

The islands of perception

Eppur si muove¹

For people from earlier times the earth was the center of the universe and sun and moon revolved it. This was the firm conviction of man for a long time and a look to the sky seemed to confirm this "truth". As we all can see sun and moon quite obviously move and revolve the earth.

Also today, we live in convictions for which we have proofs like the people who saw how the moon and the sun revolved the earth. But no conviction, no theory lasts forever. There will be a time when the observations and experiences don't agree with the previous convictions any more. Such observations and experiences which don't fit in the previous conception of the world any more are abnormal in that time and the people which make such experiences seems to be confused or crazy at the beginning of such a time of radical change. If more and more people see the things which only a few saw till then, science will introduce a new proof for another "new" reality; it is slowly time for a new conception of the world, for a new paradigm but again it will be a picture presumably and therefore again an idea for a time.

The paradigm that the earth is a plate and one would fall down if one would step only over the edge, was part of the conception of the world in prior times, it was what people used to think. Perhaps today we smile about this; we know now that we at least don't need to be afraid of falling down from the earth by stepping over the edge. But what about nowadays assumptions, what about nowadays paradigms? And on reply to this question let's not forget that every paradigm is only a model, an idea of the real reality. Also today we consider a paradigm as *the* reality.

We are convinced to be right with this assumption and it will take time until more and more people recognize that the things are different as previously assumed. Such a strong concussion turned out in what people believed when Albert Einstein at the beginning of the 20th century swaying Newton's conception of the world and other scientists and researchers after him still brought much more unbelievable cognitions to light and old convictions caved into themselves.

Much of what science watches today scientists cannot explain and they stands helplessly in front of the watched phenomena and perhaps this is the reason why only very few of this have arrived into the heads (and heart) of the general public until now. Perhaps the scientists have become more caution to give answers since they had to recognize too often that they hadn't looked deeply enough and they were too rash with their answers. Perhaps it simply needs time, until a type of new thinking has spread out up to the smallest angles of our life.

¹ „Eppur si muove – and she is moving“. This sentence by Galileo Galilei isn't historically proved but it is told that he whispered this sentence when he was led out of the courtroom in 1633 where he has to abjure his teachings that the earth and other planets are revolving the sun. For these teachings he was punished with lifelong arrest.

There is a position today and it lasts obstinately which shall be object of our consideration here that it is the firm conviction of man that we, with our sensory organs, like seeing hearing etc. are able to be aware of our surrounding on a full scale. And that there is nothing more than we can smell, view, listen and touch². The conviction is so complete that also here in this case any other position than this is regarded as absurd like in the time when Galileo Galilei recognized that the earth revolves the sun. Every perception which falls out of a certain scheme and which shows a different view of what all others are aware of, which is out from the agreement of the mainstream people, is in the best case an hallucination, an illusion and in the worst case it is pathological, a malfunction of our perception apparatus, in short words one must be ill.

Perception with our senses

Normally all of us know that the spectrum of our senses of perception is relatively limited in their frequency range. Let's take our ears for example. We people hear a frequency spectrum between 16 Hz and 20 kHz, i.e. with our ears we are aware of vibrations which oscillate between 16 and 20.000 times in a second. This area is our hearing domain and this only when we are quite young. When we get older, the ability of our hearing decreases particularly in the upper area and so children and younger people are aware of certain tones that we simply are not aware of any more. And it should be clear to everybody that this is caused by our restricted ability of our senses. That we don't hear these tones any more doesn't mean that these tones wouldn't be there. They still are there only on the other side of our perception ability.

So there are animals, like the dolphins for example, which skim over a far bigger area with their hearing perception. They "speak" to each other in audible frequencies which we use too and also in an area which is far exceeded, in the ultrasound area of approx. 20 kHz to 1 GHz. And in the infrasound area which is below our limit of audibility, under the area of 16 Hz, the whales communicates with each other, with a considerably larger spectrum not only below but also above our hearing frequencies.

With our eyes it is just similar. Also here with our eyes it is vibrations which we are aware of, only much faster vibrations. We also can see frequencies in the terms of wavelength. The visible frequency spectrum of our eyes lies between 380 and 760 nm and an nm corresponds to a billionth of a meter or a millionth of a millimeter wavelength. In this so unbelievable fast swinging area lies the perception possibility of our eyes for all colors and we only have receptors for the color red, green and blue, the so-called cones, and for black and white contrasts, the so-called sticks. With these receptors we map our environment. We see all the nuances of colors and portray our visual reality.

² Normally we think that our 5 senses can show us a whole picture of the world. Scientifically (by the old paradigm) there is no 6th sense, which would explain the paranormal abilities like telepathy, clear view and precognition. Sometimes the more enhanced abilities of the animals were called the 6th sense, for example the ability of the whales to recognize the magnetic field of the earth.



If the frequencies are only a little lower we're talking about infrared radiation in the area of 780 nm and we are not able to notice the light of an infrared source, such as the remote control of our television. The ultraviolet radiation lies with a wavelength from 10 to 380 nm at the other end of our perception ability. Also here we find some animals, which are able to be aware of a frequency's spectrum below ours, like the Bee for example, who can find the way in its world, by sensing the thermal radiation in the infrared area.

Beyond our senses

As an example the analysis of these two senses shall be enough to realize, that with each of our senses we're only able to be aware of a quite certain and relatively narrow area and that below and above of our perception abilities lies areas which we just cannot be aware of and that therefore they aren't less real. We don't get to them just due to the restricted perception ability of our perception apparatus. Between our senses, under and over their physiological perception limits are laying areas which we only can be aware of by taking technical equipment. And by pushing forward the progressive development of this equipment in areas which were closed till now, the reality slowly step by step discloses itself to us.

In consideration of the relatively small frequency range of the perception ability of our senses we can talk about islands which are on a sea of reality. Even with the help of our scientific instruments we penetrate into areas, in the macroscopic area which seems so infinitely, like the empire of the stars and the solar systems of our universe and also in the microscopic area the empire of the smallest particles which resist the exact definition whether they are particles or waves. We only see islands swimming on a gigantic sea of reality. And every time, we adhere to it again that the islands would be our reality and not the sea in which they swim.

It is already fascinating to imagine that everything what surrounds us and what we are aware of are vibrations of different frequencies. Even matter which seems so reliably and solid to us discloses itself to the scientist as an immense empty room, in which the distances between the single particles are relational approximately as big as between the stars and planets of our universe. Indeed it is rather an immense room in which small sets of particles are vibrating then it would be solid substances. But this time this shall not be object of our consideration but the question what is actually left if we gather all up, what our senses are able to show us? And furthermore, when we capture everything what we only can perceive with the help of measuring instruments and other technical equipment? If we summarize all this, then we have a certain quantity of "reality" but still there will be something beyond, because we have no senses, because we have no technical equipment to perceive it. No matter how great the mass of our reality will be then, I am inclined to assume that it would always be an island which swims in the midst of a gigantic sea. The times science assumed to shortly reveal the last secrets of the universe is over and it was only a (hopefully passing) temporary misbelieve of a spirit sunk into megalomania. Today, science is further away from explaining what goes on around us and what life is, than ever.



No words

Quite soon, if we want to look at how our perceived reality and the “real” reality behave, we discover the difficulty of not having any general conceptual system for this consideration. We handle the terms “reality” and “substantiality” and we always must be very prudent to name the particular context in which we use the term. Out of the context, reality and substantiality are only two words which name the very same, which shows us again how we became a slave of the idea, that we are able to picture the reality with our perception apparatus. Other terms are confusing us and seem to be paradoxical. How can something beyond our reality be substantiality? For example the word “Tao” from the teaching of Lao Tse, who lived in the 7th pre-Christian century, names what can’t be named. Everything what lies on the other side of the denominated is Tao and as soon as we found a word for it, it is no more Tao.

So it’s told in the translation by Richard Wilhelm³:

*"The meaning which can be expressed isn't the eternal meaning.
The name which can be mentioned isn't the eternal name."*

Or in another translation by Mitchell⁴:

*"The Tao which can be told about isn't the eternal Tao.
The name which can be mentioned isn't the eternal name."*

And it is then called further:

"Nonexistence is the beginning of sky and earth..."

Or in other translation:

"The unspeakable is the eternally reality..."

This already shakes our understanding of reality quite strongly. How can what can’t be named be the reality? And why does something lose the character of the "eternal meaning" or the "eternal name" as soon as we name it?

New words

Another world of concepts opens up for us if we deal with the shamanic position what associates with reality and substantiality. Perhaps the occupation with these concepts would even help us to get a little further with the questions we just asked. After all, the shamans already handle these concepts around “reality” and “substantiality” for a very long time and quite sovereignty. They have a traditional terminology for it. They have terms which permit them to handle these things which seem to be paradoxical for us.

³ „Tao Te King – the book of the way of life“ translated by Richard Wilhelm

⁴ „Tao Te King“ translated by Stephen Mitchell, German by Peter Kobbe

For whatever reasons, this knowledge has always survived through time and within the different shamanic cultures. I want to express with that: I am convinced that we also had an easier contact with these things but we just removed from it over the time. We sold a piece of our homeland, our real "home" for the illusion of being able to declare everything rationally. But we find our way back there easily, if we take the terminology of an old culture as assistance.

There surely are differences in the used concepts and terminologies of the different shamanic cultures and the one introduced here by me now is also only one of surely much other. Over the years of my occupation with the teachings this one has proved quite extensive, as precise and constant, and served as a basis for other systems, which have developed, such as concepts from the process work of Arnold Mindell, to which I will come later in this article.

The concept system of which I speak here goes back to the teachings of a Yaqui shaman with the name Don Juan Matus. I quite early encountered this teaching as a young man with approximately 18 years by the books of Carlos Castaneda. First fascinated by the insights into this strange and magic World, which revealed itself in the Stories of Carlos Castaneda, the initial fascination changed gradually into the knowledge that this strange magic world described in the books refers to exactly this world in which I and we all live. Carlos Castaneda didn't experience these things on any strange other planet but exact here in this world, in which we all live. Over the time more and more parallels to experience reports of other people disclosed themselves and experiences of my own joined soon, so that it seemed more and more real to me and lost the character of a fiction, a story which only arises from a variety imagination. Suddenly things, inconceivable before, became real. Not only the reality in which Carlos Castaneda lived changed over the time, but my reality also became another.

The island – the Tonal⁵

As mentioned at the beginning, this shamanic teaching contains concepts which can explain us this area around reality and substantiality a little. So the idea of an island which represents our substantiality which swims in the midst of a sea of reality is described as *tonal*. The tonal is everything, what we are, what we can name and what we have concepts for.

So Don Juan says to Carlos Castaneda when he explains him this new concept for the first time⁶:

"This is my tonal" Don Juan said, rubbing his hands on his chest.

"Your suit?"

"No. My person."

He pounded his chest and his thighs and the side of his ribs.

"My tonal is all this."

⁵ In anthropological literature on the ancient cultures of central Mexico the "tonal" (pronounced, toh-na'hl) was thought to be a kind of guardian spirit.

⁶ Taken from „Tales of Power“, the fourth book of the teachings of Don Juan.



How new and first incomprehensibly this was also for Carlos Castaneda shows his idea Don Juan would mean his suit.

In the further explanation it is then said and this indicates already that it's about much more:

"The tonal is everything we are. Name it! Anything we have a word for is the tonal. And since the tonal is its own doings, then everything, obviously, has to fall under its domain."

"The tonal is the social person."

"The tonal is, rightfully so, a protector, a guardian - a guardian that most of the time turns into a guard."

In these words swings how addicted we are to our ability to explain the world on one side, and how, on the other side, it easily becomes a prison, a dead end for us, when we only expect and think of reality as what fits into our concept system.

And Don Juan further explains:

"The tonal is the organizer of the world. [...] This perhaps describes its enormous work if one says that the task of organizing the chaos of the world rests on its shoulders. At the moment for example it is your tonal which tries to understand our conversation. There would be only funny noises and grimaces without this and you wouldn't understand anything."

The tonal helps us to find our way through the world. It helps us so to speak to get across the street in the daily traffic of life. And how much Don Juan words get close to the teachings of the Tao becomes clear in the following paragraph:

"The tonal is everything we know," he repeated slowly. "And that includes not only us, as persons, but everything in our world. It can be said that the tonal is everything that meets the eye."

"We begin to groom it at the moment of birth. The moment we take the first gasp of air we also breathe in power for the tonal. So, it is proper to say that the tonal of a human being is intimately tied to his birth."

"You must remember this point. It is of great importance in understanding all this. The tonal begins at birth and ends at death."

So the tonal in this context is what we can know, what we are able to perceive with our senses and also with the help of technical equipment, everything what we can name. But does this mean that this island is the reality? It names only a part of the reality and as soon as we fit it in into a concept system it loses its real character, namely to be more than the sum of its parts.

The use of terms implies we would know what it is. As if a term really could contain something completely. With an example of a map it gets clear that this can't be. A map can be as precise as possible and can represent the described area in extremely details; it will never be able to replace the area which it describes. There is much more to be in an area, in listening to the noises of the waves at the rocks in the



sea, in smelling the germinating earth in spring or in feeling the earthy bark of a tree. You can never really describe being in this area. You can approximate this, and people of all times did this, by using music or poetry, to describe feelings beyond definition, but it always will be different to be really there. A map can never describe an area completely. The real character of something lies beyond description and is always more than the term or the description itself. This doesn't negate the value of a description or term but only relativizes its meaning. A name helps us to find our way in the world and simultaneously holds the danger that we take it for the actual reality.

The sea, the Nagual⁷

But what is the reality now? How we can imagine the sea on which the island of the tonal swims? Also here we take a concept which Don Juan Matus uses to explain Carlos Castaneda the topic reality. The word *nagual* names the sea, but it is much more difficult for us, to handle with this concept because as soon as we name something it is tonal. If we now go with this new term nagual it means to take care of that. We always have to keep this in the back of our head. As soon as we name something it lifts out from a condition of "nonexistence" (what doesn't say that *it* wasn't before), it is tonal again as we name it and it gets a shape by our naming.

This helpless "look around and search" feeling which perhaps we feel now, Carlos Castaneda also felt when he asked Don Juan in the book:

"Is the nagual the highest nature? Is this nagual God?"

"No, God is an object of our personality and the tonal of our time. As I said already everything of which we think the world consists is tonal, inclusively God, of course. God has no more meaning than to be a part of tonal of our time."

And here it turns out that we must describe every concept very precisely because we cannot simply assume that other people fill a concept with the same contents. So Carlos Castaneda asks:

"In my understanding, don Juan, God is everything. Aren't we talking about the same thing?"

"No. God is only everything you can think of, therefore, properly speaking, he is only another item on the island. God cannot be witnessed at will, he can only be talked about. The nagual, on the other hand, is at the service of the warrior. It can be witnessed, but it cannot be talked about."

"Is the nagual the Supreme Being, the Almighty, God?" I asked.

"No. God is also on the table. Let's say that God is the tablecloth."

"But, are you saying that God does not exist?"

"No. I didn't say that. All I said was that the nagual was not God, because God is an item of our personal tonal and of the tonal of the times."

⁷ The "Nagual" (pronounced, nah-wa'hl) in anthropological literature was the name given to the animal into which sorcerers could transform themselves.

The tonal is, as I've already said, everything we think the world is composed of, including God, of course. God has no more importance other than being a part of the tonal of our time."

The idea that God is everything is very comprehensible in our culture. However, that we again confuse the concept with the area comes clear to our mind when we talk to representatives of other religions and notice that they carry another idea of God into themselves as Christians do and perhaps defend these persuasions with exactly the same vehemence. Which one now is the "right" God? Is it the God of the Christians or the one of the Islam? Are the Buddhists right or the Hindus? Since the beginning of time, as long as we confound concept and area, we argue about who is right now. If we would mean it really seriously that God is everything we must widen our concept of God. It must contain all other conceptualities and definitions. The quarrel would end immediately and we would recognize that all of us mean the same. Unfortunately, we still seem to be far away from this.

In this context Carlos Castaneda asks, God is a concept and therefore tonal, as in the concept of so many of us. As well as we speak and use a concept it is tonal. The answer of Don Juan shows how hard and paradox it is to name the nagual with words:

"One can experience it but one cannot talk about it."

The assembly point

There are different islands of perception. There are personal islands which are defined by our personal perception ability and there are collective islands which either share a group of people with each other or nations. But also complete mankind has a collective island, a collective tonal. There is a story about the residents of the South Sea Isles to which Christopher Columbus was sailing that they couldn't see the ships of his fleet because they had no viewing mechanisms for a thing like a ship. The shaman of this people one day noticed water movements and in the repeated analysis and examination of this water moving phenomenon the ships suddenly "appeared" and when the shaman told this to his people they finally saw it too, until the ships of Christopher Columbus finally become too really for all of them. It is known knowledge from perception psychology, that we are not consciously aware of things, although we have them directly in front of our eyes, as long as we don't dispute with them or touch them. Then suddenly they seem to appear out of nothing and remain as an integral part of our reality from that time on.

All of us pass through such phases in which we "learn" to be aware of things and to map them in a certain way. At the beginning of our life we still carry knowledge of the other side of words the island and are so to speak surrounded by a cloud of the nagual until we begin to be aware of the world like our collective tonal corresponds with it. As we learn to view the world in this way and not different, we share a type of reality to be a part of a collective and a part of a community. So also here, in viewing of a collective island we again only see a part of the reality. We share a certain form of "reality" and this we call our reality.



Don Juan Matus suggests us to use the idea of the assembly point when he tries to describe how we find within the infinite variety of perception possibilities that certain part for us in which we find our reality. We are, so to speak and to explain the terms a little more, peoples who put things together to a perception possibility. Here in this case it is called the human perception ribbon. People who can see energetic structures, someone who can see more with their eyes than the general established perception island spectrum can see that we as mankind use this ribbon under many others to create our reality. Out of the view of the shamans everything that we see as our reality is defined by our assembly point including the physical legitimacies like gravity and other things like that.

Don Juan says that shamans can move their assembly point to different positions within the human energy field which leads to the composition of other reality's and also in areas out of the human energy field which leads to completely different realities for which we people don't have any words to describe. Depending on the position of the assembly point one activates quite normal secondary (perception-) abilities of man, like aura viewing, far perception etc. up to others still more difficult conceivable abilities like levitation and teleportation⁸. The idea to put worlds together by the position of the assembly point correlates with the "many-world model" of the quantum physicists according to which our world is only one of infinitely others and every possible condition and every possible event most likely becomes reality in a so-called parallel -universe or -world.

Consensus

Consensus means an "Agreement" and names an agreement of a group on something without hidden or open contradiction. I.e. such an agreement isn't analyzed actually. To analyze an agreement indicates to be outside the same. We people like to be not "outside". We also don't like others to be "outside" and so we tend to marginalize and abnegate things. This together with the strong conviction of man mentioned at the beginning that there cannot be any reality outside of our perception apparatus leads to an enormous tightness of our assembly point.

The perception of things outside of this agreement (like the ships of Christopher Columbus) most likely is connected to an absolute malaise because our world breaks for a moment. The till now so reliable boards which meant our world till now sway suddenly, even break perhaps and we learn the feeling of the lack of security up to feeling to fall and that our life ends here. All of us know this feeling when we thought of meeting someone and suddenly we ran into him or her, when things happens which undergo any classification, perhaps only for a fraction of a second, and than we come back to see it as a coincidence and restore our previous view.

What, if it wasn't a "coincidence"? What if it would be a quite natural ability of man to foresee things like to meet someone whom we thought of? What if it is reality, maybe another reality? That this yet cannot be in the moment is part of the tonal of our time.

⁸ The teleportation, it mean the transportation of matter through space, happens experimentally in the area of quantum mechanics not only with photons (1997), but also with much larger particles of matter like atoms (2004).



In Arnold Mindells process work this area of agreement of people about what is reality is described as the consensus reality (CR). Also here we distinguish between personal consensus reality and the one of a group up to the one which is similarly characteristic of all people. Here as people we define our reality.

For what is outside of our consensus reality we actually don't have any words because we don't believe that there could be something outside, Words would already tell that there is something. This already would be too much threat of our world and we rather prefer to not having any words, no concepts for this. In such a case we generally use a negation by using the prefix "not-". Also in the process work we manage this by simply describing it as "non consensus reality" (NCR).

The second attention

The sentence of Don Juan: *"One can experience it but one cannot speak about it"*, indicates that there are other possibilities perception besides our perception apparatus and our rational intellect. Also Saint Exupéry's *"The Little Prince"*⁹ points out that there are things which we can only see with the heart. We are used to perceive the world with senses orientated to the outside, to literally understand it by touching it (also with our eyes and ears) and to only take for real what we can grasp. For all this our first attention serves. For other things which can't be so simply understood and what escapes a rational explanation, it needs another attention which is called the second attention in the shamanic teachings. It's a kind of perception which is open to all people similarly, but which till now receives only little attention in our society because we are used to focus the outside. As our senses are more focused and partial in the outer perception, they are blurred and smooth in the second attention so that other, rather peripheral things, can unintentionally step into our perception. The idea of the "inner attentiveness" which we use in the Integrated Process Accompany describes a quite similar consciousness condition of unintentional self-observation in which we orientate our attention to the inside and in which the things can get into our perception unintentionally. The attention and the use of the idea of the unintentional self-observation perhaps gives the impression that this form of perception would happen exclusively in our inside and correspondingly would represent a proprioceptive form of perception. Actually on this level it isn't really possible to say over which channels we perceive with our second attention. It is rather a form of the immediate recognizing or certain form of knowledge without knowing how you reached this knowledge. Characteristic to this is to be aware of the present experience, to be aware of what is happening at the moment without judging or wanting to change something to this.

The knowledge of this form of perception and the ability of man to use it can be found in all cultures everywhere. So Gautama Buddha approx. 500 BC describes a condition in its meaning, which he refers to as "Vipassana": "...to see the things like they actually are..." Other translations of the term Vipassana can be: "clear view" or also "discover".

⁹ I'm talking about the book: "The Little Prince" written by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry



The calling of the sea

With the first attention we live our everyday life. The first attention helps us across the street whereas the second attention lets us be aware of the swinging of our steps, the special way of being in this very moment. But it is not only the perception of our mood but furthermore it can be very fine subtle feelings and also ideas. C.G. Jung also described this kind of experience as *numinous*, almost beyond the senses. Further more features of such subtle perceptions are their *transient* character, they are extremely fugitive and perishable, they are passive, i.e. they happen to us and can't be caused willfully and they are *nonlocal*, they can be perceived similarly by individuals as of more people, and this independent of the spatial proximity.

Provided that we open ourselves to this second attention, we perceive all this, what rationally cannot be so simply explained. Why does our steps swing differently today and why do I have this feeling just now, that something meaningful would happen and why do I meet a person that has a significance for my life immediately after this? There aren't any answers for these questions in any cause none which would withstand a rational consideration. Answers to this are more at home in the area of myths which names a form of truth, which at least is perceptibly real and true to one man but doesn't withstand any rational explanation.

In our culture it was C.G. Jung who offered us to again discover that the surrounding talks to us. He mentioned the way of knowledge of a man, who is carried and led of signs and notes from the areas beyond the rationally explicable everyday life, as individuation. This statement also tells us, that something is interested in that we are aware of these things. The sea calls us! Today science assumes that we would live in a participatory universe. In my opinion this not only means, that everything is connected to everything, but also that the universe is a caretaking universe. Something cares that we develop. So as if the sea were interested to remind us again and again, that the true reality lies beyond our isles.

This is called the secondary process in the shamanic teachings and also in Arnold Mindell's process work. Arnold Mindell says that the secondary process follows our "mythical task" and so the secondary process is directly connected with the idea of the individuation and the idea of "meaning" of C.G. Jung. What is lived with the everyday consciousness in the first attention is the primary process. Generally a complete identification with the primary process takes place and therefore there is no place for any conscious perception of the secondary process. The perception of the primary process takes place with the first attention, whereas the secondary process can only disclose itself to man with the second attention.

The ally

Things which penetrate our attention from out of the secondary process can bring us fear and discomfort as mentioned in another place already. Something new and unforeseen is pressing in our life and the benevolent character of the caretaking universe is not always obvious immediately. Instead it can feel as if the floor was pulled away from below our feet. We frequently do not want what presses into our life



with such a might. It rather feels as if it wants to menace us and perhaps even to destroy us, and so it isn't easy to see a caretaking energy in which what comes toward us and which only wants to press ahead with our development, that wants to pull us out of our little chamber of self satisfaction.

It first feels strange that energies which comes to us with power and puts our lives "down under" are named in the teachings of the shamans as allies. Somebody who supports me benevolently in my plan and suits me aside is an ally. The consequences of the secondary process its shaping of our destinies is described as an ally as long as we can discover see the providing energies of a participatory universe. Up to this moment such destinies appears to us as an opponent and an obstacle. For the shaman it is an ally because it provides us to stay in contact with our "sin" and our "way."

This shamanic world view interconnects the taoistic view of things with parts and aspects of the ally. In contact to the Tao we learn to stay quiet and confidence in the event, that the things take their way, that there is only principle, and process and every process follows the principle and all of us therefore follow a pre-marked way. The shamanic teaching says in addition to this that it depends also on our personal strength and particularly our wanting our personal "will". So in connection with the term ally there is also the term "fight with the ally". The question here is: Do we see our fate in a refusing manner or do we remain to stay and recognize caretaking energies in the putative opponent.

In the words of the process oriented world view the fight with the ally appears between our "imaginary" and our "mythical" way where we generally put barriers and resistances between us and our secondary processes. We build barriers and edges and develop strategic behavior, which avoids and excludes us for our surviving in the loss of quality instead of integrating us. Energy is bound here and isn't any more at the complete system's disposal. By the "fight" with the ally it can come to a release and a reintegration of this split of energy and therefore to more quality.

Epilogue

A much more complete picture can arise if we connect the isles of our perception to the sea of the reality. Our senses are far bigger and there is much more, than science shows us till now. Science always hangs back quite natural a little in its attempt to show the reality and perhaps the science will never be able to show the reality really comprehensively. Furthermore the science is on the search for a theory of everything (TOE), a theory which can explain everything around us. We leave it open, whether the scientists will ever succeed.

Until this, we people can help us manage not to squint to the outside on the search for an explanation for what we experience in our inside any more. Explanations aren't always necessary and also not always possible. It already is in the nature of the thing, that the human mind (the rational intellect) is perhaps not able to understand the reality at all. In this context we as people are part of a greater and complete event and a part can never contain the whole. A part is contained by the whole but the reversal isn't possible.



Once there was a man taking a walk to the shore of the sea when he saw somebody with a small spoon going between the sea and a little hole which he dug into the sand. Obviously he was scooping water from the sea to this hole.

After a while of observation, this man went to him and asked him what he would do there.

"You see it anyway", he answered, "I scoop the sea into this hole."

*Astonished and a little confused of this answer the man says benevolently:
"Leave it because you will never succeed with this."*

Perhaps this is what we all try: We try to scoop the sea of the reality into the isles of our perception. I also think so, so we will never succeed with this.

References

"Tao Te King - The book of the way of life" translated by Richard Wilhelm

"Tao Te King" translated by Stephen Mitchell, German by Peter Kobbe

"Tales of Power" and additional books by Carlos Castaneda of the teachings of Don Juan

"At home in the universe - A new vision of reality" by Ervin Laszlo

