



11-7-2020

## Looking at Environmental Consciousness through the Lenses of Morphic Fields and Systems Theory

Johara Bellali

*California Institute of Integral Studies*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ciis.edu/cejournal>



Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#), [Cognition and Perception Commons](#), [Cognitive Psychology Commons](#), [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#), [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), [Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Ethnicity in Communication Commons](#), [Liberal Studies Commons](#), [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), [Social Psychology Commons](#), [Sociology of Culture Commons](#), [Sociology of Religion Commons](#), and the [Transpersonal Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Bellali, Johara (2020) "Looking at Environmental Consciousness through the Lenses of Morphic Fields and Systems Theory," *Journal of Conscious Evolution*: Vol. 16 : Iss. 1 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.ciis.edu/cejournal/vol16/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals and Newsletters at Digital Commons @ CIIS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Conscious Evolution by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ CIIS. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@ciis.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@ciis.edu).

# *Looking at Environmental Consciousness through the Lenses of Morphic Fields and Systems Theory*

Johara Bellali<sup>1</sup> (PhD Student)  
California Institute of Integral Studies

**Abstract:** This paper is an exploration of a space in which questions of self-determination and planetary crises can co-exist. It swims in uncomfortable seas of accepting that environmental consciousness is as innate as our existence, and at the same time not aligned to healthy ecosystems. In this paper, I will first explore environmental consciousness from an ecosystem perspective and present some self-organizing principles of our systems; then I will look into our perceptions, awareness, and sensing of them and finally propose an understanding of how the morphic fields in ecosystems and the creative flow of the life force co-exist in our environmental consciousness. The question driving this quest is why—if humans are co-creators of their system and there is an unfoldment of life—are we still destroying our ecosystems? Which enabling conditions are missing for our environmental consciousness to align with the vital impetus of life? I surmise that patterns, frequencies, and rhythms can support the alignment of our environmental consciousness with *l'élan vital*. The concluding section offers some concrete examples of programs, places, and novel ideas proposing different enabling environments.

Keywords: morphic fields, systems theory, complexity, ecosystems, environmental consciousness

## **Introduction**

The environment is not only something that is around me, it is also something inside me, the food I eat, the water I drink, the energy I absorb, and the memories I hold. I would struggle separating my being from my environment, the relationship with my environment is what allows my existence. Hence, I would define environmental consciousness as the awareness and understanding that one has of the ecosystem one is part of, and would not, as it is often done, reduce it to pro-environmental behavior (Jiménez Sánchez & Lafuente, 2010). Environmental consciousness is

perceived and written about from many different perspectives: consumption patterns, lifestyle, using energy efficiently, including recreational parks, and sustainable development

(<https://journals.sagepub.com/home/eab>).

Most of the time, the environment is an external consideration, usually a consideration *a posteriori* to pay attention to after the road is built, or the development pathway is designed. In my 18 years working on the broad concept of “sustainable development” and resilience—implementing UN environmental conventions (thegef.org), or creating permaculture schools in Somaliland, or supporting Governments in

---

<sup>1</sup> Correspondence: JBellali@mymail.ciis.edu

their low carbon transition —I have witnessed many contradictions and was torn by agonizing realities of how we govern our planet and its inhabitants.

In this paper, I will not focus on the psychological reason why we, as humanity, are not acting in front of the planet's sixth mass extinction which we created (Randers et al, 2018). I will not talk about climate change solutions, or the resilience of humanity, nor about the brain's capacity for innovation. In this paper, I take a step back and enter another temporal zone: reverse causality, *élan vital* (Bergson, 1907) and morphic resonance (Sheldrake, 1981). My world was literally turned upside down by the concept that the direction of causality can not only come from the past but also from the future (Abraham & Bruce Stewart, 1986; A. L. Combs, 2009; Sheldrake, 1984, 2009, 2012). This paper explores us, the human self-organizing system and our awareness of ourselves and our environmental consciousness using Capra and Luisi's Theories as presented in A Systems View of Life (2014). I will then make a leap and explore Sheldrake's groundbreaking Theory of Morphic Resonance and Attractor (1984, 2009) and ask: if systems are autopoietic, why are humans destroying the life-supporting systems? Can morphic resonance, the attractor and the vital impetus give us an explanation and a way forward?

### **Environmental Consciousness**

Environmental consciousness presupposes a connection with the beings around us. Often, in everyday life one can meet environmentally conscious people that place nature above the well-being of humans and forget about the unity of all beings. Others,

some climate scientists, and policy makers, relate to the environment through numbers, models, scenarios, and documents. Some, farmers and pastoralists for example, have an intimate relationship with their environment but might not see the long term impact of their daily actions. The difficulty with environmental consciousness is one of scale, boundaries, and timeframes—the distance that one feels in regard to the environment, the long-term repercussions of decisions, the trade-offs, and feedback loops. Basically, the temporal and spatial nature of environmental consciousness makes it particularly difficult to capture and even more so to reduce to a linear evolution. The nested characteristic of environmental systems, also called ecosystems, point towards systems theory as a framework to give it meaning.

### **Ecology and Ecosystem Ecology**

Ecosystems can be as large as the biosphere, or as small as micro-organisms. The key point is that “all together they form a self-regulating planetary system” (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 344). In this chapter, I first explore this important point of self-regulation.

As an introduction, I define the concept of ecosystem. According to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment ([MEA], 2005), an ecosystem is “a dynamic complex of plant, animal, and microorganism communities and the nonliving environment interacting as a functional unit. Humans are an integral part of ecosystems” (p.v). In my view, environmental consciousness is linked to the capacity to *relate to ecosystems*. The second exploration of this section is the nature of *relation(ship)*.

One important concept in the MEA definition on ecosystems is *functional unit*; it presupposes unity and in biology, complex

self-organizing processes (B. R. Johnson & Lam, 2010). I call it *unity in diversity*. In ecology, these functional units are nested within each other: “A basic principle of ecology is the recognition that ecosystems, like all living systems, form multi-level structures of systems *nesting* within other systems” (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 344). In the same vein as the concept of biological holons, defined by Koestler (1967) as “self-regulating open systems which display both the autonomous properties of wholes and the dependent properties of parts” (Koestler, 1967), “systems nesting within other systems” (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 344) is a good image for us to carry on our journey. Therefore, I focus on these two points that seem important for our understanding of the link a human being can have with the broader planetary system: the *nested* characteristic and the *self-organizing* processes.

### The Planet as an Autopoietic System

According to Capra and Luisi (2015), an autopoietic unit can be defined as “a system capable of sustaining itself due to a network of reactions which continuously regenerate the components—and this from within a boundary ‘of its own making’” (p.130). The unit has all the information it needs within its boundaries and more than that, it also includes knowledge of the larger system: Morin (1999) explained that

just as each singular point of a hologram contains the totality of information of that which it represents, each singular cell, each singular individual contains hologrammatically the whole of which [they are] part and which is at the same time part of [them]. (p. 14)

This is a mind-boggling statement. Not only is the unit, let us say the ecosystem, capable of sustaining itself but its parts have the

knowledge of the whole. Therefore, I can conclude that the individual human within the ecosystem can access the knowledge of the whole ecosystem and that it sustains itself through a set of relationships with other elements of the ecosystem. Let us look further into the characteristics of these relationships.

### Ecology’s Principles of Self-Organization

In ecology and systems ecology, we realize that the elements of the system interact and determine *how* they interact. The system has rules, is dynamic, regenerative, and always in search for equilibrium—it self-organizes. Throughout ecosystems, from bacteria to humans to the water cycle, relationships in the ecosystems have common characteristics: interdependence, a cyclical nature, and contain feedback loops (Capra & Luisi, 2014).

### Interdependence

Interdependence refers to the concept of the web of life, in which “all members of an ecological community are interconnected in a vast and intricate network of relationships (Capra & Luisi, 2014). More than a passive connection of each element to each other, there is an active defining itself *through* the relationship. Not only does each element need the other, and depend on the other, it is defined by the characteristic of the relationship:

an emergent (authentic) whole comes into being in relationships through the act of participation (process)... The participating agents are not objective parts outside of the whole, rather they are subjective participants in the ‘co-dependent arising’ of self and world (part and whole). (Wahl, 2016)

The beauty of this concept is that it is through the relationships that emergence occurs, and that the *quality* of the relationship “produces” the quality of the emerging holon. I found it very inspiring and life changing when, listening to the famous ecofeminist Starhawk (Starhawk, 2006) I first came across the notion that the quality of the relationships has a creative power for the quality of an emergent new element. This notion coupled with my belief that we cannot control the outcome, but we can control the intention with which we do something had a deep impact on me. This simple realization inspires me to slow down and be attentive in not only *what*—but especially *how* I interact.

### ***Cyclical nature***

Observing nature and its systems, oneself, or the patterns one can see in the manifested and emergent elements, it is clear that the rhythm is not linear but cyclical; “Generally speaking, all systems with more than three interacting variables are complex dynamic systems and better described by non-linear mathematics and circular rather than linear causality” (Wahl, 2016). The elements are not only in relationship but in *partnership*, meaning that there is intent and exchange: “the cyclical exchanges of energy and resources in an ecosystem are sustained by pervasive cooperation.... In the memorable words of Margulis and Sagan ... ‘life did not take over the globe by combat but by networking’” (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 355). The partnership results in a carefully balanced system of food and waste, energy input and energy output, which sustains the regeneration of life. According to Sheldrake (2012), experiments have been made to prove that the energy intake in food and nutrients, equals the measured energy output in heat, waste, sweat, etc. It was surprisingly not the

case. There seemed to be another type of energy at play. The vitalists called it the *Life Force, l’Elan Vital or the Life Impetus* (Bergson, 2016; Sheldrake, 2012) I wonder if this has something to do with the quality of the relationship or the intention I was mentioning in the previous paragraph. Can a “pure intention” mean one that is aligned to the *life force*? Can the *life force* have an influence on intention, or the *quality* of the relationship that results in the emergence of a new element? These are questions that give me pause and make me think that in the interaction between the concept of *morphic resonance* and *life force*, lies a connection point.

### ***Feedback loops***

Feedback loops are necessary for regulating the system (Mitleton-Kelly, 2003). They are based on “information” that circulates through the different elements of the system. These can take many different forms, from the symbiotic association of fungi crawling around vast networks of rhizomes called mycorrhiza, the increase of water vapor to counter act the increase of temperature, or the discovery that bacteria themselves are couriers. Feedback loops mean that the system adapts, the system is in constant change and in constant re-balancing for an eternal dynamic equilibrium, however it can do so in surprising ways: “All complex dynamic systems are fundamentally unpredictable and uncontrollable” (Wahl, 2016). Sometimes systems reach tipping points or bifurcation points (Kaufmann, 1991; Mitleton-Kelly, 2003) meaning that the system finds a whole new state of equilibrium that is quite different to the preceding one. Figure 1, Planetary Boundaries, eludes to the risk of such tipping points on planet earth, we

will get back to this concept in a further section.

The importance of feedback loops for our topic is that the system, or ecosystem, already has an inbuilt mechanism that allows receiving, understanding, and action according to information that comes from other elements of the system, and very possibly from other nested ecosystems, or holons. I wonder, if a system has a spatial feedback loop, can it also have a temporal one, or even an a-temporal one?

In order to interact with elements of our ecosystem and other nested ecosystems, and in order to be aware of the quality of the relationship we have with them, and the emergent ones, we need to be able to perceive them. How do we perceive our environment?

### **Perceiving and Interacting with the Environment**

Faced with multiple converging crises—all of them rooted in what Gregory Bateson and Fritjof Capra first called a crisis of perception—humanity is challenged to redesign the human presence on Earth (Wahl, 2016, p.1).

#### **Awareness**

##### ***Temporal and Spatial Awareness***

The difficulty with the topic of environmental consciousness related for example to climate change, is that it links not only different time frames—the now and projected scenarios of the mid and long term future—but also necessitates a different spatial awareness—the here and the consequences of my action somewhere else on the planet; or the here and the ecosystem around the here. One needs to have a certain

level of abstraction-making coupled with the ability to look at the situation from the inside (me as an individual) and from the outside as if it is an object. Wilber (as cited in Combs, 2009), described these capacities as the eight perspectives or the eight zones; each quadrant of the AQAL framework, along the axes of interior/exterior and individual/collective, has additionally an inner and an outer perspective ((A. L. Combs, 2009, pp. 117–127) summing up to eight zones. Indeed, we experience our thoughts, our environment, our actions, our place from the inside and from the outside, and our memories or projections of them in eight ways: Combs states that “all of our conscious experience flows through these eight zones” (p. 122).

Recognizing these eight perspectives are important for building a relationship with our environment, could the eight zones model also point towards possible blind spots? Could it help us become more aware of the existence of a *life force* and help us make sense and categorize it?

For example, in the bottom right quadrant of the AQAL framework, the one that represents the collective/exterior, is there a relationship between the inner perspective of the system and the outer perspective of the system that can be explored through awareness?

Secondly, could we assume that these perspectives can also have a creative function? Combs (2009) stated that “it is only from the view of the inner experience that objective outer experience solidifies into the concrete objective world” (p. 115). Many traditional myths and sayings refer to the creative power of thought or language. This makes me wonder whether on top of the principle of emergence, there is also a

principle of direct manifestation and therefore a two-way process of creativity and creation between the individual and the system. As John Wheeler said: “The observer gives the world the power to come into being, through the very act of giving meaning to that world; in brief, no consciousness; no communicating community to establish meaning? Then no world!” (Gleiser, 2014)

### *Cumulative Awareness*

Being a complex system, with interdependence at many levels, and feedback loops, there are also compound effects, meaning a cumulation of awareness coming from different origins: near, far, past, present, future, holons—how is this all organized? How can a single individual in an ecosystem be able to make sense of all what it perceives? I often asked myself as I was working on integrated approaches to risk and adaptation to (climate and other) change, how do we monitor all the sources of information at the most local level to be able to predict times of crises so that we can organize preparation and mitigation activities before the disaster happens and not after. This is when I realized that the *compound effect* of different indicators such as health, mobility, food price, temperature, and precipitation, to give a few examples, is what gives a more realistic picture of the system at play. I wonder if the human system opens and closes some awareness pathways depending on the feedback loop it receives and probably other factors. What would happen if it opened the awareness of the morphic field and could process the information contained? Is that the yearning that one feels when in presence with an astonishing natural landscape? Or when one hikes for days on mountain tops? This feeling of being home? Is it what deep ecologists call the deep experience?

### *Cognition*

The prior section on self-organizing systems presented the capacity of a system to regenerate itself and that it has internal rules to do so, “In spite of this ongoing change, the organisms maintains its overall identity of pattern of organization” (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 255). We also saw that new elements can emerge at a higher order—which we can call development—or new structures can be created at the same order. What is fascinating is that it is the system itself which *decides* if and how it will change. According to the Santiago Theory of Cognition (Maturana & Varela, 1980): “cognition is not a representation of an independently existing world but rather a continual bringing forth of a world through the process of living” (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 255). There is a constant process of co-creation not only outwardly but also inwardly in the structures and relationships within the system. The All is there, but elements of the system decide if they want to be triggered by elements of it. I find this notion of utmost importance and I will want to delve further into it when I present Sheldrake’s work below on morphic resonance. But first, in order to engage with relationships within the system, it is necessary to present our ability to sense those relationships.

### *Sensing*

Sensing is a concept that is of importance to Otto Scharmer’s Theory U (Scharmer, 2018); he calls them Sensing Journeys and their aim is to “pull out of daily routines and to break-through patterns of seeing and listening by stepping into a different and relevant perspective and experience [and results in] increased awareness of the different aspects

of a system and their relationships” (Scharmer, n.d.).

I find the practice of sensing crucial in our relationship with our environment. We can sense the frequencies when we immerse ourselves in forests, rivers, and deserts; we can sense imbalances, and geographical areas. For example, whenever I am at the edge of a continent, in northern Morocco or in eastern Africa, I can sense the continent behind me. Sensing oneself in the broader existence of beings is crucial as it is an open door to understand our interconnectedness. It can counteract our impulse, when working on climate change issues for example, to objectify the environment:

There is a risk here that the transformations within the personal sphere will only be implemented in the practical sphere, turning intersubjective change into an object to be changed by imposing certain values and world views on others in a culturally invasive way (O’Brien, 2018, p. 157).

By sensing one self, and tuning into the sensing of people around, there lies a deeper understanding that comes from the body and not just the brain, other senses than the five used ones, and I would argue sensing aligns us with our capacity to decide which environmental information we want to let ourselves be triggered by. “Meadows argues that the most powerful leverage points of the system is the mindset or paradigm out of which the system—its goals, structure, rules, delays, parameters—arises” (O’Brien, 2018, p. 157). I would argue that the knowledge emanating from the body has a deep role to play.

### **Sensing the Planetary Boundaries.**

Leading research in earth systems carried out in the last two decades is the development of

nine *planetary boundaries* at the Stockholm Resilience Centre (Steffen et al., 2015) and is being continuously improved with new incoming data. A subsequent study commissioned by the Club of Rome and published in 2018, is calling for a deep shift in awareness and sensing: “ Given current trajectories, it seems very unlikely that SDGs [Sustainable Development Goals] within PBs [Planetary Boundaries] can be attained without a shift in mind-set and values broad enough to support the acceleration of transformational actions”. It would mean that the numerous appointed experts, advisors, and governments would be able to sense the earth systems and were aware of the relationship between their decisions and the systems at play. Sensing the planetary boundaries would mean to think systemically and make decisions having the largest scale in mind and being aware of all other triggers, feedback loops, consequences of different parts of the system. It is a feat of activating all eight, previously mentioned, Wilber’s perception zones simultaneously (A. L. Combs, 2009).

What if the human had the inherent ability to simultaneously activate the eight zones because it is part of a cognitive autopoietic system and therefore can inherently *know* which information it needs to be triggered by, which information is not important, and *sense* the system in its complex dynamic movement? What if we simply had it in us and *just* had to tune into it? This subjective ability has been proven in different experiences of altered states of consciousness induced by meditation, psychedelics, prayer, birthing. What if we accept that we are holons and that our inherent knowledge of our “past” lower order and our “future” higher order give us the necessary information to use our cognitive ability (i.e. a continual bringing

forth of a world through the process of living [Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 256])? I would now like to dig a little deeper and for that exploration, use Rupert Sheldrake's concepts of *morphic resonance* and *attractors*.

### Reverse Causality

In the first section of this paper (environmental consciousness), we looked at the properties and characteristics of ecology and systems ecology and our capacity as humans to perceive and interact with our environment. We surmised that our environment is an autopoietic system endowed with cognition and that our awareness, perception, and sensing of it can be an overwhelming experience. We proceeded with the question whether morphic resonance and attractors can help us, in Wahl's (2016) words "to respond to the complex and interconnected challenges we are facing" (p. 13).

### Morphic Fields and Morphic Resonance

Sheldrake explained in an interview with Otto Scharmer in 1999 (Sheldrake, n.d.), the properties of a morphic field:

They're probabilistic in the way they work, they're within and around the systems they organize. They have attractors in them. You can model many of their properties in terms of attractors, things which draw the system towards a particular form or goal or end state or end cycle or end structure. The morphic resonance is nonlocal in the sense that I'm suggesting that some of their systems come in from another one's cross-space or turn. The fields organize systems in a nested hierarchical way (para.III).

This informal interview gave a nice dynamic sense of what Sheldrake coined morphic resonance and fields (Sheldrake, 2009). For

many years—or the best of two decades actually—I was looking at what connects things together: For example, between one holon and another, what are the means of communication or resonance between nested systems? Morphic fields assume an actual invisible connection between the different elements, it is not just a structure. The connection depends on the morphic field and works at a distance. Like the relationship between elements of an ecosystem, we surmise a powerful interconnectedness from which new elements emerge and remember where they come from. We could relate this phenomenon to Jung's concept of the unconsciousness making itself known (as cited in Johnson, 1986). My hypothesis is that through morphic resonance our environmental consciousness responds to an echo of our place within our environment, not as stewards but as part of the web of life. Our cells, our brain structure, our morphic fields know that we are connected to the whole ecosystem. The holographic order in which the whole landscape is contained and enfolded in each of our cell (Combs & Holland, 2001; Morin, 2001; Sheldrake, 2012) signifies that the knowledge of the whole is active and informs us. Therefore, if we humans, as elements of the cognitive ecosystem, can decide which information we want to be triggered by, why are we co-creating and expressing ourselves as disconnected, amnesiac individuals of an ecosystem? We know but chose not to know. Are we creating a "new" habit of nature and pattern of thought in the super implicate order that disconnects us from our ecosystem and that is amplified through morphic resonance? The implication on our environmental consciousness would then be that it is important to reverse the tendency of disconnection from our ecosystems. What

could scenarios look like if this tendency continued?

Possibly, a dissonance between the embodied connected reality of our awareness, senses and perceptions with the whole and our “new habit” multiplied through morphic resonance of our disconnection; Or a split which would result in a non-material evolution of our human consciousness; Or would the morphic resonance of life force be so strong that it overtakes the “new” habit and pattern.

This last option makes me turn to another concept introduced earlier and in Sheldrake’s (1984) description of morphic fields: the *attractor*. I believe that development comes from the past and I can agree with the linear principle of cause and effect, although I would imagine it rather multi-dimensional than linear. Therefore, I can imagine that the ecosystem, or morphic field, is co-created by past relationships between elements in the system. What is fascinating here is that the properties of the holographic order—in which the whole is enfolded in the part—and the properties of the morphic field mean that there is an inherent knowledge in each part of the systems of what we are, how we relate to each other, and what influences us. This inherent knowledge drives—mostly unconsciously—our decisions and actions in our autopoietic and cognitive system. This means that as much as we are co-creating the next level order, we also *know* all we need to know to act accordingly. I would conclude that humanity is cognizant of its disconnection and that this disconnection serves a purpose in the self-organizing ecosystem that we are part of. The system’s own dynamics draw upon our decisions and actions; the *attractor* properties in the morphic field give sense, and I believe this sense is creativity.

## Elan Vital

We saw that ecosystems are autopoietic cognitive systems that decide which information they let themselves be triggered by in their unfoldment and for further elements to emerge in the system. We also saw that through the holographic order, each part of the system knows the whole system; and finally, that when a higher order system emerges, the knowledge of the lower order system is kept and transmitted through a non-local dynamic habit called morphic resonance. Now, the theories of Bergson, and Whitehead, and the experimental proofs of Lippitt (Sheldrake, 2012) showed that causation does not only happen from the past to the future, but causation also happens from the future to the past. According to Whitehead (as cited in Sheldrake, 2012)

All self-organizing material systems have a mental as well as a physical aspect. Their minds relate them to their future goals and are shaped by memories of their past, both individual and collective. The relationship of minds to bodies has more to do with time than space. Minds chose among possible futures and mental causation runs in the opposite direction from energetic causation, from virtual futures towards the past, rather than from the past towards the future (Sheldrake, 2012).

In bringing these different concepts back to our topic of environmental consciousness, an individual has the capacity to perceive the morphic field of the ecosystem it lives in whilst simultaneously *choosing* the potential future it is attracted to. However, a good amount of this perception is unconscious such as when one drives a car, one perceives the constantly changing streams of information, but it is translated in habits. So why does systems theory and morphic resonance matter? As Wahl (2016) stated:

In order to respond appropriately to the complex and interconnected challenges we are facing - as one species - we urgently need to understand the nature of participatory wholeness. This will inform how we can facilitate the emergence of healthy wholes within wholes. (p. 13)

We need to make the unconscious habits carried through our relationship with our ecosystem conscious and re-align them with the information we are receiving from future causality. This convergence can help us reinstate our place within the web of life and participate in the co-creation of healthy wholes. Indeed, using Whitehead's (as cited in Sheldrake, 2012) concept of *prehension*, "the individual selects what aspects of the past it brings into its physical being in the present, and chooses among the possibilities to determine its future" (Sheldrake, 2012). Individuals are truly co-creators of the physical realities in our ecosystem, but co-creator with whom? Several theories point to the existence of what Bergson first coined in 1907 *l'élan vital*, translated in English as a vital impetus. Bergson would further state that "the ultimate goal is the unfolding of creativity" (Sheldrake, 2012). The concept of unfolding of creativity, is found in Jung's (as cited in Johnson, 1986) work on unconsciousness manifesting itself into consciousness and of several mystical traditions such as Sufism and Kabbalah.

Every manifestation is unique and essential albeit on a spectrum of (un)consciousness. This means that by participating in the unfoldment of unconsciousness, we as human beings can shape the higher order by bringing the patterns of morphic resonances in our awareness and perceive, feel, and comprehend, the attractors creativity. In his work with Krippner, Combs (2009) explored

different states of consciousness and complexity and concluded that

each state of consciousness has certain characteristic that work in synchrony to create the overall experience of that state ... we view each state of consciousness as an attractor, which in chaos theory means a pattern of activity that a system ... is naturally drawn into by its own dynamics (p. 53).

For environmental consciousness, ecosystem-based patterns (such as fractals, golden ratios, and other nature-based discoveries found in the field of biomimicry and traditional knowledge) can be brought forwards into the collective consciousness of our human species. Also, vibratory patterns, frequency patterns, rhythms need to be actively reinstated as foci of our collective consciousness. The aim is to feed habits in the morphic field that are aligned to the vital impetus.

### Inner and Outer Work

In this final section, I would like to draw attention to concrete ways this alignment is being done. First, many beautiful programs responding to the planetary crisis have a similar principle illustrated here in Wahl's (2016) words: "we need to understand that life is a fundamentally interconnected whole—a process of 'interbeing' that we have conceptually separated into organisms and species" (Wahl, 2016). In my work and inquiry on environmental action, I was often looking for the enabling conditions for this type of awareness—sensing the connection between elements—to rise. Creating the enabling environment for these multi-interactions to happen for emergence to occur with the quality intended; aligned with the creative force of the attractor and sensing the morphic field within each.

The current Gaia Journey (Presencing Institute, n.d.) proposed by the U lab team is bringing together many of the individual and collective work necessary. Additionally, Bruce Clarke present a concrete enterprise: the research program Gaian Systems: The Planetary Cognition Lab (Clarke, n.d.) with the aim to “perfect social mediations to produce and maintain networked individual sentience concerning planetary connectedness”. Gaia education, Schumacher college, The Active Hope work of Macy and Johnstone (Macy & Johnstone, 2012), and multiple eco-villages throughout the world try to propose concrete blueprints and models. These are fringe work, but according to Sheldrake (2009) every habit creating pattern does expand, globally.

### **Interconnected Models**

There are also processes that work hand in hand and align different spheres such as the role of women and the role of the environment in the collective consciousness.

The consistent linking of personal and political, in there and outer, is a feature of ecofeminist environmental work. Much of women's political activity has gone hand in hand with attention to psychological growth, usually undertaken in consciousness raising sessions with a re-sisterly support group. This kind of revolutionary strategy entails a profound existential commitment (Salleh et al., 1997/2017).

And there is interesting work being done to link existing dominant patterns of thinking such as economics with systemic thinking, for example the Doughnut economics that was developed by Kate Raworth (Raworth, n.d.) who focuses on matching “life’s essentials (from food and housing to

healthcare and political voice), ... with Earth’s life-supporting systems” (para.1). Amsterdam is the first city who has adopted this model to inform the post COVID development of policies and action plans (Raworth, n.d.). As we see, practical models, informed by systems thinking are emerging in mainstream discourses and inspire people. Without needing to know of it, morphic fields can then do their behind the scenes work and multiply and ease the uptake of these higher order realities.

### **Conclusion**

There is a real difficulty in systemic thinking and integral consciousness, in my view, to operationalize actions at a large scale. As soon as the thinking becomes tangible, operational, or concrete, the systemic and integral depth seems to go to the background. It is as if the systems and integral perspectives need to be the frame of reference, the lens through which one looks and acts, an attitude, and with this attitude, one acts differently. But, if the concrete solution would be presented as such, in an “objectified” way without touching the attitude behind it, then the difference to a mechanistic approach would hardly be noticeable. In conclusion, I would offer my trust in the power of the behind the scene players, namely the morphic fields and attractors, to unconsciously guide us—the elements in the ecosystems—to carry on seeking alignment with them. As Grossinger (2020) proposed: “Reality is a thoughtform where sentient beings collaborate to bring about a concrete realm vibrating at their own frequency”. I want to believe in this collaboration.

## References

- Abraham, R. H., & Bruce Stewart, H. (1986). A chaotic blue sky catastrophe in forced relaxation oscillations. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 21(2), 394–400.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789\(86\)90013-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(86)90013-8)
- Bergson, H. (2016). *Creative evolution*.
- Capra, F., & Luisi, P. L. (2014). *A Systems View of Life*. Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, B. (2011). Steps to an Ecology of Systems: Whole Earth and Systemic Holism. In H. Bergthaller & C. Schinko (Eds.), *Addressing Modernity*. Brill | Rodopi.  
[https://doi.org/10.1163/9789042032583\\_012](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789042032583_012)
- Clarke, n.d. *Gaian Systems: The Planetary Cognition Lab*. [www.gaian.systems](http://www.gaian.systems)
- Combs, A. (2002). *The radiance of being: Understanding the grand integral vision: living the integral life* (2nd ed). Paragon House.
- Combs, A., & Holland, M. (2001). *Synchronicity: Through the eyes of science, myth, and the trickster* (3rd ed.). Marlowe.
- Combs, A. L. (2009). *Consciousness Explained Better*. Paragon House.
- Gleiser, M. (2014). *The island of knowledge: The limits of science and the search for meaning*. Basic Books, a member of the Perseus Books Group.
- Grossinger, R. (2020). *Bottoming out the universe: Why there is something rather than nothing*. Park Street Press.
- Jiménez Sánchez, M., & Lafuente, R. (2010). Defining and measuring environmental consciousness. *Revista Internacional de Sociología*, 68(3), 731–755.  
<https://doi.org/10.3989/ris.2008.11.03>
- Johnson, B. R., & Lam, S. K. (2010). Self-organization, Natural Selection, and Evolution: Cellular Hardware and Genetic Software. *BioScience*, 60(11), 879–885.  
<https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2010.60.11.4>
- Johnson, R. A. (1986). *Inner Work: Using dreams and active imagination for personal growth*. Harper Collins.
- Macy, J., & Johnstone, C. (2012). *Active hope: How to face the mess we're in without going crazy*. New World Library.
- Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The realization of the living*. D. Reidel Pub. Co.

- Mitleton-Kelly, E. (Ed.). (2003). *Complex systems and evolutionary perspectives on organisations: The application of complexity theory to organisations* (1st ed). Pergamon.
- Morin, E. (2001). *Seven complex lessons in education for the future*. UNESCO.
- O'Brien, K. (2018). Is the 1.5°C target possible? Exploring the three spheres of transformation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 31, 153–160.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2018.04.010>
- Randers, et al (2018). *Transformation Is Feasible: How to Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals Within Planetary Boundaries*. Stockholm Resilience Centre.
- Raworth, K.(n.d.) *Doughnut Economics*. [www.kateraworth.org](http://www.kateraworth.org)
- Salleh, A., Shiva, V., & Clark, J. (2017). *Ecofeminism as politics: Nature, Marx and the post modern* (Second edition, this edition was published in 2017). Zed Books.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2018). *The essentials of Theory U: Core principles and applications* (First edition). BK, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., a BK Business book.
- Sheldrake, R. (1984). *A new science of life: The hypothesis of formative causation*.
- Sheldrake, R. (2009). *Morphic Resonance: The nature of formative causation* (Fourth). Park Street Press.
- Sheldrake, R. (2012). *The science delusion: Freeing the spirit of enquiry*. Coronet.
- Starhawk. (2006). *Earth magic*. Sounds True.
- Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockstrom, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S. R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C. A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G. M., Persson, L. M., Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., & Sorlin, S. (2015). Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*, 347(6223), 1259855–1259855. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855>
- Wahl, D. C. (2016). *Designing regenerative cultures*. Triarchy Press.