Exceptional experiences in decompositional dual-aspect monism

Harald Atmanspacher

Within the decompositional variety of dual-aspect monisms (such as those of Pauli-Jung, Bohm, or d'Espagnat) a basic, psychophysically neutral reality is conceived of as radically holistic, without distinctions, hence discursively inexpressible. Within this framework there are different options to address so-called exceptional experiences, which deviate from typical world models that individuals develop to cope with their environment. Such experiences can be understood (i) as either mental images or as physical events, (ii) as relations between the mental and the physical, and (iii) as direct experiences of the psychophysically neutral reality. For lack of better terms, these three classes are referred to as reified, relational and immanent experiences, and will be illustrated by reports of exceptional experiences of light.

Harald Atmanspacher, PhD, is a senior scientist and staff member at Collegium Helveticum, University and ETH Zurich, since 2007. After his PhD in physics at Munich University (1986), he worked as a research scientist at the Max-Planck-Institute for extraterrestrial Physics at Garching until 1998. Then he served as head of the theory group at the Institute for Frontier Areas of Psychology at Freiburg until 2013. His fields of research are the theory of complex systems, conceptual and theoretical aspects of (algebraic) quantum theory, and mind-matter relations from interdisciplinary perspectives. He is the president of the Society for Mind-Matter Research and editor-in-chief of the interdisciplinary international journal "Mind and Matter".

Holistic enchantment and eternal recurrence: Nietzsche, Klages, Jung, and Deleuze on the beauty of it all

Paul Bishop

For Nietzsche, the world is both disenCHANTED and ENCHANTED: from a transcendental perspective (associated with Judeo-Christianity), the world is disenchanted, it is ‘the work of a suffering and tormented God’. Yet from an immanent perspective the world is in fact enchanted — or potentially so, and the means by which Nietzsche proposes to re-enchant (or rediscover the primordial enchantment) of the world is the doctrine of the eternal recurrence. In Thus Spoke Zarathustra, his animals proclaim Zarathustra to be ‘the teacher of the eternal recurrence’, and this passage from the chapter entitled ‘The Convalescent’ has caught the attention of numerous commentators, including Heidegger and Deleuze. Deleuze’s reading of the eternal recurrence is different from that of the majority of other commentators, however: yet, in fact, Deleuze is by no means the only critic of Nietzsche’s doctrine of eternal recurrence. For another one is the German philosopher Ludwig Klages, one of the earliest significant commentators on Nietzsche’s work and a figure whose thought is deeply invested in the challenges of disenchanted and re-enchantment. Klages offers a wide-ranging critique of Nietzsche’s work, especially of its doctrine of eternal recurrence. Central to Klages’s philosophy are his doctrine of the ‘reality of images’ and his related notion of...
‘elementary similarity’. Elementary similarity informs the kind of perception he associates with *die Seele*, that is, with the soul or the psyche, and which he regards as essentially *symbolic*. Can the concepts of identity, similarity, dissimilarity, and difference help us relate and coordinate the thought of Klages, Jung, and Deleuze — and not just in relation to Nietzsche?

**Paul Bishop**, PhD, is William Jacks Chair of Modern Languages at the University of Glasgow and his research has focused on the history of ideas in general and the German intellectual tradition in particular. His most recent publication is *On the Blissfuls Islands: With Nietzsche and Jung in the Shadow of the Superman* (Routledge, 2016) and, aside from his interests in translation and in the use of languages for business, he is currently working on an introductory study on the thought of Ludwig Klages.

---

**The Practice of Holistic Reasoning: some suggestions for method**

Philip Goodchild

The contemporary holistic thinker Ervin Laszlo suggests that the new holistic paradigm in physics implies that we are no longer ‘condemned to view the world through five slits in the tower’ – ‘we can open the roof to the sky’. Yet whether articulated as metaphysical speculation or spiritual practice, holism is usually advocated through a conventional use of reason. The holistic paradigm suggests the possibility of a different relation between ideas: an internal relation between heterogeneous terms that remains particular, without being reduced to any universal.

The French tradition of metaphysics grounded in introspection has approached an articulation of such relations expressed in terms of duration and memory (Bergson); the subsequent elaboration of a ‘transcendental empiricism’ has expressed such relations as syntheses (Deleuze); alternatively, analytic psychology has conceived the unity of such relations under the form of symbols (Jung). Yet even in such philosophies, there is a danger that such creative practice can be distorted by the form of its subsequent representation. In short, holistic thinking demands a distinct methodology for disclosing the relations between ideas.

This paper aims to offer some suggestions towards a methodology of holistic reason by enumerating some characteristics of my own practice of philosophical reasoning. The point is not to reason about holistic metaphysics, spirituality or creativity, but to creatively deploy such a spirituality in the work of thinking about ordinary life. What is the new image of thought that may orient the work of a holistic philosopher?

**Philip Goodchild**, PhD, is a Professor of Religion and Philosophy, Faculty of Arts at the University of Nottingham. He joined the University of Nottingham in January 2000. He originally studied at Cambridge (Mathematics, followed by Theology and Religious Studies) and Lancaster (Religious Studies), where his postgraduate research focused on Gilles Deleuze and Friedrich Nietzsche. He has served as Head of the Department of Theology and Religious Studies, and has been Professor of Religion and Philosophy since January 2008. He joined the Department of Philosophy in December 2016. His main books include: *Gilles Deleuze and the Question of Philosophy* (1996), *Deleuze and Guattari: An Introduction to the Politics of Desire* (1996), *Capitalism and Religion: The Price of Piety* (2002), *Theology of..."

* 

**What were you thinking of? Jung as symptomalologist**

David Henderson

In their work C. G. Jung and Gilles Deleuze ventured into territory that blurred the distinction between clinical thinking and philosophical thinking. This paper will raise questions about the relationship between clinical concepts and philosophical concepts as they present themselves in their writings.

Deleuze’s symptomatological method enabled him to find a ground for engagement with non-philosophical discourses. ‘Symptomatology is situated almost outside of medicine, at a neutral point, a zero point, where artists and philosophers and doctors and patients can encounter each other.’ (‘Mystique et masochisme,’ p. 13) In what ways can Deleuze’s symptomatological method amplify Jung’s complex psychology and study of archetypal image? Does the idea within analytical psychology of the symptom as symbol bring anything to Deleuze’s project?

According to Jung ‘once we leave the domain of measureable facts we are dependent on concepts … The precision which measure and number lend to the observed fact can be replaced only by the precision of the concept.’ (CW6, para. 673) For Deleuze ‘concepts do not simply describe things but, rather, express events.’ (Cook, p. 24) In what ways are Jung’s and Deleuze’s concepts able to account for movement and affect in the psychoanalytic encounter?

Jung links the psychological intuition of wholeness to an encounter with the self. ‘Wholeness is thus an objective factor that confronts the subject independently of him.’ (CW, para. 59) He asserts that ‘The self is not a philosophical idea.’ (CW6, para. 791) What is he thinking of? Is it realistic to expect clinical concepts to do the work of philosophical concepts? Many of Deleuze’s formulations have strong resonance in the clinical setting, but is this a legitimate use of his concepts? Is the unus mundus a clinical concept or has Jung here moved beyond the clinic?

David Henderson, PhD, is Senior Lecturer in Psychoanalysis at the Centre for Psychoanalysis, Middlesex University, London. He is a member of the Association of Independent Psychotherapists. He is a convenor and regular contributor to the Jung-Lacan Research Network, and the Psychoanalysis and Liberation Research Network. His chapter, ‘Staying alive: Anima and objet a’ will appear in Re-Enountering Jung: Analytical Psychology and Contemporary Psychoanalysis, R.S. Brown (ed.), Routledge. Recently published papers include, ‘Freud and Jung: The creation of the psychoanalytic universe,’ and ”A life free from care”: The hermit and the analyst,’ in Psychodynamic Practice. His book Apophatic Elements in the Theory and Practice of Psychoanalysis: Pseudo-Dionysius and C.G. Jung is published by Routledge. He is the co-investigator on a two-year research project titled “One world”: logical and ethical implications of holism’ funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK.
Symbols of wholeness — mandalas and labyrinths as manifestations of cosmic structure

George B. Hogenson

In an important paper, the philosopher Paul Ricoeur, drawing on the work of Mircea Eliade, draws a distinction between what he terms manifestation and proclamation. Proclamation is fundamentally discursive, language bound and therefore open to the free construction of metaphor, while manifestation is based on the image and ‘bound to the configurations of the cosmos.’ In this regard the symbol only comes to language when it reveals that configuration and in so doing opens the space of the sacred.

In 1701 Leibniz presented a paper on the occasion of his election to the Paris Academy where he outlined his formulation of the binary number system, which would eventually become the basis for digital computer systems. Around the same time he caused a medallion to be struck memorializing the discovery, which he presented to Duke Rudolf August. The medallion represented the first 16 integers in Arabic and binary notation, and also bore the inscription, ‘Image of Creation.’

In The Fold Deleuze examines in detail the implications of the infinitesimal calculus for Leibniz’s metaphysics, arguing that metaphysics takes the form of mathematics in the Baroque philosopher. He is also interested in other forms of infinitesimal analysis, notably for the purposes of this paper an interest in the Koch curve, an early form of fractal geometry that foreshadows the full development of fractals by Benoit Mandelbrot.

In the proposed presentation, the relationship between certain formally constructed mandalas and other geometric forms associated by Jung with the notion of wholeness will be compared with the iterative elaboration of the equations associated with Mandelbrot’s fractal geometry. The argument will be that these symbols of wholeness are manifestations of fundamental mathematical structures that manifest throughout the natural world, and connect psyche to the rest of nature in a fundamental form. Additionally, this analysis will illustrate how the breakdown of psychic wholeness can be modelled in the breakdown of unity into chaotic states, thereby providing an argument for Jung’s model of the psyche moving from the individual complex to the unus mundus and the unity of the Self.

George B. Hogenson, PhD, teaches in the Analyst Training Program at the C. G. Jung Institute of Chicago and supervises trainees in the program. He regularly lectures on Jung’s theories in the United States and Europe, and writes on the theory of archetypes, synchronicity, and the role of symbolism in the life of the individual. His work on the nature of archetypal imagery resulted in his being invited to present the Caroline and Earnest Fay Lectures at Texas A&M University in 2011. In addition to his work as a teacher and analyst, he is on the executive committee of the International Association for Analytical Psychology, and on the editorial board of The Journal of Analytical Psychology to which he has contributed numerous articles.
The whole and the dyad: Jung, Deleuze and Plato’s unwritten doctrines

Christian Kerslake

In the *Sophist* and the *Parmenides*, Plato breaks with the Parmenidean doctrine of the ‘unity of being’, and affirms the existence of a multiplicity of eternal Forms (*eide*), ‘connected in a unity through many wholes’ (*di' olon pollon*) (*Sophist*, 253d). But he does not present an integrated account of the relation between the Forms of Being, Unity and the Good. A substantial tradition in ancient thought (Aristotle, Theophrastus, Sextus Empiricus, Simplicius and others) proposed that the ultimate basis for Plato’s theory of Forms was to be found in his unwritten doctrines, communicated in the famous lecture on the Good, in which he perplexed his audience by neglecting to discuss any ‘real’ goods, instead restricting himself to the themes of unity and number. Theophrastus claimed that Plato followed the Pythagoreans in positing *two* basic principles, ‘the One and the indefinite dyad’ (*aoristos dyas*), remarking that ‘it is absolutely impossible that for them the nature of the whole should exist without the indefinite dyad; they say it has an equal share in things with or even predominates over, the other principle; whereby they make even the first principles contrary to one another’ (*Metaphysics*, 11b). A large body of scholarship now exists on the links between the Platonic theory of Forms and Pythagorean mathematics (for instance, the work of Léon Robin, Jacob Klein, H. J. Krämer, J. N. Findlay, and Cornelia de Vogel).

Jung’s pursuit of the ‘unity of all archetypes’ (CW 14: 463) leads to an ambiguity: is he seeking ‘an original, non-differentiated unity of the world or being’ (CW 14: 462) – which sounds Parmenidean – or does the thought of the unity of all archetypes instead lead into the quite distinct domain of Platonic Pythagoreanism? Resolving this ambiguity implies facing the great philosophical ‘collective unconscious’ that is Plato’s unwritten doctrines.

If this were done, a hitherto entombed philosophical tradition might come to light. Schelling’s 1834 *Presentation of Philosophical Empiricism* is built around a return to Plato’s Pythagorean sources; as is Malfatti’s *Mathesis* (1845). Deleuze’s account of the *Sophist* in *Difference and Repetition* needs to be re-read with an ear open to the continuing influence of a kind of ‘mathesis’ that may still be obscure but is far from undocumented.

**Christian Kerslake**, PhD, is the author of *Deleuze and the Unconscious* (2007), *Immanence and the Vertigo of Philosophy: From Kant to Deleuze* (2009), and a number of articles on modern European philosophy. His most recent publication is ‘Marxism and Money in Deleuze and Guattari’s *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*’ (2015). He is currently a Tutor at the Mary Ward Centre, London.

The ethical ambivalence of holism: an exploration through the thought of Carl Jung and Gilles Deleuze

Roderick Main

Episodically over the ninety years since it was coined, the term ‘holism’ has fallen in and out of favour across a wide range of academic disciplines and cultural arenas. Frequently its
appearance has been accompanied by strong positive and negative valuations: holism has been promoted by some as a solution to the fragmentation and alienation of modernity, yet it has been identified by others as one of the roots of totalitarian thinking. In this paper I explore this ethical ambivalence of holism through comparing aspects of the work of two twentieth-century thinkers who reflected deeply on the concept of wholeness. Using the psychology of Carl Jung as a sophisticated and influential example of holistic thought, I first highlight relevant holistic features of his model, especially the concepts of the self and * unus mundus *(one world), identify the implicit metaphysics of the model's concept of the whole, and trace the cultural and social benefits that are claimed to flow from such a version of holism. I then confront Jung’s model with Gilles Deleuze’s more constructivist way of thinking about wholes and totality in terms of multiplicity, univocity of being, and pure immanence. The Deleuzian perspective arguably exposes a number of questionable philosophical assumptions in Jung’s holism, as well as some less salubrious cultural and social implications. In order to assess whether the Deleuzian critique of Jung’s holism is answerable, I focus attention on the understanding and role of immanence and transcendence within each thinker’s model, comparing Deleuze’s more pantheistic concept of the whole, which aims at pure immanence, with Jung’s more panentheistic concept, which embraces both immanence and transcendence. I argue that Jung’s position is in fact an ally of the Deleuzian critique whose real target is the kind of strong transcendence characteristic of classical theism, which both thinkers eschew.

**Roderick Main**, PhD, is a professor in the Centre for Psychoanalytic Studies and Director of the Centre for Myth Studies at the University of Essex. His publications include *The Rupture of Time: Synchronicity and Jung’s Critique of Modern Western Culture* (Brunner-Routledge, 2004), *Revelations of Chance: Synchronicity as Spiritual Experience* (SUNY, 2007), *Jung on Synchronicity and the Paranormal* (Routledge/Princeton, 1997), and *Myth, Literature, and the Unconscious* (Karnac, 2013). He is currently leading a two-year research project titled “‘One world’: logical and ethical implications of holism” funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK.

*Holistic becomings through the psychoid becoming*

Christian McMillan

In ‘On the Nature of the Psyche’ (1947/1954) C. G. Jung sought to ‘bridge’ the fissure between phenomenal and noumenal realms via his use of the ‘psychoid’, ‘a bridge to matter in general’ (para. 420). In doing so Jung presents a solution to the problem of constitutive finitude which underpinned the ‘Copernican revolution’ inaugurated by Kant’s (1724-1804) critical philosophy. For Gilles Deleuze the ‘fissure’ is determined as time, ‘the pure and empty form of time’ (2004/1968, p. 109) which acts as a problematic ground of positive ungrounding (ibid., p. 80) through which difference-in-itself and becoming return, immanent within the constitution of events. My intention in this paper is to consider what logical and ethical implications are entailed given the ‘whole’ these thinkers compel us to engage with through their respective characterisations of the ‘fissure’ and their respective empirical methods for doing so.

For Jung this whole is the * unus mundus * or ‘one-world’ (1955-56, para. 664), while for Deleuze it is the ‘plane of immanence’ (2001/1995, p. 27) or ‘virtual’. In his work on
synchronicity (1952) Jung introduces us to holistic connections linked via ‘meaning’ (para. 915) between non-causally related phenomena and events. Their relation indicates a creative intentionality of open-becoming which affects us when we affirm an active attitude towards being affected. In their consideration of ‘becomings’ (2004/1980 pp. 262-3), Deleuze and his collaborator Felix Guattari gesture to holistic forms of connection as multiplicities composed of experiential states where lines are blurred between human consciousness and animal awareness, biopsychic life and the nature of matter itself. What remains unclear is the kind of ‘meaning’ that such ‘becomings’ might entail given that they are the product of encounters that for Jung always refer to the needs of the individual but for Deleuze have most significance with respect to an open ‘experimentation’ (2004/1980, p. 176) in which old connections are dissolved and new ones forged.

One way to deal with a potential impasse between ‘meaning’ and ‘experimentation’ could be to consider Jung’s psychoid archetype-as-such – a transcendental Idea – in terms of Deleuze’s Idea as Problem. Composed of archetypal-Ideas, the unus mundus is differentiated with structures that are both transcendent and immanent to the actual; transcendent because they do not resemble the actual, immanent because they are no larger than what they condition in the actual. In the form of ‘multiplicity’ or ‘assemblage’ (Deleuze), or ‘constellation’ (Jung), asymmetrical interaction between the archetypal-Ideas and the actual refer to a productive tension, preventing the reducibility of the actual to the Idea. This irreducibility denotes the Problematic horizon of the Idea and the archetype-as-such, constitutive of the internal creative structure of existence itself.

Christian McMillan, PhD, is a researcher on a two-year research project titled “One world”: logical and ethical implications of holism' funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK in the Centre for Psychoanalytic Studies at the University of Essex.

*Holism and chance: markets and meaning under neoliberalism*

Joshua Ramey

In this presentation I will explore how extreme variants of neoliberal ideology about the power of markets, particularly as articulated in the late work of Friedrich Hayek, produce illusions about the kind of meanings that can be construed on the basis of chance or random processes. Randomness poses an interesting problem for holism in general, but here I will focus on the specific power that uncertainty (linked to the basic fact of extreme contingency, or chance) is supposed to display, within ‘correctly’ functioning markets, to generate meaning. In my recent book Politics of Divination: Neoliberal Endgame and the Religion of Contingency (Rowman and Littlefield, 2016), I have argued that the extreme version of neoliberal market apologetics holds that markets can function as divination processes — that is, as inquiries into more-than-human knowledge. The complex and unstable relation between chance and the Whole is figured here in an equivocation over whether chance means everything or nothing, and helps to explain the particular role between neoliberal ideology and nihilism.

Joshua Ramey, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Grinnell College. His work includes The Hermetic Deleuze: Philosophy and Spiritual Ordeal (2012). He is co-editor of Speculation, Heresy, and Gnosis in Contemporary Philosophy of Religion: The Enigmatic
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*Absolute* (2016) and co-translator of François Laruelle’s *Non-Philosophical Mysticism for Today’s Use* (forthcoming).

**One, two, three … one: the edusemiotic self**

Inna Semetsky

Jung and Deleuze afforded a special significance to signs, symbols, symptoms and images (even as Jung’s definitions of signs and symbols appear to be reversed). While Deleuze-Guattarian schizoanalysis critiques both Freud and Jung, Deleuze’s own works are permeated with subtle Jungian inflections, especially regarding the unconscious or ‘unthought’ dimension of experience. The crux of Jung’s depth psychology is the existence of the collective unconscious (objective psyche) structured by archetypal patterns manifesting in the form of typical habits. In a number of works, Jung referred to the axiom of Maria Prophetissa, a 3rd-century alchemist, as a metaphor for the process of individuation. The paper positions this axiom in the context of Deleuze’s paradoxical logic of multiplicities (problematic Ideas) central to his philosophy of transcendental empiricism. When phenomena betray their representation by clear and distinct ideas but flash their veiled meanings as signs, they need to be explicated and ‘read’ so that problematic encounters can make sense. Signs are formal structures of relations that function on the basis of the included ‘third’ – the elusive *tertium quid*. The reading of signs is an experiment that involves experiential learning (self-education or apprenticeship) and, ultimately, self-knowledge in the form of deep gnosis. Only as such can we become *in-dividual*, ‘whole’ selves. The paper also addresses ethics as the integration of the Jungian Shadow archetype that may manifest in events of which, according to Deleuze, we must become worthy. To conclude, the paper presents an example of the transformative, healing (‘making whole’) practice that demonstrates the actualisation of the virtual archetypes via their ‘dramatisation’ in the esoteric yet ‘real characters’ of a neutral language envisaged by Pauli, Jung’s collaborator on the concept of synchronicity. Deleuze’s call to retrieve and read the structures immanent in the depth of the psyche is thereby answered: we self-transcend by becoming-other.

*Inna Semetsky* has a PhD in educational philosophy preceded by an MA in counselling psychology and Grad.Dip.Ed. She has published ten books including *Deleuze, Education and Becoming* (2006), *Re-Symbolization of the Self* (2011) and *The Edusemiotics of Images* (2013) and has a contract with Routledge for a new book *Learning with the Unconscious*. In 2000 she received the Kevelson Award from the Semiotic Society of America for her paper ‘The Adventures of a Postmodern Fool’. Her book *Edusemiotics* (2015, co-authored) received the Book Award from the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia. She has numerous book chapters including in the 2016 volume *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Religion* as well as in international handbooks. Her papers have appeared in *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Zygon, *Semiotica* and other journals. She serves as a chief consultant to the recently established Institute for Edusemiotic Studies (Melbourne). She is also a long-time Tarot reader. Email: irs5@columbia.edu
At the heart of individuation, as Jung conceptualised it, is a reduction in egoic defences enabling the person to be more accurately in touch with external/objective reality. This is paralleled in the self-developmental endeavours of the contemporary 'mind-body spiritualities'. For both of these (insofar as they can be considered distinct), there is a tendency to regard inner, individual development as paralleling that of outer, cosmic, or evolutionary development. 'Mind-body', or 'holistic' spirituality (previously referred to as New Age) has been only rarely engaged with from a depth-psychological perspective and the views presented have tended to be unfavourable with commentators concluding New Age thinking to be regressive, nihilistic and inflated (Tacey, 2001; 2004; Faber, 1993; 1996).

In this paper I will illustrate the overlap between the predominant holistic visions present in Jung’s thinking and that of a few highly influential proponents of holistic spirituality. I demonstrate that, as the goal most strongly espoused within the literature of holistic spirituality is for the practitioner to achieve effortless harmony intra-psychically and attunement with the cosmic divine source extra-psychically, from a Jung-informed perspective, they are indeed attempting a destructive regression to a pre-egoic maternal state, the pleroma. This leads me to compare the nature of pleroma with the corresponding construct in holistic spirituality, ‘the Source’. I argue that there are some clear convergences, which point to the possibility that ‘the Source’ may be more comparable to the unus mundus in Jung’s thinking, than to pleroma. This, however, would lead to very different depth-psychological judgements about holistic spirituality, to those presented at the outset, and I invite those present to engage in a discussion of what the consequences of this might be.

Christina Sjöström has a PhD in Psychoanalytic Studies. Her thesis, titled Searches for Self: Personal and Spiritual Transformation in Jung’s Psychology and Holistic Spirituality, presented a nuanced conceptual comparison between the search for an essential self as described by Jung and various influential proponents of holistic spirituality. Concurrently with completing her thesis, she trained as a counsellor and currently works in private practice. She is a long-term student of yoga and recently completed a training to become a yoga teacher. She uses her clinical and academic understanding, as well as classical yogic texts and concepts, to inform her in designing transformative yoga classes.

*“How Do We Think in Terms of Wholes?”: Holistic Voices and Visions After World War II*

Linda Sargent Wood

This paper provides a retrospective of holism after 1945, a time when holistic sensibilities resounded throughout significant subsections of the U.S. and elsewhere. This perspective—a view that reality can only be understood as a whole—emphasized interdependencies, integration, and community. Holistic projects changed policies and perceptions, affecting the ways people lived, worked, worshipped, and interacted.
Demonstrating some of the character, manipulability, power and reach of holism at this historical juncture, I spotlight nature writer Rachel Carson; structural engineer Buckminster Fuller; Baptist minister and civil rights leader Martin Luther King, Jr; Jesuit priest and paleontologist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin; humanistic psychologist Abraham Maslow; and the Esalen Institute. These individuals and their work reflect the concept of holism. Each addressed constituent parts of the human experience from the individual (body, mind, spirit), society, the natural and built environments and the cosmos. Together, they provide a view of this whole holistic endeavor.

Illuminating the intellectual synergy of this group deepens our understanding of how some negotiated this era. Troubled by what seemed to them a fragmented world, they balked at medical approaches that treated humans as parts, systems that compartmentalized life, and huge corporations that put profit over human and environmental welfare.

Seeing this moment highlights some of the ways that holism can be used and bent for various agendas be it, for example, as a tool to rebel against hierarchical distinctions of race or a method to harmonize science and religion. In the 1970s, holism was again remade, taking on an individualistic turn to meet new circumstances.

While this paper focuses on my book on holism, I end with a short exploration of the possibilities and problems of holistic thinking and practices today. Like past iterations, this kaleidoscope of ideas offers compelling insights. The question is how it will be used, for good or ill.

**Linda Sargent Wood** is an Associate Professor of History at Northern Arizona University and the author of *A More Perfect Union: Holistic Worldviews and the Transformation of American Culture After World War II* (Oxford, 2010) and “Contact, Encounter, and Exchange at Esalen: A Window onto Late Twentieth-Century American Spirituality.” Her current project on the disability rights movement invests her in questions about who merits membership in the community and how difference is factored into the whole. Recently, she published “We Had to Start Treating Them as Human Beings”: Dr. Philip Pallister, Clinical Genetics and the Montana State Training School.”

* 

**The concept of kami in Shintō and Holism: Psychotherapy and Japanese literature**

**Megumi Yama**

Although the Japanese word *kami* is usually translated into English in terms such as deity, god, or spirit, none of these words precisely captures its full meaning. What makes this concept more ambiguous and chaotic is that due to the syncretization of Japanese religions, the same word *kami* is used both for god and goddess in Buddhism and the numerous spirits in Shintō.

In fact, the ambiguous nature of *kami* itself is considered to be not only unique in religious and cultural meaning, but also noteworthy in terms of its deep fixedness in the Japanese psyche. Many Japanese accept the concept of *kami* without even being conscious of its historical religious basis.
We can find these *kami* in the *Kojiki*, the oldest Japanese creation myth. In the very beginning, before the appearance of the ‘First Parents’ who created the world, many generations of invisible *kami* float in and out of ‘being’ one after another. They gradually take *kami* form, moving from intangible to tangible, from invisible to visible, from abstract to concrete. Although each embodies a separate *kami*, ultimately they show orientation as a whole. In this presentation I would like to argue, using examples from psychotherapy and Japanese literature, that through exploring this orientation in a connection of seemingly fragmented images, an important theme may emerge. Such a concept may finally lead to the Buddhist idea of *jinen* – a state in which everything flows spontaneously, just as it is.

**Megumi Yama**, PhD, is a professor in Depth Psychology and Clinical Psychology at Kyoto Gakuen University, Japan. She also works as a clinical psychologist and engages in training analysis mainly based on Jungian principles. Her interest is images and words; what is taking in the invisible silence? She is trying to deal with this theme by exploring clinical materials, formative art, myth and Japanese culture. Her publications include *To the Depth of words* (Seishinshobo, 2003). She has a book chapter in *Jungian and Dialogical Self Perspectives* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). Her papers have appeared in *Jung Journal: Culture and Psyche*, *The Journal of Analytical Psychology* and other journals.