worlds and tend to have powerful emotional commitment to people, objects, words, and atmospheres. In modernist terms, the magic world is a bricolage of fetishes. And social interaction as the process of semantic field/consciousness construction is also a matter of mythic affective development. Words and stories touch and move us even as we try to resist them. One may try to not have goose bumps or tears evoked by certain stories or the passing of a band playing an anthem one identifies with; such a struggle to “get hold of oneself” is always too late because magic is immediate. To get a hold on oneself is an idiom that expresses dissociation. What we identify with at the magic level is profound and prereflective. Only to a Modern is the emotional self an embarrassment. This is a true sign of ego-
hypertrophy and a world where distinction between truth and lies, a world where deception can occur.

And unlike some who claim that a failure to “deculturize” and “unlearn” one’s primary language and culture in order to assimilate into a new culture, is a sign of communicative incompetence and functional unfitness, this pluralistic world exhibits many values other than just functional efficiency. Besides, systematic “deculturizing” of oneself is impossible to do in both theory (to willingly unlearn oneself) and practice. Nor does it lead to greater cognitive complexity. A zero-sum game that requires an equal amount of unlearning to make room for new learning, as Gudykunst and Kim claim, defies the concept of growth. Much more rigorous science has demonstrated that the more languages a child learns, the greater their cognitive dexterity. And I add, also their primordial semantic and affective dexterity, realizing the validity of emotional intelligence as vital to human comportment as well as the magic idolic and mythic symbolic dimensions of language. Survival depends on even deeper archaic modes of understanding than arbitrary signs.

Briefly, the DAD theory argues that as structures of consciousness accrue, dissociation increases, and different modes of expression and interpersonal and intergroup comportment prevail. One important point must be made. No concept of evolution as progress is presumed as dimensions accrue. Nor is there any claim that one structure is good and others bad or that one is better than another. This is the point about communicative competence made earlier. What is observed is that, given a certain need, one structure may prove more efficient than another. Thus, if a coach wants to prepare her players for a game, cold, clinical analysis of the other team’s strengths and weaknesses and one’s own strengths and weaknesses as exposed by the parameters of the game itself is warranted. But at halftime, down by 20 points, it may be too late for such analysis, and the coach realizes that the team lacks passion and energy and so she may wisely switch from a recitation of Xs and Os and skill competencies (task leadership) to a more dramatic approach at motivation (emotional leadership) by telling stories with emotional intensity of past glories, reminding players that their school is counting on them (for synecdoche is a mythic form of expression and in magic the part stands for the whole), reminding them of how hard they have worked to get here, that they want to make their family proud, that this is “our house” and we defend our house, and so forth. Sometimes, emotional appeal is more efficient than rational analysis. Appropriateness of weighting in favor of one or the other depends on the context.
THE TRANSCENDENTAL AS THAT WHICH BINDS

Such binding homiletics, for religio is binding through emotional identification (we stand or fall together as one—not mere simpatico of sharing or agreement but actual identification—every shot you miss I wince), is powerful and can be appropriate given certain circumstances. It will prove far more efficient and appropriate than trying to break down each position analytically. Also a single magic word, or reminder of a mythic story, takes “no time.” Thus, coaches chant “believe” and “finish” as magic incantations and “remember last year” or “we play for Joe” as mythic references that are both literally and figuratively true.

Religio means to care and religare means to bind together, to rely not on one another but on we (only Moderns morph this into “counting” on each other). “We” means “we did it as a team,” with emotional and physical synergy, not as individuals. If we do not care, community falls apart, and we have instrumental society. The social sciences were born in large part because of a rising sense of anxiety about alienation in Modern society. This was the motive and aim of all the original social science writers from Karl Marx, Ferdinand Tönnies, and Emile Durkheim to Max Weber. A mountain of books focus on this problem, including classics such as David Riesman and Nathan Glazer’s The Lonely Crowd, Vance Packard’s A Nation of Strangers, William Whyte’s The Organization Man, Herbert Marcuse’s One-Dimensional Man, and Herbert Gans’ The Levittowners, to Christopher Lasch’s Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged and The Culture of Narcissism and Robert Putnam’s Bowling Alone.

Scholars and social observers continue to examine the social and psychological costs of hypertrophic individualism in the perspectival modern world. Like Descartes separating and then trying to put the subject and object back together again via method, organizational science and administrative management studies bifurcated workers from work and ever since have struggled to find ways to reunite institutional goals and needs with individual goals and needs.

Commitment is a temporal phenomenon. In magic communities, commitment and obligation are eternal and presumed. A loss of commitment means the end of the world. In mythic cultures, the possibility of conversion becomes thinkable. The “evil of this temporal world” of contingencies creeps in. In the modern world, even association with religion is seen as a choice, a “membership” in a particular institution or to forego religious affiliation altogether without much consequence.

The cost of such “progress” away from community, with its irrational obligations, is not just psychological or social. Dissociation in modernity
Kramer touches everything, including economic activity. For instance, money, relative wealth is an extremely emotional, magic phenomenon as well as being highly quantitative. Much political and religious contention centers on the value of sharing. Among hypertrophic individualists, Social Darwinism prevails, and as many economists such as Robert Frank and Philip Cook note in their book, *The Winner-Take-All Society*, when a tiny few get much more than “the rest of us,” this leads to a plethora of problems from chronic anxiety and physical, mental, and social problems to the disruption of other institutions such as family and education. Another example of the effects of hypertrophic individualism on modern economics is the lack of emotional commitment to and within corporations, which constitute major institutions where we live our daily lives. Workers come and go and investors invest and divest by the second per calculation. Consequently, increasingly long-term planning and research and development efforts have become practically impossible.

The late-modern attitude is that one is only as good as their last effort, the “what have you done for me lately” attitude. This is manifest temporal anxiety as inscribed in identity itself—the judgment and evaluation of the self and Other. Naively believing in community and commitment, sports fans are shocked and decry sports teams and stars leaving their cities. Such gaps illustrate the essence of dissociation as explained in the DAD theory. Increasingly, all things, even identity itself, are regarded as arbitrary and contingent—a matter of personal choice.

And this is why we find so many people under duress, who really, really care and must work and rely on each other, such as soldiers and athletes expressing religious sentiments after an ordeal. When a group or an individual calls for help from others, including supernatural beings, they are seeking *religio*. They are vulnerable and must rely on the care of others. Only the most individualistic Modern believes he will never need help. The word *help* is derived from Old English *helpan*, related to Old Norse *hjálpa*, Gothic *hilpan*, Old High German *belfan*. Perhaps this is why Scandinavian countries today are predominantly socialist.

Moderns, such as Jared Diamond, might do well to heed the historian’s explanations of the true power of the Spartan phalanx; it was the love of the mentor and protégé standing together that made the phalanx invincible during ancient times, not the bronze or style of shoes or length of spears or that the enemy was ill. If a person does not care to help, the size of their wallet or muscle is worse than useless. Indifference breeds not only sorrow but bitterness among those in real need.

Religion is defined by Moderns such as Clifford Geertz as simply “a cultural system,” an ideological movement, or a social institution among others such as education, economy, government, et cetera, which indicate the utter atomization of the world manifested by modernity. Such reduc-
tionism cannot begin to lead to an understanding of the motives and behaviors of faithful people expressing magic and mythic modes of being and communicating. Also, to the Modern individualist, there is practically no time; it is efficient or appropriate to lose oneself in a larger emotional field, and so Moderns tend to discount religious activity as irrational and primitive; as lacking cognitive complexity—being simple minded—as a waste of time. But eternity is not a temporal phenomenon. Piety and reverence are not calculations.

Another example would prove the opposite need. A terrible car accident happens. A teenage boy is rushed to the Emergency Room barely clinging to life. The doctor on duty is not permitted to do the surgery because it is her son. Surgery requires dissociated, cold, analytical competence. Precision is necessary. Emotion can confound such precise effort. The point here is that what counts as “competence,” “talent,” “ability,” “appropriateness,” efficient, and deficient are not inherent qualities but qualities that are emergent and realized only in the circumstantial integration of text and context.

IDOLIC, SYMBOLIC, AND SIGNALIC WORLDS

Each group, each individual has a tendency to manifestly express predominantly one or another structure: one-dimensional magic idolic expression, two-dimensional mythic symbolic expression, three-dimensional perspectival signalic expression, or four-dimensional integral diaphanous appreciation. As dissociation increases correlative with the accrual of dimensions of conscious awareness emotional identification and association, care, decreases (see Table 7.1).

The structures are:

- The spaceless and timeless one-dimensional pre-perspectival magic worldview. The word magic is derived from the Indo-European root magh, meaning to be able. Many modern words share this root, such as might, machine, make, mechanism, and in Spanish macho, German macht, and so forth. Magic is the origin of culture, and it is the first effort by humans to separate from the rest of the cosmos, turn back on it, and attempt to exercise their will to control things like fertility and disease. Prior to one-dimensional magic consciousness, we have zero-dimensional archaic consciousness, which is animal-like, exhibiting no dissociation and therefore not thinking about (reflecting on) reality, which requires primordial dissociation, but basically reacting to urges and events here and now.
Table 7.1. Dimensional Accrual and Dissociation (DAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Archaic</th>
<th>Magic (Sympathetic We)</th>
<th>Mythic (Heart-Passion)</th>
<th>Perspectival (Mental-Rational)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Point</td>
<td>Circle (flat)</td>
<td>Triangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Pre-Time</td>
<td>Timeless</td>
<td>Organic Natural Time</td>
<td>Abstract Mechanical Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Prespatial</td>
<td>Spaceless</td>
<td>Protospatial</td>
<td>Spatial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Awareness</td>
<td>Unconscious Spirit</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Soul/Psyche</td>
<td>Space/World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Awareness</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>Abstraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Awareness</td>
<td>Deep Sleep</td>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>Dream</td>
<td>Wakeful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Spell Casting</td>
<td>Primal Myth</td>
<td>Discourse/Dialectic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense Organ</td>
<td>Olfaction</td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>Ear/Mouth</td>
<td>Eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Expression</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Idols</td>
<td>Ambiguous Symbols</td>
<td>Signals/Arbitrary Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tatoos &amp; Rock Paintings</td>
<td>Reliefs/Tapestries</td>
<td>Free Standing Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tribal &quot;We&quot;</td>
<td>Familial (Extended)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The magic worldview manifestly exhibits an idolic incantatory mode of communication that is identically univalent. This means that, to the magic person, the statue of god is god. This piece of wood is literally a piece of the actual cross on which Christ was crucified. Often traditions and sacred places are co-opted by later faiths and resanctified according to their own beliefs. Thus, the Pantheon in Rome became a Catholic church, the pagan winter solstice became Christmas. The most sacred place to Islam, Mecca, predates the religion. In the 2nd century, Ptolemy refers to a sacred sanctuary to Arab tribes called Macoraba. Some scholars argue that the Ka’bah was dedicated to a pre-Islamic Nabatean deity Hubal (the Nabatean Empire being conquered by Trajan in the 1st century) and that the shrine once contained 360 idols that constituted the pantheon of deities worshiped by Arabian nomads. Once a year, pre-Islamic tribes from all around the Arabian Peninsula would converge on Mecca to perform a ceremonial and ritualistic activity like the Hajj. The Quraysh tribe, to which Allah belonged, took control of the area and the Ka’bah around 500.

Ka’bah is not a random structure, and the Black Stone embedded in its eastern corner is not a random meteorite nor is the rock inside the structure upon which, it is said, Abraham stood with Ishmael on his shoulders. Each Muslim around the globe should turn toward it and pray five times a day. Each Muslim should try to circumambulate the Ka’bah at least twice in their lives as a Hajj and Umrah (the lesser pilgrimage). This circling of the Ka’bah is called Tawaf. Men are supposed to circle the Ka’bah in counterclockwise direction seven times, three times quickly and then four times closer and more slowly. As they pass, they should point at the Black Stone with their right hand and proclaim, “In the name of God, God is Great, God is Great, God is Great and praise be to God” (Bism Allah Allahu Akbar, Allahu Akbar, Allahu Akbar wa lil Labi Albami) and, when close enough, touch and kiss it as Allah did. For Muslims the Tawaf of the Ka’bah is a ritual enactment that parallels the Tawaf that runs above the Jannat al-Firdaws in the seventh heaven or paradise (often described as a blissful garden), which touches Allah’s throne, the Arsh. It marks the act of keeping harmony on earth as it is in heaven.

Circumambulation of sacred places, people, and objects is practiced in all mythic communities. Hindu’s ritually circle temples as do Buddhists. Catholic priests circumambulate alters as they cense them with a thurible (ritual incense burner).

The Ka’bah and Allah’s throne are in the center of the their worlds like the dragon throne of the emperor of China was in the center of the Hall of Supreme Harmony, which is in the center of the Forbidden City (Zijin Cheng), which is in the center of Beijing, which is the central power of China, which is in the center of the world, which is the Middle Kingdom. The Hall of Supreme Harmony sits on the central axis not merely of the
Forbidden City but of the universe. It is flanked by the Hall of Perfect Harmony and the Hall of Central Harmony.

Magic cultures are conservative. Perfect harmony avoids change. Such spatial orientation is reflected in maps and mandalas. The Forbidden City is a three-dimensional mandala. Harmony between heaven and earth and among individuals is essential. The center is eternal and changeless. As a wheel turns, the farther the rim or circumference from the center, the faster it moves. Each increment of a spoke as it extends out from the center to the rim moves at a different rate, ever faster. But the axis mundi is still. The further one is from the center, the greater the rate of change and the less still the world and thought are.

Peace is equated with quietude and stillness. It is said that when Siddhartha (Buddha) was taken to a planting festival by his royal father, he went and sat under a Rose Apple tree and began to meditate; and as the sun crossed the sky, all shadows moved accordingly except the shadow of the tree under which he sat. The more delusional contingency there is, the more lost one is—loss of identity and meaning.

While the Modern embraces change and progress as good and boredom as bad, the magic person embraces eternal permanence and powerful identity/emotional association with all things. Tradition is good. Florence Kluckhohn has noted that some cultures are past-oriented and others future-oriented. This is correct if and only if one presumes modern linear time. More correctly, magic cultures are now oriented, but even that presumes a then that they may not consider. Modern societies are future-oriented, which makes sense if and only if a past is presumed by implication for modern societies also are obsessed with history recording and Moderns invented the concept of the museum, where past objects are displayed in a special form of secure space for dissociated gazing, not touching or implementation.

As dimensions accrue, time expands, allowing for movement both as social mobility and intensifying exploration of physical reality. For the Modern, speed is of the essence, and many live in a constant sense of urgency. For instance, warfare, once a highly ritualized activity, in Modernity is characterized by the blitzkrieg, and old age, once a sign of wisdom, is feared. Even our examinations are timed, and we have eating contests put against the clock. How fast, not how beautifully, one can write/type is considered an important communication competence. Time and space are conflated by Moderns as light years, miles per hour, and so forth.

Like the Ka'bah, other magic objects exert great emotional influence over people. For example, whoever is in possession of the great jade Magatama Stone (along with the Sword of Kusanagi and the Mirror of Yata no Kagami) is the rightful emperor of Japan, and in 1945, concerned
about the chaos to come with surrender, Emperor Showa ordered them retrieved from their temples and brought to him. He ordered those carrying them to defend them at all costs. Whole fleets and armies were considered expendable protecting these three sacred objects. Similarly, once in power, Hitler ordered "the" Spear of Destiny retrieved from a museum in Vienna and brought to him because he believed whoever possessed the spear, that, it is claimed actually pierced the side of Christ on the cross, would rule the world. Blood, semen, and milk are magic fluids in all magic cultures.

Such magic objects embody what modern philosophers in their way call absolute logocentrism. Nations that built the most powerful military technologies of their times, such as V-2 Rockets and massive battleships, were inspired and infused with magic and myth. To deny the continued efficacy of magic and myth is to underestimate their power and to possibly fall under their spell. Analytical dissociation offers some protection against the enchantment of language. The danger is that modern perspectival rationality can yield intensely powerful technologies that can fall under the control of pre- and unmodern motivations. In fact, one could argue that such weapons would not be developed if not for the influence of such motives. The might of magic pertains in technology. The rhythmic droning "countdown" to ignition, to "put fire on the enemy," is as invocative as any Shaman's incantatory chanting. The difference is directional teleology, the coming to a final end.

The specific magic way of knowing manifested in supernatural objects as such regards them as uniquely irreplaceable. It is appropriate to venerate if not worship them. They manifest power and are sacred. Power is the driving motive, the unrepentant urge to be. The word motive has as its root mot derived from the Indo-European root meu (meu -). The word motive comes from the Middle English motif, motive, from Old French motif, from Late Latin motivus, of motion, from Latin motus, past participle of movere, which means "to move." The Indo-European root meu - also means "to push away." Other contemporary words that share this root include motion, move, might, make, and magic. Notice that within the word emotional, we find the word motion.

Motive leads to motion, action. Whereas inanimate objects move, humans act. But for the magic person, all things are alive and cognizant and have animate motive. While cause explains the movement of inanimate objects for the Modern, motivation explains all action for the pre-Modern, and it is essential to adjudicating moral culpability. In the magic world, there is no distinction between legality and morality. Motive expresses an emotional (e-mo-t-ion-al) want more than a cognitive calculation. Motive is emotional. The words morph and mob articulate the phenomenon of emotional movement and motion toward change such as loco-mot-ion.
Myth shares the root *mu* with words such as *mouth* and *music*, which emotionally inspire courses of action from dance to heroism. Myth indicates a directionality to vitality, a narrative linearity. But in the magic world, everything, including “inanimate” objects, pulse with vitality, chi, manna, life force. It can be felt while sitting still. While the Modern must move to feel vital, run or swim endlessly back and forth in lines to feel alive, in the magic world the air itself vibrates with vitality.

In modern mental-rational terms, vitality comes to mean making a motion within a deliberative directional forum such as in a legislative body or formal meeting with an emphasis on logical disputation, an agenda ultimately taking form as progress. One “moves” the motion. Motion involves pathos, ethos, and logos, with the latter suggesting a rational course of action to change reality via policy and resource allocation, to improve oneself and things. But in the magic world, the world is alive and finished. There is no notion of progress or development. Everything necessary exists. Motive for Moderns exists in places dedicated to types of directional agendas, such as the court for forensic debate and the legislative bodies for deliberative debate. Deliberative (spatial) bodies are places where rhetoric employing logical and pathetic appeals are used as tools, as instruments in calculated fashion to effect change, to motivate action. But notice that deliberation leads to restrictive law as the will of rule dominates.

No such calculation exists for magic idolic communication. Language and communication are not tools or instruments for ulterior motives—reasons that lie elsewhere. There is no spatial sense for ulteriority in the magic world. Rather what you see and hear is what you get. Magic communication is idolic, not symbolic or metaphorical. Magic lacks rhetorical flourish. The resonance of the incantation itself embodies the power to change reality. Possession of the amulet or lucky charm is possession of the power. If a person knows the secret words and speaks them, they invoke and evoke. Many words have idolic dimensions for us yet today such as our personal names, colors and logos of nations and sports teams with which we identify, and words that we just don't like to hear such as cancer and Lucifer.

The idolic power of communication is still common and affective in our modern world. We declare war. We pronounce couples husband and wife. We take oaths to protect the Constitution of the United States as we change our identities from foreign national to “naturalized” citizen, from civilian to soldier. We swear on the Bible to tell the truth. We christen children, ships, and space vehicles with ritual ceremony and “spirits” as a process of naming, and the name carries connotations transferred to the sense of the child and machine. Such utterances must be spoken aloud and publically for the magic binding force to work.

In his *TEXNHE PHTOPIKHE* (his analysis of the “Art of Rhetoric”), Aristotle argues that to move people to action, one must do more than sim-
ply state the facts or a dispassionate argument. Logic alone does not inspire passion in most people. One must also appeal to their emotions to get them to move. So we have the fundamental difference between a competent task leader and an inspiring emotional leader. These are styles of communication rooted in appeals to the different consciousness structures within us.

For the magic person, the vital spiritual is not only real but it presents a surplus of meaning and makes all things significant. Thus, everything from clothing to ways of dancing, preparing food, agriculture, childrearing, everything is “sacred.” Sacred is in quotation marks because in the magic world, the vital dimension pervades everything, and it is not yet divided into sacred and profane. Objects that are repositories of great emotional valence cannot be replicated at will or at any cost. By stark contrast, for the staunch Modern, everything is arbitrary and replaceable, and therefore the Modern has difficulty understanding the integral idea of sustainability. As Ferdinand Toennies put it, the Modern is “instrumental” in attitude, whereas the pre-Modern is “organic.” Because of the extreme arbitrariness of signification in the late modern perspectival world, an explosion in the awareness of our inability to stop interpretation occurred. The relationship of the message to its environment becomes mutable and morphogenic. The “whole” is no longer seen as a singular or permanently fixed frame. Instead, the whole is seen as a maelstrom of ever-shifting and ever-present streams and pools of information (an archive is a pooling process for instance), and the relationships between these “data streams” and pools are in constant flux (hyperglossia). The old modern notion of fixed measurable electrons orbiting a similarly solid core has been replaced by the statistical probability of the electron cloud. The thing is no longer even and just the sum of its measures but because of uncertainty at measurement validity has been replaced in the postmodern world. The global semantic field is now referred to as an information cloud.

We are faced with multicultural, multiworlds, intraacting and interacting, the continually churning process called semiosis. Semiosis is the process by which the meanings of experiences, including things, events, emotions, and ideas, exhibit morphological qualities. Magic permanence has given way to arbitrariness that defies prediction. Experience and meaning become detached from each other. Communities are based on archaic and magic forms of mutual identity. As meaning and identity become contingent, the emotional bond that forms community begins to erode.

The Modern also has trouble understanding why a “mere spot of land,” which is used for the Jewish Temple Mount, which is used for worship, or the Muslim Dome of the Rock (the Al-Aqsa Mosque) in Jerusalem, evoke so much emotion. To the Modern, land and structures are arbitrary and contingent—negotiable and replaceable. One can always move if there is a dispute because space has no inherent meaning but is rather the dimension
that enables movement. To have meaning, space and time must be fragmented so that one knows where one is and what time it is. Without measure, the Modern is lost. Such a thing is the essence of terror for the Modern. The Modern is linear, future-oriented. The past is dead to the Modern. And so the Modern has trouble valuing an Algonquin or Sioux burial site when developers are trying to manifest progress by building golf courses and strip malls on the same “real estate.” The reality of the real in real estate is found in the commercial transaction, not in the thing itself. One should never become too “attached” to a property lest it cloud one’s ability to negotiate. Detachment is the essence of rationality for the Modern. The magic person, by comparison, seems utterly irrational and emotional.

To the Modern, both the Mosque and the Temple in Jerusalem are real estate. In the United States in recent years, converting old Wal-Marts and other large warehouse-type buildings or sports arenas into “mega-churches,” with their generous parking and opportune locations vis-à-vis major transport “arteries,” has become commonplace. Sanctification has become increasingly abstract and lacking in sacrifice. If a congregation becomes too big, the “church” simply finds a bigger space and abandons the old one with little sentiment or ceremony. Progress means not looking back. Whereas old Catholic churches required the actual presence of a Holy relic, the new churches just require electricity. The land and building are arbitrary. Real estate is one form of value that can be exchanged at will for gold, Euros, stock, other bits of land, whatever a person wants. Demand determines value. Pragmatic use determines meaning.

A Modern might well reason that the Temple Mount and the Al-Aqsa Mosque are redundant with other bits of land with equal size, and therefore they should be (a moral claim offered as sheer pragmatics) negotiable. To the Jew and Muslim, however, nothing could be more wrong. This land is not arbitrary. It is sacred (eternal) and, as such, irreplaceable. To suggest it is negotiable, even in the pursuit of mortal/political peace, is blasphemy. This mere “piece of land” is worth defending to the death—worth raising one’s children to defend to the death. After all what is mere mortality in the face of eternity? Such places constitute identity, magic, timeless being. If I bargained them away, then who am I? And so we have centuries of deadlock that can be understood only if one understands the fundamental differences among magic, mythic, and modern consciousness structuration and the process of dissociation that inversely correlates with emotional attachment/identification. Such magic expression, such sacred places have inherent meaning and power. Millions identify with them, and therefore they are non-negotiable. In semiotic terms, such places are totally “motivated.” There is no room for interpretation.

Magic consciousness is yet prevalent today. It is not extinct by any means. Magic consciousness exhibits extremely powerful emotional
expression. “Hex” signs have inherent power. If one loses the amulet, such as a magic “power crystal,” one loses the power. If I stab a voodoo doll, my victim feels pain no matter the distance. A curse against a family affects everyone everywhere without temporal limit, including those not yet born and the ancestors. If I am a member of the original “plank crew,” then when my naval vessel is retired, I get an actual piece of her as a souvenir, a memento, a repository of memories and emotions, and this magic pertains to the most technologically advanced machines yet devised, such as nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers.

A memento is time frozen, timelessness. And as time is money, such a thing is also priceless because replaceability requires time and space. But such a magic object cannot be replaced because time and space do not pertain. In the magic world, things are not merely samples. All things are equally “significant” in their own right, in their own fact of being. This is why the concept of principle has nothing to do with quantity. If it is in principle evil to kill, then killing one is no less evil than killing a thousand. Law, by definition, has no exceptions. Everything is equal, equally meaningful, under the law. This is the basis of dignity in the vital nexus of magic. In the magic world, everything is alive and requires respect. In the modern world, human dignity and the inherent value of things is considered a fiction, an obsolete sentimentality. Quantity and precision require fragmentation, and these are how Moderns regard things—as quantities, not qualities.

The magic world is spaceless and timeless. In the magic world, incantations and names have inherent power. Even scientists must be motivated by emotional needs, and one of their most relentless urges is to have a unit of measure, animal, or grand theory named after them. The same is true of philanthropists seeking immortality by having a building or an institution named after them. This is the magic power of naming in the effort to persist, a word derived from Latin persistere: per-, per- + sistere, from the Indo-European root stƏ, which means to stand and to endure, a word derived from Latin indurare, to make hard: in-, against, into, from the Indo-European root deru- meaning solid like a great tree. Perhaps the greatest expression of magic consciousness is captured in the Egyptian pyramids that awed even Alexander the Great and everyone since. As the old saying goes, all people fear time, and time fears only the pyramids.

In the magic world, animism predominates. Emotional identification is extremely strong and shared. Collective identity prevails. An important aspect of the magic world is that there is total one-to-one identity between all people and things, and therefore there is no identity as it is conceived by Moderns. For the Modern, identity requires difference. If all people are identical, then no individual has identity. My identity depends on you being different from me. But this is not identity in the magic sense.
In the magic world, there is no identity because everything is interchangeable via sympathetic magic with no direction or fragmentation: *pars pro toto* (taking a part for the whole), *totum pro parte* (taking the whole for the part), *parte pro parte* (taking part for part), *totum pro toto* (the whole is the whole). Individualism in the modern sense is regarded by magic peoples as a dangerously selfish attitude, a proto-profanity (for the sacred and profane are not yet clearly defined in oppositional terms in the magic world), foolishness if not evil-illness.

In the magic world, everything is alive. Vitalism (what some might call spirit) permeates everything, and the world is full and complete. Consuming the “dead” imparts/conveys their enduring vital qualities. If I want to be like a tiger, I should eat a tiger. If I want grandfather to endure in this realm, I should eat part of him and keep his bones with me not as symbols of my affection for him but as the essence of him, here now. Activity is muted as ceremonial etiquette must be followed or else the collective runs the risk of offending other spirits which can become me—“possession.” Preferred styles of interaction and comportment are those that encourage the maintenance of harmony. Innovation is discouraged and technological manipulation of the world remains limited because the wonton manipulation of things risks negative reprisals from the spirits that dwell therein. Before technique can be applied to the world, there must also be a sense of distanciation and dualism, which is not evident in the magic world.

- The proto-spatial and cyclically temporal two-dimensional unperspectival mythic worldview. The mythic world manifests a symbolic mode of communication that exhibits bivalent ambiguity between figural and literal meaning and a semi-linear proto-spatial narrative form. Magic incantation works as soon as it is uttered. The words, their intonation, and their sequence are not arbitrary, nor are they mere symbolic embellishments or representations, but rather they literally conjure the thing, and if the spell is broken the thing or event vanishes. Good and evil begin to polarize the magic vital realm. But they remain ambiguous. Only in the modern world is one clearly, positively, and unequivocally innocent or guilty—“case closed.” Hollywood likes to keep such designations clean, sharp, well defined, and resolute. Moderns prefer disambiguation lest emotional confusion arise. Uncertainty is felt primarily as anxiety by Moderns.

In the magic world, no interpretation is necessary. Either you say the magic spell properly (the correct spelling) and it works or you don’t. Incantation is doing. It is not merely that the medium is the message but that the enactment of idolic communication does things, makes a difference, and so all communication, even today, has a magic dimension otherwise it could not function. This is what J. L. Austin called perlocutionary
action, which combines locution with illocution as an act is performed by saying something—the cause (the utterance or icon) and the effect are the same. Articulation here is not indicative of something else. Magic expression, be it glyphs, tattoos, or sayings, does not function to name something else. It evokes and invokes.

The nature and permanence of magic meaning is threatened by the emerging polarity that mythic symbolism manifests. In the mythic world, things are interpretable. The statue symbolizes god. The wine symbolizes the blood of Christ. A crucifix is semi-sacred, neither identical with God nor totally arbitrary in form or intent/motive. Formal ambiguity, looseness within the idolic message, begins to appear. Things begin to destabilize. Magic people are conservative. Things that change are disturbing. The magic world is alive, complete, and perfect. Much effort must be taken to ensure continuity of the same. Even living god-emperors in magic communities had serious obligations to perform ritualistic bloodletting and other acts to ensure harmonious continuity at the cosmic level. They were not as free as modern celebrities to do as they would. Their power was limited by sacred commitments. This permanence within the magic world begins to falter as mythic dissociation emerges.

Mythic symbolism allows proto-individualism into the process as interpretation. At least two meanings, the literal and the figural, exist simultaneously in mythic symbolism. Mythic symbolic communication is on the way to the modern signalic quality of being and communicating. Mythic symbolism is not yet totally fragmented into signifier and signified, but it is on the way. Modern signalic communication presents a duality of separate hemispheres to an arbitrary sign, the signifier and the signified. There is no inherent relationship between the two but instead a purely, even accidentally arbitrary co-incidence, a conventionalism based on personal whim and instrumental convenience, as in maintaining red to mean stop and green to mean go. Any colors will do, but it is practical and convenient to keep the convention.

With the mutation to mythic consciousness, semi-abstract form emerges and becomes semi-fixed. The vital field is polarized into the sacred and the profane, which thematizes myth. Proto-individualism emerges as the nascent ego begins to extricate itself from the collective vital whole, which in the magic world includes not only other people but animals, plants, things, rivers, mountains; everything. With the advent of mythic consciousness, a nascent sense of space intensifies. The first inklings of ego-self begin to emerge “out” from the oceanic whole as individuation. The whole is left behind. It increasingly becomes the “background” “environment” to human projects and human agency. The world becomes increasingly a made world (machtwelt), which suggests directionality, planning, the will expressed in the idea of progress and development that will come
into full force in the three-dimensional modern world as a world yet to be made (Hegelian idealism equated with logic).

With dissociation, commentary emerges in the mythic world. People begin to think and reflect upon what the sacred and profane mean. Literature grows out of a semi-linear form of conversation with prior texts. It is not yet critique in the modern sense but a sense of development in conceptual terms. The mythic world is a world built on sacred stories and extenuating commentaries that develop out of telling and retelling. Interpretation is a form of explanation of the text in the very telling of it. Mythic performance is yet very emotional, inspired. And in this modality, performance extends, enhances, embellishes; proto-explanation. Late-mythic scholasticism and theological exegesis are not yet refutorial contestation, a form of rebuttal and critical testing with possible repudiation of sacred texts regarded as mere contingent theory if not fiction as one finds in modern criticism, but rather are a loving extension of the meaning and application of sacred texts. The Medieval commentators on the Bible, for instance, do not even dare to claim authorship to their helpful interpretations. Commentaries and illuminations remained anonymous until powerful neo-classical modern egos such as Augustine and Aquinas emerged.

The first inklings of ego as a force begin with striving to control and order the natural environment, bringing ideal judgment and will to bear on other life forms in terms of domestication and selective breeding for desired traits, which, at the height of modernity, will become imposed on the self and other humans via eugenics and genetic engineering. Magic human takes the first tentative steps to reorganize the world. Mythic human continues the dissociative process for abstraction and enables the human to exercise will more freely. The Modern valorizes personal freedom and free will and leaves the most profound “footprint” on the world conceived as a dead resource base.54

In the mythic two-dimensional world, demigods, saviors, and Eponymous heroes are not manufactured but arise and are yet identified with the group through a common bloodline. Mythic heroes are ambiguous, often exhibiting the selfish qualities of a loutish knave or thug as well as courageous sacrifice. They are obligated individuals often presenting an ambiguous nature being part god and part mortal. But they also present change, often revolutionary. Achilles marks the emergence of the first totally independent ego, and his presence disturbs the collective just as did Jesus’ appearance within the Jewish community. “Personalities” emerge from the collective. Achilles, along with the rise of independent thinking and questioning philosophers, most notably Aristotle, mark the first true moderns. Socrates yet lived in an oral world. Plato wrote critically but as dialogue. With Aristotle the single personal perspectival voice emerges as pure analytical reflective monologue. Egocentrism and personal choice is
equated with reason. Aristotle was passed over to be the headmaster of Plato's Academy because his personality was too strong, aggressive; disharmonious. He left to tutor the second generation of Moderns, notably Alexander the Great.

Prior to this first full-fledged Modern, Aristotle, the magic whole bifurcates into not yet exclusive mythic polarities such as culture and nature, sacred and profane, domestic and wild, sinful and graceful. The I-Ching is a good image representing mythic ambiguity and polarity as each polar difference (not yet stark opposite) swirls into the other with each pole containing a dot of the other. In the mythic world or us, unlike the magic we, some ego-based disharmony is tolerated as interpretation emerges and presents the potential for polivocality. Conflict is tolerable, yet painful. Purely dualistic dialectical argumentation and testing of claims will not be valorized as a "good" process that births knowledge in a linear-progressive fashion until polarity breaks completely into discrete oppositional positions—modern duality. Hence, the penultimate modern, the debater's traditional opening gambit, proclaims, "I resolve that...." Moderns take a position and defend it.

With the rupture of mythic polarity, discrete mutually excluding opposites are resolved as such. Dualistic ideology manifests as things become increasingly irreconcilable. Religion, that which binds, fragments into sectarian violence and wars of ideology, not simply of plunder and the acquisition of tribute, commence.

Resolution, in visual terminology, means a measure of definitive boundaries and edges. As a hallmark of three-dimensional modernity, objects and objectivity presuppose atomizing separation and disambiguation. Resolution also means uncompromising rigidity, the finality that will mark modern positivism as absolute certitude—established facticity. These are qualities of a definitive stance against opposing beliefs, claims, hypotheses—a stubborn insistence until and unless definitively proven incorrect. These are qualities of the three-dimensional perspectival mentality, discussed immediately below.

For predominantly mythic people, the universe expands as the spiritual domain shrinks and coalesces into semi-spatial locations such as "in heaven" or at the top of a mountain. Spatial thinking manifests as distanciation. Dissociation becomes evident. As the spiritual recedes, animism diminishes, an emphasis on physical nature increases, including sight (the spatial sense). The metaphors of light and dark gain currency as the magic is "shrouded" in mystery, the mythic is dark but dawning, and the perspectival claims clarity and precision in all things from disambiguation of definitions to an obsession with sharper vision and increasingly minute subdivisions including ever-more precise measures.
- We detour for a moment for a brief timeline of the transitional mutation from two-dimensional mythic to the three-dimensional perspectival world in Europe. Interest in visual acuity and representational accuracy occur simultaneously as the Modern extricates herself out of mythic irresolute indecisiveness. An obsessive demand for transparency, literally for glass, drives the invention of new techniques of manufacturing and architecture. Also focus and spectacles appear.

During the Early Middle Ages, from 1100 to 1270, Europe saw a revolution in construction techniques giving rise to cathedrals of exceptional size and height, what some have called the “Cathedral crusade” sparked by Suger (c. 1081-1151), the abbot and architect at Saint Denis and his friend, Bishop Henri of Sens, who was censured for promoting ideas propagated by the philosopher and logician Peter Abelard (1079-1142). Churches of the Middle Ages were built like grottos. They suggested the womb of spiritual man. But suddenly, a tremendous urge to create vaulting space seized and infatuated the European consciousness, forcing trial and error and innovation in material construction to realize this obsession. Beyond the early cathedrals reaching ever higher, we have Florentines building a cathedral that stood without a roof for over a century. What a peculiar projection of uncompromising ambition. Services were occasionally interrupted by rain.

Just as Gebser argues that first there was light that called into existence the structure of the eye, so this urge for expanding space demanded solution. It was not until Filippo Brunelleschi solved the problem of how to span the gaping 144-foot maw of the central nave. The base of the dome began 75 feet off the ground at the top of the nave. Brunelleschi erected a double-walled copula, an interior octagonal dome with a second ovoid shell with a staircase built between the domes to access a lantern at its peak at 177 feet above ground level. While the greatest ancient dome, the Pantheon, at 142 feet, a span unsurpassed for 1,300 years (and still the largest unreinforced concrete dome ever built), owes its strength to the brute weight of its thick masonry, the dome of Florence is really two relatively light domes built one within another.

The construction technique not only resuscitates the classical Greco-Roman fascination with spherical created space, but Brunelleschi’s solution for structural integrity itself emphasizes the lightness of being that Renaissance optimism expressed after a millennium of squat cave-like Medieval structures. The most essential structural component of Brunelleschi’s dome consists of six horizontal hoops of sandstone reinforced on their outer perimeter by huge iron chains, which prevent the domes from bursting under the enormous tensile forces in their parallels. It took 16 years to complete, and the total weight is about 37,000 metric tons comprised of over 4 million bricks, some of which were laid by Brunelleschi himself when workmen refused for fear of falling to their deaths.
Europe was launching into the sky, into the virtual and ephemeral world of mathematics, into abstraction and dissociation articulated by the Kantian transcendental source of reality itself; the diaphanousness of system and architectonic *apriori*. Europeans started to look up and away. Galileo would conjoin mathematics with material observation to produce a revolutionary paradigm called science derived from *scientia*, meaning more than knowledge, for by application of something that has no empirical qualities, abstract logic, claims could be made of things not yet done—predictions—hypothetical thinking brings weightless theory to the forefront of mental effort. Modernity soars, and to modernize requires, to some extent, to Westernize.

All creatures function on the basis of sensory data. Alchemists, astrologers, craftsmen, and hunters have long made close observations and have noticed repeating trends. But science has no color or weight, and only the human imagination can create it. It is a way of thinking that requires a socio-political structure that allows individuals to question authority without fear of persecution. Only where philosophers have been able to counterbalance the authority of priestly classes who derive their power from living god-kings can science survive. Secular humanism is essential. Because the Orient maintained divine infallible rulers and armies of bureaucratic scholars trained by rote memorization of a narrow Neo-Confucian curriculum, science never fully developed. Scholars were encouraged by rulers to focus on introspection rather than the examination of nature. Anything approximating science came to the Orient only in the late 19th century in Japan and not until the 20th century in China. As Duane Roller,55 the first curator of the History of Science Archives at the University of Oklahoma and a featured keynote speaker at the annual Gebser conference in 2004 (but whose untimely death prevented him from delivering his address himself), maintained, there is a big difference between authority and inquiry, a fundamental issue glossed over by other writers such as Joseph Needham.56 Even the famed Neo-Confucian Chu-Hsi (1130–1200), whose commentaries became the sole texts authorized for civil service exams in China up into the 20th century, fell far short of being the Orient’s Galileo. The persecution of Galileo and other Copernicans compared with the elevation of Chu-Hsi to near divine status highlights the profound difference in cultural proclivity. Nothing is sacred to science, and so, wherever it emerges it is a threat to mythic consciousness and the authoritative socio-political structures based on it.

Far from Rome, in Paris Albertus Magnus (c.1200–1280) revalidates Aristotle and begins promoting individual free will as the basis of ethics. Around 1100 in Occitania, the Troubadours are validating personal judgment based on direct observation as love at first sight, *amor*, which is Roma spelled backward. This radical refusal to passively accept the authority of
received doctrine and instead place authority in direct experience will become the origin of empiricism, marking the mutation in Europe from Medieval mystic consciousness structure to a modern perspectival worldview.

Spatial awareness begins to reemerge after being subdued by a powerful reactionary and exclusive preoccupation with the silent soul manifested as an inward-turning sentiment. Taken to its extreme, the body came to be seen as the contingent and carnal prison of the eternal soul, the dominion of Rex Mundi, the king of this sinful world. The break is violent coming as a crusade against the logical conclusion of pure spiritualism manifested by the Medieval Cathars and Albigensians, the latter of which were so named around 1181 in reference to the town of their origin, Albi (the ancient Albigea), northeast of Toulouse. Their extreme hatred of sensualism and the external body led many to starve themselves to death. A similar puritanical attitude about even depictions of the body would give rise to the iconoclasm of Islam and Byzantine Christianity.

This movement was repulsed by romanticism. Christian Europeans were profoundly conflicted about the nature and status of the physical/spatial body. While the firebrand and self-flagellating priest Savonarola was leading riots that ended in nightly book and art burning in Florence (the bonfires of the vanities), the de Medici would hire Galileo to be the tutor of the family’s children and embrace the carnal body, sponsoring art, some of which expressed pagan themes, that would flourish, including the first three-dimensional free-standing sculpture in over a thousand years, Donatello’s bronze nude David (1433). But we get a bit ahead of ourselves.

Manifestly heralding this sea change are several revolutionaries, including Roger Bacon (c. 1220–1292), who lectured on Aristotle at Oxford and who invented eyeglasses about the same time that an ardent student of the classical Roman natural philosopher Pliny the Elder (23–79), Jan van Eyck (1395–1441), led early Netherlandish artists in a quest for extreme visual realism, including the application of oil paints to depictions. About this time, the telescope is invented in the Low Country of Romantic Flanders (the modern Benelux region). At the same moment in history that Bacon was inventing spectacles, the fragmentation of space and time in the interest of precision and clarity was manifestly expressed in the first true mechanical clocks that employed escapement. Then in 1295, an admirer of Cicero’s writings, Dante Alighieri (c. 1260–1321), would break with tradition and write in his own local Tuscan dialect, instead of the sacred language of the Church, of his personal love for Beatrice in La Vita Nuova (The New Life).

Meanwhile, William of Occam’s (1288–1348) successor, Jean Buridan (1300–1358), the logician and priest who promoted Copernicus’ ideas across Europe, climbed Mount Ventoux and was transfixed by the perception of space sui generis, a psychic shock another student of the classics
would read about and replicate a few years later. The “father of humanism,” Petrarch (1304–1374), would make the same arduous climb for no “practical reason.” Expressing his disdain for the era, Petrarch originated the negative visual metaphor “Dark” to signify the age after the fall of the classical Greco-Roman world and preceding his own time. A quarter century later, Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472) would codify painting “by the numbers” as he began to apply geometric principles to dictate accurate rendering of perspectival depth space in art. By 1415, exploration of space was intensifying with the voyages of the Portuguese navigators and the work of Prince Henry’s cartographers. Much of this was sparked by the translation of the Arab and Persian keepers of classical Greco-Roman thought such as Avicenna (c. 980–1037) by the court of Alfonso X (1221–1284) into vernacular Castilian.

- The spatial and abstractly temporal three-dimensional perspectival worldview manifests a signalic mode of communication exhibiting trivalent arbitrary meaning. As the universe comes to be seen as random with arbitrary, with no inherent purpose or meaning (sacred or otherwise), it becomes available for willful agency to construct what it wishes. Egocentric performance flourishes.

The perspectival consciousness structure is predominant in the cultural modality known as modernity. As the modernist world fragments, meaning is separated from expression. The invocative and evocative power one finds in magic expression is lost. For the Modern, expression is bifurcated into the signifier and the signified, and the two “float” free of one another—what Claude Lévi-Strauss called the “floating signifier.”57 Thus, culture and interpretation wars erupt in the Modern world, which is characterized as a world of disputation, argumentation, competing ideologies, civil wars internal to a people. As meaning, the common sense of things begins to drift, and cooperative collectivistic traditional community gives way to mass society made up of aggregates of competing individuals.

Spatial three-dimensional thinking constitutes an environment where dualities proliferate. Morality becomes separated from legality. The world becomes increasingly mutable, a world as individual will and representation (the spatial modernist metaphysics that enabled dualism is clear here), so aptly described by Arthur Schopenhauer.58 As we confront perspectival signalic expressivity, the thing and what it means become detached from each other. Their relationship becomes arbitrary and conventional. Therefore, emotional attachment is minimal. The commitment is merely one of conventional convenience like the color of my car or my social security number.

In the mythic world, meaning is no longer an inherent quality of the thing, but yet sometimes it seems to be. This is the fundamental ambiguity
of mythic expression. Thus, the emotional dedication and attachment to the thing, for instance, a statue of Jesus, is less than if it were literally god. However, mythic expression still has charged emotional attachment. A stone statue of the Christ is not the same as a statue of a dog. A randomly designed flag is not the same as the flag of my nation, my flag, the flag with which I identify. In the perspectival world, meaning is said to not even exist. Certainly it is not seen to be an inherent quality of an isolated event or object. Meaning, insofar as it exists at all to perspectival consciousness, is a process of interactivity within a field of binary oppositions. Ironically, just as many struggled (and some still do) in the modern perspectival fashion to lock-in a singular meaning per expression, the insistence that the relationship between the signifier and the signified is totally arbitrary has given birth to an explosion in interpretive conflicts and relativism.

The modern hope was to be able to fix meanings, to avoid uncertainty by securing intent and sense, to clarify intentions once and for all so that interpretation and the potential for relativism would no longer be a problem. Thus, we have Bertrand Russell and Alfred North Whitehead's attempt to cleanse mathematical notation of all troublesome ambiguity and Levi-Strauss' attempt to create a computer program to render the one and only correct interpretation of myths (the "scientific" treatment of mythology). But because of the dissociation of meaning from expression, intent from act, for the perspectival person, there no longer exists a sense that the body of the expression and its mind or meaning have anything in common. In the modernist world, meaning is not inherent to its expression, which is reduced to a mere medium. The modern world is one where power is privatized, where power can be gained and lost. Moderns, consequently, become obsessed with the tactics and strategies for gaining and maintaining power. By contrast, in the magic one-dimensional world, shamans, for example, are not self-selecting like modern priests and politicians. Shamanism is not a vocation one pursues based on personal choice. Rather it is a transcending condition. Catholic priests who are ordained and sanctified, who receive the spiritual gifts of the sacrament, claim to have supernatural magic powers. But unlike modern Catholic priests, Shamanism is not a choice. They are identified by the previous generation of shamans, and they do not learn mystical powers but embody them. They learn to ritualize their powers, but the powers are innate to them. A modern minister, rabbi, or priest may never experience a supernatural event. But a Shaman manifests ("performs" from the modern perspective) magic. That is why pieces of a Shaman or a saint are believed to literally exude power.

In the magic world, personal preference and will have nothing to do with power. It is suffused throughout the cosmos and cannot be gained by personal want and achievement. Shamanism is not a choice. It is something that happens to a person, as Joseph Campbell so clearly explains. "The
shaman is the person, male or female, who in his late childhood or early youth has an overwhelming psychological experience that turns him totally inward... The whole unconscious opens up, and the shaman falls into it. This shaman experience has been described many, many times. It occurs all the way from Siberia right through the Americas down to Tierra del Fuego. The intensity of the experience is more than association. It is magic identification in the form of uncontrollable ecstasy. Unfortunately, Campbell does not recognize the fundamental phenomenological difference between the magic idolic lebenswelt (lifeworld) and the mythic symbolic lebenswelt, each with very different zeitgeist or shared reality. Campbell also tends to describe magic and mythic structures in modernistic psychological terms that are utterly alien to these modes of being.

The shamanic magic consciousness structure is spaceless and timeless; experiencing the cosmos has a “central point” that is “everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere.” And the function, the magical power of ritual, is not to tell a story with an ego at its center with moral lessons. Instead it is to do magic, to transform reality.

In the modern perspectival world, regions divide into nation-states with well-defined boarders, property is privatized, words are strictly defined, laws are rigorously upheld, authorship is emphasized, religion fragments into sects of feuding theologies and continues to splinter until individuals have their own singularly “personal beliefs,” and so forth. Abstracting formality continues as the virtual and actual switch places in metaphysical domination. The body, once viewed as the contingent fleshy prison of the eternal soul, comes to take precedence in a world dominated by natural philosophy and physical science. Mathematization and symbolic logic rise in importance. Geometric rationality prevails as formerly natural boarders such as rivers and mountain ranges increasingly become superseded by the straight lines generated by surveying, which dissociates from the actual landscape imposing mathematical grid formality. The mechanical clock likewise dissociates time from the actual and variable length of light and dark that varies according to the seasons. Virtual values displace actual entities. Identity is reduced to the sum of measures. Averaging mean values displaces attention to individual cases. With the aggregation of individuals, the modern mass is born. The mass is not collective community. Community is characterized by concern for individuals as such. With the rise of egocentrism, such concern comes to be seen as irrational and becomes restricted to self-interest. The mass is an aggregate of increasingly anonymous and competing egos, not a community of common blood and obligation.

The law of non-contradiction, the excluded middle and Occam’s razor become fashionable ways of thinking. Gothic and baroque embellishments in architecture, oratory, music, writing styles, clothing, and so on come to
be seen as superfluous as the razor of simplifying efficiency and pragmatic logic descends. Reductionism to simplest forms leads to abstraction in all modes of expression, including art. So too ceremonial ritual, etiquette, and ornate expressions of rank and deference come to be seen as wasteful extravagance. The colors and coat-of-arms symbolizing family and clan that were borne into battle are replaced by general issue standardization and camouflage. The warrior and worker alike become interchangeable and anonymous. Minimalism and formalism intensify. Measurable merit replaces blood-based sentiment. Hand-wrought objects, where no two are identical, are abandoned. Manufacture becomes systemic and a form of assemblage of standardized parts.

Signalic codes, such as binary computer language, with no emotional content proliferate. Sentimentality is denigrated. Language becomes a tool for ulterior means. Communication itself is measured in terms of efficiency of goal-attainment. This becomes the narrow sense of communicative competence. Rhetorical studies are reduced to communicative engineering. Pithy prose are further reduced to "bullet points" and philosophies to bumper stickers. Complexity including cultural difference comes to be regarded as "defilement" that interferes with technically competent comportment and functionally fit efficient workers. Meaning and value lose inherency and become moments, products of oppositional, mutually exclusive exchange. God can be represented in any way one wishes, the signifier has no inherent or sacred relationship to the signified. Signs become arbitrary. Randomness prevails. Cathedrals are replaced by storefront "big box" churches.

Space becomes empty *sui generis* and separates discrete objects. The universe empties and dies. Inert building blocks form the material base of all things. Emotional identification evaporates and objectivity emerges as disinterest. The best bureaucrat is one who does not show personal attitude, passion, humor, anger, or sentiment while dutifully, efficiently administering rules. Organizations are subdivided and jobs categorized on flow-charts. Labor is subdivided. Fragmentation heralds obsession with material precision. Atomizing individuation and individualism dominate. Knowledge becomes divided into expertise based on direct personal experience. Custom and traditional obligation is regarded as irrational. Rationality comes to be seen as the coherent and consistent pursuit of personal interest. Civil liberties emerge as protections of the individual from the group. Personal guilt replaces collective shame. Legality is separated from morality.

The hypertrophic Modern gains personal freedom while losing social ties and purpose. The existential crisis erupts with the specter of nihilism. Things are clear but meaningless. Mystery has been resolved into the simplest explanation. Since the universe is dead and empty, technological
ACCRUAL, DISSOCIATION, AND THE DEAD AND EMPTY UNIVERSE

According to the DAD theory, as dimensions accrue, dissociation increases. As dissociation increases, emotional identification decreases, leading to a fundamental change in expression and comportment. Empathy and sympathy decline as dissociation increases.

Thus, magic people are much more emotional and collectivistic than perspectival people who valorize dispassionate analytical reflection. Magic people feel strong obligation toward others, including other animistic "objects" "in" the world. Moderns are less sentimental about things and therefore can reorganize the material substrate at will, enabling powerful technological activities to commence without concern for spiritual consequences. The overall trend indicates that increasingly the universe expands, empties, dies, and does not know we are here and does not care. Care evaporates. With the twilight of the idols, the vanishing of animistic spirits that care, and are cognizant of human activities, we are free to rearrange the dead building blocks of nature however we want.

Progress cannot be assigned to accrual. If one needs to be emotionally engaged to be efficient, as in a sporting event or an artistic performance, then a predominantly magic attitude is useful. If emergency surgery must be performed on a young woman to save her life, it would probably not be efficient to have her physician mother perform the task due to emotional identification that would pose profound distraction. An efficient worldview is one that is self-evident because it demonstrably continues to self-replicate.

A deficient worldview is one that demonstrates its inability to endure and self-replicate. Also, the direction of mutation is not fixed. Individuals, groups, and societies have demonstrated the ability of accrual to be reversed, for a predominantly perspectival group such as pre-Nazi Germany to "develve" into a predominantly mythic collective. Mutations, sudden changes in worldview, are often catalyzed by crises such as shortages of basic needs such as food. Such sudden shifts can be in the direction of more or fewer dimensions of awareness. We shall cover four-dimensional integration below..
As dimensions accrue, space and time become concretized and become recognized as the necessary conditions for things to exist with extension (in space) and duration (in time). As dimensions accrue, dissociation increases. With the concretion of space, things increasingly become resolved and defined.

The definition of definition in visual terms means the ability (or not) to discern two adjacent objects as separate. As dimensions accrue, dissociative fragmentation increases. Holism gives way to atomism. Space and time expand and empty out. For the modern to not "lose focus," to remain narrowly egocentric is a virtue.

Only in the 20th century was the reality of a vacuous universe thinkable. Prior to that time, even the most renowned physicists presumed the existence of aethereal to mediate light and electromagnetic radiation. In the vital/spiritual realm, infinite animism that pervades all things, including mountains, rivers, objects like bowls and swords, gives way to specifically named titanic forces, which in turn increasingly solidify and consolidate into pantheons of discrete and distant gods with egos expressing purpose and direction living on faraway mountaintops, which, as the process continues, consolidate into an "absent" distant single deity and finally a world without spirit or soul, without center or care. The same process can be seen in human relationships as the all-encompassing "we" gives way to the tribal "us" that acknowledges the "them" (grudgingly acknowledging their humanity), which shrinks to the extended clan, to the nuclear family, and finally to the modern individual, who then is dissolved as the persistent enduring sameness of identity is deconstructed in the so-called postmodern attitude.

For the late-Modern, meaning, identity, and value become obsolete and regarded as useless fictions. Emotion, sentiment gets in the way of clear calculation. Everything becomes resolved into sharply focused and demarcated digits—clarified. Quality is replaced with positive disambiguated quantification. When a predominantly magic person who venerates all things in the forest as equally valued, alive, cognizant, and perfect, and who must perform intricate ritual ceremonies to ask permission of a tree before felling it, confronts a Modern who sees only a potential resource calculated as board feet of lumber and who can take out several acres a day without so much as a "thank you," the two worldviews clash.

**HISTORICAL/PHILOSOPHICAL GROUNDING OF DAD AND THE INTEGRAL**

DAD synthesizes the top-down *apriori* approach of Kantian constitutive processes that tend to leave the rescedent "thing-in-itself" (*ding an sich*)
unknowable (the unfortunate noumenon/phenomenon, rescedent/transcendent, noetic/noematic dualisms), with the bottom-up *aposteriori* environmental influences stressed by the British Empiracists such as John Locke\(^6\) and George Berkeley.\(^6\) Second, DAD theory synthesizes this result with the concept of dissociation as used by Lewis Mumford.\(^8\)

As noted here, in the previous paragraph, top-down versus bottom-up refers to the psychologicist spatial metaphors that call cognition or mental activity in the brain top-down processing, whereas the bottom-up means sensational information flowing from the senses “up” into the brain. A confusion may occur because below I also refer to work by Stephan Hawking and Thomas Hertog, in which they make a distinction between bottom-up and top-down “images” of cosmic causation and history.\(^7\)

Bottom-up cosmology presumes a single objective history that is observer-independent, progressing away from (and this is the problem for Hawking and Hertog) unknown initial boundary conditions at the “beginning of time.” In opposition to this ideal, “objective,” observer-independent cosmology, the top-down cosmos allows for multiple histories that depend on various observers’ positions in time. Top-down for Hawking and Hertog means working backward from various observers’ starting points in their respective known present conditions, or final boundary conditions, to inferentially construct cosmological histories, “images,” that are observer-dependent.

As will be seen, I argue that there is a third integrative modality whereby a single observer perceives multiple histories at once, rendering the dualisms of absolute observer independent truth/reality versus observer dependent relativism, and the top-down versus bottom-up metaphysics irrelevant.

Returning to my synthesis of Kantian top-down with Mumfordian bottom-up epistemologies, my approach avoids the nothing/something metaphysical speculation found, for instance, in Jean-Paul Sartre’s\(^7\) conclusion that consciousness is nothing. Sartre’s conclusion is a consequence of the modernistic and mutually excluding top-down versus bottom-up origins to reality. Instead, the theory of dimensional accrual and dissociation accepts what Franz Brentano,\(^7\) Karl Stumpf,\(^7\) and Edmund Husserl all demonstrated, namely, that “consciousness is always conscious of something.”\(^7\)

I recognize further that Brentano’s idea of intentionality as a directional “stretching out toward” its object is a modernist/spatial mode of thinking that is valid for only the modernist three-dimensional mode of awareness, but that does not render it a useless metaphor. As we shall see, this sense of how we become aware is a perfect expression of perspectivism, which Hawking and Hertog refer to as the observer’s “light cone.”\(^7\)

In earlier writings, I have suggested that our awareness is not a passive and disinterested process, an act of gathering random sensations as only a
bottom-up approach. This bizarre celebration of the subjectless, observer-independent epistemology that heralds as the non plus ultra of human achievement a person becoming a mere instrument, a reflecting surface that does not even have memory or the ability to process anything. This is “realistic representationalism.” It is presumed in the notion of referential accuracy that dominates modernist metaphysics and epistemology, including model building. The observer is thusly reduced to a dumb terminus of sensory impulses such as light and sound waves, a mirror of nature that does not even interpret or convert such impulses into sensations as such. This odd ambition to erase oneself becoming a formless spectator in the name of a false humility and submission to The Truth (facticity) exists because of a cultural bias. The ambition exists and is sustained because, according to positivistic ideology, this is the way to gain status by ownership and possession of religious or scientific secrets.

This ideal identity of the apprehender is brilliantly described by Friedrich Nietzsche in Beyond Good and Evil. We are told that “the objective ‘selfless’ man waits until something comes along and then gently spreads himself out, so that not even the lightest footsteps and the fluttering of ghostly beings shall be lost on his surface and skin,” an accidental observer of the capricious images that pass across his sensory tissues.

But notice that even this stark version of the observer would yield perspectival limitations. One could reflect only what comes into view based on one’s position in time and space. The purer doctrine of truth based on an observer-independent reality is what Nietzsche in Thus Spoke Zarathustra calls “immaculate perception.”

Contrary to this fantastic image of the good as self-loathing but with a craving for inheritance by way of devious meekness, we cannot get out of our own way. We cannot put ourselves “under erasure” (Sous rature) as Jacques Derrida following Heidegger, puts it. Nietzsche’s spurs and grafts, the proliferation of meaning, does not mean the subject is eliminated. We cannot, as Nietzsche says, “look around our own corner” or, as Hawking and Hertog would say, see beyond our own personal “light cone.” Identity and meaning spring from the archaic and magic levels of awareness, and even as he attempts to deny it, in the very act of putting words under erasure, Derrida is forced to emphasize the need to use the word due to its inherent power to articulate a sense. As Nietzsche noted, signs are superficial, dissociative abstractions and generalizations. He is referring to modernity’s valuation of minimalism and reduction of surfaces to simple measures. They are like all prejudices, inadequate yet necessary, for without gesture and word communication, consciousness is impossible. Derrida does not seem to realize that he is assuming an absolute immaculate conception when he denigrates all actual forms of communication as inherently (ironically) inadequate. Welcome to being human, all too human.
As I have written elsewhere, Derrida is not an integral postmodernist but a hyper-modernist who assumes and thrives on oppositional dualisms such as permanence and flux, sameness and difference, presence and absence, sense and nonsense, sobriety and play. While ridiculing others (such as Jürgen Habermas and John Searl), Derrida presumes a hard position—he is certain, positive that there are multiple voices in each text and that many are internally inconsistent. Erasing one meaning in favor of another, a willful manipulation of text (deconstruction with a positivistic hardhat), the mutual exclusivity of diacritical opposition, owes more to Hegel than to even liberal pluralism. Integrality recognizes the continual effectuality and vitality of multiple structures, including the ambiguity and ambivalence of simultaneous literal and figural senses in myth.

For magic people, the world is alive and full. One is not only never alone, but one is identical with the cosmos. With dissociation, this identity shifted. But still physical, if not spiritual contact was presumed to be the nature of existence. This presumption continued historically well into the industrial age. In fact in the West, the idea of the necessity of the aether (a postulated gas-like substance) for communication was abandoned only around the turn of the 20th century. Aristotle argued that the idea of vacuum is abhorrent to nature, what came to be known as the doctrine of *horror vacui*. The Catholic Church proclaimed the very idea of vacuum heretical, and René Descartes argued that space implies extension, which requires substance to extend. Up until 1912, eminent physicists were still arguing for the necessity of aether as a medium for light to propagate. The profoundly radical, even frightening (for its time) nature of outer space as a literal vacuum was not discovered until the 1940s. I turn now to this discovery as an example of how the Modern is obsessed with space, its measure and segmentation.

The smaller the measure, the more precise (for many, rational) the knowledge. Fragmentation presumes spatial thinking. Precision, that fundamental value of technological prowess, presupposes fragmentation of the universe into smaller and smaller increments. It involves sampling, a digital method as compared with qualitative analog methods.

The discovery of the natural vacuum of “outer space” prompted modern science to establish a firm, definite line between something and nothing. The Kármán Line established in 1956 distinguishes the boundary between earth’s atmosphere and the horror of the great vacuum just 62.5 miles above our heads—the most hostile environment to life imaginable. The point here is the obsession the Modern exhibits with spatial precision as well as the idea of space as a dimension independent of content—a categorical *a priori* necessary for form (the formless that enables form).

Theodore von Kármán immigrated to the United States from Hungary and worked in the fields of aeronautics and astronautics. The contrived line
between the two, the realm of something and the realm of nothing, was named for him. Kármán led a team of researchers for the U.S. government and the French Fédération Aéronautique Internationale to determine once and for all where outer space began and inner space ended. He decided that the line should mark the altitude at which the atmosphere was so thin that for a vehicle to be able to achieve aerodynamic lift it would have to reach orbital velocity (at that altitude). In other words, as an airplane tries to fly higher and higher, the thinning air gives less and less lift, thus requiring a higher speed to avoid stalling. At a point, Kármán decided 100 kilometers, the airplane needs to fly so fast to generate lift that it reaches orbital velocity. At that point, it becomes an astronautical vehicle, and its pilot transforms from an aeronaut into an astronaut.

The Kármán line that separates aeronautical from astronautical properties and behavior was thus established at precisely 100 kilometers or 62.13719224 miles. But, in reality, aeronautical lift depends on aircraft design, which confounds everything. Also some very rigorous scientists get upset that Kármán decided to pick 100 kilometers because it was a nice round number and also that he suggested that in countries that use miles instead of kilometers textbooks put the line at an even 60 miles (96.56064 kilometers). At any rate, a definite badge of greatness in modernity, which Kármán achieved, is to have a unit of measure named after you (like Heinrich Hertz, André-Marie Ampère, Alessandro Volta, James Watt, etc.).

While the atmosphere actually fades gradually, the Modern is compelled to dictate a line for the sake of measurement. This exemplifies the modern spatial metaphysical bias behind quantitative methods. Another is that the arbitrary decisions behind much precise science are thus exposed. The edge of space is controversial, and the discrete layers of atmosphere are merely conventional, depending on what one decides to value as a criteria such as the hydrological cycle (weather), which reaches only up to the tropopause (the boundary between the troposphere and the stratosphere, about 18-20 kilometers at the equator). Even within the United States, the definition varies for the U.S. military does not share the same definition as NASA.

This controversy effects the definition of people’s identities. NASA’s definition of an astronaut is someone who has breached the “edge of space,” which is exactly at 50 miles (~80 km) above mean sea level. Meanwhile, climatologists recognize the mesosphere, which extends from 85 kilometers to the thermosphere, also called the “outer atmosphere,” which begins at 690 kilometers up to the exosphere, which shares a “transition boundary” with the thermosphere at a whopping 10,000 kilometers or 6,200 miles high where atoms and molecules escape into space.

In 2006, three veteran NASA X-15 pilots were retroactively (two posthumously) awarded their astronaut wings, as they had flown at altitudes
between 90 and 108 km in the 1960s, but at the time had not been recognized as astronauts. After the X-15 pilots, Yuri Gagarin became the “first human” to endure in that space, orbiting in “space” on April 12, 1961. Experts, precise thinkers, and rigorous scientists have been troubled by the fact that he was not the first now that the X-15 pilots have been recognized.

In any case, the full-blown notion of pure empty dead space is a very recent discovery, and it marks the full expression of the modern perspectival worldview in one way. In another way, the Kârmán Line expresses the essential obsession of modernity with space as the felt need for precision, for clarity, for sharp distinctions and certain measures that led scientists to calculate a firm line in the first place separating the atmosphere from outer space. This involves the quantitative digital mentality that simplifies and samples the actual holistic nature of reality that exhibits a seamless world. In a seamless holistic cosmos, “levels” of oxygen in the atmosphere, like musical tones, vary and slowly fade into oblivion rather than abruptly stopping at a line. The obsessions with sharp digits and certain measures, postulate, in our example, the atmosphere as a distinct unit with a clear edge. This unitary mode of thinking pervades all modernist geometric structuralist thinking, including linguistics, where the abstract seme is postulated as the smallest unit of meaning and the meme is postulated as the smallest unit of linguistic (informative) sound.

The observer is not effectively erased by methodical objectivity for the method itself constitutes a prejudiced and enabling structure. Scientists care. Just because you cannot use a barometer to measure temperature or a telescope to study microbes does not mean that the limitations of these instruments render them useless. It only indicates their inherent interpretation, the limited image of the universe they can yield—their hermeneutic horizon—their perspective.

Everything I know has a hermeneutic horizon. Insofar as they are known by humans, all things have a horizonal quality with perspective. An object, like my father’s Marine Corp knife from World War II, has a particular story to tell. It has a history. Every scratch on it, the rotted leather-wrapped handle, the stained metal blade can be read as signs. History, that most human of imaginary disciplines, is manifested in objects that are read by anthropologists, archaeologists, paleontologists, geologists, cosmo-

ologists, biologists, and, in fact, all of us. We bother only to the extent that we care, that their magic dimension moves us, and we can associate and identify with them via a semantic field that resonates. Without emotional, magical, identification, we would not bother to write their stories for them.

From the Gua Masri caves in Borneo to Argentina’s Cueva de las Manos (Cave of the Hands) in Patagonia, and the Pech Merle caverns and Grotto Cosquer in France, whenever people enter and see the prehistoric hand stencils, the first thing they are compelled to do is put their own hand
over a stenciled silhouette. It is an attempt to “hold hands” with a person separated from us by millennia yet magically present here and now. Touch is pre-spatial and pre-temporal magic sense. We are moved. We must touch and be touched by that which we care about enough to study. Love of one’s subject matter is essential. We seek out the object of our affection, our object of interest. We do not just spread our “ghostly wings” and take in what randomly happens by. Nietzsche was correct. Even for the “objective observer,” association and identification are essential, and our pursuit of learning to explore the universe is driven by emotional needs.

The structure of our way of knowing, including our senses, influences what is real for us in the “opposite” direction than sheer passivity. Instead of conceiving of information reflecting off of us, or to be more romantic, flowing via our sensory “inputs” into us, we might see the universe as a dead and unconscious field where we, the living, grope in a profound darkness that is illuminated only where we turn our attention like moving along the bottom of the ocean with a flashlight. We choose to light a candle rather than curse the unseen universe that envelops us. Only what falls under our illuminating gaze becomes part of our awareness so that the old dualism of top-down and bottom-up is demonstrated to be integrated in a process that requires both an active sentient and searching mind and a landscape to be searched. One without the other cannot accomplish reality as something known and available for contemplation and even technological manipulation. A dead mirror lying in the desert achieves nothing. Marx and Nietzsche agree on one thing: The point is not just to describe the world but to change it; and so they are kissing cousins within the modernist tribe, each utterly infatuated with will-driven change (revolution)—to philosophize with a hammer.

But my point here is that the very act of description, to “just describe,” is not as innocent as it may seem. Description always already exposes a perspective, a structure that is a necessary condition for consciousness—a point of view. And merely more of the same, more description, does not lead to observer-independent objectivity. This is why the semiotic ethnographer Clifford Geertz suggests in his notion of “thick description” that one is still, no matter the density, irrevocably involved in “the interpretation of cultures.”83 Perspectivism is inescapable but, as we shall see, not immutable.

I bring this up because many believe that Nietzsche’s insistence that all knowing is phenomenalism and that Gebser’s notion of an aperspectival mode of awaring is nonsense. As Nietzsche puts it: “This is the essence of phenomenalism and perspectivism as I [ever self-consistent despite what the Postmodernists would like to claim of him] understand them: Owing to the nature of animal consciousness, the world of which we can become conscious is only a surface- and sign-world, a world that is made common.”84
But that is not where Nietzsche left the issue. The empiricist insists that all we know comes from our sense organs. But all animals, from the amoeba to the blue whale, function from sensation. If you put salt in the water, the amoeba will move away from the toxin. The greatest migration of biomass on the planet happens in a continual wave moving across the globe as the edge of night and day continually sweeps across the oceans. Trillions of tons of microbial life forms, aware of the setting sun, rise to the surface as dusk falls, followed but an entire entourage of larger life forms. The empiricist valorizes knowledge of a form that all animals share. This is the most base form of knowing that cannot escape current conditions. While many mechanistic psychologists prefer to see humans behave according to measurable “reactants,” human knowing is able to transcend the here and now, and Nietzsche is keenly aware of this fact. To be sure, he is honest and recognizes that “We cannot look around our own corner,” but a few lines later in his critique of arrogant and profoundly stupid positivism, he writes, “But I should think that today we are at least far from the ridiculous immodesty that would be involved in decreeing from our corner that perspectives are permitted only from this corner. Rather has the world become ‘infinite’ for us all over again, inasmuch as we cannot reject the possibility that it may [emphasis added] include infinite interpretations.” Why does he say “may”? Because he insists that the claim that all is interpretation is itself an interpretation. Nietzsche is consistent to the hilt. And his corner from which we see the universe is Gebser’s pyramid turned in three dimensions.

This claim that all is interpretation itself “cannot be decided even by the most industrious and most scrupulously conscientious analysis and self-examination of the intellect; for in the course of this analysis the human intellect cannot avoid seeing itself in its own perspectives, and only in these.” Pity Husserl did not grasp Nietzsche’s warning here before spending a lifetime lamenting being “the last positivist.” Nietzsche’s humility here, yes humility, is unnecessary, however. These infinite interpretations exist and can be proven via the variance of my own experience. My own interpretation changes.

Even as I see an infinitude of times in a single glance at the night sky, stars and galaxies scattered across space in an infinite variety of distances from me and all moving away from me at various speeds, I manage to integrate them into a common sense for me—the sublime. And for another being who may be looking at the grand spectacle from a different time and place, it is different and the same. Everything is moving away from everything else, and yet even the universe has a linear age for me/us. This plenum of interpretations is what Hawking and Hertog call pictures of the universe. The fact that Hawking and Hertog pluralize “picture” says it all.

To finish this thought, the problem with the colonization of the world not by capitalism with its single-market mechanism, for that is but one
minor expression of it, but of positivism, is that those who control the popular definition, the dominant image of reality, have tremendous power. But they are also trapped in their corner and defending it against all alternatives like a madman in a padded cell battling imaginary demons. Their fear, always, is of losing control of the dominant picture of the universe because it gives them a place, a purpose, a value; a picture of what is sacred and profane, what is natural and unnatural, what is strong and weak, what is appropriate and not, and, most important of all, what is possible and impossible. If their mechanical logic of the market is true, then we, they, have no alternative. There is nothing to fear. Gravity can be denied existence but its feelings are not hurt. It endures.

And so we observe perennial conflicts, traditional enemies clashing such as the fundamental and mutual hostility between the belief in supernatural miracles that billions presume and the scientific insistence that nothing can break the material laws of nature. But once reflection appears as egocentric orientation with personal interest, the result is dominance struggles between competing interpretations and images taken to the disassociated level of ideology; realpolitik. But this is still infused with magic for ideology leads to conflict but with “reasons.” But even symbolic violence can achieve monumental proportions. Such hostilities lead one side to consider the other as subhuman idiots possibly not worthy of resources (social Darwinism) while in the opposite direction the sentiment is that scientists, “polluters of the minds of college students,” are destined to eternal torment beyond imagination.

Knowing is an accomplishment of constitutive activity, a synergetic process that combines mental processing including cognitive, memorial, emotional, and imaginal information (top-down) with sensory information (bottom-up). Science, knowledge, mathematics, law, religion, art, and facts are all artifacts, products of this integration of the knower and the known, mind and matter, subject and object, permanence and flux, history and eternal truth. Reality is a product of integration.

The inspiration called forth here is Husserl’s effort to insist that form and content cannot be separated, that such a claim amounts to little more than metaphysical speculation (which may have value as entertainment, but other stories can engender even more passionate drama). This means that the subject perceiver and object perceived are inseparable in the act of perception. One way I explain the process to students is what I call my snowball story. If I am standing behind a window that I am unaware of and someone throws a snowball at me, when it strikes the window I will be startled. I am surprised because I did not see the snowball coming, nor was I aware of the window. The evidence for the existence of both is given in the moment of impact. The only source of data I have to study is the result of the impact. From the pattern of the splat I extrapolate everything else. In other words, reality is largely an extrapolation, a grand implication.

From the pattern of the splat I extrapolate...
As I study the pattern of the impact on the window, I can deduce with the aid of geometrical logic and physics that the window is curved in a particular way and that the snowball contained dirt and was loosely packed. Given the mass of the material on the window's surface and the size of the splat, I can deduce the velocity and direction of the snowball. So forth and so on. But the point is, the splat is all I have to study, but its pattern tells me much about the snowball and the window.

EVIDENCE IN INTEGRAL STUDIES AND THE DAD THEORY

Generally speaking, innumerable writers from several disciplines presume that consciousness is a sort of container and that its "contents" can be separated from the container. However, Husserl's very careful descriptions of perception show that this is not the case. Sticking with my analogy, without the window the snowball would pass unnoticed, and without the snowball the window likewise would have remained unobserved. The form of the glass, what we might call the constitutive structural properties exhibited in the splat, in the act of consciousness, in a Kantian sense—the noesis (____), and the nature of the snowball, the "external" stimuli or "object" perceived, the noema (____), can be studied but only as they coexist in the pattern of the act of perception (the impact pattern).

Now my story allows one to presume that there was a snowball before it hit the window and that there was a window before the impact, but to be more rigorous, I, as an investigator, have direct access only to the impact pattern for examination. Any other claims are sheer speculation like asking what happened 2 minutes before the Big Bang. What is, is the clue of something already done, which I as an investigator work with. In this sense, artifacts are self-evident in their mode of being. What Peter says about Paul may or may not tell me something about Paul. It may or may not be true, and it may be forever indeterminate. But what Peter says about Paul tells me something about Peter. That he thinks I want to hear what he has to say about Paul, that he has a right to tell me, that he wants to tell me, in the manner, at this time, and so forth. The same is true of the verition of all things, including categories, types, and the world. The world is epiphantic. Verification is evinced in the diaphanous nature of being described by Neo-Kantians as intuition, sense perception (Anschauung), which is perception independent of reason, without previous cognition—the "direct" "immediate" givenness of experience. "Verition" according to Gebser is synonymous with "waring," and it encompasses the sense of perceiving as well as imparting verity or truth. "Only through this reciprocal perception and impartation of truth by man [sic] and the world can the world become
Perception has nothing to do with rationality or irrationality, the material and the immaterial, reality or fiction. All are and therefore are equally real in the act of presentation or making present by awaring. We recognize that they are different based on qualitative differences. They are not the same but only different in quantity. No. And even as I measure I do not measure measurements but something different from the measurement itself, some quality.

The integrity of manifestation is given in concretion as indication that is self-demonstrable. What is manifest is evident. It is necessary for inventory (a manifest) and to proclaim (manifesto) the reality of a grouping (manifestation).

In statistics, it is presumed that there is something "under" cases, a common denominator (shared quality) that "ties them together," an identity that is more important, law like, principled, than each actual case. But no two things are identical. I may discover, it may become "clear," that I was mistaken, that my version of events was inaccurate, but this itself, this mistake, my awareness of this inaccuracy is given with the force of verition. It is true that I was wrong. Being wrong is just as real as being right, and both have consequences. The same is true for a perception meant as inferred, deduced, imagined, derived, hallucinated, and so on. I intuit sense. Things have sense. Things are sensical. Phenomena, experience presentiates sense given as sensible intuition.

Formal phenomena such as rules of logic are given as formal intuition, categories as categorial intuition, fictional things as fictional intuition or the awaring of a thing meant as fiction, essences themselves as eidetic intuition, and so forth. An empirical object is qualitatively discernable from an imagined object.

To consciousness, all phenomena are equally real but with qualitative differences. This means that some things are essentially imaginary while others are perceived by me as being essentially independent of my imagination. Both are "real," and often the imaginary has as much or more impact on behavior as the "real." Acting on dreams, for instance, has changed history more than once.

But modernity is obsessed with efficiency, and this requires generalizations in the form of statistical means. In the political realm, one person/one vote is the mantra with no regard for the quality of the thinking and experience that went into particular voting decisions. The presumption is that, given enough participation, the final decision will "converge on the mean," which leaves us with the lowest common denominator—hardly a recipe for exceptionally rational leadership. In the economy, every dollar is identical to every other dollar; all that matters is how many one has. In science, all hydrogen atoms are the same, and so confounding issues of qualitative differences can be ignored. Space/time orientation is purely relative. In a
world obsessed with quantity, only mass matters. One literary masterpiece or great symphony is ridiculed in the marketplace that sees pulp fiction and synthesized music leading sales. In the world as quantity, truth, as the anthropologist Jules Henry\(^8^9\) noted, is what sells.

Only in the presence of perception (the consciousness of...) is awaring possible. Gebser puts it this way, “His or her being present is in itself sufficient to effect new exfoliations and new crystallizations which could be nowhere manifest without his or her presence. It is the coming-to-manifestation itself which is effectual.”\(^8^9\)

In statistics, the reason each “sample” of some presumed grouping made by my interest becomes significant as the number of samples increases is because all things that are, are equally real. But in the modernist ideology of massifying thinking, we focus more on mathematically derived virtual averages based on one feature of interest (race, sex, income, educational attainment, etc.) than on actual cases. The assumption made in quantification is that quality is not important. What is important is quantity. But quantity of what? Apples and oranges are essentially, qualitatively different. The modern obsession with measurement and quantification is confounded by such differences even as it assumes them (stars are not starfish), and so, via reductionism, it seeks the lowest common denominator so that all observations, all things, are identical. Everything is made of atoms, and all atoms are made of subatomic particles. The only difference between one thing and another, this chair I am sitting on and me myself is the number of atoms involved. But I am alive. That qualitative difference matters.

All instruments record what was the case. In fact, telescopes looking out into the cosmos see a universe as it was. And thanks to the constant speed of light (a “small” single constant we can rely on, so far), as we look deeper into space, we see things as they were farther back in time in a smooth correlation of distance to historic time. For this reason, Hawking and Hertog argue that we must work backward (or “top-down” as they put it) from the now of final boundary conditions to presumed but unknown initial boundary conditions.

All that we know of the universe is what we have access to now. But what we see now is an accrual of an infinite variance of times that integrally present themselves to my eye together, at once. All the stars and galaxies I can see exist at various distances/times. The distances are so vast and the speed of light so slow that as I look into space I am seeing several times at once. The universe is not two-dimensional but four-dimensional. If it were just two dimensions then all I see would be the same distance from me and I would be looking at a single point in the distant past. But instead, as I behold a multitude of stars and galaxies at vastly different distances, I am beholding several points of time in the past, several “pictures” of the universe at once, integrated, combined for me in me. All that I see presentiate
various cosmic histories, an infinite number appearing to me as a single picture—reality. My cosmic reality is always already integral, and that is understood only when effective time is appreciated.

So working backward, we infer an “image” of the universe based on final observable boundary conditions “only.” It is an image with a depth of infinite layers. Our image is observer and object dependent. In other words, our starting point for cosmological studies, or in fact I would argue any studies, begins with what we currently know and works backward, just as Nietzsche stated when he said that we always begin with observed effects and work backward to try to identify probable causes. So effects always come before causes in the process of knowing. As Nietzsche put it:

“Cause” and “effect” is what one says; but we have merely perfected the image of becoming without reaching beyond the image or behind it. In every case the series of “causes” confronts us much more completely, and we infer: first, this and that has to precede in order that this or that may then follow – but this does not involve any comprehension.... We operate only with things that do not exist: lines, planes, bodies, atoms, divisible time spans, divisible spaces. Cause and effect: such a duality probably never exists; in truth we are confronted by a continuum out of which we isolate a couple of pieces, just as we perceive motion only as isolated points and then infer it without ever actually seeing it....

We see cause and effect not as a continuum and a flux but “in terms of an arbitrary division and dismemberment,” which is exactly what Hawking and Hertog mean by an “amplitude of interest,” an image of a universe “inflating” backward from our point of view, what Gebser called the pyramidal structure of perspectival consciousness, a cone of interest, a hermeneutic horizon pivoting on an egocentric point from which we gaze “up” or “out” into the heavens, a profound bias but a bias without which there would be no history, no reality at all. And as noted before, all things, all objects as events manifest a hermeneutic horizon.

All things we behold have horizons of their own. Each planet, star, nebula, and galaxy has its own horizon. Each one arrives to me after journeys of various “lengths of time.” The spectral array of the sky opens up to me an infinitude of histories layered and layering, integrating into a single collage of luminous image. Plurality is realized in a common instant, infinity not in depth but in a magnitude of histories streaming into my eyes. And so the infinite increments of time from the nearest object, the moon, to the most distant object I can see sediment at me, on my windowpane, to constitute my picture of the universe. What appears are innumerable “biases,” an infinite number of temporal perspectives, an infinitude of horizons.
This is what Hawking and Hertog miss as they tack back and forth between the opposing paradigms of observer-dependent and observer-independent pictures of the universe. Instead what I suggest is the interdependence of an infinite plenum of information sources streaming across vast but varied distances to compile my now.

The most interesting thing Hawking and Hertog note is that the set of measurers available to me, the set of “final boundary conditions” that terminate on me, is the starting point for knowing the cosmos. As noted, in terms of knowing, the effect precedes the cause. Other cosmic pictures are not directly available to me but through inference. One starts out with the “late time constraints on the alternative and select subclass of histories that contribute to the amplitude of interest.” Histories for them are pluralized by imagining different observers in different space/time coordinates. But histories for me are always already given in the plenum of information sources, the array of stars and galaxies at vastly different distances that constitute my singular vista.

For all their iconoclasm, Hawking and Hertog are stuck in perspectival consciousness. They say there are multiple histories of the universe that “depend on the precise question asked. We study the observational consequences of no boundary initial conditions on the landscape ... that admits several alternative inflationary histories.” In other words, the picture of cosmic reality we have is perspectival. I tend to amplify my interest in my own sense of the present, directly observable picture—I am logocentric. And yet, absence is present by implication with what is here/now. And since all things and events presentiate a perspective, a horizon, the pyramidal reality that entraps the modern ego is exploded into a sphere of infinite times and perspectives that are ever-present.

So long as I am egocentrically logocentric, then the picture I presume of the cosmos is based on the “precise questions asked,” our interest and our place in the cosmos, and how this bias “interplays between the fundamental laws of nature and the operation of chance in a quantum universe ... the structure and complexity of alternative universes in the landscape is predictable [backwards] from first principles to some extent, but also determined by the outcome of quantum accidents over the course of their histories.” But in that one perspective are sedimented an infinitude of perspectives. Hawking and Hertog only recognize the relativity of different observers not realizing the relativity of the observed. This is grasped when time becomes vital and not merely a measure articulated by a European mechanical contraption.

This also affects how we see change. In some ways, symbiology (as in symbiosis) is biology. Instead of a simple notion of evolution, whereby one species must adapt to the environment that is given as monolithic and changeless, a permanent target for an individual or species to conform to
or "fail," it is more accurate to speak of what I call pan-evolution, where all "the parts" of the environment are in play, all constantly adjusting to each other, a complex churning process with countless variables/horizons. Behavior cannot be understood or explained by reducing it to psychological traits inherent to a single organism by itself. Variance is omnipresent, and yet trying to combine it with analytics in the modern style, in the interest of control, ignores the essential nature of variance itself—time.

According to pan-evolution, everything is continually adjusting to everything else in the world. I do not adapt to a static world. Species adapt to each other all the time. We must think differently here. Process is neither linear nor uniperspectival. It is postspatial, everywhere (not localizable)—spherical, and "knowing" is omniscient. Thus, ancient unilinear method, for instance, simple variable analytics, is inadequate to capture the multidimensional nature of reality.

As an aside for the layman, this means some rather serious issues for the old-fashioned distinction between type-1 and type-2 errors. What is an effect from one perspective, such as the purchase of a car for a teenager, which was enabled by the prior cause of saving money for its purchase, becomes a cause given a different set of final boundary conditions, the vehicular fatality of the same teenager. If the parents had not saved up the money that enabled the purchase of a car for their teenage son, then the son would not have been killed in an accident involving that same car. The purchase of the car is both a cause of the fatality and an effect of the purchase, depending on the perspective, the final boundary conditions privileged—established to fragment flux based on the prejudice, the interest manifested in the observer's perspective. The result is multiple causes and effects embodied by a single set of the same material referents observed from different frames, multiple histories, multiple causes, effects, all of which have meaning for the perceiver. This realization of perspectivism "profoundly" changes:

the relation between cause and effect. Top down cosmology is a framework in which one essentially traces the histories backwards, from a spacelike surface at the present time. The no boundary histories of the universe thus depend on what is being observed, contrary to the usual idea that the universe has a unique, observer independent history. This is in sharp contrast with the bottom-up approach, where one assumes there is a single history with a well-defined starting point and evolution.199

One must infer an "image" of the universe by computing amplitudes for alternative histories with present "final boundary conditions only."100 Just as one may rightly deduce that a track in the mud indicates the prior passage of an unseen deer, so too I can use the unempirical powers of infer-
ence and deduction along with memory knowledge to expand the horizon of the event. While all animals function, in part, on the basis of empirical/sensational information (along with memory, urges such as hunger, and instinct), so that “being empirical” and gathering empirical data is hardly unique to humans or the scientific method, what is unique are my human powers of applying deduction and induction to an expanded temporal horizon extending into the past through memory and into the future, thus transcending the immediate here and now. Horizons are thus multiplied even more for imagined horizons are as real as empirical ones. Scientific predictions are but one example.

Parallel universes unfold. Positivity shatters into an infinitude of truths.

ENDNOTES


31. Kramer, “Cultural Fusion and the Defense of Difference,” pp. 183–230, defines fusion as not homogenization but integration based on different groups sharing some basic hermeneutic horizon but not total identification, which
would erase their identities leaving nothing left to integrate and no difference, which is the source of meaning, identity, and innovation. See J. Feagin & C. Feagin, *Racial and Ethnic Relations*. 5th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall 1996). Feagin and Feagin define assimilation as “a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life” (p. 36). I would argue a common social life but not cultural identity. Unfortunately, this is how Feagin and Feagin defined cultural fusion.

51. F. Tonnies, *Community and Civil Society*. Translated by J. Harris & M. Hollis (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1887 Ger./2001 Eng.).
62. Ibid., p. 85.
63. I prefer *lebenswelt* to *weltanschauung* because the latter is a worldview implying dualism, whereas the former captures the sense of living reality. Edmund Husserl introduced the term *lebenswelt* in his work, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (1954 Ger./1970 Eng.) to identify the field of being “in,” which I exist and participate as a living body. Reality is possible to me kinesthetically through my lived-body in the world. “Thus in whatever way we may be conscious of the world as universal horizon, as coherent universe of existing objects, we, each ‘I-the-man’ and all of us together, belong to the world as living with one another in the world; and the world is our world, valid for our consciousness as existing precisely through this ‘living together.’ We, as living in wakeful world-consciousness, are constantly active on the basis of our passive having of the world... Obviously this is true not only for me, the individual ego; rather we, in living together, have the world pre-given in this ‘together,’ as the world valid as exiting for us and to which we, together, belong, the world as world for all, pre-given with this ontic meaning... in the manifold ways of considering, together, objects pre-given to us in common, thinking together, valuing, planning, acting together... the we-subjectivity...” (pp. 108, 109) of a constantly functioning world as theme of being.
64. Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, p. 89.
73. Carl Stumpf directed Husserl's habilitation and also had a major influence on the leaders of the Gestalt School.
78. F. Nietzsche, “Thus Spoke Zarathustra.” In The *Portable Nietzsche*. Translated by W. Kaufmann (New York: Penguin, 1885 Ger./1982 Eng.).

For a great study on what humans would be like if we functioned almost exclusively on the basis of immediate empirical data, see Merleau-Ponty’s case of Schneider, “the empirical man,” in his Phenomenology of Perception (1945 Fr./1962, 2002 Eng.). For Schneider, it is out of sight, out of mind, literally. Like some victims of Alzheimer’s, when someone would step away from Schneider and then return, they were for him an entirely new empirical experience so that the transcendental ability of the mind to extend identity across contingent moments, to take a “bird’s-eye view” of things was impaired. Consequently, people would continually have to reintroduce themselves to him. The meaning-unity that transcends empirical fragments is what Merleau-Ponty calls Schneider’s “trouble with motility and thought as well as perception” (p. 125). Schneider’s “power of apprehending simultaneous wholes, and in the matter of motility, that, so to speak, of taking a bird’s-eye view of movement and projecting it outside himself” was lost (pp. 125–126).