Michael Teachings

Ton Haarmans · Wide Open Windows



I first encountered the **Michael Teachings** in the early nineteen-nineties, not as a belief system but as a peculiar typology. It presented itself as a detailed map of personality: roles, modes, goals, fears, attitudes, cycles. At the time, the material circulated primarily through books and early websites, often framed as messages from a non-physical “entity” called Michael. I never

found that origin story convincing. Whatever its source, what interested me was not where the system supposedly came from, but what it did.

It offered a way of seeing people, situations, and oneself through a structured lens. Experience became legible. Character acquired internal geometry. Behaviour was no longer random, but patterned. The system did not merely describe personalities; it generated a world in which personalities appeared as structured configurations rather than accidental accumulations of traits.

This is the sense in which the Michael Teachings matter to me: not as metaphysics, but as a world-forming model.

A world-forming model does not simply interpret experience; it reorganizes it. It installs distinctions that begin to function as perceptual habits. It teaches you what to notice, what to ignore, how to read others, and how to read yourself. After sustained exposure, you no longer “apply” the model. You inhabit it.

In the Michael Teachings, people do not merely have tendencies; they occupy defined roles. They do not merely act; they operate from modes. They do not merely desire; they pursue goals. Fear itself is formatted into recognizable patterns. Inner life becomes populated

by named functions that can be observed, compared, discussed. Everyday interaction slowly acquires the texture of a structured field.

This is where such a system derives its persuasive power. It does not convince primarily through argument, but through experiential traction. You recognize yourself in it. You recognize others. It produces moments of sudden legibility. Conflicts soften into configurations. Confusions acquire a shape. Personality stops being opaque and becomes navigable.

The gain is real. I still consider the psychological side of the Michael material to be its strongest dimension. It invites a kind of non-moral self-observation. Instead of framing traits as virtues or flaws, it frames them as structural orientations. This can release a great deal of unnecessary self-violence. One’s patterns are not mistakes; they are formats. Other people’s differences are not obstructions; they are configurations.

But world-forming models never only illuminate. They also delimit.

Every typology produces a horizon. By articulating certain distinctions, it simultaneously renders others invisible. By stabilizing meaning, it reduces ambiguity. The Michael Teachings create a world in which personality is primary, legible, and internally articulated. This makes some forms of self-inquiry easier. It also makes other questions harder to ask.

The most consequential structuring move in the Michael system is not its personality typology, but its developmental metaphysics. It frames lives within an arc of “soul age,” a hierarchical sequence through which consciousness is said to evolve across incarnations. This is where the system ceases to be merely descriptive and begins to legislate a cosmic order.

Here the world it forms becomes stratified.

Development introduces rank. Rank introduces implicit valuation. Valuation quietly reorganizes perception. Certain concerns become “early.” Others become “late.” Certain preoccupations become “immature.” Others “refined.” The system begins to distribute existential weight unevenly.

This is not a theoretical problem. It is a lived one.

Over time I became less interested in whether “soul age” was true than in what the model itself was doing. Not “is this true?”, but “what kind of world does this produce?” What kinds of selves flourish here? What kinds of questions recede? What kinds of authority emerge? What kinds of experiences become meaningful?

Seen this way, the Michael Teachings appear not as a doctrine, but as an experiential environment. They generate a particular way of inhabiting social space,

inner space, and time. They format difference into types. They format difficulty into features. They format biography into trajectory.

They also format attention.

And here is the move I still find worth saving, once the hierarchy is removed. What the Teachings call “soul age” can be read more soberly as a difference in focus: the region of life where a person’s gravity tends to gather, and where most of their drama, meaning, and urgency is generated. I keep the phenomenon, but I drop the ladder. I call this, overleaf, “focus.”

People are not absorbed by the same region of life. For some, the central drama revolves around relationship. For others, around achievement. For others, around survival. For others, around moral positioning. For others still, around existential coherence.

Different lives are organized around different gravitational centres. Certain questions repeat themselves. Certain tensions recur. Certain situations feel charged while others barely register. One does not simply “have interests.” One inhabits a world that continually regenerates a particular class of problems.

What matters here is not whether these foci are innate or contingent. What matters is that they function as world-generators. They determine what shows up as

relevant, urgent, or even real. They distribute emotional weight. They shape what counts as progress, crisis, or resolution.

This insight does not require souls, lifetimes, or hierarchies. It only requires the recognition that experience does not arrive neutrally. It arrives organized.

Systems like the Michael Teachings demonstrate that worlds are not found. They are formed. A model does not merely sit on top of experience. Given time, it rearranges what experience can be.

The question is not whether to adopt or reject such a system. The more fundamental question is whether one can learn to see it as a world rather than as reality.

Because once a system becomes reality, it stops being examinable. It stops being optional. It stops being visible as a format.

To study a world-forming model is to hold it differently: not as an explanation of what is, but as a demonstration of how easily what is becomes something. And how powerfully it then lives us.

For me, this world began, quite concretely, with one book: Messages From Michael by Chelsea Quinn Yarbro. Not as a source of truth, but as the object through which this particular format of experience first entered.