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ABSTRACT: Carl Gustav Jung, Alfred North Whitehead, and Rudolf Steiner all sought to integrate the scientific understanding of their time with their own introspective insights and the world's literary and wisdom traditions, producing valuable insights with special relevance to the spiritual and ecological challenges of our time. This essay explores the convergence and complementarity of their visions and offers an integrative vision based on a revisioning of each of their philosophies and a synthesis of these revisionings with one another.

The degeneracy of mankind is distinguished from its uprise by the dominance of chill abstractions, divorced from aesthetic content.
—Whitehead (MT 123)

Since the stars have fallen from heaven and our highest symbols have paled, a secret life holds sway in the unconscious.
—Jung (“Archetypes,” 23, para. 50)

I saw an abyss in modern thinking between natural phenomena and spiritual and morally universal meaning.
—Steiner (Autobiography 123)
Even though there is no all-encompassing, final answer to our questions, the answers we find through the soul’s inner journey go far beyond what our senses, and the reason that is bound to them, can give us.

—Steiner (Way 6)

The aim at philosophic understanding is the aim at piercing the blindness of activity in respect to its transcendent functions.

—Whitehead (MT 169)

They are genuine symbols precisely because they are ambiguous, full of half-glimpsed meanings, and in the last resort inexhaustible.

—Jung (“Archetypes,” 38, para. 80)

1. Introduction

Our time is, of necessity, a time of integration and convergence. We must recognize and embrace our role as participants in a sacred ecology or else perish and destroy much beauty with us. During this time we must draw on the wisdom we inherit from the past and cultivate the living vision that guides our collaborative shaping of the future. Carl Gustav Jung, Alfred North Whitehead, and Rudolf Steiner all sought to meet this challenge in their own respective times and contexts, integrating contemporary scientific knowledge and ancient wisdom, motivated by their love for humanity and the world and by their concern for the wellbeing and future of the evolving world process. Drawing on individual engagement and creative re-envisionment of the philosophies of each thinker, this essay explores the convergence and integration of these emergent visions, suggesting a direction of re-orientation and a set of emerging values that might help us to meet the challenges we now face as a species; this essay will also encourage us to conscientiously embrace our role as interdependent centers of awareness and creative participants within an evolving spiritual ecology.

In the first part of this essay I explore the convergence and complementarity of these three thinkers and their respective visions, and in the second part I explore the vision that emerges out of their integration—specifically, I elaborate the vision that arises from the integration of my creative re-envisionment of each of their philosophies.
The treatment that follows is by no means exhaustive of their respective philosophies and their creative potentials, but is one attempt in my own evolving context to engage and elaborate something of the wisdom and creative vision that they severally and together have to bestow upon the challenges and potentials of our living moment. It is offered in the spirit of openness and invitation to further engagement and elaboration.

2. Commonality and Complementarity of Approach

2.1 Theoretical Orientations and Approaches to Knowledge

Jung, Whitehead, and Steiner approach their thinking and investigations from different disciplines, with significantly different backgrounds of experience, and with differing aims and orientations. However, these differences often contribute to the complementary nature of their ideas and philosophies, and there is a surprising degree of convergence among the insights and visions to which their respective intellectual and spiritual journeys give rise. Whitehead approaches his later investigations into the broad nature of reality from the perspective of speculative philosophy, drawing on his background as a mathematician, logician, and physicist. His orientation is broadly speculative and phenomenological, and he draws primarily on scientific theories and discoveries, the recorded history of human thought, and his own introspective phenomenological observations. Jung approaches his later investigations into the psyche and the broader world in which it is situated as a clinical psychiatrist, psychological empiricist, and sensitive spiritual inquirer, and also draws on introspective observations of his own developmental process. Like Whitehead, Jung read widely throughout his life, drawing on contemporary scientific knowledge, philosophy, world religions, and his intensive studies of alchemy and mythology in formulating his central ideas and theories. He also made use of his own phenomenological investigations, including analysis of his dreams, detailed accounts of his own individuation process, and a multitude of synchronistic and paranormal experiences, as well as his observation of his patients and their dreams and developmental processes. Rudolf Steiner, though formally trained as an engineer, was a polymath who made significant contributions to a multitude of fields—including education, architecture, mathematics, medicine, and agriculture—and approached his mature philosophical and spiritual investigations as a philosopher, esotericist, and spiritual scientist. He describes himself as having had the precursors of his later clairvoyant
perceptions from the time of his earliest childhood memories,\textsuperscript{7} and he drew on these developing experiences and observations, as well as his extensive reading and broad education, in formulating his philosophical and esoteric insights and perspectives. Thus each thinker elaborates a vision of reality based on his own orientation, focus, and range of experiences, and this allows for a high degree of complementarity between their visions.

Whitehead explains his objective in preparing and presenting the Gifford Lectures, which were the basis for his magnum opus, \textit{Process and Reality}, as follows:

The lectures are intended to state a condensed scheme of cosmological ideas, to develop their meaning by confrontation with the various topics of experience, and finally to elaborate an adequate cosmology in terms of which all particular topics find their interconnections. \textit{(PR xii)}

He goes on to explain one of the central ways he conceives the purpose and task of speculative philosophy. For Whitehead, it is the task of philosophy to mediate among science, art, and religion, and to examine the fundamental presuppositions that lie behind the operative modes of thinking and interpretation that inform both scientific discourse and everyday experience. His approach is largely constructive and systematic, aiming toward a completeness and consistency of philosophical outlook that he knows in advance to be in principle unattainable, for, as he states, "Rationalism is an adventure in the clarification of thought, progressive and never final" \textit{(PR 9)}.

Whitehead explains the basic aim of speculative philosophy in the following manner:

\begin{quote}
Speculative Philosophy is the endeavor to frame a coherent, logical, necessary system of general ideas in terms of which every element of our experience can be interpreted. By this notion of "interpretation" I mean that everything of which we are conscious, as enjoyed, perceived, willed, or thought, shall have the character of a particular instance of the general scheme. Thus the philosophical scheme should be coherent, logical, and, in respect to its interpretation, applicable and adequate. Here "applicable" means that some items of experience are thus interpretable, and "adequate" means that there are no items incapable of such interpretation. \textit{(PR 3)}
\end{quote}

Thus, for Whitehead, an ideal philosophy can provide a meaningful account of all experiences upon which it is possible to consciously reflect, is exemplified by all of our experiences, and is capable of coordinating all such experiences and their interpretations in a logical and coherent manner.
Whitehead then goes on to explain that coherency involves seeing the various elements in our experience in terms of their complex relations with each other in the context of the whole process of existence:

In other words, it is presupposed that no entity can be conceived in complete abstraction from the system of the universe, and that it is the business of speculative philosophy to exhibit this truth. This character is its coherence. (PR 3)

According to this understanding, the full complex web of relationships that situates and constitutes any element of existence can never be fully comprehended or articulated, and any conceptual representation of reality must inherently be a simplification and a generalization, useful as a functional abstraction, but delusive and misleading if taken as literally or exhaustively true. Nonetheless, Whitehead sees the attempt to elaborate a complete and consistent account of reality to be a worthy endeavor, provided that one does not mistake one's attempts for final, complete, or certain knowledge.8

Jung repeatedly described himself as a scientist and empirical investigator, and he therefore sought to limit his claims and methods to what he saw as the legitimate field of scientific investigation. He tended to situate his theorizing and interpretation within a Kantian epistemological framework in which only the immediate phenomenal contents of experiences are directly observable and knowable. He thus followed Kant in assuming that there was an in principle unknowable reality behind these phenomenal appearances, and that speculations concerning its deeper nature extended beyond the legitimate field of empirical observation and knowledge.9 However, despite the many disclaimers that appear throughout his writings, Jung also explored and speculated upon many psychological, philosophical, and spiritual dimensions of experience in ways that transcended the strict limits set by scientific empiricism.10 Many of the central concepts in Jung's psychology refer to theoretically posited dimensions of existence that he saw as inaccessible to direct observation and knowledge, such as the personal unconscious and its prominent figures—the shadow, anima, and animus—the collective unconscious, and the archetypes. This speculative dimension was especially prominent in his private writings, including his letters and autobiography, and increasingly prominent in the formal writings that he published during the last decade or more of his life. In his preface to his pioneering monograph on synchronicity, *Synchronicity: An Acausal*
Connecting Principle, Jung describes his approach as follows:

There can be no question of a complete description and explanation of these complicated phenomena, but only an attempt to broach the problem in such a way as to reveal some of its manifold aspects and connections, and to open up a very obscure field which is philosophically of the greatest importance. ("Synchronicity," 420, para. 816)

Jung is aware that he is entering into a field that lies beyond the ordinary bounds of scientific investigation, and that here he must employ both empirical observation and philosophical speculation in order to formulate a meaningful theory and treatment of his subject. Arguably, this is true of much of Jung's investigation and theorizing, as throughout his life he struggled to integrate his desire for scientific legitimacy with his curiosity and speculative nature.

In the beginning of his exposition in the same work, Jung describes the limitations of the scientific mode of investigation, which he feels he must transgress in order to conduct his inquiry into the elusive phenomenon of synchronicity:

The experimental method of inquiry aims at establishing regular events that can be repeated. Consequently, unique or rare events are ruled out of account. Moreover, the experiment imposes limiting conditions on nature, for its aim is to force her to give answers to questions devised by man. Every answer of nature is therefore influenced by the kind of questions asked, and the result is always a hybrid product. The so-called "scientific view of the world" based on this can hardly be anything more than a psychologically biased partial view which misses out all those by no means unimportant aspects that cannot be grasped statistically. ("Synchronicity," 422, para. 821)

Here Jung expresses a critique of dogmatic scientific empiricism that is implicit in many of his more speculative writings. As he argues, the modern scientist tends to approach the world with certain assumptions as to its nature, and the methodological approach, the data gathered, and the interpretation of this data all reflect this pre-existent bias. Also, there are dimensions of existence that do not lend themselves to systematic, repeatable, and objectifying forms of empirical investigation, and prominent among these are realms in which there is the possibility of interacting responsively with beings or fields of dynamic sensitivity and intelligence.
that are not responsive to more reductive and impersonal approaches. This insight was especially important in his investigations of the unconscious and the archetypes, which he eventually came to associate with the phenomenon of synchronicity. His introspective and responsive methods of psychological inquiry, and the philosophical and spiritual vision that emerges out of his more speculative observations and reflections, offer an approach that is compensatory to the scientific one, opening up new possibilities for knowledge, relationship, and wisdom.

Jung also emphasizes, especially in his work on psychological types, the multiple ways in which we as human beings take in and organize information. In his personality typology, he identifies four main modalities of perception—thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition—all of which offer valuable information about the world and must be integrated in order to both achieve psychological wholeness and provide a relatively complete picture of reality. As he observes, most people have a primary orientation, which configures their respective personalities and perceptions in certain ways, and which plays a large role in determining the pictures they form of reality. Every human being has a unique orientation and combines these modalities in a unique manner, and this orientation and shifting balance of perceptual orientations can shift and evolve over the course of a lifetime. Similarly, Jung describes both introverted and extroverted attitudes toward existence, which lend a direction and tendency to the modalities of perception and the modes of engagement that follow from them. All of these factors are essential to understanding how we engage and make sense of the world, and the picture of the world that we form. This understanding informs Jung's more subtle relational epistemology, allowing him to value and follow intuitions, and to integrate sensations, feelings, and inner imaginings into the conceptual vision he forms of the psyche and the world. These insights and conceptual models provide a foundational background for a more subtle and integral participatory epistemology, which honors and seeks to integrate multiple interrelated ways of knowing and interacting with the world. It also provides a basis for deepening mutual understanding and appreciation for diversity between individuals, who experience the world in different but often complementary and compensatory ways. Realizing that there are different legitimate, valuable, and mutually compensatory orientations allows one to enter with greater empathy and openness into the experiences of others and have greater circumspective awareness about the limitations and biases of one's own
Like Jung, Steiner was influenced by the scientific thinking of his age and wished to conduct his investigations into the nature of reality and the spiritual worlds he observed with scientific rigor and clarity. Because of this he describes his own approach to spiritual investigation in many places as "esoteric science." However, from the beginning he approached the domain of his spiritual scientific research with conceptions as to its fundamental character that differed significantly from those that underlie conventional scientific research and was forced to adapt his methods accordingly. Living as he did with conscious perceptions of spiritual realities that were not shared by the majority of his contemporaries, Steiner could not escape the observation that the picture one forms of reality depends upon one's state of consciousness and perceptual faculties. Thus Steiner writes that, "One must begin by investigating the state of consciousness through which a person enters a relation to the world that allows things and facts to reveal their real nature" (Autobiography 34-35). Because he could see things that others could not, he was acutely aware of the role of the subject in perception, and of the co-creative character of all perception and experience. It thus became a primary concern for him how one can develop the cognitive faculties, states of consciousness, and modes of relationship through which certain types of extrasensory observation and spiritual knowledge become accessible.

Steiner also emphasized the importance of living perceptions and thoughts over fixed beliefs and static constructs. Like both Whitehead and Jung, he realized that our perception of the world must be continually informed by new experiences, and that no theoretical orientation can be final or complete. Thus, in the beginning of his primary epistemological work, Intuitive Thinking as a Spiritual Path, he writes:

But no theoretical answer is given that, once acquired, is simply carried as a conviction preserved by memory. Such an answer would have to be an illusion, according to the style of thought underlying this book. Therefore no such finished, closed-off answer is provided here; rather, reference is made to a region of soul experience in which, through the soul’s inner activity, the question answers itself in a living way, always anew, whenever a human being needs it. (Intuitive 2, para. 2)

This is an essential aspect of Steiner's philosophy, and it is reinforced by his conception of thoughts as living beings, who are participants in a
reality constituted by an ecology of ever changing relationships. Thus for Steiner, not only is it important that our view of the world always be informed by fresh experiences and new information, but it is also essential that our experiences be based on attuned relationships to the living sources of our understanding.

Like Whitehead, Steiner also recognizes that our perceptions are always simplifications and abstractions from the full complexity of the world, and reflect the limits of our subjective vantage point and organization.

To explain a thing, to make it comprehensible, means nothing other than to place it into the context from which it has been torn by the arrangement of our organization, described above. There is no such thing as an object cut off from the world-as-a-whole. All separation has merely a subjective validity for us, for the way we are organized. For us, the world-whole splits into above and below, before and after, cause and effect, object and mental picture, matter and force, object and subject, and so forth. What meets us in observation as separate details is linked, item by item, through the coherent, unitary world of our intuitions. Through thinking we join together into one everything that we separated through perceiving. (Intuitive 89, para. 26)

Though he recognized it as the role of thinking and intuition to perceive the disparate elements of our experience in terms of their relationship to the living whole, he also recognized, especially in his later epistemological reflections, that our ability to do this is always limited, and that our picture of the world must always be subject to continual revision based on new experiences and understandings.

All three thinkers grappled with the limitations of language, and of linguistically configured thought and experience, in representing the deeper insights and patterns of interconnection they intuited. Whitehead frequently commented on this challenge and the importance of relating to language and thought in a way that takes account both of its limitations and of the creative role the reader or interlocutor must play in entering into the field of experience to which the linguistic expression points. As he expresses it:

Philosophers can never hope finally to formulate these metaphysical first principles. Weakness of insight and deficiencies of language stand in the way inexorably. Words and phrases must be stretched towards a generality foreign to their ordinary usage; and however such elements of language be stabilized as technicalities, they remain metaphors mutely appealing for an imaginative leap. (PR 4)

However, though philosophers cannot finally formulate the most fundamental
principles underlying existence, they can point to and illuminate aspects of their nature in a meaningful way, deepening the process of our engagement with them. And the difficulty of arriving at adequate verbal expressions does not only arise in relationship to philosophical principles, but is a general character of language in all situations, as Whitehead makes clear when states that "no language can be anything but elliptical, requiring a leap of the imagination to understand its meaning in its relevance to immediate experience" (PR 13). This insight points not only to the limitations of language, but also to the situatedness of all experience, and to the interpretive role of intuition and imagination in all perception and experience.

Jung too is sensitive to the limitations of language and thought for comprehending and adequately representing the more pervasive and elusive dimensions of our world and experience. In discussing the nature of the archetypes, Jung famously pronounces: "for what we can establish as the one thing consistent with their nature is their manifold meaning, their almost limitless wealth of reference, which makes any unilateral formulation impossible" ("Archetypes," 38, para. 80). This is especially true of archetypes, whose manifold character eludes definition, but again it is also true in a more subtle sense of all elements of our experience, which are themselves archetypally configured and inseparable from the full living complexity of the world process. For this reason Jung frequently emphasizes the importance of symbols as reflective and creative signs pointing to both familiar and mysterious dimensions of our world and experience:

By a symbol I do not mean an allegory or a sign, but an image that describes in the best possible way the dimly discerned nature of the spirit. A symbol does not define or explain; it points beyond itself to a meaning that is darkly divined yet still beyond our grasp, and cannot be adequately expressed in the familiar words of our language. (“Spirit,” 336, para. 644)

Jung frequently encountered symbols in his explorations of the deeper psyche, including the realms of dreams and visions, and the analogous processes of collective visioning and dreaming embodied in the world's mythological traditions. Yet again, it is possible to recognize the symbolic character in all the elements of our experience. Every manifestation of existence reflects and points back to the whole living reality of which it is a part, and therefore expresses both discernible and mysterious meanings. Reality and experience are themselves inherently symbolic.
This recognition of the symbolic character of experience is shared by all three thinkers, who also share a recognition that our conscious experience in everyday life is only a small portion of our total experience. As we shall see, each of these thinkers approaches and conceives this insight in a somewhat different way, but they converge in a recognition that what we immediately and consciously experience must always be brought into relationship with and be compensated by otherwise hidden dimensions of our experience and selfhood. Whitehead reflects on this importance of mysterious symbolic expression in the realm of art:

The type of Truth which human art seeks lies in the eliciting of this background to haunt the object presented for clear consciousness....In this way the work of art is a message from the Unseen. It unlooses depths of feeling from behind the frontier where precision of consciousness fails. (AI 270-271)

Here Whitehead emphasizes not only the noetic quality of art but also its important role in evoking powerful feelings, which deepen and enrich the quality of experience. For all three thinkers, and especially for Whitehead, feeling is itself an essential part of the noetic process, shaping and giving rise to our conscious experience of thought.

Steiner also recognizes the important role that imagination and symbolic representation play in furthering human spiritual development. However, for Steiner, imagination is not merely an individual human capacity but a means through which higher spiritual beings weave their wisdom and creative impulses into human life. As he expresses it, "imagination is a doorway through which spiritual beings creatively influence cultural development indirectly through the human being" (Autobiography 111). This influence can take place through a relatively unconscious co-creative imaginative process, but the human collaborative element in the imaginative and inspirational process is generally enhanced by conscious awareness and participation.

Steiner also struggles in a special way with the limitations of language and the importance of symbols in comprehending, reflecting on, and discussing the content and character of what he refers to as "suprasensory" experience. As he explains:

Indeed, the things and beings of the higher and material worlds are sufficiently related so that—with a little good will—we can obtain a conception of the higher worlds through words intended for the material world. But we must always be conscious of the fact that a
great part of such descriptions of the supersensible worlds must inevitably consist of analogies and symbols. (How 164-165, para. 2) 

As will be evident in examining his epistemological perspective more closely, this difficulty resides not only in the reporting of such experiences, but also in the perceptions themselves, which depend on the emergence and understanding of a living language of pictorial, multi-sensory, and spiritual symbols.²³

Steiner shares Jung’s and Whitehead’s recognition of the limitations of sensory empirical scientific investigation to produce an adequate account of reality without the compensatory correction of speculative philosophy and introspective vision. For Steiner, such scientific observation only reveals the outsides of things, failing to penetrate into the interiority of their spiritual nature. Thus Steiner argues that "one will not find reality in the results of scientific research but through them in the world of spirit" (Autobiography 133). Similarly, Jung reflects on the importance of myth in conveying the deeper living realities of our experience. In his autobiography, he says that he can only tell the story of his life as a myth, for:

> What we are to our inward vision, and what man appears to be sub specie aeternitatis, can only be expressed by way of myth. Myth is more individual and expresses life more precisely than does science. Science works with concepts of averages that are far too general to do justice to the subjective variety of an individual life. (Memories 3)

Though he approaches it in a different way, Jung is again pointing to the realm of living interiority and the unique mode of individual and relational expression that characterizes the true life of a being, as opposed to its mere outward appearances. This observation, shared and differently conceived by all three thinkers, informs the fundamental aims that underlie their intellectual and spiritual endeavors.

2.2 Goals and Concerns

Whitehead, Jung, and Steiner all developed visions that encompass individual, collective, and cosmic processes of transformation. However, their relationship to these processes varied considerably. Though a socially engaged and conscientious person, Whitehead was the least concerned of the three thinkers with the need for individual and collective transformation, and he is the only one who did not develop specific practices to facilitate
psychological and spiritual development. His philosophy provides a general cosmological scheme in which creative process is primary, but he does not stress the need to create specific types of change, nor does he spend much time exploring the specific nature of human psychological growth and transformation. Nonetheless, his philosophy of creative process has both moral and aesthetic dimensions that are of central importance, and he shows special concern as a philosopher with the role that thinking plays in the shaping of human life and society.

As mentioned earlier, Whitehead sees it as among the essential roles of philosophy to integrate science, art, and religion, and thereby to coordinate the various fields of knowledge with the domains of values and aesthetics: "Also, it must be one of the motives of a complete cosmology to construct a system of ideas which brings the aesthetic, moral, and religious interests into relation with those concepts of the world which have their origin in natural science" (PR xii). For Whitehead, thought should be creatively generative, contributing to the aesthetic enhancement of existence, rather than simply producing accurate information. In keeping with this, he observes that "in the real world it is more important that a proposition be interesting than that it be true" (PR 259). He therefore emphasizes the importance of imagination in thought, explaining that "a passive knowledge of the past loses the whole value of its message" (AI 279). Thus he decries thinking that is deficient in feeling, imagination, and aesthetic value, proclaiming in what serves as the opening epigraph of this essay that "the degeneracy of mankind is distinguished from its uprise by the dominance of chill abstractions, divorced from aesthetic content" (MT 123) and that "the type of Truth required for the final stretch of Beauty is a discovery and not a recapitulation" (AI 266). Therefore the enlivening of human thought for the benefit of human social development is one of Whitehead's central concerns and aspirations, though his writings are generally optimistic in tone and do not generally express any specific need for change or exhort specific forms of transformation.

Jung, as a practicing clinical psychiatrist, was much more dismayed by what he observed both in his patients and in the prevailing political and social climate of his society. And as a physician of the soul, he was much more apt to diagnose both individual and collective maladies, seeking a cure for the harmful tendencies he sensitively felt and observed. He shared Whitehead's insight that the way we think has a powerful role in shaping our individual and collective realities, and was especially concerned
about the role that unconscious processes play in determining both our perceptions and our behavior. As Jung observed, such unconscious forces and processes have psychologically and philosophically significant influences on our perceptions, and through them on the way that we act and participate in the world, thus shaping our reality on multiple levels simultaneously. “With all the more urgency, then, we must emphasize that the smallest alteration in the psychic factor, if it be an alteration of principle, is of the utmost significance as regards our knowledge of the world and the picture we make of it” (“On,” 217, para. 423). While his early writings focused more on the internal psychological processes of individuals, in his later years Jung focused increasing attention on the role of the collective unconscious in shaping broad social and historical patterns of development. As Jung explained in his mature summative essay, “The Psychological Foundation of Belief in Spirits,”

Incisive changes in history are generally attributed exclusively to external causes. It seems to me, however, that external circumstances often serve merely as occasions for a new attitude to life and the world, long prepared in the unconscious, to become manifest. Social, political, and religious conditions affect the unconscious in the sense that all those factors which are suppressed by the prevailing views or attitudes in the life of a society gradually accumulate in the collective unconscious and activate its contents. Certain individuals gifted with particularly strong intuition then become aware of the changes going on in it and translate these changes into communicable ideas. The new ideas spread rapidly because parallel changes have been taking place in the unconscious of other people. There is a general readiness to accept the new ideas, although on the other hand they often meet with violent resistance. New ideas are not just the enemies of the old; they also appear as a rule in an extremely unacceptable form. (“Psychological Foundation,” 314, para. 594)

As such an intuitively gifted individual, Jung was sensitive to the resistance with which new and challenging ideas are often met by those who are invested in the status quo and established hierarchies and power structures. He also realized, especially following the phenomenon of Nazism, that such unconscious ideas and forces can be destructive rather than progressive, and can unleash irrational fanaticism as well as give rise to new and liberating visions.

For Jung, the decisive factor in determining both an individual and a society's relationship to these deeper collective unconscious forces is the
interaction of these forces with reflective human consciousness. Every individual is challenged to undergo his or her own individuation process, through which a unique integrated personality and center of conscious awareness is formed, and this involves developing conscious collaborative relationships with the archetypes and other unconscious and trans-conscious forces, including the encompassing anima mundi, or world soul.\textsuperscript{27} And as Jung observed, an analogous process takes place at multiple levels of collective development, including the evolution and individuation of the anima mundi itself.\textsuperscript{28} Such processes of individuation also inherently involve developing unique, meaningful, and creative relationships with other beings and elements of one's world, so that individuation is simultaneously the formation of a unique evolving pattern of interrelationship with one's environments and the beings that inhabit it.\textsuperscript{29} Thus all individuation processes at all levels of inclusiveness and complexity are profoundly interrelated.

Jung observed a decided tendency towards collective conformity and the stifling of individual development and expression, and a corresponding tendency toward relapsing into unconscious modes of perception and relationship.\textsuperscript{30} He also sensed the tremendously destructive tendencies that will inevitably be released on the world through humanity if our capacity to influence our environment is not guided by a commensurate psychological maturity and reflective spiritual awareness. As he prophetically wrote:

\begin{quote}
A mood of universal destruction and renewal . . . has set its mark on our age. This mood makes itself felt everywhere, politically, socially, and philosophically. We are living in what the Greeks called the kairos—the right moment—for a "metamorphosis of the Gods," of the fundamental principles and symbols. This peculiarity of our time, which is certainly not of our conscious choosing, is the expression of the unconscious man within us who is changing. Coming generations will have to take account of this momentous transformation if humanity is not to destroy itself through the might of its own technology and science . . . . So much is at stake and so much depends on the psychological constitution of modern man . . . . Does the individual know that he is the makeweight that tips the scales? ("Undiscovered," 304, para. 585-586)
\end{quote}

The alternative to the unconscious destructive behavior that Jung warns against is a conscious, sensitive, and reflective relationship to the complex spiritual ecology in which our lives our interwoven. This includes the natural ecology of the earth and all its inhabitants, and with it the more
subtle and elusive dimensions of the *Anima Mundi*, with its archetypal energies, beings, and forces. Thus the decisive factor in determining the direction of human, planetary, and perhaps even cosmic development is consciousness and the modes of relational creative participation it facilitates. We must awaken if we are not to destroy ourselves and the world.

As a clairvoyant observer of human and cosmic development, Steiner came to very similar conclusions regarding the need for conscious human spiritual development. For Steiner, all beings in the entire cosmos are undergoing a continual process of spiritual development and evolution. Humans are no exception to this, and are in many ways a pivotal axis in the cosmic evolutionary process. In order to realize our highest spiritual potentials and evolve in a healthy and positive way, we need to both develop ourselves morally and awaken our subtle spiritual senses and deeper soul awareness—and for Steiner these dimensions of spiritual development are closely interwoven. Like Jung, Steiner observed that while our culture has advanced in its scientific knowledge and technological capacities, "the price of this gain in outer culture has been a corresponding loss in higher knowledge and spiritual life" (*How* 19, para. 8). He also observed that, "starting in our time, human souls have entered a condition in which they *cannot* enter into the necessary relationship to life without understanding the supersensory worlds" ("Way," 54). For Steiner, this involves developing our overall consciousness and thinking abilities, and also developing specific latent capacities for spiritual perception that lie dormant in most individuals, but are always present to be developed. Thus he famously proclaims that "... every spiritual eye can be opened" (*Theosophy* 16, para. 3) and that "humans remain in an incomplete state if they do not take in hand the transformative substance within themselves, and transform themselves through their own power" (*Intuitive* 159, para. 42). In most of his writings, Steiner seems to think, optimistically, that the spiritual development of humanity is inevitable, but that failure to develop ourselves in a timely manner through conscious spiritual effort may result in a great magnification in human suffering and a slowing down and retarding of the inevitable evolutionary process. And he observes that, "Similarly, a worldview not fructified by a knowledge of the hidden element inevitably leads to desolation" (*Outline* 60–61, para. 1). Thus his perspective is simultaneously diagnostic of much of the suffering and spiritual alienation of our age, and prescriptive of a possible path of spiritual evolution and awakening.
2.3 Different and Complementary Domains of Vision

Because of their different approaches and emphases, Whitehead, Jung, and Steiner develop different, overlapping, and complementary domains of vision. They are, of course, also attempting to make sense of quite different fields of experience, and the scope and character of their philosophies reflects these differences. Whitehead attempts to create an abstract cosmology that takes account of all the elements he recognizes in his own immediate experience through introspective and contemplative observations, and to integrate and coordinate these perceptions with concepts from history, religion, and literature, and the discoveries and theories of mathematics and the natural sciences. Thus his focus is on the character of both everyday perception and contemplative consciousness as they relate to the evolving universe as revealed by human cultural reflection and scientific exploration. He takes a sweeping view of human existence, examining basic elements of our experience, such as the nature of perception and the formation of abstract concepts, in order to see them in their complex interconnections with the whole cosmic process. In this way he is able to formulate fresh perspectives on the nature of space and time, the basic character of perception, the emergence of complex sensory modalities and consciousness, and the fundamentally sensitive, creative, and relational character of reality itself as a continually unfolding dynamic process.

Whitehead also in some measure accomplishes the ideal aim that he attributes to speculative philosophy of integrating science, art, and religion, or the realms of conceptual, aesthetic, and moral experience and endeavor. He recognizes that not only is such an integration necessary, but an unconscious conflation of science and religion tends to take place in the absence of such a higher order contemplative integration. For as he observes, "Science suggests a cosmology; and whatever suggests a cosmology suggests a religion" (RM 141). Thus in our contemporary society, there is often an unconscious and unreflective default into a quasi-religious doctrine of scientific materialism, which is scientistic rather than genuinely scientific insofar as it takes metaphysical postulates associated with the prevailing scientific worldview and conflates them with the genuine scientific approach to investigating reality. There is also a frequent corollary, but by no means necessary, assumption that scientific inquiry and the type of knowledge it produces is the only valid form of
inquiry and knowledge, and the resultant automatic dismissal or derogation of other ways of exploring and knowing reality. Not only does this lead to close-mindedness, reductionism, and dogmatism, but it also deprives human life of the deeper moral, aesthetic, and feeling elements that Whitehead recognizes as essential to human life and thought—or else marginalizes and compartmentalizes them so that they do not adequately inform the cosmology and worldview that shapes our most comprehensive feelings of meaning and belonging in the universe. Thus Whitehead's philosophy offers a cosmology that integrates scientific knowledge, culturally inherited wisdom, and immediate experience, and comprehends the larger cosmic processes in a way that allows us to experience the aesthetic and ethical dimension of universal creative process.

Jung's focus, as a psychologist, is primarily on exploring the inner domain of psychological experience, but he also attempts to situate this experience in its larger context within the world process and the cosmos as a whole. Jung drew on a depth of experience working with his patients over a lifetime as a psychiatrist, including work with dreams, psychosis, and altered states of consciousness, as well as on his own quite remarkable inward, introspective, and synchronistic experiences. Thus Jung's psychology offers a wealth of observations of inner psychic life and processes, and covers domains of experience that are seldom observed with introspective and contemplative awareness. In this sense it adds a dimension of psychological depth to Whitehead's more wide-reaching and abstract conceptual generalizations. It also covers types of experiences that Whitehead does not directly address, thus perhaps increasing its adequacy in relation to the full spectrum of human experience.

Like Whitehead, Jung also responds to the revolutions in the physics of his age, represented by the emergence of electromagnetism, relativity, and quantum theory. Jung attempts to relate his psychological observations and reflections to the worldview that these discoveries and theories suggest. Thus he speculates on the relationship between the psychic and the physical, and contemplates a number of ways of understanding the more encompassing reality of which they are both expressions. Again, like Whitehead, Jung is not satisfied with a dualistic understanding of reality, and reasons that there must be a deeper unity underlying these apparently divergent dimensions of observation and experience. "The common background of microphysics and depth-psychology is as much physical as psychic and therefore neither, but rather a third thing, a neutral
nature which can at most be grasped in hints, since in its nature it is transcendental" (Mysterium Coniunctionis 538, para. 769). In other instants and in a similar vein, Jung imagines the possibility that what we ordinarily perceive as physical may itself be characterized by a kind of interiority akin to our inner psychological experience: “Also, we do not know whether what we on the empirical plane regard as physical may not, in the Unknown beyond our experience, be identical with what on this side of the border we distinguish from the physical as psychic” (Mysterium Coniunctionis 537, para. 765). Regardless, he concludes, “this much we do know beyond all doubt, that empirical reality has a transcendental background” (Mysterium Coniunctionis 538, para. 768). By this he means that what we directly observe in our conscious experience is a limited and emergent expression of a larger reality that includes and unites both the physical realities disclosed through physics and the full range of our human psychic activities and perceptions. In this way he reaches very similar conclusions to both Whitehead and Steiner, and is inspired to move beyond his limited position as a psychological empiricist into the domain of speculative philosophy and metaphysics.

In a similar way to Whitehead, Jung recognizes that whenever the deeper spiritual and experiential dimensions are excluded from our conceptualizations of reality, they tend to reassert themselves in an unconscious way, in the form of religious or quasi-religious thinking. As he puts it, “Wherever the spirit of God is extruded from our human calculations, an unconscious substitute takes its place” ("On," 170, para. 359). This often leads people to conceive of ideas that serve as religious substitutes in absolutist and irrational ways, creating a corresponding unconscious faith that is not susceptible to open and honest critical examination. Thus Jung too recognizes the need to arrive at a view of the world that encompasses the full range of human experience and unites the domains of science and religion in a single inclusive vision. He sometimes refers to such a vision in psychological terms as a personal or containing myth, though such a vision need not be static or containing in a pejorative sense, but rather serves to provide a coherent experience of reality that at its best is open-ended and continuously evolving. Jung’s concept of synchronicity, his transgressive conception of the archetypes—as shaping both internal psychic life and the world around us—and his expanded understanding of the collective unconscious—here understood in its broader character as the anima mundi and as encompassing physical as well as
psychic reality—all allowed Jung to move towards such an encompassing vision, though he never clearly lays out a comprehensive metaphysical vision in the systematic and straightforward manner of Whitehead. For Jung, the deeper reality underlying the seemingly disparate realms of our experience is transcendental in the sense that it cannot be directly experienced through ordinary consciousness, though evidence of the unitive character of its existence breaks into our experience in the form of synchronistic and paranormal events, in the pervasive patterning of the dynamic archetypes—as evidenced by cross-cultural mythological motifs and symbols—and in the discernible patterns of interconnection that arise between physical and psychic domains.\(^{41}\)

As previously mentioned, Jung, Whitehead, and Steiner all converge in seeing the conscious portion of ordinary human experience as only a limited and rarefied expression of a much more complex and comprehensive underlying reality, and they all came to see this underlying reality as partaking of something of the sentience and creativity that characterizes our conscious experience. For Jung and Whitehead, the greater part of this reality is inherently inaccessible to direct conscious experience—except perhaps, for Jung, during extraordinary states—though its existence can be inferred and intuited based on its manifestations in our observable experience. However, all three thinkers were interested in how the limitations of conscious experience could be compensated and the missing elements of this larger reality be integrated into conscious awareness. For Whitehead, the retrieval of the essential dimensions of these missing elements is among the fundamental tasks of philosophy.

Consciousness is only the last and greatest of such elements by which the selective character of the individual obscures the external totality from which it originates and which it embodies. An actual individual, of such higher grade, has truck with the totality of things by reason of its sheer actuality; but it has attained its individual depth of being by a selective emphasis limited to its own purposes. The task of philosophy is to recover the totality obscured by the selection. It replaces in rational experience what has been submerged in the higher sensitive experience and has been sunk yet deeper by the initial operations of consciousness itself. (\textit{PR} 15)

Thus Whitehead's philosophy is itself an attempt to remedy the deficiencies of our ordinary conscious perception through integrating more comprehensive concepts that allow us to both comprehend and feel the deeper processes
that underlie our immediate experience. In this case we do not consciously feel these processes as they occur at their most basic level, but we feel them consciously in a new way through evolving more complex and comprehensive forms of thought and contemplative experience—and in so doing we simultaneously create new and more complexly layered and integrative experiential realities.

For Jung, this integration of unconscious contents and expansion of consciousness is an inherent part of the individuation process. It requires not only expanding our philosophical understanding but also a continuous reorganization and growth of our personalities, at both conscious and unconscious—or perhaps “transconscious”\textsuperscript{42}—levels. This in turn requires integration of disassociated or only partially integrated aspects of personality, often referred to as complexes. It also requires developing a conscious and collaborative relationship with the archetypes, which inform these complexes,\textsuperscript{43} and which as more or less autonomous psychic or spiritual elements of the \textit{anima mundi} shape our lives and experience from both within and around us.\textsuperscript{44} As a practicing psychiatrist, Jung developed multiple methods for facilitating this type of transformation, many of which involve working with dreams and using the imagination to contact deeper levels of psychic process.\textsuperscript{45}

As already alluded to, Jung also had synchronistic and paranormal experiences throughout his life in which the deeper spiritual and archetypal reality of the \textit{anima mundi} would seem to break into his conscious experience.\textsuperscript{46} These were for him important compensations to the limitations of his ordinary conscious perspective, and powerfully informed his worldview, especially as elaborated in a more personal way beyond the limits of his professional scientific empiricism. Yet a great portion of the realms that were manifested through these experiences remained largely a mystery to him, mostly inaccessible to conscious experience and understanding. Thus Jung wrote that, “What we know of the world, and what we are immediately aware of in ourselves, are conscious contents that flow from remote, obscure sources” ("Spirit," 327, para. 624). Similarly, in describing the world of dreams, he writes: “In the waking state the psyche is apparently under the control of the conscious will, but in the sleeping state it produces contents that are strange and incomprehensible, as though they came from another world” ("Psychological Foundations," 306, para. 580). However, according to Jung, even in waking this appearance of control is largely illusory. Thus he writes that: “In our waking life, we
imagine we make our own thoughts and can have them when we want them. We also think we know where they come from, and why and to what end we have them” ("Psychological Foundations," 306, para. 580), “But if we step through the door of the shadow we discover with terror that we are the objects of unseen factors” ("Archetypes," 23, para. 49). Jung usually associates these unseen factors with unconscious complexes, and with the archetypes, and he attempts to bring them into awareness and conscious relationship through more or less direct psychological means. While the nature of these unseen factors remains largely mysterious for Jung, notwithstanding his many insights into the archetypes and the deeper dimensions of psychic process, Steiner has a great deal to say about them and how they can be perceived and are related to consciousness.

According to Steiner, this underlying and encompassing reality that all three thinkers intuit is spiritual in nature and can be observed directly if one develops the necessary faculties of perception. Many people in the modern era do not perceive or believe in such a reality because they have not developed the necessary capacities. For as he writes, "Whether or not we can persuade ourselves of the reality of any being or thing depends on our having an organ of perception, a sense, for it" (Theosophy 93, para. 1). For Steiner, perception of this deeper spiritual reality is a distinct and immediate experience. He follows a similar line of thought to Jung in penetrating to the spiritual reality that lies behind the seemingly disparate physical and psychic domains, but for him this spiritual reality is directly perceptible in its process of shaping and giving rise to these interpenetrating realms of expression. According to Steiner, entering directly into the experience of thinking brings us into this underlying realm of formative spiritual activity.

By increasingly penetrating the experience of thought, one discovers that spiritual reality comes to meet us within this life in thought. One follows the soul’s path into the spirit. But the spiritual reality one meets along this inner soul path is rediscovered as the inner reality of nature. (Autobiography 35)

Thus for Steiner, all of existence is permeated and formed by the activity of spirit, and the natural world disclosed through the senses is only a condensed portion of that spiritual reality revealed in those aspects that are accessible to sensory perception. As Steiner makes clear, this condensed portion of spirit that we know as matter is still guided and pervaded by an active spiritual principle. "However, we must not imagine that the
spiritual element is ever totally transformed into matter; matter is always only a transformed portion of the original spiritual element, which remains the actual guiding principle even while matter is evolving" (Outline 120, para. 6). Thus, for Steiner, as for Whitehead, all of existence is spiritually creative, and all of existence partakes of some degree of consciousness and intentionality. As Steiner states it: "To supersensible perception, there is no such thing as ‘unconsciousness,’ only various degrees of consciousness. Everything in the world is conscious" (Outline 153, para. 30). In fact, for Steiner, the entirety of existence consists of beings and the interrelationships among beings.

However, as stated before, for Steiner this is not merely a theory, but an immediate and continuous experience. In order to perceive this reality of the life of beings directly, one must penetrate behind the habitual appearances that conceal this underlying spiritual activity. He describes this once again in terms of the life of thought, using Plato's familiar metaphor of shadows on the wall of a cave to describe the contrast between our indirect experience of thought and the direct expression of the beings that are active within and behind our thoughts:

But thought as it appears in human beings is only a shadowy image or phantom of its real being. A thought appearing by means of a human brain corresponds to a being in the country of spirit beings as a shadow on the wall corresponds to the actual object casting the shadow. But when our spiritual senses are awakened, we actually perceive the thought being itself, just as our physical eyes perceive a table or a chair. We are surrounded and accompanied by thought beings. (Theosophy 123, para. 35)

For Steiner, a similar contrast holds for nearly all aspects of our experience, though it is easier to penetrate directly into the spiritual reality of thought than it is to penetrate behind the appearances of our material surroundings to the spiritual activity that constitutes them. Steiner offers a method of esoteric science through which this pervasive spiritual reality can be observed and creatively transformed, but this method requires developing the requisite faculties to enter into direct conscious participation in spiritual processes and activities.

It is notable that Jung intuits or experiences many of the spiritual phenomena that Steiner describes, though his perceptions tend to be more intermittent and fleeting. Steiner seems to offer a method whereby it is possible to directly and consistently explore these "transcendent" spiritual
realities, and a vision based on such observation that provides detailed accounts and descriptions of phenomena that Jung more occasionally glimpses and intuits. In describing the transcendent realm of the archetypes, Jung seems to be describing an experience that Steiner would characterize as a direct perception of higher spiritual realms.

For what comes after the door is, surprisingly enough, a boundless expanse full of unprecedented uncertainty, with apparently no inside and no outside, no above and no below, no here and no there, no mine and no thine, no good and no bad. It is the world of water, where all life floats in suspension; where the realm of the sympathetic system, the soul of everything living begins; where I am indivisibly this and that; where I experience the other in myself and the other-than-myself experiences me. ("Archetypes," 21-22, para. 45)

This is similar to many detailed descriptions that Steiner provides of various realms of spiritual being and activity. In relation to the archetypes, Steiner provides descriptions of several ascending levels of archetypal beings and activities, and the role that each of them play in shaping the familiar reality that we observe through our ordinary senses and consciousness.47 In a more general way, Steiner describes the confusion that often meets human consciousness when it ascends for the first time into direct perception of these archetypal spiritual realms:

It is true that looking into this country of spirit beings for the first time is even more confusing than looking into the soul world, because archetypes in their true forms are very unlike their sense-perceptible copies, and they bear equally little resemblance to their "shadows," our abstract thoughts. In the spiritual world, everything is in constant activity, constant motion, constant creation. "Resting" or "staying in one place" does not exist there as it does in the physical world, simply because the archetypes are creative beings, the master builders of everything that comes into existence in the physical and soul worlds. Their forms change quickly, and each archetype has the potential to assume countless specific forms. (Theosophy 124-125, para. 36)

This description echoes both the disorientation that Jung describes in his experience of the archetypal world, and the elusive and multivalent character of the archetypes that Jung so clearly apprehended and expressed. Steiner explains that when one first penetrates into direct perception of spiritual realities, one tends to perceive a unitive realm of interflowing
elements, similar to what Jung describes. It takes time to be able to
differentiate and clearly perceive the specific beings whose activity
constitutes these realms and processes. He also emphasizes the essential
class of direct spiritual experience that Jung expresses in the quote
above when he says, "I experience the other in myself and the other-than-
myself experiences me." This intimate mode of spiritual experience and
communion is fundamental to the moral vision that Steiner's philosophy
expresses, as reflected in his corresponding statement that, "Elemental
devotion is based on the experience of oneself in another being or process;
love is an experience of the other in one's own soul" ("Threshold," 105).
Through entering into a mode of participation in which we mutually share
our lives and the inner lives of other beings, we experience our shared
selfhood and can sensitively and compassionately engage the collaborative
creative process that constitutes our shared reality.

As is evident in the foregoing reflections, Jung, Whitehead, and Steiner
develop both convergent and mutually complementary spiritual approaches
and visions. Whitehead provides philosophical breadth and conceptual
clarity, Jung a wealth of introspective psychological insight and experience,
and Steiner an esoteric vision based on suprasensory spiritual observations
and insights not available to ordinary conscious perception. Not only their
different approaches and orientations but their widely different backgrounds
of experience allow them to contribute different and mutually compensatory
realms of insight, which lend themselves naturally to integration into a
more comprehensive synthesis. The exploration of one such integrative
vision, based on transmuted versions of each of their respective philosophies,
is what follows.

3. An Integrative Vision

3.1 Eros, Self, and Creativity

Some conception of the Self stands at the heart of all three visions
and of this integrative vision that unites them.\textsuperscript{48} For Jung, the Self is the
center of psychic individuality and also an encompassing archetypal
presence and reality that unites all of existence. It is simultaneously the
principle of unity and of individual distinctiveness. Thus he writes that:
“What is meant by the self is not only in me but in all beings, like Atman,
like Tao. It is psychic totality” ("Good, " 463, para. 873). The Self
constitutes the unifying inclusiveness of the *unus mundus*, the one world that paradoxically encompasses all opposites;⁴⁹ the unity of the *anima mundi*, or world soul, which unites all of existence in a developing pattern of relational selfhood and creative interfeeling; and the emergent individuality and self-formative existence of every being at every level of complexity and manifestation. The Self is thus a paradoxical concept, as it can refer to multiple levels of selfhood, experience, and creative agency. Jung therefore writes in his autobiography, "Like every other being, I am a splinter of the infinite deity" (*Memories* 4). This splinter of individual selfhood is an expression of the Self, and so also is the infinite deity of which it is a splinter. All selves are united by their participation in the divine principle of the Self, and in that sense paradoxically share in a single manifold selfhood.

Steiner similarly recognizes this divine Self and its permeation of all existence and the entire cosmic creative process with all of the beings that integrally constitute it. Thus he writes that: "Of course, the 'divine self' is contained in every man. It is in every created being. In stone, plant, and animal, the 'divine self' is also contained and active" (*Stages* 24). This Self manifests itself in many ways and on many levels, and unites these diverse manifestations. The divine Self is inherently present in what Steiner refers to as spirit, which is the dynamic living principle that shapes and constitutes all of existence. As previously explained, matter for Steiner is just a particular manifestation of spirit, often experienced in its outward manifestations through sensory perception and associated modes of thinking in abstraction from its inward creative activity and experiential interiority. "Of that world that the spiritual observer penetrates in this way, the physical is a manifestation. Whatever of the physical world is accessible to the senses and the sense bound intellect is only the outer side" (*Stages* 53). Thus spirit can experience itself directly, as a meeting and sharing of interior selfhoods, or indirectly, as a seemingly independent external manifestation in which the inward spiritual presence is hidden. Steiner therefore describes the way in which the spiritual beings and processes that are caught up in the evolution of the physical universe gradually evolve the forms and capacities through which they can consciously recognize their spiritual nature in its embodied physical context. As he explains, "What makes its way like a drop into the consciousness soul is called the spirit by esoteric science. In this way the consciousness soul is united with the spirit, which is the hidden element in everything manifest"
(Outline 49, para. 19). And as he describes it, "In what fills the consciousness soul, this hidden element steps unveiled into the innermost temple of the soul where it appears as only a drop in the sea of all-pervading spirituality" (Outline 49, para. 18). Thus the extent to which spirit is conscious of its own nature and selfhood depends on the context of its creative manifestations and interrelationships.

A dynamic conception of selfhood is also at the heart of Whitehead's metaphysical vision and of his understanding of the fundamental creative process of concrescence. For Whitehead, the basic elements of existence are self-formative processes, which he calls actual entities or actual occasions, in which the complex plurality of existence is unified in a novel synthesis of feeling and creative self-formation. As Whitehead puts it, "The creative action is the universe always becoming one in a particular unity of experience, and thereby adding to the multiplicity which is the universe as many" (PR 57). In the emergence of novel individualities the Self and its evolving self-formative expressions play a primary role. Thus Whitehead writes that, "ACTUALITY in its essence is aim at self-formation" (MT 96).

In a sense each actual occasion can be seen as a locus through which the divine principle of the Self experiences its own existence in a novel, individual, and creative way, uniting in a new way the plurality of the creative universe that is always simultaneously and paradoxically a unity. As Whitehead explains, "Each actual entity corresponds to a meaning of the 'actual world' peculiar to itself" (PR 28). Thus the entire world process and evolving selfhood of existence assumes a new form in each actual occasion. "Each atom is a system of all things" (PR 36). Thus every constellation of selfhood is an expression of the fundamental creative activity of the entire cosmos and process of existence, and therefore is an expression of the fundamental metaphysical principle that Whitehead conceives as Creativity. Creativity is akin to the notion of spirit in Steiner, in that it is the most basic and pervasive metaphysical principle, of which every specific element is a manifestation. In Whitehead's notions of concrescence and actual occasions, actual occasions are self-formative processes of Creativity, and concrescence is the way in which the manifold expressions of Creativity are gathered into a new unity. Therefore the principles of the Self and Creativity are distinct but inseparable.

Another principle that is implicit in the visions of all three thinkers, and central to this integrative vision, is that of Eros, or relationship.
Every manifestation of selfhood and Creativity is simultaneously a manifestation of Eros, or a pattern of dynamic interrelationship between relatively individualized creative elements. The principle of Eros governs all forms of relationship and their emergent archetypal principles and qualities, including sensitivity, attraction, love, intimacy, and beauty. All manifestations of selfhood and Creativity are both constituted by and participate in patterns of interrelationship governed by the principles of Eros.

The principle of Eros is inherent in Whitehead's notion of actual occasions as patterns of feeling in which the divine creative elements and expressions of selfhood that constitute the contemporary universe are united in a novel synthesis of feeling. As Whitehead explains: "Thus an actual entity combines self-identity with self-diversity" (PR 25). In my creative revisioning of Whitehead's philosophy, I have emphasized that the individuality of the actual occasion is relative, rather than absolute, and that at no point is the actual occasion completely separate from its relational environment and the selfhood of other beings. Whitehead reinforces the coherency of this interpretation when he explains, "Thus the determinateness and self-identity of one entity cannot be abstracted from the community of the diverse functioning of all entities" (PR 25). The actual occasion is a pattern of emergent individuality within the relational creative fabric of existence, shaping and patterning that fabric, but never existing in separation or isolation from it.

Similarly, I have conceived the actual occasion as a dynamically open process, which never exists in a complete, static, or separate form, but opens into and through the processes of other occasions. Thus, as Whitehead emphasizes in *Modes of Thought*, "No actuality is a static fact" (MT 90). All elements of existence are dynamically unfolding relational creative processes. Whitehead reinforces this interpretation later in the same book when he states that, "In separation all meaning evaporates" (MT 97). Every being is what it is by virtue of its complex relationship to every other being in the context of the whole creative process of existence. Thus no being is fundamentally separate from any other, or from the evolving totality of existence.

The interdependence of the principles of Self, Creativity, and Eros is also implicit in Jung's notion of individuation. In some sense individuation is a relatively macrocosmic expression of what Whitehead describes taking place on a microcosmic level in the concrescent processes of actual occasions. Every individuation process is an integration of diverse creative
elements into a novel pattern of individuality, which simultaneously constitutes and is constituted by a novel pattern of dynamic interrelationships. As Jung explains, "Individuation does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself" ("On," 226, para. 432). Individuals are not separate from their environments but are emergent patterns of individual selfhood within a relational creative matrix. From Whitehead's perspective, an individual human being is actually a society of occasions, enjoying a certain commonality and integration of form and purpose (PR 90). In the context of this present vision, the principle of the self pervades all of existence but is more powerfully constellated around certain centers of individualized experience and creative manifestation. Thus the Self expresses itself in a microcosmic form through the concrescence of actual occasions and in a more macrocosmic form through the formation of a partially unified and individualized psyche or conscious personality. In either case, the element of individualization is relative, rather than absolute, and there simultaneously exists an element of plurality and multiplicity within the emergent individuality. This is expressed in Jung's conceptions of psychic complexes, or relatively autonomous elements of the psyche that combine and interact to form the psychic totality. According to this understanding, even the ego is a centralized complex, powerfully constellated around the archetype of the Self.52 Similarly, even an actual occasion is here understood as containing partially autonomous relational creative elements that are part of its inward creative dynamism and paradoxical multiplicity.

This understanding of the interdependence of all three principles is also inherent in Steiner's spiritual vision. For Steiner, all of existence is spiritual, and all spirit is permeated by the divine principle of the Self. All spirit is also creative, and therefore governed and permeated by the principle of Creativity. According to Steiner, the entire spiritual cosmos and all the beings in it are in a constant process of evolution (How 198-199, para. 3). Steiner also sees the entirety of existence as constituted by a pattern of spiritual interrelationships among beings. As Steiner expresses it, "From the point of view of the spiritual world, we face only beings. These beings are the true reality" ("Threshold," 119). Thus the entire world process in which we participate is an evolving spiritual ecology constituted by the interrelationships among the experiences and creative processes of spiritual beings. Steiner describes this in the realm of thought, when he says that, "Thoughts that are beings speak with other thoughts
that are also beings" ("Threshold," 119). For Steiner, this reality becomes apparent whenever we penetrate into the deeper spiritual reality underlying our habituated sensory and cognitive perceptions of any domain of existence.

This understanding is coherent with Whitehead's vision, in which all of existence consists in the dynamic process of creative interfeeling within, between, and among beings. Given the permeation of all of existence by the Self, the strict distinction between actual occasions and groupings of occasions breaks down, and every individualized form participates in some degree of emergent selfhood. Selfhood can therefore be seen as emerging on a creative continuum of more or less powerfully centered, autonomous, and self-formative beings and processes. Whitehead also refers to the basic formative perceptions of other occasions by a concreting occasion as prehensions, and sees these as another category of existence (PR 18-20). However, again, given the permeation of all process by the principle of the Self as posited in this vision, even these basic perceptions of other occasions can be seen as having some degree of emergent selfhood, constituting in some sense a pluralistic dimension of the concretizing occasion. Thus, in accordance with Steiner's vision, the whole process of existence can be seen as constituted by the formative processes of beings and their interactions, and the strict distinction between beings and the patterns formed by the interactions between beings also dissolves, leaving a more seamless creative relational fabric in which patterns of emergent individuality stand out with more or less distinctness. However, despite the breaking down of these strict distinctions, Whitehead's terms remain useful in describing dimensions of process in terms of their contextual and functional significance. Thus one can still describe the prehension of one being or occasion by another without depriving the prehension itself of some degree of potential creative autonomy and selfhood. Similarly, one can talk about groupings of occasions into a society of occasions without precluding the possibility that that society enjoys some significant degree of emergent selfhood.

Another element in Whitehead's vision that here undergoes a similar dissolving of strict categorical boundaries is the concept of eternal objects. While Whitehead conceives of eternal objects as pure potentials, existing in a fixed form in the primordial mind of God (PR 13, 31), potentialities are here conceived as inseparable changing elements of the entire relational flux, existing on a continuum of potentiality and actuality in which some degree of potentiality and actuality are always present. Thus potentiality
is also relative to perspective and context, so that what is highly actualized for one being may be a faint and distant potential for another, and vice versa. This understanding still allows for patterns and forms with a relative consistency and continuity through and across the relational flux of process, such as the formal numerical relations of mathematics and the shapes and proportions of geometry, though these are here understood as inseparable from their relational context and enjoying a different meaning and relational essence depending on their mode of mutually constitutive emergence and participation. These forms do not exist anywhere in a fixed unchanging form, but emerge and transform with the relational flux of process. Attempting to isolate them and remove them from their creative context as emergent patterns within larger emergent patterns would be an example of what Whitehead calls the fallacy of misplaced concreteness, or the treatment of an abstract concept as if it had a separate concrete existence (*SMW* 51).

These patterns of relative formal coherency through and across the creative flux of process are here understood in Jungian terms as archetypes, and are seen as shaping the entire relational creative process, including the inhering continuum of potentiality and actuality. Thus archetypes are not fixed forms but transform and evolve continuously, and are inseparable from their various manifestations and modes of relational creative participation and emergence in the everlasting procession of Creativity. Possibilities, like actualities, do not exist separately from their relational context, and can be more or less individually localized or archetypally pervasive. Thus, just as there is a continuum of actuality and potentiality, so too is there a continuum between the uniquely individual and localized creative manifestations—whether more actual or potential from a given perspective—and the more pervasive archetypal patterns that have a vast multiplicity of specific embodiments and modes of creative participation. However, even when archetypes are broadly pervasive, their evolving patterned relational essence is still unique and irreducible, and in that sense paradoxically individual.

Just as Whitehead envisages the concrescing occasion as synthesizing its prehensions of other occasions through ingression of eternal objects, the creative process can here be understood as involving the establishment of a unique mode of relational feeling to the entire relational creative flux, including both relatively actual and potential, and relatively individual and archetypal dimensions of that reality. Thus a concrescing occasion of
experience feels and relates to other relationally interdependent occasions of experience, and this includes both patterns of possibility and pervasive archetypal patterns, each of which possesses some degree of creative individuality and autonomy. Again, for functional purposes, actualities can be distinguished from potentials and individual entities from archetypes, but it must be remembered that these are not absolute metaphysical distinctions but useful modes of designation and contextual conceptualization. The ways in which the phenomena on the poles of these continua manifest in actual life vary greatly, so that a possibility may perpetually haunt the imagination or escape conscious notice, and an archetype may be a relatively diffuse pattern, barely apprehended, or a powerful constellation of self-formative creativity and awareness, emerging as a deity in human consciousness.\textsuperscript{54} However, all of these manifestations are connected through their irreducible shared relational essence.

In the context of the vision I am here setting forth, every element of existence can also be seen as participating in both the \textit{unus mundus} and \textit{anima mundi}.\textsuperscript{55} These are, in a sense, two faces of the same reality, designating respectively the paradoxical inclusiveness of seemingly opposed and disparate elements, and the emergent selfhood of the entire spiritual creative process. The \textit{unus mundus} is the principle of paradoxical and inclusive openness, and is both self and no self, fullness and emptiness, being and non-being. These are also implicit elements of the \textit{anima mundi}, but the \textit{anima mundi} is characterized by its emergence as the most encompassing constellation of evolving selfhood. Because the \textit{anima mundi}, as cosmic soul, is conceived as encompassing the full range of individual and relational creative manifestations in a paradoxically unified and pluralistic form, it also encompasses conflictual and not fully integrated elements. Thus relative imperfection and evil are elements of the \textit{anima mundi} along with relative perfection and goodness.\textsuperscript{56} The \textit{anima mundi}, along with all of the beings in it, is continually struggling toward greater integration and harmonization of its internal elements. Thus, like every being, the \textit{anima mundi} shapes itself across the continua of actuality and potentiality, and individuality and universality, and contains a dimension of ever changing and inseparable potential. I have designated this potential dimension of the \textit{anima mundi} the primordial ground, or dynamic field of potential, with the understanding that it is inseparable from the more actualized dimension of its nature.

In order to distinguish a more archetypally perfected dimension of
the *anima mundi*, I have also conceived, as a modification of Whitehead's conception of the dipolar nature of God, what I designate as the divine nature, which is characterized by its more exclusive selection and harmonious integration of perceptual feelings and relational creative elements. The divine nature, like the *anima mundi*, is also paradoxically single and manifold because it may consist in a plurality of simultaneous divine envisagements each of which could be integrated into a larger whole with and from the perspective of the others and yet would thereby lose something of its unique selective perfection. Similarly, though it is characterized by a more perfect integration and harmonization of its relational elements than is the more encompassing *anima mundi*, this integration and harmonization is never absolute, and there always remains a multiplicity of irreducible individual and relational elements both within the divine nature and in each of its most expansive self-formative envisagements. Like the *anima mundi*, of which it is itself a more perfected element, the divine nature can also be conceived as having a more potential dimension, though again this is conceived as ever changing and inseparable from the larger whole and its continuum of actuality and potentiality. I have designated the patterns of possibility that constitute this potential dimension as patterns of divine potential or divine potentials. Like the divine nature of which they are elements, these patterns of potential are paradoxically infinite and exclusive in their selective perfection, and are always changing and evolving.

All of these different, overlapping, and interpenetrating divine constellations of existence correspond broadly to different conceptions and experiences of divine reality. The * unus mundus* corresponds to the more impersonal and paradoxical conception of the divine totality expressed in certain understandings of emptiness or Shunyata in Buddhism; the Way or Tao in Taoism; Ein Sof in Kabbalah; and nirguna Brahma in Hindu Vedanta. The *anima mundi* corresponds to a more personal but paradoxical conception of the divine nature, as is expressed in the notion of the Great Spirit in many Native American traditions, or in the conception of a paradoxical God who encompasses evil and imperfection in some of the Gnostic and other Christian mystical traditions. The divine nature corresponds to more traditional monotheistic understandings of a single perfect divine God, though it is here divested of the absoluteness with which it is so often associated in respect to its unity, comprehensiveness of being, omnipotence, omniscience, and static perfection. This is a
3.2 Freedom and Openness

One principle that is fundamental to this entire vision is openness. Being itself is posited, from our always provisional standpoint, as metaphysically open, and this openness is reinforced and reflected by the openness of the existential and phenomenological horizon of our experience. It is this openness that makes creative freedom and novelty possible, and it is through their participation in this openness of being and process that relatively individual beings enjoy both their self, relational, and creative unity with the whole process of existence, and their emergent distinctiveness and autonomy. Therefore, just as individuality, actuality, and unity are relative and paradoxical, manifesting on dynamic continua and through multiple dimensions of existence and selfhood, so too must freedom be relative and paradoxical. Freedom is thus a subtle and elusive concept and phenomenon. Beings that are relatively distinctive and independent enjoy relative degrees of freedom in various creative and relational contexts. Thus freedom can be exercised and experienced, but like all of the great mysteries of existence, it cannot be completely defined or measured. Its nature and extent must largely be ascertained in relation to that which limits it, which can be conceived in terms of various forms of constraint, as well as in relation to that which makes it possible. And as should now be clear, that which limits and that which constrains are aspects of a single reality, so that the very configurations of relational creative process that
potentiate a certain emergence and experience of freedom also provide its relative and relational limitations. If reality itself is a relational creative process, then individual freedom always takes place in the context of relational collaboration with other beings, and the relative freedoms of beings in relationship can variously or simultaneously limit and inform each other. In this sense, freedom is also a quality that characterizes patterns of relationship and creative processes.

Therefore freedom always emerges in relationship both to other beings and to the creative context in which it is exercised and experienced. Jung observed this when exploring the interaction between individual human centers of consciousness and the archetypes that surround and pervade them. As Jung observes, "We find ourselves in best agreement with psychological experience if we concede to the archetype a definite measure of independence, and to consciousness a degree of creative freedom proportionate to its scope" ("Answer," para. 758). In such a situation, both the archetype and the individual human consciousness enjoy a certain degree of relative freedom, and this freedom is relative to the nature and extent of awareness of each entity, to their larger relational context, and to the character of their interaction. An attitude of mutual openness therefore enhances the creative freedom of each being, as well as the freedom of their collaborative relationship and the larger creative process in which they participate. Shared experience and mutual reflection serve to enhance the relational field of awareness that they mutually constitute and in which they individually participate, while a collaborative approach allows them to work together toward the achievement of higher creative manifestations than might be possible in relative isolation—and to do so without the limitations imposed by discordant conflict and unnecessary mutual impediment. In such an interaction both beings are mutually transformed, and their interaction transforms the larger realities in which they participate. This paradigm of relational creative interaction between beings can be extended and modified in its specificity to describe the creative interrelationship between all types of beings in all types of creative contexts. The ethical and aesthetic dimensions and implications of this paradigm will be explored more deeply in a later section of this essay.

As Jung alluded to in the passage quoted above, freedom is relative to the scope and extent of consciousness—or awareness, conceived more broadly—as freedom involves creatively shaping one's self and world in a way that requires selectively feeling and weaving together various
elements and patterns of potential in one's creative context. This is the creative process that Whitehead describes as concrescence. The extent to which a being can creatively transform reality through introducing novel forms of feeling and interrelationship depends on the extent and nature of its organization and creative participation. As beings are not totally separate, they do not simply encompass awareness within themselves, but participate in a pattern of relational creative awareness. Thus a more sophisticated being is able to attune itself in a more complex and creative way to the patterns of creative interrelationship in which it participates, and is able to give rise to and implement a novel creative vision, which depends both upon its unique center of awareness and its capacity to harmoniously participate in larger patterns of creative awareness. Therefore greater complexity of organization is ideally coupled with creative openness and the type of collaborative attunement it potentiates. Neither the creative act nor the exercising of freedom can be entirely localized. Freedom is a quality of participation in a dynamic, open relational creative process.

As just mentioned, the exercising of freedom in the concrescent process involves selectively feeling and weaving together elements and patterns of potential in one's inflowing creative environment. From the perspective of the concrescing being, every element of its constitutive and inflowing environment is a potential for creative feeling and integration. In the context of this revised vision, each of these elements is not merely a potential object forprehension and creative synthesis, but a living and relatively autonomous reality with which the concrescing being must collaboratively interact in the context of its own process of creative self-formation. Thus every process of self-formation is simultaneously a process of mutual formation, and the part that shapes the whole is also shaped by the whole and all its parts. In the process of selecting among creative potentials, all elements in a being's environment and all possible relationships to and between those elements emerge as creative potentials. Thus what is actual from one perspective is a potential from another. Jung describes an aspect of this reality when he states that, “The transcendental psychophysical background corresponds to a ‘potential world’ in so far as all those conditions which determine the form of empirical phenomena are inherent in it” (Mysterium Coniunctio nis 538, para. 769). This potential world corresponds to Steiner's notion of the spiritual world that underlies and gives rise to the physical, as well as to Whitehead's notion of the prehensive background of the emergent extensive material world (SMW
However, just as for Steiner the spiritual not only underlies and constitutes but also permeates the physical world, and for Whitehead the entire reality is a relational creative process, so too is the psychophysiological background that Jung describes inseparable from its more experientially polarized physical and psychic manifestations. Thus the entire relational creative process of existence is simultaneously a potential and a reality, differently configured depending on internal perspective and mode of participation, and is simultaneously the subject and the object of its own relational self-formative process.

Whitehead tends to describe the inflowing environment in terms of the past, which must be synthesized into a new creative feeling by the concrecing entity. Thus he states: "The past is the reality at the base of each new actuality. The process is the absorption into a new unity with ideals and with anticipation, by operation of the creative Eros" (AI 276). This understanding generally implies a relatively linear and unidirectional conception of time, although it could be modified so as to understand the inflowing reality as comprehending a multiplicity of complexly interrelated temporal processes and realities. If there are multiple dimensions and currents of creative process, with corresponding time currents and systems, past and future are relative to perspective, just as are actuality and potentiality, and all of these dimensions of creative process exist as both relative potentials and actualities with which the concrecing being must creatively interact in its concrecent process. The creative Eros that Whitehead describes above can here be understood as corresponding both to the being and its relational context, which are inseparable, and thus to the creative process at all of its interwoven levels of selfhood and interrelationship. This includes the whole of existence, here conceived in terms of the unus mundus or anima mundi, and all of the other emergent levels of selfhood and interrelationship, including the divine nature and the archetypes. Therefore Whitehead asserts that "there always remains the final reaction of the self-creative unity of the universe" (PR 47). Thus the creative process belongs simultaneously to the emerging individuality and to the whole and all of its parts, all of which are interdependent and inseparable. It is the openness of being that unites all of these beings and processes at the most fundamental level, but it is their mode of creative interrelationship that unites them in their unique living specificity. And it is the openness of the individual being that allows it to participate most fully in the freedom and creativity of the larger patterns of selfhood with
whom its being is interwoven.

For Steiner, as for Whitehead, this capacity to openly participate in the creative freedom and process of more encompassing beings—here understood as including the anima mundi at the broadest level—is what grants the individual being its measure of creative freedom. As Steiner describes, "I saw in the human personality the center where the human being unites with the utmost primordial being of the world. From that center springs the will, and when the clear light of spirit is active in that center, the will is free" (Autobiography 71-72). This description seems to involve a paradox, for the individual being enjoys its creative freedom through participation in the freedom of the primordial being, and this requires both openness to that reality and some form of integration of that creative freedom into its own unique mode of creative participatory self-formation. In order for this participation to be free, it must involve a collaborative relationship to that encompassing being, and there must therefore be a mutual participation and collaboration that honors the irreducible yet interconnected selfhoods and freedoms of both participating beings. Thus freedom requires both distinctive individuality and irreducible openness, emergent autonomy and collaborative relational unity, always manifesting in transformative mutual participation.

The capacity to engage in this mode of open and honoring mutual participation requires a transcendence of the ordinary limitations of consciousness and the corresponding limited modes of conscious self-identification, and an expansion into higher, deeper, and broader modes of selfhood. Thus Steiner states, "In each of us there dwells a deeper being in whom the free human comes to expression (Intuitive 157, para. 38). Through opening to this deeper self within us, we simultaneously open into the deeper and broader selfhood of all existence. And through this opening we also come into deeper contact and creative communion with all of the other beings that participate within and constitute this larger reality. This process therefore requires and creates a vast extension of consciousness and self-identification, and releases us from the narrow bounds of our individual concerns and identifications.

Once this love of freedom has become a soul habit, we ourselves become free of all that is connected only with capacities of an individual, personal nature. We cease to look at things from our own separate, particular point of view. The boundaries set by the narrow self, which chain us to this perspective, vanish. And the mysteries of
the spiritual world may enter our inner life. (How 139, para. 27)

This process corresponds to an enlargement of vision and identity that both Jung and Whitehead describe in their respective works, as alluded to in section one of this essay. It is not that we cease to have individual perspectives, but that these perspectives are no longer bound and limited by a sense of separateness and narrow identity; rather, they open into the living perspectives, experiences, and dimensions of selfhood that we share with other beings. However, as both Jung and Steiner describe, this process of expansion and enlargement of perspective has no final end, and our understanding, freedom, and creative influence are always shaped by our level of development and mode of evolving relational creative participation.63

One limiting factor that Steiner describes in relation to human freedom has to do with the concept of karma. For Steiner, as in many spiritual traditions, our actions have effects which shape our relationship to the unfolding relational creative process. As he states, "I am a different person in my relationship to the world once I have made an impression on my environment" (Theosophy 66, para. 4). In attempting to describe how this process works, he queries, "Could it be that the results of our actions, whose character has been impressed on them by the "I," have a tendency to come back to the "I" in the same way that an impression preserved in memory comes to life again when an outer circumstance evokes it?" (Theosophy 66, para. 4). That is to say, our actions always take place in relationship and evoke responses from our relational community and environment. In this sense, we are bound and limited by the types of relationship that we have created and the responses that we have evoked in our fellow beings and ecological communities. For Steiner, this pattern of relational associations and causal influences carries over from life to life through reincarnation, so that the reincarnating soul is shaped from the beginning by the karma that it has accumulated in successive incarnations. In the context of this integrative vision, we can see the potential interaction of many different strands and patterns of individual and relational karma, so that a more encompassing principle can be adduced. All that we do affects the whole and our unique selfhood and participation within the relational creative process that constitutes that whole, and therefore our freedom, integrity, and unfolding spiritual reality depend on how we live and relate at every moment. In this sense we are inseparable not only from our past selves but from all selves, and must take responsibility for multiple
levels of interacting karma that correspond to multiple levels of interacting selves, relationships, and creative processes. The moral and aesthetic implications of this understanding are in one sense immediately apparent, but are also worthy of more sustained and in-depth consideration.

3.3 Epistemology, Ethics, and Creative Participation

As should now be clear, the integral shared identity and co-creative participation of all beings in the single, paradoxical relational creative process has important epistemological and ethical implications. All knowing must be understood as taking place in relationship and in the context of a mode of relational creative participation in the whole process of existence. Every way of being and unique pattern of creative participation constitutes a different way of knowing and a different mode of experience, as well as a unique mode of relationship and creative activity. Thus knowing is inseparable from its relational participatory context, and the act of knowing cannot be entirely localized but belongs to beings in collaborative communities and ecological patterns of interrelationship, and at its broadest level to the entire relational process of existence. Another essential implication of this epistemological vision is that every participatory act of knowing is also an act of creation, which transforms the very reality that is being known and experienced. The act of knowing is inherently and inescapably a creative participatory act, which transforms the reality it comes to know through this act of creative participation. And given the interconnection and integral nature of all beings in the whole process of creation, every act of knowing transforms the whole of existence and every being within it. Also, because all creation is co-creation, every participatory process of knowing is also a process of co-creation, with specific beings and communities, and with the whole of existence. Thus the process of knowing has profound aesthetic and ethical dimensions. We are shaping the whole of existence together at every moment.

This epistemological understanding also has paradoxical implications with respect to the limits of knowledge, especially as regards any claims to certainty or exhaustive understanding. If existence is in a continual process of transformation, and all knowledge is bound and shaped by its relational participatory context, then certain and complete knowledge of the whole changing reality from a limited and situated vantage point does
not appear to be possible. Correspondingly, if every element of existence is what it is in its complex relationship to every other element in the whole process of existence, then no single element can be known in its full living complexity, and any interpretation of any element from a given participatory perspective must inherently be provisional and incomplete. Thus paradoxically, though all knowledge is ultimately shared by the integral participatory process of all beings in the whole process of creation, these processes of knowing are dynamic, interflowing, and irreducible, and complete and certain knowledge of the whole or its parts from a given vantage point is not attainable. However, as explicated before, every way of knowing is also a creative participatory act, so each act of knowing also enriches, transforms, and adds to the reality of what is known. Each act of knowing constitutes a novel creative relationship and a new reality. In this context it does not make sense to seek absolute, certain, and complete knowledge, for these attributes seem to be incompatible with the nature of existence and knowing themselves. Rather, it makes sense to seek ways of knowing that are attuned, creatively enhancing, and mutually honoring. Every act of knowing has the potential to bring us into deeper and more beautiful relationship to other beings, to our own unfolding selves and creative processes, and to the spiritual mystery of existence. Every participatory process of knowing has the potential to deepen the intimacy and beauty of existence itself.

The preceding discussion provides a broad ontological and epistemological overview, but many dimensions of this noetic process remain to be explored. The basic elements discussed in the preceding paragraphs can also be illuminated in greater depth in the context of exploring the specific insights and perspectives offered by the thinkers upon whose integrative engagement this vision is based. Each of these thinkers became increasingly aware over the course of their lives of the inherent limitations that appertain to any claims to comprehensive knowledge, and of the corresponding need for openness and humility in the realm of inquiry and speculative thought. Thus Whitehead observed repeatedly that all knowledge is inherently incomplete and that "the closed system is the death of living understanding" (MT 83). Similarly, Jung saw claims to absolute or certain knowledge regarding the deeper metaphysical character of existence as unfounded and delusional, based on possession by limited and distorting psychological complexes or archetypal forces. “If we are convinced that we know the ultimate truth concerning metaphysical
things, this means nothing more than that archetypal images have taken possession of our powers of thought and feeling, so that these lose their quality as functions at our disposal” (Mysterium Coniunctionis 551-552, para. 787). For Jung, as for Whitehead, these epistemological limitations are connected to the limitations of the consciousness of the knower, as well as to the illimitable complexity of what is known.

This paradox becomes immediately intelligible when we realize that there is no conscious content which can with absolute certainty be said to be totally conscious, for that would necessitate an unimaginable totality of consciousness, and that in turn would presuppose an equally unimaginable wholeness and perfection of the human mind. So we come to the paradoxical conclusion that there is no conscious content which is not in some other respect unconscious. ("On," 187-188, para. 385)

Because every element of existence is what it is in its complex relationship to every other element and the whole process of existence, no element can be known it its totality, and every relatively clear and conscious perception is also inescapably linked to perceptions that are less conscious and clear. Thus the apparent clarity of consciousness is to some extent illusory and always takes place against a background of mystery and uncertainty. This mystery and uncertainty therefore pervades that which is most clearly perceived and known. Even the visible is mysterious in the light of the invisible. Whitehead makes a similar observation when he describes how "elements which shine with distinctiveness, in some circumstances, retire into penumbral shadow in other circumstances, and into black darkness on other occasions" (PR 15). Not only is conscious perception limited, but it is never in a position to know just how limited it is. Mystery is the background and shadowed face of all knowledge.

While each of these thinkers perceives the limitations of conscious perception somewhat differently in the context of his respective philosophical vision, these perceptions can easily be united in the context of this integrative vision. Jung's concept of the unconscious—which can be extended to include the transconscious domain of the archetypes and anima mundi—corresponds to Whitehead's understanding of the prehensive background of all conscious perception, and to Steiner's understanding of the deeper encompassing spiritual reality within and behind all limited sensory, or even spiritual, perceptions. Thus for each of them, what is consciously experienced at any given moment is only a limited manifestation
of a vast and interconnected underlying and pervading reality. When Jung writes, "For, in the last analysis, psychic life is for the greater part an unconscious life that surrounds consciousness on all sides—a notion that is sufficiently obvious when one considers how much unconscious preparation is needed, for instance, to register a sense-impression" ("Archetypes," 27, para. 57), this applies equally to the understandings of all three thinkers, as well as to this integrative vision. While this understanding provides limitations to claims to knowledge, it is also capable of extending the field of what it is possible to know, since knowledge is not limited to conscious perception, and consciousness has an illimitable field of interconnected experience on which to draw in the formation and informing of its perceptions.

This perception of the interconnectedness and inseparability of all phenomena is also common to all three thinkers. Thus Whitehead observed that "Any knowledge of the finite always involves a reference to infinitude" (MT 44). Jung came to a very similar conclusion regarding the character of knowledge when he observed that:

The psychoid nature of the archetype contains very much more than can be included in a psychological explanation. It points to the sphere of the unus mundus, the unitary world, towards which the psychologist and the atomic physicist are converging along separate paths, producing independently of one another certain analogous auxiliary concepts. Although the first step in the cognitive process is to discriminate and divide, at the second step it will unite what has been divided, and an explanation will be satisfactory only when it achieves a synthesis. ("Conscience," 452, para. 852)

Thus all knowledge requires both discernment and discrimination, on the one hand, and perception of the larger context and relation to the whole, on the other. And, as already pointed out, neither of these processes can ever be completely certain or complete, as the full relationship of any element of experience both to other elements and to the whole is never knowable, and therefore the knowledge of each element itself is also incomplete. This understanding therefore calls for a more holistic and provisional mode of interpretation in which perspectives are elaborated as meaningful and enhancing modes of creative interrelationship rather than as claims to exhaustive knowledge.

This same limitation and realization applies to self-knowledge, both in respect to the more limited individual self and to the encompassing Self
of all existence. Both Jung and Steiner frequently emphasize the importance of self-knowledge for human life. For Jung, self-reflection and self-knowledge are essential to the individuation process, and for Steiner they are essential to the process of higher spiritual development. In order to enter with consciousness into higher realms of perception, one must cultivate a capacity for honest and lucid self-perception, and this includes eventually perceiving one's own soul directly on a spiritual level. As Steiner succinctly states, "In order to proceed further, it is essential to pass through the experience of spiritually seeing our own soul" (How 144, para. 34). However, the attainment of self-knowledge, on both a psychological and spiritual level, is a continuous process, without a final end. Therefore Jung writes that:

There is little hope of our ever being able to reach even approximate consciousness of the self, since however much we may make conscious there will always exist an indeterminate and indeterminable amount of unconscious material which belongs to the totality of the self. Hence the self will always remain a supraordinate quantity. ("Relations," 177, para. 274)

Thus while self-reflection and self-awareness are crucial to human life, acknowledgement of the limitations of self-knowledge is also crucial to true self-awareness. Steiner reaches a similar conclusion in the context of spiritual development when he observes, "Regardless of what level we have reached on the path to supersensible worlds, there are always still higher levels where we will perceive ever more of the higher self, which can therefore reveal itself only partially at any given level" (Outline 368, para. 55). Thus the Self remains an infinite continuously unfolding mystery, even to itself. The process of attaining self-awareness is an everlasting and ever deepening creative pursuit. As many sages have observed, the more we know, the more we realize that we do not know. However, this is not merely a limitation but an opening to infinite discovery.

In respect to the actual limitations and potentials of human experience and perception, Jung, Whitehead, and Steiner all converge in the perspective that direct sensory perception represents only a limited dimension of human awareness and experience. For Jung, the existence of the archetypes, the collective unconscious, and the unus mundus, and the evidence of synchronicity and paranormal experience, suggest that an individual's immediate sensory and bodily awareness takes place against a background of deeper spiritual and archetypal influences and interconnections that are
not limited by the laws and habits that ordinarily govern material processes and their concomitant sensory perceptions ("On," 215-216, para. 418-420). If human life and experience take place within the spiritually animate world of the anima mundi, then the emergent laws, habits, and structures governing the intermediate manifestations of material reality act as a limited interference pattern for the deeper and more pervasive spiritual interconnections and creative impulses of the underlying spiritual world.66 This underlying reality can erupt into physical manifestation in the form of synchronicities and paranormal occurrences, and can be directly perceived psychically by psychologically sensitive and open individuals.

Whitehead's metaphysical philosophy and theory of perception also provides a way of understanding this broader reality and how it can manifest experientially in ways that transcend the ordinary emergent laws and habits that govern the observable material world. For Whitehead, the underlying reality is one of dynamic creativity and self-creative interfelling. The material world as we know it is an emergent dimension of this deeper creative feeling process, including the correspondingly emergent space-time continua. Every concrescing occasion prehends the entire inflowing creative process and all of its integral elements, and sensory perception and conscious awareness as we know them are only highly derivative modes of emergent experience and perception. In principle, all of the processes in the creative universe are accessible to direct perception, and are indeed perceived at highly subliminal prehensive levels. What is more rare in human life is that non-sensory or extrasensory perceptions of less environmentally immediate realities reach human awareness in a recognizable form.67 Since the perceptual process inherent in concrescence involves many level of synthesis, selection, and refinement, it is unlikely that awareness of spatially, temporally, and experientially distant events will pass through the massive filter of emphasis on immediate sensory and psychic data. Synchronicities and paranormal events can be explained in a similar manner, as representing an emergence of underlying archetypal and spiritual processes of creative interfelling into the dimension of relational creative process that constitutes the physical world. The "laws" of physics are better understood as emergent tendencies and habits,68 which are reinforced by continuous patterns of creativity and perception but which can be shaped or altered by the emergence of underlying creative processes. Thus the emergence of a pattern of underlying perception can shape material process in a synchronistic manner that does not violate
ordinary physical principles but is perceptible to consciousness, or on rare occasions, it can alter or interrupt the functioning of those principles. Though Whitehead himself does not devote much space to exploring such phenomena, they are easily explicable within his theory of perception.

For Steiner, the reality of processes and experiences that transcend the laws that ordinarily govern material processes and corresponding sensory perceptions and cognitive activities is central to his philosophical and spiritual vision. On a metaphysical level, such spiritually transcendent processes are the rule, and ordinary material reality and sensory perception of its elements are the derivative exception, which only appear as the necessary rule from a very limited vantage point. For Steiner, every human being has the potential to develop capacities for consciously experiencing spiritual realities that transcend the ordinary material realm. However, to do so requires developing spiritual organs of perceptions that are analogous to our sensory ones. Even ordinary sensory perception and consciousness, for Steiner, already employ and depend on a certain degree of direct spiritual and clairvoyant perception and development. As he frequently emphasizes, our very experience of selfhood, of having what Steiner refers to as our sense of "I," depends upon a direct spiritual intuition. Similarly, sensory perceptions are spiritual perceptions, but of a limited type that we are accustomed to having. We do not recognize the deeper spiritual processes that are inherent in these perceptions or that have shaped their spiritual development over time. Steiner makes a similar observation in relation to the process of thinking. He points out that we are already participating more directly in transcendent spiritual realities when we consciously inhabit the experience of thinking and when we engage in a kind of intuitive and contemplative thinking that is less reliant on sensory perception. Through higher spiritual development we can learn to perceive these underlying spiritual processes directly. Thus Steiner asserts, "Knowledge of the inner being within us can also come only from intuition" (Outline 339, para. 41). In saying this, he is referring primarily to the deeper self-knowledge that arises through developing higher faculties of spiritual perception, but this also applies to the nature and degree of self-awareness and inner experience that we already enjoy.

Though Whitehead's descriptions of the creative process and its emergent universe of beings and their organically structured interrelationships are focused primarily on those aspects of that reality that are disclosed through ordinary sensory perception, inner observation, and contemplative
thought, they can also be extended to encompass the types of extrasensory and paranormal experiences that were more formative for both Jung and Steiner. For Steiner, the complex spiritual cosmos consists of multiple dimensions and levels of existence, and of multiple corresponding processes and modes of being, including different dimensions or bodies of the human being. Thus for Steiner, there are physical, etheric, astral, mental, and a series of ascending spiritual worlds, and elements of the human makeup that correspond to each of these levels, or to those levels of spiritual manifestation for which the human being has developed functioning bodies. There are also specific beings, or aspects of spiritual beings, that correspond to each of these dimensions and interconnected worlds. The existence of trans-physical dimensions of reality is also implicit in Jung’s transgressive vision of the archetypes, the collective unconscious, and the unus mundus—and here of the anima mundi—although he is much less specific in his description of those realities and how they are structured. Though Whitehead does not directly address such trans-physical realities, except on the most abstract level, his philosophy does not require the type of material universe that we observe around us, nor need it be limited to the type of material processes and beings we are used to perceiving within it (PR 91). Thus it is easy within his process philosophy to conceive of etheric, astral, and spiritual dimensions of the relational creative process, and of archetypal and spiritual beings that do not manifest themselves on the emergent material plane. Perception of these beings, planes, and dimensions of reality on the most basic level would rest on the same type of prehensive process as ordinary conscious and sensory perception, and if these perceptions of alternate dimensions of creative process were differentiated into clear patterns of discrete quasi-sensory and conscious perception, they would require corresponding organs and modes of higher order derivative perception, as Steiner suggests. Thus, drawing on Whitehead’s model of perception, it might be argued that we are already prehending all of these additional dimensions of creative process but that we do not consciously perceive them both because we have not developed the requisite organs and modalities of higher order perception, and because we are used to selectively attending to the material and sensory sphere of our experience.

Steiner describes something very similar to this when he discusses the gradual formation of our faculties for higher spiritual perception, which often takes place subliminally and in the less encumbered spaces
of our dreams and deep sleep. As these faculties are gradually developed, we realize that subtle spiritual processes and perceptions are taking place within us all the time. As he describes it,

In other words, we must realize that, in addition to our ordinary, conscious, daytime life, we also lead a second, unconscious life in this other dream world. We engrave or imprint everything we perceive or think onto this other world—but we can see these imprints only if our lotus flowers have been developed. These lotus flowers, of course, are always present in us, but only in a skeletal, undeveloped form. We cannot perceive anything with them in our waking state because the impressions made upon them in that state are very weak. The reason for this is similar to why we do not see the stars by day. Namely, their light is too weak when compared with the powerful light of the sun. In the same way, the weaker impressions of the spiritual world count for very little when compared to the powerful impressions of the physical senses. (How 153-154, para. 2)

We have evolved the senses and cognitive capacities to perceive and function in the material world around us, and must evolve further to consciously and sensitively experience the spiritual realities that pervade and surround these material processes and their associated modes of perception.

According to Steiner, these higher faculties of spiritual perception also correspond to more evolved modes of spiritual creative process. As we develop these faculties we evolve into deeper forms of intimacy and collaborative relationship. Steiner describes a series of ascending modes of perception that disclose deeper and more intimate spiritual realities and potentiate subtler and more intimate modes of relational creative participation and communion.

Students of the spirit rise to this level of knowledge step by step. Imagination brings us to the point where we no longer feel that perceptions are external qualities of beings; instead, we recognize in them the emanations of something that is soul-spiritual in character. Inspiration leads us still further into the inner nature of beings and teaches us to understand what these beings are for each other. In intuition, we penetrate into the beings themselves. (Outline 338, para. 41)

Because of this increasing intimacy and sensitivity of creative communion, a corresponding degree of moral development is also necessary. As Steiner explains, "The more spiritual the worlds that you enter, the more the moral and the 'natural' laws of those worlds coincide" ("Way,"
49). As our earlier epistemological explorations suggest, all perceptions and participatory acts have aesthetic and moral dimensions, but the more directly and intimately we commune with other spiritual beings, the more direct and apparent becomes the connection between the moral and the practical dimensions of our actions. Without the illusion of an entirely inanimate and impersonal material reality mediating our interactions, the moral implications of all that we do become both more apparent and more immediate. Also, as in human relationships, the greater the intimacy and interdependence, the more care, sensitivity, and responsibility is needed.

As Steiner points out, this is true not only on a moral, but also on a functional and aesthetic level.

The more levels of cognition we attain, the more we need to be able to listen attentively, calmly, and reverently. For the work of cognizing the truth—indeed, all activity and life in the world of the spirit—is infinitely more subtle and delicate than what we do in the course of our ordinary life and thinking in the physical world. The further our horizon expands, the subtler the work we must perform. (How 105-106, para. 14)

Not only the practical and moral, but along with them the aesthetic dimensions of existence become more clearly and sensitively integrated. However, as Steiner repeatedly emphasizes, this care and attention is something that we bring not only to every moment and movement of spiritual creative relationship but also something that must be cultivated over time. Thus he clearly states, "We come to the insight that we are causing damage to the whole world and all the beings in it when we do not develop our own forces in the right way" (Outline 24, para. 19). Similarly, Steiner explains that we will not be able to develop certain faculties and enter into conscious creative interrelationship with certain types of spiritual beings if we have not developed ourselves in the right way on a moral and spiritual level. Thus he describes the type of spiritual practice and development that is necessary to develop our character and abilities in the right way.

The work of this kind of meditation is to bring the soul to a state that opens a doorway into the spiritual world. That doorway will remain closed, no matter how ingenious the thinking or how fully scientific the approach, unless the soul prepares to advance to meet the approaching spiritual experiences. ("Threshold," 69)

If we have not developed enough spiritually, we will be incapable both
of entering into more subtle modes of spiritual perception and relationship, and of honoring the moral and aesthetic sensitivities of our collaborative interactions.  

As was pointed out earlier, part of the sensitivity and spiritual maturity that we must bring to our participatory perceptions and interactions involves openness and humility. As Steiner expresses it, "Only a person who has passed through the gate of humility can ascend to the heights of the spirit" (How 17, para. 7). For with the greater subtlety of our perceptions comes greater potential for error, and with the greater intimacy of our creative interactions comes greater need for receptivity and sensitivity. This humility and openness includes our attitude of relative certainty regarding our interpretations and claims to knowledge. For, as Jung observes, “That the world inside and outside ourselves rests on a transcendent background is as certain as our own existence, but it is equally certain that the direct perception of the archetypal world inside us is just as doubtfully correct as that of the physical world outside us” (Mysterium Coniunctionis 551, para. 787). What he says of the archetypal world corresponds almost entirely to what Steiner refers to as the spiritual world, and the principle of uncertainty and need for humility and openness extends to all perceptions at all levels of relational creative participation and existence. Indeed, the more intimate and subtle the mode of relational participation, the more important the subjective and interpretive dimension of our perceptions becomes, and the more we must be open to be continually corrected and informed by receptive and inter-reflective communication. And here, as elsewhere, we both discover and create reality through participatory interactions and perceptions, and this creative dimension of our actions inherently requires even more care and sensitivity than the perceptual dimension, from which it is metaphysically and functionally inseparable. The more deeply we live, experience, and create together, the more openly and sensitively must we relate.

Another dimension of perception that is worth noting again here is its pervasively symbolic character. Because all beings and processes are interconnected, interdependent, and inseparable aspects of a single reality and relational creative process, every element reflects and flows into every other. In this sense all of reality is symbolic, manifesting a unique creativity and emerging individuality, and reflecting a world of creative interrelationships, each of which mirrors, informs, and transforms the others. Human language, thought, and experience are likewise pervaded
by symbols and symbolic modes of experience and communication. Steiner also describes the need to develop specific symbolic languages in order to perceive and interact with specific spiritual beings and types of beings, just as Jung observed that deeper psychic and spiritual realities often manifest themselves through symbols. As Jung describes it:

But when the idea or principle involved is inscrutable, when its intentions are obscure in origin and in aim and yet enforce themselves, then the spirit is necessarily felt as an independent being, as a kind of higher consciousness, and its inscrutable, superior nature can no longer be expressed in the concepts of human reason. Our powers of expression then have recourse to other means; they create a symbol. ("Spirit," 335-336, para. 643)

Jung seems to be describing a spontaneous process that corresponds closely to the formation and learning of symbolic languages that Steiner describes as a natural element in the course of learning to perceive and interact in higher dimensions of spiritual creative activity.

This occult script is inscribed forever in the spiritual world. Once the soul has attained spiritual perception, the script is revealed to it. But we do not learn to read this occult alphabet in the same way that we learn to read an ordinary human alphabet. Rather, it is as if we grow toward clairvoyant knowing, and while we grow, there develops in us—as a soul faculty—a force impelling us to decipher, as if they were the characters of a script, the events and beings of the spiritual world present before us. (How 72, para. 9)

And as Whitehead points out, all such symbols are both expressive and creative. "But the expressive sign is more than interpretable. It is creative. It elicits the intuition which interprets it" (RM 132-133). Thus the creation and use of symbols is a fundamental aspect of the creative as well as the communicative process, and communication is itself a form of creation. And as Jung repeatedly observed, symbols are best understood as pointing both to what is visible and known in our experience, and to the ever-present mystery of which the visible and known is a limited and mysterious expression. Every being and every aspect of our experience is a living mystery, regardless of the depth with which we come to know it. Thus, as Steiner observes, we "must always be ready to receive a new revelation from each and every being and thing" (How 81, para. 21). Every being and experience is a face of mystery and openness.
3.4 Good, Evil, and Beauty in Divine Evolution

Among the great challenges of existence is that of navigating the paradox of the unity and multiplicity of divine selfhood and identity. There is in a sense a single divine, manifold self-relational creative process, always shaping and discovering itself in new forms of identity and creative interrelationship. However, this process can also be understood as an existential multiplicity, in which each emergent expression of selfhood, creativity, and relationship has an irreducible sanctity and uniqueness whose fullness and sensitivity cannot be completely honored through subsuming it in a large whole of identity and creative process. Within this diversity of creative expressions and identities there are conflicting aims and desires, misunderstandings, mutual clashes and estrangements, feelings of fear, anger, and alienation, and narrow and mutually exclusive modes of self-identification, leading to fragmentation and suffering on a cataclysmic level. It is therefore one of the great challenges of existence to navigate these paradoxes and complexities—of unity and multiplicity, shared identity and unique individuality, collaboration and relatively free and autonomous self-direction and expression. How can self-diversity and self-unity be harmonized, every unique and irreducible creative self-expression be brought into a higher harmony in the whole indivisible process of divine relational self-creation? This would seem to be an ongoing challenge, with no final static solution or ending point. It is in some sense the fundamental challenge of existence. However, there also seem to be creative living visions and modes of identification and relationship that can help make the more beautiful fulfillments of this challenge possible.

Another fundamental question that may be asked regarding existence is what its inherent aim and purpose is, whence it derives its essential meaning and value. In its unique and irreducible living specificity, the answer to this question seems to be an eternally open and ineluctable mystery, incapable of adequate conception or articulation, eternally unfolding and unbounded. Nonetheless, there again seem to be emerging principles and visions that can help guide the unfolding of this mysterious eternal process. In speaking thus of these broadest principles, we hover at the threshold where all definitions dissolve into luminous living mystery. Therefore this type of contemplation must of necessity be a kind of poetic meditation, in which the deeper transcendent meanings are discerned and intuited, rather than grasped with narrow and literal conceptual interpretations.
In the context of my own contemplation, beauty emerges as among the highest principles guiding and harmonizing the whole process of creation—beauty of divine selfhood, experience, and expression; beauty of divine collaboration, Eros, and intimacy; and beauty of divine cosmic creative process, eternally creating new worlds of beauty and mystery for divine self-discovery and communion. This broadest conception of beauty is, like all intuitions expressed in words—which ultimately point back to the ineffable mystery—in its fullest essence indefinable, but it is reflected in an elusive sense of beauty that pervades time and cultures in its many shades and variations, and in a mysterious harmony and mutual enhancement of interrelationships between the inseparable elements that constitute existence.

The recognition of beauty as among the highest principles guiding the whole process of creation is among the central insights of Whitehead's mature philosophical and spiritual vision. Thus he states unequivocally that "the teleology of the universe is directed to the production of Beauty" (AI 265) and that "beauty is left as the one aim which by its very nature is self justifying" (AI 266). He also recognizes that beauty is ultimately more important than truth, since a perception can be relatively true and yet not creative of a more beautiful reality, while the value of truth itself is that it leads to and reflects a more beautiful mode of relationship and creative expression. Thus he asserts emphatically that "Truth matters because of Beauty" (AI 267). Truth nonetheless retains an important secondary value as a means of connecting the relational elements of existence through mutual knowledge and experience in the service of intimacy and creative collaboration. Whitehead therefore poetically describes the power of truth to uncover and elicit deeper understanding and resources for creative engagement. "A grave defect in truth limits the extent to which any force of feeling can be summoned from the recesses of Reality. The falsehood thus lacks the magic by which a beauty beyond the power of speech to express can be called into being, as if by the wand of an enchanter" (AI 283). Thus deeper truthfulness often corresponds and leads to deeper beauty, but where truth and beauty conflict, beauty is the higher divine guiding principle.

Beauty also emerges as the highest guide in the realm of morality and value, in some sense encompassing and subsuming the concept of the good. For what is good is so because it leads to greater spiritual beauty—of selfhood, of relationship, and of creation. As Whitehead explains it, "All order is therefore aesthetic order, and the moral order is merely certain
aspects of the aesthetic order" (RM 105). What is generally understood as morally good and right is that which leads to and reflects the most beautiful mode of spiritual relationship with other beings, honoring their sanctity, value, and sensitivity. This is beauty in the realm of relationship, and it is ultimately inseparable from beauty in the realms of selfhood and creativity, for what is most beautiful honors the selfhoods of all beings in their complex creative interrelationships, and the beauty of every being and pattern of relationship depends upon its participation in the beauty of the whole process of creation. In each of these realms, and in their complex interconnection, what is good and right is what is most beautiful. Whitehead therefore states that "The real world is good when it is beautiful" (AI 268). Thus beauty is a pervasive principle, and morality is an essential dimension of beauty. It could also be argued that all creative activity and all beauty are moral, as well as aesthetic, since all actions and modes of creative relationship have moral dimensions and consequences. In this sense the good and the beautiful, the moral and the aesthetic, are inseparable. Whitehead reflects a similar insight when he states that: "Expression is the one fundamental sacrament. It is the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace" (RM 131). The creative beauty of existence has a divine moral value and is a sacred reflection of a divine mode of spiritual communion and interrelationship. For this reason, conversely, Steiner observes that "inner experience is the only key to the beauties of the outer world" (HOW 22, para. 13). All creation is a living symbol for the divine interior meeting that constitutes it and through which it is itself experienced.

Based on all that has been said thus far, the fundamental aim of existence would appear to be the eternal deepening of self-relational creative beauty. As Whitehead describes it, "The essence of power is the drive towards aesthetic worth for its own sake...It constitutes the drive of the universe. It is efficient cause, maintaining its power of survival. It is final cause, maintaining in the creature its appetite for creation" (MT 119). However, the extent to which all of creation aligns itself with this higher aim is another issue, as is the challenge of harmonizing the multitudinous creative impulses toward achievement of this divine aim. Also, what is habitual and practically functional on one level may inhibit creative innovation and the deepening of relational beauty and intimacy on another, while vision and creative activity that is out of harmony with the dynamic relational processes that underlie it may prove to be impractical
and therefore destructive. Similarly, there are many possible obstacles that arise from distorted perceptions and mutually inhibiting and destructive modes of relationship. Thus we return to the moral, aesthetic, and practical challenge of harmonizing diverse selfhoods and creative impulses toward achievement of a higher beauty and wholeness.

As we have already seen, what is moral is what honors the relational dynamics, potentials, and sensitivities of each context of creative interaction, having reference to the multiple complex levels of selfhood, relationship, and creative participation being enacted. Thus both what is moral and what is aesthetic should ideally enhance the beauty of the creative participatory process on all of these levels. As Whitehead expresses it, "The selectiveness of individual experience is moral so far as it conforms to the balance of importance disclosed in the rational vision; and conversely the conversion of the intellectual insight into an emotional force corrects the sensitive experience in the direction of morality" (PR 15). Morality has to do with value, and a moral action aims toward and achieves an enhancement of moral and aesthetic values in each situation. However, there can be a discrepancy between moral intentions and outcomes, as intentions may be based on faulty understandings, or they may be rendered ineffectual by circumstances beyond the control of the beings that are attempting to realize them. For this reason, while the achievement of perfect knowledge and skill adequate to all creative situations and challenges is an unattainable ideal, there would seem to be a moral imperative to develop attuned knowledge, awareness, and capacities for relational creative engagement that support and potentiate the formation and achievement of higher creative aims. Ignorance, obliviousness, incompetence, and insensitivity can be both the expressions and contributing causes of moral failures. Developing and implementing moral aims seems to be the primary foundation of moral behavior—along with a fundamental sense of compassion and attuned awareness—and this requires having a sense of importance and value that reflects the complex balance of creative and relational dynamics in a situation.

One way of understanding that which is bad or immoral in a situation is that which sacrifices a greater good and beauty for a lesser one, thereby tending toward diminution of the total beauty of existence. As Whitehead expresses it, "Evil, triumphant in its enjoyment, is so far good in itself; but beyond itself it is evil in its character as a destructive agent among things greater than itself" (RM 95). This is a very broad definition of evil,
and lends itself to many shades and degrees. According to this understanding, good and evil would be relative, and that which is slightly less good and beautiful than a creative alternative would be rendered a relative evil. Again, this relative good and bad, moral and immoral, and good and evil could apply more to intentions or to outcomes, or to some combination of the two. I would argue that on the whole intentions are more important than outcomes in evaluating the agents who perpetrate them, while their moral, aesthetic, and creative value for the whole process of creation corresponds more to their outcomes. In practice moral value is derived from the interaction of these two factors, and intention and outcome are at the deepest creative level fundamentally inseparable.

However, the word “evil,” though it can be used in many different ways in different contexts, is usefully distinguished from the broader meaning of the word “bad” by designating an attitude or action that is characterized by a serious distortion and deficiency of moral sensibility and intention. If it is of the essence of all creative spirit that is awake to its own deepest nature and intentions to seek the highest relational creative beauty, then evil in the more extreme and virulent sense can only arise out of a serious distortion of this intention. Generally this involves a narrow and distorted mode of self-identification, and an embracing of values for the sake of furthering narrow and distorted ends that tends toward diminishing the moral and aesthetic worth of existence as a whole. Thus a deluded, contracted, angry, and paranoid being may come to value cruelty and domination of other beings as values in themselves, regarding love and compassion as weaknesses to be overcome, and may take a positive joy in suffering and destruction as manifestations of its own power over others. This is a more extreme and distorted expression of the broader conception of evil, which involves sacrificing the greater good for the lesser. Such a being would still be motivated at the deepest level by an underlying desire to experience and create beauty, but its perception of what is beautiful is so distorted and so limited that it tends toward the perpetuation of nearly opposite values, and thereby the undermining of its own underlying and inherent aim. Thus while the most fundamental and underlying existential intention may always be positive, the more proximate goals, values, and intentions may be distorted and immoral. Evil actions flow naturally out of such evil intentions. An action whose aim is entirely positive but which results in terrible destruction and suffering cannot be considered evil in the same sense. Such an action is tragic and
unfortunate but not the result of an act of evil.

While most immoral behaviors are expressions of the lesser, rather than the more extreme form of evil, they tend to have in common a narrowness of self-identification and correspondingly limited experience of compassion toward other beings, resulting in a distortion of existential values. Conversely, moral development generally involves widening one's sense of self and identification with the welfare and interests of other beings, and developing values and ways of relating that reflect this wider sphere of care and concern. Jung, Whitehead, and Steiner all come to nearly identical conclusions in this respect. As Whitehead puts it, "The antithesis between the general good and the individual interest can be abolished only when the individual is such that its interest is the general good, thus exemplifying the loss of the minor intensities in order to find them again with finer composition in a wider sweep of interest" (PR 15). This is always a delicate balance, as the good of the whole and its constituent parts are interdependent, and every actual situation involves a complex interaction between multiple levels of selfhood, meaning, and value.

In some sense every being is a unique center of creation and therefore enjoys a creative potential and moral responsibility that is relative to its own situated mode of relational creative participation. There is a moral value to honoring the authentic spiritual interests and creative potentials of one's own self, despite seemingly contrary teachings in many religions, for the moral value of all selves in their complex creative interrelationships within the whole process of existence is of the essence of morality. However, learning to value every being and dimension of existence in its due measure within a relational creative context is also essential to morality, and this process of evaluation is always relative to perspective. Moral development depends upon expanding and deepening one's perspective and sense of selfhood. Therefore, in order to overcome evil, we must generally help to release beings, including ourselves, from narrow and contracted modes of self-identification. This generally involves overcoming psychological defenses and releasing into deeper patterns of relational connection based on compassion and shared value and understanding. Therefore, it is largely through love and compassion that evil is overcome and spiritual connection deepened. Steiner reflects this when he states, "In every evil we must seek out the elements that allow us to transform it into good. We will then see more and more clearly that the best way to combat wickedness and imperfection is to create what is good and whole"
(How 104, para. 12). Similarly, as Whitehead observes, "The higher forms of love break down the narrow self-regarding motives" (AI 288). Love, spiritual expansion, and moral development therefore tend to evolve together. As scientist and philosopher of evolution Teilhard de Chardin similarly observes, "Love alone is capable of uniting living beings in such a way as to complete and fulfill them, for it alone takes them and joins them by what is deepest in themselves" (265).

As our sense of self expands and our identification with the life and welfare of other beings increases, both our sense of care and our sense of responsibility increase correspondingly. As Steiner notes, "It is then but a small step to the insight that, as a member or organ of humanity as a whole, I am jointly responsible, with all human beings, for everything that happens" (How 99, para. 5). Similarly, our sphere of identification, responsibility, and concern tends to expand in ever widening spheres, beginning with our most immediate experiences and desires in the moment, and expanding out over time to include our future selves, families, intimate communities, societies, humanity in its totality, the biosphere, and the ecology of the entire spiritual cosmos. As Steiner puts it, "This love for humanity must gradually expand into love for all beings, and indeed for all existence" (How 104, para. 12), and "each expansion of our horizon also extends the sphere of our responsibility" (How 191, para. 13). In this way we come to develop a profound living experience of our interconnectedness, and of how our actions and even the life and flow of our consciousness affects other beings and the whole of existence. As Steiner observes, "This brings us once more to the insight that anything we do for our own improvement benefits not just ourselves but also the world" (How 100, para. 6). However, conversely, the harm we do to ourselves and the failure to develop ourselves spiritually also harms the world and the other beings in it. And as just noted, this does not apply only to our gross outward actions but to the very inner life of our thoughts, feelings, and awareness, which are also part of the shared inner life of all beings and the whole relational creative process of existence. Therefore, Steiner asserts that "the world benefits as much from pure feelings and thoughts as from good deeds" (How 100, para. 6), and that "we must know that what we feel has as much impact upon the world as the work done by our hands" (How 100, para. 6). We are connected to other beings and to the whole at every level of our existence, and all that we do, think, and feel at every moment shapes our shared reality. This is a great responsibility,
but it also opens up a great sphere of creative potential, and it can help us to transcend our alienation and existential loneliness and open into a more dynamic and intimate world of spiritual connection and collaboration.

This experience of our interconnectedness and integral identity with the whole process of existence can also give us a sense of the divine mysterious whole, of the sacredness of existence itself, in whatever way we identify or experience it. This is a universal and yet diverse, unique, and ever changing experience, and is at the heart of nearly all spiritual and religious traditions. Whitehead expresses this eloquently in the context of his own experience and vision.

There is a unity in the universe, enjoying value and sharing value. For example, take the subtle beauty of a flower in some isolated glade of a primeval forest. No animal has ever had the subtlety of experience to enjoy its full beauty. And yet this beauty is a grand fact in the universe. When we survey nature and think however flitting and superficial has been the animal enjoyment of its wonders, and when we realize how incapable the separate cells and pulsations of the flower are of enjoying the total effect—then our sense of the value of the details for the totality dawns upon our consciousness. This is the intuition of holiness, the intuition of the sacred, which is at the foundation of all religion. In every advancing civilization this sense of sacredness has found vigorous expression. It tends to retire into a recessive factor in experience, as each phase of civilization enters upon its decay. (MT 119-120)

Here Whitehead draws on his experience of the beauty of the natural world as an expression of the divine beauty of existence, which is both created and experienced through the deepest living vision of the cosmos, informed by the divine nature. This experience of divine cosmic beauty and sense of the sacred interconnected whole of existence unites us in awe and wonder with all other beings. As all three thinkers observe, this experience and sensibility is fundamental to our spiritual growth and wellbeing, both as individuals and as members of the earth and cosmic communities. Many of our modern societies and their members suffer deeply from the absence of a deep sense of sacredness and spiritual connectedness, leading to much of the alienation and destruction of the earth that have become characteristic expressions of modernity. To move forward in a positive way, it seems that all of humanity must somehow awaken to this sense of sacredness and interconnectedness, and do so in a way that allows for shared communion and collaboration rather than divisive conflict and enmity. This, it would
seem, requires moving beyond dogma and embracing open-mindedness, open-heartedness, and open-spiritedness in a way that allows us to share in the living relational creative process in a conscious, loving, and collaborative manner. Traditional religions, though they have been the means of bringing people together, connecting them with the divine source, and uniting them in spiritual practice, have also tended to create unnecessary division and distort, limit, and disempower our relationship to the spiritual mystery of existence—as well as to ourselves and each other. Therefore, we seem to be in need of a way of relating spiritually that is based on openness and lived experience rather than dogma, rigid tradition, and exclusiveness. This need not involve rejection of all religious traditions, which are on the contrary potential sources of tremendous wisdom and beauty in human life, but it does seem to require rejection of the elements of dogmatism, prejudice, and close-mindedness that separate us from the living mystery and from each other.

One important dimension and implication of this vision, which has been central to our previous discussion, is that the divine whole of existence is evolving along with and through the interconnected creative processes of all the beings in it. Therefore, just as we must eventually assume joint responsibility with all other beings for the whole process of creation, so too must we take part in the development and evolution of the divine whole, in whatever way we experience and conceive it. This includes not only the divine totality, conceived here in terms of the divine spirit, unus mundus, or anima mundi, but also the potentially manifold dimensions of divine being that are integral to this totality, including what is here considered the divine nature, in its paradoxical unity and multiplicity, and the various archetypal beings and forces that permeate the divine creative cosmos. As Jung observes, “There are many spirits, both light and dark. We should therefore be prepared to accept the view that spirit is not absolute, but something relative that needs completing and perfecting through life” ("Spirit," 336, para. 645). Thus, in the context of this vision, all beings and all dimensions of existence, regardless of their relative degree of spiritual development and perfection, are in a constant process of evolution. And since the creative processes, selves, and experiences of all of these beings are relationally united, every being participates in the evolution of the divine totality and each of its integral elements. Therefore, in every moment and movement of our being we are participating in the evolution of consciousness and existence as a whole.
In the context of Jung's psychology, and of the integrative vision I am offering here, this means that each individuation process is also part of the individuation process of the entire anima mundi, and that the challenges we face and the developments we achieve are also parts of the developmental process of the anima mundi and all of its constituent members. Jung at times describes this incarnational and participatory process in the symbolic language of the Christian tradition, though he does so in the context of a paradoxical and evolutionary vision.

But God, who also does not hear our prayers, wants to become man, and for that purpose he has chosen, through the Holy Ghost, the creaturely man filled with darkness—the natural man who is tainted with original sin and who learnt the divine arts and sciences from the fallen angels. The guilty man is eminently suitable and is therefore chosen to be a vessel for the continuing incarnation, not the guiltless one who holds aloof from the world and refuses to pay his tribute to life, for in him the dark God would find no room. ("Answer," 460, para. 746)

Though we often consider purity and harmony a spiritual ideal, the evolutionary process requires that we move through endless cycles of conflict and integration in the process of harmonizing and deepening the relational creative process of existence. In so doing, we serve not only our own individual developments but the development of all beings and of the whole process of existence itself. Thus spiritual development requires the courage to move beyond accustomed ways of being and relating, and evolving our values and behaviors to the constantly transforming needs of the evolutionary process. Rigid adherence to a limited conception of the good can be as morally and developmentally problematic as other forms of egoic contraction, and moving with courage and love into complex and unexplored domains of tension, conflict, and moral ambiguity can have a morally heroic quality. In order to evolve in relationship, our individual and shared values must also evolve together, and we must evolve through conflicts into new and deeper harmonies. This understanding of the integral evolution of all beings, and of the need to pass through conflicts in the course of deepening the developmental process and relational experience of all existence is shared by Jung, Whitehead, and Steiner, though each emphasizes it differently in their respective psychological, cosmological, and esoteric spiritual domains.78

The process of opening into deeper communion and collaboration
with other beings and the whole creative process of existence also has the potential to bring with it a kind of transcendent peace, which releases one from the type of suffering that afflicts the more contracted modes of egoic identification. Whitehead again expresses this insight in a way that reflects his personal philosophy and experience.

The Peace that is here meant is not the negative conception of anesthesia. It is a positive emotion which crowns the life and motion of the soul. It is hard to define and difficult to speak of. It is not a hope for the future, nor is it an interest in present details. It is a broadening of feeling due to the emergence of some deep metaphysical insight, unverbalized, and yet momentous in its coordination of values. Its first effect is the removal of the stress of acquisitive feeling arising from the soul's preoccupation with itself. Thus peace carries with it a surpassing of personality. There is an inversion of relative values. It is primarily a trust in the efficacy of Beauty. It is a sense that fineness of achievement is as it were a key unlocking treasures that the narrow nature of things would keep remote. There is thus involved a grasp of infinitude, an appeal beyond boundaries. Its emotional effect is the subsidence of turbulence which inhibits. More accurately, it preserves the springs of energy, and at the same time masters them for the avoidance of paralyzing distractions. The trust in the self-justification of beauty introduces faith, where reason fails to reveal the details. (AI 285)

In this eloquent passage, Whitehead describes a process and experience that corresponds to various conceptions of enlightenment in different religious and spiritual traditions. Such an experience of enlightenment, or peace, need not be conceived in absolute terms, and there may therefore be numerous ways in which such a peace and transcendent spiritual release may be experienced, and numerous relative developmental levels at which it may be attained. As Whitehead notes, in accordance with many corresponding accounts throughout the world's spiritual literature, such experience moves one into a realm that transcends ordinary language and capacities for adequate verbalization and conceptualization. However, as his description suggests, this experience of transcendent peace has a moral and aesthetic dimension. It involves "a quality of mind steady in its reliance that fine action is treasured in the nature of things" (AI 274). Thus it is a kind of moral and aesthetic peace with existence, a relational harmony in which the soul can contentedly rest. Though this need not imply a cessation of movement, differentiation, and change, it opens one to a spiritual
mystery and dynamic stillness at the heart of all creation. Steiner describes a similar experience of peace within movement taking place in transcendent spiritual dimensions in which the archetypal beings who shape the visible world are present and active.

In this world where “the archetypes are creative beings,” although there is nothing that can be called “resting in one place,” there is a peace of a spiritual kind that is totally compatible with active mobility. The spiritual equivalent of “rest” is peaceful contentment and bliss manifesting in activity rather than inactivity. (Theosophy 125, para. 36n)

This paradoxical interrelationship between dynamic creativity and spiritual peace, or movement and stillness, is connected to a similar paradoxical interrelationship between transience and eternity.

3.5 The Transient, the Eternal, and the Everlasting

Some contrast between the transience of the passing world and a sense of the transcendent and eternal lies at the heart of most spiritual and religious traditions—around the world and across time. This sense of a sacred dimension of existence is based on deep spiritual insights, experiences, and intuitions. Jung exemplifies this when reflecting on his own spiritual intimations in his autobiography:

Life has always seemed to me like a plant that lives on its rhizome. Its true life is invisible, hidden in the rhizome. The part that lives above ground lasts only a single summer. Then it withers away—an ephemeral apparition....Yet I have never lost a sense of something that lives and endures underneath the eternal flux. What we see is the blossom which passes. The rhizome remains. (Memories 4)

For Jung, as for many others, contact with this seemingly everlasting and imperishable realm carried with it the deepest sense of sacredness and transcendent meaning. It was the source of his greatest creative inspirations, and that which stood out as of lasting importance when he looked back upon his life.

In the end the only events in my life worth telling are those when the imperishable world irrupted into this transitory one. That is why I speak chiefly of inner experiences, amongst which I include my dreams and visions. These form the prima materia of my scientific work. They were the fiery magma out of which the stone that had to
be worked was crystallized. (Memories 4)

However, when this contrast between the fleeting and eternal is literalized, it often leads to irreconcilable dualism and the many philosophical contradictions and difficulties that this entails. Like most of the great mysteries of existence, it seems best understood as a paradox, which must be experienced and intuited, but cannot be comprehended literally in reductive and static concepts, especially if everlastingness is reified into an "eternal" realm that is completely outside of time. Each of the three central thinkers engaged in this essay addresses this mystery and paradox in the context of his own respective vision, and the emergent integrative vision here being elaborated offers some further speculative reflections in the spirit of openness and exploration.

If existence is itself a dynamic creative process—ever unfolding, never finally completed, never standing still—how can there be a lasting or imperishable dimension? If every element of existence is what it is in its complex relation to every other element, and the whole and all its parts are continually changing, how can any element be preserved from endless and continual change—how can any element be otherwise than ultimately fleeting and evanescent? How can there be any realm that transcends or stands above change and continuous movement? In the spirit of this dynamic perspective Whitehead writes: "One principle is that the very essence of real actuality—that is, of the completely real—is process. Thus each actual thing is only to be understood in terms of its becoming and perishing. There is no halt in which the actuality is just its static self" (AI 274). One way of understanding the paradox to which these questions and the experiences that underlie them point is that there are elements of existence that everlastingly persist through change—not unchanging, but with a self, relational, and creative continuity that everlastingly preserves and extends their essence, whose character is thus to be everlastingly evolved and so preserved. If change is of the essence of all existence, then it is of the essence of all that endures in a meaningful form to persist and evolve through change. Thus, even what is preserved in a relatively unchanging form enjoys an everlastingly fresh and ever transforming existence through its continuous participation in the dynamically open relational creative process. Even what endures changes. Preservation is preservation in and through change. Thus Whitehead writes that "no static maintenance of perfection is possible" (AI 274). This understanding is
consistent with a mutually coherent interpretation of the reflections of each of these three thinkers.

This mysterious paradox of the fleeting and eternal is also connected to the mystery of time. Is time simply a human construct or is it a fundamental dimension of existence? Is time a continuous progression in a single direction or an emergent and relative dimension of creative processes and how they unfold in their complex relation to one another? Is there a single time or are there many times? Is there a realm—or are there multiple realms—beyond time, or are there only realms that transcend the parameters of specific emergent time systems? The answers to all of these questions seem to depend on how time is conceived and defined, which opens us once again to the living mystery that underlies these conceptions and definitions. If time is an emergent dimension of the relationship between elements in creative processes, and all creative processes are elements in other creative processes, ad infinitum, then time would seem to be infinitely variant and relative, yet also eternal pervasive and unfolding. There would be infinite different times from infinite different perspectives, and all of these times would be interrelated and belong in some sense to larger and larger time systems—disappearing into the infinitely textured openness of existence, which ripples with infinite time dimensions yet always transcends their internal limitations. In this context time can be conceived as a fundamental principle pervading existence, integral to process, and correspondingly varied in its manifestations. According to this understanding, processes would not take place outside of time, but they could transcend the limitations of localized emergent time systems, opening, like these interdependent time systems themselves, into every new temporal dimensions and manifestations.

In this sense time, though relative and infinitely varied, is integral to experience, existence, and creativity itself. Thus Whitehead writes that "apart from time there is no meaning for purpose, hope, fear, energy" (MT 101). Time is essential to how creative processes unfold, and generally has a direction—toward a relative future, or the birth of a novel creative reality and experience. Correspondingly, there is generally a relative past on which creative beings in their relational creative processes draw in the formation of new realities and experiences. Thus Whitehead writes:

The individual, real facts of the past lie at the base of our immediate experience in the present. They are the reality from which the occasion springs, the reality from which it derives its source of
emotion, from which it inherits its purposes, to which it directs its passions. (Al 280)

However, if time is relative, and there are many different interconnected time systems emerging within the continuously unfolding creative process, which is itself both single and manifold, then there is the potential to draw on a multiplicity of different temporal processes and realities in any given creative context, including what might be considered past and future realities from different relational creative vantage points. This is connected to the paradoxical interrelationship between potentiality and actuality. What is actual from one perspective is a creative potential from another, and these perspectives are interdependent and co-constitutive, emerging as relational dimensions of single inclusive relational creative process. In this sense there need not be a single present, but there might be an infinitude of different presents, each with its own unique relationship to the entire open process of existence and its infinite relational processes and time systems. From the context of a creative present, both relatively past and future creative processes emerge as relational fields of creative potential that exist on a continuum of actuality and potentiality. As such they are both resources for creation and creative fields that will inevitably be transformed by the activity of the present creative moment. Thus all creative processes, in all momentary presents, in all emergent time systems, continuously transform one another.

However, it is part of the paradox of time that influence, while multidirectional and mutual, need not be symmetrical. Thus the directionality of emergent time currents within creative processes creates directions and pathways of greater relative influence. In this context a distinction might be drawn between indirect systemic influence, wherein a reality is implicitly changed by a change in the relational field to which it belongs, and more direct interactive or formative influence, although these distinctions would be relative and provisional rather than absolute. What we do now changes our relative past because the past is a dimension of an open relational reality continuously unfolding through time and process, in which any change in any dimension of that unfolding reality changes the whole and all its parts. In contrast, we change our relative future in a more immediate and direct way, though we also change it systemically, and it is also possible that we might have more direct and immediate influences on the past, as would be the case were time travel proved possible, either in our physical bodies or in a more subtle psychic form. If it is possible to move
fluidly between time systems, then the complexity of our interrelationship with relative pasts and relative futures becomes much greater. In this case, many different multi-directional time currents and systems could be woven into a single creative process, so that there would be layered interacting time currents and systems inherent in a single reality and experience. From this perspective it is tempting to speak of processes as transcending time, or as being outside of time, although again it would be more accurate to say that processes transcend the internal limitations of relative emergent time systems. In reality, all such time systems would be interdependent relational dimensions of a more encompassing process, so that they would of necessity open into and pervade one another as internal and integral dimensions. The movement beyond a process or time system is a deepening and evolution of that very process and system. All times and all processes are internally related. All times and all processes are transcended and included in the procession of creativity. All dimensions of existence are evolving.

Another paradoxical interrelationship that relates both to the mystery of time and the relationship between the transient and the eternal is that of stillness and change. Many religious and spiritual traditions posit a divine reality that is eternally still and unchanging, beyond the flux of time and motion. This intimation of a transcendent divine stillness at the heart of existence is again based on profound spiritual experiences and intuitions, and is again perhaps better understood as the reflection of paradoxical living mystery than as a literal metaphysical truth. In the context of this vision, I suggest that there is a vanishing point of stillness within all movement, in which there is a relative cessation of all distinction and differentiation, and a sense of boundless openness and bliss. This stillness is present everywhere, within all movement and dynamic process, and all movement and process paradoxically takes place within this stillness and openness. However, rather than being a realm of literal changelessness, apart from the dynamic realm of process, I would suggest that all change and process takes place within it, and that this stillness is a dimension of the relational process of existence, always rippling invisibly with inner activity, and like every element of existence, always different and fresh and unique depending on its relational context within the paradoxical whole of existence. All movement and process would arise from and sink back into this stillness, and would be invisibly present within it, so that this stillness, though in a sense continuous and omnipresent, would also
be different from every relative internal vantage point. Within this stillness, time, as it is generally conceived and experienced, would also reach a vanishing point into relative timelessness, and yet temporal processes would continue to arise within the subtle and invisible ripples of process that open into, arise from, and pervade this stillness. Thus all time is pervaded by a dimension of relative timelessness, and timeless stillness by invisible ripples of time, and even the divine stillness of existence is eternally changing and ever new.

Dynamics that resembles this paradox seem to be occurring in the physical universe on multiple levels, which are perhaps manifestations of a single underlying principle. One of these is reflected in the concept of the quantum vacuum, which represents a vanishing point of material density and energetic process, which rather than being literally empty, contains a fluctuating field in which waves and particles apparently bubble in and out of existence like foam on invisible sea waves (see Dittrich and Gies). Another is the slowing down and virtual cessation of the passage of time as particles approach the speed of light (Greene 49). From the perspective of the particle travelling at the speed of light, it is theorized that the passage of time ceases, although that particle is still moving through a dynamic energetic field of interacting waves and particles that have their own space-time dimensionality and for whom time is continuously passing. From the perspective of the surrounding waves and particles time is still passing, and the movement of the light speed particle endures for a certain time duration. From the perspective of the light speed particle itself, a process in its environment will have taken place during the period of its light speed movement—time and its related processes of change will have elapsed for its relational environment. Thus there would be an internal vanishing point in which time and movement would theoretically cease, but this internal stillness and timelessness would be relationally permeated by interacting temporal processes. Changes would be taking place and time would be invisibly elapsing within the field of relative stillness and timelessness.

It also appears that the entire universe is becoming increasingly less dense as it expands, so that if this process continues indefinitely it will eventually approach a vanishing point of density akin to a quantum vacuum. Thus Whitehead writes that:

The universe shows us two aspects: on the one side it is physically
wasting, on the other side it is spiritually ascending .... It is thus passing with a slowness, inconceivable in our measures of time, to new creative conditions, amid which the physical universe, as we at present know it, will be represented by a ripple barely to be distinguished from nonentity. (RM 160)

Here Whitehead suggest that a kind of rarefication is taking place, in which the material density of the universe is gradually disappearing into a more subtle spiritual condition.\textsuperscript{80} This notion, derived both from theoretical physics and from Whitehead's own philosophy, corresponds with Steiner's esoteric account of the evolution of the cosmos. According to Steiner, the entire spiritual cosmos is in a constant process of evolution, and the material conditions we now physically embody and witness in the universe represent a temporary stage in spiritual evolutionary development.\textsuperscript{81} Matter is a phase in the development of spirit. For Steiner, this is true on both a microcosmic and macrocosmic level: individual beings undergo physical phases in their spiritual development, as is the case for embodied human beings during this cosmic epoch, and entire cosmic processes undergo physical phases in their development, as represented by the physical dimension of our current universe.\textsuperscript{82}

This developmental process through and beyond physical states corresponds to the paradox of the transient and the everlasting with which this section began. For Steiner, the physical body is ephemeral and soon perishes, along with its etheric and astral correlates, which last only a bit longer, but the soul that undergoes physical incarnation is immortal and imperishable, and continues to evolve through successive incarnations and spiritual conditions. The soul grows through each of its embodiments, retaining subtle traces and capacities from all of its incarnations and the processes and experiences that are integral to them. Thus, Steiner writes that "as the keeper of the past, the soul is continuually collecting treasures for the spirit" (\textit{Theosophy} 68, para. 6), and that "the fruits of learning are the abilities we acquire, and in this way, the fruits of our transitory life are imprinted on our immortal spirit" (\textit{Theosophy} 80, para. 17). However, in speaking of the immortality of the spirit, he does not mean that the spirit does not change, but rather, as discussed before, that it persists and develops through change.

This immortality can again be conceived on interrelated microcosmic and macrocosmic levels. Every soul is a spark of the divine, ultimately inseparable from the divine totality yet paradoxically individual and
undergoing its own unique process of spiritual evolution. Correspondingly, all souls are interconnected and integral dimensions of the divine totality, and as such their individual developmental processes are interwoven within a macrocosmic development of the spiritual entirety of existence. Therefore, during our physical incarnations we are undergoing both the evolution of our individual souls and participating in the evolution of the entire spiritual cosmos, which is undergoing a physical phase in its development that will have corresponding spiritual results. Thus Steiner writes:

Hence, as human beings, we have a double nature: mortal and immortal. Our mortal being is in its final stages, our immortal being is only beginning. But only within the twofold world, mortal and immortal, whose expression is the sense-perceptible physical world, can we acquire the faculties that will lead the world to immortality. Our task is to harvest from the mortal world fruits for the immortal. (How 199, para. 4)

This understanding is fully compatible with Whitehead's understanding of the creative process, which does not require conditions corresponding to those that prevail in our physical universe during this cosmic epoch, and in which past creative conditions and experiences are interwoven into the fabric of the ongoing procession of creativity in a series of prehensive inclusions in concrescent processes.

Similarly, both Whitehead and Steiner conceive of past events and experiences as being preserved in an everlasting form on both microcosmic and macrocosmic levels. For Steiner, each soul preserves the traces of its previous experiences, and all spiritual events and experiences in their interconnected totality are preserved in what he called the akashic record, or akashic chronicles. As Steiner explains:

For the moment, it should only be mentioned that as far as spiritual research is concerned, facts about even the most distant past have not disappeared. Once a being has achieved physical existence, the material part of it disappears after the death of its body. However, the spiritual forces that have expelled this bodily element do not “disappear” in the same way. They leave their traces, exact reproductions of themselves, in the spiritual foundations of the world. If we are able to raise our perception from the level of the visible world to the invisible, we ultimately find ourselves face to face with something comparable to a mighty spiritual panorama that records all the bygone processes of the world. These imperishable traces of everything spiritual may be called the “Akashic record,” if we designate the spiritually lasting element in world events as their
Akashic essence, in contrast to their transient forms. *(Outline* 121-122, para. 8)

As this record is continually being added to by new unfolding events and experiences, and it is itself a dimension of the relational creative process to which these unfolding events belong, the subtle relational creative essence of these akashic traces would be transformed by the procession of creativity, but previous events and experiences would be preserved in a meaningful continuity of ongoing experiential process. In this sense also the fleeting becomes everlasting, though it never ceases to change and evolve.

For Whitehead, not only does every actual occasion prehend the entire past and include it in a novel creative envisagement, but the consequent nature of God also preserves the entire creative past in a comprehensive and perfecting divine envisagement, allowing every element to be preserved in an ideal harmonious unison with every other.

This final phase of passage in God's nature is ever enlarging itself. In it the complete adjustment of the immediacy of joy and suffering reaches the final end of creation. This end is existence in the perfect unity of adjustment as means, and in the perfect multiplicity of the attainment of individual types of self-existence. The function of being a means is not disjoined from the function of being an end. The sense of worth beyond itself is immediately enjoyed as an overpowering element in the individual self attainment. It is in this way that the immediacy of sorrow and pain is transformed into an element of triumph. This is the notion of redemption through suffering which haunts the world. *(PR* 349-350)

Thus there may be some correspondence between Steiner's notion of the Akashic record and Whitehead's notion of the consequent nature of God,$^83$ although Steiner's notion of the Akashic record does not directly involve this element of divine harmonization and perfection. For Steiner this redemption of suffering and perfection of existence are part of the total process of spiritual evolution, which would be reflected in the relationship of the evolving spirit to the formation and experience of its Akashic traces. In the context of this transmuted integrative vision, the divine nature is seen as constituting a paradoxical unity and plurality within the similarly singular and plural *anima mundi*, so that past events and experiences might be preserved and creatively transmuted through a multitude of different creative envisagements, each of which would possess its own unique qualities and balance of internal harmonies and emphases. In this sense,
everything that has ever happened in the entire relational creative process of existence is creatively embedded and preserved in the ongoing procession of creativity, but every element is also eternally transforming and evolving. Both Whitehead and Steiner are optimistic about this cosmic evolutionary process, despite its apparent perturbations and the suffering they entail, and Steiner especially sees all of existence as moving toward an inevitable perfection. Therefore he states with confidence that "in the end, we must all appear in harmonious perfection" (How 201, para. 7). If the evolution of existence is eternal, then this perfection must be ever evolving and ever deepening.

We seem to be at a critical juncture in the evolution of humanity, of the biosphere, and perhaps of the entire spiritual creative cosmos. Human self-reflective intelligence and ingenuity is reaping the early rewards of its competitive preeminence and technological mastery, and is also being forced to face the consequences of its selfish and irresponsible misuse of power. We are destroying the ecological world of natural and spiritual beauty to which we belong as participants before we have had an opportunity to comprehend its deeper nature and our optimal creative role within it, and in so doing are undermining the very foundation that supports us and betraying our fellow spiritual beings. However, this very reflective intelligence and ingenuity has the potential to deepen and enhance our creative participation in existence, allowing us to cultivate wisdom and compassion, and to honor connections with our fellow beings and the living spiritual mystery that pervades and connects us. In order to do this, we must assume a more spiritual attitude toward existence itself, seeking wisdom before instrumental knowledge, compassion and understanding over defensive control, and spiritual intimacy and beauty over power and domination.

This in turn requires that we develop a living vision of existence that honors its sensitive relational depths and pervasive spiritual mystery, opening us to deeper self-awareness and more honoring modes of creative participation with our fellow beings and within the sacred whole of existence. We must realize that we are shaping reality together at every moment—with our actions and through the evolving movements of our consciousness—in the sense that, as Steiner says, "in the act of knowing one is within the being of things" (Autobiography 85), and take responsibility for this in our moment to moment awareness and relationships. We should take responsibility for this process in our moment to moment awareness
and relationships. We are thus challenged to awaken to the deeper spiritual and creative potentials of our nature, and of the creative spiritual reality to which we belong, because, as Steiner explains, "we can truly work on the earth only if we share in those worlds where creative forces are concealed" (How 175-176, para. 4). With increasing knowledge and power comes increasing responsibility and the need for ever deepening spiritual maturity and wisdom. As Jung prophetically announced, "The only thing that really matters now is whether man can climb up to a higher moral level, to a higher plane of consciousness, in order to be equal to the superhuman powers which the fallen angels have played into his hands" ("Answer," 460, para. 746). If we do not do this we will destroy and diminish much of the spiritual and creative beauty that has evolved over billions of years, and betray the sacred trust of our fellow beings. Though this transient life be a passing phase in an eternal spiritual process, what we do now and at every moment has consequences that ripple through time. Thus we are challenged to live with love, wisdom, and beauty at every moment, deepening love and intimacy rather than suffering and estrangement, creating an eternally evolving paradise of creative collaboration and communion, rather than an eternal hell of agony and despair.

Existence itself is a great creative venture, and as Whitehead observes, "Adventure rarely reaches its predetermined end" (AI 278). Correspondingly, "Only the adventurous can understand the greatness of the past" (AI 279) and bring this wisdom to the courageous and sensitive shaping of the future. We have the potential to live most beautifully out of our highest and most creative visions, allowing these visions to shape our creative participation and simultaneously be transformed by them in an ever-deepening spiral of creative evolution. We live most beautifully through cultivating and inhabiting a space of spiritual openness and receptive collaboration with our fellow beings and the spiritual mystery of existence, guided in our collective evolution by love, wisdom, and beauty. As Steiner proclaims, "This is the mystery of all future evolution: that our knowledge and everything we do out of a true understanding of evolution sow seeds that must ripen into love. The greater the power of the love that comes into being, the more we will be able to accomplish creatively on behalf of the future" (Outline 396-397, para. 11). And we, as the divine actors in this unfolding drama, are both the creators and the recipients of this future, always discovering ourselves in new forms of divine creative relationship and spiritual communion.
ENDNOTES

1. I have written three previous papers, each devoted to an exploration and creative re-visioning of the respective philosophies of Whitehead, Jung, and Steiner, and a fourth exploring the integration of the emergent visions of Jung and Whitehead. This paper broadly synthesizes all of these previous papers and their corresponding visions. These essays are all listed in the works cited section.

2. Of course, there are also important differences between their philosophies, but the focus in this essay is on their convergence and complementarity, and especially on the integration of the transformed visions that emerge out of my engagement with each of them.

3. For a detailed description of the sources and course of development of Whitehead's thought, see Victor Lowe's extended essay, "The Development of Whitehead's Philosophy," in the compendium volume *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*.

4. The most intimate account of these methods and processes is provided in Jung's autobiography, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, and in respect to his private introspective and imaginative psychological process, in *The Red Book*, published posthumously in 2009.

5. Steiner influenced so many different fields that it is difficult to find a single adequate account of his diverse achievements. Biographers Gary Lachman, in his *Rudolf Steiner: An Introduction to his Life and Work*, and Henry Barnes, in his *A Life for the Spirit: Rudolf Steiner in the Crosscurrents of Our Time*, both provide accounts of his important contributions and the development of his thought, while one must seek out more specialized works, for instance on Waldorf Education, Biodynamic Agriculture, or Medical Anthroposophy, for detailed accounts of his contributions to these respective fields.

6. The word "clairvoyant," which means literally "clear seeing," does not here denote omniscience or infallibility of perception, but refers to the ability to see clearly into subtle spiritual dimensions of reality that are usually excluded from sensory perception and ordinary waking consciousness.


8. See Whitehead's many incisive reflections in the first chapter of *Process*
and Reality, entitled "Speculative Philosophy," as well as the quotations in this section of the current essay.

9. Jung employs this epistemological stance without critically examining it throughout much of his formal writing, though he at times makes statements that would seem to go beyond it, especially in his personal and less formal writings. Thus he often distinguishes between archetypes and the archetypal images and ideas to which they give rise, and speaks of the archetypes as inaccessible to direct perception. In describing the collective unconscious, he states that: "It consists of pre-existent forms, the archetypes, which can only become conscious secondarily and which give definite form to certain psychic contents" ("Concept," 43, para. 90). He here assumes that the archetypes are not themselves present in their manifestations, but stand invisibly behind them, whereas in the context of this essay the archetypes are understood as permeating the creative world and being active in and through their manifestations.

10. Numerous examples of such philosophical speculation could be adduced, both from Jung's personal writings and from his later theoretical publications. For instance, in the second to last footnote of his monograph on synchronicity, "Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle," Jung suggests that "what happens successively in time is simultaneous in the mind of God" (518, para. 967).

11. This critique is especially marked in his introductions to both his monograph on synchronicity and his autobiography and is implicit in many of his later writings. For Jung, it is essential to recognize that the psyche is itself a great mystery and cannot be taken for granted as a familiar object or reduced to material processes in accordance with the trends of scientific materialism. Jung reinforces this in his comprehensive later essay On the Nature of the Psyche, when he states that: "All the same, every science is a function of the psyche, and all knowledge is rooted in it. The Psyche is the greatest of all psychic wonders and the sine qua non of the world as an object" ("On," 169, para. 357). The philosophical vision implicit in his later writings, which are collectively one of the bases for this essay, diverge considerably from the reductive scientific materialist paradigm.


13. For a concise exposition of Jung's more spiritually sensitive and responsive therapeutic and investigative methods, including his relationship to synchronistic patterning, see the chapter "Synchronicity and Its Implications" in Richard Tarnas' Cosmos and Psyche.

14. Psychological Types.
15. *Psychological Types*, Chapter X.

16. *Psychological Types*, Chapter X.

17. *Psychological Types*, 495, para. 856.

18. This need to adjust his methods of investigation to the requirements of spiritual research is a motif in many of his writings, including his most comprehensive volume, *An Outline of Esoteric Science*. For a more intimate description of the development of his approach, see his autobiography, *Autobiography: Chapters in the Course of My Life*.

19. Steiner makes this clear in many places, as when he states that, "Only because sense-perceptible things are nothing other than condensed spirit beings can we human beings—who can lift ourselves up in thought to the level of spirit beings—think about and understand them" (*Theosophy* 149, para. 54).

20. While Steiner refers to his early philosophical work, translated as *Intuitive Thinking as a Spiritual Path: A Philosophy of Freedom*, as expressing his foundational epistemology, comments contained in the addenda to that work and in his autobiography, as well as scattered among his later esoteric writings, suggest a development in his epistemological position. I have explored this in a recently completed unpublished essay, entitled "Collaboration, Intimacy, and Evolution: Exploring Steiner's Epistemology of Spiritual Perception." In this later emergent epistemological perspective the limitations of conscious perception are more clearly illuminated.

21. Jung gave an early exposition of his theories and findings on the archetypal symbolism contained in dreams and mythology in his book length work, *Symbols of Transformation*, originally published in 1912, and continued to research these symbols and develop his theories for the remainder of his life.

22. Feeling in a broad philosophical sense is especially central for Whitehead, although he does not emphasize emotion more strongly than the other two thinkers.

23. Steiner describes this existence of a living occult language and the process of learning to decipher it in the following manner:

This occult script is inscribed forever in the spiritual world. Once the soul has attained spiritual perception, the script is revealed to it. But we do not learn to read this occult alphabet in the same way that we learn to read an ordinary human alphabet. Rather, it is as if we grow
toward clairvoyant knowing, and while we grow, there develops in us—as a soul faculty—a force impelling us to decipher, as if they were the characters of a script, the events and beings of the spiritual world present before us. (*How 72*, para. 9)

24. Jung expressed this concern increasingly in his later writings, often addressing the interconnected plights of the individual and society. See for instance, “The Undiscovered Self” and the chapter "Late Thoughts" in his autobiography, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*.

25. This approach and concern is powerfully expressed in his 1957 work, “The Undiscovered Self” as well as in his autobiography.

26. See the sources cited in the previous endnote.

27. Though Jung made use of this term, familiar to him from his explorations of neo-Platonism, Gnosticism, and alchemy, in referring to a cosmic or world soul, he did not himself systematically employ it as a replacement or enlargement of his later expanded conception of the collective unconscious. Richard Tarnas suggests the appropriateness of this terminological shift in *Cosmos and Psyche* (57), especially when referring to the more expansive and mystical conception of a spiritual cosmos implicit in Jung's mature philosophical and spiritual vision. I have employed the term in this way in two previous papers—on Jung, and on Jung and Whitehead—that are in certain respects foundational to the present one.

28. The phenomenon of collective development is described in the last quotation, and the role of consciousness in the evolution of collective development, re-conceived here in its broadest form as the evolution of the *anima mundi*, is also central to Jung's analysis in "Answer to Job."

29. As Jung expresses it, “Individuation does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself” (*On,* 226, para. 432).

30. Thus Jung continuously urges us to embrace our own individuation processes and become mature psychological individuals. Characteristically, he writes:

    We can say that individuals are equal only in so far as they are unconscious—unconscious, that is, of their actual differences. The more unconscious a man is, the more he will conform to the general canon of psychic behavior. But the more he becomes conscious of his individuality, the more pronounced will be his difference from other subjects and the less he will come up to common expectations.
Further, his reactions are much less predictable. This is due to the fact that an individual consciousness is always more highly differentiated and more extensive. But the more extensive it becomes, the more difference it will perceive and the more it will emancipate itself from collective rules, for the empirical freedom of the will grows in proportion to the extension of consciousness. ("On," 160-161, para. 344)

31. See the quotations in the body of the text below, and also his many references to the need for spiritual development in How to Know Higher Worlds and Outline of Esoteric Science.

32. Thus Steiner writes:

We come to the insight that we are causing damage to the whole world and all the beings in it when we do not develop our own forces in the right way. If we ravage our life by losing our connection to the supersensible world, not only do we destroy something within us, something that can ultimately drive us to despair as it dies off, but our weakness also creates a hindrance to the evolution of the entire world in which we live. (Outline 24, para. 19)

33. See, for instance, his references to history and literature throughout the first part of Adventures of Ideas, and his appeal to religious experience and intuitions in Religion in the Making and Modes of Thought.

34. All of these themes are treated in his magnum opus, Process and Reality, and they are treated independently or in combinations in a number of other works, including both scientific and speculative writings from the middle period of his career, and the important later philosophical works listed in the works cited section of this essay.

35. See the above quotation and discussion.

36. For an in-depth discussion of the limitations of scientifically reductive accounts of reality, see Whitehead's reflections in the chapter "Nature Lifeless" in Modes of Thought. For an examination of this broader tendency towards conflation of prevailing scientific worldviews with genuine scientific methods of investigating reality, see Thomas Kuhn's discussion of paradigms in The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.

37. See Jung's autobiography, Memories, Dreams, Reflections, for detailed accounts of his psychiatric work and personal experiences and their effect upon his development and thinking. See also the recently published autobiographical accounts of his inner development in The Red Book.
38. This endeavor is especially apparent in Jung's monograph on synchronicity, *Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle*, which he originally published in 1952 in an independent volume, *The Interpretation of Nature and the Psyche*, along with an essay by physicist Wolfgang Pauli. However, the influence of these recent developments in theoretical physics is evident in much of his writing during the latter decades of his life.

39. Jung discusses his personal containing myths, or the myths by which he lives, in his autobiography, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, as well as the important role that such shared mythologies play on a collective level.

40. In his 1947 essay, "On the Nature of the Psyche," published in a revised form in 1954, two years after his monograph on synchronicity, Jung describes a development in his treatment of the archetypes in terms of what he refers to as their "psychoid" nature, meaning that though they manifest psychically and are "psyche like" in their behavior, their nature is transcendent to the psyche and not bound by its limitations.

   In my previous writings I have always treated archetypal phenomena as psychic, because the material to be expounded or investigated was concerned solely with ideas and images. The psychoid nature of the archetypes, as put forward here, does not contradict these earlier formulations; it only means a further degree of conceptual differentiation, which became inevitable as soon as I saw myself obliged to undertake a more general analysis of the nature of the psyche and to clarify the empirical concepts concerning it and their relationship to one another. ("On," 215, para. 419)

   While this discussion assumes a more limited conception of the nature and scope of the psyche, to the extent that the term "psyche" is also used to designate the greater collective unconscious, or *anima mundi*, the distinction between what is psychic and psychoid loses something of its meaning and relevance. This way of speaking serves as a bridge between his more reductive and his more expansive conceptions.

41. See the section "Method of Proof" in the essay "The Concept of the Collective Unconscious" for a brief account of methods for accessing and identifying archetypal manifestations.

42. Though Jung himself did not employ the term "trans-conscious" in a technical capacity in his psychology, I here introduce it as a way of suggesting that there may be levels of awareness that are beyond rather than beneath ordinary consciousness. For, as Jung notes, the unconscious is only unconscious from the perspective of ordinary waking consciousness, and is not "necessarily unconscious of itself" ("Structure," 334, para. 641).
43. For a discussion of complexes, see Jung's essay, "A Review of the Complex Theory" in *Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*.

44. Jung describes the individuation process and the integration of conscious and unconscious psychic elements throughout much of his written work. In the following quotation from "On the Nature of the Psyche," Jung describes this process as also encompassing the development of a reflexive relationship to the archetypes. "The achievement of a synthesis of conscious and unconscious contents, and the conscious realization of the archetype's effects upon the conscious contents, represents the climax of a concentrated spiritual and psychic effort, in so far as this is undertaken consciously and of set purpose" ("On," 210-211, para. 413). For an exploration of the relative creative autonomy of the archetypes, see Jung's discussion of the archetypes in "Answer to Job," Collected Works 11.

45. Jung's discussions of his various therapeutic techniques are scattered throughout his collected works, and there is also a significant body of secondary work consolidating and extending his methods. See his autobiography, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, for examples of how he employed these methods in actual therapeutic situations, as well as in his own life.

46. See his autobiography, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* and *The Red Book*.

47. See *Theosophy* 126-128, para. 38–39.

48. In referring to the philosophies of each thinker during this second section of the essay, I refer to the versions of their respective visions that emerge out of my selective engagement in the context of this integrative synthesis. Alternative versions could be extracted that would emphasize different stages or trends in their thinking and development. Where my conception of various elements diverges from their corresponding original conceptions, these differences will be made clear.

49. Drawing on his ongoing explorations of alchemy and Gnosticism, Jung frequently referred to this larger reality that encompasses not only the physical and psychic dimensions but all polarities and oppositions as the *unus mundus*, or one world ("Psychological View," 452, para. 852).

50. Whitehead describes Creativity as "the universal of universals," which cannot be adequately characterized because "all characters are more special than itself" (*PR* 21).

51. Though the term "Eros" is at times employed by each of these thinkers
in a secondary and non-technical manner, its use and definition here are based on the logic implicit in their respective philosophies and this emerging vision and not on their specific manners of employing it.

52. In his essay, "The Psychological Foundation of Belief in Spirits," Jung describes the incomplete and fragmentary nature of consciousness, and the role of the ego as a central organizing complex.

Common to all three types of phenomena is the fact that the psyche is not an indivisible unity but a divisible and more or less divided whole. Although the separate parts are connected with one another, they are relatively independent, so much so that certain parts of the psyche never become associated with the ego at all, or only very rarely. I have called these fragments "autonomous complexes," and I based my theory of complexes on their existence. According to this theory the ego-complex forms the centre characteristic of our psyche. But it is only one among several complexes. The others are more often than not associated with the ego complex and in this way become conscious, but they can also exist for some time without being associated with it ("Psychological Foundation," 307, para. 582).

53. Whitehead describes the fundamental "categories of existence" in chapter 2, page 22 of PR. In addition to actual occasions, prehensions, and nexus—or groupings of occasions—there are a number of derivative notions, which do not have direct bearing on this discussion but fall into the broad description to which this note corresponds. Eternal objects, which are discussed and reconceived in this essay, are also included among the eight basic categories of existence.

54. For a lucid exposition of the many ways in which archetypes can be conceived and experienced, see the section "Archetypal Principles" in Richard Tarnas' Cosmos and psyche, with special attention to the discussion on page 84.

55. Though Jung at times used both of these terms, they are here employed in a more prominent and technical manner, with meanings that have been elaborated in the context of this emerging vision.

56. See my more in-depth treatment of this topic later in the present essay for relevant quotations and discussion.

57. See PR, 13; also Part 5, chapter 2, "God and the World."

58. Whitehead analyzes his own "philosophy of organism" as being more
akin to certain strains of Indian or Chinese religious thought than their Western counterparts, in so far as it makes process primary, rather than any transcendent metaphysical absolute (PR 7). David Ray Griffin, in his article "Steiner's Anthroposophy and Whitehead's Philosophy" (1-22), also suggests that different aspects of Whitehead's metaphysical system might be understood as corresponding to different fundamental religious interpretations of reality.

59. Jung, as a student of the Gnostics, was undoubtedly influenced by this tradition, and he refers specifically to Jacob Boehm, among Christian mystics, as a support for his understanding of the paradoxical co-existence of good and evil within the divine nature (Memories 333-334).

60. See, for instance, Huston Smith's discussions of Hinduism and Primal religion in The World's Religions (60-61, 376-377), or Mark Dyczkowski's treatment of Kashmir Shaivism in The Doctrine of Vibration (46).

61. For a relatively detailed account of the character and process of concrescence, see PR 40-42.

62. Whitehead sees the concrescent process as being non-temporal, insofar as it cannot be located in time (PR 69). I am here conceiving it as temporal in a complex way that transcends the limitations of emergent space-time as it is usually conceived, and therefore allows for a multi-directionality of creative time currents and processes that interpenetrate in non-linear ways. See my essay, "Flux and Openness: Dissolving Fixity in Whitehead's Vision of Process" (150–170), for a more in-depth discussion in relationship to Whitehead's philosophy. See also part 2, section 5 of this essay for a more general exploration of the nature of time in the context of this emerging vision.

63. In “On the Nature of the Psyche,” Jung describes the indefinite and incomplete character of the self and its corresponding modes of consciousness: "Nor is it a fully integrated whole even at the higher and highest stages; rather, it is capable of indefinite expansion" (189, para. 387). For a similar observation on the part of Steiner, see the quotation from An Outline of Esoteric Science on page 55 of this essay.

64. On a more practical and definite level, this means that all of our sensory modalities; our somatic and proprioceptive sensations; our emotions, dreams thoughts, imaginations, and intuitions; and our modes of interaction and functional participatory behavior are all ways of knowing and shaping reality. A full experience of knowing integrates these many interacting dimensions of our experience in a spontaneous and holistic manner. While we share many of these basic modes of perception and experience in common with other
people and living beings, we also participate in and know reality in unique and never repeated ways. This type of integral participatory epistemology is present in the thought of many thinkers from the last century, being present in the Integral Yoga of Sri Aurobindo (The Synthesis of Yoga), implicit in the works of Jung, Whitehead, and Steiner here being explored, and emerging clearly in the more recent work of philosophers such as Richard Tarnas (Cosmos) and Jorge Ferrer (Revisioning).

65. See endnote 23 for Jung's emphasis on the importance of self-knowledge in the individuation process. Steiner expresses the importance of self-knowledge for spiritual development repeatedly throughout his writings, as in the following quotation. "It cannot be emphasized often enough that the sure path to higher worlds leads through careful self-knowledge and the self-assessment of our own nature" (How 144, para. 35).

66. This is analogous to the way in which underlying quantum field processes and relationships, including non-local connections, are obscured or interrupted at the level of the dense aggregate activities that constitute most of the directly observable physical world, as explained by the theory of decoherence (Greene 210).

67. David Ray Griffin offers a similar and more in-depth analysis of how Whitehead's prehensive theory of perception can help to explain extrasensory perception in his essays on Jung and Whitehead ("Archetypal"), and Whitehead and Steiner ("Steiner's," 1-22).

68. See PR 91. Also note a similar understanding in the works of biologist Rupert Sheldrake, the proponent and expositor of the theory of morphic resonance (A New Science of Life, The Presence of the Past).

69. Steiner asserts this emphatically in the opening sentence of How to Know Higher Worlds: "The capacities by which we can gain insights into higher worlds lie dormant within each one of us" (How 13, para. 1).

70. "Just as natural forces equip the physical body with organs fashioned from unstructured living matter, so the care and cultivation of our lives of feeling and thinking endow our soul and spiritual bodies with higher senses and organs of activity" (How 39, para. 3).

71. Steiner asserts this unequivocally in How to Know Higher Worlds when he states that "perception of our ordinary sense-perceptible surroundings already requires a degree of clairvoyance" (How 173, para. 2).
72. As Steiner observes, "In ordinary life man has only one 'intuition' — namely, of the ego itself, for the ego can in no way be perceived from without; it can only be experienced in the inner life" (*Stages 9*).

73. "Through directly experienced ideas, one comprehends not the sense world but the spiritual world adjoining the sense world" (*Autobiography* 167).

74. See chapter 1 of *Theosophy*.

75. Whitehead distinguishes between several primary modes of perception: perception in the mode of causal efficacy, or prehension; perception in the mode of presentational immediacy, in which a given world appears fully formed in our awareness, as exemplified by conscious sense perception; and the mixed mode of perception in the mode of symbolic reference, in which meaningful relationships are sought between elements disclosed through the other two modes, as exemplified by abstract thought and speculation (*PR* 61, 121, 168). It might be argued that we already have inner psychic experiences in the mode of presentational immediacy, in the form of spontaneously arising and immediately presented dreams, memories, and inner visions. To have clairvoyant perception of subtle spiritual realities in this mode would require the development of a corresponding set of psychic senses and cognitive functions. Once evolved, these perceptions would naturally be integrated into the content of experiences in the mode of symbolic reference—they would inform our thinking and vision.

76. In his magnum opus, *The Phenomenon of Man*, Teilhard de Chardin suggests a fundamental principle that "Fuller being is closer union" and that accordingly, "union increases only through an increase in consciousness, that is to say in vision" (31). This basic understanding is also implicit in this vision.

77. In relationship to Whitehead, this insight is clearly expressed in the quotation immediately following this note in the main body of the text, and in relation to Steiner in the quotations found in the following paragraph. For Jung, the need to enlarge consciousness is central to his conception of individuation, which "does not shut one out from the world, but gathers the world to oneself" (*On,* 226, para. 432). Thus individuation requires the individual to expand consciousness to encompass both the seemingly inward realm of the unconscious and the archetypes, and the seemingly outer world of fellow beings, collective social consciousness, and the surrounding environment, and to integrate them and realize their ultimate unity within the encompassing reality of the *Anima Mundi* from the unique perspective of the forming individual.
78. Jung explores the progress of individual and collective psychic development through integration of psychic tensions and polarities in the chapter "Late Thoughts" of his autobiography *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Similarly, in the chapter entitled "Ideal Opposites" in *PR*, Whitehead describes the way creative advancement requires a continual movement through cycles of relative order and disorder, creative novelty disrupting old patterns of order in order to potentiate the emergence of new harmonies out of discord and tension. Rudolf Steiner describes a similar evolution of the spiritual worlds through successive phases of decay and the emergence of new life, including the passage through *perishable* physical incarnations on both individual and collective levels (*How*, 198-199, para. 3-4).

79. The entire apophatic approach, or *via negativa*, with representations in nearly every religious tradition around the world, is a testament to this universal experience and challenge.

80. This concept is also posited by Teilhard de Chardin in terms of the gradual transformation of tangential into radial energy. As Teilhard writes:

> It is thus entirely by its tangential envelope that the world keeps on dissipating itself in a chance way into matter. By its radial nucleus it finds its shape and its natural consistency in gravitating against the tide of probability toward a divine focus of mind that draws it onward. Thus something in the cosmos escapes from entropy, and does so more and more. (Teilhard 271)

If one posits spiritual energy as the original source of all matter, and matter as a temporary form that spiritual energy assumes in its process of creative evolution, then this represents a creative return, perhaps occurring in endless evolutionary spirals of process. What we know as matter may just be one such form that spirit can assume in its endless process of metamorphosis, fashioning for itself endlessly new cocoons and winged emergences.

81. See *How to Know Higher Worlds* 198-199.

82. Ibid.

83. This similarity is also explored by David Ray Griffin in his article, "Steiner's Anthroposophy and Whitehead's Philosophy" (1-22).
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