People who are ill may simply be living in the wrong place

Are sick or unhappy people in a geographically alien energy-field – the wrong district, even the wrong country? Are they on the wrong kind of rock – or is a granite person living on clay, a sand person on limestone? Sea people may be stuck inland, plains people in the mountains and mountain people in the Fens. Is this a city person forcibly isolated in the country, a village person confined to the town? One person from the North of England, forced to live in the South, was always unwell till she went to Manchester, where she was fine (despite the fact that her troublesome family lived there). She needed look no further for the root of her malaise.

Explorers of earth-energy, aiming to relate to the planet as a whole, are on the edge of something important. In China, the houses have to suit the Dragon Spirit, being built so that no evil spirits can enter – indeed, mirrors are put up to scare them off …

**Spirit of Cities**

Places like Glastonbury are no longer the powerful energy centres of Great Britain. The truly major magnetic and spiritual centres for the collective are the big cities. They are like chakras in the country’s total energy system, while the ley-lines, crossing at power-points across the land, are its acupuncture meridians. Each town and city is a sacred site with its different geology and topography, like a lotus with an initiating triangle at its centre, the ‘jewel in the lotus’. Each petal has a different energy, its own cellular structure.

Cities have regions which correspond to different areas of consciousness. London, for instance, consists of villages that have grown together, each with its own spirit: Westminster for Government, the City for money and banking, Bloomsbury for education and medicine, Lincoln’s Inn for justice. (And south of the river lies the shadow, where the Redeemer lives …) All are different; we sense it as we cross streets that represent boundaries. The local spirits are very important both for the people and for the organisations there. Until quite recently, the postman was a walking, Tolkien-style *ent*, like a tree; there were corner-shop
people, porters, caretakers, dustmen, milkmen, street-cleaners. Love them, support them, become one of them – they are being crowded out. Little room is left for them when the cellular structure of a city is destroyed. The centre fades as huge motorways and car parks appear on the edges, breaking up the archetypal shapes, cutting into the squares and circles and crescents, shattering its structure.

**Spirit of nations**

They, too, have different collective national energies. For the United Kingdom, Alice Bailey suggested *love* and *wisdom* were the soul energies while *power* was that of the ego-personality which had been dominant in the age of Empire. Recently, Great Britain had been shifting towards the energy of the soul or Self of the country. In the United States, love and wisdom were again the soul’s energies, but the personality was that of the *devotee*. In Russia, the *magician* was the soul’s energy and, again, devotion the ego’s; both Russia and America were shifting towards their soul energies. China had power for the soul and *ideas* for the ego; India, again, power for the soul but *mediation* for the ego.

As nations, towns and cities differ, and the areas within cities – and individual people – so too do organisations:

**LIFE-CYCLES OF GROUPS AND ORGANISATIONS**

*There is genuine good will in industry,*  
*but in esoteric groups they cut each other’s throats …*

Important movements tend to be led by a small number of pioneers. The second generation are almost bound to foul it up; then the third generation redresses the balance.

There are parallels between the behaviour of the individual and behaviour in the collective. In the individual, the borderline between conscious and unconscious is varied and fluid, where in the collective it is more distinctly marked. Groups, like individuals, have their journeys and their cycles: the goal, the energy used and the style of management depend on the archetype, and the group must meet the test of the market place, each activity serving a real need. When we consider an organisation,
we need to remember not only its conscious side, but its unconscious purpose, its structure, leadership, size, way of communication, relations and life-cycle.

**Purpose.** What is the keynote of the group? Is it a voluntary organisation, or an industry? Organisations designed for *love* – those which, on the surface, care for spirituality – tend to have the knives out underneath in the unconscious. And in esoteric groups, people cut each other’s throats. On the contrary, in those organisations designed for *profit* the battles are less destructive. People who have worked in both the industrial and the therapy worlds have tended to find more genuine love and good will in industry, where power-trippers get their legs pulled, than in ‘helping’ groups where they are stabbed in the back. What’s in the unconscious of a competitive, cut-throat organisation? The answer is, *love*.

**Structure.** In our society, well-functioning groups are usually hierarchical: democracy still turns out that way. Balancing a strong central energy with group involvement is difficult, and few are yet ready for it; organising and tightening up the structure brings up quarrels. Although the interplay of power and money is crucial in all organisations, one is normally set against the other. And in voluntary and ‘New Age’ groups, they are both in the shadow: ‘If we make appeals, we should send out accounts – ’ or should we?

**Leadership.** Are the leaders charismatic? Charisma is what we beam out – it makes it possible for others to project on to us. Charismatic leaders set up groups which become extensions of themselves; they can touch and feel what’s going on. This is an instinctual phase in the life of the group: the leader carries not only the life force but the masculine and feminine principles too. Are they tight, disciplined and hierarchical; or, as in certain types of network, do they keep a looser hold? Both are useful and necessary – but which is appropriate? It depends on the archetype under which the group functions.

**Charismatic leaders,** whether men or women, tend to be entrepreneurs, not managers. But a charismatic man needs a colleague, often a woman, who *can* manage; and the charismatic woman will remain just a wise woman of the *village* unless she has a manager, usually a man. If each has the other, a *sect* grows.

**Size.** With fewer than about twenty-five, everyone knows everyone. When the number grows above that, the group becomes an organisation
and charismatic leaders often can’t cope. Earlier than one might think, starting in the second seven-year cycle, the work increases, numbers rise and problems multiply. As soon as the archetypal structure gets spoilt, relationships are ruined. The secret is, make haste slowly. On a bigger scale, two to five hundred is a critical size. An organisation is ‘small’ if it’s under five hundred; over that, and it’s inhuman, non-organic, and doesn’t work. Other ways – the way of the network, the way of the matrix – must be found.

**Communication.** Within organisations there are process people and there are project people. Lines of communication between them need to be kept open. Process people mind the shop and get pleasure thereby; project people undertake a task, and when that is accomplished they want another, different task. There are project and process organisations, too. Their breakdowns can be compared with those of individuals: at odds with their purpose, everything gets too much, too big for them. Communication fails. The organisation needs the small things again, till it can begin to extend lines of communication within itself, and finally with others.

**Relations.** Within the archetypal field of the organisation, people mix in inner groups. Each archetype needs to be present at some level, a balance giving effective action. The masculine and feminine principles are both crucial for success. Hospitals, schools, industry and so on, traditionally allowed women only menial tasks: the feminine was carried by the secretaries and the tea ladies and canteen staff and porters. But organisations which have ignored, suppressed or barred the feminine principle in this way are organisations in trouble.

**Life-cycles of groups and organisations**

There are cycles in the lives of groups as well as of people. The first six nursery years ground the vision. Expansion takes place from seven to thirteen. In the next seven years – the adolescent, apprentice stage – the children rebel and leave home. From twenty-one to twenty seven is the first stage of the hero’s journey, when group generation takes place. Groups and organisations multiply because the founder doesn’t prepare adequately for the succession – he can’t let go. People come and go; very few stay for more than one seven-year cycle. However, to be prepared for the central energy of leadership a person needs to be there for two seven-year cycles. Most candidates for the succession won’t hang around that long. They break away.
What happens? Many organisations – the Club, the Mafia – simply bring in like-minded people, family, friends; the Old Boy network makes history, through trust based on personal contact. This spider’s web of nepotism enables speedy decisions and is cheap and effective. How do industrial and financial, head-type organisations multiply? The love is in the unconscious and groups spin off from each other quite amicably as individuals feel a need to be left to themselves. For example, a bank has money in the coffers and uses it to fund bright enterprises. Networking is the way; people are left free, and if one of them gets successful, that endeavour grows and the bank wants to float it off – rather like a spider-plant. It’s seen as good that individuals go off and do their own thing. Of course, splits do also take place in industry; there are takeovers, as well as deliberate divisions by the originator. But in these ‘for-profit’ organisations a genuine group sexual process, a mating, is sometimes possible.

They certainly have something to teach many ‘love’ organisations, which, not yet at this evolutionary mating stage, tend to be more like amoeba: they multiply by splitting. Within five years of the retirement or death of the founder, trouble arises. As new groups evolve out of the old, feelings of betrayal arise. It’s painful. Many knives go in backs. The second generation, as we saw, has good intentions but is without charisma. Group-think and planning are substituted for inspiration. People divide into two ideological factions, one saying: ‘Our Leader taught thus, and we must remain true to that!’ – the other, ‘If he were here, he wouldn’t want us to stick to the old ways. It’s stupid!’

And so they split and start new organisations. This way seems to be natural for our age. How are we to use and respond to such unavoidable splits? The subsequent decline of the organisation is not necessarily a disaster. It can lead to a scattering of the seed. It might even be quite nice to look back at twenty-five years on when the protagonists are dead and the creative energy has been released. For the split may yet prove good for the future – and it does stop the leader from becoming a poor old senex.

**Secondary Archetypes**
The splitting of groups is not difficult at the level of the Self, the primary archetype of a group’s personality. For example, in Psychosynthesis, Assagioli was first and foremost a priest-healer. But ask, which subsidiary archetypes lend energy to organisations? This is very
difficult. Where some groups have ‘power’ or ‘thinker’ second, others have ‘magician’ or
‘conciliator’. It makes a difference. In some kinds of group everyone falls over themselves to
be helpful, while in others no one at all will volunteer to help new and ignorant members.
Again, Humanistic psychology is under a different secondary archetype, more social and
political, from Transpersonal psychology which leans more towards relationship and the
spiritual. Humanistic people advertise more than transpersonal people, who believe that
advertising even gets in the way. Could it be that ‘psychology people’ have more heart and
less head, while ‘astrology people’ are the other way round? The god of the Scientist is truth,
but what about the god of the transport organisations? – of engineering, sculpting, philosophy
groups, poets’ societies? – they all differ in archetypal energy.

Leadership. Some leaders are better than others over questions of networks versus hierarchies.
Political groups such as most governments, running on power and tight organisation, need
Harmonisers among the Idealists. Yes, Rulers are required for focus and purpose, but also the
heart of the Priest-healer, the clear analysis of the Scientist, the Magician to organise, and the
Devotee to keep the show on the road. Educational groups need Conciliators to blend the
harsh outlines of schools, universities, colleges; they need Science for clarity and they need
Love to relate people with each other. Scientific groups need Thinkers for clarity, and
Harmonisers too. Who is in charge of the health service? Take hospitals. The consultants are
usually Ruler types, often trying to be Magicians too. But where are the Healers?

It needs a mix. In successful organisations, the leaders often succeed in blending the
archetypes within themselves. If they don’t, they will need the combined energies of two or
three other people; otherwise, a lopsided organisation and a lot of trouble follow. The right
archetype must be in charge, within the individuals and thus in the group. Its outer form must
be compatible with its spirit. In applying for an apparently ideal job, ask: does the resonance
of this group really match this individual? We recall Jung’s concept of the accidental and the
chosen family. We are not all of the same stuff, but have our spiritual families. At a certain
stage we find our own people – and come home.

Again, it may be appropriate to end this workshop with the Universal Blessing of Buddhism.