

A Haunting 'Ideology': Doubling

Conf. univ. dr. Daniela Țuchel
Universitatea "Dunărea de Jos" din Galați

Abstract : *Dans cet article l'idéologie sera prise, d'une manière simpliste, pour un moyen de considérer les choses. Son épithète en anglais envisage l'intensité de la pression sociale quotidienne exercée par l'esprit d'imitation. Dans l'étude de certains procès de doublement, nous devons nous rapporter à l'humanité qui doit résister au cauchemar du clone scientifique. En plus, la vision double sera prise pour une réaction en chaîne en tant que la mort de la diversité et le doublement de l'original fort culturel. La dissémination du double semble mettre en danger les ressources créatrices de la planète par son appauvrissement graduel. Finalement, l'originalité même d'un petit pays sera affectée par la globalisation contemporaine et son procès de doublement.*

Keywords: *clone, diversity, globalization, originality, sameness, simulacrum*

1. Doubling through translation

To make a proper start, we need to account for the scare quotes in the title. Going by online definitions for the concept of ideology, it does not seem to matter for our current concerns about doubling whether we investigate "a set of aims and ideas that directs one's goals, expectations and actions" (Wikipedia) or the organized expression of "social needs and aspirations of an individual, group, class or culture" (American Heritage Dictionary). Eventually, an ideology can be thought of as a comprehensive vision, as a way of looking at things. Between inverted commas, ideology has thus become useful to non-specialized, but vaguely cultural readings.

In a funny parallel hinting at Harry Houdini's tricks, Cronin (2003: 93) writes on instances when translators, finding themselves "bound and handcuffed" "in periods of repression and political conflict", have become "escape artists" by force of circumstance. One step further in this demonstration takes us to seeing translation studies in the light of a branch of escapology. The idea is hinged upon the remark that translators produce that other double which is the translated text.

Since one cannot accept an uncritical transfer of words from one language to another, let us analyze one transfer managed by a student translator in our university department. She set herself the task of producing the equivalent for the Romanian proverb inside a spoken line in a fairy tale: "Împărate, paza bună trece primejdia rea". She subsequently compiled a list of four pieces of advice volunteered in direct address, which is practically the first contextualizing clue: "Caution is the parent of safety", "Good watch prevents misfortune", "Fast bind, fast find", "Fear keeps the garden better than the gardener". The student overlooked the host of connotations and put her finger on the third solution. She supplied two arguments in favour of her choice (alliteration and symmetry), to which we might add the advantages of rhyme and concision. Yet, the second solution looks a much happier double: it circumvents the academism of the first proverb, which is misplaced with an emperor of immemorial days, though, at the same time, epitomizing the message in the best way; it excludes the temptation of identifying royalty with the good worker that binds and finds or with a gardener with his occupational duties. Number two is, to our mind, the right double due to its being culturally adapted to the discourse strategies that are visible: persuasion through the use of explicit (bună vs. rea) or implicit (good vs. mis-) opposites, the implied conceptual equivalence between caution (the goal of communication) and prevention (in the word family of the English predicate), as well as the pun contained by 'watch' in English and the Romanian 'pază' in a similar way. If we focus longer on the relations of equivalence, we find that in ordinary language they hold between the items in a set, only one of which is chosen; thus, equivalence pre-exists translation work.

A text is an original only when a double has been created for it – a translation, very likely to gain an autonomous existence afterwards. That is why we can quote Dollerup with gusto, when giving a particular allowance: "we do not have to uphold the 'original' as a rigid yardstick for all discussions" (2006: 94). This idea comes after fully understanding that the

original author recedes in the background, as long as the reader of the translated writing no longer considers the endeavour of the author and reads in translation just because he has no knowledge of the original idiom. The double is measured for its own parameters.

There are two sides of the issue: relations with other words in the language and relations with words in other languages.

The Romanian speaker of today often chooses, instead of a relation of equivalence, to word his thoughts with the help of relations of combination, as if to demonstrate that it is a question of prejudice to continue thinking that an 'original' has a different status from the translated version. Thus, in Mircea Mihaieş's text (*România literară*) we read about "*small talk-uri*, *harababură internetistică*", computer operators refer to '*folder*', alternatively '*director*', or - embraced in the same phrase - '*ecran touch screen*' and '*soluții electronice online*'. If an entity is one of my worldly possessions and I should have a name for it, the handiest solution is another language's proposition for that particular entity or a set of identical entities. The items are collectively nameable and this how I come to inserting duplicates in my vocabulary. On the other hand, the untranslated half discloses a tendency of authors or speakers to modernize, whereas the translated half or using only the translated half reveals a concern for purifying vocabulary or preserving the tradition.

Eventually, with unwillingness to translate, what seems to find more and more room in Romanian consciousness is the idea of 'one person with two languages'. After all, Vivian Cook (in Aronoff, *The Handbook of Linguistics*, p. 488) interestingly remarks that "monolinguals are probably in a minority in the world as a whole".

In such cases as illustrated above, linguistic doubling is apparently the effect of social dealings that require contemporary man to play the role of *homo loquens* quite intensely. Once again, to take a simplified view of the combinatory solution of two languages in one equation, probably the most important conclusion we should reach refers to the layperson that knows what it means without extra effort. Doubling has quickened knowledge of the meaning and has highlighted value; in these cases as shown above the value is 'internal completeness' of the message, in the long run.

2. Double vision as nightmare

We will further demonstrate in this article that an image can escape referentiality, and also that an image can escape ideology. Words, even translated words, are less apt to 'escape' than images. In a way, we feel overburdened by the role and power of images, while admitting that our society is image-saturated. Our problems are enhanced by the image becoming more important than the referent when it should be only a reflection of the referent. We can think of icons and instructions on the computer: the former double the latter or vice versa.

Reality becomes problematic when it is a construction, a 'reality'. The camera, for one thing, is a devilish tool for re-re-re-presenting. It is a commodity recording and circulating images, manipulating and mystifying truth into scores of 'truths'. The pessimist will say that there is no absolute truth, we are beneficiaries of the mimetic approach since we are educated into being fed on images.

Friske (1997: 55) explains our dependence on doubling reality, while explaining our age as the age of the simulacrum (taking over the theory from Baudrillard). These theorists uphold that "the concept of 'reproduction' requires that of the 'original'. The simulacrum, however, is both the reproduction and the original, both the image and the referent imploded into a single concept. In this account there can be no original reality whose image is reproduced on millions of screens" (ibid.).

The relationship between factual experience and its image avoids, therefore, a discussion of truth: something is at one with its representation. We gaze at a prime-minister at Easter tide, met by family, and the father knocks an egg against his son's conveniently low

and handy forehead. Emil Boc taking the joke with a smile has been a piece of reality seen 'live' by witnesses; yet commentators can say that seeing it 'there' is no more authentic an experience than seeing it on the small screen. There is no difference of ontological status between them; not in the way there is an ontological difference between the egg-against-egg Romanian ritual and its parodic copy of egg's head-against-man's head. The scene as narrated above has been relaid around the media, as Latinate scholars would say, *ad nauseam*. Each such occasion of sharing the respective news is as real or as unreal as the other. John Friske (1997: 56) makes use of the concept of hyper-reality, in which he merges so-far distinct ideas of reality, spectacle, sensation, image, meaning. He illustrates as follows: "New York is not a real city, it is hyperreal. As we approach it for the first time or the millionth time, there is no original authentic reality for us to experience, New York *is* its images on TV and cinema screens, on calendars and posters, on T-shirts and coffee mugs, through the windows of the bus about to descend into the Lincoln tunnel or from the deck of the Staten Island Ferry. Walking down Broadway is not a different order of experience from enjoying its cinematic representation. In postmodernism the image has broken free from the constraints of both mimesis and representation: it cannot be controlled by either reality or ideology" (ibid.).

Doubling experience, in sum, becomes nightmarish if and when something goes wrong between the social construction of normalcy and the effects of the pressures exerted by social expectation.

Cronin's (2003) cultural memory turns to the nineteenth century as being remarkably haunted by the double vision. He raises his interpretation upon two guidelines, Victor Frankenstein and his Creature, on the one hand, and Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, on the other. The nightmare is thus set in by phantasms that are "both hideously different and ominously similar" (2003: 128). Surprisingly, our own age has its contribution to the doubling nightmare: no more nor less than the *clone*. Dictionary explanations illuminate us on how to apply the label of 'clone' to persons or things that duplicate, imitate, perhaps only closely resemble other persons or things (in appearance, in style, in function or performance, and so on). There are advocates for both sides of the issue of cloning or not. Pros and cons require informed decisions, perhaps ethical ones too. Putting aside the prospect of cloning humans, which is something extremely controversial and nightmarish, we may adopt milder attitudes to metaphorical cloning, definitely not a risky activity except for boredom.

Human thought and human action have engineered the artificial form of life which is the most and the worst in matters of copying. Cronin comments on what he has dubbed to be *clonialism*: "This is globalization-as-homogenization [...] because under clonialism everything turns out to be a replica, a simulacrum, a copy of a limited set of economically and culturally powerful originals." (2003: 129) In order to illustrate the darker side of clonialism which is presented as duplication, it is enough to think that different countries, on different continents, will share the experience of the same 'Desperate Wives' episodes, McDonald's chains, Carrefour supermarkets, and so on.

3. Double vision as death of diversity

Diversity is, at first, created by the spread of the double. Diversity is, ultimately, endangered by the gradual impoverishment of the creative resources of the planet. To illustrate simplistically, when characters, emotions, experiences or conversations are easily assimilated into the texture of everyday life, life itself seems to be a copy of artistic life. Viewers begin to imitate what they see in soaps. For instance, when women watch the wife's reaction to her husband's affair in a movie – her decision to divorce him could be one – the reaction may be seen as reflected in any housewife's determination to do the same.

The principle of diversity is derived from equality, which requires that no special favour be given to power holders. On the one hand, literal equality should be an offer:

everyone receives the same chances (for instance, contending parties receive equal time in an election, or separate language groups, such as in Belgium, receive an equivalent media service). Perhaps we understand this proportional representation as ‘fairness’.

The issue of creating a world of doubles contains a puzzle: are people in favour of persistence or are they in favour of change? Does one exclude the other? If ours is a world of flux, which way do we turn in order to look at persisting things which are the only anchor we have?

Persisting objects undergo intrinsic change, in all certainty. When an entity has temporary intrinsic properties, it has them only some of the time. How is change possible then?

We people have different shapes at different times. Nations themselves are involved in transnational dynamics and undergo change. Owing to the fact that our time is an exciting time, we will never contemplate death of diversity as a contemporary threat. At the same time, let us consider at least this one aspect observed by Srebeny-Mohammadi (1997: 198): “it is ironic to note how Third World concerns about cultural identity, so scorned by western countries in the 1970s, are now articulated by those very countries in the 1990s”.

An Aristotelian formulation says that it is impossible that the same thing should both belong and not belong to the same thing at the same time and in the same respect, which is exactly what intuitions allow.

To the non-philosopher, what looks odd is the fact that we crave for a change, yet we multiply what we have with special zest. Change requires sameness: a thing that changes must be one and the same both before and after the change. We have referred to a source of diversity from duplicates that are both the consequence of intrinsic change and of extrinsic change.

This said, one might consider that change is a useful fiction: the pretension that there is change may be useful for discussing philosophical views of progress.

4. Double vision as chain reaction

The broad look at the spirit of imitation in a world transformed by forces of globalization has to take into account the fact that “space and time have collapsed and the experience of distance imploded for ever” (Srebeny-Mohammadi 1997: 177). And now it is not only that local happenings are shaped by events occurring huge distances away, but they closely copy them, double them, reproduce reality at a different scale. What takes place is a number of paradoxical connections of presence and absence.

The close look at how originality in one small country has been affected by contemporary globalization inspires us to make an attempt at uncovering Oprah’s impact on Romanian televised shows. Narratives are most of the time produced within this television format, but this mechanism has been with us in fact from ancient times. How is the myth of old Atlantis passed down in Plato’s dialogues? The Egyptians (the first communicators) conveyed the information to wise Solon (the second communicator), who took his turn and told it to Critias the elderly (the third communicator), who further passed it to his grandson Critias when the latter was a child (the fourth communicator), and from him, no one being able to say whether directly or indirectly, it reached Plato (the fifth communicator), and yet there might be another go-between (or there might not be) in the presence of one more participant in the Platonic dialogue, and he is Socrates. We have reproduced here a helpful instance of chain-creation such as reconstituted by a trustworthy reader of Plato (Ioana Pârvulescu in *România Literară*, # 5 / Feb. 6, 2009).

To go back to the American success to be considered the original on a variety of levels, we enumerate the following present-day imitations in our culture: shows that blur the boundaries between entertainment and art, or between entertainment and news; clubbing, domestic videos, playing computer games, building up stardom, catwalk shows, the career

stylists, shopping spree in malls, cooking exotic recipes, viewing telenovelas, and many others. A cross-border flow of materials and the interaction between cultures happens with other nations as well, raising issues of culture and identity around the world. What we mostly fear is that our contribution to the 'chain' may grow even more commercial and garish than the western 'originals'.

The Oprah Winfrey talk show has cumulated such superlatives as almost impossible to be equaled by other productions: the highest-rated, the longest-running in American television history, and the best television series of the twentieth-century (in 1998), with topics that enter American pop-cultural consciousness. The Wikipedia information underlines its becoming "a more positive, spiritually uplifting experience by featuring book clubs, celebrity interviews, self-improvement segments, and philanthropic forays into world events".

We Romanians may think of the Oprah show as the originator of *Ne vedem la TVR! Dincolo de aparențe, Trenul vieții, Celebri sau nu cu Mihaela Tatu, Stele sub lupă, Oamenii timpului nostru, Miezul zilei*, and so forth (some even sort out Oprah imitators as daytime television talkshow). Things are not so bad when people report learning from them. Oprification is the format that contains narratives and in which the female moderator, if not adopting a norm of citizenship and responsibility for family and children, makes an attempt at producing infotainment, but the narrative power is less, and counter-cultural issues may self-select. The truth is that Romanian duplicates have managed, at times, to bring some availability for really talking about culturally blocked topics.

And this brings us to the problem of globalization. From the examples supplied above, and all the illustrations that anyone can supplement from personal experience, one could subdivide globalization itself: globalization of media forms, of firms and companies, and of effects.

5. Conclusion about doubling as an instantiation of globalization

The spread of the double has revealed tensions between macro and micro levels of culture and not only, as long as economic structure are also involved. Another thing is eventually found true here: like in any other respect in culture, by learning about language, we have inevitably learnt about human nature and about how meanings are computed.

How can things be the same and different? The answer found is that, in the light of quantitative identity, we say that the changing thing is the same. In the light of qualitative identity, we say that the thing is not the same. These are ultimately two different apprehensions of "the same".

Our tour of duplicative processes cannot, to our mind, reveal any other less uncontroversial conclusion than the following: public opinion in a given society is tapped through polls and surveys, whereas *global* public opinion is a simulacrum as long as it is wholly a media construction – in the absence of global polls or other similar evidence. And then, insofar as societies do have coherent ideologies, we are likely to discover parallel duplicative 'ideologies' for cultural matters mostly. The adoption of transnational forms and practices is to be connected with recurring circumstances, expectations and needs as well.

References:

- Aronoff, Mark and Jamie Rees-Miller (eds.), *The Handbook of Linguistics*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2003.
- Cronin, Michael, *Translation and Globalization*, Routledge, London & New York, 2003.
- Dollerup, Cay, *Basics of Translation Studies*, Institutul European, Iasi, 2006.
- Fiske, John, *Postmodernism and Television*, in "Mass media and Society", J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (eds.), Arnold, London, New York, Sydney, Auckland, 1997, pp. 53-65.
- Srebeny-Mohammadi, Annabelle, *The Global and the Local in International Communications*, in "Mass media and Society", J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (eds.), Arnold, London, New York, Sydney, Auckland, 1997, pp. 177-203.

Human Psyche at the Core of Globalization

Conf. univ. dr. Dana Sorana Urs
University Politehnica of Bucharest

Résumé: L' auteur vise à localiser la source de la mondialisation qui pourrait être considéré comme non seulement l'idéologie dominante, mais aussi le système de croyance dominante de notre temps. La mondialisation est un terme général utilisé pour décrire une grande variété d'interconnexions économique, politique, culturelle qui enlèvent les frontières entre les pays. Il se réfère également à l'ensemble complexe d'interdépendances provoquées par les innovations technologiques, qui rendent les gens plus conscients de la profonde reconfiguration des relations géographiques, sociaux et culturels. La revendication de cet article est que la cause ultime de ce phénomène multibranches se couche dans le fond même de la psyché humaine. A partir d'une synthèse des principaux postulats de la psychologie analytique et les principes fondamentaux de la philosophie hindoue, l'auteur suggère que la mondialisation est la manifestation de surface de la signification primordiale de l'évolution, c'est à dire l'individualité de l'homme (Ego) à la recherche de la réinsertion au sein de sa source - le Soi. Ce processus psychologique, étiqueté «Individuation» par Carl Gustav Jung, un archétype de la nature est, en tant que telle, la conscience qui gouverne, la langue et la connaissance au sens large. Psyché est un phénomène pratiquement infinie, un système complet de relations à l'intérieur duquel la matière et l'esprit représentent des potentialités qui transcendent la conscience humaine. En fin de compte, la psyché et le cosmos sont une seule unité entre l'observateur et l'objet, entre le Soi comme «*imago Dei*» et Moi, comme l'identité subjective. Ainsi, chaque acte de l'homme est considéré comme ayant un but sous-jacent de base - la recherche de l'état de plénitude, remplir les lacunes qui le rendent incomplète et l'éloigner de Soi. Dans ce contexte, les systèmes économique, politique, social et culturel qui semblent transgresser les barrières, ne sont que les formes visibles d'un schéma d'évolution plus profonde où l'homme a de parvenir à un nouvel état de conscience. C'est à ce niveau que l'individu doit peu à peu devenir un être universel, capable de réaliser l'unité essentielle et la plénitude de la Réalité et capable de se déterminer-même pas d'une vérité fragmentaire, mais avec la Vérité Absolue comme le Soi.

Mots-clés: mondialisation, l'individualité, le Soi, «Individuation», psyché

The aim of this paper is to suggest that globalization as the dominant ideology and belief system of our times, has its origins into the depth of human psyche, namely into the Collective Unconscious. This zone is known to be organized into archetypes or dynamic patterns underlying our perception and kynesthetic interactions with the environment, therefore giving coherence and meaning to our experience. This idea is supported by analytical psychology and the ancient Hindu philosophy of language mainly because their basic postulates give a valuable insight into the nature of man's relationships with the physical world. The paper starts with a short outline of "globalization" as a contradictory phenomenon, typical of the present times and then proceeds with an attempt at locating the source of this concept.

Globalization has been defined as a set of ongoing multidimensional processes that strengthen worldwide interdependencies, thereby raising in people the awareness of profound connections between countries and continents. Being driven by economic, socio-cultural, political and biological factors, it tends towards integrating the entire planet into an integrated network of communication and trade. The pace of this global flow has become faster over the last decade due to, among others, the unprecedented advancements in technology, science and industry. Generally used to describe a process, a state, a driving force and even an age, globalization refers to a multitude of phenomena implying the gradual change of forces away from the nation-states toward a state of globality. The idea of change is essential because the concept implies a fast reconfiguration of economic, social and even cultural spaces. New contexts and environments are being born where "free" markets vigorously expand, where internet blasts gaps and barriers between countries and continents and where communication and trade integrate mankind into a globe- spanning array.

Globalization is usually confined to an extremely complex set of contradictory processes that practically compress time and space as a result of crucial changes affecting all life areas. Both supporters and critics find grounds for their positions because black and white aspects mingle in a bewildering interplay. Among the negative effects revealed by the latter, one could mention the advantage taken of the export poverty of developing countries, the cheap labor in weaker nations, the inequalities in the global trading system, the brain

drain to richer countries, the environmental degradation, the spread of infectious diseases due to immigrations a.s.o.

Upon a surface analysis of the discourse constructed in the context of globalization, a number of core terms emerge as conceptual underpinnings of the new mode of narrative. Terms like “globality”, “globalism”, “centrality”, “holistic”, “expansion”, “growth”, “integration”, “irreversibility”, “order”, “change” have rather mathematical connotations, that is, meanings related to sets of qualities and structures accurately described by theorems and formulas. Thus, the root concept of all these terms is that of “globe”, a word with a geographical meaning that, in its turn, could be traced back to its geometrical origin – a “sphere” as a tri-dimensional body which is completely symmetrical around its center. When reduced to its two dimensions, the sphere becomes a “circle”.

But why, of all images has the circle been chosen to play the role of the representational symbol of our era? What is its deep significance and hidden message? In order to give an answer, a number of the less known aspects of the human psyche will have to be revealed. The psyche is generally defined as a form of expressing the relationships with the environment, a subjective reproduction of the external natural reality. It involves the totality of reactions like sensations, perceptions, thoughts etc. through which an organism relates with an external object and thereby sees, hears, moves and thinks. Thus, psyche means a set of relationships and, as such, it evolves and manifests through communication or language in its largest sense. More recent theories have included it among informational phenomena by developing a holistic vision of psyche through revealing its non-substantial character because information basically consists in impalpable relations among entities. The system theory improved the concept even more by including new features pertaining to living systems: the interactive dynamic character of psyche, the anti-entropic and anti-redundant ability that confer it the ability to evolve to a superior level etc. Analytical psychology made one step further when stating that psyche and nature are just two aspects of one fundamental entity called “*unus mundus*”. In other words, the macrocosm of the material reality and the microcosm of the being make up an energy continuum that is psychic in its essence. According to Carl Gustav Jung, psyche is an almost infinite phenomenon, a system of comprehensive relationships where matter and spirit are only names given to potentialities transcending consciousness. This “*unus mundus*” or functional-dynamic unity of the entire universe is governed by organizing patterns called archetypes. Having their origin into the Collective Unconscious, archetypes exert their influence not only upon the material world but also upon consciousness and human behavior (hence upon communication and language). They are inborn values in the absence of which man could neither know nor act. The archetypes lie behind the so called “principle of resonance” according to which matter is a reflection or mirror of psyche through which the latter permanently seeks its identity. Resonance is possible only because both matter and psyche are rooted in a common source – the Spirit or Self. As a matter of fact, quantum physics has confirmed it that the objective world cannot be separated from the subject because they are both integrated into the same “*unus mundus*”, or continuum of energy/information at various levels of manifestation.

The mythical equivalent of Jung’s archetypes is found in the theory of the ancient Hindu grammarians that went back to the very origins of the Universe. The philosophers of those times believed that at the beginning there was only the Unmanifest God or Parabrahman (Parama –transcendent, Sanskr.) who was beyond name or definition. At a certain moment He divided into the Supreme Witness and Adi Shakti (Primordial Power-Sanskr). This division manifested in the first sound called the primordial Word or the universal “Sound –Vibration” that was said to be endowed with the power of generating the worlds.

The ancient Hindus called it “Shabda Brahman” (Word of Brahma, Sanskr), The Word of God or the Primordial Energy unifying all forms of the material world, the consciousness of these forms as well as the nature of consciousness itself. The concept of “Word of God” indicates that the Hindu grammarians were aware of the unique nature of language as Vibration-Energy that, at a higher ontological level, was identical to Creation and Knowledge. Shabda Brahman means the Matrix - Container of all possible forms, the Absolute as the seed of plurality, the Generator of objects, phenomena, cognition, consciousness, language etc. The scientific equivalent of Brahman is the pure super-condensed Information in the form of the particle that enclosed the infinity of possibilities before the Big Bang. This image of the Primordial Word does not essentially differ from what we normally understand by “word” because human knowledge that ultimately consists in recreating reality at the mental level is not possible in the absence of words/names expressing relationships between the objects of thinking. Our entire world is in this way “produced” by words and its objects/phenomena are ordered in time and space, through words. The ancient Hindu grammarians believed that words had their origin and matrix in the causal zone called “sphota” (explosion-Sanskr.) which is closely related to the initial explosion out of which the entire creation emerged. Sphota included all universals (archetypes), all objects and their respective sounds/words, because each object appeared to be eternally associated with its sound “print”.

Thus, the entire manifestation of gross matter, psyche and spirit appeared to be engraved on “sphota” which, in Jung’s terminology, is an equivalent to the collective Unconscious as the repository of archetypes. They are responsible for the entire evolution of the Universe from the stage of gross matter to the appearance of the living world and eventually, the birth of man. Far from being the result of pure hazard, man had to appear in the Universe, (an idea confirmed by the “ anthropic principle “of astrophysics), as an entity connecting microcosm and macrocosm into one Whole. It was human consciousness that practically gave birth to the objective world because, in his absence, there would have been no knowledge and no evolution.

Archetypes, residing in the Collective Unconscious, precede consciousness and therefore, cannot be accessed directly. The only way in which they can reach the mind is through symbolic or abstract images. Archetypes have only a formal determination like in the case of the axis system pre-forming the future shape of a crystal. In other words, they are organizers of images and ideas that only upon reaching consciousness are “filled’ with the content provided by conscious experience. After Jung, archetypes control the entire evolution of psyche from its most primitive amoeba forms up to the human level.

They actually connect the psyche to its extremes: on the one hand to the instinctive, physical nature further merging with the gross matter and, on the other hand to the Spirit or Self. One might say that the entire evolution is ultimately archetypal in nature, i.e. closely governed and controlled by patterns of action that precede consciousness. Their purpose is to enable the Ego, as the centre of consciousness, to gradually assimilate the contents of the Unconscious and thus achieve Wholeness, and become aware of its Identity with the Self. As such, archetypes perform a compensatory function by introducing balance into the psychic system.

These contents, however, are paradoxical and contradictory, impossible to be understood directly by the logical mind. They have to be gradually assimilated by the Ego through archetypes that still preserve their paradoxical nature. Archetypes reach consciousness through images (Divine Child, Sage, Dragon etc.) usually emerging in dreams and myths or through abstract figures (circle, triangle, square etc.) and concepts (numbers etc.) surfacing in mathematical postulates and formulas. Being stored in the Collective Unconscious, they are like a mnemonic deposit of all human experience back through to its

remotest beginnings. As structuring principles of the psyche, they emerge in order to reach consciousness and shock the logical mind with their paradoxical coexistence of good and bad, of light and darkness. For example, the Dragon as a mythical figure, can be a protector, a guide and also a devouring creature. Its two opposite extremes meet because “*unus mundus*” is not a rectangular axis but rather a circle usually symbolized by a serpent eating its own tail (*ouroborus*). The significance of this archetypal image is the joining of contrasts (“*conjunctio oppositorum*”) through which the two opposing poles of the world – matter and spirit – meet together in an insoluble connection. *Ouroborus* is essentially the psyche. Being connected to both the physical body and the spirit (Self), the psyche receives impulses both towards instinctive actions and towards knowledge. The entire process is determined by the archetype as a controller of instinctive actions, conscious activities and knowledge at large. The archetype is also defined as a scheme or dynamic pattern of perception and thinking in general. These patterns are also known as sensorimotor schemes such as: Part-Whole, Inside-Outside, Down-Up, Left-Right etc. Being pre-logical in nature, they are metaphorically projected upon abstract domains helping man to conceptualize through thinking.

The sensori-motor schemes are action schemes through which infants construct their understanding of the world by coordinating sensory experiences (seeing, hearing) with motoric actions. For example, round 4-8 month of age, infants develop their coordination between vision and prehension (by intentionally grasping in the in the direction of a desired object), which signifies the birth of habits and dawn of logic. His actions of inclusion, ordering, grouping etc. have an archetypal background because their coordinates are found in the structure and functioning of all systems. These schemes of action gradually assimilate the environment and give birth to the intelligent process of increasing abstraction. They ultimately underlie structures of mental operations. The mind reproduces/constructs the world with the purpose of knowing it better and the result is function of the archetypal disposition of the child. Thus, the material world “borrows” its spatial attributes from the inborn motor schemes of the observer. The human body projects its coordinates to the environment and both eventually fuse into one Whole.

But the ultimate “purpose” of archetypes is to allow the Ego to access the attributes of the Self, thereby reaching full knowledge of the latter. This is equivalent to a fundamental change in the psychic state usually termed Self-Realization. What is the meaning of self realization? The centre of the conscious psyche is the Ego with its functions of coordinating and controlling the conscious contents. In its turn, this is governed by the Self as the centre of the entire Personality. The Ego-Self relationships manifests during all the stages of human evolution and can be represented by the Ego-Self axis. The axis is directly connected to Jung’s concept of Individuation denoting the process through which the person consciously attempts at developing the inborn of his/her psyche to the benefit of totality/wholeness. The exact meaning of this evolution is the conscious relationship with the Self that confers stability to the Ego. The Self, as the highest entity of divine essence, represents the automatic, natural objective of human beings. It is simultaneously abstract and empirical in nature taking the form of a numinous, fascinating experience. As a symbolic image, the Self actively manifests by stimulating man towards order and balance. The archetype of the Self is usually a circle (*mandala*), a model suggesting a protective, integrative space that ensures perfect equilibrium and well-being. On the other hand, the Self needs the Ego as the entity endowed with consciousness and hence, with the capacity of Realization. The Ego-Self axis is a fundamental archetype of the Universe because it has been guiding the entire evolution towards the final achievement of Individuation. It gives direction to all human existence, organizing it in such a way that man should intuitively seek reunion with the Self.

The archetype is nothing but a method of “catching” the subtle energies of the Self. Each and every human act like “getting dressed”, “sleeping”, “working” etc. aims at”

drawing ” the Ego closer to its original source, the Self. What we usually call “habits” are nothing but a set of repetitive actions hiding a vital need of balance, fulfillment and inner peace, an instinct that refers to self-preservation, and self-protection. All every-day acts are, thus, perceived as vital necessities. Their absence would mean annihilation of the human being.

The globe-circle archetype is especially manifest in the social contents of the human psyche in search of his/her union with the Self. The circle/mandala is recognized to be a symbol of Totality and Wholeness, where each and every part is harmoniously integrated and contained inside. The family nucleus of father-mother-child is the first “universe” perceived/created by the infant. With the passing of time, the circumference of the circle enlarges to include “the other”, like friends, colleagues, acquaintances and co-nationals. The Ego is always in the centre while the Self creates the direction of meaning as the circumference. If we were to represent this archetypal figure, it would rather resemble an ever expanding spiral that gradually embraces and incorporates new attributes of the Self.

In this context, it is to be understood that globalization, globality and similar concepts represent a higher stage in the evolution of psyche that now manifests a wider capacity to consciously assimilate new contents of the “globe-circle” archetype. Globalization can be an idea, an act of a communication, a model of behavior or a physical manifestation. It is through these instances that people intuitively tend to represent those unconscious contents that are felt to be needed at this moment for their compensatory function at the psychic level. As long as human psyche is a collective phenomenon and the Unconscious as its “feeding source” is also collective in nature, the present day need towards trespassing the old barriers of separatedness in order to achieve Wholeness appears to be an inborn, automatic and most natural phenomenon. The need always reveals a “gap” which, in this case, can be filled by restoring to consciousness the archetype of the “globe-circle” as the ideal connection with an all-knowledgeable and omnipotent centre occupied by the higher Ego/Self as Repairer, Restorer, Integrator and Protector.

The Ego of our postmodern, “globalist” era is no longer comfortable with the inherited value system. It questions the norms and concepts of the past that now look void and illogical. It deconstructs reality in order to reveal the illusory nature of all phenomena. It looks for new forms, like globalization and integration and yet, it discovers that problems are far from being solved. This moment acts like a warning, namely, that the Ego has reached an impasse. However, this is inherent in the very process of the Ego-Self ascent. The present crisis simply announces that the Ego is in for a “Becoming” out of its stagnant, limited awareness into a stage where it will have accepted and assimilated new contents of the Unconscious. The crisis is ultimately produced by the Self Itself because He is the great Ruler of the Unconscious and the great Challenger. He challenges our Ego to go beyond the limits of the present Knowledge and thereby, come closer to the Self. And how does the Self achieve that? He “injects” the Ego with Its (unconscious) contents that are contradictory, beyond logic and impossible to accept by the ordinary mind. The conscious Ego cannot cope with them and the outcome is fragmentation and confusion that destabilizes personality. In so doing, however, it opens the possibility of re-stabilizing it at a higher level. And this is the job of the Self.

The present-day shifting ideologies of globalization and anti-globalization are rooted in a multitude of physical and mental dimensions such as ethnic, technical, economic, financial, social and cultural. They point to a new condition and to a superior constellation of values and relationships. Practically, the entire present phenomena and their associated discourse and semantics is nothing else than part of the strategy devised by the Self to attract the Ego towards Itself. Here, it should not be forgotten that sociality and transcendence are not

enemies but simultaneous parts of psyche, waiting to be known and integrated, because the Self is nearer to man than anything else.

The imperative lies now not as much in seeking globalization outside human psyche but in looking for it inside. The deepest significance of globalization is Self-Realization. When this process has been achieved at a universal scale, the existing chain of conflicting and often dramatic external events will automatically be corrected and adjusted. It is only then, we might say, that globalization, as a concept not fully understood by the present day humanity, will take care of itself.

References:

- Bhartrihari, *The Vakyapadya. Critical texts of Cantos I and II. Summary of Ideas and Notes by K. Raghavan Pillai*, Motilal Banarsidass, 1971.
- Giddens, Anthony, *Runaway World – How Globalization is Reshaping our Lives*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group Ltd., London, 2002.
- Jung, Carl Gustav, *Dreams*, Routledge, 2002 – London.
- Jung, Carl Gustav, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious (Collected works, 1991)*, Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Steger, B. Manfred, *Ideologies of Globalization*, “*Journal of Political Ideologies*” (Feb. 2005), 10 (8), 11-30, Taylor & Francis Group Ltd.
- Urs, Dana Sorana, *Puterea limbajulu*, Ed. Oscar Print, București, 2007.