

**Arriving in the Future: The Utopia of Here and Now in the Work of
Modern-Day Mystics From Eric Fromm to Eckhart Tolle**

Thomas Reuter

Introduction: Whither Now, Utopia?

The great appeal of modern utopian and dystopian literature seems to be that it provides authors and readers with the liberty to engage in imaginative, playful reflection on the flow of time, and on where this flow might be taking us all. But appearances can be deceptive, we are told. Psychoanalysts rightly warn that authors' utopian imaginings most likely include projections of their own unique personal fears, hopes and other expectations upon the blank canvas of an unknown future. Social scientists and historians will tell us there is more to this determinism than individual projection. They rightly argue that people are always intricately interconnected, and that their personal outlook thus reflects the shared "social imaginary" of the culture, society and historical period in which they find themselves embedded. Therein lies the relevance of utopian writing for both the study of different cultures and historical epochs as well as their cultural and historical limitations. Together, psychological and social determinisms suggest that utopian literature is an interesting specimen for analysis, from which

we may learn more about our specific psychological, cultural and historical conditioning but which fails to deliver us to a place beyond such conditioning. Indeed, such a perspective sheds doubt on our very capacity to fashion a future of our own design. I beg to differ. I argue that utopian writing contains an intrinsic element of creative insight which provides momentary glimpses of a future that is not anticipated but ours to create, and even more importantly (though perhaps also more rarely), a capacity for visionary experience that altogether escapes the limitations of psycho-social conditioning and the horizon of intellectual scrutiny. In order to illustrate this, I will be examining a special branch of utopianism which directly addresses the problem of conditioning and psycho-social determinism.

If in this essay I begin by asking “wither utopia?” and, by implication, “wither the world?”, it indicates that I am adopting a cultural-historical perspective. I would like to argue, on both historical and cultural grounds, that tectonic societal shifts have radically transformed the life experience of utopian writers and their readers in today’s world, and that these new experiences are encouraging the popular rise of a variant of utopian imagination that is less constrained by cultural and psychological conditioning.

After some preliminary reflections on the nature of this historical moment, I will explore an age-old mystical utopianism that has permuted to enter mainstream popular culture over the past half century, and promotes a radically different utopian vision based explicitly on the idea of achieving freedom from past conditioning as well as freedom from future projections. In short, the proposal of this utopianism is for a new, post-modern utopia in the Now. In that sense, what I shall be describing is a post-utopian movement. Given that the proponents of this post-utopian vision tend to reject mental speculation about, and emotional preoccupation with, the future, their work, unfortunately, has not been widely recognised or classified as utopian until now, and the aim of the present contribution is to remedy this situation.

Analysis of utopian texts in general provides excellent opportunities for social scientists to study tectonic historical shifts in what Lacan and Castoriadis refer to as “the social imaginary” or in what anthropologists like Clifford Geertz more modestly refer to as culture.¹ It is important to recognise from the outset that the history of “the” social imaginary is not a single history, as many Western social theorists quietly seem to assume. Rather, there always have been and still are many thousands of different cultures that all foster distinct ways of imagining oneself, the world, its history and the future, reflecting and informing fundamental and important differences in the contents of their cosmologies. More important still, the fact that this cross-cultural diversity exists is now evident to almost everyone on the

planet. As a consequence of the worldwide information networking and increased mobility of humanity, commonly referred to as “globalisation,” exposure to cultural difference and to a vast, culturally diverse array of social imaginaries and cosmologies has come to define the experience of people in the late modern world, in the West and everywhere else. We are now all exposed to a cacophony of ‘imaginaries’ or ‘cultures’ contesting for our attention, and to some a singular authoritative collective vision of the past or the future may seem inconceivable under these circumstances, or undesirable for other reasons, even though, as a global society faced with global issues, developing such a common vision would seem essential and urgent. On what cultural feet would such a vision stand? And if it were to be cultureless, how would that be conceivable?

In order to appreciate the significance of the late- or post-modern shift in society for the utopian imagination more fully, it may be necessary to look back at the transition from traditional to modern society. Both traditional and modern societies have tended to posit their cosmologies as truth, whether on religious or so-called scientific grounds. The difference is not radical, it is one of scale. For example, modern forms of utopian literature are generally viewed as works of fiction, namely by those who chose to focus on the aspect of individual authorship and individual creativity. This perspective is reflected in the designation “science fiction”, which seems a world apart from earlier, more “collectivist” (widely accepted) forms of futuristic imagination such as the texts of prophecy contained in the sacred literature or oral traditions of most religions. Those who choose to focus instead on the social embeddedness of modern works, however, will not find it difficult to see that modern utopianism also reflects and indeed helps to articulate the hidden cosmology of the modern world, just as traditional utopianism reflects the cosmologies of traditional societies. The modern world has seemed to us to be lacking in “culture” and “collective representations” only because we have taken our own culture and its cosmology utterly for granted. Modernity is itself a distinct kind of culture, which conditions people to think of themselves in terms of a Cartesian dualism wherein the “individual” subject – conceived as a separate, thinking entity, an ego cogito – is placed at the centre of a cosmos that is the object of the separated subject’s panoptic cognition and strategic control. The subject or ego here is asked to be independent, free, and unbound by traditions, and it is defined by the very act of thinking. It is denied that “asking” someone to be a “modern” individual is in itself a form of cultural conditioning, as is our extreme attachment to the process of thinking, which arose in tandem with modernity. Modernity, however, has proudly viewed itself as cultureless and as historically superseding all forms of culture.²

Maintaining such a modernist outlook has become almost as difficult as it is to maintain a traditionalist approach to life in today's world. In the wake of globalisation, we are constantly confronted with other individuals and groups of people who have a "culture" that is different from our own. While we may still wish to deny that we have a culture too, it is very difficult to defend a culture that purportedly does not exist and conservative impulses are thus impelling us to accept our cultural condition. Those who feel threatened by globalisation and migration and by the dizzying diversity of cultural artefacts displayed on their TV screens, tend to retract to a defensive, conservative position vis-à-vis their own Western culture, and as a result its Christian heritage, in particular, has been vehemently reemphasised in recent times. That too is only a temporary solution. Diversity cannot be eradicated or denied any longer, nor can it be so easily bypassed with a hierarchical distinction, between "modern us" and "primitive them"; not in a post-modern world where high-tech means largely "made in China" or "made in Japan" rather than America or Australia. What then is the impact of post-modern exposure to cultural diversity on the social imaginary of people around the globe, and more specifically, on our utopian imagination?

In an earlier paper, I argued that successive experiences of immersion in new and unfamiliar cultural worlds produce a fragmented, and sometimes a critically fragmented sense of self, mirroring actual cultural discontinuities and fractures in the world at large.³ Such fragmentation experiences have become common place in this post-modern era of globalisation. Given that these can be very distressing experiences, exposure to multiple cultural worlds may trigger a range of defence mechanisms designed to protect an individual's Egoic identity structures rather than allow fragmentation to run its course. Worse still, the course of cross-cultural encounters can also be manipulated politically at a collective level to create a distinctly post-modern dystopia, where violence toward cultural others is promoted by fanning the fear of fragmentation of self, which is synonymous with a fear of fragmentation of the world. We can see this kind of vicious manipulation at work, for example, in the fundamentalist ideologies on both sides of the War on Terror.

In view of such reactionary responses, does the post-modern shift to a more fragmented sense of self hold any utopian promise for contemporary human society and human consciousness? In my earlier paper I argued that the most common responses to exposure to cultural discontinuities are indeed denial, fear and violence, but that it is not necessarily so. I used ethnography as the counter example par excellence, for – if all goes well – ethnography can be a peaceful way of engaging with other people and their

cultures, by deliberately extending one's identity to embrace their lifeworld, and by accepting it as another possible, legitimate way of life and "world". I also argued that this is possible only for people who are willing to face up to the fact that their own identity is not fixed but emergent, not natural but culturally constructed, not ever completely homogenous across individuals, and now increasingly fragmented within them. And here the paper stopped, positing the valiant but rather uncomfortable ideal of a fragmented post-modern self, half-attached to fragments of many cultures but grounded in none, such as you may find also in many other theories of post-modernity. It was not much of a utopia.

In the remainder of this paper, however, I wish to outline where we may end up if we unquestioningly accept the culturally constructed and fragmented nature of our personal Egoic selves as post-modern individuals. I maintain that the experience of fragmentation can lead to a radical and permanent shift in consciousness, a complete break with the still dominant modernist idea of a radically separate and monolithic Ego and also with the early post-modernist idea of a fragmented and hence self-alienated consciousness. This is not to deny that the early post-modern idea of a bi-cultural, multicultural or utterly cultural-patchwork sense of self is quite descriptive of what many people experience. Nor is it to deny that modernism and modern forms of selfhood still persists in many quarters. Rather, I would like to reflect on the alternative, more utopian vision of a post-modern world and Self wherein fragmentation is neither avoided nor any longer experienced as suffering, but were this suffering may become the force that propels us permanently beyond our identification with the Ego. In view of the current multi-dimensional global crisis we are facing, from the escalating inequities in our political economies to the impending catastrophe of climate change, an evolutionary leap in consciousness may be not only possible but urgently required to ensure the survival of the human species at this historical juncture.

I will describe what such a shift would involve by reference to examples of a newly popularised form of utopianism which explicitly defines the road to a better future in terms of advances in human consciousness rather than technology or political reform. It is futile to try and pinpoint the origins of this form of utopianism historically, because it has its roots in ancient mystical traditions that are probably as old as humanity itself. The important historical point is that the "post-utopian" vision put forward by its numerous and diverse proponents, especially over the last fifty years, is contemporary and increasingly relevant to and popular among a growing number of people in today's post-modern society who are typically subject to the experience of a fragmented identity. In my view, it is the mass experience of

fragmentation that explains why this rather different kind of utopian thought has become so immensely popular.

As a first example, I will look at the work of Eric Fromm (1900-1980), a member of the Frankfurt School of social theory as well as a post-Freudian psychoanalyst. Fromm is an ideal point of connection between Western social theory and the more explicitly mystical expressions of this form of utopianism. Like many others in his generation, Fromm received the message of the ancient mystical traditions of the East and popularised them among an academic as well as popular Western audience. He did so without crediting mysticism as the main source of his inspiration, perhaps to avoid endangering his credibility as a social scientist. While the influx of Eastern thinking into psychology, philosophy and other fields of knowledge in the 1930s and 40s was itself a mark of early globalisation, Fromm's success in translating the message relies on the fact that, while it may be of Eastern origin, it is, in its essence, not culture-specific but universal. It was nonetheless an important achievement for Fromm, Carl Jung, Heinrich Zimmer and many others in that generation to recognise and articulate the broader relevance of this non-Western tradition of pursuing an "inner utopia", which is based on the idea of Self-Realisation or "Enlightenment".⁴

The self of having and the Self of being: Eric Fromm's road from human destructiveness to freedom

Eric Fromm argued that the root cause of the crisis of modernity is a consciousness dominated by alienation, paranoia, greed, insatiable consumption and an underlying fear and rejection of life. The societal shift required to meet contemporary global challenges, in his view, would require us to dispel the delusion of a Cartesian dualism of mind and matter, and our associated false identification with a separate Egoic mind. Rather than being genuinely transcendental, this Egoic self is a mirage based on an ill-founded dualism of mind and matter.

Let me begin with a quote from two of Fromm's colleagues in the Frankfurt School, Horkheimer and Adorno, whom Fromm cites to outline their core insight (as well as their pessimistic prognosis) about modernity:

As soon as man discards his awareness that he himself is nature, all the aims for which he keeps himself alive - social progress, the intensification of his material and spiritual powers, even consciousness itself, are nullified... [T]he enthronement of the means as an end, which under late capitalism is tantamount to open insanity, is already perceptible in the prehistory of subjectivity. Man's domina-

tion over himself, which grounds his selfhood, is almost always the destruction of the subject in whose service it is undertaken, for the substance which is dominated, suppressed and dissolved by virtue of self-preservation is none other than the life as functions of which the achievements of self-preservation find their sole definition and purpose.⁵

Eric Fromm recognised this problem but took a more positive approach, which was heavily influenced by some of the major themes of the 60s and 70s counter-culture movement. This youth movement popularised many key ideas of Hinduism and Buddhism which, hitherto, had been confined to a relatively small intellectual elite. One prominent representative of the movement was the American popular philosopher Alan Watts (1915-1973), who was one of the most important popularisers of Zen Buddhism and who, like Fromm, had collaborated with D.T. Suzuki, the main conduit of Zen philosophy to the West at that time. In his last and most provocative book, published in 1966, Watts put forward the following thesis:

the prevalent sensation of oneself as a separate Ego enclosed in a bag of skin is a hallucination which accords neither with Western science nor with the experimental philosophy-religions of the East.... This hallucination underlies the misuse of technology for the violent subjugation of man's natural environment and, consequently, its eventual destruction. We are therefore in urgent need of a sense of our own existence which is in accord with the physical facts, and which overcomes our feeling of alienation from the universe.⁶

Ten years later, in his own masterwork, *To Have and to Be*, Fromm takes up similar Eastern cosmological ideas, which had also crept into the thinking of the European elite by way of Martin Heidegger's and several existentialist philosophers' reflections on the idea of being. Fromm approaches the notion of being from a psychological perspective. He argues that individuals may realise the potential for freedom that lies dormant in their consciousness and that, collectively, we may realise the potential for a more sane society by shifting our focus. Rather than cling to mental identifications, Fromm advocates we should experience the living awareness of being. Fromm bases his analysis on a fundamental distinction between two modes of consciousness, one based on 'being' and the other based on 'having'. I will briefly flesh out this distinction, though it is quite difficult to do so in a fully satisfactory manner in the limited space available. After all, Fromm's project is to dismantle the entire edifice of Western culture, based, as it is, on our attachment to an all-pervasive delusion.

The "having" mode of existence is characteristic of the modern con-

sumerist way of life which, according to Fromm, can be traced to the Renaissance, when the rediscovery and development of Greek rationalist philosophy laid the foundation for a scientific revolution and the advent of modern societies. The dualistic metaphysics of Enlightenment thinkers like Renee Descartes postulates the existence of an independent mental self which, based on its powers as the transcendental subject of thought, is able to survey, analyse, compare, possess and control the world and the body from a vantage point of separateness. The aim of this attitude toward nature, including our inner nature, is to achieve a maximum of pleasure and control through the continual satisfaction of subjectively felt wants (wants are by no means to be confused with genuine needs, nor pleasure with happiness, argues Fromm). This attitude has reached its ultimate expression in the consumer culture of late capitalist modernity. The project of the Enlightenment is thus failing. It has not delivered happiness as it had intended (despite all the material comforts and powers we may enjoy), and has unwittingly helped to legitimise a philosophy of greed that is now pushing us toward a major environmental disaster. In Fromm's words:

The need for profound human change emerges not only as an ethical or religious demand, not only as a psychological demand arising from the pathogenic nature of our present social character, but also as a condition for the sheer survival of the human race.⁷

Fromm's utopian alternative for a healthier personality and society is to encourage an approach to life based on "being". Understandably, perhaps, he struggles to define this alternative mode of "being" to an audience habituated to operating in the "having" mode:

By being or having I do not refer to certain separate qualities of a subject as illustrated in such statements as "I have a car" or "I am happy". I refer to two fundamental modes of existence, to two different kinds of orientation toward self and world, to two types of character structure the respective predominance of which determines the totality of a person's thinking, feeling and acting. In the having mode of existence my relationship to the world is one of possessing and owning, one in which I want to make everybody and everything, including my self, my property. .. [T]he being mode of existence means aliveness and authentic relatedness to the world.⁸

In one of his many examples, most relevant to academic egos perhaps, he distinguishes between "having knowledge" and "knowing":

Knowing does not mean to be in possession of the truth, it means to penetrate the surface [of appearances] and to strive critically and ac-

tively in order to approach truth ever more closely. [Yet] our education generally trains people to *have* knowledge as a possession, by and large commensurate with the amount of property or social prestige they are likely to have later in life.⁹

Fromm's vision is a mode of 'being' that places man inside nature, at one with all that is. In the place of a separate transcendental subject, a false self that is forever afraid of death because it is but a fragile delusion, and never content because it is continually preoccupied with the past memories or future expectations, Fromm puts the idea of a Self that is fully immanent, and hence an inseparable part of the whole, like a wave in the ocean. From this kind of monistic identity perspective, psychological fear of death is eradicated. Having no Ego to defend, no desire beyond the legitimate need for self-preservation, such a person will:

show respect for life in all its manifestations, in the knowledge that not things, power, all that is dead, but life and all that pertains to its growth are sacred, making full growth of oneself and of one's fellow beings the supreme goal of living.¹⁰

Human psychological growth, according to Fromm's revised psychoanalysis, and similarly with many Eastern religious traditions, is based on the transformation of what is unconscious into consciousness, or to put it differently, on a greater awareness of reality as it is, and on full emotional and cognitive acceptance of our embeddedness in that reality, so that world and self are seen as one, as "Suchness". The project of modernity has led to what at first sight may seem like the opposite scenario, characterised by an ever increasing sense of separation of self from reality, through identification with false consciousness. But unlike Fromm, I would argue that the sense of separation and controlling possessiveness of modernity (and more so the sense of fragmentation of post-modernity) are not necessarily opposed to Fromm's utopian mode of "being" in any simple sense, and that his utopia may not be as unachievable as we might otherwise suppose. Rather, I see these experiences as necessary for the growth of consciousness and as precursors for a state of conscious being, in the Jungian sense of an ontogenetic progression toward individuation, but at a collective evolutionary level.

The utopia of Now: Eckhart Tolle's model for a new consciousness and a new earth

In order to illustrate this idea of a historical process of collective individuation, I now would like to discuss a more recent thinker in the same

post-modern mystical tradition, Eckhart Tolle, whose first work, *The Power of Now*, has been so popular that it sold more than two million copies in eight years and has been widely reviewed in the popular media, most notably on the Oprah Winfrey Show.¹¹ Tolle and “Oprah” now also jointly operate an “on-line classroom” to instruct hundreds of thousands of people on how to practice the principles of Tolle’s mystical philosophy of everyday life. While popularity is not the measure of all things, this does suggest that Tolle’s ideas are appealing to many contemporary, post-modern individuals.

According to Tolle, the historical shifts from tradition to modernity and post-modernity are part of a historical process that has led us to a climax, a point where our sense of individual separateness has reached completion, and thus becomes unbearable and reversible:

The compulsive thinker, which means nearly everyone, lives in a state of apparent separateness, in an insanely complex world of continuous problems and conflict, a world that reflects the ever increasing fragmentation of the mind.¹²

This leads us to a threshold, where it becomes more likely we might notice the fallacy of our self-identification with mental activity. We are made to confront the fallacy of identification with a supposedly transcendental mind because the resulting state of separation leads to alienation and immense suffering, rather than to a blissful state of transcendental liberation from the material world. Against the backdrop of this kind of experience, identification with mind may become untenable.

Why is it so hard to let go of the idea of separateness if it causes such suffering, and why is it so difficult to simply recognize that we are a part of the Suchness of Being? The great religious traditions of this world suggest, as does Tolle, that what stops us is ultimately fear of death, arising from false identification with form. Identification with form can manifest as attachment to material possessions or attachment to symbolic possessions such as personal, social, cultural or national identities. Entrapment in form is also evident as attachment to conditioned emotional patterns, which are our standard physical reactions to repetitive and negative patterns of thought. But at the subtlest level, so Tolle suggests, our attachment is to the very process of thinking:

Why should we be addicted to thinking? Because you are identified with it, which means that you derive your sense of self from the content and activity of your mind. Because you believe you would cease to be if you stopped thinking. As you grow up, you form a mental image of who you are, based on your personal and cultural condition-

ing. ... The term ego means different things to different people, but when I use it here it means a false self, created by unconscious identification with the mind.¹³

This Ego, Tolle suggests, is forever afraid of annihilation, afraid that its emptiness could be revealed by a confrontation with Being, which is life itself as it unfolds in the eternal present of this moment. The Ego is thus forever on the run to try and escape the Now:

To the ego, the present moment hardly exists. Only past and future are considered important. This total reversal of the truth accounts for the fact that in the ego mode the mind is so dysfunctional. It is always concerned with keeping the past alive, because without it – who are you? It constantly projects itself into the future to ensure its continued survival and to find some kind of release and fulfilment there. “one day, when this, that, or the other happens, I am going to be okay, happy, at peace.” Even when the ego seems to be concerned with the present, it is not the present that it sees: It misperceives it completely because it looks at it through the eyes of the past. Or it reduces the present to a means to an end, an end that always lies in the mind-projected future. ... the present moment holds the key to liberation. But you cannot find the present moment as long as you *are* your mind.¹⁴

Tolle says that what we fear is the death, not of the body, but of the Ego. The body itself is not afraid of death, for it simply is alive and immortal – forever an inseparable part of the stream of life, the universe and eternity. It may be hungry now, but it fears not tomorrow’s hunger, nor does it fret at the memory of yesterday’s struggles. It is the false self, our identification with mind and associated emotional pain, which fuels our sense of separation and fear of death. The false self struggles to conceal the fact that it is already dead, and always has been, because it is an illusion, a ghost.

According to Tolle, the gateway to a new consciousness lies not in the future but in the Here and Now, or what he calls “being present”, or simply “Being”:

Why does the mind habitually deny or resist the Now? Because it cannot function and remain in control without time, which is past and future, so it perceives the timeless Now as threatening. Time and mind are in fact inseparable.¹⁵

What you think of as the past is a memory trace, stored in the mind, a former Now. The Future is an imagined Now, a projection of the mind. When the future comes, it comes as the Now. When you think

about the past, you are doing it Now. Past and Future obviously have no reality of their own ... Their reality is “borrowed” from the Now ... the moment you grasp this there is a shift in consciousness from mind to Being, from time to Presence. Suddenly everything feels alive, radiates energy, emanates Being.¹⁶

For Tolle, therefore, conventional utopianism is a form of mind identification that separates us from the Now, the only place where we can be, act, and experience freedom. It does not mean we cannot reflect on our present condition; indeed, Presence encourages that. And we can also plan ahead to change our circumstances. But Tolle recommends that the only utopia we can ever arrive at is the Now, and that our only road to freedom lies in being present and accepting what is. If we take on a project for improving our circumstances in this attitude of Presence rather than as a means to an end that lies in an ever receding future, he argues, then the road to freedom is no longer an endless struggle but an open space for alert intelligence and enthusiastic action.

Concluding Remarks: Inner Utopia and the World Today

Utopian thinkers could add an important alternative framework to their analyses if they were to consider the closely related insights of Fromm, Watts and Tolle and many others who have argued that a better future depends on breaking our identification with form, which at the most subtle level consists of the thought forms of the mind. The future we chase after simply does not exist, they maintain, and hence the only site where our imagination can take shape is in the Now. As Tolle has argued again and again in his books, it is only by accepting and fully understanding the Now that we can take meaningful action towards creating a new consciousness and a new earth.¹⁷

While many objections could be raised against the psychological models of Fromm, Tolle and other modern day proponents of an “inner utopianism”, there is certainly much value in reflecting on this newly popular form of utopian vision. From my own experience, both as an anthropologist and an immigrant twice over, I would add that this historical Now is a rather special time of opportunity for all of us. The current process of globalisation is confronting us, every day, with the fact that there is a vast array of options for individuals and groups to construct a mental identity for themselves. Post-modern urban societies are increasingly composed of a patchwork of cultures, so that there is no single, unchallenged cultural model of self-hood for individuals to identify with and to be socially supported in. This fragmentation of identity discourses, whether it is simply witnessed as a

rupture of social cohesion in the external world or internalised through cross-cultural engagement, reveals that every person's own mental concept of self is a fragile and rather arbitrary construct among countless other mental constructs of similar kind, in short, it is a product of our personal and collective imaginary. This experience encourages us to loosen our identification with a once monolithic traditional or modernist sense of self, and to entertain the possibility of having a fragmented self or multiple selves. Faced with the possibility of such an uncomfortable and ambiguous Ego structure, many will try everything to deny the heterogeneity of the post-modern world, will fearfully retract, and attempt to prop up their separate and homogeneous sense of self, if necessary, by eliminating, silencing or marginalising people with different cultural beliefs. Others will perhaps choose to linger within the new mode of identity, drifting aimlessly amidst the wreckage of the multiple colliding regimes of truth around them, unwilling to commit to any of these evidently arbitrary identities but at the same time also finding themselves unable to connect to other people in the absence of a shared identity discourse. Many, however, are choosing to make their way into what Tolle calls the Now, into a state of stillness and Presence wherein the mind, and with it both the modern pain of separation and the post-modern pain of fragmentation, loses its power to define who we are, and is reduced to a mere tool of a living Self that is at one with all.

Monash University

Thomas.Reuter@arts.monash.edu.au

NOTES

¹ Cornelius Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, trans. K Blamey (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998); Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar, Book III: The Psychoses*, editor J-A Miller, trans. R Grigg (W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 1993); Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of cultures: Selected Essays* (Hutchinson, London, 1973).

² A prominent example of this belief that modernity and globalization are cultureless, and will thus eventually eradicate cultural diversity globally, is Francis Fukuyama's *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York, Free Press, 1992).

³ Thomas Reuter, "The Fragmented Self: Cross-cultural Difference, Conflict and the Lessons of Ethnographic Experience", *Paideuma* 52 (2006) 220-232.

⁴ For a more detailed discussion of historical shifts in religion and society in the wake of modernity and globalization, see Thomas Reuter, *Global Trends in Religion*. (Clayton, Vic., Monash Asia Institute Press, 2008).

- ⁵ Erich Fromm, *To Have and to Be* (Continuum Press, London & New York, 1997) 54.
- ⁶ Alan Watts, *The Book – On the taboo against knowing who you are* (Vintage Books, New York 1971; first edition Random House, New York, 1966) IX-X.
- ⁷ Fromm, *To Have and to Be*, 9.
- ⁸ Fromm, *To Have and to Be*, 24.
- ⁹ Fromm, *To Have and to Be*, 40.
- ¹⁰ Fromm, *To Have and to Be*, 171.
- ¹¹ Eckhart Tolle, *The Power of Now* (Hodder Australia, edition 2005; first US edition 1999).
- ¹² Tolle, *The Power of Now*, 15.
- ¹³ Tolle, *The Power of Now*, 22.
- ¹⁴ Tolle, *The Power of Now*, 22-3.
- ¹⁵ Tolle, *The Power of Now*, 34.
- ¹⁶ Tolle, *The Power of Now*, 50.
- ¹⁷ Eckhart Tolle, *A New Earth: Awakening to Your Life's Purpose* (New York, Penguin Books, 2005).