

## MEDITATION AND THE UNCONSCIOUS: A NEW PERSPECTIVE

John Welwood  
*Santa Barbara, California*

Among other things the unconscious in any given individual is his body, along with the body's psychological expression in temperament. The great error of modern psychology has been to ignore this fact and to speak of the unconscious as though it were some kind of unknowable .... But insofar as the unconscious is the body, and insofar as the body determines temperament, the unconscious can be known and studied, both behavioristically and introspectively. And insofar as it is ... (a) timeless principle, the unconscious can be studied and finally realized in an act of unitive knowledge.

Aldous Huxley (1970)

For Zen the main point is that the entire structure of being, including its unconscious aspect, must be radically broken through. The aim of Zen is not for the unconscious aspect of being-whether personal or collective-to come to consciousness. The aim of Zen is, rather, the breaking-up of the very dualistic structure of consciousness-and-unconsciousness.

Richard DeMartino (1961)

Meditation has not yet been perceived accurately in a Western psychological framework. A major attempt to interpret meditation in light of a complete psychological theory was made by Jung, who analyzed it in terms of his concept of the collective unconscious. However, Jung's view is unsatisfactory to most meditation practitioners who find the dualistic model of conscious and unconscious inappropriate for describing their experience. The traditional notions of the unconscious have needed overhauling even within the limits of ordinary experience, and a new model of unconscious process would be useful in allowing the psychological community to approach transpersonal and non-dualistic experience in an appropriate manner. This paper proposes a new way of looking at unconscious process that may be more useful in this regard.

*a new  
model of  
unconscious  
process*

In a very real sense, neither meditation nor non-dualistic experiences can ever be completely understood objectively, with the tools and categories of thinking mind, precisely because their nature is to transcend these categories. Meditation is not so much a particular delimited experience, but is rather *a way of seeing through* experience, always eluding any attempt to pin it down conceptually. Therefore, no attempt to discuss meditation psychologically could ever be a substitute for the personal understanding of meditation derived from actually practicing it. Also, in order to avoid confusions that might arise from the fact that many different practices are commonly termed "meditation," the reference here is to a basic form of Buddhist meditation, in which attention is directed toward the breath, while thoughts are allowed to arise without being denied or given any importance.

#### THE TRADITIONAL MODEL OF THE UNCONSCIOUS

*explanatory  
role  
of  
the unconscious*

The unconscious has played an important explanatory role in transpersonal psychology, having been used to account for many kinds of altered states of consciousness, paranormal phenomena, and meditative states. Yet there is little specification of what the term actually refers to, or agreement among psychologists and spiritual leaders as to its usage. The unconscious has become a catch-all term that appears to explain phenomena for which there is no other explanation, without explaining very much at all, since its meaning remains obscure. Western psychology has used the concept "unconscious" as an explanatory concept in at least sixteen senses (Miller, 1942).

In critically re-examining the traditional model of the unconscious, it is not necessary to deny *some* kind of unconscious process occurring in human experience, as illustrated by Freud and Jung in such phenomena as forgetting, slips of the tongue, laughter, habit, neurotic symptoms, and dreams. Clearly these phenomena point to a way in which the organism functions outside the narrow range of ordinary focal attention. It is the notion of *the* unconscious as a separate mental region that needs to be reformulated for transpersonal psychology. Admittedly, there have been some Western attempts to do away with the idea of an unconscious mental sphere, but they have not been pursued systematically. (A review of the literature on the unconscious is beyond the scope of this paper. However, for another attempt to reformulate the unconscious, which includes a complete review of the problems of the Freudian formulation, *see* Matte Blanco, 1975.) Freud himself saw that his early idea of an unconscious mental system did not quite fit the facts, and he tried replacing it with the idea of

unconsciousness as a quality of events, in light of the threefold id-ego-superego functions. Nonetheless, the id remained an unconscious region separate from the ego, and Freud continually fell back into the topographic language whose implications he himself repudiated. Freud continued trying to reformulate the unconscious throughout his career, and we must pay homage to his extraordinary perspicacity, persistence, and willingness to keep re-visioning his theory. However, he never clearly distinguished the dynamic model of the unconscious from the topographic one, and the notion of the id with its innate instincts remains ambiguous, as Freud himself admitted: "The theory of the instincts is, as it were, our mythology. The instincts are mythical beings, superb in their indefiniteness" (1963, p. 131).

*Freud's  
notion  
of the  
id*

Jung, whose work generally is more amenable to a transpersonal perspective, was unfortunately less meticulous than Freud about the theoretical problems involved in the concept of the unconscious. He tended to make statements like the following, which ascribe an autonomous agency to the unconscious: "The unconscious perceives, has purposes and intuitions, feels and thinks as does the conscious mind" (1933, p. 185). Consequently, Jungians still talk as though the unconscious is a psychic system with "a mind of its own," a container with a distinct set of contents that are like those of consciousness, except that they remain below the threshold of awareness. Jung must be commended for emphasizing the transpersonal aspects of the unconscious, as well as for his attempts to evolve a holistic approach to the complementarity of conscious and unconscious. However, the inherent assumptions of the conceptual model of the psyche that he was working with never allowed him to completely overcome its dualistic limitations.

*Jung's  
model  
of the  
psyche*

This model of the unconscious as a separate part of the psyche has created certain problems that have made it unacceptable to a wide range of philosophers and psychologists. (The critiques of the unconscious are too numerous to summarize here. The reader is referred to Broad, [1949]; MacIntyre [1958]; Boss [1963]; Binswanger [1963]; Gendlin [1964]; Miles (1966); and Matte Blanco [1975].) It reifies aspects of experience into "unconscious contents" (e.g. instinct, repressed material, archetypes). It thereby continues the Cartesian model of mind as "something distinct and apart, a place or a realm that can be inhabited by such entities as ideas" (MacIntyre, 1958, p. 45). This approach exemplifies the classic Western dualism in which mind is seen as residing "inside" the organism, inherently separate from the total world process. Freud tried to objectify mind as a separate, analyzable object in defining it as

*the  
Cartesian  
model of  
mind*

a psychical "apparatus to which we ascribe the characteristics of being extended in space" (1949, p. 14). This view not only defines mind as a separate system of "internal" events, but also defines the greater part of mind, which is unconscious, as inherently unknowable and "other." This creates a dualism within a dualism, leaving man essentially alienated from his own nature.

*diffuse  
attention*

In this paper unconscious process is redefined as a *holistic mode of organizing experience, a mode of relationship* which transcends the normal workings of focal attention by grasping multiple connections as a whole, without serial differentiations. As a mode of relationship, it is no longer dark and totally unknowable. It is unknowable through focal attention, which would necessarily distort its nature by breaking it into serial, discrete elements. However, we can recognize a type of "diffuse attention" (Ehrenzweig, 1965) that allows a whole field to be experienced all at once in its wholeness, without serial analysis. Diffuse attention, though an important element of everyday awareness, perhaps reaches its fullest expression in meditation and non-dualistic experience, where the object of attention is seen holistically, and the subject-object duality merges in a larger field of awareness functioning prior to any differentiations.

*"explaining"  
non-dualistic  
experiences*

The traditional view of the unconscious, which, like classical physics, "works" within limits, has been useful in interpreting pathological symptoms, although even here it has been rejected in many of the above-mentioned critiques. It completely breaks down, however, when it tries to explain meditation and non-dualistic experiences (which are analogous to the macro- and microscopic data that led to the development of relativity and quantum theory in modern physics). If meditation is viewed as an introverted probing of the hidden contents of the unconscious, it might seem to be a dangerous occupation or just another form of a "new narcissism" (Marin, 1975). Non-dualistic experience is simply not understandable by a theory of the unconscious based on dualistic assumptions. We need to reformulate the notion of unconscious process to show how it is possible for meditation to put us in direct touch with "things as they are."

#### THE DEPTH-PSYCHOLOGY INTERPRETATION OF MEDITATION

Within the depth-psychology model, meditation has been conceptualized as a method, like dreams, for contacting the unconscious. For instance, Kretschmer says, "Dreams are similar to meditation, except meditation gains the reaction of the

unconscious by a systematic technique which is faster than depending on dreams" (1969, p. 224). He sees meditation as a therapeutic technique that can be used as a "provocation of the unconscious" in order to "make its creative possibilities available in the healing process" (p. 234). Jung (1958), referring to Buddhist meditation, sees it as a direct route into the unconscious:

*meditation  
as a  
therapeutic  
technique*

Meditation does not center upon anything. Not being centered, it would be rather like a dissolution of consciousness and hence a direct approach to the unconscious condition .... The meditation our text has in mind seems to be a sort of Royal Road to the unconscious (pp. 501, 508).

The questions these passages raise are: How does meditation "provoke" or "approach" the unconscious? Why is a meditation that does not center on anything equated with a dissolution of consciousness? If the unconscious, by definition, cannot be experienced, is meditation to be conceived as some kind of narrowed awareness, similar to dreams?

If the unconscious is conceived as an inner realm of the psyche, and meditation is a means of contacting it, then it might appear that meditation is a purely interior journey that would neglect one's relationship with the world. Maupin (1969) cites this danger:

*an objection  
to  
meditation*

The deepest objections to meditation have been raised against its tendency to produce withdrawn, serene people who are not accessible to what is actually going on in their lives. . . . With meditation it is easy to overvalue the internal at the expense of the external so that they remain split apart (pp. 182-83).

This objection to meditation, which is shared by many Westerners today, is based on a misconception that is reinforced by the model of the unconscious as a realm of mind "within."

Jung, the first major psychologist to explore fully the relation between Buddhist meditation and the Western notion of the unconscious, made a valiant effort to connect them. However, the limitations of his model of the unconscious, and his apparent lack of direct experience with the practice of meditation hampered his investigations. Jung saw meditation as a one-sided attempt to withdraw from the world, betraying what he called the "introverted prejudice" of the East. Introversion, the fixation with one's inner world, was by definition opposed to the extroverted stance of dealing with the objective world. He saw meditation leading primarily to an indefinite experience of oneness and timelessness. For him these characteristics were a

*the  
function  
of the  
ego*

hallmark of the collective unconscious, leading him to conclude that meditation was a kind of surrender to the unconscious—a dangerous indulgence that could work against relating realistically with the world's demands.

Eastern talk of egolessness also suggested an introverted prejudice, for Jung saw dissolution of the ego as leading back to a primitive state of mind dominated by the unconscious, to the detriment of differentiated consciousness. Jung's assumption of the real existence of an unconscious mind led him to posit the real existence and necessity of the ego as well. The ego was what allowed consciousness to function, presenting the main line of defense against the possibility of being overwhelmed by unconscious dominants:

To us, consciousness is inconceivable without an ego. If there is no ego, there is nobody to be conscious of anything. The ego is therefore indispensable to the conscious process. The Eastern mind, however, has no difficulty in conceiving of a consciousness without an ego.... Such an ego-less mental condition can only be unconscious to us, for the simple reason that there would be nobody to witness it. ... I cannot imagine a conscious mental state that does not relate to an ego (1958, p. 484).

*the  
separation  
of mind  
and  
matter*

These statements reveal certain philosophical assumptions of Western culture that have only recently begun to be questioned. The idea that conscious experience is only possible for a separate self-conscious subject (ego) has roots in Aristotle's separation of thinking mind (form) from the total natural process (matter). Jung admits this separation of mind from the world-process as a basic feature of Western thought:

The development of Western philosophy during the last two centuries has succeeded in isolating the mind in its own sphere and in severing it from its primordial oneness with the universe (1958, p.476).

By contrast, these dualistic reifications of experience—the unconscious as a separate mental realm, or mind as independent of world—are the root of *samsara* and confusion in the Buddhist perspective. According to Chogyam Trungpa (1969):

Where there is ... the concept of something that is separate from oneself, then we tend to think that because there is something outside, there must be something here as well. The external phenomenon sometimes becomes such an overwhelming thing and seems to have all sorts of seductive and aggressive qualities, so we erect a kind of defense mechanism against it, failing to see that that is a continuity of the external, and this creates a kind of gigantic bubble in us which consists of nothing but air and water, or, in this case, fear and the reflection of the external thing. So this

huge bubble prevents any fresh air from coming in, and that is "I"-the ego. So in that sense there is the existence of ego, but it is in fact illusory (p. 55).

**In** other words, the notion of the unconscious as a real "other," "external" or alien to consciousness, would create, from a Buddhist perspective, both its "seductive and aggressive qualities" and the sense of a real ego that must be defended against these qualities. In fact, Jung advised Westerners against practicing meditation for this very reason: the seductiveness of ego-loss could lead to a dangerous uprush from the unconscious. But his concept of the unconscious was built on a conception of mind thoroughly rooted in the subject-object alienation to begin with, which for the East is the very root of ignorance, defensiveness, and suffering.

*Jung's  
concept  
of the  
unconscious*

Thus Jung apparently did not conceive of enlightened mind as described in Eastern texts as a clear and precise way of being and living in the world. Instead, he saw it as referring only to the inner realm of the unconscious:

Thus our concept of the 'collective unconscious' would be the European equivalent of *buddhi*, the enlightened mind (1958, p. 485).

The "seeing of the Mind" implies self-liberation. This means, psychologically, that the more weight we attach to unconscious processes ... the nearer we draw to the state of unconsciousness with its qualities of oneness, indefiniteness, and timelessness (p. 496).

Jung's interpretation of meditation as approaching the "state of unconsciousness" contrasts sharply with that of Buddhist teachers, who stress clear awareness of the world as it is:

Therefore the practice of meditation does not require an inward concentration .... There is no centralizing concept at all.... In fact without the external world, the world of apparent phenomena, meditation would be almost impossible to practice, for the individual and the external world are not separate, but merely co-exist together (Trungpa, 1969, p. 52),

*meditation  
as  
clear  
awareness*

But from the Buddhist point of view, the point of meditation is not to develop trance-like states; rather it is to sharpen perceptions, to see things as they are. Meditation at this level is relating with the conflicts of our life situations. Like using a stone to sharpen a knife, the situation being the stone (Guenther & Trungpa, 1975, p. 22).

The enlightened man., has cleared out his mind.... When you wake up fully, you see everything clearly. You are not distracted because you see everything as it is (Dhiravarnsa, 1974, p. 32).

When the texts say that enlightened mind cannot be described, Jung equates *indescribable* with *unknowable*, assuming that they must be referring to the unconscious. Trungpa's perception-sharpening stone becomes dulled into the vague philosopher's stone:

The statement that 'the various names given to it (the Mind) are innumerable' proves that the Mind must be something *as* vague and indefinite as the philosopher's stone. A substance that can be described in 'innumerable' ways must be expected to display as many qualities or facets. If these are really 'innumerable', they cannot be counted, and it follows that the substance is well-nigh indescribable and unknowable. It can never be realized completely. This is certainly true of the unconscious, and a further proof that the Mind is the Eastern equivalent of our concept of the unconscious, more particularly of the collective unconscious (Jung, 1958, p. 502).

But the awareness developed in meditation must always encompass more than one could ever say about it, since any way of describing it, from one of the innumerable vantage points of focal articulation, must always be partial. It is like taking pictures of Mt. Fuji from every possible angle, yet none of the pictures, nor even the whole series, truly expresses the presence of the mountain. Jung misinterprets such a fact to mean that Mt. Fuji can never be seen or known clearly and directly, simply because it can be described from so many different perspectives.

#### TOWARD A NEW MODEL OF UNCONSCIOUS PROCESS

Psychology needs a model of unconscious process that will enable it to approach unitive experience and the awake state of mind properly, rather than as "inner" states arising from an unconscious psyche.

*two  
basic  
assumptions*

Two basic assumptions, which should be amenable to Eastern psychologies and Western humanistic approaches, can help create a new picture of unconscious process:

1) The human being can be understood as an ongoing process that is always in *relation to* situations. These situations—environmental, social, personal, spiritual—are both inherited and, to some extent, created by the human organism itself. From this perspective, all organismic processes are ways of organizing relationships. Psychological events must be understood as forms of interaction, rather than as separate mental phenomena.

2) The word *organism* refers to the *whole* ongoing process that we are. This holistic model, in which no autonomous psycho-

logical functions pursue their own ends apart from the whole organismic process, is corroborated by such biologists as Goldstein (1939), Portmann (1954), Sinnott (1955), and Szent-Gyorgyi (1974).

In light of these two premises, conscious and unconscious become, not two separate parts of a psyche, but rather two different modes in which the organism structures interaction. What is unconscious are the holistic ways in which the organism structures situations, without having to articulate them in discrete focal units. These unconscious modes of relationship always occur as the background of an experiential field whose foreground consists of discrete objects or figures of focal attention.

Three features of the figure/ground relationship are particularly relevant here:

1) Figure and ground are part of a constantly alternating continuum. Figures, once articulated, become incorporated into, and subsequently function as part of the background whole (hence unconsciously). For example, everything I know and have experienced about a particular person now functions as the global background in which I notice this new quality in him. This new quality stands out as figure for a while, and then also becomes part of the ground, allowing further qualities to stand out. Thus many focal bits may function holistically as ground, without my being conscious of them in a differentiated way. This is one sense in which the organism "knows," as we say, "unconsciously," more than focal attention can ever articulate serially. This accounts for how what was once conscious now functions unconsciously (as ground), and how from this ground, which functions in a pre-articulate holistic way, a figure may suddenly become articulated as though it had been there all along in the "unconscious." It was not there as a discrete "content of the unconscious," but was felt implicitly as part of a wider experiential background. This is what William James (1967) points to when he says:

*figure/  
ground  
alternation*

In the pulse of inner life immediately present now in each of us is a little past, a little future, a little awareness of our own body, of each other's persons, of these sublimities we are trying to talk about, of the earth's geography and the direction of history, of truth and error, of good and bad, and of who knows how much more? Feeling, however dimly and subconsciously all these things, your pulse of inner life is continuous with them, belongs to them and

\*The word "part" here is logically wrong, for it implies discreteness. It is difficult to express linguistically how "parts" function holistically. That an element is already implicit in a larger whole, but only becomes itself as it discrete element when consciously focused on - this can only be verified experientially.

they to it. You can't identify it with either one of them rather than the others, for if you let it develop into no matter which of those directions, what it develops into will look back on it and say, 'That was the original germ of me' (pp. 295-96).

Gendlin (1973) makes a similar point:

What we go through is much more than we 'have', . . . Any moment is a myriad richness, but rarely do we take time to 'have' it. When we do, what we are focused on is usually only some specific. Going through a simple act involves an enormous number of familiarities, learnings, senses for the situation. understandings of life and people, as well as the many specifics of the given situation. All this goes into just saying 'hello' in a fitting way to a not very close friend .... The feel of doing anything involves our sense of the whole situation at any moment, despite our not focally reflecting on it as such, This is the myriad multiplicity ... (p. 370).

*ground  
is implicit  
in  
figure*

2) The ground is implicit in the figure, in that the figure assumes and "needs" the ground to stand out as what it is. To use a cognitive example, if I differentiate the concept 'dog' into collies, beagles, and boxers, then 'dog' becomes the cognitive background that remains implicit in my examining of the collie category. In this sense the unconscious ground does not "have a mind of its own," or live separately from consciousness, but is *actually present* implicitly in whatever is going on at the moment.

*diffuse  
attention  
and  
"groundless"  
ground*

3) While focal attention can only articulate successive figures, there is a *diffuse attention* that can apprehend the whole experiential field without differentiating it into figure and ground. Diffuse attention is necessary for contacting the pre-articulate portion of the experiential field.

4) The word *ground* as used here has a deliberate double meaning. It refers not only to background, but also to the ground that underlies and makes possible this present moment. Insofar as this ground is not solid, but a changing flux of meanings, it is also a "groundless ground."

This new approach to unconscious functioning, which can only be briefly outlined here, is based on a notion of organismic process already relating to its world in global ways prior to the articulations of thinking mind. The sense of being encompassed by a wisdom greater than oneself, which may be ascribed to an "unconscious mind," comes from this dependence of focal intelligence on the wider organismic process that is always operating beyond its range. Since we cannot pinpoint focally this organismic totality, we tend to deny its reality, or treat it as "other," separate from ourselves. But

conscious and unconscious are not necessarily opposing tendencies, as depth psychology contends; rather, focal attention and holistic ground are complementary modes of organism! environment relationship. The organismic ground, moreover, is not truly unknowable in that it may be directly contacted in wider states of awareness. Thus, instead of postulating a separate psychodynamic principle to explain unconscious process, it becomes possible to explore the unconscious ground by a phenomenological examination of the field of awareness, which includes this ground in a global, non-focal way.

What follows is a description of four levels of the normally unconscious background of experience, or progressively wider, more global ways in which experience seems to be organized. The word "levels" here has no topological significance, but refers instead to "fields within fields" or "grounds within grounds." The wider fields, or levels of ground, shape what we are conscious of moment to moment in an encompassing, global way, and are difficult to experience directly, at least in our linear culture, without some kind of special direction or practice. At the same time, the more "frontal" fields express aspects of the wider grounds underlying them, just as the words of any given sentence one speaks express many underlying levels of experiential structuring all at once (e.g., conveying the content one intends, taking account of the situation in which it is said, imbuing the words with appropriate emphasis and feeling, adjusting the words to what one has already said before, expressing one's aliveness and energy of the moment, and so on.) Accordingly, the unconscious ground of experience may be seen to have at least four levels: 1) the *situational ground* of felt meaning—the way in which we have an implicit felt sense of the immediate situations we live; 2) the *personal ground-how* patterns of personal meanings presently shape our consciousness, behavior, and world-view in a background way; 3) the *transpersonal ground—the* ways in which the whole organism is attuned to the patterns and currents of the universe and Ute life process itself; and 4) the *basic ground-pure* immediate presence to the world prior to any identification with the individual organism.

*four  
levelsof  
unconscious  
experience*

### *The Situational Ground:Felt Meaning*

The most readily experienceable ground of focal attention is what Gendlin (1962) has called "felt meaning," the way in which the organism carries with it an implicit felt sense of the situations it lives. A felt sense is the cognitively undifferentiated, pre-articulate way in which the organism feels a network of relationships. A simple example: If you the reader stop and

*felt  
meaning*

think for a moment of some person you know, you may notice that behind any specific thoughts, emotions, or images you may have about that person, there is a whole fuzzy "feel" which is quite different from the felt sense that you may have for any other person. Felt meaning normally functions as the immediate situational background against which focal attention articulates particular objects of interest. As Gendlin has shown, speech and action are guided implicitly by these background felt meanings that provide a continuity and context for one's immediate transactions with the world. Felt meaning is what we refer to when we want to find out how we feel, or when we lose track of what we were saying. This relatively accessible background corresponds to, and is an experiential rendering of: the traditional concept of the preconscious.

During meditation, aspects of the situational ground emerge in the form of thoughts and feelings about one's immediate life-situation. Since attention has no delimited object to focus on, attention begins to diffuse, and aspects of the background begin to emerge. One may remember things that have been forgotten, or find oneself mulling over decisions, problems, situations in one's immediate life. One starts churning up feeling-and-thought textures related to immediate life situations. By not following up these thoughts and feelings, one finds that they may diminish if one sits in meditation long enough. People who sit only half an hour at a time often complain that they cannot get beyond the swells and currents of felt meaning as it rises to the surface of attention. However, given enough time, one begins to get bored with, and move beyond, this "subconscious gossip," as Trungpa (1976) calls it. Then the next widest level of the organismic ground may emerge.

### *The Personal Ground*

*personal  
meaning*

The personal ground of consciousness is somewhat less accessible. It is the way in which personal meanings and associations, developed during the individual's history, presently shape consciousness in a background way. Situations have a unique set of personal meanings for each individual, and together they determine to a large extent *what* an individual sees and how it is seen. In Merleau-Ponty's terms, there is a "sedimentation" of layers of meanings that make up one's habitual style of relating to the world. This personal level of ground also corresponds to Grof's (1975) "systems of condensed experience (COEX)," which tend to emerge during psychedelic drug sessions. But instead of seeing them as contents stored in the unconscious, we can understand them as a

presently-functioning background whole that influences and shapes one's personal style of being-in-the-world. The use of specific methods that develop diffuse attention, such as hypnosis, psychotherapeutic introspective techniques, or drugs, make this ground accessible for further conscious elaboration.

Focal attention, by its very nature, screens out wholes in favor of differentiated parts. Together with the personal identification with fixed, habitual patterns (ego), this factor sets up distortions in the experiential field that the organism tends to "correct" through behavioral and emotional manifestations (e.g., dreams, fantasy, neurotic symptoms). This phenomenon, basic to psychopathology, is what Jung personified as the *shadow*, the compensatory function of the unconscious. But the shadow-function can be understood as an instance of the "holistic tendency" of the organism, rather than as the work of a separate unconscious principle. Overemphasizing any extreme at the expense of the balanced whole sets an opposite tendency in motion, as part of a larger equilibrium process. Ego tends to get out of alignment with the whole organism by selectively carving out and attending to only certain meanings from the organismic totality, thereby creating its mirror reversal in that part of the experiential field not taken account of. "Messages from the unconscious" may be re-interpreted as manifestations of the play of opposites inherent in all dynamic systems (e.g. in electricity, magnetism, kinetic laws, and weather patterns). Insofar as mind is part of the total natural process, it must also participate in these same cycles.

*the  
holistic  
tendency  
of the  
organism*

In meditation the personal ground (both in terms of habitual tendencies and the "shadow") emerges in the form of memories, fantasies, projections, desires, aversions, and by continually churning emotional upsurges. Normally we are too busy, and focal attention too limited, to take account of all that is happening in the whole experiential field, much of which is "swept under the rug" and ignored. In the absence of a project to occupy oneself with, one begins to see very clearly the character of one's personal world. One starts to understand one's personal neurotic style of identifying with and maintaining one's separate self-sense. By watching thoughts go by, one comes to understand one's own strategies, tendencies, and self-deceptions. Diffuse attention allows things swept under the rug to emerge and be acknowledged. There is something very powerful about this neutral observation of thoughts, without either indulging or suppressing them.

*watching  
thoughts*

At this level, meditation can lead to "therapeutic-like" insights, as this clear observing of personal patterns seems to have some alterative effect on them. Dhiravamsa (1974) sees

this stage of meditation as a realization of just how conditioned one is:

By observing our thoughts and emotions, we are able to see that each of them is conditioned by something else. . . . The motive for meditating is to see, to look, to go through oneself. You see what kind of person you are, what your particular weaknesses, qualities, and characteristics are ... without having to be told by anyone, without being tested, interpreted, or diagnosed. You can be your own analyst by looking into yourself, seeing yourself every moment (pp. 13, 31).

### *The Transpersonal Ground*

The next widest ground seems to be a level where there is an identification with the whole organism as being embedded in the larger organism/environment field. As Ken Wilber (1975) puts it, this *is* "where man is not conscious of his identity with the All and yet neither is his identity confined to the boundaries of the individual organism" (p. 108). This transpersonal ground comprises all the ways in which we function as human organism, as body-in-the-world, beneath the more differentiated types of self-consciousness.

*archetypes  
as  
universal  
patterns*

In this approach, archetypes, instead of being seen as inborn psychic structures or contents of the collective unconscious, may be understood as universal patterns of body-in-the-world. The orientation of the organism, as a body-mind totality with a given genetic background, seems to be the transpersonal basis for the specific individual meanings that a person develops and actualizes during his lifetime. For instance, the meaning of up and down, the very notion of "higher" states of consciousness, derive from the transpersonal meaning of being an upright body rooted to the earth by the force of gravity. Thus being "high" -physically or psychologically-carries with it archetypal overtones that are exciting and/or frightening, in that we seem to be cut loose from our normal grounded position. A given individual's fear of heights (acrophobia), developed out of specific life-history experiences, is one way in which these archetypal meanings might be felt in a *personal* form. The universal associations of left and right, active and passive, yin and yang, which assume a personal form with every individual, also seem to be related to transpersonal patterns of bodily orientation to the world, probably correlated with the differentiated functions of the right and left hemispheres of the brain (Ornstein, 1972).

In *this* formulation the transpersonal ground also includes the unusual transpersonal or universal pattern experiences de-

scribed by Grof (1975, p. 155) as "elements of the collective unconscious." Such experiences can be seen as the emergence into the foreground of consciousness of a wider mode of organismic relationship with the world, which is normally part of the global background of our experience.

Another aspect of the transpersonal ground is the forward impetus of the organism in its developmental process, the natural wisdom of the organism (what Carl Rogers [1959] calls the "organismic valuing process"), which continually functions as a background guide and inspiration for the individual's growth. The organism "transpersonalizes" situations by structuring individual problems in wider contexts of relationship, resulting in sudden insights, inventions, creative inspiration, dream visions, resolutions of personal problems. These phenomena seem to arise out of an incubation process during which the organism feels out and integrates whole textures and networks of relationships, in ways that are impossible for the serial method of focal attention. This "organismic resolution of problems" is an essential factor in therapy or healing.

*the  
natural  
wisdom  
Of the  
organism*

The transpersonal ground may be experienced directly in many different ways. The ecstatic perception of oneness in mystical experience, where the organism is felt as totally embedded in the universe, is but one instance. Nature mysticism seems to be this kind of experience; in the words of Thomas Traherne:

You never enjoy the world aright till the sea itself floweth in your veins, till you are clothed with the heavens and crowned with the stars; and perceive yourself to be the sole heir of the whole world ... till you more feel it than your private estate, and are more present in the hemisphere, considering the glories and beauties there, than in your own house ... (quoted in Huxley, 1944, p. 67).

**In** meditation, at a very simple level, this organismic wholeness is often experienced as a state of well-being, simply sitting here, breathing and feeling alive. Although not particularly encouraged to do so, many people find their most creative ideas arising during these times.

*organismic  
wholeness*

The transpersonal ground as described here seems to correspond to what some schools of Buddhism refer to as the *alaya-vijnana*. The Yogacara school sees the *alaya* as a transitional phase between totally open, unconditioned awareness and the separate self-sense,

the first phase in the process of self-differentiation .... It is not the absolute consciousness since it already contains the seed of self-

disruption. Consciousness has already started bifurcating .... The *alaya* is the first phenomenalization of the Absolute (Chatterjee, 1971, pp. 18, 19,22).

The subtle identification with one's organism, while including a sense of wholeness and relationship, seems to provide the basis for the development of the individual self-sense .

... the *Alaya* is mind in its deepest and most comprehensive sense, while it manifests itself as individualized in our empirical consciousness and as subject to the momentary changes that are taking place in it. ... Though it is pure and immaculate in its original nature, it allows itself to be affected by *Manas*, the principle of individuation. And thus affected, the dualism of subject and object is created in it, which issues in the appearance of a world of particular objects (Suzuki, 1930, p. 197).

The *alaya*, as Suzuki describes it above, seems to correspond to the broad, undifferentiated transpersonal ground that normally we are aware of only as it is shaped into the more easily focalized forms of personal meanings ("*Manas*, the principle of individuation"), situational meanings ("SUBject to momentary changes taking place") and focal meanings ("individualized in empirical consciousness").

*the  
immediate  
sense of  
being*

In experiential terms, *alaya-vijnana* or transpersonal ground, refers to the concrete felt presence of "being-here" as a process of relating-to life, to other people, to the varieties of awareness itself, to all things. This *inter-relational presence* is the immediate sense of being that persists behind all the differentiated changes in objects of attention. As F. S. C. Northrop (1946) points out:

This explains how it is possible for one to apprehend the blueness of the sky and the color of the rose and the moving beauty of the sunset with precisely the same immediacy with which the pain of one's local toothache is apprehended .... Thus, it is quite erroneous to conceive of a person, after the manner of the Lockean mental substance, as a completely local, independent thing having nothing in common with all other persons and things. There is an all-embracing indeterminate continuum of feeling common to all creatures in their aesthetic immediacy. . . . The ineffable, the emotionally moving, the aesthetically vivid ... is the immediate, purely factual portion of human nature and the nature of all things. This is the portion of human knowledge that can be known without recourse to inference and speculative hypotheses and deductive logic.... This we have and are in ourselves before all speculation, with immediacy and hence with absolute certainty (pp.461-62).

This relational immediacy is so close and encompassing that it usually falls into the background of the experiential field,

while the differentiated objects of attention-thoughts, emotions, perceptions-occupy the focus of attention. For instance, as I listen to a bird singing, my attention is normally on the differentiated sounds and tones of the song (focal meanings), the feelings the song arouse in me (situational felt meanings), or the associations and memories that may arise (personal meanings). Unless I am directed to it I tend to ignore the sheer vividness of the being-here that underlies and surrounds this experience (transpersonal meaning). Thus, this normally unconscious aspect of experience can be seen as a feature of relationship usually overlooked, rather than as a structural component of the psyche. Further implications of this difference in perspective will be mentioned below.

### *The Basic Ground*

The transpersonal ground may be felt as a sense of oneness and relatedness between self and world. Nevertheless, a subtle sense of identification with one's organism still persists. It does not quite reach the sense of "zero-ness" which marks an even deeper relatedness which Chogyam Trungpa has called the "basic ground."

This widest ground of experience appears to be pure, immediate presence before it becomes differentiated into any form of subject-object duality. As Trungpa (1976) describes it:

*the widest  
ground of  
experience*

This basic ground does not depend on relative situations at all. It is natural being which just is. Energies appear out of this basic ground and those energies are the source of the development of relative situations... Both liberation and confusion are that energy which happens constantly, which sparks out and then goes back to its basic nature, like clouds ... emerging from and disappearing back into the sky (p. 58).

Split-second flashes of this basic ground, which Buddhists have also called "primordial awareness," "original mind," "no mind," are happening all the time, although one does not usually notice them. Buddha spoke about literally developing awareness in terms of fractions of a second, to awaken people to the fleeting glimpses of an open, pre-cognitive spaciousness that keeps occurring before things get interpreted in a particular perspective.

Our most fundamental state of mind ... is such that there is basic openness, basic freedom, a spacious quality; and we have now and have always had this openness. Take, for example, our everyday lives and thought patterns, When we see an object, in the first instant there is a sudden perception which has no logic or conceptualization to it at all; we just perceive the thing in the open

ground. Then immediately we panic and begin to rush about trying to add something to it, either trying to find a name for it or trying to find pigeon-holes in which we could locate and categorize it. Gradually things develop from there (Trungpa, 1973, p. 122).

This fleeting sense of openness underlying all our thoughts and conceptualizations is not particularly esoteric, but is a part of ordinary experience that is normally overlooked. The psychologist Matte Blanco (1975) notes it as follows:

The findings of introspection suggest that there is, in fact, a very fleeting instant of *prise de conscience*, or 'becoming aware', or 'assumption of consciousness' when sensation is in consciousness in a naked state, not clothed in either explicit or implicit propositions, not even rudimentary ones. But an essential feature of this phenomenon is that it is fleeting. As soon as it arises in consciousness, sensation is caught by thoughts, wrapped by them .... So, sensation seems to be born in consciousness in a naked state, like a baby. But the baby *can* be left naked whereas sensation, in order to remain in consciousness, in order not to disappear immediately *from existence*, needs to be clothed in thoughts ... (p. 230).

*recreating  
our versions  
of the  
world*

It is this fact that leads Buddhists to say that we are constantly re-creating our versions of the world from moment to moment, as awareness emerges from the basic open ground and locks into particular interpretation schemes that are cloaked with personal meanings and associations. This "locking-in" is reinforced by the overlapping sequence of *perceptions*, thoughts, feelings which create a dense texture of mind that obscures the underlying ground of pure awareness. Nevertheless, it is possible, once sensitized and taught to do so, to notice the split-second holes in this fabric of mind. (First thing in the morning, lying in bed right after awakening, before one's thinking begins to take over, may be prime time for glimpsing such a space.)

In meditation, awareness of the basic ground breaks through when one wears out the projects and distractions of thought and emotion. Then there is a sudden gap in the stream of thought, a flash of clarity and openness. It is neither particularly mystical or esoteric, nor any kind of introverted self-consciousness, but a clear perception of the immediacy of being.

Ignorance in this perspective is the lack of recognition of this pre-personal awareness that surrounds the objects of thought and feeling, and the treating of the latter as solid, substantial realities. This ignoring seems to be an activity that is constantly re-created from moment to moment. When it relaxes somewhat, as in meditation, flashes of the underlying basic ground may come through. From a Buddhist perspective this pure

awareness is our original nature, and meditation is the major way to let it emerge from its normally submerged background role. In Zen *satori*, the emergence of the basic ground has a sudden and dramatic quality, which has been likened to the "bottom of the bucket breaking through" to the "thoroughly clear, ever-present awareness" in which the subject-object and conscious-unconscious dichotomies disappear, and things stand out simply as what they are. "The seer becomes the seeing and the seeing becomes the seen" (Hora, 1962, p. 87).

#### IMPLICATIONS

This paper has presented a non-dualistic interpretation of the conscious-unconscious polarity as two aspects of one whole process—the organism's interrelationship with the world. It has focused on the particular implications of this approach for making sense of meditation practice, which has been largely misunderstood by depth psychology. [How this non-dualistic interpretation of unconscious process can illuminate the nature of creativity, artistic intuition, mystical experience, and transpersonal symbolism is discussed elsewhere (Welwood, 1974.)] The depth psychology model of the unconscious is inadequate for an understanding of meditation because it is dualistic in the following ways:

1) The mind is seen as a psychic system with given contents, as though it had a substantial existence that could be observed as an object separate from the knower and the process of knowing. This model misconstrues meditation by making it appear to be only an exploration of "regions of inner space," the various territories of an unconscious realm of the mind. This model has led some Jungians to interpret the awakened state of mind in terms of "an extraordinarily significant and numinous content [that] enters consciousness," resulting in a "new viewpoint" (Kirsch, 1960, p. 85). But this language is not experientially precise, for enlightenment is a radical doing away with "viewpoints." Awakening is not additive, in the sense of unconscious contents breaking through into consciousness, but if anything, subtractive, in that it removes fixations with any particular contents. In such awakening, as Guenther (1975) points out, "attention is on the field rather than on its contents" (p.27).

2) The unconscious is typically seen as "other"-alien, unknowable, even threatening. In this perspective meditation is conceived as potentially dangerous, in that it may subject the ego to "the disintegrating powers of the unconscious" (Horsch, 1961, p. 148). Such possible confusions led the Zen

*the  
inadequacy  
of the  
depth  
psychology  
model*

teacher Hisamatsu (1968), after a conversation with Jung, to distinguish the basic ground of open awareness from the depth psychology model of the unconscious:

The 'unconscious' of psychoanalysis is quite different from the 'no-mind' of Zen. In the 'unconscious' ... are the *a posteriori* 'personal unconscious' and the *a priori* 'impersonal unconscious', namely the 'collective unconscious.' They are both unknown to the ego. But the 'no-mind' of Zen is, on the contrary, not only known, but it is most clearly known, as it is called ... 'always clearly aware.' More exactly, it is clearly 'self awakening to itself' without separation between the knower and the known. 'No-mind' is a state of mind clearly aware ... (p. 31).

*inner  
and  
outer  
reality*

3) The inner demands of the unconscious and the outer demands of the world are seen as two opposing worlds, with the ego caught in between. This perspective views meditation as an inward journey that is separate from the process of relating with the world. The confusion here stems from the dualistic interpretation of *inner* and *outer*, *Inner* is assumed to mean "inside me," that which is psychical, immaterial. However, the new approach presented here allows us to recast the inner/outer duality in a different way. *Inner* truth, *inner* reality does not refer to a realm of the psyche *inside the organism*, but rather to the living, dynamic, holistic process that shapes and structures the *outer* reality of constituent parts. In this sense everything in nature has an inner reality (its holistic, formal, expressive *side*), which is not separate from the inner reality of the human process, Zuckerkandl (1956) makes this point in relation to music:

The voice of music testifies against interpreting the 'inner' of 'inner world' as synonymous with 'in me.' The place of this 'inner world' is just as much outside me as in me; the inner world extends as far as the world itself, *the* world itself is divided into an 'inner' and 'outer.' The boundary is not vertical, running between self and world, but horizontal running through both (p. 370).

The inner aspect of music makes something living out of its outer elements, such as 'vibrating air' or "auditory frequency." In the same way, unconscious process can be seen as the inner reality of human mind, without necessarily being interpreted as a "region of inner space," inside the organism.

In this paper the unconscious process has been reformulated to show that:

1) What is unconscious generally are patterns of organismic structuring and relating, which function holistically as the background of focal attention,

2) This background consists of wider and wider interpenetrating levels, which can be contacted experientially through differing intensities and ranges of diffuse attention. The paradigm here is one of "fields within fields." These fields are dynamic patterns of relationship, each of which allows for certain kinds of knowledge and experience to occur. They do not in themselves contain any "mental stuff," any psychic contents. They do not exist in the sense of being any kind of substantial entities. Rather, they are functional determinants of consciousness that actively shape how we relate to things from moment to moment. Awareness begins with openness, becomes humanized at the transpersonal level, individualized at the personal level, and particularized at the situational level. Awareness thus becomes more and more faceted, further and further shaped with each more differentiated level. Nonetheless, in the very midst of the most differentiated moment of awareness, there remains a totally open, unconditioned quality, although it is normally very much in the background.

*dynamic  
patterns  
of inter-  
relationship*

3) The basic ground of open awareness, though beyond the span of focal attention (and in this sense "unconscious"), is not a mysterious psychic region, but is perfectly knowable, both in fleeting glimpses and in "sudden awakening."

This basic ground reveals a level of total organism/environment interpenetration that is so far beyond conceptualization and thought that it becomes hidden beneath the overlay of focal thoughts, feelings, and perceptions with which we are normally so preoccupied. Meditation, by opening up this wider attunement, allows for a more direct, precise relationship with "what is." At this level of open awareness,

The meditator develops new depths of insight through direct communication with the phenomenal world... , Conceptualized mind is not involved in the perception and so we are able to see with great precision, as though a veil had been removed from our eyes (Trungpa, 1973, p. 223, 219).

The basic ground is present all the time. At any moment, especially if one develops some sensitivity to the process of consciousness through meditation, one may glimpse this ineffable, non-specifiable, omni-potential open awareness that underlies specific perceptions. The fundamental nature of awareness seems to have this open quality, this complete receptivity that becomes progressively faceted, shaped, articulated, elaborated, while remaining open and "empty." In Hui-Neng's words (1964), "from the very beginning, not a single thing is."

*the  
fundamental  
nature of  
awareness*

So far we have examined some implications that this reformulation of unconscious process has for understanding meditation, transpersonal experience, and self-insight. What follows are some suggested clinical and therapeutic considerations of this holistic approach, contrasted briefly with aspects of the depth psychology therapeutic model,

*threats  
to the  
ego*

If, as we have seen, what is most deeply unconscious in man is his pre-personal relatedness to all things, this has important implications for the understanding of neurosis, defense mechanisms, repression, and psychopathology in general. What is most threatening to the ego in this view is not instinctual demands, but rather the groundless, open quality of our basic being-in-the-world. We find that we cannot establish our ego securely, our self-identity keeps slipping away, we are subject to little deaths from moment to moment, there is nothing to hold on to. Thus anxiety signals a threat, not so much from instinctual demands, but rather from the insubstantial nature of the basic ground of our existence. Guilt can be interpreted in this light as arising from a commitment to "small mind," as opposed to "big mind." We may feel guilty when we choose our small version of the world, at the expense of the larger, expansive vision that arises from the basic relatedness of self and world. Resistance, repression, and defenses can be recast here as ways of armoring ourselves against this relatedness that undercuts our notions of our separate self.

*fearing  
our  
higher  
possibilities*

Letting go of habit and self-created identity is painful, There can be a resistance to the openness that underlies us at the same time that we are drawn to it, which is the root meaning of ambivalence. Maslow (1967) recognized this fact in his description of the Jonah syndrome:

We fear our highest possibility.... We are generally afraid to become that which we can glimpse in our most perfect moments. . . . We enjoy and even thrill to the godlike possibilities we see in ourselves in such peak moments. And yet we simultaneously shiver with weakness, awe, and fear before these same possibilities (p. 163).

Ernest Becker (1973) points to the same reality when he says that "normality is neurosis," in that it constitutes a refusal and repression of our groundlessness, our complete openness and vulnerability to the world. Dominated by fear of both life and death, we fear living fully, in touch with the supra-individual power and richness of our being:

... the child could not out of himself muster the stamina and the authority necessary to live in fun expansiveness with limitless horizons of perceptions and experience (p. 62.)

... these defenses ... allow him to feel that he *control* his life and his death, that he really does live and act as a willful and free individual, that he has a unique and self-fashioned identity, that he *is somebody* (p. 55).

This avoidance of the fullness of life On the supra-individual level is also an avoidance of death; for at this level, one is constantly dying, as there is nothing permanent and solid to cling to, to maintain oneself with. In schizophrenia this fear of life and death becomes a full-blown panic, where the potentially creative basic ground is felt as an overwhelming threat to one's very existence. Wilson Van Dusen (1958) discovered that blank spaces (what we might call embryonic glimpses of the basic open ground) play a major role in all psychopathology:

*fearing  
the  
"blank  
spaces"*

More and more it came to appear that these blank holes lay at the center of psychopathology. The blank holes came to be the key both to pathology and to psychotherapeutic change ....

In the obsessive compulsive they represent the loss of order and control In the depressive they are the black hole of time standing still. In the character disorders they represent unbearable ambivalence. In schizophrenia they are the encroachment of meaninglessness or terror. In every case they represent the unknown, the unnamed threat, the source of anxiety and disintegration. They are nothingness, non-being, threat.

It is extremely important to know what people do when faced with encroaching blankness. Many talk to fill up space. Many must act to fill the empty space with themselves. In all cases it must be filled up or sealed off. I have yet to see a case of psychopathology where the blankness was comfortably tolerated (p. 254).

In this light, therapies that tend to fill up space only play into the schizophrenic's basic problem. A more direct therapeutic approach would lie in the direction of helping the patient make friends with and accept the pre-personal open ground of his being, rather than colluding with him to fill it in and avoid it further. As Van Dusen points out: "The feared empty space is a fertile void. Exploring it is a turning point towards therapeutic change" (p. 254).

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that the point of this paper has not been to "explain" meditation, but rather to

*total  
interpenetration  
of self  
and world*

provide Western psychology with a way of approaching it in light of a revised notion of unconscious process. Misconceptions of meditation as a spiritual practice are very common in the West. On the one hand, it is tempting to view meditation as another technique for self-improvement, for mastery over the world and other people. On the other hand, meditation may be seen as an avoidance or passive withdrawal from the world into a private inner realm. The approach developed here allows us to avoid both these pitfalls, grounded as it is in the understanding of the total interpenetration of organism and environment, self and world. Thus meditation can be understood as a process of self-discovery that is simultaneously a world-discovery, insofar as we are both continually re-creating our world, and, beyond *that*, we *are* world, we are not other than world. The way in is the way out. In this light, the following description of meditation from a Tibetan Text (Trungpa & Hookham, 1974, p. 6) begins to make sense:

One should realize that one does not meditate in order to go deeply into oneself and withdraw from the world... There should be no feeling of striving to reach some exalted or higher state, since this simply produces something conditioned and artificial that will *act* as an *obstruction* to the free flow of the mind. . . . The everyday practice is simply to develop a complete awareness and openness to all situations and emotions, and to all people, experiencing everything totally without mental reservations and blockages, so that one never withdraws or centralizes onto oneself. . . . When performing the meditation practice, one should develop the feeling of opening oneself out completely to the whole universe with absolute simplicity and nakedness of mind.

REFERENCES

- BECKER, E. *The denial of death*. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- BINSWANGER, L. *Being-in-the-world: Selected papers of* . . . Edited and Translated by J. Needham. New York: Basic Books, 1963.
- BOSS, M. *Psychoanalysis and daseinsanalysis*. New York: Basic Books, 1963.
- BROAD, C. D. *Mind and its place in nature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949.
- CHATERJEE, A. *Readings on Yogacara Buddhism*. Banaras: Hindu University Press, 1971.
- DEMARTINO, R., SATO, K. *et. al.* What is the true self? A discussion. *Psychologia*, 1961, 4, 126-32.
- DHIRAVAMSA. *The middlepath of We* Surrey, England: Unwin, 1974.
- EHRENZWEIG, A. *The psychoanalysis of artistic vision and hearing*. New York: George Braziller, 1965.

- FREUD, S. *New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis*. Translated by W. J. H. Sprott. London: Hogarth Press, 1933.
- FREUD, S. *An outline of psychoanalysis*. Trans. J. Strachey. New York: W. W. Norton, 1949.
- GENDLINE, T. *Experiencing and the creation of meaning*. New York: Free Press, 1962.
- GENDLINE, T. A theory of personality change. In P. Worchel & D. Byrne (Eds.), *Personality change*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- GENDLINE, T. A phenomenology of emotions: Anger. In D. Carr & E. Casey (Eds.), *Explorations in phenomenology*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- GOLDSTEIN, K. *The organism*. New York: American Books, 1939.
- GROF, S. *Realms of the human unconscious*. New York: Viking, 1975.
- GUENTHER, H. V. & TRUNGPA, C. *The dawn of Tantra*. Berkeley: Shambhala, 1975.
- HISAMATSU, S. Additional note to: On the unconscious, the self, and therapy. *Psychologic*, 1968, 11, 25-32.
- HORA, T. Beyond self. *Psychologia*; 1962, 5, 84-87.
- HORSCH, J. The self in analytical psychology. *Psychologia*, 1961, 4,
- HUI-NENG. *The sutra of the sixth patriarch*. Fung, P. and Fung, G. (translators). San Francisco: Buddhist Universal Church, 1964.
- HUXLEY, A. *The perennial philosophy*. New York: Harper & Row, 1944.
- HUXLEY, A. *Letters of . . .* Edited by G. Smith. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- JAMES, W. *The writings of . . .* Edited by J. McDermott. New York: Random House, 1967.
- JUNG, C. G. *Modern man in search of a soul*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1933.
- JUNG, C. G. Psychological commentary on the *Tibetan book of the great liberation*. In *Psychology and religion*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Vol. 11. *Collected works*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1958.
- KIRSCH, J. Affinities between Zen and analytical psychology. *Psychologia*, 1960, 3, 85-91.
- KRETSCHMER, W. Meditative techniques in psychotherapy. In C. T. Tart (Ed.), *Altered states of consciousness*. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- MACINTYRE, A. *The unconscious: A conceptual analysis*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958.
- MARIN, P. The new narcissism. *Harper's Magazine*, 1975, 251,
- MASLOW, A. Neurosis as a failure of personal growth. *Humanitas*, 1967, 3, 153-69.

- MATTEBLANCO, *The unconscious as infinite sets*. London: Duckworth, 1975.
- MAUPINE. On meditation. In C. T. Tart (Ed.), *Altered states of consciousness*. New York: Wiley, 1969.
- MILES, T. *Eliminating the unconscious*. London: Pergamon Press, 1966.
- MILLER, J. *Unconsciousness*. New York: Wiley, 1942.
- NORTHROP, S. C. *The meeting of east and west*. New York: MacMillan, 1946.
- ORNSTEIN, R. *The psychology of consciousness*. San Francisco: Freeman, 1972.
- PORTMAN, A. Biology and the phenomenon of the spiritual. In *Spirit and nature*. Vol. 1. *Papers from the Eranos year-books*. New York: Pantheon, 1954.
- ROGERS, C. R. A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships. In S. Koch (Ed.) *Psychology: A study of a science*. Vol. III. New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.
- SINNOTT, W. *Biology of the spirit*. New York: Viking Press, 1955.
- SUZUKI, D. T. *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1930.
- SZENT-GYÖRGYI, A. Drive in living matter to perfect itself. *Synthesis*, 1974, I, 12-24.
- TRUNGPA, C. *Meditation in action*. Berkeley: Shambhala, 1969.
- TRUNGPA, C. *Cutting through spiritual materialism*. Berkeley: Shambhala, 1973.
- TRUNGPA, C. The basic ground and the eight consciousnesses, *Garuda*, 1976, 4, 57-64.
- TRUNGPA, C. & HOOKHAM, J. (Translators). *Maha Ati. Vajra*, 1974, 1, 6-8.
- VANDUSEN, W. Wu-Wei, no-mind, and the fertile void in psychotherapy. *Psychologia*, 1958, 1, 253-56.
- WELWOOD, J. A theoretical re-interpretation of the unconscious from a humanistic and phenomenological perspective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1974.
- WILBER, K. Psychologia perennis: The spectrum of consciousness, *J. Transpersonal Psychol.*, 1975, 7, 105-32.
- ZUCKERKANDL, E. *Sound and symbol*. Translated by W. R. Trask. New York: Pantheon, 1956.