

# The metaphilosophy of globalisation

Csaba Varga

## Overture

First of all: there is not one, but there are *many globalisations*. We can experience not one, but several kinds of globalisation. There is old and recent globalisation, and the global world can be interpreted together with a global consciousness.

The global world and continuous globalisation are impossible to interpret, and even senseless without the *continuous creation* of the *absolute (the world/consciousness of a higher order)* and that of another type of the absolute directed at the middle and the lower worlds. On the other hand, it is also senseless to disregard *human self-creation aiming for the absolute* in the opposite direction, from the bottom up. This is a there and back type of connection with the starting point standing out clear all through.

In reply to this albeit baffling overture, it can be said that although the starting question is cardinal, it is both unmanageable and unscientific. Let *one single quote* suffice as a counter-argument: "If modern cosmology has an all-encompassing lesson, it is the realisation that the events of the physical world cannot be described in three dimensional space and time".<sup>1</sup>

This overture can also be thought of as a refusal of the following: „...the Whole is no longer that certain Whole comprised of theology, metaphysics, universalism, and cosmopolitanism, but simply a Whole that has become the object of economic, technical, and political fashioning.”<sup>2</sup>

One of the overt purposes of a meta-theory of globalisation is to show the connection between recent globalisation and the search for the Whole, that is, to consistently show that an ever more globalising world is bound to re-discover the Whole as well as an universal collective consciousness submerged in the consciousness of the Whole.

A global world plane, its existential content, and especially its whereabouts are all very dubious. Let us forget for the time being about whether a world which is independent of us, which can be regarded as objective by an observer exists at all, and let us also disregard the dilemma that a phenomenal world can only be perceived and interpreted within ourselves, in our personal consciousness.

Let us assume instead that the visible-invisible world, and its momentary-historical shapes, the global and local worlds exist simultaneously on the outside (in earthly civilisation), in the lives of individual human beings (the local world), and on the inside (in our personal consciousness), and what is more, even in the *collective consciousness* of earthly civilisation. Thus, globalisation occurs on four parallel levels, in other words, this is a four-level globalisation which can be interpreted on each of its four separate levels.

---

<sup>1</sup> Arthur Koestler, 1959: The Sleepwalkers. (Hutchinson). In Hungarian: A. Koestler: Alvajárók. (Európa Publishing, 2007). p. 773.

<sup>2</sup> Rüdiger Safranski, 2003: Wieviel Globalisierung verträgt der Mensch? (Carl Hanser Verlag München Wien). In Hungarian: Mennyi globalizációt bír az ember? (Európa Publishing, 2004), p. 71.

For an examination of globalisation, it is absolutely necessary for the observing and interpreting personality – as Nietzsche had required – to view outer-inner history with anticipated irony without, however, an anticipated acknowledgement of himself and world history, that is to say, he must work himself out of , and get above history.<sup>3</sup> This, by the way, is the pre-requisite of a search for the Whole, too.

Globalisation can be lived at the same time from the inside and the outside, but it can only be viewed without partiality *from above* (if possible, from outside of history). Presumably, history views us at the same time from the inside and the outside, while the absolute is both extraneous and neutral, filled (or not filled?) with love.

Let us take at first an intellectual journey in the "*elevator*" of the *entire world structure*. Thus regardless of whether the world exists on the "outside" or the "inside" at the same time, or in both places, let us accept the hypothesis that the simultaneously objective-subjective world is multi-layered, complex, structured both vertically and horizontally at the same time.

The total (transcending and reaching beyond) elevator of world structure presumably moves in the multi-storey world house which encompasses the Whole, and whose "roof" (the absolute) and whose "bottom" (personal consciousness) both reach into infinity. *The structure* of the simultaneously real/virtual, simultaneously affirmative/negative world looks like this from top to bottom:

a) the "world" of the absolute that is a consciousness of the highest order (the world of God, a higher world, a cosmic intelligence, etc.);

b) the universal "world" (the world of not a single, but several universes, the world of the multi-verse) and universal consciousness;

c) the global world and global consciousness (the whole and global world of the Globe which can be regarded as an inner "universe" or "inner absolute" when compared to the multi-verse);

d) continental worlds (partial worlds within an earthly, global world) and continental consciousness;

e) the worlds of peoples, nations, states and national and social consciousness;

f) local worlds (the sum total of partial worlds within peoples, nations and states) and local consciousness;

g) the inner and the outer world of the individual (the latter having a personal consciousness which includes the "world" of the absolute too, and this is where we have come full circle).

In this *vertical* total world structure every *horizontal* level is a *complex system*, too. In this essay we "only" interpret the *middle* (global, continental, national and local) *worlds and collective consciousness*. This is obviously none other than the inner world structure of civilisation. Therefore, we shall talk about two, *vertical-horizontal (partially overlapping) world structures* all along.

In the inner world system of civilisation, too, each level/dimension can be regarded as the real world, but each can also be regarded as *a collective field of consciousness, and even as a world beyond reality (i.e.: a transcendent) world*.. Traditionally, of course, we can also assume that the earthly and the inner earthly world levels are exclusively *material-*

---

<sup>3</sup> A meta-theoretical interpretation of history consists of at least two stages: a) while making the analysis, we assume a history which is both outer (outside of individual consciousness) and inner (within personality /consciousness), both a material-institutional, and a collective state of consciousness, both upper (transcendent) and lower (earthly, civilisational), both positive and negative, both empty and full, both sacred and profane, both affirming and denying salvation (nihilism); b) when concluding the analysis, however, we do not refrain from coming to a conclusion, from making a choice between alternatives, or from the earthly, material, or rational application of meta-theory in practice.

*institutional, real-rational systems*, and even the collective consciousness fields are secondary, or unimportant, with only the higher worlds placed beyond reality perceivable as transcendental ones.

In his "An Eulogy of Philosophy"<sup>4</sup> Maurice Merleau-Ponty is compelled to say that we must be content with less than the existence of the transcendental world, because "the philosopher never assumes an absolute absolute but only an absolute which is connected with it". (Let us note here that the "absolute absolute" is a superb spot-on concept.) As for ourselves, it is not at all sure that we must accept such reasonable self-limitation.

Why must we not accept such self-limitation? Because according to our experience and interpretation the global (and/or local) world is the creation of a *collective consciousness* which on the one hand becomes objective in a subjective consciousness, and on the other hand it is created continuously in the collective consciousness by individual consciousnesses. This is *dual creation*: it happens both from below (from earthly civilisation) and from above (from the levels of a collective and a transcendent consciousness).

What we see, experience, and observe of global worlds can also be interpreted as the system and/or network of *varying absolutes*. In this sense, the global world *is the world of a "lower" absolute - in front of, or behind, the curtain of the mind*.

The global world has, of course, at least two dimensions horizontally: on the one hand, the dimension of global collective consciousness, i.e. the unified consciousness field of mankind, and on the other, that of the *manifestation, institutionalisation, and "objectivisation"* of global collective consciousness. And this second, global world, both creating and created, has *also at least two dimensions*: those of a substantial and a functional global world.

Collective consciousness does not give birth to the reality and illusion of the global world in itself and by itself, because - according to our hypothesis - the consciousness field created by the absolute, i.e. a collective consciousness is also connected to *higher levels*.

Thus the meta-philosophy of globalisation simultaneously perceives and interprets the *material-natural and the consciousness reality* of the global world global world (*and/or the beyondness of reality too*), and, on the other hand, the observer/interpreter both lives and visualises the world structure levels that are placed both *beneath and above the earthly global world*. The meta-theory of globalisation picks up the interpretations of classical philosophy, especially (but not exclusively) religious philosophy or phenomenology, and it creates a *meta-philosophy* proposing new dimensions and assuming new starting points whilst building on those philosophical foundations.

Philosopher Endre Kiss has examined the global as the absolute becoming direct<sup>5</sup>, yet in this connection he has not defined the concept of the absolute. He has not connected the creation and the existence of the global world perhaps due to the lack of a metaphysics of the Whole, nor the levels of the transcendent absolute and its principles of operation, although the global level can indeed be interpreted as the transcendent and/or universal absolute becoming direct.

In our opinion, the meta-philosophy of globalisation states first and foremost that this theory unambiguously points to the fact that the *universal middle level* of the ever existent/non-existent reality of reality/non-reality is the global world itself. The present inner universification of earthly reality (or more narrowly, globalisation in the sociological and economic sense) just discovers the actual world structure, or it just makes it more visible, while offering an intellectual return to the spectacle/experience of the whole, or its philosophical assumption.

---

<sup>4</sup> Merleau-Ponty, 1953: *Éloge de la philosophie*, Éditions Gallimard; In Hungarian : *A filozófia dicsérete*, Európa Publishing, 2005. p. 12. .

<sup>5</sup> Endre Kiss – Csaba Varga , 2001: *The Very Last Chance* (Knowledge Society Books), Institute for Strategic Research (ISR) , p. 19

If the essence of a particular human being is *not the same as his body*<sup>6</sup> (he/she is not a body and/or primarily not body), then it is an obvious theorem that many people together, i.e. the collective world (the system of outer worlds) created by mankind is *not the same as a natural-physical "body" either*, not the same as the natural global-local world. And if the individual is first and foremost equal to the Self-real, the Absolute, then collective civilisation, too, is equal to the *collective Self-real*, or the *absolute Absolute*.

But let us start the analysis with the introduction of the *substantial-material global-local* world and of *globalisation-localisation*, a process that models its development.

## 1. A new global-local problem inventory<sup>7</sup>

There are almost as *many* globalisation interpretations and global reality concepts as there are theorists. Not to mention the fact that in various languages, within scientific thinking, in scientific branches which are distant from one another, and of course, in public thinking which differs from culture to culture, the majority of the basic categories necessary for globalisation theory (reality, world, hyperspace, universe and/or metaverse, world structure, society, functional-substantial etc.) are not interpreted in a uniform manner but are either defined with differing contents or with contents excluding one another.

Therefore, all we can do is take time to explain the concepts wherever that is possible. Where that is not possible, we can only make references.

We now narrow down the globalisation theme further in space and time: we shall mainly observe the earthly global world immediately before and after the millennium. This is the *middle level* of the total world structure, and the apex of the earthly world structure at the same time, and as to time, it is the *momentary present*, a sphere involving both totality and non-totality. However, the narrowing of our theme cannot also mean that we regard both the upper and lower levels of world structures as non-existent or invisible.

The total or universal middle level is inevitably both total and incomplete at the same time when *regarded from within*. It is always closed functionally, and always open substantially. The world of earthly civilisation - becoming uniform at the beginning of the third millennium - is still *not uniform*, nor is it certain that it can *ever* be totally uniform.

The chapter title firstly refers to the assumption that in the world structure of our planet, in its space-time structures there is a *watershed in time*: before the turn of the present millennium (thus in the eighties and the nineties) and after the millennium (in the 2000s and 2010s social realities have already been *partially different*, and *they will become more different still*. We may say that in the final stage of our expanded present, global hyperspace is becoming different.

The reason for the transformation of spatial and social fields is first and foremost the development of a *new global-local world structure*, an as yet incomplete, but rapid *change* in the general *world-model* of mankind. It is not a coincidence that a renowned sociologist (Z. Bauman, 1998) has described the last quarter of the twentieth century as the great war of independence in our break-away from space".<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> „I am neither the rough body nor the fine body, nor am I the causal body either. I am similar to the universe. I am that which is transcendental knowledge according to its nature. Besides, I am eternal, the Lord, the immaculate who is free of the states of being awake, asleep or being in deep sleep, The One for whom the universe does not exist.” Devikhalottara with the introduction of Shri Bhagavan (The Complete Works of Ramana Maharshi, Filosz Publishing 2006, p. 218)

<sup>7</sup> Sociologist Zsolt Szoboszlai also took part in a space theory and space structure study of globalisation.

<sup>8</sup> Bauman, Zygmunt, 1998 Globalisation: The Human Consequences (In Hungarian: Globalizáció, a társadalmi következmények, Budapest, 2002, pp. 24.)

Hungarian researchers<sup>9</sup> of spatial and social studies have reacted rather quickly to the new phenomena of globalisation and localisation, and many have striven to define the natural history of the new reality as exactly as possible, still at the same time many have regarded globalisation as the spread of world economic processes only.

However, there is nothing unusual about the new global-local world and global knowledge/consciousness being continuously one step ahead of science.

Although we know more and more about globalisation, no uniform and encompassing globalisation theories have been born. All of the sciences lack a picture of reality which would expose the essence. Therefore, one of the criteria, or perhaps the cardinal criterion, of the development of a complete globalisation theory, is the gradual birth of meta-theory.

Because of this, at present we cannot do more than to offer the analysis below of the processes of "lower" globalisation, an analysis that serves as an *integrated hypothesis* about new localisation at the same time.

Before defining theoretical hypotheses, it is well worth summing up the *known-unknown* problems of globalisation. Our problem inventory is in fact an incomplete collection of *unanswered questions, dilemmas, confusions, and deficiencies*.

Once the new global-local<sup>10</sup> world keeps changing by the minute, once scientific analyses are only scrambling to keep up with those changes, once even pre-change pictures of reality are hazy, once we do not sense the effects of global states of consciousness, we can do nothing but *augment* our problem inventory *continuously*.

Even if we merely research the social conditions of territorial development, we find ourselves faced with the problems of various spaces and societies, and if we examine them systematically, we arrive again at the various conflicts of a *new global-local world and consciousness*, that is, at conflicts of *the complex (natural, economic and cultural etc.) spaces and multi-layered collective consciousness* yet again.

Summarised in a minimum of thirty to thirty five points, selected issues of our problem inventory are as follows:

1. Globalisation is perhaps not globalisation at all; globalisation is the new universalisation, or just the extension of an Euro-Atlantic reality to the entire civilisation prior to globalisation;

2. Globalisation is new space time in earthly reality of three and, in time, four dimensions, or to put it in the language of physics, this must be a five-dimensional hyperspace;

3. The "middle" and the "apex" of our trans-national hyperspace is a highly organised political-economic meta-power, or the super reality of our planet, the reality of an earthly absolute which has been empty, unfilled, and without role players for thousands of years.

4. Economic globalisation, or a transcendental economy wields a political-economic influence over the states of nations whilst especially the smaller state nations would go bankrupt without the economic emergence of the trans-national;

5. "Bodiless", "flying" trans-national monetary markets do away with the economic-financial sovereignty of nations, while the governments of particular countries can only regain control over their own economies if they decide to establish a global financial authority, an international clearing bank for example;

---

<sup>9</sup> E.g: György Enyedi, 1996: Regional processes in Hungary, Budapest; Tóth József, 1993. As to the interpretation of globality and locality, Juss, Vol. VI. No. 1-2. Szolnok, pp. 136-142; Csaba Varga, 1996. National strategy in the new global field of force (In: Tradition and strategy, Kapu, Budapest, 1997, pp. 194-250)

<sup>10</sup> From here on we always talk about earthly globalisation. Should we diverge from this, we shall always indicate it.

6. Does globalisation give birth to a new global (civil and cultural) consciousness, or does a long existing global-universal consciousness now create the material-physical, global-local world?

7. Our global-local civilisation is a three-to-five-thousand-year detour and a wrong one which now returns to its roots, the spiritual-sacral world states of mankind, or it falls for good into an excessively consumptive, material and body-centred, rational, godless, and self destructive nihilism;

8. The world before recent globalisation had created a second nature for thousands of years whereas now a third nature (the global virtual world) is created, a nature that represents second society and second culture for the individual ;

9. New globalisation is a new type of globalisation because it is done through not only economic-power actors, but because it has become partially or wholly a totally independent existence, an independent "machine", and an independent collective "personality" which can hardly be influenced by mankind anymore;

10. The greatest novelty of new global-local structures and processes is that they demand universal governance for mankind with post-parliamentarian and post-governmental alternatives;

11. Is globalisation, and even global-localisation, a wide-range fulfilment of an earthly civilisation doomed to failure, or it is in fact an alternative for escape or breakout involving a measure of destruction and deterioration ?

12. Does globalisation endanger itself on the global level, too, while it generates new crises, while continents/countries that lag behind because of a lack of globalisation may find themselves in a desperate situation?

13. New globalisation may well overpower underdeveloped local and sublocal territories lacking in capacities for resistance on all levels of the world structure, but without the wide-range strengthening of local worlds functional globalisation itself may well fail;

14. At this point in time new globalisation cannot handle most world problems of the industrial age (ecological crises, the risks of virtual monetary markets etc.) but without globalisation and global co-operation these world problems will only become more severe;

15. A global society cannot come into being through uniformisation, only through dialogue between cultures and religions, emerging as a new universal society that should order religions and cultures into a solid whole;

16. Globalism is either the spreading of an Euro-Atlantic atheist culture making atheism general, or indeed it is the world process of self-liquidation for atheist culture incomprehensible even for itself;

17. The essence of a new global-local world is that it gradually makes the governing structures of today and tomorrow impossible without continuing the development of states that turn against their own, or indeed it promotes the freedom and competence of civil societies, and to this end it creates a network of new types of states and governance;

18. Globalisation has reached and ensnared the Third (developing) world, and where the combination of the new and the old economy becomes competitive, there poverty and defencelessness will decrease, but as an effect of this the economic competitiveness of the Second world (with Hungary in it) will also decrease;

19. In Europe, the seemingly often impervious and intractable global processes do not come to a halt, on the contrary, they continue at an increased pace, yet, at the same time the Euro-Atlantic economic-political alliance has not even a clue as to how to qualitatively change global-local processes ;

20. The economic-social differences between the First, Second, and Third worlds remain and even increase in the global world, or indeed can it be that mutual dependencies bring about an increase on every level, or at least they can stop the general decline;

21. One of the characteristics of the new global-local world is that a particular area can develop dynamically even when social and economic conditions happen to be weak, however, there are also examples of particular areas withering in spite of favourable social conditions; that is, the new space structure and its operation send all previous space theories and space dynamics into disarray;

22. As a result of new and widespread globalisation-localisation, a new collective consciousness is established which is sensitive to the new, global values (too), or indeed just on the contrary, the self-developing collective consciousness controls the new unification of the globe invisibly and unrecognisably;

23. In earthly culture it is an almost universal consciousness that creates the collective consciousness levels, and thus the new global, national, and local consciousnesses, or indeed, it is the individuals or groups who try to defend themselves against the negative effects of globalisation, i.e. the lack of solidarity and compassion, who create virtual, local, isolated ways of thinking;

24. Can it be that an upper level, global consciousness – both visibly and invisibly – simply integrates continental, religion based, cultural consciousnesses, or indeed, the collective consciousness emerging before and after the millennium performs its unification process by destroying or at least endangering continental – or, in our case, European – consciousness?

25. The new global-local world and globalisation itself creates the future with a stunning force, what is more, this reality is the embodied future itself, while the new global-local international and national elites have no vision of the future at all, not even about how to control this embodied future ;

26. The new type of globalisation cannot be stopped, nor can it be undone, however, the severe global-local conflicts caused by it wait to be stopped: thus the opposite of globalisation is not holding it back, but alternative globalisation, a project lacking in an encompassing and mature programme;

27. However rational and profit-oriented earthly globalisation may be, the condition for its rational alteration is that it should be led by values rather than the profit principle, that is, the remedying of the actual crises of earthly civilisation are unimaginable without the help of the entire (total) world system-world order, and without putting the universal-global consciousness in order;

28. The economies and societies of Central Europe slowly integrate into the global-continental world, while Europe cannot diminish its disadvantage against the most developed countries of the world, our own great region thus vegetates along with our stationary continent, or indeed, it can improve its position within a continental structure (i.e. within Europe);

29. In the past two decades Hungary has been both a winner and a loser of globalisation, however, it can only get out of the group of countries deemed as losers and only partially competitive, if it performs exceedingly well in globalisation-localisation;

30. Due to an ever increasing number of half-truths, personal and collective prejudices, immature "expert" analyses, the cognition difficulties of science, and the political system's inability to act, the transparency and the transformability of the world become questionable, or indeed, universalisation and its high level reception will force new thinking to evolve with the transparency of the world increasing by leaps and bounds;

31. In the coming decades, individuals currently alive or being born now will want to (and will be able to) reach higher levels of personal and collective consciousness, or indeed it will be an universal-global consciousness that could enable individuals (all, or not all of them) to "make the leap" in their states of mind within a short period of time.

32. Previous partial globalisations have carried out and completed the break-up and fragmentation of the Whole, the emptying of Man's consciousness of the Whole, or indeed, this destruction carried out by capitalism and new capitalism in the second half of the past century can be undone by substantial globalisation by creating a global chance for individuals and Mankind to find their way back to the Whole.

Etc.

P. S. If globalisation or global-localisation goes hand in hand with so many "or indeeds", then inevitably the *new locality (and/or: the new localisation) theory* will contain at least as many "or indeeds".

The problem-inventory could *go on and on*, however, with the complexity and disjunctivity of the problems above we only wished to point out that the usual thinking patterns or scientific theorems can often be extended, in fact, intelligent thought extensions or *new trains of thought* are inevitable.

## 2. The dominant effects of a universal and/or global field of force

The *new space-time structure* which is happening in earthly civilisation and culture, or the new globalisation and global-localisation and the universal changes effected by them can be examined at least from *three angles*: 1. *How* the leading Euro-Atlantic sciences collectively *view and characterise* the globalisation-localisation in which they are both witnesses and role-players; 2. What kind of new reality is actually being born in new globalisation irrespective of where the various leading and peripheral interpretations have lead to; and 3. What kind of new *collective consciousness* (universal, global, national and local) will emerge in mankind as the reason or consequence of a new global-local reality.

The global world and *globalisation* (the local world and localisation etc.) do not mean the same thing, nor do they mean the same thing in the same way. The global world is none other than the result actualised in the present by globalisation, the actual present state, the completed past and the present, in short: existing reality. (This is true for the local world as well.) And globalisation on our planet is a universal world process, the dynamics of world change, the characteristic trait of global processes, or the self-movement and history of actions of civilisation.

According to accepted views, globalisation is not a new world phenomenon, but today its *new (or newer)* form is being established. Scientific special literature alternatively uses three concepts: *globalisation, universalisation, and mondialisation*. The connectedness, unification and at the same time, the fragmentation of earthly civilisation are created by globalisation, and in contrast to all opposing views, this does not mean and does not exclusively mean economic globalisation only. (The category of mondialisation essentially carries the same content.) Universalisation, however, cannot be mixed up with globalisation because it happens to assert social-political norms coined in the name of universal values. Mondialisation or globalisation is, according to an apt interpretation (Derrida, 1996), none other than the "peculiar alliance of Christianity interpreted as an experience of the death of God and tele-technical-scientific capitalism."<sup>11</sup>

Yet, a decade later it is recognisable that the processes of globalisation *scroll beyond* technical-scientific capitalism, while the new science indirectly *resurrects* God, and after the United States, Europe slowly becomes more spiritual too.

Thus, the three or four globalisation concepts are not at all of the same content, but they undoubtedly overlap.

---

<sup>11</sup> Derrida, Jacques, 1996. Faith and Knowledge. In Hungarian: Brambauer Publishing, Pécs, pp. 25-26.

The concept of globalisation is the most widespread and most general, especially when we build the contents of the concept of universalisation into the concept of substantial globalisation which we can interpret in a wider manner than e.g. rational globalisation – but more of this later.

In any case, globalisation/mondialisation cannot be described with a yes-no logic, several of its phenomena *can be evaluated* as both creating and destroying chances for mankind.

At least nine out of ten analyses describe globalisation (basically or exclusively) as *economic and political globalisation*. The well-accepted definition goes like this: globalisation marks the integration in world economy which was really born at the dawn of the European colonisation age, and in the last quarter of a century this process has been accelerated by (a) the explosion-like development of computer technology, (b) the demolition of trade barriers, (c) the increase in the political and economic power of giant multi-national companies.<sup>12</sup>

One analysis of the highest standard (Beck, U. 1997) claims this for instance: "By globalism I mean that the world market represses, respectively it replaces political action as well as the ideology of the dominance of world-market, and the ideology of neo-liberalism."<sup>13</sup>

This paradox is one of the characteristics of globalisation: the liberal ideology of politics and its programme are destroyed by a more developed reality of the liberal global world market.

The *philosophical criticism* of globalisation has also been born. The definition of the historical-philosophical essence of new globalisation was attempted by a philosopher (Endre Kiss, 2001<sup>14</sup>) who connected the theory of the end of history and the characterisation of the new state of the world to the real criterion that a new historical situation can only come into being if we give up the social set-up based on a *master-servant relationship* and its ideological philosophic representation. One of the reasons for this is that before 1989 the Soviet semi-global world system had been based on the acceptance of the master-servant relationship as described by Kant. Of course, one and a half decades after the change of the political system in Eastern Europe, only very few believe that we have reached the realm of "eternal peace" in the Kantian sense.

One of the most extreme criticisms of globalisation and mondialisation has been elaborated by French philosopher Jean Baudrillard<sup>15</sup>. According to him, globalisation exercises its effects precisely against universality, and a *perfectly undifferentiated unculturedness* is created because, on the one hand, technology, market, tourism and information integrate into mundiality while universal values of culture and democracy disappear. However, another French thinker, Alain Touraine<sup>16</sup> believes that although mondialisation is advancing, old cultures will remain, because among other things industrial democracy has been established, a set-up in which a diversity of cultures unites with

---

<sup>12</sup> Wayne Ellwood, 2001: *The No-Nonsense Guide to Globalisation*, New Internationalist Publications Ltd. Oxford, and Verso, London. In Hungarian: *A globalizáció*, HVG Publishing, 2003, p. 13.

<sup>13</sup> Beck, Ulrich, 1997 *Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalisierung*, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1997. In Hungarian: Beck, U.: *Mi a globalizáció? Belvedere Meridionale*, Szeged, 2005, pp. 18.

<sup>14</sup> Endre Kiss (2001). *The global as the becoming direct of the absolute, or the present as a philosophical problem INCO 2001/1* (E. Kiss: *Globalisation and/or postmodern*, János Kodolányi College Székesfehérvár, 2003, pp. 8-20.)

<sup>15</sup> Jean Baudrillard, 1997. *The Penultimate Moment. Discussions with Philippe Petit*. In Hungarian: Magvető Publishing Budapest, 2000

<sup>16</sup> *Rapport mondial sur la culture. Culture, créativité et marchés*, UNESCO, 1998 (World report on culture. Culture, creativity and the markets.)

participation in the technical-economic world. After the analysis of several contradictory interpretations, we can risk making the statement that time has confirmed neither an extreme denial, nor an unambiguous affirmation of globalisation.

The process of globalisation is inevitably *double-faced*. We argue for a differentiation of *functional and substantial* (or ontological) globalisation.<sup>17</sup> We might as well call this the contrast of particular and essential globalisation, but we must also add that global economy and global politics are naturally capable of a *particular behaviour* motivated purely by interests of power on a global level, too.

Basically economy centred, functional globalisation subordinating even politics to the economy creates a new economic-political world order that guarantees advantages for the leading countries of civilisation yet again, however, despite all fragmentation, it also creates *economic-social opportunities* for the second and third worlds. In the nineties, Central-Europe would not have been economically rebuilt had it not been for the presence and strength of a global economy, even though the majority of the trans-national enterprises do not invest their profits in this particular region.

While the functional global political changes are not *unambiguously* negative, paradoxically, neither is the unification generated by substantial globalisation *unambiguously positive*. It is important to recognise that globalisation is a danger to the *humane and natural resources* of mankind, however, this danger was originally caused by classic world capitalism before recent globalisation, at the same time, the ecological crises can only be appeased globally with the help of globalisation. Neither affirmation, nor denial – what then is the alternative?

Thus, on the global and continental levels spaces-processes both *chaotic and changeable, even complex and continuously further changing*, have come and still come into being, processes that are often unusual and unmanageable, yet based on chaos theory we also happen to know that chaos-likeness is part of the essence of nature (and society). Therefore there is a need for *complex, refined, and sensitive analyses* in the case of every question.

Yesterday's and today's globalisation has built and continues to build an earthly world structure. Hungary, for example, throughout the years of Socialism has continuously experienced that it was severely cut off from the continental-global levels, and the totalitarian state had done away with all or most elements of localisation. To us, the world structure had been cut off both from below and from above. Just because of this the connection and relation between *space theory and globalisation theory* is one of the most complex questions.

Thus in past centuries and even millennia, for the particular person *sometimes the whole, and sometimes just a fragmented* world structure was visible and accessible to explore. Before the present turn of the millennium however, due to the effects of a new civilisational universalisation, the world's structure has become a "multi-storey condo" again: at the top there is the upper level of civilisation, or the global level, below is the system of local worlds, headed by the region, and in-between the two dominant elements *a mediating level* remained that has no old or new name, perhaps we can say that it is the level of countries (or/and nations<sup>18</sup>). At the beginning of the 21st century, the actual and virtual world structure is *once again complete and complex*.

According to widespread views, the connections of *globalisation and localisation* have also transformed over the past two decades. Analyses up to now have arrived at the conclusion, partly in a superficial and partly in a justified manner, that there is *no balance* between *the two main elements* (the global and the local levels) – it has been governance

---

<sup>17</sup> Csaba Varga, 2003. In front of new theory horizons, Tertia Publishing, Budapest, pp. 63-65.

<sup>18</sup> Hungarian scientific language is in trouble because it has no similar definition to globalism and localism to name the middle level within globalisation. For lack of better terms we should be talking about the new phenomena of country-isation and nationalisation.

globalisation that has become and remained dominant. The momentary end result is difficult to register unambiguously, however, because the dilemma of *what we compare to* is continuous, and of course we cannot compare our present situation to anything but the age of "normal" capitalism or the age of industrial society. (Where industrial-capitalist development was late, or even stayed incomplete due to the zone rankings of world powers after the Second World War, it is especially difficult to make a stance.) In Hungary, during the period between the two world wars, or during the period of "existing socialism" the local level - during the period of state capitalism - *was extremely subordinated and exposed*. When compared to this, the independence and freedom of movement of Hungarian local regions has grown significantly, while the cessation of subordination is as yet hardly tangible.

The concept introduced and accepted for at least three decades has been that there is *no* actual globalisation *in itself*, because *localisation* is a parallel process that cannot escape the effects of globalisation, and the other way around, too, localisation exerts an ever stronger effect contravening the effects of intensive globalisation, and also on globalisation itself. This dual intertwining process is *global-localisation*. If we introduce the concept of a new country-isation/nationalisation<sup>19</sup> into this system, it becomes *a triple process* generally bypassed by current interpretations.

### 3. The leading theses of a new global-local reality

By the turn of the millennium, earthly civilisation's *new (naturally: global-local) reality* has finally been born. This is a new civilisation which can also be a *new culture* at the same time. This on the one hand visible-tangible, yet, on the other hand it is an almost wholly hidden reality very far from what has been defined as reality in Europe or on another continent a hundred years ago.

The new reality is *new space, new time and new space-time*, in fact the German sociologist (Beck, U. 1997) already defines Europe not as geographical but as *imaginary space*.<sup>20</sup>

This a new world state, a new superstructure and network of processes, which we examine at the same time and in a complex manner as functional reality and a reality beyond functionality, the radically new view of our analysis just happens to be that it does not only interpret globalisation as new political, economic intertwining world order.

Let us now go back to *the problem inventory* of globalisation again, and let us look at *what we can say* about some of the more important characteristics.

Global-localisation as the new world and consciousness process has undergone *the following more important changes* in the past two to three decades:

1.

As a result of continuous globalisation, joint globalisation and localisation an at least five dimensional (geographical, economic, social, cultural) global trans-national space/time has been created which is a multi-dimensional, united space and time, or in other words: the reality of the earthly Absolute; (*the thesis of a global, multi-dimensional hyperspace*)

2.

At the same time, global-local reality creates a new global-universal collective consciousness which also inspires, generates, and levels globalisation and localisation. The new collective

---

<sup>19</sup> See: Emese Ugrin - Csaba Varga, 2008: A New State and Democracy Theory, Institute for Strategic Research, 2008; In Hungarian: Emese Ugrin - Csaba Varga, 2007: A New Democracy and State Theory (Századvég);

<sup>20</sup> Beck, Ulrich, 1997 Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalisierung, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1997 (In Hungarian: Beck, U.: Mi a globalizáció? Belvedere Meridionale, Szeged, 2005, pp. 167.

consciousness affects every single citizen of Earth while a collective consciousness-change is taking place: the old, false consciousness will in its essence (but not in its parts) become true consciousness, and vice versa. *(the thesis of a new global consciousness)*

3.

Globalisation has gradually flowed on from the centres of world economy and world politics and has practically "covered" the entire earthly civilisation, it has practically already reached the most isolated worlds, peoples and tribes. It affects everybody and more and more everybody can reflect back. *(the thesis of civilisation becoming united)*

4.

Spreading globalisation has long not lain in an Euro-Atlantic political-economic interest but it has expressed the world-wide will of an entire civilisation full of conflicts and identical interests at the same time. *(the thesis of a global conflict of interests and their levelling)*

5.

The new global or global-local space is not only a material-physical, or state- political, or indeed an economic-social space but a new imaginary space, a new virtual space-time, a world of new substantial space-time. *(the thesis of new imaginary global space)*

6.

The new global space (space-time, time-space) is not simply a vertical and horizontal space structure but a multi-centred, multi-dimensional, multi-imaged space process which includes space flows and space breaks, stationary and moving space structures at the same time. There emerge multi-levelled, simultaneous connections, new relations, new dynamisms. *(the thesis of fluid and set space and time processes)*

7.

In a global space structure the vertical transforms into horizontal, the horizontal, into vertical, what is more, the vertical-horizontal structure closed until now opens both to the inside and to the outside, while a limitless, infinite, non-linear horizontal and vertical space network is created. *(the thesis of an open, mobile space structure)*

8.

Uniting, or global civilisation is a process only partially submitted to economic-social governance centres because in part, and at an ever increasing rate, it is a world dimension that moves and develops by itself. *(the thesis of self changing globalisation)*

9.

Despite all moving and turning time elements, the basic structure of global world reality is that of a highrise building that is not only static, linear, and rational but it is a macro, mezzo and micro level at the same time where the micro level, i.e. the space and time of localisation have unexpectedly become highly valued. *(the thesis of a highrise world structure)*

10.

Global top reality, the uppermost macro level, however, is not organised by earthly economic-governance centres, there are no decision prepared or made in this field. This is an "empty" three dimensional space without actions, a space that has come into existence as virtual space-time being presently conquered by transcendent and intellectual actors. *(the thesis of the emptiness of uppermost global reality)*

11.

Owing to the spread of new information-communication networks and systems the rational global space-world, space-time world (at present mainly thanks to the internet) has redoubled virtually. It can be called the third nature of mankind through which both the actual and virtual realities have shrunk to a village (or to a point). *(the thesis of a multiple complex reality)*

12.

Globalisation has two parallel, interactive key elements and world processes, i.e. functional and substantial globalisation. We can call the two profit-oriented vs. value-oriented, or quantitative vs. qualitative globalisation; or in other words, globalisation with a barbaric as opposed to a humanistic content. Thus, globalisation can no longer be described as being just the globalisation of capital, goods, or information since those processes can also alternate between quantitative and qualitative stages. *(the thesis of functional and substantial globalisation)*

13.

A new unified culture is being born since globalisation both destroys and builds culture. On the one hand, it carries with itself an undifferentiated antagonism to culture, and on the other hand, a high-level co-operation between differentiated cultures. *(the thesis of an antagonism to culture and differentiated culture)*

14.

Globalisation both strengthens and dulls the senseless-mindless power and prestige rivalry among world cultures, thus, total, open, and mutually destructive wars between cultures are unlikely. Since the turn of the millennium, the new world movements have no longer been just American, but also Asian or African. *(the thesis of clashes between cultures being avoidable)*

15.

Partly or fully, gradually or quickly, closed vertical communities and cultures change into open horizontal communities and cultures. This is true on another level, too: in a spiritual sense, localities, nations or the entire global world may well recover a sense of the infinite, the absolute. *(the thesis of infinite horizontal cultures)*

16.

New globalisation is also a contest of mentalities resulting not in the victory of one or another basic mentality, but in a mutual reflexive effect of one upon the other. *(the thesis of the reflexive effects of purely individual and purely communal behaviours)*

17.

New globalisation could for a long time be regarded as a second colonisation ( bringing new poverty for example) while – especially in the intellectual and spiritual senses – post-colonisation which continuously "takes shape" both economically and socially has accelerated alleviating multi-layered poverty. Functional globalisation organises its own enemy: the programme of alternative globalisation and its civilian world community. *(the thesis of post-colonial globalisation)*

18.

Globalisation on the one hand is the result of the birth of new knowledge (normal, post-normal, scientific and post-scientific new knowledge at the same time), and on the other hand it enforces, inspires, and dynamically spreads the new knowledge. New globalisation assumes and enforces the creation of new knowledge and its accessibility from all directions. *(the thesis of globally new and accessible knowledge)*

19.

In past decades the biggest change was brought about by the change in which an exclusively mind- and rationality-centred normal science birthed by industrial society transformed into post-normal post-science which creates new knowledge, new approaches, and an extended method of cognition. *(the thesis of new science and mentality)*

20.

The first analyses of globalisation-localisation applied rudimentary, one-two dimensional, empty concepts which were merely economy-centred, dogmatic scientific, or rather quasi-scientific half-truths and half-lies. New globalisation is not just the world-wide export of neo-liberal basic structures, but also the import of human-communal rights, understandings, and

practices built from the norms of other cultures. *(the thesis that the simplified theses of science may cover up the actual reality/consciousness of globalisation)*

21.

We do not know any era in the history of mankind where a globe-encompassing global society should have existed, however, now every chance is given for a united world society to be established until the middle of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, even though it will be burdened with severe contradictions. *(the thesis of a new world society being born)*

22.

As a result of the change of political systems in Eastern and Central Europe at the beginning of the nineties, the bipolar political system has become unipolar while the rise of new potential poles (China, India etc.) is accelerating. A power-political, military concentration and a general devaluation and disfunctionality of politics is also occurring at the same time. *(the thesis that an unipolar world is not the end of history)*

23.

American, European, and Third World globalising endeavours tend to compete, with, and also to assimilate to one another. They may also extinguish or terminate each other. *(the thesis of continental globalisation power groups and their competition techniques)*

24.

In a new global-local world order, representational, manipulative, hidden dictatorship-type democracies are exposed for what they are, and it becomes ever more clear that new, participation-based, emancipatory and at the same time electronic democracies are needed on every level of the world structure and also on globalisation levels. *(the thesis of participatory post-democracies)*

25.

Against a world economy that is ever more unified but partly still market-based, partly transnational, partly still state capitalist, partly money-market-centred new capitalist, partly knowledge-based and of a post-market style, the new global world reality is becoming less unified while retaining its independence and uniqueness on each continent and in each culture. *(the thesis of a mega-economy becoming structured and world culture less unified)*

26.

Globalisation partly preserves and rescues market-oriented neo-capitalism further while with the various the endeavours of new economy centred around knowledge, morals, social issues, spiritual values it gradually makes it impossible for an obsolete post-liberal neo-capitalism to survive. *(the thesis of money-centred neo capitalism and value-centred post-capitalism)*

27.

Civilisation after the millennium is not conflict free, on the contrary, along with old ones, new and expressly global crises emerge. Universal ecological crises, new international and local, political and military conflicts, social divisions between continents and states all clamour for radically new solutions built on non-strength and a lack of superiority. *(the thesis of making new and total crises manageable)*

28.

Long drawn-out, almost boundless modernity typical for Europe with its post-modern interlude will be quickly, wholly and spectacularly eliminated in the next one or two decades. Like modernism, post-modernism will also end as linear and non-linear history reaches forward and backward in time for new alternatives. *(the thesis of the emergence of a new historical space-time after the end of post-modernism)*

29.

Highly developed Euro-Atlantic civilisation - especially in the past one-hundred years – has lost its spiritual and/or sacred qualities, the pendulum, however, is swinging back and wide-ranging Enlightenment is gradually replaced by a new type of transcendental world picture

and lifestyle. The age of physics denying metaphysics, i.e. the industrial age is over, only to be replaced by the unified new age of new physics, new metaphysics, and new sacrality. (*the thesis of a new spiritualism and/or religiousness instead of secularised individualism*)

30.

Globalisation is the combination of two parallel intellectual/spiritual processes: on the one hand, it is the triumph of atheism reaching its fullness in post-modernism which began with the Enlightenment, on the other hand, it is the emergence of a new religiousness reaching its fullness behind modernism-post-modernism. Today it is not yet possible to predict whether the two intellectual-spiritual processes should extinguish each other, or whether one should win over the other, or indeed the two should unite on a higher level. (*the thesis of intellectual-spiritual dialogue instead of the battle of atheism vs. religiousness*)

31.

Through the course of history various processes of globalisation and localisation have occurred, but the process that has taken place since the turn of the millennium will be radically different in its totality, complexity, style, risks or character. (*the thesis of a new global-localism/local-globalism*)

32.

New globalisation which cannot be described in a yes/no logic has already produced the very thinking that is critical of globalisation, and it has also produced the groups representing this thinking as well as those virtual networks that prepare a paradigm-shifting, alternative globalisation. However, quantum logic does not eliminate the difference between good and bad. (*the thesis of how yesterday's globalisation (may) give birth to an alternative globalisation*)

33.

New and ever-emerging globalisation/localisation and all its new branches re-fashion global space-time at least every three to five years, and when looking back in thirty to fifty years time, several new globalisation stages will be discernible. (*the thesis of globalisation renewing every few years*)

34.

Integrated-integrating globalisation would inevitably demand an unified globalisation theory and/or philosophy, something unimaginable without the development and spreading of unified theory (meta-theory). This, at the same time, is the unified reality of both the "heavenly" and the "earthly" Absolute. (*the thesis of the lack of a meta-philosophy of globalisation*)

35.

Etc.

We could formulate several *other* theses on globalisation. Let us for example pose the question whether it is at all possible for any one country or region to move to a *higher level*? (Here is the answer or our nth thesis:) Fortunately, *actual and virtual passages* between the structure levels of globalisation are indeed possible.

By the turn of the millennium, *two types* of mediating channels had been established. *Direct* vertical and horizontal passages of multi-level globalisation are the world economy, world politics, the informational world system and the structures, networks, and processes of the media system. Wide, quick two-way connecting channels between the global and local worlds are established by global economy, global politics, and the institutions and actions of information and communication systems (telephone, radio, television, internet etc.) which influence the previous two types, too.

The *indirect* passages of globalisation have established themselves in different spheres, different systems and sub-systems: in world society, in global knowledge systems in world cultures and world religions. Here, between the global and the local worlds, those

*mediating-connecting channels* that are between societies and social strata, knowledge networks, cultures, religions and moralities are narrower and slower.

There is also a third type of co-operation between world structure levels and within the levels themselves: the technological "*fibres*". Every structure and network of the world structure is covered by technological revolutions, changes which follow hot on each other's heels. Whether there are built market and institutional passages or not, the new technologies often – even despite social resistance – spread quickly and become accepted quickly.

Passages between world structures also fall into a fourth type: i.e. that of ecological gates or network connections. Currently the biggest conflict of earthly civilisation is indicated by the approach and possible occurrence of natural and environmental catastrophes, most of which cannot at all be localised at local or continental levels. They exert the same effect, and in unison, on every level of the world structure. However, the *real problems* of the natural-ecological crises have not yet been exposed while more and more new (post-normal) scientific discoveries point to the fact that natural crises cannot be handled as merely material-physical-natural realities.

Likely ecological crises and the fears aroused by them are thus already universal, however, the global-local remedy therapies of crises management *have not yet been found*, presumably even though these, too, must be universal in nature. The ecological problems appearing in physical reality affect everyone, too, and they can only be solved *globally and locally* at the same time.

All this however is "only" one side of global-universal reality, the other side being *the post-reality of a global-universal collective consciousness*.

#### **4. The global inner field of force, or localisation**

The "lower" third of a globalised-localised earthly world structure is clearly the system of *local realities/worlds*. This is horizontal and vertical at the same time.

There are such sociologists (e.g. Z. Bauman, 1998) who presume outright that to be "local in a globalised world is the sign of a disadvantaged and deteriorating social situation"<sup>21</sup>. Today, i.e. ten or so years later, we might as well say that to be local in a globalised world is the sign of an advantageous social situation and recovery. The truth must be somewhere *between the two statements*.

By *inner fields of force* of earthly globalisation we now merely mean the local (i.e. national) fields of forces. Local space-groups (economic, social, educational, cultural spaces) exist out of necessity in a *globalised/mondialized space*. Those are inner global spaces that are inevitably also localised outer fields of force *between which mediation spaces, space channels, space passages* operate. This is the national or nation-state level, or such sub-regional spaces which are bound to the boundaries of nation-states nations, yet they reach beyond borders.

However, from this we *cannot automatically deduce* that: 1. global and local relationships are exclusively formed through national mediation systems. 2. local (and global) spaces should exist and work in isolation, by themselves, in a consciously isolated manner. 3. intermediate levels should be bound by the sole task of mediation losing their autonomy and capacity for independent action.

If those three conclusions are wrong, then *logical conclusions must be deduced* from them: 1. One of the characteristics of global-local relationships is that they tend to leap over

---

<sup>21</sup> Zygmunt Bauman, 1998: Globalisation: The Human Consequences, Polity Press (In Hungarian: Z. Bauman: Globalizáció, a társadalmi következmények, Szukits Könyvkiadó, 2001) p.17

intermediate systems. 2. All-infiltrating globalisation has eliminated the isolation of local spaces which, however, does not mean the complete loss of autonomy of localities. 3. On the intermediate levels (not on the level of nations) *partial independence* remains with institutional steps possible, steps that can exert serious political influence on global-local space or one of its poles.

Globalisation and especially localisation is bound to a *natural-geographical space*. We cannot even name local space if we do not say to which region and what environment it belong. There is no local space without *geographical-regional space*.

One of the best Hungarian regionalists (J. Nemes-Nagy 1998) differentiates among three characteristic forms of vertical geographical structure: a) a division into levels means positioning above one another, a vertical geographical structure, b) in social-economic real organisations the relation of forms of development is also vertical, c) the dependence in the control mechanisms of dominance and subservience creates hierarchy and hierarchic organisations.<sup>22</sup> This classical vertical structure characteristic of the industrial and social era has been then well and truly "*ploughed up*" and *made complex* by a new type of localisation-globalisation.

The old and new *structure* of local space can be exposed ever more clearly today. This, at present, is also a complex space or space-time which is not always a space network bound together. This is what its height-structure looks like: 1. regional space or upper local space, 2. county and metropolitan or medium size town space, or local and middle space; 3. Micro (e.g. small-region or lower local space; 4. strata (from small-town to tiny village) space or local space. Thus, this is a divided, four-level structure with hierarchical, and on the other hand, parallel and network relations (horizontal ones which break the old hierarchies down). The four-level structure is at times enduring, and at other times rapidly changing.

Global-localisation is *not the same* as local globalisation. Global-localisation is a model in which globalisation is the more dominant, whereas local globalisation is a formation in which localisation is dominant, or there is a balance between the global and the local poles.

Locality (or local space) is both a *universal and local phenomenon*. In earthly civilisation, wherever there had been continental or semi-global processes and relations earlier, the local was a general phenomenon. Historians have believed for a long time that the birth of mankind took place locally, however, today the belief is growing stronger and stronger that its genesis could have been universal, i.e. continental and local at the same time, especially if we assume separate groups of mankind who differed from one another.

The general functions of place (i.e. actual place) are different in the *new world structure and "at the bottom" of the new world structure*. The local world – perhaps in the beginning, too, but later on even more so – has always performed general or even global functions. General functions were for example: the sustenance of individual and community life, making the relationship between man and nature harmonious, the naming and passing of of universal and local knowledge, the raising of offspring and bestowing individual and group consciousness upon him/her. As long as there was no globality, generally locality took on the functions of globality. In the decades before time man was a universal being too, even when the majority basically lived in locality either socially or economically. Man and his community always thought and acted universally. Now we might call this the substantial characteristic of locality.

A theorist of information society (M. Castells, 2003) has introduced the concept of a "*space of fluxes*". He writes the following about this: "Through the course of history, the simultaneity of most human activities rested on neighbourliness, i.e. spatial proximity. But what is the situation today when we can work together in real time, yet physically far removed

---

<sup>22</sup>József Nemes Nagy, 1998: Space in social research (Budapest) pp. 106-107

from each other? Simultaneity is the same, yet it takes place in a totally different space because telecommunication and the computer make this possible even at far removed places at the same time. Thus, this a space of fluxes: on the one hand, electronic processes take place in it, on the other, a network of those places are bound together by a common social activity through an electronic circuit and related tools<sup>23</sup>. *Simultaneous, yet multi-spaced reality* also means that a new type of universal/global space is being created.

*Functional* and *substantial* localisation is similar to functional-substantial globalisation. Modernisation had strengthened, and permanently separated the functional and substantial elements of the local world. Today, the local world can be understood to be a dominantly functional space-world that seems so one-sided because we perceive the functional processes from the global world primarily, and we tend to simplify the complex relation systems to tangible and brutal phenomena.

The *eternal characteristic* of locality stands out once again. In the old ages it was evident that while the individual got deeply rooted into his home turf, intellectually or spiritually he existed in eternity. For the past two hundred years, civilisation in its developed regions has cut the roots which bound it to the place, or they were thinned out by an industrial economy and society. Therefore, it cannot be surprising that to counterbalance the effects of rough globalisation, the restoration of the eternal characteristics and beauty of locality becomes a social demand. And it is not difficult to assume that after the re-creation of locality the social demand for a restoration of the universal characteristics and beauty of man will also grow.

One of the *most typical paradoxes* is that in science, be it sociology, social geography, etc., there is simply no *localisation-theory*, or the localisation theory happens to be fragmented even though local space and an ever stronger localisation does enjoy the sympathy of science.

The *economy types* of local economic spaces are: a) non market economy; b) local market economy; c) local economy for a national market; d) local economy for a global-continental market; e) local knowledge economy; f) local post economy; etc. Neither global space, nor local space can be described with just the processes of a trans-national economy and its profit approach. Local space, understandably (simultaneously due to the effect of globalisation and to counter-balancing globalisation) "mixes", "ranks" "prioritises" or just "unifies" very complex economic models.

The types and processes of local *social space* are less clear. If there is no locality theory, or if space theory is generally immature, then, inevitably, local society types or social space models are not defined. The problem is that not a single local society is innocent or free of various external influences, and almost every local social space is just partly dependent on the local environment and the local traditions. Many claim that every single social space is unique, and often irregular while it is worth realising that there are also very similar type-groups among very different locality types. It is not coincidental, for instance, what the strata structure of some geographic region is like, a structure that no longer meets the social or intellectual demands of the new times. We meet nothing but dissonance, and paradoxes.

Affecting local structures and processes are inner states, capacity as well as external ones, the latter "distorted" by the national mediation level. Meanwhile, those states and capacities are often disturbed by a stiffened relation system, the political-governance will of the central state, or, for example, the obsolescence of the educational system.

The importance of local knowledge and cultural spaces increases continuously. Since the turn of the millennium, probably to a never before seen extent and with a never before seen strength, the power of knowledge and culture of local spaces, local space levels, local

---

<sup>23</sup> Conversations with Castells, 2003, Polity Press Ltd. Cambridge (In Hungarian: Manuel Castells, Manuel Castells és Martin Ince beszélgetése, Napvilág Kiadó, 2006) p.61

space processes has moved to the forefront. Today we can absolutely talk about different types of knowledge and culture spaces with a semblance of independence.

At times, local economic-social spaces become separate from *natural-geographical* spaces. It is very interesting that there is simultaneously a tight and a loose connection between an environment and a space type.

Untouched, blooming natural-environmental spaces are primarily found where civilisation has not reached, has not destroyed anything; such are for example the spaces without a second nature. An opposite situation prevails where only second nature has been left, e.g. every demolished and already abandoned industrial environment where, however, with natural-environmental re-settlement one has created a green belt condo, a true community of inhabitants.

The connection between space structures and the state of spaces is unclear. Within the local world on higher space levels (for example, the regional level, or in the local upper world) are the state of spaces better? On the one part, there is the experience that– as we move farther below on the steep descent of spatial society – the local world is always in an ever worse, more disadvantaged, more defenceless, more oppressed state. On the other part, there is also the experience that over and above a blooming, prosperous, strong local (below) world, strong because of civil groups<sup>24</sup> there functions a reality, i.e. county-regional reality that is politically powerless, having opposite interests economically, cutting the local market back, mentally retarded, or just unprepared.

Locality as a *new process* - this is perhaps the most interesting change. Globalisation passing by like a storm cloud above the heads of isolated, mostly untouched localities is not a source of interest in itself. Here are some of the characteristics of new localisation: (1) The local world does not or will hardly remain untouched; (2) Localisation strengthens the process of, or at least creates a chance for, the local world to protect itself against the negative processes of globalisation, and at the same time, lift the competitive elements of the local world into global space; (3) Localisation is basically self-interested, but it clearly realises that an inward turning strategy cannot be successful; (4) The local world feels it is simultaneously disadvantaged against the global and national/state role players, yet usually the localities do not rebel as yet, they do not stick together, nor do they strive for autonomy consciously; (5) The society of locality is not power-centred, and it is continuously forced to build on its own civil society.

Local spaces are unified and inner-structured: *partial autonomies*. The local world could not think earlier, and cannot think of full autonomy today either, yet at the same time it is not true that it has no chance whatsoever even for the most modest independence. The question is this: how can partial autonomies survive or even increase. No less important is what to strive for and what not to strive for. It is not political independence in itself which is at stake, but an inner participatory democracy, or not economic freedom in itself, but the switching of a neo-liberal economic model to another type of economy (knowledge centred, community centred, moral oriented, post-market style).

Ulrich Beck's statement "it is not the traditional renaissance of locality which will come if the local particularities can be placed globally and within this frame, renew themselves amid conflicts"<sup>25</sup> is correct and acceptable.

---

<sup>24</sup> „...the task of politics can not only be just activity, but just that the government does not stand in the way of such individuals and communities, why attempt to create social capital for themselves?” Francis Fukuyama: *The Task of Politics*. Op. cit. p. 366.

<sup>25</sup> Beck, Ulrich, 1997 *Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalisierung*, Duhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1997 (In Hungarian: Beck, U.: *Mi a globalizáció?* Belvedere Meridionale, Szeged, 2005, pp. 57

The special critiquelessness and utopia-centredness of localisation strengthen each other. In several cases, locality is the example or the only example even, of the one remaining homeliness. Locality is the imagined or real refuge of personality, but this is the hope of rescuing the Earth and its environment-centred personality of feudal-peasant world. It is the rebirth of a still mostly inward turning-small town utopia of the late Middle Ages or the early Capitalist age. Locality: the island dream. The program of keeping the disturbing outer world (the big world) at a distance. The self-providing, basically non-market type local economy's harking back to a practice and the newly recreated ideal of local society bathing in directness. In the end: the creation of a utopia of a directness and homeliness which has never existed and which appears as a daily program in the European worlds partly directly and openly, and partly indirectly and in a hidden way. The kind of idea which is not followed by criticism since it does not exist physically, and because it is mainly a spiritual-intellectual program, a non-existent reality cannot be attacked. It is a strange paradox: on the one part, there is no anti-localisation movement (which could even be supported by the supporters of globalisation), but there is no European or universal pro-localisation movement either though the local world is frequently exploited by national/state power<sup>26</sup>, and now it is also frequently exploited in a new manner by global economic-political power. Locality is an existing, unavoidable, partially independent reality, yet only in particular cases is it the same as the ideas connected to it. It is not the pawn of the future, but it is not just the museum relic of the past either. It is not the paradise-like state of the present because it is often the existence form and symbol of underdevelopment and poverty even though it is potentially one of the most hopeful levels of new earthly civilisation. Whether globalisation *eases* or *strengthens*, almost every human being lives in a local world *primarily*.

## 5. History and the new interpretation of historical consciousness

Firstly, history is none other than *time dimension*, and the continuous creation of time dimension. History is naturally always bound to *space, region and country*, but the course of history is not just always real and concrete history, event, or historical shape, but it is about memories, knowledge, and representations (time and culture dependent on, and at the same time, above time and interpretations). And then we have not yet talked about the time-space bound and non-time-non space bound versions of the collective consciousness and the unconscious; this is why it is not likely that an objective past, present or future consciousness exists.

The expansion of globalisation has lifted time out of Euro-Atlantic history interpretations and their limited and biased dimensions plotted out according to continents/countries, and unified them while opening real/symbolic windows on the metaverse and, beyond it, on spiritual and transcendent vectors.

Despite a wide-spread mistake, new globalisation and localisation is also not just simply bound to age, it is not exclusively a product of age. We can debate the ratio of the boundness as opposed to a lack of it, but the new world structure is simultaneously *age dependent* and *age independent*. This is not so difficult to see, and we may also assume that not one, but several space-time dimensions may exist.

Globalisation and localisation are general and incessant endeavours of mankind. This is so even if during several eras they presumed that the given world empire (or more exactly the empire of a part of the world) is the same as the entire civilisation. In the millennia before and after the Christian Era probably on every continent and in every shorter or longer era there was the general desire to expand (step out into the macro world, reach the unknown, the

---

<sup>26</sup> It is not our task here to sketch a new theory of exploitation.

search for new continents, the extension of the empire's borders, the exploration of intellectual universes etc.) and the desire of the micro world to turn inwards (tribe-centredness, the revaluation of the family, the importance of the congregation, the bond of the village or the town, the withdrawal into personal consciousness, and also seclusion etc.)

Endre Kiss was one of those who defined the differentiation of the local level below globalisation and its nation state level, however, he did raise that this is not a static but a *dynamic triad*. "Therefore the question relating to the power relations of these three levels should methodologically be modified because of considerations like these: ('which one is the stronger?')"<sup>27</sup> In an optimal case, there is some kind of power balance between the three levels, today, however, we are very far as yet from this optimal situation.

In the alternatives of the individual there is now a simultaneous *quantitative* and *qualitative* change. Everyone breaks out and steps out of his own world: individualisation is far more total than at any other previous juncture. For many travelling across our globe becomes an opportunity, or to travel the earthly world becomes a virtual opportunity at least. Today, civilisation becomes globally visible and perceptible, the once time partial and limited globalisations have expanded, state and continent boundaries mean no or smaller obstacles, almost every person knows about the existence of the whole of mankind, because through the new information-communication technologies earthly consciousness, the consciousness of mankind integrates and unites everybody to a certain extent. Fragmented space in an earthly sense is total space, the space structure has upper, middle and lower levels.

Geographical globalisation is entwined with *economic globalisation* which is helped by *informational globalisation*. However, let us not fall into exaggeration, or let us not accept primitive patterns. Where multi-national companies have taken root, national or regional economic organisations have not ceased to operate. These changes are era-dependent, or we might as well say that they are strongly space and time dependent. If we just examine the history of the past two hundred years, we can recognise encompassing longer and shorter eras. Understandably, it follows from this, that the present is also a part of some era, what is more, the future cannot be totally above any era either, or for the time being it cannot free itself from some kind of an era-boundness.

While introducing the encompassing concepts of globalisation and global-localisation we also elaborated on the fact that the spiritual or transcendent life of civilisation have declined, and it can be seen ever more sharply that there is a collective interest in spiritual-transcendent and even religious values and life forms primarily in North America, but also in Europe. This will be true even when new declines come if they come. In the meantime, *spiritual economic and social theories* continue to appear one after the other. F. Fukuyama's remark is interesting: "But whatever theorists thought and expected at the beginning of modernism, since then not only the civilisation of warrior cultures has occurred while interests took over the place of passions, something else happened too: economic life became spiritualised, and it was enhanced with those competitive compelling energies which have previously nurtured the political life. People often act not like rational promoters of their well-being, but they validate several of the moral values tied to their social status in their economic activities as well."<sup>28</sup>

Around Hungary (and every other country) an *outer field of force has globalised*, and a *globalised space structure* has been created which is not similar to the space world at the beginning and in the middle of the twentieth century. In Europe, the capitalist space world characteristic of industrial economy has ended, and the state capitalist, political-governance centred "socialist" space system has fallen apart. What is being born over the past two

---

<sup>27</sup> Endre Kiss: op.cit. pg.403

<sup>28</sup> Fukuyama, F.1997: Trust, The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity (The Free Press, New York); In Hungarian: Bizalom (Európa, 1997) p. 501.

decades, is rather a *new space world* or *space time world* which is created according to the laws of the knowledge-controlled new era.

The new historical consciousness divides the past two hundred years into *two great eras*: 1. Modernity rooted in Enlightenment (the era of modernity) which lasted in the underdeveloped parts of the world until the fifties and the sixties; 2. After modernity (or post-modern) era which has not been completed with the present yet.

The very same almost two centuries can be described in economic-social terms as well: 1. Modernity can be regarded as the period of industrial economy and society (The Industrial Era 2. The period after modernity can be called post-industrial era or even (somewhat more broadly) the information era. Space science uses the expression Fordism gladly for the industrial age, it is uncertain in the definition of the information era as yet.

East-European thinking cannot do as if the period of half a century of Soviet socialism had not happened, thus the historical process to capitalism, socialism and the period after the changes of the political system in the late Eighties and early Nineties is called capitalism again. This view of history, however, is not really sustainable because actual socialism was a particular state capitalism and in many respects classical industrialisation, thus, it is perhaps more appropriate to evaluate the past two hundred years as the unified era of *various types of capitalism*. What is poignant in the analysis is that the unmatched, delayed, rather complex East-European process could not turn into classical capitalism by the end of the twentieth century either. For this to happen it really was belated, and it hit the post-modern, post industrial new world structure to boot.

Similar processes take place in the various second and third worlds of civilisation, and maybe its not even sure that in the first (most developed) world there ever was an enduring industrial economy society fitting the perfect model and which, for a long time (using a current expression) was *the prisoner of* post-feudal structures and processes.

It is another question that today we can no longer examine the early, partially still feudal capitalism with nostalgia, because for example it was rather local in type and rather homely, but in brutality and implacability it was not much more low-key than late capitalism also built on raw interests. Thus, it is an illusion to think that any one of the various capitalisms would have favoured actual democracy, though East-European "socialist" democracy was a lot less presentable than the Western-European model built on consumer freedom and civil self-movement.<sup>29</sup>

Thus, the present is not an industrial era, nor can it be understood on the basis of post-industrial logic, it is not the era of modernity, and it has most likely already transcended into post-industrial thinking, it is not information-era, and presumably - especially in Central Eastern Europe - it has no way, nor space, or time to work out a mature information model. We have reached the point where, due to the imperfection of historical grand models, the swift and unclear change of grand models, it is not so easy to tell *how to characterise* the social spaces, or more narrowly, the rapidly changing space fields in this very drawn-out, almost eternal, permanent transition.

One thing is certain: it is ridiculous if in Hungary or in Central Europe, or even in the global world most of our leading analytical-planning views continue to concentrate on Fordism. If, for example there is no Fordist world in Hungary, we cannot think in terms of Fordism, "socialist" or post-socialist - post capitalist Fordism either.

The past is over even if the past's buildings, tools, and institutions do still exist.

If, because of historical processes, there were never any classical (typical) industrial regions or areas here, if, due to new global-localisation the "normal", purely economy-centred regions cannot be established anymore, if, due to the continuous lagging behind of

---

<sup>29</sup> We have elaborated on the new democracy and state model in a separate book. See : Emese Ugrin - Csaba Varga, Op.cit.

Central Europe (or Hungary) again, no wholly typical information regions or areas are born, then why would it be complete and sustainable to preserve the concepts, starting points and connections of the Fordist space science of the industrial era?

But the surprising question is not this only. There is a strange, unexplored, unsaid, latent twist. The new type of global-localisation us and others in a manner that puts economic belatedness in parentheses, and even skips it. If on the level of the grand model our world in the Carpathian Basin goes through a *newer, complex series of changes* simultaneously, then we should talk about *something else*: 1. Non-era-dependent global-localisation finds its way here as well, it partly becomes organic, it integrates; 2. The era-dependent global-localisation liquidates at least partly, the previous arrears; 3. The disadvantages of the past fifty to seventy years will partly remain, while new– and not any less severe– disadvantages will form and will add up, too; 4. The new era-dependent and non-era-dependent world state will become groundless and insecure uniformly, while on the one part never before seen paradigm shifts will get off to a start, on the other part, new paradigm shifts will radically be missing to a never before seen extent due to civilisation's lack of a vision of the future.

The spread of era-dependent and non-era-dependent globalisation and its parallel spiritualisation brings with it and to the agenda the basic questions of the unification of mankind.. „The fight thus was for the base, trying to find the path to grounding which leads to the whole of the universe, the aim which floated before us was the eternal existence without a beginning and without an end and all our endeavours were directed at exposing and securing the essential relation between this and human existence. This is how man became a spirit regarding his essence, in a new sense an "immortal soul" which is bound by an existence relation to that which never gets lost"<sup>30</sup> This endeavour continues in the new world and points towards a new world state and a new historical consciousness.

We might as well say that history *slowly frees* itself from the musts of political and economic processes, and at last history will not only be about the individual *sustaining himself physically*, though mankind will continue to face the ghost of individual and collective hunger. History can, perhaps in this century, be free of that *fear of exploitation and fear of subordination* in which civilisation's functionally stronger continents and powers continuously want to gain advantages in the global space, and in order to obtain these advantages they do not hesitate to employ most of the available means of power and governance. For all this, a new consciousness and knowledge-centred world model is needed, and the actualisation of new world history cannot be cancelled.

The development of the unified meta-theory of globalisation-localisation and global consciousness spurs on nothing less than to aid the preparation and execution of the new, historically rational world model.

So, from time to time we are faced with *the dilemmas of time*. Well, *where do we go from here?* What can come? Is the near future an *era of knowledge* as announced by many? And whatever may come, what will new localisation be like? Will *traditional history* stay? What will the new historical model be? Will the radical new age be called the era of consciousness? And will knowledge and/or the era of consciousness enable man to become *an immortal soul*?

## 6. Global (collective) consciousness and its variations

The development of the *theory of social consciousness* has long been on the agenda. People .....,know deep inside that man's state of consciousness somehow - they don't exactly

---

<sup>30</sup> Jan Patočka, 1988: Europa und Nacheuropa; Das Geschichtsschema, Praha, In Hungarian: Európa és az Európa utáni kor, Kalligram, 2001,p. 121

know how - may influence the state of consciousness of other people. We sense the existence of the fact that consciousness spreads on a transpersonal level, and if somebody just comes along and says that he has devised a theory or can validate the probability of this with research results, we feel that finally we have the proof we have always wanted in our hands". (Stanislav Grof, 1999)<sup>31</sup>

Our hypothesis is obvious: *there is a collective consciousness*. At first in European culture, what primarily became an awareness was that collective unconsciousness does exist as the collective storehouse of mankind's past. Meanwhile, due to the effect of Eastern philosophies, it was realised that personal consciousness exists, too, which, according to many, is the one and only reality. Parallel with this, however it did not become widely accepted that *a universal consciousness of a higher order undoubtedly* exists, which is presumably partially or totally a supernatural consciousness. Despite the already recognised dimensions, forms of knowledge, *collective consciousness* remained shrouded in haziness because natural-material reality experiences and interpretations known thus far have mostly excluded the discovery of the "unknown land". How can we explain the collective *consciousness* field?

Instead of social psychology we much prefer the more productive *social consciousness theory*, but an encompassing, trans-disciplinary *general* consciousness theory is would be most helpful. Accordingly, we could examine that collective consciousness does not give birth to the reality and illusion of the global world just by itself alone since on the one hand, according to our hypothesis, collective consciousness is a consciousness field created by the Absolute, that is, collective consciousness also connects to the *higher levels*, and on the other hand, it is in an interactive relationship with *lower levels*, i.e. particular human consciousnesses. Or: every collective consciousness level creates a unified consciousness field.

There are almost as many visions of reality, globalisation interpretations as there are interpretative thinkers, therefore *many more*, often contradictory theories or interpretations of global consciousness and its variations exist. The intellectual chaos is almost total. The already well known or commonly misunderstood basic concepts (human brain, mind, psyche, soul, consciousness, I, spirit, and respectively: collective mind, soul, knowledge or consciousness, etc.) are defined totally differently for example in physics, biology, psychology, sociology, philosophy etc.

We lack the space to write an ideology or concept history of the categories of collective consciousness. Therefore now we can do nothing else than we touch upon the explanations of the concepts wherever that is possible. Where this is not possible, we can only make references. In any case, we have put together and showcase a possible short *concept thesaurus*.

In scientific special literature there are *two basic uncertainties*: 1. *In a particular language* we apply different expressions to the same content/phenomenon. For the record, this is why we point out right now that according to us *brain* is 'agy' in Hungarian, *mind* is 'elme', *consciousness* is just 'tudat' and finally *awareness* is 'tudatosság'; 2. In a particular branch of science, and within that branch of science often many authors interpret the top concepts in different ways, for example the word 'mind' should not be translated as *soul, spirit, or consciousness* while at the same time for example mind is not the same as either wisdom or consciousness, neither is consciousness the same as the soul, or the psyche, and the concept of I (self) cannot be mixed up with that of the ego. *Self-consciousness*, however, is the sensing of the personal consciousness which "reaches into" the collective consciousness as well, and it is the consciousness picture about this known/not known self-consciousness.

---

<sup>31</sup> See: Ervin László (ed.), 1999: Stanislav Grof - Ervin László - Peter Russel: The Consciousness Revolution (Elf Rock, 2003); In Hungarian: A tudat forradalma (Új Paradigma Publishing, 1999), p. 83.

Émile Durkheim was one of the first to introduce the concept of collective consciousness at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century: „two consciousnesses live in us: the state of one is unique in each one of us, and is characteristic of us only, while the states of the other are common in regard to the whole society.”<sup>32</sup> According to his belief, in every member of society a *same* and *common* consciousness content is present, and though individual and collective consciousness differ from each other, they form a unit and are mutually dependent on each other. At the same time, he presumed that collective consciousness is on the other hand independent of the *existence conditions* of individuals which are temporal, still, collective consciousness remains and connects the generations.

For a long time he held this opinion: collective consciousness is thus totally different from individual consciousnesses even though it only becomes actual in the individuals.<sup>33</sup> Later on he went as far as to itemise society as a new kind of psychological creature, and believed that religion is but the particular way of thinking of the collective creature. From this came the realisation that "compared to the individual's, the outer social consciousness does not only contain those elements which are the same in each member of the group".<sup>34</sup> Therefore a collective consciousness which covers our entire consciousness is possible which does not cover our consciousness entirely, but has a wider content than our own consciousness.

Thus collective consciousness contains on the one hand those contents which are the *same* and *common* in each individual of society, and on the other hand those too which are *not the same* in each member of society. A hundred years later, at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we can adopt this view as a *starting point*.

Similarly, we can reach back to the concept of the social unconscious which was developed by Karl Gustav Jung, and which is just as valid today as E. Durkheim's social consciousness interpretation. Jung's famous statements go like this:

We must differentiate between personal unconscious and a personless or an above-person unconscious. The latter is also called collective unconscious because this is independent of the individual, and is totally general, its contents can be found everywhere, which is naturally not so in the case of personal contents.<sup>35,36</sup>

Thus, the collective unconscious unifies personal lost memories, suppressed embarrassing ideas, personal experiences beneath the threshold, ancient patterns also lost in the pattern of immature contents, collective memories, suppressed old experiences, timeless symbols.

„The collective unconscious is the picture of such a world which has formed since ancient times from the precipitation of experiences and their prior character. Certain traits, the so-called archetypes or dominants have been exactly outlined in this picture through the course of time. These reign, these are the gods, or dominant laws and pictures of principles, the average regularities of the series of pictures which the soul relives again and again.”<sup>37,38</sup>

By the way, Stanislaw Grof differentiates three *thought stages* in the change in Jung's perception of the collective unconscious.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Durkheim, Émile, 1893: On a social division of labour, Budapest: Osiris, 2001 (trans: Mihály Csákó). pp.117–8.

<sup>33</sup> op cit.. p. 94.

<sup>34</sup> Dénes Némedi, 1996: Durkheim. Knowledge and society (Áron Publishing,1996)

<sup>35</sup> Jung's footnote: “The collective unconscious represents the objective, whereas the personal unconscious represents the subjective psyche.”

<sup>36</sup> Jung, K. G. 1916: An introduction to the psychology of the unconscious, 2003.

<sup>37</sup> Jung's footnote: “As I already remarked above, we can regard the archetypes as effects and precipitations of occurred events, but they can be regarded just as much as the factors which have caused these events.”

<sup>38</sup> K. G. Jung, 1916: Op. cit.

<sup>39</sup> Jung ”At the beginning he believed that this is innate and originally thought it to be the "hardware" of the brain, to some extent similar to the tendency of intuitive behaviour. At other times however he called it part of

Thus, according to the Jungian perception, the collective unconscious *is the unconscious above the person*, which according to the author's footnote is the same as the objective psyche, and this collective unconscious contains such archetype organisms into which the experience and wisdom of several thousand years are embedded. We would not like to guess *why* K.G Jung – beside the exploration of the collective unconscious – *did not bother* with collective consciousness<sup>40</sup>, however, we can venture this much: there is *no boundary*, or at least there is no sharp boundary between collective consciousness and a collective unconscious. Therefore, we have to take care not to discuss particular collective contents as part of the unconscious.

Integrated and general consciousness theories obviously and inevitably unite *two types of consciousness, two types of consciousness fields*: personal consciousness (or the I-conscious) and collective (or social) consciousness: this latter with reason can be called universal consciousness too.

We agree with Peter Russel who – a hundred years after Durkheim - said the following: „I think sooner or later we will have to accept that consciousness is the independent, basic part of the universe, and not merely the result of material operation.”<sup>41</sup> If we perceive consciousness in such a wide sense, we can definitely not identify it with the mind or the concept of the person. Therefore, the following can be a *fruitful proposition* too: 1. Consciousness is the *fifth* dimension besides the three space and the one time dimension; 2. Consciousness is the *hyperspace* in which the three space and one time dimensions come into being. We will touch upon the question of in what material or non-material form the collective consciousness of our supernatural and/or natural-social-intellectual society exists presently.

It cannot be our task either now to make an attempt at elaborating on the *new general theory* of man/consciousness and society/social consciousness through an interdisciplinary approach or rather within the framework of an *integrated meta-theory*.

However, it is inevitable that we introduce the basic reality field/consciousness field and the accompanying concept inventory represented by us.

What is *collective consciousness not*? 1. It is not the collective psychical, because that is none other than the collective mind (if there is such a thing), provided that by mind we understand the psychical, the psychical functions, for example, what we sense. 2. Nor is it collective knowledge because that is none other than the all time spirit of the era, the interpreted information, knowledge mostly arranged in a closed paradigm although it is possible to regard collective knowledge as the twin brother of collective consciousness. 3. Nor is it collective feeling, sensibility, desire etc. because that is none other than the collective soul provided that we understand by it the mutual world of feeling and desire of societies. 4. It is not equal to the smaller or bigger groups of people which it is because those are none other than families, nations, and societies, though it is possible to maintain that a society above time and space is the same as a collective consciousness, a social institution. 5. Nor is it a collective symbol system because that is none other than the visualisation and representation of the collective symbol system, which in the same way cannot otherwise be narrowed down or be simplified. 6. On the collective identity which is none other than the feeling and consciousness of belonging together of communities and societies. Provided they still or

---

the cultural heritage of mankind. Even later, he saw ancient cosmic patterns in the archetypes, superimposed above consensual reality. ” Ed: Ervin László, 1999: The revolution of consciousness (Új Paradigma Publ., 1999), p. 146. o.

<sup>40</sup> Co-authored with Wolfgang Pauli and published in 1952, in their book "Natural explanation and psyche" they have both stated that quantum theory and synchronicity do not contradict each other.

<sup>41</sup> Ervin László (ed.), 1999: Stanislaw Grof - Ervin László - Peter Russel: The Consciousness Revolution (Elf Rock, 2003); In Hungarian: A tudat forradalma (Új Paradigma Publ. , 1999), p. 62

already have it. Further differentiation: 7. Not (or not just) the collective unconscious which is none other than un-manifested common feelings, joys, sorrows, memories, mysteries and archetypes which of course describe the depths of the hidden layers of collective consciousness. Lastly, it is important to note that. 8. The whole of collective consciousness is not the same as one of its levels or contents, for example, local or continental consciousness, or natural and cultural consciousness. From this distancing it can be understood that by collective consciousness we always mean an *universal-global consciousness* and the *common wholeness* of every part-consciousness.

The negative distancing is a theoretical starting point from *two other aspects* as well: a) collective consciousness is not only the unit of the particular existing people, or its mechanical-natural common multiple; b) collective consciousness cannot be torn away and cannot be closed off from higher, transcendent, supernatural, spiritual influences and levels of consciousness. We must assume this even if we are not idealists, or religious, and now from the aspect of collective consciousness the question whether we call this higher level of consciousness cosmic intelligence, God, or for example The Absolute, is not a crucial issue.

Before we seek to find an answer to the question of *what collective consciousness really is*, we need to clarify *the unified interpretation framework* of the brain, the mind, the psyche, and consciousness. The most well-known psychologists and philosophers (from G.W. Allport and J. Eccles to D.C. Dennet or D.J. Chalmers) often disagree with one another about many things, but generally they tie the (narrow) interpretation of consciousness strictly to the brain. One of the exceptions is John C. Eccles (Eccles, 1989, 1977), who, referring to quantum physicist Henry Margineau, accepts that the mind (consciousness?) can be interpreted as a non-material physical field, which has no mass, energy, and cannot be broken down to parts, and is inherently holistic.

From the angle of the philosopher-biologist, Attila S. Székely assumes the following: "The process of consciousness is built on the bio level, it is built from and through this...it cannot be discussed separated, isolated, on one plane, and totally separated from this<sup>42</sup>." Though it is possible that the process of consciousness is *not built* on the bio level<sup>43</sup>, as individual consciousness is not necessarily a part of the psyche either, nor is it located within the brain. At the same time, this does not mean that consciousness would totally separate itself from the brain or the bio-psyche. Or let us be careful: it is possible that consciousness either directly or indirectly "reaches" into the bio level, yet it could also be possible that the bio level is built on the consciousness level. Or: the bio level and the consciousness level together form a unified field.

However, personal consciousness stands partly separate, or separates itself, while is not impossible that it is a yet unknown material, an unknown type of material, however autonomy enables consciousness to *deeply influence* not just the psyche, but the brain too, as a complex bio system. After the material principled interpretations of the past hundred years, natural sciences have just now reached that change of paradigm which points beyond the bio level of the past hundred years.

Psychology regards the psyche as a more complete and heavier concept than personal consciousness. Although Attila S. Székely is a philosopher, he did write an excellent psychology based book of a wide spectrum<sup>44</sup> -in which he sums up his bio-psychological standpoint as follows: "The psyche is a far wider concept than consciousness, while it incorporates the entire working of the brain on the scale of a past-present-future time scale." This is the leading standpoint of classical psychology. The psyche does indeed incorporate the

---

<sup>42</sup> op.cit. p. 67.

<sup>43</sup> Peter Russel's question is this: "And does the nervous system not create but only strengthen consciousness?" (The Revolution of Consciousness) op.cit. p. 189

<sup>44</sup> Attila S. Székely: The basic lines of consciousness bio-psychology (Appendix Publishing, Turgu Mures, 2005)

total working of the brain, however, consciousness is *not* the product of the brain, thus it is not its representation either, but it exists above and behind the entire brain and the entire psyche: it co-ordinates and mediates like a bridge between the collective consciousness and the personal mind.

The latest schools of the science of psychology - from transpersonal psychology to for example quantum psychology - have *reconstructed* the bio level and the level of the psyche. The most complex mind and consciousness theory was developed by Ken Wilber in the eighties and the nineties. He calls the higher transpersonal levels of personal consciousness a development ladder made of nine rungs representing levels of the occult, the subtle, and the causal.<sup>45</sup> According to him we go behind and beyond the mind on these levels right into the deepest depths of consciousness which are not limited to the ego, to the individual. (p. 210)

The interpretation of consciousness as a physical field is thus just valid together with the analysis of the depth (the capability to always transcend oneself): "The Spirit living within us is meant to awaken to its own consciousness and even - as many would put it - to become superimposed above consciousness. The depth from the unconscious to the consciousness through to the supra-conscious gets ever deeper and at the end of the road the shocking realisation awaits us that we are totally at one with the radiant Whole, and as soon as you have realised this you yourself have already become The One." (Ken Wilber, 1996)<sup>46</sup>

The collective consciousness interpretations are about to face the paradigm change of consciousness theory just now. If society is "just" the natural (material? objective? objectivised? etc.) reality, then the collective consciousness of society is built on *the bio level of society*, too. If society is first and foremost virtual reality, a collective mind construction which is also embodied in the form of institutions, then the collective consciousness of society also breaks away from the natural social sphere and is an *independent dimension of existence*.

If we have come as far as the physical/biological dimensions then it is well worth summarising what kind of *new research results* were born about social consciousness in the past two-three decades. For example, among the practitioners of transcendental meditation (TM) technique from the beginning of the sixties, there was the presumption that if at least one percent of the population practices the TM technique regularly, then some *measurable positive effects* can be observed in society.

According to Maharishi's Vedic psychology, the force which most basically influences the quality of society is the *collective consciousness* of society. By collective consciousness they understand the whole consciousness of a social group. The basic units of society - family, community society, and the whole world - have their own collective consciousness. "As the thinking and behaviour of the individual is influenced by the consciousness of the individual, there exists on the side of society as a whole a quality of consciousness. Every family, every region or nation's collective consciousness has an independent reality, and has its own path of development. Collective consciousness of society is the direct and sensitive mirror of the individuals who make up society."<sup>47</sup>

The research started to check this view (Borland and Landrith 1977) examined the amount of crime in 22 minor North American cities, and among these, a decrease in crime was observed in cities where practitioners of TM have reached or exceeded 1%, while in the control cities the number of crimes increased further. Since the seventies national or world-wide group meditations were organised 42 times, out of this eight were world-wide, for example in 1982 a seven thousand person one in the United States, and in 1987 also a seven thousand person collective meditation in India.

---

<sup>45</sup> Ken Wilber, 1996: A Brief History of Everything (Shambhala Publications, Inc.), In Hungarian : The short history of the working spirit (Európa, 2003) pp. 147-156 .

<sup>46</sup> Op. cit. p. 52

<sup>47</sup> Maharishi Mahesh Yogi (1977), Creating an Ideal Society, Rheinweiler, West Germany: MERU Press. p. 122

Intensive group meditation directed at social consciousness, or super radiation *decreases the number of negative phenomena in society* (events of crime, accidents, events of fire, suicides, contagious illnesses etc.) or *increases* the effectiveness of the economy, reduces the fluctuations of the stock market, and improves the national mood. Researchers assume that the induced phenomena (group meditation) exert their effect on the *basic and holistic level of nature*, and the data at disposal support the hypothesis of the field-likeness of consciousness.

A remark: many still feel an aversion about meditation, yet Endre Gyökössi wrote down long ago that both John Calvin and Martin Luther King continuously meditated. "Luther who had a large family said: "I would never sacrifice my meditation time (he meditated at least for an hour every morning), *because that is not time lost, it is time won.*"<sup>48</sup>

Thus what kind of *physical/consciousness law* explains on the one part the effect of the meditators on the effects of the consciousness field, and respectively, on the other part, the effect of social consciousness on society? While we could evaluate the successes of super-radiation rather more as the success of consciousness than that of a field reaching into the distance, physics leads phenomena reaching into the distance back to the *presence of a mediating field*. The quadratic dependence of the size of the effect and size of the group are also physical phenomena characteristic of a field where the radiators are active in coherent co-operation.

In a scientific sense, the appearance of a coherent amplitude-super position necessary for a constructive interference of such intensity indicates the presence and operation of a boson-field.

According to quantum physics we can expect a non-space-bound, long distance appearance in the case of consciousness phenomena, too, in other words, we can interpret the data of super-radiation as the sign that through individual consciousness the level of unification is directly accessible, which verifies the presumed sameness of pure consciousness and the unified field.

According to István Dienes<sup>49</sup>, the unified field's structure viewed from the aspect of modern theoretical physics can be perfectly reconciled with the point of view that a unified field possesses which has at the same time *subjective or conscious* and *objective or material* qualities. Since the view that in the size domain of super-unification the unified field is the one single dynamic degree is generally wide-spread, then we have to look for and define both the subjective and the objective within the self-interaction activity of the unified field.

The *sameness* between the unified field of modern theoretical physics which can be regarded as objective, and the unified field of consciousness can thus logically said to be contradiction free. Presumably, most particle-physicists would agree with the view that the unified field can be the source of subjective (or conscious) and objective qualities of existence at the same time. The modern scientific assumption based on Vedic knowledge is that the state of higher consciousness (called pure consciousness) achievable through meditation *is the same* as collective consciousness, or it "just" *connects* to the collective consciousness, which then again is none other than the unified consciousness field. In any case, research has indirectly verified that *collective consciousness (as a unified, at the same time both physical and biological consciousness field)* does exist, though the interpretation and understanding of this phenomenon which transcends physics and biology of the present is not yet complete by far.

---

<sup>48</sup> Endre Gyökössi: Three meditations on meditation (Publishing or press) p. 115 (or see: John Main: From word to silence Christian meditation Vincentian Spiritual Series 42. 2005.)

<sup>49</sup> István Dienes (2008): The live hologram, the new approach to the theory of the universe, the foundations of a new physics (Institute for Strategic Research, forthcoming in: 2008)

If the unified consciousness field exists, then logically *two solutions* are possible: a) There is no separate individual or collective consciousness, thus each individual in a higher state of consciousness is unconsciously or consciously through prayer, meditation, or yoga etc. is in the unified consciousness field; b) Though the unified consciousness field is unified, it is at the same time structured, and the individual subjective and all higher states of consciousness bear independent particularities. By the way, logically it cannot be excluded either, that the unified consciousness field is capable of behaving *this way*, or *that way* simultaneously, while with the help of information physics it can be explained that a consciousness field is at the same time also *an information field, even a visual-symbolic field* of which *the collective unconscious* is also a part. According to our hypothesis, the latter is the more likely assumption.

The realisation of a *consciousness-centred reality* is not new in itself either. For thousands of years we have known that everything depends on an ungraspable, difficult to measure, unknowable and inexhaustible field, space and energy: consciousness. And let us now disregard the fact that attempts have been made to grasp the reality and post reality defined as consciousness with many concepts, and maybe it has today finally become clear that neither the brain, nor the mind are to be confused with consciousness. The ancient lores and modern sciences both differentiate between *alert consciousness* (alert state, sleep, deep sleep), and *the higher states of consciousness* (pure consciousness, cosmic consciousness, God-consciousness, unified consciousness).

The theoretical dilemma is what stages are the collective or the common stages of consciousness, and to what extent and how these are connected with personal consciousness. If the individual states of consciousness embody *several steps*, then with the collective states of consciousness we may presume *several steps*, too. According to our judgement, this is why we can talk about *transcendental, common, cosmic (pantheistic-universal) God (sacral) and unity (unified)* collective state of consciousness.

If thus collective consciousness and/or a unified consciousness field has/may have a structure, then *we can compare* the structure of the collective consciousness to the structure of individual consciousness, and of course, with the structure of a global society too.

<b>levels of consciousness (from bottom to top)</b>	<b>individual consciousness (real subjective)</b>	<b>collective consciousness (unified consciousness field)</b>	<b>society (unified collective)</b>
<b>Fifth level</b>	unified consciousness	Absolute unified consciousness field	unified social consciousness field
<b>Fourth level</b>	God-consciousness (personal God consciousness)	sacral humanity consciousness	sacral "society"
<b>Third level</b>	cosmic consciousness	pantheistic-universal (and multi-verse) consciousness	universal-cosmic "consciousness society"
<b>Second level</b>	transcendent consciousness	transcendent communal knowledge	network of virtual (family, local, national etc) communities
<b>First level</b>	alert consciousness (awakeness, deep sleep, and dreaming)	normal social consciousness (on all levels of society)	structured, functional society (and its institutions)

<b>Zero level</b>	unconscious	social unconscious	below society
-------------------	-------------	--------------------	---------------

Perhaps then it can be accepted *as a starting point*<sup>50</sup> that: 1. The communal states of consciousness have *lower* (normal social) and *higher* (transcendent? *pantheistic-universal?* *sacral?* etc.) consciousnesses. 2. The communal states of consciousness encompass and represent smaller or bigger social-territorial (municipal, urban, regional, national European and universal) units. (This will presumably generate a new social theory which we may well call an *unified collection* theory) 3. According to psychology, social psychology, and transpersonal psychology a social unconscious does exist and it has an intensive effect. 4. The communal states of consciousness - although individuals are seldom aware of this - strongly determine the *consciousness content* and the *consciousness quality* of members and groups of society. The personal and social behaviour of the individuals is probably more strongly and deeply defined by social consciousness than by the system of social realities. 5. This has a reverse effect as well: the simultaneously horizontal and hierarchical network of social consciousness collects and sums up the personal-communal consciousness of individuals.

We differentiate between several types of collective structure. "There are collective pre-personal structures (magical and mythical) collective structures (rational and existential) and collective transpersonal structures (occult and subtle). The expression "collective" simply means a universal structure such as for example the ability to sense or see the inspirations, the emotions etc. However, all these are not necessarily transpersonal phenomena: they are just collective, that is to say common."<sup>51</sup> This differentiation is baffling because it does not assume universal structures which are not transpersonal.

Quantum physicist John Hagelin differentiates only between two types of collective consciousness in the case of enlightened societies: the state of cosmic consciousness and the state of unified consciousness; a society with a cosmic state of consciousness is in harmony with the laws of nature and the intelligence of the world, and a society with a unified state of consciousness is, according to him, like the Meissner-effect known from physics because unity can then be seen from both sides, people live the unity as a living reality. In this state of consciousness the nation, the society is undisturbed and invincible. This is none other than a state of balance and orderliness.

Let us not think, however, that the theory of social consciousness is some kind of post-modern philosophical phenomenon. We can read theses like these in Semion L. Frank's *spiritual (or intellectual) social theory* published in Paris, in 1930: "*an intellectual and not a material relationship between the members of society, and since this connects the particular consciousnesses, it bears a validity which is above space*"<sup>52</sup> „The unity of society is expressed not in the consciousness of a special "social" subject but in the harmony of individual consciousnesses which form a real and active unit together."<sup>53</sup> „Thus social consciousness is none other than those units of memories and aims above the individual which are above time. Even more important than this consciousness above time is that trait of social existence that communal life itself is above time too."<sup>54</sup>

<sup>50</sup> See in more detail: Emese Ugrin – Csaba Varga: *New democracy and state theory*, Századvég Publishing, 2007

<sup>51</sup> Ken Wilber, i.m. 226.o.

<sup>52</sup> Frank, Semion L. (1930, Paris ): *The intellectual bases of society*, Kairosz Publishing , Budapest, 2005, p. 151.

<sup>53</sup> op cit. p. 153

<sup>54</sup> op cit. p. 182

The immigrant Russian thinker thus harmonises the approach to philosophy and religion in his social philosophy that according to the organic theory of society between the members of society there is not (or not primarily) a material, but an *intellectual* connection, which is the Whole above the individual, or the substantial "what" which we might as well call the objective spirit

However, he does not dare to state unambiguously the *independence* of the collective consciousness, while very clearly, the concept that society and social existence are above time, gets his vote. (Meanwhile, he does not elaborate on the problem as to what extent and how society and social consciousness are *above space*).

Since S.L. Frank does not interpret collective consciousness as an independent substance, its structure and layers do not appear as a dilemma with him.

How may we sum up the theses so far? From the point of view of our theme, we have exposed *the old-new realisation*. According to several signs and experiences, the spiritual, intellectual, social, state and even democratic (or less democratic) behaviour of individuals are defined by a social/common consciousness. What is more, it influences it more markedly and roughly than the harshest social situation, a limited activity field, or even weak social knowledge, or a closed spirit of the age.

If this is true, and it happens in fact to be true, then the assumption is justified that post-modern civilisation cannot but re-learn perhaps on a higher level *the recognition, creation and the organisation in order* to acquire collective consciousness.

European consciousness-centred reality by the way assumes that we integrate some of the consciousness-centred individual and community concepts of Oriental cultures, too.

Social consciousness is thus *the primary and complex space, what is more, it is the directly appearing consciousness space of space-time*. We can no longer be satisfied with the simple collective consciousness metaphors ("cloud", "mirror", "decanter", "ether" etc.) because the model of collective consciousness presumes multi-level, multi-passage, twisted, bent, rotating etc. social spaces of consciousness. The task of the next decades' trans-disciplinary or, rather, meta-theoretical research will be to create ever more precisely the theory of individual and collective levels of consciousness and systems of consciousness. In such a model we can observe and influence in an itemised manner why and how a particular town or continent can move into a higher state of collective consciousness.

Aware and conscious of the above, let us examine *what common consciousness is, and what the characteristics of collective consciousness are*.

- (*the common consciousness field of mankind*) There are two possible answers to define a collective (among other things, a sacral, universal, communal etc.) consciousness: a) a united-unified consciousness field of which the collective unconscious is also part; b) a unified, but unambiguously structured (transpersonal) field of consciousness. To sum up, we can say that the common consciousness reality of earthly nature, civilisation, and culture is the collective consciousness of mankind;

- (*simultaneously independent and dependent system of consciousness*) Presumably, collective consciousness is independent on the one part of time and space and on the other part it is also independent of the consciousness and awareness of individuals, yet this primordial realness or neutrality - even if it seems like a paradox - does not exclude, it even supports that the collective consciousness is continuously influenced by the individual consciousnesses, and the collective consciousness, too, exerts intensive effects on the consciousness of individuals;

- (*the collective consciousness connects to a sacral consciousness field*) The simultaneously universal and local collective consciousness connects to a cosmic intelligence, the transcendental reality/consciousness, and to the absolute or the absolute consciousness,

but this connection or connection-opportunity in the present era does not in itself guarantee that mankind will reach a higher state of consciousness;

- (*the differentiation between consciousness and the state of consciousness*) As in the case of the individual, we differentiate between various normal and higher states of consciousnesses, in the same pattern we differentiate between higher collective consciousness levels within the unified field of consciousness. The basis for the differentiation between the states of consciousness is that intelligence is higher in the collective consciousness, or as opposed to this, the qualities of the material are more dominant;

- (*the collective consciousness is a natural or post-natural phenomenon*) According to our knowledge at present, the collective consciousness is on the one part both supernatural and transpersonal, yet at the same time also a natural phenomenon which, however, cannot yet be explained satisfactorily according to the theories of physics at present;

- (*the clouded quality of the perception of collective consciousness*) The large majority of individual consciousnesses are unaware of what kind of effect collective consciousness exerts on them, and through them on society, and the other way around, people are unaware, too, that they knowingly or unknowingly exert a constant effect on the collective consciousness. The basic reason for this is that the attention of the personal consciousness is totally directed at the material world, the coarsest level of reality, and mistakenly it identifies itself with this part-reality only. In the case of the majority, there is a lack of the gradual dominance of the values of the higher states of consciousness in individual consciousnesses instead of the dominance of material values;

- (*the two basic qualities of collective consciousness*) Collective consciousness can be influenced equally by the qualities of the material world or the values of a "higher" reality, such as harmony, happiness and contentment. People and their communities however can only reach general well-being if they live, think, and act in complete harmony with the higher intelligence which controls nature, the united consciousness field that is;

- (*the possibility of the united consciousness field*) On the one part, the united consciousness field can be regarded as the subjective or conscious, and on the other part as its objective quality source. The individuals and mankind would have to reach the eternal balance of returning to the absolute.

What did we write in the *introduction*? How can we develop our starting theses further? According to our experience and perception, the global (and/or local) world is the creation of *the collective consciousness* (united consciousness field) which on the one part becomes objective in the subjective consciousnesses, and on the other part the individual consciousnesses continuously create it in the collective consciousness. We thus attribute creative function and ability to collective consciousness, but *this dual or multiple creation* takes place equally from the bottom (from earthly civilisation) upwards, and from above, (from the collective consciousness and transcendent consciousness levels) downwards. Its most important element is thus *the continuous creation* with the help of which the collective consciousness - often unconsciously - has an effect on the world and every dimension and movement of the world through individual and group consciousnesses.

What we see and experience and observe in and from the global worlds, can also be interpreted as the *various "embodied" flows of absolute, the system and/or network of absolute qualities*. In this sense, the global world is *the "lower absolute" - the world in front of or behind the common mind curtain* - when compared to the transcendent absolute, and what is more, when compared to the individual consciousnesses the universal and yes, even the global consciousness (and its states of consciousness) are the *"actualised" absolute*, or the upper absolute becoming direct.

The global world of course is a minimum of *two dimensions* horizontally: on the one hand, it is the global *collective consciousness*, the united consciousness field of mankind, and

on the other hand, the manifestation, institutionalisation "*objectivisation*" of the global collective consciousness. And this second, manifested, simultaneously creative and created global world also has a minimum of two dimensions: the substantial and the functional global world.

And with this we have returned to the general and functional-substantial analysis of globalisation.

Instead of a post scriptum: "The higher the collective level of our consciousness rises, the bigger a chance we give to unexpected miracles." Peter Russell<sup>55</sup>

## **7. The leading theses of global-local consciousness and global-local awareness**

We have already showcased the higher states of collective consciousness: from bottom to top: (a) the *transcendent communal*, (b) the cosmic (*pantheistic-universal*), (c) the *Godly (sacral)* and (d) the state of *unified consciousness*, or the *united* state of collective consciousness. The collective, non individual *social consciousness* – whether we imagine it in a dual or multi-dimensional space-time – is also *structured*: in the lower spheres of the united consciousness field generally "only" the universal-cosmic consciousness can be seen, which is also the cosmic intelligence, the global consciousness of planet Earth seems to be in the middle, and it is below, in the localities where the national and local consciousness exists.

In the state of the present European knowledge and consciousness few people experience or accept intellectually the ultimate reality as the "apex" of universal consciousness which we have marked with the concept of the *Absolute*, though the encompassing consciousness of our planet can be lived and understood as *the Absolute becoming direct* as well. And incidentally: this is the *global-local consciousness*.

In this chapter we now sum up the theses concerning a *global* (continental, national, and local) consciousness and the theses of *the collective* consciousness, but in the previous chapter we have already recorded eight basic statements which of course we will not repeat.

1. Global (global-local) consciousness is the collective consciousness or one of the particular fields of the unified consciousness field and as such it is firstly the common section of normal social consciousness and higher global consciousness (*global consciousness is the field of the collective consciousness thesis*)

2. If we have described the new global-local space from the start as a multidimensional hyperspace (space-time), then collective consciousness and as one of its fields, global consciousness, are in fact the fifth and/or the umpteenth space-time dimension which, however, exerts an encompassing effect on material space-time dimensions (*the collective and the global consciousness is the fifth time dimension thesis*)

3. Collective consciousness exists above and behind three dimensional space-time and existed even at the time when there was no talk of globalisation, and mankind was farther away from functional unity. The basic value of global consciousness is thus constant, it does not spread, it does not decrease, it reaches everybody and affects everybody; (*global consciousness affects every living being of earthly civilisation and culture thesis*)

4. The unified consciousness field and all its layers presume and at the same time create - or help create/experience - the new knowledge necessary to understand the new reality and states of consciousness on every level of the global-local reality, and this new knowledge creates new symbols and new symbolic spaces at the same time; (*the global world is at the same time the new knowledge and the new symbolic space thesis*)

---

<sup>55</sup> Ervin László (ed ), 1999.op. cit. pp. 137-138

5. The present level of global consciousness hardly heeds the consciousness development from the aspect of the absolute, nor does it embrace the necessary knowledge either, therefore chaos, suffering and dissatisfaction dominate in our society, and the larger part of society only accepts material goods as the most important value, and in the end as a consequence of this, the material world is struck by natural catastrophes; *(mankind is suffering because of the state of functional consciousness thesis)*

6. Global consciousness is structured within itself too, it is also a highrise-like structure in which the continental, national, local and collective consciousnesses play a cardinal role. The part consciousnesses of the global consciousness are quite independent and not totally subordinate to the broader consciousness dimensions; *(global consciousness does not extinguish European, national or local consciousness thesis)*

7. The recognition of global consciousness has accelerated since the second half of the twentieth century, the present paradigm-changing novelty is primarily only that the existence of global consciousness has begun to become conscious in ever widening social circles, yet today, the current global consciousness exerts its effect in a more general and wider spectrum than functional globalisation itself; *(the becoming aware of the global consciousness thesis)*

8. Global consciousness – similarly to the complete collective consciousness - takes on two qualities: the material, wealth, consumption (etc) centred and the love, justice, well-being, and spiritual (etc) centred quality of consciousness. The first quality is primarily expressed by functional globalisation, whereas the second quality is embodied by substantial globalisation, thus we differentiate between the two qualities of consciousness as functional and substantial global consciousness; *(the two basic qualities of global-local consciousness thesis)*

9. As the individual and the collective nervous systems are as yet not sufficiently clear and organised, therefore the collective "mind" cannot preserve absolute happiness-harmony, i.e. the substantial consciousness quality to its full extent, thus it continuously falls out from this state of consciousness of a higher level; *(despite an increasing collective awareness, mankind is not prepared for the global improvement of consciousness)*

10. At the beginning of the twenty-first century global consciousness is, on the one hand, the material-natural and functional consciousness of the majority of today's mankind, on the other hand, it is the consciousness of substantial solidarity and happiness of an increasing minority of mankind, thus the quality task of globalisation cannot be any other than the spreading of the individual and group quality of consciousness of a momentary minority; *(the support of the spread of the substantial global consciousness of the minority thesis)*

11. The radical change of paradigm occurring in the global consciousness is represented by the switch between the two qualities of consciousness, therefore individual and the collective prayers, meditations (etc.) can transform the collective consciousness and its fields with general stimulation; *(the paradigm of the present and future global consciousness shift thesis)*

12. Due to a lack of radical paradigm shift of awareness, the substantial global consciousness for the time being can only manage, ease, and refine the conflicts generated or caused by functional globalisation only partially, temporarily and within limits; *(global consciousness only eases the conflicts and the extent of the conflicts within limits thesis)*

13. The basic processes of new globalisation or especially alternative globalisation are basically dependent in the future on transcendent global knowledge and its quality, but for the time being the individuals and communities of globalisation often present their own, often low-level states of consciousness; *(the success of alternative globalisation depends on an alternative global consciousness thesis)*

14. If substantial global consciousness temporarily or irrevocably prevails over functional states of mind, if it does not fall out of the uppermost awareness, and an organised unified collective consciousness field is created, this will mean functional protection for our

planet and for all levels of world society, and will make all nations invincible; (*substantial collective consciousness offers protection for nations, continents, or the entire civilisation thesis*)

15. In collective consciousness which is in the state of coherence, topical global-universal tasks ahead of mankind, i.e. a consciousness controlled economy, society, or the actualisation of a participatory state and democracy controlled by collective consciousness is not utopia pushed into infinity, but is the opportunity and chance of this century (*global consciousness gives a program for the creation of a consciousness controlled state, society and democracy thesis*)

16. After the loss of the Whole and then the rejection of the Whole and as a result of this, the lack of whole-consciousness, a collective consciousness, and the rediscovery of mankind's common consciousness make it possible for mankind to find its way back to itself, to the reality it created, to the absolute from which it became estranged, and advance; (*through the increase of global consciousness there is a chance to find the spiritual way back thesis*)

17. The global experience of the absolute will fill the social consciousness with a sensation which cannot be compared to any kind of happiness offered by the relative world, thus the individual and the group consciousness will want to find their way back to this kind of pure state of consciousness again and again. The more time consciousness spends in this state the more it is permeated by it and finally when it has been totally permeated, it will not lose it again. At this time, collective consciousness will find its way back to its original and worthy state which is the collective enlightenment. (*the global experience of the absolute global will cause the collective enlightenment thesis*)

18. Collective consciousness and the collective states of consciousness will become the central theme of trans-disciplinary post-normal sciences, and within this the further research of global-local consciousnesses and states of consciousness since understanding individual and collective consciousnesses and their way of operation is the most important post-scientific and meta-theoretical task (*meta-theoretical research and interpretation of collective consciousness and its states of consciousness thesis*)

19. The development of alternative globalisation and its global acceptance first and foremost depends on the strengthening and effect of an alternative global consciousness. Alternative global consciousness cannot be anything other than an optimal collective consciousness which goes together with the unified and general increase of the collective consciousness of mankind; (*the alternative global consciousness thesis*)

20. (My readers are welcome to carry on with the wording of similar theses!)

Earthly civilisation can experience the state of an *united and balanced humanity* in collective consciousness right now. This is also the greatest inner joy of the individual consciousnesses/states of consciousness. We are one, we act in solidarity, we are inseparable parts of higher realities/consciousnesses. Global-global-local reality thus lifts us up to the state of harmony, or more widely, to the state and quality of substantial humanity.

To validate this, we now quote a famous succinct statement by A.H. Maslow: "Transcendence points to the highest levels of human consciousness or the total levels which encompass or build mainly when man relates to himself as an aim than a tool, to the things he considers important, to others, generally people, to other species, to Nature and to the Universe."<sup>56</sup> *One of the total levels* of the hierarchy of the transcendent collective consciousness is global consciousness.

---

<sup>56</sup> Maslow, Abraham H., 1969: The various meanings of transcendence (A.H. Maslow – R. Assagioli – K. Wilber: Introduction to transpersonal psychology, Ursus Libris Publishing, 2006) p. 62

## **8. The new theory and/or philosophy of globalisation**

The new theory of globalisation, or more exactly its *meta-philosophy*, in accordance with its intentions, is firstly a new philosophy, and secondly, a new global reality and consciousness picture, what is more, thirdly it is a new reality and a new, high state of consciousness. The new personal and collective state of consciousness is creative in ability and practice, and as such it inspires not only substantial but also functional globalisation to create a new reality/ new consciousness.

The meta-philosophy of globalisation starts out not from the fact that the global-local world system is the completion of helplessness and an inability to act, but on the contrary, a new type of globalisation creates an opportunity to carry through a *new way of thinking and world action* based on the increase of individual and collective consciousness.

## Select bibliography:

- Arntz, V.- Chasse, B.- Vicente, Mark, 2003: *What the Bleep Do We Know?*, In Hungarian: *Mi a... (fütytyöt) tudunk?*, EzVan Publishing, 2007
- Baudrillard, Jean 1997. *The penultimate moment* Discussions with Philippe Petit- Magvető Publishing Budapest, 2000
- Bauman, Zygmunt, 1998 *Globalisation: The Human Consequences* (In Hungarian: *Globalizáció, a társadalmi következmények*, Budapest, 2002,.
- Beck, Ulrich, 1997: *Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalisierung*, Duhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1997 (In Hungarian: Beck, U.: *Mi a globalizáció?* Belvedere Meridionale, Szeged, 2005.
- Behe, Michael J., 1996: *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, Simon & Schuster Inc., In Hungarian: *Darwin fekete doboza, az evolúcióelmélet biokémiai kihívása*, Harmat Publishing, 2002
- Derrida, Jacques, 1996. *Faith and knowledge*, Brambauer Publishing, Pécs.
- Durkheim, Émile, 1893: *On social work division*, Osiris, Budapest, 2001.
- Eccles, J.C. (1989): *Evolution of the Brain: Creation of the Self*. Routledge- New York.
- Eccles, J.C. - Popper, K.R. (1977): *The Self and Its Brain - An argument for interactionism*. Springer Verlag, Heidelberg.
- Ellwood, Wayne 2001: *The No-Nonsense Guide to Globalisation*, New Internationalist Publications Ltd. Oxford, and Verso, London. In Hungarian: *A globalizáció*, HVG Publishing 2003
- Frank, Semion L. (1930, Páris): *The intellectual bases of society* Kairosz Publishing, Budapest, 2005
- Giddens, Anthony, 1999: *Runaway World*, Profile Books, Ltd, in Hungarian: *Elszabadult világ*, Napvilág Publishing , 2000
- Gyököcssy, Endre: *Three meditations on meditation* (see : Endre Gyököcssy: *The How A Szent Gellért Publishing and Press, Budapest.*)
- Jäger, Villigis: *Die Welle ist das Meer*, Verlag Herder, 2000. In Hungarian: *Hullámaiban a tenger*, Villigis Jäger és Christoph Quarch beszélgetése a misztikus spiritualitásról, Editio M Kft, 2001)
- Jung, K.G. *Introduction to the psychology of the unconscious* (Európa Publishing 2000)
- Kiss, Endre: *Globalisation and/or the post-modern*, János Kodolányi College Székesfehérvár, 2003.)
- Kiss, Endre – Varga, Csaba 2001: *The ultimate last chance* (Knowledge Society Books Institute for Strategic Research, Nagykovácsi
- Kiss, Endre (2001). *The global as the becoming direct of the absolute, or the present as a philosophical problem* INCO 2001/1
- Kiss, Endre: *Monetarist globalisation and the change in the Hungarian political system* Ferenczi & Co.Ltd. 2002
- Koestler, Arthur, 1959: *The Sleepwalkers*, (Hutchinson). In Hungarian: *A. Koestler: Alvajárók* (Európa Publishing, 2007).
- Kónya, Anikó – Király, Ildikó – Bodor, Péter – Pléh, Csaba (eds.): *Collective, shared, social*. Akadémiai Publishing 1999
- Ervin László (ed.), 1999: Stanislav Grof - Ervin László - Peter Russel: *The Consciousness Revolution* (Elf Rock, 2003); In Hungarian: *A tudat forradalma* (New Paradigm Publishing 1999).
- Margenau, H. (1978). *Physics and Philosophy: Selected Essays*. D. Reidel Co..
- Merleau-Ponty, 1953: *Éloge de la philosophie*, Éditions Gallimard; In Hungarian: *A filozófia dicsérete*, Európa Publishing , 2005.
- Popper K.R. (1994): *Knowledge and the Body-Mind Problem*. M.A. Notturmo, Routledge, London
- Rapport mondial sur la culture. Culture, créativité et marchés, UNESCO, 1998 (World report about culture. Culture, creativity and the markets.)

- Safranski, Rüdiger 2003: *Wieviel Globalisierung verträgt der Mensch?* (Carl Hanser Verlag München Wien). In Hungarian: *Mennyi globalizációt bír az ember?* (Európa Publishing, 2004),.
- Székely, Attila S.: *The basic outlines of consciousness-bio psychology A tudat-biopszichológia alapvonalai* (Appendix Publishing, Turgu Mures, 2005)
- Ugrin, Emese - Varga, Csaba 2007: *New democracy and state theory*. Századvég Publishing, Budapest
- Varga, Csaba 2003. *In front of new theory horizons*, Tertia Publishing , Budapest
- Varga, Csaba (ed.), 2005: *Metatheory, metaphilosophy*, Institute for Strategic Research Nagykovácsi
- Wilber, Ken 1996: *A Brief History of Everything* (Shambhala Publications, Inc.), In Hungarian: *A Működő Szellem rövid története* (Európa, 2003).