Chapter Five: An Ecological-Evolutionary Theory of Consciousness
Part Two - Emotion and Motivation

Introduction

Introduced in Chapter Two, two additional connected features of consciousness that in my view are phenomenologically fundamental and evolutionarily primordial are emotion and motivation. Emotion and motivation manifest certain distinctive and essential qualities within the make-up of consciousness and these features of consciousness I suggest have prehistoric beginnings in early animal evolution. Moreover, emotion and motivation are concomitant and functionally connected with the other proposed fundamental features of consciousness, including perception, proprioception, and purposeful behavior.

Definitions and descriptions of emotion and motivation are developed below in a series of steps. The reader is referred to my book *Future Consciousness*, Chapters Ten through Twelve for extensive examinations of emotion and motivation that highlight their essential role in future consciousness.

My starting point in this present text for describing and defining these fundamental features of consciousness is "conscious feeling." Conscious feelings are a key phenomenological feature of both emotion and motivation. There are other conscious phenomena that are basic features of emotion and motivation, including for example, conscious behavior and thinking/imagery—to be examined later—but I begin my examination of emotion and motivation with the ubiquitous conscious phenomena of feelings as essential constituents in the make-up of conscious emotion and conscious motivation.

Damasio characterizes emotion as "the feeling of what happens"—the title of one of his books. I would slightly modify this description to read "the feeling of what is happening," to highlight the ongoing dynamic flow of consciousness and emotion. I would also though add that emotion covers "the feeling of what has happen"—we have emotions about past experienced events—and "the feelings of what may happen"—we have emotions about anticipated future events. The latter is of central significance in understanding the holistic nature of future consciousness. All in all, we have feelings and emotions about the past, present, and future. Anchoring to the concept of feeling, motivation can be described as "the feeling of what I am wanting or desiring."

Feeling

Feelings are an ongoing and ubiquitous feature of consciousness. In fact, it has been argued that feeling is essential to consciousness; without feelings there is no consciousness. But how do we define the phenomenological nature or quality of conscious feelings? Perusing the literature, introspecting on consciousness, and considering how the term is popularly used, it appears that there are diverse and even contradictory meanings associated with conscious feelings.

Feeling can refer to touch and skin sensations and perceptions. One can "feel" being touched (on the skin), or "feel" the shape and surface texture of a physical object

through touch or grasping. The former is a conscious feeling pertaining to one's body; the latter is a perceptual feeling pertaining to the make-up of an physical object.

Feeling can refer to bodily sensory proprioceptions. We feel the position of our body and our limbs. We feel muscular tension within our body and feel movements in our body.

Feeling can refer to experienced bodily states, both diffuse and localized. We feel our stomach churning and stomach aches. We can feel nauseated or dizzy. We can feel toothaches or headaches. We can feel either lazy and relaxed or energetic and tense. We can feel tired or sleepy. We can feel sick.

Pleasure and pain are connected with feelings. Bodily feelings can be pleasurable or painful. We feel pleasure; we feel pain in our bodies. Pleasure and pain can come in degrees; feelings can be mild or intense. All in all, feelings can possess a "valence;" there are positive feelings (which we are drawn to and attempt to maximize) and negative feelings (which we attempt to avoid or minimize). A general conversational question relevant to this meaning of feeling is: "How do you feel?"

Bringing emotion into this discussion of feeling, phenomenologically it appears that different emotions manifest distinctive and different feeling states. Anger feels different than sadness; fear feels different than happiness. In general, it appears that we feel emotions; emotions are a type of conscious feeling state (with other factors involved as well) and different emotions are associated with discriminatively different feeling states. These different conscious emotional-feeling states appear to be associated with different neural-chemical states of the body (See more detail on this last point below).

Bringing motivation into the discussion, phenomenologically it appears that we feel desires and wants. We feel hungry or thirsty. We feel horny and sexually aroused. We feel motivated or apathetic. We feel satisfied or deprived. Motivation is a type of conscious feeling state (with other factors involved as well).

Feelings can be complex, involving at the very least both emotional and motivational feeling states. We can feel frustrated; feel "in love;" feel confident and optimistic; or feel insecure and helpless.

All in all, feelings, which encompass all the diverse types of conscious phenomena identified above, are a continuously present and complex feature of consciousness; as noted above, it could be argued that feeling in this broad and complex fashion as described above is essential to consciousness (see more below). Feelings can be body-diffuse or body-localized; feelings can be intense or mild; feelings can be pleasurable or painful; feelings can be mixtures and syntheses of more elemental feeling states.

Feelings and the Hard Problem of Consciousness

One important aspect or part of the "Hard Problem of Consciousness" concerns feeling. Consciousness has been described as "What it feels like to exist." An object without consciousness—no matter how complex—would not feel that it existed. In this regard, feeling is taken as a defining feature of consciousness and as clearly distinguishable and something more than simply a state of a physical body. Feeling states are ontologically and qualitatively different than physical states. The hard

problem of consciousness could be framed as how can a physical state—no matter how complex—give rise to a feeling state?

Yet, there is a puzzle, if not paradox, associated with this formulation of the hard problem. As I described in an earlier section of this chapter, phenomenologically it appears that our bodies are conscious. The hands consciously feel objects and consciously feel their configuration and transformation in configurations. Phenomenologically, consciousness appears to pervade the entire body (in relative degrees of intensity and detail), from the mouth and face to the toes and feet. Even our gut, at least some of the time, is conscious vis-a-vis aches, bloating, and distress. This bodily consciousness is part of our total ongoing complex and transformative state of consciousness.

From the previous discussion on types of feelings we experience, it appears that the bulk of different meanings associated with feeling reference types of bodily consciousness. In essence, the body in the form of feelings is conscious of its own states. (Even perceptual feelings—to feel an object—involves a conscious body.) Feelings are modes of bodily consciousness. As such, without a body there would be no conscious feelings.[1] Hence, a paradox arises: We can imagine a physical entity without consciousness or feeling (for example, the idea of a zombie), and the hard problem clearly distinguishes physical-bodily states from conscious states, yet it would appear that conscious feeling requires a physical body, in so far as conscious feelings are states of the body being conscious of itself. The idea of a disembodied conscious being possessing feelings is impossible.

It could be argued that the conscious self experiences feelings. Feelings (inclusive of emotional and motivational feelings) are states of a conscious self. We use such common expressions as "I'm angry; I'm sad; I'm hungry; I'm dizzy, etc." Phenomenologically, it appears that my conscious self can be and often is in emotional states; emotional feelings appear as intrinsic to the conscious self. Yet, we could argue that the conscious self necessarily and primordially contains a dimension of embodiment—the conscious self has its foundation in a proprioceptual-based conscious body—than conscious emotional feelings are states of an embodied conscious self.

All in all, given the ubiquity and essential dimension of feelings in consciousness, it would seem to be the case that consciousness is always an embodied consciousness. Although one might attempt to imagine a disembodied consciousness, the essential reality of feeling as integral to consciousness would seem to imply the impossibility of such a mode of existence. Even if we were to grant that consciousness is qualitatively and ontologically distinct from a biological body, the former can not exist without the latter.

Cognition and Knowing versus Emotion and Feeling

Another important topic to consider in understanding the nature and significance of feeling and emotion in consciousness is the common distinction between cognition

[1] One could argue that it is possible to imagine having conscious feelings without possessing a body. I am, though, doubtful whether such a state of consciousness is conceivable or possible.

and knowing and emotion and feeling. The philosopher Nietzsche argued that in ancient Greece we find two different general attitudes toward reality and human existence: The Dionysian and the Apollonian. The former mindset emphasized sensation and reverie, whereas the latter emphasized reason and order. In more contemporary times we find the distinctive philosophies of rationalism (associated with the Western Enlightenment) versus Romanticism, the former emphasizing thought and reason whereas the latter emphasizing emotion, feeling, and the artistic temperament. (See Chapter Two.) These historical-philosophical distinctions in general align with the common distinction made between feeling/emotion and cognition/knowing/reasoned thinking.

This basic distinction is supported by a number of arguments. It can be argued that we can experience non-cognitive emotions and feelings, such as "free-floating anxiety." Presumably there can be pure emotional states of consciousness without any cognition or thinking. There is the common dictum that we should "Go with or listen to our feelings," rather than use thought to evaluate a situation or make a decision.

Conversely, there is the idea (and ideal) that we can have non-feeling, non-emotional, non-motivational conscious states of cognition or knowing. Mr. Spock in *Star Trek* presumably strove to follow reason and logic without allowing emotion and feeling to influence his decisions. (Spock had emotions; he just attempted to not let such feeling states influence his thinking and decision making.) We can suppose that there can be pure cognitive states of consciousness—to simply consciously know—without any emotional or motivational factors involved. This presumed type or state of consciousness has been identified as an aspirational goal or ideal.

We make a common distinction between people who appear to be more emotional and feeling oriented and people who are more rational and thoughtful. This distinction aligns with the historical-philosophical polarities of Dionysian versus Apollonian and Romantic versus rational.

Emotion and cognition can be thought of as separate conscious realities because at times these two states of consciousness may appear in conflict with each other: To feel one thing and yet think something totally different.

Yet, in spite of this historically long-standing distinction and the above contemporary arguments separating cognition/thinking and emotion/feeling, there are numerous counter-arguments and viewpoints that these two conscious phenomena are not totally distinct and independent.

Those areas of the brain and nervous system identified as involved in cognition and emotion/feeling are deeply intertwined and interactive. It appears physiologically impossible to have non-feelings thoughts and cognitions or non-cognitive feelings and emotions. It would be more accurate to describe consciousness as involving "feeling-cognitions" or "cognitive-feelings."

From a phenomenological perspective on emotion, following Brentano's foundational point that consciousness is intentionality and hence must be "of something," it follows that emotion or emotional feeling can not exist without cognitive "appraisal." Feeling/emotional states of consciousness are always about some cognitively identified object. Cognitive appraisal can be perceptual, rather than necessarily involving thought, but in all cases emotions and feelings in general are about some cognitively identified object.

The cognitively identified object can be a state of the body. Hence, there can not be emotion or feeling without cognition.

From both introspective and phenomenological assessments of consciousness, it appears that feeling and emotion are ubiquitous, ever-present features of consciousness. There are no observable non-emotional, non-feeling states of consciousness or conscious knowing. As the father of introspection psychology Wilhelm Wundt argued, feelings and emotions may be mild, minimal, or at the perimeter of consciousness, but these phenomena are always present in consciousness. There is no simple or pure state of conscious awareness, knowing, or believing without feeling.

The cognitive theory of emotions in modern psychology asserts that emotional experience depends upon the cognitive interpretation (or appraisal) of reality and cognitive interpretations of bodily arousal states. Different cognitive patterns of thinking and interpretation generate distinctively different emotions. There are anxious thoughts, sad thoughts, and happy thoughts. Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavioral psychotherapies attempt to change the thoughts, interpretations, and cognitive appraisals in clients as a method for changing the felt emotions in clients.

Conversely (or reciprocally) there is the emotional theory of cognition, which contends that emotions impact all other conscious phenomena and processes. Emotions are causally efficacious in consciousness. Emotions can dampen or excite and energize cognition, thinking, creativity, and (conscious purposeful) behavior. Emotional states, such as anger, happiness, or sadness, generate different patterns of cognition.

Damasio goes so far as to argue that emotion is actually a form of cognition, involving the apprehension and evaluation of the environment. Emotion is a cognitive appraisal that is felt. (But from the above, it may be the case that all cognitive appraisals are felt.)

All in all, “to know” and “to feel” are reciprocally fused in consciousness. This necessary integration is of central relevance in providing a realistic and comprehensive definition of emotion (See below).

The same type of fused reciprocity applies to cognition and motivation. Desire impacts cognition and cognition impacts desire. There is no dispassionate identification and description of reality (or the truth) achieved through cognition, and reciprocally, desire invariably has a cognitively identified object of desire. These considerations are relevant to providing a realistic and comprehensive definition of motivation.

Conclusions on Conscious Feelings

The feeling dimension of consciousness pertains to bodily awareness of states of the body.

Feeling, inclusive of emotion and motivation, is a ubiquitous and essential feature of consciousness. There is no non-feeling consciousness.

Feeling and cognition (knowing) are essential and interconnected features of both emotion and motivation.

Emotion

Having introduced a number of important and essential features of both emotion and motivation, at this point I expand the discussion and consider other central features of these conscious phenomena. I begin with emotion.

A comprehensive definition of emotion recognizes that emotional consciousness is a *psycho-physiological Gestalt*: A holistic integrative reality involving a variety of factors. Key factors in emotion include: Bodily consciousness of bodily states, including states of arousal; bodily and proprioceptual sensations; these first two factors together constituting the conscious feeling dimension of emotion; behavioral (including facial) expressions of emotion and feedback effect on conscious feelings (see discussion below); conscious behavioral engagement with the environment (ecological factor) (see discussion below); a plethora of neurological and physiological correlates (including biochemical states); a cognitive dimension—the apprehension and interpretation of objects of emotion and arousal states (see above discussion and more elaboration below); and an evaluation and valence dimension including pleasure and pain (in part cognitive and in part feeling). Some of these factors have already been introduced; other factors are examined below.[2]

Two key themes highlighted in the following examination of emotion are the evolutionary and ecological dimensions of emotion. I begin with evolutionary considerations regarding emotion.

Evolutionary Perspectives on Emotion

Evolutionary Perspective I: In agreement with Robert Plutchik and Paul Ekman's highly influential theories of emotions, emotion exists in animals.[3] In so far as emotion involves as a key feature conscious feelings, it seems to me highly credible that emotional consciousness exists in animals. As proposed in Chapter Two and further elaborated on in this chapter, emotional consciousness is a primordial dimension of consciousness. Emotional consciousness manifests itself in the earliest evolutionary beginnings of consciousness.

In Chapter Two I proposed that consciousness appeared in our evolutionary history at least as far back as the emergence of an integrated central nervous system, such as can be found in trilobites circa 500 million years BCE. Emotion (and motivation as well) are associated with sub-cortical structures in the brain and these structures emerged very early in the evolution of the brain. This view on emotion (emotional consciousness) does not rule out the possibility that either consciousness or emotional consciousness in particular may extend back even earlier in evolutionary history, but at the very least,

---

[2] An extensive review of the complex thinking and research throughout history regarding emotion, including areas of agreement and disagreement, on emotion can be found at: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Emotion* - https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/emotion/.

[3] *Robert Plutchik*: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Plutchik and *Paul Ekman*: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Ekman.

it seems reasonable to suppose that these phenomena extend back 500 million years to the formation of a complex central nervous system.

Throughout modern history though it should be acknowledged that there has been ongoing debate regarding whether animals experience emotions. Descartes in the seventeenth century proposed that animals are complex non-conscious mechanical machines. Over the last couple of centuries the argument has repeatedly been made that attributing emotions to animals is a case of anthropomorphizing animal existence; we imaginatively project into the animal qualities of human experience. There is the standard argument that since we can not directly observe the consciousness of animals (if consciousness is viewed as a unobservable private reality) we can not determine the existence or make-up of their consciousness. But Darwin in the nineteenth century, contradicting such views on emotion and consciousness in animals, argued at length, with copious details and evidence provided, that animals do experience various emotions. In line with Darwin and extending the argument even further, contemporary researchers have proposed that there is a great deal of evidence that animals experience emotions; aside from primates and mammals, there is experimental research suggesting that even crayfish and bees have emotions. Following Plutchik and Ekman, it makes sense to believe that there is a set of universal emotions existing in humans and animals. (See below)

As a set of related questions: Do animals experience desire? (For example, hunger or thirst) Do animals experience pleasure and pain? And do animals experience conscious feelings in the broad sense? (Do they conscious feelings of their bodies?) Regarding all these questions, it seems to me that the answers would be yes. Conscious emotion, desire, bodily feelings, and pleasure and pain all exist in animal consciousness and have existed in our evolutionary history for hundreds of millions of years (at the very least).

Evolutionary Perspective II: A second basic evolutionary point to make regarding emotions—a thesis presented by Darwin, Ekman, and Plutchik—is that emotions evolved to serve an adaptive and survival function. Emotions, which include as part of their integrative Gestalt nature both affective cognition and appropriate behaviors, provide conscious responses to key life-environmental challenges. Emotions are conscious responses—in particular, consciously felt responses—specific to various important meanings and/or values of the environment relevant to an animal's continued existence. In this sense, conscious emotions have an ecological dimension, in that conscious emotions appropriately couple or connect with different important environmental facts and events. Fear is a conscious response to a dangerous environmental event; anger is a response to a threatening event; and happiness/enjoyment to a positive and beneficial event. Emotions evolved to support appropriate conscious responses to key environmental meanings or values for the animal.

This ecological dimension to emotion illuminates how emotion is connected with perception, cognition in general, and purposeful behavior. (Recall that I proposed that perception and purposeful behavior are fundamental primordial states of consciousness.) Let's start with the connection between perception and emotion. Perception is sensory cognition of the environment. To recall, perception involves sensory consciousness of meanings, values, and functions—collectively identified as "affordances"—of the environment. Perception attunes to functions the environment

possesses for behavior; perception attunes to values, positive and negative, the environment possesses regarding animal survival. As such, perception is not simply an awareness that "X is the case," but also that "X" possesses some value or function for the animal. Hence, emotion, at a primordial level, can be viewed as the consciously felt response to the perceptual cognition of values and meanings in the environment. (Recall, from the intentionality thesis on emotion that emotions must have an object of cognition; at the most basic level, before the emergence of thought, such objects of cognition are apprehended through perception.) This basic coupling of perception and emotion in primordial consciousness indicates that the environment is apprehended and felt in the simplest of conscious creatures as having value, both positive and negative.

In that both emotion and motivation involve dimensions of feeling and cognition, both possess a similar ecological structure. Both emotion and motivation involve bodily feelings (desires in the case of motivation) about factors or features of the environment, in particular, the affordances and values perceived in the environment. In the case of motivation, it is consciously felt responses toward what is desired and what is to be avoided. Hence, the cognitive dimension of both emotion and motivation is "outer-directed"—an identification of the object toward which the conscious being has feelings and desires. Emotions and motivations though can also be conscious feelings and cognitively identified features self-reflectively pertaining to the self (and body); animals and humans can emotionally and motivationally respond to cognitively identified states of their body.

Regarding the connection between purposeful behavior and emotion, different emotions are associated with different types of behavior specific to different meanings and values in the environment. In a state of fear, an animal runs and/or hides from perceived danger; in a state of anger, an animal attacks or threatens a perceived threat; and in disgust, an animal avoids or withdraws from a perceived aversive reality. As noted earlier, the function of perception is to guide behavior, and if we bring emotion into the picture, the function of emotion (which includes as its cognitive element the perception of some affordance or value in the environment) is similarly to prime or instigate appropriate types of behavior toward important environmental events.

There is the argument, often associated with the famous psychologist William James, that different behaviors cause different emotions. Instead of thinking that behavior is an expression of emotion (or caused by emotion), James took the reverse position that behavior causes emotion. We do not run because we are afraid; we are afraid because we run. Given the psychological interactivity of the various key elements of emotion, it is probably more valid to argue that emotional feeling and purposeful behavior form a reciprocal loop, each impacting the other. An animal or human may be afraid before they run, but running intensifies the feeling of fear.

Relevant to the connection between emotion and behavior, Ekman famously proposed his "Universal Facial Expression" theory of emotion. He argued (based on extensive cross-cultural research) that there are a small set of universal fundamental emotions humans (and animals) possess (see below) and each of these basic emotions is associated with a distinctive facial expression; a happy face is distinctively and universally different than a sad face. Moreover, adopting a distinctive facial expression associated with a distinctive emotion will causally amplify the felt experience of that

emotion. Smiling makes you happier; frowning makes you sadder. This latter idea of facial expressions impacting felt emotions aligns with James' theory of behavior causing emotions.

Evolutionary Perspective III: A third evolutionary perspective on emotion is the theory proposed by Ekman and others that there are a relatively small set of primary emotions in humans that are innate and inherited from animals. Ekman proposed that happiness (enjoyment), sadness, anger, fear, surprise, and disgust are primary innate emotions found in both animals (at least mammals) and humans. Ekman later in his writings added "contempt," a social emotion, as an eighth primary emotion. Grounded in this primary set of emotions, numerous secondary emotions emerge in the psychological development of individuals. Secondary emotions are viewed as a result of learning and psychological development, and involving combinations of primary emotions that emerge in psychological development. There are variations in different theories of emotion regarding what are the primary emotions and what emotions are secondary and develop as a human (or animal?) matures, but this distinction between primary (innate/inherited) and secondary emotions is a common idea among theories of emotion. I might suggest adding love, hate (as distinguishable from anger), grief, and hope (positive anticipation) as primary emotions.

Based on this common distinction of primary and secondary emotions, a frequent type of model of emotions, proposed by Plutchik and others, is to visualize all emotions as existing on a "Wheel," in which the primary emotions are represented as a set of oppositional pairs, each primary pair positioned on opposite sides of the wheel (or circle) of emotions.[4] Also of significance in Plutchik's wheel of emotions, for each oppositional pair of primary emotions, he identifies corresponding opposite types of behavior associated with the primary emotions. As noted earlier, distinctive behaviors are an integral part of different emotions.

In Plutchik's wheel: Joy is identified as the opposite of sadness and the aligned opposite associated behaviors are to connect (joy) versus to withdraw (sadness); fear is the opposite of anger and the associated opposite behaviors are "get small and hide" (fear) versus "get big and loud;" anticipation is the opposite of surprise and the associated behaviors are examine closely (approach) versus jump back (retreat); and finally disgust is identified as the opposite of trust and the oppositional associated behaviors are reject versus embrace. It's worth noting that Plutchik's proposed set of primary emotions is somewhat different than the set proposed by Ekman. In general, there is not total consensus among different theories of primary emotions regarding what are the foundational primary emotions.

In the various different wheel diagrams of emotions, secondary emotions are placed between the primary emotions on the wheel representing the idea that secondary emotions are combinations or mixtures of the primary emotions. A key feature, though, of all the different wheel models is to represent emotions as oppositional pairs or polarities, which leads us into the next important theme regarding understanding emotions.

---

[4] See Plutchik's "Oppositional Wheel" of emotions at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Plutchik.

Emotion: Hedonic, Reciprocity, and Motivational Dimensions

A common view among different theories of emotion is that emotions can be either pleasurable or unpleasant and painful. Some emotions feel good; some emotions feel bad. Emotions have a hedonic polarity dimension. This proposed basic oppositional dimension of emotions, associated with the primordial feelings of pleasure and pain, has relevance to a number of key ideas regarding the nature of emotions, including: emotions being associated with distinctive adaptive behavioral responses; emotions having motivational power; emotions possessing a reciprocity dimension; and emotions as feelings.

To begin, at a basic level the oppositional conscious states of pleasure versus pain (which includes pleasurable versus painful emotions) are associated with the opposing behaviors of approach versus avoidance (or escape). According to the hedonic theory of motivation, humans and animals approach and seek out pleasure (pleasurable conscious states), and avoid and escape from pain (painful conscious states). Bringing the environment into the theory, humans and animals will approach environmental conditions that generate pleasure and avoid or escape from environmental conditions which produce pain. If we incorporate emotion into the hedonic theory of motivation, we can argue that humans and animals approach and seek out pleasurable conscious emotions and avoid or escape from painful conscious emotions. As such, in this theory we find a basic alignment between two different types of emotion—pleasurable and painful—and two different associated basic types of behavior—to approach and to avoid. Moreover, to approach versus to avoid (or escape) represent two polar opposite forms of behavior.

Within this line of thinking, emotions clearly have a motivational power. We are motivated to approach and maintain pleasurable emotions and motivated to avoid or escape from unpleasant emotions. Each of the two general classes of emotion—pleasurable and painful—is associated with a distinctive and opposing type of motivated behavior—to pursue pleasurable emotions and to avoid and escape from unpleasant emotions.

Moreover, the connection between emotion and motivated behavior in a more complex and detailed representation is also apparent in Plutchik's wheel. Each of the eight primary emotions is associated with a distinctive type of motivated behavior. Also, in line with the theme of oppositional organization, each pair of motivated behaviors for each pair of opposing emotions involves opposite forms of behavior.

We can, in fact, postulate that the various types of primary emotions (whatever set is identified as primary) are motivational causes of behavior. Each emotion motivates the human or animal to execute a distinctive type of behavior. We run (escape/avoid) because we are afraid; we attack or threaten because we are angry; we withdraw from life activities (become inactive) because we are sad; and we embrace or connect because we are joyful (happy). As such, emotions constitute an important class of fundamental motives in human and animal behavior.

Based on the above polarities of pleasure and pain (pleasurable and painful emotions) and opposing pairs of emotion-driven motivated behaviors (such as approach versus avoidance), a plausible hypothesis is that various central features of consciousness are organized as reciprocities, of distinct but interdependent and

complementary pairs. In this regard, pleasure and pain, inclusive of pleasurable and painful emotions, although oppositional in nature, require each other for their distinctive existence.[5] Without conscious pain, there could not be conscious pleasure. The various wheels of oppositional emotions (both primary and secondary) are complex versions of conscious Yin-Yangs, each postulated pair constituting complementary and mutually implicative pairs. Approach and avoidance are a basic complementary pair of fundamental adaptive behaviors in engaging the environment.

Emotion: Feelings, Hedonic and Reciprocity Dimensions, and Physiology

The concept of reciprocity, in at least a couple of different ways, applies to the feeling dimension of emotion. To begin, I review some basic points about feelings and emotions.

Different bodily conscious feelings (inclusive of sensory-proprioceptual) are an essential part of emotional consciousness; feelings are the body conscious of states of itself. Each basic emotion has a distinctive conscious feel that is connected with distinctive physiological (neural-chemical) states of the body. There is a body-diffuse conscious quality of emotional feelings aligning with generalized as opposed to localized states of the body; emotional feelings are felt throughout the body. Such emotional feelings can be pleasurable or unpleasant and painful; this bi-polar and oppositional quality constitutes the hedonic dimension of emotional feelings and is one form of a reciprocal dimension to emotional feelings. Cognitive interpretations (or appraisals), as integral to emotions, impact this hedonic dimension, amplifying, dampening, and enriching the experience. Associated behaviors can also impact the feeling dimension of emotion. Depending on what I think and how I behave, the dimension of pleasure versus pain is affected.

Adding another reciprocal dimension into the above description of emotional feeling, it is often hypothesized that emotions pertain to felt states of arousal in the body. But humans (at the very least) experience highly agitated and intense emotional states, such as hatred and terror, but also experience relatively calm and relaxing emotional states such as bliss and contentment. This contrast between agitated versus calm (emotional) states aligns with the oppositional physiological systems of the sympathetic versus parasympathetic nervous systems. The former becomes more active and dominant during periods of stress, tension, and preparedness for action; the latter becomes more dominant during periods of rest and relaxation. These reciprocal physiological systems support the reciprocal conscious realities of excited versus calm (emotional) states. These systems are also involved in the basic oscillatory rest-activity cycle in human and animal behavior, in which humans and animals (with variations depending upon the species), manifest regular daily rhythms of alert consciousness and relatively unconscious periods of relatively relaxed sleep.

Emotion: Final Points

---

[5] See Lombardo, *Future Consciousness*, pp. 389-395 for a discussion of the necessity and value of negative painful emotions.

Temporal transformations of emotions are a basic feature of emotional consciousness. Part of the flow of consciousness is changes in current conscious emotions. Different emotions (states of emotional consciousness) manifest themselves sequentially in consciousness; different emotions come and go, lasting for various periods of time. Humans (and probably animals) can and do experience emotional swings, in which consciousness is dominated by relatively pleasurable emotions followed by unpleasant emotions and so forth.

A common distinction is made between emotions, which are relatively short term, and moods, which are relatively longer term. But in my view, a mood is simply a long-term emotional state. A person may have long term generalized emotional states (such as sadness, anxiety, or irritability) that persist for days, weeks, or even years, and such states are often referred to as "moods;" a person can be in a good or bad mood that persists for extended periods of time. Yet, the term "moody" is often used to refer to people who are prone to sudden and dramatic shifts in emotional consciousness. Bi-polar disorder or manic-depression is classified as a "mood" disorder, characterized by pronounced conscious shifts from depressive states to elated states. On the other hand, other types of mood disorders, such as anxiety disorders, can be characterized as long term generalized emotional states (e.g. persistent anxiety) that persist for extended periods of time.

Also of relevance to the issue of the degree of persistence of emotions and moods is the concept of psychological temperament. Some individuals appear more generally pleasant, happy, and content, whereas other individuals, of an opposed temperament, appear more sour, depressed, irritable, or angry. There are diverse variations among individuals on this simple dichotomy. Such generalized emotional states among individuals appear to be relatively life-long differences in emotional consciousness.

Emotions relative to conscious thoughts, are longer term states of consciousness; thoughts are relatively fleeting, following each other quickly, whereas once a person becomes angry or sad, it takes at least some time for the emotional state to dissipate. Distinctive emotional states of consciousness are difficult, if not impossible, to simply "turn off" or transform, although it is the case that the manifestation of significant and meaningful new events in the environment can abruptly provoke changes in emotions (though not necessarily). It is, of course, possible though challenging, to volitionally transform negative emotional states of consciousness into more uplifting emotional states by intentionally thinking positive interpretive thoughts about reality.

All in all, emotional consciousness transforms, different emotions following each other in succession, but there are also relatively persistent generalized emotional states in human consciousness as well.

There has been debate regarding whether there can be unconscious emotions. Can a person be feeling angry or sad and yet not be consciously aware that they are in such an emotional state? The psychological theory of the unconscious, as popularized by Freud and other depth psychologists, has given credence or plausibility to this idea of unconscious emotions. But a basic argument against this view, asserting that emotions are necessarily conscious, is grounded in the idea that emotions are feelings (or contain a feeling component) and that feelings can not be unconscious. Can one be in pain, but not be conscious of feeling the pain? Such a state seems to make no sense.

Yet the issue of unconscious emotions is not so simple as to lend itself to an absolute either-or answer. Consider the extensively studied phenomena of emotional intelligence.[6] As one of the key qualities of emotional intelligence, there appear to be individual differences regarding a person's ability to recognize and identify the particular emotions he or she is experiencing at the moment. As such, there are among humans degrees of awareness (or self-awareness) regarding their current emotional states. A person may be angry and yet not be clearly or decidedly conscious of this emotional state. People can either ignore (even volitionally), or not pay much attention to the emotions they are experiencing. As such, there are degrees of conscious clarity regarding what emotions are occurring at a particular moment, and moreover, there is variability regarding how well a person understands and recognizes how their emotional states are influencing their thinking and behavior. All in all, in considering emotions, the separation between consciousness and the unconscious is blurry, coming in degrees. One can be marginally conscious or attentively conscious of one's emotions.

As introduced above, there is the issue of whether we can voluntarily or purposefully control our emotions. For example, can we control (or change) our emotional states through our thoughts? Based on the cognitive theory of emotions and associated Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavioral psychotherapies, it appears that through changing both our thinking and behavioral habits we can control and transform the content and flow of our emotional consciousness. Keeping in mind that altering our emotional states (though either thought or behavior) is a difficult and challenging psychological process, it does appear that such volitional control of emotions can be realized to various degrees of success. For example, as I discuss in my book Future Consciousness, happiness as a general emotional state of consciousness (or being) is an accomplishment; one can purposefully evolve our emotional consciousness.[7] Although as a key component in such potential volitional control we need to be able to clearly recognize and identify the emotional states we are currently experiencing (rather than to deny or suppress them), we do not simply have emotions (as if we are passive victims of our emotions), but we can learn how to guide and transform them.

Although emotions first arise in perceptual-behavioral engagement with the current or present environment, we can have emotions about both the remembered past and the anticipated future (the latter constituting the emotional dimension of future consciousness). As stated at the beginning of this section on emotion and motivation, emotion involves the feeling of what is happening, as well as the feeling of what has happened and the feeling of what may happen. For example, sadness and regret can be experienced regarding remembered past events, and fear can pertain to anticipated negative future events and hope pertains to anticipated positive future events. As such, emotional consciousness colors the entire temporal span of consciousness, of past, present, and future.

Another important feature of emotion is its interpersonal dimension. We often experience interpersonal conscious resonance with emotional states in others. We can

---

[6] *Wikipedia: Emotional Intelligence* - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emotional_intelligence.

[7] Lombardo, *Future Consciousness*, Chapter Ten.

sympathize or empathize with how others are feeling. Emotions can even be thought of as contagious. Being around others who are happy can (and often does) provoke happiness in us. Being around angry or depressed individuals can provoke anger or depression in us. As I argued earlier, consciousness is not an entirely private first-person reality, and this public dimension of consciousness is strongly apparent in emotional consciousness. We perceive, and often in resonance, experience the emotions of people around us. Emotions can be intersubjective realities.

Consistent with the above points, emotions can be taught and shaped. In our psychological development, we are taught emotional terminology and our teachers (including parents, elders, peers, and social authorities) identify for us which emotions we are currently manifesting. Moreover, people are taught to engage in different emotions, for example, to be happy or depressed, often through the simple fact of the "teachers" recurrently manifesting such emotions in the presence of those individuals being influenced and taught. Emotions are contagious. Bringing the cognitive dimension of emotion into the picture, we are taught by others (parents, teachers, and friends) that life and the world is something to feel justifiably (with reason and evidence) happy about, or angry and depressed about. Philosophies of life do not simply provide cognitive frameworks of understanding (the Apollonian side of consciousness), they also prime and energize particular emotional dispositions toward our living existence (the Romantic-Dionysian side of consciousness).

The Connection of Emotion and Motivation

Humans and animals are both emotional and motivational conscious beings, and just as emotion is a primordial form of consciousness occurring in animals, motivational consciousness is also a primitive and basic form of experience existing in animals. Indeed, motivation and emotion as conscious realities are intimately connected in fundamental ways. Emotions can motivate; that is, emotions can be motives. For example, fear or anger can provoke or instigate distinctive types of behavior. (Discussed above) But also, emotions are often concomitantly experienced when an animal or human is in a state of motivational consciousness and motivated behavior. In approaching a desirable or attractive object or feature of the environment, we may feel joy or love. In general, both emotions and motivational states of consciousness have a feeling dimension associated with them; emotions and motives are consciously felt.

Defining Motivation and the Dimension of Desire

A motive can be defined as the cause or reason of behavior. Motives are a postulated psychological (and often conscious) reality used to explain behavior. An animal hunts because it is hungry (the motive); a human socializes and interacts with other humans because he or she *desires* friendship or social recognition (the motive). Motives, though, can also be proposed as a way to explain the content and directional flow of consciousness. A person may engage in conscious thoughtful planning because they desire to purchase a house, win a baseball game, or earn a salary raise. In general, motivation is a central psychological concept that involves identifying the

causes, aspirations, and purposeful goals of conscious humans and animals and their behavior.

The term "motive" is used to refer to the (consciously felt) desires, wants, values, and needs causing (or instigating) behavior. I placed "consciously felt" in parentheses because it is plausible—having been proposed by depth psychologists and others—that motives may be unconscious. (See discussion below.) But desires and wants, as motives, often have distinctive conscious feelings (as do emotions). Hunger or thirst have distinctive conscious feelings, but so do revenge or love (as motives). In general, motivational psychology is about "What people and animals want and value and why and how such wants and values determine behavior."[8]

Conceived as a state of desire or wanting, a motive energizes (impetus propelling) behavior and the flow of consciousness. Understood as a state of conscious arousal, such as in the "Drive-Reduction" theory of motivation, the intent of motivated behavior is to reduce the arousal state. But whether the goal of behavior is to reduce an arousal state, motives as states of desire energize and arouse humans and animals. In this sense of motivation, a motive is an antecedent/concurrent cause of behavior (or flow of consciousness) instigating and propelling action (and/or thinking).

Motivation as Purpose

The concept of motivation is also integrally connected with the concept of purpose. Purpose is defined as "intention, aim, or goal." Behavior and the flow of consciousness is often directed toward the achievement of goals or ends. As noted earlier, much of human and animal behavior is purposeful in this sense. A motive refers to the intended goal or direction of behavior (and as applicable the flow of consciousness).

Because motives have the distinctive dimension of purpose, motives as purposes have a future-directional quality or future reference. Purposeful behavior and consciousness is directed toward the realization (achievement) of some future state of affairs. Future consciousness—consciousness with reference to the future—at a primordial level is motivational consciousness, involving the key conscious quality of an affective or feeling dimension. In its primordial form, future consciousness is the felt desire to purposefully achieve future goals.

Referring back to my earlier argument that purposeful behavior is one of the key and primordial forms of consciousness to emerge in animal evolution, I can add to that hypothesis that integral to conscious purposeful behavior is motivational consciousness energizing and directing such behavior. Motivational consciousness, which is felt as well as cognitively articulated, is the conscious cause and aspiration behind purposeful behavior. Animals act with purpose, and that purpose is a felt motivational conscious state.

Synthesizing the above two main features of motivation—energizing desires and purpose—we can define motivation as "The energized and purposeful intent and effort to satisfy wants and desires through the achievement of goals….motivation, as purpose, identifies a future goal or intent, and as a current energizes force, propels us

---

[8] See Lombardo, *Future Consciousness, Chapter Eleven-Motivation*.

toward that goal or intent. All in all, most behavior and a good deal of the flow of consciousness is motivated and purposeful.

Motivation: A Psycho-Physiological Gestalt

Motivation is a psycho-physiological Gestalt, involving a desire-feeling dimension; an emotional dimension; a pleasure-pain dimension; a cognitive (which can include thought) dimension; a bodily arousal and proprioceptual dimension; a perceptual dimension; a dimension of goal-directed purposeful behavior; and a valence and value dimension. To review each of these dimensions:

As described above, motivational consciousness frequently involves consciously felt desires and wants, covering the range of hunger, thirst, and sexual desire to love, ambition, and the need for friendship and companionship.

Also, as described above, motives often have accompanying conscious emotions—what emotions we may feel in states of motivational consciousness and engaged purposeful behavior—and emotions can, in fact, be conscious motives, such as fear motivating avoidance or escape behavior, or love motivating approach behavior.

As discussed in the previous section on emotion, one popular theory of motivation is the hedonic theory: Animals and humans are motivated to maximize and approach pleasurable realities and avoid and escape from painful realities. Motivated behavior, especially if we conceptualize it as either approach or avoidance behaviors, is associated with feelings of pleasure and pain. We may anticipate pleasure from our actions; we may anticipate the reduction of pain from our actions. The emotional version of this theory is that we are motivated to seek and maximize pleasurable emotions and avoid and minimize painful emotions. We seek happiness and love, and avoid fear, anxiety, and sadness. In general, motivational consciousness often has a hedonic feeling dimension.

Motives in humans often get consciously articulated and developed as thoughts and associated imagery. Motives can include rationalizations and reasons regarding why the desired identified goal is valuable and good. We imagine and think about both our goals and planned actions for achieving our goals. Motives can be through thought and inner directed reasoning intentionally developed and strengthened. Feelings of pleasure and pain are often fused with such thoughts and imagery.

As noted above, motivational consciousness includes states of bodily arousal. There are often proprioceptual features to such bodily states, including feelings of muscular tension and excited readiness for action.

Perceptual consciousness is an important dimension in motivational consciousness. Through perception we identify objects of desire and value. But also, perceived objects can provoke conscious desires; appetizing food, for example, can trigger off feelings of hunger. The perception of hideous, ugly, or repugnant realities can provoke avoidance and escape directed motivated behavior.

Although purposeful behavior (and habits of behavior) can be seen as serving the function of achieving goals and satisfying desires, purposeful behaviors and habits of behavior can become motives in and of themselves. We can develop positive and negative addictions to certain modes of behavior. Our motivation may simply be to exercise the habit. We may start physical exercising with the goal to become healthier

or lose weight, but exercising may become intrinsically motivating—we learn to enjoy and find pleasurable the behavior of exercising. Motives can be strengthened through practicing the relevant motivated behavior.

Values, inclusive of ideals, standards, ethics, and moral principles, motivate consciousness and behavior. Values identify desirable or preferable goals of living and behavior; values energize and direct purposeful behavior. Values are frequently cognitively articulated and rationalized, but often have emotional and feeling dimensions as well. Values, as motives, include justice and fairness, honesty and truth, autonomy and self-determination, beauty and courage, and other ethical principles. People engage in purposeful behaviors to realize such values.

All the above factors, as features of the holistic Gestalt of motivational consciousness and purposeful behavior, are interdependent and interactive—desires affecting thoughts, thoughts affecting desires, desires affecting behaviors and vice versa, emotions arising in motivated behaviors and at times instigating such behaviors, and so forth.

Types of Motives

Especially if we consider human motivational consciousness, there appear to be huge number of different motives that can energize and direct human behavior and the flow of consciousness. As just a representative sampling, the diversity of human motives include: survival, hunger, thirst, urination and defecation, sexual desire, the desire for rest and relaxation, hope and fear, achievement and excellence, fame and popularity, ethical and moral ideals, conquest and power, destruction, wealth and luxury, love, concern and compassion for others, helping and benefiting others, protection of self and others, nurturance, the desire for friendship, companionship, and belonging, safety and security, peace and stability, self-esteem and enhancement of self-image, self-actualization and self-transformation, curiosity/discovery/learning/the acquisition of knowledge and understanding, excitement and adventure, entertainment and play, meaning in life, reverence and worship, anger and revenge, to contribute to the improvement of the human condition, and the pursuit of wisdom and enlightenment.

Motivation: Other Key Themes and Theoretical Perspectives

This section reviews a number of additional central features of motivation and motivational consciousness and examines a number of significant theories of motivation.

An experienced motivational desire can vary in intensity from weak to strong. We may feel intensely motivated, or weakly motivated to achieving some goal; we may feel highly aroused and passionate, or mildly aroused and lukewarm or anywhere in between.

Experienced motivational arousal (for a particular motive) can intensify or dissipate, the latter often occurring if a motivational desire or want is momentarily satisfied. (But see below on drive-reduction versus drive-induction theories of motivation.) At different times in the ongoing flow of consciousness, different motives—with associated

experienced desires—can come to dominate consciousness. Throughout the period of diurnal consciousness an ongoing sequential stream of experienced motives with associated patterns of purposeful behaviors emerge and dissipate, sometimes satisfied, sometimes not. Just as experienced emotions fluctuate and change in the flow of consciousness, so do experiential desires. The complexity and richness in the flow of diverse behaviors in human life reflect the sequential complexity of different motives coming to the forefront of consciousness.

Fluctuations and transformations in dominate experienced desires can be tied to the phenomena of biological rhythms; motivational states can be rhythmic, such as in hunger, thirst, and the need for rest. We may feel rhythmic variation in the experienced desires for rest and calm and stimulation and activity.

Motives can be relatively short-term versus long-term in felt conscious intensity, conscious importance, and influence on thinking and behavior. Desires can be quickly and easily satisfied, or may involve long-term sustained purposeful behavior to be be fulfilled. In this regard, humans frequently develop certain dominant motives that persist in influence and importance throughout extended periods of their lives. Different central motives may dominate different periods in life. Humans can develop a deep purpose in their lives, involving a psychologically holistic long-term directionality and purpose in their actions and focus of consciousness.[9] (See the discussion on master motives below; one or more master motives can emerge in psychological development.)

Motives are sometimes distinguished between basic physiological-biological motives and social-psychological motives, such as hunger, thirst, and sex versus self-esteem, companionship, and compassion. But this distinction reflects a dualistic perspective—of body versus mind—and upon examination, the supposed biological motives usually contain psycho-social elements and conversely the supposed psycho-social motives usually contain biological features.

There is the related motivational theory that distinguishes between primordial and advanced motives and this theory is applied to both animal-human evolution and human development. Building on a fundamental foundation of primitive survival needs, new motives emerge as we trace the evolution of animals from simpler to more advanced creatures. In human psychological development, presumably new motives emerge as we trace the development of humans from infancy to adulthood. Maslow presented in his famous hierarchal (pyramid) theory of motivation a system of classification system of motives starting from basic physiological needs at the bottom of the pyramid, and through higher levels such as security, safety, and self-esteem, reaching upon at the top of the pyramid to self-actualization as the highest motive, which may or may not manifest itself in the development of individual humans. Wilber presents a developmental sequence from egocentric motivation to Kosmocentric motivation—an expansion in sphere of concern. Yet, as least regarding Maslow's theory, advanced conscious qualities can develop for what he identifies as primordial motives. Sex and hunger, for example, can evolve across individual human development into highly complex motives, consciously and behaviorally, involving learning, elaborate cognitions, aesthetics, skills, and psychological-social refinements.

---

[9] Lombardo, *Future Consciousness*, pp. 477-483.

Related to the primordial versus advanced distinction in motivation, it has been proposed that certain motives are instinctual and other motives are learned. But the counter-argument is that all motives can elements of both the instinctual (genetic) and the learned.

As discussed earlier, the motivational polarity between approach and avoidance has been proposed as a basic division between two fundamental types of motives. Avoidance (or escape) motivation is driven by fear, anxiety, and pain reduction and involves behaviors directed toward eliminating or avoiding certain aversive/undesirable objects or states of consciousness. Approach motivation is driven by hope, curiosity, and the anticipation of pleasure and involves behaviors directed toward connecting with a desirable object or achieving a desirable state of consciousness. Approach versus avoidance motivation is connected to the basic conscious polarity of pleasure versus pain and associated with the hedonic theory of motivation. This distinction though can be questioned: Perhaps all motivated behaviors involve both approach and avoidance/escape—there is always something we are attempting to move toward and always something we are attempting to move away from in motivated behavior. Still, we can plausibly argue that there is a distinctive difference between a conscious state that focuses upon realizing a positive state of affairs versus avoiding or escaping from a negative state of affairs. Put otherwise, is motivational consciousness dominated by hopeful anticipation of pleasure versus being dominated by fearful anticipation of pain.

A related motivational polarity is between optimism versus pessimism. Are expectations of the future more dominated by anticipation of the negative versus anticipation of the positive? Motivational states of consciousness can be dominated more by expectations of things going wrong versus expectations of things going right. Optimism and pessimism are associated with the contrary psychological states of perceived self-efficacy versus perceived helplessness. Optimists feel more self-efficacious (believe they can achieve goals), whereas pessimists feel more helpless (believe they are incapable of achieving goals). Optimism is associated more with growth and approach, whereas pessimism is associated more with survive, protect against, and avoid. Optimism amplifies motivational states of consciousness; pessimism and helplessness dampen motivational conscious states, often generating the emotional-behavioral states of depression and sadness.

Maslow also distinguished between deficiency versus growth motivation. The former type of motivation involving the elimination of an undesirable state (a deficiency) versus the latter involving the addition or accrual of some new reality, conscious or environmental. The former type of motivated behavior returns the animal or human to a satiated state, the latter changes or transforms the basic state of consciousness. This distinction is conceptually connected with the escape/avoidance versus approach distinction. Growth is approach; deficiency is escape/avoid. Maslow identified the basic biological needs in his pyramid with deficiency motives, whereas he saw self-actualization at the top of the pyramid as a growth motive.

Another proposed basic motivational polarity is between stability (including homeostatic) motivation and change (including growth) motivation. I discussed in previous chapters the power of stability motivation (inclusive of survival) in human motivation and action; the weaving together of stability and change in the dynamics of nature and the cosmos; and the phenomena of evolution and purposeful evolution,

which entail change and transformation in nature and human affairs. In my mind, both stability and change are powerful forces in human motivation, and probably reflect the basic necessary inclusion of both these forces in nature. Humans desire both. Indeed, it has been proposed that either factor carried to an extreme in human affairs becomes aversive. Too much stability generates boredom and malaise; too much change generates anxiety and confusion. People ideally seek a balance of the two factors in human life, although there are probably individual and cultural differences in preference for one factor over the other. Although homeostasis has been proposed as the master or foundational motive in living creatures (see discussion of master motives below), it seems to me that this view is too one-sided. Life pursues change as well as stability, the former fueling the evolutionary process. There is the adage "Grow or die," which would imply that stability, in the sense of survival and perpetuation, actually requires change to be maintained. The converse is true as well; change (and growth) require a certain amount of stability. Change and stability are psychological and motivational reciprocities.

Another polarity that has emerged in psychological thinking and research on motivation is between "Drive/Arousal Reduction" theory and "Drive/Arousal Induction" theory. Do animals and humans act to reduce and eliminate states of arousal, seeking and desiring calm and quiescence? Or do animals and humans (at least some of the time) seek stimulation and excitation? Perhaps the answer is both; perhaps animals and humans seek a balance of the two states, in line with the natural bio-rhythm of rest and activity?

One particular implication regarding these two different views on motivation concerns the question of whether the satisfaction of a desire through some particular behavior produces a reduction and weakening in the inclination/motivation to perform that behavior again—an implication of "Drive-Reduction" theory—or does the satisfaction of a desire through behavior actually strengthen and intensify the motivation to perform that behavior again? Does eating, for example, decrease the desire to eat, or does it intensify it? Perhaps, in the short run it may do the former, but contrarily, in the longer run it may do the latter. From the Drive-Induction perspective, engaging in a certain motivated behavior may actually stimulate the desire to engage in that behavior more. We could even argue that sometimes engaging in the motivated behavior becomes motivating in itself. We may eat because we are hungry, but eating may become motivating in itself. Eating becomes self-motivating. Engaging in the purposeful behavior becomes the goal of the purposeful behavior.

Another important theoretical issue in thinking about motivation is whether there can be unconscious motives. Can our behavior be motivated by reasons or desires of which we are not conscious? Freud proposed that there exists unconscious motives for behavior. He suggested two primary motives, Eros (the life instinct) and Thanatos (the death instinct) and these underlying causes of behavior operate below the surface of consciousness instigating and directing the flow of behavior and consciousness. Freud's postulated "id," the source of our fundamental biological desires, exist at an unconscious level influencing and directing our conscious behavior. Moreover, for Freud, there may exist—usually does exist—psychologically charged repressed memories and feelings existing in the unconscious that powerfully influence the content and direction of consciousness. All in all, it is plausible that we may not be

clearly aware of what motives are driving our conscious thinking and behavior. In my previous discussion of emotion I noted that our capacity to clearly identify what emotions we are feeling can vary or come in degrees; the same can be true regarding our conscious clarity of what motives are directing our behavior. In this regard, I suggested that the line between consciousness and unconscious psychological phenomena may be blurry; there exists degrees of clarity of consciousness.

Another significant phenomena in motivation is motivational conflict. Two or more different motives (including values) can conflict with or oppose each other in consciousness and directing the flow of behavior. We can experience conflicting desires or be conscious of conflicting values in our decision making regarding what actions to execute. Motivational consciousness is not necessarily a unified or harmonious reality; indeed, the overall content of consciousness is not necessarily a unified and consistent whole. The theory of cognitive dissonance proposes that humans find inner psychological conflicts and contradictions an aversive or unpleasant conscious state and we will act or think in ways to eliminate or reduce the experienced oppositional tension in our consciousness.

In considering major factors that influence motivational consciousness and motivated purposeful behavior it is essential to include social-cultural and interpersonal dimensions and variables. Cultures and societies emphasize and reinforce various central values, norms, and aspirations, and these motivating collective ideals are selectively taught, monitored, and enforced in the psychological development and ways of life of the members of the culture and society. Certain goals and values are treated as critical and essential to being an acceptable and functioning member of the society; individuals within the social collective should aspire toward these goals and values. Indeed, the social ideal is not simply to have people behave in accordance with the society's key values, but for the members to actually consciously desire to pursue these values. Fundamental values and ideals can vary among cultures. For example, it appears that Eastern cultures value and reinforce conformity more, whereas Western cultures value and reinforce individual expression more. Differences in central motives guiding and structuring human consciousness and behavior will reflect such differences in key cultural values. If we follow the rough distinction between biological-innate motives and social-learned motives, than the values taught and enforced in a particular society are social-learned motives. One though can argue that certain fundamental social motives, such as the desire for belongingness and the desire to be loved and valued as individuals, are built into the innate biological foundation of human motivation.

Just as the interpersonal ecology of human conscious existence supports a rich and complex array of human emotions, our interpersonal reality encompasses and supports a huge array of different motives that impact and influence our social interactions and relationships. With respect to other humans we may feel the desires to form friendships; achieve romance and sexual relations; establish cooperative relationships and mutual agreements; achieve mutual understanding; engage in competition; enact revenge and retribution; nurture and protect significant others (family, offspring, and friends); show admiration or distain; teach and educate or learn from others; resolve or create conflicts; and control or influence the behavior and thinking of others. A huge

portion of our motivated behavior and motivational consciousness involves purposefully influencing and structuring our interpersonal relationships.

One final key issue in understanding motivational consciousness and purposeful behavior is the question of whether there is one (or a select few) master motive determining and directing consciousness and behavior. (We can compare this issue with the previously addressed question of whether there are a fundamental set of basic emotions.) The master motive argument is that all the different motives are actually expressions and manifestations of a core motive (or small set of basic motives). Different theories have been proposed regarding what is the master motive (or motives) of all human behavior. Aristotle believed that the pursuit of happiness is central to human thinking and behavior; Nietzsche proposed that power is the master motive; Freud proposed two master motives: Creation (Eros) and destruction (Thanatos), which respectively align with the complementary natural processes of evolution and entropy; Jung, on the other hand, saw the aspiration toward psychological wholeness and unity as primary in human existence; perhaps the two master motives, complementary in nature, are to establish and maintain individual distinctiveness and conversely to strive toward togetherness and immersion into the grand whole of things; the Hedonistic theory states that the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance/escape from pain are the two primary motives; Damasio, following a biological and physiological informed perspective, has argued that homeostasis is the primary motive; analogously, we could argue that balance is what drives us in everything (this view connects with Jung's theory); the psychotherapist Carl Rogers proposed that self-actualization (the realization of our psychological potentials) is the central driving force of human behavior and consciousness; and finally, referring back to earlier discussions, perhaps the complementary (or opposing) drives toward stability and change (growth) are the two master motives. All these different theories can be seen as possessing plausible and credible reasons for their validity, and reviewing over the list above, there are various ways in which the theories can be combined and integrated. But all in all, grappling with the question of a master motive is directly relevant to understanding what fundamentally drives human motivational consciousness and forms the core of human nature.

Motivation and Emotion: Evolution and Ecology

The central issue regarding the (future) purposeful evolution of consciousness can be framed as determining what should be the key conscious motives (including values) driving and directing our consciousness and behavior in the future. Since motivational psychology explores the reasons and causes behind our behavior and the flow of our consciousness, identifying our key motives in the future of our consciousness gets at the core of how we envision our consciousness in the future and what fundamental ideals we should strive toward in our future purposeful evolution.

Since emotion is an essential feature of human consciousness and directly contributes into the set of motives that drive motivational consciousness and purposeful behavior, the future evolution of emotional consciousness is a critical factor in addressing the future of consciousness. Indeed, it may be non-sensical to think

about the future of consciousness without bringing in emotion; there is no consciousness without feeling and emotion.

In the above discussion a variety of points have been presented regarding the essential evolutionary and ecological nature of emotion and motivation. In both cases, each of these conscious phenomena is best understood as psycho-physiological Gestalts involving bodily states and feelings, environmental factors, perceptual and behavioral components, thinking and cognitive factors, and values and ideals. Moreover, both emotion and motivation appear to manifest an evolutionary history and foundation, as well as an individual-developmental history. Hence, emotional and motivational consciousness align with the general thesis that consciousness is an evolutionary and ecological phenomenon.