

**A NewWorldOverView**  
By Paul M. Helfrich, Ph.D.

[www.paulhelfrich.com](http://www.paulhelfrich.com)  
[helfrich@newworldview.com](mailto:helfrich@newworldview.com)

## Contents

- How do we know that we are Divine?**
- What is the Perennial Philosophy?**
- Why are the terms “traditional, modern, and postmodern” important?**
- How did modernity react to traditional perennial wisdom?**
- What is the difference between postmodern spirituality and religion?**
- What is the Seth Material?**
- What are other perennial themes found in the Seth Material?**
- What is channeling and how is it different than mediumship?**
- Is channeling a developmental intelligence we all possess?**
- Who and what is Seth?**
- What is the Integral Approach?**
- What is Integral Conscious Creation?**
- How does Integral Conscious Creation compare to Integral Spirituality?**
- What about Creationism?**
- What about Creation Spirituality and Christianity?**
- Who are Elias, Kris, and Rose?**
- So What?**
- Endnotes**

(A free two hour video and Powerpoint presentation that covers all the above [is available here!](#))

### How do we know that we are Divine?

People have had a variety of deeply intuitive or spiritual experiences for thousands of years. They provide personal testimony that we all have a direct subjective connection with the Divine, which goes by many names including Source, Spirit, Consciousness, God, or All-That-Is. We, too, can better understand our connection with the Divine – not just have faith in it – through our own direct experience.

*Methods to do so and opportunities to share personal experiences are provided here on NewWorldView (in our [Toolbox](#)).*

Most religious traditions – including the ones we were raised in – contain practices that consist of shallow or *translative* beliefs, rituals, and rules. They provide useful ways to help us to cope with the vicissitudes of life – illness, birth, death, marriage, jobs, and the like. But they also contain practices that are deep or *transformative* that promote growth and direct, personal experience of the Divine within. The latter are the kinds of experiences described by the founders of every authentic religious tradition. Over the centuries many of them have lost their transformative focus in favor of translative rituals and dogmas that no longer promote direct experience of the Divine. Still, the traditions developed various methods to teach us how to recognize our own connection to the Divine, and urge us to look inward for all the answers to life’s questions. The common elements between the traditions are sometimes referred to as *the Perennial Philosophy*.

“The words differ from one tradition to another, but their central message is the same: You are more than you think! Look deep within, and you will find that your ego is only a tiny wave atop the vast ocean that is your real Self. Look within, and at the center of your mind, in the depths of your soul, you will find your true Self, that this Self is intimately linked to the sacred, and that you share in the unbounded bliss of the sacred.” ~ Roger Walsh, Psychiatrist, Buddhist Meditator (1)

### **What is the Perennial Philosophy?**

Philosopher and mathematician Godfrey Leibniz (1646-1716) coined the term “*Philosophia Perennis*.” Writer Aldous Huxley (1894-1963) made it famous in *The Perennial Philosophy* (1945), and religious scholar Huston Smith showed its continued relevance to modern and postmodern worldviews in *Forgotten Truth* (1992). According to Huxley, it is:

“... the metaphysic that recognizes a divine Reality substantial to the world of things and lives and minds; the psychology that finds in the soul something similar to, or even identical with, divine Reality; the ethic that places man’s final end in the knowledge of the immanent and transcendent Ground of all being – the thing is immemorial and universal.

“Rudiments of the Perennial Philosophy may be found among the traditional lore of primitive people in every region of the world, and in its fully developed forms it has a place in every one of the higher religions.” (2)

Thus, perennial wisdom is found in some form in all the major religions of the East and West (e.g., Buddhist, Hindu, Taoist, Kabbalist, Gnostic Christian, Sufi, etc.). In spite of their varying origins, the following ideas consistently appear:

1. The physical field is not the only reality, because there is a nonphysical Source which is not usually perceived by the physical senses.
2. As long as we never experience this Source we live in a world of separation and illusion.
3. We can, however, learn to directly experience this Source, within and without, through the use deep intuitions or inner senses.

The premodern traditions also perceived the universe as a multiverse – A Great Chain of Being – usually in some kind of a hierarchy that included the realms of *matter*, *body*, *mind*, *soul*, and *spirit*. For example, in Christianity the realms of matter, body, and mind were the place of physical birth and death, the soul realms were inhabited by immortal orders of angels such as seraphim, cherubim, and archangels, and the ultimate realm of spirit was inhabited by God or Holy Spirit.

Modern and postmodern worldviews don't agree with all of the above, and that's part of what defines them as such. What's important from a postmodern perspective is to seek out the gems of truth from premodern worldviews, namely:

***Spirit or Consciousness with a capital “C” exists. Our universe is a multiverse of nested fields of consciousness, most of which are not perceivable by the five senses or their extensions (telescopes, microscopes) alone.***

### Why are the terms “traditional, modern, and postmodern” important?

We use the terms *traditional*, *modern*, and *postmodern* to first, distinguish between different periods of Western history, and second, describe the development of the worldviews (belief systems) in those periods in distinct stages.

In the first context, traditional Western history proceeded roughly from **Ancient** (everything before 500 CE) to **Medieval** (500 to 1500 CE) to **Modern** (1500 to present). The modern era began to emerge over six hundred years ago with the European Renaissance (14th-16th centuries) and Enlightenment (17th-18th centuries). Modernity saw the emergence of art, science, and morals into what German sociologist Max Weber called three distinct “value spheres” no longer solely controlled by The Medieval Church. The arts, literature, and science gradually developed new ideas and institutions independent of the direct influence of The Church.

What began to define the postmodern era were criticisms of the excesses and limitations of modern arts, literature, and science that emerged in force during the 20th century. Important critiques issued from philosophers like Foucault, Derrida, Lacan, and Lyotard showed that all languages carry hidden assumptions, power drives, and subconscious agendas within all three modern “values spheres.” Further, they showed how the interpretation of any text, artwork, or equation was based on highly subjective, first-person perspectives and social contexts. Contexts and knowledge become relative, not absolute. The postmodern era is still embryonic and began to gain prominence only fifty years ago.

In summary, we now have three overlapping periods of Western history – traditional, modern, and postmodern – with postmodern just emerging.

Period of History:	<b>Traditional</b>	<==>	<b>Modern</b>	<==>	<b>Postmodern</b>
Time:	Ancient-		1400 CE-Present		ca. 1950-
Value Spheres:	1500 CE The Church		Art, Science, and Morals		Present leading edge Not yet known....

In the second context, developmental psychologists like Piaget (1896-1980), Maslow (1908-1970), Graves (1914-1986), Kohlberg (1927-1987), Gilligan (b.1936), and many others have shown that humans universally begin at stage one and subsequently grow through more mature physical and psychological stages. Though they used different terms, and have mapped different stages and abilities like cognition, emotions, morals, needs, values, linguistic, mathematical, musical, kinesthetic, etc., in all cases basic development follows in what Clare Graves called “an

unfolding, emergent, oscillating, spiraling process marked by progressive subordination of older, lower-order behavior systems to new, higher-order systems as man's existential problems change." In short, as we mature we are better able to handle complexity and discern more subtle relationships between ourselves, our world, and how we can all get along.

Even though we are still in the early stages of postmodernity, we can clearly discern three broad stages of worldview development: traditional (religious), modern (scientific), and postmodern (relativistic). (3) However – and this is crucial – we each begin at stage one, or what we're generally calling traditional (religious), then grow into modern (scientific), and with any luck into postmodern (relativistic). We don't skip any stages, just like a seedling must become a sapling before it becomes a tree. Along the way it is possible to arrest and remain in whatever worldview adequately handles the existential challenges at hand. This applies on a global scale, and there are many, many different cultural situations people have to contend with every day.

Further, developmental anthropologists like Jean Gebser (1905-1973) have shown that human evolution, while far from a linear process, consists of worldviews that gradually unfold hierarchically in stages of increased complexity. Thus, each subsequent stage *is built upon the foundation that preceded it*. Each stage, in turn, creates new challenges that can only be solved by more sophisticated approaches or risk regression and arrested development. Albert Einstein intuited this when he said, "The significant problems we face can never be solved at the level of thinking that created them." Thus, the global dynamics between these three main worldviews fuel current social, economic, religious, political, and spiritual challenges.

In summary, within our three periods of history we can trace three distinct worldviews of mature adults that unfold in distinct seedling/sapling/tree-like stages.

Period of History:	<b>Traditional</b>	<==>	<b>Modern</b>	<==>	<b>Postmodern</b>
Worldviews:	Traditional		Traditional		Traditional
Worldviews:	(religious)		(religious)		(religious)
Worldviews:	-----		Modern		Modern (scientific)
	-----		(scientific)	-----	Postmodern
					(relativistic)

The scale of complexity is unprecedented, and many have detected emerging postmodern worldviews that cope with this frothy mix, for instance, Joseph Campbell's *The Hero of a Thousand Faces*, Michael Murphy's *The Future of the Body*, Paul Ray and Sherry Anderson's Cultural Creatives, Willis Harman's *Global Mind Change*, Peter Russell's *Waking Up in Time*, Marilyn Ferguson's *Aquarian Conspiracy*, Mark Woodhouse's *Paradigm Wars: Worldviews for a New Age*, Don Beck and Chris Cowan's *Spiral Dynamics*, Ken Wilber's *Boomeritis*, and many, many more. (4)

***Because worldviews build upon each other, it is critical that we mine the gems of wisdom found in traditional, modern, and postmodern periods of history and worldviews.***

One way to do this is through an *Integral Approach* – a postmodern attempt to connect the dots between and better understand the disparate worldviews that currently exist without reducing one

to the other, or setting ours up as the final say on all things (see more below in “What is the Integral Approach?”).

### **How did modernity react to traditional perennial wisdom?**

When modernity divided art, science, and morals into separate value spheres, it created modern science and left issues of morals, ethics, soul, and spirit to the traditional Church. By the 17th century, Descartes had reduced the idea of Causal Consciousness, found in all traditional religions, to a body/mind type of consciousness (with a small “c”) that science could measure. In the 18th century, Newton outlined the mechanical laws that governed this body/mind. By the mid-19th century, Darwin and Wallace detailed biological evolution and natural selection that randomly produced this body/mind. In the mid-20th century, as students of William James in America, and Sigmund Freud in Europe codified modern psychology, the consciousness of this body/mind was reduced to a byproduct of brain chemistry. Body in the form of quantum fields, DNA, genes, and hormones caused mind.

However, there was a problem. As modern science (e.g. Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, etc.) produced centuries of discoveries that shredded traditional religious claims of scripture as Absolute Truth, it declared its way of knowing through third person objectivity as the *only real* way to know truth. The notion of first person subjectivity was marginalized, replaced by third person facts, objects, and processes. As the modern values spheres splintered further into extreme forms, *Scientism* and its subset *Evolutionism* were born. These modern “religions” relied on the *same faith as traditional religion* in that they could not provide a valid scientific proof that scientific method was the only way to know truth, an assumption that is inherently contradictory.

Scientism and Evolutionism thus took their place next to Creationism in various institutional forms. Though the traditional religions remained intact during the modern era, they lost political, military, and economic power. Thus, today we still have traditional and modern worldviews competing with each other. Witness the efforts in the United States to have Creationism, in the sophisticated guise of Intelligent Design theory, mandated in public schools as a viable alternative to Darwin and Evolution. In 2005 there were seventeen states with attempts to legislate Intelligent Design into high school curriculum.

As we go forward we want to include the best of modern sciences, and be clear that they offer a limited but important view of the physical aspects of the multiverse. The strength of modern sciences are their third person perspectives that produce facts, statistics, mathematics, and other empirical data. However, postmoderns have shown that science in its scientismist forms, reduces all valid data into only third person facts, completely ignoring the effects of first person perspectives necessary to conceive, bring forth, and interpret the data in the first place! First person perspectives are deemed too subjective and prone to error and distortion. One unfortunate effect is that all mystical experience from the traditional religions are thus negated. As a result, modern sciences threw out, denied, and repressed the transcendental baby along with the superstitious bathwater, because it no longer recognized the difference!

***Therefore, part of what characterizes postmodern worldviews is that Consciousness with a capital “C” is struggling to make a comeback (the irony is that It never left!).***

### **What is the difference between postmodern spirituality and religion?**

Philosopher and psychologist Ken Wilber (b.1949) coined the term *Person-Centered Civil Religion* in *One Taste: Daily Reflections on Integral Spirituality* (2000). He described important postmodern spiritual and religious trends.

First, postmoderns make a distinction between *spiritual* as a more individual pursuit and *religious* as an institutional pursuit. However, both are important in their healthy forms, and it's also important to learn to identify them in their unhealthy forms.

Second, from a developmental perspective there are two main forms of postmodern spiritual and religious practices mentioned earlier: *translative* and *transformative*. Translative forms of spirituality and religion help people deal with their present situations and cope with the vicissitudes of life – illness, birth, death, marriage, jobs, and the like. In their healthy forms they provide legitimacy and meaning. Translative versions tend to promote feel-good practices, and often ignore stages of personal and spiritual development.

Transformative versions help people develop their abilities into new stages, particularly in terms of using deep intuitions (i.e., “eye of contemplation” or inner senses). In their healthy forms they deal with authenticity and transcendence. Transformative forms of spirituality and religion help people cope with the inevitable vagaries of developing through the stages of spiritual growth.

Again, in their healthy forms both translative and transformative practices are very important postmodern spiritual trends we support at NewWorldView. They are not mutually exclusive pursuits. Whether we emphasize one or both, or a Person-Centered spirituality or religion, is always a matter of choice, intent, and need.

On the unhealthy side, both trends can lead to extremes, and that's something we wish remain alert for and avoid. Go too far toward the translative spiritual side and we see forms of narcissism that elevate egocentric behavior to deep spiritual realization. Go too far toward the translative religious side and we see practices that inhibit growth and arrest development. Go too far on the transformative spiritual and religious side and we see people who live in “psychological caves” and never share their insights, or deny the flesh and promote “sinful self” ideologies.

Of course, there is a middle ground. In terms of *translative spirituality*, at NewWorldView we explore ways to promote abundance, wellness, and fulfillment. In terms of *transformative spirituality*, we explore various ways to engage the remembrance of Source.

***NewWorldView promotes those sources that provide tools for translative and transformative spirituality. These tools can be adapted for postmodern religious practices as well.***

## What is the Seth Material?

Jane Roberts (1929-1984) was born in Saratoga Springs, NY, and spent most of her adult life in Elmira, NY, with husband Robert Butts (1919-2008). She was a gifted writer, poet, and psychic whose life's work spans over forty published books, including metaphysics, short stories, fiction, and poetry. Roberts is best remembered today for a series of twenty-eight books that are referred to as *the Seth Material* – a body of perennial wisdom she *channeled* between 1963-1984.

The body of Roberts's work forms a contemporary translation of the perennial wisdom into a postmodern format. It is not offered as dogmatic absolutes, but as a flexible framework to cope with the challenges of twenty-first century life. *Seth never claimed to be an infallible source or hold the Truth or The Way*, and made this point very clear early in the sessions. This puts the responsibility of discerning the truth where it really belongs, on each one of us.

“Truth contains no distortions, and this material with all my best efforts, and with yours, of necessity must contain distortions merely in order to make itself exist at all on your plane. I will never condone an attitude in which either you [Rob] or [Jane] maintain that you hold undiluted truth through these sessions.”

“Inner data, even this, must make its entry through some distortion. We must always work together, but you must never consider me as an infallible source. This material is more valid than any material possible on your plane, but it is nevertheless to some degree conditioned by the camouflage attributes of the plane.” (5)

The above excerpt puts the Seth Material in a postmodern light that reveals its authentic nature *by claiming, up front, that it is fallible and incomplete*. Whether it is “more valid than any material possible on your plane” remains up to our ability to realize its transformative potentials through direct experience. Otherwise, the ideas remain intellectual prattle.

Jane Roberts referred to the Seth Material as “The New Way” in *The Way Toward Health* (1997). According to Seth:

“In [her] own mind, [Jane] calls these ideas, taken together, ‘The New Way.’

“The ideas themselves are quite ancient, of course. They are expressed by many [traditional] cultures and religions, esoteric groups and cults from the past, and continuing into the present. Their strength, vitality, and worth has been greatly undermined, however, by distortions, negative ideas, and some sheer nonsense.

“In other words, these concepts, so natural to all of creation, have not been practiced by humanity in anything like their pure form. To that extent they do indeed represent a new way. They run directly counter to much of your official [modern] knowledge and contemporary thought as far as the mainstream of world culture is concerned. Where such ideas are practiced, they are frequently contaminated by [traditional] fanaticism, superstition, and expediency.

“The main point I want to make is that this ‘new way’ is the ideal and easiest complement to nature’s own innate integrity....” (6)

The main difference, then, between older perennial translations and Seth’s is that his ideas are presented in their original form in the context of Western culture and belief systems. They have been “translated” only once into the calcified mold of language. In this sense, they presently exist in a state of very low distortion.

Translations of mystical experiences get distorted and calcified through the filter of the individual’s perception and cultural biases into language. Thus the concepts experienced in mystical or subjective states that form the basis of the world’s religions can never be fully translated into words. As Norman Friedman, author of *Bridging Science and Spirit* (1990) said, “it is literally impossible to really understand these concepts because the mystics do not have a mystical calculus. In short, when the mystic has an experience, merely by the act of converting it into words or even possibly mathematics, it will fall short.” (7)

***One of the central themes throughout the Seth Material is that “you create your own reality.”***


The challenge is to learn how to recognize this “you” who creates 100% of your reality, and then how to take full responsibility for everything you manifest in your life – abundance/scarcity, fear/love, sickness/health, etc. It can be challenging, as growth often is, but the payoffs can be very rewarding. Most Seth books usually get lumped under the category of *Human Potentials*, *Self-Help*, or *Self-Improvement*. This is because the Seth Material provides a detailed map of the psyche and exercises – a yoga – in which to test out the waters. (8)

Below are recommended Seth books for beginners.




***The Seth Material***, New Awareness Network, 1970/2001.

Jane Roberts discusses her experiences with channeling and Seth’s ideas. It’s easy to read, full of insights, and explains the basic concepts introduced during the early years of Seth sessions. A perfect place to begin!



***Seth Speaks: The Eternal Validity of the Soul***, Amber-Allen Publishing, 1972/1994.

A postmodern classic from the proverbial horse’s mouth! This is the first book dictated by Seth. He introduces the nature of multidimensional personality, and provides simple exercises to test out the waters.



**Glossary ~ ABCs of Conscious Creation (From the Seth Material)**, Wildfire Media, 2001.

Paul M. Helfrich, Ph.D. has written a Glossary for those just getting started.

### **What are other perennial themes in the Seth Material?**

An important theme is that *Consciousness is Primal Cause*, an idea we can trace back over 2,500 years to Plato in the West, and the Buddha in the East. All matter was, is, and will be constructed by Consciousness; individually and collectively. Our multiverse by definition contains multiple, nested orders of sentience, perception, and memory, and everything is conscious on some level, from subatomic particles, to galaxies, to *All-That-Is* (Seth's term for the multiverse).

According to Seth, human consciousness is fueled by an *inner ego* or soul that simultaneously exists "inside" of physical reality. Our outer ego – our primary physical identity – forms the "outside." It not only survives death but continues to grow and develop in other *frameworks of consciousness* "afterward." The physical universe is but one of an infinite array of conscious frameworks, because our souls are multidimensional by nature. We actually exist in multiple places and times, and constantly seek new experiences.

Seth never demands that we take anything on faith or simply his say-so, but provides methods for us to develop our abilities to *personally experience ourselves as All-That-Is*. Seth opens *The Individual and the Nature of Mass Events* (1995) with a call to transformation:

"We have never told anybody to do anything except to face up to the abilities of consciousness."

Further, when he introduced the inner senses, he challenged:

"If you would momentarily put aside the selves you take for granted, you could experience your own multidimensional reality. ... I have told you that there are inner senses as well as physical ones. ... You must, first of all, cease identifying yourself completely with your [outer] ego, and realize that you can perceive more than your ego perceives. *You must demand more of yourself than you ever have before.*

"... The inner senses are not important because they release clairvoyant or telepathic abilities, but because they reveal to us our own independence from physical matter, and let us recognize our unique, individual multidimensional identity. Properly utilized, they also show us the miracle of physical existence and our place in it. We can live a wiser, more productive, happier physical life because we begin to understand why we are here, individually and as a people." (9)

When discussing the immediate afterdeath experience, Seth humorously cautioned:

“Now: For those of you who are lazy I can offer no hope: death will not bring you an eternal resting place. You may rest, if this is your wish, for a while. Not only must you use your abilities after death, however, but you must face up to yourself for those that you did not use during your previous existence.

“Those of you who had faith in life after death will find it much easier to accustom yourself to the new conditions. Those of you who do not have such faith may gain it in a different way, by following through in the exercises I will give you later in this book; for these will enable you to extend your perceptions to these other layers of reality if you are persistent, expectant, and determined.” (10)

Finally, Seth also challenged us that:

“This material is not for those who would deceive themselves with pretty, packaged, ribboned, truths – truths that are parceled out and cut apart so that you can digest them. That sort of material does serve a [translative] need, and there are many who give it and it is helpful for those who need it. This material demands more. It demands that you intellectually and intuitively expand, it demands that you use your abilities [i.e. transform, grow, develop].

“There are other ways far more difficult and you are not ready for those, but you are ready for the methods that I have given if you are willing to work. And yet by work, I mean a joyful endeavor, a spontaneous endeavor. You have simply to allow yourselves to be yourselves.” (11)

***Therefore, the Seth Material, and its expansion in other sources like Elias, Kris, and Rose are based upon a call to transformation, and are not limited to translation.*** (12)

This further suggests that we need a balanced, comprehensive, and inclusive approach as we proceed to put theory into practice (see more below in “What is Integral Conscious Creation?”).

### **What is channeling and how is it different than mediumship?**

Jane Roberts channeled a source named Seth – a distinct personality complete with unique facial and vocal patterns from 1963-1984. She and her husband, Robert Butts, held twice weekly sessions in which Jane would go into a trance state and Seth would come through and dictate information that Rob transcribed by hand, and then typed up. After several years of laying a foundation, Seth announced in one day that he was going to dictate his own books. An amazing feature was that *Seth dictated every one of his books from start to finish without changing a word.* The sessions occurred twice a week, and most of the books were delivered in a period of weeks.

Clearly something extraordinary was going on, something that neither the traditional or modern worldviews of their time could explain. For example, Jane rejected the explanations of traditional religion (“speaking in tongues” or *glossolalia*, demonic possession) and modern science (dissociative personality disorder, infantile dissociation) as completely inadequate. This led her and Rob to explore the phenomenon independently. The result was a fledgling outline called *Aspect Psychology* that she published in three books (see endnote 8). Coincidentally, this

happened during the time that the transpersonal psychology movement was emerging in the late 1960s led by Anthony Sutich, James Fadiman, Michael Murphy, Miles Vich, Stan Grof, and others. While Roberts did not pursue an academic career, from a phenomenological point of view, her work holds its own with other transpersonal theories of her time.

In the United States, we can trace the channeling phenomena back to the Spiritualist movement that began in the mid-19th century. But the majority of those occurrences were what we call *mediumship*, or allowing a dead person to speak through the medium while in an altered state or trance. These were studied by the modern psychologists of great integrity such as F.W.H. Meyers in the U.K. and William James in the U.S. While many were uncovered as frauds, there were a small number of authentic cases that eluded any firm scientific explanation (e.g., Daniel Dunglas Home, 1833-1886, Leonore E. Piper, 1857-1950). Channeling remains poorly understood by modern and postmodern sciences, and there are wide a spectrum of abilities that are sometimes lumped together in a way that blurs understanding.

There is an important distinction between mediumship and channeling. Mediumship deals with communication from dead humans whereas channeling deals with communication from deeper aspects within All-That-Is. Contemporary mediums like John Edward, Sylvia Browne, and James Van Praagh have made careers from communicating with the deceased relatives of clients. All three remain awake, and seem to “see” dream-like psychic impressions and translate them. Their outer ego doesn’t significantly change. They aren’t 100% accurate, but that doesn’t mean they are frauds – they’re not. It means that adequately interpreting inner communications is a highly developed intelligence that is still more of an art than a science at this time.

There are also examples of mediums going into a trance state and speaking as deceased people. That is, the medium takes on vocal, facial, and bodily gestures of the deceased personality. Jane Roberts did this several times but chose not to pursue that direction with her career. Instead, she and Rob focused on the Seth persona. Seth claimed to be a “gestalt personality” that transcended but included his many physical lives. Thus, channeling in this case seemed to access something much deeper, within what psychologist Carl Jung (1875-1961) called *the collective unconscious*, than communications from dead relatives.

Another important feature of channeling is the transmission of transpersonal teachings meant to enhance personal and collective fulfillment, whereas mediumship tends to help the living process their loss of departed relatives. For example, transpersonal psychologist Arthur Hastings cited Jane Roberts’s work as marking “the dividing point between classical mediums, who called up spirits of the dead, and contemporary channeling, with its teachers, sages, and guides.” (13) Parapsychologist Jon Klimo cites Roberts’s work as defining “the modern era of channeling,” (14) though channeling can be traced in the United States back to Helen Shucman (1909-1981) of *The Course in Miracles*, Alice Bailey (1880-1949), Edgar Cayce (1877-1945), Helen Blavatsky (1831-1891), and others.

Moreover, channeling has been found in every culture throughout recorded history. Arthur Hastings traces it as far back as the Babylonian oracle of the goddess Astarte in the eleventh century BCE. He notes that ancient channels who:

“... spoke in trances and ecstasy were considered prophets or oracles for the gods. Even now, in various mainstream and minority religions, within many cultures, possession by the holy spirit, speaking in ecstasy, or possession by spirits is considered a sign of spiritual development, and is often encouraged and facilitated by ceremony and ritual. Channeling may be the current equivalent of ancient prophecy, bringing spiritual guidance and teachings for this time.” (15)

Jon Klimo states that:

“Throughout history and among various peoples, channels have been named according to what they do. Besides the term ‘medium’ and the more recent ‘channel,’ other names have included shaman, witch doctor, healer, and medicine man in native cultures. They have also been called fortune-tellers, oracles, seers, soothsayers, savants, and visionaries. In religious contexts, they have been known as priests, gurus, prophets, saints, mystics, and holy ones. And in the esoteric schools they are called light workers, initiates, teachers, adepts, or masters. The majority of mainstream [modern] psychologists and psychiatrists would probably regard the channels as hallucinating, delusional, suffering from dissociative identity disorder (once called multiple personality disorder), schizophrenic, or simply as persons with runaway imaginations, or even as downright frauds.” (16)

The latter thoughts reflect more poorly on the narrow, incomplete view of human personality found in modern cognitive sciences than anything else. While acknowledging that people make fraudulent claims in every discipline, again, we must learn to adequately discern the veracity and utility of information from by any source, be it a channeler, scientist, minister, philosopher, economist, politician, or whomever.

Klimo offers a useful working definition for channeling as:

“... the communication of information to or through a physically embodied human being from a source that is said to exist on some other level or dimension of reality than the physical as we know it, and that is not from the normal mind (or self) of the channel.” (17)

Like all definitions, it is open to continued research, debate, and refinement. We are trying to understand something that is primarily subjective and psychological in nature that can't be fully quantified in current scientific terms.

***The main point is that there is a three thousand year old recorded tradition in which people speak in an “inspired” state and deliver useful information geared toward cultural needs and challenges.***


Sometimes the information pushes and pulls at the officially accepted, consensus reality, yet helps to facilitate change from calcified dogmas that the collective has outgrown like a snake

shedding its skin. For more information on channeling, we recommend the Jon Klimo and Michael Brown books below.



*Channeling: Investigations on Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources*, Foreword by Charles Tart, North Atlantic Books, 1998.

Perfect for those who want a scientific understanding of channeling. Parapsychologist Jon Klimo provides a clear historical overview that reaches back to the first recorded histories in the West. This book helps to demystify channeling as a human intelligence we all possess.



*The Channeling Zone: American Spirituality in an Anxious Age*, By Michael Brown, Harvard University Press, 1997.

Perfect for those who want a sociological perspective on channeling. Anthropologist Michael Brown provides an ethnographic look at channeling in the United States and covers a wide range of cases. He shows that channeling, while driven underground during the Modern age, remains a human spiritual intelligence that fuels an alternative postmodern spiritual movement.

### **Is channeling a developmental intelligence we all possess?**

Is channeling a latent potential in every human being, like certain streams of development mapped by the great developmental psychologists Piaget, Maslow, Graves, Kohlberg, Gilligan, and others? It is possible in the sense that we all have the potential ability to be a mystic, physicist, or concert pianist. Since all forms of development occur along a spectrum, some of us will naturally be better at channeling than others.

For example, Jon Klimo believes that we channel when we are in any state of inspiration or creativity. He terms this “open channeling,” something that we all do to varying degrees, though most don’t “step aside” or dissociate to allow another personality speak through us. Other popular terms are “being in the zone” or “in the flow,” an altered state when everything seems to happen effortlessly, whether it’s a spiritual epiphany, a breakthrough scientific concept, or performance of a piano concerto. The spectrum includes differing degrees of dissociation from our more regular form of waking cognition.

However, a small number of those who learn to channel are capable of masterful, even virtuoso, performances with potential impacts on a global scale. Perhaps these virtuosos stand out because their spiritual, scientific inventions, and artistic masterpieces tap directly into, and even beyond, that deep archetypal area of Jung’s collective unconscious. This may well be the psychological process behind the spiritual philosophies, scientific theories, and bodies of art that literally change the course of entire civilizations – like the work of Christ, Einstein, and Beethoven respectively changed the religious, scientific, and musical direction of the Western world. We don’t know for certain if they channeled, but the connection can be made that enhanced creativity is often associated with channeling.

In practical terms, channeling abilities take time to develop similar to the skills of any mystic, scientist, or musician. As the developmental psychologists have mapped, we all go through adult stages of cognitive development that Piaget termed *conventional operational, formal operational*, and *postformal operational*. According to Wilber, it is beyond the postformal stage where the skill levels of a Buddha, Hawking, or Mozart emerge. (Mozart was a child prodigy, and these stages can emerge at precocious ages. There are no firm rules on how slowly or quickly anyone passes through them.)

Therefore, a plausible hypothesis for scientific study is to view channeling as its own intelligence. Howard Gardner discovered that humans have multiple intelligences in the 1980s, and mapped distinct linguistic, mathematical, kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, etc., abilities. Ken Wilber calls them *streams* or *lines*, and lists as many as two dozen. These tend to develop independently in an uneven fashion, that is, they are necessary but not sufficient for each other to flourish. Some of us develop in many lines, some in only a few. Someone can have a very high cognitive line and a very low moral line, like the executives who ruined Enron. Or someone can have a very high kinesthetic line and a low linguistic line, like some professional athletes. There are endless permutations.

In this light I propose the following definition of channeling:

*Channeling is a spectrum of dissociative states that develop over time in discrete stages, similar to any multiple intelligence. In its mild form, the dissociative state is one of an enhanced creativity that can be applied to any field (science, art, spirituality, etc.). In its more extreme form, the dissociative state includes fully formed secondary personalities that offer knowledge well beyond the current capacity of the proximate self (outer ego). Accessing this state at will is characteristic of a later, mature stage.*

This could require decades of research to adequately map, but suggests why the majority of channeled sources appear immature, even ridiculous in their beginning stages. Given that many people never learn the critical thinking, feeling, and emotional skills necessary to discern the veracity and utility of spiritual information (i.e. their other *developmental lines* are still at “preconventional” and “conventional” stages), we often find conclusions drawn from channeled information biased by fanaticism, overinflated ego, religious dogma, and superstition. Still, given time, practice, and community support, we all hold the potential to develop this ability.

### **Who and what is Seth?**

Seth describes himself as an “energy personality essence” that is no longer focused in physical reality. This implies that, from Seth’s perspective, there is a nonphysical Source Realm in which human consciousness co-exists yet also emanates from. Seth spoke through Jane Roberts for close to twenty-one years; her own struggle to understand what Seth was led her to develop what she called *Aspect Psychology*.

Aspect Psychology defines the psyche as a multidimensional Source Self of vast proportions. In terms of the Great Chain, the Source Self exists in the soul realm. A physical life is an Aspect of that Source Self, and vice versa. A Source like Seth is defined as a wider Aspect Self as

evidenced by its access to information that transcends our notions of space and time. Seth exists as an Aspect Self as does Jane, but they each have their own unique identities while being Aspects of an even larger psychological gestalt – what Seth termed a *Primary Pyramid Gestalt*.

Jane struggled for years in her understanding. She didn't come to her conclusions lightly or without determined introspection and experimentation. The creative aspects of the phenomenon were undeniable: Jane was writing books, Seth was writing books, Rob was painting and adding copious notes to supplement the books. To find her own answers, Jane had to look deep inside and reconcile an array of psychic experiences. Here are Seth's comments on Jane's search for understanding:

"I am writing this book through a personality known as Jane Roberts. That is the name given her at her birth. She shares with you the triumphs and travails of physical existence. Like you she is presented with a life that seems to begin at her birth and that is suspended from that point of emergence until the moment of death's departure. She has asked the same questions that you ask in your quiet moments.

"Her questions were asked with such a vehemence however that she broke through the barriers that most of you erect and so began a journey that is undertaken for herself and for you also for each of your experiences however minute or seemingly insignificant, becomes part of the knowledge of your species. Where did you come from and where are you going? What are you? What is the nature of the psyche?

"... 'The Psyche' is meaningless except as it relates to the individual psyche. I speak to you from levels of your self that you have forgotten, and yet not forgotten. I speak to you through that printed page, and yet my words will rearouse within you the voices that spoke to you in your childhood, and before your birth." (18)

Jane offers some insights into her perspective circa 1971, after eight years of engaging the Seth phenomenon full-time:

"Rob and I don't refer to Seth as a spirit; we dislike the connotations of the term. Actually, what we object to is the conventional idea of a spirit, which is an extension of quite limited ideas of human personality, only projected more or less intact into an afterlife. You can say that Seth is a dramatization of the unconscious or an independent personality. Personally I don't see why the statements have to be contradictory. Seth may be a dramatization playing a very real role – explaining his greater reality in the only terms we can understand." (19)

"And so there may be others now (like Seth), also without images, but knowing – others who have been what we are and more – others who remember what we have forgotten. They may have discovered through some acceleration of

consciousness other forms of being, or dimensions of reality of which we are also part.

“So we give them names who are nameless, as basically we are nameless. And we listen, but usually we try to squeeze their messages into concepts that we can understand, cloaking them in worn stereotyped images. Yet they are all about us, in the wind and trees, formed and unformed, more alive in many ways perhaps than we are – the speakers [of inner truths].”

“Through these voices, these intuitions, these flashes of insights and messages, the universe speaks to us, to each of us personally. You are being addressed, and so am I. Learn to hear your own messages, not to distort what you hear or translate it into old alphabets.”

“... Seth may be leading us out of our usual limitations, into another realm that is ours by right – elemental whether we are in flesh or out of it. He may be the voice of our combined selves saying, ‘while you are conscious bodies, remember what it was like and will be like to be bodiless, to be freewheeling energy without a name but with a voice that does not need tongue, with a creativity that does not need flesh. We are ourselves turned inside out’.” (20)

If Seth has a greater reality elsewhere, then what actually happens when Jane goes into trance? Seth uses the term “bridge personality” to describe the psychological portal that allows him to communicate through Jane:

“In regular sessions, as now, [she] and I again both make adjustments, and so in session I am what I call a bridge personality, composed of a composite self – [Jane] and I meeting and merging to form a personality that is not truly either of us, but a new one that exists between dimensions. Beyond that is my real identity.” (21)

In terms of Aspect Psychology, Jane likened her Seth Aspect to a telegram or message from Source, one that comes with a complete, though temporary, personality structure. Since Source exists in a nonphysical realm, it requires some kind of bridge personality to communicate within the physical realm. So she called Seth a *personagram*:

“The personagram, then, *is* an electromagnetic and psychological structure that exists potentially under certain conditions. It is a bridge personality, a unique psychological being equipped to operate between systems of reality, but its source may well be entirely outside of the three-dimensional system. It is a psychological rapport, but dependent for its physical expression upon the receiving personality with which it merges to some extent.” (22)

“As the entity or source self [soul] has many Aspects, so any one personagram could also be considered as only one larger Aspect-print in itself, of a still more extensive personagram. (The Aspect-prints, again, represent traces of another

Aspect of the entity.) So one such personogram such as Seth would represent only one face of the entity; one multidimensional Aspect of many; one characteristic in the nature of a kind of entity we can hardly comprehend.” (23)

So Seth per se, the Seth we would encounter during a channeling session, is really a composite of elements, a temporary construction that takes the form of various characteristics. These include emotions, facial expressions, gestures, a sense of humor, even an accent: all to create a familiar framework in which the messages delivered can be comfortably received in culturally acceptable terms. It is limited to the vocabulary and physical constraints of the channeler. So what we see is *neither fully Seth, nor Jane, but a hybrid.*

***When we ask who and what is Seth, then, we also ask, “who and what are we?”***

The more we explore the “you” who creates 100% of its reality, the more we sense there may be more to us than we realize.

### **What is the Integral Approach?**

There are several integral psychologies available today, most notably AQAL (all quadrants, levels, lines, states, types, and self-system) by Ken Wilber (1995), and Spiral Dynamics integral by Clare Graves and Don Beck (2002). They form a basic postmodern operating system, to use a computer analogy, from which to take a balanced, comprehensive, and inclusive approach to research, business, politics, education, health care, spirituality, and well, everything. The basic idea is that when we become “integrally informed,” we employ a set of checks and balances that transcends yet includes the best practices of traditional, modern, and postmodern approaches.

Wilber’s AQAL maps the six most important aspects of human consciousness, aspects that exist in our awareness right now. It doesn’t tell us what or how to think, but ballparks the main areas we need to consider for a more complete understanding:

**Quadrants** = four innate perspectives: I, We, It, Its. These are expressed in our languages and reflect how we know the world through first, second, and third person perspectives. They include interior, exterior, individual, and collective dimensions of being in the world: first person contains individual interiors, second person contains collective interiors, and third person contains individual and collective exteriors.

**Levels** = the general altitude or “center of gravity” of our overall stage of development at any time. These cover the perennial spectrum of *matter, body, mind, soul, and spirit*. We simplify this into body, mind, and spirit, or expand it into ten or more stages, just like we could use Centigrade (100 degrees) or Fahrenheit (212 degrees) to measure the energy between freezing and boiling water.

**Lines** = up to two dozen multiple intelligences like cognition, emotional, needs, morals, values, linguistic, mathematics, kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, musical, etc. More often than not, each line has a different “altitude” within our overall development, from beginner to

intermediate to advanced. So uneven development in these various lines helps explain why we are good at some things and not so good at others.

**States** = every twenty-four hours we cycle through waking, dreaming, and deep sleep states. Additional states include meditative, drug-induced, peak experiences, and other altered states. States are always temporary, they come and go as opposed to Levels which are permanent constructions.

**Types** = various typologies like male/female, Myers-Briggs, Enneagram, Intention (Roberts's families of consciousness), Orientations (Ennis), etc. These are the different "voices" through which we express ourselves. For instance, we may lean toward feminine, introvert-intuitive-thinking-judging, Sumafi intent, common, etc., types of expressions as we grow through any Level or experience any State.

**Self-System** = Navigator and integrator of *all* the above. Also, the focus of attention and will, volition, and choice.

*Thus, an integrally informed approach takes all the above into consideration. It provides a comprehensive way to explore the "you" who creates 100% of its reality.*

Below are the recommended books, CDs, and DVDs on the Integral Approach.




### The Integral Vision by Ken Wilber, Shambhala, 2007.

A concise introduction to the integral map and practices. Great for those who like to read, but don't want all those footnotes. Lots of great pictures and images.




### Integral Life Practice: A 21st Century Blueprint for Physical Health, Emotional Balance, Mental Clarity, and Spiritual Awakening by Ken Wilber, Terry Patten, Adam Leonard, & Marco Morelli, Integral Books, 2008.

An easy to read, yet thorough introduction to integral life practice. Lots of useful charts and diagrams.



### The Integral Operating System: Version 1.0 (DVD, 2 CDs, booklet, poster), Sounds True, 2005.

A condensed introduction to Wilber's integral theory. Relies mostly on video and audio. Great for those more visually and aurally oriented.




### [A Theory of Everything](#), Shambhala, 2000.

A good introduction to Ken Wilber's integral theory called AQAL (pronounced ah-qwul) which stands for all quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types. Not many endnotes, lots of charts and graphs to help visualization.



### [Kosmic Consciousness](#) (10 CDs), Sounds True, 2003.

A detailed audio introduction to Wilber's integral theory taught by Ken himself. Over twelve hours of audio. Great for those who like to listen!



### [Spiral Dynamics: Mastering Values, Leadership, And Change](#), Blackwell Publishing, 1996.

Don Beck and Christopher Cowan wrote a great overview of the integral psychology called Spiral Dynamics. Based in the emerging science of memetics, the focus is on business and organizational applications.



### [Spiral Dynamics Integral](#), Sounds True, 2006.

A thorough introduction to Spiral Dynamics Integral by Don Beck. Over seven hours of audio. Great for beginners!

## What is Integral Conscious Creation?

The phrase “conscious creation” has been used for decades, possibly longer. Applying the term to the Seth Material can be traced to Lynda Dahl, who published three books in the 1990s that used “conscious creation” to mean “you create your own reality.” (24) The latter phrase was coined by Jane Roberts in *The Nature of Personal Reality* (1974). It went on to become a New Age mantra uttered by Amit Goswami in the New Age hit *What the F%#? Do We Know?* (2004). It is popular in the Seth community to use the phrase “conscious creation,” and sometimes YCYOR (you create your own reality) to represent the core ideas in the Seth Material.

This concept has been around for millennia, and is traceable back to the New Thought movement founded by Phineas Quimby (1802-1866) in mid-19th century America. Moreover, it extends all the way back in some form to the Idealist philosophers, from Plato (c.427-c. 347 BCE) to Plotinus (c.205-270 CE) and Nagarjuna (150-250 CE), onwards to Fichte (1762-1814), Hegel (1770-1831), Schelling (1775-1854), Berdyaev (1874-1948), and others. Seen in this light, Jane Roberts’s *The Physical Universe as Idea Construction* (1963), the manuscript that preceded

Seth's emergence, and the Seth Material that followed are variations of Western idealism. When we compare the Seth Material to traditional and modern forms of idealism we discover three main similarities:

1. Universe As Multiverse: All-That-Is as nested fields of physical, subtle, and causal consciousness (exteriors).
2. Self As Multidimensional: All-That-Is as nested Aspects: I-I-I (interiors). (25)
3. Involution/Evolution: All-That-Is as Primal Cause and Effect (causality).

Therefore, conscious creation can't be limited to only the Seth material, because the basic epistemology of concept 1 above and ontology of concept 2 above are found in some variation in all traditional and modern traditions.

1. The way that we create 100% of our reality in physical, subtle, and causal fields includes some variation of:

- (Eye of Flesh) - Physical senses/emotions.
- (Eye of Mind) - Mental/rational intelligences.
- (Eye of Spirit) - Inner senses/deep intuitions.

2. The entire "You" who creates 100% of its own reality includes some variation of:

- (I) - Outer ego in the physical field.
- (I) - Inner ego in the subtle field.
- (I) - Pyramid Gestalts/Causal Consciousness in the causal field.

3. Involution/evolution describes the simultaneous action of creation in nonphysical and physical fields. Involution describes how All-That-Is acts as Primal Cause to create causal, subtle, and physical fields. For example, Seth used consciousness units (causal CUs) and electromagnetic energy units (subtle EEs) in this way in *Dreams, "Evolution," and Value Fulfillment* (1986). (26) Sri Aurobindo (1872-1950) used the Hindu Vedantic version of involution in *The Life Divine* (1949). Involution also helps explain pre-birth choices like intent, gender, who our parents will be, etc., that are not made by the outer ego.

*Thus, "conscious creation" more accurately applies to any modern or postmodern body of work that explores the simultaneous action of involution/evolution in physical, subtle, and causal fields via physical, mental, and spiritual senses.*

Modern examples of conscious creation include Vedanta Hinduism and Vajrayana Buddhism. Postmodern examples include the information offered by Seth, Elias, Kris, Rose, Wilber, and others.

However, while the premodern traditions had an understanding of involution – the action of Consciousness as Primal Cause – what's missing is an understanding of evolution: Consciousness unfolding in broad stages of increasing complexity over time in the physical field, or what Seth called Framework 1. We're not talking about the crude distortions of Social

Darwinism used by Robber Barons or Nazi Germany to justify economic inequalities or genocide, but the kind of evolutionary theories found in Fichte, Hegel, Schelling, Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955), Radhakrishnan (1888-1975), Gopi Krishna (1903-1984), Wilber, and others. These modern and postmodern thinkers all show the driving “Force” behind evolution – natural selection, genetic mutations, etc. – to be none other than Consciousness, not chance, chaos, or randomness.

Unfortunately, traditional forms of idealism have tended to demean the physical. Since they correctly intuit that Consciousness is Primal Cause, and not material quantum fields, idealists tend to reduce everything to Consciousness, which is no-thing and immaterial. This has led to extreme asceticism, denial of the flesh, and other “sinful self” ideologies that marginalize the physical as secondary. On the other hand, modern materialist science claims that everything is reducible to quantum fields, and consciousness is a mere after-effect or epiphenomenon of matter. This has led to alienation, fragmentation, and dissociation from Causal Consciousness that marginalizes consciousness as secondary. The two “value spheres” have been at odds for the past five centuries, and have yet to find a viable middle ground.

Therefore, part of what defines postmodernism are attempts to find that middle ground – ways to more adequately situate the inner/outer and individual/collective aspects of reality. Give each its place and don’t reduce one to the other. Moreover, situate the physical and nonphysical as nested, interpenetrated fields within All-That-Is. Postmodernism attempts to bring Consciousness, which was present in traditional worldviews, back into the picture while acknowledging the advances and limits of modern science. When we combine an *Integral Approach* with the above definition of conscious creation, we get *Integral Conscious Creation* (ICC).

***In short, Integral Conscious Creation applies the checks and balances of an Integral Approach to any conscious creation source to help mine its many gems.***

The results:

- Promote multiple perspectives yet make no claim to have the final say or one true interpretation.
- Include exercises and other practical applications that promote personal transformation.
- Provide a thorough overview of the core ideas.
- Outline a scalable methodology that *anyone* can use to mine new insights from existing and emerging knowledge domains.
- Help demystify the channeling phenomenon – one of the thorniest issues for the mainstream to come to terms with the Seth, Elias, Kris, and Rose Materials.
- Show how all the above fits into a wider organizing principle – emerging postmodern worldviews – that affects *all* people globally, and doesn’t unduly privilege genders, races, or special interest groups.
- Is done in a way that doesn’t reek of scientism, New Age/Religious woo-woo, Sethism, and any other -ism.

## How does Integral Conscious Creation compare to Integral Spirituality?

There many different ways that people define “spirituality” and “spiritual practice.” Some define spirituality as an *attitude of universal love, tolerance, and compassion*. Others consider it a *level of development*, or even its own *developmental line*. Some define it in terms of *states of consciousness*. Many feel that spirituality involves some kind of *ultimate concern or care*.

Integral Spirituality includes all the above, and lets each individual decide what works best for them. It takes an *Integral Approach* to any spiritual tradition. So there is Integral Buddhism, Integral Christianity, Integral Islam, etc. and Integral Conscious Creation (ICC). Again, ICC uses the Integral Approach of Ken Wilber (AQAL) and Don Beck (SDi) to focus on the Seth Material and its expansion in bodies of work like the information offered by Elias, Kris, and Rose. ICC focuses upon *translative* and *transformative* spiritual practices that promote individual and collective abundance, fulfillment, and remembrance.

***The basic idea behind Integral Spirituality is that all authentic transformative traditions lead to the Divine within, and there is much we can learn from their best practices.***

## What about Creationism?

Integral Conscious Creation has little to do with *Creationism* or its more sophisticated formulation *Intelligent Design*. Integral Conscious Creation is postmodern, Creationism is traditional. Both contain the gem that Causal Consciousness created our universe. However, the similarities end there as the literal interpretation of Genesis and Christian dogma of the virgin birth, Satan as root of all Evil, and salvation in the resurrected Christ – ideals promoted by Intelligent Design’s leading proponent William Dembski – are traditional fairy tales contradicted by Seth and shredded by modern and postmodern sciences.

Phillip E. Johnson, a lawyer, coined the phrase “intelligent design” in 1991 to mean that biological life was created by an intelligent but unidentified designer.

“Biochemist Michael Behe devised the argument of ‘irreducible complexity’ (IC) to which theologian William Dembski added his doctrine of ‘specified complexity’ (SC) as a supporting element. IC is, however, by far the most frequently cited of the two hypotheses.” (27)

Thus, Intelligent Design theory is a more sophisticated guise that traditional Creationism has taken recently. It offers some valid and not so valid critiques of modern Darwinism, but its covert political agenda is clearly regressive. For example, in his book *Intelligent Design; the Bridge Between Science and Theology* (1999), Dembski states that “the conceptual soundings of the [intelligent design] theory can in the end only be located in Christ.” (28)

Again, Integral Conscious Creation shares the important traditional gem of Causal Consciousness and any valid modern scientific critiques but rejects the traditional dogma and superstition. Intelligent Design has been rejected, predictably, by mainstream science; the National Academy of Sciences calls ID a pseudoscience.

*Intelligent Design may serve as a bridge to help bring Causal Consciousness back into the equation, but as long as it is hijacked by fundamentalist agendas it will remain mired in traditional inaccuracies and distortions.*

### **What about Creation Spirituality and Christianity?**

Matthew Fox, an Episcopalian theologian, coined the term *Creation Spirituality*. A postmodern attempt to rehabilitate the original gnostic ideals in Christianity, it still hangs onto an odd mix of traditional Christian dogma. It contains the same gem of Causal Consciousness and refutes the sinful self with what he calls the “original blessing.” Fox’s interpretations earned him the official censure of the Vatican in 1989, and forced his dismissal from the Dominican Order in 1993. Like Creationism, Creation Spirituality and Integral Conscious Creation share the traditional notion of Causal Consciousness, and perhaps a few more things, but in general have significant differences. To Fox’s credit, Creation Spirituality may evolve into a *translative* postmodern religion, but it is not clear how it claims to integrate the advances of modern science, something at the heart of Integral Spiritual movements like Integral Conscious Creation.

So what does Christianity have to do with Integral Conscious Creation? Jane Roberts was raised Roman Catholic, but rejected translative Christianity outright in her adult life. Her work doesn’t seek to rehabilitate institutionalized Christianity, but instead to move beyond worn out Christian mythos and pave the way for whatever comes next in postmodern terms. In particular, in *The Further Education of Oversoul Seven* (1979) Christ is put into a retirement home along with Zeus and other gods whose time has passed. There is also a significant amount of so-called Christ material in various Jane Roberts books, including *Seth Speaks*, that provide Seth and Jane’s critiques on historical Christianity. For instance, Seth claimed that Christ was never actually crucified, but would reincarnate anonymously to participate in a global spiritual reformation to be completed by 2,075.

While the Seth Material was produced in the cultural milieu of Christianity, it is at the very least an attempt to cast the transformative elements of Christianity, and all the great traditional religions, into postmodern clothing. The idea of the sinful self, or self flawed by Original Sin, is refuted; the inner senses, or means of direct experience of Causal Consciousness is mandated; Consciousness is seen as in the world (immanent) but simultaneously not of it (transcendent); and the need for institutional spiritual middle-folk is rejected. In this sense, it may be the precursor of an authentic postmodern religion.

*Along with other channeled sources like Elias, Kris, and Rose, the Seth Material represents a clear trend that transformative teachings continue to bubble up from grass root sources.*

### **Who are Elias, Kris, and Rose?**

Elias, Kris, and Rose are additional channeled sources we’ve mentioned earlier. Elias is channeled by Mary Ennis (b.1954) of Brattleboro, Vermont, Kris is channeled by Serge J. Grandbois (b.1955) of Toronto, Ontario, and Rose is channeled by Joanne Helfrich (b. 1957) of Castaic, CA. They are of interest because they expand the conceptual foundation laid by

Seth/Jane Roberts. While there have been many people who claimed to channel Seth during and after Jane's lifetime, none to date have shown the depth and similarity to the original.

Serge began to channel Kris in 1980, Mary began to channel Elias in 1995, and Joanne began to channel Rose in 2007. Just as three jazz musicians will play very different solos during the same song, these three sources have notable surface level differences in syntax, style, and content, and yet have similarities between the core elements of their teachings. All sources outline a map of our multiverse, the multidimensional psyche, conscious creation as a variant of involution/evolution, and more. Further, all three sources provide various exercises in which to directly test out the waters. Elias and Rose do not give theirs a name, though Kris calls his Avatar Yoga. (29)

***Seth, Elias, Kris, Rose, and others like them are further evidence that Consciousness with a Capital "C" is seeking to redefine Itself within emerging postmodern worldviews.***

Below are recommended Elias, Kris, and Rose resources for beginners.

### The Elias forum



***[Introduction and Overview](#)***, Wildfire Media, 1999.

Paul M. Helfrich, Ph.D. has written a series of introductory resources and essays for those just getting started.

### The Kris Chronicles

Mark Bukator and John Hawkins have compiled a reference guide for terms commonly used in the Kris Chronicles. Great for beginners.

### The Essence of Rose



***[The Essence of Rose](#)***, Wildfire Media, 2007.

Joanne Helfrich has written an introduction and overview of commonly used terms and concepts for those new to the essence of Rose.

## So What?

As we have seen, we live in a time of transition and rapid change as evidenced by high-tech, global telecommunications networks, and rapid advances in all fields of art, science, and spirituality. Thus, we live in the most complex social and global conditions ever known to humankind! There are emerging, postmodern worldviews and related spiritual movements afoot. While the past has a strong hold that resists new ideas and changes, it is clear that a greater number of people than ever seek to better understand the Divine within, and seek authentic ways to find the truth in what are often confusing, contradictory, and hostile worldviews. But how to test the waters the mystics pointed out over and over again to us? You can learn to develop your deeper potentials and transform body, mind, spirit, and shadow through our FREE **Integral Toolbox** provided by the postmodern channelers mentioned in this essay. These powerful transformative tools can be used in the privacy of your home to determine the truth for yourself. We don't ask you to take anything on faith, and invite you to test them out directly. If you get what you concentrate on, then learn to concentrate in ways and on goals that produce your best health, abundance, fulfillment, and creativity.

*We invite you to join us at NewWorldView to do so! For more information, please contact Paul Helfrich at [helfrich@newworldview.com](mailto:helfrich@newworldview.com) or Joanne Helfrich at [jo@newworldview.com](mailto:jo@newworldview.com). Thank you, and we look forward to hearing from you!*

### Endnotes:

(1) Roger Walsh, *Essential Spirituality: Exercises from the World's Religions to Cultivate Kindness, Love, Joy, Peace, Vision, Wisdom, and Generosity*, John Wiley & Sons, New York NY, 1999, p.9.

(2) Aldous Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*, Harper & Row, New York, New York, 1945, p. vii.

(3) Seth readers are familiar with the importance of belief systems and worldviews. So it's a natural step to explore Seth's ideas in relation to the excellent research done over the past seventy-five years on how they unfold in time, individually and culturally. The science of *memetics*, or belief systems, was created by English biologist Richard Dawkins (b.1941) in *The Selfish Gene* (1976) as a mental counterpart for physical DNA and genes. Developmental psychologists and anthropologists, like those listed below, have subsequently begun to map how belief systems develop individually through *preconventional*, *conventional*, and *postconventional* stages, and culturally through *traditional (religious)*, *modern (scientific)*, and *postmodern (relativistic)* stages.

To clarify my semantics throughout, I define these individual and cultural stages in term of the developmental psychology outlined in Ken Wilber's *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy* (2000). He surveyed over one hundred developmental systems from the West, East, North, and South (p.197-217). Each stage transcends, yet includes elements in the preceding stage. So subsequent stages are built upon the foundational elements in preceding stages. Thus, in a "development that is envelopment" each stage shows qualities of increasing complexity, wholeness, evolution, and thus consciousness. So development by definition, then, doesn't skip stages. Each stage is "more comprehensive, differentiated and integrated than its predecessors."

To be clear, I am not using the terms *preconventional*, *conventional*, and *postconventional* to be the same as cultural stages of *traditional (religious)*, *modern (scientific)*, and *postmodern (relativistic)*. Technically, the former were coined by psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg (1927-1987) to describe stages of moral development. So they are used here only as an example of stages of individual development in general.

Therefore, if we use Clare Graves and Don Beck's stages of individual development from *Spiral Dynamics* (1996/2000), *traditional* corresponds roughly to BEIGE, PURPLE, RED, and BLUE vMemes. *Modern* corresponds roughly to the ORANGE

vMeme, and *postmodern* corresponds roughly to GREEN, YELLOW, and TURQUOISE vMemes. *Post-postmodern* represents worldviews on the distant horizon, corresponds roughly to the CORAL vMeme.

If we use Jean Gebser's stages of cultural development from *The Ever-Present Origin* (1949), then *traditional* corresponds roughly to *archaic*, *magic*, and *mythic*. *Modern* corresponds roughly to *rational*, and *postmodern* corresponds roughly to *integral*. Gebser didn't identify a *post-postmodern* stage.

If we use Wilber's stages of cultural development from *Sex, Ecology, and Spirituality* (1995/2000), then *traditional* corresponds roughly to *uroboric*, *typhonic*, *archaic*, *magic*, and *mythic*. *Modern* corresponds roughly to *rational*, and *postmodern* corresponds roughly to *centauric*. *Post-postmodern* corresponds to *psychic*.

The point, then, is that there is a general, discernable progression in developmental terms of individuals within overall cultural worldviews. For example, a sixteenth century Aztec shaman who engaged in ritual human sacrifice is less complex, less whole, less developed, and thus less conscious than American Christian evangelist Rev. Billy Graham, though both hold traditional worldviews (the Aztec is PURPLE/magic and Graham is BLUE/mythic). In turn, they are less complex, less whole, less developed, and thus less conscious than American publisher of *Skeptical Inquirer* Michael Schermer who exemplifies a modern worldview (ORANGE/rational). In turn, all three are less complex, less whole, less developed, and thus less conscious than French paleontologist/philosopher Teilhard de Chardin and American psychic Jane Roberts who exemplify postmodern worldviews (GREEN/integral/centauric).

Historically speaking, once the modern value spheres of science, art, and religion split from the traditional Church they were dominated by the rise of rationality. That produced many wonderful breakthroughs we still enjoy to this day. However, my main thesis throughout is that as variants of scientism and evolutionism emerged, Causal Consciousness or Source was thrown out with the magic/mythic bathwater. This is a form of social pathology that has crippled the Western world for close to two hundred years as noted by various social critics (e.g., Smith/1976, Wilber/1981, De Quincey/2002).

Therefore, what will come to define mature postmodernism is not only the excellent critiques of modernity that currently go by the name “postmodern,” but more significantly those critiques that begin to rehabilitate, rejoin, and heal the pathological split, particularly, between religion and science. That is, postmodernism is more accurately defined as *all attempts by Causal Consciousness to make a comeback (the irony is that It never left!) to its rightful place within institutional sciences, arts, and religions without pre/trans fallacies* (the fallacy of elevating traditional magical/mythic worldviews to forms of postmodern rationality/translogic or reducing authentic transpersonal insights to traditional irrationality and pathology).

This is the struggle we can observe on multiple fronts in terms of current dynamics between traditional, modern, and emergent postmodern worldviews. Developmental psychologists, anthropologists, and philosophers continue to refine ways to more accurately map the birth pangs, the leading edge of the so-called New Age, New Paradigm, or what I generally call *postmodern worldviews* throughout.

(4) For further details, see Seth on “The Origins of the Universe and of the Species” – An Integral Conscious Creation Myth.

(5) Jane Roberts, *The Early Sessions: Book Two of the Seth Material*, session #47, New Awareness Network, Manhasset, New York, 1997, p. 43.

(6) Jane Roberts, *The Way Toward Health*, Allen Publishing, San Rafael, California, 1997, p. 85-86.

(7) Norman Friedman, Personal correspondence, May 1999.

(8) Below are the published works of Jane Roberts:

“The Seth Material” in the form of twenty-eight Seth-dictated books:

- *Seth Speaks: The Eternal Validity of the Soul*
- *The Nature of Personal Reality*
- *The “Unknown” Reality, Vol. 1*
- *The “Unknown” Reality, Vol. 2*
- *The Nature of the Psyche: Its Human Expression*
- *The Individual and the Nature of Mass Events*

- *Dreams, “Evolution,” and Value Fulfillment, Vol. 1*
- *Dreams, “Evolution,” and Value Fulfillment, Vol. 2*
- *The Magical Approach: Seth Speaks About the Art of Creative Living*
- *The Way Toward Health*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 1 of the Seth Material*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 2 of the Seth Material*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 3 of the Seth Material*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 4 of the Seth Material*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 5 of the Seth Material*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 6 of the Seth Material*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 7 of the Seth Material*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 8 of the Seth Material*
- *The Early Sessions: Book 9 of the Seth Material*
- *The Personal Sessions: Book 1 of the Deleted Seth Material*
- *The Personal Sessions: Book 2 of the Deleted Seth Material*
- *The Personal Sessions: Book 3 of the Deleted Seth Material*
- *The Personal Sessions: Book 4 of the Deleted Seth Material*
- *The Personal Sessions: Book 5 of the Deleted Seth Material*
- *The Personal Sessions: Book 6 of the Deleted Seth Material*
- *The Personal Sessions: Book 7 of the Deleted Seth Material*
- *The Early Class Sessions: Book 1*
- *The Early Class Sessions: Book 2*

Introductory books to “the Seth Material”:

- *How to Develop Your ESP Power*
- *The Seth Material*
- *Seth, Dreams, and Projections of Consciousness*

Three Aspect Psychology books:

- *Adventures in Consciousness: An Introduction to Aspect Psychology*
- *Psychic Politics*
- *The God of Jane: A Psychic Manifesto*

Worldview books:

- *The Afterdeath Journal of an American Philosopher: The World View of William James*
- *The World View of Paul Cézanne: A Psychic Interpretation*
- *The World View of Rembrandt*

Fictional Oversoul Seven books, combined into:

- *The Oversoul Seven Trilogy (The Education of Oversoul Seven, The Further Education of Oversoul Seven, Oversoul Seven and the Museum of Time)*

Books of poetry:

- *Dialogues of the Soul and Mortal Self in Time*
- *If We Live Again, or, Public Magic and Private Love*

A children's book:

- *Emir's Education in the Proper Use of Magical Powers*

The detailed observations and notes of Rob Butts.

Additional books by close friend and student Susan M. Watkins:

- *Conversations with Seth: The Story of Jane Roberts's ESP Class, Vol 1 & 2*
- *Speaking of Jane Roberts: Remembering the Author of the Seth Material*

(9) Jane Roberts, *The Seth Material*, Buccaneer Books, Cutchogue, New York, 1970, p. 275-277.

(10) Jane Roberts, *Seth Speaks: The Eternal Validity of the Soul*, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, California, 1994. p. 121.

(11) Jane Roberts. ESP Class transcript, October 21, 1969.

(12) For further details, see The New Person-Centered Civil Religion.

(13) Arthur Hastings, *With the Tongues of Men and Angels: A Study of Channeling*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1991, p. 78.

(14) Jon Klimo, *Channeling: Investigations on Receiving Information from Paranormal Sources*, Preface, North Atlantic Books, Berkeley, California, 1998, p. 22.

(15) Arthur Hastings, Charles Tart, editor, *Body, Mind, and Spirit: Exploring the Parapsychology of Spirituality*, Chapter 12, Channeling and Spiritual Teachings, Hampton Roads, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1997, p. 199.

(16) Klimo, Op. Cit., p. 103.

(17) Klimo, Op. Cit., p. 2.

(18) Jane Roberts, *The Nature of the Psyche*, session 753, Amber-Allen Publishing, San Rafael, California, 1995, p. 4-5.

(19) Jane Roberts, *Seth Speaks: The Eternal Validity of the Soul*, Amber-Allen, San Rafael, California, 1994. xvi.

(20) Roberts, Ibid, p. xviii.

(21) Jane Roberts, *The "Unknown" Reality*, Vol. 1, Amber-Allen Publishing, San Rafael, California, 1996, p. 338.

(22) Jane Roberts, *Adventures in Consciousness*, SethNet Publishing, Eugene, Oregon, 1997, p. 113

(23) Roberts, Ibid, p. 114.


(24) *Beyond the Winning Streak: Using Conscious Creation to Consistently Win at Life* (1993), *Ten Thousand Whispers: A Guide to Conscious Creation* (1995), *The Wizards of Consciousness: Making the Imponderable Practical* (1997).

(25) More importantly, this ontological distinction prevents the reduction of the "You" who creates all its reality to only the outer ego (physical field) which creates solely through thoughts – a common distortion found in many New Age interpretations of conscious creation. Since I define the "you" in "you create your own reality" as existing in simultaneous physical, subtle, and causal fields I sometimes use the term "I-I-I" to represent this ontology. Thus, to say, "I-I-I create my reality" more accurately reflects this.

For further details, see *Who is the "You" in You Create Your Own Reality?*

(26) In the first five chapters, Seth used CUs and EEs to explain how involution preceded the Big Bang in what he calls “before the beginning.” CUs are the causal “force” of All-That-Is within the causal field that formed the subtle field, EEs are the causal “force” within the subtle field that formed the physical field, and quantum fields are the form taken by CUs and EEs in what Seth calls Framework 1. Thus, All-That-Is creates all Its reality simultaneously through interpenetrated causal, subtle, and physical fields via CUs/EEs/quantum fields. These three nested fields are accessible through waking, dreaming, and deep dreamless states, because CUs dream and have inner senses.

Further, as evolution proceeded after the Big Bang, Seth is clear that there is an order of play which maps to Teilhard de Chardin’s three basic stages of physical (geosphere), biological (biosphere), and self-reflexive mental (noosphere) outlined in *The Phenomenon of Man* (1959). Also, the noosphere evolved, generally speaking, to include traditional, modern, and emergent postmodern worldviews.



For further details, see [Seth on “The Origins of the Universe and of the Species” – An Integral Conscious Creation Myth](#).

(27) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\\_Dembski](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Dembski).

(28) p. 210. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\\_Dembski](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Dembski).

(29) For further details, see A Kris, Seth, Elias Comparative Overview.