

# What is Enlightened Communication? In What Way is it New and How can it be used to Further Human Evolution? An interview with Chris Parish<sup>1</sup>

By Nick Drummond, Nordic Integral  
January 17, 2004

[www.nordicintegral.com](http://www.nordicintegral.com)

*The collective becomes singular; the collective becomes one mind; it's a higher level of evolutionary potential. It's the power of the many literally becoming one.*<sup>2</sup>

Andrew Cohen

## Summary

In this interview with Chris Parish, chief coordinator of Andrew Cohen's European IEF centres, we enquire into: what would it mean to come together and communicate with a large group of people and have the feeling that you were meeting yourself? What would be the quality of the communication? How might it affect the relationship you have with yourself, the people and world around you? And what might this new quality of communication and thinking offer in terms of practical application? What's more, how can this new level of intersubjective communication be approached as an integral science?

Chris Parish distinguishes enlightened communication as being a clear example of how enlightened minds can come together to create a deep sense of mutual understanding. He also explains the prerequisites for bringing about this higher form of collective wisdom and intelligence in communication. *"It's not just a group of people having a dialogue or conversation together... It's a different sort of movement than trying to come together and finding consensus or trying to agree or argue out what's the best thing. Because while all that has its place, often a lot of the ways people have come together in the past have tended to cater to the lowest common denominator of being the best way of getting an agreement"* Whereas here, *"there's often a real sense of urgency that we want to go somewhere. So this isn't something for one's own indulgence. It's not something to just bask in for one's own self-satisfaction."*

As Chris Parish explains, enlightened communication creates, *"the possibility of a network of consciousnesses that is so fast ... where there is no inertia between minds; there's nothing in the way of communication; it opens up the possibility of something exponentially faster. Because the interesting thing is that when each person is speaking authentically... it's not really a personal thing at all ... It's like someone is articulating one's own deepest soul"*

---

<sup>1</sup> Chris Parish heads Andrew Cohen's European Centres and has been a student of his for over seventeen years. Chris can be contacted at email: [cparish@andrewcohen.org](mailto:cparish@andrewcohen.org), [www.andrewcohen.org](http://www.andrewcohen.org)

<sup>2</sup> See [www.andrewcohen.org/supermind](http://www.andrewcohen.org/supermind) for a short introductory video presentation of intersubjective consciousness.

*feeling... the possibility is there that we could tackle all sorts of problems and find creative collective solutions that we probably would never have come across before. The possibilities are enormous."*

## 1. What is enlightened communication?

*ND: Chris, what is enlightened communication?*

**CP:** Well this may not be the only use of the word, but it is a term that my teacher Andrew Cohen coined when he was talking about the seemingly unknown art of enlightened communication. For many years he has said that we don't know how to deeply communicate and he would talk about an as-yet-unknown art of enlightened communication that he was sensing or intuiting as possible between people – that there is a fundamentally different way for human beings to interact and relate with each other. This is vitally important because most of our problems as human beings are in the field of relationship. And that is the root cause of most of the world's problems – how we relate to each other. So anything that can possibly be or form a part of a solution to that is obviously going to be very important.

Enlightened communication, in the way I'm referring to it, has really only just begun over the last two or three years. Using Andrew Cohen's teachings as a basis, I have been involved with groups of people in a number of different countries experimenting with this phenomenon of enlightened communication and finding out what's possible. We are discovering that by coming together with shared interest, focus, and receptivity, individuals are able to experience a state of "intersubjective" consciousness, a shared state of consciousness, between them, through which any topic can be explored and understood in far greater depth and subtlety than is usually possible.

And we have been experiencing a surprising degree of success, far more than we would have ever imagined. But even so, it is still something very embryonic. However there are some very real occurrences of this higher collective consciousness and quite often too. It is something that offers a tremendous potential with wider applicability. I know it can make an enormous difference and feel almost like it could be a universal panacea for many of the conflicts between people. But of course if people will be interested in doing this remains to be seen.

## 2. What is the context for enlightened communication?

*ND: What is the context you use when using enlightened communication?*

**CP:** This is very much part of and coming out of Andrew Cohen's teachings of evolutionary enlightenment. I mean, to be honest, that is the context. That's been my involvement, but when you get down to it that's actually an extremely broad subject, what that context means, because if evolutionary enlightenment is going to mean anything it's about the evolution of human consciousness itself. So it couldn't be construed in any sort of narrow way. So my use and experimentation of enlightened communication has been from within the context of Andrew Cohen's teachings and has been with students of Andrew Cohen and also with people who have come along to discussion group events but who don't know anything about it. But my use of it revolves around evolutionary enlightenment. Usually as a foundation or catalyst for these groups I use an excerpt from one of Andrew Cohen's videos, from one of his teachings, or audios, or a quote, or something like that to focus everyone's mind on this evolutionary context and on a higher possibility. I mean it wouldn't have to be that; potentially it could be anything, but definitely my experience thus far has been based on using Andrew Cohen's work.

We have also been using it to discuss different articles from Andrew Cohen's magazine *What is Enlightenment?* with different people. And that can definitely work too, but I'm using

material from Andrew Cohen's teachings because that seems like the most direct way to get enlightened communication happening. But it is not in any way limited to this. This is just how we have started and been doing this thus far. I can see that potentially and ideally it could be used for any grouping.

### **3. What are the prerequisites and rules for enlightened communication?**

*ND: What prerequisites and rules are necessary for enlightened communication to be a possibility within a group of people?*

**CP:** I definitely feel we do have to have some guidelines, but even then it doesn't guarantee anything. But having a set of rules definitely helps; you need some form and structure, and experienced facilitator to help make it happen. The points I often go through with people include the following.

#### **Choosing to be interested and open**

One must begin by just being interested because really that's the simplest human quality. If people are interested in going further than they have before – that's the most basic prerequisite. Which is quite a thing actually because many of us prefer to just insist that we already know all we need to know, and we don't want to know anymore. But it actually becomes more difficult if that is the case. So interest and receptivity is a key part. One needs a willingness to listen and therefore to have some openness to what is being said. Part of one's attention is on the collective phenomenon, but if someone just wants to come along and spout their opinions or just keep on their own track and say what they think, then obviously it doesn't work very well like that.

So it's not a forum to get on your soapbox or sharing one's personal woes. It's not a therapeutic group, let's be clear about that. The idea is that we are trying to go somewhere collectively, so the focus isn't on the personal issues of the individual. It's not a therapy group. And this is very important; that one has to be interested in looking at the bigger questions that have to do with all of us rather than my particular, "What I like; what I don't like; what I am struggling with." I'm not saying that those questions don't have any meaning; I'm just saying that for this particular purpose we want to go for the commonality, the universal things, which actually are deeper things that pertain to all of us, to all human beings. One must be receptive and willing to have some openness to something outside of oneself, to a collective, because it takes one's attention off oneself. This is necessary because we are so embedded in our postmodern culture and most of us don't realise just how self-centred and narcissistic we are and this stops us from being receptive and open.

It sounds bad but I think it's just normal for most of us in the West who have the luxury of having plenty of time to reflect on ourselves. So most of us are pretty self-preoccupied and a lot of our attention actually goes to ourselves and onto all of our thoughts and our feelings, and our personal troubles, desires and fears. So I don't think most of us realise just how much that is so or the effect that it has on us and our receptivity. So you need to make a conscious effort to be interested in something beyond the boundaries of our personal self.

#### **Willing to be vulnerable and genuine**

Another quality is that of being willing to be vulnerable and genuine.

*ND: What do you mean by vulnerable?*

**CP:** By vulnerable I mean – because it usually has a weak connotation – just to be undefended. It would mean a willingness to speak and take steps beyond what one knows. Because often we only speak about what we already know. And so when we meet together we just swap what we know with each other, "I know this and I am going to say it to you", and the other person tells you what they know, but there is nothing really new or creative in a lot of that. So vulnerable doesn't mean some sort of weakness, rather it means willing *not to already know*. It means that we don't already know everything – heaven forbid! What we do know is absolutely fine, but we don't have to hang on to it, because the whole point of evolution and of going somewhere together is that we want to focus on what we don't already know.

**ND:** Which would be the same as comparing one event with a previous event?

**CP:** Yes that's right, because if you have a great experience of enlightened communication, people can actually come away basking in the experience and think, "We are great", and want to recreate the same feeling or experience. And you can't plan and control how something is going to be or your emotional response. So the way I am using it, vulnerability is the same as being willing to not already know or anticipate. Because it takes something to actually speak about that which you don't know. It's like stepping out from or leaving behind our familiar borders. And to my mind it is not at all what people normally think of as being vulnerable because in this sense it also means being genuine or authentic to whom you really are.

### **Facilitating emergence through natural hierarchy**

It is also very helpful for the group to be facilitated because while great things can happen without facilitation and they sometimes do, I find that it does make quite a big difference to actually steer a group. A natural hierarchy has to be encouraged for something new to emerge. It is important to point out and say that some comments are more significant than others, and to be willing to make that distinction. So somebody has to make that distinction. Of course in our pluralistic postmodern society, a society that hates hierarchy and being judgemental, that is an unpopular thing to say. We wish to treat everyone's contribution as being inherently equal and that we have a right to express ourselves regardless of the significance of what is being expressed. And in a group this tends to mean, "Well we are all here together and if it's going well we will each hear each other out, how ever long that takes, and we can't question it because the highest truth is what each of us think and feel in that moment." And of course that is fine to do that if people want to do that. There is no doubt that it has a certain value and appeals to the GREEN meme in people. But we are now talking about going further because most of us, at least the more affluent people in the West who are already interested in these sorts of questions are already deeply steeped in GREEN anyway. I don't think we need any more practice in this way of thinking and communicating. And if we want to go somewhere new we have to be willing to say, "Okay – every human being has equal rights but everything they say isn't necessarily of equal value."

So I think the job of the facilitator, that I am trying to do, is steering the process by pointing out that this is a better direction to go. This means pointing out which way is going to take us deeper and which way is going to take us off the subject, and hence towards less depth.

This needs to be mentioned disarmingly at the beginning so that people don't fall into the trap of taking it personally in some way if I have to point this out to them during the session. It basically gets back to them having an open interest in the whole group going further. And in the end people usually appreciate it because the whole group does go deeper. Because as I

said before, if you just let everyone speak whatever they want, okay everyone has their bit of airplay, but how valuable was it in the end? How deep did we actually go? Well, usually not very far.

So facilitation is especially important until some sort of collective consciousness emerges, because once that does emerge people become naturally more sensitive to this consciousness itself and don't tend to want to talk about themselves. There isn't the same urge to go on about, "Well I think this" or bring in irrelevant things like some book they've read or start heading off the subject. We want to head towards whatever way is going to make it more genuine, deeper and more universal. We are not used to discriminating in that way, many of us anyway. So a lot of great points may be made in a group, but the participants can become lost in an indigestible mix of comments. Some comments may be incredibly powerful and meaningful and can open up great vistas while others are much more superficial. But if we leave it at "everything said being equal", it's never going to go anywhere. With facilitation the participants themselves begin to notice this more. Because if you focus on something that is more significant or higher and these things are in everyone's experiences, it becomes what we naturally choose to put our attention on. Because in the whole spectrum of our awareness the mind is churning up all sorts of things – from the most morbid and malignant to all sorts of higher possibilities. It's not like we don't know about these things, it's just that we are not trained to focus on that. So part of the facilitators job is drawing peoples attention to the points that are deeper and more significant and steering the group as necessary until this starts to happen by itself.

And it does happen more because as more people experience this consciousness and the more it is pointed out, the more the person doesn't want to go on about him or herself or bring in very extraneous and irrelevant things. The person then feels in touch with him or herself, with that sense of wanting to go deeper. It's an innate human condition that naturally emerges when we are not distracted by desire and fear. It seems that there is a natural human urge, a natural human interest and passion to evolve, to want to actually go further.

### **Staying focused**

Staying focused is another important point because if you don't follow on from what each person is saying, or respond to people too generally, you end up off track or lost. You need to know if what is being said is something that doesn't make sense. Likewise if you feel it is something actually inaccurate rather than just always say, "No leave it – that's that persons contribution so it's just as valid as anyone else's." Because if we don't find out and make distinctions it gets confusing and we don't know what we are building on. We create a mess of different things and sometimes contradictory things and it ends up being some sort of messy soup and people become confused and loose the thread of it. So responding to what is being said is definitely important.

### **A balance between not going too personal and not becoming too abstract**

*ND: Could you also clarify the distinction of not becoming either too personal or too abstract.*

**CP:** Yes, well this is also a very important point. If one is interested and genuine and speaks with a sort of vulnerability, one will not want to be abstract, because it is often safer for the ego to just remove oneself and talk abstractly about things. But if one is being vulnerable and interested in wanting to go deeper, then you don't want to do that. But the interesting thing is once there is something deeply established you can actually look into personal and intellectual

things. It's not like there is something wrong with the intellect, it's more like asking, "What is our intellect in the service of?" When it is in service of the ego, that part of ourselves that wants to maintain a distance from the whole, then it is something that is always making things vague and removed, i.e. abstract. But actually when there is no longer any desire, or you are no longer acting from any desire to separate oneself then our mind and brain actually becomes an extraordinary tool. It is actually one of the main means by which evolution occurs, by way of greater and greater discrimination. But then you are not using the mind in order to make oneself special, to keep one's own security, to prove you know better, to score points or to shine.

Usually the intellect has gotten such a bad rap, at least in spiritual circles, that often spiritual people tend to say, "Hey don't think at all" as if thinking is a bad thing, because of the way it is often misused to remain abstract and removed. But actually it is an extraordinary tool and the means by which we can choose to go deeper. And our experience of consciousness deepens by greater and greater discrimination – a greater subtlety of discrimination – which comes out of a pure interest of wanting to go further. So this leads to deeper, higher, more integral and more all-inclusive consciousness.

Please make the distinction that we are not talking about an amorphous vague consciousness in which you cannot function or use your mind. It's actually the opposite and it actually liberates our human potential and the way we can behave as human beings.

#### **4. Bring about a higher form of collective wisdom**

*ND: What is it that distinguishes enlightened communication from the many other ways people have come together and discussed things in the past?*

**CP:** The actual term "enlightened communication" doesn't seem to be used that much as yet. But I am aware that there are a lot of different people working on ways of bringing about a higher form of collective consciousness. This field of enquiry called collective wisdom or collective consciousness is very large and has all sorts of groups looking into it. And people have been doing it for years – probably going back twenty-five years ago with David Bohm's pioneering work with dialogue to these days with people like Peter Senge working with organisational learning. It seems that there are a lot of people finding ways of coming together and it does seem to be very much a growing field. But I'm not so sure how similar or dissimilar these different approaches are.

With enlightened communication we are basically meeting in a different form of collective consciousness, it's not just a group of individuals having a dialogue together, debating together, or coming to a consensus together. It's a different sort of movement than trying to come together and finding consensus or trying to agree or argue out what's the best thing. Because while all that has its place, often a lot of the ways people have come together in the past have tended to cater to the lowest common denominator of being the best way of getting an agreement. So you do get something, some form of a resolution in a conflict, but it is not necessarily the most creative or the highest form.

#### **5. A sense of oneness or communion, of having one conversation**

So what I'm talking about in this, in what we are starting to experience, is a way of coming together where people in no way give up their creativity and individuality or compromise in any way, but strangely enough the opposite. They come together in a much deeper way as well that actually enhances their creativity and their true authenticity. It sounds like a

paradox, and in a conventional or first tier way of looking at things it definitely is a paradox, because one of the essential features is very definitely a possibility of consciousness which is bigger than any of the individual participants in the group. Yet it is very real and there is a meeting of minds in the sense of oneness or communion far deeper than you could ever get to by any means of agreement or because people share a similar belief or something, because it's not about sharing the same belief. It's not about agreeing on something. It's about coming together in literally a deeper consciousness where there is already non-separation. So you're meeting in non-separation but this doesn't mean – because I think people when they hear that would assume it sounds something spiritual – we all dissolve away in some sort of nebulous-fuzzy-form of woolly-oneness, or something; that maybe feels nice but it's more like a descent into some predifferentiated state. I'm not talking about that. It's not that at all. The extraordinary feature of it is a sense of oneness, the sense of it being an experience of having one conversation. When it works it is almost as if there is only one person in the room and that can be felt to a very powerful degree by all participants. Yet at the same time no one's independence or self-agency is in any way decreased by someone taking over. In fact far the opposite; people often say things like, "I've never felt so much myself", "at home", "free", or "able to be myself in such a natural way."

I know this can sound a little unbelievable, a little bit fantastic, but actually what I am talking about is literal experience and has been verified with many people reporting this same phenomenon.

## **6. A collective natural intelligence emerges**

*ND: Can you describe a little more about those experiences?*

**CP:** Well one thing is there is a sense of a collective intelligence; it's not just a group of people having a dialogue or conversation together. Sometimes it can happen like a dramatic flip or turn around into this. Or it can be like an almost imperceptible deepening that people don't realise is happening until it almost like creeps up underneath in a way. It may need to be pointed out because people don't realise it is happening until suddenly you realise it has almost, sort of, overtaken one without you really being conscious of it.

One feature of it, that is interesting, is that it seems that there is a natural intelligence to this consciousness, and it is a strange thing because it is going to sound like – it's hard to describe this accurately – it's like a separate entity. In some way there is that aspect to it although it is totally dependent on the participants. It's not like we are channelling something. It's not like we are being taken over by aliens or spirits or something! But there is a quality about it; that it has an intelligence of its own that seems to guide things and that people can come to creative solutions collectively in ways that no one would have individually come up with. It's a good example of "transcend and include", i.e. what emerges is more than the sum of the parts. It's literally, to use an analogy, as if the people participating have become like the cells of a greater body that's come together. It's like a network of participant's consciousnesses, but it's not really entirely like that either. This makes it sound like they are patched together. But the funny thing is it depends on all the individuals, but it is something more than the individuals. I'm going back and forth like this because it's a peculiar paradoxical sense; it's both something more than, but it's nothing alien, it's also something that very much feels is one self too. Like all the participants would say, "No that's what I feel, that's my experience, that's my deepest most authentic part of me."

## **7. An impersonal experience – overcoming a major roadblock in human evolution**

So it's not something foreign, it feels completely at home, and yet the interesting thing is it's a very impersonal consciousness. You can't claim it for your own although it is most deeply one's own. You can't have it for yourself; it's something that comes about as a collective. It's a sort of consciousness that has different properties and coming together like this there is an extraordinary lack of separation. And on the human level that's something that's quite extraordinary because there's not the usual banging up against each other's egos, which is quite an experience for people to have really because a lot of us – you know we have moments when we are at our very best, when we are free, uninhibited and not wanting anything for ourselves – there is none of that sense of ego. I'm using the term ego here to mean the universal human compulsion to separate ourselves off, to make ourselves special, to be self-focused. This ego - that which is deeply habituated in us – has been a valuable thing in evolution up to this point, but is now a major roadblock stopping us from developing further. And I think that is one of the biggest things that is experienced – that this sense of ego is largely absent and can be seen for what it really is.

## **8. Egoless communication and a feeling of intimate relaxation**

So the usual conflicts are not occurring as no one is trying to assert themselves. There's no one trying to make themselves look good. There's no sort of competition in the egoic sense of trying to do better than someone else. But at the same time there's very much – in this sense of consciousness – a sense of rest and of peace because there's none of this anxious trying to get somewhere. So there's a feeling of relaxation that comes into this as well and people often feel and report back that they have never been as intimate as this before.

## **9. A sense of urgency to evolve**

But at the same time – and this is another one of these paradoxes – there's often a real sense of urgency, that we want to go somewhere. This isn't something for one's own indulgence. It's not something to just bask in and in any way take self-satisfaction in like, "Haven't we got a wonderful state together." It seems inherent in this consciousness that there is an urgency to move forward, but not in the neurotic way. Normally when we think of urgency we think of being anxious and of something being wrong. I'm talking about a sense of collective consciousness where there's nothing wrong and yet inherently wants to go forward. It's like a consciousness free of the normal inertia of ego, the sense of always wanting to maintain the status quo. Because in this sort of consciousness there isn't that inertia, there isn't that status quo. There's a natural, always wanting to go forward, always wanting to explore more. It's not coming from an experience of something being wrong. It's coming from a different place, it's coming from a sense of an imperative to evolve.

This might seem very cosmic sounding, but this is literally happening on a very regular basis. I'm not talking about some occasional peak experience.

## **10. Where is enlightened communication on the integral map?**

*ND: From an integral perspective – all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, and all types – where does enlightened communication arise on the integral map?*

**CP:** Well I think we need to explore this because obviously this will be somewhat speculative. But we can start with what I think in terms of Spiral Dynamics. I think that what we are doing, this collective consciousness – and based on what I have understood from

Andrew Cohen's teachings – that it is actually coming from third tier. It's an awakened Spiritual consciousness that we intuit; it's beyond the second tier and actually I think it demands its own order. It sounds a bit weird like this, but it actually demands a sort of conformity from a higher and much more inclusive Spiritual vantage point.

*ND: Maybe in terms of demanding order in the Spiral?*

**CP:** Definitely. I know in the Spiral Dynamics model it gets a bit speculative out there but this would be, what we are trying to establish here, a consciousness from the level of Teal.

*ND: So in using Ken Wilber's model this would then be the level of subtle consciousness.*

**CP:** Yes. Consciousness here is beyond the level of worldcentric and is actually consciousness-centric, or Kosmo-centric, or God-centric if you like to use those terms.

*ND: So from a four-quadrant perspective, this would be an intuitable or manifest subtle call arising within ourselves i.e. within the Upper Left quadrant, calling on us to evolve from wherever level we are at.*

**CP:** Definitely.

*ND: What else are we trying to do from this four-quadrant perspective in regards to intersubjective consciousness?*

**CP:** Well – definitely we are doing something very powerful in the Lower Left intersubjective quadrant. And the more I think of what is needed it is to really start establishing this in the Lower Right quadrant as well, because as Ken Wilber always says, no revolution will really succeed unless it has a very strong Lower Right element. So this has to do with the manifestation of what we are talking about in the interobjective world so that this doesn't remain just a nice spiritual experience between like-minded groups of people. That it actually has real world visible effects between people within the structures of society. That it actually becomes a cultural and social revolution. Otherwise if it isn't manifest in the Lower Right, it becomes in the end, just one more form of cultural narcissism, sort of titillating ourselves with experiments in consciousness. I mean, I don't feel that is the case, but I'm just saying that that is the part that is coming next.

The interesting thing is though that this is all coming out of actual experiences of people. It's not like we're trying to fit it in to something by saying this is a certain level in Spiral Dynamics. It's a more a case of going from the actual experiences gained over years with many people in many countries and then wondering, "What is going on here?" and asking, "What does this mean?" And then finding, "Well that's interesting, there seems to be a correlation with these other models or maps." And the interesting thing also is that there is this collective consciousness which would certainly fit in with this third tier view, although that is not clearly worked out, I know, because there is not much research done on that. There isn't a lot of data on what it could look like. It has tended to be an Upper Left occurrence with rare enlightened individuals few and far between, but not in the sense of a collective awakened consciousness and what that would mean between human beings. I can't prove that, but that's the sort of sense I get that there does seem to be some sort of correlation. I'm not an expert in Spiral Dynamics, but I feel Teal would demand order from a higher, more significant, point of view, not a "should" from we've got to fit in with some rules. But this is

like a "should" from a much deeper place; it's coming directly from this higher consciousness – a concern and demand from a higher level of order that everything fits in with, in ones life. So it does seem that there is a demand from this higher level for everything to conform to this.

## **11. Enquiring into deeper questions**

*ND: One of the questions I'm interested in pursuing using these integral models is the relationship between our own development and the level of problems we are dealing with. It would be reasonable to assume that most, if not all of the people that are now engaging in enlightened communication are working with problems created by levels of thinking in the first tier. We need a higher or deeper level of consciousness or complexity in our thinking in order to work with these problems and to better understand consciousness. As such we are very concerned in manifesting this next leap in consciousness and complexity of thinking that will be necessary on a cultural level in order to manage the level of problems that we have.*

*So I'm thinking about enlightened communication as being not just a new way to bring minds together, but being used to facilitate this next leap in consciousness as well. Implicit in that then is the question concerning what areas and questions we could apply enlightened communication to?*

**CP:** Well I think potentially we could apply it to anything. I have to say though that we haven't done so yet, but I don't see why not when we get willing individuals. At the moment it's more exploring what the sort of contours of this new consciousness looks like. Trying to get more familiar with it, find out what its qualities are, because although I'm saying that you can't keep repeating this, while it is ever new, there is always something fresh and new in this but there are similar features that keep emerging. And I feel that there is a lot to go into. So I would say that we are more at the moment focusing on what the implications of this collective consciousness are, because it's not separate from the individual. The individual is essential for it and yet it is something more than the individual. And that has a tremendous affect on our sense of self. Like answering the question: "Who are we when this level of collective consciousness manifests itself?" And of course, "What does it then mean to be a human being?"

It demands a different view of oneself and one's life and one's problems really. So it seems in answer to what you were saying, I think this level of consciousness itself starts to reconfigure our lives if we let it, if we have interest in it. Of course you can just have an experience of it and that could be, "Wow – this is something great!" But if you take the significance of it deeply then it actually means – it's like what Ken Wilber calls, a top-down model – one's life has to be reevaluated to fit in with this higher consciousness, implying sort of a shakedown into a new order.

I mean the way we look at things is pretty ancient really. We tend to approach all our problems from the point of view of the separate ego self, the separate individual, which has been great to develop us as far as we have. But the ego at this point has become like an evolutionary dead end for us. That now this degree of separation has enabled us to differentiate ourselves from our parents, from our tribe, from our church, from nature. It has enabled the Western enlightenment to occur and all sorts of extraordinary things. But it has now become disintegration; we have gone so far that it has become a pathology of individualisation, in terms of ego, "This is my life, I can do what I want with it, whenever I please, and no one tells me what to do."

*ND: And the pluralistic thinking GREEN meme has enabled that to go to an extreme.*

**CP:** Yes – at least for some of us. That’s really a sort of dead end, and we need something very different. We can’t continue to approach problems from that point of view. This is stopping us from coming up with new solutions that are going to match the extraordinarily and exponentially accelerating changes now occurring on every level. And this is because our emotional level, the level of *passion* we experience for caring and becoming committed and involved is still a bit Neolithic. By that I mean it no way comes close in matching, in its current level of development, the problems we need to face and the sort of agility and nimbleness and fluidity that will be required of us.

## **12. Enquiring into: What does it mean to be a human being?**

*ND: The complexity of thinking we are using falls very short of what is required?*

**CP:** Yes, the complexity and interactions, the constant changing, the flexibility, to be free, to be willing, not to go always by security, and by the needs of the ego to be affirmed. So enquiring into the potential of human beings, "What does it then mean to be a human being?" that’s what I think we will be touching on in these groups. The possibility of a network of consciousnesses that is so fast that things could be so fluid, where there is no inertia between minds; there’s nothing in the way of communication; it opens up the possibility of something exponentially faster. And we can learn from each other there, because the interesting thing is that when each person is speaking authentically – and the deeper we go, people let go and they speak from their deepest self – it’s not really a personal thing at all. What any one person says is always interesting to the other person, because really it is if you could have said that yourself. It’s like someone is articulating ones own deepest soul feeling. And in this setting we are all learning from each other. It doesn’t really matter who’s speaking in that sort of a communion. So I feel that the possibility is there that we could tackle all sorts of problems and find creative collective solutions that we probably would never have come across before. The possibilities are enormous, especially when some people are somewhat established in this and have some stability in this sort of consciousness.

## **13. Pushing the evolution of consciousness forward**

It is the speed of collective consciousness that we are aiming for, what Andrew Cohen calls evolutionary enlightenment. Evolutionary enlightenment in his terms is not something that an individual can have. You can’t get evolutionary enlightenment; you can’t have it as something you take home – "I’ve become enlightened in an evolutionary way." Because you can’t have it, something happens between people and in the context they come together. It’s a very impersonal phenomenon. It’s much more about a group of people coming together beyond the personal, being interested in the context of evolution of consciousness for it’s own sake. So in that sense it’s a very different movement. It gives a radically different context and meaning for being alive and it’s really focusing on the essence of creativity in human beings.

*ND: How do you feel that that is being pushed forward in these discussions?*

**CP:** Well by how sincere the participants are, is really how far it takes it really. And as I said, I feel we are only in the beginning stages of what we are doing. I feel we are really only scratching the surface of doing these sort of groups and definitely in a certain rarefied atmosphere.

## **14. What is enlightened communication based on?**

*ND: What is enlightened communication based on?*

**CP:** Well it is definitely based on the teachings of Andrew Cohen. For example he has developed a schematic model of reality, ([www.andrewcohen.org/teachings/model.asp](http://www.andrewcohen.org/teachings/model.asp)) of his teachings of what it means to live from and become the authentic self [Heaven], as opposed to a life based around the ego and its desires and fears [Hell]. And ultimately everything boils down to these two realities. We can believe in a reality that unfolds based on a sense of ego – in primarily there being a sense of separation, of it being all about me, "I'm a victim, it's always someone else's fault." But if we can be willing to say, "No – I am not a victim, it's actually up to me" then when that happens, and it only takes a split second, we take on a radically different view of reality, where we take responsibility for all our actions, and our true authenticity begins to emerge. This teaching model of his was based on experiences with many thousands of students over many years. The model wasn't created and then people's experiences got shoehorned in there in order to fit a nice spiritual model.

It is actually based on all the experiences as they were happening - and part of that is the necessity for the individual to deal with his or her compulsive sense of narcissism, at least to get a handle on it and to get it largely out of the picture. And Andrew has a whole teaching for dealing with the ego, (which is always the only obstacle to enlightenment), that he calls the five tenets.<sup>3</sup> And the experience has been that when someone does deal with their ego that what spontaneously emerges is this authentic self, and the higher qualities of this collective consciousness come about automatically when someone does that. And especially when someone gets the ego largely out of the way what emerges from that person is their authenticity, what Andrew calls their authentic self. And when a group of people meet together like that, what emerges are the qualities of what he calls the six principles<sup>4</sup> of evolutionary enlightenment which are really the qualities of this collective consciousness.

So what I am saying is that this was based on a tremendous amount of fieldwork, and now we have been experimenting more broadly with all sorts of people. It is based on a lot of field data, blood sweat and tears, with Andrew Cohen dealing with so many people over a period of some eighteen years, this is what emerged, these sort of universal principles. This is how things seem to work.

## **15. Dealing with ego by experiencing collective consciousness**

In order for this collective consciousness to be really established it does need people to deal with their egos. So that's on one hand, but this whole thing is not quite as linear as I am putting it because the most effective way of dealing with ones ego is to have an experience of this collective consciousness because then one really sees much more the true picture. And really at this point, the ego is seen clearly to be harmful to any further form of evolution and there's much more a sense of, "I want to deal with it because I care more about this bigger picture. I want something else to emerge that is much more important than me insisting on my right to do whatever I want whenever I feel like it", to sort of insist on ones full postmodern freedoms.

So I'm just saying that that's been some of the background to this. It's not like we have gotten together and had a few high experiences. It's based on a lot of work. But the interesting thing is that now people can come who have not necessarily been through all that and can

---

<sup>3</sup> Clarity of Intention, The Law of Volitionality, Face everything and avoid nothing, The truth of impersonality, and For the sake of the whole.

<sup>4</sup> Evolutionary tension, natural hierarchy, purity of motive, integrity of action, autonomy, and communion.

experience this emerging collective consciousness much easier, much more directly right away and that in a way people can get this sort of a view – can experience this higher meme right away. It doesn't mean necessarily that their centre of gravity is at that level, but the experience of that can give extraordinary conviction, motivation, inspiration, and reason why someone can change their life much quicker. Because it's not just going for some pie-in-the-sky like, "Oh there's some reward at the end." Because no, this is how human life can be, you get a direct experience of it.

I feel it's more powerful than the old traditional spiritual experience that you had for yourself, an individual subjective thing, but you never really know how real that is. Whereas collective consciousness is something that you experience intersubjectively between a group of people, it's undeniable.

*ND: The group experiences it?*

**CP:** Yes because you experience it and each person experiences it, and you know that they know.

*ND: Everybody is experiencing the same thing?*

**CP:** Yes because it directly flies in the face of all our beliefs, all our mistrust, all our cynicism, our separation, everything that we feel is wrong with life, it directly goes against that and says, "No – actually things can be radically different now." So that experience can accelerate people's evolution. I don't know how fast that might go because it seems that people can get this much quicker now than they ever could before. So I'm saying maybe people don't have to go through that long process. It seems that people are certainly experiencing this very quickly now rather than at the end of some long process.

## **16. Validating the authenticity of one mind**

*ND: I'd like to discuss our ability to check the validity of knowledge gained from these enquires into collective consciousness. If you remember, Ken Wilber talks about three strands that need to be followed in order to check the validity of all genuine knowledge and that each of the four quadrants has its own validity claim. The first strand is to perform the injunction or the experiment, i.e. follow a set of instructions. The second is to gather the interpretable data or apprehensions, i.e. engage in a practice. And the third is to compare the data or apprehensions with others who have completed the experiment, i.e. verify with others who have more adequately experience.*

*What you are doing here clearly follows these three strands for gathering data in the intersubjective quadrant.*

## **17. Is there a science to enlightened communication? How can we validate what happens?**

*And it is only when one has completed strands one and two that one can begin to engage authentically in discussing the validity of enlightened communication.*

*So it would seem then that the practice of enlightened communication follows these three strands in order for the individual and group to gain experience and verifiable knowledge concerning collective consciousness. And the exciting part is that this investigation and the knowledge gained are brought into real time. A group of people – which as a rule includes*

*experienced practitioners – are given a context, set of prerequisites and rules to follow. They then start engaging in enlightened communication and gather immediate experiences while the facilitator is guiding them in performing the injunction, i.e. set of instructions, rightly or wrongly. The individuals are then self-reflecting with the group, comparing what is being experienced within themselves with one another both during and after the event. The fact that participants are able to check their own experiences with a group of people immediately, mutually recognise the meaning and significance of it, and the fact that all of them perform the same injunction at the same time means that everyone essentially experiences the same event and therefore what is meant by one mind or the "collective becoming singular and the power of the many literally becoming one within an enlightened evolutionary context."*

*So in this sense each person can check the validity of what is happening and the objective truth of that statement, i.e. the validity of their practice, the experience of one mind, and the knowledge gained. In a sense each person, as well as the group, is checking to see if they are aligned with the evolutionary impulse – the authentic self.*

*We can compare this to talking with another group of people who have never engaged in carrying out these three strands of knowledge in regards to enlightened communication but wish to discuss it's validity. Now obviously they have no genuine knowledge accumulated upon which to enter into any debate. So until they engage in the three strands they have no epistemological basis for the claims they are making. What they are claiming is not authentic knowledge and can be disqualified.*

*So we see the three precepts for gaining valid knowledge being already applied to validate what is occurring, but we also see the possibility of applying more rigour to develop this level of communication as an integral science.*

**CP:** I haven't thought about it in these terms, but it makes sense what you are saying. If I understand you rightly we are actually carrying out these three strands, because we are definitely saying, "If you do this – then you have to do it this way, and you have to experience it yourself," and then people are reporting on these results and it is reproducible in another time, in another place, with another group of people.

**ND:** *That's right. Follow the precepts and you will reach the same knowledge.*

**CP:** And you're right, to an extent we probably haven't gathered the data in a strictly scientific way. But from all the experiences I have had with different people in different countries, and from other people I know who have been doing similar groups, the features are extraordinarily uniform. It doesn't mean that there isn't individual creativity; each thing is different, has a slightly different flavour, because we are talking about something alive and real. But the essential elements are always the same.

**ND:** *Like it's a universally accessible knowledge. Follow the three precepts and the results will be the same regardless of whether I carry out the experiment in Copenhagen or in London or in Sydney, I am still going to reach the same results.*

**CP:** Yes.

**ND:** *It's like if I look through a microscope at blood cells here or in the New York and follow the same procedure, the essential characteristics of what I see are still going to be the same.*

**CP:** Yes, we are doing that, and also to the extent of having gathered all sorts of testimonies from the people afterwards by asking questions about their experiences. We are recording what they are reporting afterwards, and what they are saying is all pointing in the same direction. We are definitely building a certain body of evidence for this phenomenon.

## **18. Facilitating a leap into the future**

*ND: Your description is very exciting because what we are witnessing is, I believe, an example of this leap from first tier to second tier, but from a top-down perspective that involves a shift from our ego to our authentic self. It also seems that enlightened communication can actually facilitate this leap on an experiential level. And as you were explaining, this is becoming easier to do, like for some reason, probably a combination of experience and also because the more people that do it actually seems to also have an effect, in a subtle dimension. So something happens whereby it seems to be easier for others to reproduce enlightened communication. Because more and more people have been doing it – taking this leap.*

*And if this is true then the implication of it becomes very important regarding what we are doing as a culture, as more and more people start to leap from first tier or from GREEN up to YELLOW. Because if we're not in YELLOW as yet as a culture, and are working primarily bottom-up in order to leap then we will actually be preventing true potential from happening and filling whatever is built with pathology.*

*Returning to the question of maps. For sure these will be hierarchical and integral model, but an important question concerns the way in which we will be coming together to communicate with each other. And it seems then that enlightened communication would be one of the top-down ways that will be used as a way of facilitating coming together interpersonally in second tier, YELLOW and TURQUOISE. This is radically different from using a bottom-up ego based approach for coming together to discuss something in second tier.*

**CP:** That makes sense – yes.

## **19. Creating a Kosmic habit**

**CP:** Going back to what you have just brought up because my experience has been – because I do all these different groups in different countries, in different settings with different people – that the access, the emergence of this sort of consciousness gets much easier all the time. And I'm noticing that – there are blips in it certainly – but there is an irrefutable feeling when I look at it, of it becoming easier. I don't think it's – well I might be getting more skilled in it – but I don't think that is the main factor at all. I think it has infinitely more to do with that something is actually being created in consciousness itself. And when I first thought of this, it actually sort of quite floored me, because I never thought of consciousness as being that impersonal, that vast.

I used to think, okay if individuals work with a group then the group gets better at it, and gets more facility in it. But what I'm finding now is that, increasingly, people without any experience whatsoever can participate and can have access to this higher consciousness. They are actually able to see the significance of it much quicker than people would six months back or a year before that. So there is this continual progression and it doesn't matter where it happens.

To me this points to the idea that something is literally starting to be created in consciousness itself, like we are leaving some sort of mark. And as it's a new level of consciousness it's much easier for others to take part and create because it's been done before.

It literally seems, what Ken Wilber would say, the very start of something that could later become a Kosmic habit, which is something like Rupert Sheldrake's morphogenetic fields.<sup>5</sup> This means that consciousness is really unitary and not something local. So in that sense when you start to see that – it's one thing to talk about, "Yes I'm interested in the evolution of consciousness", but when you actually see that – then what I'm saying is literally true.

It means that what one is doing, ones own efforts, and striving, and success is actually making it easier for all those anywhere else. So it gives a very different view on things when you start to use that top-down perspective. It's not just some big metaphor for the evolution of consciousness to try to give you a good feeling that you are doing it for the benefit of all. But it actually literally is for the evolution of consciousness itself.

## **20. A sense of awe and responsibility**

*ND: For sure and I think this is very different than reaching second tier while still being stuck in ego, a position that we have had up until now in each of the previous levels. I mean the possibility is that we can choose to create a "groove" for people to reach second tier and still remain stuck in ego. While there is this other choice, this top-down possibility of choosing to make a "groove" or second tier Kosmic habit that is characterized by being aligned with the authentic self.*

**CP:** Wow yes.

*ND: So if we are like in the forefront of going from first to second tier, with many following in our steps, then it's going to be extremely important for us to decide which path to take.*

**CP:** Well certainly it makes sense to me. I know that Ken Wilber has written a fair bit about this and I've read some of his web site material. And in choosing what we create you can get some pretty twisted versions. We can make something new that will have pathology in it from the start.

*ND: That's right. So if we want culture to evolve, then we would want to be as aware as we possibly could to avoid as much pathology as possible.*

**CP:** Yes.

*ND: We actually have a huge responsibility. We could choose to introduce second tier from this ego perspective or we could choose to do it from the authentic self perspective. The implications are enormous.*

**CP:** Yes.

---

<sup>5</sup> "The more anybody "plugs into" the higher, transcendental, and actual archetypes, lying now as structural potentials, the easier it is for subsequent individuals to likewise "plug in"; and that is what the great past heroes of the transpersonal have done. But what *they* were plugging into was *not* mere past common and typical and repetitive patterns, but the future and higher possibilities. They inherited the future, not the past." Ken Wilber, *Sex Ecology Spirituality - The Spirit of Evolution*. p594 (1995).

*ND: I also feel that the meeting up of Ken Wilber, Don Beck and Andrew Cohen is having a big influence on how we decide to take this leap.*

**CP:** Yes – well if you start seeing things like that it gives one a sense of awe and responsibility. It gives it much more import. It's not at all about oneself and how one feels, "Did I have a good group, did I enjoy myself?" And it's not about any grandiose sense of thinking, "Aren't I or we wonderful for doing this." Or, "Hey look at what we are doing." But actually seeing it as, "There's actually a tremendous significance and responsibility in what we are doing." "We are actually trying to create something for the future." And we are doing this now from a very different motive that is coming from a very different direction.

But we are striving trying to push the edge and to make it as integral as possible because we are responsible for what is created in the future. That is part of this whole idea of what Ken Wilber talks about these days as postmetaphysical spirituality. It's not like there is anything already laid out for us. And on one hand when you let that in it's seems like there is a great abyss. There's nothing there, it's a bit like, "Oh my God." But then actually it's incredibly empowering and thrilling because it means that we are literally the authors of our own future development and what happens is up to us. There is nothing else out there, it's going to be what we and other people like us make of it. And that what we and other people whoever's pushing this edge, or trying to, is going to determine what becomes the common place, the fixed levels of development eventually for future people, so it's quite a thing.

*ND: Yes it's fantastically thrilling and at the same time awe inspiring and humbling.*

**CP:** Yes.

## **21. It's time to liberate what we already know**

*ND: Lets turn now to how we can possibly use enlightened communication as a way of coming together in second tier. How could we use this new science of intersubjective consciousness? As I think I mentioned before to you, it may open a whole new field for gaining knowledge.*

**CP:** Yes definitely.

*ND: We are coming without already knowing. It's definitely nothing like how we have up until now looked through what is already known in order to create or build something new. It's like we are coming together as a group of people to explore something without all this pre-knowledge about how something should be. I mean it would be very thrilling. I mean, for example, imagine a group of people with lots of experience in the field of education, but they are now coming to the topic with a blank page, with a freshness and eagerness to know. They are entering the discussion without knowing what they or anybody else is going to say.*

**CP:** Well I think it is extraordinary then. In a way I feel like we are still in a laboratory with this. And although we haven't applied it as yet in any sort of larger scale I feel it offers extraordinary possibilities. Like you were saying, you were picturing some people coming together like this who already have a lot of knowledge, but then I think the beauty of this way of coming together, this sort of consciousness, is that it liberates people's potential and it liberates what they already do know.

*ND: Which is what is necessary.*

## **22. Not knowing and drawing on everything we already know**

**CP:** When we say not knowing, it doesn't mean we have to be stupid and pretend we don't know anything. We don't have to invent the wheel again. It's just that we are not only limited to what we already know. We are more interested in something new. But in that we can draw on everything we do know, which is already there. And I think the fascinating thing is that all that we really do know is accessible when we need it. It's like the human brain and the mind can serve us as it was meant to because for most of us it's a sort of a mixed blessing. Some people hold rigidly to the rational and don't believe anything else – just go with the mind. In a way that's a sort of perversion of the mind really to value it exclusively over everything else so we deny anything else but what is rational and logical. We have gotten so tied up in the mind, or more accurately with the ego, which acts like glue on our mental functioning; ego being that compulsive sense to insist on oneself being separate, and to make everything about oneself. Ego is more like a spanner in the works of anything very creative and higher happening.

*ND: And even if we have a very intelligent brain, what is required is something very different to happen, or to emerge and take form within this group.*

*Imagine if we could bring a group of minds together with knowledge in a particular field such as education and explore a question like, "What is integral education?" Or, "What does it mean to be a parent?"*

**CP:** Right.

*ND: So it's a higher level of consciousness that is going to take form because this group of minds that engage in enlightened communication are going to create a vehicle for it to happen. They will actively want to evolve and push a creative edge.*

## **23. Seeing the big picture and being grounded in reality**

**CP:** Right and the interesting thing that I've found concerning the practical application of this consciousness, say in our organisation – in terms of like dealing with practical things like the financial situation of an organisation – is how to meet different priorities, like how to deal with shortages of money. It's not like we are talking about highfaluting things but the fascinating thing is that there is a new way of meeting that we are discovering that I feel does reflect this. There is vision to it and a focus but also at the same time, and inseparable from it, there is a practical side of, "No – we've got to have results – it's got to work." And as I was saying before there's something in this consciousness that doesn't seem inherently like we just want to go off into the clouds and have big raves, because it's easy to have a lot of wonderful ideas and then do nothing. And in the end that becomes narcissistic because it doesn't deliver anything. In the end you are just left with a lot of fancy ideas that amount to nothing more than narcissism.

So it seems to be that when this sort of consciousness enlivens people, and they start meeting together, there's a strong sense of, "No – we've got to nail things down, get it practical and do things as well." But this urgency is now informed by intersubjective consciousness, whereas up until now the two haven't gone together very well at all. Often people either have a big view or big picture but it's not grounded in reality, so nothing happens or it can be that people focus on the practical and there is no real overarching vision to it. It's often one or the other. And to my mind what I have seen is that this higher consciousness seems to inherently

include both of those at the same time. That's what I meant when I said there is a certain order that is demanded from this consciousness – you want this sort of order. You don't want to just stay in big ideas. It demands application – it's got to be manifest. Part of this whole evolutionary movement is that it has got to be manifest in form between people in the world. There seems to be an imperative that seems to be coming through us and through this consciousness – when I say this consciousness – I mean we want it. It's hard to distinguish, as it's now becoming the same thing, what it wants and what we want are essentially one and the same.

*ND: It's literally the process of the many becoming one, of one mind manifesting itself.*

**CP:** Exactly. What I'm saying is that we don't have an awful lot of experience in this as yet, but from my experience I see this is the sort of direction we are headed. I think that what you're pointing to could be of enormous potential and significance in tackling real problems, questioning how to go forward and how to find new ways of doing things. It could be leadership, education, conflict resolution, and healthcare. It could be done with any groupings really – I don't see why it shouldn't be.

## **24. Applying an impersonal perspective to personal problems**

*ND: How could a group of people come together to discuss personal problems and conflicts using an impersonal perspective? Does it even make sense?*

**CP:** Definitely it does. I think that it can very easily be used for that. Because I think the main problem with personal problems is that they are so personal. That's the main problem with them that we don't have a top-down perspective on them. That's why they're such big problems. It doesn't mean that with some high consciousness there still won't be personal problems. There could well be, but they won't be so big in consciousness that we are prohibited from seeing anything else.

Because the problem is we don't really see others, or the whole picture objectively. But because our own feelings and opinions loom so large we largely only see our own feelings, our own needs and how it affects us and we see other people through that filter. So it's very hard to come to any solution unless it's some sort of compromise. What I mean is, if our concern is not primarily on ourselves – which is what this collective intelligence is all about – then the whole is always more important than my individual needs. So that already gives a different value system. It's actually a whole different morality; it's a whole different way of being. So it's always more important that the whole goes forward – focusing on what's best for the whole. What is most conducive for evolution becomes more important to us. And surprisingly enough we actually start to develop an emotional compass where the direction we need to take as a collective becomes very clear.

In that way I think personal problems can be solved so much quicker because there's no longer the same personal investment in them. Instead we become interested in wanting to solve them for the highest good.

*ND: Can you give an example of how that might sound?*

**CP:** Well I think it's possible to just address these personal conflicts straight away, by just being simple and straight forward. There is no need to beat around the bush because if two or

more individuals who are involved are interested in this it's just a matter of them addressing it simply and there is actually no reason for it not to be resolved.

*ND: Simplicity on the other side of complexity?*

**CP:** Exactly.

## **25. Applying an impersonal perspective to sociocultural conflicts**

*ND: How would you introduce an impersonal perspective to a group of people who were new to this?*

**CP:** Well it's going to be interesting to see how. I don't know how far that is going to work. We have come to groups who definitely have very contrary or cynical viewpoints, or very much argumentative, or don't like this or that about it. And actually I've seen people transform within a matter of minutes or during the course of a group discussion over one and a half hours. I've seen a lot of big shifts in people like that.

*ND: So the conflict can be that of having trouble with a particular frame of mind?*

**CP:** Yes or not liking what's going on, or coming along and then taking issue with that they don't like this or don't believe in that. Or, "This is rubbish, what are you talking about!" and that sort of thing. And I have seen that dissolve quite easily. But already these are people who have some interest otherwise they wouldn't come along. I'm not suggesting that you could suddenly go in and bring Ariel Sharon and Yassir Arafat together and say, "Oh yes, we've got collective consciousness here!" I'm not naive. So I think there is a lot further to go in these situations.

I mean I don't really know quite how it would apply to these very challenging situations but I know it can apply. Definitely in terms of people who have some interest and receptivity and want to go further even though they may not know about this sort of approach. I don't see why that couldn't help a lot. Obviously it's a more difficult thing to introduce if you've got people at each other throats. It might not have any affect at all and they would most probably laugh at you.

*ND: Or kill you!*

**CP:** Exactly – I can't imagine quite suddenly bringing this to Palestine or Iraq and telling them "Stop – no, you shouldn't be doing suicide bombing" and expecting them to say, "Oh yes – that's right we are already together in collective consciousness! We'll stop it right away!"

*ND: In fact what you are pointing to is our ability to recognise this natural hierarchy of different levels of consciousness being in conflict with each other.*

**CP:** Yes that's right, this has to be appreciated.

## **26. Enlightened communication at the cutting edge of integral leadership**

*ND: It would seem then that if we are using an integral map to understand unfolding levels of consciousness then enlightened communication would be more suitable for people at higher levels to come together, or whom at east where interested.*

**CP:** Yes definitely, that's true; interest is a key factor as I said before.

*ND: So that in certain situations enlightened communication is more suitable than other methods. Whereas at another position on the integral map, such as in meeting RED tyrannical egocentric warlords, other more appropriate methods will be necessary.*

**CP:** Yes that's exactly the point. A lot of the people who are at the cutting edge and who have a lot of potential influence – who determine the way things are going potentially – could be amenable for this sort of approach.

*ND: So it's going to be very applicable to this group of leaders?*

**CP:** Yes – although it may well not be directly applicable to a lot of people in the world it will be applicable to quite a few people who are in positions of influence in determining where the world goes.

*ND: Wouldn't you think then that it would be very applicable for those people, those integral leaders now moving from GREEN to YELLOW...*

**CP:** Definitely.

*ND: More so than those leaders centred in RED and BLUE?*

**CP:** Definitely yes. And obviously other people, the ones in narcissistic GREEN would just laugh at this. They say, "Why are you doing this." They would even be insulted and say, "What's this? How dare you do this?"

*ND: So those more centred in BLUE and ORANGE if they are not able to shift or are open in GREEN...*

**CP:** Probably not. No.

*ND: Wouldn't you agree then that it must very important for those people who are now interested in leaping into second tier to have the opportunity of coming together using enlightened communication rather than come together in a GREEN way?*

**CP:** Well I think so.

*ND: It's going to be impacting on how they see the world and relate to it.*

**CP:** Yes exactly.

*ND: Whereas it won't affect directly the levels of RED and BLUE, it could radically affect how people in YELLOW will relate to RED and BLUE.*

**CP:** Yes exactly.

*ND: Which is what you are saying.*

**CP:** Which in effect is a much higher level of leadership, understanding and leverage. It's true all that you are saying. It is higher this level of integral leadership it is applicable to. So of course it's not applicable to everyone. And it's interesting because I haven't really thought about it like this before. But it's true all that you are saying.

*ND: And as a collective then, this group will be impacting upon the culture they are imbedded in. So it would seem, from a Ken Wilber sense, that even though the GREEN meme has been around the fewest number of years, a global Kosmic habit for doing GREEN has already been formed. And ORANGE, as it's been around much longer, when people and whole cultures, as in China, reach ORANGE they do ORANGE in an very materialistic way. And for BLUE, when people come together in BLUE, the natural pattern is even more established. Where as in YELLOW...*

**CP:** It's very plastic isn't it?

*ND: Yes indeed. Like our discussion about the possibility and significance of deciding to enter second tier from either the position of ego or the authentic self and the experience of enlightened communication to help us appreciate the significance of that decision. It's been a fantastic experience to discuss this with you.*

Nick Drummond  
January 17, 2004